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Travel Awards Committee Midterm Report, 2015–2016
As Submitted by Brian A. Coussens, chair of the Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee

Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee Members
Brian A. Coussens (Chair), Religious Studies
Katelin McCulloch, Classics
Kailey Rocker, Anthropology
Nathan Rodeberg, Chemistry
Leah Townsend, Neurobiology

Summary of Awards through December 2015
(see Appendix 5 for full information on awards, including winners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#Apps</th>
<th>#Awrd</th>
<th>Awrd Amt</th>
<th>Wait-list</th>
<th>Remain Wait-list</th>
<th>#Dom Awrds</th>
<th>#Intl Awrds</th>
<th>#Group Awrds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9¹</td>
<td>$4500.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$7900.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1⁴</td>
<td>0⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals at Midterm</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$12400.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments through December 2015
At the beginning of the year, I did a review of the available GPSF Travel Awards historical documents to ensure the Twelfth Committee would be in compliance with all existing policies. This review process was undertaken because of the Executive Board’s preparation of the organization for governmental changes (under the assumption that the proposed 2014–2015 Student Government Constitutional Amendments would be passed during the course of the present year) and because of the complete dearth of information handed down to me when I took over the Committee last year. Although some years of data are missing in the online archive, I was able to determine that several elements in the Committee’s policies and procedures have been lost over the Committee’s history. In light of this review process, we determined (1) to

¹ This number is the actual number of awards (8 individual and 1 group). The number of individual awardees, including all group members, is 10.
² All money awarded for Fall Cycle 1 has been disbursed at the writing of this report. We are maintaining the Waiting List for this cycle in case other monies become available during the course of the year.
³ The only group for Fall Cycle 2 was a group of two. The committee actually had no groups apply during this cycle. However, the two individuals applied for the same event with very similar applications, so with their permission, the committee awarded them as a group.
⁴ The Committee only had 8 applicants for “international travel” for Fall Cycle 2. Two awards were actually given, but the committee determined that, according to the wording of current Travel Law, one of these must count as “domestic.” See Outlook, Point #3, for context to this issue and the Committee’s proposal for addressing it.
⁵ Only one group applied to Fall Cycle 2 and its application was considered insufficient by the Committee.
make the Committee more open, (2) to revise several documents and policies to ensure the continuity of operation in the future, and (3) to address the past operational shortcomings of the Committee.

1. **Making the Committee More Open.** The process by which the Committee has operated in the past has not always been clear to those not on the Committee, either within the Senate or outside of it. Although historically a grading rubric existed (see below), the only information available to the public since the abandonment of the graduate school’s wikis and movement to the website seems to have been the Travel FAQs and the Travel Law. To address this issue, the Committee has…

   a. *Adopted a Publicly-Available Policies and Procedures Document.* The Committee designed a document—the first of its kind in the Committee’s history—which outlines exactly how the Committee operates, and has made it publicly available on the website. For Policies and Procedures, see Appendix 1.

   b. *Adopted a Publicly-Available Rubric.* Since the formal Grading Rubric had fallen out of use (it does not appear to have been used for several years now), the Committee revised and re-adopted the old rubric and placed it on the website for applicants to read before their submissions. For the rubric, see Appendix 2.

   c. *Adopted a Public Agenda Policy.* At least two days prior to a Committee meeting, the Committee Chair now prepares an agenda for that meeting, including the date and location of the meeting, and makes it publicly available through the website. This policy is another first in the history of the Committee. For current Agendas, see Appendix 3.

   d. *Adopted a Public Minutes Policy.* Again, in another first for the Travel Awards Committee, the Chair now takes detailed meeting minutes and makes them available on the website. For current minutes, see Appendix 4.

   e. *Adopted a Policy of Formal Voting.* The Committee has also decided to take and record in the minutes a formal vote on every motion, application discussed, and resolution prepared for the Senate. This policy preserves the integrity of our body and allows the recording of dissent and abstention.

2. **Addressing Committee Continuity.** Given that the historical documents show two or three points (including last year) wherein the Committee’s practices were lost due to a failure of the systems of continuity in place, the Committee is attempting to ensure seamless transitions in the future by…

   a. *Adopting a Policies and Procedures Document.* This document, mentioned above, can be passed down from Committee to Committee. While the document is not Law and each Committee may revise it to fit their needs, this policy ensures that each Committee will know exactly the procedures adopted and followed by the previous Committee, without a dependence upon unreliable oral histories of former members.

   b. *Changing the Constitutional Law concerning the Appointment of the Chair.* This change, which has the Senate appoint the next chair in April, ensures that outgoing and incoming chairs have a chance to interact and discuss policies and procedures over the month of April (see further information in 3.a. below).

3. **Address Operational Shortcomings.** In the review of the Committee, I found several points of change necessary to address ongoing issues with the Committee or an ongoing oversight by the Committee. To address these issues, the Committee has…
a. **Changed the Constitutional Law concerning the Appointment of the Chair.** According to the Constitution in place at the beginning of the year, the Committee would begin each year with no chair in place, leaving the emails for the GPSF Travel Awards listserv unanswered through the summer and the July to September Travel Awards application unmonitored. Additionally, the first application usually would close before a Chair could be appointed, and technically, the Committee would operate without a chair until its first meeting. Besides these issues with the transition in leadership in the existing Constitution, the historical records also contained a constitutional amendment addressing this exact issue (Resolution 06-08), but for whatever reason, it no longer appeared in the constitution and was not enforced. To address all these issues, the Committee proposed Resolution 15-09 (see Appendix 6), which passed the Senate on December 1. The Senate will now appoint the Travel Awards Committee Chair in April, ensuring that someone is in place to oversee the operations of the Committee through the summer and to maintain the application and email account throughout the year.

b. **Updated the Application.** The application has been changed twice during the course of the semester:
   i. At the beginning of the year, the GPSF Secretary and Treasurer updated the application. While there were some issues with this update (the application should not be changed without consultation with the Committee, given the separation of branches, and should not have been done mid-cycle, a condition which resulted in additional work for the chair), it preserved the nature of the former application, only re-organizing it to a better flow. To address the issues that emerged from this editing of the Application, the Committee adopted a Policy stating that the application may only be changed in consultation with the Committee (Policies and Procedures, Part 1, Section 2), and in practice, the Committee now takes a formal vote on all changes to the Application.
   ii. In November, the Committee added a sentence to the prompt for the application essay to try to save the Chair some redaction work in the preparation of the applications for the Committee. The Committee added the following: “Additionally, please refrain from including your name or contact information in the body of the text as this is a blind review process.”

**Operations (Changes)**
For the most part, the operation of the Committee can be obtained from the Policies and Procedures document. Here, I only acknowledge the major changes that have been made since last year to our operations, some of which have been noted under accomplishments above. Most of these changes (1) resume former practices, (2) embody the goals listed above (especially openness), and/or (3) attempt to address operational problems I noted as chair last year. See Critique of Operations for an assessment of these changes.

1. **Re-adoption of a Rubric.** As noted above, I discovered that the formal grading rubric had gone out of use some years ago. The Committee decided to re-introduce a revised version of the rubric to insure consistency in grading.
2. **Double Blind.** In previous years, both the reading process was blind (graders did not know applicants names) and the grading process was blind (graders did not know each other’s scores). The latter disappeared when Google document-based grading was adopted. To preserve the blindness of grades and avoid the undue influence of the graders on one another, I have created locked files in a Dropbox folder: only the grader and Chair know the password to enter the files. To maintain blindness in reading, the chair redacts all identifying information except department from the applications. Department is maintained simply for recusal/abstention purposes.

3. **Science / Humanities & Social Sciences Division.** Given our 2-2 split on grading members, we decided it would be most effective if the readers review the applications of those applicants from fields closest to their own, with Humanities & Social Sciences reading Humanities & Social Sciences and Sciences reading Sciences.

4. **Dropbox Sharing.** Because of the issue with Google sharing, I have adopted using Dropbox, not only for grading but also for sharing all relevant files with the Committee members prior to the meeting. This includes bills/resolutions, the blind application files, grading files, and our budget. I have also shared the Committee’s working budget with the GPSF Treasurer to ensure the Committee’s and Treasurer’s numbers are consistent.

5. **Meeting Minutes.** As noted above, the minutes are recorded by the Chair in the course of each meeting

6. **Formal Voting.** As noted above, the Committee now records a formal vote on each motion brought up before the Committee, along with each application discussed in the meeting

7. **Writing of the Resolution in Meeting.** The awards resolution to the Senate is now written in meeting and voted on by the Committee at the meeting. Previously, after the decisions were made, the Chair would fill it out at home, and no “formal” vote was actually made, though the Committee had approved all decisions in the course of discussing the applications.

**Critique of Operations**

Overall, despite some hiccups, the Committee has run fairly smoothly this year. Following is an assessment of each of the adopted operational changes listed above:

1. **Re-adoption of a rubric.** Despite the initial debate over some of the rubric’s categories, it has been working well, and I find that we are able to do a more objective analysis with the rubric than in the Committee’s recent past.

2. **Double blind.** I have found that people’s scores more honestly represent their own opinions this year. This has, at times, resulted in score discrepancies. To combat this issue, I have done two things:
   - a. I have Excel calculate score difference, and we consider any scores with high differentials, and
   - b. If I find the scores for one subject area to be higher than the other, we have, at times, given preference to lower scores in the other subject area, depending on the recommendations of the graders, in order to maintain an appropriate balance between the subject areas.

3. **Science / Humanities & Social Sciences Division.** This policy has worked generally well this year, as we are finding that the various fields are more equipped to deal with the particularities of their own areas. The most difficult points have been…
a. The grading discrepancy noted above, but we have instituted policies to combat that issue, and

b. Some programs (especially math-based programs, but also some professional programs) fall into liminal areas. We have been dividing these outliers on the basis of their research content. Applicants from these areas have received several awards, and their success speaks to the effectiveness of the current solution. However, if problems should occur, the Committee will consult with the Senators of the programs most impacted to determine how best to serve them.

4. Dropbox Sharing. Dropbox has also been great for making sure that all members know what is going on, and it allows me to make changes to documents without having to send out multiple emails. It has also been great for the Treasurer to keep us abreast of our current financial situation. A couple of issues did occur early on. For example, in experimenting with shared files, I tried locked sheets in Excel for the grading files: this created a series of repeating files. This issue has since been resolved by individualized files which I later combine into a single Excel document with multiple sheets.

5. Meeting Minutes. With the addition of Chair-as-minute-taker, I am having trouble at times taking Committee minutes and directing the flow of the discussion, so future Committee Chairs may consider inviting someone (the Secretary?) to the meeting to take notes. Doing so would require a change in the current Policies and Procedures.

6. Formal Voting. Formal voting is a hassle (we have 20–30 votes per meeting), but it provides a necessary public record for the policies and decisions adopted by the Committee. It is the most open way of presenting the Committee’s findings.

