

**GLOBAL SUMMER PROGRAM WORKING COMMITTEE MEETING 2011  
OUTCOMES FROM THE 5TH MEETING**  
17 – 18 September, University of Copenhagen

Agenda	Meeting Outcomes	Action by/ Notes
1.1	<b>GSP Course Reports</b>	
	<p>The GSP Working Committee agreed that the 2011 courses were a continuation and refinement of the program. Response from students was positive overall. Other highlights from course coordinators included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The field trips and extracurricular activities, enabling good interaction between participants and faculty</li> <li>• NUS' Southeast Asia in Context had 32 students this year, and noted that it was a good class size to work with. It previously had 52 students in 2010 and 41 students in 2009. Berkeley also observed that of its two courses, Media &amp; Society with nine students interacted better than its Peacekeeping course with 35 students.</li> <li>• It is important to encourage interaction between students – for example, students attending Copenhagen's Security course shared that they overcame their initial shyness and language barriers to offer their ideas.</li> <li>• Through the development and refinement of their GSP courses, Cambridge shared that students were coping well with subject areas beyond their comfort zones, despite being at different levels of academic abilities. It also welcomed its first mature student from Berkeley.</li> <li>• Copenhagen reported that its three courses – Security, Ageing and Kierkegaard will continue for the next two to three years. The Security and Ageing courses were chosen to complement existing IARU initiatives, and Kierkegaard was a region-specific or specialist offering from Denmark.</li> <li>• Yale and Copenhagen (Security) invited guest speakers, and students enjoyed the opportunity to interact with a variety of presenters.</li> </ul>	

	<p>GSP coordinators highlighted the following challenges/observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students’ proficiency in the English language continued to be a concern in some cases. These students were unable to participate confidently and effectively in discussions.</li> <li>• Lower level of grading may harm the reputation of a course, especially if significantly different from the home institutions. This did not go unnoticed by students.</li> <li>• Partners agreed that it was important to have a few local students participating in GSP courses to provide the local context and interactions.</li> <li>• Berkeley acknowledged that they had an over-representation of local students in their Peacekeeping course and this did not augur well, as there was an expectation of a good mix of students from IARU institutions.</li> <li>• Need to manage students’ expectations well, especially if the courses on offer differed from what was publicized to students, e.g. state upfront if the course is not fully represented by students from all IARU institutions, or send out a participant list in advance.</li> <li>• ETH Zurich shared that while the two-week long courses it offered on Robotics was a success in Zurich, it was not successful as a GSP program as it was too technical. Faculty feedback that it created too much paperwork for just three students.</li> <li>• Copenhagen’s Security course was one of the last to run (August 2011). A major consideration was to coincide the course with their parliamentary session. This provided students an opportunity to meet with the ministry for a discussion surrounding the drafting of the IPCC report.</li> </ul>	All to note
	<p>This year, ETH Zurich offered a third summer course in Sustainability – UpCycling. Although it did not meet the “go-live” deadline to qualify as a GSP course, it was opened to all IARU partners.</p>	
	<p>In response to student concerns about the tsunami and earthquake of March 2011, Todai adopted the following steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A guidebook and other preparedness measures were provided to all students.</li> <li>• Tuition and accommodation fees were only collected upon arrival, a deviation from the norm of collecting these upon acceptance. Eventually, only 2 out of 27 students declined their offers because of concerns regarding earthquake.</li> </ul>	

