I Approval of Minutes

II Reports
A. Standing Committee Chairs:
   1. Budget and Planning—Joe Chemisky, Frank Sherry
   2. Faculty (also Ctte on Cttes)—Linda Currivan, Ruth Pfeiffer
   3. Elections—Stephanie Palombo
   4. Academic/Institutional Support—Cindy Martin
   5. Legislative Relations—Joe Chemisky, Frank Sherry
   6. Student Committee (also ODE Coordinator)—Ron Flegal
   7. Program Review—Kathy Hill
   8. Curriculum—Paul Lococo

B. Ad Hoc Committee
   1. Senate Service Committee—Mimi Nakano

C. Chair’s Report
   1. BOR Meeting/ACCFSC Meeting. KCC 1/16/04.
      a. UHPA Informational Picket.

III New Business
A. Discussion of system-wide uniformity of grading and GPA policy.
B. Student “No Shows” and Disenrollment.
C. Approval of CAO Interview Timeline.

IV Adjournment
*Future Senate Meetings: February 18, March 10, March 31, April 21, May 5.*
LEEWARD COMMUNITY COLLEGE
2003 – 2004 Faculty Senate

APPROVED Minutes of the January 28, 2004 Meeting

James Goodman, Chair
Nancy Buchanan, Vice Chair
Candace Hochstein, Secretary

SENATORS PRESENT: N. Buchanan, J. Chernisky, L. Curriivan, R. Flegal, J.
Goodman, K. Hill, C. Hochstein, W. Imada, P. Lococo, C. Martin, M. Nakano, S.
Palombo, R. Pfeiffer, F. Sherry, S. Wood

SENATORS EXCUSED: C. Ganne, P. Kennedy, D. Sakai

GUESTS: Linda Yamada, Mark Silliman

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order at 3:20 p.m. with a quorum.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: The minutes of the December 10, 2003 meet were
read and approved with minor corrections.
-under Senators Present, R. Pfeiffer should be included.
-under the Chair’s Report, delete Mike Rota, and insert, “Letter from Vice President for
Academic Affairs (VPAA), David McClain…”

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

BUDGET AND PLANNING – no report given.

FACULTY COMMITTEE – Senator Currivan submitted three nominees to replace the
three senators (G. Levy, K. Kahn, and C. Yokotake) who were unable to be active
members of the Senate for Spring 2004. The three recommendations were: Wes Teraoka
(Social Science), Mike Reese (Math and Science), and Linda Yamada (Voc Tech).

Motion 04-01: (Flegal/Hill) To approve W. Teraoka (SS), M. Reese (MS), and L.
Yamada (VT) as replacement senators for Spring 2004.

PASSED – Unanimously

ELECTIONS – no report given.

ACADEMIC/INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT – no report given.

LEGISLATIVE RELATIONS – no report given.
STUDENT COMMITTEE – Senator Flegal reported that Chancellor Silliman informed him that the WASC (Western Association Schools and Colleges) Accreditation Report required LCC to review and begin some form of action on the F and N grading confusion. WASC has set a deadline of April 1, 2004 for an initial progress report.

Chancellor Silliman also reported that the UH Board of Regents are requiring that all reports that are to be submitted to WASC first be submitted to the Board for approval. This means that LCC must review and submit a report to the Board of Regents for approval by the March 2004 meeting. Consequently, this requires LCC to have the report prepared and finalized by the end of February 2004 so that it can be placed on the Board’s March agenda.

Unfortunately, due to other obligations that Senator Flegal has, the Student Committee will not be able to continue work on this issue. The Senate as a whole then decided to assume the responsibility for conducting open forums on campus; informing and soliciting information from the campus community. Two open forums will be held. They will be on: Tuesday, February 10, 2004 from 1:30 to 2:30, and Wednesday, February 11, 2004 from 3:00 to 4:00. It was recommended that the campus community be presented with 2-3 options to discuss and vote upon in order to focus the discussions on the issues presented by WASC. Some possibilities presented were:

1. Drop the N grade.
2. Drop the F grade.
3. Keep both grades but redefine each so to be clear when they may be used.
4. Other?

