DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 952 JC 740 446

AUTHOR	Handleman, Chester
TITLE	Academic Grade Inflation at Broward Community College.
PUB DATE	23 Jun 74
NOTE	37p.; Practicum submitted to Nova University in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education degree
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Academic Standards; *College Students; *Community Colleges; *Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; Post Secondary Education; Practicums
IDENTIFIERS	*Broward Community College; Florida

ABSTRACT

This practicum examines the phenomenon of academic grade inflation which has occurred in recent years in many two- and four-year institutions of higher education. After a review of the literature, possible grade inflation at Broward Community College in Fort Lauderdale, Florida is examined. The research clearly indicates that very significant grade inflation has taken place at the college, both in the Social Science Division, in particular, and in the college at large. Many reasons why this has occurred are indicated. Recommendations are made that student grading conform more closely with academic achievement, and explanations of why this should be done are offered. At the same time, allowance and accommodation for the underprepared student are recognized. Limited innovative teaching techniques are suggested in order to help such students, including individualized instructions. Perhaps a no-fail or pass-fail evaluation system might be in order. The public demands that students achieve academically if they are to receive academic credentials to that effect. (Author/DB)

ACADEMIC GRADE INFLATION AT BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

EDUCATIONAL POLICY SYSTEMS PRACTICUM

by

Chester Handleman, Ed.M., M.A.

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Nova University

June 23, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRACTICUM ABSTRACT

ACADEMIC GRADE INFLATION AT BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

This practicum has examined the phenomenon of academic grade inflation, which has occurred in recent years in many two and four-year institutions of higher education. Some critics argue that such a development is not a serious problem: that many underprepared students cannot achieve academically as do traditional students anyway. Therefore, it is claimed, such students should be encouraged by receiving passing grades even though they do not achieve academically. The concept that "success encourages success" is an important factor in this position. Educational innovators like K. Patricia Cross sometimes follow this line of argument; but even she opposes giving non-achieving and underprepared students credentials simply to increase their socio-economic position.

Those who oppose the above liberalized grading systems argue that since the world is a competitive place, students should prepare for it by being graded according to their real academic achievement, regardless of their previous disadvantaged or underprepared status. This practicum, after reviewing the literature and finding that academic grade inflation has indeed occurred in recent years in many institutions of higher education, examines possible grade inflation at Broward Community College in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Research clearly indicates that very significant grade inflation has taken place, both in the Social Science Division in particular and in the

college at large. Many reasons are indicated as to why this has occurred.

Recommendations are made to make student grading conform more closely with academic achievement, and explanations are offered why this should be done. At the same time, allowance and accommodation for the underprepared student are recognized. Limited innovative teaching techniques are suggested in order to help such students -- including individualized instruction. Perhaps a no-fail or pass-fail evaluation system might be in order. Other recommendations for change are made. Yet such changes must not be allowed to erode academic standards. The public demands that students achieve academically if they are to receive academic credentials to that effect.

ACADEMIC GRADE INFLATION AT BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION

In recent years it has become evident at many institutions of higher education, and especially at community colleges, that academic grade inflation, or the tendency of instructors to grade students higher than their work warrants, has become a fact of life. Traditionally, and as recently as barely a decade ago, a C grade was considered average. The situation now is quite different. So many A's and B's are today being given that educators who have studied the phenomenon claim that the average grade in many institutions is B. This tendency has apparently occurred not because college students are more capable than in earlier years or that they study harder. Indeed the reverse may be true, since college entrance examination scores are lower today than in previous years. The Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey reports that college admissions scores are 15 percent lower than they were ten years ago.[1]

The Miami Herald interviewed several officials from Florida's institutions of higher education and found a number of explanations for the recent grade inflation.[2] Dr. Robert Mautz, Chancellor of Florida's nine-university system, is concerned with this development, and has asked academic leaders to study it. Others theorize that the state of the economy is largely to blame; that the drop in the

number of college students has caused instructors to grade more leniently in order that further erosion in enrollments might be reduced. Still others claim that the recent emphasis on student evaluations of instructors has intimidated the latter so that they give higher grades. Others yet claim that grades should not be punitive; that everyone should be given an opportunity to succeed; that a student's failure simply encourages him to repeat such failure. Many argue that so-called disadvantaged or underprepared students should receive special consideration in grading.

Whatever the reasons for the more liberal grading systems today, there can be little doubt that Broward Community College in Fort Lauderdale, Florida and some of its neighboring two and four-year institutions are following this same practice. An examination of the percentage of A's given at BCC in 1969, for example, shows 11.8 percent of all grades in that category. In 1973, however, the percentage had risen to 17.2. The percentage increase of "A" grades at nearby Miami-Dade Community College has been even more startling: from 13.2 percent in 1969 to 26.5 percent in 1973.[3] The increases in this category for Florida Atlantic University for corresponding years has gone from 17.6 to 25.1 percent; the University of Miami from 18.6 to 24.1 percent; and the University of Florida from 21.6 to 28.2 percent.[4]

The purpose of this practicum is to ascertain to what extent "academic grade inflation" has occurred in the decade between

1963-1964 and 1973-1974, and especially from 1968-1969 to 1973-1974. Also, recommendations will be suggested concerning the significance of this tendency and how it might be dealt with at BCC.

