

3-21-2019

# Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 21, 2019

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College, "Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, March 21, 2019" (2019).  
*The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes*. 142.  
[https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/142](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/142)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [rwalton@rollins.edu](mailto:rwalton@rollins.edu).



**Agenda: Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts  
3/21/19**

1. Approval of Minutes from 2/28 CLA meetings
2. Committee Reports
3. Business
  - a. Diversity Council Report Question and Answers
  - b. Race and Gender Equity Committee Election (select 4)
  - c. Course Repeat Policy Discussion and Vote
  - d. Endowed Chair Policy Discussion
  - e. Cumulative GPA Policy Discussion and Vote



**Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts  
3/21/19**

**In Attendance**

---

Anderson; Armenia; Balzac; Baranes; Barnes; Boniface; Brannock; Caban; Cannaday; J. Cavanaugh; Charles; Cheng; Chick; Chong; G. Cook; Cornwell; Coyle; Crozier; Decker; DeLorenzi; DiQuattro; Douguet; Ebin; Elva; Ewing; Fokidis; Forsythe; French; Fuse; Garcia; Gerchman; S. Gonzalez Guittar; Gournelos; Grau; Habgood; Devin Hargrove; Harper; Hewit; Hudson; Jones; KC Raghavendra; Kiefer; Kincaid; Kistler; Kodzi; Kypraios; Lewin; Lines; McClure; McLaren; McLaughlin; Mesbah; Mohr; Montgomery; Moore; Mosby; Murdaugh; Myers; Namingit; Newcomb; Nichter; Niles; Nodine; Norsworthy; Park; Parsloe; Parziale; Patrone; Pett; Pieczynski; Pistor; Poole; Prosser; Queen; Ray; Reich; Roe; Russell; Santiago Narvaez; Sardy; Schoen; Simmons; Sinclair; Singer; Smaw; St. John; Summet; Tillmann; Vander Poppen; Warnecke; Wellman; Williams; Wilson; Wunderlich; Yellen; Yu

---

*Meeting started at 12:31 pm.*

**Approval of Minutes**

---

**Motion:** *Do you approve the minutes from the February 28, 2019 CLA faculty meeting?*

**Debate:** Ashley Kistler

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 66, No – 0, Abstain - 5)

**Announcements and Committee Reports**

---

**Ashley Kistler:** The first announcement concerns the clickers. Karla and IT spent time over the break testing the clickers in Bush Auditorium and checking the batteries. In the very back of Bush the clickers are out of range unless you hold them high. Please do not sit in the very back of Bush so that every vote is counted. Today is the final day of voting for divisional elections. If you are having issues see me at the end of meeting. The results will be sent via email later today followed by a call for at-large candidates.

**Amy Sugar:** I am here to share the results of the learning management system pilot we completed in the fall to compare Blackboard Ultra to Instructure Canvas. As a reminder, we conducted this pilot proactively due to the fact that Blackboard dedicated 80% of their development resources to Ultra, which is significantly different than our current Blackboard environment. [Attachment 1 contains the slides presented]

Nineteen faculty and 460 students participated in the fall pilot, which included representation from CLA, Holt, and Crummer. We also scheduled on-campus vendor demos that were open to faculty, students, and staff, and provided sandbox courses to faculty and staff upon request. Additionally, the Instructional Design & Technology team conducted a review of key areas, including course features, administrative features, mobile apps, course reports, security, and database access.

We collected feedback from faculty, students, and staff via surveys and focus groups. Collectively, the feedback revealed that students and faculty had a more positive experience with Canvas than with Ultra. Canvas overwhelming received more positive feedback in the areas of ease of use, and the number of available features and third-party integrations, such as Turnitin and Kaltura. Pilot faculty and students shared concerns with Ultra's user interface, specifically "too many clicks" to get things done. Ultra lacked key features, such as a student preview for faculty, and third-party integrations that are commonly used at Rollins. A detailed report of the pilot results is accessible on our IT website: <https://www.rollins.edu/lms>

On February 5, 2019, the LMS selection committee voted unanimously to adopt Canvas. The LMS Selection committee members were nominated by the CLA Executive Committee and are listed on this slide and on our IT website: <https://www.rollins.edu/lms>

So, what is the plan to move to Canvas? We will continue using Blackboard through the spring and summer terms. In fall 2019, all academic courses will be taught in Canvas. A campus-wide communication to inform all students, faculty, and staff of this decision is forthcoming. In April, faculty and staff will gain access to our Canvas environment.

My team and I will provide you with resources and training opportunities starting in April. We will also provide you with multiple sandbox courses so that you can start learning how to use Canvas and building your courses. You will be able to move content from Blackboard to Canvas, but for the sake of transparency, I want to say that it will not be as simple as exporting your Blackboard course and importing it into Canvas. This approach would require a lot of clean-up. My team will provide you with a step-by-step guide with practices to help you decide how to move content to Canvas or build from scratch.

Faculty, students, and staff will be responsible for exporting content and data that you may need from Blackboard since you will lose access to Blackboard on December 20, 2019. It will be important for you to download grades for potential grade appeals and download student artifacts for accreditation purposes or departmental assessments. We will provide you with directions on how to do this.

My team will continue to provide training and resources through the summer and fall to help make this transition as smooth as possible. We will offer both on-campus and virtual training. If there is anything that you or your department needs in addition to the support we are offering, please don't hesitate to reach out to me.

**Ashley Kistler:** EC has been discussing all of the items of business we will hear today. EC approved changes to the catalog language about academic probation. Will be presented at the April 18 faculty meeting. EC has been working on compiling a slate for FEC, to be ratified at our April 4 faculty meeting. EC has also been working on bylaw changes in accordance with some of the recommendations of the T&P review working group. Will be circulated later today for discussion and

possible approval at 4/4 CLA faculty meeting.

**Chris Fuse:** FAC recently reviewed FITI and OER grants. FAC also evaluated the 61 proposals submitted to the Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarship program. Announcements of grant and proposal decisions should be sent out in the next few days. FAC has continued to discuss and review policies regarding lecturers.

**Gloria Cook:** Since the last report at the CLA general faculty meeting in November, The Curriculum Committee has approved the following proposals: Academic Calendar, AMP Credit Hour Change, International Affairs, Chemistry, Course Repeat, History, Cumulative GPA for rFLA, Political Science, Archeology, International Relations, Creative Writing, Holt Upper level Credit Hours Requirements, Music, Master of Education with a new Reading major, Foreign Language Competency requirements.

**Ashley Kistler:** The first agenda item relates to the Diversity Council report presented at the last faculty meeting and providing faculty an opportunity to ask additional questions.

## **Old Business**

---

**Discussion:** Diversity Council Report Questions and Answers

**Debate:** Jennifer Herr and Martha Cheng

**Margaret McLaren:** Thanks the Diversity Council members for all the work on the report representing a year-long study. What are the next steps going forward?

**Martha Cheng:** We are following up with two task forces. The first related to gender and inclusion, including the Lucy Cross Center. The second is an employee resource group in consultation with HR and Lester Aleman in admissions to help with retention of underrepresented students, faculty, and staff.

**Kathryn Norsworthy:** Related to Margaret's question regarding follow-up on the report, issues related to gender equity previously went to the finance and service committee. Given the current governance structure and way in which the Diversity Council is situated, how do we involve the current governance structure when there is an explicit power differential?

**Ashley Kistler:** The bylaws changes now call for committee reports at faculty meetings once a semester which will help bring awareness to issues. With the formation of the new faculty and research development committee for grants, FAC will have more time to dedicate to these kinds of issues. I have reread the FAC charge and it does include equity issues.

**Martha Cheng:** Invites people to email the current Diversity Council co-chairs Maridath Wison and Jenn Herr as thoughts and concerns are welcome. Reiterates that the report and notes Alice Davidson presented at the last faculty meeting are available in the minutes.

**Ashley Kistler:** Seeing no additional questions, moves to the next item of business.

## **New Business**

---

**Motion:** *Who shall serve on the Race and Gender Equity Salary Study Committee? (select 4)*

**Debate:** Ashley Kistler

**Ashley Kistler:** This committee was convened by the Provost's office, FAC solicited nominations in the fall and the current slate reflects that some people originally nominated are no longer able to serve. Are there any nominees from the floor? Seeks motion to open the discussion.

**Mattea Garcia:** Self-nominates.

**Devin Hargrove:** Self-nominates.

**Hesham Mesbah:** Withdraws nomination due to sabbatical.

**Ashley Kistler:** Seeing no other nominations states that we will vote for four candidates.

**Jenny Queen:** Asks if we vote four times.

**Karla Knight:** Confirms the system is set to register four votes.

**Ashley Kistler:** Announces that Amy Armenia, Devin Hargrove, and Mattea Garcia are elected and a runoff between Beni Balak and Wendy Brandon appears necessary. Beni Balak is elected.

Results of the clicker poll are not shown due to a program setting which took the raw data and rounded up the percentages. After the meeting the raw data indicated a runoff was not necessary. Both Wendy and Beni were asked to serve by the Provost.

**Ashley Kistler:** The next item of business is changes to the course repeat policy.

**Discussion and Motion:** Course Repeat Policy and Vote

**Debate:** Gloria Cook and Stephanie Henning

Attachment 1 contains the slides presented with information about the current practice, proposal, and supporting rationale with data.

**Gloria Cook:** Presents the information on the slides noting the research is based on peer and aspirant schools. In the Holt School repeated courses are not covered by financial aid. Reiterates all repeated courses/grades are shown on the transcript, but the most recent is used in the GPA calculation, even if the second attempt has a lower grade.

**Stephanie Henning:** Notes the strong rationale, aside from the data, is the benefit to the student. It takes longer for students to repair the damage to their GPA in the current system rather than removing grade and putting in repeat grade. For students in departments where courses have minimum grade requirements to continue in the major courses will benefit.

**Motion:** Susan Montgomery

**Second:** Jill Jones

**Susan Montgomery:** Asks when the policy would take effect.

**Stephanie Henning:** Fall 2019

**Leigh DeLorenzi:** Will this apply to graduate programs in Holt? There is a direct conflict with graduate counseling policies.

**Stephanie Henning:** Each program will maintain their current restrictions.

**Fiona Harper:** States she has no issue with students repeating but is trying to understand the numbers. The highest grade or most recent grade standing is 40% so it less convincing allowing students to repeat. Questions if this hurts majors using course grades as part of their autonomous measures.

**Stephanie Henning:** They looked at science courses in advance and notes the restriction that if a student gets C or better they must get permission of instructor of course to repeat.

**Hesham Mesbah:** This policy appears to change from a cumulative GPA to a selective cumulative GPA.

**Stephanie Henning:** Notes that the first grade is not removed from the transcript. It is not part of the GPA calculation.

**Avi Baranes:** Seeks clarification about the data table. What is the count, is it students or institutions, and do institutions have more than one policy?

**Stephanie Henning:** Institutions responding to the survey could respond yes or no to more than one question so it might appear confusing.

**Avi Baranes:** Do institutions have multiple policies?

**Jenny Queen:** Notes that the top three (highest grade stands, grades are averaged, and most recent grade stands) data doesn't make sense as adds to over 100 percent. Also questions if a single institution can have more than one policy.

**Ashley Kistler:** Suggest we don't want to dwell on the numbers but the bigger picture.

**Jenny Queen:** Wants to look at the numbers because part of the rationale is that we are in the bottom quartile.

**Amy McClure:** Asks if we have data on when students repeat courses.

**Stephanie Henning:** Approximately 12-15 student per semester do this and 80% repeating had original grades of C- or below.

**Robert Vander Poppen:** How does the federal government treat this in progress towards graduation?

**Stephanie Henning:** Steve Booker was consulted for financial aid questions. You may repeat once, but no aid for third time a class is taken.

**Ashley Kistler:** Asks on behalf of a faculty member unable to attend what semester does this student earn the credit. How does this impact credit load, particularly for athletes?

**Stephanie Henning:** When new grade is added the credit hours in the prior semester are adjusted. The credit hours are kept in the most recent attempt. For athletes credit hours are calculated on a yearly basis.

**Ashley Kistler:** To repeat does it have to be the same course with the same professor or same divisional designation (rFLA) or in a major the same course but potentially taught by different faculty members?

**Gloria Cook:** Defers to Emily Russell

**Emily Russell:** As rFLA 200 courses are so different for the repeat policy it has to be the same course and professor.

**Gloria Cook:** Notes the policy has restrictions with repeats pending available seats and no auditing.

**David Charles:** This appears to be designed for struggling students. What about the type a who don't want an A-. Is it possible space permitting and with instructor permission?

**Dan Chong:** Notes the disincentive piece as it is the most recent grade. It is still a gamble that the second grade is higher.

**Mark Anderson:** We have the credit/no credit option until last day of class with the purpose to help first semester freshmen. Does this go away? Are we now too friendly?

**Ashley Kistler:** Yes, the credit/no credit option remains.

**Jill Jones:** Has concerns about students playing the system. Notes that for high performing students entering and then struggling with the adjustment to college it is a chance for them to learn from mistakes.

**Deb Wellman:** I think we have to take into consideration that at times grades are not representative because of personal issues the students may encounter in a particular semester.

**Ashley Kistler:** Seeing no hands notes we are ready to vote.

**Motion:** I approve of the proposed course repeat policy.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree – 45, Disagree – 35, Abstain - 7)

**Discussion: Draft Endowed Chair Policy**

**Debate: Chris Fuse**

**Ashley Kistler:** Calls up Chris Fuse as FAC chair to lead discussion for the draft endowed chair policy.

**Chris Fuse:** Describes how we got here, goes through the information on the slides. Notes FAC looked at our policies and researched benchmark institutions. In addition to the policy, the committee thought about recommendations. FAC consulted institutional advancement in regards to a potential name change and was told that what we call these position internally doesn't matter externally when they seek funds. There have been a number of prior discussions and opens the floor for comments.

The following information was presented on a series of slides.

#### Draft Endowed Chair Policy

- Faculty Compensation Philosophy states “The process of selecting recipients of major awards and endowed chairs must be open and transparent. Faculty should be able to nominate and self-nominate in all cases.”
- Designates Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards as a type of endowed position.
- Establishes a new term-limited endowed position, Endowed Professorship.
- Endowed professorships and endowed chairs would be held for 6-year terms. Chairs could be indefinitely renewed, professorships could be held for two consecutive terms.
- Establishes a Recommending Committee (FAC chair, a tenured faculty member appointed by FAC, three current endowed chairs, Dean of Faculty, and Provost).
- Designates a well-defined set of processes for application, recommendation, review, and renewal for endowed positions.

#### Draft Endowed Chair Policy Recommendations

- The current endowed chairs not restricted to specific departments could most easily, and without additional funds, be converted to term-limited endowed professorships.
- We encourage the Administration to review funding for each of these positions and make prudent choices regarding future appointments.
- Given the three-tiered endowed chair structure, it may be appropriate for the Administration to review the benefits provided to award holders.
- The terms endowed professorship and endowed chair are used internally to Rollins College to differentiate between fixed-term and fully renewable endowed faculty positions. Both titles indicate a type of endowed position.

**Jim McLaughlin:** Asks for clarification of the intent of the discussion. Based on comments today are changes possible prior to the April vote or not.

**Ashley Kistler:** Notes EC has already endorsed the current policy draft but based on feedback can make changes or send back to FAC for changes and new EC vote. The intent for today is to listen and

be open, not determine before the discussion if changes will be made or not. We are not voting but do have survey questions for the end.

**Jay Yellen:** States that the proposed policy won't affect me as my chair is tied to a discipline. He doesn't see justification for the rotation and is concerned for the current chairholders that would be impacted.

**Chris Fuse:** Notes that FAC proposed both a policy and recommendations and they are not tied to together. Recommendations were made with the thought to be budget neutral If the policy passed. We could pass the policy but not impact current chairs if the recommendations are not implemented.

**Ashley Kistler:** Consider the policy, how it is implemented depends on the administration. We can discuss our will to inform the administration.

**Lee Lines:** Is in support of term limit and rotation as it magnifies the impact of the chairs long. Earlier versions prioritize scholarship over innovative teaching. I understand much comes out of agreements and founding documents so to what extent is scholarship specified in the agreements. As a general observation we are at heart a teaching college with a strong history of innovative teaching but only one endowed chair focuses on this. Clearly what we choose to recognize signifies what we value and sends a message to faculty of all ranks. Think about how innovative teaching can be worked into recognition of this system. I have sat in on amazing classes and the one chair that relates to teaching has not rotated for seven years.

