



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
**FULLERTON**

## Minutes

### **Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee**

📅 Fri October 29th, 2021

🕒 3:00pm - 4:00pm PDT

📍 ASI Boardroom - Titan Student Union

👤 **In Attendance**

#### 1. **Call to Order - Marcus Reveles, Chair**

Marcus Reveles, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

##### **Roll Call:**

Student Members Present: Bridges, Vyas

Absent: Kelley, Lee (E), Perna (E), Riched (E), Sharma (E)

Faculty Members Present: Abnet, Brusckke, Leekeenan, Miyamoto, Ngo, Nobari, Tucker

Absent: Xie (E)

Non-Voting Members Present: Edwards, Masoud, Stang, Ward

Non-Voting Members Absent: Mollenaur

##### **Decision:** EXCUSALS

(Tucker-m/Miyamoto-s) A motion to excuse Kelley, Lee, Perna, Riched, Sharma, and Xie was approved by unanimous consent.

#### 2. **Approval of Agenda**

**Decision:** (Nobari-m/Bridges-s) The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

### 3. **Approval of Minutes**

**Decision:** (Tucker-m/Abnet-s) The October 8, 2021 IRA Committee meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

#### a. **10/08/2021 IRA Committee Meeting Minutes**

### 4. **Public Speakers**

There were no public speakers.

### 5. **Reports**

#### a. **Chair - Reveles**

Reveles reported:

- Welcomed student representatives, Tasneem Riched, HSS, and Sonali Vyas, NSM. Dr. Edwards will provide an overview of the committee process.

#### b. **ASI Executive Director - Dr. Edwards**

Dr. Edwards reviewed the upcoming committee timeline and the next steps in the application review process. There is a ten day window for review and processing of IRA Funding Applications through the Assessment Rubric.

### 6. **Time Certain:**

#### a. **NONE**

### 7. **Unfinished Business**

There was no unfinished business.

#### a. **NONE**

### 8. **New Business**

#### a. **Action: Line Item Transfer Requests - Reveles**

*The Committee will consider a line item transfer for Forensics IRA program #3305*

**IRA 002 21/22 (Bruschke-m/Ngo-s) A motion was made and seconded to approve a line item transfer for Program #3305 Forensics to move \$37,850 from travel (8077) to supplies (8050), student wages (8069) and contracts, fees, and rentals (8074). The transfer of funds is being reallocated due to a disruption in their planned programming as a result of the continuing COVID travel restrictions.** Reveles yielded to Dr. Edwards to review the request.

- Edwards explained due to the restriction of travel during the pandemic, funding for travel has been repurposed for other program needs. For example: using funds for travel to fund virtual meetings. As well as other funding needs that are associated with the program.

Reveles opened the floor to questions.

- Miyamoto asked, is there a breakdown for the repurposed funding. Edwards answered, gave a breakdown of the repurposed funding allocation with associated amounts.

Reveles opened the floor to discussion. There was no discussion.

Reveles asked if there were any objections to moving to a roll call vote. There were no objections.

**Decision: IRA 002 21/22 (Bruschke-m/Ngo-s) Roll Call Vote: 10-0-0 The motion to approve a line item transfer for Program #3305 Forensics to move \$37,850 from travel (8077) to supplies (8050), student wages (8069) and contracts, fees and rentals (8074) was adopted.**

b. **Discussion: IRA Funding Deliberation Training - Reveles**

*The Committee will review the mock application rating process and the rubric calibration with Dr. Su Swarat.*

Reveles yielded to Edwards to introduce Dr. Su Swarat, AVP Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation, to lead the discussion regarding the mock application scoring exercise and rubric calibration.

Dr. Swarat shared information for the Rubric training. A rubric is a set of rules/criteria for grading/assessing applications/documents. A discrepancy has been noted on Criteria #3 regarding the interpretation of the criteria in question.

- Dr. Swarat reviewed various scores given by members for rubric Criteria #3 and opened the floor to discussion.

