

IRA Committee Meeting Agenda Tuesday, October 18th 2016 — 8:00-9:00 AM

Meeting Objective: To sort submitted proposals and begin reviewing Category III proposals.

Attendees: Sean Kelly; Paul Murphy; Elizabeth Heim; Dianne Wei; Kiera Sailor; Natasha Pillai; Elizabeth Salgado.

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

I. Approval of Meeting Documents

A. This Week's Agenda

- Meeting called to order at 8:07am; D. Daniels recommended to amend agenda to have a complete round of introductions, all committee members introduced themselves; E. Heim moved to approve this week's agenda, K. Sailor second, agenda approved with no objections;

B. Last Week's Minutes

- P. Murphy had previously reviewed the minutes and motioned to have them approved, K. Sailor second, meeting minutes from 10/11/16 approved with no objections;

II. Sorting Proposals (Dave Daniels)

A. Earmark Research-Related Proposals (Dave Daniels, Dr. Sean Kelly)

- D. Daniels reviewed spreadsheet that has been sorted by internal categories I, II and III, with assistance from A. Tovar; recalled the request to add sub-categories for proposals related to student research and those planning a trip to Santa Rosa Island, this info has also been captured; S. Kelly noted that one of the proposals is a number off in the student research category; D. Daniels thanked S. Kelly for his observation and recalled that this was due to a repeat proposal in the spreadsheet that has since been deleted, D. Daniels will revise this list to reflect current proposal numbers;

III. Review Category III Proposals

- IRA#820 UNIV 392 to South Africa: P. Murphy observed the budget line request for an international cell phone plan, recommended we ask for clarification on this; further noted that "airport transportation in CA (shared)" is on this same line, recommended we ask more about this; N. Pillai agreed, not opposed to it, but don't recall seeing it in the past; P. Murphy referenced flight costs,

recognized that it may not be easy to get an accurate estimate of flight costs because the trip is more than a year out, but suggested that we may want to ask her to price out a similar time this year so that we can have a better idea of the flight estimates; we can also ask about the lodging, where they stayed last time, etc.; S. Kelly offered that we could ask certain proposal sponsors to come to this meeting to discuss their proposal and/or budget, especially the UNIV 392s and larger trips; P. Murphy recalled that we've done this in the past, especially for the more complicated ones; noted that as a committee we can decide on who we want to bring, but maybe we don't blanket decide to bring in all UNIV 392 in the interest of time constraints; K. Sailor agreed that in some cases we'll want to bring some of the proposers to a given committee meeting; P. Murphy reminded that this is the student's money, so we are able to ask questions in the best interests of how it's spent, and to this aim we can also ask why two faculty members are needed for 15 students; D. Daniels recalled that a common ratio for domestic trips is one faculty member to 10-15 students, then it's common to see two faculty members to help manage / coordinate larger groups, but again this is for domestic trips, not recalling a common ratio when referencing international trips; P. Murphy reiterated that he is not against funding the trip; D. Daniels summarized that he will send all questions raised by the committee to Dr. Grove along with an invitation to attend our next meeting;

- IRA#828 CSU Student Research: P. Murphy asked if we could hear from S. Kelly to help introduce this proposal; S. Kelly noted that the proposal is on behalf of the Student Research Advisory Committee (SRAC), recalled that at the time of the IRA application deadline the SRAC wasn't fully up and running, so it should be noted that it's not specifically his proposal; observed that this proposal is a little different from others, as we don't know the exact amount of requests or exactly how much money, i.e. a variety of student-based research requests and conferences will come up that we / the SRAC will fund via support from the IRA; what we've done in the past is that we've limited per student allocations to \$700; there are a few exceptions to this, i.e. if students go to the Student Research Competition (SRC) or SCUR, those wouldn't affect their \$700 funding cap, because we want the best students at these and don't want to provide a disincentive for going; recalled that in the past when we had less money, we would only fund students who were presenting at the conference, but as we've had more funding we'd like to bring students who'd like to participate even when not presenting, as this in itself is a valuable experience; P. Murphy asked who determines which students want to go and how much they get; S. Kelly answered that in the past there's a committee who reviews proposals, usually with more requests than

money to give; but it's relatively pro formo (standard operating procedure) that faculty come to us and not students who are making the request, this way it's the faculty's expertise that is evaluating a particular student's research, rather than the SRAC; N. Pillai asked how much money is typically required for SCUR and SRC – answer from S. Kelly was for SCUR was about \$10K, about \$3K for SRC; noted that then we do have some temporary money coming from the Provost Office, totaling with \$75K combined with PO and IRA allocations; N. Pillai estimated that this works out to be roughly 65-70 students in terms of potential funding for their research / conferences; S. Kelly agreed that this is about right assuming full funding at \$700 each, which doesn't always happen; N. Pillai asked if there are plans to make requests from other sources of funding – S. Kelly answered yes we encourage this, because some programs do have more flexible sources of funding; combining funding sources we could easily be looking at providing opportunities for 200-300 students ; K. Sailor asked for more information about SCUR; S. Kelly recalled that last year we sent 100 students, we had three buses to help transport everyone;

- N. Pillai asked to move to the next Cat-III proposal, IRA#846 UNIV 392 to London; began intro for this proposal, but coming up on the end of the allotted meeting time; asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting; E. Salgado moved, E. Heim seconded, meeting adjourned at 9:03am.

IV. Discussion: University Vans

- Not discussed due to time constraints