Meeting called by: Co-chairs Jeff Guenther and Jen Murray
Type of meeting: General meeting of the 2016-17 academic year

I. Call Meeting to Order
   The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

II. Introductions (Name, Department, Pronouns-in-use)
   A. Members in attendance: Cary Costello, Tim Danielson, Jeff Guenther, Sarah Terry, Jerry Becker, Kate Nelson, Elijah Walker, Sarah DeGeorge, Robin Van Harpen, Nelida Cortez, Jeffrey Hawkins, Jazz Nance, Karen Wolfert, Don Green, Teresa DuChateau, Erin Parcell, Jen Murray, and Angela McManaman.
   B. Guests in attendance: Casey O’Brien, Paul Dupont, Jane Hampden Daley

III. Automatic Consent
   A. Adoption of agenda
      The agenda was approved at 11:07 a.m.
   B. Approval of December 2016 meeting minutes
      The December 2016 minutes were approved at 11:07 a.m.
   C. Approval of January 2017 discussion notes
      Discussion notes from the January 2017 meeting, at which there was no quorum, were approved to be entered into record as posted online at 11:07 a.m.

IV. New Business
   A. Election of January co-chair
      1. One nomination (for Jen Murray) was made from the floor at the December meeting.
      2. Robin received no additional nominations via e-mail.
      3. Time for additional nominations from the floor
         No additional nominations were made from the floor.
      4. Nominations from the floor were closed at 11:09 a.m. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to elect Jen Murray as January Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for LGBT+ Advocacy Co-Chair.
      5. Jen Murray’s term will go through December 31st, 2017.
   B. UW System Task Force on Campus Climate
      1. Elijah reported attending the initial meeting in November and said that the conversations were primarily focused on what is wrong on campuses. The topic of Hate/Bias was also discussed. Elijah mentioned that the UW System Task Force did not have any information on transgender students because this information has not been collected. The Task Force hopes to collect gender identity data when common
application changes go through. Elijah reported that a follow up meeting has not been scheduled yet, but that the plan is to meet every few months.

2. Jen explained that Elijah became one of UWM’s Task Force representatives when Chancellor Mone recommended that a student committee member be selected, and Elijah’s schedule allowed him to participate. In total, four students were recommended for participation, but the other three were not able to participate due to schedule conflicts.

C. Distribution of appointment letters
   The Chancellor’s Office printed appointment letters on January 27th, 2017. The letters and acceptance forms were distributed at today’s meeting.

V. Old Business
A. Group Insurance Board (GIB) updates
   1. The GIB was to meet on January 18th to continue the discussion about rescission of coverage for transgender healthcare, but this meeting was cancelled.
   2. The GIB has rescheduled for February 8th 2017. UWSA members are planning to attend this meeting, and they will share developments with UW campuses.
   3. Cary suggested that the Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for LGBT+ Advocacy should formally recommend that the UW System representative on the GIB advocate against rescission of healthcare coverage for transgender employees.
   4. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to ask the Chancellor to recommend that the UW System representative on the GIB advocate against rescission of healthcare coverage for transgender employees.

B. Updates on 2016-17 CAACLGBT+A goals
   1. IRB gender- and sexuality-inclusive language guidelines (Erin)
      a. Erin is helping us to continue to move forward with the gender- and sexuality-inclusive language guidelines. Our committee can expect to receive an update in March.
      b. Jen mentioned that Melissa, who is the head of the IRB office, is very supportive of our subcommittee’s goals. Melissa has indicated that she is looking forward to our recommended guidelines.
      c. Erin shared that Melissa did point out that outside researchers can come onto our campus and can solicit student participation. Melissa mentioned that sometimes students express frustration about this when the research studies are not well constructed or when students feel that they are part of a demographic group that is being over-researched, e.g., transwomen students.

2. Syllabus language/APC meeting
   a. The Academic Policy Committee chairperson did forward draft language to Jen, Jeff, and Paula.
   b. The proposed changes to the Uniform Syllabus policy will include the following:
      i. Requirement that instructors list their name-in-use and pronoun-in-use.
ii. An addition to the policies section of syllabi that provides LGBT+ resources for faculty and staff by providing contact information for the LGBT Resource Center.

iii. An addition to the “recommended” elements of the syllabus policy that gender non-binary pronouns and nouns be used throughout course syllabi

C. The APC will vote on the proposed changes during the first week of February. They are very open to changes for syllabi that are written in English; some committee members would like more guidance for inclusive language for syllabi in other languages, and particularly for more-gendered languages. After approval from APC, the proposed changes will go onto the Faculty Senate for approval. The plan is to launch the syllabus language policy by fall. Jen asked if any of us committee members are on the Faculty Senate. Based on who is present at our meeting today, no committee members are on the Faculty Senate.

