

**CFR Meeting Minutes
30 January 2026
Zoom & VDEN 129
9:15 – 10:45AM**

Members attending: Bonamy, Dimitrov, Drapela, Grigar (Chair), He, LoSavio, Olson, Reisz, Schimelpfenig, Spradlin

Senators in attendance: Phelps (TT), Solovitz (TT), Thrush (CT)

Recording Secretary: Paul Bonamy

The meeting began with a report on Senate activities.

A major topic of discussion at the last Faculty Senate meeting is the *proposed 90 credit degree option*. In essence, this would allow units to stand up bachelor's degree programs that have between 90 and 120 credits, rather than the traditional 120+. These new degrees would still be subject to UCORE requirements, so the reduction in credits would come from removing a combination of in-major electives and courses outside the major, courses which currently encourage exploration and breadth of study.

The Provost's office brought the reduced-credit major proposal to FacSen's Academic Affairs committee. The University's accrediting agency, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU), recently moved to permit these programs, and there is a desire to lead in the field. However, it is not clear that any market research – usually required for new programs – has been completed. While there are reports of other schools considering reduced-credit majors, they are not schools that WSU typically considers peers.

Faculty Senators are pushing back on the proposal, calling for additional discussion. Open issues include:

- Whether there is actual demand for reduced-credit majors
- What role these majors are expected to play within the University
- How these majors would be differentiated from their full-credit counterparts
- What, if anything, it says for an R1 institution to be offering reduced-credit majors

Following the Senate report, Grigar reported on her regularly occurring meeting campus administration.

Faculty raised a concern that *campus Town Hall meetings always being at the same time means some faculty can never attend*. According to scheduling data, the busiest time for classes is between 9am and 2pm, Monday through Thursday. As such, morning meetings would probably also be problematic. However, there is support for doing dual town halls, one morning and one afternoon.

There are reports that *some programs are already making cuts* based on the Governor's requested budget changes. Since the requests have not been approved by the legislature, why is this happening? [I don't have this in my notes. – P]

An email went out which appears to indicate that the Dean of Education is physically moving to Vancouver campus. Portfors indicates that she is aware that something is happening there, but not a ton of detail. The Dean will not be solely located here but will be spending more time on our campus.

Finally, a concern was raised as to why the University President didn't meet with the campus while she was here for the most recent CAC meeting. Apparently, she was only in Vancouver long enough to attend the meeting.

Having completed reports, discussion turned to *planning the next Faculty Assembly meeting*, which will be held February 13. Planned topics of discussion include:

- 90 credit degrees
- Workload policy
- Campus town halls
- rpk
- Closure of the fountain
- The CFR Bylaws

Faculty assembly discussion naturally segued into other campus and constituent concerns:

| *Workload policy implementation seems uneven ~~and~~ to vary widely by unit.* CAS leadership has been given policy documents that apply college-wide but were told not to distribute it, and only asked for feedback from chairs, not faculty. VCEA's central policy is publicly available but is written such that incentives for doing more are unattainable in Vancouver, and it fails to account for the existence of 80/20 teaching/faculty here.

| *New Register Student Org (RSO) advisor expectations have been released which massively increase advisors' roles and requirements.* The guidelines require 1-2 hours per week of service per club, along with mandatory bi-weekly meetings with the club. There is also language ~~that~~ requires advisors to personally assume liability for club activities. Having standardized expectations for involvement is good for all involved, but these guidelines were published without drafts or soliciting feedback ~~from advisors~~, represent a huge service load, and force legal entanglements onto advisors.

Deleted: which

| The meeting closed with the approval of the minutes for the November 21st and January 16th meetings.