

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON WOMEN FACULTY AND STUDENTS  
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME**

**April 23, 2012 Meeting**

**12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m., 119 O’Shaughnessy Hall**

**Members present:** Maura Ryan—chair, Jade Avelis, Kevin Barry, Kathy Brickley, Aimee Buccellato, Kathie Newman, Susan Ohmer, Claire Solas, Catherine Rastovski

**Members absent and excused:** Tracy Bergstrom, Paulette Curtis, Anne Huntington, Jennifer Mason McAward, Heather Rakoczy Russell, Alison Rice, Susan Sheridan, D. Katherine Spiess, Diane Wagner

**Guests:** Dan Myers, Denise Murphy

**1. Welcome**

The minutes of the February 28, 2012 meeting were unanimously approved.

**2. Brief update from ECDC committee**

Prof. Ryan gave a brief report on the ECDC committee meeting, which was also attended by Ms. Jade Avelis and Prof. Susan Ohmer. The committee is continuing its work to track current and anticipated need and to think strategically about the future needs for childcare. The centers currently serve 168 children with a wait list average of 77-82. 68% of faculty and staff applicants get selected by lottery for enrollment; 72% of student applicants gain enrollment. The percentage is slightly higher here because student applicants are willing to take part time slots when available. The committee did a study of future campus needs: there are 912 children under the age of 5 in the campus faculty and staff population, and 265 children under the age of 2. Note this does not include graduate student children. Since 2006, there has been a 50% increase in the number of children under 5.

In 2011, the committee did an extensive study of area childcare needs and options. As part of the study, kindergarten care and care for sick children was studied. On the issue of childcare for children under two, the conclusion reached is that under the current structure of ECDC, it would not be the best use of resources to expand service to include childcare for this age group. The committee continues to take the issue of this need seriously.

The committee has also monitored the issue of subsidies for tuition. It is committed to maintaining its policy of equal access to childcare, through the lottery method. It is also committed to continuing the university subsidy which covers the cost needs, based on a sliding scale, of qualified applicants. The full tuition rate is paid overwhelmingly by faculty applicants. Enrollment in ECDC is done democratically; no one is guaranteed enrollment except for the admissions preference given to families who have a child already enrolled in the program.

A website will be rolled out in Fall 2012 that will provide links and information on a comprehensive set of resources in the community related to family topics. At that time, Linda Kroll will be invited to meet with the UCWFS committee.

### **3. Brief update on plans for 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of co-education**

Prof. Ryan recently met with Ann Firth, the President's Chief of Staff, who is the representative on the planning committee for the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration of co-education. She shared the committee's ideas: a lecture series of women who are making a difference in a given field; banners providing a visual and artistic recognition of women's roles; a piece of art to be placed on campus. Prof. Ryan reported that the planning group was still somewhat unsure of the type and extent of the celebration. There are some plans being discussed for events bringing alumni and students together. At this time, the planning group is addressing the level of emphasis to give this anniversary; it was noted that the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary offers another opportunity for recognition.

Prof. Ryan will continue to be in contact with the President's Office and will continue to recommend a constructive and positive academic event that honors and recognizes the many roles and contributions of women at ND.

### **4. Continuation of discussion of FMLA policy—Dan Myers and Denise Murphy**

Vice President and Associate Provost Dan Myers thanked members for inviting Denise Murphy and him to return to the meeting to continue the conversation about the FMLA policy revisions and clarifications. Prof. Myers has gathered input from this group and other stakeholders, benchmarked policies at other institutions, and drafted a first version of a revised policy. He noted that nothing in this draft is settled as of yet; rather, this draft represents a basic notion from which to work. He will take feedback today, draft a revised policy and then present it to chairs and deans, with an accompanying education program to insure that the policy is clearly understood by all campus members.

Prof. Myers reviewed what he called 'the basic notion:'

Workload and tenure clock relief:

One semester workload relief per child.

One year of tenure clock extension per child.

Prof. Myers noted that each term in this policy draft needs to be defined.

- What is a child?
- Who is a parent?
- What is workload relief?
- What is acceptable as tenure clock stoppage?
- What timing is acceptable for opting to use the policy?

