I. The meeting was called to order at noon. In attendance were Young An, Beth Blonigen, Liz Dussol, Amy Kritzer, Sue Myers, Ea Porter, Paddy Satzer, and Margie Siegel.

II. Welcome to new members of the council!: Young An, Beth Blonigen, Elizabeth Wehner, and Lindsay Schwab.

III. The first part of the meeting was devoted to discussion of climate at UST and difficulties that can arise in dealing with unreceptive or inappropriate supervisors, especially if the behaviors occur behind closed doors but do not fit into the established category of sexual harassment. We agreed that we need to continue to press for policies at UST that address bullying behaviors or establishment of a hostile environment, while we continue to provide support for those who are affected by negative behaviors. Climate concerns at the university affect certain groups of people (people of color, women, GLBT, etc.), but also certain individuals who have to deal with the individual environments in which they work.

IV. Announcements/reports:
The Climate Survey Advisory Group is working with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to conduct facilitated workgroups designed to gather feedback for help in producing the next climate survey at UST. Several UAWE council members have attended or plan to attend such groups. We are also offering several groups, in particular one for female staff members and one for female faculty.

Young mentioned the Green Dot program to combat sexual violence. A cohort of individuals was trained last summer to work on establishing a safe environment on campus and to encourage the idea that everyone has a role to play in preventing sexual violence.

We discussed the reality of safe zones or designated individuals who can be advocates for people who have experienced a hostile environment at UST. These need to be better publicized. In addition, some control mechanism is needed in order to ensure that the individuals designated as advocates are genuinely able and willing to serve in that role.

Vanessa’s session on Mindfulness received rave reviews and there is interest in other sessions of a similar nature.

V. We spent some time evaluating our fall reception. There was plenty of food and most agreed that the space worked well. Having a raised podium did not seem necessary. We discussed briefly the possibility of having a split reception (one on the St. Paul campus and one on the Minneapolis campus), but decided that such a plan would only further split the community. We also discussed having the reception in Minneapolis, but agreed to keep it in St. Paul, since there are usually more new employees on the St. Paul campus. There was some discussion about requesting RSVPs or asking supervisors to talk with their employees about
attending the reception. Margie suggested employing an evite to know who plans to attend.

VI. We will discuss the feedback we received at the reception and further programming for the year at our next meeting.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 12:55

Respectfully submitted,
Sue Myers
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