7. Writing of the Resolution in Meeting. This point is a problem. I still maintain it is necessary to write the resolution during the meeting so that the Committee may formally approve it, but it is a very time-consuming process that brings all discussion to a halt. To solve part of the issue, I have taken to preparing potential successful candidates’ data in advance (based on the scores I receive from the graders) and then copying and pasting them into the document at the meeting, but it is probably more effective to have a non-Committee member prepare the Resolution during the course of the discussion and the Committee check over it prior to the final vote, as the Chair cannot possibly do this, take minutes, record votes, and moderate the discussion effectively.

Overall, the Committee has been great, and I have generally been impressed with all we have accomplished this year thus far.

Outlook / Goals for the Remainder of the 2015–2016 Fiscal Year

The Committee has a remainder of $13,900.00 to award in the spring cycles. In addition to the awards, per the Committee’s Policies and Procedures document, the Committee has a number of duties required of it in the spring, particularly the review and revisement of certain essential documents. The following are our major goals for the spring beyond continuing consideration of applications and giving out of awards:

1. Revise Travel Law. The current Travel Awards Law was originally adopted on September 6, 2011, and last updated on March 5, 2013. During the spring meetings, the Committee plans to:

   a. Examine the Law for any necessary changes (some specific issues have already been identified in Points 2 and 3 below).
b. Re-number and re-organize the Law, as in its current form, certain requirements are hard to pinpoint when introducing resolutions/bills to the Senate. In particular, we need to enumerate Parts 2–5 to include Sections and Subsections.
c. Present these changes to the Senate by the April meeting for approval.

2. **Ensure consistency across Travel Law, the Application, the Rubric, and the FAQs with respect to the requirements for the application essay.** At this time, not all of these documents are in total agreement. Minor edits will solve these issues and provide further clarity in the application process.

3. **Revise the Travel Law concerning the “International Differential.”** The International Differential clause (Part 1, Section E) is currently written in a manner that requires the Committee to determine “international” status by destination. At least one award this semester consisted of an applicant traveling from an international location to a US destination, but the current law does not classify this as “international” travel. The law needs to be re-written to allow for international researchers who have to travel back to the US for conferences, as this law disproportionately penalizes students who are conducting long-term field research.

4. **Review and revise the FAQs.** The FAQs have not been updated since 2013 and should be reviewed and updated on a yearly basis.

5. **Search for and present a candidate to the Senate for the Thirteenth Travel Awards Committee Chair (2016–2017),** per the Constitutional Amendment passed in Resolution 15-09.

6. **Produce a History of the Committee.** In my review of the Committee, I began the production of a file recording the history of the Committee from its foundation in 2004–2005. I hope that, by the end of the year, we will have a working “History of the Committee” file that summarizes the major events in the history of the Committee to serve as a secondary reference point for continuity between future Committees, along with the Policies and Procedures document.

7. **Produce a Working and Accessible Committee Archive.** Although some files pertaining to the Committee are kept in the GPSF archive and others are maintained on the website, (1) the former files are not easily accessible to the Committee Chair, (2) the latter are spread among multiple documents, and (3) some types of files are not preserved at all. By the end of the year, I would like to have a working Travel Awards Archive that collects into one place all locatable Travel Awards Resolutions, Reports, and other relevant documentation so that future Committees will have easy access to these documents.

**Ongoing Issues & Current Solutions**

Over the course of the past few months, the following issues have been brought to the attention of the chair and may need to be re-considered in the spring. Some of these issues have been considered and tabled for now.

1. **The Program Score.** Currently, Travel Law, Part 2, #2 of the criteria states that applicants may be graded on the criteria of their program having a GPSF Senator in good standing. This has been one of the charges against the Travel Awards Committee in the back-and-forth between certain members of Student Congress and the GPSF. Some Congress members have argued that this should not be a criterion for consideration, contending that Travel Awards should be solely based on the applicant’s own merit. Several points should be made with respect to this criterion:
a. This criterion was included to encourage participation in the Senate. In the Chair’s discussion with several senators, they have stated that this factor is a continuing part of their department’s consideration of active participation in the Senate.

b. Despite point a, past Committees have found this criterion problematic. It is a clearly stated issue for the Third (2006–07) and Fifth (2008–09) Committees, as noted in their reports. Sometime between 2009 and 2011, the Committee reduced the weight of this category to 3 points instead of 5, to address the Committee’s discomfort with the policy.

c. The Twelfth Committee has taken a couple of actions with regard to this policy:
   i. In re-adopting the rubric, we have further specified a partial awarding of the 3 points. Whereas the score used to be either a 3 or 1 (or, previously, 5 or 1), we have enabled the awarding of an intermediate score of 2 points by further defining the interpretation of what a “senator in good standing” means. A 1-point score is now only received if the program does not currently have a Senator **AND** did not have a Senator in good standing the year before; and a 2-point score is received if only one of these criteria is met. This move has significantly reduced the impact of this score on applicants’ scores while preserving departments’ incentive to participate in the Senate.

   ii. The Committee considered removing the point altogether, but in returning to the issue in our November meeting, we decided, in consultation with the Executive Board, to table the issue for now as (1) there is no university stipulation against this policy, (2) it actively encourages some departments to participate in the Senate, and (3) it now only minimally impacts final scores.

      1. The Committee is not opposed to returning to the issue if the general sentiment of the Senate is that it should be changed, and we may reconsider the issue during the Spring revisions of the Travel Law.

      2. If the status of the GPSF is changed in the coming months, especially if it should become a separate and independent governing body instead of an advocacy group, the criterion should then probably be eliminated, as the added benefits of the GPSF being an actual governmental institution may eliminate the necessity of incentivizing participation.

2. **Response to a Committee Rejection**. While generally the response to the Committee has been positive, a handful of applicants have been quite dissatisfied due to the perception that they should have received an award. Again several points should be made:

   a. This problem has a long standing history. It appears in the Committee’s Final Report of 2008–09. The Fifth Committee’s Chair, Kate Arpen, wrote, “Believing all they had to do was meet the requirements, they did not understand why they didn’t receive funds. This resulted in an exchange of emails explaining the process, etc. These email exchanges were very time-consuming and, in some cases, the applicants were a bit combative.”
b. My own experience as the Chair of the Eleventh and Twelfth Committees fits Chair Arpen’s description exactly.

c. Chair Arpen suggested that the issue might be resolved by the visibility of information. The visibility of information could still be increased (some of the data may be difficult to locate on the website). However, given some of my recent interactions, I suspect that, however much information is made available, it will not address the issues at the heart of these complaints, as the persistent and disrespectful nature of some of these email chains seems to derive from (1) the applicant’s expectation that they should have received the award (for whatever reason) and (2) the knowledge that the Committee consists of graduate students. In particular, the latter seems to be the most relevant point, as I cannot imagine anyone being so combative and dismissive of the policies of other committees on campus, such as the committee which awards the Graduate School’s Transportation Award.

d. At this time, I have no better solution to this issue than the visibility-response approach, though answering these email chains remains an immense time suck for whoever is chair. Currently, I point dissatisfied applicants to the locations where they may find all public information on the awards, provide public documents if they have not yet been posted by the Secretary, try to explain the philosophy behind our current positions and laws, and encourage them to submit well-thought-out ideas for the Committee to consider as we evaluate changes to the Travel Law.

3. **Adjustment of Award Amounts.** At the beginning of the year, I met with the GPSF Treasurer and the Vice-President of Internal Affairs to discuss possible changes to the award levels. The issue was broached because of rising costs of travel. In the end, the general consensus of the Committee members and the VPIA was that the award amounts should be maintained at the current level.

   a. The ultimate decision to maintain the current level of funding was due to the fact that increasing the amount of the awards reduces the number of awards that we are able to give out, from about 25% of applicants receiving an award to about 10–15%, depending on amounts used for calculation. The purpose of the award is to provide funding to those who do not have other funding opportunities for travel, and if we increase the amount of the award, we reduce the accessibility of this funding source. We decided it is better to pare down the burden of travel for a larger number of applicants than to cover a handful of people’s travel in its entirety.

   b. In consideration of the changes, we contemplated adopting a tiered regional approach to awards, delineating levels of funding in radiating circles from Chapel Hill. This would embody in Law what we already do, to some degree, in practice. However, the Committee was concerned that any formalized system of this sort (1) would be too complicated to work effectively and (2) would not allow the Committee to consider other circumstances that might affect the amounts that the Committee awards. Therefore, we decided not to adopt this method for now, though we may reconsider it when we examine the Travel Law in the Spring.

   c. If the GPSF gains access to additional Travel Awards moneys for future fiscal years, the Committee should maintain the same percentage of awardees and
consider raising award amounts. This recommendation has to do with the point at which the Committee has found the quality of applications begin to decline to significantly.

4. **Need for an Ethics Committee.** Although we have adopted criteria for treating the potential for malfeasance and the like in our Process and Procedures document, the Senate currently does not have a constitutional section addressing the potential problem of ethics violations. The addition of an Ethics Committee to the Senate may address this issue. At the very least, the Constitution needs to be amended to address this issue in some manner.
Appendix 1: Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure

As Adopted by the Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee (2015–2016)

(Adapted and Combined from the Policies of the First to Eighth Committees and Ninth to Twelfth Committees, as found described in Various Committee Reports. The Twelfth Committee marks the first time these policies were deliberately written out in this manner.)

Part 1: Applications

1. Applications will be collected electronically via Google Forms, as has been procedure since the Eighth Committee (2011–2012).
2. The Application will be constrained to the format as established and will not be changed without consultation with the Committee (last modified by the Committee, November 2015).
3. The Application deadlines for the following fiscal year will be set by the Committee in their final meeting.
   a. The Application deadlines will occur on the first work day after the deadline set by the Travel Law, Part 3, Section B.
   b. The Application deadlines will not occur on a University holiday.
4. The Application may open at any point after the previous Awards Cycle has ended; however, the Application should not be opened less than a month.
5. A Call for Applications should begin cycling in the first GPSF Newsletter after the opening of the Applications and continue until the closing of the Applications.

Part 2: Grading

1. Prior to each meeting of the Committee, the Committee Members will grade each Application.
2. Grading of the Applications will follow the “Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria” as adopted by the Committee at its first meeting.
3. Every Application will be read and graded by two Voting Members of the Committee and the Chair (see Part 5).
   a. The Applications will be divided into two categories: 1) Science and 2) Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences.
   b. The Applications will be read and graded by the Voting Members belonging to the corresponding fields.
4. Grading of the Applications by the Voting Members will be blind to avoid undue influence on the Graders.
   a. Voting Members will receive a form of the Applications containing no information by which the applicant may be identified, excepting their Department.
   b. Voting Members will not have knowledge of the scores awarded to Applications by their co-Members prior to the meeting of the Committee.