- Bruschke shared, the purchasing of technology was viewed as an attempt to attain certification from an outside source which would define the program as "not integrated". This would not be interpreted as applicable to the goals of an "integrated" campus-based program. Sheet music, for example, would be purchased and used by students in a program related to campus-based activity where music is played through a course on campus.
- Dr. Swarat reviewed various scores given by members to rubric Criteria #3 and opened the floor to discussion.
- Ngo shared an interpretation on whether the program has "minimal", or "no clear connection" to the university goals.
- Abnet shared, we can include a program that has been around for fourteen years as "integrated" as it has established itself over a length of time. The program can be "well-integrated" where the students will have completed all coursework within the course itself through the program. If the program seemed to have students involved on campus while the certification received is something to be attained down the line.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, the discussion of disagreements is to encourage us to find common ground on the interpretation of the rubric.
- Abnet shared, regarding the previous example. It satisfied the criteria very well.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, encouraged the sharing of any additional thoughts from committee members. The committee is attempting to understand the disagreements on the interpretation of the rubric. One side of the argument considers a program "integrated" over a length of time. Another argument considers a program as "not integrated" where the certification, for example, is received from a source off-campus.
- Bruschke shared, some programs receive funding from non-IRA, or outside, sources. IRA funding is typically for programs with activities related to course work by interpretation of the criteria. If not, Microsoft is being paid to give the students a certificate rather than allowing students to receive a certificate through CSUF.
- Ngo shared, the existence of a program over a number of years can be used as a means to validate an application. Ngo inquired, should the quality of the application and associated awards be a factor; if the applicant is great at writing proposals for example. Should the writing of a proposal determine whether the program is good or bad? The applicant should write how the program is relevant to the rubric/criteria.

- Dr. Swarat clarified, a reference to goals is not explicitly stated in the rubric criteria. The purpose of the committee is to agree upon where the emphasis will be placed when grading applications through the rubric criteria. The applicants have not been asked to provide explicit information.
- Brusckke clarified, the rubric has been available online for a number of years now. This committee struggles with a broader definition for the rubric, but not whether or not an unclear rubric should be counted against applicants. As the rubric is published, programs should receive the benefits of this information.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, as a group, the committee needs to resolve differences in how we interpret terms found in the rubric such as "integration/connection/staffing of the group". The committee will decide as a group which interpretation any given term will hold.
- Edwards clarified, this Committee is a collective discussion for the members present to make suggestions to change the rubric now, for use in the future. Making certain elements a priority for resolution is the goal of the meeting.
- Leekeenan asked, the Staffing Formula is unclear. There is nothing explicitly stating what defines the "connections to university missions and goals", it would be unfair to expect applicants to interpret this by implication. The rubric can be changed to include the language necessary to clarify this message and its intent.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, the priority seems to be on the term "integration".
- Brusckke asked, regarding an interpretation of "academic study". The applicants do not have the same information available to them as the Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to produce a common interpretation used by everyone in the case of disagreement. An applicant will provide different information for a program based in whether the course is listed as performance-based rather than a lecture; the applicant will provide information accordingly. Where the connection to mission and goals is not clearly stated in the application, is it required for the applicant to express this information to meet the criteria?
- Bridges clarified, "integrated to the applicable unit".
- Brusckke asked, is a course where students are hired, instructed through faculty, including assistants integrated. A choir, for example, performs at a high school, is the program considered "integrated" in one department or is it "integrated" beyond one department, many, or all?
- Dr. Swarat clarified, when reviewing the statement "program is well integrated into an academic unit", the committee needs to follow the

statement.

- Nobari clarified, the priority was on the phrase "broader impact".
- Bruschke asked, does the question relate to the "program's relationship to the course". Or, does this reference refer to the "program" as part of the "academic unit"? Is the priority given to the "program" as part of the "academic unit", over "student engagement"? Does this include grad students and their connection to other courses within the "academic unit"? There are references meeting criteria other than simply referring to the course.
- Reveles clarified, encouraged members to take note of how intimidating this process can be. Encouraged members to engage in conversation even when they are not entirely familiar with the content shared.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, because there is overlap between Criteria #3 and Criteria #5, Criteria #3 has been interpreted narrowly to focus on the program's integration with the specific academic unit. What is different among the three levels of ratings is the adjectives: "Well-integrated", "Somewhat integrated", "Minimally Integrated." For "mission" the options available are "clear connection", "connection", and "no clear connection". When an applicant does not convey their connection to the mission explicitly we can assume there is a connection. However, it would be an exaggeration to say there is a "clear connection". The committee will decide regarding the means by which these three elements are weighed during the review.
- Nobari asked, wherein the application is a description of the Staffing Formula located?
- Bruschke requests the document be displayed on the projector for members' reference.
- Edwards asked and clarified, where on the application does one acquire information to evaluate this document?
- Edwards clarified, the rubric question regarding "Mission & Goals".
- Dr. Swarat clarified, this is a reference to the "mission & goals" of the Program for which funding is received. Not a "connection" to the "mission & goals" of the university.
- Edwards reviews the rubric questions.
- Miyamoto asked, the application on occasion uses the terms "course" and "program" interchangeably. Is there a distinction between the terms: "course", "activity", "program", and the "academic unit"? Are these terms separate? There was some confusion between the phrase "the course is well integrated" versus "the activity was well integrated in the course".

