

Faculty-led Proposal Review Rubric

Faculty-led Proposal Rubric for FLPS Members

All faculty-led proposals submitted for the January 15, 2026 proposal deadline will be reviewed by the Faculty-led Study Away Programs Subcommittee (FLPS) members using the rubric below. FLPS members will independently review each proposal in advance of the FLPS meeting when the proposal is discussed. The rubric will be completed as a Qualtrics survey.

Instructions for FLPS members: Please complete the rubric below evaluating the faculty-led proposal. Please include comments if answering "strongly disagree," "somewhat disagree," or "no" for any questions. Please contact Kathy Jicinsky (kathy.jicinsky@winona.edu) with questions about the Qualtrics survey.

Part 1: Program General Information

1.1 If this is a repeat proposal, the changes that were described are appropriate.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
N/A

1.2 The minimum/maximum enrollment numbers are appropriate.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

1.3 Comments on Part 1: Program General Information (open ended)

Part 2: Course Information & Program Itinerary

2.1 The number of credits correlates with the itinerary and assignments.

Yes
No

2.2 Course Information Template: The course learning outcomes connect to the program location and activities.

Yes
No

2.3 Draft Itinerary: The program itinerary includes sufficient activities to satisfy the needs of the program.

Yes
No

2.4 Comments on Part 2: Course Information & Program Itinerary (open ended)

Part 3: Recruitment & Intended Audience

3.1 The target audience is described adequately.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

3.2 The recruitment strategy was explained in detail.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

3.3 Comments on Part 3: Recruitment & Intended Audience (open ended)

Part 4: Program Leader(s) Information

4.1 The number of program leaders and their familiarity with the site(s) is appropriate given the scope of the program.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

4.2 The program leaders described in sufficient detail how responsibilities will be shared (if applicable).

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
N/A

4.3 If there is more than one leader, both/all leaders' roles are sufficiently described and needed (if applicable).

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
N/A – there is only one leader

4.4 A replacement faculty leader has been identified.

Yes
No

Comments on Part 4: Program Leader(s) Information (open ended)

Part 5: Program Logistics

5.1 Sufficient detail was provided regarding third-party provider and/or on-site contacts.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

5.2 Comments on Part 5: Program Logistics (open ended)

Part 6: Preparing Students to Travel

6.1 Health and safety issues are clearly articulated for the destination(s).

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

6.2 Physical capacities or skills required are adequately described.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

6.3 Are there any deviations in program leader travel?

With safety and fairness to all participants as primary goals, students and program leaders are expected to travel as a group to the destination, throughout the program, and return together. If a program leader wishes to deviate, they must discuss this with the Assistant Director during the early planning phases of the program.

Yes
If Yes, 6.3.1 Explain the deviation(s) in program leader travel. (open ended)
No

6.4 Plan for pre-departure meetings with students are adequate and well explained.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree

6.5 If spouse/partner and/or dependent children are accompanying, sufficient detail was provided regarding accommodations and oversight, and appropriate rationale was given.

Strongly agree
Somewhat agree
Somewhat disagree
Strongly disagree
N/A

6.6 Comments on Part 6: Health and Safety (open ended)

Part 7: Overall Evaluation, Recommendation, and Comments

7.1 The proposed faculty-led program is within the scope of the [WSU mission](#) and integrated into the curriculum of the University (e.g., courses must be appropriate for a university-level curriculum).

Yes

No

7.2 Based on my review, this proposal should be:

Approved

Decision pending minor revisions (option to enter explanatory text) – *Program leader will resubmit proposal with changes. Revisions will be approved by FLPS Chair. No additional FLPS approval vote needed.*

Decision pending major revisions (option to enter explanatory text) – *Program leader will resubmit proposal with changes. Revised proposal will be re-reviewed by FLPS and re-voted on for approval.*

Denied

7.3 Final comments, notes, questions, etc.