---

6 Note that the procedures contained herein are not “Law.” They are guidelines adopted each academic year for the guidance of Committee operations based on the former operations of the committee.
5. Grading of the Applications will be electronic.
   a. Grades will be collected in a manner that allows for the maintenance of blindness (Part 2, Section 4 (b)).
   b. Grades will be compiled by the Chair (Part 5, Section 2 (h)).
6. Grades of Applications should be submitted to the Chair at least **24-hours** prior to the meeting.
   a. If the Voting Member is unable to turn in grades on time, they should notify the Chair.
   b. If the Voting Member repeatedly fails to turn in grades or repeatedly fails to turn in grades in a timely fashion, they may be considered delinquent in their duty by the Committee and recalled (see Part 6, Section 2).
7. Recusal.
   a. A Voting Member will recuse themselves from grading an Application if…
      i. They recognize that they know the applicant because of the nature of the project or
      ii. They belong to the same Department as the Applicant.
   b. In case of a recusal, the Chair will assign a second reader from the Voting Members of the Committee to the Application. From necessity, the second grader will not belong to the same category as the Application, as is the expressed ideal in Part 2, Section 4.

**Part 3: Meetings of the Committee**

1. For all meetings, the Committee will follow Robert’s Rules for committees and the procedures set forth in this document.
2. The Committee may conduct business at two types of meetings:
   a. Application Meetings will occur at least four times a year and be scheduled so that the Committee may make their recommendations to the Senate within 35 days of the deadline (per Travel Law, Part 4)
   b. Special Meetings…
      i. May be called for any number of reasons, including but not limited to, the re-writing of Travel Law, the Replacement of a Member, and the Recall of a Member and
      ii. Should be scheduled at least 7 days prior to the meeting.
3. All types of meeting will have a posted agenda, including the location and time of the meeting, made public at least two days prior to the meeting.
   a. Each meeting should include…
      i. Call to order and roll call,
      ii. Additional business,
      iii. Setting or review of the date for the next meeting, and
      iv. Dismissal.
   b. Each application meeting should include…
      i. Review of the budget,
      ii. Discussion and voting on current applications,
      iii. Completion of the proposed Senate bill on recommendations, and
      iv. Voting on the Senate bill.
   c. Some meetings require special business:
i. In the First Meeting, the Committee will…
   1. Review the Budget and apportion it among the Award Cycles based on previous year’s applicant ratios,
   2. Review, edit, and adopt the document “Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria,” and
   3. Review, edit, and adopt the document “Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure.”

ii. In the Last Meeting, the Committee will…
   1. Set the Application dates for the following year,
   2. Nominate a Chair for the following year,
   3. Review of the document “Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure” and recommend changes for the following year, and
   4. Review of the document “Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria” and recommend changes for the following year.

iii. Each year, the Committee should also…
   1. Review the Travel Awards Law and make any recommendations for changes to the GPSF VPIA and the Resolutions Committee,
   2. Review the Travel Awards Law FAQs and forward any requested changes to the GPSF Secretary, and
   3. Review the Application Forum and adopt any changes necessary.

d. The meeting will be called to order by the Chair and conducted in the order of the Agenda.

4. Each meeting of the Committee will be recorded in the minutes, which should be made available to the GPSF VPIA within two days of the meeting, along with all supporting documentation passed by the Committee.

5. Quorum and Attendance.
   a. The Quorum of the Committee is 75% of the Voting Members.
      i. Given the nature of the work of the Committee, every member of the Committee is required to be at Committee meetings.
      ii. However, a Committee Member may miss a meeting if an emergency arises and they contact the Chair to notify them of their absence.
      iii. A member who is repeatedly absent from Committee meetings may be considered delinquent in their duties and be recalled (see Part 6, Section 2).
   b. If, in the Roll Call, the Quorum is not met, the Committee will set a new date for the meeting, not to exceed a week from the original meeting date, and the meeting will be dismissed.

6. Voting
   a. Voting will be done *viva voce*.
   b. Passage of any resolution in the Committee must have 60% vote or greater in favor of the resolution.
      i. The Voting Members will vote first.
      ii. If the Voting Members are unable to reach a decision and the vote is split 2-2 among its Members, the Chair of the Committee may cast a vote (per the Constitution, Article 5, Section 8 (c) 4) and break the tie.
Part 4: Process of Application Selection by the Committee

1. At an Application Meeting, the Chair will open the discussion of the Applications.
2. The Chair will direct discussion of the Applications and will organize the discussion of the applications according to the following order and guidelines:
   a. The Committee will consider Applications according to the results from the Grading process, in order, from the highest average score of their graders to the lowest.
   b. When Applications have the same score, the Committee will generally refer to the Application number for ordering; however, if the chair sees imbalance among the chosen applications, they may adopt an order that restores the balance (e.g., if Sciences applications are dominating the selection process, in the event of the same score, the Chair can choose to begin with Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences).
   c. The Committee may table any Application and may return to the Application at any appropriate point in the course of deliberations.
   d. The Committee will deliberate on applications in order until the point at which the agreed upon allocated budget for that Application Meeting has been reached.
   e. At that time, the Committee will continue to consider applications in this order until at least five alternates are selected for the “Wait List.”
   f. At the end of deliberations, the Committee should reconsider:
      i. Any group applications that did not make the voting cutoff to see if they are worthy of an award, and
      ii. Any application with a high grade discrepancy between the graders.
3. During the deliberation over the Applications,
   a. The Chair will direct the ordering of the discussion (see above)
   b. The applications will continue to be blind during this stage of the discussion.
   c. After the Chair opens discussion on a particular Application, the graders of the Application will present it to the Committee, including:
      i. Its merits,
      ii. Its weaknesses, and
      iii. A recommendation as to how the Committee should treat the Application, including...
         1. Awarding of a Full Award (Domestic or International),
         2. Awarding of a Partial Award (Domestic or International),
         3. Tabling of the Application until later in the Deliberations, and
         4. Not Awarding the Application.
   d. The entire Committee may then discuss the Application.
      i. A Member who recused themselves…
         1. May comment on the impact of the research or the conference, but
         2. They may make no recommendation on whether or not to grant the award or on the amount.
      ii. In this discussion, the Committee should come to a general consensus of the award amount and decision.
   e. At the end of deliberation over each Application, the Chair will call for a viva voce vote to approve the decision.
i. A Member who recused themselves may not vote for this application.
ii. Per Constitutional Law, the Chair will only vote in the event of a tie (see Part 4, Section 6 above)

4. After the deliberations on all applications are completed according to Sections 2 and 3, the Chair will ask for the closing of the deliberations and decisions.

5. Upon receiving assent from the Committee, the Chair and the Committee will write up their recommendations as a bill to present to the Senate per Travel Law, Part 4, and the GPSF Constitution, Article 5, Section 8 (c) 6.
   a. At this stage, with awards and amounts having already been decided upon, the process is no longer blind.
   b. The Bill should…
      i. Outline Senate law on the duties of the Committee and declare the fulfillment of these duties by the Committee,
      ii. Provide a brief summary of the recommendations of the Committee, and
      iii. Provide fuller information on the recommendations of the Committee, including…
         1. A table of “awardees,” with the amounts of their awards and any appropriate accompanying information (at least, department, domestic/international travel, partial/full award, and group/individual travel),
         2. A “wait list” table, with an ordering of those applicants on the wait list and any appropriate accompanying information (at least, department, domestic/international travel, partial/full award, and group/individual travel), and
         3. A summary of the current budgets and expenditures for Travel Awards.
   c. After completion of the Bill, the Committee Members will review it and vote to forward the bill to the Senate. The vote will be recorded at the top of the bill.

Part 5: The Chair
1. The Chair is a non-voting member of the Committee (see exceptions above).
2. The Chair’s duties will include, but will not be limited to,…
   a. Obtaining a working knowledge of all GPSF Travel Awards Laws and Constitutional Laws concerning Travel Awards;
   b. Maintaining relative continuity between past Committee practice and current Committee practice;
   c. Creating, monitoring, and closing of the Committee’s Application Forms (See Part 1 on Applications), including…
      i. Opening a new Application Form by duplicating the old one (unless given permission for changes by the Committee) and appropriately (and consistently) entitling them,
      ii. Sharing Application Forms and their Response Sheets with the GPSF Google account, the GPSF VPIA, and the GPSF Treasurer, and
      iii. Closing the Application on the deadline and creating a new application to replace the old;
   d. Advertising of Travel Awards, including…
i. Providing the public link of new forms to the GPSF Secretary to replace the old one on the GPSF Travel Awards Website, and
ii. Providing an announcement for the GPSF Newsletter, containing links to the Application and the Travel Awards Website, to run until the closing of the Application;
e. Answering all emails which are received by the GPSFTravel listserv in a timely fashion;
f. Communicating with the GPSF VPIA and the Executive Board on behalf of the Committee;
g. Organizing of Committee meetings, including…
   i. Arranging a time suitable to all members of the Committee (and, if possible, the VPIA),
   ii. Scheduling of the room (usually with technology for the display of voting, applications, and other documentation), and
   iii. Preparing and posting of the agenda (with location and time) at least two day prior to the meeting;
h. Collecting and preparing applications for the Voting Members of the Committee, including…
   i. Downloading of the Applications as an Excel sheet,
   ii. Organizing the resultant Excel database in a manner which is easily readable,
   iii. Blinding of the Applications by the deletion of columns with identifying information and redaction of names from essays (the Chair should maintain both a full database copy and a blind database copy),
   iv. Classifying the applications as Science or Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences,
   v. Determining the Eligibility of each applicant by comparing with the record of past winners (Ctrl + F search),
   vi. Preparing of a voting form for the Voting Members, which maintains blind reading, and
   vii. Providing the grades for the Applicants’ Department’s involvement with GPSF;
i. Preparing and disseminating any and all documentation needed for the Committee Meetings, including but not limited to…
   i. Agendas,
   ii. Application Scores,
   iii. Proposed Budgets,
   iv. Proposed “Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria,”
   v. Proposed “Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure,” and
   vi. All Preliminary Drafts of Bills;
j. Reading all applications for each Award Cycle in case the Chair’s vote is necessary to resolve a tie among the Voting Members;
k. Ordering of and presiding over all Committee Meetings (see above, Parts 3 and 4);
l. Entering data and recording minutes during the course of all Committee Meetings;
m. Presenting the Committee’s processes, recommendations, and bills to the Senate;
n. Contacting all applicants after the approval of the Committee’s Awards Bills by the Senate, including…
   i. An initial award letter that informs the applicant that they will be receiving an award, not receiving an award, or will be on the wait list and
   ii. A follow-up email to waitlisted applicants as moneys become available throughout the course of the year;
o. Maintaining a Committee-based Budget so that the committee generally knows what moneys are available, a task which requires constant communication with the GPSF Treasurer to ascertain…
   i. Any declined awards,
   ii. Any awards only partially used by applicants, and
   iii. The current status of accounts (especially current expended amounts and any outstanding, unclaimed awards);
p. Preparing a bi-annual report of the Committee’s activities for the GPSF Midterm and Final Report;
q. Archiving of all documentation of the Committee’s activities and procedures in conjunction with the GPSF Secretary; and
r. Making sure that the next Chair is aware of all the procedures, policies, etc. of the Committee.
3. Temporary Chairs and Replacement of the Chair
   a. If the Chair is unable to attend a meeting because of an emergency…
      i. The most senior Voting Member will act as Chair of the meeting in their stead.
      ii. If all Members have served equally on the Committee, the Voting Members will select a Chair from their number.
b. If the Chair is recalled by the Committee or requests to be replaced on the Committee, the Committee…
      i. Will follow the procedures for Recall and Replacement of the Chair as if they were a Voting Member and
      ii. Will select a new chair from among their number to serve as Chair, giving precedence to those with the most experienced on the Committee.

