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The Academic Standards and Grading Subcommittee (a subcommittee of the Academic Policy and Planning Committee of the Academic Senate) is charged with "monitoring the maintenance of academic, instructional, and grading standards appropriate to courses offered by the University".

Our charge ${ }^{1}$ instructs us to "review policies and practices concerning grading standards" and specifies that this may include:

1. "determining the effect of extraneous concerns on sound grading practices", and
2. "assembly, study, and distribution of appropriate grade summaries and trends for various schools, departments, course categories, and courses".

We note that the Graduation Initiative (GI 2025) of the CSU is an extraneous concern that may affect sound grading practices. We observe that this initiative has created intense pressure to reduce fail rates so that students can graduate, and to reduce the impact of bottleneck classes. This is an extraneous pressure on grading practices. Therefore, it is within our charge to examine whether it has had an impact on grading practices.

Furthermore, as the charge of the committee proposes that we should produce grade summaries, we conducted the current review of grade distributions to help monitor grading practices in light of the GI 2025 initiative.

We have two areas of interest with respect to grade distributions. First, the focus on increasing graduation rates has identified high fail rate and bottleneck classes, and highlighted ways that pedagogy can be improved to enhance learning in these classes. This has elevated the attention paid to groups of students who have traditionally struggled and courses that have traditionally proved to be difficult for our students. We support these efforts, and hope to help identify classes on campus that deserve attention in order to make improvements to pedagogy and reduce fail rates. We want to support efforts that maintain academic standards while improving student support and pedagogy.

Second, we speculate that efforts to reduce fail rates may sometimes produce a lowering of academic standards and grade inflation. Grade inflation over the past century has been welldocumented nationally, with convincing evidence that grades in college classes are going up even as student effort and learning is reduced. This is known as "content deflation" a lowering of standards so that everyone can succeed because the standards have fallen so low. We are concerned that continued grade inflation, and its companion content deflation, at Fresno State harms our students. When students receive inflated grades that do not reflect learning in preliminary classes, they go into more advanced classes unprepared. Therefore, they still fail to
graduate, but they fail after making significant investments in time and money. Worse yet, they graduate and go into the workforce unprepared and incapable of succeeding.

While there have been significant efforts on campus to identify high fail-rate classes, there have not been commensurate efforts to monitor for, or guard against, the content deflation that might accompany the efforts to reduce fail rates. We suspect that both improved support of learning and content deflation are happening concurrently.

That national average at 4-year colleges is about $45 \%$ of grades given are $\mathrm{As}^{2}$. Nationally, this number increased dramatically in the 1970s, and has been steadily increasing again since about 1985.


Many scholars in the Academy consider this to be a problem because it reflects a separation of grades from academic performance. Essentially, the grading scale has been compressed so that virtually every student gets an A or a B. With this compression of grades, the meaning of a grade, and therefore its utility, are diminished. With the compression of the grading scale, a good grade no longer signifies that a student has mastered content well enough to pursue more rigorous work that requires a strong foundation. When students are not required to master material before moving on, they inevitably move into advanced coursework for which they are unprepared. Then those classes have a high fail rate, and students waste their money and time. Furthermore, upon graduation, employers and graduate schools have no way of distinguishing the top notch students from those who barely scraped by.

Consistent with our charge, we conducted a review of grade records for all courses offered at Fresno State for the academic years 2012-13 thru 2017-18. We reviewed those records to identify classes with high fail rates that need attention, and to identify classes that are potentially grade inflated.

## METHODS

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness prepared for us a list of all courses offered on campus for six academic years (fall 2012 thru spring 2018). Each course offered during these years was analyzed, along with the department and college, the General Education area if applicable, the course classification code, number of students enrolled, and the rank of the instructor. Classes were designated as lower-division, upper-division, or graduate level based on the course number (1-99, 100-199, 200+). Independent study, project, and thesis units (190, 290, 298, 299, 590, 598, and 599) classes were identified to be examined separately from other types of classes.

Grade distributions were determined by using the number of each grade assigned to enrolled students. Post-semester grade changes are reflected in the data; all data were extracted in October 2019. For each class, we calculated the number of grades assigned in order to extract classes in which no grades were assigned at all (CR/NC classes, or those with RP grading). The percentage of each grade is the proportion of the number of grades given to the total number of grades assigned in the class.

Because the national average for percent A's is $45 \%$, we have used this figure to dichotomize classes at Fresno State. Classes with more than $45 \%$ A's are considered potentially grade inflated. To identify classes with a high DFW rate, we used the number $25 \%$. This has been used $^{3}$ to indicate a high fail rate, although it's not clear where the number comes from. Classes with $25 \%$ or more Ds and Fs are considered high fail rate classes.

## RESULTS: UNIVERSITY-WIDE

In all of these results, we have highlighted percent A's in undergraduate classes that are above the national average of $45 \%$, and which might therefore be considered to be potentially grade inflated, and those fail rates that are above $25 \%$ and might therefore be considered problematic.

## Descriptive Statistics

During the academic years 2012-13 thru 2017-18, there were 50,968 classes offered at Fresno State, of which $15.3 \%$ had no grades assigned. After extracting those, we analyzed 43,165 classes. Most of those $(35,878)$ are undergraduate classes.

Grade Distributions in Undergraduate and Graduate Graded Classes, University-Wide

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent B | Average <br> Percent C | Average <br> Percent D | Average <br> Percent F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Undergraduate | 35,878 | $51 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Graduate | 7,287 | $85 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1 \%$ |

Overall at Fresno State, $51 \%$ of grades earned in undergraduate courses were As, and $8 \%$ were Ds or Fs.

As graduate school requires high standards for admittance and for performance, we would expect that those students would perform better than undergraduates. Therefore, we are not surprised by the high rate of As $(85 \%)$ and low rate of failure $(1 \% \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{F})$ in graduate classes.

## Before and After Launch of the Graduation Initiative 2025

The Graduation Initiative 2025 was launched in 2015. We explored whether this initiative was associated with any appreciable changes in grade distributions.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes, University-Wide, Over Time

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2012-2013$ | 5498 | $51 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $2013-2014$ | 5673 | $51 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $2014-2015$ | 5835 | $50 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $2015-2016$ | 6031 | $50 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| $2016-2017$ | 6327 | $51 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| $2017-2018$ | 6514 | $51 \%$ | $8 \%$ |

Grade distributions have changed very little year to year. It does not appear that grades have become any more inflated since the Graduation Initiative was launched. Neither have we reduced the fail rate.

## Rank of Instructor, Undergraduate Classes Only

The rank of the instructor may be relevant to grading practices. More experienced faculty, and those protected by tenure, may feel safer to enforce academic standards, while temporary faculty (i.e., lecturers, teaching assistants) may feel more pressure to avoid enforcing standards in order to protect their student ratings, and therefore their employment. On the other hand, more deeply invested faculty (i.e., those on the tenure-track) may feel more pressure to submit to grade inflation to contribute to the Graduation Initiative or to meet other expectations of the department, college, or university.

Examining grade inflation by instructor rank suggests that, university-wide, there is not much variation in grading practices among academic instructors. However, among the non-academic instructors (coaches and MPPs, and others) almost all classes appear to be grade inflated.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes, University-Wide, by Rank of Instructor

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TA or GA | 1,408 | $54 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Lecturer | 17,241 | $48 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Assistant Prof | 4,502 | $52 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Associate Prof | 4,531 | $49 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Professor | 7,046 | $52 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Coach | 78 | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| MPP | 331 | $97 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Other (staff, <br> librarian, grant- <br> related) | 469 | $91 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Information Missing | 681 | $79 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

These data also raise the question of why there are almost 700 classes for which instructor rank cannot be determined. And why non-academic instructors are teaching undergraduate classes that assign grades. We propose that classes taught by non-academic instructors should be offered CR/NC only.

