

Stamford Faculty Council Meeting
January 27, 2025, 7:15 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)
Minutes by Jonathan Gilbert

SFC Attendees: Claudia Kraemer, Bill Schwendner, Sharon Lattig, Felice Lesser, Beth Ginsberg, Evan Rawley, Katie Nagrotsky, Christina McElroy, Ellie Sherafat

Guest Attendees: Joel Blatt

OPEN COUNCIL DISCUSSION

- I. Approve Minutes
 - A. 12/2 minutes
 - I. Bill approves, Claudia seconds

- II. Follow up status
 - A. Faculty Concourse Office Hours
 - I. 2/11 – STEM 2-3:30
 - II. 3/6 - Fine Arts & Engineering 2-3pm, Social Science & Business 3:30-5
 - III. 4/16 – Education 2:00 – 3:00
 - IV. Since there is no news from the administrative office and Aris left his position, Bill will address Erica Granoff & Kathy Harrison for confirmation.

- III. Spring Discussion Points
 - A. Student awards ceremony (Move to spring engagement)
 - I. Laura is now in charge.
 - A. Joel explains the history of the event and how he became the coordinator.
 - I. The awards were intended to help students with their confidence and careers.
 - II. Food was always appreciated and included, until this past year.
 - B. A member states that the ceremony has always been the responsibility of the Directors office.
 - C. Another proposes that it's possible to request food, although it may be a budget issue.
 - D. Another member suggests Claudia speaks at the coordinator meeting and requests that faculty are given more leeway in nominating students.

- E. Another member asks if Joell would want to continue to be the coordinator for the event
 - I. Yes, he does, however, he has time constraints and would need assistance with programs & coordination.
- B. Campus CPR class
 - I. Target for Spring
 - A. Claudia mentions that there has been a change in club officers, and she is in contact with the other members.
 - I. Claudia will reach out and get back to everyone.
 - II. January 30th, the Blood drive will be back on campus
 - A. Claudia includes a flyer in the chat.
 - B. January 30, 2025, 11:00am to 4:45 pm
- C. Peer Professor Observation Proposal
 - I. Peer Review (outside of SET). How to evaluate who signs off, Union considering considerations/agreement.
 - A. Claudia suggests writing a proposal for faculty explaining the details of the SFC voluntary peer review.
 - I. Included would be a collected list of volunteers (SFC members and others) that could offer reviews to other faculty.
 - II. These reviews would ideally be in the discipline but may benefit from reviews outside of their field.
 - B. Ellie offers to help with the peer observation format.
 - I. She suggests reaching out to departments to recommend a format.
 - I. Claudia explains that each department is different and not all require reviews. This should not be required, just on a voluntary basis.
 - II. Beth says there may be a contract/union issue, and we should tread lightly in requiring reviews. We don't want to create policy for those that do not need and/or want.
 - I. Members agree global policy changes through the administration should not be sought and be kept solely as voluntary and informal.
 - C. Ellie says engineering (dept) is different in requiring observation reviews on a regular basis.
 - I. She outlines the process and purpose of these reviews.
 - D. Claudia reiterates that reviews are department dependent and the goal and purpose of any SFC review would be voluntary.
 - I. Jonathan asks if the direction of the SFC offers informal services to faculty.

- I. Members agree that the future of the SFC and its mission should be reevaluated and present at the next council meeting.

IV. SFC meetings 7:15 pm

- A. Spring 2025 SFC proposal scheduled (all Mondays @ 7:15)
 - I. 1/27, 2/10, 3/10, 4/28
- B. 2025-2026 SFC presidents will be needed as Claudia and Bill are stepping down
 - I. Bill asks the community if anyone wants to volunteer
 - A. Jonathan offers but has reservations given his lack of experience.
 - I. The Co-presidents offer support and wisdom.
 - I. Jonathan mentions that if his position changes, a new secretary will be needed.
- C. Council Bio's
 - I. Please adjust & correct your Bio's. Send in any changes.
- D. Future of SFC
 - I. Any changes and recommendations should be brought to the table.
 - A. Given the lack of faculty attendance maybe a shift is required. The topic reiterates comments made earlier during the peer review discussion
- E. By-law policy.
 - I. The member clause currently written only affects Felice's SFC position.
 - A. Not being a current faculty member, she should be removed from SFC unless she is voted to stay as a non-voting member.
 - I. All members voted for Felice to stay on the SFC.

NEW BUSINESS

- I. ICE
 - A. New global policies are in place, but the university has not been vocal or have procedures disseminated to the faculty.
 - B. Beth asked and has not received any useful news regarding policies from the Union (as a representative)
 - I. Beth said that Michael Bailey can come to an SFC meeting if we want.
 - A. One member says, Yes
 - I. Another says, no, because the group is too small, and faculty participation is none. To bring him to campus should be for a wider audience.
 - II. Bill asks that all information be shared with the group.
 - C. Katie says that she had discussed the topic the Marie and considered options including collaborations with LCI and an education grant that may include an event for April to address current issues.

- I. Marie had an idea for a workshop as well, and Katie reiterates the importance of sensitivity in planning for the security of the students.
 - A. Tara shared with Katie that Building One Community is an organization that is working to address this topic.
- D. A member shares inside information from the AAUP, and says the Administration will not release a statement for some time despite the AAUP is pressing the Administration to issue a comment or response.
 - I. Beth offers to bring up the topic at the Senate meeting
 - A. Members agree this is a good idea.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS