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To the Faculty and Students:

Over four years ago, the Academic Senate referred back to the Academic Council the last attempt by the faculty to bring change into the grading system at MSU. The Council referred the problem to the Educational Policies Committee for study and further recommendations. In the spring of 1966, the EPC embarked on a study of grading practices and the grading system at MSU.

The whole sphere of grades and student evaluation is woven intricately through the fabric of the University and to suggest that improvement is possible within a system so firmly established for decades is a risky undertaking. The EPC has learned that what appears to be just a small change in the system, will create, upon reflection, new problems throughout the structure. A piecemeal, patchwork approach is almost an endless and circuitous path.

The EPC also realizes that conflicts which arise between faculty and students over grade assignments are only the syndromes of a different sickness that cannot be cured by the magic of a new scheme. Some of our broad based recommendations are designed to treat the underlying causes of these conflicts, and to clarify the relationships between grades and motivation for learning.

It is possible to expand educational opportunities for students through changes in the grade structure by reducing the rigidity in the system. In the recommendation for a limited use of a credit-no credit scheme we have attempted to open a new avenue for educational exploration by students. Our approach may appear conservative to some but our objective is to open opportunities for the serious student rather than to provide easy paths to graduation for the marginal ones.

Finally, we have attempted to simplify the complicated inter-relationship among, class standing, level of passing, grade point average, and the graduation requirements plus the new demands of a dual number-letter scheme.

The committee respectfully requests any deletions or amendments to the document be made with careful attention to the total picture rather than to accommodate an isolated circumstance. The report deserves careful study, discussion, and reflection.

- The Educational Policies Committee
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SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS
AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

1. The present system of letter grades, A, B, C, D, and F, shall be discontinued and replaced by a numerical system of grading based upon the present grade point scale.

2. The numerical grading system shall consist of the following scale:

   4.5, 4.0, 3.5, 3.0, 2.5, 2.0, 1.5, 1.0, 0.5, 0.

3. The grade of 4.5 shall be awarded only for exceptionally high performance. The grade point average of the student shall be calculated by including 4.5 grades as well as others, but once the student's cumulative average reaches 4.00, it shall be limited to this maximum value.

4. The minimum grade point average required for graduation shall be 2.0 for undergraduate students and 3.0 for graduate students.

5. In the numerical system, the minimum levels at which course credit shall be awarded are as follows:

   1.0 for undergraduate students who have completed fewer than 85 credits at the beginning of a given term.
   1.5 for undergraduate students who have completed 85 credits or more at the beginning of a given term.
   2.0 for graduate students.

   Within particular graduate programs, such levels as 2.5 and 3.0 may be established as the minimum for earning credit. Also, the number of 2.0 grades acceptable for credit may be expressly restricted.

6. A supplementary system of letter grades which do not count in the computation of the grade point average shall be introduced. It shall consist of "Cr," meaning that credit is granted toward degree or program requirements, and "Ne," meaning that no credit is granted.

7. A grade of "Cr" shall be awarded for performance at a level equivalent to or above the grade point average required for graduation. This is understood to mean 2.0 for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduates. A grade of "Ne" shall be given for performance below the grade point level required for graduation.
8. A limited use, at the option of the student, of the "Cr-Nc" system shall be open to all undergraduate students, subject to the following conditions:

a. Course prerequisites or other criteria for enrolling a student in any course shall be determined by the department or college offering the course and shall apply equally to students in the letter grade system and in the numerical system.

b. All courses in every department or college shall be available on a letter grade basis unless those courses are 1) used to satisfy the general education requirements, or 2) specifically excluded by the department or college in which the student is a major or in which he is fulfilling a field of concentration. Each department or college shall designate those courses that its majors cannot take on the letter grade basis.

c. The student's enrollment in a course on a letter grade basis is recorded only with the Registrar and is not noted on the instructor's class list.

At the completion of the course the instructor shall grade all the students in his class on the numerical system, and the Registrar shall convert the numerical grades to letter grades for those students enrolled on the letter grade basis. The Registrar shall retain (in his records) the numerical grades that are converted to letter grades.

d. When a student changes his major, the Registrar shall convert those letter grades to numerical grades in courses that are necessarily graded on the numerical system in the given major.

e. A student enrolling in a course on a letter grade basis must do so at registration and may not subsequently change his status in the course except during the free drop and free add periods. Any course which is taken more than once must be taken under the same grading system in which the student first enrolled, except where standard requirements to the contrary must be satisfied, in order for the student to graduate.

f. Grades awarded on the numerical system cannot be converted to letter grades.

g. No student may enroll in more than 30 credits on the letter grade basis and a student may be enrolled in no more than one course in any given term.
h. The choice by the student of a letter or numerical basis for grading in a given course shall not enter into the question of admission to the course.

9. Subject to approval by the University Curriculum Committee, particular colleges or departments may extend use of the "Cr-Nc" system as the basis for grading in such clearly defined requirements as field study.

10. An annual review of the proposed letter grade system shall be initiated and administered by the Provost's Office and reported to the Academic Council during the first five years after adoption of this proposal.

11. The Graduate Council is requested to study the grading system for graduate students and to make appropriate recommendations. References in the present report to grades and grade point averages for graduate students shall be considered tentative until specific recommendations of the Graduate Council are acted upon.

