

Associated Students Inc.



## Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee

Fri Mar 1, 2024 2:00 PM - 4:00 PM PST

### 1. Call to Order (Awadalla)

Maysem Awadalla, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:01 pm.

Student Members Present: Miranda, Sharma, Escudero, Delgado, DeGuzman, Awadalla

Student Members Absent: Calderon, Park, Baik

Faculty Members Present: Goldberg, Li, McAlexander, McKee.

Faculty Members Absent: Kurwadkar, Jung

Liaisons Present: Adamson, Macy, Juanico, Tran, Edwards.

Liaisons Absent: None

### 2. Approval of Agenda

**(Escudero-m / Miranda-s) The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.**

### 3. Approval of Minutes

#### a. 02/09/2024 IRA Committee Meeting Minutes

**(McAlexander-m / Goldberg-s) 02/09/24 IRA Committee meeting minutes were approved by unanimous consent.**

### 4. Public Speakers

*This is a time where members of the public may address the IRA Committee regarding any item on this posted agenda.*

None.

### 5. Reports

#### a. Chair (Awadalla)

Awadalla, Chair, acknowledged gratitude from various programs for funding their 2024-2025 IRA proposals. The note of one of the professors expresses appreciation

on behalf of one of the newly funded programs.

**b. ASI Executive Director (Dr. Edwards)**

Edwards, ASI Executive Director, noted that the committee was nearing the end of its term. He reminded everyone that there was only one more meeting scheduled in April to wrap up activities and transition responsibilities to the next year's committee. Typically, about half of the committee members stayed on for the following year, while new members replaced others.

**6. Time Certain:**

**a. 2:15 pm: Dr. Amir Dabirian, VP Academic Affairs/Provost**

Dr. Amir Dabirian, VP Academic Affairs/Provost, discussed potential uses for IRA reserves.

\* Dabirian emphasized the importance of providing transformative experiences for students, particularly first-generation and underrepresented individuals.

\* Highlighting the significance of study abroad programs, Dabirian underscored their role in enhancing learning, bridging achievement gaps, and fostering global citizenship. He stressed the need for fully funding such initiatives, given their proven impact on graduation rates and social mobility.

\* Acknowledging the constraints faced by existing study abroad programs, Dabirian proposed granting authority to allocate reserves to underfunded initiatives and expanding program capacity to accommodate more students.

\* He emphasized the flexibility of using funds for both study abroad and study away opportunities, advocating for initiatives that enrich students' educational experiences and prepare them for future success.

Awadalla opened the floor to questions and points of discussion.

McAlexander raised concerns about the equity of using IRA funds for study abroad programs, particularly due to their impact on a small number of students compared to other IRA initiatives. Dabirian emphasized the long-term impact of study abroad experiences, noting their value in enhancing students' educational journeys and promoting global citizenship. He highlighted the broader community impact and the role of such programs in facilitating student success and graduation.

Goldberg expressed apprehension about the sustainability of allocating IRA funds for study abroad, given the potential depletion of reserves within a year. He questioned the feasibility of continuing such funding levels and urged a cautious approach to long-term budgeting. Dabirian acknowledged the need for sustainable funding practices but advocated for maximizing the immediate benefits of available reserves. He suggested evaluating IRA fees in the future to support impactful initiatives and stressed the importance of prioritizing student experiences in the present.

Patel raised concerns about the diverse nature of study abroad programs, questioning the academic value of certain initiatives perceived as more focused on leisure activities. Dabirian agreed on the need for a clear academic mission in study abroad programs, emphasizing the importance of promoting educational experiences over recreational trips.

Dabirian proposed redirecting IRA funds towards student consumables, particularly in disciplines such as music and art, where materials are expensive. He emphasized the immediate benefits of supporting students with necessary resources while working towards reducing reserve levels.

## 7. Unfinished Business

None.

## 8. New Business

### a. Action: Line Item Transfer Request (Awadalla)

*The Committee will consider approving a Line Item Transfer request.*

**IRA 009 23/24 (Goldberg-m / Afzal-s) A motion was made and seconded to approve the line item transfer requests for 3504 Choral Programs and 3507 Jazz Ensembles.**

Awadalla yielded the floor to Collins, Assistant Director of Corporate Affairs, to review the line item transfer requests request.

The first request came from the professor of the Choral programs, seeking to reallocate funds originally designated for printing to student wages and in-state travel. This adjustment was necessary because printing expenses were no longer eligible for funding through the IRA.

The second request, for the Jazz Ensembles, involved moving funds from publications to cover registration fees for an upcoming performance event.

Both requests aimed to ensure adequate funding for program activities within the updated funding guidelines.

Awadalla opened the floor to questions and points of discussion.

There were none.

**IRA 009 23/24 (Goldberg-m/Afzal-s) Roll Call Vote: 11-0-0 The motion to approve the line item transfer requests for 3504 Choral Programs and 3507 Jazz Ensembles was adopted.**

**b. Action: IRA Governance Document Revisions 2024-25 (Awadalla)**

*The Committee will consider approving recommended revisions to the IRA Governance Document for the 2024-25 Academic Year.*

**IRA 010 23/24 (Sharma-m / Miranda-s) A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommended revisions to the IRA Governance Document for the 2024-25 Academic Year.**

Awadalla yielded the floor to Dr. Edwards, ASI Executive Director, to review the IRA Governance Document Revisions 2024-25.

Edwards provided an update on two important documents relevant to the Committee's operations. These documents, reviewed annually in spring, outline past practices, funding methods, and governance concerns, serving as a basis for recommendations to university officials. Notably, this year marks a significant transition as the management of the IRA program shifts from ASI to university academic affairs, student affairs, and administration and finance. Consequently, adjustments in procedures are anticipated.

Members were encouraged to share their experiences and propose changes during this period. Edwards highlighted the upcoming discussion with the Provost on IRA reserve levels. After gathering feedback from the Provost, the committee plans to present proposals for consideration in the next meeting.

After the Provost's report during the Time Certain section, Edwards acknowledged the Provost's earlier comments and announced plans for a collaborative effort between academic affairs, administration and finance, and student affairs to address the Provost's request regarding the use of IRA reserves. They aim to present proposals for consideration at the April meeting.

Dr. Edwards concluded by encouraging Committee members to share their thoughts or opinions on utilizing the reserves, particularly in response to the Vice President for

Administration and Finance's directive to spend them down. Input from Committee members would help inform the proposals to be brought forward in April.

Awadalla opened the floor to questions and points of discussion.

