Minutes


Excused: J. Dobrauc, J. Furze, K. Flynn, C. Krajicek, S. Naatz, M. Pierce, J. Pierce, T. Young

Unexcused: K. Pitts, D. Ward, A. Westhoff

Guests: P. Yenko, A. Batson

I. Approval of minutes for the March 13, 2012 meeting – Michele Starzyk
   a. Motion to approve. Seconded. Approved.

II. Treasurer report – Cindy Fendrick
   a. Luncheon books are closed; Summit expenses still rolling in.
   b. $6907.63 is the current balance, with expenses for the Networking for Success event that still need to be accounted for.

III. Eileen B. Lieben Center for Women Report – Lori Durako
   a. Thank you for helping with Women’s History Month events and attending the events. The center was excited about the collaboration that took place to make the month a success.
   b. Wrapping up for the year—book clubs have ended and they may help with one more event on campus in April.
   c. Will now begin long-term planning for next school year, as well as work with their advisory board to approve their mission, vision, and objectives. Durako also working on staffing for next year; applications will be accepted until Friday, April 13. She prefers a freshman or sophomore for this position (see attached position description).

IV. Russell Child Development Center Report – Katie Miller
   a. No report.

V. WIMS Report – Roselyn Cerutis
   a. No report.

VI. Old Business
   a. Networking for Success update – Katie Wadas-Thalken
      i. Event went very well, great partnership between CSW, Lieben, Alumni Relations, and Career Center. Thank you to Durako and Starzyk for their leadership on this project. We had 15 students and 15 faculty, staff, and alumnae participate. We will likely do something like this again next year.
      ii. Starzyk reiterated her appreciation for those who worked on the event and participated and reminded us that the CSW Way of Proceeding guided this event since there was a goal to partner with the Lieben Center on events for students.
   b. Parental Leave Update – Michele Starzyk
      i. Starzyk emailed Fr. Lannon’s office a month ago with a request to get on a Cabinet agenda for April. She has not hear back, but heard at the Summit that Fr. Lannon is supportive of the proposal. Even though he is supportive, it is important a conversation still take place. Starzyk
and Dr. Gintaras Duda, Chair of the Benefits Committee, are strategizing and requesting a meeting again. If no meeting can take place, Starzyk and Dr. Duda will draft a memo to introduce the proposal and submit it via hard copy.

ii. Starzyk received a draft from Branstetter (Human Resources) of what the Parental Leave Policy could look like (see attached). Branstetter reiterated that Fr. Lannon is supportive of this policy, which includes 4 weeks of paid leave for both parents, as well as 4 weeks of leave for adoptive parents.

1. Branstetter explained there were concerns regarding faculty, both 9 and 12 month faculty. He and his staff drafted the policy and included some suggestions for how to use the policy in regards to faculty.

iii. Discussion was opened.

1. A statement was made that Dean Lueger is already trying to implement this policy, but that his interpretation of 4 weeks paid leave is equal to one course reduction. This is not good for moms who need time off, not just less work to do. There is physical recovery that needs to take place.
   a. HR is uncomfortable letting schools/colleges administer the policy because there may be disparities in how it is implemented. They will try to figure something out for the schools and colleges.

2. Another statement was made that disparity already takes place since leave is determined by the department chair and/or dean.

3. Member stated the subcommittee didn’t want to tell the deans what to do, but that there needs to be someone to approve what the deans come up with. The HR suggestions in the policy don’t even say anything about course reductions. This really needs to be about time off.

4. Starzyk reiterated that CSW and the Benefits Committee will offer a cover letter or memo to the policy when submitted to Fr. Lannon and they will explain why we have not included specific ideas for faculty time off. They will state that the Academic and Faculty Councils need to come up with some stipulations.

5. Starzyk asked if CSW is okay with item #5 in the policy.
   a. Member replied that if we make any changes to the policy, do we have to go back to all of the university groups and committees we have already gotten support from? Maybe just putting the information about faculty in the cover letter is sufficient.
   b. Member said that #5 is left open for interpretation so that any dean can do what he/she wants.
   c. Member reminded us we need to not make this about faculty vs. administration. We should all assume a faculty member has an interest in the success of the school/college, as do the administration. Happy faculty teach better and are likely to stay at Creighton.

6. Question regarding the chart for 12 month faculty with no disability, does a person have to use all of his/her sick time before the 4 weeks leave can be used?
   a. Member reminded us we want to preserve the sick and vacation time, so why wouldn’t a person use his/her 4 weeks first?
   b. Response was that a person can only use sick time until the doctor gives them approval to return to work (usually 6-8 weeks). Maybe we need to clarify how and when sick time can be used.
   c. Member suggested adding a column to state that if a person does not use anything else, he/she can get 4 weeks.
   d. Member said we should add that a person should discuss their leave options with Human Resources to determine the best time to use the 4 weeks of leave in order to maximize the benefits of leave, sick, and vacation time.
   e. Member said it sounds like a person can only use their 4 weeks if they want to get 12 weeks off. The word “remainder” is confusing.
   f. A suggestion to say 4 weeks can be used on the employee’s discretion was shared.
   g. Member said we should clarify that sick time can only be used when a person is under a doctor’s care.
h. Member suggested examples for how to implement the policy.
   i. Another member agreed and suggested that examples should include adoptive parents and fathers too.
   j. Maybe a section on possibilities of leave that can be taken should be added (sick, short-term disability, 4 weeks, etc).
   k. Member said we should be careful about examples. She is also frustrated this language has not been discussed until now because it is similar to language in previous charts.