1.2	<b>GSP2011 Overview/Snapshot</b>	
	<p>A total of 19 courses were conducted this year. In terms of applications, 768 were received this year compared to 1065 last year. Some agreed that this was not necessarily a cause for concern but others commented that the drop in applicants needed to be looked into, as it would affect the competitive nature of the selection process. Application rates might improve if GSP conducted more effective publicity for this program.</p> <p>On student mobility and participation, partners were committed to maintain or enable greater student mobility in the coming years. Several partners voiced that relevance of course content and diminishing financial support, despite receiving grants, may have caused the slight drop in student mobility figures/participation this year.</p> <p>Copenhagen asked whether each partner should try to set a benchmark or goal for student mobility, e.g. should each try to achieve a balance of incoming and outgoing students. The committee agreed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To explore offering up to three places to each institution, including its own students, per course</li> <li>• To explore sending two to three students to each course</li> <li>• Nominate up to two backup students, to take up places that may not have been taken up by other institutions</li> </ul> <p>The committee agreed that if the course capacity was raised to about 30 students (from the suggested 10 - 25), it would still be a manageable course size and course quality would not be compromised.</p>	All to note
1.3	<b>Questionnaire Analysis</b>	
	<p>Prof Khatharya UM (Berkeley) and Dr XIA Hongwei (Beida) took the committee through a longitudinal analysis on the feedback received from GSP course participants from 2009 to 2011. The following key observations were made.</p> <p><u>Course Quality and Experience</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive experience about GSP: 94.5% to 95%</li> <li>• Rigor of courses: 81.3% to 88.3%</li> <li>• Work with outstanding peers: 91.2% to 93.9%</li> <li>• Work with outstanding professors: 79.1% to 80.6%</li> <li>• Tackle major challenges of the 21st century: 80.2% to 82.9%</li> </ul> <p><u>Unique Character of the GSP</u></p> <p>A significant improvement in its ability to distinguish itself as a unique summer program that is different from other summer program offerings: 60.5% to 82.8%.</p> <p><u>Improvements Needed</u></p> <p>The feedback indicated three areas that need further improvement (under 75%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-departure course information: 59.3% to 64.4%</li> <li>• Usefulness of information on IARU website: 65.9%-74.8%</li> <li>• Awareness about IARU before the GSP: 17.6% to 37.6%</li> </ul>	All to note

	<p>Analysis of the 2011 feedback (using SPSS) provided the following insights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Course content on global issues or culture scored better overall</li> <li>• Students from ANU, NUS and Cambridge indicated the strongest awareness for IARU</li> <li>• Students from courses with high interaction and participatory-styled teaching have higher numbers of students signing up in the GSP Facebook page</li> <li>• While it remains a critical factor, cost is becoming less of a consideration for students, as some partners have been actively sourcing sponship and providing support for incoming/outgoing students.</li> </ul> <p>The meeting commented that this information would be useful for their internal analysis.</p> <p>The meeting proposed surveying or inviting feedback from other channels, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students who did not choose to apply for GSP to seek areas of improvement and if there were any curriculum gaps</li> <li>• Administrators, on how to improve logistics</li> </ul> <p>It was also suggested that we should further review the survey portion on course content and rigor as it is currently rather vague.</p>	<p>GSP2011 analysis by Xia Hongwei (Bedia)</p>  <p>GSP2011 Analysis - XHW.doc</p> <p>Secretariat to review</p> <p>Secretariat to review</p>
<b>1.4</b>	<b>Analyzing GSP2011 &amp; Future Directions of GSP</b>	
	<p>Prof William Whobrey (Yale) shared with the committee that the GSP started out as an endeavor that few thought would take off and yet this year marked the completion of its fourth successful season. GSP remains an effective combination of top down vision from Presidents and bottom up individual efforts by all ten partners determined to develop a slew of summer programs along broadly uniformed outlines on course design and conditions.</p> <p>The committee agreed that it was important to not lose sight of what was working well for the program and to keep working at it, and at the same time, there was a need to start thinking about the future of GSP to ensure that it continues to grow while remaining relevant and of high quality.</p>	

	<p><u>Defining the GSP brand /what GSP stands for:</u> The Working Committee acknowledged that the strong interaction that students get from their peers across the ten member universities is a key characteristic of the program and continues to be a draw factor</p> <p>The term “boutique program” conveys exclusivity and elitism, and should be avoided. Rather, the GSP is “unique, special and distinctive” and these were the qualities to be conveyed.</p> <p>The key principles – academically rigorous; highly interdisciplinary courses; addressing global challenges; commitment to excellence and raising awareness about the complexity of the world, remain relevant and should be retained, and built upon.</p> <p>GSP has succeeded as a program because every member was engaged and committed to creating a unique learning experience. The rigor of the selection process by each partner institution should not be underestimated as many students value being selected/nominated.</p>	All of note
	<p><u>IARUness:</u> GSP, as a distinct summer program, run by ten leading research-intensive universities is a natural attraction and can generate good level of applications if the program was well publicised.</p> <p>The committee debated the need for students to have greater awareness of IARU. After some discussion, it was agreed that it was desirable but not necessary. The post-course survey confirmed that most students did not know about IARU before attending the GSP and it did not prevent them from benefitting from the course. It was agreed that it was more important for faculty and staff to get to know IARU and how to leverage on the Alliance.</p>	
	<p><u>Improving Publicity for GSP:</u> All partners agreed that there was a need to strengthen the publicity of GSP courses.</p> <p>The following were some suggestions to improve publicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Word-of-mouth is a very effective form of publicity (e.g. leverage on past participants, inviting them to future recruitment sessions)</li> <li>• Consider post-documentation of students’ experiences. It can be by way of blog posts (Berkeley does this well), electronic journals, or interview videos (Yale has done this).</li> <li>• To consider creating an e-newsletter for recruitment and creating awareness about the GSP</li> <li>• Target publicity at students’ “interest groups” or the corresponding faculty/departments in addition to general publicity</li> </ul> <p>Partners said that the posters and t-shirts were well received and they would continue to use them. The Secretariat agreed to prepare an updated poster for GSP2012. The brochure will no longer be produced, as many did not find it useful.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>The Secretariat will organize the next mass t-shirt order at the end of 2011</p>

	<p><u>Improving course administration</u> The committee acknowledged the feedback received and agreed that more work needs to be done in this area to bring about the required improvements. All partners agreed to work on a FAQ and this will be made available on the GSP website.</p> <p>The committee agreed that it was the responsibility of the receiving university to ensure that all course participants are properly briefed prior to their departure for the course.</p> <p>On visa application, it was emphasized that students have to read all the requirements clearly.</p> <p>Pre-course interactions may help clarify administrative related queries and issues, as well as serve as an icebreaker even before the course begins. Participants can interact via Facebook pages created by Secretariat or course conveners or Skype.</p> <p><u>Main GSP Facebook 2011 Listing:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">ANU1</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">ETH1</a>, <a href="#">ETH2</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">NUS1</a>, <a href="#">NUS2</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">PKU1</a>, <a href="#">PKU2</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">TOK1</a>, <a href="#">TOK2</a>, <a href="#">TOK3</a>, <a href="#">TOK4</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">UCB1</a>, <a href="#">UCB2</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">CAM1</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">KU1</a>, <a href="#">KU2</a>, <a href="#">KU3</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">OXF1</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Yale1</a></li> </ul>	<p>All to note The Secretariat will prepare a FAQ list</p> <p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p>
	<p><u>Course duration:</u> Students requested a longer duration for GSP courses. However, in places such as Copenhagen, Berkeley, Beida and Todai, it does not correspond with their vacation timetable. Partners will encourage their faculty to extend the duration of the GSP courses where possible.</p> <p>Yale has a requirement for the courses to run for a minimum of four weeks to be able to grant credits and receive financial aid. Yale would discuss this with institutions with short duration courses to see if two or three of its courses can be presented in one transcript to qualify as a single course.</p> <p>Yale is proposing building in research duration as an add-on/ enhancement to the GSP as students are already there – it is one way to break beyond classroom style teaching and discussions, and in-line with a research-intensive university. Berkeley is doing the same with its field engagement, i.e. Peacekeeping field study in Costa Rica.</p>	<p>All ot note</p>

