

Faculty council meeting agenda (3.17.23)

Meeting time: 9:00 AM @ Science Center room 1

1. Opening prayer
2. Review the meeting notes from the last meeting for committee approval. Voting item #1.
3. Any announcements/information relevant to the Faculty Council that participants wish to share.
4. Aimee Schrader will present 3 CCGs for approval from the nursing department. Voting item #2.
5. Dr. Jim Green will give an update on the Institute for Indigenous Teaching and the WINHEC accreditation.
6. Seek administration leaders' input on restructuring the required participant list for official meetings. The recent Faculty discussion did not result in a conclusion. The summary of this discussion is below:

Cons of Admin attending FC:

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

Pros of Admin attending FC:

- a. Faculty voice is directly heard by administrative attendees, potentially empowering the faculty voice,
- b. As administration "hears" the discussion actively rather than passive reading of minutes.
- c. Administration gets the immediate voice of faculty, rather than delayed info by published minutes
- d. 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:

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

7. Seek administration leaders' input on the results of the recent faculty discussion over the registration/student orientation process. The summary of the main points of the discussion is below:

Enrollment issues:

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

- b. Faculty felt there was too much miscommunication, regarding course being added, closed, and advisors notifying other faculty of students added to a course.
- c. 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.
- d. Students come to campus enrollment/registration with inaccurate information, and did not understand college enrollment expectations.
- e. 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.
- f. 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 it’s 21st century University status and student growth numbers of 800+.

Registration:

- a. 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.
- b. 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.
- c. Faculty voiced concern about Late Registration Policies in need of evaluation and practicality.
- d. Faculty observed that Systemic issues cannot be addressed by merely “working harder.” **The goal should be to work smarter, not harder.**
- e. This semester, there was confusion over the enrollment sequence—students to first enroll, then register? Students were doing it both ways.
- f. 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”.
- g. 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.
- h. 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)

- i. 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.
- j. Has the university calculated a maximum student enrollment number (capacity) that takes into account the current available faculty/staff numbers?
- k. Should the university increase Registration office staff to accommodate the growing number of students enrolling?
- l. 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.

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.

8. End of meeting.