

IRA Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 11th 2016 — 8:00-9:00 AM

Meeting Objective: To review this semester's budget, finish remaining discussion items, and review proposal questions

Attendees: Sean Kelly; Natasha Pillai; Elizabeth Heim; Paul Murphy; Leticia Cazares; Elizabeth Salgado; Kiera Sailor Staff Present: David Daniels; Kate Harrington; Anna Tovar; Dianne Wei

- I. New Member Introductions
 - A. Meeting called to order at 8:09AM; committee members
 S. Kelly and K. Sailor made introductions;
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - A. P. Murphy moved to approve the minutes, K. Sailor second, All in Favor to approve the prior meeting minutes from 10/4, 9/27 and 5/3/16;
- III. Final 2016-2017 Budget and Proposals (Dave Daniels)
 - A. D. Daniels reviewed the updated budget file, noting that 65 proposals have been received, for a total of \$512,728 in requested funds; further noted that we will still have a surplus, but that it was reduced down to \$39K; recalled that our committee normally organizes these proposals into Category I, II, and III, described general guidelines of Cat-I's being \$0-\$5000, Cat-II's being \$5000-\$10,000, and Cat-III's being \$10,000+ and containing our UNIV 392 proposals;
 - B. S. Kelly observed that there are multiple IRA proposals that are centered around student research, not only the one proposed by S. Kelly re: CSU Student Research, but also seeing the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR), the Student Undergraduate Research Fellows (SURF), and the American Chemical Society Conference; noted that he is sensitive to the work that D. Daniels is doing, wants to help alleviate some of this, and out of efficiency sake does it make sense to earmark these proposals as a group, i.e. a "student research" group of proposals;

- C. N. Pillai asked to clarify if that means that all of these activities become written as a single proposal, or what would this process look like; S. Kelly answered that there is a new Student Research Advisory Council (formerly the Student Research Steering Council or SRSC), in the past there would be competition for that money, but it may be better to see a grant system; for example, the \$12K proposed by the ACSC would be directed to the SRAC, where this money is earmarked for its specific projects, then a single request can be delivered to D. Daniels to handle expenditures, rather than 30-50 separate requests that come in; the earmarking of funds could come with instructions on how this can be done for this purpose; not sure if this is the moment to do this, but looking for efficiencies that may be able to be employed;
- D. P. Murphy in favor of supporting student research, but concern may be where we would want to avoid say an entire group of student research-related proposals being jeopardized by a single proposal that doesn't meet standards; S. Kelly yes the assumption is that all of the proposals are good; we could still assign our committee categories of I, II, III way, but as the student research ones are approved by the IRA, we are earmarking this for the SRAC, and then they take care of the details, then they send all of the bills to D. Daniels for payment (instead of sending him the large amount of logistical tasks);
- E. K. Sailor does our application portal ask proposers to do any category-type grouping; D. Daniels answered that there are info prompts that allow for proposers to describe the nature of their activity, but no specific categories i.e. in a drop-down menu style;
- F. K. Sailor asked if the student research ones always have the same amount; S. Kelly answered that currently proposers are coming to the IRA committee individually and saying "I want to do this for student research," but looking into a long term goal of weaning off of IRA funds completely; the IRA could then redirect these types of proposals to a campus funding source specifically designed for this; the idea being that it should be included in the cost of the student's tuition, these should not be extras, it's what universities should be doing to support student research; P. Murphy asked if this is seen as being feasible that the University would do that; S. Kelly answered that hopeful within the next year that

this will happen; N. Pillai so these for now would still be directed to IRA funds; S. Kelly, yes, recalled that chair of SRAC is not himself but is S. Frisch, others are B. Monsma, C. Harris-Keith, C. Smith, S. Anderson; N. Parmar, K. Leonard;

- G. P. Murphy was there any discussion at this meeting about this possible shift; S. Kelly no, it's been something I've been championing; there is a budget meeting today, 2381 Madera at 11AM;
- H. E. Salgado asked if we should communicate with them first; S. Kelly answered for sure, wasn't sure if any decisions were going to be made today, so that's why he's bringing up the concept now;
- N. Pillai asked D. Daniels if we're prepared to review proposals; D. Daniels answered that we're prepared for the Cat-III proposals, which is where we've historically started the review from; N. Pillai asked if we should touch base with the Student Research Advisory Committee; S. Kelly answered yes that he can bring this discussion up in the meeting today;
- J. K. Sailor asked what the source of funding is for the SRAC, does this come from stateside; S. Kelly recalled that for the first time last year received stateside temporary funds, about half of what we need; we have been advocating for permanent funds for this, optimistic that this will occur with more receptive ears on this; N. Pillai summarized that we should continue this discussion at our next meeting;
- IV. Revise Submitted Proposals (Dave Daniels, Natasha Pillai) A. Roll-Over Request from Dr. Bieszczad, Proposal #810
 - D. Daniels accounted for this request, N. Pillai recalled the previous discussion; K. Sailor asked if this is something that we will see a lot of; D. Daniels answered that we'll see a small number of these similar to other semesters, will keep the committee informed and will act as a liaison between faculty sponsors and the committee; K. Sailor moved to officially approve this request, second by E. Salgado, All in Favor of approval;
 - B. Fund Transfer Request from Dr. White, Proposal #782
 - P. Murphy asked if A. White provided any budget figures, D. Daniels answered yes that this info was provided in her budget file; S. Kelly suggested that if we approve we could limit it to whatever the rate is set by the state per diem amount for breakfast, should be something like

\$10-12; D. Daniels agreed to communicate this to A. White; S. Kelly moved to approve, P. Murphy second, All in Favor to approve request;

- V. Revisit Discussion: Change Meeting Time
 - N. Pillai and D. Daniels summarized that none of us have another available slot for this meeting time, so we are back to our normal schedule of Tuesday mornings each week at 8:00AM (in BTW#1188);
- VI. Parliamentary Procedure Training Materials (Natasha Pillai)
 - A. N. Pillai recalled asking Michelle Noyes for materials on ParliPro, which were the training materials that they use in student government; these tools might help students be more comfortable in any other arenas; will forward these once they become available; E. Salgado recalled having some of these materials as well, offered to forward them to N. Pillai;
- VII. Review Proposals if available
 - A. S. Kelly recalled going back through the minutes on previous meetings, i.e. the issue of not having vans to take students places, then we end up paying Roadrunner a lot of money; offered an idea that the university has an auxiliary / site authority, used to be called University Glen – what if they bought the vans, they take on the liability, then they charge us for the use; we could continue this discussion in our committee and leverage this committee's history of spending money on Roadrunner to possibly negotiate a contract; N. Pillai summarized that we should continue this discussion at our next meeting, and will not have time today to review proposals; L. Cazares moved to adjourn, second by E. Heim, meeting was adjourned at 9:02AM.