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Travel Awards Committee Final Report, 2015–2016

Section 1. Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee Members
Brian A. Coussens (Chair), Religious Studies
Katelin McCullogh, Classics
Kailey Rocker, Anthropology
Nathan Rodeberg, Chemistry
Leah Townsend, Neurobiology

Section 2. Summary of Awards through May 10, 2016
(see Appendix 6 for awards bills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Apps</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Wait-list</th>
<th>Remaining Wait-list</th>
<th>Domestic Awards</th>
<th>International Awards</th>
<th>Group Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 1 (July 1–Sept 30)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9²</td>
<td>$4500.00³</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 2 (Oct 1–Dec 31)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$8100.00⁵</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2⁶</td>
<td>0⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 1 (Jan 1–Mar 31)</td>
<td>40⁸</td>
<td>13⁹</td>
<td>$5900.00¹⁰</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 1 (Apr 1–Jun 30)</td>
<td>82¹¹</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$7800.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals at Final</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$26300.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Group Awards are also counted in the Domestic/International Awards categories, as appropriate.
2 This number is the actual number of awards (8 individual and 1 group). The number of individual awardees, including all group members, is 10.
3 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 moneys become available during the course of the year.
4 The only group for Fall Cycle 2 was a group of two. The committee actually had no groups apply during this cycle. However, two individuals applied for the same event with very similar applications, so with their permission, the committee awarded them as a group.
5 Jeffrey Harris’ award was amended in Resolution 16-08 with an additional $200.00, bringing the total awarded this cycle from $7900.00 to $8100.00. All money awarded for Fall Cycle 2 has been disbursed at the writing of this report. We are maintaining the Waiting List for this cycle in case other moneys become available during the course of the year.
6 The Committee only had 8 applicants for “international travel” for Fall Cycle 2. Jeffrey Harris’ award was redefined as an “International Award” in Resolution 16-08 and given an International Differential according to the rewriting of the Travel Law under Resolution 16-07.
7 Only one group applied to Fall Cycle 2 and its application was considered insufficient by the Committee.
8 Three applicants were ineligible: 2 because travel occurs outside of cycle dates and 1 because they received an award in the fall.
9 This number is the actual number of awards (12 individual and 1 group). The number of individual awardees, including all group members, is 15.
10 All money awarded for Spring Cycle 1 has been disbursed at the writing of this report. We are maintaining the Waiting List for this cycle in case other moneys become available during the course of the year.
11 One applicant was ineligible because their travel occurs outside of cycle dates.
12 Only two groups applied to Spring Cycle 2 and their applications were considered insufficient by the Committee.
Section 3. Accomplishments through May 2016

At the beginning of the year, I did a review of the available GPSF Travel Awards historical documents to ensure that the Twelfth Travel Awards 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 had been lost over the Committee’s history. In light of this review process, we determined (1) to make the Committee and its process 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 GPSF’s wikis and the migration 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. See Appendix 1 for the version used for the 2015–2016 fiscal year. See Appendix 9A for the version amended at the end of the year and handed down to the Thirteenth Committee.

   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 submitting their application. At the end of the year, to ensure that the rubric will not be lost again, we amended the Travel Law such that the Committee must maintain and amend this document. See Appendix 2 for the version used for the 2015–2016 fiscal year. See Appendix 9B for the version amended at the end of the year and handed down to the Thirteenth Committee.

   c. **Adopted a Public Agenda Policy**. At least two days prior to a Committee meeting, the Committee Chair prepared an agenda for that meeting, including the date and location of the meeting, and gave it to the GPSF Secretary to be made publicly available through the website. This policy was another first in the history of the Committee. For the Agendas of the Twelfth Travel Awards Committee, see Appendix 4.

   d. **Adopted a Public Minutes Policy**. Again, in another first for the Travel Awards Committee, the Chair now took detailed meeting minutes and made them available on the website. Due to issues encountered over the year (see Sections 4 and 5 below), we reassigned the responsibility for the minutes at the end of the year to another member of the Committee. For the minutes of the Twelfth Travel Awards Committee, see Appendix 5.
e. *Adopted a Policy of Formal Voting*. The Committee also took and recorded in the minutes a formal vote on every motion, application discussed, and bill/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 my first year as chair last year) wherein the Committee’s practices were lost due to a failure of the systems of continuity in place, the Committee has attempted 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 with one another and discuss policies and procedures over the month of April (see further information in 3.a. below).

c. *Amending the Travel Law to require that the Committee perform duties to ensure continuity*. Previously, the Travel Law included few details of the Committee’s duties, the organizational theory seeming to be to allow each Committee to operate freely. However, to prevent lapses in institutional memory, the Committee felt it necessary that some portions of the processes should be maintained to preserve continuity. Thus, we added Part 6 to the Travel which legislated, among other things, the following:

   i. *Travel Law Review*. Having found that the Travel Law had not been amended since 2013, we amended the law such that the Committee must review the law on a yearly basis and either change the law or submit a formal report to the Senate stating that no change was found necessary. Dates for both review and change are to be included in the law to maintain a record of these activities.

   ii. *Documents*. To prevent the loss of documents, the Committee is now required to maintain and review all relevant Committee documents, including the Policies & Procedures, Grading Rubric, and FAQs.

   iii. *Reporting*. To ensure that the Committee’s process remains open and to prevent loss of data, the Committee must submit a formal report of its operations twice a year, detailing its accomplishments. Additionally, all relevant Committee documents and files, including Policies & Procedures, Grading Rubrics, FAQs, Agendas, Minutes, and Bills must be preserved in the appendices of these reports.

d. *Producing a History of the Committee*. As noted above, in my review of the Committee, I found that much information and several policies were lost between the various Committees. Given the amount of time I personally expended in combing through the online archive, I thought it would be beneficial to the Committee to have a working document on the Committee’s history, summarizing
the major events and changes in the history of the Committee. The document currently consists of a short history of the Committee, the membership of the previous Committees, and a running list of awardees (for the latter, I could not locate the results for the First to Third Committees and the Sixth). This document should provide an easily accessible and useful secondary reference point for continuity between Committees and also ensure that future Committees are not trying to reinvent the wheel or replicating failed policies of previous Committees. This document is now stored in the Committee Archive (see below). It should be updated at least once a year.

E. Producing a Working and Accessible Committee Archive. One of the greatest issues in my review of the Committee and preparation of the History of the Committee was access to information. Although some files pertaining to the Committee are kept in the GPSF archives and others are maintained on the website, (1) the former files are not easily accessible to the Committee Chair (i.e., the Chair really does not have access to these files at all), (2) the latter are spread among multiple documents and require significant labor to locate relevant information, and (3) some types of files are not preserved at all. In addition to the History of the Committee noted above, I have now created a Committee Archive which consists of everything available in the online archive and all documents produced in my time as chair of the Eleventh and Twelfth Committees, including all application and grading files. Provision of this information should allow succeeding Chairs to determine easily the methodology used and provide formats for certain information (bill writing, email notifications, etc.), although, on the latter point, I would recommend following the structure and files of the Twelfth Committee rather than the Eleventh.

3. Addressing 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 (it may have been repealed, but we could not locate the corresponding bill). To address all these issues, the Committee proposed Resolution 15-09 (see Appendix 7), 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. In keeping with this change, Candace L. Buckner was
appointed chair of the Thirteenth Committee (2016–17) in Resolution 16-15 after an open call for applications and an interview process (see Appendix 8).

b. Updated the Application. The application has been changed four times 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, largely reorganizing it. 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 discusses the wording of and takes a formal vote on all changes to the Application. For this version of the application, see Appendix 3.

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.”

iii. In February, the Committee amended the opening phrasing of the Application in hopes of directing applicants to existing informational documents prior to emailing the gpsf-travel email address. The Committee changed the phrasing to the following: “If you still have questions unaddressed by the GPSF Travel Awards Law, FAQs, and Grading Rubric on the GPSF Travel Awards website (http://gpsf.unc.edu/gpsf-funding/travel-awards/), please e-mail the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.”

iv. In March, the Committee did a major overhaul to the application in an effort to bring it in line with the Grading Rubric, Travel Law, and the Travel FAQs and to address issues that came up during the year. Major changes included reorganization to remove redundant form spaces, the rewriting of the prompt to bring it in line with the rubric and Travel Law and to clarify the needs for each type of application, additions to collect new data (e.g., a budget for research travel), and the re-addition of the Honor Statement agreement, which had been removed in the first amendment to the application noted above. For this version of the application, see Appendix 9D.

c. Updated and edited the Travel FAQs. The FAQs had not been updated since 2013 and did not fully reflect the current content of Travel Law and Committee practice. Additionally, several persistent questions received by the chair throughout the year were not addressed in the FAQs. Thus, we did a major edit of the FAQs. We also attempted to make them more user friendly, as they previously presented as just a long list of questions and answers, which was not conducive to
quick-scanning of topics. Thus, we created a menu page with hyperlinks to the various questions/answers, a change which should significantly improve accessibility. For the updated version of the FAQs, see Appendix 9C.

d. **Reviewed and edited the Travel Law.** At the end of the year, the Committee did a full review and revision of the Travel Law. Most of the changes fell under the categories of clarification and/or bringing the Law in line with practice. However, a handful of significant changes were made to address persistent or new problems, as detailed below. For the changes to the Travel Law in full, see Resolution 16-14 in Appendix 8C.

i. **Part VI: Travel Awards Committee Clauses.** As mentioned above, Part VI was added to address the issue of continuity. Additionally, it clarifies the process of the Committee with respect to awarding moneys, particularly detailing the operation of the Waitlist, for which no previous instructions existed.

ii. **Good Standing Clause.** As detailed in the Midyear Report, the Good Standing clause (referred to in the previous report as “the Program Score”) has been a long-standing bone of contention, both for those on the Committee and those outside of the Committee. Previous Committees had noted objection to this score in their reports and reduced the weight of the score. Additionally, this was 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. The Committee considered this point at the beginning of the year and had considered striking it altogether, but after reconsidering it, we decided to reduce the impact of the award by changing it from an all-or-nothing score to a partial score and then we tabled the issue at that time. As we prepared to present the Travel Law updates to the Senate, we brought the issue back up, and, feeling uncomfortable about making the decision for such a contentious point ourselves, we polled the Senate in the March meeting to ascertain the will of the body. Overwhelmingly, the Senate decided that we should not eliminate the Good Standing Clause altogether because it incentivizes involvement in the Senate. Rather, we reduced its impact by making it such that, if all things are equal between two applications, the applicants’ program’s standing with the GPSF shall be used as a determining factor between them.

iii. **International Differential.** As indicated in the midyear report, we encountered an issue with the International Differential. As it was written, it required the Committee to determine “international” status by destination. As written, the law, without cause, excluded those who, for research or for personal reason, were spending an extended period abroad from receiving travel funds for a conference occurring in the continental US. Therefore, we amended the law such that destination is not the determining factor but travel to/from a place outside the continental US. This part of the law was amended in Resolution 16-07 (See Appendix 8A)
so that we could amend the award of one applicant whose travel plans prevented him from receiving the International Differential under the old law.

iv. **Restrictions.** Previously, Travel Law referred the applicant to Treasury Law for restrictions imposed on the use of Travel Awards moneys; however, the Treasury Law had no references to Travel Law. We clarified the law and placed the restrictions (e.g., weapons, alcohol) within the Travel Law itself.

v. **Honor Code.** Because of a clear instance of plagiarism between two applications this year (over 50% agreement), the Committee considered addressing this issue in Travel Law and re-adding the Honor Code to the application (it was removed in the first edit this year) to be necessary. The Law now states that those applications found to be in violation of the Honor Code will be disqualified. They should probably also be brought before the Honor Court. We ultimately decided not to act on this year’s violation beyond disqualification because the removal of the Honor Code pledge from the application weakened the case, but this point should no longer an issue with the final edit of the application for the year.

**Section 4. 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 **Section 3** 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 from the applications except department. 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.

### Section 5. 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. At the end of the year, we slightly edited the rubric to reflect the change in the “Good Standing” Clause. See above for discussion of the clause and see Appendix 9 for the changed rubric.

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 Excel calculate score difference, and we consider any scores with high differentials that might be competitive if regraded.

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. **Grading Discrepancies between Fields.** Cycle to cycle, because the fields are graded by different graders, the grades of one field may be higher than those of another. If I found the scores for one subject area to be higher than the other, we, at times, gave preference to lower scores in the other subject area in order to maintain an appropriate balance between the subject areas. However, this decision depended on the recommendations of the graders as, in certain cycles, the graders (and I, having read all the applications) felt that one grouping of applications was significantly weaker than the other and the discrepancies between the groups warranted.
   b. **The Liminality of Some Programs** (especially math-based programs, but also some professional programs). 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 arise in the future, the Committee should consult with the Senators of the programs most impacted to determine how best to serve their needs and find an appropriate course of action.

4. **Dropbox Sharing.** Dropbox was great for making sure that all members knew what was going on, and it allowed 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 locked 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 had trouble at times taking Committee minutes and directing the flow of the discussion. At the end of the year, the decision was made to change the Policies such that the Committee shall appoint a Vice-Chair from the voting members whose main job will be to record meeting notes. If future Committees find this policy does not work, they may consider altering the Policies and Procedures so that they may invite someone (the Secretary?) to the meeting to take notes.

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 remains 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 began preparing potential successful candidates’ data in advance (based on the scores I receive from the graders) and then copying and pasting them into the prepared blank version of the bill at the meeting. Given that our addition of the Vice-Chair specifies that, because of their voting member status, they remain blind, any preparatory work necessarily will remain that of the Chair in future years. It may be that, with the meeting notes being handed over to the Vice-Chair, this duty will become less onerous for the Chair, and they may be able to complete the bill as decisions are made. If, however, future Committees continue to find this to be a problem, they may consider changing the Policies & Procedures such that a non-Committee member helps prepare the resolution in house.

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

**Section 6. Ongoing Issues & Current Solutions**

Over the course of the year, the following issues have been brought to the attention of the Chair and may need to be re-considered by future committees.

1. **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. 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.” My own experience as the Chair of the Eleventh and Twelfth Committees fits Chair Arpen’s description exactly.
   b. **The previous solutions are ineffective because they do not address the underlying issues.** 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 interactions this year, 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.

c. **However, for now, the Committee continues to use the same solutions.** 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 GPSF 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.

2. **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 (Cortney Miller) was that the award amounts should be maintained at the current level.

a. **The Logic behind Maintaining Current Award Levels.** The ultimate decision to maintain the current level of funding was due to the fact that increasing the awards amount 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. **Regional Calculations.** 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 at this time.

c. **Future Increases in Awards.** If the GPSF gains access to additional Travel Awards moneys for future fiscal years, I recommend that award increases be calculated in such a way as to maintain the percentage of applicants currently being awarded (20–25%). This recommendation has to do with the point at which the Committee has found the quality of applications begins to decline to significantly (this year, often as we filled out the waitlist, we felt that the quality of the applications had changed).
Section 7. Recommendations for Future Committees

During the year, I addressed most of the issues I had with the operation of the Committee. Therefore, my main recommendation is that future Committees make a concerted effort not to let the safeguards put in place for continuity to lapse again. Additionally, I recommend the following:

1. Committee/Chair Access to the Post-Travel Reports. The reports seem to have been previously collected by the Committee but are now collected by the GPSF Treasurer. Although methodology of collection need not change, the purpose behind the reports—measuring the effectiveness of the awards—is diminished if the Committee does not have access to these files. In addition, keeping a copy of these files in the Committee Archive will provide future Chairs with a more complete data set as they consider what changes are necessary to the Committee.

2. Need for an Ethics Committee. Although the Committee has 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 these problems. We had no issues this year, and our Committee members were excellent. However, the Senate should have the ability to recall and replace Committee members who demonstrate dereliction of duty, as experienced by other Committees this year, or commit other 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 and provide a process for recall and method for ensuring accountability of the Committee to the Senate and the Senators to their constituents.
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.

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…
   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 GPSF Travel 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 (5pts)
      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 anyway.

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: Application Form, 2015–2016

The GPSF Travel Awards Application Period is closed for the Second Fall Travel Awards Cycle (travel between October 1 and December 31). The application for the First Spring Awards Cycle will open soon. Please be on the lookout for it. If you applied during the first round of applications, notifications of your status will be sent out shortly after the December GPSF Senate meeting.

GPSF Travel Award Application

Please keep the following dates and deadlines in mind when applying:

If Travel Occurs: 
- July 1—September 30
- October 1—December 31
- January 1—March 31
- April 1—June 30

You Must Apply By: 
- September 1 (Fall 1 Cycle)
- November 1 (Fall 2 Cycle)
- February 1 (Spring 1 Cycle)
- March 15 (Spring 2 Cycle)

GPSF Travel Awards are used to assist with conference and research travel expenses for graduate and professional students who have no other source of funding or financial support. Travel Awards are competitive; we receive more qualified applications than we can fund every cycle.

If you have any questions, please e-mail the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.

Award Eligibility

GPSF Travel Awards cannot be used in combination with any other source of funding (other than personal funds). Any reimbursement by your department, PI, advisor, mentor, or any other source will disqualify you from receiving your award. If you have received a GPSF Travel Award in the past two (2) years, you are also ineligible to apply.

If awarded, I certify that no other source of funding will be used for the conference or research travel for which I'm applying. *

Please write your full legal name to agree:

I certify that I have not received a GPSF Travel Award in the past two (2) years. *

Please write your full legal name to agree:
Application

Are you applying for conference or research travel?*
- Conference Travel
- Research Travel

Are you traveling domestically or internationally?*
- Domestic
- International

Are you applying for an individual or group award?*
- Individual
- Group

If applying for Group Award, list all names and email addresses of group members
Only UNC graduate and professional students are eligible for GPSF Travel Awards

First Name*

Last Name*

PID*

Email Address*

Department*

Degree Pursued*
(MA, MS, MBA, JD, PhD, etc.)

Name of Faculty Sponsor*

Email of Faculty Sponsor*
Statement of Purpose

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.

Conference Travel

What is the title of the conference you are attending?

What is the website for the conference you are attending?

To what city will you be traveling?
Include country if outside of USA

When does your travel begin?
Month: [ ] Day: [ ] 2016

When does your travel end?
Month: [ ] Day: [ ] 2016

In what manner are you participating in the conference?
- Paper / Oral Presentation
- Poster
- Session Chair or Presider
- Discussant
- Invited Panelist
- Attending, not otherwise presenting
- Other: [ ]
If presenting, what is the title of your paper or presentation?

If presenting, are there multiple authors of the paper or presentation?
- Yes
- No

If presenting, please list all other authors of the paper or presentation besides yourself.

Add Item

---

**Research Travel**

When does your travel begin?
- Month: [ ]
- Day: [ ]
- 2016: [ ]

When does your travel end?
- Month: [ ]
- Day: [ ]
- 2016: [ ]

To what city will you be travelling?
Include country if outside of USA

Please use this space to clarify any details about your research travel that are otherwise unspecified.

Add Item

---

Thank you for submitting your application to the GPSF Travel Awards. Award announcements will be made after the GPSF Senate meeting in December. If you have any questions concerning Travel Awards, please email the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpftravel@unc.edu.

- [ ] Show link to submit another response
- [ ] Publish and show a public link to form results
- [ ] Allow responders to edit responses after submitting

Send form
Appendix 4: GPSF Travel Awards 2015–2016 Agendas

Appendix 4A: Agenda for GPSF TAC First Meeting, 2015–2016

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
Appendix 4B: Agenda for GPSF TAC Second Meeting, 2015–2016

GPSF Travel Awards Committee
Agenda for Second Meeting
November 23, 2015 at 7:00pm
Murphey 220

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
Appendix 4C: Agenda for GPSF TAC Third Meeting, 2015–2016

GPSF Travel Awards Committee
Agenda for Third Meeting
February 16, 2016 at 6:30pm
Room Murphey 221

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Review and Adjustment of the Budget
3. Old Business
4. Discussion & Voting on Current Applications
5. Completion and Editing of Senate Bill for the Acceptance of Award Recommendations
6. Voting on Senate Award Bill
7. Additional Business
   a. Discussion & Voting on Changes to Application (Introductory wording)
   b. Discussion & Voting on Resolution to Change International Differential
   c. Discussion & Voting Resolution to Adjust Award for Applicant #44 of Fall Cycle #2 in relationship to 7b above
   d. Discussion of the Committee Chair Search for 2016–2017
      i. Consideration of the Chair Search Application
8. Setting a Date for the March Meeting
9. Dismissal
Appendix 4D: Agenda for GPSF TAC Fourth Meeting, 2015–2016

GPSF Travel Awards Committee
Agenda for Fourth Meeting
March 29, 2016 at 6:30pm
Room Carolina Hall 104

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Review of Budget
3. Old Business
4. Discussion with Chair Applicants / Voting on Chair for 2016–2017
5. Discussion & Voting on Current Award Applications
6. Completion and Editing of Senate Bill for the Acceptance of Award Recommendations
7. Voting on Senate Award Bill
8. Discussion & Voting on Travel Law
9. Additional Business
   a. End of the Year Review/Editing of Travel Awards Documents
      i. Application
      ii. FAQs
      iii. Grading Criteria
      iv. Policies & Procedures
   b. Setting of Application Deadlines for 2016–2017
10. Dismissal
Appendix 5: GPSF Travel Awards 2015–2016 Minutes

Appendix 5A: Minutes 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

<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. 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):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA1</td>
<td>4300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA2</td>
<td>8000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP1</td>
<td>6000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2</td>
<td>8000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 fieldwork, 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 their 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.
KM: 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.
KR: 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: 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

\emph{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.

\textbf{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.

\textbf{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?

\textbf{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

\textbf{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 addended 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

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
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 meeting

2. Review and Adjustment of the Budget

*Discussion:*

BC: We have $13900 remaining for the year. Unfortunately, based on last year’s awards, we decided retain $6000.00 for this cycle, but we fell 30% in applicants for this cycle for this year, meaning we only have five more than the first cycle, to which we allocated $4500 (we’ve actually spent $4900 there). I recommend giving out no more than $5800.00 this cycle. We will address the additional $200.00 in one of the resolutions we will address later.

*Committee Vote on Proposed Budget:*

Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

3. Old Business

*Discussion:*

BC: I don’t have any old business this time. Does anyone else? Is there anything about the processes we have in place not working?
4. Discussion & Voting on Current Applications

Discussion of Applications:

BC: Let’s just go with the apps in order as the top numbers are fairly balanced. There are a couple more sciences this time, which honestly reflects the quality of the applications this time and makes up for previous cycles. Do note that I missed two ineligible applicants in my initial review, as they applied out of cycle.

App #10
LT: I liked it a little bit more than you.
NR: That was my top score so…
LT: The last sentence was weak but everything else was solid.
NR: It is dissertation research, has good visibility, but it could be organized more.
BC: Recommendation?
NR: Full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#10:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App #13
KM: This was really good.
KR: They are on a panel with two UNC faculty. It has good UNC visibility, and they seem well-prepared to talk on subject matter. They are also looking to enter academic job market.
KM: It looks more like professional development but it looks like, for what they are doing, they have their stuff together. Also, is this the one working with digital humanities?
KR: Yeah
KM: So, they have cool stuff, and it seems like they have a big presence.
KR: It seems like it is even more benefit for UNC because their opportunities to gather strategies for approaching history.
KM: I recommend we fund this one.
BC: Full funding?
KR: Full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#13:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App #28
NR: It is a group.
LT: They went to ACS, which is a big conference.
NR: The all did an oral presentation.
LT: Which is unheard of…
NR: They described the potential gains well and those were specific to the field.
LT: There PI is accompanying them. Having a PI there is also good for introductions because other PIs won’t talk to you without being introduced.
NR: There is a token sentence about UNC.
KM: This means they read the application.
NR: The only thing I knocked them on was vagueness about research but other was solid. How many were in the group?
BC: It was three. Let me double check the amount per person in a domestic group… the max is $300 per person.
NR: Do we really want to give 1/5 of our budget for one group?
KM: I’m fine if you think it was a good one.
BC: It is the best group application I’ve read in two years.
NR: Ok, full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#28:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App #14
NR: This one deals with interpersonal violence and was very methodological. They are very good on impact; they were invited; and it seems to be crucial for planning dissertation. Did they write this after they went?
LT: Yes
NR: Yeah, they wrote this after they already had already gone and mentioned a professor they were able to interface with. Overall, it was well-written.
LT: They also gave a presentation, so it wasn’t as if just attended and they got feedback on their research.
KM: So was this kind of like research and a conference?
NR: It was a workshop at the University of Michigan but seems necessary to their dissertation work.
BC: Recommendation?
NR: Full Funding
Voting on Full Funding of App#14:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App #8
KM: Interesting. They are working with another UNC institute
LT: They are presenting dissertation and discuss UNC impact.
NR: They are searching for postdoc and it appears to be the largest conference on marine science.
LT: I looked it up, so the claim seems legit.
NR: They describe their research well, it is a really solid application.
BC: Recommendation?
NR: How many do we have in this range?
BC: This is the first in this range, and there are seven total. We should have enough to cover this full category.
LT: Full Funding.

**Voting on Full Funding of App#8:**
- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**App #21**
BC: Alright. I highlighted this one because the difference in your grades but we’re likely giving them award anyways, so it is a moot point.
KR: I might have been harsh after coming off a series of bad applications.
KM: I might have had the opposite reaction.
KR: They wanted to vet their initial dissertation ideas.
KM: It is in Latin America and I think the most respect in their field will be there; they specifically state they are working towards trends in their field but they have their own niche.
KR: My main issue is the presentation. What is the project and their question? I was wanting better organization; also there were some weird phrases.
LT: Is English not their first language?
KR: They do not say but could be.
NR: It could be a language barrier as the opening phrasing is odd.
KM: It seems like a large conference and the proceedings will get published. It also has benefits outside of academia.
KR: Looking at it now I might award it higher.
BC: Recommendation?
KM: I would give it some funding.
KR: We can keep giving funding until we run into the international one.
BC: This one is international.
KR: Oh, well, it is still early.
KM: Fully fund it.

**Voting on Full Funding of App#21:**
- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**App #25**
BC: I had some issues with this one because it is local travel.
LT: Is this the mimic snake ones?
NR: They have a good application with specific reasons for research, research plan, why it must occur in this area, etc My main issue is why they need the award to travel three hours.
LT: I made assumptions about what we could fund.
NR: Can we fund resources?
BC: My understanding of the law is that it is specifically for travel expenses and that physical resources, like the snakes, may not be allowable by treasury laws.

LT: I would revise my grade then because I assumed we could cover those research expenses. It is one trip out.

KM: It sounds cool but it doesn’t sound need funding. Could we ask them to do a budget break down?

BC: They do have to provide receipts and the worse that can happen is that the treasurer will say that GPSF can’t fund this. We did have a local in NC travel last year. Do you remember?

NR: Yeah.

BC: Let me look up what we awarded them... we gave them a $200 award. Of course, this was travel to a conference and, if I remember correctly, they provided us with a project budget.

KR: This one is doing two projects.

KM: They have something that could be very cool but it is not framed well

NR: They did well except in explaining what they needed the funding for.