12. The present designations of "X", "I", and "DF" for the purpose of postponing final grades shall be retained. The definitions shall be changed to allow all of them to apply to undergraduate work. In undergraduate level work, the "DF" shall be employed only for continuing work in field or thesis courses and for courses wherein the work normally extends beyond one term.

The "DF" must be removed upon completion of the final course in the sequence on the same basis as an "I". The current bases for assigning "X" and "I" grades and procedures for removing them shall be retained.

Grades of "X", "I", and "DF" shall apply to both the letter and the numerical systems, but in the letter system they shall revert to "no record" if the student fails to complete the required work in the time stipulated.

13. Currently prepared reports on grades shall be made available to each academic department and each report shall be circulated among the faculty members thereof. Where feasible, each faculty member should receive a copy of appropriate portions of such reports. In general, each department should receive summary data on the grades given in other departments and detailed data, by section, for the courses of the department. Departmental faculties shall be encouraged to study and discuss the data in these reports.
14. An All-University four-year graduated step scale shall be introduced in place of the present so-called "double hurdle" of a required 2.00 grade point average for both graduation and for admission to the junior year. It shall be structured so that the student must have a 2.00 for graduation. The details of the step scale shall be formulated by the Assistant Deans' Group in consultation with the Office of Evaluation Services, the Office of Institutional Research, and other appropriate University offices.

15. Departments and colleges shall be encouraged to introduce modifications in grading systems or new grading systems provided they are approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost. Only carefully planned and coordinated experiments with evaluation processes and time limits are recommended as appropriate to the purposes of this recommendation.

16. The Provost's Office shall establish a research program or direct existing offices to organize a research program to provide continual study of the motivational factors associated with the learning and teaching processes and to evaluate the effects of various grading systems on these factors.

17. A detailed formal statement setting forth the definitions of grades, the bases for grading, and the University's policies with respect to grades and grading shall be prepared, approved, and distributed to students, faculty, and administrators.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Prior to the present study, a subcommittee of the Academic Council, designated as the B-1 Committee on Grading Practices, prepared a report with recommendations on several prevailing problems in grading. The B-1 Committee (also referred to as the Warrington Committee) submitted its report, dated January 14, 1964, to the Academic Council, which, following approval, transmitted it to the Academic Senate. The Senate returned it to the Academic Council, which asked the Educational Policies Committee to study the whole issue of grading and prepare a proposal.

The Educational Policies Committee appointed a subcommittee to prepare recommendations. In the course of its work, the subcommittee studied the present grading system with the aid of the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of the Educational Development Program, and the Office of Evaluation Services. It consulted with members of the faculty and with a corresponding subcommittee of ASMSU. An open hearing was held for both students and faculty. Practices at other institutions were reviewed. The EPC and its subcommittee continually exchanged views, and the Assistant Deans' Group of the University offered its evaluation. From these deliberations, recommendations were formulated.

Among the questions raised concerning grading systems, were (1) what are the functions of grades, (2) what is wrong with the present system, and (3) what can be done to improve it? To answer such questions, facts were needed -- and while considerable information about grades at MSU and elsewhere was found, not enough is available to provide unequivocal answers to all relevant questions.
Nevertheless, the study pursued the facts available and sought expert opinion in areas that had a paucity of data.

Presented herein is the revised grading system at MSU, and appropriate supporting data.
II. PURPOSES OF GRADES

Grades are used most frequently in American higher education as a means of designating and reporting the extent of a student's achievement in academic pursuits. However, they are also used for other reasons. They are often used as the basis for defining academic standards, as predictors of future academic success, and as data for counseling purposes. Grades are employed by the student to transfer from one school to another, to obtain scholarships, honor society membership, admission to graduate school, and employment following graduation. They can be used to motivate the student to work and to learn. Some claim that grades, by generating competition and by promoting the adaptability and discipline that characterize life in our society, serve a positive purpose.

A summary of the functions that grades serve is given below.

1. **Achievement.** Grades should reflect as accurately as possible the academic accomplishment of students.

2. **Certification.** Grades in individual courses and cumulative grade point averages are certifications by the University of the accomplishment of the student. As such, grades should, as accurately as possible, reflect the degree to which students attain the objectives and meet the academic standards of the university.

3. **Diagnosis.** Grades should be useful to students and advisors as indicators of the presence or absence of aptitudes for special program areas. As such, grades in introductory
courses should be indicative of probable success in more advanced
courses in the same area.

4. Motivation. Grades motivate students. Therefore, they should
be assigned on the basis of the achievement of significant
educational objectives.

5. Screening. Certain courses are designed, at least implicitly,
to serve as screening devices for students planning to take
more advanced courses in the same department or area. A
satisfactory grade in such a course should indicate that the
student is expected to succeed in the more advanced courses;
an unsatisfactory grade should indicate that the student is
not expected to succeed in the advanced courses.

6. Advancement, Transfer, and Admission. Grades are used as a
criterion for advancement from one educational level to the
next as well as for graduation.

7. Distribution. Grades and grade point averages are used to
distinguish among students on the basis of academic accomplish-
ment.

