

University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate  
MINUTES  
April 16, 2018 McCormick Room 12:00 pm

Present: (Senators) Kristin Johnson, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain, Jung Kim, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Sunil Kukreja, Andrew Monaco, Robin Jacobson, Gwynne Brown, Collin Noble, Pierre Ly, Alisa Kessel, Peter Wimberger

Guests: Eowyn Greeno, Joel Elliott, Landon Wade, Kriszta Kotsis, Danny McMillian

The Meeting was called to order and the minutes of April 2, 2018 were approved.

The ASUPS representative noted the ASUPS Health & Wellness Vending Machine is up and running, Lumbershoot is in the works, and budget meetings are concluding. Noble also encouraged any feedback or suggestions regarding ASUPS from faculty.

Updates from liaisons to standing committees

Kessel shared that the Board will be asked to change the University Bylaws to reflect the language change to Provost, rather than the Faculty changing the language in its Bylaws.

Elliott presented the Institutional Review Board's Year-End Report. (ATTACHED).

Questions during discussion included: 1) whether the IRB could be smaller given the fact the charge regarding assessment has been completed. Elliott advised keeping the current number of members on the grounds the number of protocols is keeping the committee quite busy; 2) whether the IRB is already 'set' in terms of data-use and preservation policies (work that LMIS has been pursuing). Elliott noted that some protocols do exist, but given the increasing move from paper to digital records (including online surveys) that work does seem applicable, and that a charge linking LMIS and IRB's work on this problem for next year does make sense. Chair Kessel requested that Senators and the Executive Committee make note of the report's passage with respect to maintaining a diverse IRB and including members from departments like SOAN that have strong background in subject research. In reply to a final question regarding whether the IRB should keep in touch with the IEC regarding the feasibility of research projects in high risk areas, Elliott replied that, as of yet, that conversation has not taken place, but that doing so is important. M/S/A to receive the report.

Review of motion to revise the Faculty Code (regarding phased implementation measures).

Kessel reminded senators that there is a concern that if a phased-in implementation of the language regarding promotion to Full Professor is passed, technically two codes would have to exist simultaneously. The proposal is to revise the Code to allow for phased implementation for certain things (Parts D and E). Kessel will be taking this to the PSC for review this afternoon.

Proposed language:

Added at Chapter I.F

Section 6 – Phased Implementation

Amendments to Chapter III Section 3, Parts D and E of the Faculty Code may include provisions for phased implementation. In those cases, the Professional Standards Committee, in keeping with its responsibility (at III.3.A of the Faculty Code) to “publish periodically a statement of university evaluation standards,” will communicate relevant details concerning the provisions through its normal channels.

Kotsis presented the International Education Committee Year-End-Report (ATTACHED). In addition to dealing with three of the five Senate charges, the IEC also submitted a statement with respect to international education to Goal Team #1 of the Strategic Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the impact of

merit-aid being extended to Study Abroad. The total numbers of students studying abroad has not changed significantly, but there has been large shift from summer study abroad to semester study abroad. (The University does not pay program costs or provide aid to summer study abroad, but does to semester study abroad). As a result, more student study abroad applications were denied and the selection criteria refined. M/S/P to receive the report.

McMillian presented the Academic Standards Committee Year-End-Report (ATTACHED). Discussion ensued regarding the role of departmental approval in giving Running Start credit, given departments can still conclude a course does not count for a departmental requirement. Given the argument that the new policy should help with recruitment, the question was asked: when would departmental decisions be made? Kukreja noted that it would be useful for each department to have a standing policy on file with the Registrar's office and Admissions. Kessel asked whether a charge to reevaluate the number of core courses allowed for transfer approval would be useful. Kessel noted that, with respect to the ASC's question whether a change to the due date for final grades for the Fall semester is warranted, a joint charge to the CC and ASC to examine the question seems warranted.

A question was posed regarding the rationale for changing the Dean's List, given the rationale seem to be establishing consistency between things that are in fact quite different. Kukreja explained that the proposal to align the Dean's List GPA with university honors came from the Registrar, and that no one knows what the criteria of 'top 10%' is predicated on in the first place (in addition, the lowest GPA on the Dean's List moved each semester). In reply to a question whether lowering the GPA undermines the intent of the Dean's List, Kukreja noted that comparative research shows that the revision puts us in the middle of other institutions' criteria. And that in the end there was a sense that "If you're going to be arbitrary, better be arbitrary once rather than twice." M/S/A to receive the report.

Conversation ensued regarding the next agenda item, related to the ASC report: Consideration of measure approved by the Academic Standards Committee (regarding core credit transfer). (ATTACHED). Kessel opened discussion as to whether 1) the full faculty needs to review this measure, in which case the Faculty Senate would need to pass a motion to delay implementation until the faculty could consider it in Fall 2018, 2) a motion to endorse the policy would be appropriate, or 3) the policy should simply be taken to departments so they can consider what actions might be required on their part. Senators expressed agreement that delay should be avoided on the grounds the ASC has done due diligence with respect to the policy, but that it is certainly worthwhile to have a discussion regarding how departments should proceed.

Johnson M/S/A to, first, request that at the April 25th Chair's meeting the recently approved ASC policy regarding core credit transfer around AP/IB credit should be the focus of conversation (if that can't happen, then the Senate needs to decide whether to delay implementation so the conversation can happen in the Fall), and second, that the faculty senate endorses the ASC's approved policy.

#### Discussion of interim and long-term measures to address bias in student evaluations of teaching.

The Faculty Senate offered some insights around long- and short-term measures to address bias in student evaluations of teaching that the Faculty Senate Chair intended to share with the members of the Professional Standards Committee at its upcoming meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30pm.  
Minutes prepared by Kristin Johnson.

Respectfully submitted,  
Pierre Ly  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Institutional Review Board  
Report to the Faculty Senate  
AY 2017-2018

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) exists for the purpose of protecting the rights, health, and well-being of human beings solicited and volunteering for participation as research subjects. In the context of reviewing proposed research studies involving human subjects, the IRB attends to issues such as potential risks to participants, protection of participants' identities and disclosed sensitive information, safety, ethical recruitment practices, and the accessibility and adequacy of informed consent. This is a report to the University of Puget Sound Faculty Senate regarding activities of the IRB during the 2017-2018 academic year.

2016-17 IRB membership: Tim Beyer (co-chair) and Joel Elliott (co-chair); Lisa Ferrari (ex-officio); Wendell Nakamura, Mike Pohl, Sara Protasi, Mark Reinitz, Alexa Tullis, Andreas Udbye; Jan Wolfe (community representative).

To date, the Institutional Review Board has reviewed 91 proposals this academic year. Of these 2 were full board, 85 were expedited, and 4 were exempt.

In addition, the board focused on addressing the following formal charges from the Senate:

**1) Identify appropriate modules from CITI for training of faculty**

The Faculty Senate charged the IRB to **identify appropriate modules from CITI for training of faculty** who submit protocols to the IRB. Currently, all student researchers are required to complete the CITI student module. The IRB committee members reviewed the CITI training modules in relation to the following specific questions: 1) Should *ALL* faculty complete the *SAME* module(s)? If so, which one(s)? 2) Should *SOME* faculty complete *SPECIFIC* modules? (e.g., should faculty who submit a protocol involving children to the module(s) on research with children, regardless of their disciplinary background, prior training or experience working with children, etc.) If so, which track(s) and module(s)? 3) Should faculty complete *NO* modules? After compiling responses from committee members and then deliberating the pros and cons of each training module, the IRB committee decided on the following recommendation:

Faculty members underwriting research protocols need to have passed a block of five CITI courses consisting of: 1) Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction, 2) Informed Consent, 3) Cultural Competence in Research, 4) Assessing Risk, 5) Unanticipated Problems and Reporting Requirements in Social and Behavioral Research. Research involving vulnerable populations or specific procedures may require additional course modules (e.g., Internet-based research, International Research, Research With Prisoners, Research With Children, Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, Vulnerable Subjects, Research Involving Pregnant Women, Fetuses, and Neonates). Certification will be valid for three years after which some of the modules have refresher courses or will need to be retaken.

The IRB sent these recommendations to the Faculty Senate to obtain some initial feedback, and the Senate's response was positive and recommended that the IRB obtain additional feedback from department chairs in those disciplines that submit a substantial number of protocols to the IRB.

**2) Develop a policy for uniform assessment of international research conducted by Puget Sound faculty, students, and staff**

At the start of AY 17-18, the IRB did not have a policy for international research. Because of this, approval of international research was handled on a case-by-case basis resulting in inconsistencies during review and approval. In order to standardize how international research reviewed and approved, Beyer, Elliott, and Ferrari reviewed policies from peer institutions and federal guidelines and presented their findings to the full board. Based on these findings, the full board agreed that:

- The university's "Travel Abroad Policy for High-Risk Areas" must be upheld. As such, the IRB cannot review projects for independent research in travel warning countries;
- The IRB policies must reflect the "International Compilation of Human Research Standards" compiled by the Office for Human Research Protections at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- Special attention must be given to ensuring cultural sensitivity and linguistic equivalence

Based on these considerations, Beyer, Elliott, and Ferrari drafted a policy for international research, which was approved by the full board in Fall, 2017, and can be found in Appendix A. The policy is also live on the IRB website

(<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/policy-for-international-research/>)

**3) Review the common rule and our policies to see where our policies are more stringent than federal guidelines, and determine whether and when such requirements are justified.**

The IRB could not complete this charge because the federal government has not yet decided which version of the common rule will apply in the future.

On January 18, 2017, President Obama approved a revised version of the common rule, which is a portion of the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46) that addresses research with human subjects and applies to many federal agencies. The new common rule was set to come into effect on January 19, 2018, which would allow research institutions a year to update their procedures. In the meantime, President Trump came into office and voiced a strong anti-regulatory stance. On January 19, 2018, the Trump administration announced that it was postponing the effective date of the revised common rule to July 19, 2018, in part to assess whether the common rule should be changed at all. In the meantime, IRBs are prohibited from applying the revised common rule and must use the pre-2018 version.

Some of the 2018 revisions to the common rule would have an impact on our IRB procedures in such areas as informed consent, what qualifies for exemption from ongoing IRB oversight (which is not the same as being excused from submitting an IRB protocol), and which types of research fall under IRB purview. However, at this point we can't know which, if any, of these revisions will become the law. Therefore, the IRB has postponed addressing this charge until the federal government decides which version of the common rule will apply going forward.

In addition to the formal Senate charges, the board worked on the following self-charges:

### **1) Work on standardizing IRB procedures**

In an on-going effort to standardize IRB procedures and make them more transparent, the full board has completed the following tasks this academic year:

- a. Updated e-mail correspondence:** E-mail correspondence to be used with student researchers during the review process has been updated to ensure that the correct dates are used when determining how long a study is approved for. Please see Appendix B.
- b. Updated protocol template and checklist:** In order to further increase transparency in what information the IRB needs to review protocols, the committee has further refined our protocol templates and checklists during AY 17-18. This updated protocol and checklist is currently being used alongside the previous version, which will no longer be accepted by the IRB in AY 18-19. This updated protocol and checklist has made review simpler for IRB members as specific information needed for review is now more explicitly requested. These updated documents are found in Appendix C.

### **2) Summer review policy**

The IRB cannot maintain its review capacity over the summer months due to limited resources over the summer months. For this reason, the full board decided on the following actions:

- Individuals from the full board will volunteer to serve as reviewers of IRB protocols during the summer months
- The IRB will only review exempt and expedited protocols
- The IRB will not review full board protocols

This policy has been communicated with the departments that produce the largest number of IRB protocols and is available on the IRB website. This policy can be found in Appendix D.