The general problem of grade inflation has become quite serious in recent years; some critics maintain that the practice, if continued, may threaten academic standards and even the very foundation of higher education. Others claim that it is not a serious threat and can be reasonably expected to occur in these days of "open admissions" and innovative teaching techniques. The latter group asks for increased consideration for the disadvantaged, underprepared and heterogeneous student populations and for changing educational philosophies, which tend to reduce the importance of grades.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Keith R. St. Onge, a departmental chairman at Southern Illinois University, writing in Change, is quite concerned with the tendency toward grade inflation. He notes the broad attack on traditional grading, which argues that the use of grades is "bad" because poor grades lead to the conclusion that some students have learned nothing when apparently they have.[5] According to such misguided critics, says St. Onge,"to fail students is bad because it reduces enrollments." He argues:

> The entire retinue of contemporary academic adaptations...--student-run colloquia, proficiency tests, credits for on-the-job training,

> selective and even total exemption of certain students (often potentially the best) from general education--all argue strongly that many students are poor and/or incompetent scholars.[6]

St. Onge is especially critical of the practice of students evaluating instructors, claiming that this practice intimidates teachers into giving out higher grades than are earned. Says St. Onge:

> It [student evaluations of instructors] is a fraud perpetrated on students and ourselves to support the delusion that teaching is being evaluated. Students undoubtedly derive some gratification from registering their impressions on unlovable instructors, demanding and uncompliant instructors, aging and less "with it" instructors. Such exercise could be a useful catharsis for the students, but they should not be deluded into thinking they are evaluating teaching.
>
> This (student evaluations of teaching] would be a victory of the uninformed over the informed, even of the stupid over the intelligent, resulting in a new tyranny of the incompetent over the competent.[7]

On the other hand, George Benston claims that the practice of students evaluating their instructors is a useful one, and does not necessarily cause grade inflation.[8] He claims that it is not true that the students value entertainment, easy courses, and the physically-attractive professors. He maintains that students show little respect for the "easy" teacher and that they show no objection to working hard in worthwhile courses.[9]

Yet research by Robert W. Powell, Professor of Psychology at the University of South Florida, shows exactly opposite findings

compared with Benston, especially concerning academic grad inflation and student evaluations of instructors. He points out that evaluations of professors by students may be "worse than useless." Powell claims that he did some analysis of factors such as amount learned, stringency of grading, and student evaluations of his teaching. In reference to them he says:

> I receive much higher evaluations from stutents when they are required to do less work, receive higher grades and learn substantially less.
>
> Powell found that in the one section in which he employed a "lenient" grading policy, students gave him a high rating but learned significantly less. The students in the three other sections were graded on a stricter policy and they learned more but gave the professor a lower evaluation.[10]

The above examples give exactly opposing views of the influence of student evaluations of instructors and their influence upon grade inflation. Newsweek addresses itself to the phenomenon of grade inflation also, pointing out that "a number of educators are voicing concern over the rampant inflation of grades."[11] It points out that an unhappy consequence is causing graduate schools to dismiss the transcripts of their applicants as misleading; they are concentrating instead on test scores. Newsweek continues:

> Very few educators believe that grades are higher because students are smarter. "You know damn well they're not," scoffs Pierce Williams, chairman of the history department at Cornell University. "If anything, today they are even more functionally illiterate than they used to be..."

> "The schools aren't so anxious to flunk students out anymore," says the dean of one Southern university. "They need to help students to stay in business, so they're grading higher."[12]

Time claims that a major cause of grade inflation was the dissatisfaction with traditional marking during the 1960's. Schools like Hamilton College in upstate New York resisted grade inflation practices. But when graduate schools did not buy this explanation, Hamilton too has reluctantly allowed its strict grade distribution to slowly creep upward. Dean Stephen Kurtz of Hamilton wonders if the world no longer cares for quality anymore.[13]

Warren Bryan Martin, Vice-President of the Danforth Foundation, also deprecates the practice of grade inflation. He points out that the shortage of student enrollments has caused some faculty to resort to practices they know threaten their integrity. Martin says that they "jazz up classes, follow fads, relax requirements and coddle students." He explains that cynical students exploit this situation unmercifully"...:

> They can threaten to withdraw from a class that has a minimum FTE (where a certain enrollment is necessary for the class to "make)," insist on special arrangements regarding attendance, pare down reading lists, negotiate for grades. Some faculty feel intimidated.[14]