KR: We don’t put in the application that they have to provide budget.

NR: We can provide $200.

BC: Do note: next meeting, we are reviewing all of our documentation for next year. If there is anything missing, we can make additions. For example, we could add a budget section if necessary.

NR: We can add something about budget for the research ones and the NC.

BC: So, the recommendation was $200. What is the vote?

*Voting on Partial Funding of App#25:*

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

---

**App #29**

NR: This is Psychology and Neuroscience. The conference is well-tailored to their interests; it is dissertation work; and there is visibility for UNC, though the extent is not as clear because they are only presenting a poster.

LT: I thought it was cool they were selected for a special poster session. At these things, there are usually thousands of posters and getting selected for these special sessions is an honor.

NR: It is generally well-written.

BC: Recommendation?

LT: Full

*Voting on Full Funding of App#29:*

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

---

**App #33**
KR: They are presenting a chapter from their dissertation, and they explained the study they performed (cash transfer v. household happiness).

KM: There were small typos but it is well-written, and it seems like an important conference.

KR: I don’t like when they write the conference is the most important: on what grounds? They are on the job market so they need the networking, and it is showcasing UNC’s CPC.

KM: Their research stems off CPC. It is in DC but DC is expensive. They have a good research and good plan.

BC: Recommendation?

KR: Full funding.

*Voting on Full Funding of App#33:*

Yeas: 4

Nays: 0

---

**App #40**

KM: This was the music one.

KR: It is a weird amalgamation of conference and research as their research is the conference; how meta is that?

KM: It is a conference of audio engineers and interviewing them. My only real issue is they talked about interviewing people in general terms without having interviews set up.

KR: I’m kind of ok with that in terms of participant observant.

BC: That doesn’t surprise me coming from the anthropologist in the room.

KR: It could be better if set up a couple in advance.

KM: It does sound like at this type of conference they will walk away with the sort of information they will need. I would still give them funding but the kitchy thing at the end…

KR: Yeah, that was offputting.

KM: But the project still had merit despite that, so I recommend full funding.

*Voting on Full Funding of App#40:*

Yeas: 4

Nays: 0

---

**App #**

BC: Ok, this one is international and has a poster, which, as you know, is an issue for me.

NR: It does provide an opportunity for collaboration.

BC: Are they getting more collaboration out of this than they already have?

LT: I think they are presenting on Guatemala field school at the Colombia conference.
NR: They said something about being in touch with director, so that is a strong opportunity of networking though you really know what that means.
LT: They also speak Spanish fluently so this could be a good opportunity for them.
NR: My main issue was how it affected the field. Is it a niche thing? They didn’t really tie into greater field.
LT: There does seem to be a lot of buzz words
BC: Recommendation?
NR: Full

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

App #35
KM: They are attending but not presenting
KR: Though it seems like something worthwhile to attend
KM: They are the head of Carolina Health law organization and going to a conference on healthcare law and getting information to bring back to their UNC group.
KR: They want to come back and organize interdisciplinary events.
KM: It seems like want more interaction with health school and law school
KR: It is also a good networking opportunity because they are in their last year
NR: Yeah I think the major issue is the benefit for UNC with just attending
BC: Recommendation?
LT: Full funding
NR: Otherwise will have to do odd breakups as we progress down the line.

Voting on Full Funding of App#35:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #31
LT: I initially didn’t like this one as they were trying to frame poster and workshop as something very awesome
NR: It is what I would do if I knew my other points were weak.
LT: They are presenting a poster.
NR: They did play up UNC, but did not describe research very much.
KM: Yet they had a long paragraph.
NR: They could have spent more words on more important things.
BC: Recommendation?
LT: Full funding

Voting on Full Funding of App#31:
Yeas: 4
App #23
BC: Are we agreed on this group of five: we cannot fund them this cycle.
NR: It is not practical
KM: Only one of them was even remotely professional and sufficient
KR: They didn’t even put together their projects and you sort of have to piece it together by reading the five different applications. They even conflict at times.
BC: The reality of it is they could have worked together and put together something cohesive. In addition, even if we put them on the waitlist, the likelihood of us ever having the $1500 to fulfill the award is almost nil and, if we put them at the top of the waitlist, we prevent both them and anyone else from getting the left over funds. So, vote on omitting them from this cycle?

Voting on omitting from funding / WL?
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: Ok. We are moving into discussion of our waitlist options.

App #39
KR: This one is an international research proposal
KM: But it was part of a class or something. The way they talked about it sounded it would be cool, but they didn’t give us enough information
KR: It would not be something we traditional fund but I could see them applying this project to some future research
KM: I didn’t see any methodology except to take video
KR: They said they would use 360 video technology
KM: I’m not sure they know what it is
KR: I thought it was better written than the first half.
KM: Since they are in media and journalism, it might lead to something
KR: They don’t have to be first on the waitlist.
BC: Let’s look at the other in the category to decide which is first

App #22
LT: It’s Puerto Rico and Boston, collecting data comparing dietary effects in Puerto Rico v. Boston. They selected Boston because they were involved in larger health study there. The reason I’m not super sure is that I’m not sure what measures collecting and not sure why need a month for 12 interviews. It seems excessive.
NR: They have good methodology but they have logistical issues.
KM: Is it international?
BC: If they had just placed Puerto Rico, according to the International Differential, we could qualify as international, but because they have Boston, it does not.
LT: If they had explained why have to be there for a month…  
KR: We can only give $400 so it is really only a minor impact for a month.  
KM: It wouldn’t cover that much but I would put higher on WL than #39.  
KR: I agree, as the research is going towards their dissertation research.  
BC: Voting on placing this one as Waitlist 1?  
Voting on Waitlist #1 for App#22:  
Yeas: 4  
Nays: 0  

BC: Voting on placing #39 as Waitlist 2?  
Voting on Waitlist #2 for App#39:  
Yeas: 4  
Nays: 0  

App #5  
LT: They are not presenting research but they talked about an awesome committee they are on. However, the committee had nothing to do with conference.  
NR: Yeah, it seems like it is not related. They did focus on tangible gains for UNC but not individual research.  
LT: Can we look at the others first?  
BC: We will return to this.  

App #4  
NR: They didn’t elaborate on the conference at all. It is international and they are seeking advice early on dissertation material  
KM: They are presenting a paper.  
NR: The research is interesting  
KM: They spent too much time addressing research instead of what we wanted to know  
NR: Well-written but professional gains and conference sections are missing.  
KM: I would put on waitlist  
NR: I like this better than #5  
BC: So would this be WL #3?  
Voting on Waitlist #3 for App#4:  
Yeas: 4  
Nays: 0  

App #24  
LT: This is capstone research. They hit most my high points, and they are working with mentor to turn into a full manuscript. It is cool because they want to do a specialized fellowship and could benefit them.  
NR: It seemed very college-application-like and only spent one sentence on research. I gave them some points for the possibility of the
manuscript, but they were not specific about research. They spent a lot of words on emotional appeal.

KM: I feel like if they had ended on the first sentence of the last paragraph, it would have been good.

BC: My issues were the missing research.

LT: We have to send a poster over #5

BC: So voting on this as Waitlist #4?

**Voting on Waitlist #4 for App#24:**

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**Voting on Waitlist #5 for App#5:**

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

**Committee Vote to Close Discussion and Accept Awards:**

- Yeas: 4
- Nays: 0

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

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

6. Voting on Senate Award Bill

   **Committee Vote on Award Bill:**
   
   - Yeas: 4
   - Nay: 0

7. Additional Business

   a. Discussion & Voting on Changes to Application (Introductory wording)

   **Discussion:**

   BC: This is for a minor change to the application. Basically, I get a bunch of emails that could be answered by the website and this is to provide another reference point for applicants to review the material. Nathan suggested different wording from what I originally suggested. Discussion?

   **Discussion of application wording between Voting Members while chair edited Awards Bill.**

   Original Wording: If you have any questions, please email the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.
Adopted Wording: If you still have questions unaddressed by the GPSF Travel Awards Law, FAQs, and Grading Rubric on the GPSF Travel Awards website (http://gpsf.unc.edu/gpsf-funding/travel-awards/), please e-mail the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.

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

b. Discussion & Voting on Resolution to Change International Differential

Discussion:
BC: This resolution is to address the problem that we ran into last cycle concerning the international differential being determined by destination. Are there any questions?

Discussion of resolution between Voting Members while chair edited Awards Bill. No wording changes suggested.

Committee Vote on Resolution to Change International Differential:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

c. Discussion & Voting Resolution to Adjust Award for Applicant #44 of Fall Cycle #2 in relationship to 7b above

Discussion:
BC: This resolution is to address the problem that we ran into last cycle concerning the international differential being determined by destination. Are there any questions?

Discussion of resolution between Voting Members while chair edited Awards Bill. No wording changes suggested.

Committee Vote on Resolution to Adjust Award for Applicant #44:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

d. Discussion of the Committee Chair Search for 2016–2017

i. Consideration of the Chair Search Application

Discussion:
BC: Here is what I have for the current application. Any suggestion of changes?

Discussion of application between Voting Members while chair edited Awards Bill. No wording changes suggested. Issue of having a senator in place for the committee to consider was brought up, but we noted that
this is the only year this should be an issue because voting standards are changing next year as everyone should be voted for in February of next year. It was agreed upon that we would just have to encourage people to get departmental approval in the next month.

Committee Vote on Chair Application:
Yea: 4
Nay: 0

ii. Inquiry if any of the committee is willing to be chair next year

Discussion:
BC: Is there any of you who would be interested in applying for next year?
None of the current committee is able to serve as chair next year, though some may be able to serve on the committee if they are their departmental senators next year.

8. Setting a Date for the March Meeting

March 29 at 6:30pm

9. Dismissal
Appendix 5D: Minutes for GPSF TAC Fourth Meeting, 2015–2016

GPSF Travel Awards Committee
Agenda for Fourth Meeting
March 29, 2016 at 6:30pm
Room Carolina Hall 104

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>Candace Buckner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Review of Budget

Discussion:
BC: We have $7800 left to expend for this session. Since there is no apportionment left to vote on, we will move on to the next point of business.

3. Old Business

Discussion:
BC: I don’t have any old business this time. Does anyone else? Is there anything about the processes we have in place not working?
No old business to discuss.

4. Discussion with Chair Applicants / Voting on Chair for 2016–2017

Discussion:
BC: We have Candace Buckner, our applicant for the GPSF Travel Awards Chair position present, both so that she can observe the meeting and so that we can ask her any questions we may have about her application and CV. Does anyone have any questions for Candace?

No Questions from TAC

BC: Tell us about your previous experience that qualifies you for this position.

CB: I did committee work in my undergrad student government. I served on the budget committee of student government, where we allocated more than $600,000 of student funds. While I was on that committee, in a bid to minimize student fees, we created an endowment from left over funds that would be used to pay down future students fees. Obviously, that is not what we are here to do, but this previous committee work shows how I have been thinking about students and their need for financial relief since 2007. This year, I’ve been working with Brian as Senator for Religious Studies. I’ve also planned speakers for the department, which involved budgeting fees, getting people from point A to point B.

BC: Any other questions for the candidate?

No Questions from TAC

BC: Candace, will you please leave the room for a moment while the Committee deliberates your application?

KR: She is very articulate and has experience even if only candidate.

KM: I agree. Even if she is our only candidate, she is an exceptionally good one.

BC: We should take a formal Committee vote in favor of the applicant. Here is the proposed resolution for the Committee.

Committee Vote on 2016-2017 Chair:

Yeas: 4

Nays: 0

5. Discussion & Voting on Current Award Applications

Discussion of Applications:

BC: We have a lot of apps to discuss this time. Unfortunately, there is a lack of balance between Sciences and Humanities/Social Sciences. To be honest, Science was weaker across the board this time. I think we will be ok if we just discuss applicants in order of score.

BC: Because this comes up right away, we need to address the plagiarism case. My personal opinion and, actually what I have added to Policies and the law for next year, is that any act of falsification and plagiarism disqualifies an application. What do you think?

NR: There really is no way to determine who was the original text, so I think we have to disqualify them both.

Voting to Disqualify Applications #52 and #72 for Plagiarism:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0
BC: Alright, moving into applications.

App #46
KR: This one was very well-written and organized. It addresses all parts of the prompt. They are going to one of largest media conferences, and they are trying to convince two people there to be on their dissertation committee.
KM: The dissertation committee members thing was a concern for me because the person is in their final year.
LT: I know with computer science, they do not propose their projects until they are in their final year so might be like that.
KM: If it is different for different programs, then I’ll have to take them at that word.
KR: They are getting something out of the conference beyond presenting. It is a good networking opportunity, and the paper they are presenting seems like it is addressing major topics in field.
KM: It was convincing. The project sounds good; and they even had the throw-away sentence about UNC.
BC: Recommendation?
KR: Full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#46:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #59
KM: It is well-written. The person is in Italian studies but engaged in comparative studies. They are getting to the end of their dissertation process and are preparing to go on job market. They are going to an Italian studies conference because they are trying to diversify and show specialization in different areas. They also justify the international travel because they want to include Canada in their job search.
KR: Organization was problem for me but it ultimately was a good application.
KM: They deserve funding.
BC: It is international, but Toronto? Does that affect your recommendation?
KR: I’d like to do full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#59:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #12
NR: They were invited to a symposium, and they try to show the relevance of symposium. It is their first time presenting. They kind of hit the key points.

LT: Of the sciences, it is one of the better ones. And, in this case, they paid more than lip service to the prompt requirements, especially UNC.

BC: Recommendation?

LT: Full funding.

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

App #66

KR: It is well-written. They are presenting a paper that will be published, and they have two interviews.

BC: Are the job interviews actually at the conference? They never say so in the application.