The IRB has identified the following issues which should be addressed in 2018-2019:

### **1) Formulate a policy for how staff/faculty are used for surveys and interviews**

It is unclear how many protocols the IRB reviews and approves use staff and faculty as research subjects. Here, the IRB should work with Sherry Mondou (Vice President for Finance and Administration) and Ellen Peters (Director of Institutional Research and Retention) to ensure that student researchers are:

- a. Using the appropriate channels to recruit,
- b. Not overloading faculty and staff with research requests, and
- c. Not replicating existing research conducted through Office of Institutional Research and Retention

In addition, the sunset clause for the MOU with Institutional Research and Retention is expiring. It is therefore suggested that this new policy for staff/faculty who are used in research should be incorporated when the existing MOU is reviewed next AY.

**2) Develop policy for online research**

Currently, there is no official policy for online research. As the IRB is seeing more protocols that use online research tools (both in terms of data collection and storage), it is suggested that the IRB reviews best practices in how to use online research tools to (a) protect the identity of participants, (b) protect the integrity of data collection, and (c) review who “owns” data stored by online data collection tools. The IRB must develop a uniform policy to be used with online research.

**3) Review updated Common Rule and incorporate changes**

As the federal government makes decisions about The Common Rule, the IRB should review any potential changes to the Common Rule to ensure that our procedures are in line with new Federal Guidelines.

**4) Meet the Federal Guidelines requiring a representative board**

Current Federal Guidelines specify that the board must consist of scientists and non-scientists as well as a community member who is not part of the university. Our current board meets these criteria. In addition, Federal Guidelines state that the board must also be diverse in terms of race and ethnicity. Our current board does not meet this criterion. With the understanding that we are a small faculty with many service assignments, the IRB requests that extra attention, when possible, is taken to meet the Federal Guidelines to create a representative, diverse board. In addition, although the board is quite diverse in terms of academic disciplines, many questions surrounding oral histories and ethnographic research methods often arise. For this reason, having a colleague from Sociology and Anthropology serve on the committee could be helpful in navigating different research methods during IRB review processes.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Tim Beyer, PhD and Joel Elliott, PhD  
IRB Co-Chairs AY 2017-18

Appendices:

- A: International Research Policy
- B: Updated standardized e-mail responses
- C: Updated protocol template and checklist
- D: Summer review policy

## **Appendix A: International Research Policy**

### **Policy for International Research**

Puget Sound's IRB reviews your research protocol to see that it meets the ethical standards of the university and the U.S. government. Many other countries have regulations and requirements for conducting human subjects research within their borders. The IRB expects that researchers associated with the University of Puget Sound will acquaint themselves with the regulations and standards of any country, region, or locality in which they plan to do research. Thus, researchers must ensure that their project is conducted within the context of local political, legal, social, economic, and cultural standards and norms. Researchers are responsible for guaranteeing to the IRB that their research meets such standards and norms.

Additional considerations:

- All student researchers who wish to conduct international research must complete the International Research - SBE (ID: 509) module of the CITI Program and provide their successful completion report with their protocol to the IRB.
- Researchers may need to seek approval from an IRB, ethics committee, or equivalent governing body in the country the research will take place. If a foreign institution is engaged in the research project, then approval from that institution will need to be secured. To be engaged means that the foreign institution recruits and secures consent from participants, conducts the research procedures, or receives/shares private, identifiable information.

### **For Students Planning to Conduct Research Outside the United States**

The university relies on assessments by the U.S. Department of State and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to determine the safety of student travel outside of the U.S. Please consult the Travel Abroad Policy for High-Risk Areas, which you can find in its entirety here [get URL].

Before you submit a protocol to the IRB, please make sure the University of Puget Sound can support your project. Some important provisions for student researchers include:

- Students may not use university resources (which includes funding, faculty advising, and IRB review) for independent research in any country under State Department travel warning or CDC travel health warning. This policy cannot be waived.
- Students who will be accompanied by a Puget Sound faculty member while conducting research abroad may ask that faculty member to petition for a waiver of the restriction on travel to travel warning countries.

- These restrictions apply only to countries under travel warning and travel health warning. For areas on lower levels of alert (e.g., travel alert, travel notice), independent student travel is not restricted.

Information on [State Department travel advisories](#) is available online, as are [CDC travel health advisories](#).

### **International Compilation of Human Research Protections**

To help international researchers familiarize themselves with regulations in other countries, the Office of Human Research Protections (OHRP) of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has compiled an extensive list of national laws, regulations, and guidelines from more than 100 countries. Please note that there may be provincial, tribal, or local regulations that are not included in the OHRP compilation. Much of the information concerns biomedical research, but each country's listing begins with a "general" section that concerns all types of human subjects research. You can find the International Compilation of Human Research Standards on the OHRP website by following the link on [this page](#).

### **Cultural Differences**

International research may raise special issues related to cultural differences and researchers must ensure that local customs are taken into account in developing research, creating recruitment material(s), drafting consent/assent documents, and constructing data collection instruments. Research proposals submitted to the IRB must explain how cultural norms were taken into account in the development of the research project. In particular, researchers should:

- Seek guidance from representatives of the community when developing and implementing protocols within their communities
- Consider adding members with expertise in the community under study as part of the research team.
- Use *equivalent protections* when considering cultural norms. The OHRP guidance for equivalent protections is found [here](#)). For example:
  - Minors who are treated as adults in their own locale will be treated as minors for the purpose of protection in research.
  - "Parental consent" for minors may be viewed more broadly and grandparents, elders, or tribal leaders, who serve as the head of the household in a specific cultural context, may be approached to provide parental consent.
  - Written consent may be waived in favor of verbal consent due to cultural reasons. For example, in some cultural contexts, signing a consent form may be inappropriate due to religious reasons or issues of literacy. Researchers who seek a waiver of written consent must justify this request in their protocol by describing local customs that



may impede using written consent. Criteria for waiver of written consent are found here.

### **Linguistic Differences**

If research is not conducted in English, researchers must provide back-translated versions of all materials a participant will see, including recruitment materials, consent procedures (written consent forms, verbal consent scripts, assent forms), testing materials, and debriefing forms. Back-translation involves taking a document in one language, translating it to the other language, and having someone else translate it back to the original language. The original document and the back-translated document can then be compared, and any discrepancies between the two documents must be resolved. Once the two documents are deemed semantically equivalent, successful back translation has occurred. Semantically equivalent means that the content is the same, although individual words may differ. For example, if a researcher wants to conduct research in Spain:

- The researcher first constructs all materials in English and then someone who is competent in both English and Spanish, translates the materials into Spanish.
- Second, a different person, who may not be the researcher, translates all Spanish materials back into English.
- Third, the two versions of the English materials (the original version and the back-translated version) are compared and any semantic differences are resolved.
- The process of translating and back translating continues until the two versions are semantically equivalent.

The researcher must submit to the IRB:

- The original version, the version in the other language, and the final back-translated version of all materials.
- A description in the protocol which explains:
  - How the back-translation was obtained
  - Who created the initial translation into the non-English language and who created the back-translation. For both individuals include:
    - Contact information, and
    - Qualifications (i.e., a description of why the person is linguistically and culturally competent to provide a translation)

## Appendix B: Updated Standardized E-mail Responses

### Standardized E-mail Responses for Student Protocols

Below, please find standardized language for e-mail responses for student protocols. There are four responses, corresponding to the different outcomes of review. Please note that the responses differ by *Expedited* protocols (which require continued IRB oversight) and *Exempt* protocols (which do not require continued IRB oversight). Please be sure to use the appropriate response for the level of review.

For **Expedited** Protocols:

1) For **approval**:

- a. *If the first protocol that was submitted can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

Please note that your study is approved for **one year from the submission date marked on the *Protocol Decision Document***. If you finish data collection before this date, please complete the required *Informational Follow-up Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>). If your data collection will continue past the year date, be sure to submit the required *Renewal/Modification Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

(*Your name*)

- b. *If a resubmitted protocol can be approved, use this standardized language:*

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for resubmitting your protocol (“Enter protocol number *xxxx-xxx*”) and incorporating the requested changes and/or clarifications. As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

Please note that your study is approved for **one year from the submission date marked on the *Protocol Decision Document***. If you finish data collection before this date, please complete the required *Informational Follow-up Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>). If your data collection will continue past the year date, be sure to submit the required *Renewal/Modification Form* (found under *Additional Forms* on <http://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

(*Your name*)

- 2) To request **minor corrections or clarifications:**

Dear (*Investigator's Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(*Enter Protocol Title*)”. It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Minor changes and/or clarifications are necessary before this protocol can be approved. The required changes and/or clarifications are outlined at the end of this e-mail. Please highlight all the requested changes and/or clarifications to the protocol, and submit this revised, highlighted version to me for approval.

Please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that *no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.*

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

3) For **reconsideration after investigator corresponds to identified concerns:**

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled "*(Enter Protocol Title)*". It meets the criteria for *expedited* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, I cannot approve the protocol in its current form. There are serious concerns that must be addressed before approval is possible. These concerns are outlined at the end of this e-mail.

Please seriously reflect on the concerns raised. If the concerns can be addressed, please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that *no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.*

If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

4) For **disapproval:**

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled "*(Enter Protocol Title)*". It has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, this protocol cannot be approved in its current form. **Please understand that this means you may not collect data for your project.** Specific reasons for this decision are outlined in the attached “Protocol Decision Document”. If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

For **Exempt** Protocols:

1) For **approval**:

- a. *If the first protocol that was submitted can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear *(Investigator’s Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “*(Enter Protocol Title)*”. It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

*(Your name)*

- b. *If a resubmitted protocol can be approved*, use this standardized language:

Dear *(Investigator’s Name)*,

Thank you for resubmitting your protocol (“Enter protocol number *xxxx-xxx*”) and incorporating the requested changes and/or clarifications. As indicated on the *Protocol Decision Document* your protocol is now approved. Please keep the attached document for your records.

\*\*\*\*\*For studies that require consent forms, please add:

Please note that you must get your consent forms stamped before you may start collecting any data. To get your consent form stamped, please bring a hard copy of your (1) approval document/e-mail, and (2) consent form to Jimmy McMichael (Jones 212).

Good luck with your research!

*(Your name)*

2) To request **minor corrections or clarifications**:

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled "*(Enter Protocol Title)*". It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number *xxxx-xxx*. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Minor changes and/or clarifications are necessary before this protocol can be approved. The required changes and/or clarifications are outlined at the end of this e-mail. Please highlight all the requested changes and/or clarifications to the protocol, and submit this revised, highlighted version to me for approval.

Please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

*(Your Name)*

3) For **reconsideration after investigator corresponds to identified concerns**:

Dear *(Investigator's Name)*,

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(Enter Protocol Title)”. It meets the criteria for *exempt* review and has been assigned the protocol number xxxx-xxx. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, I cannot approve the protocol in its current form. There are serious concerns that must be addressed before approval is possible. These concerns are outlined at the end of this e-mail.

Please seriously reflect on the concerns raised. If the concerns can be addressed, please respond with your revised protocol within *one week* of this e-mail. If you cannot complete the revisions within one week, please let me know by what date you intend to submit your revisions.

Please note that ***no data collection may occur until you have secured IRB approval.***

If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

(*Your Name*)

4) For **disapproval**:

Dear (*Investigator’s Name*),

Thank you for submitting your protocol entitled “(Enter Protocol Title)”. It has been assigned the protocol number xxxx-xxx. Please keep this protocol number for your reference.

Unfortunately, this protocol cannot be approved in its current form. **Please understand that this means you may not collect data for your project.** Specific reasons for this decision are outlined in the attached “Protocol Decision Document”. If you have any questions or concerns about your protocol or this decision, please contact me via e-mail (*enter e-mail address*) or phone (*x-xxxx*).

Best,

(*Your Name*)

## Appendix C: Updated Protocol Template and Checklist

### (A) PROTOCOL DESCRIPTION:

1. **Introduction:** Introduce the topic of your research with background information and citations.
2. **Purpose:** Clearly state what your study seeks to address and why this is important.
3. **Exposition:** Explain how your project adds to or expands the body of knowledge that relates to your topic.

