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Editor’s Note

We’re in the first year of the 21st century; the first year of the 2nd millennium, and CHANGE appears to be the operative word. In this issue of C&U we give our readers both a philosophical approach in a commentary on change and a feature article on how one institution, Kent State University, has developed and is implementing an institution-wide strategic plan.

The WEB! Can anyone really remember when we didn’t have it? Is it another case of a bothersome camel’s nose into the academic tent, or can it be used as an effective means of communication. Kevin Houchnin helps connect the institution via the Web with both internal and external audiences.

BUDGET, truly a dreaded word! Another feature article analyzes the differential effects state funding reductions of the early 1900s had on doctoral and non-doctoral institutions. Do the results of this study conform to what happened at your institution?

The final word we look at in this issue of C&U is an old-timer—it’s been around at least from the 1960s but was quite probably alive and kicking during Colonial times. The “word” is GRADE INFLATION! To learn the latest update on this ever popular topic we have turned to an institutional study carried through at Eastern Kentucky University. Have the faculty of your institution complained that grades are influenced by student evaluations? You will find out what was the case at EKU and what was done about it. You may even want to write the editor a letter.

Instructions to Authors

The C&U Editorial Board welcomes manuscripts for publication in College & University, AACRAO’s scholarly research journal. AACRAO members are especially encouraged to submit articles pertaining to their own experiences with emerging issues or innovative practices within the profession.

The Board also welcomes comments on articles, timely issues in higher education, and other topics of interest to this journal’s readers in the form of letters to the editor or longer guest commentary. We especially invite AACRAO members to participate in reviewing books.

Manuscript Preparation

Manuscripts for feature articles should be no longer than 4,500 words. Manuscripts for guest commentary and book reviews should not exceed 2,000 words. Letters to the editor will ordinarily be limited to 200 words.

All submissions must be saved to an IBM-compatible disk (Microsoft Word, preferably) and include a hard-copy original printed on 8.5” x 11” white paper. Because the Board has a blind review policy, the author’s name should not appear on any text page. A cover sheet should include the title of the manuscript, author’s name, address, phone and fax number, and e-mail address.

References should be formatted in the author-date style and follow guidelines provided on page 526 of The Chicago Manual of Style, 14th edition. A list of references should appear at the end of the article. Text citations also follow the author-date format; examples may be found on page 641 of the Manual. For more information or for samples, please contact the C&U Editor.

Essential tables and charts should be included on separate pages at the end of the manuscript. All graphics should be submitted on clean, reproducible, or camera-ready paper.

All submissions are accepted for publication with the understanding that the College & University editors reserve the right to edit for clarity and style. Please do not submit articles that are under consideration for publication by another periodical.

Authors whose manuscripts are selected for publication will be asked to submit a short biographical statement and an abstract of their article, each no more than thirty-five words.

Submit manuscripts, letters, and direct inquiries to—

Roman S. Gawkoski
C&U Editor
Office of the Registrar
Marquette University
PO Box 1881
Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881
Phone: (262) 782-3855; Fax: (414) 288-1773;
E-mail: 9761gawkoski@marquette.edu

Editorial Procedure

The editor will acknowledge receipt of manuscripts (letters will not be acknowledged) and will forward them to members of the C&U Editorial Board for review. The Board will consider the appropriateness of the article for AACRAO’s membership, the current needs of the professions, the usefulness of the information, the nature and logic of the research methodology, clarity, and the style of presentation.

This review may take as long as three months, after which the C&U editor will inform the author of the manuscript’s acceptance or rejection.
Mention of the words “strategic planning” is enough to make some college and university administrators take cover, deep cover. Many professionals consider strategic plans to be a massive waste of time and paper. And they can be, if there is no buy-in at the grassroots level of an organization, or if the resulting document is so lengthy that it sits on a shelf collecting dust.

But there are surprising benefits of a strategic planning process that is well-executed, especially for those responsible for enrollment management. In a recent round of strategic planning at Kent State University, we applied several measures to ensure that the university community would reap the maximum benefits from such an effort.

Under the leadership of University President Carol A. Cartwright, Kent State developed a strategic planning approach that sought broad participation at every step. In the decentralized environment of a major public institution – Kent State has an enrollment of more than 32,000 on eight campuses across Northeast Ohio – this was deemed necessary to advance a shared vision that would guide common goal-setting and coordinated implementation for the University’s 4,000 faculty, staff, and administrators.

To facilitate an inclusive, bottom-up strategic planning process at Kent State, academic deans and administrators worked with faculty and staff to select participants of the 60-member Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). Each major department or unit on campus (including students) had at least one representative on the committee. This helped to encourage an open two-way dialogue between the steering committee and the respective units. Various groups on campus also were consulted. In addition, an e-mail bulletin board was created for the SPSC and drafts of the strategic plan were posted for discussion. Documents also were available for review on the World Wide Web.

More than 1,000 faculty and staff from all eight campuses participated in small-group unit planning discussions. Each unit then submitted a report to the SPSC, which used the material to develop a draft of the strategic plan, which was circulated back to the units for feedback. Before going to the University Board of Trustees for final approval in September 1999, the plan was adopted by Kent State’s Educational Policy Council and Faculty Senate.

An essential starting point for any strategic planning process is to have an accurate analysis of your institution’s current situation, as well as the challenges on the horizon. With these insights, your stated mission can be matched with known strengths to capitalize on opportunities for...
positive change. The strategies chosen must reflect your institution's values and be economically justifiable, politically attainable, and consistent with serving student needs.

Kent State began its planning efforts from an exceptionally strong position, having just completed an in-depth analysis of both its internal operations and the external environment. In September 1997, the University convened a Centennial Commission to assess Kent State's strengths and opportunities for its second century of service to the community. The 160-member Commission was composed primarily of prominent alumni, business executives, and civic leaders with a stake in the University's continued success. Recommendations made by the Commission in June 1998 were closely linked with the strategies proposed by the SPSC.

Concurrent with this external analysis, Kent State conducted a Cultural Self-Study to measure the underlying assumptions, beliefs, and values of the university community. These internal perspectives suggested the development of a highly inclusive approach to our planning process. Also, known cultural factors can now be addressed as we implement the strategic plan.

Managing Change for the 21st Century

The future will require enrollment managers to fully implement the concept of strategic planning. This type of planning will be required because of the rapidly changing student recruitment environment in which colleges and universities find themselves in the 21st century. Strategic planning is an institution-wide, future-examining, participatory process resulting in statements of institutional intention that match program strengths with opportunities to serve society. Strategic planning requires the institution to create its own future.

Strategic planning also places an emphasis on change rather than stability, and external factors rather than internal ones. Strategic planning assumes an open system in which organizations are dynamic and constantly changing as they integrate information from various sources.

In terms of managing enrollment, Kent State had to grapple with many of the same issues facing all colleges and universities. Institutions of higher education serve an increasingly diverse student population, including working adults who must balance work and/or family commitments with educational pursuits. In addition, the availability of scholarships and financial aid has grown in importance as the portion of educational costs subsidized by state and federal government has steadily diminished. This rapidly changing enrollment environment, coupled with the fact that the University's budget is largely enrollment driven, made it critically important to link our enrollment management plan to the University's new strategic plan.

Benefits of a Defined Vision

A clearly defined vision creates the possibility of synergy between areas of an institution that tend to operate in relative isolation. An obvious example would be how a strategic plan facilitates closer coordination of the activities related to admissions, public relations, marketing, alumni relations, and fund raising. The process of articulating a shared purpose or set of intended messages helps to break down the silo mentality, especially in a large institution.

Our second strategic directive, “Increase the University's capacity to competitively recruit and retain students,” would seem to relate only to the goals of enrollment management. At Kent State, however, this strategy has become a catalyst for efforts to enhance the quality of instruction and student services, as well as to raise private scholarship endowments. The University has embarked on an integrated marketing plan, in conjunction with a major fund-raising campaign, that will employ a consistent message and visual identity to recruit students, cultivate donors, and build Kent State's overall reputation for quality. A well-defined public image—one that reflects the vision articulated in the University Strategic Plan—will help to position Kent State as a top choice for public higher education.

Perhaps the biggest reason to invest time in strategic planning is to raise awareness about current challenges
and how they might be overcome. Recommendations submitted to the SPSC by our Division of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) placed a critical emphasis on satisfying the growing demand for lifelong learning by developing more courses that can be offered via the Internet. The EMSA report pointed out that, at a time when students have more choices than ever regarding where they can acquire a degree and academic programming, Kent State must be a player in the newly forming global higher educational marketplace in order to remain competitive. The strategic planning process also allowed EMSA to underscore the need to develop effective methods for advising these students and providing them with needed services as a result of Kent State’s entry into the distance learning market.