## General Education

Grade inflation appears to exist mainly within major courses, as opposed to General Education (GE) classes. Additionally, GE classes do seem to have much higher fail rates than major courses.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded General Education Classes, University-Wide

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not GE | 24,832 | $56 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Lower Division | 7,472 | $37 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| A1-Oral Communication | 864 | $37 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| A2-Written Communication | 807 | $41 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| A3-Critical Thinking | 712 | $35 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| B1-Physical Science | 428 | $22 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| B1LS | 24 | $19 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| B2-Life Science | 150 | $29 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| B4-Quantitative Reasoning | 448 | $24 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| C1-Arts | 631 | $57 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| C2-Humanities | 984 | $48 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| D1Americian History | 406 | $24 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| D2-American Government | 287 | $23 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| D3-Social Science | 869 | $26 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| E-Lifelong Understanding and <br> Self-Development | 862 | $43 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Upper Division | 3,573 | $42 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| IB-Physical Universe \& Its Life | 721 | $34 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Forms | 1,003 | $50 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| IC-Arts \& Humanities | 848 | $36 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| ID-Social, Political, and <br> Economic Institutions and <br> Behavior | 8,001 | $45 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| MI-Multicultural/International | 1,901 |  |  |

## Class Size

Fresno State does not have very many large lecture halls, but we do have some. It is widely believed that large classes are pedagogically difficult, and therefore not good for student learning. And yet, the demand is such that we must offer some large classes.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes, by Class Size

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very Small $(<10$ students $)$ | 6,297 | $81 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Small $(11-30)$ | 15,531 | $51 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Medium-Sized $(31-50)$ | 11,406 | $35 \%$ | $12 \%$ |


| Large (51-90) | 1,859 | $42 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very Large $(<90)$ | 803 | $32 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

It is true that very large classes have a higher DFW rate than other classes. It is also true that small classes (especially very small classes) are potentially seriously grade inflated. It is also remarkable just how many very small classes are offered on campus. (This does not include independent study classes, which are also likely to be small.)

## Course Classification Codes

The CSU has a uniform system for classifying course type ${ }^{4}$. It is not especially sensitive or up-to-date, but it may capture some variations in class types.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes, University-Wide, by Course Classification Code

|  | Hours per <br> Unit | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C1-Large lecture | 1 | 2,279 | 39 | 13 |
| C2-Lecture Discussion | 1 | 10,930 | 38 | 11 |
| C3-Lecture-Composition | 1 | 660 | 46 | 8 |
| C4-Discussion | 1 | 11,330 | 40 | 10 |
| C5-Seminar | 1 | 71 | 67 | 3 |
| C6-Clinical Processes | 2 | 777 | 60 | 1 |
| C7-Fine Arts \& Science Activities | 2 | 43 | 71 | 4 |
| C8-Education Workshops \& Social <br> Science Activities | 2 | 61 | 91 | 2 |
| C9-Music Activity, Large Group | 2 | 264 | 85 | 2 |
| C10-Music Activity-Small Group | 2 | 1,084 | 89 | 2 |
| C11-Physical Education and <br> recreational activities | 2 | 105 | 82 | 2 |
| C12-Speech, drama \& journalism <br> activities | 2 | 418 | 66 | 6 |
|  <br> laboratories, 2 hrs = unit | 2 | 3 | 97 | 0 |
| C14-Remedial activities | 2 | 163 | 88 | $<1$ |
| C15-Technical activities and <br> laboratories | 3 | 1,065 | 44 | 8 |
| C16 - Science laboratories | 3 | 518 | 94 | $<1$ |
| C17 - Clinical practice <br> laboratories off-campus | 3 | 109 | 100 | 0 |
| C18 - Major intercollegiate sports | 3 | 78 | 100 | 0 |
| C19 - Minor intercollegiate sports | 3 | 229 | 93 | 2 |
| C20 - Performance/production | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |


| C21 - Performance/production <br> activities | 3 | 66 | 94 | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S25 - Practice teaching, work <br> study, thesis and projects | varies | 676 | 92 | $<1$ |
| S36 - Independent study, field <br> work, studio instruction, <br> supervised activities | varies | 1923 | 86 | 1 |
| S48 - Independent study, studio <br> instruction, supervised activities | varies | 903 | 87 | 1 |
| C77 - Peer taught classes, ROTC <br> or non-workload instruction <br> which is not state supported | varies | 37 | 79 | 2 |
| C78 - Non-traditional instruction, <br> examination, or evaluation <br> (workload is assigned) | varies | 10 | 75 | 0 |

Course classification codes are meaningful predictors of apparent grade inflation. C codes of C6 and higher, as well as S codes have such high A rates that they should probably be offered as CR/NC classes.

## Independent Study Classes

The university offered 5,954 independent study classes during this time. A majority $(4,048)$ were graduate level classes. The graduate level classes were roughly evenly split between those that assigned grades and those that did not. Undergraduate level independent study classes almost always assign grades. In both cases, those grades are almost always As.

Grades in Independent Study Classes, Graduate and Undergraduate, University-Wide

|  | Number <br> of <br> Sections | No Letter <br> Grades | Average <br> Percent <br> A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Undergraduate | 1,906 | $169(9 \%)$ | $88 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Graduate | 4,048 | 2,189 <br> $(54 \%)$ | $92 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

Most undergraduate level independent study classes are assigned grades, although almost every student in those classes earns an A. While we can imagine scenarios by which letter grades would be appropriate in independent study classes, we believe that it is far more often the case that they reflect individualized projects that would more accurately be graded as CR/NC.

## RESULTS: COLLEGE-LEVEL

If we examine only the undergraduate classes, we see the following patterns by college:
Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes by College

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CAH | 10,546 | $57 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| CHHS | 4,819 | $63 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| COSS | 5,106 | $36 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| CSB | 3,236 | $30 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| CSM | 5,152 | $43 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $21 \%$ |
| JCAST | 2,699 | $49 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| KSOEHD | 1,636 | $77 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| LCOE | 1,950 | $43 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| SPE | 734 | $91 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $96 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

This overview of grades in undergraduate classes at Fresno State reveals some disparities in grading distributions on campus. Ignoring the Special Programs classes for the time being, we see that classes in three of our colleges (CAH, CHHS, and KSOEHD) appear to be grade inflated, classes in three other colleges (CSM, JCAST, and LCOE) are very close to the national average, and two (CSB and COSS) are significantly lower than the national average. KSOEH is noted for the most extreme grade inflation, with $91 \%$ of undergraduate classes potentially grade inflated.

None of our colleges meets the threshold for high DFW rate. The CSM has the most high fail rate classes, with LCOE, CSB, and COSS not far behind.

## College of Arts and Humanities

CAH offers more undergraduate classes than any other college on campus by a very wide margin. They offer more than double the number of course sections as the runner up. Overall, $57 \%$ of students in CAH classes earn an A, while $6 \%$ fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the CAH by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Armenian Studies | 75 | $36 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Art \& Design | 1346 | $60 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Communication | 1453 | $39 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| English | 1567 | $47 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Humanities | 212 | $43 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Linguistics | 766 | $46 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Media, | 605 | $56 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
|  <br> Journalism | 1095 | $57 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Modern \& Classical <br>  <br> Literatures | 1965 | $78 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Music | 629 | $42 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Philosophy | 833 | $79 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Theater Arts |  |  |  |  |  |

A few departments in CAH (Art \& Design, Music, and Theater Arts) appear to be overwhelmingly grade inflated. Most others (English, Humanities, Linguistics, Media Communication \& Journalism, Modern \& Classical Languages \& Literatures, and Philosophy) are much closer to the national average. The Department of Communication is the only one in the college that is meaningfully lower than the national average.

No classes in CAH have especially high fail rates.

