

CFR Meeting Minutes
12 September 2025
Zoom & VCLS 14
9:15 – 10:45AM

Members Attending:

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

Senators in attendance:

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

Guests: Mark Stephan

Recording Secretary: Paul Bonamy

The meeting began with *a brief report on the Campus Council Retreat*, which took place on 9/5/25. The Campus Council is comprised of academic directors, members of academic affairs and the chancellor's cabinet, and representatives from student affairs and enrollment; as well as a faculty member (CFR chair) and a student representative (ASWSUV President). Grigar reports that she was the only "trench faculty" member present and has recommended that more of us be included. She further indicated that a primary focus of the retreat was centered on the goal of being a "student focused campus," which was not presented as detracting from our research mission.

Discussion of the Campus Council raised a question of whether rpk GROUP will be reaching out to the city, county, or other regional stakeholders as part of their data gathering.

There followed *a discussion with Mark Stephan on the databases maintained by the University and how The rpk Group (rpk) relates to that*. Stephan is a member of the Political Science, Public Affairs, and Social Science faculty and serves part time in an Institutional Research role in the VCAA's office. The discussion began with an acknowledgement that Stephan works with the same data rpk will be using but is not actually working with rpk directly. That was the original plan, but it was decided that rpk's review needs the full resources of system IR.

We began with a tour of the system's databases. There are three primary repositories:

- Workday holds a significant amount of data, though Stephan doesn't use data from it in his work. It's predominately related to the faculty, staff, etc.
- Institutional Research maintains a set of dashboards accessible at <https://data.wsu.edu/system-data/institutional-dashboards>. These are pre-built visualizations which have some options but can't necessarily answer all questions

one might have. About half of the data in past campus profiles have come from IR's dashboards.

- Much of the University's data is held in OBIEE. It's accessible in myWSU, but not necessarily automatically or to everyone (people who need access can request it.) This is the raw data that feeds into IR's visualizations, and most of the data rpk requests will ultimately come from here, especially student-centric data.

With a better understanding of the University databases, *discussion could turn to what rpk GROUP are doing.*

Per Stephan, rpk is not interpreting data. Instead, *the Chancellor has posed them some questions and rpk are focused on finding data with which to answer those questions.*

Exactly what questions they have been given is an open question. It was observed that it is worth reaching out to colleagues at Tri-Cities to see what data came back for them and what changes were made based on the interpretation of the data. rpk is focused on collecting data from the last three years, using system-level data to examine faculty teaching worklaos, broadly speaking, along with information on enrollment, retention, and course offerings (what is offered and what demand looks like, for example).

The overall plan is for rpk to gather up their data and then present it to the faculty for comment. They're working with IR to gather information, and do not have direct access to our databases. It's entirely possible that contradictory data will be discovered, which will have to be resolved. There have also been some initial meetings with units, but these seem to be related to difficulty in figuring out what our programs actually are specific to our campus, in light of data thus far collected. Institutional Research does not necessarily have a complete view of how programs are set up at WSUV, so rpk has been bringing their questions directly to units for input.

Following the conversation with Mark Stephan, *discussion turned to planning for the fall Faculty Assembly meeting, to be held September 26 at 9:15am.* Grigar has requested VDEN 129 and 130. Interim Chancellor Haynes and Interim VCFO Sinnott agree that it doesn't make sense for the campus to charge internal groups – like CFR – for the use of space, so they will review current practices in that regard.

The Interim Chancellor has been invited to the FA meeting, with the understanding that we want a conversation, not a set of slides. A short list of questions for her has been created, to be asked before questions from the faculty at large. The list includes:

- What questions did you pose to the rpk Group that formed the basis of its data collection?
- There are faculty affairs issues in TriCities that are concerning to us (i.e., the firing of a CT Anthropology professor shortly before classes started, their course moved to Global, and taught by someone else; CT contracts arriving just before classes start). Should we expect these situations at WSU Vancouver?
- How are we working collectively to create a Strategic Plan?

- Can you elaborate on the student-focused promise and how faculty fit into this approach?
- What do you see our community (i.e., Clark, industry, non-profit) needing from us?
- When can we start to hire again? Is it set to a specific enrollment number?

Updates to the CFR Bylaws are needed to bring them into alignment with campus composition and the actual operations of the organization. Suggested technical draft changes generated by a CFR subcommittee (Bonamy, Reisz, and Grigar) include:

- Removing the College of Medicine (as they are not an on-campus unit)
- Formalizing the process by which the FA votes
- Clarifying who may vote for unit representatives
- Specifying that Senate elections we facilitate use Senate rules
- Dealing with special elections
- Explicitly allowing the Chair to negotiate compensation other than a course release (SOP in the past)
- Providing a standing invitation to campus Senators to attend CFR meetings
- Providing a procedure for FA members and others to attend meetings

Further discussion is required to figure out changes to other areas of the Bylaws that also need to be updated:

- What is the role of adjuncts in the FA?
 - At present, adjunct faculty are not considered part of the Faculty Assembly, but general consensus within the CFR is that they should be. This has potential logistical complications around elections, assuming adjuncts become full, voting members.
- How CFR officers are selected if there are multiple candidates
 - This year saw the first instance of two people running for Vice Chair, which prompted an ad-hoc vote. A formal procedure should be documented for future cases in which there are multiple candidates for Vice Chair or Reporter. (The Chair and Immediately Past Chair are not directly elected and therefore do not need specific policy.)
- Is the existing procedure for amending the bylaws reasonable?
 - The current procedure requires a 2/3 vote of the CFR, after which a 2/3 vote of the entire FA membership is required to approve the amendment. This requirement makes actually raising enough votes difficult and would be further exacerbated by granting adjunct faculty a vote.

Bonamy has offered to work on partitioning the existing CFR bylaws into a Faculty Assembly Constitution that distinguishes the FA and CFR, grants the latter a mandate, and establishes a separate set of CFR Bylaws to govern operation of the CFR itself. Reisz has agreed to help with this project.

Minutes for the August 29th meeting were passed by email vote after the meeting.