

**Evaluating Student Performance in University Level Course Work:  
The Certification of Academic Accomplishment Reveals  
a Hidden Conflict in Academe**

**Dr. Melvin Anderson**

---

**Abstract**

Although higher education has begun to come to grips with problems in the process of evaluation of student performance, these problems continue to challenge teachers and universities. Grade inflation is rampant; teachers are seemingly unable and often discouraged in their efforts to return the grading system back to a former status when "C" was an average grade and "A" was reserved for the few truly exceptional students. Most teachers know that students expect high grades and will use a variety of methods to bring pressure on teachers who grade more objectively. To complicate the process further, students have access via the world-wide web to a wide variety of term paper and thesis web sites that make plagiarism very easy and very attractive—at the expense of legitimate research and learning.

This paper provides a framework for examining the effects of these problems and identifying a hidden conflict that causes them to persist. At the crossroad of a number of critical educational paths lies a decision point wherein teachers must decide whether to avoid conflict with students by awarding mostly high grades, or avoid the inevitable conflict with students' current and future employers and clients by awarding objective grades that certify actual learning and ability. As long as this is seen as an "either-or" relationship, teachers will opt out of conflict with students, or at best, compromise and satisfy neither alternative. The conflict is supported by the flawed assumption that there is no way to avoid conflict with the student except to award inflated grades.

The paper concludes that there is a third alternative that permits both requirements to exist—satisfying students realistically as well as satisfying their present and future employers—and in so doing, allowing the university to grade objectively and retain its academic reputation. This third alternative makes use of resources that are already available, and brings all three interests—students, employers and the university—together in a relationship involving professional societies and organizations to enhance genuine learning and evaluate student performance realistically.

### **Higher Education at the Crossroad**

American higher education has come to a crossroad—a busy intersection—that brings a number of critical paths together at the same place and time. Approaching this junction is the explosion of high technology in the delivery of academic courses that includes the internet, video tapes and sophisticated classroom equipment. Interactive teaching methods are also coming down an avenue of development as teachers apply new technologies along with computerized teaching tools and simulations to their learning environments. Another path leading into this crossroad is the reasonable expectation in industry and the professional world that a college graduate whose credential—the college degree—represents real learning that can become real value to an employer or client.

The goal of higher education is preparing people for life. The objective of an effective process of evaluating student performance must support this goal by upholding the academic reputation of the institution. Therefore, a college degree must be considered a certification that the student has acquired skills, knowledge and understanding related to the discipline identified by that degree.

In many disciplines, even a college degree is insufficient certification. Additional certification and licensing are often required before a person can work or conduct business—another indication that student evaluation contributes not only to a certificate but also to actual certification.

At the same time, a sequence of ongoing problems has emerged within the nation's schools, some generated internally and others promoted by external influences that involve pre-college as well as post-college factors. These external influences seem to be creating the greatest internal problems for educators, and many of these problems involve the process of evaluating and reporting student performance. Despite increasing discussion and concern about improving the process of evaluating student performance in our colleges and

universities, efforts to implement effective student evaluation have become frustrated in recent years.

### **Pre-College Evaluation and Certification**

Enrollment in a university is not an automatic administrative event. It requires legitimate secondary school qualifications—a high school diploma or successfully passing GED (General Education Development) Tests. One out of every seven high school diplomas issued each year is based on passing the GED Tests. Some states provide standardized testing before awarding a high school diploma. The New York State Board of Regents, for example, requires formal testing in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies for high school diploma certification.

Students entering college with valid high school diplomas are in effect certified by their states, schools or testing agencies to have achieved specific knowledge levels in their curricula. This, along with accreditation of schools, provides a good measure of assurance that a high school graduate is qualified for higher education.

### **Graduate Certification**

The same certification concerns exist for students planning to enter post-graduate college degree programs. There exists a very rigid procedure at all universities for ensuring that students enrolling in master's degree programs have completed all the requirements for the bachelor's degree they claim, as well as specific prerequisites for advanced degrees they seek to earn. Most graduate schools require that prospective students complete standardized entrance exams given by private agencies such as the GRE or GMAT. Graduate schools also maintain standards regarding the accreditation of the colleges and degree programs of their prospective students.