	<p><u>Course design and themes:</u> Beida and Berkeley proposed that members should carefully review the list of offerings, in particular courses that have overlapping themes. Yale suggested internally examining trends of students going abroad, and sharing them with GSP coordinators for future course development.</p> <p>In the development of new courses, partners suggested inviting faculty members from a partner university to give inputs on newly developed courses. GSP coordinators may be approached for introductions to a specific faculty member or department.</p> <p>When approaching faculty to design/conduct GSP courses, ETH Zurich shared that it was helpful to share with them the GSP principles to give them a sense of GSP's aims and requirements. Partners establishing new courses were encouraged to do the same.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>GSP coordinators to facilitate</p> <p>All to note</p>
	<p><u>GSP Funding/Sponsorship</u> The Secretariat informed the meeting that grants from the central funds to support the GSP, approved by IARU presidents over the last two years, were not sustainable, and alternative funding should be sought. Oxford and Yale shared that Banco Santander was providing US\$10,000 and US\$55,000 respectively for in-coming GSP participants. NUS and PKU shared that they were receiving Santander funds for other education related initiatives.</p> <p>The meeting agreed to a two-prong approach to secure external funding: 1) Centrally by the Secretariat and 2) locally by partner institutions. Partners who would be making a local approach may consult Oxford, Yale, NUS or PKU for advice on what has worked in securing local funding.</p> <p>Other possible sources of funding suggested were with the Rockefeller Foundation and respective National Institutes for Research or Education.</p> <p><i>Post meeting note:</i> Students from Todai, Yale and Berkeley are also supported by Friends of Todai, a New York based institution. Eight grants worth US\$3,000 were provided in 2011. 2012 sponsorship details are yet to be confirmed.</p> <p>Berkeley suggested securing funding of at least US\$2,000 per student, providing for both incoming and outgoing students. It was suggested that such funds should be channeled to less popular or newer courses to encourage greater participation.</p>	<p>All to note Secretariat to approach Santander</p> <p>Partners to note</p> <p>All to note</p>

	<p><u>Tuition Fees</u> The committee revisited the principle which stipulates that “GSP costs are minimized for students as much as possible, both by sending institutions providing aid, as well as hosting institutions minimizing tuition and other costs”. Cambridge and Oxford have offered to look into the possibility of providing incoming aid, as they are unable to waive tuition fees. Other partners charging full or partial tuition fees were encouraged to look into this possibility as well.</p>	All to note
	<p><u>Future of GSP</u> In addition to the four key areas discussed, i.e. awareness, logistics, content and funding, partners shared the following suggestions to strengthen the GSP brand and its offerings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More faculty exchange to conduct GSP courses. For example, Cynthia Chou (KU) co-taught for NUS’ ‘Southeast Asia in Context’ course.</li> <li>• Yale extended an invitation for partners to send faculty applications to co-teach summer courses.</li> <li>• NUS added that a GSP course, or collaboration may happen with the movement of faculty members from PKU, Yale and Berkeley on its CREATE Campus (Campus for Research Excellence and Technological Enterprise)</li> <li>• Berkeley might be able to offer a Visiting Professor scholarship to partners who were sending a large number of students to its summer program</li> <li>• ETH Zurich will be conducting a course on food security, including building an iPhone app that can inform the user about its origins and other interesting details. Interested partner faculties are invited to co-teach this program.</li> <li>• Copenhagen and Beida were embarking on the possibility of running a collaborative GSP course on ageing, involving either faculty exchange with the possibility of hosting this on alternative years.</li> <li>• Organizing a large scale, thematic course for GSP done on rotation in our campuses</li> <li>• Online component or module, similar to the program run between Yale, Harvard and NUS</li> <li>• In the longer term – explore the possibility of a “collaboration of summer activities” ranging from GSP, internships, research, summer lab fellows, etc.</li> </ul>	All to note
	<p>An area IARU wishes to progress is the Global Internship Program. Although the GSP Working Committee had decided (in 2010) that it was not able to manage internships, they were prepared to consider offering opportunities under the IARU banner for the 2012 summer. Beida supported the idea, adding that if students combine their GSP experience with internships, it would be much more meaningful.</p> <p>Yale suggested creating greater synergies with the Sustainability Student Fellows or Sustainability Officers. While the groups were different, there might be value in creating linkages to see how they might work together.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will make a call for internships, &amp; submit a general guideline for GIP-style internships.</p> <p>All to note</p>

