



Faculty Council Meeting Minutes

February 17, 2023

DEPARTMENT	REPRESENTATIVE	P	A	E
Arts & Sciences	Mike Leneagh, Chair	X		
	Jerry Lester	X		
Art Institute	Jerry Smith, Secretary	X		
Business	Sheila Wheeler	X		
Education	Aimee Shrader, Vice Chair	X		
	Abby Mentos	X		
Human Services	Dwayne Stenstrom, Sr. Sergeant-at-Arms	X		
Institute of Indigenous Learning	Richard Moves Camp		X	
Institute of Technology	Tashina LaVallie	X		
Library	Diana Dillon		X	
Nursing	Rhonda Jackman	X		
IOTA	Tony			
VP of Academic Affairs	NON-VOTING MEMBERS:		X	
	Cheryl Mederis		X	
Academic Affairs	Patti Farmer			
VP of Student Services				
Student Association	Keya Pipeboy		X	
Staff/Faculty Representative	Nick Emery		X	
Recruitment & Retention	Not Represented			
<i>President's Office</i>	Ted Hamilton			X
Ihanktonwan C.C.	Janell Garcia		X	
	Rebecca Kennedy-Sazue		X	
Past FC President/Advisor.	Ned Day	X		

Additional Faculty	Katerina Jurich-Pipeboy	X		
Additional Staff	Art Fisher	X		

The meeting of Faculty Council 2/17/2023 was called to order by President Mike Leneagh at 9:04 am.

Agenda items:

1. **Opening prayer:** Opening Prayer was led by Sergeant of Arms Dwayne Stenstrom at 9:05 am.
2. **Review the meeting notes from the last meeting for committee approval.** Voting item #1.

Recommendation to approve of minutes with revisions as requested by FC. Vote approved: 5/0/1 abstain.

3. **Any announcements /information relevant to the Faculty Council that members wish to share.**

CCG's of Art Institute

Class I:

- CR-2023-03. Change AI 373 to AI 271.
- Change AI 374 to AI 272.
- Change AI 473 to AI 471.
- Change AI 474 to AI 472.

Vote approved: 7 in favor, 0 against, 1 not voting

Class II:

- CR- 2023-01. AI 215: Update course objectives & course description.

Vote approved: 7 in favor, 0 against, 1 not voting

- CR-2023-02: AI 398 Special Projects. Add course objectives & course description.

Vote approved: 7 in favor, 0 against, 1 not voting

- CR-2023-03: AI 499. New course, add course descriptions & course objectives.

Vote approved: 7 in favor, 0 against, 1 not voting

- CR-2023-05: AI 271 & 272. Change course objectives & course descriptions.
- AI 371 & 372. Add new course, course objectives & course descriptions

AI 471 & 472. Change course objectives & course descriptions.

Vote approved: 7 in favor, 0 against, 1 not voting

- 4. Seek faculty input on restructuring the required participant list for official meetings. Specifically, discuss the “pros” and “cons” of university administration attending regular meetings of the faculty. Example discussion topic: “Should the Faculty Council meeting be a safe space for attendees to discuss issues of faculty concern without university administration present?”**

Summary of White Board recorded remarks:

Cons of Admin attending FC:

1. There is or can be a conflict of interests with leadership present
2. Administration may “lead” the meeting agenda, promoting their functional duties, and FC advocacy or agenda items can become secondary, or downplayed administrative attendees
3. Faculty can feel discomfort with sharing ideas, inhibited by leadership present

Pros of Admin attending FC:

1. Faculty voice is directly heard by administrative attendees, potentially empowering the faculty voice, As administration “hears” the discussion actively rather than passive reading of minutes.
2. Administration gets the immediate voice of faculty, rather than delayed info by published minutes
3. There can be a better potential to accomplish goals, due to the vocal interaction and dialogue process in real time with key administrators.

Observations of Other University’s policies:

1. Many schools maintain a distinct separation of Powers.
2. Some schools admit administration by FC invitation only.
3. Most schools require Provosts to attend all college meetings as part of main duties—but strictly as a non-voting member.