Part 6: Recall and Replacement
Section is to be revised in the future in accordance with the adoption of Senate policies on Recall and Replacement of committee members, along with relevant subsections above.

1. The GPSF Constitution currently does not directly deal with the issue of recall of committee members for nonfeasance, malfeasance, and misfeasance or the replacement of members for whatever need. These are the procedures adopted by this committee and will be carried out by the presentation of resolutions before the Senate.
2. Recall due to Nonfeasance (charges of malfeasance and misfeasance should adopt a similar procedure).
   a. A Committee Member may be recalled if they are found to be delinquent in their duties, which includes…
      i. Missing of more than one Committee meeting,
ii. Failure to submit Application grades,
iii. Repeated failure to submit Application grades in a timely fashion, and
iv. Repeated failure to communicate with the Committee and the Chair.
b. Procedure of Recall.
   i. On a vote of the Committee, the Committee shall issue a formal warning and reprimand to the Member and work with the GPSF VPIA to solve the issue.
   ii. If the nonfeasance continues, on a vote of the Committee, the Committee may propose a resolution to the Senate which...
       1. Outlines Senate practice on Recall,
       2. Outlines the nonfeasance of the member,
       3. Outlines the hardship of the nonfeasance on the Committee in performing its Constitutionally-defined duties,
       4. Resolves that the Senate recall that member, and
       5. Resolves that the Senate nominate and approve a new nominee for the Committee, to be seated prior to the next Committee meeting.
3. Replacement.
   a. Should a Committee Member be unable to perform for their duties due to an unexpected by persistent cause (e.g., unexpected longterm illness), they may be replaced upon their request.
b. Procedure of Replacement
   i. The Member being replaced must submit a formal request in writing to the Committee stating that they can no longer perform their duties and requesting the Committee to seek their replacement.
   ii. On a vote of the Committee, the Committee may propose a resolution to the senate which...
       1. Outlines Senate practice on Replacement,
       2. Reviews the formal request made by the Committee Member,
       3. Resolves that the Senate consent to the Committee Member’s request, and
       4. Resolves that the Senate nominate and approve a new nominee for the Committee, to be seated prior to the next Committee meeting.
Appendix 2: Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria  
As Adopted by the Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee (2015–2016)  
(Adapted from the Criteria used by the First to Eighth Committees, as found in Appendix C of the 2011-2012 GPSF Final Report)

Part 1: Criteria for Conference Travel

1. Personal Impact
   a. applicant(s) clearly demonstrates how they will benefit intellectually (5 pts)
      5: The applicant(s) argues convincingly that they are likely to gain a great deal of knowledge that will influence their intellectual and professional development.
      1: Their presentation and/or presence at the conference is unlikely to contribute substantially to their intellectual or professional development.
   b. applicant(s) describes how attending the conference will help them network/find a job AND/OR it is their first conference/presentation AND/OR they are presenting on dissertation/thesis material (5 pts)
      5: The applicant(s) will have a chance to interact with leading scholars/professionals who will be able to further their professional development, either by providing actual job opportunities or by offering valuable advice and guidance. Additionally, their presentation is likely to be seen by colleagues whose opinions will be important determinants of their ultimate professional stature and reputation.
      1: Their participation in the conference is unlikely to enhance their professional stature. Additionally, the conference is unlikely to attract scholars/professionals whose opinions could substantially affect the applicant’s reputation.

2. Professional Impact
   a. applicant(s) demonstrates how their work will contribute to their field (5 pts.)
      5: Their presentation will be of such quality and significance that it will make a substantial contribution to both the proceedings of the conference and to the field in general.
      1: Neither the quality nor significance of their presentation is such that it will be of any real consequence to the field in question.
   b. applicant(s) indicates that the specific conference is significant for their field (5 pts.)
      5: The proceedings of the conference are likely to have a significant impact upon the present and future state of the field. (Some potentially, but not necessarily, pertinent factors include the number of attendees or members, the scholarly and/or professional stature of the people involved, the scope and cogency of the subject matter to be addressed, or the degree of difficulty involved in having a presentation proposal accepted.)
Additionally, the proceedings of the conference will have potentially important implications (social, economic, philosophical, political, environmental, etc.) for the world beyond academia.

1: The conference is of little significance, even within the specific field, either because very few respected scholars/professionals are likely to attend or because its subject matter is so obscure or esoteric that only a small segment of the field is likely to take notice.

3. **University Impact (5 pts)**

    *applicant(s) describes how attending the conference will draw attention to the University of North Carolina OR how their attending can be beneficial for the UNC community*

    5: The applicant(s) will have an opportunity to draw significant attention to the University because of participation in multiple and/or highly visible roles at the conference AND/OR because their research is unique and groundbreaking because of the particular resources (e.g., research facilities) available at the University.

    1: The applicant’s participation in the event is unlikely to draw attention to the University or be beneficial to the Carolina community in any way.

4. **Communication Skills (5 pts)**

    5: The written statement is concise and clear with no obvious grammatical errors, and it is of a sufficient length to address the questions.

    1: Their written communication skills are deficient to the extent that he or she is unlikely to contribute to any scholarly or professional conference and the application is difficult to read.

    If applicant is significantly over 500 words (exceeding 50 words or more), -1 point, and a point for every fifty after.

5. **Departmental Standing with GPSF (3 pts)**

    3: Applicant’s department has a GPSF Senator in good standing.

    2: Applicant’s department has a GPSF Senator but the Senator of the previous fiscal year did not attend the minimum for allocations (unless the department is newly added to the Senate and had no Senator the previous year)

    1: Applicant’s department does not have a recognized GPSF Senator

    *Note 1: In the case of groups, average the score of all represented departments.*

    *Note 2: Fewer points in this section reflect concerns of earlier Committees that this section unfairly penalized some excellent applicants. Thus, this is why the rubric equals 33 pts instead of 35 pts.*

**Part 2: Criteria for Research Travel**
1. Personal Impact
   
   a. *applicant(s) clearly demonstrates how they will benefit intellectually (5 pts.)*
      
      5: The applicant(s) argues convincingly that they are likely to gain a great deal of knowledge that will influence their intellectual and professional development
      
      1: Their research and/or travel to the research facility is unlikely to contribute substantially to his/her intellectual or professional development.
   
   b. *applicant(s) justifies why visiting the specific institution or facility is necessary to the success of their research (5 pts.)*
      
      5: The applicant(s) convincingly explains why the research cannot be conducted at UNC, Duke, NC State, or some other local institution/facility.
      
      1: The applicant(s) does not adequately explain why travel to the specific facility/institution is absolutely necessary, nor does the nature of the proposed research appear to require travel to facilities outside of the Triangle area.

2. Professional Impact
   
   a. *applicant(s) demonstrates how their research will contribute to their field (5 pts)*
      
      5: Their research will be of such quality and significance that it will make a substantial contribution to their field. Additionally, the applicant(s) has clear intentions of publishing or presenting the results of the research in a respected and appropriate forum.
      
      1: It is likely that neither the quality nor significance of their proposed research will be such that it will be of any real consequence to the field in question (For example, the subject matter of the research is so obscure or esoteric that only a small segment of the field is likely to take notice).
   
   b. *applicant(s) indicates that their research has potential significance for the world outside of academia (5 pts)*
      
      5: Their research has potentially important implications (social, economic, philosophical, political, environmental, etc.) for the world beyond academia, and the applicant(s) indicates that they will publish or present the results of the research in such a way that these implications can be recognized.
      
      1: The research has no potential implications for any area outside of their own specific field.

3. Methodology / Intentionality
applicant(s) demonstrates sound methodology and a feasible project AND/OR significant progress / intentionality in preparing for their research travel

5: The applicant(s) demonstrate that they have invested significant time in preparing for the research travel, as they have outlined a clear and practical research plan and demonstrate progress in making the necessary contacts / arrangements at research facilities to conduct their research.

1: Their methodology is unsound; their project is impractical; and they have taken very few steps towards making the necessary contacts for the research to take place

4. Communication Skills (5 pts)

5: The written statement is concise and clear with no obvious grammatical errors, and it is of a sufficient length to address the questions.

1: Their written communication skills are deficient to the extent that he or she is unlikely to contribute to any scholarly or professional conference and the application is difficult to read.

If applicant is significantly over 500 words (exceeding 50 words or more), -1 point, and a point for every fifty after.

5. Departmental Standing with GPSF (3 pts)

3: Applicant’s department has a GPSF Senator in good standing.

2: Applicant’s department has a GPSF Senator but the Senator of the previous fiscal year did not attend the minimum for allocations (unless the department is newly added to the Senate and had no Senator the previous year)

1: Applicant’s department does not have a recognized GPSF Senator

Note 1: In the case of groups, average the score of all represented departments.

Note 2: Fewer points in this section reflect concerns of earlier Committees that this section unfairly penalized some excellent applicants. Thus, this is why the rubric equals 33 pts instead of 35 pts.
Appendix 3: GPSF Travel Awards 2015–2016 Agendas

Appendix 3A: Agenda for GPSF TAC First Meeting, 2015–2016

GPSF Travel Awards Committee
Agenda for First Meeting
September 22, 2015 at 7:00pm
Murphey, Room 111

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

2. Appointment of the GPSF Travel Awards Committee Chair

3. Discussion of 2015–2016 Budget & Division of Moneys between Award Cycles


5. Discussion of & Voting on Current Applications

6. Complete and Edit Senate Bill for the Acceptance of TAC Recommendations

7. Voting on Senate Bill

8. Additional Business

9. Setting of a Date for the November Meeting

10. Dismissal
1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Review and Adjustment of the Budget
3. Old Business
   a. Review of Constitutional Resolution (if received back from Resolutions)
   b. Review of Department Grading Policy
   c. Division of Applications: Assessment of Continued Effectiveness of Method
4. Discussion & Voting on Current Applications
5. Completion and Editing of Senate Bill for the Acceptance of TAC Recommendations
6. Voting on Senate Bill
7. Additional Business
   a. Discussion of slight changes to Application (Clarity on Essay Instructions)
8. Setting a Preliminary Date for the February Meeting
9. Dismissal
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Coussens</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelin McCullough</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailey Rocker</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Rodeberg</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Townsend</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No other parties present at the meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Appointment of the GPSF Travel Awards Committee Chair

Discussion:
BC: Given the amount of work I’ve already done, I nominate myself as chair
KR: I second

Committee Vote in Favor of naming Brian Coussens as Chair:
Yeas: 4 – BC abstaining as acting interim chair.
Nays: 0

3. Discussion of 2015–2016 Budget & Division of Moneys between Award Cycles

Discussion:
BC: Here is the budget as I have suggested it be broken down. We received $26,300, which is the same budget as last year. The main difference is that, instead of having our budget divided between the Main and Reserve budget, we have it all in the Main budget. I have divided it according to last year’s application numbers per cycle. The current cycle is always the weakest. I don’t know if it because travel is less in this period or because
new students don’t know about the awards. Our strongest cycles are the second fall and second spring cycles. Our first spring cycle is a little weaker. Any comments on the proposed budget?