### (B) METHODS AND MATERIALS: For each of the following subheadings explain how you will conduct your research.

#### 1. Subject Recruitment:

- a. What is the total number of subjects?
- b. How and where subjects will be recruited (word of mouth, posters on campus emails, etc.)? Provide any recruitment materials (e.g., sample flyers, sample emails, etc.).
- c. What are the criteria, if any, by which subjects will be included or excluded (gender, athletes, age, race, etc.)?

If the study involves students from the University of Puget Sound the following standard statement may be used:

The subject population will resemble the \_\_\_\_\_ Department at the University of Puget Sound in terms of age, ethnicity, and gender.

- d. How will you obtain informed consent?
- e. Are there any special conditions or procedures that will be necessary for the project? If no, write N/A.
- f. Does your proposed study (a) involve non-English speakers, or (b) take place outside of the United States? If yes, review the International Research Policy (<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/policy-for-international-research/>) and address all questions as they relate to your study. If no, write N/A.

#### 2. Risks to Subjects:

- a. All studies carry at least minimal risk; explain the nature of risks that might occur to the subjects from participating in this study (physical, psychological, social, legal, or economic; see the IRB website for additional information on how to classify risk: <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>)
- b. Describe the precautions you have taken to minimize risks.

3. **Instrumentation:** Describe any equipment, surveys, software, etc. that will be used in the study, and include validity and reliability of the instrumentation if relevant.



4. **Data collection:** Procedures of data collection need to be clearly described (e.g., how many times the subject must be tested or interviewed, how long will the session last, what is the subject to actually do during the testing session or interview, are there treatments/interventions, for ethnographic research methods specify interview type (structured, semi-structured, unstructured) along with questions and/or interview guide, etc.).
  5. **Data Analysis:** Explain clearly how the data will be analyzed (e.g. qualitative research themes, ANOVA, t-tests, etc.).
- (C) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:** Explain how data will be secured to safeguard identifiable records of individuals. This might include how and where the data will be housed, how the data were recorded (audio or visual tapes, paper pencil, etc.), how long the data will be kept, how it will be disposed of, who will have access to the data, etc. If applicable, describe deception and/or assent procedures.

If applicable, the following standard statement may be used:

The names of participants will not appear on materials containing their responses. All identifying materials such as the consent forms will be kept in a locked file cabinet in the \_\_\_\_\_ Department at the University of Puget Sound.

- (D) **BENEFITS:** Describe the anticipated benefits to subjects, science, and/or society, that may occur as a result of this study.
- (E) **QUALIFICATIONS OF INVESTIGATOR(S):**
1. If a *faculty member* is involved please summarize their qualifications: e.g., Jamila Jensen is an associate professor in the Department of Psychology and has conducted and published many research studies dealing with Social and Cross-Cultural Psychology.
  2. If a *student* is involved, please indicate why they are qualified to conduct the research: e.g., Jane Johnson is a senior in the Department of Psychology and has taken the following classes which provide her the skills to conduct this research: Developmental Psychology, Applied Psychological Measurement, Cross-Cultural Psychology and Social Psychology.
- (F) **REFERENCES:** Provide the list of references you cited throughout the protocol (e.g., *Introduction* section, *Methods and Materials* section, etc.).

**CONSENT FORMS:** Consent forms are required for most research involving human subjects. Please see the instructions for consent forms in the IRB Handbook, Section 6, found on the University of Puget Sound Institutional Review Board website:

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>

Please use this checklist to ensure that your protocol meets IRB requirements.

**Submit application for full board review before the deadline indicated on the IRB website <https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>**

**Applications for exempt and expedited review may be submitted at any time**

**COVERSHEET**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Completed
- \_\_\_\_\_ Typed
- \_\_\_\_\_ Signed (investigators, and if appropriate, faculty advisor)
- \_\_\_\_\_ CITI Training Certificate of Completion attached

**PROTOCOL (5 pages maximum)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Pages numbered throughout

**(A) Protocol Description**

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Introduction
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Purpose
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Exposition
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. References

**(B) Methods and Materials**

**1. Subject Recruitment**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Number of subjects
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. How and where subjects are recruited
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Criteria for inclusion and exclusion
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Method of obtaining informed consent
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Special conditions or procedures (if applicable)
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. International research considerations (if applicable)

**2. Risks to Subjects**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Risks to subjects
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Precautions to minimize risks

**3. Instrumentation**

**4. Data collection**

**5. Data analysis**

**(C) CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Procedure used to protect confidentiality
- \_\_\_\_\_ Manner of recording information

- \_\_\_\_\_ Use of audio and visual tapes and their disposition
- \_\_\_\_\_ How long identifying information will be kept
- \_\_\_\_\_ Deception or assent (if applicable)

**(D) BENEFITS**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Benefits of the research

**(E) QUALIFICATIONS OF INVESTIGATOR(S)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty:     Qualifications for conducting the research
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student:    Qualifications for conducting the research

**(F) REFERENCES**

**CONSENT FORMS:** Consent forms are required for most research involving human subjects. Please see the instructions for consent forms in the IRB Handbook, Section 6, found on the University of Puget Sound Institutional Review Board website:

<https://www.pugetsound.edu/gateways/faculty-staff/institutional-review-board/>

Because consent forms must be representative of each project, below is a general checklist. Each Principal Investigator (PI) must ensure that the consent form(s) submitted for IRB review are a complete and accurate description of the research project that allows a potential subject to give voluntary informed consent.

**Procedural Details:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Page 1 is on appropriate institution letterhead.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Project title (identical title used on consent form and protocol).
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Pages numbered (protocol and consent form numbered separately).
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. List all investigators, email addresses, and business telephone numbers  
(personal numbers, e.g., cell phone numbers may not be used).
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. If consent form is longer than 1 page, line for subject's initials appears in lower right corner of each page of consent form.
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Signature lines for all that apply to a specific study, e.g., subject, witness, parent, corroborator.

Consent forms are required for all individuals who need to consent. Separate consent forms are required for individuals who experience different levels of the study. For example, adults in a treatment group, the control group, parents/guardians all require separate consent forms. Children require assent scripts/forms dependent on age and purpose of study. Additional consent forms may be needed given a specific study's design.

**Content:**

- \_\_\_\_\_ Description of study written in non-technical language no greater than 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading level
- \_\_\_\_\_ Risks/benefits clearly described
- \_\_\_\_\_ Alternative treatments, if applicable
- \_\_\_\_\_ Costs and payments, if applicable
- \_\_\_\_\_ Confidentiality and use of protected health information
- \_\_\_\_\_ Phone number for Associate Dean's Office
- \_\_\_\_\_ Right to refuse or end participation
- \_\_\_\_\_ No compensation for injury, if applicable
- \_\_\_\_\_ Voluntary consent
- \_\_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment of parent, if applicable
- \_\_\_\_\_ Investigator's certification

## **Appendix D: Summer Review Policy**

### **Protocol Review during Summer**

Due to diminished resources during the summer (about mid-May to late August), the IRB will:

- Not review *full board* protocols
- Continue to review *exempt and expedited* protocols

Responses from the IRB for exempt and expedited protocols may take longer than three business days, the review timeframe the IRB upholds during the academic year. Principal Investigators should be aware of the potential for a longer review time during summer.

## MEMO

**TO: Faculty Senate**

**FROM: International Education Committee**

**RE: Final Report of the IEC for AY 2017-2018**

**DATE: April 14, 2017**

Please find attached a report of the work completed by the IEC in AY 2017-2018 to date, as well as recommendations for charges to the IEC for next year. At the time of the writing of this report, the IEC has two more meetings in April and will submit an addendum to the Senate at the end of the semester regarding work accomplished during these meetings.

We expect the addendum to address items such as:

- Revision of Study Abroad Selection Criteria document.
- New Faculty-Led Program Proposal Form to guide faculty to meet the expectations set out in the evaluation rubric and to facilitate review by our committee.
- Eric Orlin's proposal to approve Lewis and Clark's Greece – Athens and Lesbos program so that Puget Sound students may apply to the program in January 2019 for the 2019-2020 academic year.
- IEC response to Senate suggestion to reduce the IEC faculty number to 5, to remove the Dean of Student's representative, and to decrease the number of student representatives from 2 to 1 will be elaborated in the addendum.

These items are not discussed in this report. Where they should be addressed within the current report is highlighted in red.

**IEC Final Report  
2017-2018  
Presented to the Senate April 16, 2017**

During the past academic year, the International Education Committee (IEC) engaged in its normal duties prescribed in the faculty bylaws. In addition, the IEC was charged with the following tasks for the 2017-2018 academic year (**in bold**). What the committee accomplished is indicated following each charge.

**CHARGES:**

**Charge 1: With respect to the issue of sexual violence, continue the review of sexual violence policies at study abroad programs used by Puget Sound students and recommend action for those policies that don't conform to our standards.**

The subcommittee finalized the card informing students about resources in response to sexual assault (*Sexual Assault Emergency Response*); this card is based on the cards found in campus bathrooms but was tailored for the use in study abroad. After review by Tiffany Davis (Associate Director of Diversity and Inclusion and Deputy Title IX Coordinator) the cards were finalized, printed, and used this spring for our on campus information session that prepares students for study abroad. (See Appendix 1a.)

The subcommittee also revised the *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Brochure*, integrating more information about how to reduce risk and strategies of prevention, along with information about personal safety as well as information about how to support victims of sexual violence. We have sent the draft to Tiffany Davis and are awaiting her comments. The subcommittee recommends that this document is not printed on card stock as the Sexual Assault Card mentioned above, but rather is printed as necessary for OIP information sessions. OIP will keep an electronic version of this document so that it can be updated regularly. (See Appendix 1b.)

The subcommittee reviewed the *Sexual Misconduct, Education Abroad and Title IX/Clary Act* document prepared by the Forum on Education Abroad (February 2017), and developed evaluation criteria for reviewing sexual assault response in study abroad programs. The draft of the criteria have been sent to Tiffany Davis for feedback. (See Appendix 1c.)

**Recommendation for next year:**

- finalize the *Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Brochure*
- finalize evaluation criteria for reviewing sexual assault response
- continue review of sexual violence policies at study abroad programs by employing the evaluation criteria

**Charge 2:**

**a. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g. language, discipline, or geography) or are expensive relative to Puget Sound tuition, room and board.**

**b. Develop language that clearly incorporates this charge into the standing charge that deals with program review.**

2a. The summer and semester programs we have approved so far this year are summarized in the discussion of Standing Charge 2 below. During AY 17-18 the IEC removed a good number of abroad programs from our approved list.

2b. The committee suggested changes to the language of standing charges 1 and 2 and the changes were passed by the faculty and approved by the Board of Trustees:

**The old language in the Bylaws is as follows:**

1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.
2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.

**The approved new language is as follows:**

1. Through the review of new and existing programs, maintain an institutionally sustainable number of international education programs that are consistent with, and that promote the goals and objectives of, international education at Puget Sound.
2. Review criteria and assessment procedures for evaluating international education programs as needed.

**Recommendation for next year:**

**Given that the new language for Standing Charges 1 and 2 encompasses the charges from the senate in 2a above, we recommend that this charge be eliminated for next year.**

**Charge 3: Develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students. Work with the appropriate offices and groups to implement these changes.**

The subcommittee for this charge met with Vice-President for Enrollment Laura Martin-Fedich to discuss how faculty might be able to partner with admissions to improve recruitment and retention of international students. As a result of this meeting, the subcommittee arranged outreach to admitted international students by members of the university committee. Using a list of admitted international students provided by Admissions, the subcommittee asked university representatives (faculty with an interest in the home country, current students or recent alumni) to make contact with admitted international students to welcome them to our community and be available for questions. The subcommittee composed suggested text for university representatives to use in their initial contact. At least three of the approximately 70 students contacted responded, and of those we think two of them (one from Japan and one from China) will come to Puget Sound. We intend to follow up with admissions next year to see how many of the admitted international students that were contacted matriculate and potentially follow up with them as well to determine the effectiveness of this approach.