The above comments on grades are not made to overemphasize their importance in the classroom. Indeed, the well-known educator K. Patricia Cross (Beyond the Open Door) points out that in the community college, especially, partly because of the great variations in student abilities and socioeconomic backgrounds, an excessive

emphasis on grades may be harmful to the learning process. She believes, and rightly so, that higher education "should be open to all those able and willing to do work in the manner and form in which it is now offered." But even Cross, who represents the liberal position in issues such as "open admissions," and on accommodating all types of abilities and skills is not willing:

> to lower the standards of academic education in order to get credentials in the hands of the disadvantaged so that they can obtain the material and social benefits of society.[15]

Cross says that because of limited successes in the past we would do well "to give up our preoccupation with correcting the deficiencies of New Students, and concentrate instead on developing the new range of talents and interests they bring to higher education." She wishes to help move the New Student toward the development of his abilities; but not try to make him "a pale carbon copy of the academically elite of bygone days."

The above approach, of course, would tend to downgrade evaluation as it has previously been known; but Cross still speaks out for New Students' "reaching higher and higher standards of performance."[16] In any event, Cross apparently would to some degree solve the grade inflation problem concerning new students by avoiding it or modifying it. She does speak out for tailoring academic programs for the student rather than the reverse. Her well-known volume Beyond the Open Door does make a good case for certain curriculum "alternatives," and perhaps these may very well be useful in tailoring

a college experience for "New Learners" with limited academic skills and abilities. They usually include non-traditional evaluation techniques, which have a "no-threat" approach.

This year the University of Florida reported that 28.2 percent of its grades were A's compared with only 17 percent seven years ago. Yet this year's students were testably less able, according to the Educational Testing Service, than those of 1967.[17] At the University of Miami, a private institution which has dropped by almost 2,000 in enrollment in recent years, the pattern is the same. The eventual dismissal point has dropped while the Dean's List has grown.[18] In 1970, 19.5 percent of UM's 11,020 undergraduates had grade point averages below C. But last fall only 15.2 percent of 9,162 students were in that category. To compound the problem, the average scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) of entering UM students had dropped about 20 points out of a possible 1600 in recent years.[19]

Sue Holmes, a UM researcher, speculated that professors may feel forced to be relative about grading and, therefore, reduce standards because of economic and enrollment factors. Dr. Sidney I. Desvinick, Associate Academic Dean at UM, suggested that professors are afraid of students. He explained that during the militancy of the late 1960's students began to challenge grades and to ask professors to justify giving a C rather than a B or an A. Professors found themselves vulnerable and found it easier at some

institutions to give A's and B's rather than "fight it." At the University of Wisconsin, at many state universities and community colleges, and even at some of the more selective institutions this has been a fact of life.[20]

Dr. Bob Feinberg, a University of Florida researcher, claims a major reason for the change is largely due to the rather recently emphasized student evaluations of instructors, which have tended to intimidate professors. He points out that these evaluations are entered into the professors' personnel files and are later taken into account in promotions. He also says that in this period of declining enrollments instuctors grade easier in order to attract students.[21]

Dr. Robert Mautz, the university-system chancellor noted above, sees the trend as bad for the student. He points out that it is wrong to delude students by saying they have qualities which they do not really have. Also, the trend toward easier grading confuses graduate schools in picking promising upper-level students. UM's Besvinick agrees, pointing out that in the real world there is competition, and students should be prepared for this. Dr. L.E. Grinter, retired Graduate Dean of the University of Florida, has spent the past year in stydying the change, arguing that it is important to an employer that grades have meaning. He claims that students have lost an important part of their credentials if grades mean nothing.[22]

On the other hand, Desvitick, like many educators, doesn't see very much relationship between grades and learning, maintaining that some students learn much in a course in which they made a C, while others might make an A in another course in which they learned little. While Mautz says that the average person won't work hard to get good grades if he doesn't have to, he does admit that people at the University of Florida tell him that students are working harder than ever.[23]

The above remarks indicate that grading has become more lenient in recent years. But at the same time, some of the people who claim this fact downgrade grades to some degree as a perfect reflection of what students learn in a course. Still, grades probably do reflect student achievement to a reasonable extent. As such, grades should not be given with little relationship to what was achieved academically. On the other hand, the importance of grades should not be exaggerated so that students are impelled to study more for the grade than for what grades represent in learning. Grades should not be overemphasized to such an extent that the very atmosphere in a class reflects grade consciousness to the virtual exclusion of interest and joy in learning and in creative thought. Academic standards should not be allowed to erode further; yet accommodation to varied student abilities and socioeconomic populations should still be an important consideration in the curriculum.