McAlexander expressed concern about the timing for considering the use of funds, particularly for expanding study abroad programs in the current term. Edwards and Adamson discussed the possibility of both short-term and long-term uses for the funds, focusing on providing support for existing programs and potential expansions.

Escudero sought clarification on whether the discussion involved obtaining new requests or expanding existing ones. Edwards explained the ongoing transition of IRA management from ASI to the University and clarified his changing role within the IRA framework.

Patel inquired about the origin of the proposed changes in the document, prompting explanations about grammar corrections, title changes, and suggestions from the IRA team.

Goldberg raised a concern about the removal of a line regarding the rubric and sought confirmation that a valid rubric would be in place for all applicants. Collins reassured Goldberg that the rubric approval process is intact and referenced the funding deliberation document for further details.

The Committee moved to a roll call vote.

**IRA 010 23/24 (Sharma-m/Miranda-s) Roll Call Vote: 11-0-0 The motion to approve the recommended revisions to the IRA Governance Document for the 2024-25 Academic Year was adopted.**

- c. Action: IRA Funding Deliberation Document Revisions 2024-25 (Awadalla)  
*The Committee will consider approving recommended revisions to the IRA Funding Deliberation document for the 2024-25 Academic Year.*

**IRA 011 23/24 (McAlexander-m / Goldberg-s) A motion was made and seconded to approve the recommended revisions to the IRA Funding Deliberation document for the 2024-25 Academic Year.**

Awadalla yielded the floor to Dr. Edwards, ASI Executive Director, to review the IRA Funding Deliberation Document Revisions 2024-25.

Edwards highlighted the document's focus on detailing the funding deliberation process carried out by the committee each fall, emphasizing its relevance in distributing funds.

Collins pointed out changes in the document, such as potentially relocating the first sentence to another section for better organization. The Committee's role in reviewing and approving the application rubric and funding process was emphasized for clarity.

Edwards discussed the administrative review conducted by the IRA team after applications are submitted, focusing on compliance-related checks to ensure completeness and adherence to university standards.

Collins and Forgues addressed specific points in the document, including the incorporation of travel cost documentation into the budget documentation form and the removal of the travel spreadsheet, which was not utilized.

Edwards mentioned the addition of language to reinforce program accountability in adhering to university policies and procedures regarding fund usage, reflecting a commitment to compliance and transparency.

Awadalla opened the floor to questions and points of discussion.

Patel raised a point regarding the necessity for study abroad funds to have a clear educational component, as emphasized by the Provost. Edwards acknowledged the importance of this requirement, especially considering the unique nature of the program.

Edwards provided insights into the use of InfoReady as a software program and the involvement of college deans in rating programs, highlighting challenges faced and clarifying the purpose of Dean ratings in the deliberation process.

Edwards elaborated on the steps involved in the funding process, including considerations for existing and new programs, distribution of funds based on available resources, and the historical context of funding allocations.

Edwards addressed concerns regarding the long-term viability of funding and the implications of spending down reserves, emphasizing the need for cautious financial management and the absence of a guaranteed future funding scenario.

Edwards clarified the role of the IRA team in making final funding recommendations, which are then forwarded to the university president for approval, ensuring

transparency and accountability in the allocation process.

**IRA 011 23/24 (McAlexander-m/Goldberg-s) Roll Call Vote: 11-0-0 The motion to approve the recommended revisions to the IRA Funding Deliberation document for the 2024-25 Academic Year was adopted.**

- d. Discussion: SFAC Summary Regarding Academic Equity Proposal (Awadalla)  
*The Committee will discuss the Student Fee Advisory Committee (SFAC) summary and recommendation regarding the IRA fee.*

Edwards introduced the discussion on the 2022-2023 SFAC Summary regarding academic equity, highlighting its continuation from the previous meeting and the request by Dr. McAlexander to review the entire proposal.

Dr. Edwards highlighted the proposal submitted by Dr. Bruske to the Student Fee Advisory Committee, calling for stable funding of 38.1% of the IRA budget for sections B through G, which encompass non-athletics identifiable programs such as music, drama, arts, student newspaper, and debate.

Forgues briefly mentioned SFAC's role in the review process and highlighted the requirement for a referendum for any proposed fee increases, underscoring the significance of student input.

Edwards suggested taking a recess to await Dr. Bruscke 's presence for a detailed presentation of his proposal, ensuring that his perspective is adequately represented. Awadalla officially recessed the meeting until Dr. Bruscke 's anticipated arrival at 3:30 PM, encouraging participants to return promptly. Upon reconvening, Edwards noted Dr. Bruscke 's absence and sought confirmation from other attendees about their readiness to proceed.

Edwards provided an overview of the categories outlined in the proposal, including sections B through G for non-athletics programs and section H for other activities, which includes study abroad.

Upon arriving, Bruscke provided a summary of the proposal, highlighting its aim to ensure stable and adequate funding for academic IRA programs listed in Education Code categories B through G. He emphasized the disparity in funding mechanisms between academic IRA programs and athletics, noting the need for academic programs to reapply for funding annually.

Bruschke explained that the proposal seeks to provide consistency and stability in funding for academic programs, which is crucial for student participation and program continuity. He also mentioned that the proposal has already received approval from the IRA program and suggested that the IRA committee has the authority to adopt it without needing additional approval.

Awadalla opened the floor to questions and points of discussion.

Goldberg raised a technical question regarding the outdated list of programs included in the proposal and its relevance to the current discussion. Collins clarified that the list of programs in the proposal serves as an example rather than an exhaustive representation of current programs, highlighting its illustrative purpose. Edwards supplemented the discussion by providing context on the Education Code language regarding program categories, emphasizing that they are suggested rather than mandatory for funding.

Goldberg inquired about the nature of the proposal and how it would affect existing and new programs within the IRA framework. Bruschke clarified that existing programs listed in the education code as IRA programs would receive stable funding, with any adjustments being the purview of the IRA committee.

McAlexander raised concerns about the decision-making process for allocating funds, particularly regarding the potential impact on existing programs and the inclusion of new programs. Bruschke expressed frustration over the lack of clarity in the process, emphasizing the need for clearer policies and procedures.

Adamson sought clarification on the next steps for the proposal and the process for implementation. Edwards explained that the proposal would require a referendum for approval by the student body, as indicated by the student Fee Advisory Committee's directive.

Patel questioned how new programs would be accommodated and expressed concerns about potential reductions in funding for existing programs. Bruschke underscored the importance of honoring existing programs and called for clarity in decision-making processes.

