

8-28-2010

GPSA Council Meeting, 8/28/2010

Graduate and Professional Student Association

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/gpsa_meetings

Recommended Citation

Graduate and Professional Student Association. "GPSA Council Meeting, 8/28/2010." (2010). http://digitalrepository.unm.edu/gpsa_meetings/94

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate and Professional Student Association at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in GPSA Meeting Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.



GPSA @ UNM

Graduate And Professional Student Association

GPSA Council Meeting Agenda Saturday, August 28, 2010 – 9 am – 12 pm Domenici Education Building - Room 3010

1. Breakfast and Council Paperwork

Please check in with Council Chair to check your credentials and pick up your name plate and voting record sheet

NOTE: No proxies or credentials can be accepted after meeting is called to order

2. Call to Order

3. Approval of the Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes

- a. May 2010 meeting – attached

5. Upcoming Meeting Dates

- a. Saturday, September 25

6. Gallery and Media/Guest Speakers – 15 min limit

7. Information Items

- a. President's Report (attached)
- b. Council Chair Report (attached)
- c. Elections Report (attached)
- d. Projects Report (attached)
- e. Programs/Service Report (attached)
- f. Assistantships and Benefits (mission attached)
- g. Ad-hoc Grants Committee Report (attached)
- h. Finance Report (available at meeting)

8. Action Items

a. Council Committees

- i. Ad-hoc Grants Committee proposed bylaw changes (attached)

b. Appointments

i. Standing Committee Chairs

1. Finance – Amna Malik, Grants – Katie Richardson, Grants (vice chair)– Ashley Carter, Lobby – Mark Worthy, Programs – Brendan Picker, Projects – Brandi Lawless

ii. Ad Hoc Committee Chairs

1. Assistantships and Benefits – Liza Minno-Bloom, Equity and Inclusion – Rachel Levitt, International Student Caucus – Japji Hundal, Information and Technology – Japji Hundal, Outreach – Ashley Carter, Transparency – Theresa Rogers

iii. Court of Review Justices

1. TBA

iv. University Wide Committees

1. Student Publications Board – Jakob Schiller, American Studies PhD Student

2. Student Union Building Board –Sean Fitzpatrick, Law School JD Student

3. Recreation Services Board – Manoj Kumar
4. Student Transportation Board– Alexander Andrews, Community & Regional Planning CRP Student
5. Faculty Senate Graduate and Professional Student Committee – Megan McRobert, Community & Regional Planning, CRP Student
6. Educational Leadership – Margaret (Guida) Leicester, College of Education, MA Student
7. Athletic Council – Ashley Carter, Sports Administration PhD Student

c. Appropriations

- i. Appropriation for Pelvic Models (Medical Students) -**\$4,424.40** (memo attached)
- ii. Appropriation for Lobo Growl - **\$2354.16** (memo attached)
- iii. Appropriation for Child Care Grant - **\$9,500.00** (memo attached)
- iv. Appropriation for G.E.T - **\$ 4,100 .00** (memo attached)
- v. Appropriation for Ad Hoc Transparency Committee Budget - **\$5069.87** (memo attached)
- vi. Appropriation for Summer ST Grants **\$1,350.00**, Fall/Spring ST **\$10,000.00** – ST Fall/Spring (memo attached)
- vii. Appropriation for Ad Hoc Outreach Committee Chair Stipend - **\$400.00** (memo attached)

d. Resolutions

- i. Digitize salary book (memo attached)



The University of New Mexico

GPSA @ UNM

Graduate And Professional Student Association

GPSA President's Report Aug. 2010

The last three months have been productive for the GPSA Executive branch. The Executive Board met on June 15, July 1 (continued on July 7), 21, and Aug. 16. As the Committee Reports indicate the Executive Board has many accomplishments to be proud of, not the least of which is the implementation of the **online Grants process**, the creation of the **Ad Hoc Transparency and Outreach committees**, and the drafting of the **Childcare Grant Process**. GPSA has made it a priority to improve its marketing and outreach by investing in and updating our **new and improved brochure**, attending for the first time ever more than **21 new student departmental orientations** and establishing an Ad Hoc Transparency committee to ensure all of the actions of the GPSA are documented and archived to be reviewed by any GPSA member at any time.

GPSA President Outreach and Training

In July and August, the GPSA President attended the American Association of University Professors Summer Institute in San Diego, CA and the Coalition of Graduate Employee Unions Annual Conference in Stonybrook, NY. Both of these conferences provided invaluable trainings/workshops on assessing the **financial health of the University**, **messaging**, using **social media and new media communication techniques** (eg video blogging and Youtube videos), creating **sustainable coalitions** and the benefits of solidarity, running **effective advocacy campaigns**, and discussion about the **future of Academia** with a focus on the role of contingent faculty (including TA/GA/RAs).

On the return trip from Stonybrook, the GPSA president stopped in Washington DC to meet with Senator Bingaman's and Congressman Lujan's staffers. These meetings focused on advocating for prioritizing funding for education before entertainment, capitalizing on NM's comparative advantage with regard to the National Labs and Physics and Chemistry scholarship, providing increased support for student-parents, and garnering information on how to secure DC internships for graduate and professional students. While in DC the GPSA President also met with UNM Faculty Senate Past President, a UNM Law Student, corresponded with UNM Law School Alumni, and met with a representative from Greenberg Quinlan Rosner Research.

Open Government

GPSA is actively working to obtain the following electronic data: 1) UNM Employees List, 2) % of classes taught by graduate students, and 3) placement statistics for graduate/professional students.

Law School Secession Efforts

In Spring of 2010, approximately 75% of more than 100 **law students voted to secede from GPSA**. The Law Students have presented twice at the Regents Academic and Student Affairs & Research Committee (of which the GPSA President is an advisor), the topic has been discussed as an information item at the full Board of Regents (BOR) meeting (May 2010), and the GPSA President and Council Chair have met at the law school with Student Bar Association (SBA) leadership and the Dean of the Law School and again with the Executive Vice President of Student Affairs, Walt Miller, and the Director of Student Activities, Debbie Morris. In July, both the SBA and the GPSA submitted letters of inquiry and explanation to the BOR and to VP of Student Affairs. The law school has been directed to attempt to work within the GPSA governmental structure (including attending and actively participating in the GPSA Council) to shape the organization to better meet law student needs and GPSA has been advised to specifically look at Policy and Funding areas to see what accommodations can be made to better meet the needs of the law students.

GPSA has brainstormed and developed the following tentative plans to meet the law students' areas of concern:

- 1) Increase ST funding amount to \$500 (implemented Spring 2010)
- 2) Allow for online submissions of funding requests (Implemented Summer 2010)
- 3) Hold at least 1 funding workshop at the Law School each semester (Implemented Spring 2010, Summer 2010)
- 4) Have both GPSA leadership and GPSA funding representative attend the School of Law Student Organization Orientation (Implemented Aug. 2010)
- 5) Obtain email access to every enrolled law student (Proposed implementation Sept. 2010)
- 6) Propose Grants Code revisions to ensure students can be notified of funding amounts prior to expenditure of funds (Proposed implementation Sept. 2010).
- 7) Outreach to Law School Alumni regarding concerns of last two decades (Proposed implementation Sept. 2010)
- 8) Outreach to Law School Student Organizations (Proposed Implementation Aug – Nov. 2010)
- 9) Work with Law Student Council Representatives to propose policy amendments as appropriate

GPSA Executive 2010/2011 Objectives

- 1) Advocate for zero increase in student fees and the revision of University policy 1310 to ensure greater student voice in student fee allocations.
- 2) Recruit and select outstanding student regent candidates
- 3) Utilize Internet and new media strategies (eg Facebook and digital videos) to inform students about pressing UNM issues.
 - a. Update GPSA website to make it more intuitive, aesthetically pleasing, and consistent throughout.
 - b. Establish an easily accessible updated archive of all GPSA activities
- 4) Support Graduate Employees Together as it becomes a viable and effective student organization that advocates on behalf of the needs of graduate student employees.
- 5) Support efforts that directly impact retention and graduation rates
 - a. Establish a sustainable childcare grant
 - b. Build International student participation in GPSA
 - c. Build coalitions with programs and organizations that provide resources for historically underrepresented groups (ie gender and ethnic centers, PNMGC, etc.)
- 6) Push for openness and transparency at UNM
- 7) Cultivate future GPSA Leadership
 - a. Recruit and retain GPSA volunteers
 - b. Create archives/written documents for planning of annual events
- 8) Support Council in updating the constitution and bylaws
 - a. Provide much needed constitutional revision recommendations
 - b. Update the online version of the constitution to reflect all constitution and by laws changes to date.
- 9) Raise at least \$500 in funds outside of student fees
- 10) Incorporate more graduate student art in GPSA communications
 - a. Paint mural in GPSA Office

The GPSA calendar has been set: <http://www.unm.edu/~gpsa/calendar.shtml>

Upcoming events: Welcome Back Open House Aug. 23-27

Executive Board Fall Semester Meeting Dates and Times

Mon. Aug. 30, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Sept.13, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Oct. 4, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Oct. 18, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Nov. 8, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Nov. 22, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

Mon. Dec. 13, 12:00pm – 1:30pm

GPSA President Office Hours – Tuesday and Thursday 9:00am – 11:00am

Please feel free to contact the GPSA President at anytime: (505) 350-9730 or unmgpsa@gmail.com.

Respectfully submitted,

Lissa Knudsen, GPSA President

Submitted by: Megan McRobert, Council Chair
Submitted to: GPSA Council
Submitted for: August 28, 2010
Subject: Council Chair Report

Since my election in May 2010, I have dedicated time and energy to deepening my understanding of GPSA procedures and history, particularly Robert's Rules of Order and the GPSA Constitution. In an effort to increase GPSA's availability to constituents, I have contacted every chartered graduate student association and will continue to do so throughout the year. Staff and officials coordinated the development of a new GPSA brochure and distributed 500 brochures to different departmental orientations before school started. Requests to join the GPSA listserv are increasing and the hopefully GPSA will be a visible and accessible entity for the 2010-2011 academic school year.

Per the convening of an ad-hoc grants fairness committee, I acted as chairperson for the committee's weekly meetings and facilitated the completion of written report and final recommendations. The committee included professional and graduate students from a range of departments. Committee members worked well together around differences of opinion and engaged in respectful dialogue throughout the summer. The entire committee report has been submitted to the Council, highlights of which include: recommending SRAC/ST and GRD bylaw changes, new score sheets, a demographic and information gathering survey for grant applicants, a GPSA-wide constituent survey, training curriculums for readers and applicants, and the grants appeals process. I am confident in the outcome of this committee and look forward to working with the Grants Standing Committee to implement the improvements.

Facilitating cross-disciplinary communication is a responsibility of GPSA in general, and particularly the Council Chair. I am assisting several student groups in organizing panel discussions around relevant and controversial issues, including intellectual property issues and community-based research practices. I have also met with and will continue to work to support the work of the graduate and professional student and faculty community at UNM through a variety of events and organizations, including: ASUNM, WRC, LGBTQRC, SGPC, Coalition, Community Engagement Center, Office of International Studies and Programs, Office of Graduate Studies, PNMGC. I look forward to a year of interdepartmental collaboration.