KM: I missed that, but they are at that stage.

KR: And they were invited by faculty members.

KM: They did rub me the wrong way in the last paragraph.

BC: That was a problem for me too. And, just in case any of you serve next year, in preparation for our changes to the travel law, I found out that one the things we cannot cover is childcare, as it is not allowed under the university business guidelines that we use for determination of what is allowance. Recommendation for this one?

KR: I think we should fund it. Organization was an issue for me but the rest is good.

BC: Full funding?

KM: Yes

Voting on Full Funding of App#66:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #67

KM: This one is international and is just requesting domestic because they are already in Europe.

BC: A point which is allowed and recommended by our recent changes to the International Differential.

KM: Their research is on spatiality, and they are presenting on dissertation research. It is their first conference presentation. Some of it is above my head, but the conference makes since because they are working in European material. They also had the throw-away sentence on UNC. At some point, I just started skimming those sentences.

NR: Mentioning it is better than nothing.

KM: It’s worth funding. I recommend, per their request, $400.

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

App #70
KM: This is one of the physical anthropology ones. They have a poster and a podium presentation. The podium talk is co-authored but they are the sole presenter. They mention that is the largest conference in field and representing UNC. They hope to get feedback on their dissertation research, and their research sounds interesting.
NR: I agree with all that. It is well-organized, and it addresses all points.
KM: The physical anthropology ones were pretty well-written.
BC: Recommendation?
KM: Full Funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#70:
Yeas: 3 (KR recused)
Nays: 0

App #82
BC: We need to discuss this one. It’s probably the best one in sciences. However, they clearly state that they are getting money for in-country travel for World Vision. I think we therefore have to disqualify this application.
NR: Yeah, the law is pretty clear on this matter.
BC: We can’t fund this one.
LT: It’s a shame. I liked this one.

App #18
LT: This is a solid application. They want to pursue a career in global health. They are pretty strong on how it contributes to the field but the conference seems slightly esoteric and there is no real discussion of UNC.
NR: Since they have traveled before, I put more emphasis on what they are getting out of it, and they seem to be getting a lot out of this conference.
LT: I recommend we fund it in full.
Voting on Full Funding of App#18:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #14
KM: Their research is on kids taking algebra a second time. They are a co-author but first author and presenting. They do the nod to largest academic, and it is their first time presenting their work at this conference, though they have apparently been before.
KR: Their research heavily involved Odum Institute, so it is good for UNC. And they are on the job market / about to graduate.
LT: It’s cool that they met their co-author, who is from UCLA, at the conference the last time they went and they collaborated on this.

KM: It sounds like they put the conference to good use.

BC: Recommendation?

KM: Full funding.

_Voting on Full Funding of App#14:_

Yeas: 4  
Nays: 0

App #26

KR: This one is Economics.

KM: They say it is the largest economic conference in the US and list a bunch of institutions involved.

KR: They didn’t really write about research impact. They instead write about how prestigious it is over and over again. The IMF is supposed to have representation. I don’t know that it is that important of a conference.

NR: It is the Capital Flows and Debt in Emerging Markets conference.

KR: Their way of addressing UNC is cheesy, and they are so focused on the prestige of conference without addressing the other prompt points.

KM: They are a co-author.

KR: Oh. They did throw in we somewhere, so it’s good to know they are a co-author and not speaking in the royal we. I recommend we give them full funding but I stand with my lower score.

_Voting on Full Funding of App#26:_

Yeas: 4  
Nays: 0

App #32

KM: This one had some mild grammatical issues.

KR: But in terms of the questions, they do a good job. They are presenting two posters. They are going to seek feedback on their research.

KM: Children with autism is their big focus.

BC: My issue is they did not cover impact field.

KM: The language is a little weird. I wonder if English is not their first language?

LT: I’m surprised they don’t mention UNC Autism program.

BC: Is it because they are in education?

LT: The autism work at UNC is hardly just medical and largely involves people in the school of education and other programs outside of healthcare.

KR: It would have been more impressed if it did link their research to a specific UNC program.

KM: Overall, though, it is still a good application.
KR: The two posters may have higher visibility.
KM: I’d be less ok with it were international, but because it’s in Baltimore…
BC: Recommendation?
KM: I guess full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#32:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App #56
KR: This one is Education.
KL: That’s odd given the grammar.
KR: They will be very visible at the conference and they are working with different methods. They give enough detail about what they are doing.
BC: My main issue is that they only listed one of the two study’s discussed in the essay in the application.
KM: It could be that they just had an issue with filling out application. I’m OK with funding.
KR: I liked it. They would have to be blatantly violating the honor code if they are misrepresenting themselves in this fashion.
KM: I feel like they just forgot to copy and paste the name of the second study. I recommend full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#56:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App #34
KM: They are traveling to Bahrain. They’ve already done research there and made contacts and have prepared research questions. It is generally well-written. It is dissertation research. They will be doing archival research along with interviews. They have clearly defined goals which a number of the research ones did not have.
LT: I didn’t like it because length.
BC: But, remember that the length cutoff for penalization is currently 50 words over.
LT: I thought it was weird because they had contacts didn’t set up interviews?
KM: To me it sounded like they had concrete plans for the interviews.
LT: I'll defer to you guys. I will not be irritated if you fund it.
BC: Recommendation?
KM: I would fund it.
LT: I will concede I was being mean.
KM: Full funding.
LT: I concur
Voting on Full Funding of App#34:
Yeas: 3 (KR recused)
Nays: 0

App #41
LT:  Yay! The peacock one!
NR:  It has a snazzy entry and talks well about their research, but it doesn’t talk about the endgame of the research.
LT:  They say they want to work in government organizations so it seemed good that this project would let them build up their contacts. They talk about methods and procuring permits. They are a bit jargoning.
NR:  I understand it at least. I like this one and recommend full funding for research.

Voting on Full Funding of App#41:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

App #68
BC:  You have a significant discrepancy here.
NR:  I gave only 2 for research description.
KM:  I don’t know why I ranked this one so high because my comments are sort of negative. It is just a graduate student symposium, and where I’m coming from, those usually don’t mean much.
NR:  They said the buzz words but, I didn’t feel like it was memorable.
KM:  They are attending other conferences this year so I don’t know.
NR:  They are? I missed that.
KM:  I’d be willing to table it and come back to it.

App#68 Tabled for future discussion.

App #51
KM:  This one was Economics. It had a lot of jargon. Like JMP. I didn’t know what a JMP was.
KR:  It seems like a unique opportunity. They have written a JMP and are vetting it at the conference. It is well-written, and they spent a lot of time addressing research in field.
KM:  But it is a bit overkill.
KR:  Yeah, so much so that they are lacking in other areas.
KM:  For me, it was hard to read because they had so many field specific things that they could say a different way.
BC:  They are warned on the application to avoid jargon.
NR:  You can penalize that in the writing section.
BC:  Recommendation?
KR:  Full Funding.

Voting on Full Funding of App#51:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0
App #64
KR: This one is English and Comp Lit. They are traveling to Sweden to present paper. Their work is interdisciplinary.
KM: This was a question for me because the conference seems like the biggest catch all. Most European conferences are very specific so this set off alarms.
KR: It is dissertation research.
KM: The research is about the interaction bet. STEM and humanities.
BC: I think the oddity you see in the conference breadth is this interplay between STEM and humanities and the entire conference is on this topic and necessitates the breadth.
KM: How much of their dissertation is it covering?
BC: I think the Antartica research is just an example from their research. I don’t think any would reasonably build their dissertation around that one point.
KM: They are an EU citizen so attending the conference helps to prep them for the EU job market.
BC: Recommendation?
KR: Full Funding
Voting on Full Funding of App#64:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App #43
LT: This one is giving an oral presentation. I’m not sure if they are presenting their thesis. The impact on the field is discussed in detail. It is well-written but I want more about personal development.
NR: This was my highest score. It was well-written and organized.
BC: Recommendations?
LT: Full funding.
Voting on Full Funding of App#43:
   Yeas: 4
   Nays: 0

App #10
KR: They are presenting and receiving awards. It seems like a unique opportunity to showcase UNC.
KM: I liked this one because it was unusual and they have accomplished a lot for MA. I am confused about the fellowship, as they are receiving it but they are not providing money to attend the award ceremony.
BC: We’ve had a couple like this year, and I honestly don’t understand fellowships that ask you to show up at a conference award ceremony but don’t provide you with the funds to get there. All I can guess is the funds aren’t available until after they receive the award?
KM: It’s a decent application all-around though.
BC: Recommendation?
KM: Well, we don’t have enough to fund many more, so let’s look at the next one.

App #10 Tabled for the moment

App #13
KM: I like this one because they are involved in a lot of different parts of the conference. They have applied for a paper and do not know if it was accepted yet, but even if they don’t get to talk, they are doing a lot of different things.
KR: I want to hear more about their research and its impact on field, but all the different things they are doing give them high visibility.
KM: The conference seems specialized.

App#10, 13, 68
BC: Between 10, 13, 68, which we tabled earlier, which do you wish to fund?
KM: I like the Toronto one better.
KR: Me too. It’s rare when we get someone with so many hats at a conference.
LT: So let’s fund #13.

Voting on Partial Funding of App#13:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

BC: Do you want to go ahead and put Apps #10 and #68 on the waitlist?
KM: Yeah.
LT: So 10 is WL1?

Voting on WL #1 for App#10:
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

KM: I’m not sure I want to put #68 on the waitlist yet.
BC: So, we are still tabling 68 for now?
KM: Yeah

App #60
KM: I am confused if workshop, panel, etc.?  
KR: I’m not sure why I gave it this score? They address all areas but needs a lot of editing.
BC: I think they didn’t know what to call what they were doing because it has an interactive portion that does not quite fit into the usually conference rubric.
KR: I liked that part.
KM: I generally liked it.
BC: Recommendation WL#2?
KM: Yea

Voting on WL#2 for App#60:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays:

App #71
KM: This is another Italian thing. I didn’t understand why didn’t translate title.
KR: They are presenting some of their dissertation research.
KM: I wished they used paragraphs. It’s not so much jargon but some of it is hard to understand without knowing the body of work they are interacting with.
KR: Yeah, I don’t know much about the figure and the figure features prominently at conference. They could provide one sentence explanation. They do seem like they are going to take something away because of the centrality of this figure at the conference.
KM: It’s a decent application.
KR: I’m not wild about its organization and phrasing
BC: Recommendation WL#3?
KM: Yes

Voting on WL#3 for App#71:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

App #53
KR: Their work is their capstone course. They’ve been doing research digitally, but then they go and do the final interview in person. It is part of a course they are taking here. The course is $2500 out of pocket for them.
KM: The problem is they are not developing anything.
KR: The point is to get experience.
BC: But our rubric suggests that they should be working towards a research goal. I have a couple of issues with it: it is part of a program that is requiring them to go and, given they are already doing interviews electronically, they’ve not proven the necessitated of the in-person interview.
LT: I don’t think it qualifies for research travel.
KR: I agree.
KM: I almost feel there needs to be a separate rubric for business.
BC: We’ve mentioned this before. But, so far, most business ones we’ve received were mainly for attendance. The others we have received have been in grey area where they are not really producing research and the benefits for a company, not the individual.

Voting against putting App#53:
  Yeas: 4
Nays: 0  
App #76
LT: I was confused by their need for travel.  
BC: Because of the group of they are working with.  
LT: Yeah, but why get involved with a group that requires you to travel when you can do the same research here? I’m also not sure why the interviews have to be done in person.  
NR: They seem to have impact outside of academia, but it’s hard to tell? They are not talking about implementation.  
KM: The name dropping thing is weird.  
NR: It shows guidance and collaboration  
LT: I don’t think they articulated it well. I still don’t get why they have to interview in person.  
BC: I think intimacy.  
NR: Yeah, given the subject, those they’re interviewing may be more comfortable with a one-on-one, in-person setting.  
KR: I sort of like this one, and it makes sense to me.  
BC: In retrospect, despite the person’s field, maybe I should have given this one to Humanities to read as the methodology is more up Anthro’s alley. Recommendation for WL#4.  
LT: Yes  
*Voting on WL#4 for App#76:*  
  Yeas: 4  
  Nays: 0  
BC: There is one waitlist spot left. Shall we return to #68?  
KM: Yes.  
*Voting on WL#4 for App#68:*  
  Yeas: 3 (KR recused)  
  Nays: 0  
BC: I move to close discussion of the applications and go to the completion of the awards bill.  
*Voting to Close Application Discussion:*  
  Yeas: 4  
  Nays: 0  

6. Completion and Editing of Senate Bill for the Acceptance of Award Recommendations

*Bill completed by Brian Coussens, Chair, during break, discussion of Items 9. Agenda re-arranged here. Item 9 discussed first, then Item 7, then Item 8 to allow for the completion of the bill.*

*Note taking for Items 7–10 taken over by Senator McCullough.*

7. Voting on Senate Award Bill
Committee Vote on Award Bill:
  Yea: 4
  Nay: 0

8. Discussion & Voting on Travel Law

Discussion:
  BC: Our Policies and Procedures document require us to review the Travel Law each year, and given it hasn’t been reviewed in three years, I have suggested significant changes that bring all of our documents into line, answers questions where not clear, and re-enumerates the Law for ease of reference in bills.

