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Artifact I. Partial Transcription of Recording 20190310 103403

[49:25] SOAD Greuel – But I do wanna try to finish out this conversation on travel grants for this semester because^ that’s gonna be super important on what we figure out you know, like I said we have the option to either keep it as is and maybe cut more strategically, I mean cut more strategically regardless. We can keep it as is right now and preliminarily approve as we’ve done in the past. We can, you know based on what we have for information currently and you know, decide to draw a line as to yes this is individual, academic or personal gain rather than RSO related as a whole for research. Or we can decide to … not make any sort of, like, not have the potential to reach out to RSOs for any additional information and just say, “No is no.” I don’t mean to give … I don’t mean to make you make hard and fast decisions but also this is probably like … how many travel grants have we had so far with this issue? We’re probably going to continue to have this issue ….

[50:43] SOAD Greuel – I can put it up to a vote if that would make things seem a little quicker and easier …

[50:49] SOAD Greuel – Ok I’ll do a first vote and then I’ll do a second vote based off of that. Then we can have discussion before the second vote. Do we have a motion to approve changing the way we fund travel grants in comparison to the way we’ve done in the past for this current funding period?


[51:29 – 51:35] **Vote is held. Senator Turchan votes in the negative. Other members vote in the positive. Motion passes.**
Artifact II. RSO Grant Training Slides
Presentation Recording Available Upon Request from SAPS

Slide 6 – Precedence

Guiding policies

Federal
- Viewpoint Neutrality as determined in Board of Regents, University of Wisconsin System v. Southworth shapes what information can and cannot be considered in financial decisionmaking.

State
- UW System Administrative Policy 820 defines what student segregated fee funding can and cannot be used for within UW System campuses.

UWM
- SAC Bylaws and precedence guide the committee on how to fairly allocate money and ensures a consistent process from semester to semester.

Slide 15 – Travel Grants

Travel Grants

Limit: 1 per semester

Overall Cap: None
- Max # of people: 4
- Lodging: State rate up to 5 nights for 2 rooms
- Ground Travel: $325 overall
- Flights: $300 round trip per person
- Registration: $150 per person

Justifications to include...
- Screenshot of registration cost
- If the cost is not yet listed, you can use a screenshot of last year’s registration cost as justification
- Screenshot of flight cost (any flight website will work) or car rental prices (Enterprise)
- Use fuel econ gov to calculate gas costs
- Screenshot of uw foxworldtravel.com hotel rate for the city you are traveling to
- DO NOT use the conference hotel – you MUST use this website!

*** Be sure to use the sources for justification listed above or your grant will not be able to be funded! ***
SAC cannot fund...

- Food
- Decorations
- Prizes
- Helium tanks
- Honorarium with a conflict of interest
- Gifts for UWM faculty or staff
- AirBnB
- Individual membership dues
- Improvement of spaces (i.e., furniture, cleaning products, appliances)
- Personal items (t-shirts, business cards, uniforms)
- Anything that has a free alternative on campus
- Off-campus facilities (unless the group has confirmed with Student Involvement that there are no adequate on-campus spaces for an event)
- Old quotes from performers, Event Services, Marketing, etc. The only exception is for Travel Grants, in which you can use last year’s conference price as registration justification
Artifact III. SAC Bylaws

(e) SAC shall meet at least once in September to set funding criteria in the form of publicly available written addenda, set a timeline for the allocation process, and to elect a vice chair.

(g) SAC shall provide training for officers of RSOs to ensure that relevant and important information about the SAC funding process is explained, and to answer questions that RSO officers might have.

(d) SAC will fund eligible RSOs with an emphasis on the following criteria:

(i) Bring recognition to UW-Milwaukee

(ii) Provide support for student leadership development

(iii) Encourage on-campus programming

(iv) Aid which assists RSOs in accomplishing their goals

(v) Support and enrich the experience of students at UW-Milwaukee

Article III – Funding

Section 3.01 Allocation Principles

(a) All SAC funding decisions must be made in a viewpoint neutral manner.
Artifact IV. UW System Policy 820

(3) Prohibited SUF Expenditures. In addition to other limits established by law or policy, SUF shall not be assessed or charged for:

a. Academic credit-producing activities;
b. Student services determined to be essential to the basic mission of the university, as identified in the UW System Administrative Policy 822 (SYS 822), Student Services Funding.
c. Normal campus-wide activities and functions that service the entire institution, such as campus-wide, centrally provided physical plant and institutional support.
d. Direct financial aid to an enrolled student such as scholarships, tuition, room and board except as permitted in Section I.B. (2)e.5.
e. Gifts, donations and contributions.
f. Awards to UW faculty or staff, other than non-monetary, de minimis items such as certificates, plaques, and the like.
g. Costs of legal services, except where the governor has approved hiring an attorney to provide student legal services at an institution.
h. Lump sum payments to student organizations (as opposed to payments for specific purposes supported by invoices budgets and/or grant applications).
i. Contracts between a UW institution and a recognized student organization, except where subparagraph (6)(b)(6), below, applies.
j. Overhead costs of student organizations in facilities not owned, leased, or subject to control by the university, except as permitted in Section I.B.(6)(a), below. As used in this section, overhead costs means those general organization expenses which cannot be charged as belonging exclusively to any particular part of the organization's activities or work, including without limitation because of enumeration, salaries of the organization's employees who are not UW employees, rent, taxes, insurance, lighting, heating, and similar expenses.

(2) Permitted SUF Expenditures.

Except as limited elsewhere by law or policy, SUF may be assessed and collected for the following:

a. Travel expenses in accordance with applicable state and UW System travel regulations, and admissions and registration expenses incurred by UW staff or students for:
   1. Attending educational, cultural, social, recreational, or university athletic events.
   2. Recruiting students for musical groups, theatrical groups, or publication writing, and the like.
   3. Representing the institution or a recognized student organization in the operation and fulfillment of the mission of the student organizations, student service operations, and student government, subject to approval by the chancellor or his/her designee.
   4. Recruiting athletes, as allowed by conference or membership affiliation.
   5. Transit and busing services.
Hi all,

Below is Legal Counsel's read of 820. I would like to remind you that Legal Counsel does not represent the Student Association.

"Good afternoon, Quincy:

I understand you reached out to ask whether students can use seg fees to present their personal research at conferences (under UWS 820). I know you are looking for a yes/no answer, but I believe you will have to look at these on a case-by-case basis. Here is how I view the spectrum of these requests:

- **Disallowed by UWS 820:** Student will receive academic credit in conjunction with conference attendance.
- **May be allowed under UWS 820:** Student will attend educational conference and present work there.
- **Allowed under UWS 820:** Student will attend educational conference as a general attendee.

My thinking is that a student who is attending purely as an audience member shouldn’t necessarily be treated differently than a student who is attending mostly as an audience member but also is presenting during a session. So my approach to these requests with respect to UWS 820 would be to consider these factors:

- Is the student going to receive academic credit automatically for attending the presentation? (disallowed)
- Is the student presenting work for which they already received academic credit and cannot receive further credit? (likely allowable)
- Is the student presenting work for which they may eventually receive academic credit? (likely disallowed)
- Is the student only going to the conference to present or as an attendee as well (the latter situation is more likely to be allowable).
- Is the presenter going alone or with a group of other students (the latter situation is more likely to be allowable).

Please reach out if you would like to discuss this further.

Thank you,

Jennifer Herzog
University Legal Counsel
UWM Office of Legal Affairs
P.O. Box 413
PUBLIC MEETING NOTICE

Student Appropriations Committee

DATE:   Sunday, March 10th, 2019
TIME:   9:00 AM-4:00 PM
LOCATION:   Student Union EG80
            2200 East Kenwood Blvd
            Milwaukee, WI 53211

SUBJECT MATTER:   Items of discussion will include SAC Grant Hearings.

***

All meetings are open to the general public.
An agenda will be posted in conjunction with this public notice at least 24 hours prior to the start of the meeting.

***

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) COMPLIANCE NOTICE
The Student Association at UWM is committed to making its meetings accessible to all individuals. If, due to a disability, you need an accommodation or assistance to participate in the public meeting, please contact Mary Greuel at megreuel@uwm.edu within a reasonable time before the meeting.
AGENDA

Student Appropriations Committee Meeting
Sunday, March 10th, 2019
9:00 AM-4:00 PM
Student Union EG80
2200 East Kenwood Blvd, Milwaukee, WI 53211

1. Call to order
2. Roll Call
3. Reports
4. Open Forum
5. Approval of Agenda
6. Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes
7. Special Orders
8. Old Business
9. New Business
   a. SAC Grant Hearings
10. Questions/Concerns
11. Adjournment

For questions about this meeting of the Student Appropriations Committee, please contact: Mary Greuel
Mary Greuel, Student Organization Appropriations Director – mgreuel@uwm.edu – 414-229-4866
Artifact VII. Factually Unsound Statements Made During SAC Meeting 3.10.2019

All statements are drawn from recordings of 3.10.2019 provided by SAPS Assistant Director Kissack at Request of the Graduate Student Representation Committee

Recording 20190310 103403
32:58 – Former Senator Raatz – “I personally don’t think it’s ok that these funds are coming out of student segregated fees, fees that students are paying … and it’s going for the most part to individuals who are seeking … to present their research related to their degree.”