Members discussed each term in detail. The committee's recommendations on these topics are as follows.

- Child: includes minors added to the family through birth, adoption and/or foster care. Current policy sets the age limit as pre-school. The revised policy will include all minor children.
- Parent:  
Co-equal care givers should be eligible for the benefit. The university should not aggressively police the claim of co-equal. Members discussed the ramifications of the possibility that in some circumstances, faculty who are sharing parenting care and choose to take this benefit may be members of the same department. This might result in a department losing the services of two faculty members simultaneously. It was noted that two unrelated faculty members might be released from teaching responsibilities at the same time for different and unrelated reasons, incurring a similar situation for a department.

Prof. Myers stated that while the law allows two people who are married and employed at the same institution to take up to 12 weeks of full leave, the University could extend to the hypothetical couple two sets of 12 weeks of full leave. Not to extend this benefit would mean that the couple is negatively impacted by its dual employment at the university. The policy offers 8 weeks paid leave to the faculty member giving birth. Members stressed that paid parental leave should be available to fathers and mothers.

- Workload relief:  
It was agreed that workload relief currently includes relief from teaching duties for one semester. The policy could be extended to include relief from administrative services to the department for that one semester (and not only for the period while the faculty member is on FMLA). In addition, the faculty member could have relief from service in the summer nearest to the semester taken off. Members acknowledged that even if the policy were extended to include relief from all departmental service for the semester, relief might not cover duties to advise and consult with students; some peer institutions do not include this in the policy. Some institutions also do not include relief from research responsibilities. It was noted that some research cannot be 'turned off' for a variety of reasons both internal and external.
- Tenure clock stop:  
Under our current primary caregiver policy, a tenure clock can be stopped for one year for each new addition up to two children (twins count as one child for purposes of the policy). In total, a faculty member can request the tenure clock be stopped twice in the probationary period under this policy. Under current policies, at least in the College of Arts and Letters, faculty taking research leave can request one year extension of the tenure clock. The university's administration has discussed extending the tenure window from 6 years to 7 years for most faculty. If a 7 year tenure clock is approved, the one-year extension for research purpose would be phased out. Prof. Buccellato urged members and Prof. Myers to keep in mind the facts of the 'actual context' of South Bend. It is challenging to find good childcare for children less than two years of age in South Bend, including at ECDC. In

addition, she noted that the university's policies should support faculty members' intention to follow church dogma as pertains to children and conception. She urged speed in formulating this policy.

- **Timing:**  
The committee recommended that faculty be permitted to choose which semester to take the relief; according to our current policies, the relief must be concluded up to 12 months from the arrival of the child. It was noted that policy could be revised to allow co-equal partners to stagger the semesters in which work relief is taken. It also recommended that faculty in the terminal year of a contract be permitted workload relief. It was noted that this would extend the 'good for families' policy to faculty in this circumstance.

Members discussed at length the need for clear communication of the content of a revised policy and of the importance of full compliance with family leave policies. It was noted that there is often an unequal application of policies. In addition, there can be direct or indirect pressure applied to discourage applicants from taking this leave. There was discussion of a possible requirement for faculty to take a semester leave with the addition of a child to a family; some institutions include this requirement in their policies. Members agreed that a culture change is necessary.

Prof. Ohmer noted that the policy will encounter some cultural issues and some contingency issues. She suggested the policy statement might include an acknowledgment that issues will arise and be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Members agreed that there needs to be a 'point person' in the Provost's Office who handles questions about this policy; this person should demonstrate sensitivity to faculty concerns. The policy needs to be clear and needs to be established with committed support so as to rapidly make it broadly accepted and understood. This will prevent varying and contradictory interpretations.

Members discussed provision of training in this (and other) policy for chairs, a critical element in effective implementation. It was noted that the training should be provided regularly, because of chair turnover. Members agreed that it will be 10-15 years before any policy can be 'ingrained' in institutional habits.

Prof. Ryan thanked Prof. Myers and Ms. Murphy for attending the meeting and conducting this helpful discussion.

The meeting was adjourned.