



## memo

---

**TO:** Fr. John P. Schlegel, S.J., President and the Creighton Community

**FROM:** Michele Starzyk, CSW 2009-2010 Chair, and the 2010 CSW Summit Participants

**CC:** 2010 CSW Summit Participants (see attached distribution list)

**SUBJECT:** Committee on the Status of Women Summit

**DATE:** May 4, 2010

Thank you for your support of the Committee on the Status of Women's (CSW) 2010 Summit. Your financial support of this event helped tremendously as well as your introductory remarks helped set the tone for the conversations had that day. From all accounts, the Summit was a resounding success. Much feedback has been received by the CSW members regarding the power of coming together and the networking that was established; while others commented that the "women at Creighton now have hope." CSW distributed an online program evaluation and received an 80% response rate. On a scale where 5 = Strongly Agree and 1 = Strongly Disagree, participants rated the statement "Overall, I was pleased with the summit" at 4.30. Seventy percent felt the summit should be offered annually and 53 women have volunteered to serve in ad hoc positions to continue the work started on March 19, 2010.

Following Professor Christine Wiseman's address and Sr. Maureen Fay's facilitation, it became clear that a common agenda had emerged. The following themes were discussed by the Summit participants:

- *Communication* – The participants believe that there is a lack of communication at Creighton. Straight forward communication in decision making is lacking. Decision making such as budgeting, prioritization process, etc., appears to be shrouded in mystery. In addition, there is a sense of isolation as Creighton constituents keep information to themselves to help protect their own resources. This is exacerbated since women are often not at the decision making table (see below) which adds to a level of perceived inequity.
- *Lack of Mentoring and Networking* – The culture of Creighton does not include one of mentoring. Women are hesitant to ask other female leaders to serve as a mentor, acknowledging their already overtaxed schedules. Networking opportunities are non-existent, as women work in university silos. Additionally, there is a sense of female sabotage; women who do not advocate for other women since they themselves had to overcome obstacles.
- *Women are Not at the Table* – Currently, there are no academically-based women at the Cabinet level and there are no women on the Budget Committee. In order for women to be present in decision making, a conscious effort must be made to include women in selection committees and in appointments to serve the University in various ways. Men who have the authority to make such appointments need to be committed to bring women to the table so their voices may be heard.
- *No Central Location/Person* – There is a lack of a central location such as a women's center to focus grassroots efforts. The Lieben Center is geared towards student efforts and is located in the basement of a freshmen residence hall which is not inclusive to the needs of all women at



the University. There is also not a centralized human resource, such as an ombudsperson, or full time director of a center for women to help coordinate efforts across campus.

- *Family Concerns* – There are a myriad of family issues on the minds of the Creighton women. In order to have a child, women must take sick or vacation time. Adoptive mothers and fathers are not afforded such a luxury, affecting the family dynamic. Pre-determined lactation room locations are now to be shared with student organizations for bake sales. There is a lack of a policy and/or resources for pregnant students. The Child Development Center on campus has a two-year waitlist for infants, yet it is used as a recruitment tool to employ faculty and staff to Creighton.
- *Need for Education* – There is a need for professional development opportunities for women at Creighton. Drawing on established programs such as Foundations of Effective Supervision and the University of Cincinnati's WILD (Women's Institute for Leadership Development) Women, there is a need for leadership and professional development to help attract and retain talented female staff and faculty. Additionally, there is a need to educate the men on campus regarding gender differences in the workplace. Women's issues need to be further educated across campus, i.e., sexual harassment, unhealthy relationships, etc.
- *Work Life Balance* – There are women who would like to have a reduction in work hours during unproductive periods or have flexibility in their schedules but management has not been supportive of these efforts. For example, many women were not allowed to attend the Summit, unless they utilized vacation time. Unfortunately, it appears that university systems reward hard work with additional work, therefore creating further life imbalance.
- *Lack of Role Modeling* – The students at the Summit readily admitted that they easily observed a glass ceiling at Creighton for women's leadership. Women in attendance questioned how we could ourselves be considered role models for our students since they did not see us challenging the status quo.

While these themes rang loud and clear at the Summit, the women who participated did not focus on the negative. The conversations were constructive, empowering and called for further action. As a Jesuit Catholic University, we ascribe to the Ignatian value of *Magis*, or “more”. Creighton University was founded by two women who believed in serving the greater good and while we have much to be proud of, there is much more work to be done. We would fail our Jesuit roots to be *more* and to seek *more* from one another if we did not challenge Creighton to be better.

