

INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES (IRA) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
OCTOBER 29, 2019 4:00 PM KNDL 103
MINUTES

Members Present: Anthony Ruiz (Chair), Trevor Guthrie, Adam Irish, Hope Munro, Dennis O'Connor

Members Absent: Emily Bruns, Chris Rufo, Gary Braun

Staff Present: Jeni Kitchell, Jennifer Mays, Kendall Ross, Kim Williams, Stephen Cummins

Staff Absent: none

Guests: Provost Larson and Rick Ford

- I. Call to Order – Anthony called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes - none
- III. New Business
 - a. Action Items – none
 - b. Discussion Items –
 - i. Attendees introduced themselves.
 - ii. Members received an email from Academic Senate Chair Chiara Ferrari stating that the Executive Committee (EC) of the Academic Senate was exploring ways to revise EM 16-002 (EM), but were awaiting clarification from the Chancellor's Office (CO) in relation to compliance with EO-1102. She wrote that the IRA Advisory Committee should continue to operate under the current EM until the EC has a chance to finalize a decision, and recommended that the committee focus its efforts on the normal and long-standing processes in place. She also encouraged members to collect their thoughts and interests to provide suggestions for improvement to the EM to be transmitted to a FASP subcommittee or another assigned committee.

Rick Ford, former member of the Campus Fee Advisory Committee (CFAC), explained that one interpretation of EO-1102 is that all campus fees should be recommendations to CFAC who then makes recommendations to the President. IRA currently makes recommendations to the Provost and EC is looking at this because they want to be in compliance with EOs as they come out. CFAC has changed significantly over the years (reduced workload), and it looks like CFAC would have the capacity to take on IRA if we were to find out that IRA is to report to CFAC.

Provost Larson met with Adam Irish and Dennis O'Connor this past summer. There were two concerns identified last year: Rewriting the EM and "re-benching" of the allocations. She believes that, because of the way the EM is written and the way the committee is structured, the committee does not have the time capacity or technical wherewithal to go through the process of re-benching as currently structured. She is interested in the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate providing advice on how to proceed. Because of the uncertainty about EO-1102 and whether it is the guiding EO for IRA, we are trying to get a consultation from someone at the CO. This has delayed the decision

of the EC. In the meantime, the IRA Advisory Committee has “normal” work to do. As questions or concerns arise, members could be making a list of the concerns/observations that they want to share--Dr. Ferrari has indicated that this could either be with FASP or CFAC or another body. After responding to questions for additional clarification about continuing committee work under the current EM, Provost Larson asked the group to gather the list and to not attempt to rewrite the EM.

Questions about how budget allocations should be handled this year led to a suggestion that members work to collect data to do the groundwork for a future re-benching that shows that the process was more objective and more fair, and that the committee is collecting the data in a way that supports change. The committee could work on gathering more information based on Annual Program Reviews, perhaps revising the form for the future, and requesting additional information from stakeholders.

The problem that Rick sees is that EO-1102, in his judgement, should be governing all Category II fees. IRA is a Category II fee. One of the protections in EO-1102 is that the committee that makes the recommendation to the President has a majority of representation of students. In his view, IRA is out of compliance because it does not have a majority representation of students. On the other hand, if the committee makes a recommendation to CFAC instead of the Provost then other issues arise. Right now we are in a bit of a stutter step, and we are waiting for information from the CO to verify exactly what EO-1102 is supposed to cover.

An additional question about how the committee should progress regarding the budget, led to another clarification that the chair of the senate said to keep moving forward the way the committee normally operates. It was also stated that, this year, it may happen that the recommendation of the committee may go to both CFAC and the Provost. Provost Larson said that the group will continue to work to complete normal tasks such as Requests for Certification, Requests for Exemplary Performance, and Annual Program Reviews.

Staff shared that the IRA Advisory Committee goes back to 1978, before CFAC came about. Jeni Kitchell interprets the EM’s concern is with allocating dollars, while the EO is concerned with the level of fee.

Rick and Provost Larson excused themselves. Rick will return to a future committee meeting once they have answers from the CO.

A lengthy discussion ensued around and about the need to decide if members want to take on the work that Provost Larson suggested. In her meeting this past summer with Adam and Dennis, she suggested that members include stakeholder engagement in their decision making about re-benching allocations. Staff suggested that members could spend time gathering data for the future. The question was asked about whether the ABC (Activity Based Costing model) could be used, or a version of it, for IRA allocations. Staff agreed to give a short presentation on the model at a future meeting. November 15th would be the next meeting date that would allow time to have a brief presentation on the ABC model, and continue this discussion, due to seven groups/activities waiting to present their Requests for Certification. Due to time, the discussion ended.

- V. Announcements – Annual Program Review forms and requests for Exemplary Performance funding were due October 31st.
- VI. Adjournment – Anthony adjourned the meeting at 5:05 pm.