KR: I think it is a good idea to base it on previous application numbers.

BC: Keep in mind that the budget is something we can re-arrange during the course of the year during the course of our considerations, depending on the strength of cycles and applications. Do you accept the suggested budget as is?

Committee Vote on Proposed Budget:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

Accepted Budget (to be adjusted as needed, see adjustment for FA1 below):
FA1 4300.00
FA2 8000.00
SP1 6000.00
SP2 8000.00


Discussion of Committee Procedure:

BC: I’m the only one who added comments to the procedure file, but Nathan and I addressed some concerns via email. We’ll go through my comments and address any other problems as you see them.

BC: Part 2: Grading, Section 3a, Nathan and I had a discussion about grading the applications and whether or not continuing the division between Science and Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences. How do you think things went this time?

NR: I see your point now.

BC: Does anyone have objections to continuing with this methodology. I am really pinpointing this question on you KR and KM because there are usually a few more Arts / Humanities / Social Sciences. I do try to alleviate that by pushing borderline subjects over to the Sciences, like Psychology, or specific projects that deal with health like a philosophy project from this time.

NR: Both of us deal with the mind so…

BC: Ha. Good. I’ll just give y’all all psych now.

No objection continuing subject division.

BC: Part 6, Recall and Replacement. This is an issue because the Senate does not currently have a procedure to address this topic. One of the topics we have discussed is adding these processes to the Constitution and possibly an ethics committee. My question is if we leave this in place to take out when the Senate has put a policy in place or do we take it out now and refer to a non-existent Senate process, looking forward to its creation?
KR: What if we leave it in and add a line about revision dependent upon Senate decision upon the process.
BC: Any objections to the proposal?

No objections. Line added under Part 6 title:
“Section is to be revised in the future in accordance with the adoption of Senate policies on Recall and Replacement of committee members, along with relevant subsections above.”

BC: Part 3, Section 4. On the question of publicly available, I have a question on when we make this material publicly available as it seems problematic if our decisions are made publicly available before the Senate considers them.
KR: Perhaps we could add something about until after the Senate has approved them?
BC: Now that I look at it more, what if we delete the Senate and make it say VPIA. That way, we have put it in the hands of those who can make it publicly available to the Senate and let them make the decisions on when to make the rest of it public to everyone else.

Consensus that work around is sufficient.
BC: Part 4, Section 5C, on the presentation of the Bill to the Senate. The Constitution is conflicting on this point but I have reworded it to reflect that we will present the bill directly to the Senate without going through Resolutions. This was after a lengthy discussion with the VPIA, Resolutions, and the Treasurer about what the Constitution actually means here.

No Objections
BC: Part 5, 2(h)vii, on the chair providing grades for the applicants departments. This is actually a grading issue, which we will cover next, but since we have it here, I’ll bring up here. There has been some concern brought up about this criterion from some parties. The problem is that this is actually clearly stated as a criterion in travel law. My opinion is that we leave this in place until the time that the Travel Law is re-written by the Senate. What do you think?
NR: What exactly is the problem with the law?
BC: It seems to be something about how Student Congress is allowed to give out money.
LT: I have to admit it is reasons like this that we have a senator at all for the department, to ensure eligibility for this.
BC: That was the point of it.
NR: I don’t see how it is that big of a deal because it is so few points.

Examined effect of the three points on current cycle and we decided it was minimal
BC: Should we take the initiative and rewrite the law or should we wait until it becomes an issue and let others address it?
KM: I would rather that we address it before it becomes a problem.
BC: All in favor of asking Resolutions to rewrite the law?
Committee Vote on Removing the Requirement of Department Participation from Travel Law:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

Discussion of Committee Procedure, continued:
  BC: Alright, I will write up a preliminary resolution and we can discuss it further at the next meeting.
  BC: With that, I think we’ve covered most the issues with policies. Anyone have additional discussion?
  None.
  BC: All in favor of adopting the current document on Committee Procedure?

Committee Vote on Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedures:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

Discussion on Committee Grading Policies:
  BC: We also need to discuss the grading policies. Were there any issues with them? Was there anything that needs to be changed or improved?

NR: Concern over 2b and the ability to ascertain the significance of the conference.
Discussion of grading and comparison of grading methods. Decision to maintain wording with a better sense of being on the same page that it is part of the applicant’s role to convince the reader it is important.
NR: Also concerned over the issue of university impact
Discussion of grading and comparison of grading methods. Decision to maintain wording because it is clearly expressed as an expectation on application.
NR: Concern over no policy on violation of length
LT: Needs to be some sort of policy, probably under communication skills.
NR: Suggestions of graduated system of penalty.
KR: We can say something like if they exceed 50 words, they lose a point.
BC: What about we add under the Communication Skills, “If applicant is significantly over 500 words (exceeding 50 words or more), -1 point, and a point for every fifty after.”
Concurrence
BC: Any more discussion on grading? All in favor of accepting our grading policies?

Committee Vote on Travel Awards Committee Grading Criteria:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

5. Discussion of & Voting on Current Applications
Discussion of Applications:

BC: The applications are weighted a bit in favor of Social Sciences. In general, I have graded all of them, and I don’t find there to be any bias in the grading in favor of Social Sciences but find the waiting reflects the percentage of applications for each category and the quality of the applications.

After question from LT, review of policies and procedures on this part of the committee meeting. Application discussion, per policy, begins with highest ranked and works down until there is no money left to award for that cycle.

App#29
KM: Well-written, elaborates goals in visiting sites, methodology is in place
KR: I really liked it.

Hesitation on process. NR reminded that top tiers of the process usually get full-funding, unless going somewhere relatively close. BC noted that we might only need to give one partial.

KM: Recommendation – Full funding (Dom)
BC: Further discussion? All in favor?
Voting on Full Funding of App#29:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#17
KR: This is an international conference. They addressed all points well.
KM: This seems pretty high profile, involving directly relevant for what they want to do. It is well-written.

KM: Recommendation – Full Funding (Intl)
BC: Further discussion? All in favor?
Voting on Full Funding of App#17:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#27
KM: Is this the American Studies one?
KR: Yes. It is clear, concise, and addressed all points.
KM: I only had good things to say.
KR: They did receive funding from their department for another conference.

Discussion on knowledge of other funding sources, Travel Law on Funding sources, and problem of considering factor.
KR: Can we table for now and return back to it at the end?
BC: Yes.
Application tabled.

App#9
KR: They touched on all the components and seem to represent UNC strongly and in a beneficial way.
KM: They did bring this fact throughout.
KR: Research seems to have an impact on the conference.
KM: This is their first conference, and this conference only occurs every two years.
KR: They will also be doing two presentations.
KR: Recommendation – Full Funding (Dom)

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?
Voting on Full Funding of App#9:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#28
KM: This is another research opportunity. It is international and seems to have impact outside their own project with outreach and communicating with other scholars. What did you think?
BC: KR is recused from this one. NR read it.
NR: I really liked it. It seems like a unique opportunity.
BC: I agree with both of you. My one issue is that methodology seems to be lacking.
KM: This can sometimes be an issue in anthropology.
KR: I think they are trying to lay the groundwork for future field work, so that may be why they are not quite there.
KM: Recommendation – Full Funding (Intl)
NR: It is well-written, systematic, and even though they have previously traveled there, a different experience.
NR: Recommendation – Full Funding (Intl)
BC: Note that only three of you may vote on this as KR is recused. All in favor?
Voting on Full Funding of App#28:
Yeas: 3
Nays: 0

App#2
LT: Although they have presented multiple times, this is a prestigious opportunity that seems to have significant impact for UNC. It seems really important if the only grad student attendee out of forty other participants.
NR: It seems like a good networking opportunity, though it is difficult to determine the impact of the conference, it seems significant.
LT: Recommendation – Full Funding (Intl)
NR. Second
BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

*Voting on Full Funding of App#2:*

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**App#14**

LT: I docked them because I was confused on where this was and why they could not do it here.

NR: I think the conference provided the opportunity to interface with a larger group of OCD people.

LT: It’s just not clear.

NR: I think it’s something they could have done here, but this conference provided the opportunity to have a greater impact.

LT: Ok. Recommendation – Full Funding (Dom)

NR: Second.

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

*Voting on Full Funding of App#14:*

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**App#25&32:**

BC: Last night, I noted the similarities between these applications and asked them if they would consider allowing us to consider them as a group as they fit the bill. They agreed. Ultimately, it is to one of their benefits as one of them would be on the waiting list otherwise, and it saves us some issue as you two are flipped on the applications.

LT: I ranked one higher because one seemed to be a bit snarky and the other seemed fairly grateful for the opportunity

NR: I could see the language difference if you are competing with someone.

LT: Recommend full funding (DomGrp)

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

*Voting on Full Funding of App#25&32:*

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**App#27**

BC: We don’t have much money left, so I recommend we return to our tabled app. Since both of our next applications are international. I recommend that we give #27 a partial domestic to leave us a minimum for an international award of $400.00

KM: Agreed. I think this one is a good one to give a partial to if we have to give a partial to someone.

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

*Voting on Partial Funding of App#27:*

- Yeas: 4
Extended debate on Apps #6 & #31 because same score and last moneys.

BC: We have a problem with #6 and #31 because you have them ranked the same. So, have at it.

KM: #6 is well-written. The way they phrased it made it seem like a big deal. They have members there in the field they're working on and they spoke to an audience of sixty and the president for the American Academy of Medievalists, whatever that is.

KR: #6 only really lost points for representing UNC

BC: Let me remind you that this was also the major point against #31.

KR: I also took off because they did not explain their research.

Whole committee read both together.

KM: #31 has the opportunity to be published.

KR: #6 shows they spent time at the conference.

KM: While #6 did spend time at the conference, #31 organized the panel and presented.

LT: I don’t think the number of panels should matter, and you should go to the keynote address at a conference.

KR: I’m leaning towards #31 because they have the opportunity to publish and because they organized the panel.