	Beida highlighted that its Sustainability Intern volunteered to assist with students attending its GSP courses. This enabled better interaction, and indirectly spreading IARUness to other participants.	
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Post GSP Course Alumni Survey</b>	
	<p>The majority of the meeting supported the proposal to run a post-course survey with alumni participants from the 2008, 2009 and 2010 GSP. The purpose of this survey is to obtain a better sense of the impact of GSP especially after participants have graduated from university. The survey results may also be used for approaching potential sponsors, and for reporting to Presidents and Senior Officers.</p> <p>In constructing the survey questions, it should be recognized that a three or four-week program was unlikely to be a life changing experience. Possible questions may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where are they working now? (i.e. in graduate studies, global careers)</li> <li>• Are they making use of the GSP/IARU network?</li> <li>• If they have done more than one GSP course / IARU internship</li> </ul> <p>It was acknowledged that contacting past participants would be a challenge. The Secretariat does not have a complete record of all past GSP course participants (several partner universities' policies do not allow for the release of such information) and most emails were institutional emails and most of these were likely to be inactive accounts. Home institutions offered to contact past participants with the Secretariat providing the survey link. It was also suggested that Facebook be used as a channel to reach out to past GSP participants.</p> <p>The Secretariat will work with Dr Jane Edwards (Yale) to refine the survey questions, and work out the logistics for the survey including the timeframe for conducting the survey.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p>
<b>2.2</b>	<b>New Courses / Initiatives</b>	
	<p><u>Global Flows</u> Berkeley (lead), NUS and Oxford shared their initial ideas on a proposal entitled "Global flows" - a multi-level collaboration on topics related to migration bringing together many related centers as well as rich sources of data from these three partner institutions. There was strong potential for this initiative to be developed into a sophisticated GSP module, as well as a platform for graduate and undergraduate mentorship or research.</p> <p>The meeting gave their support for this proposal. Prof Khatharya Um (Berkeley) invited others to join this collaboration if there was interest. Berkeley, NUS and Oxford would work together to further develop this proposal and obtain the support of IARU Senior Officers at the October 2011 meeting in Canberra.</p>	<p>Global Flows Proposal:</p>  <p>Um proposal GLOBAL FLOWS.docx</p> <p>Berkeley, NUS &amp; Oxford</p>

	<p><u>New courses for GSP 2012</u>  The meeting discussed ideas for new courses and confirmed the courses that would be offered for the 2012 GSP. All partners were requested to submit basic course details to the Secretariat by 3 October 2011. These would be compiled and tabled to the 2011 Senior Officers' Meeting for information. It would also be circulated to all GSP coordinators for internal review.</p>	All to note
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Coordination Matters</b>	
	<p>The single point of contact adopted by ANU, Todai, Yale and Beida has worked well for students participating in the GSP as well as fellow GSP Coordinators. Confusion is minimized when there is one person who acts as the liaison point between internal areas of the university, such as housing, enrolments, finance offices, etc, and the students/counterparts from partner institutions. Although desirable, this arrangement is not possible with the decentralized organizational structures of several partners.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that partners without a single point of contact should 1) minimize the contact points as far as possible, and 2) indicate the contact points clearly and early to all incoming students and other GSP coordinators. ANU requested that, where possible, the multiple contacts share a single email address (e.g. iarugsp@anu.edu.au) and have the main point of contact in the copy of all key emails to students.</p> <p>The meeting also discussed the usefulness of including a flowchart on each partner's course website, providing information on 1) step-by-step processes for pre-departure and upon arrival, and 2) contact persons. These could also be included as part of the welcome handbook. All coordinators also agreed to simplify housing and visa matters.</p> <p>The Secretariat would distribute three forms to all GSP Coordinators for their follow up after the meeting.  Part I (by 3 October) – a listing of courses offered for the 2012 GSP;  Part II (by 19 December) – all course information for uploading on the IARU website and contact information; and  Part III (by 2 March) – payment details and schedules.</p> <p>Partners requested including minimum attendance requirement, cancellation policy and style of teaching as part of the course information.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that only pre-application information will be published on the IARU website. Acceptance and pre-departure information would be published on the respective course website, course handbook or through direct email communications.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p> <p>Partners to provide information by stated deadlines</p> <p>Secretariat to include in web form</p> <p>All to note; please see ETH Zurich's All Just Rubbish <a href="#">handbook</a>.</p>

