August 30, 2011

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Steering Committee of Academic Governance

FROM: Provost Kim Wilcox

RE: MSU Course Repeat Policy

I have appreciated the careful consideration given to the revision of the MSU Course Repeat Policy. The University Committee on Academic Policy (UCAP) spent nearly three academic years reviewing relevant data and its implications, and all relevant standing committees have provided feedback on the revisions.

The primary change from the current policy involves allowing undergraduate students to repeat a course a maximum of two times (three total enrollments). The proposed policy revision liberalizes the existing policy to the extent that it eliminates the course grade restriction on repeating a course for credit for undergraduate students, but does not change existing policy for graduate students. Additionally, the revision retains the restriction on repeating a maximum of 20 credits.

The change would allow students who have not failed a course to repeat that course in order to improve their grade (or increase their knowledge), and thus improve their overall GPA. This is particularly important where GPA is tied to admission to or progression within certain academic programs.

While there were some concerns expressed about the recommended changes to the MSU Course Repeat Policy, the revisions were supported by University Committee on Academic Policy, University Committee on Student Affairs, The University Council on Faculty Affairs, and University Graduate Council, ASMSU and COGS.

I endorse the change in the Course Repeat Policy, but have decided to indefinitely defer implementation of the policy until we have the technological ability to manage the prioritization of student enrollment. As you know, one major concern around the change in policy was the demand on a set of courses which are already heavily subscribed, and courses where enrollment is limited because of required laboratory facilities. At present, we have no efficient way to determine whether a student is enrolling for the first time, or attempting to repeat
the course. Our current Student Information System will not support this function, and without it, we are unable to discriminate, for example, among those who must take the course to make progress toward degree, and those who simply elect to take the course again. Where there are resource limitations on our ability to match the number of course sections offered to demand, we must have a reasonable method of analyzing demand.

I will continue to seek advice from our Administrative Information Systems and Office of the Registrar on solutions to our information needs to implement the policy. I will periodically report back to Academic Governance on our progress.
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