3. Ongoing expansion of department trainings

a. The Astronomy, Gravitation and Cosmology group received a four hour training on Friday. The group raised a number of key ideas and was very engaged with the training. The group plans to train all of their doctoral students and post doc fellows.

b. Casey O’Brien from the Center for Excellence Teaching and Learning (CETL) will work with our committee and the LGBT Resource Center to address inclusivity in the classroom. Casey mentioned that CETL is looking for ideas about what content to include in workshops. Faculty have mentioned that they would like to support more inclusivity in the classroom, but they do not feel they have the skills to create an inclusive classroom. Casey reported that she watched a grad student give a presentation on pronouns and the faculty were very interested. A committee member asked if university wide TA training exists. Casey reported that she coordinates this. Evaluations of TA trainings showed inclusivity training as a highlight of their training. Jen mentioned that the LGBT Resource Center tailors trainings to department needs.

c. Nelida reported that Equity and Diversity Services will be offering a workshop called “Sex and Gender Have Never Been Binaries” on March 31st from 1:00pm-3:30pm in the Chapman Hall Regents Room. Nelida reported that Cary Costello will be present to contribute to the workshop. 20 people have already registered and 70 more have been invited through a list serve for the community. If registration exceeds seating space in the Chapman Hall Regents Room, then an alternative space will be chosen.

d. Jerry asked if University Staff receives inclusivity training as part of new employee onboarding. Jen mentioned that the University Staff Council may be involved with this. Jeff asked if an onboarding program exists for University Staff employees, and Robin replied that there is not a single point of contact for University Staff trainings, but that HR could provide some information. Jen mentioned that Jerry could take the lead on this for University Staff.
4. Sexual violence prevention/bystander intervention
   a. Nelida explained that there was supposed to be a pilot project with 400 students last semester, but because Dee Dee Merritt who was in charge of it left UWM, there has been a delay.
   b. Nancy Muro from the Dean of Students Office has stepped into the role, but still needs to first be trained. She will then train 10 or 12 individuals who will then train the 400 students.
   c. Nancy and Nelida would like to get our committee’s feedback, and they can share the PowerPoint training through our committee’s list serve. Jen mentioned that if the PowerPoint is shared through One Drive, we can make edits.
   d. A committee member asked if this is the same initiative that is being offered through Norris and if this is different from the student version. Committee members talked about how there appear to be several versions of campus bystander prevention programs (including programs that have been developed with CampusClarity and Step Up!). There is also some overlap in content for Title IX and bystander intervention training, but both are required trainings.

5. Ally of the Year Award
   a. Kate reported that the subcommittee has reviewed the rubric and have developed two additional criteria. The new criteria include are as follows:
      i. How do the advocacy activities of this individual or group go beyond the scope of their job duties?
      ii. How has this individual or group infused LGBT+ inclusion into existing campus initiatives?
   b. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to include the two new criteria on the rubric for the Ally of the Year Award.
   c. Kate explained that the scoring scale was changed to include a five point rating scale including options of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
   d. Kate mentioned that originally, the subcommittee had five members on it, but that two have left. The group now includes Kate, Katie, and Jerry. Angela and Erin volunteered to join the subcommittee.
   e. For review, Jeff read the four original criteria which will remain part of the rubric. They are:
      i. How has this individual or group demonstrated commitment to improving climate, diversity, and inclusivity at UWM?
      ii. What policies or practices has this individual or group introduced or improved to positively affect LGBT+ students and employees?
      iii. How has this individual or group worked to increase awareness of issues that affect LGBT+ individuals?
      iv. How has this individual or group provided administrative, institutional, or personal support to LGBT+ campus constituents?

6. Inclusive facilities review
   a. Klotsche Center
      i. Signs for Klotsche Center are still being processed.
      ii. Jen and Jeff wrote to the UWM Office of Legal Affairs in December asking them to attend our January meeting and explain how the
current policy was selected and is being implemented in the Klotsche Center.

iii. UWM Office of Legal Affairs responded that they are unable to answer this question because they provided counsel to Chancellor Mone and that their conversations with Chancellor Mone fall under attorney-client privilege.

iv. One committee member mentioned receiving an email from Jim Hill that summarized how the current plan is to follow the Klotsche Center inclusive facilities policy until federal legislation is made and how the new private shower and changing spaces now provide options for private shower and changing space.

v. Committee members discussed if maybe they could speak with Jim Hill about this. They also discussed whether we could verify that Klotsche Center student employees receive inclusivity training.

vi. One committee member asked if we are allowed to reach out to ACLU or other outside representation for advice. Robin said that for faculty, staff, or the committee, we should rely on Office of Legal Affairs for guidance, but that students are welcome to seek advice from outside sources. Robin mentioned how there will continue to be disagreements on this issue regardless of legal advice and that our committee may want to review our goals and the charge of our committee when proceeding. We want to make choices that help us live up to our commitment to supporting students; however, our ultimate charge is to make policy and practice recommendations to the Chancellor.

b. Restrooms

i. Kate sent a second request for department chairs to conduct a survey of their buildings and complete the OneDrive document, and that responses were good. Karen reported that a number of updates have been made in identifying inclusive restrooms across campus including in Architecture and Urban Planning, Engineering and Mechanical Sciences, Golda Meir Library, Mellencamp Hall, Vogel Hall, and additional buildings. Karen reported that some already have locks and signs, but that others still need them.