Eligibility
  - 2 years defined
  - Change to remove gender to they
  - Automatically disqualified if they breach honor code

Conference Travel
  - Definition Changing the wording
  - Added clause to show how they might have to prove that just attending is beneficial

Research Travel
  - Definition, keep it parallel with conference meeting
  - Demonstrate specific benefits from travel, added budget, and specific plans/prep for research

Guidelines for Group Travel
  - Apply as a group with a single application
  - Show how each member benefits from the travel

Decision criteria
  - Reiterates the GPSF constitution
  - Adds things from the grading rubric

Non-discrimination
  - Brings the travel law into agreement UNC’s non-discrimination statement

Committee and the Selection Process

Application Materials
  - Updated to reflect what the application actually looks like on the website

Timeline
  - Added “between” after “if travel occurs ____”
  - Application dates
  - Change to allow for moving the date in accordance with holidays/weekends

Senate Approval of Travel Awards

Required Documentation
  - Brings it up to date with what is already on the website
  - Added SAFO as they are the reason that the website changes
Reimbursement
- Originally said the “treasury law,” now changed to “Travel Law”
  o Also mentions the things that we cannot buy

Additional Duties and Restrictions of the Committee
- Travel law needs to be reviewed once per fiscal year
  o If it is changed, it has to go through all the other senate
- All the other documents need to be updated

Fiscal Limitations of the Committee
- What the Senate approves, this is what we will do.
- Wait list, in order chosen by the committee, we go through each cycle in order

Reporting Duties of the Committee
- Continue to have historical records of the GPSF travel awards committee.
- Other documents must appear in the appendices

Committee Vote on Travel Awards Law Bill:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0

9. Additional Business

  a. End of the Year Review/Editing of Travel Awards Documents

    BC: In keeping with our Policies and Procedures, we also need to do a review of all our documents and make sure they are in working order for the new committee.

    i. Application

       Keep dates on there; add PLEASE NOTE THE DATE with note
       Automatically disqualified if applying to the incorrect funding cycle.
       Agree to moving number 3 down, below the name, etc.
       Add requirement for UNC email address
       Yes, having drop down menu on degree
       Yes, providing instructions for faculty member
       Yes, reworking of the statement of purpose
       Yes, consolidating the conference travel and moving it under traveling domestically or internationally
       Yes, providing a brief budget and instructions on Research Travel
       Yes, adding “working project title” on Research Travel
       Yes, adding the Honor Code pledge at the end is a necessity

Voting on Application Changes:
  Yeas: 4
  Nays: 0
ii. FAQs

Between added to chart of application dates: If travel occurs “between”
Add another FAQ for when the application will be open: application must be open for at least 30 days before the deadline
Eligibility questions section: Remove “in good standing” and add “fee-paying”

_Voting on FAQ Changes:_
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

iii. Grading Criteria

Keep the law regarding the Departmental/Program Standing with GPSF as stated in red.
Communication skills
  Change “50 words” to “25 words”; and “a point for every fifty after”
  to “a point for every twenty-five after”

_Voting on Grading Criteria Changes:_
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

iv. Policies & Procedures

Everyone is one board for the policies. No additional comments, accept all changes!

_Voting on Policies & Procedures Changes:_
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

b. Setting of Application Deadlines for 2016–2017

_Discussion:_
BC: Your last duties on the Twelfth GPSF Travel Awards Committee is to set the dates for next year’s application in accordance with Travel Law. I have already checked the dates and the only one that proposes a problem is Spring 2 again. I have proposed moving it to March 20 for next year.

_Committee Vote on Application Deadlines:_
Yeas: 4
Nays: 0

10. Dismissal
Appendix 6: GPSF Travel Awards 2015–2016 Awards Bills

Appendix 6A: Bill 15-04

BILL 15-04

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

22 SEP 2015 PASSED 4-0 TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE
6 OCT 2015 SPONSORED BY BRIAN A. COUSSENS, CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE
6 OCT 2015 PASSED __-__ 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 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>Cervantes</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 (July1 – 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                  Brandon Linz
Vice-President of Internal Affairs       President
Appendix 6B: Bill 15-08

BILL 15-08

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

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 1: Awardees for the Second Fall Awards Cycle

<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>

**Table 2: Waitlist for the Second Fall Awards Cycle**

<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>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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $7900.00
| 82 | Meisha McDaniels | City & Regional Planning & BusAd | MCRP & MBA | Individual | Domestic | National Minority Supplier Development Council Conference | 5 |

93
Table 3: Total Applicant Numbers

Total Applicants: 83  Withdrawn: 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,  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 spring awards cycle (January 1–March 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:

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 the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8 (c) 6 and GPSF Travel Law, Part 4.
<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>8</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Jalowska</td>
<td>Marine Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Ocean Science Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>Physics &amp; Astronomy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>The 227th Meeting of the American Astronomical Society</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Fryar</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Crossroads: The Future of Graduate History Education</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cara</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Health Behavior</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>NISVS Training at the Interuniversity Consortium for Political &amp; Social Research, University of Michigan</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>English &amp; Comparative Literature</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>63rd Annual Conference of the Southeastern Council of Latin American Studies</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Akcali</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Research on Mimicry among Kingsnakes</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>Atkinson</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>251st American Chemical Society National Meeting &amp; Exposition</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Volpe</td>
<td>Psychology &amp; Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Society for Research on Adolescence</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Environmental Sciences &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Transportation Research Board 95th Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Kilburn</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Population Association of America Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>JD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Bar Association’s 17th Annual Conference on Emerging Issues in Healthcare Law</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Dahlie</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Research on the Pollstar Live! Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Lavalle</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>2016 Congreso Colombiano de Terapia Ocupacional</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Waitlist for the Second Fall Awards Cycle

<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>22</td>
<td>Yanire</td>
<td>Estrada Del Campo</td>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Research on Factors Influencing Dietary Behaviors on Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico and Boston</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Aleah</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>School of Media &amp; Journalism</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Research for Documentary on Panama’s Coral Reefs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Ofstehage</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Society for Applied Anthropology Conference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yancey</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Southeastern Surgical Congress Annual Scientific Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>DPT</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Physical Therapy Association Combined Sections Meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Total Applicant Numbers

Total Applicants: 40  Ineligible: 3  Awardees: 15  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 Spring Cycle 1 (January 1 – March 31)...........................................$5900.00
Total Funds Spent/Waiting to Be Disbursed/Claimed to Date.........................$12400.00
Total Funds Spent/Awarded ...........................................................................$18300.00
Remaining Budget for 2015/2016.................................................................$8000.00

Done this day, the first of March, in the year two thousand and sixteen.

Taylor Livingston
Vice-President of Internal Affairs

G. Dylan Russell
President
RESOLUTION 16-13

A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS FOR APRIL 1–JUNE 30, 2016 (SECOND SPRING CYCLE)

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 spring awards cycle (April 1–June 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 17 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 $7800.00, 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 due to not meeting the requirements of 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 the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8 (c) 6 and GPSF Travel Law, Part 4.
<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>12</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Brewer</td>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>King's College Health Humanities Symposium</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>Vardell</td>
<td>School of Information and Library Science</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Annual Meeting of the Medical Library Association (MLA)</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Agger</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nadja</td>
<td>Vielot</td>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>EUROGIN 2016 International Multidisciplinary Congress</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Gonzalo</td>
<td>De Asis Ruiz</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Capital Flows and Debt in Emerging Markets</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Shuting</td>
<td>Zheng</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>International Meeting for Autism Research</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Marwa</td>
<td>Koheji</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Research on Climate Change Approaches in Bahrain</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>O'Brien</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Field Research on Reproductive Character Displacement</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Apostolos</td>
<td>Alexandridis</td>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>The College on Problems of Drug Dependence 78th Annual Scientific Meeting</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Society of Cinema and Media Studies</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Apoorva</td>
<td>Jain</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>91st Western Economic Association International Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Audra</td>
<td>Kosh</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>National Council on Measurement in Education</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Alexis</td>
<td>Giachetti</td>
<td>English and Comparative Literature</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Canadian Society of Italian Studies Annual Conference</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Anneke</td>
<td>Schwob</td>
<td>English and Comparative Literature</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>European Meeting for the Society for Literature, Science,</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$600.00</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>66</td>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Senta</td>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Educational Research Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Hambro</td>
<td>Germanic &amp; Slavic Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Spatiality and Temporality International Symposium</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Marissa</td>
<td>Wojcinski</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Association of Physical Anthropology, 85th Annual Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $7800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Waitlist for the Second Fall Awards Cycle

<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>10</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Weimer</td>
<td>City and Regional Planning</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Planning Association National Conference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Michaela</td>
<td>Dwyer</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>Humanities, Arts, Science, and Technology Alliance and Collaboratory Conference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Giuliano</td>
<td>Migliori</td>
<td>Romance Studies</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Association of Italian Studies Annual Conference</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Kenny</td>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Intl</td>
<td>Research on Mother-Child Separation, HIV Vulnerability, and Sex Worker Well-being</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>Dent</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>American Association of Physical Anthropology, 85th Annual Meeting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Total Applicant Numbers

Total Applicants: 82  Ineligible: 1  Awardees: 17  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 Spring Cycle 2 (April 1 – June 30)...............................................$7800.00
Total Funds Spent/Waiting to Be Disbursed/Claimed to Date............................$18500.00
Total Funds Spent/Awarded ............................................................................$26300.00
Remaining Budget for 2015/2016.................................................................$0.00

Done this day, the twelfth of April, in the year two thousand and sixteen.

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Taylor Livingston                                          G. Dylan Russell
Vice-President of Internal Affairs                          President
Appendix 7: Constitutional Amendment 15-09

RESOLUTION 15-09

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION AS IT RELATES TO THE NOMINATION OF THE CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE

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
Appendix 8: Additional Bills & Resolutions

Appendix 8A: Resolution 16-07 International Differential

RESOLUTION 16-07

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS LAW, THE INTERNATIONAL DIFFERENTIAL

16 FEB 2016 PASSED 4-0 TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE AND REFERRED TO SENT TO SENATE

1 MAR 2016 SPONSORED BY BRIAN A. COUSSENS, CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE

1 MAR 2016 PASSED ##-## BY GPSF SENATE

WHEREAS, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C, Point 5 of the GPSF Constitution states: “The Travel Awards Committee shall have the power to set rules and guidelines regarding the application, selection, and distribution process for travel Awards. These rules and guidelines must be approved and/or amended by a majority affirmative vote of those present and voting at a duly called meeting of the Senate”;

WHEREAS, The GPSF Travel Awards Law, Part 1, Section E, entitled “International Differential,” states: “If the applicant is traveling outside the continental US, the Committee may award an additional amount up to 50% of the domestic maximum award (e.g., $200 for individual travel). To receive this differential, the applicant must demonstrate specific benefits from the travel that could not be achieved by traveling to a similar conference or institution within the continental US”;
WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee has found that the final sentence of the GPSF Travel Awards Law, Part 1, Section E, currently restricts the “International Differential” to destinations outside of the continental United States;

WHEREAS, At least two applications for Travel Awards for the fiscal 2015–2016 involved an applicant traveling from a field work location outside of the continental United States to a destination within the United States;

WHEREAS, The Law, as written, (1) does not take into account of such a situation and thus (2) unfairly penalizes applicants for pursuing research and other long-term endeavors in international locations while remaining an active fee-paying student of the University;

THEREFORE, BE RESOLVED that the Travel Awards Law, Part 1, Section E, entitled “International Differential,” be re-written to say the following:

1. If the applicant is traveling internationally, the Committee may augment the amount received from a domestic award with an International Differential.
   a. The International Differential may be up to 50% of the domestic maximum award (e.g., an additional $200 for individual international travel).
   b. “Traveling internationally” is defined as traveling between a location in the continental United States and a location outside the continental United States, without regard to direction of travel.

2. To receive the International Differential, the applicant must demonstrate to the Committee the specific benefits from the international travel that could not be achieved by traveling to a similar conference or institution near their origination point.

3. The Committee may decide to award a partial or no International Differential. The Committee may render this decision on the basis of several factors, including
   a. The failure to convince the Committee of the necessity of the international travel (Part 1, Section E, Subsection 2),
   b. The destination’s proximity to the origination point, and/or
   c. Any of the decision criteria and rules established under Travel Law, Part 2.

Done this day, the first of March two thousand and sixteen.

______________________________     ________________________________
Taylor Livingston                        G. Dylan Russell
Vice-President of Internal Affairs      President
Appendix 8B: Resolution 16-08 Award Amended

RESOLUTION 16-08

A RESOLUTION TO ADJUST AWARD AMOUNT FOR JEFFREY HARRIS

16 FEB 2016 PASSED 4-0 TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE AND REFERRED TO SENT TO SENATE

1 MAR 2016 SPONSORED BY BRIAN A. COUSSENS, CHAIR OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE

1 MAR 2016 PASSED ##-## BY GPSF SENATE

WHEREAS, The GPSF Travel Awards Law, Part 1, Section E, entitled “International Differential,” states: “If the applicant is traveling outside the continental US, the Committee may award an additional amount up to 50% of the domestic maximum award (e.g., $200 for individual travel). To receive this differential, the applicant must demonstrate specific benefits from the travel that could not be achieved by traveling to a similar conference or institution within the continental US”;

WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee found that the final sentence of the GPSF Travel Awards Law, Part 1, Section E, currently restricts the “International Differential” to destinations outside of the United States;

WHEREAS, The Committee, following this law, awarded Jeffrey Harris, Applicant #44 of Fall Cycle 2 of 2015, a domestic award of $400.00 because the applicant’s destination was within the United States;

WHEREAS, The Law was amended under Resolution 16-07 to re-define the “International Differential” without specification of destination;
WHEREAS, The Applicant’s travel can now be defined as falling under the “International Differential”;

WHEREAS, The duty of the Committee is to make recommendations concerning Travel Awards per GPSF Travel Law and the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8, Subsection c;

WHEREAS, The Committee has recommended that the Senate retroactively adjust Jeffrey Harris’ award for Fall Cycle 2 to a full international award of $600.00;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the GPSF Senate hereby approves the adjustment to the GPSF Travel Awards as proposed by the Travel Awards Committee per Article V, Section 8 (c) 6 and Travel Law, Part 4.