CAH Courses of Note:

- AH 100H: 96\% A (86-100)
- AH 101H: 96\% A ( 86-100)
- AH 105: $100 \%$ A
- ARAB 1A: $98 \%$ A ( $88-100)$
- ARAB 1B: $99 \%$ A ( 94-100)
- ARAB 2A: $100 \%$ A
- ARAB 2B: $100 \%$ A
- ARM 1B: 50\% A (25-86)
- ARMS 120: 67\% A (29-100)
- ARMS 190: 100\% A
- ART 101: 63\% A (24-81)
- ART 102: 57\% A (30-92)
- ART 107: 57\% A (27-79)
- ART 109T: 88\% A (76-100)
- ART 112: 65\% A (20-100)
- ART 113: 55\% A (20-89)
- ART 116: 63\% A (40-85)
- ART 120: 64\% A (53-80)
- ART 121: 75\% A (39-92)
- ART 125: 64\% A (0-100)
- ART 127: 64\% A (25-100)
- ART 13: 57\% A (18-100)
- ART 130: 69\% A (22-93)
- ART 133: 71\% A (67-75)
- ART 14: 64\% A (31-91)
- ART 140: 83\% A (62-100)
- ART 141: 83\% A (40-100)
- ART 152: 80\% A (50-100)
- ART 153: 84\% (43-100)
- ART 155: 82\% (41-100)
- ART 160: 67\% (50-83)
- ART 161: 69\% (25-100)
- ART 166: 75\% (48-94)
- ART 170: 100\%
- A177S: 50\% (0-100)
- ART 179: 63\% (22-92)
- ART 180: 62\% (38-90)
- ART 182: 75\% (63-100)
- ART 183: 71\% (56-80)
- ART 188: 79\% (44-100)
- ART 190: 83\% (0-100)
- ART 20: 51\% (15-100)
- ART 24: 50\% (12-79)
- ART 30: 55\% (19-94)
- ART 37: 55\% (38-100)
- ART 40: 84\% (65-100)
- ART 50: 66\% (38-100)
- ART 60: 69\% (18-100)
- ART 70: 67\% (47-92)
- ART 80: 51\% (35-73)
- ARTH 109: 64\% (52-75)
- ARTH 131: 54\% (52-55)
- ARTH 132: 58\% (28-77)
- ARTH 136: 58\% (43-73)
- ARTH 160: 53\% (46-63)
- ARTH 170: 78\% (67-87)
- ARTH 173: 56\% (43-82)
- ARTH 175: 61\% (38-76)
- ARTH 190: 100\%
- CHIN 100: 67\% (44-100)
- CHIN 1B: $52 \%$ (0-83)
- CHIN 2A: 75\% (50-90)
- CHIN 2B: 72\% (30-100)
- COMM 103: 715 (57-88)
- COMM 115: 88\% (31-100)
- COMM 15: 88\% (63-100)
- COMM 167: 54\% (37-81)
- COMM 170: 52\% (8-82)
- COMM 188: 50\% (0-100)
- COMM 189: 935 (63-100)
- COMM 190: 86\% (0-100)
- COMM 6H: 99\% (93-100)
- DANCE 11: 87\% (50-100)
- DANCE 15: 77\% (46-100)
- DANCE 16: 84\% (20-100)
- DANCE 17: 52\% (29-83)
- DANCE 20: 89\% (80-100)
- DRAMA 11: 89\% (11-100)
- DRAMA 13: 81\% (40-100)
- DRAMA 15: 84\% (0-100)
- DRAMA 16: 53\% (20-80)
- DRAMA 17: 98\% (83-100)
- DRAMA 18: 83\% (0-100)
- DRAMA 19: 86\% (0-100)
- DRAMA 22: 96\% (92-100)
- DRAMA 30: 51\% (29-80)
- DRAMA 31: 72\% (60-85)
- DRAMA 32: 79\% (45-100
- DRAMA 82\% (73-100)
- DRAMA 34: 66\% (45-84)
- DRAMA 35: 73\% (65-83)
- DRAMA 41: 71\% (57-90)
- DRAMA 42: $100 \%$
- DRAMA 62: 69\% (27-100)
- DRAMA 75: 97\% (94-100)
- DRAMA 89: 91\% (0-100)
- ENGL 10H: 94\% (86-100)
- ENGL 116: 50\% (0-100)
- ENGL 117: 73\% (25-100)
- ENGL 131:57\% (38-90)
- ENGL 152: 54\% (42-83)
- ENGL 154: 53\% (31-75)
- ENGL 156: 63\% (33-92)
- ENGL 161: 85\% (67-100)
- ENGL 163: 83\% (55-100)
- ENLG 164: 80\% (56-100)
- ENGL 169: 69\% (50-88)
- ENGL 175: 67\% (44-80)
- ENGL 176: 89\% (83-95)
- ENGL 178: 61\% (50-78)
- ENGL 179: 51\% (33-67)
- ENGL 186: 100\%
- ENGL 190: 91\% (0-100)
- ENGL 191: 93\% (0-100)
- ENGL 193: 55\% (13-90)
- ENGL 194: 55\% (29-84)
- ENGL 2: 92\% (60-100)
- ENGL 41: 75\% (35-100)
- ENGL 42H: 99\% (94-100)
- ENGL 43: 74\% (23-100)
- ENGL 44: 76\% (44-100)
- FL 131: 100\%
- FREN 103: 62\% (42-86)
- FREN 109: 55\% (13-83)
- FREN 110: 54\% (50-57)
- FREN 111: 74\% (60-83)
- FREN 112: 63\% (50-75)
- FREN 113: 52\% (22-70)
- FREN 120: 83\% (80-86)
- FREN 132: 89\% (67-100)
- FREN 149: 53\% (28-77)
- FREN 150: 78\% (40-100)
- FREN 160: 76\% (73-80)
- FREN 190: 96\% (33-100)
- FREN 2A: 53\% (19-81)
- FREN 2B: 67\% (40-100)
- FREN 5: 80\% (60-100)
- GD 150: 57\% (0-90)
- GD 153: 72\% (33-100)
- GD 155: 72\% (0-100)
- GD 157: 62\% (0-100)
- GD 163: 75\% (45-100)
- GD 165: 66\% (9-86)
- GD 167: 70\% (44-93)
- GD 169: 64\% (56-71)
- GD 180: 64\% (20-100)
- GD 190: 83\% (0-100)
- GERM 101: 92\% (50-100)
- GERM 150: 100\%
- GERM 190: 100\%