8. Recognition. Grades and grade averages are used as a basis
for recognition of outstanding accomplishment. Graduation
honors and scholarships are illustrations of this use.

The Committee is of the opinion that of these functions, the
most important is motivation. Although grades can be used to motivate,
they must be used very carefully so that studying for a grade is the
same as studying to learn.
As in the case of motivation, the other functions can take on the aspect of a dysfunction if an inappropriate emphasis is placed on them. The functions of certification, advancement, transfer, admission, distribution, and recognition are almost automatically accomplished by the grade point averages. Thus, they are in a comparative sense the least important of the purposes. It is possible that other ways could be devised to meet the other needs, but at present, grades are so used.

The screening, diagnosis, and achievement functions are closely associated with the learning process and thus assume an importance approaching that of motivation. Correspondingly they are easily misused. The importance of the "grade-giving behavior" of the faculty is voiced in the following quotation.

It is easy enough for an institution to change its grading system. A number have done so. It is more difficult to find a system that will solve the problems and satisfy the critics. Most of the problems of grading are not products of the particular system of notation for designating achievement. They are rather more fundamental problems of knowing what achievement is, and of having the ability and the courage to give and accept honest assessments of it. The problems reside mainly in the grade-giving behavior of the faculty and in the grade-seeking behavior of the students. Changing the grading system is not likely to do much to solve those problems. (1)*

In delineating the functions of grades it is also necessary to recognize some of the characteristics that grades do not measure.

According to Dressel:

The habits, attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, interests, and values of an individual coupled with his intelligence will, in the long run, determine the quality of his contribution to society much more than will the knowledge or even the methodological techniques he learns in college. These

*Numbers in parentheses refer to the List of References at the end of the report.
affective qualities are not readily graded in an objective manner, and any attempt to grade them must be regarded with some suspicion as verging on an authoritarianism not consistent with the freedom of opinion and action permitted the individual in a democracy. (2)
III. RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN THE CURRENT GRADING SCALE

When an instructor carefully uses the grade as a tool in the learning process, the previously listed functions can be fulfilled to the advantage of the student. This is not to say, however, that grades are the "ultimate weapon" in the battle for education. There are undoubtedly modifications, if not completely different approaches, that might improve the present system. The California Institute of Technology, which does not grade its freshmen at all, reports many good results. So, too, does Harvey Mudd College, which uses a satisfactory, not-satisfactory system for freshmen. However, there are few comprehensive studies of unconventional grading systems. Therefore, the EPC believes it inadvisable at this time to propose an across-the-board elimination of grades.

A NUMERICAL SYSTEM

A few changes, however, seem desirable. Both letters and numbers are used in the current grading system with direct equivalencies established between them. Most teachers, by use of a mixture of curve and absolute grading approaches, convert their own particular numerical scales of individual student performance to letter grades. The Registrar then takes all of the grade letters so assigned and calculates a grade point average to two decimal points for each student. This conversion and reconversion process seems unnecessary and probably introduces inaccuracies. The Committee recommends the grading system used to mark a student's progress in a course be standardized with the grading system used to mark a student's progress in the University toward his degree.
1. The present system of letter grades, A, B, C, D, and F, shall be discontinued and replaced by a numerical system of grading based upon the present grade point scale.

2. The numerical grading system shall consist of the following scale:

   4.5, 4.0, 3.5, 3.0, 2.5, 2.0, 1.5, 1.0, 0.5, 0.

3. The grade of 4.5 shall be awarded only for exceptionally high performance. The grade point average of the student shall be calculated by including 4.5 grades as well as others, but once the student's cumulative average reaches 4.00, it shall be limited to this maximum value.

Although supplementary letter symbols are recommended later in this report, the only final grades counted in the grade point averages would be the numerical grades. These would be recorded directly in the present grade point language.

The numerical system proposed is 0 to 4.5 inclusive with 0.5 increments. The present letter system can be easily recognized in this number scale. A is 4, B is 3, etc. The smaller subdivisions are introduced to give those teachers who feel they can grade more accurately this way an opportunity to do so. In addition, two other features are introduced. First, a 4.5 grade is included for the very exceptional case when a 4.00 (or an A grade in the current system) would seem insufficient.

Second, 0 and 0.5 are both failing grades. Thus, a "degree of failing" has been introduced that does not exist at present. By "failing" is meant that credit would not be obtained in the course if the grade were 0.5 or 0, as is now true of the F grade. The 1.0 and 1.5 grades may or may not be passing for credit, depending on other parameters. This last point will be discussed later. The
0.5 grade is included to emphasize the fact that degrees of deficiency remain consequential to the student's grade point average even if credit is not granted for the course. It would in that way provide a more accurate grade point average. The use of the 0.5 increment also avoids any non-uniform gaps or large steps in the scale.

Although statistical characteristics of grades are discussed later in this report, one justification for the proposed increase in the number of points on the grading scale is that it may result in more reliable grades and grade point averages. (3)

The performance level at which credit is awarded in a given course cannot be selected without a definition of the grade point average required for graduation. The Committee saw no need for a change from current practice in this regard.

4. The minimum grade point average required for graduation shall be 2.0 for undergraduate students and 3.0 for graduate students.