<b>3.2</b>	<b>Proposed Timeline for GSP</b>	
	The meeting discussed and agreed to the timeline to prepare for the 2012 GSP (indicated in the attachment).	 GSP2012 Timeline (v28Sep).pptx
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Review of GSP Working Committee Meeting</b>	
	<p>The committee discussed the requirement to meet annually in September and re-affirmed that it was important to do so. On the policy of holding the GSP Meeting back to back with EAIE, it was decided that an alternating year approach would be adopted, i.e. the meeting will alternate between European/EAIE venues, and non-European venues. This would give non-European partners the opportunity to host the GSP Meeting on their home campus.</p> <p>The meeting agreed that the 2012 GSP Working Committee Meeting would be held at Peking University on 24 – 25 September.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>All to note</p>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Central e-Application System</b>	
	<p>As a follow up to the proposal at the 2010 GSP Working Committee Meeting to set up an e-application system, the Secretariat updated the committee that it would cost about US\$40,000 and six months to develop such a system. The system had to be fairly sophisticated to meet the various unique requirements of all partners including direct access, and flexibility to choose different formats (e.g. Excel, Word) when churning out application information.</p> <p>In view of the significant resources required to develop such a system, the committee agreed to stay with the current manual application system, as the application numbers were not large. It was agreed that if the GSP grew and application numbers increased significantly, the need for such a system would have to be revisited. In the meantime, ANU and NUS shared that they would be using their own e-application systems, and would be re-directing interested students from IARU’s “How to Apply” webpage via weblink to their respective e-application sites.</p>	<p>All to note</p> <p>ANU and NUS to provide an e-application weblink</p>
<b>3.5</b>	<b>IARU Website Revamp</b>	
	<p>The Secretariat updated the meeting that the revamped website was launched on 4 April 2011. The revamp had two key objectives; 1) to make the website more user-friendly and 2) to reorganize the content into the four agreed categories (Global Education Initiatives, Joint Working, Grand Challenge and Research).</p> <p>The revamped website has been designed to allow GSP coordinators to self-edit their own course pages, after the Secretariat has uploaded the initial writeup. An automatic email would be sent to the Secretariat whenever an edit was made and the Secretariat would inform all partners if there were important changes made to a course profile.</p>	<p>All to note</p>

	<p>To familiarize coordinators, a virtual demonstration on how to edit GSP pages would be conducted before information “goes live” on 9 January 2012. Coordinators may also refer to the manual or approach the Secretariat for assistance.</p>	<p>All to note</p>  <p>GSP Website Manual.pdf</p>
	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	
	<p>Cambridge shared that the IARU Alumni Directors have collaborated to produce the first “Alumni GSP”. Madingley Hall, Cambridge will organize “Treasure Houses and Power Houses: the University’s Museums and their Role in the Future” on 12 – 18 August 2012. The alumni GSP will be hosted on rotation on various IARU campuses.</p> <p>More information will be circulated to GSP coordinators. 45 – 50 places will be made available for this Alumni GSP.</p>	<p>For more information, visit:  <a href="http://www.ice.cam.ac.uk/component/content/article/900">http://www.ice.cam.ac.uk/component/content/article/900</a></p>
	<p><b>Conclusion</b></p>	
	<p>The Chair thanked all GSP Coordinators and their colleagues for another successful GSP season. As a wrap up to the meeting, he summarized the key decisions made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GSP program was developing well, and the Working Committee agreed, after much discussion, that the best approach, for now, was to let it grow and evolve incrementally</li> <li>• In the area of funding, it was agreed that a two-prong approach would be taken to seek external funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Secretariat would approach Banco Santander to seek funding for the IARU GSP; and</li> <li>- Individual partners will approach the local branch of Santander for support</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The GSP Working Committee will continue to meet annually with the timing and venue for this meeting tied to EAIE on an alternating year basis. The 2012 GSP Working Committee Meeting will be held at and hosted by Peking University on 24-25 September.</li> </ul> <p>In closing, the Chair thanked the University of Copenhagen for hosting the 2011 IARU GSP Working Committee Meeting, specifically Dr John E Andersen and his team for the warm hospitality and the excellent meeting arrangements and support. He also thanked all GSP Coordinators and their colleagues for their participation and contributions at this meeting, and wished everyone a safe journey home.</p>	