Table 1: Travel Awards Budget and Expenditures YTD

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

Award Adjustment with Spring Cycle 1:
Award Adjustment for Jeffrey Harris, Fall Cycle 2 ..................................................$200.00
Awarding Spring Cycle 1 (January 1 – March 31) ..................................................$5900.00
Total Funds Spent/Waiting to Be Disbursed/Claimed to Date ..................................$12400.00
Total Funds Spent/Awarded ..................................................................................$18500.00
Remaining Budget for 2015/2016 ......................................................................$7800.00

Done this day, the first of March two thousand and sixteen.

Taylor Livingston
Vice-President of Internal Affairs

G. Dylan Russell
President
Appendix 8C: Resolution 16-14 Travel Law Changes

BILL 16-14

A BILL TO AMEND THE GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS LAW

WHEREAS, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (5) of the GPSF Constitution states: “The Travel Awards Committee shall have the power to set rules and guidelines regarding the application, selection, and distribution process for travel Awards. These rules and guidelines must be approved and/or amended by a majority affirmative vote of those present and voting at a duly called meeting of the Senate”;

WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee has reviewed the GPSF Travel Law and suggested the following updates to the Travel Law (see Appendix) (1) to enumerate the Law for easier reference to the Law in bills and resolutions, (2) to resolve minor tensions between existing GPSF Travel Awards documents, including the FAQs, application, and Law, (3) to clarify certain aspects of the Law, and (4) to codify some of the duties of the Committee;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Travel Awards Law be revised and re-enumerated according to the appended recommendations of the GPSF Travel Awards Committee, in accordance with the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (5).

Done this day, the twelfth of April two thousand and sixteen.

Taylor Livingston
Vice-President of Internal Affairs

G. Dylan Russell
President
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APPENDIX TO RESOLUTION 16-##: A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE GPSF Travel Law

GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENT FEDERATION (GPSF) TRAVEL AWARDS LAW

Adopted September 6, 2011.
Reviewed March 29, 2016.
Changed April 12, 2016.

PART 1. ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS

A. GENERAL ELIGIBILITY

1. An applicant must be a fee-paying graduate or professional student in good standing.
2. An applicant must be enrolled during the semester corresponding to the travel (see Part 3, Section B, Subsection 2).
3. An applicant must not have received a GPSF Travel Award (individual or group) in the past two years.
   a. The two years of ineligibility are calculated as the eight cycles following the cycle in which the applicant received their last award.
   b. An applicant becomes eligible for an award again in the ninth cycle after the receipt of an award, as demonstrated by the table below (for cycles, see Part 3, Section B):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SP1</th>
<th>SP2</th>
<th>FA1</th>
<th>FA2</th>
<th>SP1</th>
<th>SP2</th>
<th>FA1</th>
<th>FA2</th>
<th>SP1</th>
<th>SP2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AWARD</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
<td>ELIG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. GPSF Travel Awards are intended for students without other travel funding for said trip.
   a. The applicant must certify that they will not use GPSF Travel Award in conjunction with another funding source for the same trip.
   b. If the applicant later becomes eligible for other travel funding for the same trip, they must decline the GPSF Travel Award or decline the other funding.
   c. GPSF Travel Awards are not transferable to another trip or another individual.
5. All applicants are bound the UNC Honor Code. Violations of the Honor Code during the application process shall be grounds for the disqualification of an application.

B. CONFERENCE TRAVEL

1. An applicant may be awarded a GPSF Travel Award for travel to a Conference, Meeting, or similar academic gathering.
2. “Conference Travel” includes:
   a. Traveling to a conference or meeting to present original research (poster, paper, etc.) or to serve as a member on a panel, as a session chair, or as a discussant or
   b. Traveling to a conference for some other reason not covered above (e.g., job interviews, attendance). To receive such an award, the applicant belonging to this category of conference travel must:
      i. Demonstrate specific benefits the applicant will receive from their travel that could not be achieved without traveling and
ii. Demonstrate how their participation in the conference or meeting might be merited above an applicant falling under the first category of conference travel.

3. The maximum individual domestic award amount for Conference Travel is $400.

C. RESEARCH TRAVEL

1. An applicant may be awarded a GPSF Travel Award for research travel.
2. “Research Travel” is defined as traveling to conduct original research, usually at another institution or location.
3. The maximum individual domestic award amount for Research Travel is $400.
4. When applying for an award for Research Travel, an applicant must:
   a. Demonstrate specific benefits from their travel that could not be achieved at UNC,
   b. Demonstrate preparation to conduct the research, which may include information such as a preliminary research plan and initial contacts, and
   c. Provide a preliminary projected budget for the proposed research travel, if requested by the Committee.

D. GROUP TRAVEL

1. Applicants to GPSF Travel Awards for Conference or Research Travel may also apply as a Group.
2. A Group is defined as applicants traveling to the same conference or institution.
   a. Each member of the group must meet the eligibility requirements in Part 1, Section A.
   b. A group may only submit a single application.
   c. The application must demonstrate how the group travel benefits each member of the group.
3. The maximum domestic award amount for Group Travel is $300 per group member.

E. INTERNATIONAL DIFFERENTIAL

1. If the applicant is traveling internationally, the Committee may augment the amount received from a domestic award with an International Differential.
   a. The International Differential may be up to 50% of the domestic maximum award (e.g., an additional $200 for individual international travel).
   b. “Traveling internationally” is defined as traveling between a location in the continental United States and a location outside the continental United States, without regard to direction of travel.
2. To receive the International Differential, the applicant must demonstrate to the Committee the specific benefits from the international travel that could not be achieved by traveling to a similar conference or institution near their origination point.
3. The Committee may decide to award a partial or no International Differential. The Committee may render this decision on the basis of several factors, including
   a. The failure to convince the Committee of the necessity of the international travel (Part 1, Section E, Subsection 2),
   b. The destination’s proximity to the origination point, and/or
   c. Any of the decision criteria and rules established Under Travel Law, Part 2
PART 2. The Selection of Awardees

A. DECISION CRITERIA

1. GPSF Travel Awards are competitive, and awardees are decided by the Committee based on rules and guidelines set by the Committee and approved by the Senate by a majority vote (50%+1) of those present and voting at a duly called meeting of the Senate.

2. The Committee may use criteria in the selection of awardees including, but not limited to, the following:
   a. For all applicants,
      i. Whether the applicant is eligible to receive an award (as described under Part 1, Section A),
      ii. Personal impact (how the trip will benefit the applicant),
      iii. Professional impact (how the trip will benefit the applicant’s field), and
      iv. The applicant’s communication skills;
   b. For specific types of applications, the Committee may use any additional criteria required under Part 1, Sections B through E, or those mentioned below:
      i. For applicants to Conference Travel Awards (Part 1, Section B), University impact (how the trip will benefit UNC or the applicant’s community, lab, etc. at the University);
      ii. For applicants to Research Travel Awards (Part 1, Section C),
         a) Methodology / Intentionality (how the applicant has prepared for research) and/or
         b) A budget;
   c. And, in cases where all things are equal between applicants, the Committee may use whether the applicants’ departments, programs, or schools have a GPSF Senator in good standing to break the tie.

B. NON-DISCRIMINATION

1. GPSF does not discriminate on the basis of age, sex, race, color, national origin, religion, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetic information, or veteran status.

2. Selection of awardees for GPSF Travel Awards will not be based on any of these criteria.

C. THE COMMITTEE AND THE SELECTION PROCESS

1. The Committee is responsible for interpreting the above criteria in selecting award recipients.

2. The Committee may award amounts less than the maximum stated in Part 1.

3. The Committee may designate a wait list beyond those applicants recommended for funding for each application period.
PART 3. APPLICATION AND TIMELINE

A. APPLICATION MATERIALS

1. An application for the GPSF Travel Awards will be made available online through the GPSF website and the GPSF Newsletter.
2. The application will request at least the following information from applicants:
   a. Name of applicant
   b. UNC Personal Identification Number
   c. Contact information
   d. Department or School
   e. Degree pursued
   f. Name and e-mail address of a faculty reference (advisor or other sponsor)
   g. Type of travel (domestic or international)
   h. Nature of travel (group or individual)
   i. Name and contact information of group participants (if applicable)
   j. Dates of travel
   k. City and country of travel
   l. Conference Information (if applicable), including
      i. Conference title and web site
      ii. Manner of participation
      iii. Presentation title (if applicable)
      iv. If the presentation has multiple authors and their names (if applicable)
   m. Research Information (if applicable), including
      i. Working project title
      ii. Budget
      iii. Other details not specified elsewhere in the application
   n. Statement of Purpose
3. The Committee may determine the information required in the Statement of Purpose.

B. TIMELINE

1. The Application system for an Award Cycle will open at least 30 days prior to its announced deadline.
2. The Awards Cycles and their deadlines as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Cycle</th>
<th>If travel occurs</th>
<th>Apply by</th>
<th>Must be enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 1</td>
<td>July 1 – September 30</td>
<td>September 1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 2</td>
<td>October 1 – December 31</td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 1</td>
<td>January 1 – March 31</td>
<td>February 1</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 2</td>
<td>April 1 – June 30</td>
<td>March 15</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. To be eligible for an award, an applicant must be enrolled in the appropriate semester indicated above.
b. The Committee may not set an application deadline earlier than the dates designated above.
c. If the application deadline falls on a weekend or university holiday, the Committee may move the application deadline to the first available workday after the weekend or holiday.
i. All application dates should be set in the final Committee Meeting of the previous fiscal year.

ii. All application dates should be made available via the GPSF Travel Awards website and GPSF Newsletter.

3. All applicants will be notified of their status within 40 days of the application due date.

PART 4: SENATE PROCESS

A. SENATE APPROVAL OF TRAVEL AWARDS

1. The Committee shall recommend award decisions to the Senate no later than 35 days following the application deadline.

2. The Committee Chairperson shall present the proposed awards decision to the Senate in the form of a bill, which shall include at least the following:
   a. The names and departments of the recommended awardees,
   b. The recommended award amounts,
   c. The type and nature of the awards (domestic or international; individual or group), and
   d. The current status of the budget, including the original amount approved for Travel Awards by the Senate for the fiscal year, the recommended amount of expenditure in the current bill, the total amount awarded so far for the fiscal year, and the remaining budget for the fiscal year.

3. A majority vote (50% + 1) of those present and voting at a duly called meeting of the Senate shall be required to pass the recommended Travel Awards decision.

PART 5: REIMBURSEMENT REQUESTS

A. REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION

1. Awardees must submit the following within 30 days following the conclusion of travel or notification of award, whichever is later:
   a. Proof of participation, either
      i. A copy of conference proceedings or a letter of acceptance, or
      ii. A signed letter from the awardee’s research advisor or supervisor confirming the details of their travel;
   b. A report (maximum 1 page) of the awardee’s conference or research experience;
   c. A Travel Awards Expense Report (collected in a format determined by the GPSF Treasurer);
   d. Receipts for all expenses for which the awardee is requesting reimbursement, where receipts are physical copies and itemized;
      i. Photocopies or scans of receipts will not be accepted unless the only version provided to you was digital, such as an email for the purchase of airfare.
      ii. Non-itemized credit card receipts are not eligible for reimbursement.
   e. And any other information required by the GPSF Treasurer or the Student Activities Fund Office (SAFO) to process the request.

2. Applicants placed on a wait list must retain all appropriate forms of documentation through the end of the fiscal year (June 30) in case funds become available to provide them with an award.
3. The GPSF is not responsible if an applicant disposes of appropriate documentation before they are notified of receipt of award or before funds become available for those on the wait list.

B. REIMBURSEMENT

1. The GPSF Treasurer will issue reimbursement upon verifying that the expenses comply with GPSF Travel Law and are legitimate travel-related expenses.

2. Besides any restrictions established by GPSF Travel Laws, Travel Awards funds cannot be used to cover travel expenses which are excluded from reimbursement according to the UNC Finance Department's Policies and Procedures manual if the traveler were traveling on University business.

3. In addition to the categories prohibited under the UNC Finance Department's Policies and Procedures manual, the GPSF will not reimburse travelers for the following expenses:
   a. Purchase of alcohol, tobacco, illegal substances, firearms, or other weaponry, and
   b. Tangible gains, including, but not limited to, research materials, souvenirs, personal hygiene products, or other physical items that are non-essential to travel.

PART 6. ADDITIONAL DUTIES AND RESTRICTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

A. COMMITTEE REVIEW OF TRAVEL AWARDS DOCUMENTS

1. The Committee shall review the GPSF Travel Law at least once per fiscal year (July 1–June 30).
   a. If the Committee finds no amendments are necessary to the Travel Law for that year, the Committee shall report this fact to the Senate and update the review date attached to the GPSF Travel Law document.
   b. If the Committee finds that the Travel Law needs to be amended, the Committee shall write a bill amending the Travel Law, which must pass the Committee by a majority vote, and the Committee Chairperson shall present the Committee-approved bill to the Senate. To pass the Senate, the amendments bill must be approved by a majority vote (50%+1) of those present and voting at a duly called meeting of the Senate.

2. The Committee shall review all other documents governing the Committee at least once per fiscal year.
   a. These documents include the Travel Awards application, the Travel Awards Grading Criteria / Rubric, the Travel Awards FAQs, and the Travel Award Committee’s Policies & Procedures.
   b. Each of these documents may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee as long as the changes do not violate GPSF Laws or the GPSF Constitution.

B. FISCAL LIMITATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. The Committee may not award more money than approved in a Senate bill, either per individual or per cycle, unless excepted under the Wait-List clause below.

