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Upcoming Events & Deadlines
1. Decisions for 4/1 deadline (Individual/Group) distributed to applicants this week
2. 5/1 Deadline for Individual/Group Travel coming up
3. Paperwork/receipts for Jumpstart, Interview & Internship due 4/29
4. Going to start promoting volunteer form for Peer Reviewers for next year

Action Items for Assembly Members
1. Please continue to spread the word that the travel grant deadline change from the 7th to the FIRST! This is for Individual and Group Travel.

Accomplishments since previous meeting
1. Awarded 3/1 Group & Individual Travel Grants
2. VERY productive meeting with IA Committee developing recommendations (see below!)
3. A lot of progress on IA Toolkits (VP IA, Research & Travel)

Planned accomplishments by next meeting
1. Year In Review documents completed for Pauline/EOSS
2. 3 toolkits for incoming VP IA
3. Transition meetings with incoming VP IA
4. Spreadsheet/budget reconciliation for all travel and research grant programs

Committee Report (4/14/16 Meeting)
Accomplishments since previous meeting
Our fourth committee meeting of the semester was on Thursday, 4/14/16, 6-7:30 PM in the Tempe GSC. Below are the items we discussed.
1. In-depth set of recommendations developed for all 7 travel/research grant programs. (See attached addendum if you’re interested!)
2. Plus/Delta for our committee for the year (also included in attached addendum)

Planned accomplishments by next meeting
1. No more meetings!
Addendum 1:

**Internal Affairs 2016-2017 Recommendations**

**PLUS (+)**
What went well?
- Communication and embeddedness of committee members onto this team - one of the strongest committees! :)
- Marketing - Email outreach being delegated by college to all committee members
- All IA Committee Members presenting at the 2nd Fall 2015 Semester Assembly Meeting (presenting together was a good experience)
- Having multiple applicant info sessions both semesters
  - Reviewer panels were helpful in SP 16 semester
- Office hours availability (especially right before the grant deadlines)
- Socials/recognition for the Reviewers/Volunteers
- Editing/updating the rubrics as a team in the fall (clarity about what constitutes “service”)
- Transition to ZoomGrants & ZoomGrants partnership
  - We have a good relationship with them

**DELTA (-)**
What didn’t?
- Assembly Members graduating/leaving ½ way through the year - making sure the IA committee is staffed year-round
- Assembly knowledge of IA Programs outside of people that are already on IA Committee (clarity of everyone’s ability to join the committee if they want)
- Grad student unrest when not funded - lack of clarity/outreach about how fair our process actually is (perhaps more details about the peer review process in the rejection letter?)

**Recommendations Overall:**
- Internal policy document about IA committee roles
- Updated web pages and make them easier to read/follow
- More marketing across all programs!
- Earlier deadlines - bump everything up by 2 weeks
- Reviewer auditing & more clear explanation of the rubric in the training sessions

**Recommendations by Program**

**TRAVEL GRANTS:**

1. **Individual**
   a. Re-evaluate the arbitrary 15/20 requirement & $950 award cap
      i. Potentially lower this to $700 next year to serve more students
   b. Decide if we need to be more transparent (& how?) about our rubric and processes - likely need to explain this in more detail on our website
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2. Group
   a. Group over the summer? This will start in the summer of 2016 as a running program
   b. Group reviewed with Individual, or considered in a vacuum still? Guy and Andy will discuss this but likely, this will happen next year
   c. Clarity about “picking your route” aka you cannot apply for group/individual for the same conference. It’s either an Individual or a Group conference.

3. Internship
   a. Change to internship not being required by your program
   b. Not having to to be local
   c. Summer internships - This will start in summer 2017

4. Interview
   a. Names on the CVs/resumes - needs to be 100% blind
   b. When people don’t get interviews - how are we still able to use the funds if people don’t use their interview funds (e.g. April 1 deadline to let us know? Maybe earlier?)
   c. Retroactive funding - cannot be done, so what do we do with people who went on their interview during the period of application deadline - notification date
   d. Run it earlier/in the fall - run it where one application in the fall and you can go on an interview anytime in the academic year. (Would need to have really good marketing over the summer/early fall)

RESEARCH GRANTS:

1. GRSP (Graduate Research Support Program)
   a. Fall & Spring (if GradEd will allow it) - needs to run more than once a year
   b. Advocating for more $ for the program (GPSA may be chipping in some more $)
   c. Potential of GPSA creating our own “GRSP”-like program & getting rid of (blending with) Jumpstart
   d. Ensure review is blind and process is consistent (e.g. you are disqualified if you include your name on any documentation)

2. Jumpstart
   a. Make Jumpstart a more catch-all research grant program - potentially run it in the Spring too if GRSP doesn’t get more $ towards it?
   b. Too many rules & restrictions (match with GRSP policies and procedures)
   c. Allowing incentives for studies, travel funds, etc.
   d. Ensure review is blind and process is consistent (e.g. you are disqualified if you include your name on any documentation)

3. Athletics
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a. Better relationship & more communication with Athletics
b. Get it in writing that they (Athletics) cannot use the funds for anything else than grad student research
c. Undergraduate Student Leader for the program - equally accountable undergrad counterpart
d. Get USG to appoint undergrad reviewers and maybe meet with them/train them?
e. Ensure review is blind and process is consistent (e.g. you are disqualified if you include your name on any documentation)