PROCEDURES

In order to ascertain to what degree academic grade inflation may indeed have occurred at Broward Community College, an examination of grade distributions was made in the computer center. A period of ten years (1963-1973) was investigated, with major emphasis on the latter five years. The computer print-out grade distribution scheme employs two different grade distribution formats. The period from 1963-1964 through 1967-1968 uses a grade distribution format as follows: A B C D F I WP WF X W Total. The grade values are A = Excellent; B = Good; C = Fair; D = Low Pass; F = Fail; I = Incomplete; WP = Withdrew Passing; WF = Withdrew Failing; X = Failing because of leaving course without formal withdrawal; I = Incomplete. The letter X was used only until the 1968-1969 period; after that period it was not employed in order to reduce failing grades as much as possible. Whenever X or I represent only tiny percentages, of little significance to this study, they will also be omitted. For the period beginning with 1967-1968 the totals of passing grades A, B and C are indicated; likewise, totals for grades D, F, and WF, and W and WP. Finally, the totals for all enrolled students, regardless of when any withdrew, are listed, both for the earlier five-year period and the later one.

It was decided to include the grade distribution statistics for only four academic areas--history, political science, psychology, and sociology, in addition to a composite of all college course

grades. This plan would offer detailed and corroborating results for one academic division (social science); and it would also give an overall picture of all college grade distributions. The above fields in the Social Science Division were chosen to be studied in some detail largely because they are major academic fields; also because the writer of this paper teaches history and political science at BCC and is particularly interested in the social science area.

In order to make the study more meaningful, actual numbers of enrollees are included in the study, as well as percentages in the grade distributions. These numbers also indicate the growth of the college and show the relationship between the numbers of students taking courses in the above four academic areas compared with the total enrollment. To include numbers is important; simply reporting percentages without including numbers of students enrolled might give misleading information on the importance of the percentages. The three additional "totals" in the computer format for the years after 1968, noted above, are useful information for administrators concerned with the number of enrollees who satisfactorily complete courses; and also with the number of those who withdraw before the completion of their courses.

The Appendix to this practicum includes grade distributions and enrollee statistics beginning with Term I, 1963-1964, and concluding with Term II, 1973-1974. Statistics for only eight of the

ten-year period are included ; it is believed this is a sufficiently representative sample for recommendations. Because of the importance of the final year (1973-1974), both term's statistics for that year are listed.

RESULTS

It can be observed by looking at the grade distribution statistics in the Appendix that in Term I of 1963-1964, 5.3 percent (43) of the history enrollees received a grade of A. In the same period 7.8% (30) received A in political science; 10.4% (37) in psychology, and 10.9% (37) in sociology. The percentage of A's for all course enrollees given at the college that semester was 8.7%(879)--out of a total number of 10,102. It can be noticed that by the first semester of 1968-1969 there was already a moderate grade inflation in most areas under consideration. But this was not nearly so great as there would be during most of the next five-year period. Semester I grade figures for 1968-1969 show 9.7% or 155 students received A's in history, considerably more perdentagewise and, of course, in real numbers, than the 1963-1964 figures. While political science, psychology, and sociology show little change in this year, the percentage change collegewise went from from 8.7 in the earlier period to 12.1 in 1968-1969.

The really great grade inflationary period came after 1968-1969. The percentage of enrollees in courses receiving A in history

went from 5.3 in 1963-1964 to 15.9 in Term I of 1971-1972. In psychology the 1963-1964 figures had increased from 10.4 to 24.2 by the later year; and in sociology 10.9 to 23.5. Composite A grades for the entire college went from 8.7 in 1963-1964 to 17.1 in 1971-1972. Term II, 1973-1974 A percentages respectively are: history, 17.8; political science, 14.4; psychology, 24.3; sociology, 23.9. "A" grades percentagewise for the entire college were 21.15, up from 17.1 two years earlier, and from 8.7 in 1963-1964.

It now might be reasonably asked if the academic ability of BCC students was significantly higher in 1973-1974 than a decade earlier. An examination of the "Florida Twelfth Grade Test" scores of entering BCC students in both periods indicates that there is little significant difference in this area to account for the great academic grade inflation that has occurred.

To compound the problem further, there has also been some increase percentagewise in the number of B's given during the latter part of the decade compared with the earlier period. More significant yet, there has been a sizable decrease in C's during the last few years and a very significant drop in D's and F's percentagewise. Thus in 1963-1964 the percentage of B's given for the entire college was 20.8, while the percentage of C's was 26.1; D's, 11.3 and F's, 8.1. For Term I of 1973-1974, however, the percentage of B's given for all courses was up to 23.43 while C's were down to 18.34. The number of D's given at this time went far lower from a percentage

of 11.3 to 4.3; F's from the earlier 8.1 down to only 3.02. For individual fields in the Social Science Division the story is the same:

History (percentages)

	A	B	C	D	F
1963-1964	5.3	18.1	27.3	12.8	11.0
1973-1974	14.7	24.0	25.1	6.1	1.5

Political Science (percentages)

	A	B	C	D	F
1963-1964	7.8	18.1	27.3	15.9	7.7
1973-1974	15.4	27.8	23.7	3.5	4.1

Psychology (percentages

	A	B	C	D	F
1963-1964	10.4	18.4	24.3	15.0	9.6
1973-1974	21.4	21.7	20.7	5.7	3.5

Sociology (percentages)

	A	B	C	D	F
1963-1964	10.9	23.3	21.1	8.0	6.5
1973-1974	19.9	23.1	21.5	4.8	2.5

The above figures clearly indicate that the percentage of D's and F's given in the latter part of the decade is far less than in the earlier. An examination of the Appendix will show, as noted above, that most of the grade inflation took place in the period since 1968-1969.

