Academic Faculty Senate (2026-2027) Meeting MINUTES 08/22/25; 1:30-3:30 p.m.

Academic Senate	Call to order at 1:30 pm	ZOOM
Members Present		

Jessica Rowe (Chair)	Present
Patrick Bell (Vice Chair)	Present
Winnie Kortemeier (Senator Carson)	Present
Jolene Coverston (Senator Fallon/Douglas/Recorder)	Present
Michael Coudriet (NAH Senator)	Present
Brigitte Dillet (Senator LA 1)	Present
Christian Copley Salem (Senator LA 2)	Present
Scott Morrison (Senator LA 3)	Present
James (Tony) Spiker (Senator WCTE)	Present
Jacob Council (Senator Adjunct Carson)	Present
Corrine Bollendorf (Senator Adjunct Fallon/Douglas)	Present
Eric York (Past Chair)	Present

Members Absent	
Guests	Brian Prince

Agenda Topic	**1. Executive Updates (President J. Kyle Dalpe)**
Action Taken	Information
Summary of Discussion	Changing next year's Welcome Back meeting to separate it …ie..Monday Wednesday etc.

Agenda Topic	**2. Academic & Student Affairs Updates Report (VPASA Dana Ryan)**
Action Taken	Information
Summary of Discussion	90 credit bachelor degrees update: pilot program nationwide. Vice-chancellor present at meeting to get input from wide stakeholder viewpoint. Discussion of developing clear pathways. Articulate those things as to why they are important. Sept 18th webinar will be one point to start moving from input to policy language in order to have it in front of the regent meeting in December. Kyle suggests talking to colleagues who may be going through this process and are living and breathing it. Tony asked about math programs…is this existing or new programs? What would be cut? Dana says that at this point there are no decisions on how these programs would be named and/or run.

	Jeff states it is being requested by industry. Dana indicates that this will be a standing item on the curriculum agenda every month. Faculty hiring process updates: We have 8 open tenure-track positions this year. The goal is to get these through the approval process and have them posted in Early December. Very tight timeline, but it is necessary to get us to the point of making offers by mid march. Please keep an eye out for calls for serving on committees. There are 5 positions in liberal arts, 2 in nursing and 1 CTE. We will form a prioritized list for the open positions which is an intense process. Winnie brought up the importance of fixing the situation with Margaret Craig's long-term emergency hire position and bringing it into the PDC/tenure track process. Dana is happy to come talk about various topics.

Agenda Topic	**3. Director of Liberal Arts Introduction (Director Rebecca Gates)**
Action Taken	Information
Summary of Discussion	Introduction to the committee.

Agenda Topic	**4. Chair's Report (Rowe)**
Action Taken	
Summary of Discussion	90 credit bachelor degree -- The timeline is very compressed. There have been listening sessions with the Chancellor's office, adn there will be more meetings with the Chancellor, board, and Senate Chairs. All hands and voices on deck. Insights, concerns send them to Jessica. We want to make sure the language is coming through. There is a system Webinar on the 18th of September regarding the 90-credit bachelor which will fall during faculty senate time. We will split forces, and one of us will attend each meeting. The Board of Regents Quarterly meeting September 3-4 at TMCC will also have chances to provide feedback. November the policy proposal will need to be complete so that it can appear on the agenda in the December Board of Regents meeting at UNLV. We still have some open questions that the system will need to address: • Where do universities stand on accepting 90-credit

	bachelor's degrees for graduate admission? • What gets cut from existing degree programs — general education requirements, liberal arts requirements, professional content? • Funding for students who want to go back to get the remaining credits is also unclear. R. Bevans and Melody Duley have worked through the summer on the issue raised in May regarding security of classroom doors. Being able to close the door without locking the student out was a concern. We will be updated in the Welcome Back regarding the scope of the solution. Leadership for admin faculty senate and chancellor meeting. Admin faculty access to advocacy. Some have academic faculty on senate, some do not. Some want stronger collaboration. President Dalpe's periodic evaluation is coming in September.
Agenda Topic	**5. Approval of Minutes**
Action Taken	Page 5 of the minutes: Under NFA updates, second bullet, 2008 contract, which Scott Morrison does not think existed. It should revert to 2022 or something. Rachelle will check the contract and get us the right date. Rachelle says is the WNC policy on faculty workload, which was last reviewed in 2008. Which means if we don't have a contract, it revers to policy for WNC and NSHE. May 7th, but the meeting happened on May 8th. Michael was present at the meeting.
Summary of Discussion	Motion: Motion to Approve: Scott Morrison Second: Brigitte Approval: All approved Abstained: Approve motion to accept changes on dates and attendance Winnie Kortemeier Second: Brigitte Approval: All approved