A freshman may often require some time for general orientation to college and for strengthening inadequate high school preparation. Therefore, the passing level for a course, which means the level at which credit is obtained toward graduation, was put at 1.0 for freshmen and sophomores, at 1.5 for juniors and seniors, and at 2.0 for graduate students. Since the present level of passing is "D" or 1.0 for all courses taken for undergraduate credit, the academic requirements are raised at the junior and senior levels.
5. In the numerical system, the minimum levels at which course credit shall be awarded are as follows:

1.0 for undergraduate students who have completed fewer than 85 credits at the beginning of a given term.
1.5 for undergraduate students who have completed 85 credits or more at the beginning of a given term.
2.0 for graduate students.

Within particular graduate programs, such levels as 2.5 or 3.0 may be established as the minimum for earning credit. Also, the number of 2.0 grades acceptable for credit may be expressly restricted.

Two additional remarks are needed to clarify Recommendation 5. First, the specification of a graduate passing level is intended to establish the minimum acceptable by the University. Any further requirements are to be under the jurisdiction of individual colleges and departments. No encroachment on their usual prerogatives and authority is implied or intended.

Second, it is recognized that a step scale in required grade point averages for progression through an academic program is needed. For example, at present a 2.0 is required to enter the junior year. The proposed passing levels are designed to modify the present requirement and not replace it.

A LETTER SYSTEM

As remarked previously, it appears advisable to retain a quantitative grading system despite its deficiencies. But it also seems advisable to take a conservative step towards a possible improvement and particularly one that might generate greater motivation in the student.
A limited credit-no credit system is introduced to take a step toward reducing the emphasis on grades. Hopefully, this will encourage intrinsic motivation. In addition, it is intended to encourage students to broaden their course coverage by pursuing areas which they might not attempt if the danger of sustaining a reduction in grade point average prevailed.

This system is not intended to foster reduced effort. A different environment for learning is sought, not a lessening of learning. Indeed, if more enthusiastic learning does not result, then the system has failed.

6. A supplementary system of letter grades which do not count in the computation of the grade point average shall be introduced. It shall consist of "Cr," meaning that credit is granted toward degree or program requirements, and "Ne," meaning that no credit is granted.

The next question that must be resolved is the basis for deciding whether a student shall receive credit or not in a course in the "Cr-Ne" letter system. A number of ways can be devised for making such a decision; for example, the basis for assigning credit could be left to the discretion of the instructor, it could be equated to the 2.0 GPA requirement for graduation, or it could be the same as in the numerical system.

The grading system now in use puts the passing level for a given course at "D" for undergraduate students. But an additional requirement prevails in that the student must have a 2.0 GPA to graduate. Thus, if he gets a "D" in a course, he must compensate for it by obtaining an "A"
or "B" in another course to average 2.0 or more. Now if the "Cr-Nc" system awards credit for a 1.5 or 1.0 performance level, then a system is established that is exempt from the compensating requirement associated with a "D" or a numerical grade less than 2.0. In other words, there are two ways to preserve the integrity of the graduate requirements set forth in Recommendation 4. One is a system in which averages are computed, the numerical system. The other is a system devoid of averages, the letter system, in which the quality of work in each course, without help from other courses, is the basis for satisfying the graduation requirements. What is rejected is a mixture in which deficiencies are simultaneously permitted and exempted from the system of compensations.

The disadvantage of this basis for assigning credit is that two students in the same course, one on the letter system and the other on the numerical system, would be required to perform at different levels to obtain a passing or credit grade. Thus, an apparent lack of parity would exist. However, the student on the letter system would not sustain the same type of disadvantage if he failed to obtain credit; that is, his grade point average would not be lowered. Because different penalties and rewards must be identified with the two systems proposed, the recommendation given below is based on the view that the two systems represent different sorts of advantages and disadvantages, suited to different academic purposes. If the symbol "Cr" is always understood to mean 2.0 for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduates, in accord with familiar graduation standards, clarity of choice in electing one of the two grading systems in a given instance may actually be enhanced.
7. A grade of "Cr" shall be awarded for performance at a level equivalent to or above the grade point average required for graduation. This is understood to mean 2.0 for undergraduates and 3.0 for graduates. A grade of "Nc" shall be given for performance below the grade point level required for graduation.

In the "Cr-Nc" system, credit awarded is automatically and fully acceptable toward graduation. This system eliminates the type of conditional credit exemplified by the present "D" grade, which requires that deficiencies in one course be compensated for by superior work in other courses.

A detailed definition of the "Cr-Nc" system is now appropriate and is given below in Recommendation 8. The proposed approach is a conservative one. Many restrictions are stipulated -- too many in the minds of some to make it as effective as it could be. But others caution that a careful step is advisable and that further modifications are always possible. The Committee has followed the latter counsel.

8. A limited use, at the option of the student, of the "Cr-Nc" system shall be open to all undergraduate students, subject to the following conditions:

a. Course prerequisites or other criteria for enrolling a student in any course shall be determined by the department or college offering the course and shall apply equally to students in the letter grade system and in the numerical system.

b. All courses in every department or college shall be available on a letter grade basis unless those courses are 1) used to satisfy the general education requirements, or 2) specifically excluded by the department or college in which the student is a major or in which he is fulfilling a field of concentration. Each department or college shall designate those courses that its majors cannot take on the letter grade basis.
c. The student's enrollment in a course on a letter grade basis is recorded only with the Registrar and is not noted on the instructor's class list.