PROGRAM REVIEW – no report given.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – no report given.

SERVICE COMMITTEE – no report given.

CHAIR’S REPORT: No report given.

NEW BUSINESS:

Discussion of system-wide uniformity of grading and GPA policy - The All Campus Council of Faculty Senate Chairs (ACCFSC) has enquired if the Faculty Senates would be interested in having a committee to discuss the possibility of instituting a uniform grading system across the UH system. If approved, this committee would review grading options and share the information with the different senates. The senates would have the right to agree or not agree with any information or recommendations the committee submitted.

This suggestion was made because each system institution has different policies on how grade point averages are calculated. It was felt that if everyone in the UH system used the same grading system, it would alleviate this problem.
Concerns regarding the + and – grades and N grade were also raised – the use of them or if the grades would no longer be able to be used by a campus. Another issue was that regardless of the campuses using the same grading system, it was the individual campus’ policy on how grade point averages were calculated that seemed to be the crux of the issue. Perhaps one alternative might be an agreement between the UH campuses to accept the GPA which the sister campus posted for entrance purposes to the university.

**Motion 04-02: (Palombo/Pfeiffer) To approve a System wide discussion for a uniform grading policy.**

**PASSED- Y=14; N=1; Ab=0**

Student “No Shows” and Disenrollment – It was suggested that the Faculty Senate re-open the discussion of whether or not LCC should bring back the Faculty’s option to disenroll students from classes if the student did not show up for two consecutive classes. The review would look at why LCC stopped this policy, and to research if other UH campuses currently have a disenrollment policy. One possible reason for the ending of this policy might have been due to legal reasons.

This issue was assigned to the Faculty Committee to review.

Approval of Chief Academic Officer Interview timeline – The proposed timeline was based on the assumption that there would be 2 to 4 candidates to interview. Time blocks and days were designed to give faculty time to meet the candidates, eliminate “awkward” overlap of interviewees, and do so in a reasonable amount of time.

The proposed timeline would have one candidate being interviewed per day. Each candidate would meet with the faculty in an open forum, tour the campus, and have an interview with the Executive Committee.

**Motion 04-03: (Flegal/Imada) To approve the Chief Academic Officer Interview timeline.**

**PASSED – Unanimously**

Chancellor Silliman asked the Senate to consider endorsing Charlie Nishioka to be LCC’s nomination for a UH System Honorary Doctorate. He submitted Mr. Nishioka’s name to the Senate as Mr. Nishioka has been a great supporter of LCC, as well as his other accomplishments and contribution to the Leeward Community. This request was tabled as the Senate lost quorum at 5:00 pm.

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 PM.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:** Candace Hochstein, Secretary
January 23, 2004

Dr. Mark Silliman
Chancellor
Leeward Community College
96-045 Ala Ike
Pearl City, HI 96782

Dear Chancellor Silliman:

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, Western Association of Schools and Colleges, at its meeting on January 7-9, 2004, reviewed the Focused Midterm Report submitted by the college and the report of the evaluation team which visited on Friday, November 14, 2003. The Commission acted to accept the Focused Midterm Report, to place Leeward Community College on Warning, and to require two Progress Reports.

A Warning is issued when the Commission finds that an institution has pursued a course of action that deviates from the Commission’s eligibility criteria, standards of accreditation, or policies to an extent that raises concern regarding the ability of the institution to meet accreditation standards. During the warning period, the accredited status of the institution continues. The Commission is required by the U.S. Department of Education not to allow deficiencies to exist for more than a total of two years.

A first Progress Report will be due April 1, 2004, on the College’s progress in addressing the first recommendation from the fall 2003 team report. The Commission notes the 2000 and 1994 visiting teams also raised concerns about this issue.

Recommendation 1: The College should hold its planned Spring 2004 review of the "N" grade and either discontinue the use of the grade or define it to be clearly applied after instructor assessment of student learning, and assure that it reflects a unique amount of learning that is distinguishable from the "F" grade. The College should also establish and implement a policy defining when the "N" grade may be used so that all students are treated fairly.

