

CFR Meeting Minutes
29 August 2025
Zoom (Haynes) & VCLS 14 (All Others)
9:15 – 12:00PM

Representatives Attending:

Bonamy, Dimitrov, Drapela, Fortin, Grigar (Chair), He, LoSavio, Olson, Reisz,
Schimelpfenig, Spradlin.

Senators in attendance:

Gakhar (CT), Phelps (TT), Solovitz (TT)

Guests: Sandra Haynes (Interim Chancellor), Jacob Winstead (ASWSUV President)

Recording Secretary: Paul Bonamy

Recorders note: This meeting was structured as a half-day retreat and included lunch. Interim Chancellor Haynes was present via Zoom for the first part of the meeting. Winstead arrived as the meeting was breaking up (class obligations).

The meeting began with the selection of Bonamy as the Recorder for the 2025-26 academic year. Bonamy agrees with the understanding that recordings of meetings will be needed to produce minutes.

There followed a conversation with Sandra Haynes, Interim Chancellor of WSUV and Chancellor of WSU Tri-Cities.

First up, Haynes will be in Vancouver on Tuesday, September 2nd through the following Tuesday. Her plan is to alternate weekly between the Vancouver and Tri-Cities campuses, though she is looking for feedback on how well this works. She is open to changes in the length and frequency of visits. She will be flying back and forth, especially once we get further into the fall / winter weather.

Haynes was invited to the Faculty Assembly meeting scheduled for the 26th of September. She indicates that she plans to be in Vancouver that day. While discussing the location of the FA meeting, Haynes was visibly confused that CFR had been billed for the use of space for last fall's FA meeting and was unaware of this policy in our updated event planning guide. She mentioned that this is "a good thing to talk to Damien [Sinnott, Interim Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations] about" and notes that there are often separate policies for external and internal activities so a revisit may be in order.

Before continuing, Haynes wished to bring up two issues from her end. First, she specifically apologized to Grigar for forgetting to put a slide about CFR in her

welcome back address. Second, she suspects that she unintentionally broke protocol with the welcome back event. She was expecting more of a celebration of being back with some updates, rather than a full Q&A or big set of announcements. It was shared with Chancellor Haynes that WSUV faculty and staff generally expect Q&A opportunities at such events, and anticipated it at this one in particular given the “July Budget Update” email that went out on July 14, 2025.

Haynes was then *invited to present her impressions of campus, both strengths and weaknesses*. She described the campus as amazing and beautiful both physically and because of the dedication of the faculty and staff, indicating that she is “always amazed by how committed [we] are”. She believes this commitment is the best base to start from, especially right now.

Haynes is hesitant to comment on weaknesses, as she doesn’t really see any. Instead, *she identified a number of opportunities to better represent ourselves*. We’re generally doing a good job of making sure we’re seen, and Haynes would like to see more of this by, for example, bringing visitors to campus to see our research, and highlighting things we’re already doing. She sees strong opportunities to highlight research and initiatives we already have, as well as to bring in students and serve them well.

Discussion then moved to the goals (and costs) of our work with rpk GROUP. Total cost of the project is in the neighborhood of \$275,000. Haynes notes that this is “not cheap” but also less than Tri-Cities paid for similar work. She stressed that rpk will not be recommending actions or providing specific documents. Instead, the goal is for them to organize a view of our data that lets us see things we haven’t in the past. WSU’s data storage is currently very convoluted, so rpk will go in, pull it apart, and figure out how to look at it. From there, we can use the data to start asking our own questions and generally cleaning up our data storage.

Christine Portfors (Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Research, Graduate Education and Enrollment) and Sinnott are leading the project, along with Haynes. They’ll be having meetings with units of the form ‘here’s the data we have. It tells us this story. What story is it telling you?’ There will also be town halls. Haynes noted that the question isn’t so much which courses we offer but when. What do students want? How do we serve them better?

Haynes stated that we’ll be able to use the data to better show the impact of (proposed) changes made by the broader system. We’ll also be able to use the data to try and spur the system into cleaning up data storage, which is a task Haynes specifically identifies as her job. The data will definitely be available at at least the director level and up, and faculty will have access.

The soft due date for the information gathering survey is 22 September. It should notionally take 45 minutes to complete, but Grigar reports needing two hours. Some issues with the presentation of the survey (including poor options for text entry) were conveyed to Haynes as well.

The next question posed to Haynes was *at what point campus gets decentralized again?* HR has been centralized, advising is being centralized, and there are rumors of IT being centralized. Door locks and such already go through Pullman. It's unclear how these processes are being conducted, and how we are being represented in decision-making.

Haynes notes that updates at a recent "directors plus" meeting do not seem to have been relayed to faculty. President Cantwell is organizing ways to disseminate information, including her website and emails. As part of that, she has frequent meetings with a core group, and large meetings of system leaders. The directors plus meetings are supposed to be a way to push information from the higher-level meetings out to directors who can share it on. Many directors were missed during initial setup of the directors plus meeting, so Haynes is working to figure out who wasn't included and have them added to the list.

Haynes is of the opinion that *"the centralization bus is leaving the station"*. Some things are going to end up centralized. This could be a good thing, since, done right, it can save the institution as a whole money. That said, she believes that "when we centralize, if we're trying to make a true system of higher education, we can centralize compliance, but we cannot centralize service". For example, it makes sense for central IT to be handling cybersecurity and enabling bulk purchases of software or gear, but we still need IT services physically located at each of the campuses. Thus, when we look at centralizing, we have to be careful of what's for efficiency, what's for compliance, and what's for service.