- GERM 2A: 54\% (17-80)
- GERM 2B: 69\% (50-100)
- GERM 50: 63\% (0-100)
- GRK 131T: $80 \%$ (0-100)
- GRK 1A: 56\% (33-100)
- GRK 1B: 75\% (20-100)
- HMONG 10: 73\% (40-100)
- HMONG 1A: 69\% (45-94)
- HMONG 1B: 69\% (40-94)
- HMONG 4: 76\% (36-100)
- HUM 101T: 86\% (64-100)
- HUM 10H: 72\% (35-100)
- HUM 118: 52\% (40-59)
- HUM 20: 60\% (30-90)
- IAS 108: 74\% (41-90)
- ID 111: 61\% (38-90)
- ID 112: 62\% (52-89)
- ID 113: 93\% (82-100)
- ID 116: 70\% (47-100)
- ID 120: 63\% (13-100)
- ID 130: 52\% (13-100)
- ID 131: 67\% (31-100)
- ID 132T: 70\% (15-100)
- ID 133: 68\% (44-93)
- ID 134: 83\% (50-100)
- ID 136: 53\% (46-70)
- ID 137: 65\% (64-67)
- ID 138: 74\% (50-100)
- ID 145: 66\% (39-100)
- ID 149: 67\% (40-100)
- ID 150: 67\% (13-100)
- ID 152: 58\% (0-100)
- ID 155: 76\% (62-100)
- ID 190: 76\% (0-100)
- ID 143: 67\% (17-100)
- ID 70: 90\% (33-100)
- ID 71: 65\% (42-83)
- ID 77: 79\% (58-94)
- ITAL 1A: 51\% (18-81)
- ITAL 2A: $68 \%(0-100)$
- ITAL 2B: 91\% (50-100)
- LATIN 13: 79\% (0-100)
- LATIN 1B: 59\% (38-100)
- LING 110: 67\% (44-95)
- LING 115: 52\% (5-100)
- LING 120: 60\% (19-100)
- LING 121: 75\% (69-81)
- LING 140: 85\% (47-100)
- LING 142: 61\% (38-100)
- LING 143: 56\% (43-77)
- LING 148: 55\% (40-72)
- LING 151: 83\% (67-100)
- LING 153: 66\% (50-88)
- LING 154: 100\%
- LING 155: 56\% (40-64)
- LING 171: 82\% (46-100)
- LING 190: 78\% (0-100)
- MCJ 1: 53\% (12-89)
- MCJ 105: 62\% (25-100)
- MCJ 106: 60\% (35-85)
- MCJ 108: 51\% (0-91)
- MCJ 113: 74\% (54-92)
- MCJ 115: 64\% (32-100)
- MCJ 116: 69\% (42-83)
- MCJ 118S: 72\% (52-85)
- MCJ 120: 88\% (33-100)
- MCJ 126: 69\% (38-88)
- MCJ 128: 55\% (0-83)
- MCJ 131S: 64\% (59-68)
- MCJ 144: 61\% (32-93)
- MCJ 146: 68\% (33-92)
- MCJ 148: 82\% (50-100)
- MCJ 152S: 58\% (26-91)
- MCJ 158S: 58\% (18-83)
- MCJ 159S: 80\% (50-100)
- MCJ 163: 71\% (48-97)
- MCJ 173: 64\% (26-89)
- MCJ 177T: 71\% (15-100)
- MCJ 190: $88 \%$ (0-100)
- MCJ 30: 78\% (27-100)
- MES 10: 52\% (19-93)
- MUSIC 10: 94\% (27-100)
- MUSIC 11: 93\% (7-100)
- MUSIC 12: 66\% (16-100)
- MUSIC 13: 88\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 14: 74\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 15: 54\% (20-100)
- MUSIC 16: 67\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 17: 71\% (19-100)
- MUSIC 18: 58\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 19: 89\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 31: 73\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 32: 85\% (43-100)
- MUSIC 33: 90\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 34: 94\% (67-100)
- MUSIC 35: 90\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 39: 77\% (0-100)
- MUSIC 48: 71\% (25-100)
- MUSIC 4B: 62\% (42-83)
- MUSIC 4C: 93\% (68-100)
- MUSIC 58: 53\% (25-82)
- MUSIC 60: 56\% (15-96)
- MUSIC 75: 62\% (36-90)
- MUSIC 9: 54\% (18-100)
- PERS 1A: 84\% (59-100)
- PERS 1B: $84 \%$ (69-100)
- PHIL 105: 59\% (54-63)
- PHIL 110: 57\% (40-75)
- PHIL 132: 54\% (28-92)
- PHIL 135: 52\% (36-60)
- PHIL 137: 65\% (63-67)
- PHIL 139: 59\% (33-78)
- PHIL 146: 77\% (48-100)
- PHIL 151: 82\% (62-100)
- PHIL 157: 52\% (24-80)
- PHIL 158: 59\% (45-73)
- PHIL 165: 58\% (50-65)
- PHIL 170: 54\% (22-100)
- PHIL 190: 79\% (0-100)
- PHIL 192: 91\% (0-100)
- PHIL 199: 66\% (25-91)
- PHIL 32H: 74\% (62-86)
- SPAN 110: 85\% (83-88)
- SPAN 114: 73\% (61-84)
- SPAN 115: 61\% (33-84)
- SPAN 116: 69\% (54-85)
- SPAN 117: 58\% (9-100)
- SPAN 121: 52\% (6-85)
- SPAN 125: 65\% (0-100)
- SPAN 129: 76\% (14-100)
- SPAN 142: 93\% (76-100)
- SPAN 145: 51\% (17-84)
- SPAN 150: 57\% (46-74)
- SPAN 170: 63\% (25-88)
- SPAN 190: 94\% (0-100)
- SPAN 2A: $52 \%(8-100)$
- SPAN 2B: 55\% (20-88)
- SPAN 3: 55\% (28-82)
- SPAN 5: 65\% (33-94)