A second Progress Report will be due October 15, 2004, and will be followed by a visit by representatives of the Commission. The Report should describe institutional progress in addressing its need for a comprehensive program review that is integrated with institutional planning, including technology planning, as described in recommendations two and three from the 2003 team report and recommendation five from the 2000 team report.
Recommendation #2: Leeward Community should develop and implement a program review process that includes appropriate common data elements for each program, data on student needs, student achievement and student learning outcomes.

Recommendation #3: In order to ensure that program review is incorporated into institutional planning and resource distribution processes, Leeward College and all of the Hawaii Community Colleges/University of Hawaii System need to develop expectations that the institution engage in program review as part of ongoing review of institutional effectiveness, plan for improvements and incorporate those plans into strategic planning and resource distribution processes for the community college system.

Recommendation Five: "The team recommends the college formalize its planning procedures in the areas of technology and information and learning resources to address needs in the following areas: determining the sufficiency of information and learning resources, planning for the acquisition and maintenance of educational equipment and materials, ensuring accessibility of information and learning resources, providing professionally qualified staff, ensuring sufficient and consistent financial support, forging outside agreements, and evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of learning and information resources and services."

A fall 2003 team visit to the University of Hawaii Community Colleges also found the lack of an active program review process to be a system-wide issue. Consequently, the Commission has advised the system to address this issue. The College is advised to review 2002 Standards of Accreditation as well as the following recommendation provided to the University of Hawaii Community Colleges in a team report in January 2004, in developing its own Progress Report:

Recommendation 2: The Team recommends that the UH Community Colleges develop policies and procedures to ensure:

- that the community colleges engage in regular assessment of institutional effectiveness, including program review;
- that the community college system as well as each college sets priorities for implementing plans for improvement that are based in analysis of research data;
- that the colleges and the UHCC system incorporate these priorities into resource distribution processes and decisions;
- that the colleges and the UHCC system develop and employ a methodology for assessing overall institutional effectiveness and progress toward meeting goals expressed through plans for improvements; and
that the colleges and the UHCC system report regularly to internal constituencies and the Board on this progress. (Standards I.E., II A. 1. and 2., II.B.3.a., II B. 4., II.C.1.e and U.C.I; III.A.6., III.B.2.b., III.C.1. and 2., III.D.1. a, IV.B.2.b, and the Preamble to the Standards.)

In addition, the Commission wishes to express its concerns that the stability of the administrative structure of Leeward Community College remains uncertain, despite college efforts to improve working conditions. The College continues to operate with several temporary administrators, and the process for hiring permanent administrative staff appears to be stalled by the University of Hawaii's decision-making processes. Therefore, the Commission asks that the College include in its Progress Report information on its efforts to fill administrative positions.

Enclosed is a revised version of the Team Report; please discard earlier versions. Additional copies may be duplicated. The Commission requires you to give the Focused Midterm Report, the 2003 Team Report and this letter dissemination to your college staff and to those who were signatories of your college self study. This group should include the University President, campus leadership, and the Board of Regents. The Commission also requires that the reports be made available to the public. Placing copies in the college library can accomplish this. Should you want the team report electronically to place on your web site or for some other purpose, please contact Commission staff.

Please note that the next comprehensive evaluation of Leeward Community College will occur during academic year fall 2007.** [*Per clarification call to ACCJC 1/27/04.*]

On behalf of the Commission, I wish to express continuing interest in the institution's educational programs and services. Professional self-regulation is the most effective means of assuring integrity, effectiveness and quality.

Sincerely,

Barbara A. Beno
Executive Director

BAB/1

cc: Dr. Evan Dobelle, President
    Dr. David McClain, Vice President for Academic Affairs
    Mr. Michael Rota, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
    Dr. Robert Asato, Accreditation Liaison Officer
    Board President, University of Hawaii

Enclosure
Chief Academic Officer (Vice Chancellor) Position  
Open Forums  

Thursday, February 26, 2004-Friday, February 27, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
<th>Candidate 3</th>
<th>Candidate 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 noon-12:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30</td>
<td>Open Forum w/ refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open Forum w/ refreshments 12:30-1:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1-2 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tour and summary 1:30-2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Open Forum w/ refreshments 2:00-3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td>Tour and summary 2-3 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td>Executive Committee Interview, 3-4 p.m.</td>
<td>Open Forum w/ refreshments 2:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Executive Committee Interview, 2:30-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Tour and summary 3:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tour and summary 3:30-4:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:00</td>
<td>Executive Committee Interview, 4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee Interview, 4:00-5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-5:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost and time streamlining resulted in this schedule—no additional coffee and lunch costs.
Leeward Community College