## **9. Announcements and Members Privilege**

Adamson announced the conclusion of Black History Month and highlighted the various celebrations held on campus throughout the month. She then shared the news that March marks Women's History Month, a time for celebrating women's achievements and contributions.



**10. Adjournment (Awadalla)**


Awadalla, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 3:58 pm.



ASU President | Apr 16, 2024 11:47 PDT

---

Maysem Awadalla, Chair



---

Erika Perret-Martinez, Recording Secretary

# Roll Call 2023-2024

03/01/2024 IRA Committee Roll Call

MEMBER ATTENDANCE ROSTER				
STUDENT -LAST	FIRST	College	PRESENT	ABSENT
MIRANDA	KASANDRA	ARTS	1	
SHARMA	AKSHITA	CBE	1	
CALDERON	GIOVANNI	CCOM		1
PARK	ASHLEY	ECS		1
ESCUDERO	SEDONA	EDU	1	
DELGADO	ERNESTO	HHD	1	
BAIK	JUDY	HSS		1
DEGUZMAN	ALDRIN	NSM	1	
AWADALLA	MAYSEM	CHAIR	1	
FACULTY	FIRST	College		
GOLDBERG	RANDALL	ARTS	1	
LI	DAOJI	CBE	1	
MCALEXANDER	MICHAEL	CCOM	1	
KURWADKAR	SUNDERSHAN	ECS		1
MCKEE	AJA	EDU	1	
JUNG	DEANNA	HHD		1
AFZAL	AHMED	HSS	1	
PATEL	NILAY	NSM	1	

LIAISONS ATTENDANCE ROSTER				
LAST	FIRST	DEPT	PRESENT	ABSENT
ADAMSON *	ALYSSA	VPAA	1	
MACY	DAWN	VPSA	1	
JUANICO	RAYMOND	VPAF	1	
TRAN	LINH	UPR	1	
EDWARDS	DAVE	Advisor	1	
			5	0

\*Recording Secretary: Erika Perret-Martinez

\* Arrived after unfinished business

Adamson - Excused for University Business

### 03/01/24 IRA Committee Meeting Roll Call

			09 Line Item Transfer Request			10 IRA Governance Doc. Revisions		
College	LAST	FIRST	YES	NO	ABSTAIN	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
ARTS	MIRANDA	KASANDRA	1			1		
ARTS	GOLDBERG	RANDALL	1			1		
CBE	SHARMA	AKSHITA	1			1		
CBE	LI	DAOJI	1			1		
CCOM	CALDERON	GIOVANNI						
CCOM	MCALEXANDER	MICHAEL	1			1		
ECS	PARK	ASHLEY						
ECS	KURWADKAR	SUNDERSHAN						
EDU	ESCUDERO	SEDONA	1			1		
EDU	MCKEE	AJA	1			1		
HHD	DELGADO	ERNESTO	1					
HHD	JUNG	DEANNA						
HSS	BAIK	JUDY						
HSS	AFZAL	AHMED	1			1		
NSM	DEGUZMAN	ALDRIN	1			1		
NSM	PATEL	NILAY				1		
CHAIR	AWADALLA	MAYSEM	1			1		
			YES	NO	ABSTAIN	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
			11	0	0	11	0	0

			011 IRA Funding Deliberation 24/25		
College	LAST	FIRST	YES	NO	ABSTAIN
ARTS	MIRANDA	KASANDRA	1		
ARTS	GOLDBERG	RANDALL	1		
CBE	SHARMA	AKSHITA	1		
CBE	LI	DAOJI	1		
CCOM	CALDERON	GIOVANNI			
CCOM	MCALEXANDER	MICHAEL	1		
ECS	PARK	ASHLEY			
ECS	KURWADKAR	SUNDERSHAN			
EDU	ESCUDERO	SEDONA	1		
EDU	MCKEE	AJA	1		
HHD	DELGADO	ERNESTO			
HHD	JUNG	DEANNA			
HSS	BAIK	JUDY			
HSS	AFZAL	AHMED	1		
NSM	DEGUZMAN	ALDRIN	1		
NSM	PATEL	NILAY	1		
CHAIR	AWADALLA	MAYSEM	1		
			YES	NO	ABSTAIN
			11	0	0

**From:** [Howat, Andrew](#)  
**To:** [Collins, Susan](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [External] Important IRA Application Update 2024-25  
**Date:** Tuesday, February 27, 2024 3:16:43 PM

---

Dear Susan,

I just realized I was so blown away by this email that I forgot to respond! My apologies.

Thank you for this fantastic news – our department is delighted and humbled by the Committee’s decision to support our annual symposium. We will gratefully accept the award, and I cannot wait to start planning the event and the seminar that goes with it. I will keep an eye out for information about the training orientation.

Please communicate our gratitude and appreciation to the Committee for all its hard work, not only on behalf of the Department of Philosophy but above all on behalf of our students – this funding will save them vast amounts of time and stress, making the event itself more enjoyable and more educational, and freeing up time for them to concentrate on their studies, instead of on fund-raising efforts and all the related admin that usually comes with it.

Thanks and best wishes,

Andrew

Andrew Howat  
Professor of Philosophy  
California State University, Fullerton

[ahowat@fullerton.edu](mailto:ahowat@fullerton.edu)

657-278-2157

[www.andrewhowat.com](http://www.andrewhowat.com)

[www.whystudyphilosophy.com](http://www.whystudyphilosophy.com)

---

**From:** Susan Collins <support@inforeadyreview.com>  
**Date:** Monday, February 5, 2024 at 7:36 PM  
**To:** Howat, Andrew <ahowat@fullerton.edu>  
**Cc:** Nichols, Ryan <rnichols@fullerton.edu>, Schorz, Jennifer <jschorz@fullerton.edu>  
**Subject:** [External] Important IRA Application Update 2024-25

External Email Use Caution and Confirm Sender



## Action: Line Item Transfer

Item	Program	Total Amount	From	To	Reason
8.a	3504 – Choral Programs <b>Prof. Robert Istad</b>	\$3,900	Printing	Student Wages & In-State Travel	The program is requesting to move funds from printing to Student Wages and In-State Travel.
8.a	3507 – Jazz Ensembles <b>Prof. Bill Cunliffe</b>	\$279	Publications	Registration Fee	The program is requesting to move funds from publications to support the Jazz Ensembles registration fee for their upcoming performance event.

# Governance Document for the Instructionally Related Activities Committee

[1]

## PURPOSE

This document shall serve as the central organizing document for the Instructionally Related Activities (IRA) Committee. The purpose of the IRA Committee (henceforth, “committee”) is to oversee the IRA process, review and recommend changes to policies and procedures, review applications, and make annual budget recommendations to the University President. This document centralizes and supersedes previous reports and recommendations.