The Council Chair will hold weekly office hours in the GPSA office (SUB 1021) every Tuesday from 9 am – noon. Appointments available throughout the week by request.

gcchair@unm.edu or unmgpsacouncil@gmail.com

Sincerely,
Megan McRobert

Report of GPSA Elections Committee August, 2010

Chair Contact Information:

Matthew Rush
505-720-8166
mrush@unm.edu

Committee Members:

Sophia Hammett
Michael Verrilli
Cynthia Lynn Mason

(At this moment we have not filled all positions in the election committee. We plan on doing so by the finish of the first month of classes, with an emphasis on filling positions in the first week of classes.)

Meeting dates: *Meetings are to occur on the 1st Tuesday of the month @ 12pm in SUB Amigo room*

August 17th (cancelled due to emergency)

September 9th

October 5th

November 2nd

December 7th

Recommendations:

As the Elections Committee has yet to meet for the semester we have no recommendations to make at this time. In the future we plan on providing the council with several recommendations on changes to the elections code and constitution, as well as the formation of a GPSA archival committee.

Projects Report

Brandi Lawless, Projects Chair

This summer, I have been working to form a diverse projects committee. Currently, I have two open seats that I expect to fill by September 10th. The other seats have been filled by Japji Hundal (Anderson) and Kristen Cole (C&J). Application deadlines for all projects have been set for the first Friday of each month that school is in session. The GPSA website has been updated to represent the new deadlines. The projects committee will meet within two weeks of the project deadline to review applications. I have received one application for project funding and will convene with the new projects committee on September 14th for application review. An agenda for this meeting will be posted on the GPSA website and minutes will follow. I have also reviewed the bylaws for projects funding and would like to suggest an amendment. In the Grants Code (Appendix 2) section II. letter D, number 1, it states that the projects committee should: "Meet during the third week of each month of the fall and spring terms to consider Projects Committee funding requests and notify applicants of meeting dates." Due to fall conference schedules and other time conflicts for graduate students, I would like to recommend that this line be changed to: "Meet within two weeks of application deadlines of each month of the fall and spring terms to consider Committee funding requests and notify applicants of meeting dates. If no applications were submitted, no meeting is required." The last portion of this recommendation clarifies meeting requirements in the case that there are no action items to address.

Brandi Lawless

Projects Chair

Office: C&J 154

Phone: (805) 720-8085

Email: projects.unm@gmail.com

Programs/Service Committee Report

8/19/2010

Brendan Picker, Committee Chair

Brendanpicker@gmail.com, 505.453.4835

The GPSA Programs Committee is excited about the 2010-2011 school year. Continuing to build upon the successes of last year's events and programs while also starting some new initiatives is the goal of the Programs Committee this year. While the committee chair is still looking for members to fill valuable positions within the committee, he is confident that the events listed below will increase participation in the GPSA by not only GPSA members, but the larger UNM and Albuquerque community as well. He hopes to have members for the committee by the end of September 2010. The committee plans to meet the last Monday of every month from 11am to 12pm in the GPSA conference room. The dates, times, and location of these meetings are posted on the GPSA web site calendar.

List of upcoming events and programs:

1. Saturday, August 21, 2010- GPSA yard sale to raise funds for the children's campus expansion and for the graduate/professional student childcare grant/scholarship.
2. Week of Aug. 23 through Aug. 27, 2010- GPSA open house in the GPSA offices. Free coffee, tea, and snacks and sign-up sheets for people wanting to get involved in GPSA.
3. Date TBD- Art and mural event highlighting graduate and professional artists and artwork. Wine and cheese event to showcase the mural(s) that will have been painted and the artwork that will be hung on the GPSA office walls.
4. Date TBD-Fundraising event to raise awareness and funds for the children's campus and the graduate/professional student childcare grant/scholarship.
5. Possible movie nights and/or forums/workshops throughout the semester.
6. Last week of classes or week of final exams- Take-a-Break week at GPSA. Coffee, tea, snacks and 10 min. massages for graduate/professional students to rest, relax and re-connect before the semester ends.

Assistantships and Benefits Committee

Written Report for GPSA Council Meeting 8.20.2010

Chair: Liza Minno Bloom

Chair Contact: ldminno@gmail.com, (cell) 215.264.8961

Committee Members: Brendan Picker, Rachel Levitt, Jakob Schiller, Tatiana Falcon

Meetings: The ABC has met regularly throughout the Spring and Summer and has developed the following statement:

The Assistantships and Benefits Committee (ABC) exists to explore and advocate for the unique and varied needs of graduate student employees at the University. Graduate student employees hold dual roles and often carry heavy loads of teaching, grading, researching and writing all while pursuing their own personal academic goals.

In preliminary conversations—individually and in forums—with graduate student employees, The ABC has identified some core issues common to UNM's graduate student employees that we feel would be best addressed by the time-honored, democratic and participatory practice of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining not only provides a real voice for graduate student employees who, as our research is revealing, provide the bulk of the labor that allows UNM to function at its current capacity, but can also contractually obligate the university administration to remain accountable to that voice. Some of these core issues are:

- A need for year-long contracts to ensure that international students can pursue international visas with ease as well as to ensure that students can take on major purchases or leases of cars or homes.
- A need for full, adequate and affordable healthcare in order to ensure that graduate student employees can work and study sustainably and at the highest caliber. This includes expanded prenatal and natal care, vision and dental care.
- A need to earn a living wage with raises consistent to inflation rates.
- A need for transparency in job descriptions, contracts and hours worked.

Throughout the fall semester, we have scheduled Academic Worklife Forums and Workshops to provide venues for more graduate student employee feedback as well as to provide some practical skills and information specific to graduate student employees. Ultimately, I envision the ABC as an open body of and for graduate student employees that advocates for expanded graduate employee rights and a greater graduate employee voice in the workplace.

The Forums/Workshops, as of now, will be:

- Thursday September 30th, 2pm—Debt Negotiation and Student Finances
- Wednesday October 27th, 3pm—Health Care
- Tuesday November 30th, 3pm—Job Clarity
- Monday December 13th, 12pm—Semester Debrief

Action Items: The ABC seeks to support the new Graduate Student Employee Group G.E.T (Graduate Employees Together) in their goal of forming a collective bargaining unit.

Recommendations for Council: I recommend that council approve G.E.T's request for funding.

Summer 2011 Ad-hoc Grants Fairness Committee Final Report & Recommendations

Submitted on: Friday, August 20, 2010

Submitted to: GPSA Council

Submitted by:

Megan McRobert, Committee Chairperson & GPSA Council Chair

Katie Richardson, Committee Members & Grants Chair

Rachel Levitt, Committee Member

Santhosh Chandrashekar, Committee Member

Steven Samford, Committee Member

Jenny Dumont, Committee Member

Contents of Report:

1. Introduction & Context
2. Committee Proposal Summary of Recommendations
3. Bylaw Changes Summary
4. SRAC/ST Changes
5. SRAC/ST Score Sheet
6. GRD Revision
7. GRD Score Sheet
8. Reader Training Curriculum
9. Applicant Training Curriculum
10. Grant Appeal Guideline
11. Grants Committee Final Report

QuickTime™ and a
TIFF (LZW) decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Intro and Context

In May 2010, the GPSA Council convened a committee to assess and examine the process by which the GPSA Grants Committee disburses grants funding. Discussions and recommendations of this committee are contained in this report.

Why should the GPSA administer grants funding for its members?

The committee discussed the following reasons the GPSA has historically and administered grant funding and why we should continue to do so:

- SRAC and ST endowments are provided for the express purpose of funding student work.
- GPSA supports student research as an opportunity for personal and academic enrichment, as well as to provide an opportunity to fund research that might not otherwise be supported by the University.
- GPSA also supports student attendance at conferences as they provide opportunities to present original research, receive feedback, and make professional connections within their fields.
- The grants process is also a way to help students connect with one and other across departments and encourage communication about research across disciplines.
- Applying for GPSA grants is a stepping stone for many first time or new applicants who may have never applied for a grant before. Applicants are able to build a funding history and a CV and can act as a stepping stone towards future funding opportunities.
- The committee acknowledges that there are significant costs incurred when pursuing a graduate or professional course of studies. While GPSA grants are not intended to function as a form of financial aid towards standard costs of schooling, it is a valuable resource in supplementing the opportunities available to all members.

- The process also serves a pedagogical function in that students are able to practice applying for grants, writing about their research, opportunity to be a grants reader, communication skills, professional development opp for committee members and chair.
- The grants distribution process is an important constituent service and is an important tool in reaching out to GPSA members.

The GPSA Ad-Hoc Grants Committee Proposal to Council Summary:

1. Approve a demographic survey linked to Grant Applications. The survey will appear after individuals have submitted their grant applications and will be used to track who is applying, what departments are represented, what kind of philosophical approaches are getting funding, and who is not, to better outreach to departments and communities under represented.
2. Convene a committee in Summer 2011 to evaluate:
 - a. the demographic data
 - b. perspective categories and definitions
 - c. survey content areas
 - d. the appeals process
 - e. student software needs
 - f. and revise where prudent the content and administration of both the grants process and the survey data fields
3.
 - a. Approve the creation of a committee to devise and ultimately administer a GPSA wide demographic survey of the graduate and professional student constituency.
 - b. Include in the GPSA wide survey those content areas from the grant application survey so that comparative analysis can be made. Importantly, the committee should not be limited only to the areas in the grants survey.
 - c. The grants committee shall include in their April 2011 report a summary of the results of the changes implemented from the Ad Hoc committee. Additionally, the Grants Committee and Chair are responsible for tracking and reporting on questions, concerns, and issues arising from definitions of and distinctions between the perspectives used to

Bylaws Changes Summary

1. SRAC and ST processes are completely parallel. ST now requires 700 word proposal and letter of recommendation. ST score sheet is the same as SRAC. ST will still not be funded on the SRAC tiered 100%, 80%, 60% level. The lower 50% for ST can be funded, whereas it cannot be for SRAC.
 2. SRAC's purpose is clarified to address research and travel to disseminate research only. ST is for travel for any professional/career/degree purpose not related to research.
 3. GRD is now read only by three readers and will be normalized like SRAC/ST.
 4. Readers and applications will remain anonymous.
 5. Each application will be read by one reader from the applicant's perspective, and at least one reader NOT from the applicant's perspective. The last reader will be randomly assigned. Readers will NOT come from the applicant's department. No two readers will be from the same department.
 6. Appeals process is more formalized than before.
 7. An applicant workshop curriculum must be posted and followed; workshops must be conducted.
 8. A reader training curriculum must be posted and followed.
 9. Online system-specific wording adopted. Committee must accommodate users with circumstances that prevent or prohibit use of the system.
 10. Applicants no longer have to ask for funding from their department or another source.
-
4. match applicants with readers.
 5. Recruit a volunteer for data analysis of the grants process, demographic survey, and comparative success of applications.
 6. Vote to approve as is, bylaw changes to: SRAC and ST, as well as GRD.

Proposed Changes to GPSA SRAC/ST Grants Code

11. Student Research and Allocations Committee (SRAC) and Specialized Travel (ST) Grants

1. Funding History

1. The ST Grant and its quasi-endowment were established in 2004 with \$220,000 from the UNM provost's office.
2. The SRAC Grant and its quasi-endowment were established in 1996 with \$14,000 in student fees and \$14,000 from the UNM provost's office as requested by the GPSA.
3. The quasi-endowments are held in trust by the university on behalf of GPSA. Each year the spending allowance from the endowments funds grant activity.
4. SRAC funding is typically augmented by appropriations from the GPSA council.

2. Activities Funded

1. The SRAC grant funds the development and dissemination of research including travel for research related purposes.

1. Acceptable SRAC costs include

1. Software not available in UNM computer pods or accessible by the student.
- 2.
- 3.
4. Airfare, registration, hotel, shuttle fees, taxi fares, presentation materials and per diem in accordance with UNM policy. Travel must be outside of Albuquerque. Current policy and mileage rates can be found in the University Business Policies and Procedures Manual, Policy 4030.
5. Supplies, consumables and printing costs necessary for development and dissemination of research and not readily supplied by the applicant's department.

2. Unacceptable SRAC costs include

- 1.
2. Salaries, tuition or binding
3. Organization fees or conference social functions
4. Travel, room or board for any event whose purpose is not the development or dissemination of student's research

2. The ST grant funds travel expenses that further the professional and career development of students.

1. Acceptable ST costs include

1. Travel costs to interviews, clinicals, workshops, job fairs, auditions, mock trials and other career or professional events where the student is not presenting or conducting research. Costs can include airfare, registration costs, hotel, shuttle fees, taxi fares, presentation materials and per diem in accordance with UNM policy. Travel must be outside of Albuquerque. Current policy and mileage rates can be found in the University Business Policies and Procedures Manual, Policy 4030.

2. Unacceptable ST costs include

1. Conferences or travel to present research
- 2.

3. Any activity that could be funded by SRAC

3. Amount of Funding

1. SRAC Grants can fund up to \$500 per student per year.
2. ST Grants can fund up to \$500 per student per year.
3. A year refers to the period between June 1 and May 31.
4. See I.E.iv. for activity funding periods and see I.D.i. for application submission deadlines.

4. Deadlines

1. The deadline for submission of applications will be noon (12 p.m.) on the fifth (5th) Friday of the fall and spring semesters and noon (12 p.m.) of the second (2nd) Friday of the summer semester. No late applications will be accepted. In the event of unforeseen, or extraordinary circumstances, the SRAC/ST Chair may establish a new application deadline. Notice of any change to the deadline shall be posted on the GPSA Website.
2. Awarded funds must be claimed within ninety (90) days of the award notification. Otherwise funds will revert back to the committee to disseminate in the next funding cycle. See I. L.
3. Appeals of award decisions must occur within three (3) weeks of the letter of notification. See I. K.

5. Applicant Eligibility

1. Only GPSA members may receive grant funding.
2. SRAC/ST chairs, committee members and grant readers are ineligible to apply for any grants that they help score. However, a SRAC reader may apply for a ST grant and vice versa.
3. An applicant may submit only one application per semester for each grant.
4. Each application may be made for one allowable event or activity.
5. The applicant has not yet been awarded the full amount in section I.C. of SRAC (ST) funding per year. Per year means per summer-fall-spring funding cycle.
6. The event or activity for which funds are sought must occur within the next, current or previous funding period.
 1. The fall funding period is from 15 August to 31 of December.
 2. The spring funding period is from 1 January to 31 May.
 3. The summer funding period is from 1 June to 14 August.

6. Application Requirements

1. Applications must be submitted before the deadline, according to the deadlines in section I.D.
2. Applications must be for activities taking place in either the current or previous funding period, according to section I.E.vi.
- 3.
4. Submission must occur through the online application system. The grants chair must accommodate students with circumstances that prevent or prohibit their use of the online system. If a method of accommodation cannot be agreed upon by the applicant and the chair, the applicant can appeal, see I.K.
5. Applications must be the original work of the student and not the work of any other person.
6. A complete SRAC/ST application includes
 1. The completed html fields of the online SRAC/ST application
 2. An anonymous activity proposal, submitted through the online system

not to exceed two pages in length or 700 words. The applicant's name shall not appear on the proposal.

3. An anonymous activity budget submitted through the online system. The applicant's name shall not appear on the budget.

4.

5. An anonymous letter of recommendation. The applicant's name shall not appear on the anonymous letter. The faculty signature and name may remain on the letter.

7.

8.No materials besides those listed in I.F.i. and I.F.ii. shall be accepted.

9.Applications must adhere to the online instructions.

10. At the discretion of the SRAC/ST Chair, applications may not be read if the requirements outlined in I.F. are not met. The applicant may always appeal, see I.K.

7. Applicant Workshops and Outreach

1.The grants committee must conduct at least two applicant workshops for each funding cycle. The workshops must be advertised on the GPSA list-serv and on the website.

2.The grants committee shall follow workshop curriculum guidelines on the GPSA website. The committee may post updates to this curriculum.

3.The grants committee will make a good faith attempt to contact departments without a single successful applicant from the previous year to advertise the grants and offer departmental workshops. These outreach efforts and results will be included in the April report to council.

4.The grants committee will advertise the available grants at least three weeks before the deadlines on the GPSA website and list-serv. Other advertisement is encouraged.

8. Application Readers

1.Readers of grants must be GPSA members.

2.Readers cannot read for any grant for which they have also applied in the same semester.

3.Readers will be compensated for their work with a stipend.

4.Readers must attend a training once in each June 1 to May 31 cycle before reading applications. The grants chair may require re-training at their discretion. The grants chair shall follow training curriculum guidelines on the GPSA website. The committee may recommend updates to this curriculum.

5.Readers must be selected in an open call to the GPSA membership, e.g. via the list-serv.

9. Application Scoring

1.Only the anonymous parts of an application will be read and scored by 3 readers.

2.Applications will be read by readers from a different department than the applicant.

3.Applicants and readers will self-identify within one of five perspectives.

Applications will be read by at least one reader inside their perspective and at least one reader outside of their perspective.

1. Quantitative

2. Qualitative

3. Critical

4. Creative

5. Applied

4. Applications shall be scored according to the criteria online, posted at least one month prior to the application deadlines. Score criteria changes must be approved by a 2/3 vote from the grants committee.
5. The criteria for SRAC/ST must include
 1. Technical merit: 20 points
 2. Proposal composition: 20 points
 - 3.
 4. Benefits: 35 points
6. Budget: 20 points
7. Raw scores of the readers will be normalized by multiplying by the reader-group average and dividing by the individual reader average.
8. When the difference between the high and low normalized scores for an application exceeds 25% of the total possible score, two additional readers will evaluate the proposal. From these five normalized scores, the highest and lowest will be dropped, and the three remaining scores will be accepted regardless of the spread between them.

10. Application Funding Procedure

1. Funds shall be allocated in percentages according to the semester totals from the averages of the previous year. For example, if there were 250 applications in the previous year, with 50 applications for the summer and 100 each for the fall and spring, then funds should be allocated as 20%, 40%, 40% of the anticipated grants money. Furthermore, the grants chair shall set aside monies from the semester funds to be able to afford accepting 1 (summer) or 2 (fall and spring) appeals. If appeals are not granted, this money will roll over into the next funding cycle.
2. For SRAC, from the total amount of money for the funding cycle, outlined in I.I.i., the committee shall award funds according to the rank ordering of normalized (section I.G.v.) scores.
 1. The top 20% of SRAC applications will be eligible for full funding of the amount requested, up to the maximum in section I.C.i.
 2. The second 20% will be eligible for 80% of the amount requested.
 3. The next 10% will be eligible for 60% of the amount requested.
 4. The lower 50% will not be eligible for funding.
 5. If funds are not available to award all the eligible applications as outlined above, awards will be made to the highest ranked proposals until all money has been exhausted, excepting money withheld to fund 1 or 2 appeals, as provided in section I.I.i. Alternatively, additional money may be sought from council by the grants chairs.
3. For ST, from the total amount of money for the funding cycle, outlined in I.I.i., the committee shall award 100% of the requested funds according to the rank ordering of normalized (section I.G.v.) scores until all money has been exhausted, excepting money withheld to fund 1 or 2 appeals, as provided in section I.I.i. Alternatively, additional money may be sought from council by the grants chairs.
4. Funds not claimed within the ninety day limit (section I.D.ii.) revert to the grant accounts unless the original allocation for an activity was made specifically for a time period which extends beyond the ninety day limit or unless the recipient requests and is granted an extension in writing. See section I.K.iii.

11. Records

1. The committee shall keep records of
 1. all applications
 2. scores and score comment sheets
 3. a database of cover sheet information (such as name, email, department and requested amount) and score results
 4. a separate record of who was awarded at what amount and when it was awarded
2. All records should be in non-obsolete digital format, passed on to the next grants chair and kept for a minimum of five years.
3. All applicants will have access to their files and scores but not to the applications of others.

12. Appeals

1. To appeal any decision made by the grants chair or committee, a written request must be received by the SRAC/ST committee within three (3) weeks from the date on the notification letter.
2. The appeal must stipulate on what grounds the appeal is based.
3. No late applications will be accepted. Therefore, appeal on those grounds will not be heard.
4. An applicant making an appeal may request a meeting with all 3 readers. If a reader is unwilling or unable to meet with the applicant, they will need to provide a written response to an applicant's reasons for appeal. The SRAC/ST committee will review the request for an appeal within two weeks of its receipt. Applicants are entitled to attend and speak at their appeal review. The review may be delayed beyond the two week deadline if the applicant cannot attend.
5. If the committee votes that the appeal is valid, then new readers will review the application, and follow the re-reading guidelines even if the application has already been reread. If the application appeal has been heard and the application has not yet been scored, scoring will proceed normally. If the reasons for the appeal are found to be invalid, no change in funding or scoring will be granted.
6. Any applicant dissatisfied with the results of an appeal to the SRAC/ST committee may file a final appeal to the GPSA Council within two (2) weeks of receiving the SRAC/ST committee decision. The decision of the GPSA Council will be considered final. No further appeal will be granted.
7. The grants committee will maintain an appeal guideline on the GPSA website.

13. Claiming Awards

1. Grants monies will be distributed on a direct grant basis.

To claim a grant, a recipient must return a signed award form, provided online, to the GPSA office within the ninety day (section I.D.ii.) limit.

New Score Sheet

SRAC/ST

Total Points Possible: 95 points

Technical Merit

1. Generally, activity is introduced, given adequate background, and put into context of field.
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
2. Specific activity is explained in sufficient detail
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
3. Student's academic interests are explained
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
4. Relationship of specific activity to degree is explained
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
5. TOTAL = 20 points

Proposal Composition

1. Writing style is suitable for a general academic audience
0-1-2-3-4-5
2. Proposal is clearly written
0-1-2-3-4-5
3. Body of proposal avoids excessive jargon. Technical terms are defined
0-1-2-3-4-5
4. Body of proposal avoids misspelling and poor grammar.
0-1-2-3-4-5
- TOTAL = 20 points

Benefits

1. Benefits to applicant are clearly stated
 - a. 012345
2. Benefits to applicant are clearly linked to academic/professional development
 - a. 012345678910
3. Benefits to applicant will result in academic/professional development appropriate to applicant's stage in degree
 - a. 012345678910
4. Benefits to the University, academic and professional community, and/or society are clearly stated
 - a. 012345678910
5. TOTAL = 35

Budget

1. Budget is well researched
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
2. Budget is complete for the scope of the project
 - a. 0-1-2-3-4-5
3. Items to be funded by SRAC/ST are indicated
 - a. 0 OR 5
4. Items to be funded are consistent with SRAC/ST guidelines
 - a. 0 OR 5

5. TOTAL: 20 points

Graduate Research Development (GRD) Fund Changes

14. Funding History

1. The GRD quasi-endowment began with funding allocated to the GPSA by the New Mexico State Legislature in 2000. GRD grants assist with larger projects that require substantial funding and are aimed at encouraging UNM students to work on research with state agencies or in areas that directly benefit the state of New Mexico.
2. The quasi-endowment is held in trust by the university on behalf of GPSA. Each year the a small spending allowance from the endowments funds grant activity along with substantial contributions from New Mexico State Legislature allocations.

15. Activities Funded

1. The GRD grant funds the development of research including travel for research related purposes.
 1. Permanent equipment not available from the applicant(s)' UNM Department, or not otherwise available for use by the applicant(s).
 2. Computer software not available at the UNM computer pods or at the applicant(s)' UNM Department, or not otherwise available for use by the applicant(s).
 3. Room, board, and travel expenses to and from research facilities or field sites outside of Albuquerque.
 4. Supplies and consumables necessary for the research project and not readily supplied by the applicant(s)' UNM Department or not otherwise available for use by the applicant(s).
 5. Transcription expenses.
 6. Research projects commenced within the fiscal year, July 1 through June 30.
2. Unacceptable GRD costs include
 1. Salaries or stipends, except for the GRD Chair, Vice-Chair and Committee Members.
 2. Travel expenses or other fees associated with a conference.
 3. Travel, room and board expenses for workshops, schools, clinicals or other travel that does not directly aid in the creation of new student research
 4. The purchase of computers.
 5. Tuition and supplies/books for classes.
 6. Any publication or subscription costs.
 - 7.
 8. Any research project that involves, or may involve, excessive or unreasonable harm to humans or animals. See Section IV.F.5.

16. Amount of Funding

1. High Priority Research Project Grants will be awarded a maximum of \$5,000 for each research project.
2. General Research Project Grants will be awarded a maximum of \$3,000 for each research project.
3. The maximum amounts are for individual research projects regardless of the number of graduate or professional students working on the project.
4. The total amount awarded shall not exceed the total amount requested in the application.
5. The maximum amount awarded to an individual, based on the total of the applications to which they are signatory, is \$5,000 per year (July 1 – June 30).

6. No individual can receive GRD funding more than three times.

17. Deadlines

1. All applications for GRD grants must be received by the GPSA by a date and time to be announced by the GRD Committee Chair no later than the October GPSA Council Meeting. In the event of unforeseen, or extraordinary circumstances, the GRD Chair may establish a new application deadline. Notice of any change to the deadline shall be posted on the GPSA Website.
2. Late applications will not be considered for funding.
3. Awarded funds must be claimed by the June 30th following award notification. Otherwise funds will revert back to the committee to disseminate in the next funding cycle. See IV. M.
4. Appeals of award decisions must occur within three (3) weeks of the letter of notification. See IV. L.

18. Applicant Eligibility

1. A member of GPSA enrolled, at the time of application and through the completion date of the research project, at the University of New Mexico.
2. A Member of GPSA not serving on the GPSA Court of Review, as GRD Chair or as a GRD reader.
3. FOR HIGH PRIORITY RESEARCH PROJECT GRANTS ONLY: Members of GPSA collaborating with a New Mexico State Agency.
4. The research activity for which funds are sought must occur between July 1 and June 30 for the current funding cycle.

19. Application Requirements

1. Applications must be submitted before the deadline, according to the deadlines in section IV.D.
2. Applications must be for activities taking place in the current funding period according to section IV.E.4.
3. Submission must occur through the online application system. The grants chair must accommodate students with circumstances that prevent or prohibit their use of the online system. If a method of accommodation cannot be agreed upon by the applicant and the chair, the applicant can appeal, see IV.L
4. All applicant(s) must apply for either a High Priority Research Project Grant or a General Research Project Grant, but not for both for a single project.
5. For activities involving humans, animals, or hazardous materials
 1. All research projects that involve human or animal subjects or participants must, prior to the distribution of funding, be reviewed and approved by the Human Research Review Committee (HRRC); an Institutional Review Board (IRB); the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC); or by another entity empowered by the University of New Mexico for such purposes.
 2. All research projects that involve the use of biohazardous materials or chemicals, must be reviewed and approved, prior to the distribution of funding, by the Biosafety Committee or by another entity empowered by the University of New Mexico for such purposes.
 3. Approval of a research project by any of the entities described in subsections a or b above, shall not be determinative of whether or not a research project involves excessive or unreasonable harm to humans or animals.

6. Proposal

1. Each proposal must be anonymous: applicant(s)' name(s) must be excluded.
2. Each application must include a proposal identifying the following areas
 1. Description of the research project.
 2. Activity is introduced, given adequate background and put into the context of the field.
 3. Student's academic interests are explained.
 4. Relationship of specific activity to degree is explained.
 5. Methodology
 6. Significance of the project on the applicant(s) career.
 7. Significance of the project to the University of New Mexico
 8. Significance of the project to New Mexico's communities
 9. Significance of the project to New Mexico's rural communities
 10. FOR HIGH PRIORITY GRANTS ONLY: Description of the collaboration with a New Mexico State Agency
 11. FOR GENERAL GRANTS COLLABORATING WITH NON -PROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS ONLY: Description of the collaboration with a non-profit community organization
 - 12.
3. All proposals shall be written in language easily understandable by graduate or professional students in any college. All technical terms shall be defined and explained.
4. FOR GENERAL GRANTS ONLY: The maximum word count for each proposal shall be 700 words..
5. FOR HIGH PRIORITY GRANTS ONLY: The maximum word count for each proposal shall 1100 words.

7. Letter(s) of Support

1. Each letter must be anonymous: applicant(s)' name(s) must be excluded. Recommender names may remain on the letters.
2. All applications must include one (1) letter of support from a faculty member familiar with the applicant(s)' research project
3. HIGH PRIORITY GRANTS ONLY: All applications for High Priority Grants must also submit one (1) letter of support from a member in the collaborating New Mexico State Agency.
4. FOR GENERAL GRANTS COLLABORATING WITH NON-PROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS: All applicant(s) may also submit one (1) letter of support from a member in the collaborating non-profit community organization.
- 5.

8. Itemized Budget

1. Each budget must be anonymous: applicant(s)' name(s) must be excluded.
2. Each application for funding must include a reasonable itemized budget for the research project that includes the following:
 1. Total budget for the research project.
 2. Line items that will be funded with GRD grant money must be clearly indicated.
 3. All sources of funding for the research project, including all amounts requested, but not yet awarded, from any other funding source must be listed for each line item

4. Detailed information on all equipment, travel costs, supplies and consumables; including airlines, make and model numbers, hotel and motel names, rates, sizes and weights etc.
3. Narration may be added to the itemized budget to explain any proposed expenditures.
4. Itemized budgets indicating GRD funded items that are in violation of these guidelines shall be reduced by the amount indicated on the itemized budget.
5. The GRD Chair, at his/her discretion, may request of the principal applicant, the submission of a new itemized budget for review. The applicant will be given five (5) days following notification to submit the new itemized budget to the GPSA Office. Failure by the principal applicant to turn in a new itemized budget will be grounds to disqualify the application from review.
9. No materials besides the online application itself and those listed in IV.F.6.-8. shall be accepted.
10. Applications must adhere to the online instructions.
11. At the discretion of the GRD Chair, applications may not be read if the requirements outlined in IV.F. are not met. The applicant may always appeal, see IV.L.
 1. Failure to turn in an application by the deadline.
 2. Failure to turn in a complete application.
 3. Applications for High Priority Research Project Grants without a collaborating New Mexico State Agency.
 4. Failure to submit a new itemized budget when requested to do so by the GRD Chair within the prescribed deadline.
 5. Violation of any of the guidelines enumerated within this article of the GPSA Grants Code.
 6. Failure to submit appropriate anonymous proposal, budget and letters of recommendation.
20. Applicant Workshops and Outreach
 1. The GRD committee must conduct at least two applicant workshops for each funding cycle. The workshops must be advertised on the GPSA list-serv and on the website.
 2. The GRD committee shall follow workshop curriculum guidelines on the GPSA website. The committee may post updates to this curriculum.
 3. The GRD committee will make a good faith attempt to contact departments without a single successful applicant from the previous year to advertise the grants and offer departmental workshops. These outreach efforts and results will be included in the April report to council.
 4. The grants committee will advertise the available grants at least three weeks before the deadlines on the GPSA website and list-serv. Other advertisement is encouraged.
21. Application Readers
 1. Readers of grants must be GPSA members.
 2. Readers cannot read for any grant for which they have also applied in the same semester.
 3. Readers will be compensated for their work with a stipend.
 4. Readers must attend a training once in each cycle before reading applications. The grants chair may require re-training at their discretion. The grants chair shall follow training curriculum guidelines on the GPSA website. The committee may recommend updates to this curriculum.
 5. Readers must be selected in an open call to the GPSA membership, e.g. via the list-serv.
22. Application Scoring

1. An application will be read and scored by 3 readers.
2. Applications will be read by readers from a different department than the applicant.
3. Applicants and readers will self-identify within one of five disciplines. Applications will be read by at least one reader inside their perspective and at least one reader outside of their perspective.
 1. Quantitative
 2. Qualitative
 3. Critical
 4. Creative
 5. Applied
4. Applications shall be scored according to the criteria online, posted at least one month prior to the application deadlines. Score criteria changes must be approved by a 2/3 vote from the GRD committee.
5. The criteria for GRD scoring must include
 1. Description of the research project, 5 points.
 2. Activity is introduced, given adequate background and put into the context of the field, 5 points
 3. Student's academic interests are explained, 5 points
 4. Relationship of specific activity to degree is explained, 5 points
 5. Language in the proposal is easily understandable by graduate and professional students in any college and all technical terms are defined and explained, 10 points
 6. Methodology: Are the research project fundamentals and procedures sufficient to ensure project success?, 10 points
 7. Student Benefits: Project will result in graduate/professional student development appropriate to the applicant's stage in career, 10 points
 8. UNM Benefits: Research project benefits UNM, 10 points
 9. Budget shows source of funding for each line item, 5 points
 10. Budget is well researched and complete for project, 5 points
 11. Does the project directly impact New Mexico's communities?, 10 points
 12. Does the project significantly impact New Mexico's communities?, 10 points
 13. Does the project directly and significantly impact New Mexico's rural communities?, 10 points
 14. Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from UNM faculty, 10 points
 15. FOR HIGH PRIORITY APPLICATIONS ONLY: Description of the collaboration with a New Mexico State Agency, 20 points.
 16. FOR HIGH PRIORITY APPLICATIONS ONLY: Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from the New Mexico State Agency, 10 points.
 17. FOR GENERAL GRANTS COLLABORATING WITH A NON-PROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: Description of the collaboration with a non-profit community organization, 5 optional points.
 18. FOR GENERAL GRANTS COLLABORATING WITH A NON-PROFIT COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION: Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from the non-profit community organization, 5 points.
 - 19.
6. When the difference between the high and low normalized scores for an application exceeds 25% of the total possible score, two additional readers will evaluate the proposal. From these five normalized scores, the highest and lowest will be dropped,

and the three remaining scores will be accepted regardless of the spread between them.
Funding Procedures

7. GRD Total Budget The GPSA President shall recommend and the GPSA Council shall approve the total amount allocated each year for the GRD Funding Process.