The subcommittee also crafted the following two statements regarding improvement of the presence of international students on our campus. After ratification by the committee as a whole, they were sent to Strategic Planning Goal Team One:

Regarding support for international student scholarships:

*International students are not eligible for federal aid; all financial aid for international students comes from the university or from private scholarships. Last year, an additional \$2000 per student was allocated as scholarships for international students. While this gesture is appreciated, it would not make a difference to an international student with high financial need.*



*As an expression of the university's dedication to globalization of our campus as well as increased diversity, the International Education Committee would like to express its support for dedicated funds for international student scholarships.*

Regarding the establishment of a 3-year faculty liaison between IEC and Admissions:

*As we work toward recruiting more international students to the University of Puget Sound, the International Education Committee recommends that a 3-year rotating faculty position be established to serve as a liaison between the IEC and the office of admissions. This faculty member would also be a member of the IEC and work to coordinate efforts to support the office of admissions in the recruitment of international students. A three-year rotation would ensure some continuity of efforts and coordination. We have met with Laura Martin-Fedich and believe her office would welcome this contribution to their work.*

### **Recommendation for next year:**

#### **We recommend Charge 3 be continued for next year.**

In addition to other approaches, the subcommittee intends to:

- Continue working on development of a relationship with Admissions that will allow Admissions a mechanism to seek faculty input and support.
- Seek data on the effectiveness of the first contact campaign to reach out to admitted international students.
- Ask relevant faculty, staff, students or alumni to contact admitted international students if benefits of this approach are recognized.

#### **Charge 4: Further examine the causes of the disparity in first-generation and historically underrepresented student participation in study abroad. Review and implement recommendations (2017 IEC Final Report) to reduce that disparity.**

To further examine the causes of disparity the subcommittee requested updated data from the Office of Institutional Research on study abroad participation rates to compare 2016-2017 with previous years. Looking ahead, we are interested to see how numbers will compare based on the recent study abroad financial policy change which will be in effect for students studying abroad in 2018-2019. Considering a top cited reason for students who did not study abroad in the past was "I was not able to apply enough of my financial aid to study abroad", the new policy may alleviate some of that burden.

We reached out to the Diversity Abroad network to request information on best practices, however, we found that their resources are exclusive to member institutions. At this time, the Office of International Programs (OIP) does not have the budget to support that membership.

OIP reached out to Posse Scholars to hold targeted informational sessions, with an emphasis placed on scholarships available for studying abroad.

Coincidentally, the IEC received a request from a visiting assistant professor in African American Studies for funding to explore a program in Ghana. This program may reach underrepresented students in the future, which is in line with one of the recommendations from the 2017 IEC Final Report.

Additionally, with the implementation of a new online system for processing study abroad applications, paperwork and forms in the OIP, staff will have more time in pre-departure sessions to focus on issues of identity in study abroad. This is also in line with a recommendation from the 2017 report.

### **Recommendation for next year:**

**We recommend Charge 4 be continued for next year.**

### **Additional Recommended Charges:**

1. In response to the increasing number of short-term study abroad program applications from faculty, it has come to our attention that the committee should draft guidelines that could be of use to faculty as they prepare to incorporate short-term study abroad into their courses. Items to address and evaluate could include:
  - Different models (for example, 10 weeks of classes on campus + the equivalent of 5 weeks of class time abroad, or a full-time course on campus + 1/4 unit for the study abroad portion, etc.)
  - The question of contact hours per unit and the translation of in-classroom vs. out-of-classroom contact hours into credit hours.
2. Establishment of criteria for distribution of funds for faculty development of programs and student support (to defray costs of these programs, which do not permit the application of financial aid).
3. Discussion of how study abroad application criteria will apply to Running Start students. As of now, students must be on campus for one year before studying abroad, which might preclude Running Start students from study abroad as they will have to satisfy major requirements. Also, Running Start students are often the same age as freshmen when they start at a 4-year college, although their credit transfer could place them into their junior year. After one year, they would be the same age as a sophomore, but could have enough credits to be classified as a senior and thus get priority according to our current criteria over all other applicants. Would Running Start students qualify as sophomores when they apply or would they be considered what their credit count places them in their academic career? This could become important when we are required to make cuts to stay in budget.
4. Examine the potential use of Digication e-portfolio software amongst students studying abroad.

### **STANDING CHARGES:**

*As a reminder, Standing Charges 1 and 2 have been changed as discussed above on pp 2-3. Here is the language of the new Standing Charges, for your reference for inclusion in the Standing Charges for AY 18-19:*

*1. Through the review of new and existing programs, maintain an institutionally sustainable number of international education programs that are consistent with, and that promote the goals and objectives of, international education at Puget Sound.*

*2. Review criteria and assessment procedures for evaluating international education programs as needed.*

### **The Standing Charges for AY 17-18 were as follows:**

#### **1. Establish criteria and assessment procedures for international education programs.**

**The revised Study Abroad Selection criteria will be addressed in and appended to an addendum.** In an effort to save paper and streamline, the committee recommends no longer including the Study Abroad Selection Criteria in the printed Bulletin. Rather, we suggest a brief statement in the Bulletin referring readers to the criteria on the website of the Office of International Programs. The Interim Director of the Office of International Programs, Eowyn Greeno, will include this change in the revisions to the Bulletin submitted by her office.

## 2. Review and approve new and existing international education programs and program proposals, including programs led by University faculty.

To facilitate review of proposals by faculty to lead study abroad programs, the IEC last year established an evaluation rubric. This year, a subcommittee created a Faculty-Led Program Proposal Form to guide faculty to meet the expectations set out in the rubric and to facilitate review by our committee. **This form will be addressed in and appended to the addendum to this report.**

The IEC made the following changes to our program list:

Removed:

- CGEE Central America in Guatemala because of new Level 3 travel warning.

Reinstated:

- CIEE Jordan because Jordan is no longer under a travel warning.

Approved student petitions to study\* at:

- IES Amsterdam “Society, Culture and Gender in Amsterdam” (Summer)
- CIEE Dakar “Language and Culture – Dakar, Senegal) (Semester program)

*\*note: All student petitions approved this year are for a one-time basis and will be revisited for permanent inclusion in Puget Sound abroad offerings after getting student input on the programs. See IEC minutes of October 20, 2017 and November 3, 2017.*

Approved the following faculty petitions:

- Andreas Udbye’s proposal for a short-term study abroad component in India to complement BUS 474, “Business in India and South Asia.”
- Kris Imbrigotta’ proposal for a short-term study abroad component in Berlin, Germany to complement a new course on Berlin that he is proposing, GERM 320.
- Robin Jacobson and Andrew Gardner’s proposal for a short-term study abroad component in both Amsterdam and Doha to accompany their course CONN 397 “Migration and the Global City.”
- Brett Rogers’ request for funds (\$3000) to accompany Professor Mike Lippman (University of Nebraska—Lincoln) on a three-week intensive course in Greece and also to visit the site of College Year in Athens (CYA).
- LaToya Brackett’s request for funds (\$3000) to travel to Ghana with a sister-cities delegation with which she is already associated to lay groundwork for establishing a study abroad program for Puget Sound students.
- **To be addressed in the addendum: Eric Orlin’s proposal to approve Lewis and Clark’s Greece – Athens and Lesbos program so that Puget Sound students may apply to the program in January 2019 for the 2019-2020 academic year.**

Denied the following petition:

- A student petition to allow her to study abroad despite initial denial by the committee.

## 3. Assist the Office of International Programs in selecting students for study abroad.

This year, the new policy on study abroad allows students to have access to all their financial aid during their study abroad semester(s). Despite greater accessibility to study abroad granted by this new policy, there was not an influx of students applying to study abroad. Rather, the number of applications remained about the same, and of those applications more of them were for semester programs and fewer were for summer study abroad.

Of the total of 230 applications:

46 students applied for summer programs

10 students applied for full academic year single programs

80 students applied for Fall 2018

94 students applied for Spring 2019

5 students applied to two separate programs in Fall and Spring 18-19

In two separate meetings, the committee reviewed materials and spreadsheets expertly provided by OIP staff to determine approvals given budgetary constraints. All students for summer programs (which are budget-neutral for the university) were approved. Of the remaining 185 applications for semester-long programs, 173 were approved. Denials were largely due to not meeting GPA requirements, although other criteria were also considered.

**4. Represent the interests of the Faculty in international education.**

**5. Such other duties as may be assigned to it.**

**ADDITIONAL WORK:**

1. **Statement to Strategic Goal Team One.** In response to the Strategic Planning Initiative undertaken by the university in this academic year, the IEC approved the following statement and forwarded it to Goal Team One early on in the spring semester. We feel that both study abroad and the globalization of our campus are important to underscore in the Strategic Plan.

**Statement from the IEC to Strategic Goal Team One**

The International Education Committee believes that the importance of international education (especially study abroad and the increased presence of international students on our campus) should be included in the document put forward by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee. International educational experiences are very much consistent with the “strategic goals” this team is charged with promoting: high impact engagement, student recruitment and retention, the distinction of a Puget Sound education.

**BACKGROUND & RATIONALE:**

1. Study abroad is a critical “high impact practice” as mentioned in the principles for Goal Team One.
2. Enhancing study abroad and the presence of international students on our campus is critical to fulfilling the commitment to “rich knowledge of self and others” in our Mission Statement.  
At the University of Puget Sound, study abroad programs are evaluated and approved based on their ability to “foster intercultural competence, cross-cultural communication skills, and personal development” as well as their ability to “foster global citizenship and appreciation of international

diversity and interdependencies” including social responsibility, social justice and civic engagement. (See International Education Committee Program Evaluation Criteria.)

3. Study abroad is prominently promoted by our admissions office to prospective students, and while recent changes to our merit aid policy supports students’ interest in study abroad, further support is needed to realize the benefits of study abroad for both our students and the university.
4. Study abroad adds distinction to Puget Sound. For example, short-term study abroad programs that complement certain courses are becoming more prevalent on our campus. This form of high impact experiential learning – extending learning beyond the classroom, purposefully and within a course – is not widely available everywhere. It is critical that we prioritize and strengthen our faculty’s ability to develop such short-term abroad opportunities for our students.
5. The PacRim program is distinctive to Puget Sound and students come here because of it. It is essential we continue to build on the strengths of this program.
6. Internship programs (both those developed and supported by our own faculty or those offered through 3<sup>rd</sup> party providers) offer appeal and are strong examples of experiential learning that go beyond even the traditional study abroad experience. Going forward, it is essential that we strengthen these initiatives.

#### GOALS TO PROMOTE IN STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSIONS:

1. Include a statement in the Strategic Plan that further internationalization of our curriculum and students’ learning through strengthening of resources for study abroad, short-term faculty-lead programs, be a high priority for Puget Sound.
2. Make recruitment and success of international students at Puget Sound a high priority.