Accreditation is not an automatic condition. The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges rescinded the accreditation of The University of Northern Colorado just over twenty years ago because of a number of substandard academic practices including

evaluation of student performance. The university expended considerable energy and money to correct these deficiencies and regain accreditation.

It is therefore evident that higher education has a fully developed process for ascertaining the certification of the credentials of students entering the university, as well as those advancing to higher levels within degree programs or enrolling in advanced degree programs. Certification is a valid and recognized process throughout higher education in America.

### **Evaluation is an Essential Part of All Certification**

Certification is not just a word. From kindergarten through Ph.D., students are certified for promotion, advancement, diplomas or other certifications of educational accomplishment via diplomas, letter grades and standardized numerical values. Every accredited university reports academic achievement in a recognizable grading structure (usually A through F) with standardized credit hour measurements and numerical values (4 for an "A," 3 for a "B," etc.). Students' overall performance is calculated as an average of their earned grades, and is often held to specific minimum levels for remaining in good standing or being accepted for higher levels and advanced degree programs. And yet grading is currently one of the most controversial, disturbing and frustrating topics in virtually every level of education.

### **Grading Controversy Extends Outward**

The current interest in grading and evaluation methods is ample proof that there is a great deal of ongoing concern about it. Authors and education experts generate literally thousands of books, articles and papers each year on evaluation of student performance. Educators are genuinely upset about the apparent widespread disparity between student performance and how that performance is measured and reported.

All university teachers have personal grading theories and methods, mostly in line with the policies of their institutions, and usually producing considerable dissatisfaction for teachers and students alike. We attend seminars and symposia; we discuss evaluation of student performance. We write papers and books on the subject and we develop personal or organizational formulae for doing it. We agree that a formal evaluation process is a necessary condition—a teaching tool for inspiring (or coercing) students to perform better in their coursework. We agree on the purposes and general content of the evaluation system and the kinds of problem we encounter with it, but most of us are very hesitant to try to change anything.

### **Standards and Measurements**

Whatever evaluation concept a teacher uses is based on some set of standards and measurements derived objectively from students' attendance, participation, exam scores, presentations, research papers and the like. A good grading schema must begin with clear definition of what is expected and how it will be measured. Virtually every university course is built on a published Course Description, accompanied by specified course goals, textbooks and learning outcomes that teachers are required to address in their course content. Achieving these objectives requires a clear set of measurable performance outcomes in syllabi and student expectations. In all cases, the evaluation process is something internal to the system, and whatever evaluation methods are applied are supposed to be as prescribed by the policies of each institution. And although every teacher has a personal grading philosophy that s/he believes is appropriate, it is very unlikely that any single approach provides a perfect formula for fair and objective evaluation. But there is enough common ground on which most of us agree.

It is even more unlikely that any one study or paper will provide a formula that satisfies a majority of the academic community, yet we agree on the general aspects of what indicates how much a student has learned.

Whether we evaluate input factors such as attendance and participation, or output factors such as skills and understanding, there is a general confluence of viewpoints about how these should be measured and graded.

### **Trouble on the Report Cards**

Despite general agreement in academe about the importance of evaluation and the apparent determination of most teachers to do it right, the grading process has become severely inflated. "A" has become the median grade. For this reason, more than all others, we are now searching for solutions that will re-create a central tendency in grading averages. If it were up to the teachers en masse, evaluation of student performance would suddenly return to the days when "C" was average, "B" was considered a good grade and "A" identified truly outstanding work. We know how to do it, but we don't.

Harvard University professor Harvey Mansfield is a long-time critic of grade inflation who offers some insight into the internal aspects of this phenomenon. In an article in the April 6, 2001 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* entitled "Grade Inflation: It's Time to Face the Facts," he offers some thoughts that bring out the seriousness of the problem:

In a healthy university, it would not be necessary to say what is wrong with grade inflation. But once the evil becomes routine, people can no longer see it for what it is. Even though educators should instinctively understand why grade inflation is a problem, one has to be explicit about it.

