



- Members of the committee felt that the wording in faculty selection was too absolute. A better choice would be “preference” as it would provide OIP with flexibility when absolutely necessary. (The revised text would be: Preference will be given to faculty from departments/programs already using a specific Approved Program will be eligible for participation on site reviews for that program.) There could be a case where there is a fantastic, gung ho, faculty member from a department that has not approved the program but might draw the department in or create an energy with this opportunity versus faculty members from departments who approve the program but aren’t strong evaluators.
- The committee suggested shortening the nominating letter to one page and including the committee’s advisory role in selecting evaluators in the document. Cori will make recommended changes to document and redistribute.
- OIP’s concern with less precise language is that it causes lots of trouble when someone is unhappy with the final decision. The committee thought that there may be mechanisms that will diffuse the likelihood of those situations. The role of this committee as an advisory body is one. The nature of the evaluations themselves and how much work they require is another. Once people realized how much is involved there will be a self selecting process.
- The committee ultimately decided that some people will get upset at the decisions made no matter what the guidelines state. That the existence of stricter guidelines won’t necessarily protect one from the decisions made. It would be better to at least give oneself some flexibility just in case it is needed.
- It was mentioned that having this flexibility might allow the cultivation of interest in study abroad among faculty. OIP strongly believed that it should not be seen as a faculty development opportunity. Several committee members said the trouble with not allowing it as any type of development opportunity is that there aren’t many