**2. IEC response to the Senate suggestion to reduce the IEC faculty number to 5 will be addressed in the addendum.**

## Appendix 1a:

SEXUAL ASSAULT EMERGENCY RESPONSE WHILE STUDYING ABROAD	PUGET SOUND RESOURCES FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY SEXUAL ASSAULT
<p><b>ONSITE CHECKLIST</b></p> <p><b>You are encouraged to take these steps immediately to ensure your safety:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Call one of the program emergency phone numbers</li></ol> <p><i>(write local emergency numbers here)</i></p> <p>and request that a program staff member accompany you to the hospital, clinic, or doctor for support such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• treatment of injuries</li><li>• testing for STD</li><li>• other response options (such as learning about whether emergency contraception is available, and about the possibility of preserving evidence.)</li></ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. If necessary, request to be moved from your current living quarters to safe housing.</li><li>3. If the alleged perpetrator was from your own program, request action from the program staff that will assure your safety.</li><li>4. After consultation with a program staff member, you may decide to contact the police.</li></ol>	<p><b>Harassment Reporting Officers (Mandatory Reporters):</b></p> <p><i>Roy Robinson</i>, Director of International Programs (1.253.879.3653; robinson@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><i>Michael Benitez</i>, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, Chief Diversity Officer, Title IX Coordinator/Equal Opportunity Officer (1.253.879.2827; titleIX@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><i>Sarah Shives</i>, Assistant Dean of Students (1.253.879.3360; sshives@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><i>Grace Kirchner</i>, Sexual Harassment Complaint Ombudsperson (1.253.879.3785; kirchner@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><b>Confidential Support:</b></p> <p><i>Marta Cady</i>, Associate Dean of Students and Director of New Student Orientation (Mobile: 1.253.219.0516; Office: 1.253.879.3317; martacady@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><i>Dave Wright</i>, Director of Spiritual Life and Civic Engagement, University Chaplain (1.253.879.3818 or 1.253.879.2751; dwright@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p><i>Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services</i> (1.253.879.1555; pugetsound.edu/chws)</p> <p><b>Other Support:</b></p> <p><i>Security Services</i> (1.253.879.3311; security@pugetsound.edu) is available 24 hours a day; the attendant can connect you to Puget Sound staff who can help with your concern.</p> <p><i>Peer Allies</i> (peerallies@pugetsound.edu; facebook.com/pugetsoundpeerallies) are available by Skype; message them on the Peer Allies Facebook page to make a Skype appointment.</p> <p><b>Title IX Deputy Coordinator:</b></p> <p><i>Tiffany Davis</i>, Associate Director of Diversity and Inclusion, Deputy Title IX Coordinator (1.253.879.3793; titleIX@pugetsound.edu)</p> <p>For more information and resources, go to <a href="https://pugetsound.edu/sexualmisconduct">pugetsound.edu/sexualmisconduct</a>.</p>

## Appendix 1b:

### Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Brochure:

Sexual assault can happen anywhere, even when you are studying abroad. Sexual assault is never the victim's fault. This brochure offers tips on **preventing** and **responding** to sexual assault, as well as advice about **supporting others** who have been victims of sexual assault.

The University of Puget Sound makes every effort to send students to **study abroad programs** that take sexual assault and discrimination seriously, and is committed to upholding the rights granted by Title IX and to fully investigating and addressing Title IX violations. (For information about Title IX, see <https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/title-ix/>) **Puget Sound students** attending a study abroad program must follow both the conduct policies of the University of Puget Sound and of the study abroad program.

### SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION

#### Education and Prevention

- Learn about cultural norms in your host country. *Don't make assumptions* about dating, relationships, and social interactions. Instead, ask questions about gender related attitudes during your on-site orientation.

- Observe how the locals dress and act. Understand that what is seen as provocative or respectful dress or behavior in your host country may not be in line with your practices in the US. Also pay particular attention to body language and behavior.
- Talk to local students. Learn about their experiences with dating and social interactions, and how these might differ from U.S. expectations.
- Learn about stereotypes of American students.
- Know where not to go. Ask your on-site staff or locals about which areas are risky for American students.

### **Strategies to Reduce Risk**

- Travel and go out in a *group*. Tell others where you are going and how you are getting there.
- Don't assume others understand your boundaries. Locals may have a different concept of personal boundaries, or may not stop behaviors that lead to sexual violations unless you take definitive action.
- You are the safest when *sober!*
- Never leave drinks unattended. When you do, you may expose yourself to date rape or other possible violence or criminal activity (e.g., robbery).
- Get a cell phone that works in your host country – make sure it is charged and has credit available. Carry emergency numbers with you.
- Consider the benefits of learning to blend in with the host culture.
- Consider power dynamics.
  - Watch out for “freebies.” Be aware that a false sense of indebtedness can occur when someone buys you a drink or a meal. The person offering freebies or the culture in which they live may believe that you owe them something in return. Remember, you do not! Always carry enough money for your own food, drink, and cab ride.
  - Be aware of “quid pro quo” harassment. This occurs when sexual favors are used or threatened to be used as a basis for a decision, such as ‘sleep with me and you’ll get an A.’ If you feel that someone is using their position of authority to make you do something you don’t want to do, call one of the contacts in your program.

### **Personal Safety**

- Don't be afraid to say “No.” Don't worry about being rude. Your personal safety is most important.
- Tell your friends if you feel uncomfortable. Have a plan for what to do if this happens.
- Look out for your friends, and speak up if you are concerned.
- Pay attention to your internal voice that alerts you to danger.
- Ignore the person and/or the harassing behavior. If possible, walk away or remove yourself from the situation. If someone sits next to you, get up and leave without comment. If someone walks alongside you, turn around and walk in the other direction.
- If you are not able to ignore and walk away from the harassing person, make a scene and create a commotion and embarrass the person into leaving you alone.

### **SEXUAL ASSAULT EMERGENCY RESPONSE: ONSITE CHECKLIST**

#### **You are encouraged to take these steps immediately to ensure your safety if you are a victim of sexual assault:**

1. Seek a safe place immediately.
2. Call one of the program emergency phone numbers \_\_\_\_\_.  
*write local emergency numbers here*
3. Consider seeking immediate medical attention. Request that a program staff member accompany you to the hospital, clinic, or doctor.  
When receiving medical attention:

- A. Seek treatment for injuries.
- B. Test for STI's (Sexually Transmitted Infections)
- C. Look into emergency contraception (if available and legal in that country).

If you decide to seek immediate medical attention you may consider doing the following in order to preserve evidence:

- A. Do not shower or clean up.
- B. Keep clothes in paper bag, not plastic.
- C. Do not brush hair.
- D. Do not use the toilet.
- E. Do not brush teeth.
- F. Do not clean up the crime scene.
- G. If you think predator drugs were involved, get tested.

- 4. Try to record as many of the details as you can recall.
- 5. If necessary, request to be moved from your current living quarters to safe housing.
- 6. If the alleged perpetrator was from your own program, request action from the program staff that will assure your safety.

**After your immediate concerns have been addressed, you may take the following steps while you are still abroad:**

- 7. Contact a program staff member or the U.S. Consulate for information on reporting laws in country. They will know if police systems in that country are supportive of victims of sexual assault.
  - a. Consider filing a police report - bring someone fluent in the language of the host country with you to the police station.
- 8. Seek assistance, follow-up counseling, or support in the host country.
  - a. Program staff will be able to provide contact information for a center for victims of sexual assault or counseling service.
  - b. Talk to someone. Confide in a friend or counselor.
- 9. You may contact the 24-hour Crisis Center of the Sexual Assault Support and Help for Americans Abroad (use their Live Chat at [sashaa.org](http://sashaa.org) or find the access code for your country at [sashaa.org/crisis-line](http://sashaa.org/crisis-line), then dial: 866-879-6636 or 833-723-3833).
- 10. You may also contact any of the individuals at Puget Sound listed below to receive support.

*Please note: program staff are typically mandatory reporters and will report the incident to Roy Robinson, Director of International Programs (1-253-879-3653) and Dean Michael Benitez, Title IX Coordinator (1-253-879-2827). A **mandatory reporter** is required to report an incident of sexual assault to the Title IX Coordinator or a Harassment Reporting Officer of the university; this does not directly result in a criminal charge for the perpetrator.*

**SUPPORTING VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT**

No matter what they were wearing, whom they were with, where they were going—they did not ask to be harassed, raped, or assaulted. Take assault and harassment seriously.

**Easy steps to take to provide support to your peers:**

- 1. Avoid touching your peer
- 2. Listen and be supportive
- 3. Provide small comforts such as tissues or a beverage
- 4. Avoid sitting too close or looming above the peer
- 5. Be conscious of your body language
- 6. Convey empathy
- 7. Be careful not to convey judgment



8. Do not promise anything that you can't commit to
9. Provide referrals and additional support as needed

## **PUGET SOUND RESOURCES FOR THOSE AFFECTED BY SEXUAL ASSAULT**

**Sexual Misconduct Resource Center:** <http://www.pugetsound.edu/sexualmisconduct>

### **Harassment Reporting Officers (Mandatory Reporters) at Puget Sound:**

Roy Robinson, Director of International Programs (1-253-879-3653, [rrobinson@pugetsound.edu](mailto:rrobinson@pugetsound.edu))

Michael Benitez, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, Chief Diversity Officer, Title IX Coordinator/Equal Opportunity Officer (1-253-879-2827, [chiefdiversity@pugetsound.edu](mailto:chiefdiversity@pugetsound.edu))

Sarah Shives, Assistant Dean of Students (1-253-879-3360, [sshives@pugetsound.edu](mailto:sshives@pugetsound.edu)).

Grace Kirchner, Sexual Harassment Complaint Ombudsperson (1-253-879-3785, [kirchner@pugetsound.edu](mailto:kirchner@pugetsound.edu))

### **Confidential Support:**

Marta Cady, Associate Dean of Students and Director of New Student Orientation (Mobile: 1-253-219-0516, Office: 1-253-879-3317, [martacady@pugetsound.edu](mailto:martacady@pugetsound.edu))

Dave Wright, Director of Spiritual Life and Civic Engagement, University Chaplain (1-253-879-3818, 1-253-879-2751, [dwright@pugetsound.edu](mailto:dwright@pugetsound.edu))

Counseling, Health, and Wellness Services (1-253-879-1555, [pugetsound.edu/chws](http://pugetsound.edu/chws))

### **Other Support:**

Security Services (1-253-879-3311, [security@pugetsound.edu](mailto:security@pugetsound.edu)) is available 24 hours a day; the attendant can connect you to Puget Sound staff who can help with your concern.

Peer Allies ([peerallies@pugetsound.edu](mailto:peerallies@pugetsound.edu), [facebook.com/pugetsoundpeerallies](https://facebook.com/pugetsoundpeerallies)) are available by Skype; message them on the Peer Allies Facebook page to make a Skype appointment.

### **Title IX Deputy Coordinator:**

Tiffany Davis, Associate Director of Diversity and Inclusion, Deputy Title IX Coordinator (1-253-879-3793); [titleIX@pugetsound.edu](mailto:titleIX@pugetsound.edu)

## **SEXUAL ASSAULT RESPONSE AFTER RETURNING TO CAMPUS:**

### **You may take the following steps after returning to campus to report sexual misconduct and to seek advocacy:**

1. Seek assistance or counseling after returning to Puget Sound by contacting the following individuals or support groups **in addition to those listed above:**

A list of Harassment Reporting Officers may be found at <https://www.pugetsound.edu/about/offices-services/human-resources/policies/campus-policies/campus-policy-prohibiting-discrimination-and-harassment/harassment-reporting-officers/>

Rebuilding Hope! Sexual Assault Center of Pierce County (24-hours crisis, information, and referral line, 1-800-756-7273, 1-253-474-7273)

YWCA of Pierce County (24-hour crisis line: 1-253-383-2593, [ywcapiercecounty.org](http://ywcapiercecounty.org))

National Sexual Assault Helpline (1-800-656-HOPE, <https://www.rainn.org/>)

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence Hotline (1-800-799-SAFE, <http://www.nrcdv.org/>).

2. Review information about sexual misconduct at <http://www.pugetsound.edu/sexualmisconduct>.

3. Review materials that describe the steps of how to file an official report (<http://www.pugetsound.edu/report>) and seek advice about filing an official report by contacting the individuals listed above as Harassment Reporting Officers.

4. If you decide to make an official report, you may seek advocacy during the official reporting process by contacting the Harassment Reporting Officers.