Input from EMSA regarding the opportunity to ensure the University’s financial health by addressing an external factor, the growing demand for distance learning, was incorporated into Kent State’s fifth and ninth strategic directions. The ninth directive concerns the need to develop multiple sources of revenue to offset declines in support from the state. Bulleted action items (not shown here) under each directive identify the most likely approaches for achieving that specific aim. One action item under direction #5, for example, is to “realize distributed learning as a new source of instructional revenue.” Each strategic direction also is accompanied by a brief rationale. Strategic Direction #9 was amplified by the statement that, “The University’s ability to deliver a quality learning experience to this expanding audience can contribute to student success. To emphasize the impact that individuals can have on the bottom line, we listed the following action item under direction #9: Promote the awareness that all faculty and staff have a role in strengthening the revenue base through the quality of their daily interactions with students and the services they provide.

Kent State’s final strategic plan is 13 pages in length—not an unwieldy tome, yet still potentially daunting to read. To keep the main points of the plan at the forefront of people’s minds, we produced a wall calendar featuring full-color campus scenes, an abbreviated version of the strategic plan and a motivational theme for each month, as well as important dates and telephone numbers. The calendar, distributed to every faculty and staff member across the eight-campus network, has been a popular success.

Broad participation in strategic planning also helps an institution to identify and capitalize on its strengths, aligning them with opportunities for positive change. For example, Kent State is the only school in the state to offer the Master of Library Science degree. Kent also has one of the top ten schools of journalism in the nation, along with strong programs in business and computer sciences. The process of strategic planning made it clear that the increasing demand for graduates with information literacy and technology skills has placed Kent State in an excellent position to establish a multidisciplinary program in the information sciences. Addressing this external need, in turn, have a significant impact on Kent’s enrollment.

It’s all About Building Relationships: Linking the Enrollment Management Plan to Institutional Vision

In order for enrollment management to be truly strategic, it must be actively integrated with an institution’s fundamental mission. Ideally, enrollment strategies should be part and parcel of the strategic plan adopted by a college or university.

To ensure close integration of both planning efforts, Kent State has formed an Enrollment Planning Steering Committee (EPSC) comprised of high-level decision-makers from each major administrative area. This steering committee determines which academic units have the potential for enrollment growth, based on existing environmental factors and University-wide strategies. The EPSC then establishes enrollment targets for various academic programs to support the University’s overall budget plan. The Committee also monitors and assesses the effectiveness of the University’s marketing plan as it relates to student recruitment.

Although the work of the EPSC focuses primarily on strategic directions 2 and 3, its success is also tied to Strategic Direction #6: Articulate and promote Kent State’s distinct institutional identity. To collectively achieve an integrated marketing theme, a great deal of attention was directed to building relationships across different areas of the University. These relationships can be defined as “strategic” in that they assist with maintaining the “strategic perspective” that positions the University to be competitive and successful. It is these strategic relationships that provide for a sustained competitive advantage. The numerous people responsible for the University’s marketing and public relations enterprise are now committed to building the strong unified institutional identity that is
required for success in both the student recruitment and fund-raising arenas.

In its input for the strategic plan, the Division of EMSA also emphasized the need to attract students with progressively higher GPAs by targeting recruitment efforts towards students who are most likely to be academically successful and to be graduated from Kent State. Enrollment management professionals were most pleased to see their recommendations incorporated into the strategic plan. One of the action items for achieving Strategic Direction #2, for example, is to “Determine the characteristics of students who are most likely to enroll and succeed at Kent State; target recruitment approaches toward those populations.” The directive to “Recruit students whose needs and educational goals most closely match Kent State’s academic curricula and student services” also followed directly from the “good fit” model submitted by EMSA.

The Division also emphasized the role of private scholarships and other financial aid in the recruitment of high-ability students. EMSA recommendations highlighted the need to expand the University’s resource base by fostering early and continued connections with alumni who will become the next donors to the University.

Summary/Outcomes
An important thing to realize about strategic planning is that it is not an end in itself, but an ongoing process. As a result of our new strategic plan, Kent State changed the basic format of the annual planning documents required from academic and administrative units. In the past, these documents had functioned primarily as “reports” on accomplishments of the previous year. They are now much more forward-looking, focusing on how our strategic aims will be achieved in the future.

Due to the rigorous process of developing the strategic plan, Kent State faculty and staff members have a greater sense of issues and concerns facing the University than in the past. As a result, they are more able to contribute and develop effective plans to address the complex needs of the institution. The plan promotes creative thinking and cross-divisional initiatives at all levels of the University. The University community now clearly understands, as a result of the strategic planning process, that strategic relationships are critical to the University’s efforts to sustain effective marketing and advancement efforts.

The strategic relationships developed as a result of this process also provide a common language for interaction among the University leaders: executive officers, academic deans, board members, key alumni, and President Carol Cartwright. This unified vision of the institution and its future translates into a better educational “product” for Kent State, which in turn enhances student recruitment and retention.

Among the specific EMSA goals for 1999-2000 is to involve more Kent State alumni in student recruitment activities. This strategy follows directly from a recommendation made by the Centennial Commission to increase alumni engagement in all aspects of University life. This shared perception of our alumni base as an underutilized resource can have a positive impact in many areas, including student recruitment and institutional advancement.

The strategic plan incorporated a directive to “Increase the endowment for merit scholarships to aid in the recruitment of a diverse, academically talented student body.” This laid the groundwork for Kent State to set the goal of raising $20 million in scholarship funds by the year 2003. Here is just one example of how a well-managed strategic planning process can unite the efforts of faculty, staff, alumni, and administrators in a truly collaborative effort, not only to achieve enrollment goals, but also to enhance the reputation of the institution and to benefit future generations of students.

Situational Analysis: National Issues in Higher Education

- The expectation that institutions will be learner-centered;
- The inability of state and federal governments to adequately support public education, and the concurrent search for alternative funding partnerships;
- Increasing emphasis on measurable performance related to student access, retention, graduation and job placement;
- Transformation to a knowledge-based economy that requires technology skills;
- The rapid growth of human knowledge, which creates new demands for lifelong learning;
- A shift from the campus as the sole site of learning to the addition of homes, libraries, and workplaces as classrooms; and
- A steadily accelerating shift in the demographic makeup of populations from which colleges and universities have traditionally drawn students.

Source: Center for Higher Education Policy at the University of Southern California, Los Angeles
Now that your campus is wired port to pillow, it's time to rewire the way you communicate with internal and external audiences. You probably realize that the easiest way for most people off campus to find out more about you is by entering www.yourcollege.edu in their browsers. That could include prospects, alumni, potential faculty members, and million-dollar donors.

Meanwhile back at Old Main, assuming that knowledge = power and time = money, you can make staff and faculty much more effective and efficient by putting the information they need right at their fingertips—as close as the nearest computer.

Geographically dispersed external audiences—especially younger people who routinely use the Internet at school and work—may already think of your Web site as the first place to look for information. This is particularly valuable for recruiting traditional students and business people for adult education. Using the Web can be two weeks faster than requesting brochures by mail. With a little encouragement—like a nudge during a telephone call, or maybe a postcard announcing Homecoming activities that says, “Visit our Web site for more information”—older alumni and donors will catch on, too.

Teaching Old Dogs New Tricks

Encouraging internal audiences to find answers on the Web means breaking with tradition and changing old habits. In previous years, your staff had to wait for the 25 boxes of course catalogs to come back from the printer. People might find it hard to believe all that information is now online, two weeks earlier and more accurate than ever before—since corrections and updates can be made within minutes. But after they've learned the new programs and seen for themselves how easily information pops up from a keyword search, you can expect an enthusiastic reception for the next phase of your online conversion.

Think how much of your budget could be saved by reducing the hard copies of many documents. Plus you eliminate staff time at the copy machine, cut out mailing and distribution costs, and avoid the stress of making last-minute changes before “going to press.”

If you're concerned about making internal communications too public, those sections of the Web site that contain sensitive information may be password protected. Other internal uses for your site could include an online newsletter, special sections for personnel and health insurance information, job postings, and so on.

One disadvantage of your Web site is that users have to log on and look for the information, which makes it somewhat easier to ignore than brochures and letters stacked on the corner of their desks. The best way around this is to keep reminding them—announce new information on the site with e-mail, memos, and in newsletters.

Keeping Up With the Smiths

The trend for university Web sites is to offer audience-specific menu options on the home page so that daily users, such as students and faculty, immediately head for a different area than do alumni and donors, or prospective students. These categories are not intended to segregate but to speed the search for information.

Kevin Houchin is a client consultant at Stamats Communications, a higher education marketing firm based in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. For more information about Stamats, visit our Web site at www.stamats.com or e-mail us at inforequest@stamats.com.
Features you might want offer these audiences:

- **Local community/news reporters**—speaker series, cultural events, resources (like the library or athletic facilities), and an institutional profile with quick facts about current enrollment, founding date, and so on.
- **Alumni**—directory; searchable “class notes” from the alumni magazine; roster of alumni events for reunions, homecoming, and others.
- **Faculty**—password-protected chat rooms for their committee work that allow discussions to continue even when scheduling is difficult; special pages for posting class assignments; and resources for online research.