## SECTION I: COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The IRA Committee is composed of:

### Voting Members

- Chair<sub>5</sub>
  - Currently enrolled student
  - ASI President or designee for one-year term
  - Shall have full voting privileges to ensure a student voting majority exists
- 8 Student Representatives
  - Currently enrolled
  - One from each college
  - Appointed by ASI President
  - One-year term
- 8 Faculty Representatives
  - One from each college
  - Appointed by Academic Senate Chair upon recommendation of college Dean
  - Two-year term
  - Terms shall expire on staggered basis, 4 colleges per year
  - Faculty members shall serve no more than two consecutive two-year terms
- Faculty status is defined as Unit 3 employment under the CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.

### Non-voting members

- University President representative
- Vice President of Student Affairs representative
- Vice President of Administration & Finance representative
- Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost representative
- ~~ASI Executive Director or designee~~[2]
- ~~Recording Secretary ASI,~~ [IRA Administrator][3] ~~or Accounting Staff, or designee~~

38 A quorum of the IRA Committee shall be necessary to conduct business. A quorum shall consist of  
39 the 50% of the membership plus 1. Additionally, 50% of the student and 50% of the faculty must be  
40 present to constitute a quorum.

41 Deans shall recommend faculty representatives to the Academic Senate Executive Committee, which  
42 shall consider the input and provide a recommendation to the University President. Student  
43 representatives are recommended by the President of the Associated Students Inc. (“ASI President”)  
44 according to established ASI procedures. All committee member recommendations shall be  
45 submitted to the University President for consideration by September 30 of each academic year.

46 Faculty and administration members may not be applicants or current award recipients for IRA  
47 funding. Prior experience as an IRA recipient, however, is a desirable quality to be considered in  
48 committee appointments. Student committee members who participate in an active IRA funded  
49 program are encouraged to recuse themselves from discussion and voting on that specific program.

50 Deans will direct and oversee the operational aspects of IRA program funding awarded to their  
51 college and will ensure administrative support to the faculty, staff, and students who participate in  
52 courses that benefit from the IRA fee.

53 The IRA Administrator, alongside The Chair shall set meeting times, prepare agendas, preside over  
54 all meetings, act as the official liaison between the committee and the University President, act as an  
55 official spokesperson with programs desiring funds, assure all student appointments are made by  
56 September 30, call an introductory meeting by October 30, and supervise the preparation of the  
57 recommended IRA budget for consideration by the University President.

58 The University President will consider the proposed IRA budget as submitted by the committee  
59 through the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, Vice President for Administration and  
60 Finance, and Vice President for Student Affairs. Additionally, the University President will consider  
61 all committee appointments prior to September 30.

62 The committee will

- 63 ● Review and establish policies and procedures as specified below,
- 64 ● Review budget requests from programs
- 65 ● Make budget recommendations.

66 The IRA Chair, in cases where the ASI President appoints a chair, shall receive an annual financial  
67 award equal to 10% of the average annual cost of attendance.

68 Appointed student members will receive priority registration. [4][5]

## 69 SECTION II: PURPOSE, AUTHORITY, AND RESPONSIBILITY

### 70 A. SUPPORT OF CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

71 IRA funding levels are set by the Student Fee Advisory Committee<sup>1</sup>. ~~Associated Students Inc.,~~  
72 ~~CSUF (henceforth, “ASI”)~~ The Cross-divisional IRA leadership team, CSUF (henceforth, “IRA  
73 team”) provides support to the Committee and administers the annual proposal and budget

---

<sup>1</sup> CSU, Fullerton President Executive Order 10 on Campus Student Fee Advisory Committee.

74 development for IRA. The IRA Committee has responsibility for all policies and procedures for  
75 IRA funds within the limits described below, reviews program applications, and establishes  
76 funding levels based on those applications. The Ceommittee should review funding needs and  
77 communicate them to the Student Fee Advisory Committee as needed.

78 IRA funds exist to support activities and laboratory experiences that are at least partially  
79 sponsored by an academic discipline or department and are integrally related to its formal  
80 instructional offerings.<sup>2</sup> As an overall framework, academic courses offered by academic  
81 departments are curricular activities. Other activities, including ASI sponsored[6][7], outside-of-  
82 class curricular offerings and those that are outside of the regular curricular portion of a class but  
83 integral to its content, are considered co-curricular activities. ~~While ASI sponsored co-curricular~~  
84 ~~activities are not typically considered IRA funded programs; those that are affiliated with~~  
85 ~~instruction are supported by IRA funds.~~The objective of the IRA fee is to ensure stable and  
86 adequate funding for instructionally related activities,<sup>3</sup> while also providing funds to “keep and  
87 expand current programs and allow for the development of new curriculum-related programs in  
88 the future.”<sup>4</sup> For those programs that are funded, the funding should be stable (i.e. not likely to be  
89 overturned; firmly fixed), adequate (i.e., full or partial funding that is satisfactory or acceptable),  
90 and predictable (i.e., foreseeable).

91 Because of their co-curricular nature, IRA funding must also be predictable to be effectively  
92 utilized by academic departments and cognizant of academic timelines (which are subject to  
93 change). Understanding the University’s limited financial resources, including the IRA fund, all  
94 programs are encouraged to pursue additional, alternative sources of funding to complement any  
95 IRA funds the program may receive.

## 96 B. LEVELS OF REVIEW

97 On matters of policy and for budget recommendations, the IRA Committee has the authority to  
98 review any matter relevant to IRA and report its recommendations to the Vice President of  
99 Student Affairs, Vice President of Administration and Finance, and Provost, and such  
100 recommendations become effective when signed by the President (or designee).

101 On matters of application or budget procedure[8][9], decisions of the IRA Committee become  
102 effective immediately upon a majority committee vote unless otherwise specified. Applicants  
103 may appeal a committee decision on procedure to the University President or designee by  
104 providing a written notice to the IRA Committee Chair within 48 hours of the committee vote, in  
105 which case the vote-ratified change becomes effective when signed by the President. The  
106 President shall sign or reject the change within 30 days. The IRA Committee decision remains in  
107 place during the appeal and remains in effect unless overturned.

---

<sup>2</sup> Title III, Division 8, Part 55, Chapter 2, Article 4, Section 89230.

<sup>3</sup> CSU Administrative Procedures for IRA dated March 28, 1978 and coded memorandum BA 78-13/EPR 78-15.