A Study

of

"F" and "N" Grading Patterns

Prepared by

Andy Rossi
Institutional Analyst/Researcher

December 5, 2003
A STUDY of
"F" and "N" Grading Patterns
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Abstract

In 1994, the Accrediting Team from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) reported that there was "confusion and uneven application" of the punitive “F” and non-punitive “N” grades in the courses taught at LCC (ref: ACCJC 1994 Evaluation Report p. 6). The Team recommended that the College examine its uneven application of these two grades. This same condition was again mentioned by the ACCJC visiting accrediting team in the 2000 Evaluation Report (p. 20).

In response to these comments by the ACCJC, this study was conducted to determine the extent of the uneven application of the “F” and “N” grades. More specifically, there were three questions associated with this research initiative. Those questions were:

1. What percentage of grades awarded were “Fs” and “Ns”?
2. What percentage of classes had “F” grades assigned but no “N” grades, and vice versa?
3. How many instructors used the “F” grade exclusive of the “N” grade, and vice versa?

This study involved a quantitative approach to analyzing the grading patterns of the LCC instructors. Descriptive Statistics was the statistical method used to evaluative grading patterns. The data used in this study were historical data spanning six-semesters (3-years) and were retrieved from the Leeward Community College’s central computer “Aldrich” and “Banner” systems.

Of the 4,338 classes conducted over the 3-year study period, 34% (or 1,487) of these classes had “F” grades assigned, but no “N” grades. The number of “F” grades given in a single class ranged from as few as one, to as many as 16 “F”s being assigned without any “N”s being given. When the “N” grade was reviewed, the data reflected that 34% (or 1,465) of the classes had “N” grades given but no “F” grades assigned. There were several classes that had more than 20 “N” grades assigned while there were no “F” grades awarded in these same classes.

When analysis was performed using the instructors as the “unit of analysis”, the data suggested that approximately 40% of the instructors seem predisposed towards either assigning the “F” or “N” grades exclusively. Further analysis implies that the exclusive assignment of the “F” or “N” grades was, in most cases, not associated with any specific courses, but rather a discretionary decision made by individual faculty members.

Based upon the data, the findings of the ACCJC Accreditation Teams appear to be correct. Apparently there was (is) some uneven application of these grades, and confusion concerning when the “F” and “N” grades should be given.
A STUDY of “F” and “N” Grading Patterns

Introduction

Background

Leeward Community College was first established as an institution of higher education in 1968. At that time, the College did not include the “F” grade (Less than minimal passing) in its grading system. Instead, an “N” (No grade assigned) was awarded to students that did not achieve minimal passing standards.

After many years of debate on the issue of grading, LCC revised its grading policy and incorporated the “F” grade into its system. In addition to the “F” grade, the policy was revised to allow students to audit classes and take courses on a credit/no credit basis. The “AU” (Audit), “CR” (Credit awarded) and “NC” (No credit given) grades became part of this new grading system. These grades had not been part of the original grading system. This revised policy took effect in approximately 1991.

While the change in the grading system was supposed to bring LCC more inline with other colleges, yet still allow faculty the flexibility to award a non-punitive “N” grade, there was apparently some confusion concerning when an “F” grade should be given versus an “N” grade. In its 1994 Evaluation Report (p. 6), the Accreditation Team from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (ACCJC) concluded that there was "confusion and uneven application" of the punitive “F” and non-punitive “N” grades in the courses taught at LCC. The Team recommended that the College examine its uneven application of these two grades. This same condition was again mentioned by the ACCJC visiting accreditation team in the 2000 Evaluation Report (p. 20). The Accrediting Team determined that the uneven and confusing use of the “F” and “N” grades by faculty was still a valid concern.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent of the uneven application of the “F” and “N” grades. More specifically, there were three questions associated with this research initiative. Those questions were:

1. What percentage of grades awarded were “Fs” and “Ns”?
2. What percentage of classes had “F” grades assigned but no “N” grades, and vice versa?
3. How many instructors used the “F” grade exclusive of the “N” grade, and vice versa?