A frequent cause for concern with this system is that faculty or administrators believe their information is “buried” three or four levels from the top. The counterargument is that the top levels are focused on navigation. Research shows that if the site is logically organized, visitors do not mind drilling down three levels to find information about the organic chemistry department. They are quickly frustrated, however, if they don’t find it under “Sciences” and have to hunt for five minutes to find it under “Nursing.”

It’s understandable that everybody wants their department linked from the home page, where no one can miss it. But there’s only so much real estate on one page, and most of it should be given links to other navigational pages. As a compromise, you may want to offer a one-week reign as “featured page”—which also functions as an incentive to persuade departments to convert their old pages to a new style standard you’re attempting to enforce. Just create a colorful banner ad on the homepage to encourage traffic to the featured page. The next week give the plug to another department, and so on, until every area with a Web page has conformed to the design specifications and has had a turn in the spotlight.

---

The Pluses and Minuses of Linking to the Student Newspaper

Many college administrators are reluctant to put the campus newspaper where anyone might see it. They worry that a single critical story will tarnish the image they’ve been so careful to craft throughout the admissions funnel.

On the other hand, a headline like “Students Demand Increased Flexibility in Scheduling” has a positive side. It indicates that your student body wants a say in how the campus is run and the student paper feels free to report on it. Those are strong, positive messages to convey to your prospective students.

Students look to the online paper for many reasons, such as:

- To get a sense of what there is to do on and around campus—a snapshot of the life they can experience there as a student.
- To search for a product or service—classified ads for apartments, requests for rides home, and announcements of poetry contests all provide site visitors with valuable information.
- To learn about the people—features about students/faculty doing unusual research or winning prestigious awards give them an idea of the kind of people your institution attracts.

Many colleges put a modified version of their newspaper online, for a variety of reasons:

- They don’t have the time to convert the entire paper to HTML.
- They recognize the limitations of the format.
- They want to steer clear of negativity. However, you should offer a balanced view of your campus. Too much positive information sounds too good to be true; visitors will be skeptical. Occasional critical articles increase the Web site’s credibility with readers.
Was This Piece of Paper Really Necessary?

Q How many of the following documents could be added to your Web site?

A All of them, of course. The more effort you put into integrating your campus database systems with your Web site, the less work the people in your office have to do. That frees them up to talk to people, providing that “personal attention” in which your office takes pride.
National recession and declining state revenues in the early 1990s brought tough times to public colleges and universities. Higher education, one of the few discretionary items in state budgets, became the big loser in budget battles with mandated programs in health care, corrections, welfare, and K-12 education (Gold 1995). Nationally, its share of state budgets declined drastically in the first half of 1990s (Callan and Finney 1997). Gold and Ritchie (1995) report that state funding in higher education fell from 14 percent in 1990 to 12.5 percent of the total in 1994. Hines (1994) notes that in 1993, for the first time in decades, states provided fewer resources for higher education than they did the previous year. Two studies have traced the effect of budget problems during the period on public university systems (Burke 1999) and on baccalaureate campuses (Burke 1998). This paper compares how doctoral and non-doctoral campuses reacted to reduced levels of state funding in the first half of the 1990s.

Study Framework
This study explores whether the doctoral and non-doctoral institutions differed on seven issues:
1. Planning for reduced levels of state support.
2. Using tuition and fee increases to fill budget shortfalls.
3. Reducing classes and sections as a response to budget problems.
4. Increasing part-time and decreasing full-time faculty to cut expenditures.
5. Retrenching non-tenured and tenured faculty to reduce spending.
6. Protecting quality and access in undergraduate education.
7. Safeguarding the quality of graduate education and research activities.

Given their different mission, size, and diversity, conventional wisdom suggests that doctoral and non-doctoral campuses might well differ in the following ways:
* Non-doctoral campuses would be more likely than doctoral universities to adopt long-term budget plans.

Non-doctoral campuses—which tend to be smaller, less diversified, and more administratively centralized—would seem more likely to adopt and accept...
long-term strategic plans for dealing with budget cuts than doctoral universities.

- Tuition and fees would fill more of the budget shortfall in doctoral than non-doctoral campuses. Heavier student demand for admission would offer more opportunity for doctoral universities to raise tuition and fees. Increasing student charges at the less selective non-doctoral institutions would more likely result in enrollment losses and corresponding decreases in revenues from tuition and fees.

- Doctoral universities would reduce classes and sections more than non-doctoral institutions. In general, the larger doctoral universities have many more classes and sections than non-doctoral campuses. Their greater number of offerings should allow the former to make bigger cuts in classes and sections than the latter.

- Both types of campuses would show a decrease in full-time faculty positions, but doctoral universities would experience a smaller decline than non-doctoral campuses. The diminished state support would inevitably force a reduction in full-time faculty, which constitute one of the largest expenses in all colleges and universities. However, the size of budgets and diversity of activities at doctoral universities would permit larger cuts in non-instructional areas and lessen the need for reductions in full-time faculty.

- Doctoral universities would increase their part-time faculty more than non-doctoral institutions. The availability of graduate students and, in many cases, the greater access to qualified part-time lecturers would give doctoral universities more ability to increase their part-time faculty than non-doctoral institutions.

- Neither group of institutions would retrench many non-tenured faculty members and few tenured professors, but graduate universities would retrench fewer faculty members in either category than non-doctoral campuses. Faculty on all campuses consider retrenchment—dismissing faculty with term contracts or tenure—as reprehensible. But the strength of faculty governance and the desire to protect national reputations would make retrenchment of non-tenured faculty more difficult and tenured faculty almost unthinkable in doctoral universities.

- Non-doctoral campuses would protect access and quality in undergraduate education, while doctoral universities would safeguard the quality of graduate education and research activities. Although colleges and universities naturally want to protect all of their purposes, it seems reasonable to assume that each type of institution would protect its special mission. The primary mission of non-doctoral colleges and universities is undergraduate education. Doctoral universities share that purpose, but graduate studies and research constitute their special mission and distinction.

Methods
Study Population
This study uses the results of a survey conducted by the Higher Education Program at the Rockefeller Institute in 1997. The population consisted of the chief financial officers of four-year public campuses in six states. It included a representative sample of doctoral and non-doctoral campuses from California, Florida, Massachusetts, New York, Texas, and Wisconsin. These six states represent a range of the nation’s regions and reflect the economic, cultural, and political differences that exist among the states. The first mailing of the surveys went in October 1997, with a follow-up in November. The project sent questionnaires to 145 baccalaureate campuses and received 98 replies, for a response rate of 68 percent. The study divides the responses into doctoral and non-doctoral groups, based on the Carnegie Classification (1994). The non-doctoral institutions comprised Master’s I and II, Baccalaureate I and II. The doctoral campuses consisted of research institutions I and II and Doctoral universities I and II. The survey population included 34 doctoral and 54 nondoctoral institutions.

Survey Instrument
While the questionnaire itself consisted of 26 closed questions, covering a range of issues in planning and budgeting for difficult times, this study considers only those questions that seem useful and feasible for comparing the reactions to budget problems by doctoral and non-doctoral campuses. Table 1 presents the questions, options, and scoring.

Data Analysis
The analysis explores both similarities and differences in the budget strategies of doctoral and non-doctoral institutions. It provides the mean scores and standard deviations. Bar graphs also give the percentages of the responses on the options for each question, because averages may often be misleading, for they obscure the variations within the two groups. This study employs discriminant analysis to investigate the relationship between institutional type and a set of variables signifying issues in budgeting during difficult times. The two groups of respondents from doctoral and non-doctoral institutions constitute the dependent variable. The independent or discriminating variables consist of the responses to the issues presented in the framework. The analysis includes enrollment size to control for its effect.
Results

Univariate Analysis

The univariate information appears under the issues discussed in the framework of this study. Table 1 displays group means and standard deviations. The finance officers of both doctoral and non-doctoral campuses, on average, assessed the size of their budget problems during the period as large. The mean scores¹ of doctoral (3.87) and non-doctoral (3.88) groups were nearly identical. Clearly, they agreed on the size of the problem. The only remaining question is whether they differed in their responses.

1. Planning

The mean scores on planning for doctoral and non-doctoral campuses are nearly identical. They suggest that planning in both types of institutions leaned slightly toward a middle term or two-year strategy. However, the percentages of institutions shown in Figure 1 suggest that the mean scores hide variances within each group. More than twice as many non-doctoral as doctoral campuses had only short-term plans, while doctoral universities tended to plot medium-term strategies. Both types showed considerable interest in plans that combined multiple time frames.