- Dr. Swarat answered, "the program is well integrated in an academic unit" refers to the program where one receives a certificate, for example. What the program is added to is the "academic unit".
- Nobari asked, is the "course" the "academic unit", not the department containing the courses within?
- Dr. Swarat answered, the applicant is not seeking funding for the course to add to the program. Funding is sought to add a certificate program to the course.
- Edwards explained, there is only one application meeting the needs of over one-hundred-thirty programs. Some courses only receive funding through IRA. Some courses contain a component or activity within the course, funded through IRA. Some courses may take a trip funded through IRA. Some courses are completely dependent on IRA funding.
- Reveles posed a question to committee members, would an example of this be Daily Titan, versus, attending a competition?
- Edwards answered, a better example would be: a.) a study abroad trip - completely funded by IRA. The entire course would be contingent upon receiving funding from IRA. b.) the orchestra, where the musicians will take a trip funded by IRA, but whether or not the trip takes place the course would still exist.
- Dr. Swarat reviewed, drew attention to Criteria #5 and Criteria #2, dealing with a "broader impact". The rubric questions whether or not there is a "significant direct or indirect impact". The second issue, of whether or not the number of students is "directly or indirectly impacted". "Directly or indirectly" and "large", "modest", and "small" are subjective and increase the difficulty for interpretation. Reviewed members' scores given to rubric criteria and opened the floor to discussion.
- Tucker referenced "directly or indirectly impact the campus community and other students". The phrase "other students" is stated while only the students who are involved in the certificate program are involved and affected. The score given was a result of no impact to students who are not a part of the certificate program in question. References the "impact to community, stakeholders, and individuals". One can argue, at some point in the future, the perceived impact would be greater if more companies hired CSUF students as a result. But this is not directly impacting the students at this time.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, priority in this assessment was given to the term "impact" rather than the "number" of students involved.
- Tucker explained, there were only eighty students involved in the related question where the student population on campus totals approximately forty-five thousand. When the rubric criteria asked

whether or not "the number of students directly or indirectly involved" we seem to be discussing the "community", not the "program".

- Bridges explained, priority was given to the number of students in the applications in general.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, Bridges placed priority on the second half of the statement, "number of students". Emphasized the number of students in one application to that of another when regarding the "number of students" involved. The committee is advised to find common criteria in the interpretation of these terms. What is meant by "large", "modest", or "small". A comparative analysis is relative and lacks a common criterion to measure these terms. The committee is encouraged to find a common understanding for the interpretation of such terms.
- Miyamoto explained, everything on the list was treated as equivalent. Students acquiring jobs after leaving CSUF was considered a significant indirect effect to the external community.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, are only students participating in the program counted as part of the "impact"?
- Leekeenan responded, interpreted "broader impact" as the impact beyond the students. Students sharing their experiences and knowledge gained through their education at CSUF cannot be assumed. The rubric does not explicitly state how the "impact" affected students "directly". It is unlikely the committee will be able to predict how these terms will apply to the questions on the applications.
- Dr. Swarat clarified, the committee can opt to remove from the criteria the term "broader impact". This appears to be the consensus. Criteria #2 and Criteria #4 can be discussed among the members of the committee as to how the scores differ.
- Dr. Swarat left the committee due to time restraints.
- Edwards invited Dr. Swarat to return in the Spring semester to fine-tune the understanding of the Rubric.
- Abnet asked, whether or not there is clarification or classification of terms listed in the application? Stang answered, the information is located in the application. Edwards responded, the information will be found and distributed to the committee members for clarification.
- Brusckke and Stang commented on the classification keys for courses as previously located in the application. Edwards responded, the application will be distributed to members of the committee today. Information regarding classification keys can be viewed at a later time.
- Brusckke asked, why the rubric criteria, or definitions, were removed from the application when the information is available to members of



the committee. Each course has been previously classified based on an objective interpretation of the course itself. Edwards answered, the applicants of the year prior did not understand the criteria or definitions; the inclusion of this information would be unfair to the applicants.