Theory/Hypothesis

The College believed that the use of the “F” and “N” grades was not as uneven as it may have appeared.

Research Procedures/Methodology

Design

This study involved a quantitative approach to analyzing the grading patterns of the LCC instructors. Descriptive Statistics was the statistical method used to evaluative grading patterns.

The data used in this study were historical data spanning six-semesters (3-years) and were retrieved from the Leeward Community College’s central computer “Aldrich” and “Banner” systems.

Population and Sample Size

The population was considered to be all the credit courses taught at Leeward Community College.

The data (sample) used in this research included all the classes (and grades) conducted at LCC during the Fall 2000 through Spring 2003 semesters, with the exception of distance education classes, and those classes that had been taught by instructors who taught less than 5 classes over the six-semester time frame.
Data Excluded from the Study

Distance education classes were excluded from the analysis because the information obtained from the mainframe computer (Aldrich & Banner) was not reliable with respect to these classes. The difficulty with extracting data on distance education classes was associated with the way these classes were stored in the mainframe database. Each distance education class was listed multiple times, once for each location where the course was offered. For accountability purposes, each class has a main record and a listing for each of the other campuses in the community college system. The problem that arose was that the host campus was difficult to identify and some double counting of grades occurred. Therefore, to reduce the possibility of errors, the distance education courses were excluded from this analysis.

Also, excluded from this study were the classes that had been taught by instructors who taught less than 5 classes over the six-semester study period. These classes were excluded because it was felt that in order to effectively assess the degree of application of the “F” and “N” grades, instructors needed to have been afforded every opportunity to award these various grades. Instructors who taught fewer than five classes might not have had the situations arise where awarding these different grades was appropriate. Therefore, in order to effectively evaluate the grading patterns of instructors relative to the “F” and “N” grades, these classes were excluded from the database.

Data Collection Methods

A data extraction grade report, which included all classes taught at LCC, was developed by the LCC Computer Center. The data were then downloaded via ASCII files to the Researcher’s desktop computer and subsequently imported into Excel files. The data was then reviewed and the distance education classes, and classes that had been taught by instructors who taught less than 5 classes over the six-semester study time period were excluded. These files were then used to analyze the data.

Method of Analysis

Numerous data sorts and frequency counts were completed in order to assess the grading patterns. All sorting and mathematical calculations were completed utilizing the Microsoft Excel, and the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) programs.
Validity/Reliability

The data used in the analysis were historical data which spanned 3 academic years, or six-semesters (Fall 00 through Spring 03).

Data selection was based on a purposeful sampling technique whereby criteria were established in order to reduce the possibility of using unreliable data. Distance education classes were excluded from the analysis because information obtained from the mainframe computer (Aldrich & Banner) was not reliable. Also, excluded from this study were classes that had been taught by instructors who taught less than 5 classes over the six-semester study period. These classes were excluded because keeping them in the database might have unnecessarily skewed the results.

Not counting the classes that were excluded from the study, there were a total of 4,338 classes used in the analysis. These classes were taught by a total of 226 instructors.
Findings/Results

The 4,338 classes taught by 226 instructors over a six-semester period were analyzed to answer the research questions developed at the beginning of this study. Descriptive Statistics was the technique used to perform this analysis. The following are the findings/results.

Research Question 1: What percentage of grades awarded were “Fs” and “Ns”?

Findings/Results: Of the 82,645 grades given over the 3-year study period, 9% (or 7,217) of these grades were “F”s, and 9% (or 7,118) were “N”s. The following table depicts the percentages of grades given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon this representation of data, there appears to be an even usage of the “F” and “N” grades.

Research Question 2: What percentage of classes had “F” grades assigned but no “N” grades, and vice versa?