<sup>4</sup> CSUF IRA Referendum 2010



108 C. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

109 The following lists the authorities in order of hierarchy; authorities lower on the list are  
110 subordinate to and are superseded by decisions at higher levels.

- 111 1. *Actions by the legislature, including enacted laws such as the California Education Code.*  
112 IRA programs were created in Title 5, Division 5, Chapter 1, subchapter 3, CCR paragraph  
113 41800.2. IRA activities are regulated by Title III, Division 8, Part 55, Chapter 2, and  
114 paragraphs 89230 of the California Education Code.
- 115 2. *Executive Orders or other policy statements or directives by the CSU Board of Trustees or the*  
116 *Office of the Chancellor of the California State University System.*  
117 Historically, IRA fees were created by CSU Executive Order 290, which was superseded by  
118 Executive Order 429. CSU Executive Order 1059 further regulates Auxiliaries including  
119 delegation of authority for administration of IRA programs. These orders have since been  
120 retired. CSU Executive Order 1102 has been codified as California State University Student  
121 Fee Policy and governs student fees including Instructionally Related Activities.
- 122 3. *Presidential Directives or other policy statements by the President of California State*  
123 *University, Fullerton.*  
124 Presidential Directives that are of particular relevance to IRA activities include 11, 12, and 16.
- 125 4. *CSUF Previous IRA Referenda in 1984, 2000, 2010 and Student Success Initiative*  
126 *Referendum 2014.*<sup>5</sup>  
127 Three IRA referenda approved and adjusted the fee levels and further clarified the purpose of  
128 the IRA fee. The SSI referendum established an annual inflationary adjustment to the IRA  
129 fee.
- 130 5. *Policies of the CSUF Academic Senate and the ASI.*  
131 University Policy Statements sections 300 pertain to student policies and sections 400 pertain  
132 to curricula.
- 133 6. *Orders or other policy statements by the Provost of Cal State, Fullerton, Vice President of*  
134 *Administration and Finance, or the Vice President of Student Affairs.*  
135 The Vice President of Administration and Finance, Vice President of Academic  
136 Affairs/Provost, or the Vice President of Student Affairs, may issue policy documents.
- 137 7. *Policies and Procedures of the IRA Committee, as codified in this document.*

138 D. COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS

139 The IRA Committee is empowered to formulate, review, and recommend policies and procedures  
140 regarding the process for recommending funding levels for programs using Instructionally  
141 Related Activities funds.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://asi.fullerton.edu/services>

142 The Committee will recommend the use of IRA reserves according to the IRA Reserve Policy.  
143 Annually, the Committee will review the reserve policy and recommend modifications to the  
144 Vice President of Administration and Finance (or designee).

145 The IRA Committee will review annual budget requests and forward its recommendations for the  
146 budget to the Vice President of Student Affairs (or designee), who will forward their  
147 recommendations to the Provost (or designee), who will forward their recommendations to the  
148 Vice President of Administration and Finance (or designee), who will forward their  
149 recommendations to the University President. The University President may accept, modify or  
150 reject any funding recommendation, and the final decision on funding allocations rests with the  
151 President.

#### 152 E. POLICIES AND PROCEDURES DECISION PROCESSES

153 IRA procedures regarding application and funding deliberation should be appended to this  
154 document, updated in a timely way, and to the maximum extent possible be made publicly  
155 available. Procedures should be numbered, and amendments should be dated with the amending  
156 authority cited.

### 157 SECTION III: SPECIFIC POLICIES

#### 158 A. TIMELINES AND PURPOSES

159 Because of their co-curricular nature, all IRA courses are included as part of course offerings and  
160 must therefore follow the academic calendar. The timeline should be set so that funding  
161 decisions can be made, when possible, prior to the Final Draft scheduling deadline for course  
162 offerings.<sup>6</sup> For example, funding decisions for the AY2020/21 semester should be announced  
163 prior to the course deadline for the fall 2020 Final Draft scheduling deadline. The Final Draft  
164 scheduling deadline is typically in late February or early March. Therefore, the meeting calendar  
165 will need to be set so that applications can be received in time for decisions to be made and  
166 announced by the Final Draft deadline. The first meeting of the year should review the  
167 deliberation process and the evaluation rubric; ~~any changes to the rubric should be made before~~  
168 ~~applications are solicited.~~

#### 169 B. ELIGIBILITY FOR FUNDING

170 Activities that are considered to be essential to a quality educational program and an important  
171 instructional experience for any student enrolled in the respective program may be considered  
172 instructionally related activities. Eligibility for funding does not guarantee funding but simply  
173 designates that a program may have its application for funding considered by the IRA  
174 Committee.<sup>7</sup>

175 The program shall be required as part of a class for which residential academic credit can be  
176 applied towards an undergraduate or graduate degree. The program must be closely related to  
177 and/or in support of the classroom study of students. The program must be offered in the Fall,  
178 Spring, Winter or Summer terms. Courses must have received final University approval. The

---

<sup>6</sup> The 2016 Task Force recommends fewer meetings of longer duration, perhaps daylong length. The 2018 Working Group recommended an earlier timeline with specific dates; this document incorporates the spirit of the 2018 Work Group in policy language that does not codify specific dates.

<sup>7</sup> The 2016 Task Force report, p. 7. See also CSU Executive Order 429; eligibility is distinct from funding level.

179 program should normally include a high proportion of required participatory activity on the part  
180 of enrolled students. By definition, a class that instructs through planned and supervised  
181 activities would be eligible, but a class that instructs through lectures, seminars, and individual  
182 projects, would not be eligible as IRA programs are intended to be experiential, and active student  
183 participation is required for funding. For example, travel to conferences, exhibitions, concerts, or  
184 meetings is fundable only when students are presenting, performing, competing, or otherwise  
185 actively engaged.

186 The student activity associated with the program must be deemed by the IRA Committee to be  
187 integrally related to the formal instructional offerings of the University and will meet a  
188 requirement for one or more courses. Additionally, the IRA Committee must determine that the  
189 program involves enrolled students in a significant out-of-class activity, which results in a  
190 planned product. Such products include, but are not limited to, competition or performance before  
191 an audience, a display of equipment or material of instructional value to the University  
192 community, or a written or electronic publication or other media available to university students.

193 A program requesting approval for funding from IRA funds must meet one of the following  
194 criteria to be considered eligible for funding.<sup>8</sup> The titles and descriptions below represent the  
195 categories of IRA funding in the original CA educational code applicable to the entire CSU  
196 system; they may not directly represent titles of departments or programs at CSUF.