At the completion of the course the instructor shall grade all the students in his class on the numerical system, and the Registrar shall convert the numerical grades to letter grades for those students enrolled on the letter grade basis. The Registrar shall retain (in his records) the numerical grades that are converted to letter grades.

d. When a student changes his major, the Registrar shall convert those letter grades to numerical grades in courses that are necessarily graded on the numerical system in the given major.

e. A student enrolling in a course on a letter-grade basis must do so at registration and may not subsequently change his status in the course except during the free drop and free add periods. Any course which is taken more than once must be taken under the same grading system in which the student first enrolled, except where standard requirements to the contrary must be satisfied, in order for the student to graduate.

f. Grades awarded on the numerical system cannot be converted to letter grades.

g. No student may enroll in more than 30 credits on the letter grade basis and a student may be enrolled in no more than one course in any given term.

h. The choice by the student of a letter or numerical basis for grading in a given course shall not enter into the question of admission to the course.

Several individual departments and colleges need specific characteristics in a grading system that can be accommodated in part or in whole by some extension of the specific "Cr-Nc" system delineated in Recommendations 6, 7, and 8. Therefore, the following recommendation is intended to suggest that a consideration of extensions is appropriate, and that each proposal must stand or fall on its own merits.
9. Subject to approval by the University Curriculum Committee, particular colleges or departments may extend use of the "Cr-Nc" system as the basis for grading in such clearly defined requirements as field study.

As indicated in the previous discussion the letter grade system is introduced to take a first step toward improving student motivation. To take full advantage of its effect, a study of the system should be made so that its advantages can be extended and its faults removed.

10. An annual review of the proposed letter grade system shall be initiated and administered by the Provost's Office and reported to the Academic Council during the first five years after adoption of this proposal.

Most of the above presentation has been directed at changes in the undergraduate system of grading. The graduate grading system also requires attention, but additional work coordinated with the Graduate Council is considered necessary. Therefore, it is recommended:

11. The Graduate Council is requested to study the grading system for graduate students and to make appropriate recommendations. References in the present report to grades and grade point averages for graduate students shall be considered tentative until specific recommendations of the Graduate Council are acted upon.

POSTPONEMENT OF GRADING

Currently there are three letter designations for the purpose of postponing a grade; these are: "X," "I," and "DF." The "X" is given for incomplete work without an acceptable student excuse, and the "I" for incomplete work with a satisfactory reason. The "DF"
is given for incomplete but satisfactory work for extenuating reasons or for work completed except for the term end examination, again for extenuating reasons.

The definitions of these three letter designations shall be modified to permit each to apply to undergraduate work. At the undergraduate level, the "DF" shall be employed only for continuing work in field or thesis courses and for courses wherein the work normally extends beyond one term. The "I" and "X" grades shall be for incomplete work in formal classroom courses other than those that fall under the "DF" category. The current bases for assigning these grades of "I," "X," and "DF" and the procedures for removing them shall be retained.

12. The present designations of "X," "I," and "DF" for the purpose of postponing final grades shall be retained. The definitions shall be changed to allow all of them to apply to undergraduate work. In undergraduate level work, the "DF" shall be employed only for continuing work in field or thesis courses and for courses wherein the work normally extends beyond one term.

The "DF" must be removed upon completion of the final course in the sequence on the same basis as an "I." The current bases for assigning "X" and "I" grades and procedures for removing them shall be retained.

Grades of "X," "I," and "DF" shall apply to both the letter and the numerical systems, but in the letter system they shall revert to "no record" if the student fails to complete the required work in the time stipulated.
IV. GRADES AND MOTIVATION

In one of the more extensive studies of grading systems reviewed by EPC, the following brief conversation was recorded.

Professor to student: "What did you get out of the course?"
Student: "I got a 'B'." (4)

Unfortunately, the importance assigned to a grade by faculty and by society in general has increased steadily in recent decades and is reaching exaggerated proportions. The student's grade point average determines much of his intellectual image in the eyes of his fellow students, his teachers, and his parents. It determines if he will be an honor society member, if he will graduate, if he will be drafted, if he will be admitted to graduate school, if he will receive a fellowship, if he will be hired by certain employers, and so on. It is small wonder that the student focuses intensely on obtaining high grades, since society seems to treasure them so.

The student should seek to develop fully his inherent capabilities, and the educational program, including grades, should not impede this learning process. Moreover, the learning process continues for a full lifetime and the attitudes and habits developed during a college education should encourage such continuing study. More specifically, the student should not be conditioned to study for a grade and stop his studying when a grade does not exist.