## College of Health and Human Services

CHHS is mid-range at Fresno State for how many classes it offers. Overall, $63 \%$ of students in CHHS classes earn an A, while 5\% fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the CHHS by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comm Studies <br> $\&$ Deaf Studies | 576 | $59 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Gerontology | 153 | $52 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $59 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
|  <br> Human Svcs | 12 | $86 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Interdisciplinary | $12 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Kinesiology | 1675 | $63 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Physical <br> Therapy | 27 | $34 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Public Health | 716 | $47 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
|  <br> Administration | 340 | $84 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| School of <br> Nursing | 946 | $67 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Social Work <br> Education | 375 |  |  |  |  |

Every department but one (Public Health) in CHHS gives more A's than the national average. The School of Nursing has very high standards for entry into the major, which probably explains the strong performance of their students. But it is not clear that this is true of the other departments for whom more than half of their undergraduate classes appear to be potentially grade inflated.

CHHS Courses of Note:

- CDDS 102: 52\% (23-100)
- CDDS 105: 54\% (38-70)
- CDDS 107: 80\% (47-100)
- CDDS 114: 66\% (32-84)
- CDDS 116: 62\% (48-84)
- CDDS 117: 67\% (59-79)
- CDDS 121: 64\% (30-83)
- CDDS 128: 93\% (60-100)
- CDDS 138: 75\% (68-81)
- CDDS 141: 62\% (45-76)
- CDDS 162: 66\% (50-75)
- CDDS 164: 65\% (22-92)
- CDDS 168: 935 (78-100)
- CDDS 171: 52\% (39-66)
- CDDS 172: 61\% (51-76)
- CDDS 188: 95\% (70-100)
- CDDS 190: 86\% (0-100)
- CDDS 91: 64\% (10-96)
- CDDS 92: 62\% (35-100)
- CDDS 93: 63\% (29-100)
- CDDS 94S: 68\% (13-91)
- CDDS 96: 68\% (62-76)
- GERON 10: 52\% (4-100)
- GERON 12: 83\% (44-100)
- GERON 13: 65\% (41-100)
- GERON 14: 64\% (22-100)
- GERON 18: 50\% (29-67)
- HHS 114: 99\% (96-100)
- HHS 115: 100\%
- HHS 116W: 53\% (40-64)
- KAC 10: 1005
- KAC 101: 72\% (50-100)
- KAC 103: $82 \%$ (60-100)
- KAC 11: 90\% (77-100)
- KAC 12: 93\% (81-100)
- KAC 13: 93\% (82-100)
- KAC 15: 89\% (71-100)
- KAC 22: 96\% (79-100)
- KAC 24: 75\% (26-100)
- KAC 27: 98\% (90-100)
- KAC 31: 71\% (35-95)
- KAC 33: 88\% (60-100)
- KAC 39: 89\% (53-100)
- KAC 4: 79\% (48-100)
- KAC 40: $96 \%$ (88-100)
- KAC 41: 83\% (61-96)
- KAC 49: 96\% (80-100)
- KAC 54: 82\% (64-100)
- KAC 6: 69\% (36-100)
- KAC 60: 81\% (62-97)
- KAC 61: 72\% (31-100)
- KAC 65: 88\% (52-100)
- KAC 68: 93\% (79-100)
- KAC 71: 92\% (79-100)
- KAC 73: 92\% (71-100)
- KINES 10: 56\% (10-79)
- KINES 12: 51\% (0-100)
- KINES 13: 52\% (7-100)
- KINES 14: 59\% (0-100)
- KINES 15: 64\% (5-100)
- KINES 18: 57\% (13-92)
- KINES 19: 95\% (0-100)
- KINES 20: 75\% (57-88)
- KINES 25: 57\% (42-79)
- NURS 10A: 78\% (30-100)
- NURS 10L: 98\% (78-100)
- NURS 110: 93\% (33-100)
- NURS 111: 92\% (66-100)
- NURS 112: 71\% (25-91)
- NURS 121: 92\% (32-100)
- NURS 123: 80\% (02-100\%)
- NURS 124: 80\% (65-97)
- NURS 131: 80\% (9-100)
- NURS 132: 81\% (5-100)
- NURS 136: 83\% (54-100)
- NURS 138: 59\% (21-100)
- NURS 140: 84\% (0-100)
- NURS 141: 86\% (27-100)
- NURS 145: 91\% (62-100)
- NURS 150: 85\% (17-100)
- NURS 151: 97\% (91-100)
- NURS 152: 85\% (52-96)
- NURS 154: 59\% (23-95)
- NURS 190: 71\% (0-100)
- PH 110: 51\% (19-82)
- PH 127: 84\% (68-100)
- PH 152T: 53\% (10-100)
- PH 162A: 67\% (21-100)
- PH 190: 88\% (0-100)
- PH 48: 93\% (83-100)
- PH 49: 90\% (82-97)
- PHTH 102: 56\% (33-84)
- PHTH 105: 73\% (56-100)
- PHTH 106: 79\% (58-100)
- PHTH 119: 52\% (46-57)
- PHTH 127: 70\% (55-78)
- RA 106: 76\% (33-100)
- RA 113: 79\% (61-90)
- RA 144B: 54\% (40-69)
- RA 146: 70\% (23-100)
- RA 148: 53\% (6-100)
- RA 180: 57\% (17-93)
- RA 184: 84\% (0-100)
- RA 187: $82 \%$ (33-100)
- RA 190: 75\% (0-100)
- RA 60: 71\% (61-81)
- RA 70: 77\% (56-100)
- SWRK 123: 66\% (23-100)
- SWRK 125: 75\% (25-100)
- SWRK 128: 71\% (21-100)
- SWRK 129: 64\% (24-92)
- SWRK 135: 65\% (29-100)
- SWRK 136: 62\% (23-100)
- SWRK 137: 72\% (31-100)
- SWRK 160: 73\% (7-100)
- SWRK 161: 72\% (13-100)
- SWRK 170: 53\% (4-92)
- SWRK 171: 70\% (21-97)
- SWRK 180: 73\% (14-100)
- SWRK 183: 75\% (22-100)
- SWRK 190: 50\% (10-100)
- SWRK 20: 60\% (33-88)


## College of Social Sciences

COSS is mid-range at Fresno State for how many classes it offers. Overall, 36\% of students in COSS classes earn an A, while $12 \%$ fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the COSS by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Africana <br> Studies | 149 | $36 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Anthropology | 593 | $47 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
|  <br> Latin American <br> Studies | 334 | $32 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Criminology | 1224 | $35 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
|  <br> City \& Regional <br> Planning | 403 | $33 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| History | 810 | $29 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Political <br> Science | 513 | $27 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Social Sciences <br> Interdisciplinary | 84 | $57 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $65 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Sociology | 655 | $40 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Women's <br> Studies | 361 | $51 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

No classes in COSS have terribly high A rates. Anthropology and Women's Studies are slightly above the national average. Every other department is well below the national average.

Both CLAS and Political Science face high fail rates in about 30\% of their classes.

COSS Courses of note:

- AFRS 129 51\% A (33\%-65\%)
- AFRS 142 48\% A ( 46-50)
- AIS 189: 100\% A
- ANTH 100: 68\% A ( 55-100)
- ANTH 101: 100\% A
- ANTH 104: $62 \%$ A ( 20-93)
- ANTH 105: 58\% ( $13-100$ )
- ANTH 111: $90 \%$ A ( 52-100)
- ANTH 118: 68\% A ( 42-90)
- ANTH 140: 65\% A ( $29-96$ )
- ANTH 145: 93\% A ( 84-100)
- ANTH 163: 74\% A ( $56-93$ )
- ANTH 164: 79\% A ( 75-83)
- ANTH 169: 85\% A ( 71-100)
- ANTH 190: $99 \%$ A ( 91-100)
- ANTH 192: $100 \%$ A
- ANTH 194: $100 \%$ A
- ANTH 195: 96\% A ( 87-100)
- CLAS 106: 52\% (41-71)
- CLAS 120: 62\% (30-100)
- CLAS 145: 90\% (50-100)
- CLAS 42B: 70\% (56-80)
- CRIM 136: 81\% (18-100)
- CRIM 156: 60\% (57-63)
- CRIM 160: 72\% (24-100)
- CRIM 174: 53\% (5-100)
- GEOG 118: 57\% (33-80)
- GEOG 132: 96\% (89-100)
- GEOG 165: 76\% (67-86)
- GEOG 178: 59\% (52-67)
- GEOG 184: 76\% (42-100)
- GEOG 190: 92\% (0-100)
- HIST 129: 75\% (71-78)
- HIST 15H: 81\% (55-100)
- HIST 179: 54\% (0-89)
- HIST 187: 63\% (31-96)
- HIST 188: 62\% (39-92)
- HIST 190: 100\%
- HIST 2: 51\% (35-62)
- PLSI 102: 50\% (18-80)
- PLSI 152: 57\% (55-64)
- PLSI 154: 52\% (45-60)
- PLSI 156: 52\% (35-68)
- PLSI 159: 75\% (73-76)
- PLSI 179: 72\% (25-100)
- PLSI 182: 58\% (56-61)
- PLSI 190: 75\% (0-100)
- PLSI 2H: 92\% (68-100)
- PLSI 71H: 77\% (50-100)
- PLSI 90: 50\% (11-80)
- SOC 131: 60\% (8-96)
- SOC 132: 60\% (23-100)
- SOC 150T: 57\% (11-100)
- SOC 162: 58\% (48-68)
- SOC 168: 88\% (76-93)
- SOC 170T: 50\% (29-72)
- SOC 174: 52\% (17-87)
- SOC 183: 62\% (47-76)
- SOC 183S: 59\% (50-68)
- SOC 184: 52\% (40-77)
- SOC 184S: 65\% (62-69)
- SO 186S: 68\% (62-75)
- SOC 187S: 68\% (57-78)
- SOC 190: 93\% (0-100)
- SSCI 150: $85 \%$ (40-100)
- SSCI 180: 59\% (7-100)
- WS 108: 77\% (20-100)
- WS 109: 92\% (87-97)
- WS 110: 50\% (18-88)
- WS 115: 99\% (97-100)
- WS 116: 89\% (68-100)
- WS 12: 52\% (5-100)
- WS 120: 70\% (56-86)
- WS 125: 68\% (63-75)
- WS 127: 74\% (43-100)
- WS 132: 57\% (0-88)
- WS 136T: 84\% (83-85)
- WS 143: 62\% (35-92)
- WS 153: 92\% (60-100)
- WS 175: 75\% (50-100)
- WS 18: 52\% (46-56)
- WS 190: 100\%


## Craig School of Business

CSB is mid-range on the Fresno State for how many classes it offers. Overall, 30\% of students in CSB classes earn an A, while $12 \%$ fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the CSB by Department

|  | Number <br> of <br> Sections | Average Percent A | Average Percent DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent Classes High Fail Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accountancy | 356 | 25\% | 16\% | 10\% | 21\% |
| Aerospace Studies | 95 | 75\% | 2\% | 82\% | 1\% |
| Economics | 424 | 23\% | 20\% | 6\% | 32\% |
| Finance \& Business Law | 780 | 30\% | 10\% | 19\% | 11\% |
| Information Systems \& Decision Sciences | 1675 | 23\% | 13\% | 7\% | 16\% |
| Management | 522 | 30\% | 8\% | 23\% | 7\% |
| Marketing \& Logistics | 341 | 24\% | 6\% | 13\% | 5\% |
| Military Science | 206 | 79\% | 2\% | 87\% | 0\% |

With the possible exceptions of Aerospace Studies and Military Science, the Craig School does not appear to have a problem with grade inflation.