**Chris Fuse:** in terms of gift agreements, few have language for teaching as a significant component. We looked at where there was flexibility. We all do three things, but more emphasis is placed on scholarship as tradition. There is the possibility to add more weight to service and teaching.

**Amy Armenia:** Last year we spoke about transparency . There is a long stretch between promotion to full professor and retirement. Rotation of chairs creates more opportunities for people to be recognized

**Dexter Boniface:** I am an endowed chair and it is a privilege not a right, each are subject to renewal. My comments are in reference to two things from the slides. Personally I have issue with a tiered structure or the habit of giving the administration a license to reduce benefits for awards received. It would privilege disciplinary chairs as only the lesser tiered chairs would be rotated. My main point is with an eye towards revision. The proposed process for review and renewal doesn't seem well defined and I didn't like it. There is a portfolio in the third and sixth year is modeled after tenure and promotion, Is this the appropriate model for an endowed chair? We already complete FSARs and endowed chair reports and post-tenure reviews and now I am adding to the fun of a review happy committee. I don't like the bureaucracy.

**Chris Fuse:** If you look at the gift agreements the benefits are very ill defined, which isn't helpful. We wanted to make sure there is thought to the levels of benefit. Are any awards at the right level? If some have indefinite renewal and others are limited, we should think about this. In terms of review/renewal, what happens if someone is not living up to standards, how does the endowed chair know they need to improve prior to renewal.

**Deb Wellman:** The endowed chair I had my eye on was the one which Rachel Newcomb currently

holds. I don't like the title of endowed professorships as seems unknown outside the College. Expresses concerns that the chairs that might rotate are currently held primarily by women.

**Chris Fuse:** Responds that benchmark schools use the title of endowed professorships and had different titles/levels. FAC was concerned about impacting predominantly women. We sought to make a policy if system was starting from scratch

**Tonia Warnecke:** I appreciate the intention here to create more opportunities for faculty. I am sure we all agree that we have amazing faculty, and we should have more opportunities to recognize the impressive work being done in teaching, scholarship and service across the entire career trajectory. From reviewing the proposed policy, it seems that one desire is to create a new award which, in terms of duration and associated compensation and benefits, falls in between the existing Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award and the established endowed chair system at Rollins. In so doing, that would provide opportunities to a different cohort of faculty. I like this idea but propose an alternative pathway to getting there. I think we should create this new type of award, formulate criteria for it, and ask the Administration to prioritize fundraising for the new award, rather than downgrading existing opportunities for the faculty in order to create the new award. My proposal would truly create more opportunities for the faculty.

**Chris Fuse:** The policy can pass without the need to support any of the recommendations.

**Kathryn Norsworthy:** When we first starting talking about endowed chairs I didn't know much about them. I learned through conversations with colleagues in my discipline at other institutions similar to and larger than Rollins, then conversations here online. This helped me flesh out implications of the currently proposed policy and recommendations. I am glad we decoupled discussion from voting to figure out this together and hear different perspectives. I see the good intentions towards equity and access in the currently proposed policy; but also we are voting on a proposal suggesting and facilitating potential downgrading of compensation based on the tiered system. I am thinking of Rick Foglesong's references to management and labor. As faculty represent labor, it is our responsibility to advocate for our interests. Paving the way for and opening possibility for compensation reductions does not seem consistent with our interests. I did a calculation revealing the introduction of an inequity in the current proposal. Ten or eleven departments have one or more designated endowed chairs and fourteen departments do not. Currently, ten endowed chairs are not designated for particular departments. This means faculty from fourteen departments would never have the this opportunity, other than those holding the departmentally designated chairs. Endowed chairs have meaning outside the institution, helping those holding them make a difference elsewhere. If a department member has a chair, other department members can apply for other chairs. I support Tonia's idea.

**Ashley Kistler:** We have three minutes left and no time for survey. These questions will be sent electronically and additional comments or concerns can be directed to me or Chris. Reiterates that the will of the body is that the space is better than Bush Auditorium but the seats must be configured next time to allow for a center aisle.