Haynes is concerned by changes to advising. She has talked extensively with Provost Chris Riley-Tillman and the future leader of centralized advising. In her view, changes to advising could have been handled via an advisory team, but the Provost elected to use a reporting line approach instead. Per Haynes, the Provost is focused on "what is good Cougar advising?" The goal is that each campus can set its own standards, but those must be communicated back up, and advisors have to use system resources where they exist. There has already been a campus-level meeting to discuss what best practices look like for Vancouver, and the system will not be pushing down a central view. Additionally, advisors shouldn't be leaving their current units to be supervised by someone else, and rpk will be looking at how scheduling works.

Related to the topic of (de-)centralization is the question *what is the President's vision for the non-Pullman campuses? What about the Provost's? And can we have*

our own? From Haynes' perspective, the president is currently running a design process to figure out what the vision should be. This includes working with a design team that includes Kerri Davidson, President and CEO of Evolve Business Strategies (and retired Executive Director and Chief of Staff in the Office of the Chief Operating Officer at Arizona State University) and Emily Callaghan, Project Architect & Lead Facilitator, Design+. This design process will involve sending out lots of surveys about our purpose, what we should be doing, how to function better as a system, and so forth. While it's not yet clear what exactly the vision will be, it is clear to Haynes that Cantwell is deeply tied to the University's land grant mission, so the vision will include access and opportunity.

Closer to home, we have the question of *when do we get our cafeteria back?* While not strictly a budgetary issue, we do need to make sure that the cafeteria either supports itself or there is a clear mechanism to make up the difference. That said, Haynes is open to ideas, including options like bringing in a franchise or more variety of food trucks. She also notes that Tri-Cities has been bringing in a rotating selection of food trucks.

At the end of the meeting with Haynes, there was a *brief discussion of possible changes in vaccination policy for the non-residential campuses*. As far as Haynes knows, the current policy is that students who graduated from a Washington high school must already have been vaccinated, so they can simply certify that in the portal. Others will be required to be vaccinated. There is an open question as to whether non-residential campuses need the full suite of vaccinations required by the residential ones, but Haynes supports at least requiring the normal mainline vaccines, including MMR.

Following the visit from the Interim Chancellor, the meeting continued with other business.

Grigar presented some draft information on time commitments for CFR and FacSen members, broken out by position. This information has been shared with the Faculty Senate and awaiting its input.

This being the second year of Grigar's term as Chair of CFR, it is time to elect a Vice Chair. Representatives Olson and Spradlin both volunteered for the position. *Wendy Olson was selected as Vice-Chair*, and consequently CFR Chair for the 2026-27 and 27-28 academic years. She remains a representative for this year in addition to being Vice-Chair, and will need to have a replacement elected in the spring to serve as Education's rep next year. In this case we simply voted for each candidate in turn, but it was agreed that a formal system should be added to the bylaws.

Interim Chancellor Haynes' willingness to discuss the cafeteria situation prompted additional discussion of the topic. It was noted that Clark College has a culinary / hospitality program that runs their cafeteria. This prompted a question of whether we can

team up with them to run our cafeteria. To investigate this and other options, *an ad-hoc committee on food on campus was formed, consisting of Spradlin (chair) and LoSavio.*

There followed a selection of announcements and updates:

- rpk GROUP will be holding a town hall meeting Monday, September 22 from 3-4pm in VDEN 110.
 - It was noted that this conflicts with ENCS' accreditation visit by ABET. Grigar will share with Portfors.
- The fall Faculty Assembly meeting will be Friday, September 26 at 9:15am. Location TBD based on estimated attendance.

Next, the following open seats were filled:

- The discussion about who from the campus's Faculty Senate contingency will serve on Faculty Senate Steering Committee took place next. Grigar reported that there were no Career-Track faculty able to attend the meetings. She had reached out to the Faculty Senate Parliamentarian to find out how to fill this seat under this circumstance and learned that a Tenure-Track Representative could do so. This prompted a vote resulting in Grigar and Phelps being unanimously selected to serve of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee representing WSUV. Grigar has the tenure-track seat while Phelps is representing the career track. It was learned following the meeting that Shiloh Soto-Green, who represents Career-Track faculty on the Faculty Senate would be able to undertake this important service.
- *Drapela will continue to serve on the Chancellor's Advisory Council.* She will be asking for another faculty seat or two on the council, for better representation. She also notes that the schedule is currently fluctuating, which might be a good reason to have multiple faculty representatives.

This being the first meeting of the year, some time was then dedicated to fleshing out our meeting schedule. A meeting was added on October 10th. We will invite Sinnott to the November 7 meeting, and move the meeting on November 28 to November 21 and earmark it for bylaws discussion.

Regarding the bylaws, *Grigar would like to ratify the existing bylaw edits from last year at the FA meeting.* We can then work on new changes, including the aforementioned issue of contested Vice-Chair voting, and possible structural changes to the document.

Discussion then turned to constituent concerns:

- The security call pillar in Green Lot 1 has been wrapped in a trash bag for at least a year. We will investigate.

- The Provost does not support cost of living adjustments and wants to move entirely to merit-based raises. It's unclear how this would address systemic inequities, and it also directly contradicts the recommendations of FacSen's ad-hoc committee on compensation.
- We're hearing some questions about telework agreement notifications. It seems that telework policy changes for faculty are primarily for people who are out-of-state beyond just living in Portland or Moscow.
- FacSen reports that about 40% of Vancouver's faculty are contingent. What's going on with that?

ASWSUV President Jacob Winstead arrived right at the end of the meeting. We'll work with him to set up another student/faculty mixer, as well as getting student input on food on campus and the rescheduling of commencement.

Summary of discussion topics for future meetings:

- Bylaws
 - How do we handle selecting a vice-chair when multiple members volunteer?
 - Should the bylaws be partitioned into FA constitution and CFR operating procedure?
 - What should be the formal process for amending the bylaws?