In order to understand the Appendix more fully, it should again be emphasized that starting with the year 1968-1969 the computer grade distribution format was modified so that the sums and percentages of enrollees who received passing grades of A, B, and C are indicated. Likewise, totals and percentages of those

receiving grades of D, F, and WF are included; and the same [illegible] and percentages of grades of W and WP. Totals of A grade percentages in individual academic areas and for the college as a whole are underlined twice in order to make these figures stand out.

It might further be stated that eligibility for membership in Phi Theta Kappa, the Community-Junior College National Honorary Scholastic Society, has increased numerically almost three-fold during the past six years, as has the number of students listed on the Dean's List and the President's List. To be eligible for Phi Theta Kappa, a full-time student must have at least a 3.3 grade point average; for the Dean's List, at least 3.5; and for the President's List, 4.0. The writer of this practicum has been the Faculty Sponsor for Phi Theta Kappa at BCC since 1967 and, therefore, is in a unique position to be acquainted with this situation. While it is true that Broward Community College has grown in enrollment by approximately seventy percent during this period, this increase does not compare with the almost 300 percent increase in numbers of students qualifying for membership in Phi Theta Kappa--in spite of the fact that the Phi Theta Kappa G.P.A. requirement has been increased from 3.1 to 3.3. For the 1974-1975 academic year students at BCC will have to gain a 3.35 G.P.A.--another effort to counteract the results of academic grade inflation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It appears to this writer that academic grade inflation may already have gone beyond an optimum point. It has sometimes been compared with inflation in the economy, although, obviously, there are manifold differences between the two to make for a close analogy. Nevertheless, both types of inflation come about because of insufficient goods (the economy) or academic achievement (in education) to make for a realistic balance or relationship. While it is true that new developments in higher education require new solutions, innovations to help solve them should be gradual, rational and carefully considered before they are employed on a large scale. The overuse of certain types of "hardware," much of which lies rusting in warehouses, is an example of the problem. It is true that disadvantaged or underprepared students cannot reasonably be expected to perform academically like more traditional ones. Yet to properly accommodate the former in the community college, reasonable academic standards for their level of ability should be expected and enforced--as K. Patricia Cross points out:

> The full meaning of universal postsecondary education has probably not been understood, and certainly not been accepted, by the majority of people whose life is education. The most common position among faculty who consider themselves enlightened is that higher education should be open to all those able and willing to do the work in the manner and form in which they are now offered. A second position is taken by a growing minority to lower the standards of academic education in

> order to get credentials in the hands of the disadvantaged so that they can obtain the material and social benefits of society.
>
> Neither position is adequate in these times...[The purpose of education] is to maximize the potential of each person to live a fulfilled and constructive life. And to accomplish this end we need not lower standards. Quite the contrary, we should organize education around the premise that we must demand of each student the highest standards of performance in the utilization of his or her talents.[24]

In recent years greater emphasis has been placed on so-called "career education" curriculums, sometimes at the expense of general education. This development to a limited degree is a healthy one; today's technological world needs skilled people as perhaps never before. Teachers in the liberal arts areas have been overproduced; many have been unable to find positions in areas for which they have been trained. On the other hand, basic communication and citizenship skills and learning should be emphasized much more than they have been in recent years. Therefore, courses in English composition, history and political science should usually be made required courses in the Community College, especially for students planning university-transfer programs. Even for those in two-year terminal programs these courses should be strongly encouraged. Certainly the field of sociology should not be allowed to be a substitute for a solid course in history or political science, as is the practice in all too many two-year institutions today.

More important yet, courses should not be "watered down" unduly simply to accommodate underprepared students. This writer has seen all too often the substitution of so-called "innovative" courses for "substantive" ones, with the rationale that it is more important to interest a student in an area than to require him to really learn something.

On the other hand, everything possible should be done to accommodate the so-called New Student--within the framework of proper academic standards and requirements. So-called innovative teaching techniques, if they include reasonable evaluative techniques, might be useful. But runaway grade inflation is not one of these techniques. Evaluation, in whatever form, should include a reasonable relationship between academic achievement and the grade or symbol employed to represent this achievement.

Other recommendations are as follows:

1) The world is a competitive place; academic grades to a reasonable degree should represent student accomplishment in a particular course--at least until better evaluative methods are found.

2) While success to some extent "may breed success," this concept should not be overused so that students receive much higher grades than their achievement warrants.

3) The administration should make every effort to insure that student evaluations of instructors do not overly influence instructors' grading of students--a result sometimes of student intimidation of instructors.

4) The word relevance is an important concept in the college curriculum, but it should not be used simply to do away with basic required courses, or to reduce academic standards.