197 1. Intercollegiate Athletics

198 Costs necessary for a basic competitive program including equipment, supplies, and scheduled  
199 travel not now provided by the State. Athletic grants are not included. Athletic funding from the  
200 IRA fund is guaranteed per student-approved referendum.

201 2. Radio, Television, and Film

202 Costs related to the provision of basic “hands-on” experiences not now provided by the State.  
203 Purchase/rental of film as instructional aids is not included.

204 3. Music and Dance Performances

205 Costs to provide experience in individual and group performance (including recitals) before  
206 audiences and in settings sufficiently varied to familiarize students with performing.

207 4. Drama and Musical Productions

208 Basic support of theatrical and operatic activities sufficient to permit experience with  
209 performance, production, set design, and other elements considered a part of professional training  
210 in these fields.

211 5. Art Exhibits

212 Support for student art shows given in connection with degree programs.

---

<sup>8</sup> Title III, Division 8, Part 55, Chapter 2, Article 4, Section 89230.

213 6. Publications

214 Costs to support and operate basic publication programs including a periodic newspaper and other  
215 laboratory experience related to journalism and literary training. Additional publications designed  
216 primarily to inform or entertain shall not be included.

217 7. Forensics

218 Activities designed to provide experience in debate, public speaking, and related programs  
219 including travel required for a competitive debate program.

220 8. Other Activities

221 Activities associated with other instructional areas, which are consistent with purposes included  
222 in the above, may be added as identified and approved by the campus President.<sup>[CS10]</sup>

223 9. Other Programs and Considerations

224 A program that does not meet one of the established categories (1 – 9 above) may be considered  
225 an IRA eligible program if the program is a primary component of a class in which residential  
226 academic credit is earned and is closely related to and/or in support of the classroom study.

227 Existing guidelines suggest “stable and adequate” funding for existing programs along with a  
228 need to “keep and expand current programs and allow for the development of new curriculum-  
229 related programs in the future.” A further consideration is that the normal process of inflation will  
230 require additional funding for existing programs. These pressures are not unique to IRA funding  
231 and the need for innovation must be balanced against the need for stability. As a general rule, this  
232 will require careful consideration by the Committee to balance the support of long-standing  
233 IRA-funded programs, while also supporting funding of new programs.

234 **IRA funds cannot be used for the following:** Athletic grants; purchase or rental of films as  
235 instructional aids; publications designed primarily to inform or entertain (other than periodic  
236 newspaper and laboratory experiences related to journalism and literary training); non-recurring  
237 maintenance and repair and capital improvement projects; and faculty and professional staff  
238 salaries, and other forms of compensation normally funded through the University’s instructional  
239 program.

240 IRA will not directly reimburse students for instructionally related activities expenses or  
241 reimburse faculty/staff for payments made to vendors for services performed or goods purchased  
242 where CSUF is obligated to report such payment to the IRS on form 1099.

243 C. APPLICATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROPOSAL REVIEW  
244 PROCEDURES

245 The Committee will evaluate all completed IRA proposals received by the announced application  
246 deadline. A complete proposal submission will include a current year application (reviewed and  
247 certified by the faculty member, department chair, and Dean). Returning programs shall also have  
248 previously submitted their prior year’s final report. All IRA proposals, which meet the criteria for  
249 IRA funding, will be equitably considered for funding by the IRA Committee.

250  
251 Evaluation Workload and Scoring  
252 The Committee will review and approve the rubric and the deliberation/funding process in the  
253 spring semester and propose any changes to the University President, if necessary. The approved  
254 deliberation/funding process and the approved rubric scores will be used in the fall semester to  
255 determine which programs will be recommended to receive IRA funding. The rubric may be  
256 edited to include campus priorities, as well as the need to provide ongoing support for activities  
257 essential to quality programs “that aid and supplement the foundational educational mission of the  
258 institution.” Because of the possible inequitable impact, student self-contributions will not be  
259 included as rubric criteria.

260  
261 The total workload for evaluating proposals shall be divided so that each committee member  
262 reviews a roughly equal number of proposals, and all proposals are reviewed by at least three  
263 committee members. The evaluation will be based on a rubric (included in the appendix); this  
264 rubric is considered a procedural document and may be reviewed and amended by a majority vote  
265 at any time prior to the call for proposals. In addition, each program will be rated by the Dean of  
266 the college, and those ratings will be submitted to the IRA Committee prior to the committee’s  
267 final rankings. The Committee should be mindful that the rubric is intended to mitigate bias.  
268 However, it may be difficult for committee members outside of certain specialties to precisely  
269 evaluate the importance and impact of programs within a specialty. Therefore, the rubric and a  
270 deliberation process may be necessary to determine funding allocations.

271 Prior to the funding deliberation process, the IRA Committee will be informed of the available  
272 funds for distribution to potential programs. Per a student-approved referendum in 2010, the IRA  
273 allocation to Titan Athletics shall be 36% of the total IRA fee (after the administrative fee). The  
274 IRA allocation to Titan Athletics will be primarily used for student-athlete travel and operational  
275 expenses. Titan Athletics will not participate in the annual deliberation process. The remaining  
276 IRA fee will be available for distribution to IRA programs. Athletics funding does not follow the  
277 processes outlined in this document.

278 Evaluation Criteria  
279 Prior to the start of the evaluation cycle, all IRA Committee members will participate in a guided  
280 rater training session, where rater calibration activities will be completed using the approved  
281 rubric for the current academic year and proposals from a previous cycle.

282 Subsequently and using the approved rubric, all proposals will be rated by a minimum of three  
283 committee members, with no committee member rating proposals from their own college.[11] The  
284 Committee will review completed applications through the designated application review  
285 software and input their rubric ratings by the published date. ASI-Administration and Finance will  
286 be tasked with calculation of the overall rubric score per rater based upon the weighted rubric  
287 category scores. Once all proposal rubric ratings have been received, the proposal rating for each  
288 submission will be calculated with an average score and standard deviation for that score. The  
289 ASI-IRA-Administration Office- Admin and Finance will then calculate and prepare a report of  
290 these values for presentation to the IRA Committee.

291 Proposals will be listed in rank order by overall average score (along with standard deviation for  
292 each average score), ~~and will include the Dean's rating~~ and the total requested funds and  
293 presented to the committee. Allocations will be determined utilizing the deliberation/funding  
294 process approved in the fall, including the additional consideration of weighting variables, Dean's  
295 ratings, etc. as factors contributing to the final funding recommendation.