Thus, the faculty should minimize the emphasis on grades and seek to make them inconspicuous compared to the tasks of learning and developing. Dressel suggests:

If the view is accepted that many (and perhaps most) significant outcomes of education are not subject to grading, the students should be so informed. The grade
in a course should be defined as based upon knowledge and upon those intellectual skills for which correctness and accepted standards provide the possibility of reasonably consistent evaluation for all individuals. Finally, the grading on this basis should be handled in the most expeditious and inconspicuous fashion possible, with the teacher assuming the obligation of emphasizing other ungraded outcomes and working out means whereby students may evaluate their own progress toward these goals. Such a conception implies a rather different attitude toward examinations, grading, and student-teacher relations than is commonly found in the classroom. (2)

A viewpoint that looks more specifically at the present grading system is that expressed by Ebel:

The principal evils associated with grading for which the faculty is responsible are the results, primarily, of: (a) Failure, as a faculty, to define the meaning of grades and the bases for grading explicitly, (b) Failure, as a faculty, to require uniform observance by all faculty members of the specified meanings of grades and bases for grading, (c) Failure, as individual instructors, to grade carefully and honestly. The principal evils associated with grading for which students are responsible are the results, primarily, of: (a) Short-sighted pursuit of higher grades at the expense of useful learning, (b) Unrealistic pursuit of achievements which are at or beyond the limits of the students reasonable capabilities, and which as a result cost more in dull toil, anxiety, and disappointment than they are worth. (1)

A statement of student outlook on grades includes the following:

After a student has experienced several terms here his classroom education has a tendency to become routine rather than stimulating and exciting. 'Psyching-out' the professor becomes a dull game with no one really winning. Students frequently have answers to the question, 'What's he like?' when they enter the classroom the first day. Communication informing students as to the types of examinations to expect and what to study for them is often passed freely from the experienced to the less experienced. Faculty members often increase grading fever by devoting considerable time to a discussion of grade distributions. This seems to encourage the process of mechanical test instruction and equally mechanical study habits. There is some evidence of considerable bitterness and cynicism toward the university on the part of those students who try and fail or who have friends that do. Many students feel their freedom considerably limited to learn those things which are most relevant to them as individuals. Creativity is replaced
with a tendency towards conformity. Some students become by their own admissions too restricted to their major field for fear of receiving a low grade in otherwise interesting coursework. Some students because of a rigid punishment-and-reward system in some courses find it nearly impossible to develop an intrinsic motivating force unless it would chance to be rewarded with a good grade. (5)

The most important factor in the learning process is probably motivation. And the most effective kind of motivation is that which is intrinsic. Although extrinsic motivation can be useful, it often dominates the intrinsic kind and to that extent is inconsistent with or even antithetical to motivation for significant learning. A few remarks are listed below that give opinions on the dysfunctions of grades relative to motivation:

a. An artificial stimulus, such as the fear of low marks, may in some cases produce educational motivation, but it also may lead to cheating, rote memorization, frustration, and rejection of desirable academic values. (6)

b. Conventional A-F letter grading may corrupt the teaching situation by encouraging grade-grubbing and alienating student and teacher. (4)

c. Motivation for grades often discourages students from increasing the breadth of their educational programs by enrolling in courses in areas unrelated to their major. (4, 6)

d. Since 60% of all grades fall within one grade point (2.0 and 3.0) many able students develop a fatalistic attitude which leads to performance below their capabilities. (4)

e. The incentive provided by grades apparently does not even yield a retention of knowledge much less a development of discipline. (4)

f. Grades may be encouraging an irrelevant kind of learning, i.e., emphasis on stored knowledge rather than an ability to learn the process by which new knowledge is acquired. (4)
V. NON-UNIFORMITY IN GRADING PRACTICES

Grades and grade point averages should reflect as accurately and equitably as possible the accomplishments of students in the courses and programs in which they are enrolled. To serve the several functions outlined above, grades should be valid, reliable, and equitable.

The validity of grades is the degree to which they provide a true reflection of accomplishments, the degree to which grades and grade point averages provide a true ranking of students in terms of their relative accomplishments. They can be valid, then, only to the degree that there exists a common conception of the basis on which grades are assigned, that is, a common definition of the types of accomplishments on which grades are based. To the degree that some instructors base grades on effort and attitude while others do not, the resulting grade point averages will lack validity. One has only to reflect upon the wide variety of criteria and procedures utilized by individual instructors to assert that grades possess less validity than they should.

The reliability of grades is the degree to which they are consistent, the degree to which the choice of an instructor for a particular course does not affect the student's grade for the course, and the degree to which there is a tendency for students to earn generally similar grades in all of their courses. It is a reasonable assumption that a grade point average based upon a series of grades that are concentrated near a single level is more meaningful than one which is based upon a number of highly disparate grades. Grades may and perhaps should never be perfectly reliable due to normal variations.
in student effort and other factors. As with validity, disparate bases for grading detract from the reliability of grades. So does the basing of grades upon limited evidence of accomplishment. (A grade for a single course will be less reliable than a grade point average for a number of courses.) Certainly at MSU there are sufficient instances of disparate bases in grading and of the basing of grades upon overly limited evidence to assert that grades and grade averages are not as reliable as they might be.

Equitability in grading has special reference to the rationality, consistency, and uniformity of grading standards. It may be agreed that some academic areas, by virtue of the nature of the subject matter, should have more demanding academic standards than others. But in order that grades may be compared on a meaningful basis, there should be some uniformity in the grading standards used by different faculty members, particularly in different sections of the same course and even in different courses and academic areas.