LT: Both presented dissertation research, but #31 won’t definitely won’t get the opportunity to present at this conference again while here because the conference is every four years.

KM: I’m leaning towards #31

LT: And acceptance process; two levels of peers says that #31 is worthwhile.

NR: I recommend we give full funding to whomever we fund.

BC: That’s not a problem. As I said at the beginning, we can adjust our budget as necessary. We did this at the beginning of last year. I think we set $4000.00 for the first meeting last year and moved it up to $4200.00. We will just have to re-adjust the budget at the beginning of the next meeting.

KM: We should give full funding if we are going to fund either. I think we should award #31

NR: Concur

LT: Concur

KR: I like #31 more now. I just wished it had been clearer on certain aspects and not so vague.

BC: That’s fair. That’s why it has the current score and not a 30-something.

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

Voting on Full Funding of App#31:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: With that said, are we all in agreement that #6 should be Waitlist #1?
Voting on Waitlist #1 for App#6:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App#34
   LT: Overall, they went to Finland to represent work at a meeting that only occurs every four years. It seems very impactful, but it is very long and not very well edited, which I found surprising from philosophy.
   NR: Agreed. I recommend we add them to the Waitlist.
   BC: Further discussion? All in favor?
Voting on Waitlist #2 for App#34:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App#30
   LT: This is a hard research conference to get into and they presented dissertation research
   NR: They alluded to learning a lot but they did specify, but they should have good conference impact.
   NR: Recommend – Waitlist #3
   BC: Further discussion? All in favor?
Voting on Waitlist #3 for App#30:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

Extended Discussion on App#33 and App#26
   KR: #33 Conference seems important for the field, having 10000 participants. They try to substantiate the fact that it is the most important conference; however, they are only attending not presenting.
   LT: #26 is doing a poster.
   BC: If #26 is presenting a poster and #33 is only attending, perhaps we should switch them.
   KM: #26 should be next on the waitlist if they are presenting.
   LT: I have some issues. It seems that they are presenting undergrad research.
   BC: But, where is there undergrad research from? Isn’t it from UNC? Doesn’t this actually make the school look good that one of our undergrads is able to produce this work and continue to pursue into their grade?
   LT: It’s actually not surprising that the research is from their undergrad given the amount of time this sort of research takes
   NR: Agrees looks good for UNC because undergrad but vagueness in some areas.
BC: Is it their first conference? The fact that they are presenting undergrad research seems to indicate that they are fairly early in their degree program and this may account for the vagueness. May be their first conference.

KM: They are working on MA, so probably.

LT: Recommendation – WL#4

BC: Further discussion? All in favor?

Voting on Waitlist #4 for App#26:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: Are we agreed #33 should be Waitlist #5?

Voting on Waitlist #5 for App#33:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

6. Complete and Edit Senate Bill for the Acceptance of TAC Recommendations

Bill completed by Brian Coussens, Chair, during break in meeting. Bill read and checked against decisions by Committee.

7. Voting on Senate Bill

Committee Vote on Proposed Budget:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

8. Additional Business

Committee Vote on Forwarding Nominations Bill as currently worded to Resolutions Committee:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

9. Setting of a Date for the November Meeting

Next committee applications meeting set for Monday, November 23, at 7:00pm, to decide applications due on November 1 and get decision to Senate by December meeting. Place TBD.

10. Dismissal
1. Call to Order and Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Coussens</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katelin McCullough</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailey Rocker</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Rodeberg</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leah Townsend</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No other parties present at the meeting

2. Review and Adjustment of the Budget

Discussion:
BC: Because we spent around $200.00 more than recommended in the first session, we need to figure out what to shoot for this time. My recommendation is to subtract the $200.00 from the final cycle, based on historical numbers, and shoot for $8000.00 for this round, as this is traditionally our largest round. Any discussion? Vote?

Committee Vote on Proposed Budget:
- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

3. Old Business

a. Review of Constitutional Resolution (if received back from Resolutions)

Discussion:
BC: We just received our resolution back from the Resolutions Committee. They basically approved it unchanged, and I made minor edits to dates
and the president to prepare it for the upcoming Senate meeting. We must approve the final version. Do we remember what this is about?

LT: No.
NR: Appointment of the Chair?
BC: Yeah, the appointment of the chair at the end of the year so that xe is already in place for the coming year and can have everything set up. Any questions? Any further discussion? Vote?

Committee Vote on Constitutional Resolution concerning the Appointment of Travel Awards Chair:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

b. Review of Department Grading Policy

Discussion:

BC: I wanted to return to our decision to revise the grading policy. Last time, we voted to revise the department portion of the Law, making it no longer a requirement. The E-board has recommended that, for now, we hold off on the re-writing of the Travel Law. Number one, it may be a moot point if we are able to separate. Number two, neither they nor their critiques have been able to pinpoint a university law that would make this criteria problematic. My recommendation is that we maintain it for now because it only slightly affects grades and it encourages departments to participate in the organization. Recommendations and discussion? Vote?

Committee Vote on Maintaining Current Policy on Grading by Departmental Participation in Senate:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

c. Division of applications (assessment of continued effectiveness)

Discussion:

BC: Finally, before we get into current discussions, I’d like to ascertain how our current division of applications is working for the committee?
LT: I’m not specifically qualified to read the Public Health and Health Policy & Management.
BC: Right now, I’m dividing them on the basis of the health. They could be read as social science, but science needed more apps this time.
LT: Fair enough. I wasn’t saying you shouldn’t divide them accordingly, but that there is no particular advantage to me reading them over someone else.
KM: For us, the MBA problem. Professional almost needs its own category.
KR: Our grading policies seem to be looking for something different: there focus seems to be on networking.
BC: We do over-represent those presenting verses than those attending.
LT: Is that something that we need to revise? For those further along, it’s crucial for them to present.
NR: The attendees could still fit the grading criteria. The just need to show that they are doing more than benefiting themselves.
BC: As chair, separating the STOR apps has been a problem. Right now, I am separating them on the basis of content, as with MPA, but they do not fit comfortably in either category.

BC: The other factor is grade because social sciences were significantly better
LT: I wasn’t blown away with the sciences.
BC: Having read both groups, I felt that humanities / social sciences were better written but I may be biased
LT: I’m not sure the sciences were good as they were last time.

*Committee Vote on Maintaining Current Policy on Division of Applications:*
- Yea: 4
- Nay: 0

4. Discussion & Voting on Current Applications

*Discussion of Applications:*

BC: Let’s start with the first five humanities/social sciences since they have the highest scores and then we will look at the sciences.

App#75:
- KR: This one covers all bases well. They are from Religious Studies and going to the Society of Biblical literature, and they are hoping to turn this paper into a publication. They actually mentioned names of people in the field that can give feedback and stipulate how their research differs from current research and how it changes the field.
- KM: They basically checked off all the dots, including UNC.
- KR: Collaborative with other UNC students
- KR: Full award

*Voting on Full Funding of App#75:*
- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

App#48
- KR: They laid out their research well.
- KM: They are also representing different UNC institutions (Americas and Global Initiatives) and talk about other members on panel and how it is suited to their career ambitions. They lay out their research very well.
- KR: It seems like they will have a high impact at the conference.
KM: They are doing a presentation, and this is going to be part of their dissertation.
KR: The only reservation I have is that they have presented a version of this before.
KM: But if it is continued to be accepted, and they did not receive funding before, one version should probably receive funding.
KR: Full funding
*Voting on Full Funding of App#48:*
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

**App#62**
KR: They are presenting dissertation work on material from Chile.
KM: They will be networking with Chileans at the conference.
KR: They are presenting dissertation research and are looking for job opportunities.
KM: Considering the number of applications for this conference, it sounds like a big conference.
KR: Full funding
*Voting on Full Funding of App#62:*
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

**App#51**
KR: It is concise and well-written. It is only one paragraph but it covers all the bases.
KM: They sum up their research without the entire thing being a summary of research; they are preparing to enter job market; and it sounds like conference is really important for their field.
KR: The application pool for conference seems competitive, and the applicant distinguishes how they will contribute to field and in what ways and notes people in the field they will be able to meet.
KM: Full funding
*Voting on Full Funding of App#51:*
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

**App#78**
KM: This was good but I’m not sure how big of an impact it will have on the field as I am not an expert in the area. They presented dissertation research about Mozart and Beethoven.
KR: I just wrote strong candidate. They laid it out well; and it is for one of the largest conferences for field but lacking in how impact field.
KM: It is lacking by like a point.
KR: They are also on the academic job market.
KM: The chair of the session is on their dissertation committee and an expert in the field, so they know people in the conference and will be networking.
KM: Full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#78:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: Let’s move on to sciences. Because of the weakness of the science scores, I would say let’s go ahead and discuss the six highest scores in science, and then we can discuss what to do from there.

App#10
LT: They are presenting dissertation work at a medical conference in Philadelphia. Basically, their dissertation is research looking at Malaria at a molecular level, especially in pregnant women.
NR: It seems like a strong networking opportunity and their work is collaborative
LT: Yes, they are trying to get collaboration to develop vaccine
NR: It is well-written
LT: Full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#10:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#35
LT: This is the first conference for this student as a grad student in fourth year. It is protein engineering.
KM: It seems like the conference is going to be a big place for both academia and industry.
LT: It’s rare when you have both represented well. They are also participating in young researchers forum
KM: It looks like it’s supposed to be a connecting thing to get them integrated with older names in the field and being at the point they are, it seems important.
LT: They also mention that their work is novel in the field and why and how it brings recognition to the university.
KM: Good in my opinion but not an amazing. Full funding.
LT: Yeah

Voting on Full Funding of App#35:
Yeas: 3 (NR recused because same department)
Nays: 0

App#31
KR: This is a PhD candidate attending the Academy of Neuroscience. They are also working with a UNC group for helping vets returning
with cognitive issues. They had 100 vets complete the study, and they want to share results. It is one of the best representations of UNC so far, and the research seems to have a real-world impact.

NR: It is a good display of the research of university, and they gave a talk at a conference where posters are more common.

LT: Yeah, papers rare, even for professors and doctors.

KR: Full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#31:
Yeas: 3 (LT recused because same department)
Nays: 0

App#29
NR: They discussed the conference well, research well, and they mention looking for postdoc opportunities at the conference. It looks like the research impacts the local community through public events.

LT: It is a standard well-rounded app

NR: They could have organized it better

LT: They weren’t super vague and mentioned specific opportunities

NR: It looks like they are international

BC: It is domestic. It is Puerto Rico, which unfortunately, still falls under a domestic category.

KM: The last time I looked at flights to PR, they were fairly cheap

NR: Full Funding.

Voting on Full Funding of App#29:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#18
NR: I docked points because didn’t say a lot for their own benefit, but they probably did benefit serving on a panel at a big conference

LT: Yeah, I though the impact of being on a panel at big conference would be significant.