5) Accommodating the underprepared student is an important and viable task for the community college. Yet this idea should not be employed mainly to put credentials in the hands of unqualified students.

6) College students should be required to written or subjective tests as well as the often overused objective, "multiple-choice" format.

7) A stricter class attendance policy should be enforced at BCC. Some instructors, not wishing to drop students from class for excessive absence, thereby reducing their own class "holding power," allow students to remain. Some of these are academically marginal students and need class attendance for success. Instructors often pass these students, regardless of achievement. This problem should be resolved.

8) Serious consideration should be given to a non-failing grading system. Some institutions employ a grading system such as A, B, C, and NR (no record). This plan would prevent a student's G.P.A. from going below the passing level of 2.0. At the same time it could reduce the tendency of some instructors to pass non-achieving students simply to avoid giving them failing grades. A limited pass-fail grading system might also be considered.

9) Division and departmental meetings should be called to discuss grading in relation to academic achievement. They should be reminded to avoid excessive academic grade inflation. Instructors teaching different sections of the same course should attempt to agree on general evaluation techniques. A certain amount of academic achievement in one section should be roughly equivalent to that of another. The concept of learning objectives might be discussed; but this should not be forced on any academic department.

10) The above recommendations could be made through so-called "academic" channels at BCC. These would go to such academic committees as the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Academic Standards. Next they might go to the departmental, divisional heads where they would be discussed by the respective faculties. Recommendations might then be made to the academic and executive academic campus deans; from there to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the Executive Vice-President. In a few instances some of these recommendations could even go to the BCC President and to the Board of Trustees. At some time during

this process the Faculty Senate and a full faculty meeting might consider some of these recommendations. The writer of this practicum happens to be a member of the BCC Faculty Senate and as such plans to bring up some of these items at Senate meetings.

In conclusion, it can be said that the adoption of some of the above recommendations can represent positive change for Broward Community College. These could help combine some innovative teaching procedures with more positive evaluation techniques than are now in use. Accountability is the word that state legislatures are using more than ever before in reference to quality education. Runaway academic grade inflation does not help to improve academic accountability and proven learning in the classroom. For too long a period the public has been critical of the amount of learning that has been going-on in many schools and colleges. It must be admitted that change such as is indicated above for BCC will play only a limited part in the improvement in community college education in Florida or throughout the country. Yet this change, if successful, might be described in educational journals and might have some influence beyond Broward County.

It appears that the time is overdue for serious consideration of some of the changes suggested above. Such innovations might help to bring to the public renewed confidence in education, confidence which in recent years has sometimes been eroding. Such confidence could bring greater financial and moral support to our institutions of higher learning.

LIST OF FOOTNOTES

[1]"Decline of the SAT's," Time, December 31, 1973, 45.

[2]Louise Montgomery, Miami Herald, June 10, 1974, p. 1A, cols. 3, 4.

[3]Ibid., cols. 1-3.

[4]Ibid., cols. 2-4, p. 18A, col. 1.

[5]Keith St. Onge, "Let's Get Back to Essentials," Change, June, 1974, p. 7.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[8]George Benston, "Good Teaching and the Ambitious University, Evaluation: Guide and Guardian," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973, p. 42.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Dr. Robert W. Powell, "Evaluations of Professors by Students--May Be Worse Than Useless," National On Campus Report, XXI, August, 1974, pp. 7-8.

[11]Newsweek, July 1, 1974, pp. 49-50.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Warren Bryan Martin,"The Ethical Crisis in Education." Change, Vol. 6 (June 1, 1974), 50.

[15]K. Patricia Cross, "The New Learners," On Learning and Change, ed. G.W. Bonham, 1973, 74.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Louise Montgomery, "College Report Cards Climb Higher As Part of Baffling Trend," Miami Herald, June 10, 1974, p. 18A, cols. 3, 4.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid., cols. 2-4.

[22]Ibid., col. 2.

[23]Ibid., col. 3.

[24]K. Patricia Cross, "The New Learners," On Learning and Change, ed. G.W. Bonham, 1973, 74.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Academic Grade Inflation," Newsweek, July 1, 1974, pp. 49-50.

Bernston, George. "Good Teaching and the Ambitious University Evaluation: Guide and Guardian," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. XXI, Winter, 1973, p. 42.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 200.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The New Learners," On Learning and Change, eds. of Change Magazine (New Rochelle: Change Magazine, 1974), p. 74.

"Decline of the SAT's, Time, December 31, 1973, p. 45.

Karabel, Jerome. "Open Admissions: Toward Meritocracy or Democracy," On Learning and Change, ed. G.W. Bonham (New Rochelle: Change Magazine, 1973), p. 65.

Martin, Warren Bryan. "The Ethical Crisis in Education," Change (June, 1974), 50.

Montgomery, Louise. "Academic Grade Inflation--A's Easier Now," Miami Herald, June 10, 1974, pp. 1A and 18A.

