

## IRA Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 25th 2016 — 8:00-9:00 AM

---

Meeting Objective: To enable the committee to review proposals in the most efficient manner possible

---

Attendees: Paul Murphy; Sean Kelly; Natasha Pillai; Elizabeth Heim; Kiera Sailor; Leticia Cazares; Debora Ehrich; Elizabeth Salgado.

Staff Present: David Daniels; Kate Harrington; Anna Tovar.

- I. Approve Meeting Materials
  - A. Meeting called to order at 8:06AM; N. Pillai recommended that in this meeting and those moving forward that we could ask that meeting minutes and agenda could be read outside of meeting time, then we can move to approve them here; S. Kelly moved, P. Murphy seconded, meeting minutes and agenda were approved with no objections;
- II. Continue review of UNIV 392 Proposals
  - A. IRA#846 London: N. Pillai had a question about the “entrance fees” line, doesn’t add up to \$200; S. Kelly observed that if you took out the Oxford component that it would then add up to \$200; what does the Oxford entrance fee get you; S. Kelly and N. Pillai conferred and then asked if we can ask this sponsor to clarify the \$100 listed for “communications”; P. Murphy added that in light of the whole Brexit thing, wondered if this could contribute to the trip being more affordable, could we also ask about the possible affects to this budget proposal;
  - B. P. Murphy recalled discussions in past committees about frequency of trips – in the past when we haven’t had a surplus, we would favor trips that haven’t gone versus seeing the same trip go again from the year before; N. Pillai commented that in this period of having a surplus, it may not be as big of an issue; K. Sailor agreed that in general we should favor proposals that haven’t yet gone in applicable cases; S. Kelly asked if it makes sense to carry some amount of surplus; D. Daniels agreed yes, and that contained within our IRA policy we do have guidelines that compel us to keep a certain percentage (from memory is either 5% or 10%) so that we are not left with zero dollars at the end of a given semester and are without flexibility; P. Murphy agreed that this is a good policy to keep in place;
  - C. N. Pillai called to review answers received from A. Grove; P. Murphy sought more clarity for the “without pay” portion of her answer; S. Kelly answered that we generally haven’t done that, but saw the merits of having two faculty in this case as a benefit to students; P. Murphy agreed that when taking

students on multiple activities such as what is being proposed here may provide an advantage; N. Pillai agreed that it all seemed pretty reasonable to her; E. Salgado added that she recalled funding this in the past for both instructors to attend;

- D. N. Pillai asked in reviewing the question from D. Rodriguez, would like to know what is being taken away, if we were to grant the \$750 diversion of line-item funds; S. Kelly agreed that we should ask if this \$750 would adversely impact any of the students; P. Murphy added that he has been to Costa Rica on three occasions, was supportive of the benefits of setting up this exchange agreement, even if it were to take an additional allocation of \$750 in IRA funds; N. Pillai agreed that we could pursue this due to the potential benefits of such an exchange; D. Daniels agreed to follow up with D. Rodriguez to clarify where the \$750 is coming from within his existing budget and to ensure that it would adversely impact the student experience;
- E. IRA#836 UNIV 392 to Germany: N. Pillai observed the \$200 request for printed flyers; E. Salgado recalled that in the past we were strict with allocation for flyers, but it may be different this time given our surplus; S. Kelly noted that this would seem to be just the cost of doing business from the program, and from this particular program (Business) they should be able to afford the cost of flyers; P. Murphy recalled that in the past we've capped all requests for printing at \$50, we can either go ahead with this, take it out completely, or have other options; S. Kelly posed that let's say they are full color flyers and they're a dollar a piece, that's still a lot of flyers, there are not 200 bulletin boards available on campus to post them; N. Pillai expressed inclination to not fund this line-item request for flyers at all; S. Kelly added that it's not enhancing the student experience that he can see; K. Sailor agreed with either capping it at \$50 or having the program fund it on their own;
- F. IRA#872 Arts Under The Stars (AUTS); P. Murphy introduced proposal as being Heather Castillo's project, who is also in Performing Arts, and even featured D. Daniels on guitar last time; summarized that it's the only event quite like this on campus in the country, where it is an interdisciplinary approach to campus-wide involvement and hundreds of CI students; noted that this year it will also be the Spring PA Production as well; H. Castillo has a related production class so that students can be delegated to tasks involving set up, promotion, social media, etc.; S. Kelly recalled that we've done this every year for the last 4 or 5; N. Pillai asked if there was anything different from last year or if anyone had further comments; P. Murphy answered that the scope is bigger than last time and so it is more money being requested; K. Sailor asked to clarify if instead of a separate PA production, it's going to be AUTS instead – P. Murphy and committee verified this as correct;
- G. N. Pillai summarized IRA#871 on the NASA robotics competition, in that CI has been selected to participate in this; noted that a corresponding course is being offered in the Spring to help students prepare; N. Pillai didn't see anything that raises any particular questions; E. Salgado and other committee members observed that this is a pretty cool proposal, a good opportunity for CI and CI students;
- H. IRA#843 Detroit Study Tour: S. Kelly recalled that last time he was on the IRA committee that this was approved; N. Pillai observed a similar request

for \$400 in printing, suggested that we can tell them the same thing, that the \$400 in printing should be paid for by the program; S. Kelly commented and asked the open question, “when is the last time you as a student got information from a poster... you’re really getting it from your phone instead”; K. Sailor added that maybe it’s for one of the larger posters, but if you’ve had the banner in the past shouldn’t you be able to reuse it; N. Pillai was inclined to ask what the \$400 is for; S. Kelly added that if printing is integral to the project, such as the Island Fox literary journal, that’s one thing that would be justifiable to spend money on printing costs; D. Ehrich asked if we can check with this proposal sponsor about their need for the \$400; D. Daniels agreed that he could perform this follow-up;

### III. Discussion: Offline Proposal Review (Natasha Pillai, Dave Daniels)

#### A. Propose Review Timeline

- D. Daniels recalled off line discussions with N. Pillai and K. Harrington, summarized that with 5 or 6 meetings left on the calendar, recommended that we have a strategic plan that involves performing the majority of our proposal reviews outside of scheduled meeting time; did not want to discourage feedback or from doing our jobs, we should certainly bring any feedback or questions to the committee discussions, but if we resign to reviewing proposals for the first time at meetings we will run out of time; sent a draft strategic meeting plan to N. Pillai that basically allows for two meeting times for each of our three internal categories; if we follow this suggested plan (open to further committee input), then next week we would vote on our Category-III’s and review the first half of Cat-II’s in advance; P. Murphy suggested that similar to what we’ve done with UNIV 392s, in the sense of organizing them into a sub-category, maybe we break up Cat-I’s into sub categories that pair up similar proposals – for example, there’s a few guest artist-type proposals that are coming from Performing Arts; committee agreed, will look into this structure to increase efficiency;
- D. Daniels added that before we adjourn, let’s introduce our new committee member, Debora Ehrich! Committee welcomed D. Ehrich to the committee and thanked her for attending; E. Salgado moved to adjourn, L. Cazares seconded, meeting adjourned at 9:03AM.