

Dear Dean Emily Chan,
Office of International Programs,
and the Admission Office:

Thank you all for the lunch meeting regarding the GSP Program. We are excited to see that the College is implementing new changes for the 2017 GSP. It is important to promise changes for the future. However, as 2016 GSP students, we also expect the College to take responsibility for the problems of the past. It has been two months since the GSP ended. Many issues of the Program – the selection criteria, the loss of 0.5 credits and the school's double standard in running GSP – have been brought up and discussed officially and unofficially. While we appreciate the schools' progress on our G/S credit, there are several other actions we need the college to take to fully address the problems of 2016 GSP:

1. An official explanation about the 2016 GSP selection standard;
2. A partial refund of tuition and the activity fee;
3. A formal apology published in *the Catalyst*.

The College acknowledges a lack of communication between the academic division and the Admissions Office and promises to make future changes. However, the Admissions Office was not even present during the lunch meeting on the Oct. 25th. Regarding the exact selection standard of the 2016 GSP, Dean Chan emphasizes the separation of the Academic and the Admission divisions, and offered her guesses to answer our questions. We feel the Admissions Office, and the academic divisions are deflecting the responsibility to each other, and are not sincere in finding a resolution for the 2016 GSP participants.

We also requested to know the exact selection criteria of the past year's GSP participants. We have received many contradicting replies in the past couple of months, some concerning financial status, while other were claiming to be only about the teaching language of high schools. However, none of these explanations justified why all of us (25 international students from China) were required to participate in the program.

Among many versions of GSP selection standards we heard from the staff of the College, we are particularly concerned about the one related to students' financial status: the Admission Office starts with "the default that full tuition students will be required to attend the Global Scholars Program". This raises our concern about why financial status would even be one factor impacting the selection of an academic program such as GSP. Compared to the fully funded and free Bridge Scholar Program, the College seems to have a double standard. It even made us question whether GSP was established based on genuine care for international students, or as an additional form of extra funding for the College. Hence, we demand Colorado College give an official explanation about the 2016 GSP student selection standard.

In the lunch meeting, the school also attempted to legitimize our loss of 0.5 credits by saying that the 1.5 units was a typo and we were only charged for 1.0 unit. However, we find this explanation unsatisfactory. First, the College clarified that 1.5 units was a typo only after the program ended and there were no clarifications during the program at all. Second, an unintentional mistake does not exempt the school from any responsibility. And even if it is legitimate to charge \$4300 for one credit, the following issues concerning the tuition fee and the credits are still problematic.

First, we question the legitimacy of the decrease of credits. Dean Emily Chan talked about the former IEI program in the lunch meeting, and claims the 1.5 credits to be a typo as a remnant of the IEI. As GSP fulfills a full block course along with an afternoon workshop, the workload of GSP equals a full block course plus an adjunct course. As a result, our workload is not much different from former IEI in 2015.

Moreover, the usage of the activity fee is not transparent to students during the program. Even after some GSP students requested to know, we still haven't heard anything. Some of us feel the total \$1200 charged for activities is too expensive; there's no way the activities we participated in GSP cost that much. Therefore, we request the school to open the detailed activity fee spending to us and refund the unspent money if there is any.

For the above reasons, we the GSP students feel cheated by the College and insist the College pay a partial refund of our fees.

Regarding all issues, apart from the compensations we mentioned above, we would like the Colorado College to publish a former apology in *the Catalyst*.

In the past months, we have been working together with Colorado College in looking for a solution for the GSP. We hope our efforts will improve the GSP for future students.

Sincerely,

GSP Students:

李一帆 Yifan Li
11/9/2016

Shane Tu
11/10/2016

周冰清 Zeng Zhou 11/05/16

崔利伟 David Cui 11/06/16

Legi Feng Nov 06, 2016

Aiqiao Chen 陈其桥
11/8/16

章沛恒 Peiheng Zhang

王若辰 Rusden Wang
11/8/16

张如佳 Angel Zhang
11/8/2016

陈荣兴 Ethan Ren
11/8/2016

元子真 Trillian Fan Nov 3, 2016

杨博群 Boqi Yang Nov 3, 2016

周勤心 Jiexin Zhou Nov. 4 2016

郑若思 Ruonan Zheng Nov. 4 2016

陈国昆 Jack Gu Nov. 4. 2016

陈思璇 Sixuan Chen Nov. 4 2016

王欣婷 Yiting Wang Nov. 4 2016

吴启荣 Richard Wu Nov. 4 2016

WATSAWAN CHANCHAI
NOV 4 2016

吴晨 Caroline Wu Nov 4 2016

王心悦 Xinyue Wang Nov 4 2016

Note: This document was re-copied from the original and shared with *The Catalyst* with permission from the 2016 GSP Students whose signatures are above.