Grade inflation compresses all grades at the top, making it difficult to discriminate the best from the very good, the good from the mediocre . . . some of my colleagues say that all you have to do to interpret inflated grades is to recalibrate them in your mind so that a B+ equals a C, and

so forth. But the compression at the top of the scale does not permit the gradation that you need to rate students accurately . . . mere recalibration does not address the real problem: the raising of grades way beyond what students deserve . . . we have lost the notion of an average student.

Mansfield connects the grade inflation problem with external problems like student course evaluations, student expectations rather than their own criteria, and the resultant effect on authority and morale:

The loss of the notion of average shows that the professors today do not begin with their own criteria for the performance of students in their courses. Professors do not say to themselves, "This is what I can require; anything above that enters into excellence." No. With an eye to student course evaluations and confounded by the realization that they have somehow lost authority, professors begin from what they think students expect. American colleges used to set their own expectations. Now, increasingly, they react to student expectations.

Thus another evil of grade inflation is the loss of faculty morale that it reveals. It signifies that professors care less about teaching. Anyone who cares a lot about something is very critical in making judgments about it. Far from the opposite of caring, being critical is the very consequence of caring. It is difficult for students to work hard, or the professor to get them to work hard, when they know that their chances of getting an A or A- are 50-50. Students today are still motivated to get good grades, but if they do not wish to work hard toward that end, they can always maneuver and bargain.

Mansfield concludes by admitting that the reasons for growing grade inflation are not entirely clear, but that the solution will come only when we put our standards first and muster the determination to act.

We must remember that learning really occurs in our institutions and we are capable of evaluating student performance objectively. And so why is the grading system inflated? Since it is not an internally-caused problem, then it must be an externally-caused problem. In other words, despite our own abilities and intentions, something is pulling our red pencils upward as we measure student performance and report it. It cannot be pre-college external factors such as high school certifications, because these are in the book long before students receive their first college semester grades. Therefore, it must be something external—something other than our own methods—that induces teachers as individuals to distort the evaluation process after we have set standards and transmitted expectations to students. Moreover, it must involve a hidden conflict that prevents or discourages objectivity despite our clear objective of implementing an effective student performance evaluation system and upholding a good academic reputation for our universities.

### **Two External Requirements**

If we know that the stated objective is effective evaluation of students that upholds our academic reputation, then we also should know what requirements must be maintained in order to reach that objective. The two basic requirements are fairly obvious:

#### **First, avoid conflict with students.**

Students consider themselves customers who deserve something for their investment in tuition and effort: learning or good grades, or both. Whether students really seek to achieve academic objectives or are more interested in high grades is important because it defines what they consider proper in the evaluation process. Within the MTV generation we will continue to find both kinds of student.

#### **Second, avoid conflict with the students' employers and clients.**

Students' employers and clients, present and future, expect something for their investment if they pay their employees' tuition or trust them to provide specific skills their degrees indicate.

Both of these requirements must be met in order to achieve the stated objective. If we conflict with our students, we certainly will not uphold our reputation with them and we will probably lose many of them to "looser" schools or programs. If we conflict with the students' eventual employers and clients, we will probably lose their confidence in the institution's credibility and the credibility of its degrees and certifications.

In our litigious society, the university bears some of the responsibility for representing the capabilities of its graduates. It may even find it is liable for the actions of the people it certifies.

#### **Avoiding the Obvious Conflict**

In order to avoid conflict with those who place grades above learning, we tend to allow easy grading—pass almost everyone. Whereas students once earned grades, they often try to negotiate their grades. In some cases, they try to litigate grades by putting pressure directly on the teacher through formal complaint channels, persuasive techniques and a variety of outright coercive maneuvers. In rare cases, students take legal action against schools and teachers over grades. In that environment, teachers are only too willing to avoid conflict by easy grading. For many students, the grade is everything; for many teachers not interested in conflict, the grade is not worth fighting about.