Agenda Topic	**6. Senator Reports [Rowe & Senators]**
Action Taken	
Summary of Discussion	Talked about agenda. Bring privacy matters to the floor in a

	private matter. Introduction to Committee

Agenda Topic	**7. NFA Information [Bassen]**
Action Taken	Information/Discussion
Summary of Discussion	• MOU signed for another year; same contract terms continue despite three years of negotiations. • Membership is near the 30% threshold — dropping below risks losing the contract and all associated protections. • Funding data shows WNC instruction spending has declined in nominal dollars since 2005; inflation-adjusted gap is approximately $4 million for instruction and $14 million in general state funds. • While many of the NFA benefits – such as negotiated collective bargaining benefits or workplace protections are available to all – some benefits, such as legal representation, are available only to members • Members receive legal representation for contract-related issues; Rachelle can attend HR/director meetings as a faculty rep. • You can view the contract under college bylaws, NFA contract • Rachelle will send out more information in a newsletter. Membership Application here: https://nevadafacultyalliance.org/MembershipApplication?

Old Business

Agenda Topic	**8. Faculty Survey Ad Hoc Committee [Rowe]**
Action Taken	• **Ad hoc climate survey group formed**: • Members: Christian Copely-Salem, Scott Morrison, and Tony Spiker • Charge: to compare Faculty Senate survey with the all-college climate survey and return action recommendations to the full Senate.
Summary of Discussion	Motion: to accept Ad Hoc Committee with the members

	Motion to Approve: Brigitte Second: Winnie Approval: It carries Abstained:

Agenda Topic	**9. Faculty Senate Roles [Rowe]**
Action Taken	**Recorder Ratified:** Jolene Coverston **Part-time Senators Ratified**: Corey Bollendorf (new) and Jacob Council (returning). **Executive Board Ratified:** Brigitte and Christian as senators-at-large; Jolene Coverston as recorder; Patrick Bell as vice chair/chair-elect; Eric as former chair. **Jana Conkey ratified** to join the sabbatical committee, replacing Rachel Stiff; announcement of sabbatical will go out before September 15th. Sharepoint will be made available for working documents until they are finalized.
Summary of Discussion	Motion to recorder and two part-time senators Motion to Approve: Brigitte Dillet Second: Christian Approval: Approve Abstained: Motion to ratify Jana Conkey to join sabbatical committee Motion to Approve: Winnie Kortemeier Second: Jolene Coverston Approval: Approved Abstained: Motion to ratify executive board Brigitte and Christian at large. Patrick, Jessica and Eric Motion to Approve: Scott Morrison Second: Winnie Kortemeier Approval: approved Abstained:

New Business

Agenda Topic	**10. Presidential Evaluation//NSHE [Rowe]**
Action Taken	Information

Summary of Discussion	Kyle is under a periodic evaluation which is an NSHE process and governed by NSHE Procedures & Guidelines Manual Ch. 2; Sec. 2; Item 2. The evaluation covers the last 4 years. Eric York is the Academic Faculty Senate representative on the committee. This is a 360-evaluation, stakeholders within the institution and system involved, other institutions, and community partners. Interviews of roughly 40 stakeholders. That is the bulk of the evaluation process. Additionally, there is a faculty survey that goes to all academic and administration faculty. Survey is a template that has been used multiple times, across the system, but has been minimally modified to fit WNC. There is explicit procedure for faculty input on the tool, but the timeline falls outside the timeline that faculty was out on contract. Eric suggested that timeline would need to be modified for the process while faculty is on contract. Initial response was positive, both from chancellor and NSHE. Eric thinks it is going to require significant change to the process. For it to work while faculty is on contract, the committee would need to be developed much earlier. Committee doesn't get formed until the end of April, first meeting is the last week of the semester. Responses were positive. No conclusion or additional interactions for roughly a month. Winnie.. When will the survey come out? Eric. It will be opened for 1 month from 08-31 - 09/30 Jessica: Asks Eric to make us aware of what this process is and how it works. The survey tool is fairly generic and used by other institutions. We have received questions about how the tool will be administered: Is the survey going to be managed by our IR? Similarly, there are questions regarding privacy of participants…Will System Office use a third party tool to administrator of the survey? Will people have access to responses? Eric: System will use a third party tool. Even the members of the committee will not see raw responses. This is an anonymous tool. Academic and admin faculty can weight in. Committee will meet again towards the end of September. Faculty from UNLV will be tasked with doing the report. That reporting will be done in October. Addressed at the board of regents meeting in December. Rachelle: How are they going to aggregate the results? Eric: There are at least a couple of pre-response questions,