2. If, for whatever reason, the Committee feels an award needs to be amended, they must present the Senate with a bill amending the previous awarded amount and explaining why the amount must be amended.
3. According to Part 2, Section C, the Committee may designate a wait list. The wait list will be awarded as follows:
   a. Applicants on the wait list will receive an award if funds for their awards cycle become available because an applicant recommended for funding does not accept the full award or declines the award entirety under the eligibility requirements of Part 1, Section A.
   b. Applicants on the wait list will be awarded in their enumerated order per award cycle.
   c. The award offered to a wait-listed applicant shall be determined by the discretion of the Committee Chairperson according to
      i. The remaining funds approved by the Senate for that cycle (though see exception below).
      ii. The maximum award amounts established by the GPSF Travel Law, and
      iii. The minimum award amounts established by the Committee’s historical decisions.
         a) It is the prerogative of the Committee to reassess and set new “historical minimums.”
         b) If the available funds do not meet the historical minimums used by the Committee, the Chairperson should wait to offer an award until such funds become available for that awards cycle.
   d. If the wait list of one cycle has been completely cleared and all wait-listed applicants have either received funds or declined an award, any money approved for that cycle by the Senate may then be applied to the remaining waitlists from that fiscal year.
      i. This process will continue until all waitlists are cleared.
      ii. Any budget remaining for that fiscal year after all waitlists are cleared or after the Chairperson has determined insufficient funds remain to make another award will return to the GPSF Reserve Fund.

C. REPORTING DUTIES OF THE COMMITTEE

1. To maintain the Committee’s accountability to the Senate, the Committee Chairperson must compile mid-year and year-end reports for the Senate, to be made publicly available through the GPSF website.
   a. The mid-year report will be due by 30 days after the approval of the awards bill for Fall Cycle 2 (early January).
   b. The year-end report will be due by 30 days after the approval of the awards bill for Spring Cycle 2 (early May).
      i. Although the new Chairperson will be appointed at the beginning of April and the outgoing Chairperson’s office ends on the same date, the end of the year report is the responsibility of the outgoing Chairperson and falls under the transitional clause for GPSF Travel Awards Chairs as written in the GPSF Constitution.
      ii. The Chairperson’s end of the year report shall reflect the status of Travel Awards at the time of the reports completion. These numbers will be amended in the Appendix of the following year’s report to reflect developments that occur at the end of the fiscal year (see below).

2. These reports must at least include the following in the body of a report:
   a. A list of current Committee members with their departments;
   b. A summary of the GPSF Travel Awards, including at least the number of applications, the numbers of awards given, the amount awarded, the number of
applicants wait-listed, and the number of applicants remaining on the waitlist for each cycle and in total;
c. A summary of accomplishments;
d. A section on Committee operational changes and their success/failure;
e. A section presenting outlooks/goals for the remainder of the fiscal year (midyear report only);
f. A section presenting recommendations for the following year’s Committee (year-end report only); and
g. An optional section on ongoing, unresolved issues.
3. These reports should also add a number of appendices, including the following documents:
   a. An addendum updating the summary of the previous year’s numbers in the year-end report to reflect accurately the disbursement of Travel Awards in the previous fiscal year,
b. The current Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedures document,
c. The current Travel Awards Grading Criteria / Rubric,
d. Agendas for any past Committee meetings of the current fiscal year,
e. Meeting minutes for any past Committee meetings of the current fiscal year,
f. Awards bills for any past awards cycle of the current fiscal year, and
g. Any other resolution presented to Senate, whether it passed or failed. The report should clearly indicate to the reader which resolutions passed or failed.
A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT THE CHAIR OF THE 2016-2017 GPSF TRAVEL AWARDS COMMITTEE

WHEREAS, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (1b), as amended by Resolution 15-09, states, “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.”

WHEREAS, The Travel Awards Committee made an open call for applications from those interested parties who had secured the Senate seat of their department or program for the academic year 2016–2017 (the application being open from February 25 to March 15, 2016), and the Committee dutifully considered all received applications.

WHEREAS, The Committee has recommended that Candace L. Buckner be named the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the GPSF Senate appoint from its membership Candace L. Buckner, the Senator from the Department of Religious Studies, to serve as the Chair of the Travel Awards Committee for 2016–2017, in accordance with the GPSF Constitution, Article V, Section 8, Subsection C (1b).

Done this day, the twelfth of April two thousand and sixteen.

Taylor Livingston
Vice-President of Internal Affairs

G. Dylan Russell
President
Appendix 9: Updated Versions of Committee Documents

Appendix 9A: Policies and Procedures, as Changed in End of the Year Review

Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure\(^n\)

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.)

Last Updated 29 March 2016

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, April 2016).
3. The Application deadlines for the following fiscal year will be set by the Committee in their final meeting.
   a. Deadlines follow those set in GPSF Travel Law
   b. However, if the deadline falls on a weekend or University holiday, the Application deadlines will occur on the first work day after the deadline set by the Travel Law.
4. The Application may open at any point after the previous Awards Cycle has ended; however, the Application should not be opened for less than 30 days (per GPSF Travel Law, Part 3, B).
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.

\(^n\) 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.
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.

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 7, 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 (excepting the final 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,”
      3. Review, edit, and adopt the document “Travel Awards Committee Policies & Procedure,”
      4. Election of a Vice-Chair, and
      5. If necessary, election of a Chair from the members (if, for whatever reason, the Chair selected in April has stepped down and can no longer serve)
   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 7, 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…
      i. If the order is not determinative of an award (both Applicants would receive an award anyways), the Committee will generally refer to the Application number for ordering;
      ii. However, if the order is determinative of an award (one of the Applicants may receive an award or a full award and the other may not), the Committee shall first consider if the tied Applicant’s Departments/Programs have a Senator in good standing.
         1. If one Applicant has a Senator in good standing and the other does not, the one with an Applicant in good standing should be given preference
         2. If the Applicants remain tied, the Committee shall find another appropriate factor to distinguish between them.
      iii. Additionally, 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. When large portions of applications have obviously been plagiarized, wherein two or more applications share extensive word-for-word agreement, the Committee shall disqualify all applications involved.
   d. The Committee may table any Application and may return to the Application at any appropriate point in the course of deliberations.
   e. 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.
   f. At that time, the Committee will continue to consider applications in this order until at least five alternates are selected for the “Wait List.”
   g. 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).
   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, optionally, whether they are partial or full) and any appropriate accompanying information (Travel Law requires at least the inclusion of department, domestic/international travel, 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, and group/individual travel), and
3. A summary of the current budget and expenditures for Travel Awards through that point in the year, including the original amount approved for Travel Awards, the recommended expenditure of the current bill, the total amount awarded so far for the fiscal year, and the remaining budget for the fiscal year.

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) and checking of travel dates,
   vi. Preparing of a voting form for the Voting Members, which maintains blind reading, and
   vii. Determining if the Applicant’s Department/Program has a GPSF Senator in “good standing”;

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. Ensuring all data (minutes, grade scores, bills, etc.) from the Committee Meetings is properly recorded, by themselves, the Vice-Chair, or another person,

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. If an Application meeting, the meeting shall be rescheduled as soon as possible, as the Committee will not be able to maintain blindness among the Voting Members in the absence of the Chair,
      ii. If a Special meeting and the issue is not time sensitive, the meeting shall be rescheduled as soon as possible, and
      iii. If a Special meeting and the issue is time sensitive, the Vice-Chair shall serve as the “Acting Chair.”
         1. In this role, the Vice-Chair temporarily vacates their position as a Voting Member; therefore,
         2. The Vice-Chair may not cast a vote when serving as “Acting Chair.”
   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 appoint the Vice-Chair, whom they have already selected from their Members, as the Chair of the Committee. If the Vice-Chair is unable to replace the Chair, the Committee 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: Vice-Chair
1. The Vice-Chair is a Voting Member selected by the Committee from its Membership to assist the Chair in their duties.
2. The Vice-Chair’s duties will include…
   a. Assisting the chair in the completion of any necessary documentation for Committee Meetings, including the recording of Committee Minutes,
   b. And assuming the role of “Acting Chair” under the conditions outlined in Part 5 above.
3. To preserve the standard of blind voting, the Vice-Chair, as a Voting Member, shall not have any additional access to Applicant data. Only when deliberations over applications end shall they have access to Applicant data.

Part 7: 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 but persistent cause (e.g., unexpected long-term 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 9B: Grading Criteria, as Changed in End of the Year Review

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)
Updated March 26, 2016

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 (5pts)
      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 anyway.

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 25 words or more), -1 point, and a point for every fifty after.

5. Departmental/Program Standing with GPSF

In cases where all things are equal between two applicants, the Committee may use whether the applicants’ departments, programs, or schools have a GPSF Senator in good standing to break the tie.
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 25 words or more), -1 point, and a point for every fifty after.

5. **Departmental/Program Standing with GPSF**

   *In cases where all things are equal between two applicants, the Committee may use whether the applicants’ departments, programs, or schools have a GPSF Senator in good standing to break the tie.*
Appendix 9C: FAQs, as Changed in End of the Year Review

GPSF Travel Awards
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Click on the questions below to jump to the answer.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Review Process</th>
<th>Reimbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this a competitive award?</td>
<td>Where can I find the Travel Awards guidelines and application?</td>
<td>If I submit an application, am I guaranteed to receive an award?</td>
<td>Where can I find information on the reimbursement process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this award be combined with other sources of funding for a particular event?</td>
<td>Will a confirmation receipt for the application be issued?</td>
<td>How many individual travel awards will be awarded?</td>
<td>Should I register for the conference or event for which I am hoping to receive an award?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can this award be combined with internal funding from UNC?</td>
<td>Can applications be updated after the application deadline has passed?</td>
<td>Typically, how many applications are submitted for the travel awards?</td>
<td>If I receive an award, what items must be submitted to be reimbursed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where do the funds for these awards come from?</td>
<td>Is the essay a required component of the application?</td>
<td>What criteria are used to evaluate travel awards?</td>
<td>What constitutes proof of participation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Timeline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Where can I find information on the reimbursement process?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can groups apply?</td>
<td>What are the application periods for the awards?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applying as a group, how many applications do we submit?</td>
<td>When are applications available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we apply as a group or individuals?</td>
<td>What if my travel occurs before the GPSF application due date?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award Use</strong></td>
<td>What if my travel overlaps between two award cycles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can awards be used to attend conferences?</td>
<td>What if I have submitted an abstract to a conference but have not received confirmation of its acceptance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are pre-conference/ event activities eligible for reimbursement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students have to be presenting to be eligible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are awards available for research travel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does research travel have to be to an institution to be reimbursable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Updated March 29, 2016
GENERAL QUESTIONS

Is this a competitive award?
Yes. The process is open and competitive. You should therefore approach the travel award application process in the same way that you would approach an application for any prestigious external award. (Menu)

Can this travel award be combined with other sources of award funding for a particular event?
NO. The GPSF Travel Awards are intended to provide a source of travel funds where no other options exist. If another source of funds will be utilized for travel to an event, GPSF travel awards cannot be used for that event. The GPSF encourages applicants to apply for as many sources of funding for travel as possible and then evaluate the advantages of the various sources if more than one award is offered. However, GPSF awards cannot be used in combination with other awards for the same event. (Menu)

Can this travel award be combined with internal funding from UNC?
NO. The GPSF Travel Awards Law states that other sources of funding (whether internal from UNC or external) cannot be used in conjunction with a GPSF Travel Award for the same travel. A student may have access to other funding, but they cannot use it for the same conference for which they are using a GPSF Travel Award. These awards are intended for students without access to ANY other travel funding. (Menu)

Where do the funds for the travel awards come from?
A portion of the annual GPSF budget, which comes from graduate student fees, is allocated for Travel Awards. The specific amount of this allocation is recommended by the GPSF Finance Committee and approved by the GPSF Senate yearly. (Menu)

ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS

General Eligibility Questions

Who is eligible for these travel awards?
Any fee-paying graduate or professional student in is eligible. The applicant must be enrolled during the semester associated with the appropriate travel cycle, as defined by Travel Law. (Menu)

Are these travel awards available for professional students?
Yes. Any fee-paying graduate or professional student in a Masters, PhD, or advanced professional school program (e.g., MD, PharmD, etc) at UNC is eligible to apply for a Travel Award. (Menu)

Are doctoral candidates at the dissertation-only (i.e., ABD) stage of their careers eligible for these awards?
Yes. As long as the candidate is a fee-paying student, they are eligible for a GPSF travel award. (Menu)

Are students eligible for more than one GPSF travel award during their program?
Yes. If an applicant is awarded a GPSF travel award, they will be ineligible to apply for any additional GPSF travel awards for the two years thereafter during their graduate program at UNC, where two years is calculated as the eight cycles following the cycle in which the applicant received their last award. After two years, a student may apply again for a GPSF travel award. However, a student may apply more frequently than once every two years if they do not receive a GPSF Travel Award. (Menu)
Are those who were awarded an award but declined it still eligible?
Yes. A student only enters into the two year ineligibility period once they accept the award and receive money from the GPSF. (Menu)

Can a student apply for an award for travel which occurs after their graduation?
Yes. A student may apply for an award if travel occurs after the semester of their graduation but within the dates of travel stipulated by the travel award application. For example, with Spring Cycle 2 (travel between April 1 and June 30), applicants graduating in May remain eligible for travel through June 30. (Menu)

Are travel funds available for summer travel?
Yes. Currently, summer travel is split between Spring Cycle 2 (travel through June 30) and Fall Cycle 1 (travel from July 1). Applicants must be fee-paying students of the appropriate semester to be eligible. (Menu)

Group Travel Questions

Can groups apply?
Yes. Applicants must apply for a group travel award, NOT an individual award. (Menu)

