

INSTRUCTIONALLY RELATED ACTIVITIES (IRA) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

APRIL 27, 2020 2:00 PM VIA ZOOM

M I N U T E S

Members Present: Anthony Ruiz (Chair), Emily Bruns, Trevor Guthrie, Chris Rufo, Gary Braun, Adam Irish, Hope Munro, and Dennis O'Connor

Members Absent: none

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

Staff Absent: none

Guests: Jennifer Mendoza, Associated Students' Executive Vice President-elect

- I. Call to Order – Anthony called the meeting to order at 2:03 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes -
 - a. 1.27.2020 Minutes – Approved 8-0-0
- III. New Business
 - a. Discussion Items -
 - i. Baseline funding for next year:

There was a request for time-certain discussion on draft recommendations to FASP at 2:40pm. Request approved.

Members discussed next year's baseline budget and the reality of a decrease in funding due to an expected decrease in enrollment. We have approximately \$75,000 in reserves that we can add to this coming year to try to offset the expected decrease in funding for next year. The \$75,000 reserve is already added to the estimated allocation. An estimated FTES of 14,500 was used in calculating, which was estimated before the pandemic. We do not have an estimate for what might happen next year but we have reserves that we can use for one year so that we won't have to pull money back for 20-21. This discussion will likely be more difficult next year when we know the full effect of a decline in enrollment.

Given this information, the committee does not have enough information to do a significant re-benching or adding to the baseline of any college/program. We only know that we will have approximately \$70,000 less than last year. It was suggested that the committee not do a flat reduction across all the colleges/programs, but try to determine a method to cut more from the higher funded ones for less impact on the less funded ones. It was also suggested that it might not be feasible to determine an intricate method of cutting budgets at this point because next year is so uncertain. If the college already gets a significant amount of money, they also receive the largest cut when allocations are cut across the board. Also, consider

that the clubs will have a rollover amount from this year. We only have two meetings and this is not enough time to determine a new model. It was also suggested that we do not cut the programs that added programs this year and that we distribute the cuts over the other colleges/programs.

One of the points that the provost has made recently is that some colleges have the potential to support IRA with other funds. There are a lot of variables that are going to impact these programs that we do not know. It is very hard to allocate in a responsible way or to change funding when there are so many variables.

Even though the committee approved new programs this year, they were not guaranteed funding. Both AGR and ECC added programs. The provost indicated that some colleges have money but the committee does not have this information when they make decisions about IRA allocations. The spirit of the committee is to fund programs that are deserving so it seems that if you approve something that those programs be considered for funding. It does not seem that the group is ready to make a decision. Giving everyone an equal decrease seems to be the best choice at this point. But, then does it make sense to not cut those colleges that added new programs. It is the responsibility of the dean to make sure there is funding before they approve the application for consideration to the IRA committee.

The students voiced that they trust the decision of more experienced members, and that this is a difficult decision given the uncertainty. A flat cut is not ideal but it may be the best decision given the time left.

Jennifer Mendoza, incoming AS Executive Vice President, was introduced.

ii. EM governing the IRA committee and recommending changes for FASP:

Members discussed a draft letter to FASP that was presented for consideration and comment. A revision to CFAC was voted down in FASP but it is expected to be taken up again next year. The major points with FASP were that they did not want to reduce the size of the IRA committee, going from 12 members to 7, and also fewer faculty voices from 4 to 1.

Staff asked what the purpose of a letter from IRA to FASP would be at this point when the revision to the CFAC EM was voted down by FASP. Any effort at this point takes away from the baseline budget discussion. It was the Executive Committee of the Senate that suggested the CFAC EM be updated. It is believed that the process would have to be restarted and a new revision be presented.

There is only one faculty representative on CFAC. There should be significant faculty representation. There really is no down side to the letter since it is just documenting what was felt at this time. Edits can be made and the item will be voted on at next meeting. The student chair voiced agreement.

IV. Old Business – none.

- IV. Announcements – Work Study allocation Scenario 2 selected by an email vote of 5 (Ruiz, Guthrie, Bruns, Rufo, Munro) to 3 (Braun, Irish, O’Connor). Kim sent the recommendation to the Provost on Friday, April 24th. Exemplary Performance Round III requests are due April 30th—as expected, due to virtual campus status, none received to date.

- V. Adjournment – Anthony adjourned the meeting at 3:07 pm.