

What the MgtMkt Profs could Learn from the Instructors

A recent report at USMPRIDE.COM showed some of the “easy grading” that occurs in management and marketing classes in USM’s CoB. A table from that report is shown below:

TABLE 1
Grading in MGT/MKT at USM

Name	Course	#Students	CumGPA	A	B	C	D	F
Bushardt, S.	MGT 454	26	3.11	38%	38%	19%	4%	0%
Bushardt, S.	MGT 480	27	3.00	26%	48%	26%	0%	0%
Carr, J.	MGT 400	44	3.00	23%	59%	14%	5%	0%
Carr, J.	MGT 475	52	2.96	23%	58%	13%	4%	2%
Daniel, F.	MGT 480	20	2.85	15%	55%	30%	0%	0%
Duhon, D.	MGT 400	171	2.76	20%	38%	40%	1%	1%
Lopez, T.	MKT 428	43	3.11	26%	60%	14%	0%	0%
Michael, D.	MGT 300	52	3.07	27%	54%	19%	0%	0%
Michael, D.	MGT 364	36	3.16	28%	61%	11%	0%	0%
Michael, D.	MGT 454	28	3.42	43%	57%	0%	0%	0%
Osmon., T.	MKT 495	47	2.76	19%	51%	19%	9%	2%
Peyrefitte, J.	MGT 400	38	2.89	18%	58%	21%	0%	3%
Peyrefitte, J.	MGT 495	30	3.10	20%	70%	10%	0%	0%
Sequeira, J.	MGT 475	102	3.03	24%	57%	20%	0%	0%
Sequeira, J.	MGT 482	28	3.17	29%	61%	11%	0%	0%
Yang, J.	MGT 325	23	2.86	26%	35%	39%	0%	0%
Yang, J.	MGT 465	13	2.84	23%	46%	23%	8%	0%
Zantow, K.	MGT 400	28	2.64	7%	50%	43%	0%	0%
Zantow, K.	MGT 455	29	2.89	24%	45%	28%	3%	0%

Some of the data above are quite shocking. Daniel Michael’s grade distributions for MGT 300, MGT 364, and MGT 454 show that not a single D or F was awarded among a group 116 students. In one section, not even a C was recorded. Others, such as Stephen Bushardt, show “easy grader” tendencies (see USMPRIDE.COM for other reports on Bushardt’s grading histories).

We visited pick-a-prof ourselves in order to gather information on the grading histories of the department’s three instructors – Wanda Fennell, Dolly Loyd, and Amy Sevier. What we encountered is presented below:

Management and Marketing Grade Histories: The Instructors

Name	Course	#Students	CumGPA	A	B	C	D	F
Fennell, W.	MGT 325	331	2.08	15%	24%	25%	27%	9%
Fennell, W.	MGT 465	44	2.52	18%	34%	32%	14%	2%
Loyd, D.	MKT 300	172	2.04	7%	28%	34%	22%	8%
Loyd, D.	MKT 444	77	2.40	4%	40%	51%	3%	3%
Sevier, A.	MGT 300	396	2.19	11%	30%	35%	16%	8%

As the data in the table above show, the MgtMkt instructors are doing a much crisper job at “holding the line” on grading standards than are the department’s PhD personnel. Both Loyd and Sevier are much more solid on grading at the principles level (one in MKT and the other in MGT) than Daniel Michael.

The *highest* CumGPA among the instructors is 2.52 (Fennell, MGT 465). The *lowest* CumGPA among the professors in the first table above is 2.64 (Zantow, MGT 400). Of course, the hard work that the department’s instructors are doing is not going to get any recognition. Like professor Laurie Babin, these instructors have a role to play. When it comes to recognition, they’re like academic service – and, we all now know how CoB evaluators view academic service:

**According to George Carter, how do Administrators
Evaluate the Service Contributions of Faculty?**

“How good service you do isn’t even going to be recognized, in this or any other place. It’s just . . . what we do, way it has to be . . .”

George Carter,
on how administrators evaluate service,
2006