2. Tuition and Fees

The mean scores indicate that respondents from both doctoral and non-doctoral institutions tended toward the option of tuition and fees as moderately filling the budget gap. However, Figure 2 shows that the highest percentage of those from doctoral universities saw tuition and fees as contributing only slightly to the budget problem. Conversely, a third of the replies from non-doctoral campuses cited moderately; and nearly a third, significantly.

---

Table 1: Group Means, Standard Deviations, Options, and Scoring of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Doctoral Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Non-Doctoral Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Measured as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of plan</td>
<td>2.03 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.04 (1.39)</td>
<td>0) no plan, 1) short term [1 year]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) middle term [2 years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) long term [more than 2 years]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) combination of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition increase filled budget gap</td>
<td>2.92 (0.93)</td>
<td>2.98 (1.11)</td>
<td>1) none 2) slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) moderately 4) significantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of classes reduced</td>
<td>1.61 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.36 (1.93)</td>
<td>1) none 2) less than 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) 2.1-4% 4) 4.1-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) 6.1-8% 6) 8.1-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) more than 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in full-time faculty</td>
<td>1.70 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.66 (0.91)</td>
<td>1) net-decrease 2) no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) net-increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in part-time faculty</td>
<td>2.23 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.17 (1.01)</td>
<td>1) net-decrease 2) no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) net-increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of undergrad. edu</td>
<td>1.3 (0.92)</td>
<td>1.83 (0.70)</td>
<td>1) decrease 2) maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of grad. edu</td>
<td>1.73 (0.87)</td>
<td>1.86 (0.77)</td>
<td>1) decrease 2) maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research</td>
<td>1.88 (0.95)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.73)</td>
<td>1) decrease 2) maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to undergrad. edu</td>
<td>1.30 (0.97)</td>
<td>1.64 (0.70)</td>
<td>1) decrease 2) maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Retrenchment of full-time non-tenured faculty”</td>
<td>1.80 (1.6)</td>
<td>2.34 (2.24)</td>
<td>1) none 2) 1% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) 1.1-2% 4) 2.1-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) 3.1-4% 6) 4.1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) more than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Retrenchment of full-time tenured faculty”</td>
<td>1.60 (1.8)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.66)</td>
<td>1) none 2) 1% or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) 1.1-2% 4) 2.1-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) 3.1-4% 6) 4.1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) more than 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Mean on a 5-point scale:
1 = none, 2 = small, 3 = moderate, 4 = large, 5 = very large

---

Figure 1: The Distributions of Institution Type Within Plan Types

Figure 2: The Percentage of Institutions Reporting Various Levels of Tuition and Fees
3. Class and Section Reduction
On average, doctoral campuses reduced a relatively small percentage of classes and sections. Their average responses indicate that cuts fell in the category of less than 2 percent, while those from non-doctoral institutions reported reductions from 2 to 4 percent. Figure 3 reveals that over half of the respondents from doctoral campuses claimed no cuts, as opposed to only a third of those from non-doctoral institutions. Eight percent of the latter said their institutions reduced more than ten percent of their classes and sections.

4. Changes in Faculty
Doctoral and non-doctoral institutions differed only slightly on changes in the number of their full- and part-time faculty. On average, the replies from both types of institutions ranked closer to a net-decrease in their full-time faculty during the budget crisis. However, both doctoral and non-doctoral institutions reported closer to a net increase in part-time faculty. Figure 4 also reveals that over half of the responses from both types of campuses checked a net decrease in full-time faculty. Moreover, it suggests that doctoral institutions reduced full-time faculty slightly less than non-doctoral units. Conversely, Figure 5 demonstrates that more than half of both groups claimed a net increase in part-time faculty, with doctoral universities showing somewhat larger gains.

5. Retrenchment
Relatively few institutions of either type retrenched tenured faculty. Both doctoral and non-doctoral institutions, on average, reported that they dismissed less than one percent of tenured professors. The two groups did differ somewhat on retrenchment of non-tenured faculty. The mean scores suggest that doctoral institutions retrenched their full-time non-tenured faculty by less than 1 percent, while non-doctoral institutions averaged closer to 1 to 2 percent.

Figures 6 and 7 show the percentages retrenched for full-time non-tenured and tenured faculty. Despite many similarities, Figure 6 indicates that 13 percent of the non-doctoral campuses retrenched more than five percent of their non-tenured faculty—three times that of doctoral institutions. Although averages indicate that both types of institutions retrenched relatively few tenured faculty, Figure 7 shows that eight percent of the doctoral universities and six percent of the non-doctoral schools dismissed more than five percent of their tenured faculty.

6. Quality and Access in Undergraduate Education
An unusually large percent (23 percent) of the finance officers from doctoral universities failed to answer questions on the impact of the budget cuts on quality and access in undergraduate education. These two questions produced some of the largest differences between the two types of campuses. The mean scores for doctoral univer-
sities tended toward a decrease in the quality, while those for the non-doctoral leaned toward a maintenance of quality. The average for doctoral universities on access to undergraduate education also suggests a trend toward decrease. That for non-doctoral institutions indicates some bias toward maintenance.

Figures 8 and 9 present a clearer picture of both issues. Figure 8 reveals that 69 percent of the non-doctoral but only 46 percent of the doctoral respondents said they either maintained or increased the quality of undergraduate education. Figure 9 shows that non-doctoral campuses proved more protective of access, but even they show a large and even split between a decrease and a maintenance of quality. Doctoral universities have a similar split, with the category of decrease ranking slightly higher than that for maintenance. Again, the large percentage of doctoral respondents who failed to answer the questions on access or quality skews the percentages of this group.

7. Quality of Graduate Education
The mean scores of doctoral and non-doctoral institutions are close in assessing the impact of budget problems on the quality of graduate education. They suggest that both maintained the quality of graduate education. The surprise is that the non-doctoral campuses proved slightly more protective than the graduate universities. Figure 10 shows that a majority of both types of institutions maintained the quality of graduate education.

8. Quality of Research
While the mean scores suggest that both doctoral and non-doctoral campuses maintained the quality of research, Figure 11 affords a different view. More non-doctoral campuses decreased and maintained their quality of research than do research universities, but almost twice the percentage of the former than the latter institutions increased research quality.

Summary of Univariate Analysis
Univariate analysis confirms nearly all of the assumptions about the different responses of doctoral and non-doctoral institutions to their budget problems. Doctoral universities seem somewhat more favorable to longer-term budget plans. They reduced fewer classes and sections, increased part-time faculty more, and reduced full-time faculty less than did non-doctoral campuses. Non-doctoral campuses did protect quality and access in undergraduate education, while doctoral universities safeguarded research. The assumptions appeared faulty only in assuming that doctoral campuses would increase tuition and fees and safeguard graduate education more than non-doctoral institutions. Yet even these assumptions may have had more validity than the responses suggest. Leaders of doctoral institutions in several of the six states had urged larger tuition increases than legislatures permitted. Consequently, their responses on tuition may
indicate disappointment rather than reality. Their replies on the quality of graduate education may also say more about their high expectations than the budget impact.

**Multivariate Analysis**

Multivariate analysis tells a different story. Univariate analysis compares the reactions of the two types of campuses on each of the variables. Multivariate analysis identifies the relative power of each of those variables in distinguishing the responses from doctoral and non-doctoral campuses. It tells the statistical significance of the differences between two groups on all of the variables.

Multivariate analysis in this study uses the discriminant procedure of the SPSS system with linear classification rules and prior probabilities proportional to the sample size. This procedure deals with unequal sample sizes among the two groups (Weslowsky 1976; SPSS 1988; Huberty 1994). It computes a linear combination of independent variables (Canonical Discriminant Function) that significantly ($P<0.001$) explains the differences in responses between doctoral and non-doctoral institutions. The canonical correlation of 0.6 indicates that the discriminant function provides a moderate degree of association between the function and group membership (Table 2). Analysts often use the percentage of correct classification of respondents into appropriate groups to measure the accuracy of discriminant models (Johnsrud and Heck 1994). A classification of 50 percent represents no better than chance. This model classifies correctly 77 percent of the respondents into the proper groups of doctoral and non-doctoral campuses.

To explain the contribution of variables to the canonical discriminant function, two main indices may be used. The first, canonical structure coefficients, indicates correlation coefficients between the scores of the discriminant function and the values of the variables (similar to variable loadings in factor analysis). The second, standardized discriminant function coefficients, provides information about the joint contribution of the independent variables to the canonical function (Momen and Zehr 1998; Cruze-Castillo et al. 1994; Rencher 1992; SPSS 1988). The canonical structure offers a better procedure when a high correlation exists among discriminating or independent variables (Afifi and Clark 1990; Cruze-Castillo et al. 1994; Matthew et al. 1994). In this study, significant correlations among some of the variables requires the use of canonical structure coefficients. Table 3 presents the canonical structures that indicate correlation coefficients between variables and the score of canonical discriminant function. The variables with positive signs represent non-doctoral campuses; those with negative signs, doctoral universities.