#### 296 Appeals

297 Applicants will have five business days after receiving the award notification to request an appeal  
298 to the IRA Committee. The applicant must be able to demonstrate that a technical or procedural  
299 error was made and support it with the appropriate documentation. The ~~C~~committee will review  
300 the request for appeal before reconsidering the proposal for funding. If an applicant is  
301 successfully able to appeal the decision, the recommendation for funding for the program will be  
302 modified appropriately. Once a decision is made on the appeal, the recommendation for the  
303 revised program IRA budget will be submitted to the University President for approval.

304  
305 Following the University President's approval of the annual IRA budget, the amount of the IRA  
306 allocations and any restrictions on how those funds are to be spent will be communicated by the  
307 ~~Associated Students, Inc. IRA team~~ to the faculty requestor, the respective department chair, and  
308 the office of the Dean ~~and Administration and Finance Resource Planning and Budget~~.

#### 309 Contingency requests

310 No contingency requests are accepted.

#### 311 Presentations

312  
313 Presentations for individual programs or proposals are neither required nor generally held, but  
314 might occur upon a majority vote of the ~~C~~committee. For example, the ~~C~~committee might wish  
315 to hold a presentation prior to discontinuing all or a major portion of funding for an existing  
316 program.  
317  
318

### 319 SECTION IV: AWARD ADMINISTRATION FRAMEWORK

320 ~~The ASI will work with campus Resource Planning and Budget to~~ The IRA team will ensure program  
321 awards are updated in the campus system for the fiscal year. Each college shall review and oversee  
322 the IRA fee for awarded programs within their college and provide support to faculty, staff, advisors,  
323 and the students who participate in courses that benefit from this fee. Every year, ~~the committee~~ the  
324 IRA team updates its website, provides online orientation and accepts proposals for the following  
325 academic year.

326 Accounting procedures are governed by Chapter 12 of the CSU Legal Accounting and Reporting  
327 manual (section 3.0). Additional accounting procedures may be created by the ~~Executive Director or~~  
328 ~~designee~~ IRA team. Committee decisions may not contravene local, state, or federal law, CSU, or  
329 CSUF policy.

330 Accounting procedures are available on the Cal State Fullerton website.

331 IRA accounting procedures must follow the accounting procedures and policies of CSUF since the  
332 IRA fee is a Category II fee. All IRA programs must follow university policies regarding

333 procurement, contracts, travel, student employment, etc. ~~Annually, ASI~~Every other year, the IRA  
334 team will provide a status update to the Student Fee Advisory Committee regarding the IRA fee's  
335 status, its allocation, and current usage.

## IRA Funding/Deliberation Process

### 2023-24 Academic Year

The IRA Committee will evaluate all completed IRA proposals received by the announced application deadline.<sup>[CS1]</sup> The Committee will review and approve the application rubric and the deliberation/funding process in the spring semester of each academic year and propose any changes to the University President, if necessary. The approved deliberation/funding process and the approved rubric scores will be utilized in the fall semester to determine which programs will be recommended to receive IRA funding. The rubric may be edited by a majority approval of the IRA Committee to include campus priorities, while providing ongoing support for quality programs “that aid and supplement the foundational educational mission of the institution.”<sup>1</sup>

#### IRA Application Process

A call for application submissions will be issued to all campus faculty in summer. The open call will allow members sufficient time to prepare and submit their proposals for the activity and use of funds for their program(s). Applications will route through the InfoReady portal on the website of the Office of Research and Sponsored Projects (<https://csuf.infoready4.com/>). The system will allow for application submission, Department Chair review and approval, Dean rating and approval, [ASI-IRA team](#) review and confirmation of eligibility, Committee review and rating, and notification of funding status to all programs. Additionally, the system will track the final report submissions and communicate when the reports are due.

#### Post-Application Process

After receipt of applications for IRA funding, ~~ASI will conduct an administrative review- an administrative review will be conducted by the IRA team to~~ and prepare the applications for consideration by the Committee. This process will typically occur in the fall prior to the beginning of the Committee’s deliberation. This administrative review will confirm:

- Mandatory funding orientation was completed through the Employee Training Center (ETC).
- IRA Final Report for the previous year was submitted, if the program received an award in the prior year. The report summarizes the program’s learning outcomes and financial performance in the prior year.
- Syllabus for the course listed in the application was submitted
- Courses listed in the application have final University approval
- Start/end dates of the program match the semesters the course is taught and are within the upcoming fiscal year (July 1 through June 30 of the next year)
- Expenditures listed in the application are eligible for IRA funding. Return the application to the submitter to modify and remove ineligible items from the proposal

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.fullerton.edu/data/assessment/assessment\\_at\\_csuf/missionstrategicplan.php](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/assessment/assessment_at_csuf/missionstrategicplan.php)



and a modified proposal is submitted to the Committee for consideration and noted in the application review.

- Travel costs are documented on the appropriate form for each trip[2][3]. Additionally, travel dates are confirmed to ensure travel occurs during the fiscal year.
- Travel is required for course credit by verifying with the syllabus.
- Proposals for new programs meet the general criteria from the IRA Governance Document
- The amount of the request is between \$2,000 (minimum award) and \$120,000 (maximum award).

Programs that fail to submit their final report from the prior year as required will only be considered for funding after consideration of all programs that submitted a complete application, if funds are available.[4]

### Committee Role

Using the approved rubric, all proposals will be rated by a minimum of three Committee members, with no Committee member rating proposals from their own college. Proposals will be assigned to each voting committee member for evaluation through the application funding software program. Each committee member will have access to the following:

- Current year application
  - Prior year final report, if applicable
  - Budget spreadsheet
  - ~~Travel spreadsheet as applicable~~
  - Certification of Department Chair
  - Dean's approval and rating
  - Any modifications made to the application by ASI the IRA team
- Study abroad add educational component requirement

Committee members will conduct their evaluation and electronically submit their rubric ratings ~~to ASI in InfoReady~~ for calculation by the published evaluation deadline. ~~The IRA Administration Office~~ Administration and Finance will be tasked with calculation of the overall rubric score per rater based upon the weighted rubric category scores.

### **Deliberation Considerations**

To outline a fair process to allocate IRA funds, the following deliberation process is provided. The purpose of the deliberation process is to determine how to fund as many programs as possible. Factors to consider include how existing programs have used funds in prior years, how to provide “stable and adequate” funding, and how to encourage new and innovative programs. Because returning programs have additional information (prior year ratings, prior funding levels, prior expenditure levels, etc.) there are additional factors considered. See Governance Document section III-B for more guidance on balancing funding priorities. The Committee should keep in mind the purpose of the IRA funds to balance the needs of returning and new programs.