- Stang and Brusckke asked, for clarification as to whether or not something in a course is classified as an "activity". Edwards clarified, the definition of what constitutes an "activity". Brusckke responded, the minutes from previous IRA Committee meetings can be used to clarify whether or not a definition of "activity" was agreed upon previously. Reveles responded, encouraged the discussion of "activity".
- Nobari asked, regarding funding received from alternate sources for "activity classes". Brusckke answered, various courses receive funding as an "integrated program". The source of frustration in this discussion comes from the shifting of criteria, definitions, and interpretation of rubric over time; the definition of whether or not a program is "integrated".
- Stang responded, the committee needs to check the minutes from previous IRA Committee meetings as to whether or not there has been a change to the criteria. Board concurred. Every applicant wants to receive full points for the application written, having been provided an understanding of the rubric criteria, and making the effort to receive full points from rubric scoring. The rubric is a tool for the committee to gain some understanding of the criteria and definitions. The applicants did not have this information provided to them; they had to figure this out on their own. It would be unfair to score their application based on a difference of opinion after the criteria and definitions had been set. Reveles concurred.
- Brusckke clarified, if the rubric is distributed with the applications now, having been previously removed according to the previous IRA Committee meeting minutes, this will cause a problem. Edwards clarified, the information will be sought for clarification.
- Brusckke commented. Edwards clarified, the purpose of the committee is to reach an agreement of shared understanding on the definitions of criteria and rubric. Where the committee is comfortable with a common understanding, the committee can move on. Where there is a need for clarification the committee members are encouraged to share the question with the committee.
- Bridges asked, regarding Criteria #1, Criteria #2, and Criteria #4, is an application strictly adhering to the rubric criteria to be interpreted as a better application? Edwards responded, references the purpose

of IRA Funding. To fund activities where student engagement is involved. The more engaged a student is through the activity the more likely the activity will receive funding, for example. This can be viewed as "high-level engagement" versus "low-level engagement".

9. **Announcements and Members Privilege**

NONE

10. **Adjournment**

Reveles adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.



Marcus Reveles (Feb 8, 2022 11:58 PST)

---

Marcus Reveles, IRA Committee Chair



---

Susan Collins, Recording Secretary

## Roll Call 2021-2022

### 10/29/2021 IRA Committee Meeting Roll Call

Attendance		Board Members		
Voting Members:			Present	Absent
HSS - Faculty	ABNET	DUSTIN	1	
HHD - Student	BRIDGES	KORLI	1	
COMM - Faculty	BRUSCHKE	JON	1	
COMM - Student	KELLEY	LYDIA		1
ARTS - Student	LEE	YASMINE		1
EDU - Faculty	LEEKEENAN	KIRA	1	
NSM - Faculty	MIYAMOTO	ALISON	1	
ECS - Faculty	NGO	CHEAN CHIN	1	
HHD - Faculty	NOBARI	TABASHIR	1	
EDU - Student	PERNA	BRENDA		1
HSS - Student	RICHED	TASNEEM		1
ECS - Student	SHARMA	RADHIKA		1
ARTS - Faculty	TUCKER	JAMIE	1	
CBE - Student	VACANT			
NSM - Student	VYAS	SONALI	1	
CBE - Faculty	XIE	JIA		1
Chair	REVELES	MARCUS	1	
			Present	Absent
			10	6

Attendance		Liaisons		
			Present	Absent
ASI ED	EDWARDS	DAVE	1	
VPA&F	MASOUD	HOMAIRA	1	
UPR	MOLLENAUR	JEANNIE		1
VPAA REP	STANG	KRISTIN	1	
VPASA	WARD	CATHERINE	1	
			Present	Absent
			4	1