Table 2: Canonical Discriminant Function

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Canonical Correlation (CC)</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$&lt;0.05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that quality of undergraduate education, reduction of classes and sections, access to undergraduate education, and retrenchment of full-time non-tenured faculty represent the most significant variables in distinguishing the responses of non-doctoral and doctoral campuses. This table suggests that non-doctoral institutions protected quality and access in undergraduate education, reduced classes and sections, and retrenched non-tenured faculty more than did doctoral universities. The remaining variables exhibit a declining power for discriminating between the two groups of responses. They show non-significant and decreasing differences between the replies from doctoral and non-doctoral institutions.

**Discussion**

At first glance, the results of multivariate analysis appear disappointing. Only four variables reveal significant differences in the reactions of doctoral and non-doctoral campuses to the budget problems of the first half of the 1990s. Still, these findings seem significant for two reasons. First, they run counter to the assumption that the two types of institutions would react differently to serious fiscal problems. Second, the few differences that do
appear are the ones that matter most for public campuses, for they involve the touchstones of public higher education — quality and access in undergraduate education.

The results confirmed only three of the seven assumptions about the different reactions of the two groups of institutions. Moreover, only four of the 11 variables show significant differences. Almost no difference appeared in their planning, which conflicts with the assumption that non-doctoral institutions would develop longer-range plans than doctoral universities. Tuition and fees actually filled slightly more of the gap at the non-doctoral group than at the doctoral group. The responses from non-doctoral campuses also claimed to reduce a significantly higher percentage of courses and sections than did the doctoral institutions. Although the doctoral universities did reduce their net full-time faculty slightly less than non-doctoral campuses and increased their part-time faculty slightly more than non-doctoral campuses, the differences seem much smaller than expected. As anticipated, non-doctoral campuses retrenched

Table 3: Canonical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Structure coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of undergraduate education</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of classes reduced</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to undergrad. education</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrenchment of full-time non-tenured faculty</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of graduate education</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of research activities</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition increase fill budget gap</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in part-time faculty</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in full-time faculty</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrenchment of full-time tenured faculty</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of plan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p<0.05
a significantly higher percent of non-tenured faculty, but surprisingly, doctoral campuses reported slightly more retrenchment of tenured faculty.

Clear differences did appear, as anticipated, on quality and access in undergraduate education. The non-doctoral campuses proved significantly more protective than doctoral institutions. Indeed, quality and access represented the first and third highest variables in discriminating between the two groups. Neither group of campuses did a credible job of protecting quality and access in undergraduate education. But the result for doctoral universities is likely to fuel complaints that they neglected undergraduate education to protect graduate studies and research. Surprisingly, respondents from non-doctoral campuses seemed more optimistic about the quality of graduate education than did those from doctoral campuses, although - as noted above - the pessimism of doctoral respondents may flow from their higher expectations. The replies from doctoral universities did report less impact on the quality of research than their non-doctoral counterparts.

Conclusion

The responses of the institutions in this study to the budget cuts of the first half of the 1990s represent something less than the finest hour of public higher education. Clearly, campuses chose to cope incrementally with the budget problem rather than change fundamentally. Relatively few colleges or universities adopted long-range plans for dealing with their budget difficulties. Nearly all relied too heavily on raising tuition and fees to fill their budget shortfalls. Most did too little to reduce duplicative courses. Most raised their reliance on part-time faculty to questionable levels. Finally, far too few responded to the budget problems of the period in ways that protected their primary purposes of quality and access in undergraduate education.

This study shows that the reactions of both doctoral and non-doctoral institutions shared those deficiencies. Their responses to the budget problems of the period reveal few differences. They did not act differently, but both should have reacted better.
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Faculty Opinion on Grade Inflation: Contradictions About Its Cause

Abstract
This study reports faculty opinion on grade inflation at a relatively large, open enrollment, public university. The results of a faculty survey reveal that most faculty perceive that there has been an increase in grades over the years. Insofar as most faculty believe that the grade rise is not warranted by an improvement in student ability over the years, the survey supports the finding of grade inflation. Indeed, when asked whether they believe grade inflation to be a University problem, the majority of faculty respond affirmatively. When asked to speculate on the single greatest cause of grade inflation, one-third of the faculty openly reply that student evaluation of instruction is the single biggest cause. However, individual faculty do not believe that they themselves are influenced by student evaluations when they assign grades. The contradiction is that faculty believe student evaluation of faculty leads to grade inflation, but individually reject its influence. These results do not significantly deviate by faculty rank or tenure status. Thus, while faculty indict student evaluation of instruction as the single biggest cause in general of grade inflation, they disclaim its effect in personal circumstances and claim that they themselves use objective and relative performance criteria in evaluating student work.

Three years ago an ad hoc Committee to Study Grade Inflation was created at Eastern Kentucky University, an open-admissions, regional public university with an annual undergraduate enrollment of 13,000 students. The Committee was created by the University Senate in response to murmurs and even worry among faculty that the steady rise in grade point average (GPA) and the rise in the number of A grades over a period of years was due to a decline in grading standards rather than a rise in academic excellence among our students. Faculty from Accounting, Education, English, Mathematics, and Sociology were charged with the responsibility of examining campus grading trends and determining if, and if so, to what extent grades were being inflated.

In reviewing grade trends on campus, the Committee used two methods: 1) a general analysis of grade point average over time, and 2) a survey of faculty viewpoints on grades, grading, and grade inflation. While faculty perception is the topic of this paper, perhaps it will be useful for readers to know that our general analysis of grade trends does indicate grade inflation. Basing general analysis on a panel of full-time entering freshmen, the Committee identified a consistent and significant rise from 1983 to 1996 in first semester, lower division GPA, while scores on the American College Test (ACT) over the same time period remained relatively stable. This provides empirical evidence of grade inflation based on classical definitions. That is, grade inflation is often defined as a notable increase in grade point average without a corresponding
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increase in student aptitude and preparation levels as typically measured through incoming scores on college-entrance tests (Cluskey, Griffin, and Ehlin 1997; Carney, Isakson, and Ellsworth 1978; Weller 1986). In short, our general analysis of student grade trends at Eastern Kentucky University demonstrates inflation. The results from our faculty survey show that faculty had suspected this trend.

Faculty Survey on Grade Inflation

Our survey was mailed to the campus address of all full-time faculty, including those of visiting professor or instructor status. Over half the surveys were returned (Response Rate=53 percent), for a total of 329 completed questionnaires. Of this number, most (39 percent) were completed by faculty of full Professor rank; returns of other ranks are as follows: Associate Professor (29 percent), Assistant Professor (30 percent), and Instructor (2 percent). Most faculty returning the survey were tenured (72 percent); the next largest segment (23 percent) was in tenure-track positions, while the remaining full-time faculty (5 percent) held visiting professor status.

For the purposes of this study we include only the responses of tenured faculty or faculty in tenure-track positions (n=275), excluding visiting faculty and faculty at the Instructor level.1 We asked tenured and tenure-track faculty a range of questions. We asked them to comment generally on perceived trends in grade point average, in average student ability, and their own course expectations over the years. We asked faculty whether or not they believe grade inflation to be a University problem. If they replied affirmatively, we asked them to comment openly on what they perceive to be the single greatest cause of grade inflation. Faculty (n=208) seemed eager to respond to this question and did so with insightful statements. Apart from these open-ended responses, we used a series of more structured questions to probe possible outside pressures faculty might face in the grading process. Finally, we left white space on the questionnaire and invited faculty to elaborate on any of the above questions. Many faculty members (n=156) took the opportunity to write more lengthy statements. Some elaborated on their general philosophy towards grading and/or grade inflation, while others speculated more on the current causes of grade inflation on campus.

Survey Results: Is Grade Inflation a Problem?

Results from the faculty survey indicate that most faculty at our university believe that grade inflation is a problem. A review of Table 1, which summarizes the results of the survey, indicates that 58 percent of the faculty suspect that student grade point average has risen over the years. However, rank and tenure status result in some noteworthy differences. Faculty of full Professor rank, those who have been at the institution the longest, are most likely (72 percent) to report a steady rise in student GPA. On the other hand, Assistant Professors are significantly (p<.05) less likely to report observing any increase in grade point average (\(\chi^2=12.2, df=4, p=.016\)). Nevertheless, despite their lesser tenure at the institution, nearly half (49 percent) the faculty of Assistant Professor rank report observing a rise in student GPA during their shorter sojourn at the institution. The same pattern holds true for tenured versus non-tenured faculty. Tenured faculty (64 percent) are significantly more likely than non-tenured faculty (36 percent) to report observing an aggregate rise in student GPA over the years (\(\chi^2=6.36, df=2, p=.015\)). Both results suggest that faculty perceptions of grade trends depend at least in some measure on length of stay at the institution. Faculty who have been at the institution the longest (tenured faculty and faculty of Professor rank) are most likely to report observing a notable increase in student grades over the years. Yet despite these significant differences by rank and tenure status, it is noteworthy that the majority of faculty possess an intuitive sense that student grades have steadily increased over time.