ii. Jen inquired about the possibility of an inclusive facility map or sign that would direct campus constituents to the inclusive facilities in the KIRC building. The KIRC building inclusive facilities are located on the fourth floor of the building making the difficult to find.

a) Committee members discussed whether directional signage could be included in the KIRC and other buildings where inclusive facilities are more difficult to locate.

b) Committee members discussed the potential expenses of putting directional signs in all of the buildings on campus, but wondered if when construction projects take place, signs could be added as part of a project. Jerry asked if inclusive restroom information could be added on evacuation maps since they are paper and are easy to replace. Karen said that directional signs could be added on
a case-by-case basis in various buildings. She mentioned that it might be possible to add information to evacuation maps, but that because they are small and have a lot of information on them, it may be difficult to do this. The committee agreed that it would be acceptable to start with requesting signage in the most heavily used buildings (in terms of students and community foot traffic).

7. LGBT+101 online module update
   Module updates are continuing. Additional developments will be provided at future meetings.

8. Tobacco-Free Alliance/Tobacco-Free Campus
   a. The Student Association (SA) brought forward recommendations for the Physical Environment Committee (PEC) for designated smoking areas including a range of best options, moderate options, and worst options.
   b. The PEC has been concerned with smoking in high traffic areas, near building entrances, and near intake vents. They have been discussing that people are already not following the “25 feet” rule. The PEC and SA discussed whether people would follow signs to go to designated smoking areas if they are smoking while walking to class.
   c. The PEC and SA also discussed the recommendation to make campus smoke free and acknowledged that there are some groups of smokers on campus who could be negatively impacted by making campus smoke free, e.g., smokers who are veterans, LGBT+ identified individuals, members of University Staff.
   d. Kate shared that sidewalks are technically not university property, so this could be one way to help keep campus community members from crossing the street and smoking on residential properties.

C. Discussion: How can we help the Campus to better prepare for and respond to controversial speakers or events?
   1. Jeff reported that Joan Prince is working on a “First Amendment” initiative to investigate when free speech becomes impermissible speech, how to be critical thinkers in a “post truth” world.
      a. One planned activity is a forum with an external panel to answer questions about what is permitted and prohibited by law.
      b. VC Prince also hopes to facilitate a campus conversation: How do we support an inclusive environment, respond to speech that one disagrees with?
      c. The Common Read Experience will also focus on speech and inclusivity. This year, the plan is to engage the entire campus—and not just new students.
   2. University Relations
      a. Angela has provided Jen and Jeff with the name of the University Relations employee who is responsible for responding to extraordinary events.
      b. We can invite this employee to attend a future meeting, if desired.
   3. With which campus offices and resources would we like to engage to plan for improved responses and preparation in the future? How might campus have engaged behind the scenes?
      This topic could perhaps be discussed further at a future meeting.
D. Paul Dupont, guest from Norris Health Center

1. To provide a brief recap from last month, committee members and Paul Dupont discussed how our committee had brought forward anecdotal stories of LGBT+ students having concerns about going to Norris Health Center. This is because students were concerned that the Norris staff would automatically assume that all issues brought up would be based on their LGBT+ identity.

2. The group revisited how Paul had mentioned that when LGBT+ identified do use Norris services, they respond to surveys at a higher rate and their satisfaction and willingness to recommend use of services are higher than non-LGBT users.

3. A committee member asked how LGBT+ students seen at Norris are identified. Paul explained that students self-identify on the initial intake forms.

4. The committee also re-visited the conversation about Norris Counseling staff having received training on how to serve LGBT+ identified students. Paul confirmed that all of the counseling staff have had LGBT+ advocacy training. He also mentioned that the staff are interested in additional training, but the budget for Norris is unable to cover the cost of professional trainings that would require travel. Paul mentioned that Norris is open to the idea of seeking Academic Staff grants that could be used to bring in a professional presenter to provide training for staff.

5. The committee also talked about increasing the visibility of Norris for LGBT+ students. Karen asked if referrals to Norris are made through our campus LGBT+ advocacy trainings. Jen said that yes they are, but that many LGBT+ identified students need longer-term services, and Norris can only provide short-term services.

6. It was also mentioned that Norris is looking to bring services to student groups around campus who may be at higher risk or may have more issues with stigma as a barrier. Norris is looking to conduct interviews with campus resource centers to learn more about how to connect more students to services and how to reduce barriers to use of Norris services.

VI. Announcements

A. UWM Annual Drag Show, Saturday, February 18, 2017, Milwaukee Theatre

B. The Milwaukee LGBT Community Center will host an intergenerational chat night on Friday, February 24, 6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. at the Center, 1110 N. Market St. Food and non-alcoholic beverages will be available.

VII. Outstanding Committee Needs

No outstanding committee needs were identified.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 1, 2017, 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Chapman Hall Regents Room