#### **Fanning the Fire**

Evaluation is not a one-way street. Most schools obtain feedback about teachers and courses through a formal course evaluation process, usually one in which students complete a standardized form during the last session of a course. Students complete the forms anonymously, without teachers' inputs

or influence, responding to questions about various course “quality” issues. The forms typically contain objective multiple-choice questions, plus a number of open-ended questions requiring written responses. Completed forms are collected and delivered via administrative channels to data centers where numerical scores are computed. This is properly done before teachers award final course grades. Results, including the written responses, go to teachers’ department chairs and perhaps deans, and eventually back to the teachers. Teachers know these evaluations are inevitable and they are concerned about ratings.

Teachers quickly learn what it takes to get high scores in these evaluations; happy students (happy customers?) write good evaluations. In this era of “credentialism,” teachers cannot afford to overlook the importance of good formal evaluations *from* students, as well as good evaluations *of* students. Looking good is career enhancing.

Credentialism has become so dominant in our society that in some cases, people sometimes take the risk of claiming to have earned college degrees they really haven’t completed. Recently, the United States Olympics Committee President Sandy Baldwin was forced to resign when it was learned that her resume contained false information about earned degrees. Baldwin was a talented and highly effective leader who fudged on her resume—and is now history. Her exit was appropriate, but we ought to consider how many others, who actually receive their diplomas, do not have the learning and talent needed to perform the jobs they were offered on the basis of their credentials.

### **The Quality Era**

This concept of “quality” in higher education became popular during the onset of the “quality movement” around 1980.

Manufacturers developed programs to measure and improve customer satisfaction, and universities began developing programs to measure and improve student

satisfaction. The results of these “quality” initiatives are now described in the history books of business and academe.

In the manufacturing arena, it eventually became evident that quality is important, but not the true goal of either business or higher education. Of the 30 American firms who have won the coveted Baldrige Award for Quality since 1987, six have already gone through bankruptcy—*after* receiving the award! Whereas the Deming Award for Quality in Japan focuses on product quality (“happy customers”), the Baldrige award is based heavily on input factors like innovative practices in human resource management—“happy employees,” according to the Human Resources Learning Center. In academe, much of the quality we espouse is measured at the input level, before students have had a chance to apply what they’ve learned in the real world. At that level, all we have to go on is “happy students.” It is becoming increasingly apparent that the “customers” of higher education are not just the students.

### **On the web**

Another challenge has exploded into the college environment: plagiarism. In just two years, from 2000 to 2002, the number of “term paper” web sites has grown from 12,000 to more than one million. In June, 2002, the world-wide web could link a student to 1,094,805 sites from which students can buy ready-made term papers on any topic. All they must do is click on the keyword “term papers.” These sites don’t exist for aesthetic purposes; there is a market for such products in academe.

Plagiarism is not just a way for some students to get higher grades; it does irreparable damage to the students who don’t do it, and in time, to the institutions that don’t stop it.

Julie J. C. H. Ryan of George Washington University provides an incisive view of the issue of plagiarism and evaluation of student performance:

Often lost in the discussion of plagiarism is the interest of the students who don’t cheat. They do

legitimate research and write their own papers. They work harder (and learn more) than the plagiarists, yet their grades may suffer when their papers are judged and graded against papers that are superior but stolen material. Students have a right to expect fairness in the classroom. When teachers turn a blind eye to plagiarism, it undermines that right and denigrates the grades, degrees and even institutions.”

At the same time, a large number of plagiarism-fighting tools are available to teachers to help identify and counter ill-gotten term papers and reports. There are currently more than 194,000 web sites that offer software products and services for detecting and countering plagiarism. This cyber-jousting verifies further our awareness of the fact that credentials, not substance, are more important to many students.