Economics is facing high fail rates in one third of their classes.

CSB Courses of Note:

- ASP 103C: 84\% A (57-100)
- ASP 104A: 65\% (14-100)
- ASP 104B: 70\% (33-100)
- ASP 105A: 77\% (0-100)
- ASP 105B: 93\% (40-100)
- ASP 1A: 77\% (50-100)
- ASP 1B: 84\% (60-100)
- ASP 2A: 64\% (0-100)
- ASP 2B: 65\% (38-100)
- ASP 5: 63\% (17-100)
- BA 152: 62\% (50-85)
- BA 175: 59\% (18-96)
- BA 176: 69\% (46-100)
- BA 177: 58\% (35-77)
- CSB 185: $100 \%$
- CSB 186: 95\% (80-100)
- ECON 117: 50\% (46-61)
- ECON 185: 100\%
- ECON 190: 100\%
- ECON 192: 58\% (5-96)
- ENTR 161: 98\% (92-100)
- ENTR 165: 59\% (56-63)
- ENTR 189: 97\% (79-100)
- ENTR 190: 70\% (0-100)
- FIN 190: $88 \%(0-100)$
- FM 130: 68\% (40-88)
- HRM 157: 56\% (49-76)
- HRM 159: 73\% (50-100)
- HRM 190: 815 (38-100)
- IS 187: 77\% (24-100)
- IS 190: 50\% (0-100)
- MGT 133S: 54\% (29-94)
- MGT 189T: 67\% (48-89\%)
- MGT 190: 60\% (0-100)
- MKTG 167: 59\% (18-100)
- MKTG 190: 60\% (0-100)
- MS 1: 74\% (29-100)
- MS 11: 57\% (0-100)
- MS 12: 73\% (0-100)
- MS 13: $100 \%$
- MS 131: 86\% (50-100)
- MS 132: 91\% (50-100)
- MS 133: 96\% (67-100)
- MS 142: 74\% (0-100)
- MS 150A: 92\% (50-100)
- MS 150B: 88\% (0-100)
- MS 190: 76\% (0-100)
- MS 192: 55\% (29-100)
- MS 2: 67\% (0-100)
- MS 50A: 86\% (0-100)
- MS 50B: 87\% (50-100)


## College of Science and Mathematics

CSM is mid-range at Fresno State for how many classes it offers. Overall, $43 \%$ of students in CSM classes earn an A, while 13\% fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the CSM by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Biology | 864 | $55 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Chemistry | 781 | $37 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| Computer <br> Science | 245 | $38 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
|  <br> Environmental <br> Sciences | 488 | $45 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Mathematics | 939 | $26 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Physics | 426 | $46 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Psychology | 1162 | $53 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Science \& Math <br> Interdisciplinary | 245 | $32 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

The College of Science and Math has two departments (Biology and Psychology) in which some classes may be grade inflated. Two more (Earth and Environmental Sciences and Physics) which are at the national average in terms of A rate, and several that are lower than the national average.

CSM has one department (Mathematics) in which half of the classes can be classified as having a high fail rate. This is by far the highest proportion of any department on campus. This is not a surprise, given the well-documented and national problem of poor math preparation of college students.

CSM Courses of Note:

- BIOL 104: 63\% A (21-100)
- BIOL 10H: 975 (92-100)
- BIOL 143: 96\% (94-100)
- BIOL 151: 65\% (44-100)
- BIOL 152: 97\% (92-100)
- BIOL 158: 76\% (65-86)
- BIOL 162: 61\% (8-92)
- BIOL 171: 79\% (29-100)
- BIOL 174: 60\% (50-67)
- BIOL 175: 50\% (44-56)
- BIOL 178: 55\% (47-64)
- BIOL 180: 80\% (68-91)
- BIOL 189: 78\% (0-100)
- BIOL 190: 95\% (0-100)
- CSCI 10: 55\% (17-78)
- CHEM 106: 78\% (44-100)
- CHEM 10H: 73\% (46-100)
- CHEM 124: 52\% (25-86)
- CHEM 129: 50\% (13-100)
- CHEM 156: 52\% (23-100)
- CHEM 160: 98\% (88-100)
- CHEM 165: 100\%
- CHEM 180: 83\% (0-100)
- CHEM 190: 98\% (0-100)
- CHEM 199: 100\%
- CSCI 130: 56\% (14-100)
- CSCI 166: 50\% (43-56)
- CSCI 174: 54\% (32-86)
- CSCI 190: 715 (0-100)
- CSCI 198: 78\% (0-100)
- CSM 15: 56\% (46-67)
- EES 108: 59\% (0-100)
- EES 109: 90\% (70-100)
- EES 117: 56\% (39-72)
- EES 130T: 80\% (75-86)
- EES 150T: $85 \%$ (50-100)
- EES 154: 68\% (60-75)
- EES 155: 100\%
- EES 178: 75\% (54-100)
- EES 186: 78\% (33-100)
- EES 190: 95\% (0-100)
- EES 199: 91\% (33-100)
- EES 1V: 61\% (35-88)
- EES 8H: 70\% (57-82)
- MATH 108: 58\% (38-75)
- MATH 109: 60\% (36-73)
- MATH 149: 88\% (73-100)
- MATH 190: 74\% (0-100)
- MATH 191: 71\% (33-100)
- MATH 192: 60\% (33-88)
- MATH 198: 96\% (50-100)
- NSCI 106: 81\% (55-100)
- NSCI 120: 59\% (35-85)
- NSCI 4H: 91\% (79-100)
- PHYS 135: 60\% (40-80)
- PHYS 137: 55\% (29-75)
- PHYS 151: 62\% (30-100)
- PHYS 155: 90\% (80-100)
- PHYS 156: 62\% (33-80)
- PHYS 162: 60\% (20-100)
- PHYS 168: 86\% (73-100)
- PHYS 175: 57\% (14-100)
- PHYS 180: 91\% (0-100)
- PHYS 190: 92\% (0-100)
- PSYCH 16: 70\% (14-100)
- PSYCH 17: 61\% (0-100)
- PSYCH 18: 62\% (17-100)
- PSYCH 19: 98\% (0-100)
- PSYCH 60: 70\% (19-100)
- PSYCH 62: 98\% (93-100)
- PSYCH 63: 62\% (16-86)


## Jordan College of Agricultural Sciences and Technology

JCAST is offers fewer classes than most other colleges on the Fresno State campus. Overall, 49\% of students in JCAST classes earn an A, while 5\% fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the JCAST by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ag Business | 375 | $36 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  <br> Ag Education | 577 | $65 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Child and <br> Family <br> Science | 409 | $33 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Food Science <br> $\& ~ N u t r i t i o n ~$ | 305 | $43 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Industrial <br> Technology | 392 | $57 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Plant Science | 429 | $47 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
|  <br> Enology | 200 | $58 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $2 \%$ |

A few departments in JCAST (Animal Science \& Ag Education, Industrial Technology, and Viticulture \& Enology) award more As than the national average. Two (Food Science \&
Nutrition, and Plant Science) are close to the national average. Two departments (Ag Business, and Child \& Family Science) have a rate of As lower than the national average.