## **Motion to Adjourn**

---

**Moved:** Martha Cheng

**Second:** Chris Fuse

**Approved by Voice Vote at 1:43 pm.**

## ATTACHMENT 1

### Learning Management System (LMS) Pilot

- Completed LMS pilot in fall 2018
- Scheduled on-campus vendor demos
- Provided sandbox courses upon request
- Conducted a review of key areas
- Collected feedback: Surveys and focus groups

### LMS Pilot Results

- More positive experience with Canvas
  - Ease of use
  - Number of available features
  - Availability of third party integrations (e.g., Turnitin, Kaltura)
- Major limitations with Blackboard Ultra
  - Too many clicks
  - Lack of features (e.g., student view, course-level reports)
  - Lack of integrations (e.g., Kaltura)
- The full pilot report is available at <https://www.rollins.edu/lms>

### LMS Decision

- On February 5, 2019, the LMS selection committee voted unanimously to adopt Canvas.
- LMS Selection Committee: CLA faculty representatives (Amy Armenia, EC; Nancy Niles, Holt; Jamey Ray, CC), Crummer faculty representative (Kyle Meyer), IT representatives (Amy Sugar, Troy Thomason, ex officio Dean's Office representative (Emily Russell)

### Migration to Canvas

- Spring 2019
  - Continue using Blackboard
  - Campus-wide announcement
  - Faculty and staff access Canvas (April)
  - IDT team provides resources, training and sandbox courses (April)
  - Export Blackboard courses, grades, student submissions
  - Fall courses will be created in Canvas (late April)
- Summer 2019
  - Continue using Blackboard
  - Early adopters teach in Canvas (July)
  - IDT team provides resources and training
  - Export Blackboard courses and data
- Fall 2019
  - All academic courses will be taught in Canvas
  - IDT team provides resources and training

- Complete exporting Blackboard courses and data
- You will lose access to Blackboard on December 20, 2019

## **ATTACHMENT 2**

### Proposal to Change Repeated Course Policy (CLA & Holt)

- To change the current repeat policy from using all repeated course grades in calculation of the cumulative and major/minor GPA to using only the most recent grade.
- Rationale: The current Rollins policy for repeating courses allows for all grades earned in repeated courses to count in the student's cumulative GPA. This is outside of the best practices and the practice of our peer and competitor institutions.

### Current Practice in CLA & Holt

- All grades will be calculated in the GPA, and all courses and grades will be part of the official academic transcript.
- REPEATED COURSES (Current-CLA)
  - Students may repeat courses regardless of the grades earned. However, students will only earn credit hours for the course one time.
- REPEATED COURSE (Current-Holt UG)
  - Students may repeat courses regardless of the grades earned; however, students will only earn credit hours for the course one time. In most cases, repeated courses will not be covered by financial aid.

### Proposal

#### REPEATED COURSES (Proposed)

- When a course is repeated, all courses and grades will remain on the official academic transcript, but only the most recent grade will be used in calculation of the student's grade point average. In the instance that a student fails a course after earning a passing grade and credit, the student will forfeit any prior credits earned for the course.

### Supporting Rationale

- Supporting Rationale: A 2015 (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) survey published results on course repeat practices:
- More than three-quarters (79%, n=819) of undergraduate respondents indicated that their institution does not limit the total number of credits that can be repeated. The same percentage of institutions report that they do not limit the number of courses that can be repeated either (79.1%, n=780).

### Supporting Data

(next page)

**Figure 1: Use of Course Repeat Practices for Undergraduate Students**

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Count</b>
Most courses may be repeated only once.	26.4%	73.6%	784
A student must seek permission in advance to register for a repeated course.	22.1%	77.9%	786
A student must petition for a course grade to be replaced after the repeated course is successfully completed.	10.7%	89.3%	783
Course replacements happen automatically (i.e., no petition required).	78.7%	21.3%	784
The highest grade stands.	40.0%	60.0%	782
Grades are averaged.	11.9%	88.1%	780
The most recent course grade stands.	54.2%	45.8%	781
Students may transfer a course from another institution for a course repeat.	41.3%	58.7%	779
Some courses may be taken more than once for credit (e.g., topical courses, music lessons).	86.7%	13.3%	783
Credit is earned for only ONE of the course attempts even if both grades are considered passing grades.	83.7%	16.3%	781
There is a limit on the total number of courses that may be repeated.	20.9%	79.1%	780