Findings/Results: Of the 4,338 classes conducted over the 3-year study period, 34% (or 1,487) of these classes had “F” grades assigned, but no “N” grades. The number of “F” grades given ranged from as few as one, to as many as 16 “F”s in a single class without any “N”s being given (see Appendix A for a detailed breakout of the “F” and “N” grade comparisons).

When the “N” grade was reviewed, the data reflected that 34% (or 1,465) of the classes had “N” grades given but no “F” grades assigned. There were several classes that had more than 20 “N” grades assigned while there were no “F” grades awarded in these same classes.

An analysis of these classes by disciplines further revealed that many of these situations where only the “F” or only the “N” grades were given occurred at the same course level. From this analysis it appears as though the assignment of only “F”s or “N”s was not subject to the type of course or the level, but rather a discretionary decision made by the individual instructors. A listing of these
classes reflecting the "F" and "N" grades by subject area was not included in this report in order to protect the privacy of the faculty.

Based upon the distribution of "F" and "N" grades assigned within each class, and that the assignment of these grades does not appear to be based upon the course, an uneven application of the "F" and "N" grades begins to appear. Appendix A reflects this somewhat apparent uneven distribution of these grades.

**Research Question 3:** How many instructors used the "F" grade exclusive of the "N" grade, and vice versa?

Findings/Results: Of the 226 instructors who taught the 4,338 classes, 34 of these teachers never gave an "N" grade in any of their classes yet gave "F"s. These 34 instructors (15% of the total instructors) seemed to be predisposed towards not giving any "N" grades at all.

Conversely, the data suggests that there were 25% (or 56 instructors) that seemed predisposed towards not giving "F" grades. These 56 instructors awarded "N" grades in their classes but never assigned any "F" grades.

Below is a chart that depicts this distribution of instructors that used the "F" and "N" grades exclusively, and those that used both the grades. From the chart below it can be easily seen that out of the 226 instructors who taught courses over the 3-year study period, approximately 40% (15% + 25%) seemed predisposed towards either assigning the "F" or "N" grade exclusively.
Summary/Conclusion

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the extent of the uneven application of the “F” and “N” grades. More specifically, there were three questions associated with this research initiative. Those questions were:

1. What percentage of grades awarded were “Fs” and “Ns”?
2. What percentage of classes had “F” grades assigned but no “N” grades, and vice versa?
3. How many instructors used the “F” grade exclusive of the “N” grade, and vice versa?

Based upon the data, it appears that 34 instructors (15% of the total instructors) seemed predisposed towards not giving any “N” grades at all. These 34 instructors awarded “F” grades however, did not give any “N” grades in any of their classes. Conversely, the data suggests that there were 56 instructors (25% of the total instructors) that seemed predisposed towards not giving “F” grades. These 56 instructors awarded “N” grades in their classes but never assigned any “F” grades. An analysis of these particular classes further revealed that the awarding of the “F” or “N” grade did not appear to be associated with specific courses.

Of most concern with the awarding of the “F” and “N” grades is the issue of fairness to the students. The data suggests that a situation could arise where two students take the same course from different instructors, yet one student could receive an “F” grade for the same amount of course work completed while the other student might receive an “N” grade. This potential for the uneven application of the “F” and “N” grade should be rectified.

Based upon the data, one must conclude that the findings of the ACCJC Accrediting Teams appear to be correct.Apparently there was (is) some confusion concerning when the “F” and “N” grades should be given.

It is recommended that the faculty better define the meaning of both the “F” and “N” grades. Presently, the LCC 2002-2003 Catalog defines an “F” grade as: “less than minimal passing achievement”. The “N” grade is defined as a grade “used to indicate that the student has made progress in the course (learning has occurred) and demonstrated sustained effort, but has not reached a level of accomplishment which will allow for an evaluation”. From these definitions it is not easy to discern when awarding of one grade versus the other would be more appropriate.
The Chart reflects the combinations of “F” and “N” grades given in the 4338 classes conducted over the 3-year study period.
Examples: 1) There were 10 of the 4338 classes that had 2 “F”s and 5 “N”s grades awarded
2) There was 1 of the 4338 classes that had 8 “F”s and 12 “N”s grades assigned.
3) There was 1 of the 4338 classes that had 16 “F”s and 0 “N”s given.