Courses of Note:

- AGBS 124: 55\% A (46\% to 64\%)
- ABGS 155: 76\% A ( $34 \%$ to $100 \%$ )
- AGBS 180: 80\% A ( 0-100)
- AGBS 2: 635 A ( 32-100)
- AGBS 32: 50\% A ( 5-78)
- AGBS 5: 51\% (50-53)
- AGBS 80: 50\% ( 0-100)
- AGED 115: 95\% ( 89-100)
- AGED 120: 100\% (all 100\%)
- AGED 150: 64\% ( 54-72)
- AGED 160: 88\% (65-100)
- AGED 166: 64\% ( 50-72)
- AGED 180: 100\% A (all 100\%)
- AGED 190: 99\% A ( 67-100)
- AGED 66: 63\% A ( 50-73)
- AGED 80: 100\% A (all 100\%)
- AGRI 100: 97\% A ( 89-100)
- AGRI 101: 100\% A (all 100\%)
- ASCI 121: 65\% (59-76)
- ASCI 146: 50\% (18-82)
- ASCI 153: 55\% (29-100)
- ASCI 156: 52\% (33-95)
- ASCI 161: 58\% (29-100)
- ASCI 164: 92\% (67-100)
- ASCI 172: 69\% (35-81)
- ASCI 175: 89\% (87-90\%)
- ASCI 180: 100\%
- ASCI 181: 81\% (63-95)
- ASCI 182: 97\% (84-100)
- ASCI 185: 92\% (70-100)
- ASCI 186: 78\% (49-100)
- ASCI 187: 100\% A
- ASCI 190: 99\% A (50-100)
- ASCI 56: 72\% A (65-88)
- ASCI 57: 78\% (64-100)
- ASCI 61: 55\% (14-93)
- ASCI 67: 61\% (26-90)
- ASCI 68: 80\% (63-100)
- ASCI 81: 75\% (52-90)
- CFS 100: 65\% (50-93)
- CFS 130W: 50\% (22-80)
- CFS 139: 76\% (20-100)
- CFS 37: 66\% (6-97)
- CFS 38H: 93\% (87-100)
- CRSC 101: 91\% (72-100)
- CRSC 102: 63\% (25-100)
- CRSC 105: 71\% (34-100)
- CRSC 115: 53\% (35-75)
- CULG 50: 62\% (31-80)
- ENOL 105: 59\% (29-100)
- ENOL 116: 53\% (48-59)
- ENOL 140: 61\% (30-76)
- ENOL 166: 52\% (22-96)
- ENOL 170: 52\% (29-74)
- ENOL 173: 67\% (40-100)
- ENOL 175: 74\% (71-78)
- ENOL 180: 50\% (0-100)
- ENOL 190: 90\% (0-100)
- ENOL 199: 87\% (78-100)
- FCS 190: 81\% (0-100)
- FSC 180: 100\%
- FSC 190: 75\% (0-100)
- FSC 199: 56\% (38-71)
- FSM 190: $100 \%$
- HORT 113: 59\% (44-73)
- IT 102: 76\% (54-100)
- IT 104: 62\% (50-80)
- IT 106: 63\% (41-79)
- IT 112: 53\% (36-70)
- IT 115: 69\% (46-95)
- IT 116: 58\% (25-86)
- IT 131: 50\% (21-65)
- IT 133: 76\% (67-86)
- IT 156: 81\% (50-100)
- IT 186: 58\% (25-100)
- IT 190: 56\% (0-100)
- IT 191T: $87 \%(58-100)$
- IT 196: 90\% (46-100)
- IT 199: 83\% (0-100)
- IT 30: 68\% (54-78)
- IT 71: 54\% (0-100)
- IT 92: 72\% (54-90)
- MEAG 1: 58\% (35-91)
- MEAG 103: 52\% (50-54)
- MEAG 120: 61\% (50-82)
- NUTR 147: 65\% (38-83)
- NUTR 149: 90\% (75-100)
- NUTR 165: 63\% (44-71)
- NUTR 166: 58\% (33-81)
- NUTR 170: 67\% (52-85)
- NUTR 175: 58\% (23-75)
- NUTR 53: 52\% (15-81)
- NUTR 61: 51\% (29-90)
- OH 4: 88\% (72-95)
- PLANT 15: 50\% (14-77)
- PLANT 17: 53\% (27-100)
- PLANT 18: 83\% (0-100)
- PLANT 19: 78\% (0-100)
- SW 100N: 56\% (21-100)
- VIT 101: 62\% (24-100)
- VIT 105: 50\% (29-71)
- VIT 160: 97\% (93-100)
- VIT 190: 84\% (0-100)
- VIT 196: 80\% (0-100)
- VIT 199: 85\% (57-100)


## Kremen School of Education and Human Development

KSOEHD is offers fewer undergraduate classes than most other colleges on the Fresno State campus. Overall, $77 \%$ of students in KSOEHD classes earn an A, while $3 \%$ fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the KSOEHD by Department

|  | Number <br> of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent <br> A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Counselor Ed \& Rehab | 85 | $69 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Curriculum \& Instruction | 623 | $73 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Education <br> Interdisciplinary | 100 | $77 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Educational Leadership | 15 | $59 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Liberal Studies | 5 | $72 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Literacy, Early, Bilingual, <br> \& Special Education | 788 | $82 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $95 \%$ | $1 \%$ |

Every single department in Kremen gives more A's than the national average, by a lot. In fact, virtually every class ( $95 \%$ ) in the biggest department in Kremen (LEBSE) are potentially grade inflated based on the number of As earned in those classes.

KSOEHD Courses of Note:

- CI 100: 70\% (21-100)
- CI 101: 87\% (79-100)
- CI 123: 100\%
- CI 149: 73\% (46-100)
- CI 151: 74\% (19-100)
- CI 152: 63\% (16-100)
- CI 158: 75\% (50-100)
- CI 159: 79\% (27-100)
- CI 161: 75\% (0-100)
- CI 171: 87\% (28-100)
- CI 171EC: 77\% (58-92)
- CI 175: 83\% (36-100)
- CI 176: 77\% (40-100)
- CI 180T: 92\% (53-100)
- CI 190: 100\%
- COUN 150: 61\% (43-78)
- COUN 174: 79\% (16-100)
- COUN 176: 55\% (39-77)
- EHD 107: 69\% (33-95)
- EHD 180T: 78\% (31-100)
- EHD 50: 77\% (13-100)
- ERA 153: 58\% (18-100)
- ERE 153: 77\% (26-100)
- LEE 109S: 90\% (72-100)
- LEE 110W: 77\% (48-100)
- LEE 120C: 61\% (34-100)
- LEE 129: 98\% (90-100)
- LEE 135: 88\% (75-100)
- LEE 136: 95\% (84-100)
- LEE 144S: 66\% (21-100)
- LEE 148: 73\% (55-86)
- LEE 154: 81\% (35-97)
- LEE 156: 84\% (50-100)
- LEE 157: 80\% (44-100)
- LEE 170: 82\% (73-88)
- LEE 171: 86\% (62-100)
- LEE 172: 93\% (41-100)
- LEE 173: 81\% (22-100)
- LEE 173E: 89\% (79-100)
- LEE 177: 82\% (39-100)
- LEE 177E: 96\% (88-100)
- LEE 180T: 88\% (38-100)
- LEE 190: 100\%
- LEE 80T: 59\% (29-83)
- SPED 120: 63\% (18-96)
- SPED 121: 79\% (60-94)
- SPED 125: 68\% (43-100)
- SPED 130: 67\% (36-100)
- SPED 136: 77\% (50-100)
- SPED 137: 77\% (72-81)
- SPED 145: 88\% (64-100)
- SPED 146: 61\% (25-100)
- SPED 158: 80\% (40-100)
- SPED 160: 90\% (0-100)
- SPED 171: 87\% (0-100)
- SPED 172: 80\% (0-100)
- SPED 175: 90\% (0-100)
- SPED 176: 83\% (0-100)
- SPED 179: 84\% (44-100)


## Lyles College of Engineering

LCOE is offers fewer classes than most other colleges on the Fresno State campus. Overall, 43\% of students in LCOE classes earn an A, while $11 \%$ fail.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the LCOE by Department

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Civil \& Geomatics <br> Engineering | 673 | $45 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Construction <br> Management | 244 | $53 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
|  <br> Computer <br> Engineering | 519 | $37 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Engineering <br> Interdisciplinary | 41 | $67 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Mechanical <br> Engineering | 481 | $42 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

The only department in the Lyles College with an A rate above the national average is Construction Management.

