

IRA Committee Meeting Agenda Tuesday, April 2, 2019 — 8:00-9:00AM

Provost’s Conference Room BTW#2185

Meeting Objective: Proposal review for Fall 2019 and FY19-20 activities, beginning with Category-III proposals.

Attendees: Sean Kelly, Vigneshwari Kumar, Andrea Skinner, Bryan Ruiz

Staff present: David Daniels

Guest: Andrea Grove: Director, Center for International Affairs

1. Review of Category-III proposals
	* 1. B. Ruiz called meeting to order at 8:07am;
	1. IRA#1147 Student Research
		1. B. Ruiz asked about what happens when remaining funds are not used from student research award; S. Kelly replied that unused funds from Fall will roll over to Spring, thus avoiding two proposals; B. Ruiz asked if this proposal has been funded every year; S. Kelly recalled history behind IRA funding support of the Student Research Advisory Committee (SRAC), began in 2008 to fund student conference travel; as the impact has grown and participation has grown, the ask to IRA has increased; as an example, we currently have over 100 students participating this semester;
	2. IRA#1184 SACNAS Conference
		1. D. Daniels and A. Skinner noted the high price tag for this, and also not as many students would be able to go due to location of conference in Hawaii; S. Kelly noted that with SRAC there is a per student cap of $700 in funding support; A. Skinner observed that 15 students is written on the spreadsheet, but 35 students requested on the proposal and elsewhere on the spreadsheet; also does not indicate how long the trip will be – S. Kelly looked it up, runs from Oct 22-Nov 2, further recalled that this has received other monies in the past before coming to IRA; A. Skinner asked if this is new; D. Daniels replied yes that it is new to the IRA committee; S. Kelly suggested that we could run it through SRAC, and to offer partial funding of $1000 per student ($300 above SRAC cap), and would not preclude the separate $700 per student support from SRAC; V. Kumar asked how many faculty are going, says “5” in airfare, 4 in registration fee; S. Kelly added that it could be that one of the registration days is complimentary; D. Daniels agreed to reach out to proposal sponsor in order to clarify how many students and how many faculty;
	3. IRA#1176 Coastal Monitoring with RPS’s in Maui
		1. V. Kumar observed that only six students are going; D. Daniels added that the committee in the past has redirected funding to other sources (e.g. mini-grants) when student participant number is low; further observed that this proposal requires student use of drones, drones that need a license to fly, and mentions our ESRM course that would grant licensure at the end of the class; so, the licensing course would act as a prerequisite for the activity; however, current IRA guidelines require that IRA supported activities are open for all students to participate, but this one would by default limit student participation to those taking the ESRM class.
2. Question and answer session from the Center for International Affairs (8:30AM with Andrea Grove)
	* 1. A. Grove recalled that the CIA committee approved trips from New Zealand, they went for the first time last semester; also approved a new one to Spain, new one to Peru, and approved India and Germany as repeats; in terms of ranking, one thing we consider is to weigh whether or not to prioritize ones that have been before versus new trips; CIA committee noted an advantage for ones that have gone before, as relationships have been built with overseas universities; we also weigh heavily toward faculty trip leaders that have been to the host country before; committee takes a focused look at the academic rigor of the trip versus looking like a tour; e.g. Germany course has a relationship with our school of MVS; D. Daniels observed that there was no IRA proposal for Germany; A. Grove recalled sending the Germany group a lengthy communication about this; S. Kelly suggested the idea of a different funding approach, what if IRA sends CIA a chunk of money instead – currently there’s an odd disconnect on IRA’s end for trying to approve courses with the international logistics in mind; the IRA committee grapples with a lack of experience in reviewing international courses, which is the expertise the CIA committee brings; A. Grove saw the benefits of this approach, agreed that it could work; noted that sometimes we have two proposals and sometimes we have six proposals, but surplus funds would just be returned to the IRA; S. Kelly recalled from early data capture that the chunk would be about 30% of IRA’s total budget; delivered as a chunk to CIA, it would give the center(s) more control; A. Skinner added that this would be more of an equitable approach as well, so that IRA spends equal amounts on the different categories,, noting that IRA funds must also go to other trips, speakers, etc.; A. Grove in consideration of if you have to cut any, India has gone every year for many years running; Peru we’ve turned down before, but this proposal was stronger this year; CIA’s ranking would be as follows: 1) Spain, 2) New Zealand, 3) Peru, 4) India; V. Kumar asked more about the academic focus of the India trip; A. Grove agreed that this trip is strong academically and that they study bio-technology; V. Kumar asked if the Peru trip had the same level of academic rigor; A. Grove replied that you can see that those objectives are in there, but possibly not as compelling; also only one unit of credit for Peru, because the trip is shorter; S. Kelly asked about New Zealand, A. Grove recalled that the faculty leader does a great job of interfacing with other NZ universities; A. Skinner asked about the staffing requirements, J. Edwards does a lot but also is tackling Senate and the other three mission centers; A. Grove agreed and added that all of the post-decision management is what she’s currently doing;
3. Other business and meeting adjournment
	1. Meeting adjourned at 8:58am.