\*Recording Secretary: Brian Erskine

Roll Call Votes			002 - Line Item Transfer 3305		
			Yes	No	Abstain
ARTS - Student	LEE	YASMINE			Absent
ARTS - Faculty	TUCKER	JAMIE	1		
CBE - Student	VACANT				
CBE - Faculty	XIE	JIA			Absent
COMM - Student	KELLEY	LYDIA			Absent
COMM - Faculty	BRUSCHKE	JON	1		
EDU - Student	PERNA	BRENDA			Absent
EDU - Faculty	LEEKEENAN	KIRA	1		
ECS - Student	SHARMA	RADHIKA			Absent
ECS - Faculty	NGO	CHEAN CHIN	1		
HHD - Student	BRIDGES	KORLI	1		
HHD - Faculty	NOBARI	TABASHIR	1		
HSS - Student	RICHED	TASNEEM			Absent
HSS - Faculty	ABNET	DUSTIN	1		
NSM - Student	VYAS	SONALI	1		
NSM - Faculty	MIYAMOTO	ALISON	1		
CHAIR	REVELES	MARCUS	1		
			Yes	No	Abstain
			10	0	0



**Instructionally Related Activities (IRA)  
Request for Line Item Transfer**



Fiscal Year 2021-2022

Program Name & Number Forensics 3305 Date 10/22/2021

**Account(s) to Transfer From:**

Account #	Current Budget Amount *	Transfer Amount	Revised Budget Amount
3305-8077	75000	37850	37150

**Account(s) to Transfer To:**

Account #	Current Budget Amount *	Transfer Amount	Revised Budget Amount
8050	2000	2400	4400
8052	200	2400	2600
8074	8563	33050	41613

**NOTE: Request Only Even Dollar Amounts to be Transferred  
Send Form to IRA Funding, c/o ASI Financial Services, TSU-224.  
Amounts over \$1,000 must be approved by the IRA Committee.**


Reason for Transfer (detailed information required):

**\*Current budget amount should be entered here. However, if other transfers have occurred, contact the ASI Financial Services Office (x2404) for the current amount .**

**Approvals:**

Faculty in Charge of IRA Program

Erika M. Thomas  
Print Name

  
Signature

x8319  
Extension

IRA Committee Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Line Item Transfer Completed By \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
ASI Financial Services Personnel

**Forensics (3305) - transfer request 2021**

**\*all requested amounts to be transferred from line item account 8077 (travel)**

Request to transfer **\$2,400.00** into 8050 Supplies

- c. Other Expendable Supplies
  - i. **\$2,400.00**
  - ii. **Plaques, serving as awards for the 2021-2022 virtual MS/HS tournaments (roughly 400 @ 6.00 per award)**

Request to transfer **\$2,400** into 8052 Communications

- a. Postage/Mailing
  - i. **\$2,400.00**
  - ii. **mailings of small parcels and boxes of student competition awards (70 packages @ \$20.00 in the fall, 50 packages @ \$20.00 in the spring)**

Request to transfer **\$33,050** into 8074 Contracts/Fees/Rentals

- a. Speakers/Master Classes/Performers
  - i. **\$30,050.00**
  - ii. **1 speaker/consultant @ \$1,000.00 (\$500.00 per semester) October 14-17, 2021 & spring dates (March or April) TBD;** provides students with additional instructional assistance, tech support consulting, and also serves as a guest speaker at the virtual hosted tournaments for all participants  
**1 speaker/consultant @ \$1,000.00, January 3-9, 2022;** provides students with additional instructional assistance, tech support consulting, and also serves as a guest speaker/tabulation consultant at the virtual hosted tournaments for all intercollegiate participants  
**3 speakers/consultants @ \$350.00 for each, upcoming spring dates (March or April) TBD;** provides students with additional instructional assistance, tech support consulting, and/or also serves as a guest speaker at the virtual hosted tournaments for all participants  
**3 speakers/consultants @ \$5,000.00 throughout 2021-2022 academic year (\$2,500.00);** provides intercollegiate student competitors with additional instruction & lectures, one-on-one coaching sessions, tech support, and judging coverage at virtual competitions  
**1 speaker/consultant @ \$12,000.00 throughout 2021-2022 academic year; (\$6,000.00 per semester)** provides intercollegiate student competitors with additional instruction & lectures, one-on-one coaching sessions, tech support, and judging coverage at virtual competitions
- c. Fees, including service fees, license copyright fees and permits
  - i. **\$3,000.00**

- ii. **cost of rental of virtual platform (\$6.00 per room x 500)** to run virtual speech/debate competitions on NSDA Canvas (roughly 500 rooms per day for two days) October 15-17, 2021 and spring TBD (March or April)

The Forensics Program is requesting line-item transfers due to the changes in our activity resulting in the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. In order to complete the missions, goals, learning outcomes, and educational and high impact experiences that are typically fulfilled by the semester-long co-curricular course, the Forensics Program requires the transferring of funds from the Travel account (8077) into the Supplies account (8050), Communications (8052), and Contracts/Fees/Rentals account (8074).