When asked whether an increase in student aptitude could explain the perceived grade rise, many faculty respond in the negative. In fact, nearly half the faculty (48 percent) report observing a general decline in student aptitude over the years. On this question there are no notable differences by faculty rank or tenure status (see Table 1), with full (45 percent), Associate (47 percent), and Assistant (47 percent) professors as well as tenured (46 percent) versus non-tenured faculty (48 percent) noting a decline in student aptitude and preparedness levels over the years. At some level the fact that there is no notable difference in response to this question corresponding to length of stay at the institution renders the responses suspect: perhaps half the faculty are simply inclined to believe that students today are not of the same caliber or commitment as students of yesterday, or perhaps these faculty are merely painting their own past with a rosy glow. However, a review of ACT scores for the interquartile segment of students (ACT score between 18 and 21) confirms faculty perceptions. These ACT scores...

---

1 David Foster and Edith Foster argue that a current reason for grade inflation is the influx of temporary, visiting faculty who, supposedly, have little knowledge of, or commitment to the academic and grade standards of their current university employer ("It’s a Buyers’ Market: Disposable Professors, Grade Inflation and Other Problems," Academe 84 [Jan./Feb. 1998]: 28-32). Under this approach, a review of the position of visiting faculty in comparison to the views of more job-secure faculty is important either to confirm or refute the claim. However, Eastern Kentucky University does not employ a large contingent workforce of full-time faculty [thus explaining the small number of survey responses from visiting faculty (n=13) and faculty of instructor rank (n=8)]. The small number of cases from each of these segments makes any later subgroup analyses (namely, Chi Square) suspect for these subgroups. Consequently for this study we exclude the views of visiting professors and instructors. But we encourage other researchers in the future to include them in their analyses of grade inflation.
The negative effects of grade inflation; that is, not only are higher grades not justified by a rise in student aptitude, but also, students appear to earn higher marks in courses whose standards have diminished over the years. These results amplify the view that grade inflation is a problem. Consequently, it is not a concern to me. Our survey asks faculty to report on whether or not their own course expectations have diminished over the years. Three-tenths of the faculty (29 percent) report that their course standards have declined (see again Table 1). As with perceptions of student ability, there is no significant difference by faculty rank at the Professor and Associate levels, with roughly equal percentages of full (34 percent) and Associate (31 percent) Professors reporting declining standards; on this question fewer Assistant Professors (23 percent) report adjusting their course requirements downward. Tenured (29 percent) and non-tenured faculty (33 percent) are equally likely to report scaling down their course expectations over the years. These results amplify the negative effects of grade inflation; that is, not only are higher grades not justified by a rise in student aptitude, but also, students appear to earn higher marks in courses whose standards have diminished over the years.

Yet other aspects of grading must be considered. Course content, for example, could influence grades. Grade inflation could be obtained even when student grade point average and aptitude levels remain relatively constant. As one faculty member commented, “GPA is only one way of looking at grade inflation. I think the more insidious problem—and the problem I suspect that we have here—is that of eroding course requirements to achieve the grades that we give. Thus, there can be significant grade inflation even with stable GPAs.” Although more difficult to document, lowering course standards and expectations also results in grade inflation in that the grades awarded under diminished standards represent inflated, devalued currency.

For typical ACT students (students with ACT scores between the defined interquartile range of 18 through 21), ANOVA results indicated a significant (p<.001) decline in average ACT score across time periods for this group. Specifically, post hoc Scheffe test results indicated a significant decline in ACT score from the first period (1983-1985) to the third (1990-1993) (p=.016) and to the fourth (1994-1996) (p<.001). Thus, there has been an overall fall in typical student ability across the period of our investigation.
But once again, as Figure 1 shows, over half the faculty believe grade inflation is a current problem, with a good number (18 percent) in strong agreement and a larger number (37 percent) in general agreement. To be sure, Figure 1 indicates a sizeable minority of faculty disagreeing (15 percent) or disagreeing strongly (4 percent) that grade inflation is an issue. Because it only thinly veils the accusation that faculty are loosening their standards and grading more leniently (and perhaps being lax in their duties), grade inflation is a controversial topic that naturally renders competing views. Nonetheless, the results of our survey reveal that most faculty are concerned about it and are willing to confront it. As one faculty member writes, “Thanks for looking into what can be a very touchy issue. But it is important that we consider this as a potential problem and see what is out there.”

Survey Results: What is the Single Biggest Cause of Grade Inflation?

When faculty are asked to comment openly on what they believe to be the single biggest cause of grade inflation, one-third of faculty (31 percent) respond, in one form or another, that student evaluation of instruction is the principal factor. As in most other teaching institutions, at our university student ratings play a central role in evaluating faculty job performance; student evaluations of the course and the instructor weigh heavily in decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit pay. As one faculty member comments, the importance of student opinion of instruction in important professional decisions leads to grade inflation:

“Have you ever sat in on a Promotion and Tenure Committee (college level)? If so, you will hear the importance of student opinion (evaluation). Since student opinions have been introduced, you can see a link to grade inflation....”

A number of faculty suggest that for professional self preservation and economic survival teachers may be giving good grades to stay on favorable terms with students generally; they argue that invariably students turn around and rate them as they have been rated (Birnbaum 1977; Hendrickson 1976). Research is mixed, however, on the connection between grades and student ratings. Early studies note a weak correlation between the two, with faculty who give lower-than-average grades not necessarily receiving lower-than-average ratings, and conversely, faculty who confer high grades not always receiving high course ratings (Howard and Maxwell 1980, 1982). Others point out that there are confounding factors such as course quality and perceived usefulness of the course (student interest) that also need to be considered (McKenzie 1975; Zangenehzadeh 1988). That is, when students perceive a course as useful and also as well-structured and well-organized, they usually rate high, irrespective of their expected grade. Zangenehzadeh (1988) claims that many studies have not controlled for these factors, but when he did, he found a significant correlation between grades and student ratings, with faculty who award higher marks being remunerated with higher ratings. Greenwald and Gilmore (1997) also find a strong correspondence between student grades and student evaluation of the course and instructor, with students rating more highly those instructors who award higher marks. These latter findings confirm faculty intuition as expressed in our survey and open-ended comments. Faculty sense that “what goes around, comes around.” Faculty believe that those who give high marks fare better during the critical moment when students rate them, hence the self-preservationist and economic imperatives to give good grades. As a consequence, faculty at our university in a nearly three-to-one margin target student evaluation of instruction as the single biggest cause of grade inflation.

Curiously, however, when asked directly whether they are swayed by student evaluations in the grades they give, most faculty take the high road and report that they themselves are not influenced (67 percent; see Table 2). Full professors claim being the least affected by student
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evaluations, in that three-quarters (73 percent) report that concern for student opinion is not an important factor in assigning grades. We originally proposed that the faculty cohort that is least economically secure (that is, Assistant Professors and non-tenured faculty) would report being most influenced by student evaluations in assigning grades since student evaluation of instruction plays such a pivotal role in tenure and promotion decisions. While our survey originally seemed to confirm this hypothesis in that full professors are least likely (27 percent) and Assistant Professors most likely (34 percent) to report that student ratings are either somewhat or very important in determining grades, this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=3.00, df=4, p=.56$) and so the null hypothesis must be retained; i.e., no difference between the two ranks. Likewise, although tenured faculty are least likely (30 percent) and non-tenured faculty most likely (40 percent) to report being somewhat or very influenced by student evaluations when grading, again the difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=2.42, df=2, p=.299$). Although counterintuitive, these results corroborate findings from earlier studies; Kurt Geisinger (1980) and David Weller (1986) found no evidence to suggest that young, unseasoned faculty are more likely than experienced faculty to assign higher grades in an effort to win higher student ratings.

