

CFR Meeting Minutes
13 December 2024
VCLS 14 & Zoom
9:15 – 10:45AM

Representatives Attending:

Bonamy, Drapela, Grigar (Chair), He, Olson, Reisz, Schimelpfenig, Welchel

Ex-officio members in attendance:

Sekhar (Past Chair)

Guest: Caitlyn Kruger, Director of Campus & Community Outreach, ASWSUV (Associated Students of WSU Vancouver)

Recording Secretary: Paul Bonamy

The meeting began *a conversation with Caitlyn Kruger, Directory of Campus and Community Outreach for ASWSUV*. [Recorder's note: the president of ASWSUV was originally scheduled to attend alongside Kruger but was unable to at the last minute.]

Discussion focused primary on student perceptions of campus, and ways in which ASWSUV and CFR could work together, including:

- *Campus lacks a sense of community.* There's not a whole lot going on most of the time, and some examples of organic community building like a small student/staff/faculty band have been actively quashed by campus administration. Funding can be an issue in some cases, but we don't necessarily need money for people to come together, and there's no reason that student funds couldn't be supplemented with faculty / staff funds for multi-group events.
- *Campus isn't widely known, even locally.* Anecdotally, people who live in the area often aren't aware that WSUV exists, often assuming that mentions of a local college must be referring to Clark. Not knowing campus exists means we often aren't even considered as an option for prospective students.
- *Campus resources aren't widely known, either.* There's an ongoing mental health crisis among students. In principle the Student Wellness Center exists to address this, but students typically aren't aware that it exists. A town hall with the SWS held the week before Thanksgiving break was only attended by 4-5 students who mostly showed up for the food. Granted, the event was held on short notice the week before a break.
- *Students aren't particularly comfortable talking to the faculty because they really don't know us.* There are no common places for us to meet and interact outside of the bounds of class, so we don't develop community or familiarity. Compare this to institutions with watering holes – or even cafeterias – where students, staff, and faculty can interact socially.

- *There's room under our 'if it doesn't cost money, you can do it' mandate for community building and fun.* VCAA Christopher is on record giving CFR permission to do things that help morale so long as they aren't going to cost the university any money. There's no reason we can't extend that to not-entirely-academic exercises like supporting a Little Free Library or book exchange. Likewise, CFR can provide cover and support to ASWSUV if they're getting pushback just for the sake of pushback.
- *ASWSUV and CFR are going to co-sponsoring at least one event in the spring semester.* Initially, we'll work on a campus mixer during the first week of the semester. The goal is to bring students, staff, and faculty together, share some food, listen to some music, and generally get to know each other. Depending on how it goes, we can then work on additional events with similar, community building motivations.
- *Food on campus is a concern for everyone, and bringing in a new Chancellor is a great time to do something about it.* We'll want to figure out what people want to see, and then we can look into accomplishing it. Maybe we could find an outfit that would be willing to run the kitchen in VDEN. Maybe we could partner with Clark to have their students staff our space. If we can get a conversation back up and running, and have information to present, we can bring it to the new Chancellor right away.

Following the discussion with Kruger, some brief announcements were made.

The Faculty Senate meeting included reporting back on campus activities including our meeting with VCAA Christopher last week, and the hiring of the new AVCAA along with the hiring taking place in Sociology.

The MoU about AR 60 is being worked on by Faculty Senate. Hopefully a draft will be completed and shared with the President by January 9th.

The 6 December minutes were then discussed. Olson motioned to accept the minutes, with Drapela seconding. *The minutes were unanimously approved as modified.*

Much of the rest of the meeting was consumed by discussion of proposed revisions to the CFR bylaws.

A significant question is *whether adjunct faculty should be considered members of the Faculty Assembly* and factored into apportionment for CFR seats. The general opinion is that yes, adjunct faculty are faculty and thus should be counted under the umbrella of the Faculty Assembly. This is an important recognition of the role they play and helps support a sense of belonging. The primary difficulty with including adjuncts is that adjunct appointments are much more variable than other roles, which means more work may be required to have accurate numbers for voting. However, the bylaws do not, at present, stipulate quorum for the purposes of FA votes. Additionally, if votes are infrequent, we

might be able to include adjunct counting as part of apportionment for CFR seats. The university maintains mailing lists for the purposes of announcing things to the faculty. While these are known to be incorrect, they can at least serve as a starting point.

Assuming we count adjuncts as faculty, it's important to make sure they feel welcome to participate in FA functions. *It would probably be a good idea to host a special, specific to adjuncts, CFR meeting in the spring* in much the same style as the career track one last year. Scheduling is likely to be more complicated as adjuncts are more likely to have other work at CFR meeting times, but we can at least make it easy to submit comments ahead of time.

While graduate students can serve as instructor of record, the general thinking is that *at present, the ASE contact means GTAs don't need representation within CFR / the FA.*

The question of what disqualifies someone from FA membership remains an open issue. It is general agree that *the FA does not include administrators, but how do we define administrators?* Under the current rules, anyone with a faculty appointment who is not more than 50% admin is a member of the FA. The FacSen rules are more restrictive, in that they provide a list of positions that are disqualifying, in addition to the time commitments. There is a desire to exclude people who are on-paper faculty but whose role is more administrative. However, it's unclear how to identify such individuals.

There is an open question over when the CFR chair officially starts. Both the current and past chair began working in the role of chair the summer before their first semester, but neither were paid for that work. Consensus is that people should be compensated for their effort, but how? One proposal is that a small stipend (on the order of \$500) could be paid to either the outgoing or incoming chair to compensate them for their effort. Alternatively, the pay schedule could be alter so that the outgoing chair receives half a month of pay in the first half of the summer, with the incoming chair receiving half a month of pay in the second half. This latter option leaves total summer compensation approximately the same but effectively shifts it earlier by half a summer.

A related question is *when do CFR representative terms start?* The current bylaws do not stipulate but do include procedures for what to do if a summer meeting is required. Past practice is that terms start at the first meeting of the semester, leaving the previous CFR in place over the summer.

The current bylaws are both very specific and very unspecific on the question of *what does the Chair actually do?* Updated bylaws should be more specific about what is expected over the summer, deadlines for scheduling meetings, and the like. Additionally, there should be a distinction between things the Chair does and things the Chair needs to make sure are done.

As a side item, we're going to ask Mike Stamper if we can get a dedicated CFR email address created.

Another issue to consider is exactly how open CFR meetings are. Per Grigar, it's the opinion of University legal and the FacSen that CFR meetings do not count as shared governance and therefore are not required to comply with open meeting laws. Thus, we are clear to do whatever we'd like. It makes sense that meetings would be largely open to FA members, but we do need to be careful about how open meetings might affect what we can discuss. For example, we might not want arbitrary FA members to be present if we're talking to a student representing the opinions of other students (as at this meeting). Proposed language in the draft bylaws is intended to indicate that meetings are generally open but may in some circumstances need to be closed, so FA members should ask before just showing up.

As a longer-term goal, *it would be nice for the CFR Chair to automatically have a seat on Faculty Senate.* It happens to be the case that Grigar is a voting member of the Senate, but not because of her role as Chair. We will almost certainly not be able to get this change made in the Senate this year, but hopefully the emergence of CFR-like organizations on the other campuses will cause their leaders to get ex-officio Senate seats in the future.

The meeting closed with discussion of a CFR winter gathering, to be held during break.

Respectfully submitted by Paul Bonamy, Recording Secretary