Powell, Robert M. "Evaluations of Professors by Students May Be Worse Than Useless," National On Campus Report, Hilsdale Center, Madison (August, 1974), pp. 7-8.

St. Onge, Keith. "Let's Get Back to Essentials," Change, June, 1974, p. 7.

APPENDIX

GRADE DISTRIBUTIONS AT BROWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1963 - 1964 Term I

	A	B	C	D	F	I	WP	WF	X	W	Total
					History						
Nos.	43	161	271	129	63	5	34	15	36	51	808
%	5.3	19.9	33.5	15.9	7.7	.6	4.2	1.8	4.4	6.3	
					Political Science						
Nos.	30	69	104	49	42	6	25	5	14	36	380
%	7.8	18.1	27.3	12.8	11.0	1.5	6.5	1.3	3.6	9.4	
					Psychology						
Nos.	37	65	86	53	34	10	16	7	15	29	353
%	10.4	18.4	24.3	15.0	9.6	2.8	4.5	1.9	4.2	8.2	
					Sociology						
Nos.	16	32	29	11	9	4	7	7	10	12	137
%	11.9	23.3	21.1	8.0	6.5	2.9	5.1	5.1	7.2	8.7	
					All College Courses						
Nos.	879	2109	2653	1149	825	318	118	519	264	539	10,102
%	8.7	20.8	26.2	11.3	8.1	1.1	5.1	2.6	5.3	9.4	

1965 - 1966 Term I

	A	B	C	D	F	I	WP	WF	W	Total
					History					
Nos.	56	194	478	215	187	10	42	26	144	1,352
%	4.1	14.3	35.3	15.9	13.8	.7	.7	1.9		
					Political Science					
Nos.	28	91	165	98	6	10	42	26	29	549
%	5.1	16.5	30.3	17.8	1.0	.7	3.1	1.9	5.2	
					Psychology					
Nos.	36	117	129	56	40	11	14	3	45	451
%	7.6	25.9	33.6	12.4	8.8	2.4	3.1	.6	9.9	
					Sociology					
Nos.	18	53	77	17	10	3	6	5	40	229
%	7.8	23.1	33.6	7.4	4.3	1.3	2.6	2.1	17.4	
					All College Courses					
Nos.	1907	4203	4995	2042	1909	200	863	367	2495	19,352
%	9.8	21.7	25.8	10.5	9.8	1.0	4.4	1.0	12.8	

1966 - 1967 Term I

	A	B	C	D	F	WP	WF	W	Total
				History					
Nos.	120	369	536	218	126	89	12	74	1,677
%	7.1	22.0	31.9	12.9	7.5	5.3	.7	10.3	
				Political Science					
Nos.	29	131	150	54	47	23	11	91	552
%	5.2	23.7	27.1	9.7	8.5	4.1	1.9		
				Psychology					
Nos.	68	227	263	123	72	69	4	106	946
%	7.1	23.9	27.8	13.0	7.6	7.2	.4	11.2	
				Sociology					
Nos.	6	45	74	34	16	9	4	50	246
%	2.4	18.2	30.0	13.8	6.5	3.6	1.6	20.3	
				All College Courses					
Nos.	2417	5505	5848	2139	2139	240	207	1403	23,492
%	10.2	24.4	24.8	9.1	9.1	1.0	.8	5.9	

1987-1988 Term I

	A	B	C	Total	D	F	WF	Total	W	WP	I	Total	Total
						History							
Nos.	137	304	485	926	179	58	13	250	79	72	17	181	1,357
%	10.1	22.4	35.7	68.2	13.2	4.3	1.0	18.4	5.8	5.3	1.3	13.3	
						Political Science							
Nos.	37	84	125	246	86	44	10	141	35	26	6	71	458
%	8.1	18.3	27.3	53.7	18.8	9.6	2.2	30.8	7.6	5.7	1.3	15.5	
						Psychology							
Nos.	86	244	291	621	130	42	12	185	43	10	17	49	928
%	9.3	26.3	31.4	46.6	14.0	4.5	1.3	19.	4.6	1.1	1.5	5.3	
						Sociology							
Nos.	19	87	122	228	24	--	16	24	9	--	--	36	288
%	6.6	30.2	42.4	79.2	8.3	--	5.6	8.3	3.1	--	--	125	
						All College Courses							
Nos.	468	5210	6115	1379	3739	709	226	268	1654	300	528	1930	20,411
%	12.1	25.5	30.0	67.6	8.5	3.5	1.1	13.1	8.1	1.5	2.6	19.3	