The following tables of data on MSU grades are designed to illustrate types of non-uniformity in grading practices that derive basically from the three interrelated sources just discussed. Clearly some degree of non-uniformity in data of these types is "valid" and should be expected. However, it is the Committee's judgment that there exists a degree of non-uniformity in these data that is undesirable and that should and can be reduced. (Additional data and remarks on these points are contained in references 2, 6, 7, 8, and 9.)
Table 1 shows grade averages for the courses of each college by course level (5A). Ignoring All-University courses, these averages at the 100-200 level range from 2.15 to 2.73 and at the 300-499 level from 2.40 to 2.78. At the 800-900 level the range is from 3.22 to 3.57.

Some of the non-uniformities reflected in this table may be reasonably attributed to intrinsic differences in the subject matter offered by the several colleges. Other aspects of this non-uniformity may be attributable to differences in the abilities of students taking courses in the several colleges. However, a special analysis of fall, 1965, grades, designed specifically to furnish evidence on this latter point, indicates that grade averages vary among the colleges even if the factor of student ability is statistically controlled. (11)
Table 2 illustrates differences among departments in average grades assigned. (7) Data of this type could be displayed for any selected group of departments and would exhibit characteristics similar to those shown here. (The College of Arts and Letters was not selected on the basis of the variations shown in this table.) While several other features of the data in this table are of interest, the figures in the final column, "Difference in Mean Grades," are perhaps most relevant. These figures are the differences between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Section(s)</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Section(s)</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Difference in Mean Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>10,962</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>4,016</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2,634</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>8,695</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>2,085</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4,719</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>100-200</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300-400</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the mean grades earned by students in the courses of the specified department and, on a course-by-course basis, the mean grades earned in all other courses the students in the object course were taking. The "Mean Grade in Other Courses" figure is thus a norm by which the department's mean grades are compared.

For lower division courses the difference in mean grades for these eight departments ranged from over one-half a letter grade high (.54, department A) to over one-half a grade lower (-.57, department H). The variation for upper division courses was not as great, the index ranging from .28 to -.23, or approximately one-fourth of a letter grade at the extremes. Thus, there is non-uniformity among the grades assigned by different departments.

Another reference provides a more dramatic illustration of the variation among departmental grading standards. (12) For the 80 departments offering 100-200 level courses in the fall of 1966, 29 had average grades in these courses of 2.60 or greater and 12 had averages below 2.20. The full range was 3.31 for African Languages to 1.87 for Statistics. Other departmental averages fill in this range making it clear that many departments participate in data of this sort and not just the two departments mentioned.

Table 3 exhibits an analysis similar to that of Table 2 for the average grades given in the several largest courses for a single depart-
The department, E in Table 2, was selected because of its median position in Table 2. The 'differences in mean grades' shown here range from almost one-half a letter grade lower (-.46, course A) to almost one-half a letter grade higher (.43, courses H and J). This is, in all likelihood, not a typical department in terms of the non-uniformity represented in this table.

Table 4 contains similar data for the several sections of a single course. The mean grades in the sections of this course ranged from 1.64 to 2.83, a difference of more than a full letter grade, and the difference-in-mean-grades measure ranged from -.59 to .45. In terms of this range of average grades for the sections of a single course, this course is probably not typical. However, an appreciable number of courses in the basic reference (8) do exhibit a pattern of this type.

Of the several types of non-uniformity of grades among colleges, among departments, among courses within departments, and among sections within a single department, it is this latter type which is perhaps most inequitable to the students involved. But it is also this type which is perhaps most amenable to correction by means of the use of common examinations and, more significantly, by means of discussions within departments of grading standards and of the proper basis for the assignment of grades.

The Committee believes that non-uniformity is a serious problem but one that can be attacked without detracting in any fundamental way
### Table 3

Summary of Grades in Selected Courses of a Single Department*
Fall, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Section(s)</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Section(s)</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Difference in Mean Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Courses with enrollments over 50, except for courses J and K which were the largest 400 level courses, for department E of Table 2.

### Table 4

Summary of Grades by Section for a Single Course*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Numbers</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Section</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Section</th>
<th>Number of Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Mean Grades in Other Courses</th>
<th>Difference in Mean Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>-.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Course C in Table 3, the largest course in the department.
from the individual instructor's rights and responsibilities for grading. The basic approach recommended is to encourage the faculty of each department to carry forward continuing study and discussion of their individual and departmental grading practices and, in order to facilitate such study and discussion, to make available to departments and the faculty members thereof appropriate data on grades. The procedure recommended is thus a self-correcting one in which instructors can knowledgeably decide which parts of existing non-uniformity in current grading practices are dysfunctional and which parts are valid, and can reach agreements on appropriate bases of and standards for grading. Uniformity for its own sake is not sought. Rather, uniformity attained through mutually developed and understood academic goals and relationships between academic goals and grades is desired.

13. Currently prepared reports on grades shall be made available to each academic department and each report shall be circulated among the faculty members thereof. Where feasible, each faculty member should receive a copy of appropriate portions of such reports. In general, each department should receive summary data on the grades given in other departments and detailed data, by section, for the courses of the department. Departmental faculties shall be encouraged to study and discuss the data in these reports.