7. Member went back to the discussion that we need to discuss how translating “weeks” into time off works for faculty. In the past some schools have determined how many courses add up to a certain amount of time off.
   a. Starzyk asked Branstetter if Dan Burkey asked him to make the faculty charts and why.
      i. Answer: Not sure who wanted the charts, but the request was likely from the Deans and VPs.
   b. Question was asked about the tenure clock for faculty.
      i. Answer: The Faculty Handbook states that a one-year extension is granted per child.
   c. Member stated course reduction should not have anything to do with this. It should be time off and a chair should find someone to cover the time.
      i. Person who made the original statement agreed but stated that this doesn’t seem to be how deans or department chairs have implemented this in the past.
      ii. Another member agreed that it should be time off.
   d. Question: Does a department chair have risk in requiring someone to come teach before medical clearance has been granted?
      i. Answer: There is a lot of risk. HR likes this policy because it puts parameters for long term use and forces these issues to be addressed.
      ii. The policy gives HR fuel to not allow for course reductions to take place, but rather offer real time off.
      iii. And allows someone to negotiate something else if they do not want real time off, but rather a course reduction. A faculty member can always negotiate, but we need to offer them a solid option first.

8. Starzyk asked Branstetter if he has received enough feedback and information from CSW.
   a. Yes, he thinks the deans are uncomfortable but that we need to stick to our guns regarding time off and NOT course reductions.
   iv. Starzyk will work with Dr. Duda to author a cover memo or meet with Fr. Lannon. The memo and proposal will then be posted to our website. Any objections?
      1. No objections.
   c. Summit Debriefing and Ideas for Next Year – Summit Committee
      i. A survey to event participants is out. There has been good feedback thus far on the breakout sessions and mixed reviews on the keynote speakers.
      ii. A lot of no shows or people who backed out at the last minute. The NCAA tournament also contributed to absences.
         1. Some discussion about choosing a different day or time of year has started, as well as whether we should have a conference or listening session next year.
      iii. Discussion was opened.
         1. Member stated the Summit was very organized, but she has a concern about one of the sessions. The session speaker stated that “Christianity is under attack” and shared some negative feelings about Muslims. On the other hand, this member also attended a session about yoga and thought it was great. Member also said the
Summit lacked intellectual rigor, but loved the faith and cura personalis themes (minus the anti-Muslim comments).

2. Member suggested maybe we should require speakers to share an outline of their presentations one week prior to the Summit and remind them about the learning outcomes and CSW (and Creighton) values.

3. Member said that the keynotes the last couple of years have seemed to let their family go by the wayside (and some were very explicit about putting family second). Maybe we need a speaker who has balanced work/life better but may not have a fancy title.

4. Member liked the Guidebook App and the sessions she attended.

5. Starzyk reminded CSW that if we ever have ideas for keynote speakers to share them with the Summit chair(s) right away. They sometimes struggle to find good speakers.
   a. Member said that University Relations was a great resource for alumnae speakers and we need to keep that in mind for the future.

6. Question: What were the final numbers, in particular the number of students, faculty and staff?
   a. Answer: A lot more staff, but good amount of students and maybe 12 faculty.
      Exact numbers to be shared at next meeting.
      i. Also, 160 registered but only 140 came. This messed up catering numbers.

iv. Starzyk asked if there were any objections to moving the Summit to the fall.
   1. Question: This fall or next fall for the next Summit (fall 2012 or 2013)?
      a. Answer: It would be doable for fall 2012.
      b. We would also have Fr. Lannon’s climate survey for the fall; it should come out in May 2012.
      i. Branstetter said they had a 63% response rate which was great! Thank you!

   2. Member said fall might offer more energy but we definitely need to look at the calendar.

v. Any other comments or ideas for the Summit should be shared with Nownes and Taylor.

d. Thoughts regarding Fr. Lannon’s email communication – Michele Starzyk
   i. If you think CSW should address anything that Fr. Lannon’s emails have shared regarding birth control coverage, please email Starzyk.
      1. Discussion regarding this topic was not completed since the meeting time was wrapping up.

VII. New business
   a. Elections
      i. Elections will take place at May meeting. A list of who is eligible is attached.
         1. You can nominate yourself or someone else.
         2. Ask the exec board if you have any questions about the positions. Fendrick stated that Banner experience is helpful for the Treasurer but not necessary.

VIII. Subcommittee Updates
   a. No time remained for subcommittee updates. Subcommittees will email any necessary information.

IX. Closing
   a. As Staff Advisory Council, Creighton Students Union, and Faculty Council prepare to appoint new people to University committees, please “shoulder tap” others and encourage them to consider applying or expressing their interest for the committee.

2011-12 Meeting Dates
All meetings are 12:30-1:30 p.m.
Tuesday, May 1, Skutt 105

• Lunch will be provided. Please RSVP here.