	those will be distilled by a third party. We will not see the actual survey results. We will not see any individual survey Jessica: Your committee, when you receive those results and have your meeting, what does that look like and what do you do? Eric: We will see percentages for each question. Most likely on a Likert scale and summary of comments. It's up to the committee to ensure that important topics get addressed in the final report. I would also mention that the committee consists of 7 people: I am the only WNC faculty. The president of student government is also on the committee. Jessica: Some are community stakeholders. Eric Yes. The committee is made up of system employees and community stakeholders. Jessica: Do you have a chance to see the comments to advocate, provide context, answer questions? Eric: Yes. Jessica: Do you have an opportunity if people are communicating to advocate and convey context or opinion? Eric: That is a lot more challenging as a question. Because the evaluation is supposed to be unbiased. Me acting as an advocate for what I see in senate is maybe not appropriate. Jessica: I am not asking you to speak for Senate or step out of the role; rather, we're trying to understand what mechanisms you are allowed to do. For example, if comments come up in the listening session, and you have context that might help clarify those comments, if other committee members needed that context, can you provide it? Eric: Yes, I have already done that once. Jessica: The ability to give context helps me feel a little better for a process that can be a little generic. Anything else? Eric: This is pretty personal. It has been challenging for me, I feel like I have to weigh what is appropriate to say and what is not. I have my own experience. Some are very positive and some are less positive. Nobody else in the committee has this type of position -- other than Karla, and she is a student not an employee. It's a challenge to make sure this is an honest and

	robust process, without overweighing it. Jessica: At least there is a place where you can communicate, and we need to use the provided tools to make sure our voice is heard. Good participation during the listening session will be important. Eric: The forum is so important. I would feel comfortable to add context, especially to points and comments that came up there. I would feel less comfortable adding my own personal interjection. Jessica: Would it be helpful to have Eric come back in to Senate and have him update us on how this process is going? Do you want another touch back on this? Scott agrees it would be helpful to keep us in the loop and on our radar. Jessica will put it on the agenda. Jeff: Do you have confidence that if faculty has concerns that these will be listened to? Eric: I think it is my responsibility as a committee member that if there are significant themes brought forth in the survey, forum, or both, that don't seem to be getting into the report to raise those. I need to do everything I can to ensure that happens and that those are included. There is a link in the agenda regarding the process to look over if needed. (NSHE Procedures & Guidelines Manual Ch. 2; Sec. 2; Item 2) Eric: Participation in the survey and forum is critical. We need to talk to everybody, whether we agree or not. • **Eric** will return to Senate on September 18 to update on presidential evaluation progress.

Agenda Topic	**11. Faculty Senate & All-Faculty Digital Resources [Rowe]**
Action Taken	Information
Summary of Discussion	Website, as the minutes get ratified, these will be uploaded. 20 years of minutes are available. This allows outreach to faculty who can not come to meetings.

	Jessica was able to get training and ability to access SharePoint. Access through Liberal Arts. Jessica will be sending out invites for access. Jessica and Patrick will monitor access. Anyone who has access to the website can see everything, there is no confidential. SharePoint is confidential. Should managing access be someone's role in the bylaws. Jessica agrees that laying out the roles would be helpful for future. Faculty and Staff Resource page in the Learning and Innovation website provides helpful information. Learning and Innovation undertook the creation and archiving of a faculty handbook with the review of the governance groups, departments and administration. That resource had been discussed by Senate as a need to have information for new faculty members all in one place, and Eric made the request to L&I in late spring to help compile one. The handbook is housed in the Faculty & Staff Resource page.

Agenda Topic	**12. Distance Ed Committee Online Course Review Mechanism Discussion [P.Bell]**
Action Taken	Information
Summary of Discussion	Meeting coming up. Overview: In the past, we have used a Quality Matters evaluation which has 44 review standards. Distance Ed is moving to a SUNY OSCQR, which is more flexible. Benefits of SUNY: Faculty development, institution-specific review works in conjunction with formal course observations by directors. Continuous course improvement. No score, just ways to improve. Creating a WNC specific rubric Benefits of QM External quality assurance cert Demonstrating nationally recognized course quality Standardized institution review. Recommend: Use SUNY as the instructional course review framework. Brigitte: How many review standards did you say are in the