This information is available at <https://www.pugetsound.edu/academics/international-programs/>

### **Appendix 1c:**

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SEXUAL ASSAULT RESPONSE IN STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS**

### **I: Policy and Response**

1. Does the program has a sexual assault policy? Is this policy easy to find?
2. Does the program have a step-by-step process on responding to sexual violence?
3. Does the program have clearly identified contacts to turn to in case of sexual violence?
4. Does the program provide a list of hospitals/doctors/clinics where the student may seek medical attention?
5. Is there counseling available for victims of sexual violence on site?

### **II: Education and Prevention**

1. Does the on-site orientation of students include a discussion of how to prevent or respond to sexual violence? Is this information specific enough?
2. How much information is provided about the prevention of sexual violence and gender discrimination and about risk reduction?
3. Is all the information about prevention and responding to sexual violence available in handouts, brochures, online? Are the online documents easy to find?

### **III: On-site Staff**

1. Do on-site staff members receive training in sexual violence response and in responding to gender discrimination?
2. Do on-site staff receive first responder<sup>1</sup> training as defined by the Forum on Education Abroad?
3. Do any on-site staff members receive trauma-informed investigation training?

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition of first responder: "In the Title IX context, the first person to receive a disclosure of sexual misconduct and to provide or aid in the delivery of assistance," p. 17 of *Sexual Misconduct, Education Abroad and Title IX/Clery Act*, February 2017, see <https://forumea.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/ForumEA-Sexual-Misconduct-Education-Abroad-and-Title-IXClery-Act-Updated-Feb-2017.pdf>

#### **IV: Reporting**

1. Are there resources on how to report sexual violence? Is the reporting process clear?

## MEMO

**TO: Faculty Senate**  
**FROM: International Education Committee**  
**RE: Addendum to the Final Report of the IEC for AY 2017-2018**  
**DATE: April 30, 2018**

Please find below a response to questions and comments for the IEC after submission of its final report for AY 2017-2018, as well as a summary of actions taken by the committee not included in the final report dated April 14.

### **Corrections:**

1. The final report should have been dated April 14, 2018 instead of April 14, 2017.
2. The final report should have included the list of committee members:

Emma Casey (student – fall only), Debbie Chee, Carmen Eyssautier, Lea Fortmann (spring only) Eowyn Greeno, Mark Harpring, Emily Katz (student), Diane Kelley, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Kriszta Kotsis, Andrea Kueter (library representative), Sunil Kukreja, Mike Spivey, Matt Warning, Sheryl Zylstra.

### **Questions posed by the Senate:**

Questions and comments from the senate:

- 1. Did the change in merit aid policy result in the tightening of the budget and therefore need to deny some students from studying abroad?**

Yes.

- 2. What impact did the new financial aid policy have on acceptances and denials. Were some students denied who would have previously been approved?**

Twelve (12) students were denied this year. Denials were largely due to low GPA. We applied the selection criteria used in the past.

- 3. Will there be more rigorous letter of recommendation for faculty members to fill out.**

No. The plan is to keep the same format for the recommendation in order to keep faculty workload low.

### **Additional committee work completed:**

1. Completion and approval of the Faculty-Led Study Abroad Program proposal document (attached).
2. Revision and approval of Study Abroad Eligibility and Selection Criteria document (appended below).
3. Approval of Eric Orlin's proposal to add Lewis and Clark's "Greece - Athens and Lesbos" ("GAL") program pending confirmation of the cost of the program with Lewis and Clark. Puget Sound students may apply to the program in January 2019 for the 2019-2020 academic year.
4. Removal of the College Year in Athens from our list of approved programs (replaced by Orlin's proposed GAL program).
5. Affirmation that the IEC recommends that the number of faculty on the IEC be kept at 7 and not be reduced.

Additionally, the IEC discussed the issue of requiring attendance at standing committee meetings. Consensus was reached that we think the Senate should take up this issue.

### **ADDENDUM:**

These Study Abroad Eligibility and Selection criteria were approved by the IEC on Friday, April 20, 2018.

### **Eligibility Criteria**

1. To demonstrate academic achievement:
  - a. Students must meet all program-specific requirements (including minimum GPA, class standing, course pre-requisites, language pre-requisites, etc.). Please note: if a student's cumulative GPA is below 2.5 the application will not be considered.
  - b. Students must be in good academic standing (not on any type of academic sanction) at time of application and until time of departure.
  - c. Students with cumulative GPA lower than 3.0 may apply but must demonstrate, in an additional application essay, that they have made significant progress towards achieving overall academic excellence.
  - d. Students applying to attend two different programs (one fall and one spring) must be aware that permission to study in two different programs during one academic year will be granted only in exceptional cases as justified by compelling academic goals. Students must submit an additional application essay that explains their reasons for applying to two programs, identify one preferred program, and identify how they will navigate the visa processes for both programs in a timely manner.
2. To demonstrate strong stability, responsibility, independence, and maturity:
  - a. Students must be in good conduct standing at time of application and until time of departure
    - i. Students on Conduct Probation Level II (CP II) are not allowed to represent Puget Sound, and no waivers are permitted. Students may not

apply for study abroad, nor may they participate in a study abroad program while on CP II.

- ii. Students on Conduct Probation Level I (CP I) are not allowed to represent Puget Sound, unless they obtain a waiver for specific purposes. A student wanting to apply to study abroad may petition for a waiver by following the process outlined by the Dean of Students Office. If a waiver is granted, the International Education Committee may consider the student's application to study abroad.
  - b. Students must have no financial holds at time of application and until time of departure
  - c. Students must have appropriate class standing at the time of application:
    - i. Current first year students: may apply for Summer term (if earned at least 7 units during first year). Note: Current first year students may apply for Spring term in compelling and specific circumstances but will not be given priority
    - ii. Current second year students: may apply for Summer, Fall, and Spring terms
    - iii. Current third year students: may apply for Summer, Fall, and Spring terms
    - iv. Transfer students must complete one year in residence before studying abroad
  - d. Students must be on campus the semester when applying (spring) and the semester before studying abroad (fall or spring)
  - e. Students must submit a completed Puget Sound application by the deadline for an approved Study Abroad program. Completed applications include additional essays required if:
    - i. A student's GPA is below 3.0
    - ii. A student is applying to more than one semester program in an academic year
- Puget Sound does not permit students to apply for study abroad credit retroactively.
- f. Students must, once approved by Puget Sound to study abroad, complete the program-specific application by the deadline set by Puget Sound

#### **Selection Criteria for Semester applicants:**

1. Continued adherence to all eligibility criteria
2. Program consideration. Priority will be given to
  - a. Majors that require study abroad (**need to list exact majors** – tbd with registrar's office over summer 2018)
  - b. Puget Sound sponsored programs (Oaxaca, Granada, Dijon)
  - c. Language immersion programs

3. Preference will be given to current third year students (at the time of application) who have not previously studied abroad, then current second year students, then current first year students.
4. Priority will be given to students who provide, in their response to the application essay prompt, a strong and detailed academic rationale for their study abroad plan and provide strong evidence of possessing the appropriate maturity, stability, flexibility, independence, and openness to be successful abroad.
5. Priority will be given to students with a cumulative GPA of at least 3.0. Students with a cumulative GPA lower than 3.0 may be approved if they successfully demonstrate, in an additional application essay, that they have made significant progress towards achieving overall academic excellence.
6. Students may be limited to a single program (semester or year). Students may only be approved for two different programs in a single academic year if they successfully convey, in an additional essay, compelling academic goals that can only be met by participating in two different programs and they provide evidence that they can complete the visa processes for both programs in a timely manner.

## FACULTY-LED STUDY ABROAD PROGRAM PROPOSAL

All new study abroad and international activities, including noncredit-based programs in which faculty or staff from the University of Puget Sound take students outside of the United States, must be proposed and approved in advance by the International Education Committee of the University of Puget Sound.

### APPLICATION GUIDELINES

1. Meet with the Director of International Programs to discuss study abroad options and the program proposal process.
2. Answer in writing all questions on the Faculty-Led Study Abroad Program Proposal.
3. Meet with the Title IX coordinator to learn about Faculty-Leader responsibilities and reporting requirements related to Title IX.
4. Meet with the director of CHWS to discuss how best to support students' mental and physical health as a Faculty-Leader.
5. Submit the completed application packet. Be sure this includes:
  - a. Answers to all questions in the Proposal form.
  - b. Letter of support from your department chair endorsing the proposed program.
  - c. Draft syllabus for the course to be taught.
  - d. Proposed budget for the program.(See Proposal form for more details on b, c and d.)

In person: Howarth 215

By mail:

Director of International Programs

By email: Eowyn Greeno

1500 N. Warner St. #1055

at egreeno@pugetsound.edu

Tacoma, WA 98416

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact the Office of International Programs (OIP). Staff can be reached by phone at 253-879-2515 or by e-mail:

Carmen Eyssautier, Acting Assoc. Director and Study Abroad Coordinator (ceyssautier@pugetsound.edu)

Eowyn Greeno, Acting Director and International Student Advisor (egreeno@pugetsound.edu)

Roy Robinson, Director (Away AY 2017-2018) (rrobinson@pugetsound.edu)

### PUGET SOUND OBJECTIVES FOR STUDY ABROAD EXPERIENCES

*To foster intercultural competence, cross-cultural communication skills, and personal development*

**KNOWLEDGE:** To develop a richer understanding of another culture and a broad competence that is applicable across a variety of intercultural contexts

**COMMUNICATION:** To develop skills and ability to engage in effective cross-cultural communication and understanding

**SELF-AWARENESS AND REFLEXIVITY:** To develop the ability to contextualize and understand alternative perspectives based on different cultural systems

*To foster global citizenship and appreciation of international diversity and interdependencies*

To develop a deeper understanding of global interconnectedness and diversity

To develop a stronger sense of social responsibility, social justice, and international power relationships

To foster civic engagement at home and abroad



<b>FACULTY LEADER</b>
-----------------------

Name:

Title:

Department:

Email:

Tel:

Will this program require a second faculty leader or staff member?  YES  NO

If yes, please provide contact information:

Name:

Title:

Department:

Email:

Tel:

Alternate faculty member (if needed):

Name:

Title:

Department:

Email:

Tel:

<b>PROGRAM INFORMATION</b>
----------------------------

Program Name:

Proposed Program Location(s):

Term(s) in which program will be offered:

Proposed number of months/weeks/days:

Frequency of program:

**ADMINISTRATION**

- 1. Please attach a letter of support from your Department Chair.**
2. In what way(s) does the program draw on faculty expertise? Describe your experience in the proposed location(s)?
3. Are other faculty members willing to serve as subsequent program directors?

**ACADEMIC COMPONENT**

**Proposed Course 1:**

Department and number:

Units:

Instructor(s):

Prerequisites:

**Proposed Course 2:**

Department and number:

Units:

Instructor(s):

Prerequisites:

**Please attach a course syllabus (or syllabi) that includes a general course description, the academic content of the course, the course objectives, the academic work required (readings, assignments, projects), the grading system and methods of assessment.**

1. Compared to programs already offered at Puget Sound, does this program provide qualitatively different or unique experiences that address the university's objectives for international education? (See objectives on page 1 of this document.)
2. How does this course(s) enhance the university's existing curriculum? How does this program relate to campus learning? Does the program support a globalized and internationalized on-campus curriculum?
3. Which academic need(s) does the program fill? Does the program contribute to coursework in a particular major/minor/program/department? How does this program complement current departmental offerings?
4. Does the program draw on partnerships with international universities and non-profit organizations? In what ways?
5. Does the program integrate foreign language courses (either pre-departure or while abroad)?
6. Will students complete a research project, participate in a service learning experience or internship?
7. In what ways does the program provide strong site utilization through interdisciplinary or discipline-based fieldwork or experiential engagement? Provide some justification for offering course off campus.
8. How will the location allow students opportunities to engage with cultures that are significantly different from those they experience in the U.S.?
9. How do you envision your role outside of the classroom?
10. How will students be selected for the program?

**ON-SITE LOGISTICS**

1. Are you partnering with a local university, service provider, or an International Education Organization (such as CIEE or SIT) to provide any services?

YES (please list their contact info below)  NO

Host University/Organization:

Contact Name:

Title:

Address:

Email:

Phone:

Website:

1. What kinds of support are provided on-site by the organization listed above?
2. How do you anticipate managing student issues/crises as they arise? Will you manage problems on your own or with the assistance of a program provider?
3. Please describe student accommodations and meal arrangements while abroad.
4. What will be the primary means of transportation? (for field trips, daily commuting, etc.)
5. Will students have access to computer labs, libraries and the internet?
6. Is the site accessible to students with disabilities? Are there any concerns related to accessibility of services for these students.
7. How is the on-site orientation organized? What does it include?
8. Is there other relevant on-site information?

**STUDENT RECRUITMENT**

1. Who is the target student population?
2. Why will the program (courses and location) appeal to the target population?
3. Are there enough students in the target population to meet the student recruitment needs?
4. Will this program attract students who are historically underrepresented in international education at Puget Sound?
5. How do you intend to promote the program?

**SAFETY AND SECURITY**

1. What are the potential safety and security risks and concerns?
2. How have safety and security on the program been vetted?
3. Have you met with the Title IX coordinator to learn about Faculty-Leader responsibilities and reporting requirements related to Title IX.?
4. How will cases of sexual violence/harassment be handled on-site? What type of support services are available? (<https://www.pugetsound.edu/sexual-misconduct-resource-center/>)

<b>HEALTH</b>
---------------

1. What are possible health risks in the locations of travel?
2. What are the local health resources?
3. Have you met with the director of CHWS to discuss how best to support students' mental and physical health as a Faculty-Leader.
4. How will cases of student mental health issues be handled?

<b>ESTIMATED PROGRAM BUDGET</b>
---------------------------------

**Please attach an estimated program budget. Contact the Director of International Programs for budget-related questions.**

1. The estimated budget should include:
  - Airfare
  - Housing
  - Meals
  - Field trips/excursions
  - Local transportation
  - Visa/departure fees
  - Immunizations/needed medicine
  - Course materials
  - Other

<b>OTHER</b>
--------------

1. Is there any additional information you would like the committee to consider regarding your proposal?

**Academic Standards Committee**  
**2017-18 Year-End Report to Faculty Senate**  
**Prepared by Spring Semester Chair, Danny McMillian**  
**April 14, 2018**

Faculty members on the Academic Standards Committee (ASC) are organized into two groups with individuals serving on the policy or petition subcommittee one semester and then, customarily, switching groups the following semester. This report contains a summary of the policy subcommittee's activities during the 2017-2018 academic year. See Appendix A for a list of policy subcommittee members for each semester. Note that a spring 2018 report from the petitions subcommittee will follow at the end of the term. A summary of the petitions subcommittee's fall work is below.

**Faculty Senate charges to the ASC for the 2017-18 academic year:**

- Review the policy of the university for the transfer of running start credits as articulated by the offices of the registrar and admissions.
- Review university policy regarding AP credit, in regards to fulfilling the foreign language requirement, major requirements, and the minimum AP exam score to receive credit.

**Work completed by the ASC Policy Subcommittee:**

- **Per the Faculty Senate charge to review AP credit in regards to fulfilling the foreign language requirement, major requirements, and the minimum AP exam score to receive credit, the policy subcommittee deliberated on this issue on three occasions.**
  - Questions concerning AP credit stem from a specific request from Kent Hooper regarding German AP credit (see ASC 2016-17 year-end report). His proposal: An AP German exam score of 3 provides one unit of credit to apply to the 32-unit graduation requirement and one unit toward the major. AP German exam score of 4 or 5 provides two units to apply to the 32-unit graduation requirement and two units toward the major. In the past, departments have given approval to the registrar to award AP credit based on scores. Major requirements are waived to place students at the appropriate level; awarding major credit would be new. The questions of consistency across programs was raised, as well as different implementation options.
  - In the fall of 2017, the policy subcommittee concluded that a good rationale was needed to suggest a policy that would result in differential units awarded for different language programs on campus.
  - In the spring of 2018, Sunil Kukreja contacted a professional association for teaching a foreign language and reported that there appears to be no standard recommended policy for awarding AP credit. Accordingly, the policy subcommittee decided to take no further action.

- **Per the Faculty Senate Charge to review the policy on Running Start credit, the policy subcommittee completed its review in the fall and recommended an amended policy.**
  - Colleen Mitchell provided background for the issues concerning awarding Running Start credit in the meeting on 9.12.17. The same course may or may not receive credit depending on when the student took the course, and UPS is more restrictive than all of our peers on awarding Running Start and College in the High School credit. Laura Martin-Fedich and Shannon Carr visited the committee on 10.10.17. They articulated the University's goal of bringing in more transfer students, and outlined in detail how our policy is hindering recruitment. Laura and Shannon returned again on 11.21.17 to lay out their ideal transfer credit policy, and answered questions at the start of the meeting. During the subsequent discussion, Michael Pastore made a simple proposal, extending Laura and Shannon's proposal: award transfer credit for accredited college course work up to 16 units, the same as for any transfer student, with Admissions free to recruit the best available students. Consequences and the pros and cons of such a policy were discussed at this meeting and the next, on 12.5.17. In particular, how would such a policy affect the Puget Sound college experience? Will students transferring in with significant credit receive less than a full Puget Sound Education? Is double counting of high school and college credit an issue of concern? Is College in the High School an experience of sufficient caliber to be included in the policy? See minutes for 11.21.17 and 12.5.17 for discussion details. At the 12.5.17 meeting Alyce Demarais moved a proposal, that was subsequently amended, that reads:
    - “The University of Puget Sound will accept up to 16 units of transfer credit. Most transfer credit is granted through:
      - Performance on the College Board Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate examinations.
      - Successful completion of course(s) through accredited colleges and universities, including concurrent enrollment programs.
      - Internationally recognized academic programs (such as Cambridge GCE A levels)”
  - Rationale: The rationale for presenting this motion is to move forward with policy changes that will attract high-achieving students to Puget Sound. With our current policy, we are dissuading some students with college credit taken in high school from attending Puget Sound. This policy change will help us be more competitive for students in the admissions market without reducing the quality of admitted students. Making a change to a more generous policy at this time will provide clear direction for our colleagues in Admission as they work to recruit and yield the Fall 2018 incoming class. **The committee unanimously approved the motion.** The committee decided that the need for a simple, uniform, comprehensive policy outweighed any reservations about various aspects of the policy, and that the new policy could significantly help the Institution without diluting the educational experience that we offer. Should the new policy meet the approval of the Senate and the Faculty, implementation work will need to be undertaken by the Registrar's office, and the ASC will need to consider modifications to the Academic Handbook and further policy ramifications.

- **Approved a proposal from the Registrar for AP-IP exam credit toward core requirements**
  - Proposal: Exam credit (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate High Level exams) may satisfy Core Requirements when deemed equivalent to core-fulfilling Puget Sound courses by the appropriate academic departments.
  - Background:
    - The transfer credit policy approved by the Academic Standards Committee on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 allows for transfer of coursework earned through concurrent enrollment programs such as Washington's College in the High School (CIHS) program.
    - In the CIHS program, students may receive a college transcript for coursework taught at their high school but approved by a university for credit. Many high schools designate such courses as AP/IB classes and allow students to A) take the AP/IB exam after completing the high school course, B) register and pay for CIHS transcription of that course, or C) do both. Students who opt to complete both options (taking the exam *and* paying to receive college credit on a university transcript) may thus enter the University of Puget Sound with both concurrent enrollment credit and exam credit for the same content.
    - Under the current policy, a student who took the AP exam would earn 1-2 units of credit, but would not be able to apply that credit toward our Core Requirements, regardless of course equivalency. A student who opted for only the CIHS credit would likely earn fewer units of credit (0.83 units for a 5-credit quarter system course), but would be able to use that transfer course to fulfill Core Requirements.
    - For a student who paid for and completed *both* options, we cannot award credit twice, but would have to:
      - Choose which kind of credit to award (if both, then always give AP or always give CIHS)
        - As new students frequently do not send in all transcripts/score reports immediately or report planned work in their Common Applications, it may be a few years into a student's Puget Sound career before we know they have both kinds of credit, so a blanket policy to pick one kind over the other could disadvantage a student down the road (losing core credit, for example, in favor of AP exam credit if the score report is sent in late).
      - Leave the choice to the student
        - New students will not yet know which option would be more beneficial to them, and allowing them to change their option later would pose a significant administrative burden.
    - The ideal solution then would be to change the policy to give such students the AP/IB exam credit *units* and *allow that credit to also fulfill Core requirements*.

- Additionally, as the only difference between a student taking the AP exam and one opting for CIHS credit is that the first student takes that additional exam, it is unfair to give advantage to CIHS credit over exam credit (or vice-versa), especially as this may disadvantage students who cannot afford the fees for both the exams and the CIHS transcribing and so choose only one option. As such, we should allow AP exams to fulfill Core Requirements, regardless of whether the student has also paid for CIHS transcribing.
  - **Discussion and Approval:** The rationale provided above by the Registrar’s Office was the starting point for a robust discussion. The primary factors leading to the vote for **unanimous approval** were: 1) the proposal removes indefensible inconsistencies between core credit given for AP/IB examinations and College in the High School, and 2) the proposal provides greater transparency for students (possibly leading to more efficient interaction with the Registrar’s Office). Please see the ASC minutes from March 6 and March 20 for a more complete record of the discussion.
- **Approved the Incomplete Grade Contract proposal, submitted by the Registrar**
  - Rationale: There is no documentation require for an incomplete grade. As such, the student may not know they were assigned an incomplete, or there may be disagreement about the work to be completed and the deadline for it.
  - Additionally, the committee approved changes to language in the Academic Handbook to ensure consistency with the new contract.
  - **Motion was approved.**
  - See Appendix B for details
- **Approved revision of the Dean’s List designation**
  - Background: Currently students make the Dean’s List if they are in the top 10% of the university based on GPA. The actual GPA fluctuates but in recent semesters the cut-off was between 3.80 and 3.90. At the same time, university honors can be received starting at a 3.70 GPA.
  - Motion: Change the criterion for the Dean’s List to a GPA equal to or greater than 3.70. **Motion was approved.**
- **Approved revision of the Disruptive Class Behavior Policy**
  - Motion: Change “sixth” week to “tenth” week in the policy on Disruptive Class Behavior. This brings consistency with our current policy on WF grades. **Motion was approved.**
- **Approved a proposal to rephrase the Last 8 units in residence policy to “Of the last 8 units earned, 6 units must be in residence.”**
  - This new option would ensure that our seniors would have at least 6 units of their senior year completed in residence. Six units is a fulltime year.
  - Rationale: The following data was used in developing this proposal, using the petition history since the Fall of 2015.
    - There have been 66 petitions to waive the last 8 units in residence.