LCOE Courses of Note:

- CE 123L: 76\% A (9-100)
- CE 124: 52\% (0-96)
- CE 127: 57\% (49-65)
- CE 129: 76\% (22-100)
- CE 142L: 70\% (0-100)
- CE 180A: 84\% (43-100)
- CE 190: 71\% (0-100)
- CM 110: 62\% (33-91)
- CM 131: 59\% (40-73)
- CM 132: 54\% (23-75)
- CM 140: 63\% (24-100)
- CM 150: 66\% (33-100)
- CM 151: 62\% (27-85)
- CM 180AS: 70\% (0-100)
- CM 180B: 65\% (0-100)
- CM 181: 64\% (50-81)
- CM 190: 66\% (0-100)
- CM 193: 84\% (33-100)
- CM 31: 57\% (44-70)
- CM 32: 61\% (44-77)
- ECE 118L: 52\% (17-90)
- ECE 120L: 55\% (7-94)
- ECE 121L: 78\% (56-100)
- ECE 128L: 52\% (13-100)
- ECE 135: 57\% (47-67\%)
- ECE 138L: 72\% (41-100)
- ECE 186A: 66\% (22-100)
- ECE 186B: 57\% (18-100)
- ECE 190: 64\% (0-100)
- ECE 90L: 57\% (5-100)
- ECE 91L: 59\% (9-100)
- ENGR 191: 555 (33-100)
- ENGR 1H: 100\%
- ENGR 2H: 100\%
- ENGR 3H: 100\%
- ENGR 4H: 100\%
- GME 1: 69\% (40-92)
- GME 102: 83\% (70-92)
- GME 151: 53\% (38-67)
- GME 15L: 79\% (25-100)
- GME 16L: $87 \%$ (50-100)
- GME 180: 68\% (0-100)
- GME 181: 58\% (0-100)
- GME 190: 67\% (0-100)
- GME 40: 63\% (30-100)
- GME 50: 53\% (43-92)
- GME 66: $65 \%$ (33-100)
- ME 115: 51\% (8-100)
- ME 155: 61\% (20-100)
- ME 162: 70\% (31-87)
- ME 164: 73\% (32-100)
- ME 166: 66\% (34-93)
- ME 190: 78\% (0-100)
- ME 26: 60\% (12-97)
- ME 95: 64\% (31-100)


## Special Programs

Courses that do not fit clearly into the college system are cataloged as Special Programs. These are mostly Smittcamp Honors College classes, and Athletics classes. A few more are COMS (Community Service) classes, and classes in the University sequence (primarily UNIV 1). Military Science and Aerospace classes used to be in Special Programs, but are now in the Craig School of Business, so for the sake of consistency, we have considered them in the CSB for all of these years.

Grades in Undergraduate Graded Classes in the Special Programs, by Program

|  | Number of <br> Sections | Average <br> Percent A | Average <br> Percent <br> DF | Percent <br> Classes <br> Potentially <br> Grade <br> Inflated | Percent <br> Classes <br> High Fail <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Smittcamp | 199 | $92 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $98 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Athletics | 382 | $99 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Community <br> Service | 12 | $99 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| University | 52 | $54 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

Grade distributions by program are very similar, with all programs except for University giving virtually all As.

The Smittcamp Honors College is highly selective and competitive, drawing the very best students of the Central Valley and beyond. Therefore, we are not surprised or concerned about the high rate of As in those classes.

The high rate of A's in COMS and ATHL classes suggests that those should be offered as CR/NC classes instead of being offered for a grade.

Courses of Note:

- ATHL 10: 83\% (57-100)
- ATHL 100: 100\%
- ATHL 176: 100\%
- ATHL 177: 100\%
- ATHL 178: 100\%
- ATHL 180: 100\%
- ATHL 182: 995 (98-100)
- ATHL 183: 100\%
- ATHL 184: 100\%
- ATHL 185: 1005
- ATHL 187: 100\%
- ATHL 189: 100\%
- ATHL 191: 100\%
- ATHL 192: 100\%
- ATHL 193: 99\% (98-100)
- ATHL 194: 100\%
- ATHL 196: 100\%
- ATHL 199: 100\%
- HONOR 1: 99\% (96-100)
- HONOR 10: 89\% (45-100)
- HONOR 18: 99\% (91-100)
- INTD 177: 66\% (55-77)
- UNIV 1: 51\% (0-100)


## CONCLUSIONS

The Fresno State A rate is very high. It is even higher than the national average, which is widely considered to be a problem. Our rate of As has not grown over the time period included in this analysis; it has stayed the same. We conclude that the Graduation Initiative has not resulted in increased grade inflation at Fresno State. However, we suspect that grade inflation was already ubiquitous in some colleges and programs on campus.

Obviously, a high rate of A grades is not always problematic grade inflation. There are some performance explanations for why some classes have this pattern. Classes that are highly selective and only admit a small number of highly qualified students are likely to include high performing students who earn the As that they receive. Upper division, and especially senior capstone classes, with a series of prerequisite classes, will probably be very selective for high performing students. Classes that meet this description may include:

- Classes for students in Honors programs
- Elective research or independent study classes
- Senior research projects
- Culminating classes in programs with rigorous lower-level coursework (e.g. internships and practica)

This committee is not in a position to identify which classes have those characteristics. Therefore, we do not know which classes are grade inflated in a problematic way and which are ones are not. But we do not believe that it is possible that these circumstances can fully explain the grade distributions we report here. Therefore, we have flagged programs and courses that we think deserve scrutiny by the curriculum experts in those areas.

A few things we think are red flags include:

- Classes in which virtually every student earns an A, every single time it's offered. (These classes should probably be offered CR/NC instead.)
- Classes in which the rate of As varies wildly across sections.
- When a large number of courses in the same department or program have a high rate of As


## Recommendations

We make the following recommendations.

1) We recommend that Deans and Department Chairs look at the numbers in this report and discuss amongst themselves if they are content with the grade distributions reported here for their areas. We ask them to look at the list of courses that have been noted as having high A rates, and explore whether there are explanations other than grade inflation for these classes.
2) Moving forward beyond this 2012-2018 data, instructors should regularly be informed of the grade distributions in their classes. Chairs and deans should review grade distributions in their units. This information is easily accessed in Tableau. APM 242 mandates that department chairs conduct an annual review of grading practices of their faculty; reviewing grade distributions is one way to meet that requirement. Raising awareness can promote reflection, and if necessary, changes in grading behavior to result in more accurate representation of our students' mastery of course content.
3) Some Fresno State courses should be offered for $\mathrm{CR} / \mathrm{NC}$, rather than being graded. This should be considered for:

- Classes taught by non-academic instructors, such as coaches and staff.
- Classes in which A is virtually the only grade ever earned. This includes COMS and ATHL classes.
- Independent study classes for which there is not a syllabus that describes meaningful differences in level of performance. If students can be dichotomized into either completing the requirement or not, it should not be graded on a letter scale.

We make these recommendations in order to protect the academic standards at Fresno State. Our concerns about grade inflation are founded in a desire to serve our students, to prepare them well for their professional lives, and to protect the reputation of Fresno State as serious academic institution. We want our community partners to know that our graduates are well-trained to succeed in the workplace.
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