1. No more than 10 percent of the total amount allocated annually may be used for administrative expenses.
2. No less than 2 percent of the total amount allocated annually shall be set aside for the appeals process.
3. The GRD Chair shall recommend and the GRD Committee shall approve the total amounts allocated annually for administrative expenses, appeals, and for High Priority and General Research Project Grants.

8. Funding Applications

1. If funds are not available to fully fund the applications as outlined below, the awards will be made to the highest ranked proposals until all money has been exhausted.
2. High Priority: The total awarded to all high priority applications shall not exceed half (1/2) of the overall amount awarded in the GRD process. High Priority applications will be fully funded, starting with the highest scoring application
3. General Priority: The total awarded to all low priority applications shall not exceed the remaining amount to be awarded in the GRD process after the High Priority grants are awarded.
4. The lower 50% of high and the lower 50% of general priority applications will not be eligible for funding.

23. Records

1. The committee shall keep records of
 1. all applications
 2. scores and score comment sheets
 3. a database of cover sheet information (such as name, email, department and requested amount) and score results
 4. a separate record of who was awarded at what amount and when it was awarded
2. All records should be in non-obsolete digital format, passed on to the next grants chair and kept for a minimum of five years.
3. All applicants will have access to their files and scores but not to the applications of others.

24. Appeals

1. To appeal any decision made by the grants chair or committee, a written request must be received by the GRD committee within three (3) weeks from the date on the notification letter.
2. The appeal must stipulate on what grounds the appeal is based.
3. No late applications will be accepted. Therefore, appeal on those grounds will not be heard.
4. An applicant making an appeal may request a meeting with all 3 readers. If a reader is unwilling or unable to meet with the applicant, they will need to provide a written response to an applicant's reasons for appeal.
5. The GRD committee will review the request for an appeal within two weeks of its receipt. Applicants are entitled to attend and speak at their appeal review. The review may be delayed beyond the two week deadline if the applicant cannot attend.
6. If the committee votes that the appeal is void, then new readers will review the application, and follow the re-reading guidelines even if the application has already been

reread. If the application appeal has been heard and the application has not yet been scored, scoring will proceed normally. If the reasons for the appeal are found to be invalid, no change in funding or scoring will be granted.

7. Any applicant dissatisfied with the results of an appeal to the GRD committee may file a final appeal to the GPSA Council within two (2) weeks of receiving the GRD committee decision. The decision of the GPSA Council will be considered final. No further appeal will be granted.

8. The grants committee will maintain an appeal guideline on the GPSA website.

25. Claiming Awards, Budget Revisions and Funding Extensions

1. To claim a grant, a recipient must return to the GPSA office within the ninety day (section I.D.ii.) limit:
 1. An award form, provided online
 2. Original receipts of the expenditures
 3. Original proposal and budget
2. Budget revisions, that is significant changes to the original budget, must be approved by the GRD Committee. Submission of the revised budget, a memo explaining the need for the revision and all the material in section IV.M.1. is necessary. The committee shall make a decision within two weeks of receiving the revision request.
3. Funding period extensions beyond the funding year (section IV.D.ii) may be requested in writing and granted at the committee's discretion within two weeks of receiving the request.

26. Definitions

1. Administrative Expenses: Shall include, but not be limited to, stipends for the GRD Chair, Vice-Chair and Committee Members; advertising; office supplies; postage; and copying/duplication services.
2. Complete Application: A signed application that includes one (1) properly executed online submission of personal information, proposal, appropriate letter(s) of support, and itemized budget, where the previously described documents exclude all references to the applicant(s)' name, address, email address, and phone number.
3. Day: A business day.
4. General Research Projects: Research projects conducted by members of GPSA that are completed independent of a New Mexico State Agency.
5. Harm to Humans or Animals: Physical, cultural, psychological, emotional, or other harm to humans or animals.
6. High Priority Research Projects: Research projects conducted by Members of GPSA that are completed in collaboration with a New Mexico State Agency.
- 7.
8. New Mexico State Agency: An entity designated by the GRD Committee that is not a college, department, or program at a public university of the State of New Mexico.
9. Non-Profit Community Organization: An entity registered as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization with the Internal Revenue Service and/or under the laws of the State of New Mexico or of an Indian tribe. This organization must have a New Mexico address and must conduct a majority of its activities within New Mexico.
10. Permanent Equipment: Items that will not be depleted at the end of the research project.
11. Research: Any activity performed by members of GPSA with the intent to generate generalizable knowledge that will be communicated for potential public use. This includes, but is not limited to, an artistic, athletic, cultural, educational, financial, historical, humanitarian, legal, linguistic, mathematical, medical, musical, occupational,

political, religious, scientific, sociological, structural, technological, or therapeutic investigation.

12. Supplies and Consumables: Items that are expected to be depleted at the end of the research project.

GPSA @ UNM

Graduate And Professional Student Association

GPSA GRD Score Sheet

120 or 140 points possible for General or High Priority

Proposal

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| | 2. 0-5 |
| 12. Description of Research Project: Is the project explained in significant detail? | |
| 13. Generally, activity is introduced, given adequate background and put into the context of the field | 3. 0-5
4. 0-5 |
| 14. Student's academic interests are explained. | |
| 15. Relationship of specific activity to degree is explained. | 5. 0-10 |
| 16. Proposal is understandable by a general academic audience and all technical terms are defined and explained. | 6. 0-10 |
| 17. Methodology: Are the research project fundamentals and procedures sufficient to ensure project success? | 7. 0-10 |
| 18. Student Benefits: Project will result in graduate/professional student development appropriate to the applicant's stage in degree. | 8. 0-10 |
| 19. UNM Benefits: Research project benefits UNM. | 9. 0-5 |
| 20. Budget shows source of funding for each line item. | 10. 0-5 |
| 21. Budget is well researched and complete for project. | |

NM Benefits

- | | |
|--|----------------------|
| 22. Does the project directly impact New Mexico's communities? | |
| 23. Does the project significantly impact New Mexico's communities? | 11. 0-10 |
| 24. Does the project directly and significantly impact New Mexico's rural communities? | 12. 0-10
13. 0-10 |

Letters & Collaborations

- | | |
|--|----------|
| 25. Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from UNM faculty | 15. 0-10 |
|--|----------|

High Priority Only

- | | |
|---|---------|
| The collaboration with a New Mexico state agency is clearly explained and meaningful to the project. | 1. 0-20 |
| Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from the New Mexico State Agency | 2. 0-10 |

General Priority Only

(optional collaboration with non-profit)

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. The collaboration with a non-profit community organization is clearly explained and meaningful to the project. | 1. 0-5 |
| 2. Degree of support demonstrated in the letter from the non-profit community organization. | 2. 0-5 |

GPSA Grant Reader Training Recommended Curriculum

The grants chair shall address the following.

26. Trainer should use a visual presentation that will be posted online and made available both to applicants and readers.
27. Readers should be informed of score due date.
28. Readers should be told when and how they will receive their stipend.
29. Readers should be told that they must score 10-15 applications and a few re-reads in order to receive their stipend.
30. Online application and scoring process should be demonstrated.
31. Score normalization must be explained. A range of scores is required.
32. Readers must make comments in each of the four sections of the SRAC/ST score sheet. Readers should explain where the applicant may improve their application.
33. Readers should be aware of the appeals system and must understand that they may be called upon to explain their scores in person or in writing.
34. Readers should be reminded to be consistent when scoring for an application set. For example, if you take off points for jargon in one application, you should be just as critical of all the other applications you score.
35. Readers should be trained that the benefits section is not meant to give them an opportunity to value one academic endeavor over others. Benefits scores should judge applicants on how clearly they have explained the benefits they anticipate from their activity.
36. Equity and Inclusion should participate in Grants reader training as either a separate training required of readers or as an additional 30 minute workshop at the end of the present reader training. E&I could train readers in negotiating some of the sticking points that have historically played out negatively in the evaluation of scholarship. For example, an E&I representative could briefly discuss the problems of and work through potential solutions to:
 1. History and politics of the perspectives used to match readers and applicants: Qualitative, Quantitative, Critical, Creative, and Applied.
 2. The Politics of the Score Sheet:
 1. Discrimination against fields identified as being jargon heavy
 2. Devaluing of critical/creative scholarship
 3. Disciplinary differences in writing styles (I vs. We, Passive vs. Active, issues surrounding plagiarism, citation practices, and communal intellectual property)
 4. The politics of clarity (clarity of proposed project vs. mechanical clarity of writing)

5. Racialized and gendered trends in evaluation
6. The politics of complex writing
7. Language discrimination

37. Readers shall be provided with the highest scoring application and an unfunded application from the previous grant cycle. Readers should be encouraged to read and score these for practice.
38. During training readers should practice scoring the lowest scored application that received funding from the previous grant cycle.
 1. Discussions of the sample application should center around the meaning of various score elements. Trainer should welcome the diversity of reader interpretations of the score sheet. In the training, the trainer should point out the differences between disciplinary backgrounds and how that may create diverse reader scores.
 2. Disciplinary distinctions between professional and academic styles will vary. In order to accommodate varying applicant backgrounds, readers should score applications on the content communicated to a general academic audience. Training can include and will not be limited to discussions around disciplinary-specific writing styles, e.g. the appropriateness of using I/we in formal writing: encouraged in scientific writing and discouraged in the humanities.
 3. Readers should be reminded that applications that score better than this border-line sample application will likely be funded. Lower scoring applications will likely not be.

GPSA Grant Applicant Workshop Recommended Curriculum

The workshop coordinator shall address the following.

39. Know your audience: Applications will be read by a general academic audience, your graduate and professional student peers. Applicants should avoid the use of jargon and define the terms they use. Applicants should be told that readers will NOT be from their department. Applicants should ask peers NOT from their department to read and score their application drafts.
40. Write clearly: Applicants should be told that they can benefit from writing their proposal ahead of time as well as reading it aloud to themselves and listening to sentence clarity. Applicants should be encouraged to take drafts of the proposal to the CAPS writing center.
41. Know how you will be scored: Applicants should be provided with the score sheet. Applicants should be told to write the proposal to address all the points on the score sheet. Coordinator should address each score item individually.
42. Know your application is complete: Applicants will be told what is required for an application, see section I.E and I.F of the SRAC/ST codes. They should also be told where to find the application, where to find the bylaws and how to contact the grants committee for questions.
43. Applicants will be provided with samples of successful applications.
44. Applicants may be provided with samples of unsuccessful applications or dummy applications with common mistakes.
45. Grants chair should make a good faith effort to reach out to under-represented and under-served departments. Grants chair will offer departmental and student group workshops upon request.
46. Applicants may request to be paired with a previously successful applicant who will review their application. This is a peer review process and not a guarantee of a funded application.
47. Coordinator will make sure that every applicant knows which grant they should apply for and which funding cycle they are eligible for.
48. Applicants should be encouraged to bring application drafts to workshop. Drafts can be exchanged and reviewed by workshop participants.
49. Applicants should be warned that applications, including letters of recommendation, should be anonymous.

Demographic Diversity

One of the challenges encountered by the committee is the variability and lack of consistency in how records were kept and what applicant data was tracked across grant cycles. The Council can play an important role in helping to ensure that these records are more standardized, as they are important historical records.

GPSA awards grants process based on merit of application, not on financial need. The purpose of gathering information about student demographics is to capture a larger picture of how the system benefits or disenfranchises student groups, not to award funding based upon individual student financial need.

- Current data collection
 - Schools/departments
 - Address info (NM and out of state)
 - Individual student names
- Current data collection on demographics is insufficient in order to analyze if a certain type of student is under or over represented within the applicant pool
 - Data collection will serve the purposes of informing future grant committee evaluation processes

Therefore, the committee discussed how to gather data for the purposes of future analysis by future committees and interested GPSA members. Two surveys were proposed, the first to be issued to grant applicants, the second to use as a GPSA-wide survey.

1. Grant Applicant Survey

Demographics-

Revisiting the goal of demographic data: How will it be used and implemented? Information will be used to access student populations applying for grants with the goal of identifying underrepresented student populations to more robustly outreach to those populations and make known funding opportunities. The demographic survey is being recommended in order to gather information on who needs to be made aware of grants opportunities as well as how to write effective grants proposals. The goal of this data collection is not intended to mark populations that need to be limited in their being awarded grants, or populations that should be awarded more grants as a corrective. Rather this data, gathered after a grant has been submitted, and not used in the decision to award or deny funding, will be used to identify trends in who is applying for and applying successfully so that if disparate evaluations of proposals or a lack of applications from a given department is identified GPSA can work to make sure those within identified student populations are made aware of and trained in the grants process.

Proposed Survey Sheet for the Purposes of Demographic Analysis

(Note: The categories with strike throughs were proposed and then dismissed by the committee. As much explanation as possible was provided around the intent of gathering this information).

The committee proposes the following survey to be voluntary and administered as the last step in the online grant application:

Thank you for applying! To better understand the grants process and how we could more robustly serve and outreach to the graduate and professional student community, we would appreciate your taking a moment to answer the following questions. These demographics will *not* be used in the funding decision process. The data we gather will be used to track trends in which students and populations typically do or do not receive funding, and how the grants process might be better tailored to given needs. Thank you for your time.

- Degree Pursuing (Text Field)
- Department, school, or program (Text Field)
- Second degree, minor, and/or certificate (if applicable) (Text Field)
- Which of the following five perspectives most accurately describes this application?
 - Quantitative
 - Qualitative
 - Critical
 - Creative
 - Applied
- If these five are not applicable, please write in one word, the perspective that best describes this research: (Text Field)
- Gender (Text Field)
- Race/Ethnicity (Text Field)
- Did you attend UNM as an undergraduate? (Y/N)
- How did you hear about GPSA's grants? (Text Field)
- Have you ever attended one of GPSA's Grant Workshops? (Y/N)
 - When? _____ (Fall/Spring/Summer) _____ (Year)
 - If you have never attended a GPSA Grants Workshop, could you please explain what prevented your attendance? (Text Field)
- What student organizations are you affiliated with? (Text Field)
- Is there anything else that you would like to share with us related to GPSA, the grants process, or UNM in general? We appreciate your thoughtful suggestions. (Text Field)

An explanation of the questions selected, as well an explanation of questions proposed and then eliminated follows below:

- **Degree Pursuing: (Text Field)**

This information is useful and important in assessing on a broader level whether or not certain departments or disciplines undergenerate applicants and whether or not certain departments or disciplines are consistently underfunded. Again, this is not to be used to penalize specific departments or disciplines, but to identify structural disparities. The committee report in 2011 should reflect an analysis of departmental applicant and funding rates, as well as a breakdown by professional vs. graduate schools.

- ~~Professional Degree: (Y/N)~~

- ~~Graduate Degree: (Y/N)~~

These categories were recommended to be deleted in part because this information can easily be gathered from the Degree information provided above, as well as many departments occupying a space of being both graduate and professional in their orientation and identification. Additionally, many students within professional programs still identify as graduate students and their programs, graduate programs. If there is a need to examine representation based on graduate vs. professional students being awarded funds from GPSA, we can break down that information using department's identifications.

- **Gender: (Text Field)**

- **Race and/or Ethnicity: (Text Field)**

Information on gender, race, and ethnicity will be used to obtain a better understanding of the applicant pool as a whole and assist future committees in assessing structural bias. A committee convened in 2008 that conducted a 5-year audit of the grants process from 2003-2008. Committee members have stated that a lack of demographic data hindered their ability to analyze inequities or disparities illuminated by anecdotal evidence. The hope is that more comprehensive data collection will enable future committees to more accurately assess the GPSA grants process. To that end, gender, race, and ethnicity as categories of analysis were specifically requested.

- ~~Sexuality: (Text Field)~~ This category was recommended for deletion because concerns were raised regarding the difference between research content (as in feminist or queer research) versus individual identity. This means that disparities in funding based on normative identity categories and normative sexual identity investments can be accessed and evaluated better based on the individual applications and the research proposed, rather than on people's individual sexuality. Indeed the committee agreed that individual identity does not translate to research projects. Instead, evaluations of funding should focus on content and methods regarding sexuality issues, identities, and challenges. However, the committee recognizes that collecting information on sexuality might be useful and

understands and supports future decisions to collect information on sexuality should the need be identified.

- ~~Country or Nation of origin: (Text Field)~~
- ~~What is your native language? (Text Field)~~ This question was originally designed to gather data on trends in non-native English speakers' grant applications and funding trends. While noting the potential bias in reader's evaluation of grant applicant's writing, particularly when an application contains written English that diverges from normative U.S. academic practice, this question was believed to assume lowered proficiency among non-native speakers. As an alternative, the committee supported putting responsibility for decreasing this bias on readers rather than on individual applicants. The recommendation was to include a training by equity and inclusion regarding the variability of writing styles.
- ~~First Generation~~
 - ~~College Student (Y/N)~~
 - ~~Graduate Student (Y/N)~~While marking the need and desirability for understanding class disparities among the graduate and professional student populations applying for grants, there was concern that the assessment of class status cannot accounted for based on first generation status. ...
- Did you attend UNM as an undergraduate? (Y/N)
- ~~Did you attend a NM elementary, middle or high school?~~
- ~~How many dependents do you take care of? (Text Field)~~
- How did you hear about GPSA's grants? (Text Field)
- Have you ever attended one of GPSA's Grant Workshops? (Y/N)
 - When? _____ (Fall/Spring) _____ (Year)
 - If you have never attended a GPSA Grants Workshop, could you please explain what prevented your attendance? (Text Field)
- What student organizations are you affiliated with? (Text Field)
- Is there anything else that you would like to share with us related to GPSA, the grants process, or UNM in general? We appreciate your thoughtful suggestions. (Text Field)

Questions for future consideration:

- A. What was the rate of response from applicants? Was the rate of response sufficient for gathering meaningful data? Are there categories of data collection that should be added in the future?
- B. Who is applying? Are the demographic data of grant applicants and the GPSA constituency equivalent on the application level?

- C. Who is getting funded? Who within the applicants are getting funding and who does the demographic data of the awardees compare with the larger GPSA constituency?

2. GPSA Wide Survey

The committee proposes that Council form a committee to create and ultimately administer a GPSA-wide demographic survey of the GPSA constituency. The ad-hoc committee further proposes that the GPSA-wide survey include, but not be limited to, the demographic survey questions posed to grant applicants for comparative purposes.

Methodological Diversity

One of the most common critiques/concerns from grant applicants has been that readers and applicants from different disciplines are ill-equipped to understand and/or judge one and other's applications. Suggestions were made to match readers and applicants from within the same departments or disciplines in order to ensure that the projects of applicants are as well understood as possible.

Pairing readers and applicants from within the same department has the potential to be negatively impacted by intradepartmental politics and pre-existing relationships amongst peers. Moreover, it is a challenge to draw grants readers from every department.

The committee also sees value in requiring students to communicate their ideas and research to a range of perspectives. Moreover, the feedback that the student receives from their readers will represent a wider range of perspectives.

Studying within the same discipline does not guarantee that the reader and applicant come from a specific perspective or framework. To that end, it is proposed that rather than asking for a disciplinary identification, readers and applicants be asked to identify from a variety of academic perspectives

Therefore, the committee proposes the following compromise:

- Every application will be assigned 3 readers, none of whom will be from the same department as the applicant. Each reader should be from a different department.
- Additionally, there should be 2 different perspectives (as defined below) represented amongst the 3 readers. One reader must be from the same perspective as the applicant and one reader must be from a different perspective as the applicant. The third reader will be assigned to the applicant regardless of their identified perspectives.
 - Both the applicant and the reader will be asked to self-identify their primary perspective from a list. The applicant will be guaranteed one reader from their primary perspective.

Proposed Definitions of Perspectives

Please choose a following category. The category you choose will be used to match you up with a reader who identifies with the same category. These categories are not comprehensive but are loosely defined in the broadest sense of the term. Any questions or concerns regarding the categories can be addressed to the Grants Chair.

- Quantitative

- Typically this perspective is methodologically and/or theoretically based in measurable, numerical, and/or empirical information, data, and/or phenomena.
- Qualitative
 - Typically this perspective is methodologically and/or theoretically based in describing and investigating phenomena via various methods. It is context-specific and fundamentally interpretive.
- Critical
 - Typically this perspective is theoretically based in interrogating and contesting power dynamics. It is often invested in researching and accounting for histories and enduring practices of oppression and resistance.
- Creative
 - Typically this perspective engages in performative and/or artistic processes and/or products.
- Applied
 - Typically this perspective implies the acquisition and/or development of professional or vocational skills.
- Online system can make this matching possible and not an onerous task for the grants chair.
- This may require more recruitment of readers and, thus, requiring more funding in the form of stipends (\$50 per reader)

Questions for future consideration:

- How effective is it to match readers and applicants from different/shared perspectives?
- Should 2 out of 3 readers identify from the same perspective as the applicant?
- Should the definitions and distinctions between the perspectives be revisited?

Recommendation:

Equity and Inclusion should participate in Grants reader training as either a separate training required of readers or as an additional 30 minute workshop at the end of the present reader training. E&I could train readers in negotiating some of the sticking points that have historically played out negatively in the evaluation of scholarship. For example, an E&I representative could briefly discuss the problems of and work through potential solutions to:

1. History and politics of the perspectives used to match readers and

applicants: Qualitative, Quantitative, Critical, Creative, and Applied.

2. The Politics of the Score Sheet:
 1. Discrimination against fields identified as being jargon heavy
 2. Devaluing of critical/creative scholarship
 3. Disciplinary differences in writing styles (I vs. We, Passive vs. Active, issues surrounding plagiarism, citation practices, and communal intellectual property)
 4. The politics of clarity (clarity of proposed project vs. mechanical clarity of writing)
 5. Racialized and gendered trends in evaluation
 6. The politics of complex writing
 7. Language discrimination

Reader Accountability & Anonymity

- a. Pros of an anonymous process:
 - i. Decrease personal bias between readers and applicants
- b. Cons of an anonymous process:
 - i. The process is always subjective, why not have as much accountability as possible?
- c. Resolved
 - i. Readers and applicants will remain anonymous throughout the reading and application process.
 - ii. Should an applicant appeal a rejection, they will be able to request a meeting with all 3 readers. If a reader is unwilling or unable to meet with the applicant, they will need to provide a written response to an applicant's reasons for appeal.

Questions for future consideration:

1. How does anonymity impact reader accountability?

Appeals Process

The committee is confident that the recommendations will help to create a more fair and streamlined grants process for both applicants, readers, and the grants committee. We also recognize that there will always be points of disagreement and conflict. Therefore, the committee recommends communicating clearly with applicants about their options to appeal the funding decision. The committee recommends that an accurate and updated description of the appeals process be posted on the GPSA website and also included in any rejection letter to applicants. Other options include providing a template to applicants that helps them to frame their concerns or questions.

The following is an outline of the current grants appeal process:

How To Appeal a Grants Committee Decision

1. Write a memo to the grants committee explaining your grievance with the grants committee decision **within three weeks** of receiving written notification of the decision.
 - a. Appeals may not be heard on the basis of late applications. Any other appeal may be heard. Appeals have been heard in the past about: funding decisions, specific reader comments, the availability of information online, the responsiveness of GPSA office staff, and a large spread in reader scores after re-read.
 - b. If your application has already been scored, it is advisable to get a copy of your scores and score comments. Also ask for the normalized scores in addition to the raw scores. Use this information to help write your memo.
 - c. Your memo should be as detailed as possible. This is likely to be the only information the committee has to help them make their decision. The committee will likely NOT look at the content of your application unless it is specifically the focus of your appeal.
50. **Within two weeks** of receiving your written memo, the grants committee will schedule and hold a meeting to review your appeal.
51. You may attend and speak at your own review. You may be able to make a stronger case for your appeal if you do this.
52. If you cannot attend the meeting time, you may ask the committee to delay review until a mutually suitable time is agreed upon.
53. Any applicant appealing a rejection or funding decision is able to request a meeting with all 3 readers. If a reader is unwilling or unable to meet with the applicant, they will need to provide a written response to an applicant's reasons for appeal.
54. The grants committee will vote on your appeal.
 1. If your appeal is granted then your application will be read if it has not been read yet, or re-read by two new readers according to the re-read guidelines, even if it has been re-read already.
 2. If your appeal is not granted, then no change in funding or scoring will occur.

55. Any applicant dissatisfied with the results of an appeal to the SRAC/ST committee may file a final appeal to the GPSA Council within two (2) weeks of receiving the SRAC/ST committee decision.
1. The GPSA grants chair, council chair, president, council reps could all help you file this appeal with council.
 2. The decision of the GPSA Council will be considered final. No further appeal will be granted.

Appeals are governed by the Grants Bylaws, section I.L.
Email unmgpsagrants@gmail.com with questions.

Additional Suggestions for Standing Grants Committee:

1. Improve and update FAQ page for the GPSA website
2. Grant data should be tracked and analyzed in order to continually address issues of equity of the grant process
3. Increase outreach and communication based on ongoing evaluation of underrepresented departments, perspectives, and individuals based on demographics, as the information becomes available.
4. Track and assess student software needs
 - If a lot of students are asking for funding for software, is it more effective to purchase programs that are in the highest demand?

To: GPSA Council
From: MSFC

Proposal for Funding

Thank you for your time in considering our request for funding. Medical Students For Choice (MSFC) is a national organization consisting of medical students and residents that are devoted to assuring that women receive the full range of reproductive health care choices. As part of its mission, MSFC also aims to reform medical school curricula and residency programs to include reproductive health and abortion care.

The University of New Mexico stands in a unique position; compared to many other medical schools in this country, we have students, faculty and doctors who have successfully fought to make sure that reproductive health is part of the medical school curriculum. The UNM MSFC students are as devoted as ever to providing the medical student body, as well as other professional students, the opportunity to further learn about reproductive health and to get hands-on experience and practice.

We are requesting funding to purchase 15 pelvic models so to be able to give Intrauterine Device (IUD) training sessions. During these sessions, MSFC will provide IUDs and speak about when and how this form of birth control is used. Members of MSFC will then demonstrate how to properly place an IUD and supervise as students who attend the sessions practice placing IUDs on the pelvic models. MSFC would also like to start giving pap smear training sessions - something that no interest group on North campus is currently doing - and will be able to do so with the purchase of these pelvic models.

Our goal is that medical students and other professional students will be able to use what they learn at our training sessions (both IUD placement training and pap smear training) to increase their reproductive health knowledge as well as their level of comfort and confidence in performing these procedures. We hope that with these pelvic models we will be able to better train and prepare our medical students for residency and beyond; provide better pelvic exams and more reproductive health services to all UNM students; and, ultimately, enable medical students to better serve their patients and community.

Proposed Budget
MSFC Request for Funding for Pelvic Models

Item	Cost	Number	Total Cost
Family Planning Educator (pelvic model)	\$255.00	15	\$3,825.00
Tenaculums	\$21.38	15	\$320.70
Forceps	\$3.58	15	\$53.70
Speculum (metal)	\$10	15	\$150.00
Disposable Uterine Sounds - box of 25	\$75	1	\$75.00
		Grand Total	\$4,424.40

Candace Miller-Murphy
Treasurer, Lobo Growl Student Association
candym@unm.edu

Megan McRobert
Council Chair, Graduate & Professional Student Association
gcchair@unm.edu

August 19, 2010

Dear Megan:

I am writing to request your organization's support of Lobo Growl: UNM's new student-run internet radio station (*a.k.a.* webstream). We are currently pre-chartered, and laying the groundwork to bring student-driven radio to the University of New Mexico.

With programming selected and produced by our diverse student body, Lobo Growl will be a dynamic forum for UNM undergraduate and graduate students to share music, thoughts and ideas. It has the power to connect people and departments, stimulate intellectual and creative energy on campus, and become an integral part of the university community. (We hope!)

Of course, as a new organization, we face some large initial costs to get up and running. Here is a list of what we determined to be our startup essentials:

<u>Computer</u> w/bundled software, mouse, keyboard	\$1499
<u>Broadcasting Software</u> (such as Station Playlist)	\$449
Copies, Promotional Materials	\$200
<u>Mixer</u>	\$141.27
<u>Desktop Microphone</u>	\$64.89
<i>Estimated Startup Cost</i>	<i>\$2354.16</i>

Other sources of support for Lobo Growl include KUNM (offering priceless technical expertise) and Dr. Richard Holder, Deputy Provost for Academic Affairs (who is securing us a temporary office for the year, until space becomes available in the SUB). We are also requesting funds from ASUNM.

Thank you for your time. If any questions arise, please contact me, or our Radio Board Liason Billy Ulibarri, at bjames@unm.edu. We look forward to hearing from you!

Sincerely,

Candace Miller-Murphy

Appropriation Request: Establish Childcare Grant Process

From: Lissa Knudsen, GPSA President

Date: Aug. 19, 2010

Amount Requested: \$9,500.00

Proposal: Establish a recurring childcare grant modeled after the GPSA Specialized Travel grant process.

There has been an unmet need for UNM graduate student parents' childcare support for more than a decade. In 2003, the GPSA president lobbied the State Legislature for a \$25,000 appropriation to provide childcare subsidies (Simoni, Daily Lobo, 2.11.03). In the Spring of 2008 the GPSA Council appropriated nearly \$30,000.00 to hire a lobbyist to advocate for a) the expansion of the UNM Children's Campus and b) the removal of the CYFD code language that excludes income eligible parents from receiving child care subsidies while taking graduate and professional classes. In 2009 the remaining moneys from that appropriation were carried forward to provide a stipend to the childcare and family friendly committee chair and to hire graduate student advocates to lobby on behalf GPSA issues including access to child care. On July 1, 2010 the remaining **\$3856.06 was reverted** to the Council General Fund from this original appropriation.

There are currently more than 500 families on the waiting list to be admitted into the UNM Children's Campus. These families must pay a \$40 fee each semester to remain on the list and the average wait time is over 2 years. Currently the NM State Children, Youth, and Families department discriminates against income eligible parents who are enrolled in graduate and professional school. Interviews conducted across campus in 2009 showed that lack of childcare support disproportionately affects female graduate students as a barrier to education¹. Given the lack of available on campus childcare and the lack of state support, the GPSA seeks to address this pressing and recurring need of graduate students.

This appropriation would establish a childcare grant process that would be modeled after the GPSA Specialized Travel Grant Process.

Proposed Grants Code Amendment:

Child Care Grant

- a. The Child Care Grant was created to fund childcare expenses for currently enrolled graduate student-parents.
- b. Applicants
 1. Any graduate or professional student currently enrolled at the University of New Mexico who has a legal dependent or child is an eligible applicant.
 2. An applicant may submit one Child Care Grant application per semester.
 - a. The application may be made for one or more childcare providers.
 - b. The maximum award an applicant may receive is \$500.00 per academic semester.
 - c. An applicant may be awarded once per academic semester.
 3. An applicant must submit one original or electronic copy of a complete Child Care fund application package, which includes:
 - a. An application form;
 - b. A one-page description of the childcare need;
 - c. An outlined budget of childcare expenditures clearly indicating items to be funded by the Childcare Grant;
 4. Application deadlines are the fifth Friday of the Fall and Spring semesters, and the second Friday

¹ The UNM Women's Resource Center endorses this appropriation and will provide a letter to that effect upon request.

in the Summer semester.

- a. Applications are due no later than noon in the GPSA website or office. Failure to comply with application procedure shall disqualify and application from consideration.

C. Criteria and Expenditures

- 1. The childcare for which funds are sought must be provided within the immediate next, the current or the previous funding period.
 - a. The Fall funding period is from 15 August to 31 December.
 - b. The Spring funding period is from 1 January to 31 May.
 - c. The Summer funding period is from 1 June to 14 August.
- 2. Childcare funds may be applied to only licensed childcare providers
 - a. Each application must include a letter on provider letterhead or equivalent confirming enrollment with a licensed childcare provider.

D. Committee Procedures

- 1. The Childcare Grant Committee shall rate proposals according to a list of criteria as follows:
 - a. Each application package shall be scored based on the following three qualities:
 - i. Completeness of the application
 - ii. Clarity of the proposal description
 - iii. Clarity of the submitted budget.

Proposed Constitution Amendments:

5. ~~Specialized Travel Committee:~~ Grants Committee

a. Allocate Travel Committee funds according to the Bylaws and Council guidelines.

(i) The GPSA Grants Codes, which governs Travel Fund grant policy, shall appear as Appendix #2 of this document.

b. Allocate Childcare Grant funds according to the Bylaws and Council guidelines.

(i.) The GPSA Grants Codes, which govern Childcare grant policy, shall appear in Appendix #2 of this document.

b. c. Provide an annual written report to the Council at its April meeting.

e. d. Other duties as directed by the Council in writing.

The Childcare Grant Sub-committee Chair (CGC) would also be charged with seeking out a sustainable funding source for the grant process. Using the SRAC, ST, and GRD grants as models, the CGC will provide a report and proposal by the April 2011 Council meeting for future funding mechanisms for the Childcare Grant.

Chair Stipend	\$500/semester	\$1000.00
Grants	5 grants @ \$500 each/ semester	\$5000.00
Readers	5 readers @ \$50/semester	\$500.00
Online Application Construction		\$3000.00
	Total	\$9,500.00

A

B

C

D

E

F

GPSA Fall Funding Request Summary for FY 2010 - 2011

2	PART III.					
4	Organization Name: Graduate Employees Together					
7		A	B	C	D	E
8	CATEGORY	GPSA Funding 2010-11	GPSA Request 2010-11	ASUNM Request 2010-11	Other Sources of Funding	Total Budget 2010-11 (B + C + D)
9	Advertising		\$400 (postcards, buttons, posters)			\$400
10	Building/Space Rental					
11	Computer Costs					
12	Copying Services					
13	Educational Supplies					
14	Equipment Rental					
15	Equipment					
16	Film Rental					
17	Food (not for resale)		\$100			\$100
18	General Operating Supplies		\$200			\$200
19	Office Supplies					
20	Postage					
21	Professional Services					
22	Salaries:					
23	Student Employees (100%)		\$3,000			\$3,000
24	Workstudy Employees (30%)					
25	Subscriptions					
26	Telephone line charge					
27	Telephone long distance charges					

28	Other		\$700 (honoraria for workshop speakers)			\$700	
29	Other						
30	Other						
31	Total		\$4,400			\$4,400	
32							
33	Notes:						
34	*Place amount requesting from GPSA & ASUNM in appropriate column.						
35	*Be sure to list any other sources of funding (including fundraisers) in appropriate column.						
36	*Please round all amounts to the nearest dollar amount. Do not include cents!!!						

Memo

To: Megan McRobert
 From: Liza Minno Bloom
 CC: GPSA Council
 Date: August 20, 2010
 Re: Funding Request for Graduate Employees Together (G.E.T)

Purpose of Memo: I am writing council to request funds for a newly formed group of graduate students called Graduate Employees Together, hereon referred to as G.E.T.

Importance of G.E.T: G.E.T is an open group made up of graduate student employees that exists to advocate for the rights of graduate student employees. G.E.T is unique in that it is the only group on campus that is made up of graduate student employees that addresses the issues and needs of graduate students' *employee* life. The over 1,600 UNM graduate student employees (RAs, PAs, TAs, GAs, etc.) carry a heavy workload of teaching, researching, grading and writing while pursuing our own academic goals. Our needs are unique and varied and G.E.T seeks to better understand and address these needs in a way that not only provides a voice for this sector that is so integral to the smooth functioning of the university, but holds the university administration accountable to that voice. Our research reveals that the research and teaching conducted by graduate student employees serves as the backbone to UNM. In truth, the university *works* because graduate student employees do. Ongoing conversations with

graduate student employees—individually and in forums—reveal a plethora of issues that graduate student employees feel they have little ability to address. Some of the core expressed needs are: affordable and adequate health care that includes dental and eye care, a living wage, transparency and clarity in job descriptions, a functional grievance policy and support in classroom conflict, and adequate and affordable healthcare, among other things.

G.E.T's primary aim is to develop a collective bargaining unit that would allow graduate student employees to voice their needs and guarantee a degree of accountability to those needs from the University administration. In order to do this G.E.T members will spend time during the fall semester visiting graduate student employees and gaining a more complete understanding of their needs, as well as exploring the feasibility of collective bargaining. G.E.T also seeks to provide the practical support that is lacking for graduate student employees before a collective bargaining unit is formed. One way we will manifest this support is holding monthly workshops throughout the year that inform about and provide the skills to negotiate issues specific to graduate student employees, workshops like: "Understanding your Healthcare plan: What You Need to Know", "Negotiating Graduate Student Debt", and "What's My Job Exactly?: Understanding the Differences Between RAs, TAs, GAs, and PAs", among others. G.E.T seeks input on other creative and practical ways to help meet graduate student needs and to make life as a graduate student employee as sustainable as possible. This benefits not only graduate student employees, but the University as a whole—if the University can offer better benefits to graduate student employees, it keeps UNM competitive, ensuring that the best and brightest find UNM a viable choice among Research-One universities.

The monies requested (detailed in the attached budget) will aid G.E.T in achieving these goals, which, again, will benefit all graduate student employees. The student salary is for me, Liza Minno Bloom, and was calculated for the course of an academic year. This salary will help ensure that there will be time carved out for the research and the labor to conduct the appropriate outreach and organize the appropriate actions. My hope, but laying this groundwork, is that G.E.T becomes something in which all graduate student employees can participate in and of which they can feel a sense of ownership. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Liza Minno Bloom

Appropriation Request: Transparency Committee Budget

Sponsor: Executive Ad Hoc Transparency Committee

Date: Aug. 19, 2010

Amount Requested: \$5069.87

Proposal: The GPSA executive branch is home to 6 standing committees, 5 executive ad hoc committees, and an executive board. The GPSA constitution and bylaws require that all committees follow the Open Meetings Act with regard to notice and minutes. This means that every committee should post agendas and minutes on the GPSA website and to the GPSA listserv. In addition agendas should be physically posted in the GPSA office. In the past, being in compliance with this has been difficult at best.

External to the organization, GPSA also participates on the Student Fee Review Board. This committee historically has met for more than 100 hours of deliberation. This Board makes decisions about close to \$10 million in student fees. One of the only ways to ensure those fees are distributed in a way consistent with the values of the student body has been to post video recordings and minutes from these meetings.

The GPSA Transparency Committee's sole purpose is to make sure all GPSA committees and the SFRB are open to the public, that proper notice is provided, and that the minutes are made available in a timely manner and are archived for future reference.

The appropriation would provide a modest stipend to the chair of this committee. \$200/semester is consistent with the stipends awarded to other ad hoc committee chairs (eg Equity and Inclusion and International Student Caucus). It would also provide for the purchase of a laptop, camcorder, external microphone, additional memory card, and an hourly stipend for a note taker and videographer for the SFRB meetings, hearings, town halls, and deliberations. The equipment would be available for all GPSA business including word processing (eg notetaking), video blogging, video editing, etc.

Service/Item	Amount/Price	Total
Transparency Committee Chair	\$200/semester	\$400.00
SFRB Note taker	100 hours @ \$12/hour	\$1200.00
SFRB Videographer	100 hours @ \$12/hour	\$1200.00
Powerbook Laptop	\$1000.00	\$1000.00
Camcorder	\$593.46	\$593.46
External microphone	\$70.15	\$70.15
Extra memory card	\$556.26	\$556.26
Copies	\$50.00	\$50.00
	Total	\$5069.87



GPSA @ UNM

Graduate And Professional Student Association

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 18, 2010
From: Katie Richardson, GPSA Grants Committee Chair
To: GPSA Council
Subject: Appropriation to make ST funding equal to SRAC funding

For the summer 2010 grants funding cycle, we received **61 SRAC** applications and **28 ST** applications. SRAC is funded by an approximately \$30,000 appropriation from council, combined with an approximately \$10,000 yearly amount from the SRAC quasi-endowment. However, ST is funded only through an approximately \$10,000 yearly amount from its quasi-endowment.

Because of the difference in the funding structures of SRAC and ST, the grants committee funded **19 SRAC applications (or 31%)**, but could only afford to fund **6 ST applications (or 21%)**. ST applications are predominantly from professional students and others who travel for professional reasons other than conducting or presenting research.

The GPSA grants committee requests that the disparity between the SRAC and ST grants is resolved by

- 1) Funding 3 additional summer applications for the amount of \$1373.50. This would bring the percentage of funded ST applications to 32%, approximately matching the SRAC funding rate.**
- 2) Allocating an additional \$10,000 to ST for the upcoming fall and spring cycles.**

Please note that in the summer cycle of 2009, we only received 11 applications, whereas this summer cycle we received 28. If this percentage increase is sustained for the rest of the year, our total of 46 ST applications in 2009-2010 becomes a total of 117 applications in 2010-2011. To fund those 117 applications at the rate of 31%, a total of \$13,795 is needed to cover both the current summer cycle and the fall and spring cycles.

Please also recall that in February of 2010, the GPSA council supported a change in the ST grant amount per person from \$300 to \$500. Due to budgetary limitations, the grants committee has awarded fewer ST applicants this summer.

Appropriation Request: Outreach Committee Chair Stipend

From: Lissa Knudsen, GPSA President

Date: Aug. 19, 2010

Amount Requested: \$400

Proposal: One of the important functions of GPSA is to appoint graduate and professional students to committees both internally and across campus. This committee would be responsible for assisting the president with marketing, recruitment, selection, and communication with GPSA appointees.

The appropriation would provide a modest stipend to the chair of this committee.

\$200/semester is consistent with the stipends awarded to other ad hoc committee chairs (eg Equity and Inclusion and International Student Caucus).

Submitted to: GPSA Council
Submitted by: Path Lohmann
Submitted on: August 20, 2010

Whereas, the UNM salary book is only available in Zimmerman Library in hard copy for two hours.

Whereas, students, faculty, staff and community members from branch campuses and elsewhere must drive to Albuquerque to see the book and aren't allowed to take it back with them.

Whereas, graduate and professional students would benefit greatly from a digital version of the UNM Salary Book when they do research on TA and GA salaries.

Whereas, at UNM, salaries are an especially contentious issue. If the university makes an effort to eliminate the shroud around administrative and other compensation, it will disarm the issue and facilitate proper discussion.

Whereas, the document only lists employees and their salaries alphabetically, so someone from a peer institution would be unable to call and ask for the salary from a comparable position.

So, be it resolved that the GPSA council encourages the Human Resources Department, the UNM Administration and University Counsel to create and update a digital spreadsheet document of the UNM Salary Book.