- Of these 66 petitions, 64 were approved.
    - Of those 66 petitions, 2 petitions were denied.
    - Of those 66 petitions, 38 petitions were from students completing their final course(s) at another school. The approved unit value varied from 0.83 unit to a high of 4.00 units.
    - Interestingly, 7 students who successfully petitioned opted instead to stay and complete their courses at Puget Sound.
  - **Motion was approved.**
    - If this policy had been in place for petitions in the period since the Fall of 2015, the number of petitions would have been 6 instead of 66. There are policies currently in place to make sure our students do not transfer in specific senior courses.
    - The Connections and Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry II cores are not transferable.
    - We do not transfer vocational or technical courses; remedial or retraining courses; personal development, human potential or coping skills courses; professional or certificate courses.
    - Students may not transfer more than 16.00 units.
    - We limit Self-Paced and Distance Education to 4.00 units.
    - Note: Generally, courses must be approved prior to petition by department.
    - Note: Upper division major courses must be approved for transfer by the major department, and all repeat major courses must be approved by the department.
    - This reduction will allow the Academic Standards Petitions Committee, student advisors, and students to work on those academic issues that need consideration.
- **Review of ASC Petitions Report for Fall 2017**
  - The registrar's office presented the summary statistics for all petitions handled during the fall semester, up through January 10, 2018 (see Appendix C). It was noted that this is still a preliminary analysis. Additional data going back four years will be provided soon. Numbers on sanctions were not included in this report but will also be made available.
  - Some observations on the data:
    - There were more waivers of the last 8 in residence in fall 2017 than fall 2018 (15 vs. 7).
    - There were fewer petitions for medical withdrawal in fall 2017 than fall 2016 (5 vs. 22).
    - There are few denials of petitions overall (15 out of 144).
- **Considered the drop policy for the RISE program**
  - Background: The program provides sophomore students with opportunities for internships with an academic component, both locally and further afield. Students

enroll in a 1/4-unit course in their sophomore Spring term, where they take five short courses concerning aspects of preparing for an internship. At the end of summer the students prepare an ePortfolio final project to showcase their internship experience. The quarter unit course shows as In Progress through the summer, and on successful completion is posted on their transcript for the Spring, not the Fall. Not all students who take the Spring class end up with an internship. This occurs late in the Spring term, past the normal deadline for dropping a course without record. As success in securing an internship is partly out of the student's control, this seems unfair. Renee Houston asked that the committee consider the pros and cons of adjusting the policy for this program so that students can drop the course by the end of the Spring term without a W or WF appearing on their record.

- Discussion:
  - The Registrar noted that the academic handbook stipulates, “An IP grade may be converted to W or WF through the period of the original contract constituting the duration of the course but not after an Incomplete has been assigned” (Academic Handbook, pg. 18). This language suggests that the RISE instructor themselves could assign a W or WF as long as it was still during the stipulated duration of the course.
  - General sentiment was expressed that assigning a W if a student was unable to obtain an internship was a reasonable policy. It was noted that a student might object to a W on the grounds that the 5 RISE sessions in the spring are (approximately) the equivalent of attending the first two weeks of a 1 unit academic course. In such a case, a student can drop after the first two weeks with no record. It was also noted that the university does not use course hours as a standard of measurement.
- Consensus was to let this first iteration of RISE play out. Any drops can be handled through petitions. Ellen Peters and Renee Houston can come back in the fall to continue the discussion of a drop policy.
- **Considered proposal to amend the due date for final grades for the fall semester**
  - Rationale: Fall grades are due after the winter break making it difficult for the Registrar’s office to process sanctions and making it difficult for students who want to appeal a sanction.
  - Landon Wade proposed moving the due date for fall grades to a couple of days before the university closes for the winter break so students know their status over break and can have more time to work on their appeal.
  - A robust discussion, noted in the February 20 minutes, ended with a call to determine purview for this matter. Subsequent communication with the Faculty Senate determined that the issue is under the purview of the Curriculum Committee, ending discussion by the ASC.

### **Recommendation for New Charge in 2018-2019**

- Assist the JED committee on the following issues under the purview of the ASC:

- Develop a written medical leave of absence policy that meets JED Campus Criteria.
  - Develop a written mandatory leave of absence policy that meets JED Campus Criteria.
  - Develop a written return from leave policy that meets JED Campus Criteria.
  - Background: Lisa Ferrari met with the policy subcommittee and briefed on the JED initiative, a national program focused on suicide prevention and policies that support mental health. The JED foundation advises schools on assessing resources and policies and helps to guide toward best practices. Discussion in the fall of 2017 concluded that as the JED committee continues their work in the spring, they will episodically bring their work back to the ASC for review and input.
  - Current status: Although the JED committee stated a preference to conclude by May 2018, no additional information has been provide to the ASC to date.
- The ASC policy committee will have two meetings after submission of this report and briefing to the Faculty Senate on April 16. To assist the Faculty Senate in planning ASC charges in the upcoming academic year, those meetings will include discussion and prioritization of high-value policy reviews. Results of those discussions will be posted in the meeting minutes and shared directly with the Faculty Senate liaison.

## **Appendix A:**

**The members of the policy subcommittee of the ASC in Fall 2017:** Geoffrey Block, Amber Brock, Alyce DeMarais (secretary), Greg Elliott (chair), Sunil Kukreja, Kariann Lee, Landon Wade, Jan Leuchtenberger, Sarah Shives, Danny McMillian, Colleen Mitchell, Michael Pastore, Peter Sullivan, Ben Tucker, Hannah Katz(student), Helen Tschurr (student). The policy subcommittee met eight times in Fall 2017.

**The members of the policy subcommittee of the ASC in Spring 2018:** Richard Anderson-Connolly, Geoffrey Block, Amber Brock, America Chambers, Alyce DeMarais, Greg Elliott, Sunil Kukreja, Kariann Lee, Danny McMillian (chair), Colleen Mitchell, Michael Pastore, Sarah Shives, Ben Tucker, Landon Wade, Hannah Katz (student), and Helen Tschurr (student).

## **Appendix B: Incomplete Grade Policy Update Proposal**

An Incomplete grade (I) indicates that, although the work accomplished in a course is of passing quality, some limited portion of the coursework remains unfinished because of illness or other exceptional circumstance. The Incomplete should not be assigned initially when a W or WF would be the correct grade. The Incomplete also is not to be used to collect fees or equipment for which the student is obligated. An Incomplete grade may not be completed by attending the course when it is offered at a later date.

It is the responsibility of the student to request an Incomplete from the instructor prior to the last class session or the final examination period and to explain the exceptional circumstance. If the instructor decides that the request is not consistent with faculty grading policy or that the circumstance does not warrant an extension of time, the instructor will assign the appropriate final grade rather than an Incomplete.

In order for an incomplete grade (I) to be awarded, the instructor is required to complete an Incomplete Grade Contract available from the Office of the Registrar. The contract identifies the balance of work remaining; the date the work is due to the instructor; and a default grade. The default grade should be the grade the student would have earned had an Incomplete not been assigned. The contract must be signed by both instructor and student, and be submitted to the Office of the Registrar no later than the final grade due date. Following submission of the contract, the Registrar will enter the Incomplete grade into the student's record.

It is the responsibility of the student to complete the work by the end of the second week of the next regular semester, or by an earlier deadline set by the instructor, and to submit the work to the instructor. The instructor must not accept work after the second week of the next regular semester unless an extension has been approved by the Office of the Registrar.

It is the responsibility of the instructor to grade the work and to submit a Final Grade Submission form to the Office of the Registrar by the end of the third week of the next regular semester. If a grade is not submitted, and if an extension is not requested by the instructor, then the Registrar will enter the default grade from the Incomplete Grade Contract, or a grade of F if no default grade was supplied, into the student's permanent academic record. An Incomplete may not be changed to W, WF, or AU.

When an Incomplete is assigned in the last term of study prior to graduation, the degree will not be awarded until the next regular degree granting date after submission of a satisfactory grade by the instructor.

## Appendix C: ASC Petitions Report

Row Labels	Fall 2017			Fall 2016		
	Approve	Denied	Grand Total	Approve	Denied	Grand Total
Late-Add Within the Automatic 'W' Period	19	0	19	7	0	7
Late-Add After the Automatic 'W' Deadline	1		1	3	0	3
Readmission After Dismissal or Suspension	9	6	15	10	10	20
Re-enrollment after Medical Withdrawal	5		5	6	3	9
Re-Enrollment After Complete Withdrawal	2		2	0	0	0
Registration for Classes with Time Conflict	36	4	40	34	2	36
Medical Withdrawal	4	1	5	22	0	22
Waiver of Last Eight Units in Residence	15	1	16	7	0	7
Concurrent Enrollment	6	1	7	2	0	2
Course Repeat for Second Time	6	0	6	2	0	2
Waiver of 6-Year Matriculation-Graduation Requirement	3	0	3	1	0	1
Waiver of Minimum GPA for an Independent Study	6	0	6	2	0	2
Enrollment in Independent Study Without Experience	1	0	1	0	0	0
Enrollment in Independent Study Prior to Junior Year	0	0	0	2	0	2
Regularly Offered Course as Independent Study	0	0	0	0	1	1
Waiver of a Core Requirement	0	1	1	0	0	0
Rescind Academic Sanction	0	0	0	1	0	1
Completion of Foreign Language by Altnerate Courses	4	1	5	4	0	4

Registration Change from Graded to Pass/Fail	0	0	0	0	1	1
Drop Without Record After the Deadline	3	0	3	0	1	1
Drop With 'W' After Automatic 'W' Deadline	5	0	5	3	3	6
Miscellaneous	2	0	2	0	1	1
Waiver of KNOW Requirement	2	0	2	1	0	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>129</b>

March 20, 2018  
TO: Faculty Senate  
FR: Academic Standards Committee  
RE: Exam Credit Counting toward Core requirements

The following proposal was unanimously approved by the policy subcommittee of the Academic Standards Committee on March 20, 2018.

**Proposal:**

Exam credit (including Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate High Level exams) may satisfy Core Requirements when deemed equivalent to core-fulfilling Puget Sound courses by the appropriate academic departments.

**Rationale** (per a March 2, 2018 memo from the University Registrar's Office, Colleen Mitchell, Amber Brock and Michael Pastore)

The transfer credit policy approved by the Academic Standards Committee on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017 allows for transfer of coursework earned through concurrent enrollment programs such as Washington's College in the High School (CIHS) program.

In the CIHS program, students may receive a college transcript for coursework taught at their high school but approved by a university for credit. Many high schools designate such courses as AP/IB classes and allow students to A) take the AP/IB exam after completing the high school course, B) register and pay for CIHS transcription of that course, or C) do both. Students who opt to complete both options (taking the exam *and* paying to receive college credit on a university transcript) may thus enter the University of Puget Sound with both concurrent enrollment credit and exam credit for the same content.

Under the current policy, a student who took the AP exam would earn 1-2 units of credit, but would not be able to apply that credit toward our Core Requirements, regardless of course equivalency. A student who opted for only the CIHS credit would likely earn fewer units of credit (0.83 units for a 5-credit quarter system course), but would be able to use that transfer course to fulfill Core Requirements.

For a student who paid for and completed *both* options, we cannot award credit twice, but would have to:

A) Choose which kind of credit to award (if both, then always give AP or always give CIHS)

As new students frequently do not send in all transcripts/score reports immediately or report planned work in their Common Applications, it may be a few years into a student's Puget Sound career before we know they have both kinds of credit, so a blanket policy to pick one kind over the other could disadvantage a student down the road (losing core credit, for example, in favor of AP exam credit if the score report is sent in late).

B) Leave the choice to the student

New students will not yet know which option would be more beneficial to them, and allowing them to change their option later would pose a significant administrative burden.

The ideal solution then would be to change the policy to give such students the AP/IB exam credit *units* and *allow that credit to also fulfill Core requirements*.



Additionally, as the only difference between a student taking the AP exam and one opting for CIHS credit is that the first student takes that additional exam, it is unfair to give advantage to CIHS credit over exam credit (or vice-versa), especially as this may disadvantage students who cannot afford the fees for both the exams and the CIHS transcripting and so choose only one option. As such, we should allow AP exams to fulfill Core Requirements, regardless of whether the student has also paid for CIHS transcripting.

### **ASC Policy Subcommittee Discussion**

The rationale provided above by the Registrar's Office was the starting point for a robust discussion. The primary factors leading to the vote for unanimous approval were: 1) the proposal removes indefensible inconsistencies between core credit given for AP/IB examinations and College in the High School, and 2) the proposal provides greater transparency for students (possibly leading to more efficient interaction with the Registrar's Office).

Please see the ASC minutes from March 6 and March 20 for a more complete record of the discussion.