Included among the reports currently available each term are "Comparative Statement of Grades," Office of the Registrar, (10) "Distribution of Grades by Section," Office of the Registrar, (13) and "Grading Practices Analysis," Office of Institutional Research, (7)

Finally, the Committee approves of the use of common examinations in multiple-section courses. While the specific use made of common
final examinations does and should vary among departments and while the practice has other values, it generally introduces desired uniformity into the grades awarded in the several sections of such courses. (11) The Committee is gratified by the fact that an increasing number of departments and courses are experimenting with and using common examinations.
VI. THE DOUBLE HURDLE

The present 2.00 G.P.A. plus other special requirements for admission to a degree-granting college with junior status creates the apparently anomalous situations in which (a) a student who by University College standards is making satisfactory progress towards a degree is not qualified for admittance to a degree-granting college when he reaches junior standing, and (b) a student who, by virtue of a G.P.A. less than 2.00 at the end of his sophomore year, is not qualified to continue in the University despite the likelihood that he could raise his average to the graduation requirement level of 2.00 by the end of his senior year.

Therefore, a more gradual and graduated scale to encourage and aid the student along a road of continual improvement, when necessary, is the objective. The focus is shifted from admission to upper college, to the requirements for graduation. To require a poorly performing freshman to peak in his performance during the sophomore year appears inadvisable.

By introducing a more gradual scale, there is the risk that some students will be encouraged to postpone corrective measures. However, the risk deserves to be tried and evaluated.

In weighing the above factors the Committee concluded that the double hurdle should be changed to a more gradual step scale to give the serious student who has inadequate preparation a more reasonable opportunity to succeed. (6)
14. An All-University four-year graduated step scale shall be introduced in place of the present so-called "double hurdle" of a required 2.00 grade point average for both graduation and for admission to the junior year. It shall be structured so that the student must have a 2.00 for graduation. The details of the step scale shall be formulated by the Assistant Deans' Group in consultation with the Office of Evaluation Services, the Office of Institutional Research, and other appropriate University offices.
VII. METHODS FOR INTRODUCING CHANGE

A single group or committee cannot determine successfully the best possible grading system for a university the size of MSU because too many different viewpoints prevail. Moreover, insufficient data exist on which to formulate decisions. But changes must be forthcoming, and the faculty of the University will be the primary source of really significant modifications. Therefore, the faculty must be allowed and encouraged to generate changes, and the administration should provide appropriate coordination and supervision. If carefully and thoroughly planned experiments are introduced, data can be obtained that may show the best directions for improvement.

15. Departments and colleges shall be encouraged to introduce modifications in grading systems or new grading systems provided they are approved by the University Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost. Only carefully planned and coordinated experiments with evaluation processes and time limits are recommended as appropriate to the purposes of this recommendation.

Experimentation merely for the purpose of "let's try it and see" is not in the spirit of this recommendation. Probably small numbers of students should be involved in any experiment and on a voluntary basis if possible. Evaluation processes must be included in the plans, and approval of the Curriculum Committee and the Office of the Provost is necessary to provide coordination and appropriate control of the numbers and diversity of experiments that can be introduced at a given time. Assistance from staff specialists in the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of the Educational Development Program, and the Office of Evaluation Services can also be obtained.
To avoid any chance of misunderstanding, it is suggested that a proliferation of experiments in all directions is not intended. Casual or incomplete approaches would be considered irresponsible.

Properly and wisely conducted experiments by the faculty who are dealing continually with the problems of motivating and teaching students should provide a tremendous possibility for worthwhile changes in a grading system that has lain dormant for many decades.

If the various opinions, statements, and assertions regarding grades and grading systems are transposed into questions, it is found that very few can be answered. For example: Are grades valid predictors of future academic work? Do grades accomplish desirable forms of motivation? Do grades detract from creativity? What does a grade mean at MSU? Are grades necessary to gain admission to graduate school, to obtain fellowships, and to get a job? Would a lack of grades encourage mediocrity? There are many other similar questions without sufficient data to answer them. Our available data are primarily directed toward inspecting the current system and its non-uniformities, and do not apply to other kinds of grading systems. (See reference 16 for a compilation of a number of questions about grading systems.)

An ad hoc committee or an occasional research project is insufficient to provide the broad base of detailed data that are needed to analyze comprehensively a grading system and to predict directions for improvement. Thus, a formal organizational step is recommended
that will introduce continual study to obtain such data. In short, such a group should study the relationships between the learning process and grades and obtain factual information to aid the faculty in future decisions on changing the grading system.

16. The Provost's Office shall establish a research program or direct existing offices to organize a research program to provide continual study of the motivational factors associated with the learning and teaching processes and to evaluate the effects of various grading systems on these factors.
A pamphlet, booklet, or similar document is needed to improve the understanding of the grading system at MSU by both faculty and students. It should include a discussion of what the grading system is, and what it is intended to accomplish. It should give general guidelines for assigning grades and a delineation of faculty and student responsibilities. It should discuss some of the aspects of the validity, equitability, and useful uniformity of grades. It should include the mechanics of grading, rules and regulations, such matters as missing grade cards, late grades, changing grades, and conditional grades.

A special committee of the Assistant Deans' Group and an appropriate student group should be appointed to prepare the booklet for distribution.

17. A detailed formal statement setting forth the definitions of grades, the bases for grading, and the University's policies with respect to grades and grading shall be prepared, approved, and distributed to students, faculty, and administrators.
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