Overall, the findings reported here seem contradictory in that faculty identify student evaluation of instruction as the principle source of grade inflation but report themselves as not being influenced by them in the grades they assign. That is, most faculty believe that other faculty manipulate student course evaluations through the grades they assign, but they themselves assign grades solely on the basis of some objective or relative performance criteria. Perhaps this is the classic “it's not me; it's them” syndrome that has already been identified in research on grade inflation and student evaluation of instruction. That is, when asked to comment on influences on grading, faculty identify student evaluations as a “substantial influence,” yet they rarely acknowledge student evaluations as an influence on their own grading practices (Hoyt and Reed 1976). Similarly, faculty report that university teaching in general is in decline, yet individually they rate themselves...
as very good teachers. How can we resolve this apparent contradiction? Unfortunately, we can't without challenging the entire method of self-reporting on which this study is based. What we can safely conclude from the apparently contradictory evidence is that most faculty indict student evaluation of instruction as the single biggest factor behind grade inflation, yet most faculty do not implicate themselves. To put it another way, while most faculty believe there is an unspoken agreement whereby high grades are rewarded with positive teaching evaluations, faculty deny that they personally are influenced by this belief.

We also find little deviation by faculty rank, with relatively large percentages of Professors, Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors reporting not being affected by student ratings in the grades they assign. This is also the case with tenured versus non-tenured faculty: equally large numbers from both groups report not being influenced by student evaluation of instruction. This also shatters expectations. We expected that the most job vulnerable faculty (especially non-tenured faculty) would more openly admit that they grade in the shadows of student ratings, but our findings indicate no significant difference between tenured and non-tenured faculty.

On the other hand, open-ended comments by faculty members deliberately link grades and evaluations, and our survey provides some evidence that the most economically insecure teachers do tend to be most vulnerable to student evaluation of instruction when they assign grades. Table 3 reports faculty who expressed initial concern with grades and tenure decisions (n=82) are very likely to report that student evaluation of instruction is somewhat important (44 percent) or very important (29 percent) in the grades that they assign. (These latter percentages are summarized in Table 3.) In short, three-quarters of non-tenured faculty concerned over grades and tenure concede being influenced by student ratings of their performance when it comes time to grade student performance. The practice of heavily weighing student evaluations of a course and its instructor in tenure decisions, and given the fact that students might grade faculty based on their own anticipated grades, may encourage bad grading habits among younger faculty as they inflate student grades in an effort to receive higher ratings. Whether or not faculty remain vulnerable to student opinion after tenure is hard to determine; our findings suggest not, for 70 percent of tenured faculty report not being influenced by student assessment of their teaching.

Post Script
In the fall of 1999 the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Inflation submitted its report and a series of Motions to the Faculty Senate, then the principal University decision making body aside from the President’s Office. In a year-long deliberation of the topic, the Senate passed most of the Committee’s recommendations to stabilize grades on campus. The Motions put forward by the Committee and passed by the Senate include: 1) more money allocated for remedial teaching, 2) the adoption of a plus and minus grade scale, 3) end-of-term course grade reports to be made available to faculty, and 4) the indexing of student transcripts with the average course grade along with the individual grades received. Adoption of these Motions has drawn much press attention, and the measures have

---

Table 3: Self-Reported Influence of Student Evaluation of Instruction on Grades by Faculty Tenure Concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for How Grades Influence Tenure Decisions</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>74%    (237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>19%    (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>7%     (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Somewhat or Very Important)</td>
<td>26%    (82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parentheses are the number of cases (n).
been billed as the most “comprehensive program” to date to combat campus grade inflation (Stepp 1999).

Yet since the above quoted press release, the Faculty Senate has passed the final, and what we perceive as one of the most important, Committee recommendations. The Senate agreed to suspend the use of student evaluation of instruction for the purposes of tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions for the term of three years. Basing its recommendation on faculty comment, the Ad Hoc Committee believes this moratorium will provide faculty with a respite from student and administrative pressures so that they might more objectively determine the grades they assign. Admittedly, with regard to some of our recommendations there was a small but vocal minority of faculty who expressed concern that any oversight on grades threatens academic freedom. However, we believe that the moratorium, perhaps even more than other Motions we proposed, represents an important gain in academic freedom. For a period of three years, faculty will be released from formal student pressures in assigning grades and will be able to make grade decisions more freely. With less pressure to be popular with students, perhaps faculty will become a bit more stringent in the grades they assign. Thus, we believe that this measure will retard the constant inflation of grades and, rather than being inflated assessments, grades will become more accurate measures of student academic performance.
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During the 1990s, a persistent harangue echoed through the halls of academia: You must change your ways. With growing competition at home and abroad, fluctuating federal and state support, and promising new technologies, it seemed obvious that professors and administrators alike would need to alter their traditional staid methods. Things would have to change in order to capture the same pool of students, let alone increase enrollment. Educators from Terry O’Banion to Michael Dolence, from Donald Norris to Patricia Carter and Richard Alfred, have all sounded the call to change. However, there are many who still don’t seem to hear this message.

For example, on a fairly routine basis, faculty members walk into my office to complain about offering college classes at a local high school. I have almost memorized their arguments which, more or less, sound like this:

- We are cheapening our reputation as an institution of higher education.
- The courses we deliver are more like GED/adult education rather than rigorous college level courses.
- If students can’t drive 30 minutes to get to campus, then they don’t belong in college.
- The courses offered don’t contain the variety of types and ages of students that we have on main campus.
- We did this 20 years ago and it failed miserably.
- Many of these concerns are legitimate. If our reputation is damaged because of off-campus course offerings, then we should reconsider. If the courses are not meeting the same objectives as their on-campus counterparts, then we need to take quick action. It is true that the population of students in extension courses is more homogenous than in some on-campus courses. But are these concerns relevant and weighty enough to offset the advantages and opportunities presented to the college? This is the big question.

The facts seem obvious. Times change. People change. The competition changes. Technology changes. The culture changes. Students’ expectations change. Why is it that intelligent professionals argue for no change in higher education? My response back to this esteemed group is tactful, although perhaps too practical to satisfy. I simply raise the logical reasons for offering classes off-site:

- The high school approached us and requested the courses. We did not seek out this arrangement. In responding to community needs, the college felt the benefits outweigh the disadvantages. Today’s students are looking for convenience and quality, just like everyone else.
- Our enrollment has declined steadily for the last few years. Taking college classes out to the community is one tactic we hope may help offset the decline. Is this the only answer to our dilemma? Certainly not. I like to think of it like this—we’re sailing on a sinking ship and the off-campus courses are our attempts to bail water.
- Exposing students to our college during high school may inspire some to attend after graduation, or to consider attending when they come home from the major state universities. Like any competent marketer, we want people to try our service with the hope that they will continue to use it in the future.
- Whether we like it or not, competition for students is intense. If we did not respond positively to the request to offer courses, then certainly one of our competitors would have.
- If all of our classes were full and enrollment was increasing, then we probably would not pursue courses in the high school, unless it was to find additional space for offerings. However, this is not the case. We’re left with a couple of choices: we can sit on our thumbs and lament the decline in student numbers or we can get out and try some new tactics. As the former statesman William to change or not to change?
Jennings Bryant once said: “Destiny is not a matter of change, it is a matter of choice; it is not a thing to be waited for, it is a thing to be achieved.”

Online courses, telecourses, and independent study courses—all with far less face-to-face teacher contact than high school extension courses—are commonplace at major institutions like UCLA, University of Colorado, University of Nebraska, and University of Texas. In fact, many universities and private colleges run off-campus courses in community centers, shopping malls, businesses, and hotel conference rooms. Even the University of Minnesota offers classes in the Mall of America. With increased competition, growing institutions are finding innovative ways to bring quality education to new markets.

It seems self-evident to many of us in higher education that colleges and universities must change their models, traditions, and habits of operation. As Campbell and Leverty (1999) offer in the *Community College Journal*: “Colleges will not be able to rest on past performance in an era of rapid change and new private for-profit and corporate university providers in the market place.” Clearly, the general public and the legislature, not to mention the business community, are turning their discerning eyes of accountability toward higher education. We have no choice but to change with the times or let the times change us.

In a practical sense, however, all businesses are shaped by the voices of their customers and by the forces of society, technology, and change in cultural norms. Car companies do extensive research to highlight the preferences of potential buyers and then adapt their products. Clothing companies shift and move quickly to capture the latest fashions. Food manufacturers monitor the latest trends in food preferences to develop new products.

Colleges and universities, too, must realize that they are in the business of providing one of the most important services available: human intellectual growth. In almost any educational publication in the last decade, warnings similar to this by Mary Futrell in *Teachers For The New Millennium* can be found: “Today's change confronts educators with a harsh choice: They can be either victims of change or agents of change. If they are not to be victimized, they must reexamine the convictions that bind them to the past” (1996). In order to thrive, colleges must meet the mercurial needs of students without altering overall quality and substance. To deny this reality is to condemn the institution to a certain mediocrity.
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Q. An applicant attended the Orthodox Theological University in Belgrade. I cannot find this institution in any publication that lists the universities in Yugoslavia. Could it still be considered a recognized institution?

A. There are two forms of official recognition that an educational institution can obtain: legal permission to operate, and official recognition as a degree-granting institution.