NR: I guess my score could be higher

LT: I liked that the panel has different people from different backgrounds so the applicant has the ability to meet these and network

NR: Full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#18:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#22
NR: They are unclear in what they were doing, vague about networking, and they didn’t address what their research was.

KM: It sounds like undergrad with the honors thing.

LT: It’s pharm. They do a lot of classes.
LT: I marked it up because collaboration and they mention a lot of professional dev workshops and seem excited about. They also mention a larger workshop; and they are, afterall, presenting their research.

KR: I see that one sentence they thrown in there.

LT: I think if we are going to look at science as a group I think this is the bottom of what we should fund.

NR: No that’s pretty much what I see. Full Funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#22:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#59

NR: I say they mention import things for dissertation.

LT: The grammar really bothered me.

NR: They didn’t really didn’t tie back to UNC.

LT: I docked them on grammar and UNC but scored them a 4 on most other categories.

NR: Do we have others?

BC: This is the last of the upper echelon in your group.

LT: I would be OK full-funding and it was accepted through blind process.

Voting on Full Funding of App#59:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: Alright, unless you want to look at the sciences with a high discrepancy rate, we can return to social sciences.

LT: I just wasn’t impressed with the sciences.

NR: We can come back for the waitlist.

App#45

KR: I thought this one was so interesting. This isn’t a stereotypical application. They were actively involved in organizing a roundtable on Syrian crisis. It is relevant.

KM: There is a lot of politicians involved and college-aged students involved, and they brag about bringing attention to UNC.

KR: It does foster relationships between UNC and certain human right groups.

KM: It may lead to research.

KR: Full funding.

Voting on Full Funding of App#45:

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#49
KR: They are on the job market and they are contemplating working in Greece.
BC: They are Greek.
KM: They are giving a talk there, and it will reconnect them to Greece and connect them to work opportunities. It is a research seminar which is an interesting mix.
KR: I am unsure which presentation they are doing.
BC: The one on absence.
LT: I think any PhD given a full talk anywhere gets a full vote
KM: It’s good to send our students abroad. It is good face to put forward for the university.
KR: Full funding

*Voting on Full Funding of App#49:*
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

**App#58**

BC: May I start the conversation on this one? I don’t understand why they can’t conduct their study locally. Why do they have to go across the country to find participants in their study when there are thousands that meet this criteria in this state.
KM: I also have a concern over the incentive.
KR: It is a fairly small sample size
LT: Why can’t they can’t do it with Skype?
BC: It has to do with their methodology.
KR: They are using phenomenological technique.
KM: They don’t establish why have to do it across the country.
KM: Even if they couldn’t get participants here, they could get participants in our region.
LT: I don’t like the word incentives.
KR: Incentives are not uncommon.
LT: I don’t think that’s what GPSF travel award should fund.
BC: They can’t. They must present a receipt and a receipt from these sources would be unacceptable.
KR: All of the award would be covered in traveled.
KM: Other than that, the reason it got such a high score is because they are far along in the interview process and framework.
KR: And they defined their method
LT: Asking 300 for incentive shows that they don’t understand what they are applying to
BC: My big thing is defense of local is the key requirement and the sole and central requirement of Travel Law.
KM: I took off two for this.
LT: I don’t see why the couldn’t do this here.
KR: I’m sure they have reasoning but they do not give it.
KM: I’d be OK skipping or giving partial.
BC: Let’s skip and come back if we need to.

App#67

KR: I thought this candidate was strong; one weakness was the importance of conference. They are presenting a portion of their dissertation research, and they note that their research is groundbreaking and why and implications. Some of their case studies are from NC

KM: Yeah, it doesn’t focus on UNC but it is NC; but it does seem they lay out their research well. It seems like this conference is tailored to what they do, and it seems like it would be beneficial for them in particular. They are economic policy advisor to members of congress, so it seems like they would be suited

KR: Also their project is interdisciplinary

KM: They are defending in March

KR: I would recommend full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#67:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#12

KR: I thought this app was good. It didn’t address how their work contributed to field.

KM: They should have provided more information on importance of the conference and how their work is impactful; however, they were invited to present. It is short, but other than that, pretty good.

KR: I wrote we should consider for partial.

KM: I ranked so high because it was the first good one.

KR: Partial is probably better.

Voting on Partial Funding of App#12:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App#44

KM: Another history one.

KR: It is Domestic but an international student from France who was applying to go to a conference in Chicago. The conference is not a big name conference but dedicated to a person in field and this person is a co-organizer.

KM: They helped to select papers, and they are going to be published.

KR: They are the only grad student participant

KM: This is typical for our field, and a great honor.

LT: How are they coming from France?

BC: They could be doing research?

KR: They could be a little more humble: I was break out star.

KM: I think they were coached to do this, especially since they are later in their graduate career
KR: Over all impressive
BC: On funding, are they domestic international? I think, given that we typically decide funding on the destination, we must classify it as domestic. There is not clear guidance on how to deal with this in Travel Law

General consensus.
KR: Full
Voting on Full Funding of App#44:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App#43
KR: This student is attending two conferences and presenting parts of dissertation at both
KM: So they went into an in depth description of research, but they are presenting at both and it seems like they feel the two conferences are different enough that they will receive helpful feedback at both
KR: They are looking for job opportunities in both fields, so both conferences are probably useful. They talked about how their research affects the field, but they didn’t talk about importance of conferences
KM: They Spent a lot of time talking about research so could have saved space that
KR: Full funding?
NR: They are going to two conference so…
KM: I would give full funding
Voting on Full Funding of App#43:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App#61
KR: This one I recommended funding.
KM: They presented at the conference last year
BC: Clarification? What are they doing?
KR: They organized the conference.
KM: They are asking for less than the $400 so we can give them a partial?
KR: Getting UNC students involved
NR: How much asking for?
KR: They do not really specify the whole number, but it seems less and they are driving to a regional conference. I suggest partial.

Voting on Partial Funding of App#75:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App#70
KM: This is a research one
KR: It is short-term travel to do archival research
KM: At University of Illinois. They are looking at interviews from Cuban Revolution and women’s role in education and policy. They already started research, so they have a methodology down
KR: I wasn’t sure how applicable their research was outside of academia?
KM: We have to guess about outside, and they don’t exactly lay out plan but it seems to be present
KR: I really like this one
KM: I’d give partial

Voting on Partial Funding of App#75:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

BC: Alright, that is all the funding. Let’s do the waitlist. Let’s return to the sciences and consider any that you think might should be on the waitlist.

App#54
  LT: This one reads like a college entrance essay but it gets the ideas across.
  NR: There is not much about the background
  KM: My beloved profession
  LT: It’s cool they are repping pharmacy in a scenario slightly out of field. If you want to find one from the sciences for the waitlist, this one would be ok.

App#55
  LT: This one had a language problem
  NR: It does mention UNC
  LT: It is very generic.
  NR: But I think it would be a good waitlist option
  BC: Which numbers?
  LT: I like the college one but where do they fall relative to the humanities?

BC: Humanities waitlist?

App#82
  KR: This student is not presenting but they followed the prompt.
  KM: It is juvenile how they answer the prompt but it is one of the MBAs, and they at least attempted to answer prompt
  KR: Well, we could move on?
  KM: This was something they were funding themselves.
  BC: My issue with it is they misinterpreted the impact on the field section.
  KM: But they attempted.
  KR: Maybe put them low on WL? #3

App#47
KR: This one is something different.
BC: I have questions about this one and actually emailed the treasurer about this one. My question is if we GPSF funds this one, are we funding conference or research travel or are we funding a business? Autumn suggested that, if we decided to fund this one, we ask the Senate what they felt about this.
LT: This seems like a lot of trouble for something on the waitlist plus, they have other funding mechanisms in place.
BC: We do need to make sure we define a position on this issue at some point
KM: Let’s table this one

App#50
KM: This one was interesting. The paper sounded cool, though I don’t know anything about Russian advertisement.
LT: Scholars only allowed to present the work every three years. Is that a thing?
KR: Perhaps? This is their last year at UNC and job market.
KM: They do stress importance of conference
KR: It is dissertation material and, it advances their field.
KM: Put it on the list
LT: #1 or #2
KM: WL#1

App#57
KM: Oh this one was about pottery.
BC: Enough to get any archaeologist excited.
KM: Modern potteries.
BC: Aww.
KR: They argue that the pottery community needs to be seen and heard outside of NC
KM: They inflate their research
KR: they have gained much from the conference. They are collaborating with people at the conference and planning a panel for next year
KM: It is for their PhD research
KR: They spoke to multiple MA to apply to UNC
BC: Is this the American Studies one?
KR: Yes.
BC: They talked about the necessity of building up the program because of its relative newness
KM: Maybe this one should be #1 and the other #2
KR: Let’s put this as #2

BC: Ok, that fills our waitlist. Are there any other applications we should go back and consider?

General consensus is no.
BC: Should we vote to close deliberations and write the bill

Committee Vote to Close Discussion and Accept Awards:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

5. Completion and Editing of Senate Bill for the Acceptance of TAC Recommendations

Bill completed by Brian Coussens, Chair, during break / discussion of Agenda Item #7.

6. Voting on Senate Bill

Committee Vote on Proposed Budget:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

7. Additional Business (Notes by Leah Townsend while Chair edited Bill)

a. Discussion of slight changes to Application (Essay Instructions)

Discussion:
BC: I would like us to look at the application and make one small change. Given the amount of editing I had to do to remove personal identifiers from the applications each cycle, I would like something added to the instructions concerning names in the application essay. Here are the Current Instructions:

Please explain briefly, in 500 words or less, the purpose of your travel and its importance to your research, the University of North Carolina, and your educational and professional development. Be sure to include enough information so the committee can evaluate the personal and professional impact of the travel (including how it will affect your research field, further your own research, and help you develop professionally). Be sure that you avoid overly technical language as the readers of the applications may not be in your field.

Committee discussion over form of the addition, particularly centering on how to term “personal identifier.”

Addendum as suggested by the Committee:
Additionally, please refrain from including your name or contact information in the body of the text as this is a blind review process.

Committee Vote on Addendum to Application:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

b. Division of Regions
Discussion:
BC: This is something Autumn brought up at the beginning of the year and we really can’t implement it right now, but I wanted to ascertain if we would consider awarding travel awards based on regions in distance from the university.

Committee Discussion, with key factors focusing on the following points:
- Complication by air fare, different hotel pricing, etc.
- Is there a real value in the change? $300 v. $400?
- We already have some self-correction mechanism in place by awarding partial awards to local travel.

Committee Vote to Maintain Current Award System divided on type of travel and international v. domestic rather than on regions:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

Committee Vote on Apportioning a part of the funds simply for travel – table topic for now:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

c. Certain types of applications

Discussion:
BC: As we noted earlier today, we have some discrepancy in the awarding of applications. Do we want to change the travel law to apportion a percentage of future funds for individuals simply to travel to a conference / attend a conference? This is a particular concern for MA students, as we give out a lot of awards to later career students presenting at conferences.