If applying as a group, how many applications should we submit?
One. GPSF Travel Law stipulates that there should be only a single application for groups. (Menu)

If classmates are interested in going to the same conference, would it be advisable for them to apply as a group or individuals?
The maximum group awards are $300 per group member versus $400 for individual awards. The applications are reviewed independent of department and are based on the personal and professional impact of attending. In some cases, it may be easier to make a case for the need and professional impact for attending if done individually; in other cases, it may be easier to demonstrate need and impact as a group. (Menu)

Awards Use Questions

Can travel awards be used to attend conferences?
Yes. (Menu)

Are pre-conference/event activities eligible for reimbursement?
Yes. However, the awardee must attend the conference as well. Additionally, the rule against combining funding sources for events still applies. (Menu)

Do students have to be presenting to be eligible for a GPSF travel award?
No. However, among the criteria used to evaluate applications, the Committee may more highly value those applications where the student is presenting their own research. (Menu)

Are travel awards available for research travel?
Yes. Research travel awards cover up to $400 of eligible expenses for domestic research travel and up to $600 of eligible expenses for international research travel. (Menu)

Does research travel have to be to an institution to be reimbursable?
No. Any research-related travel will be evaluated. (Menu)
APPLICATION QUESTIONS

Process Questions

Where can I find the Travel Award Guidelines and application?
Once available, applications, supporting materials, and guidelines for the GPSF Travel Awards can be found on the GPSF website at: http://gpsf.unc.edu/gpsf-funding/travel-awards/. (Menu)

Will a confirmation receipt for the application be issued?
Upon submission of the application, the webpage itself will provide notification of successful submission. We recommend printing this page for your records. Unfortunately the application tool that the GPSF uses does not have the ability to automatically provide email notifications of successful submission. (Menu)

Can applications be updated after the application deadline has passed?
Yes. Changes may be emailed to the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu. However, due to the application system we use, applicants will not be able to see or alter the application on their own, and if their application requires major changes which the Chair feels cannot be solved via email, they may ask the applicant to submit an entirely new application. (Menu)

Is the essay a required component of the application?
Yes. Applications with no essay will be automatically disqualified. (Menu)

Application Timeline Questions

What are the application periods for the GPSF travel awards?
Applications are accepted at four different times during the year. The following table illustrates the travel and corresponding application periods. Application periods and exact dates may vary slightly depending on the particular year's academic calendar, though any variations will always fall on a later date after the listed travel cycle period. (Menu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Cycle</th>
<th>If travel occurs between</th>
<th>Apply by</th>
<th>Must be enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 1</td>
<td>July 1 – September 30</td>
<td>September 1 Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Cycle 2</td>
<td>October 1 – December 31</td>
<td>November 1 Fall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 1</td>
<td>January 1 – March 31</td>
<td>February 1 Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Cycle 2</td>
<td>April 1 – June 30</td>
<td>March 15 Spring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When are applications available?
The new application will be available thirty days before the listed deadline. A call for applications will be sent out in the GPSF Newsletter at least two weeks prior to that period’s application due date. (Menu)

What if my travel occurs before the GPSF application due date?
Sometimes, because of the constraints of the academic calendar and the budget, travel may occur before the GPSF application due date. However, the occurrence of travel prior to the deadline is irrelevant. The GPSF Travel awards are intended to be reimbursements for travel. In all cases, if accepted for an award, the GPSF will reimburse students for the amount awarded for travel after the travel has occurred. (Menu)
What if my travel overlaps between two award cycles?
If an applicant’s travel overlaps between two award cycles, they may apply to both cycles. If they should receive an award for one cycle, they become ineligible for the other. (Menu)

What if I have submitted an abstract to a conference but have not yet received confirmation of its acceptance?
You should clearly state in your application that an abstract has been submitted but not yet accepted. The fact that the abstract has not yet been accepted shall not count against you in the ranking process. (Menu)

Questions concerning the Application and Budget

What are the current maximum awards?
The current maximum travel awards are $400.00 for domestic travel, $600.00 for international travel, and $300.00 per individual group member for domestic group travel ($450.00 for international travel). (Menu)

If I receive an award, will I automatically receive the maximum award?
No. The size of award depends on a number of factors, including where your application ranked among the applicants, the amount of money the Committee has allocated per cycle, and the nature and location of your travel. (Menu)

What amount of money should be requested in the award application?
Not all applications will be required to submit a budget, and you should not do so unless (1) you are asked to do so by the committee or (2) you expect your travel costs to be less than the maximum award. If you do present a budget, you should present the Committee with a clear and honest estimation of your projected costs and how you plan to apply the GPSF Travel Award if you should receive an award, keeping in mind the award limits as the Committee cannot award more than the limits. (Menu)

REVIEW PROCESS QUESTIONS

General Review Process Questions

If I submit an application, am I guaranteed to receive an award?
These awards are competitive, and submitting an application is no guarantee of receiving an award. (Menu)

How many individual travel awards will be awarded?
There is no set number of awards to be given. The total number of awards depends on available funding, which varies from cycle to cycle. (Menu)

Typically, how many applications are submitted for the travel awards?
The number of applications varies from cycle to cycle, with some cycles typically having a greater number of applications than others. The Committee has received as many as 80 applications in a single application period. (Menu)

What criteria are used to evaluate travel awards?
The Committee uses those criteria set forth in the GPSF Travel Awards Law in their evaluation of applications, including the eligibility of the applicant, how the travel will impact the applicant, how the travel will impact the applicant’s field, and their communication skills. In addition, for specific types of applications, additional factors may be considered. For conference travel, the Committee considers how the travel impacts the
University, and for research travel, the Committee considers the applicant’s methodology / intentionality / preparedness for the research and/or their proposed budget. Other factors considered are outlined in the Travel Law, Parts 1 and 2. (Menu)

**Review Process Timeline Questions**

**How long is the review period for applications?**
Review times are dependent on the number of applications received for review and the constraints of the Senate meeting calendar, but generally run about 4-5 weeks. The Committee cannot release the names of the individuals recommended to receive an award until the Senate has confirmed the Committee’s decisions. (Menu)

**When will application decisions be made, notifications sent, and awards issued?**
Notifications are sent as soon as possible after completion of the application review process for each period, which typically takes about 4-5 weeks. Award monies will be issued after submission of travel receipts by the award recipients. (Menu)

**Who should be contacted to determine application status?**
Please contact the GPSF Travel Award committee at gpsf-travel@unc.edu no earlier than four weeks after the application deadline. (Menu)

---

**REIMBURSEMENT QUESTIONS**

**Where can I find information on the reimbursement process?**
Most relevant information on the reimbursement process may be found in the GPSF Travel Law and on the GPSF Travel Award Reimbursement page (http://gpsf.unc.edu/gpsf-funding/travel-awards/travel-award-reimbursement/). (Menu)

**Should I register for the conference or event for which I am hoping to be reimbursed before I am notified of my application's status?**
Applying for a travel award does not guarantee receipt of an award. Payment of conference or event fees should therefore be considered the responsibility of the individual. (Menu)

**If I receive an award, what items must be submitted to be reimbursed?**
Within 30 days following the conclusion of travel or notification of the award (whichever is later), the student must submit the following: (1) proof of participation; (2) a short report (maximum 1 page) of the awardee’s conference or research experience; (3) a travel awards expense report; and (4) itemized and physical receipts for all expenses for which the awardee is requesting reimbursement. (Menu)

**What constitutes proof of participation?**
Proof of participation is a copy of conference proceedings, a letter of acceptance to the conference/event, or a signed letter from the awardee’s research advisor or supervisor confirming the details of their travel. (Menu)

**What are itemized receipts?**
Itemized receipts list and describe each item purchased. A credit card receipt which lists only the total amount charged is not an itemized receipt and will not be accepted. It is the applicant’s responsibility to request an itemized receipt at the time of purchase. (Menu)
What are physical receipts?
Physical receipts are the original receipts given to you by a vendor. Photocopies or scans of receipts will not be accepted unless the only version provided to you was digital, such as an email for the purchase of airfare. In such cases, the email receipt must be provided in printed form. (Menu)

What can be done about missing receipts for travel or combined receipts with other individuals?
No funds can be disbursed without an itemized receipt. Lost receipts must be replaced by the issuing agency. Receipts for expenses shared with other individuals must be submitted along with an explanation of how the expenses were shared. (Menu)

Are there restrictions on lodging and meal costs?
Yes. The reimbursement policies of the UNC Student Activities Fund Office (SAFO) apply to reimbursements under these awards. In addition, the GPSF cannot reimburse alcohol purchases or items considered to be personal gain. (Menu)
Appendix 9D: Application, as Changed in End of the Year Review

The GPSF Travel Awards Application Period is closed for the First Fall Travel Awards Cycle (travel between July 1 and September 30). The application for the Second Fall Awards Cycle will open soon (at least 30 days before the deadline). Please be on the lookout for it. If you applied during the First Fall Awards Cycle, notifications of your status will be sent out shortly after the October GPSF Senate meeting (October 4).

GPSF Travel Award Application

Please keep the following dates and deadlines in mind when applying:

If Travel Occurs:  
July 1—September 30  
October 1—December 31  
January 1—March 31  
April 1—June 30

You Must Apply By:  
September 1 (Fall 1 Cycle)  
November 1 (Fall 2 Cycle)  
February 1 (Spring 1 Cycle)  
March 20 (Spring 2 Cycle)

The application for a cycle opens at least 30 days prior to the cycle's deadline. Applications made in the wrong cycle will be automatically disqualified.

GPSF Travel Awards are used to assist with conference and research travel expenses for graduate and professional students who have no other source of funding or financial support. Travel Awards are competitive; we receive more qualified applications than we can fund every cycle.

If you still have questions unaddressed by the GPSF Travel Awards FAQ, and Grading Rubric on the GPSF Travel Awards website (http://gpsf.unc.edu/gpsf-funding/travel-awards/), please e-mail the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.

Award Eligibility

GPSF Travel Awards cannot be used in combination with any other source of funding (other than personal funds). Any reimbursement by your department, PI, advisor, mentor or any other source will disqualify you from receiving your award. If you have received a GPSF Travel Award in the past two (2) years, you are also ineligible to apply.

If awarded, I certify that no other source of funding will be used for the conference or research travel for which I'm applying."

Please write your full legal name to agree

I certify that I have not received a GPSF Travel Award in the past two (2) years."

Please write your full legal name to agree
Application

First Name*

Last Name*

PID*

Email Address*
Please provide a valid University of North Carolina email address.

Department*

Degree Pursued*
- DDS
- JD
- MA
- MD
- MBA
- MFA
- MS
- PharmD
- PhD
- Other

Name of Faculty Sponsor*
Please provide the name of your adviser, PI, or other University faculty member who can vouch for your work.

Email of Faculty Sponsor*
Are you applying for conference or research travel?*
- Conference Travel
- Research Travel

Are you traveling domestically or internationally?*
Please mark "International" if you are traveling to/from a location outside the continental United States. This indication does not necessitate the Committee to award a successful applicant an International Differential but indicates to the Committee that your travel is eligible for such an award.
- Domestic
- International

Are you applying for an individual or group award?*
- Individual
- Group

If applying for Group Award, list all names and email addresses of group members:
Only UNC graduate and professional students are eligible for GPSF Travel Awards

To what city will you be traveling?*
Include country if outside of USA

When does your travel begin?*
- Month
- Day
- 2016

When does your travel end?*
- Month
- Day
- 2016
Statement of Purpose

Please explain briefly, in 500 words or less, the purpose of your travel and its importance. (1) For Conference Travel, you should explain the travel's importance to your educational and professional development, your field, and the University of North Carolina. (2) For Research Travel, you should explain the travel's importance to your educational and professional development, discuss its impact on your field/industry, justify why the research cannot be conducted locally, and demonstrate a general preparedness to conduct the research through a methodology, plans, etc. Be sure to include enough information so the committee can evaluate the personal and professional impact of the travel. Be sure that you avoid overly technical language as the readers of the applications may not be in your field. Additionally, please refrain from including your name or contact information in the body of the essay as this is a blind review process.

Conference Travel

What is the title of the conference you are attending?

What is the website for the conference you are attending?

In what manner are you participating in the conference?
☐ Paper/Oral Presentation
☐ Poster
☐ Session Chair or Presider
☐ Discussant
☐ Invited Panelist
☐ Attending, not otherwise presenting
☐ Other:

If presenting, what is the title of your paper or presentation?

If presenting, are there multiple authors of the paper or presentation?
☐ Yes
☐ No

If presenting, please list all other authors of the paper or presentation besides yourself.
Research Travel

Please provide a brief budget in which you (1) lay out the projected costs of your travel, (2) explain how you plan to use the Travel Award if you should receive it, and (3) indicate the amount of travel funds requested from the Committee (especially if less than the maximum allowance). Budgets should be realistic and take into consideration the limits of Travel Awards funding (max individual domestic: $400; max individual international: $600). For GPSF Travel Law, applicants cannot use Travel Awards funds to buy research materials. Requesting a certain amount from the Committee does not guarantee that, if you should receive an award, you will receive that amount. Award amounts are determined by a number of different factors.

Please use this space to clarify any details about your research travel that are otherwise unspecified.

Honor Code Pledge

In keeping with the Honor Code of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, I confirm that all information provided in this application is, to my knowledge, true and does not misrepresent the nature of my travel, is written in my own words, and does not depend on any improper assistance (including but not limited to the plagiarism of another person's application).

Please write your full legal name to agree.

Confirmation Page

Thank you for submitting your application to the GPSF Travel Awards. Award announcements will be made after the GPSF Senate meeting on October 4. If you have any questions concerning Travel Awards, please email the GPSF Travel Awards Chair at gpsf-travel@unc.edu.