In the United States, accreditation by one of six regional accrediting associations is the process whereby an educational institution acquires formal recognition as a degree-granting institution whose courses and degrees merit reciprocal acceptance by other educational institutions. Other countries have a similar process, usually administered by a governmental agency.

In most countries, Bible colleges, imam colleges, rabbinical colleges, seminaries, theological schools, and other types of religious institutions are not part of the formal educational system. In those countries, these types of institutions usually do not have official degree-granting recognition.

If a tertiary (university-level) educational institution is not mentioned in standard reference books, one can consult the ministry of education in that country, or the U.S. embassy or consulate, or advisors in the office of a U.S.-sponsored educational organization in that country, such as AMIDEAST, the Fulbright Commission, or the Institute of International Education.

Q. What is the equivalent of a notary public in the Arab world? Is there a specific person or governmental office that provides certification that an educational credential is valid?

A. No notary public ever certifies that an educational credential is valid. No notary public ever has knowledge about the origin, contents, or authenticity of an educational credential.

The most that any notary public can certify is that the person who signed a document in front of the notary provided some type of verification of identity, or that a photocopy of a document appears to be identical to the original.

In most cases, a person signing a document that is notarized is not personally known to the notary and does not provide an authentic photo identification card, so the verification of identity is easily faked.

In most cases, a notary is not sufficiently familiar with the contents of a document to discern if a photocopy contains any alterations.

If you can’t find any reliable evidence that an educational institution is officially recognized as degree-granting in the country in which it operates, then it would be appropriate for you to apply to its grade reports and degrees the policies you apply to grade reports (transcripts) and degrees from educational institutions in the United States that do not have regional accreditation.

For example: American Baptist Seminary of the West (California) and University of St. Mary of the Lake Mundelein Seminary (Illinois) are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada, but not by their respective regional accreditation associations. It would be logical for you to apply to a religious institution in another country the policies that you apply to these two U.S. institutions.

On occasion you might discover that other educational institutions in the United States have decided to grant credit for courses taught by a foreign educational institution that is not an officially recognized degree-granting institution in the country in which it operates. Their policies, however, do not set any precedent for your institution.

In my lifetime, I have had to have many documents notarized in the United States. Only once did the notary ask me for identification, and only once did the notary watch as I signed my name. In my experience, the same is true of notary publics, gazetted officials, and persons with different titles but similar responsibilities in other countries. The more notary seals I see on an educational credential, the more I tend to suspect that the credential is not authentic.

What is the alternative? Become familiar with the format and content of educational credentials from each of the countries represented in your applicant pool. Compare newly-received credentials with known authentic credentials in your foreign admissions files. Send photocopies of any suspected credentials back to the issuing institution for verification, and defer action on that application until you receive a response.
A. Does a rose become a lily if I call it a lily?

Credit can only be awarded by the institution that does the teaching. Any credit that originates elsewhere can be considered for transfer of credit. One can call such credit accepted or earned or exchanged or recognized or anything else, but that doesn’t change the facts.

You probably have a policy for dealing with courses completed at one U.S. educational institution that have been posted on the transcript form of another U.S. educational institution. You probably require an official transcript from each institution attended, and you judge the courses completed at each institution on the merits of that institution and on the merits of the degree program of which those courses are a part.

It would be logical to apply to all courses completed at an educational institution outside of the United States the same policies you apply to courses completed at educational institutions in the United States.

Q. A regionally-accredited university in the United States has made arrangements to post on its official transcripts courses completed at unrecognized educational institutions in other countries. The U.S. university considers these courses to be the same as courses it teaches, not transferred courses. Should I accept those courses for transfer to my institution?

A. Does a rose become a lily if I call it a lily?

Credit can only be awarded by the institution that does the teaching. Any credit that originates elsewhere can be considered for transfer of credit. One can call such credit accepted or earned or exchanged or recognized or anything else, but that doesn’t change the facts.

You probably have a policy for dealing with courses completed at one U.S. educational institution that have been posted on the transcript form of another U.S. educational institution. You probably require an official transcript from each institution attended, and you judge the courses completed at each institution on the merits of that institution and on the merits of the degree program of which those courses are a part.

It would be logical to apply to all courses completed at an educational institution outside of the United States the same policies you apply to courses completed at educational institutions in the United States.
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For the past decade or so there has been an increasing interest by society in general in reviewing our historical heritage. The book Roots, by Alex Haley explored this issue at its basic foundation of the family. In his book, The Shaping of American Higher Education, author Arthur M. Cohen takes us on a similar journey through the development of the system of higher education in the United States.

The author divides the history of higher education into five eras:
- Establishing the Collegiate Form in the Colonies: 1636-1789
- The Diffusion of Small Colleges in the Emergent Nation: 1790-1869
- University Transformation as the Nation Industrializes: 1870-1944

Because of the number of excellent texts written which cover the earlier periods of higher education the author states in the preface that, “The volume’s chief contribution is its synthesis of the Mass Higher Education Era (1945-1975) and the Contemporary Era (1976-1998); most of the trends that had developed earlier matured during these periods.”

For each of the five eras the author reviews the development of higher education eight different areas: 1. Societal Context, 2. Institutions, 3. Students, 4. Faculty, 5. Curriculum, 6. Governance, 7. Finance, and 8. Outcomes. By maintaining the continuity of these areas through all five eras, the author provides the opportunity for the reader to see the important developments in each of these areas and how these developments built upon each other from era to era. The concluding chapter deals with trends and issues for the future. Again, the author uses the same eight areas to discuss his views about the trends and issues that we educators will be faced with as we move into the new millennium.

For those practicing professionals who desire to develop an appreciation of where we have come from and where we are headed in higher education in America, I highly recommend this book.

This review submitted by Jeffery M. Tanner,
Brigham Young University.
The main point of *Rules and Tools for Leaders* is that anyone with an open mind and determination who follows the book’s suggestions can become a good manager. Careful readers will agree with Perry Smith. It is not a scholarly treatise and it does not break new ground on theories of leadership, but *Rules and Tools for Leaders* is a very helpful primer for new managers who lack experience or experienced managers who need a refresher course.

In the tradition of Peter Drucker and Warren Bennis, who write extensively on leadership and management, Smith writes with practical advice on how to become an effective manager. Smith’s work is deliberately lacking a theoretical foundation, choosing to leave such cerebral matters to intellectuals. Perry Smith offers advice that works provided his suggestions are followed carefully and used properly.

Perry Smith’s insights are reflected in his humorous observations. One of my favorite passages is, “Listening is the most important skill for leaders. Introverts have a great edge, since they tend to listen quietly and usually are not ‘interruptaholics.’ Too many extroverts are thinking about what they will say next, rather than hearing what is being said now. This is called faking ‘listening.’”

The author offers concrete examples to help readers understand complicated issues. In his section on leading in crisis, Smith concedes that most managers have the same kind of crises that big city mayors have: major problems that need to be solved. Good managers must develop the crisis leadership skills of decisiveness, flexibility, innovation, simplicity, and empowerment. Leaders, especially senior- and middle-level leaders, should rely on well-trained managers among the people who report to them directly. Ask leaders to work within their abilities, and keep things simple. In a crisis, cool heads must prevail. Finger-pointing and in-fighting will not solve the crisis. For example, principals in large high schools must have access to emergency services, such as hospitals, police officers, and fire departments. They must have a plan of action to anticipate suicides, drug overdoses, and other serious problems. Teams of counselors, teachers, and administrators on various crisis action teams must be identified and pressed into service when a situation presents itself. With the proliferation of orientation programs for the college-bound and college students, leaders of admissions and registration offices should join forces with other student services personnel to develop and refine emergency plans.

Also, administrators of admissions and registration units must deal with issues involving customer service, human resources, computer hardware and software, privacy and security, and public relations. A competent and skillful administrator must know how to listen to employees, reward good service, and encourage productivity. Perry Smith offers sound advice in a comforting and reassuring, rather than preaching manner.

The section on transitions is particularly useful since many leaders must move on to move up. Smith suggests the departing leader make a videotape or audiotape describing the problems and foibles of subordinates. What is the best way to communicate quickly with subordinates? What is the standard of integrity? What is the reach of the leader’s control? Such strategies may help corporations and institutions maintain continuity during transitions.

Major General Perry Smith is a graduate of West Point and earned his Ph.D. in International Relations from Columbia University. He has served in several leadership positions in the Army including the F-15 Flight Wing and as a Commandant in the National War College. His background contributes to his emphasis on discipline and strong organizational skills.

I highly recommend *Rules and Tools for Leaders* as an essential reading for all managers in both the public and private sectors. It is well-written, and can be easily read in a few hours. It should be in the personal library of every leader and aspiring leader.

This review submitted by Ron Simmons, Associate Provost and Professor of Leadership in Higher Education at Northern Illinois University. He has written two books on higher education program management.