Prior to the first deliberation meeting with approval of the IRA Committee Chair, ASI the IRA team will submit to the Committee an overall summary of the applications including the following:

- Rubric score averages, including standard deviation
- College Dean ratings[5], if necessary
- Requested funding amount
- Revised funding amount
- Prior year funding award and rating, if applicable
- Three-year average use of funds

Proposals will be listed in rank order by overall average score (along with standard deviation for each average score). In the case of a tie in committee rankings, the Dean ratings will be considered. Allocations will be determined utilizing all available information, including the weighting rubric averages, Dean's ratings, prior year final report, etc., as factors contributing to the final funding recommendation. Programs will be rated by the Dean based on the merit of the program according to the college mission on a scale of 1 to 3 similar to the rubric. (3 - excellent, 2 - good, and 1- needs improvement)

The Committee should review any program that has a high standard deviation or a change (higher or lower) from one quartile to another from the previous year's rankings prior to making a funding decision to determine if the current ranking is appropriate. If necessary, an additional rater will be utilized and included in the average rating score.

It is important to realize that there typically are limited and often insufficient IRA funds to fully award to all programs. The Committee's purpose is to apply a critical analysis, remain focused on the intent of the IRA program, and make difficult decisions regarding which programs to fund.

The IRA Committee will, following Robert's Rules of Order, utilize a speakers' list during deliberation and debate to ensure that every voice is heard. Speakers will be called upon in order and individuals will be asked to allow others to speak first before joining the discussion for a second time. Because of IRA's student-engagement focus, student committee members are encouraged to actively participate in the deliberation discussion.

### **Funding Process**

Funding will be provided based on a correlation to the program's rubric ranking as outlined below:

#### **Step 1**

The budget shall be presented to the Committee as soon as it is available. Available funds for the upcoming year's awards are based on the estimated fee income minus the administration fee, and the 36% allocation to Athletics program (per 2010 student referendum) plus any surplus (unused) funds from the prior year.

## Step 2

ASU-The IRA team will conduct a review and analysis of all applications to ensure compliance with all regulations, policies, requirements, and application criteria. Applications that meet the requirements will be prepared for submission to the IRA Committee. To address the importance of balancing funding for existing and new programs, while establishing limits for both, the following application limits exist for existing and new applicants:

**Existing:** Existing programs may request a maximum increase of 10% above the previous (last closed fiscal) year's actual expenditures or an average of the prior three year's actual expenses, whichever is greater. Programs requesting more than 10% of their prior year(s) expenses must provide justification in the proposal for the increase. The Committee may award a higher increase, based on justification for the higher increase included in the proposal and with consideration of the Deans ratings, the program report from the prior year, etc. Existing programs that did not receive an award in one of the last three years will be funded based on their most recent year's actual expenditures. Existing programs that did not receive an award in any of the last three years will be funded in the same manner as a new program.

**New:** New programs may request funding based on the needs of their initial program proposal, but will be subject to all guidelines for existing programs in subsequent years.

## Step 3

All proposals will be rated by 3 committee members and the proposals will be ordered by average rubric scores, highest to lowest, and divided into quartiles.

If the total dollar amount of all requests is less than the total available funds, all programs will be funded at the calculated award amounts.

If the total of all requests is greater than the total available funds, decreases in awards will be made in the following order, to create an "adjusted award amount" and the process will be completed when the adjusted award amount is smaller than the total available funds.

## Step 4

When requests exceed available funds, all programs in the bottom quartile will not be funded unless the following conditions are met.

## Step 5

### A. If there are insufficient funds...

- Graduated cuts across all quartiles will be processed until the award amount matches the total available funds amount (i.e., all programs receive a 2% cut. If the requests still exceed available funds, all programs will receive a 4% cut, then 6%, etc.)

### B. If there are funds remaining...

- Any additional remaining funds shall be allocated as follows:
  - 50% of remaining funds distributed equally to the first quartile (not to exceed the requested amount).

- 30% of remaining funds distributed equally to the second quartile (not to exceed the requested amount).
- 10% of remaining funds distributed equally to the third quartile (not to exceed the requested amount).
- 10% of remaining funds at the discretion of the Committee may be allocated to the fourth quartile based on the merit of the program (not to exceed the requested amount).

C. The remaining funds will be returned to reserves.

#### Step 6

The minimum award is \$2,000 and the maximum award is \$120,000. Requests that fall below the minimum will receive no award and requests that fall above the maximum will be adjusted to \$120,000.

#### Step 7

The IRA team staff will submit the spreadsheet of all programs based on the calculations above to the IRA Committee for consideration. The IRA Committee will begin deliberation, including a thorough review of the rubric ratings, quartile placement, and proposed funding allocations. The IRA Committee may then discuss and consider adjustments to the proposed funding based upon additional information that includes the Dean ratings, prior year rankings (if any), and prior year final report(s).

#### Step 8

When the process is complete, a review of the entire list will be done to make any final adjustments to funding levels.

The IRA Committee may grant more or less funding than requested based on the funding criteria described above. In all instances, rubric rating averages, Dean's ratings, prior year final reports, etc. should inform funding decisions, but should not serve as a substitute for overall committee judgment.

### **Final Recommendation of Funding**

A majority vote by the IRA Committee is required to recommend each program's funding levels to the University President. Throughout deliberation, while there may be votes on modifications to funding levels for individual proposals, a final vote must be conducted, with a majority approval of the overall recommended IRA funding/budget.

### **Appeal**

If programs wish to appeal based on a technical or procedural error, they must do so within five business days. Appeals will be heard at the next regularly scheduled IRA Committee meeting. Once all appeals are resolved, the IRA Committee will make its final recommendation to the University President.

## Reserve Policy

The Committee will conduct an annual review of available reserves. A minimum reserve balance must be maintained at 10% of prior year's total awarded amount (does not include Athletics). The reserve balance should not exceed 50% of prior year's total awarded amount (does not include Athletics).

Committee will also review mid-year available current funds that could be reallocated from cancelled programs.

As part of the funding deliberation process, Staff will recommend annual use of reserves.

Discussed at the committee level, including unused prior year and fund balance, ~~the~~ Committee will consider and approve.

Use of reserves will be included in the annual funding recommendation and submitted to the VP ~~for of~~ Administration and Finance for review and approval.

Committee will annually review the reserve policy and make recommendations for modifications.