#### **Avoiding the Other Side of the Conflict**

There are always two sides to conflict. The other side of the evaluation conflict deals directly with the certification that a college degree represents. To award a degree is to certify that a student meets the defined requirement for that degree. For example, a person with a degree in Aeronautical Engineering is expected to know something about airplanes, mathematics, physics, propulsion and flight dynamics. A person with an MBA is expected to know something about business management, finance, accounting, marketing, production operations, project management, information systems and the like. This kind of expectation rests in the minds of employers and clients who believe that college graduates are worth their salaries or fees because they have credentials—degrees—specifying the disciplines in which they have been educated.

Anyone who has waited in a physician's office has examined the medical degrees and certifications on the wall; we understandably want to know where the doctor learned his trade. We trust the

credentials of airline pilots because we know they must pass stringent requirements in flying schools and FAA aircrew evaluations. The same applies to other disciplines, even to music and the arts; a person either learns or doesn't learn to play the cello. Today, symphony orchestras desperately seek good cellists, while a million or more young people have guitars and dream of becoming rock stars.

Labor unions that once certified their members have opted not to be involved in evaluation activities. In recent years, union membership has declined significantly; their focus has now shifted to trying to preserve membership numbers. As a result, employers and clients of the various trades must look to other indications of competence, such as training and education credentials.

Many business and government organizations pay the college tuition for their employees, in the expectation that the expense will be repaid in the form of better and more valuable performance. If this performance improvement is not realized, these organizations may discontinue tuition assistance or avoid hiring graduates from specific universities. This is the conflict every university must avoid.

In order to avoid conflict with the present and future employers and clients of students, the university must legitimately discriminate between students who really demonstrate learning and those who do not. That means that as a prerequisite to avoiding conflict with employers and clients, grades must not be handed out to those who do not earn them. In other words, schools must maintain rigid grading and evaluation standards and be selective.

But maintaining rigid evaluation standards is in direct conflict with easy grading that avoids conflict with students. This is the hidden conflict that prevents effective evaluation of student performance as a process.

### **Breaking the Hidden Conflict**

We must either be easy evaluators or objective evaluators. We cannot be both. We can either accept conflict with students by grading objectively, or accept conflict with their employers and clients by handing out unearned high grades. Or so it seems.

This conflict is held in place by a single flawed assumption: that there is no way to avoid conflict with the students except to award inflated grades. Because of this flawed assumption, we arrive at having to ask a question that has two wrong answers.

Are we more at risk of losing enrollments or of devaluing the image and marketability of our degrees? If one or the other must go, then the next task is to decide which it is. Or can we accept some kind of compromise wherein we raise the requirements a little and try to assuage the concerns of both sides? Experience tells us that compromise is usually a bad choice, except in politics. And so we eventually must come up with a third alternative. Otherwise, we continue down the more demanding path.

### **The Third Alternative**

Teachers logically consider declining enrollments as a danger to their jobs and incomes. Moreover, teachers receive pressure to keep students in college from administrators and external factions that include teacher unions and other special interests with political influence. Every reduction in university enrollment is seen as a threat to someone.

In most cases, business concepts work well in higher education. The marketing model applies in the general sense, and colleges expend a lot of effort and money attracting new students to replace those who graduate each year. Unlike tobacco smoking, education is not addictive; nearly everyone quits before they die. Logically, every college web site and catalog focuses heavily on the reasons prospective students should choose this school or the other. With this as a primary motive, schools logically attempt to maximize enrollments and retain students. But motive alone cannot produce

the desired effect of an educational institution with a strong academic reputation. It takes effective methods and the means to deliver educational products to the end users (customers).

### **Who are the True Customers?**

As long as the students are seen as the only customers of higher education, all the motives, methods and means will continue to focus on delivering that which the students dictate by their feedback in negotiating curricula, grades and faculty evaluations. In viewing the system from within, we tend to respond to immediate pressures from the students we see daily and consider customers deserving of being satisfied like people who buy hamburgers without regard for the fat content and its long-term health effects!