Other observations:

1. Faculty Council has already in it’s Constitution and Bylaws the power and authority to:
 - a. “establish ad hoc and standing committees.”
 - b. “establish rules, membership and procedures for its committees.”
 - c. Such meetings may be called for inclusion of faculty only, not administration
2. Regarding the above, the Constitution and Bylaws also formally state:
 - a. “Regular meetings of the Faculty Council are open to all University constituents, and they may participate in Faculty Council Discussions if on the agenda or upon recognition by the Chairperson.

b. "The Faculty Council may, for any meeting...go into an Executive Session for discussion of a personnel matter, or any other matter allowable under pertinent sections of the SGU Board of Regents Constitution.

c. While the administration are legally allowed to attend Faculty Council meetings, the above allows for dismissal of non-faculty for discussion of issues fitting "b" above.

3. The Bylaws clearly state in Section 4: Representation Functions: that the "Faculty Council will do whatever lies within it's power to maintain free communication between the faculty and administration."

a. It was questioned whether voting to amend the Bylaws for faculty inclusion only is a contradiction to the above bylaw of open communication and cooperation promotion of Section 4.

4. Discussion did not result in a conclusion, summation or recommendation regarding keeping current policy, changing the Bylaws by formal vote, or regarding options of Ad Hoc, Standing Committees, or Executive sessions within regularly scheduled Faculty Council Meetings.

5. Conduct an AAR (After-Action Report) over this past spring semester's registration/student orientation process and an assessment of the first few weeks of classes. The AAR will consist of creating conversations around three questions:

- What went well?
- What didn't go well?
- What are we going to do differently next time?

Discussion brought up the following points:

Enrollment issues:

1. Orientation took place too late, not allowing time to enroll students on campus, before Faculty class registration.

2. Faculty felt there was too much miscommunication, regarding course being added, closed, and advisors notifying other faculty of students added to a course.

3. Faculty noted that changes made last minute (as well as *in the moment* changes) in course offerings or course requests affected students negatively, and presented a dis-favorable image to the student about SGU.

4. Students come to campus enrollment/registration with inaccurate information, and did not understand college enrollment expectations.

5. Faculty note that In- Person class registration has desirable customer service advocacy, but is a huge burden on faculty, who have other duties such as syllabus and course prep.

6. It was observed that SGU was functioning in the manner of a small, hands-on community college with “pre-computer age” proceedings, and not growing into its 21st century University status and student growth numbers of 800+.

Registration:

1. Faculty voiced strong objections to long transcripts from years past, that have classes not relevant to current catalogue, and that students changing majors made status sheets difficult to create.

- a. Faculty wish the issue of “old classes” on transcripts to be address with a limit of how “far back” are courses allowed be utilized for a degree plan.

2. Faculty voiced concern about Late Registration Policies in need of evaluation and practicality.

3. Faculty observed that Systemic issues cannot be addressed by merely “working harder.” The goal should be to work smarter, not harder.

4. This semester, there was confusion over the enrollment sequence—students to first enroll, then register? Students were doing it both ways.

5. Faculty voiced the convoluted system of paper enrollment, then paper form sent to Student Services for computer enrollment—a delayed process affecting course closings, and course additions—or students being frustrated at thinking they were in a class, to later find out “no”.

5. Faculty feels that SGU needs to go to fully electronic status sheets—and for them to be live in Jenzabar. Or any other applicable system.

- a. Faculty request that for the sake of growth and student advocacy, that a working system of live enrollment be addressed, regardless of updates or cost—to bring SGU up to the functionality of other colleges (Tribal or non-tribal)

6. Faculty have huge concerns about our enrollment capacity, and whether it is realistic to expect the current 20 faculty to handle the increase in enrollment, doing our current registration/enrollment/advising methods.

Has the university calculated a maximum student enrollment number (capacity) that takes into account the current available faculty/staff numbers?

7. Should the university increase Registration office staff to accommodate the growing number of students enrolling?

8. Should the university increase the number of faculty in order to meet the demand for more classes?

Note: offering larger class sizes may not be the answer, one of SGU’s strengths has always been the positive academic outcomes students receive from smaller class sizes.

9. Faculty suggestion: A working/planning meeting(s) attended by the stakeholders (administration, faculty, student reps, etc...) of the orientation/registration/student advising process at SGU. Through shared governance, the various stakeholders’ input would be honored in the planning process. A proactive planning process should lead to everyone having a clear understanding of the plan/process—student success being the ultimate goal.

The Faculty Council meeting was called to Adjourn at 10:45 am with a vote of 7 for, 0 against, and 1 non-voting.

Approved:

Michael Luyf
Chairperson

3/17/23
Date