

TO: Staff Senate
FROM: Pauline Palko
DATE: September 3, 2014
SUBJECT: Minutes of August 13, 2014 Meeting

In attendance: Ms. Cherra, Ms. Mecadon, Ms. Barrett Notarianni, Ms. Palko, Ms. Edwards, Mr. Pilger, Mr. Sakowski, Mr. SanMartin, Ms. Shimsky, Ms. Bevacqua, Mr. Casabona, Ms. Driscoll-McNulty, Ms. Freeman, Ms. Joha02 533 1 1802(rerBT5.5 0 1 1802 522 ()-3(M)-4()-3(4(c)3rps.))-3(l)10(t)-4(y,

Mr. Sakowski stated his belief that wellness privileges were tied to ProDeo status, and that retirees may need to request a special Royal card.

Ms. Cherra believed that the retiree's Royal card has to be coded according to years of service

Ms. Barrett (HR) will look into it and report back.

Ms. Freeman searched the current Staff & Administrator's Handbook on her iPad and stated that a table on page 21 of the current Staff and Administrator's Handbook specifies that retirees retain fitness center privileges with no mention of Pro Deo status as a requirement.

Items for Discussion —Fairfield Article:

Mr. Murphy read a motion suggesting that that an ad-hoc committee be formed to research and develop a report to determine if the University of Scranton could develop

Mr. Wetherell called for a vote: motion unanimously approved.

Ombuds Report:

Mr. Wetherell asked the senate for recommendations on who to send the report to next UGC for all three senates to review, and then have them decide if it should go to the President's Cabinet.

Mr. Murphy stated the report contained historical information on the subject that would be valuable to upper leadership and employees for answering questions as it would help them better understand the situation.

Mr. Murphy read a motion regarding the report: "That Staff Senate forward the final

Greater transparency of how ombuds responsibilities are fulfilled at the University of Scranton and by whom, including reporting for the purpose of planning and decision making;

Offices managing ombuds functions provide open assurances that confidential, independent and impartial assistance is available;

Communication from the offices/groups responsible for ombuds functions should be ongoing, accessible and consistent for all constituents.”

Ms. Notarrianni suggested sending an email to notify the staff that this is what the Senate has been working on, send a status update and note that the Senate wanted to forward to UGC.

Mr. Sakowski stated that we would have to include the report along with any status update.

Mr. San Martin asked how many pages the report contained and admitted that he had not read the report. He added that sending the report was a good idea but doubted that many would read it due to the length of the report.

Mr. Sakowski responded that twelve pages was not a lot to read.

Mr. Bevacqua asked if it was on the website.

Mr. Casabona stated that he would put it on there and confirmed with Ms. Palko that it was sent to all senators including new senators and alternates.

Mr. Murphy cautioned that posting the report on the website before the senate discusses it and decides what they want to do with it could lead to more confusion or misrepresent the senate. This whole body has to support the report before it's posted and offered that it could be a good roundtable topic.

Mr. Wetherell stated that we would wait until after the next meeting before posting to the website.

Mr. Murphy cautioned against rushing a decision.