We are overlooking another aspect of these customers—the professional capabilities of the students we certify to their employers and clients. Some students' employers contribute to their education expenses, which means we have a quasi-legal responsibility to these employers and clients because we issue certificates of knowledge called diplomas and degrees. These are indeed our customers, although they tend not to make as much noise about what satisfies them.

In truth, the customers of higher education are twofold: the students who should benefit from their personal study efforts, and also those students' current or future employers and clients who pay for and expect to benefit from employing credentialed college graduates. Interestingly, serving one is in the long run serving the other as well. And yet they seem to be in conflict, and that to serve one is to abandon the other.

There is a third benefactor in this customer relationship: the university itself, whose long-term reputation (and perhaps its survival) inevitably benefits from an evaluation system that delivers what both sides of the conflict deserve.

Therefore, the only solution that can have long-term success is one that satisfies both sides of the problem: to avoid conflict with students and at the same time avoid creating conflict with the students' employers and customers.

### **The PTA?**

Since 1897, primary and secondary schools have maintained a formal process in which students, parents, teachers and other primary and secondary school officials could interact to discuss specific educational issues and track students' general progress and performance in individual courses. Virtually every public and private school in America has an operating Parent-Teacher Association (PTA) or similar organization. Perhaps too many children today aren't benefiting from the advantages of the PTA because their parents don't participate, but the framework is in place for those who use it.

Unfortunately, when their offspring go off to college following high school, proud parents tend to breathe a sigh of relief because they don't have to go to any more boy/girl scout and PTA meetings! Someone else will take over the role of seeing that their little darlings go to school on time, do their homework and study for exams. Someone else will monitor what courses and programs they enroll in, and someone else will sign their report cards and admonish them when their grades aren't perfect.

Nothing could be farther from the truth! Nobody, except perhaps students themselves, will assume "parental" authority when students reach adulthood and go to college.

### **Rescue Points**

Fortunately, there are some "rescue points" in the existing system that may save some students from academic disaster, if students will avail themselves of them. Rescue points are either places or events that enable students to clarify goals, or set new goals, or obtain encouragement and influence that will facilitate their academic growth. For example, there are a number of

clubs and professional fraternities, like Delta Sigma Pi for business students, which attract and encourage students with legitimate learning goals. Every university monitors its students' extracurricular activities in some way. Faculty and administrators still take time to meet with students and serve as advisors for their curricula and course selections, if students will take the time to see them.

Most of these rescue points are aimed at the students' and schools' immediate best interests. Very little is directed toward the other side of the conflict, which involves the students' current and future employers and clients.

If the PTA isn't around, and the rescue points don't address the potential conflict with students' employers and clients, then what action can be taken that formally links both student and employer concerns? It must be some "injection" or third alternative that does both.

### **The Third Alternative**

The concept of the PTA is a good one, albeit focused on student-parent-school interests at the primary and secondary levels. But there is another interest that can replace the parents when students attend college, perhaps not as authoritarian as parents, but equally concerned about the students' learning outcomes and interested in the performance evaluation process that certifies students with degrees that imply specific abilities and professional skills.

Many students' current employers are paying tuition expenses as part of employee benefit packages. This is true of military, other government agencies and many private firms, large and small. These payers not only have a vested interest in how their education money is being spent; they also expect their people to return that investment in the form of more valuable performance. These students usually know their responsibilities and know that it takes more than a good grade to convince the employer that they have learned something in college. A "PTA-like" relationship is easily

established in these cases, wherein the employers are directly involved in their employees' curriculum, course selection and academic progress, even though there are legally enforceable privacy concerns.

But what about the students who haven't yet entered the professional world? Many undergraduate college students have never held jobs, but are enrolled in degree programs aimed at specific professions. Most formal professions have professional societies that link people of the same profession through membership, seminars, annual symposia, local chapters and regular activities. A partial list of these national organizations includes the American Society for Quality (ASQ) with 70,000 members, the Society of American Military Engineers (SAME), the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) and the American Institute of Electrical Engineers (AIEE). We all know of the American Medical Association (AMA), the American Bar Association (ABA), the American Dental Association (ADA), the American Psychiatric Association (APA), the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), and the influence these organizations have had in academe as well as in the professional world. Virtually every discipline presented in a degree program in college can relate to a national organization that has nearby local chapters and members. And these chapters are already interested in what is being taught in colleges around the country that affect their future memberships.