1968-1969 Term I

	A	B	C	Total	D	F	WF	Total	W	WP	I	Total	Total
						History							
Nos.	155	421	515	1091	152	70	6	232	137	122	17	279	1,602
%	9.7	26.3	32.2	68.1	9.5	4.4	.4	14.5	8.6	7.6	7.6	17.4	
						Political Science							
Nos.	34	87	132	253	75	51	20	147	36	2510	10	72	472
%	7.2	18.4	28.0	53.6	15.9	10.8	4.2	31.2	7.6	5.32	2.1	5.3	
						Psychology							
Nos.	102	245	339	686	125	44	17	186	85	46	29	163	1,035
%	9.9	23.7	32.8	66.8	12.1	14.3	1.7	18.0	8.2	4.4	2.8	15.8	
						Sociology							
Nos.	17	65	87	169	12	3	--	--	15	14	13	28	412
%	9.0	30.7	41.0	79.7	75.7	1.4	--	--	7.1	6.6	6.1	13.2	
						All College Courses							
Nos.	2790	5321	6082	1826	748	186	2013	2633	1255	1255	348	4979	22,085
%	12.6	24.1	27.5	8.3	3.4	.8	13.2	11.9	5.7	5.7	1.6	22.5	

1970-1971 Term I

	A	B	C	Total	D	F	WF	Total	W	WP	Total	Total
						History						
Nos.	265	466	561	1292	180	63	8	269	239	93	356	1,927
%	13.8	24.2	29.1	67.0	9.3	3.3	.4	14.0	12.4	4.8	19.0	
						Political Science						
Nos.	51	143	179	373	82	41	13	11	147	103		651
%	7.8	22.0	27.5	57.3	12.6	6.3	2.0	2.2	15.8	3.4	20.1	
						Psychology						
Nos.	164	327	369	860	108	57	2	173	171	35	239	1,272
%	12.9	25.7	29.0	67.6	8.5	4.5	.2	13.6	13.4	2.8	18.8	
						Sociology						
Nos.	142	228	161	531	18	6	--	24	93	21	191	746
%	19.0	30.6	21.6	71.2	2.4	.8	--	3.2	12.5	2.8	25.6	

1971-1972 Term I

	A	B	C	Total	D	F	WF	Total	W WP	Total	Total
						History					
Nos.	263	434	466	1163	138	65	4	207	261	332	1,654
%	15.9	26.2	28.2	70.3	7.3	3.4	.2	10.9	15.8	20.1	
						Political Science					
Nos.	65	129	178	372	80	26	8	115	124		655
%	9.9	19.7	29.2	56.8	12.2	4.0	1.2	17.6	18.9	25.7	
						Psychology					
Nos.	454	492	370	1316	104	--	88	202	259	359	1,877
%	24.2	26.2	19.7	70.1	5.5	--	4.7	10.8	13.8	19.1	
						Sociology					
Nos.	284	355	246	885	--	--	33	65	180	257	1,207
%	23.5	29.4	20.4	73.3	3.1	--	1.8	4.9	14.9	21.3	
						All College Courses					
Nos.	5706	7704	7342	20076	1654	295	94	2779	6739	10,458	33.273
%	17.1	23.4	22.2	60.2	5.0	3.1	1.1	8.4	20.3	31.8	

1973-1974 Term I

	A	B	C	Total	D	WF F	Total	W WP	Total	Total
						History				
Nos.	257	419	438	1114	106	27	135	379	496	1,745
%	14.7	24.0	25.1	63.8	6.1	1.5	7.7	21.7	28.4	
						Political Science				
Nos.	123	222	189	534	28	33	62	162	202	798
%	15.4	27.8	23.7	66.9	3.5	4.1	7.8	20.3	25.3	
						Psychology				
Nos.	386	392	374	1152	103	63	177	382	478	1,807
%	21.4	21.7	20.7	63.8	5.7	3.5	9.8	21.1	26.5	
						Sociology				
Nos.	344	399	371	1114	83	43	127	316	488	1,729
%	19.9	23.1	21.5	64.4	4.8	2.5	7.3	18.3	28.2	
						All College Courses				
Nos.	7917	9820	7687	2530	1805	1264	3069	1468	1497	41,915
%	18.89	23.43	18.34	61.20	4.31	3.02	3.64	26.64	3.57	

1973-'074 Term II

	A	B	C	Total	D	F	Total	W	WP	Total	Total
					History						
Nos	386	441	441	1226	9	31	134	454		570	1,930
%	19.9	22.9	22.9	63.5	5.1	1.6	6.9	23.5		29.5	
					Political Science						
Nos	84	111	145	340	58	16	74	138	19	169	585
%	14.4	19.0	24.8	58.1	9.9	2.7	13.0	23.6	3.2	28.9	
					Psychology						
Nos	405	442	346	1193	98	50	150	336	54	472	1,815
%	22.3	24.4	19.1	65.7	5.4	2.8	8.3	18.5	3.0	26.0	
					Sociology						
Nos	351	368	294	1013	41	27	68	256	39	430	1,511
%	23.2	24.4	24.4	67.0	2.7	1.8	4.5	16.9	2.6	28.5	
					All College Courses						
Nos	[illegible]	2087	6650	27000	1725	1297		10,772			39,753
%	[illegible]	22.86	16.73	73.5	4.34	3.26		27.10			