

IRA Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, February 26, 2019 — 8:00-9:00AM

Provost’s Conference Room BTW#2185

Meeting Objective: To review the committee’s purpose and responsibilities, as well as planning for proposal review for Fall 2019 activities.

Attendees: Sean Kelly, Vigneshwari Kumar, Bryan Ruiz

Staff: David Daniels, Jacky Connell, Kirk England, Alexxa Esparza, Dianne Wei

1. Welcome and introductions
   1. Meeting called to order at 8:01am.
2. Presentation of budget, growth data and procedure review (K. England & D. Daniels)
   1. Five-year summary review of total IRA awards, and awards by area/program
      1. K. England displayed growth of proposals over the last five years, highlighting the top five programs of all awardees (eg PA and ESRM); D. Daniels is responsible for administrating all of the touch points for each awards; PA has more than doubled number of proposals from 10 to 24 over the 5-year span; at 4 administrative touches per award, it is not sustainable, one person cannot administer 500+ touches for all awards; 50% of the total awards are driven by the top five programs (PA, ESRM, ENG, COMM, CHIC); let’s be aware of “creating monsters” or having programs being dependent on funding support via IRA; programs are used to receiving funds and would push back if they suddenly were reduced funding; question for committee, “how do you manage expectations?”; let’s try to figure out how to peel back … you could, for example, distribute the top 10 awards automatically, S. Kelly recalled in the past the President can put money into buckets, as these are high impact practices; K. England we need to communicate that when proposers submit, they need to have an administrative plan; recommended the committee construct and organize a method in which it distributes the awards.
3. New Business
   1. Discussion of administrative responsibilities – what is involved and who is performing the duties
      1. K. England mentioned that D. Daniels is responsible for all administrative work and logistics involved in rewarding awards.
   2. Discussion of administrative capacity
      1. K. England proposed if a program sought funding for proposal then proposer should have a designated administrator. K. England stated implementing this would assist D. Daniels with the workload. Each program having a designated administrator could potentially decrease the amount of proposals received.
      2. K. England proposed all proposals acquiring an administrator. Majority of IRA committee in favor of this proposal.
   3. Discussion of IRA chair and committee responsibilities (referencing IRA Manual)
      1. K. England suggested distributing equal funds to all programs. S. Kelly commented his preference on seeing some of the proposals in the regular budget.
      2. K. England inquired the committee’s criteria for funding proposals. S. Kelly suggested focusing on the quantity of activities rather than the programs.
      3. K. England commented regarding IRA committee manual. The manual fosters the proposer’s involvement regarding proposal.
      4. D. Wei stated certain courses require course fees.
      5. J. Connell inquired if proposals go through the programs chair before arriving to IRA committee? S. Kelly commented he confers with his program proposals before moving to the IRA committee.
   4. Discussion of converting IRA application periods to an annual cycle (similar to MSFT)
      1. S. Kelly: let’s not forget about SRIRS, we could group those; K. England what we’re talking about is awarding new money; the criteria to consider when awarding new money, we could move toward percentage allocations; S. Kelly added that instead of looking at programs, we look at activities… we could allocate say trips for CIA;
      2. B. Ruiz asked about highest growth for PA and ESRM, K. England observed that most proposals are funded and that there are no barriers to submit; D. Wei there are some activities that request course fees; K. England commented that there should be a master calendar from SRIRS, which would be helpful to view here; J. Connell asked if these proposals are viewed by the program chair first – S. Kelly replied Yes; K. England added that proposers need to consider that if they don’t have the administrative capacity for the award, then don’t submit the award;
      3. K. England summarized that per this discussion we can inform our division that we are in favor of reducing the administrative work load of one person,
      4. ACTION ITEM: D. Daniels will reach out to applicable program analysts to arrange a meeting together;
4. Other business and meeting adjournment
   1. Meeting adjourned at 8:44am