Many professional societies have student chapters that look for future professional members at colleges and universities. And they are welcome in the colleges because they encourage enrollments and inspire better academic performance. Their presence, however, is not sufficiently formal and their influence does not often get into the process of evaluating student performance.

### **Making a Difference**

"Credentialism" is the belief that one's paper persona is more substantial than the person; the belief that an inflated resume or degree

representing inflated grades is as good as state-of-the-art knowledge, experience, and ability to perform specific skills. Credentials may get some of us in the door, but they won't keep us on the job once the employers and clients discover that we can't do the work.

Professional organizations can help avoid the pitfalls of credentialism by having a direct influence on students' learning. They can provide regular feedback to educators about those they've graduated with flying colors who can't even find the flagpole. When this relationship is established formally, the evaluation of student performance becomes a legitimate reflection of actual learning and ability; grade inflation may then become an embarrassment to easy-grading teachers. Likewise, teachers will begin to use the tools available to detect and discourage plagiarism. Many students will begin to realize that both sides of the evaluation conflict are collaborating in the students' best interest by standing fast on what constitutes learning and objective evaluation.

With this re-orientation of student attitudes must also come a re-orientation of teacher attitudes. This will require, among other things, a redirection of the process of student evaluation of teacher performance. At present, this process is mostly a measure of customer satisfaction with students seen as the only customers. As long as teachers fear student feedback that criticizes teachers who require hard work, this evaluation tool will continue to work against achieving better student performance.

To activate this already-available "PTA-like" injection to a level that influences both teachers and students, we must make it an integral part of the planning, programming and evaluation processes of the university.

It will require leadership and the willingness to change.

## Bibliography

### Books:

Perelman, Lewis. *School's Out*. New York: William Morrow, 1992. The author offers some alarming predictions about the survivability of traditional institutions of higher learning in the new "electronic classroom" era.

Rackham, Neil. *SPIN Selling*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1988. Presents a systematic series of questions designed to cause clients (students, in our application) to reveal their true intentions and provide teachers with the information needed to offer solutions that truly benefit students and the university.

### Articles and papers:

Harvey C. Mansfield, "Grade Inflation: It's Time to Face the Facts." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 6, 2001. This Harvard University professor offers some insight into the internal aspects of this phenomenon and some thoughts that bring out the seriousness of the problem.

Julia J.C.H. Ryan, *Student Plagiarism in an Online World*. Prism Online, December, 2001. A George Washington University teacher describes the enormous growth of online cheating by college students and some ideas on how to catch a plagiarist.

Alison Schneider, "Insubordination and Intimidation Signal the End of Decorum in Many Classrooms." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 27, 1998. A review of the causes and effects of growing problems in evaluating student performance.

James W. Michaels and Dirk Smillie, "Webucation--Some smart investors are betting big bucks that Peter Drucker is right about the brilliant future of online adult education." *Forbes Magazine*, May 15, 2000. A challenging discussion of Drucker's analysis of higher education, the "e-learning" race, and the differences between the various learning environments.

Robert Lenzner and Stephen S. Johnson, "Seeing Things as They Really Are--College Education as we Know it is Threatened (Peter Drucker)." *Forbes Magazine*, March 10, 1997. Another strong warning that higher education faces formidable challenges to its very survival.

Michael Prowse, "Endangered Species. Modern electronic technology could mean that the days of academics at higher-education institutions are numbered." *Financial Times*, November 20, 1995. A hard-hitting discussion about changing academic environments.

David Rothenberg, "How the Web Destroys the Quality of Students' Research Papers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 15, 1997. A sobering view of the misuse of today's electronic learning tools.