	SUNY? Patrick: 50 items but can be reduced or adjusted. We can make it more streamlined. Brigitte: We are no longer paying for QM, we designed our own rubric. That Rubric did not evaluate the content but the design. Did we decide we were going to form an AD HOC? Patrick: Yes, we will be doing that. Brigitte: If you form an AD HOC, you would get more byin. Patrick: Yes and bring it to Senate for review. Very focused on us getting a voice in this process. Scott: Sounds great. I like the content I see from QM. Who is going to use it? Is there a clear purpose or is it an "add on" to the current review process? Patrick: One thing I would like to develop. Review your own review. Peer review for course improvement, collaboration between faculty. Used by director or PDC committee, you have a nice rubric to use. Brigitte: I do want to mention we have three layers. This is an addition to. Patrick: Yes. It makes it more friendly instead of punitive. Jeff: Years ago I thought we adopted SUNY. Brigitte adopted the QM and SUNY as a possible replacement. Modeled off QM. Patrick combine the two and make them into a more friendly rubric. It is easy to use. Formation of the Ad Hoc committee at the next meeting. Putting a call to anyone who is interested and/or teaching a lot of online courses.

Agenda Topic	**13. AI-Enabled Technologies in Classroom - Gemini, Meta Smart Glasses, Course Policies, Institutional Advocacy [Rowe]**
Action Taken	Information/Discussion

Summary of Discussion	• Meta smart glasses and Google Gemini (now default-enabled in Google Classroom) raise recording, privacy, and academic integrity concerns. *3233* • Nevada is a single-person consent state, but college classrooms are not covered by K–12 recording law — institutional policy is needed. *3435* • No current institutional AI usage policy; AI task force (Troy) is working on it. Questions: We are dealing with the fact we are in an environment where Meta smart glasses exist, how do we address that usage in our classroom. What is the instructional response to these. Chromebook will already have the AI enabled…what options do we have? Corrie: With the smart glasses, I think now is to be aware of it. The big issue with it, people aren't recognizing when they have it on. Invasion of privacy…etc…If we have a student who is recording without permission, if we don't have policy in place. Are we handling this on an instructor basis. Patrick: DSS might have policy on this? They might be able to bring it to class. I have the concerns of recording without permission. We need a policy on that. They could be posting without knowledge. Whatever we are doing within our courses, has to be a policy we are making on our single person recording state. We have to have institution policy and our own policy. Brigitte it needs to be a priority. We have been told to use syllabus document. That is our contract with the student. That allows us to tell the student to remove it. That tool alone is not enough to really move the needle. The institution really hasn't made a statement on AI usage. We need both. Read the articles. Technology is moving fast. Corrie: If we have some update on the AI committee. Article showing AI taking online courses for students. The New York Times. What is the escalation process? Student services and the institution must be part of the support for this. Scott: With what phones are capable of, it's a really big and

	important discussion to have. There are layers to this. Jessica will reach out to the AI Task force and to DSS and see what they have in place for this topic.

Agenda Topic	**14. Concurrent Enrollment/Affiliate Policies & Advocacy [Rowe]**
Action Taken	Information/Discussion
Summary of Discussion	Questions and comments from the body: --How can we make sure we are articulating clearly how we are hiring qualified affiliates? That their training is relevant to what they are teaching? Creative solutions should not become something that takes the quality of that classroom down. --Course material, timelines, how is it done? The draft of the policy is a move toward standardizing this process and articulating this. -- There is no requirement that the college ensures that WNC faculty are in regular collaboration with affiliates. There is an option for that to happen and right of refusal. The college can grow this program and bring more affiliates without any boundary. There should be a guarantee that faculty is talking to teachers and vice versa. Suggested requirements language: Masters degree in field; Masters degree in other, with 18 credit hours in discipline Or be in a Masters program with completion date set to end of academic year of teaching. • **Critical concerns raised**: o Affiliates have been assigned to liaisons without notice or consent, sometimes two weeks before semester start with empty course shells. o Compensation structure (1–2 credit stipends) misaligned when full course development is required (should trigger 3-credit commissioning process). Confusion regarding pay and budget line. o Some affiliates are not using WNC materials or assessments, operating outside policy requirements. o Policy allows unlimited affiliate growth with no

	faculty-to-affiliate ratio requirement. ○ Affiliate eligibility language (bachelor's in education sufficient) potentially violates NSHE standards for subject-area qualifications. ○ Non-tenured faculty and part-time faculty feel pressure to accept assignments without ability to decline.

Agenda Topic	**Public Comment**
Action Taken	Info
Summary of Discussion	None.

Agenda Topic	**Adjournment**
Action Taken	Unanimously Adjourned at 4:15 pm
Summary of Discussion	
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	Submitted by Jolene Coverston, Recorder