Committee Discussion, with key factors focusing on the following points:
- Feeling that some applicants ‘make the case’ to attend the conference and that there are ways to stand out; burden is on applicant to prove why funding should be awarded.
- Phrasing is key…
- Masters students might be unfairly penalized as many do not present research at conferences.

Committee Vote on Apportioning a part of the funds simply for travel – table topic for now:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

8. Setting a Date for the February Meeting

Next Committee Meeting will be in the second week of February, not a Wednesday, to consider the applications due on February 1 and get a decision to the Senate by March 1. An actual date will be selected in January once the committee members’ personal schedules become clear.

9. Dismissal
Appendix 5: GPSF Travel Awards 2015–2016 Awards

Resolutions

Appendix 5A: Resolution 15-04

A BILL TO APPROVE GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS FOR JULY 1–SEPTEMBER 30, 2015
(FIRST FALL CYCLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 SEP 2015</td>
<td>PASSED 4-0 TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OCT 2015</td>
<td>SPONSORED BY BRIAN A. COUSSENS, CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 OCT 2015</td>
<td>PASSED/REJECTED <strong>-</strong> BY GPSF SENATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEREAS, The GPSF Travel Awards Committee has dutifully read and considered the eligibility and merits of all the applications to the GPSF Travel Awards for the first fall awards cycle (July 1–September 30) and selected “awardees” and a “wait list,” in accordance with the GPSF Travel Law and the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8, Subsection c,

WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee recommends the following:

1. To award the 10 graduate and professional students listed in Table 1 travel awards to attend conferences and conduct research during the first travel awards cycle, totaling an amount of $4500.00, and

2. To designate the five graduate and professional students listed in Table 2 as a “wait list,” to be awarded a Travel Award in the order enumerated by the Committee if one of the awardees from Table 1 is unable to accept a Travel Award pursuant to Travel Law, Part 1, Section A, Subsection 4,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the GPSF Senate hereby approves all recommendations for the GPSF Travel Awards as proposed by the Travel Awards Committee per Article V, Section 8 (c) 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Individual /Group</th>
<th>Type of Travel</th>
<th>Awarded for…</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>The Dagstuhl Seminar on Computational Mass Spectrometry</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>Pennell</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Intl Federation of the Teaching of English and the Conference on English Education Summer Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Blakely</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Intl OCD Foundation Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ringlee</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Intl Council for Central &amp; East European Stds, XI World Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/32</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Corey</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>PharmD</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>American Pharmacists Association &amp; Academy of Student Pharmacists Summer Leadership Institute</td>
<td>Full Group ($300/per)</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Meredith</td>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Ethnohistory 2015</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Eleanor</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Research on UNESCO Cities of Literature (Cracow, Poland)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Burgchardt</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Research on UNESCO Sites in the US &amp; their Public Presentation (Mesa Verde / Chaco Canyon)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Oxford Patristics Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $4500.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Individual /Group</th>
<th>Type of Travel</th>
<th>Awarded for…</th>
<th>Wait list Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Intl Medieval Congress</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>15th Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Breanne</td>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Gordon Research Conference and Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Niranjani</td>
<td>Radhakrishnan</td>
<td>Health Behavior / City &amp; Reg Plan</td>
<td>MPH; MCRP</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>American Public Health Association Annual Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Mariya</td>
<td>Meschcheryakova</td>
<td>Business Admin / Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Academy of Management Conference</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Total Applicant Numbers

Total Applicants: 34  Awardees: 10  Wait List: 5

Table 4: Travel Awards Budget and Expenditures YTD

2015-2016 Travel Awards Budget per Senate Bill 15-02................................. $26300.00

Current Budget for Travel Awards:
Awarding Fall Cycle 1 (July 1 – September 30)........................................... $4500.00
Total Funds Spent/Waiting to Be Disbursed/Claimed to Date........................ $0.00
Total Funds Spent/Awarded ........................................................................ $4500.00
Remaining Budget for 2015/2016................................................................. $21800.00

Done this day, the 6th of October, in the year two thousand and fifteen.

Cortney Miller
Vice-President of Internal Affairs

Brandon Linz
President
Appendix 5B: Resolution 15-08

A BILL TO APPROVE GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS FOR OCTOBER 1–DECEMBER 31, 2015 (SECOND FALL CYCLE)

23 NOV 2015 PASSED 4-0 TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE
1 DEC 2015 SPONSORED BY BRIAN A. COUSSENS, CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE
1 DEC 2015 PASSED/REJECTED ___-___ BY GPSF SENATE

WHEREAS, The GPSF Travel Awards Committee has dutifully read and considered the eligibility and merits of all the applications to the GPSF Travel Awards for the second fall awards cycle (October 1–December 31) and selected “awardees” and a “wait list,” in accordance with the GPSF Travel Law and the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8, Subsection c,

WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee recommends the following:

1. To award the 20 graduate and professional students listed in Table 1 travel awards to attend conferences and conduct research during the first travel awards cycle, totaling an amount of $7900.00, and
2. To designate the five graduate and professional students listed in Table 2 as a “wait list,” to be awarded a Travel Award in the order enumerated by the Committee if one of the awardees from Table 1 is unable to accept a Travel Award pursuant to Travel Law, Part 1, Section A, Subsection 4,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the GPSF Senate hereby approves all recommendations for the GPSF Travel Awards as proposed by the Travel Awards Committee per Article V, Section 8 (c) 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Individual /Group</th>
<th>Type of Travel</th>
<th>Awarded for…</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jaymin</td>
<td>Patel</td>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>64th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Hammond</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>National Communication Association 101st Annual Convention</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Xiaojuan</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Public Health Association Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Shen</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>PharmD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Society of Health-System Pharmacists (ASHP) Midyear Clinical Meeting and Exhibition</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Laine</td>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Annual National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences Superfund Research Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mariko</td>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Neurobiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Society for Neuroscience (SFN’s 45th annual meeting)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>International Conference on Protein Engineering</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Hillary</td>
<td>Parkhouse</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>College and University Faculty Assembly at the National Council for the Social Studies and American Educational Studies Association</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>&quot;In the Shadow of Enlightenment: Religion, Reform, and Revolution in the Age of Unigenitus: Papers in Honor of Dale K. Van Kley&quot;</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Eszenyi</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Hungarian Embassy Roundtable with ReConnect Hungary</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Forbes</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Annual</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App#</td>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Individual /Group</td>
<td>Type of Travel</td>
<td>Awarded for…</td>
<td>Wait list Order</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Southern Historical Association Annual Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Trista</td>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Southeastern College Art Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Kaitlyn</td>
<td>Buhlinger</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>PharmD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>57th American Society of Hematology Annual Meeting and Exposition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>Steyl</td>
<td>Speech-Language Pathology</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Speech and Hearing Association</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $7900.00
<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Meisha</td>
<td>McDaniel</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional Planning &amp; BusAd</td>
<td>MCRP &amp; MBA</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>National Minority Supplier Development Council Conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56
Table 3: Total Applicant Numbers

Total Applicants: 83  Withdrewn: 2  Awardees: 20  Wait List: 5

Table 4: Travel Awards Budget and Expenditures YTD

2015-2016 Travel Awards Budget per Senate Bill 15-02.................................$26300.00

Current Budget for Travel Awards:
Awarding Fall Cycle 2 (October 1 – December 31).................................$7900.00
Total Funds Spent/Waiting to Be Disbursed/Claimed to Date.........................$4500.00
Total Funds Spent/Awarded ........................................................................$12400.00
Remaining Budget for 2015/2016.................................................................$13900.00

Done this day, the 6th of October, in the year two thousand and fifteen.

______________________________  ______________________________
Cortney Miller                  Marissa Cann
Vice-President of Internal Affairs  Acting President
WHEREAS, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (1) states: “The Travel Awards Committee consists of five (5) nominated members of the GPSF Senate. The Committee shall elect its own Chair”;

WHEREAS, On the 14th of September, 2006, the Senate passed the motion to approve Resolution 06-08, “A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION AS IT RELATES TO NOMINATION OF THE CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE”;

WHEREAS, Resolution 06-08 enacted three resolutions:

1. Therefore let it be RESOLVED that the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee be changed to a position within the GPSF Cabinet and,
according to Article III Section 8 of the GPSF Constitution, come under the support of the Chief of Staff;

2. Be it further RESOLVED that the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee will be appointed by the Chief of Staff by the final Spring Senate meeting and will hold that position until the following Spring Senate meeting;

3. Be it further RESOLVED that Article IV Section C subsection 1 will be rewritten to state: “The Travel Awards Committee consists of four nominated members of the Senate and a Chair. The Chair will be appointed by the Chief of Staff by the final Spring Senate meeting of each year and the duration of this appointment will be for one calendar year”;

WHEREAS, The Senate and the Travel Awards Committee has continued to act under the Constitution as it was written prior to the passage of Resolution 06-08 since the Spurlock Administration (2008–2009) without repeal of the Resolution;

WHEREAS, The initial reasons for the adoption of Resolution 06-08 remain and have been exacerbated by the increased duties of the Chair and the addition of a second awards cycle to the Fall and Spring semesters;

WHEREAS, The duties of the Travel Awards Chair continue throughout the summer, and the first deadline for Travel Awards now occurs before the Chair of the Committee can be selected according to the Constitutional guidelines; and

WHEREAS, The solution adopted in Resolution 06-08 is inadequate because it fails to maintain a separation between the executive and legislative branches of the GPSF;

THEREFORE, LET IT BE RESOLVED that the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee for the following year be nominated by the Travel Awards Committee in the final Spring Committee meeting and presented to the Senate for its approval in the final Spring Senate meeting;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee, being approved by the Senate, will serve from the final Senate Meeting of one year until the final Senate Meeting of the next year;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the outgoing Chair will assist the newly elected Chair in the administration of the duties of that office until April 30;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that should the Chair nominated and approved by the Senate in the spring be unable to serve the following year because of unforeseen circumstances, the Senate will select five members to the Committee and the Committee will nominate its own chair from those members;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (1) of the Constitution be re-written to say the following:

1. The Travel Awards Committee consists of five nominated members of the Senate.
   a. The four voting members of the Committee will be elected by the Senate from its members in the first Fall Meeting.
   b. Each year, the Chair for the following year will be nominated by the Committee in the final Committee meeting, presented as their recommendation in a formal bill to the Senate in the final Senate meeting, and approved by the Senate. The chair will serve for one calendar year and, at the end of their term, assist the newly elected Chair in learning and administering the duties of that office until April 30.
   c. If the Chair elected in the spring is unable to serve the entire following year because of unforeseen circumstances, the Senate will nominate a fifth person to the Committee, and the Committee will choose the Chair from among its members.

Done this day, the first of December two thousand and fifteen.

______________________________    ______________________________
Cortney Miller                        Marissa Cann
Vice-President of Internal Affairs    Acting President