Therefore, the women of the 2010 CSW Summit submit the following recommendations for action:

- A need to focus on a paternity leave policy in the prioritization process, as discussed by Dr. Dan Burkey's message to Ms. Michele Starzyk
- A need to evaluate the current professional development programs offered on campus. For example, Foundations of Effective Supervision (FES) can be offered one semester while a women's focused FES could be offered the next semester.
- The Committee on the Status of Women should create an ad hoc committee over the summer to discuss the above themes, to further identify additional needs and to develop a timeline. In essence, the ad hoc committee will identify a strategic plan for the committee, identifying areas of further work and attention both within the committee and across campus. This report and plan will be shared with campus at the September 2010 CSW meeting.



In conclusion, the CSW stands ready to continue the work that was initiated at the Summit. The committee members have heard the suggestions and needs of the women on campus. Plans are currently underway to plan the 2011 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Summit during Women's History Month. However, we acknowledge that this process of change cannot be enacted alone as a committee. We need the commitment from the senior level administration to assist with this change. As over 50 women volunteered to serve in an ad hoc capacity, the momentum cannot be lost to further advance a cohesive agenda to truly affect the status of women at Creighton.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Again, our many thanks for your past support and we look forward to your future efforts once our strategic plan calls for additional action items.



The following Summit participants wanted to include their names as endorsement of this report:

FNAME	LNAME	FNAME	LNAME
1. Cindy	Adams	38. Cecilia	Hallstrom
2. Mary	Akers	39. Shanna	Harald
3. Marilyn	Appel	40. Barb	Harris
4. Betty	Bahr	41. Katie	Hatfield
5. Ronni	Beckwith	42. Angela	Hayes
6. Tammy	Biggs	43. Colleen	Hendrick
7. Rachel	Bloom	44. Mary	Higgins
8. Mary Lee	Brock	45. Rose	Hill
9. Sharon	Brown	46. Sharon	Ishi Jordan
10. Sara	Carter	47. Gail	Jensen
11. Roselyn	Cerutis	48. Heather	Jensen-Smith
12. Tracy	Chapman	49. Chris	Karasek
13. Katie	Christenson	50. Debi	Kibbee
14. Sandy	Ciriaco	51. Kathy	Knox
15. Geraldine	Clark	52. Joan	Kowalski
16. Kelli	Coover	53. Jenna	Kranzberg
17. Teri	Corcoran	54. Aimee	Limpach
18. Amy	Cosimano	55. Kate	Linden
19. Cindy	Costanzo	56. Orfa	Link
20. Diane	Crowley	57. Amanda	Lofgreen
21. Marianne	Culhane	58. Sue	Magnuson
22. Kathy	Custard	59. Britta	McEwen
23. Deborah	Daley	60. Sr. Donna	McGargill, OSM
24. Catherine (Kate)	Dosenovich	61. Michele	Millard
25. Mary	Duda	62. Katie	Miller
26. Robyn	Eden	63. Frances	Minear
27. Elizabeth	Elliot-Meisel	64. Renee	Mixan
28. Cindy	Fendrick	65. Christina	Murcek
29. Liz	Ferguson	66. Rebecca	Murray
30. Deb	Fortina	67. Susan	Naatz
31. Julie	Fox	68. Desiree	Nownes
32. Cindy	Freese	69. Anna	Nubel
33. Lori	Gigliotti	70. Catherine	Pakiz
34. Marybeth	Goddard	71. Linda	Pappas
35. Jess	Graner	72. Arnette	Payne
36. Nina	Ha	73. Sarah Jane	Pennella
37. Amy	Haddad	74. Taunya	Plater
		75. Michelle	Pope
		76. Lydia	Reinig
		77. Barbara	Rickard
		78. Sarah	Rider
		79. Victoria	Roche
		80. Ann	Ryan Haddad
		81. Betsy	Scarpaci
		82. Jan	Schnack
		83. Anne	Schoening
		84. Elizabeth	Schroer
		85. LuAnn	Schwery
		86. Karrie	Scott
		87. Marcia	Shadle Cusic
		88. Liz	Shanahan
		89. Tricia	Sharrar
		90. Helen	Shew
		91. Sheri	Shuler
		92. Laura	Simic
		93. Elizabeth	Sokolowski
		94. Mariah	Starling
		95. Michele	Starzyk
		96. Mary	Steiner
		97. Palma	Strand
		98. Judy	Streitz
		99. Tami	Thibodeau
		100. Theresa	Thurin
		101. Kate	Tworek
		102. Lori	Vander Molen
		103. Mary Ann	Vinton
		104. Katie	Wadas
		105. Maureen	Waldron
		106. Colleen	Warin
		107. Deb	Wells
		108. Tanya	Winegard
		109. Claire	Wolnisty
		110. Pam	Yenko