Normally, travel to intercollegiate speech and policy debate tournaments is integral to our program. However, as a result of the virus, most tournaments are providing virtual or hybrid tournaments which significantly cut back on the cost of travel since our travel is not likely to be approved under these conditions or simply not necessary. We will only have the cost of registration fees, so the funds in this account will likely go unused.

**We are requesting a transfer of \$2400.00 from the Travel account (8077) into the Supplies account (8050) and \$2400.00 from the Travel Account into the Communications (8052) account.** These charges are associated with running our speech and debate tournaments for the local community (a service learning experience/high impact practice for our students in the course) now entirely online. Though these events have fewer on campus costs, we bring in less revenue and require funding to pay for plaques that serve as awards. We also need a healthy budget in the Communications account to mail the awards to each participating middle school, high school, or learning academies.

The adjustment to online speech and debate activities from travel means more time spent for instructors on a virtual setting. To accommodate students' needs and cut back on Zoom fatigue for faculty/directors, we are requesting this transfer to Contracts (8074) so that we can pay additional independent contractors and gain support for our students and the activities we run online. Normally, our co-curricular's travel schedule would provide students with meaningful and substantive experiential learning interactions and feedback from other individuals, including graduate students, scholars, instructors, and professors who worked outside the University and in other parts of the country. Such opportunities to present arguments to these various judges typically occurred on a bimonthly basis. As such, we are seeking hired contractors and speakers to further support the research projects and to give our students the opportunities to present their material to other judges and integrate their feedback for upcoming tournaments. The same individuals (often hired judges and coaches) are also willing to serve as guest speakers by virtually lecturing to our students on topics pertinent to their research interests. We intend to use the funds to compensate the time and work of these guest instructors and speakers who have agreed to virtually work with our students during class time, in one-on-one coaching sessions, and on the weekend Zoom calls.

Additionally, we require more assistance on virtual tabulation rooms and with individuals providing technical support than we did in previous semesters when our events were bi-annually run in-person on campus. In addition to hiring specific experts who know the

platforms and software, we are also facing a new cost, the purchase of the platform, which is not a program that our IT department can create or a service that they can provide for free.

To fund these curriculum changes and afford contractors and the platform, **we are asking that \$33,050.00 is transferred into our Contracts/Fees/Rentals account (8074).**

\*Please note that these numbers are estimates. It is not likely for our program to spend all of its remaining funding for the 2020-2021 academic year, but this assures that all remaining funds are in the correct line-items in case we need it.

# Action: Line Item Transfer

Line Item Number	Description
8050	Supplies- office supplies and other expendable supplies
8051	Printing and Advertising- photocopying costs, costs for designing and printing brochures, posters, forms, flyers and other materials related to the specific activity
8052	Communications- postage, mailing and freight costs
8069	Personnel Services- part-time student wages
8074	Contracts/Fees/ Rentals- speakers, performers, services fees, license copyright fees, equipment rentals, facilities rentals, etc.
8077	Travel- all costs related to travel/transportation including airfare, vehicle rental fees, lodging, meals, parking, registration fees, camping rentals, third party contracted travel services and personal vehicle mileage reimbursement
8079	Dues and Subscription- membership dues required for the operation of the program
8084	Insurance- cost of insurance related to specific activities/programs



# Action: Line Item Transfer

Item	Program	Total Amount	From	To	Reason
8.a	3305 - Forensics	\$37,850	8077	8050 8052 8074	The Forensics Program is requesting line-item transfers due to the changes in activity resulting in the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic. In order to complete the missions, goals, learning outcomes, and educational and high impact experiences that are typically fulfilled by the semester-long co-curricular course, the Forensics Program requires the transferring of funds from the Travel account (8077) into the Supplies account (8050), Communications (8052), and Contracts/Fees/Rentals account (8074).