

Student Faculty Task Force

Taskforce members:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Sandy Johnson, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Srikantan Nagarajan, Nadia Ayad, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, Tejal Desai, Chase Webb, Jasmine King, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Nicole Foti

July 20, 2020

Agenda

1. Introductions

Who you are + short (1-2 sentences) of your goals for the taskforce

2. Discussion of the Summary of major DEI points document

Power point presentation (Attached) of an annotated version of the Summary of Major points in DEI plans.

Discussion will focus on whether there is general consensus, whether we can build in cross program and program/grad division efforts, and whether others need more extensive discussion of merit.

3. Next Steps

MEETING MINUTES (**Meeting recorded for note taking purposes*)

Attendees:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Sandy Johnson, Nicole Foti, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Chase Webb, Tejal Desai, Jennifer Thompson (note taker)

Key issues raised in introductions as goals for taskforce:

- . Learn from others & come up with a uniform set of guidelines around DEI to increase transparency & accountability across all Grad Programs and make UCSF a more welcoming place for all students, especially minoritized students
- . Build in accountability & sustainability to the changes we aim to make
- . Create better avenues to recognize & amplify students' voices & ensure their efforts aren't in vain
- . Compensate students for DEI leadership
- . Standardize & make admissions processes more equitable
- . Increase enrollment of black students; form coalitions and collaborations to come up with action items to improve experience for black students and black faculty at UCSF
- . Gain an understanding of the current landscape; what's being done to increase efforts to address anti-black racism & how black students are integrated into that process
- . ID issues where we can speak with one voice to leverage all programs to effect leadership on issues that we cannot solve by ourselves
- . In addition to short-term plans & actions; develop medium and long-term plans that mobilize resources to address racism and anti-blackness on campus

- . Ensure that any changes in this space are implemented at all levels of UCSF – encompassing staff/faculty as well as students
- . Increase faculty engagement & training around these issues
- . Collaboratively make a difference, so that in the near future the experience of a black trainee is exactly identical to that of a white trainee
- . Understand how those of us in the majority demographic can lighten the burden on our URM colleagues by IDing opportunities to become more involved in doing this work
- . Get up to speed with what has been done so far in this space, and as a faculty member, learn how to lift some of the burden of this work from students
- . Bridge disconnect between efforts of students and grad programs vs. institutional leadership in embracing cultural shift through actions. Lend my voice figure out how to muster resources that will enable us to move from talk to action by changing the uppermost culture; to then influence everything else
- . Synergize efforts between work of grad div and grad programs

Brief discussion to clarify end goal of meeting

End goal is to come up with a document or list that can be used to show what grad programs are committed to, and to lay out the landscape, to inform anyone who is going to work with us. To get there, we need to identify commonalities, and any differences, and assess what is working vs. what is not. Some things are in progress and some things are in the planning stage. The PPT is derived primarily from BMI's DEI plan, which is the most comprehensive and advanced & provides a snapshot as a starting point.

Discussion of PPT – (an annotated version of the Summary of Major points in DEI plans)

Key issues raised re: yearly DEI trainings for faculty

- . re: BMI DEI plan: to date, very little has been implemented or tracked in data driven way, so there is no numerical sense of what is and isn't working
- . Consensus that DEI trainings for faculty should be mandatory; but which ones?
- . Consensus that there has been little accountability for faculty to attend training. Mechanisms needed for holding faculty accountable (**more on this below**)
- . Trainings need to be viewed as a starting point for an evolution of true commitment and engagement in these activities that emphasizes direct action
- . Mandate that DEI be part of RCR (*D'Anne is developing anti-black racism content for next year's sessions)

Champion Training

- . Concern raised as to whether Champion Training has a built-in mechanism to ensure faculty engagement, so that they cannot simply tune out, then 'check a box that they've fulfilled req.'
 - o Per CG, in-person iteration of training was very interactive; Dr. Guy is working on re-imaging it for Zoom; and CG is confident that she would welcome our input
- . Champion Training (in its most recent iteration) offers up very little on what actual changes we can make vis-à-vis anti-black racism
 - o DD is working with Dr. Michelle Guy to incorporate an anti-black racism component as well as other issues of particular relevance to basic sci. faculty into Champion Training

Restorative Justice

- . Overall, 1st yr. BMI students who underwent RJ training were very receptive; their collective feedback highlighted the importance of holding the Community Circles at the beginning of the year to head off issues before they unfold. Many taskforce members were not familiar with these offerings so Ryan & D'Anne provided a brief overview. Key components of the circles include enhancing dialog and vulnerability with the intent of fostering agreements to bolster community within programs; and so that ultimately folks are more comfortable with having the

conversations that need to take place when harm is done in our community. For more info see <https://studentlife.ucsf.edu/RJP>

- . A plan to roll out these RJ circles to 1st yr. students in all the grad programs is in the works
- . Interest was expressed in broadening these activities beyond 1st yr. students, to which D'Anne noted a lack of staff resources; given the need for 1-3 trained facilitators per circle; as well as, ideally, targeted curriculums for each program.
- . See emails from Liz Silva encouraging grad program directors/administrators to continue on with RJ work so that it is not a one-time deal.
 - o Community Circles have been scheduled and confirmed w/ea. basic sci programs and will take place between Aug. 28 and Sept. 14
- . Coordinated support across grad programs, fueled by the enthusiasm evident in this meeting for the grad div's RJ initiative, exemplifies the kind of synergy that can come out of this committee

Other Avenues for educating ourselves on the origins and manifestations of white privilege/systemic racism

DEI Sessions@ retreats

- . "Mandatory" DEI sessions at retreats have not worked
 - o Several students observed that whenever DEI comes up at retreats, faculty leave the room; frequently its the same group of people who are truly engaged in these activities
 - o Students would like to understand what is so difficult about making mandatory trainings work – why the disconnect?
 - o Clearly the messaging needs to change to increase awareness among both retreat organizers and attendees that participation is mandatory, not optional and that these sessions have been carefully crafted to augment other trainings vs. presenting information that is redundant
 - o A cultural shift is necessary to elevate DEI as an integral part of retreat programs on par with skits, rather than an add-on, afterthought, or obligation

Other Challenges

- . Who is in charge of coming up with acceptable DEI trainings?
 - o Some led by students/staff are not up to par
 - o The DEI component of Tetrad's retreat was spearheaded by students. The content of what was discussed in break-out sessions varied widely and was often way off-point
 - o Clearly it's problematic to promote these activities then let the burden of taking initiative fall on the students

Seminar speakers on racism & research & systemic racism (for faculty)

- . Plug for more BIPOC seminar speakers to nucleate discussions. This could be accomplished if programs pooled their resources

Faculty (or student) led DEI book or journal club to educate majority on white privilege and structural racism

- . CG clarified that this would primarily be aimed at & led by non-URM faculty/students
- . A Plug to seek out books written by black scholars (ie. don't limit yourself to White Fragility)

Dealing with faculty/student issues; inappropriate behavior etc.

Carrot vs. Stick. