

**Instructionally Related Activities Committee**  
**October 6, 2015; 8:00 – 9:00 a.m.**  
**Bell Tower West Conference Room 1188**

**Introductions**

Attendees: Simone Aloisio, Leticia Cazares, Emerald De La Cruz, James Forrester, Elizabeth Heim, Paul Murphy, Keira Sailor, Elizabeth Salgado, Dan Wakelee, David Daniels

**Approval of Agenda**

S. Aloisio moved to approve agenda, second by E. Salgado, agenda was approved with no objections;

**Approval of Minutes from last meeting**

S. Aloisio moved to approve minutes, second by P. Murphy, minutes were approved with no objections;

**Public Forum**

Old Business:

N/A

New Business:

- 1) How the IRA Fund works and the IRA Committee Training Manual
  - a. D. Wakelee summarized the IRA fund, a Category II student fee intended to support instruction and enrich the educational experience of students; students in state-supported programs pay \$120 per year, but some of the MA and grad programs don't pay this fee; chair of our committee (J. Forrester) serves on the student advisory committee; recalled that every year we'll get an inquiry on whether or not we want to change the fees; noted that as a committee we'll review the applications to make a recommendation, but that the committee doesn't actually allocate the funds – Finance performs their analysis to then submit to the President, who makes the allocation of funds;
  - b. D. Wakelee referenced page 8 of the training manual under the "Other Activities" section as a good summary of what we're focused on as a committee;

the committee should always ask “does this have an educational benefit for our campus”; reminded that quorum is four students, and to consider a two absence policy; recommended that the committee may want to delegate certain questions to the chair if there are questions or changes to IRA proposals that don’t affect the budget amount; further referenced IRA training manual to find that auditory recordings must be made available upon request, so next meeting will implement; key is that we plan to make all of our recommendations before finals week;

## 2) Role as committee members and discretion of chair

- a. S. Aloisio suggested that we don’t want to be bogged down with questions about minor proposal details, further suggested that if 5% or less of the award amount is requested to be modified, that it is Ok for chair to approve these minor modifications; motion by K. Sailor to affirm this policy, second by E. Heim, all in favor of supporting this policy;
- b. J. Forrester recalled attendance policy, asked committee for their thoughts if two absence policy was good, calling the question – E. Heim motioned to affirm this policy, second by E. De La Cruz, all in favor of supporting this policy;
- c. D. Wakelee summarized that we’ve got a good committee that has good perspective, but let’s ensure that we all have a broad university prospective, regardless of our major affiliation, as all majors pay into the IRA fund; S. Aloisio recalled an example from a prior term where due to the number of similar majors on the IRA committee that this particular major enjoyed the majority of the funding; further noted that in recent years the IRA committee has done an outstanding job of being fair in awarding funds across all majors;

## 3) New Proposals Received and Budget Review

- a. D. Daniels summarized that we have 41 total proposals received, although is not the final number due to some awaiting final dean approval; D. Wakelee mentioned current technical issue of chairs and deans not being given an option to deny a given proposal, which will be changed for the next batch of

applications; D. Daniels and D. Wakelee discussed general sorting structure of organizing proposals into three categories (Category-I, Category-II and Category-III); D. Daniels added to the budget review that if all proposals reach this dean approval and are then also approved by the committee, that the IRA fund will have a balance left over due to 1) our carry-forward from Fall; 2) cancellation of several international trips; 3) less UNIV 392 funds being requested this term; and 4) general underspending in prior UNIV 392 events;

- b. P. Murphy asked if the proposals reflected on the spreadsheet have all made it through the dean approval stage – D. Daniels answered no, D. Wakelee further clarified that all of the proposals received are displayed; D. Daniels added that it's possible for the total requested amount to go down if certain proposals are denied, but the number will not go up as all have been included on this worksheet;
  - c. S. Aloisio recalled that usually we have less money than proposals, so this is a different challenge, but that the committee will still be working hard to evaluate each one to ensure that they conform to IRA guidelines and purposes; D. Wakelee cited examples from prior considerations, i.e. "do the Cat-I's conform to the IRA guidelines," "are the proposals connected to a course," "who is served by them," "what is being done after the experience to share it on campus," etc.; clarified that Cat-II's generally have more questions that require committee attention; Cat-III's are the larger trips and are more involved;
- 4) Emergency request from English program (Brad Monsma, Chair): \$850 for 9-person van to take students to a symposium at USC on Nov. 13<sup>th</sup>
- a. S. Aloisio recalled a similar question from the Literary Journal last year, sounds like a worthwhile trip, but why is this request late and deserving of special attention; committee should be mindful to not communicate to others that if proposals come to us as emergency requests they will bypass our normal process, we do have a process in place that shouldn't be ignored if a proposal application was failed to be submitted; D. Wakelee reviewed request and

determined no explanation as to why this request is coming now, committee has options, the option of saying yes, no, or to ask for more information; E. Salgado agreed that we should ask for this information, i.e. why is this coming to us now via an emergency request rather than a proposal application last term;

- b. S. Aloisio affirmed that it's not Ok to simply ask a committee for money because they have it, proposers have to consider the purpose of the funding as well – in this particular case the SRSC could fund it with the money and purpose guidelines they have; further noted that although he would like to see a trip like this go forward, emergency requests are to be treated with priority above everything else; D. Wakelee in terms of emergency requests there could be scenarios where an event pops up and someone wants to respond; E. De La Cruz asked who determines if the request is an emergency or not – D. Wakelee answered that it is this committee that makes this determination; P. Murphy added that emergency requests could also be flight tickets, say if prices went up on a proposal that we already approved; S. Aloisio moved to ask this emergency requestor for more info on why we're seeing it now, second by E. Salgado, all in favor of retrieving this information from the requestor.
- 5) Budget coverage request from IRA#682 (London trip)
- a. D. Wakelee recalled meeting with J. Jenkins, professor J. Jenkins was working from the CIA budget and not the IRA budget, noting it was the first trip by J. Jenkins; S. Aloisio moved to approve \$4976.89 in budget coverage for overage, second by P. Murphy; K. Sailor asked to further clarify the sequence of events – D. Wakelee answered that whenever you have an international trip, there are two groups working together (CIA & IRA), but in this case the CIA budget was used instead of the IRA budget; J. Forrester called the committee to vote, all in favor of approving this budget coverage;
  - b. P. Murphy added that in the notification letter that we advise about future procedures and to encourage opportunities to come back to the committee to discuss changes in currency exchange rates, etc.

- 6) Question from IRA#702 (D. Rodriguez): Costa Rica trip unable to go Spring-16, plan to reschedule course for Fall-16; shall this IRA cancel and a new application be submitted, or shall funds be reserved for the shift in term?
  - a. P. Murphy asked if the corresponding course was currently being offered; D. Wakelee answered that he will be having further conversations about the best mechanisms for having trips over winter breaks (i.e. class scheduling, instructor grading, etc.); S. Aloisio noted that normally the answer would be no, but since we have the fund balance that we do that we could reserve these funds for the future use of this trip; K. Sailor asked if the same students would still be able to go; J. Forrester doesn't think that students have signed up yet with the course being postponed; P. Murphy added that this is a good question to be asking, and if there were students signed up for the trip that they shouldn't be penalized; D. Daniels agreed to ask a follow up question in this regard.
- 7) Question from IRA#711 (K. Contreras): wants to use remaining \$100 for the purchase of five of the author's books to be given to students
  - a. J. Forrester offered to take a look at this, let's ask how many students participated, and ask what the selection criteria is for these five students to receive the books;
- 8) Informational item: committee resources and IRA-related paperwork (with reference to Arts & Sciences policy)
  - a. S. Aloisio suggested that these paperwork processes continue to be discussed between Arts & Sciences and Academic Affairs to determine the best method of streamlining, rather than handled via this committee; no objections from committee.
- 9) Adjourn
  - a. J. Forrester moved to adjourn meeting at 8:56am, second by E. Salgado, all in favor of meeting adjournment.