- Most RSOs are not presenting research related to their degree in the form of coursework. Research is an activity graduate students conduct outside of the classroom in tangent with their own research careers and goals. Furthermore, graduate students pay segregated fees the same as non-graduate students. Finally, most funding is not going to “individuals” but to RSOs to travel as an organization to these conferences.

36:48 – Former Senator Raatz – “There are some organizations that are formed as organizations simply to get this money from grants to go to these research conferences…”

- We disagree with this statement and consider this hearsay without empirical evidence.

36:37 – SOAD Greuel – “As Josh [Rivers] mentioned in his time he was in here to SAC that a lot of departments will push students to make an RSO for that purpose [to obtain grant money] and to get these [travel] grants for that purpose.”

- Josh Rivers did not make this statement, finds it to be false, and does not agree with this depiction of what he conveyed to SAC at their meeting on 2.10.2019. It is not noted in the minutes from that meeting and should not have been considered factual.

Recording 20190310 125838
28:52 – SOAD Greuel – At the end of the day though, our budget is comprised of thousands of students money. Each students pays in $13.25 per semester … Whatever we’re funding we want to impact the most amount of students. You get that with event grants, you get that with operations grants to a certain extent. With travel, you’re affecting, in these cases with academic and personal gain ones we’re impacting effectively four students.

- As noted in the legislation, this is factually unsound. Contrary to this statement, these grants by virtue of contributing to conference presentations, which are considered alongside publications as academic output for the sake of the Carnegie R1 Classification, have aided every single UW-Milwaukee student by helping UW-Milwaukee retain its R1 status. Beyond this, they also draw name recognition for student organizations and UW-Milwaukee at international and national conferences. SAC was informed of this at their meeting on 2.10.2019, as noted in the minutes.

29:08 – Former Senator Raatz – I think the bigger picture here is looking at the organizations and what specifically we’re talking about. Organizations who are sending the most individuals to academic conferences to present research directly connected to the grad programs that they are in [Interruption By Senator Graybow & Chair Greuel, resumed at 29:59] At the moment
that’s where most, presumably most of this travel funding is going ... to these organizations that are requesting what appears to be sending people to academic conferences.

• This appears false given the lack of evidence that Graduate Programs are not encouraging students to make RSOs to obtain money. There is no substantiation of this claim. It seem it is rooted in a misconception the committee was given by SOAD Greuel with regards to Rivers’ comments at the SAC meeting on 2.10.19.

31:31 - Senator Graybow – I think this is putting a band-aid on the real problem and I think that’s the fact that we’re not funding graduate students enough for things that they need and I think that, you know, if ... I’m looking at these and I thought you know... but these are all upwards of 3,000 ... there’s a 4,000 dollar one ... there’s a 3800 dollar one. All the highest grants are the ones that are research and it’s because these research things generally take five days, which is, you know, when I was talking about this and Josh [Rivers] was there he said, ‘Well the standard thing for graduate student programs is like five days.’

• Josh Rivers never stated that this was standard for graduate student programs, as he was never discussing graduate student programs, which are not the same as academic conferences that graduate student RSOs have attended. Discussion of this topic in any form is not noted in the minutes from 2.10.19 and should not have been considered as a factual statement.
Artifact VIII. Research-Based Support of the Positive Impact of Travel

The Role of Conferences on the Pathway to Academic Impact: Evidence from a Natural Experiment

Fernanda L. L. de Leon and Ben McQuillin

Fernanda Leite Lopez de Leon is a senior lecturer in economics at University of Kent. Ben McQuillin is a senior lecturer in economics at University of East Anglia.

Fernanda Leite Lopez de Leon, School of Economics, University of Kent, Kent, CT2 7NP, UK. Email: fernandaleon@kent.ac.uk.

Abstract

We provide evidence for the effectiveness of conferences in promoting academic impact, by exploiting the cancellation—due to “Hurricane Isaac”—of the 2012 American Political Science Association Annual Meeting. We assembled a dataset of 29,142 articles and quantified conference effects, using difference-in-differences regressions. Within four years of being presented at the conference, an article’s likelihood of becoming cited increases by five percentage points. We decompose the effects by authorship and provide an account of the underlying mechanisms. Overall, our findings point to the role of short term face-to-face interactions in the formation and dissemination of scientific innovation.

Conferences and workshops represent opportunities for a very short-term in-person interaction, which on first consideration may seem very different in character and potential for effect to the long-term opportunities mainly considered in the literature above. However, there are already hints, in existing work, that short-term face-to-face encounters may also be significant. Blau et al. (2010) showed effects from a mentoring workshop on participants’ subsequent publications and research grant applications. Boudeau et al. (2017) showed that a (within institution) ninety-minute brainstorm session could substantially increase the likelihood of collaboration between participants. In Campos et al. (2018), we use the same data and setting as this current paper to estimate conference effects on authors’ future work. We do not find that, after the 2012 APSA cancellation, participants produced fewer quality-adjusted subsequent papers (solo or in co-authorship), but we do detect effects on academic collaborations. The cancellation led to a 16 percent decrease in the likelihood of individuals subsequently co-authoring a paper with another conference participant, and to a relative subsequent clustering—a tendency for future new collaborations to form within existing cliques—within the co-authorship network.
Artifact IX. Carnegie R1 Classification Criteria

Links: http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/
      https://www.nsf.gov/statistics/srvyherd/#sd

About the Carnegie Classification®

The Carnegie Classification® has been the leading framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education for the past four and a half decades. Starting in 1970, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education developed a classification of colleges and universities to support its program of research and policy analysis. Derived from empirical data on colleges and universities, the Carnegie Classification was originally published in 1973, and subsequently updated in 1976, 1987, 1994, 2000, 2005, 2010, 2015 and 2018 to reflect changes among colleges and universities. This framework has been widely used in the study of higher education, both as a way to represent and control for institutional differences, and also in the design of research studies to ensure adequate representation of sampled institutions, students, or faculty.

The Doctoral Universities categories have been reshaped to better accommodate “Doctor’s degree – professional practice” within our methodology. These degrees, formerly referred to as “first professional degrees” and including such degrees as the MD, JD, Pharm.D., D.Div, etc., have previously not been considered as part of the Basic Classification methodology. The specific changes are as follows:

- We expanded the criteria for entering into the doctoral categories. In addition to the former threshold (conferring 20 or more “research/scholarship” doctoral degrees), institutions that conferred 30 or more “professional practice” doctoral degrees across two or more programs were also included.

- The first two doctoral university categories include institutions that conferred at least 20 research/scholarship doctorates and reported a minimum of $5 million dollars of total research expenditures through the NSF HERD survey. The research activity index was then used to determine a cutoff between the “very high research activity” (R1) institutions, and “high research activity” (R2) institutions. (Note that this represents a return to the labels used for those categories in 2005 and 2010).

- The remaining institutions that either had less than $5 million in research expenditures or conferred fewer than 20 research/scholarship doctorates, were placed into the third, newly named Doctoral/Professional Universities category.
**Data Sources**

The 2018 Classification update is based on the following data sources:

- IPEDS 2016-17 Completions
- IPEDS Fall 2017 Enrollment (preliminary)
- IPEDS Fall 2017 Human Resources (preliminary file)
- FY2017 NSF Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) survey
- FY2016 NSF Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering (GSS)

**Survey of Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering**

The Graduate Students and Postdoctorates in Science and Engineering survey is an annual census of all U.S. academic institutions granting research-based master’s degrees or doctorates in science, engineering, and selected health fields as of fall of the survey year. The survey, sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, collects the total number of graduate students, postdoctoral appointees, and doctorate-level nonfaculty researchers by demographic and other characteristic such as source of financial support. Results are used to assess shifts in graduate enrollment and postdoc appointments and trends in financial support.

2. Key Survey Information

- **a. Frequency:** Annual.
- **b. Initial survey year:** 1966.
- **c. Reference period:** Fall 2016.
- **d. Response unit:** Organizational units (e.g., academic departments, degree-granting programs, university-affiliated research centers, and health care facilities) in academic institutions.
- **e. Sample or census:** Census.
- **f. Population size:** A total of 15,853 units at 714 academic institutions.
- **g. Sample size:** Not applicable.
- **h. Key variables:** Key variables of interest are listed below.
  - Full-time graduate students by demographic and financial support characteristics
  - Part-time graduate students by demographic characteristics
  - Postdocs by demographic and financial support characteristics and by type and origin of doctoral degree
  - Doctorate-holding NFRs by sex and type of doctoral degree
  - Institutions by name, location, highest degree granted, and other institutional characteristics (e.g., historically black college or university, Carnegie Classification, public or private control)
  - Schools by name, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) unique identifier, type (e.g., graduate school and medical school), and other characteristics (e.g., Carnegie Classification)
  - Units by name, field, and highest degree granted
**Higher Education Research and Development Survey (HERD)**

The Higher Education Research and Development Survey is the primary source of information on R&D expenditures at U.S. colleges and universities. The survey collects information on R&D expenditures by field of research and source of funds and also gathers information on types of research, expenses, and headcounts of R&D personnel. The survey is an annual census of institutions that expended at least $150,000 in separately accounted for R&D in the fiscal year.

---

### 2. Key Survey Information

- **a. Frequency:** Annual.

- **b. Initial survey year:** In 2010, the HERD Survey replaced a previous annual collection, the NSF Survey of Research and Development Expenditures at Universities and Colleges (Academic R&D Expenditures Survey), which was conducted from FY 1972 through FY 2009.

- **c. Reference period:** The academic fiscal year ending in 2017; for most institutions this was 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017.

- **d. Response unit:** Establishments. U.S. academic institutions reporting at least $150,000 in R&D expenditures in the previous fiscal year.

- **e. Sample or census:** Census.

- **f. Population size:** 903 institutions.

- **g. Sample size:** Not applicable.

- **h. Key variables:** Key variables of interest are listed below.
  - R&D expenditures by field and source of funds (i.e., federal government, state and local government, business, nonprofit, institutional, and other)
  - R&D expenditures funded from foreign sources
  - R&D expenditures within medical schools
  - Clinical trial R&D expenditures (Phases I–III)
  - R&D expenditures by type of R&D (i.e., basic research, applied research, and experimental development)
  - Total and federally funded R&D expenditures passed through to subrecipients or received as a subrecipient
  - Federally funded R&D expenditures by field and federal agency
  - R&D expenditures by cost categories (e.g., salaries, software, equipment, indirect costs)
  - Total and federally funded R&D equipment expenditures by field
  - Headcount of R&D principal investigators and all other R&D personnel
  - Institutional characteristics (i.e., highest degree granted, historically black college or university [HBCU], high Hispanic enrollment [HHEI], public or private control)
[30:47] SOAD Greuel: Fair point though, we can always that’s (denying grants because SAC “has an issue with it” Turchan a few seconds prior) always an option for us to do. That would be the easiest solution but is it the best solution is the second question.

[30:55] Senator Schindler: I think that, I actually agree. I think that where we’re at, we need to deny the ... go through the minutes and obviously see which ones are which ... You know maybe even go back through the justifications and make sure we’re getting everyone who is^ ... like the ones that we’ve marked, make sure we’re getting it right and then deny them. And then I think we need to reach out either now or at the end of the process to the graduate program and express that we will no longer be funding graduates.

[31:28] Senator Turchan: Well I think you need to fix the system after this. [Not necessarily]

Senator Graybow: [Yea] I think this is putting a band-aid on the real problem and I think that’s the fact that we’re not funding graduate students enough for things that they need and I think that, you know, if ... I’m looking at these and I thought you know... but these are all upwards of 3,000 ... there’s a 4,000 dollar one ... there’s a 3800 dollar one. All the highest grants are the ones that are research and it’s because these research things generally take five days, which is, you know, when I was talking about this and Josh [Rivers] was there he said, ‘Well the standard thing for graduate student programs is like five days.’ So... they’re the most expensive, they’re kinda sketchy because we don’t really know the reason^. What I think we might need to do next time, and it’s really gonna suck and it’s gonna affect these graduate students but if we can’t find a way to get more information that’s viewpoint neutral we have to go off what we have right now and what we have isn’t sufficient enough^ to approve it^, And I think most of the committee kinda has an issue with this but we could maybe in the future ask additional questions like, “If this is for a graduate program, please explain how this relates to your RSO as a whole and not your individual members.” And then ask those questions but... Was it this much last time?! I don’t remember it being this much.

[32:55] SOAD Greuel: It has been in the past. We just haven’t been asking these right questions.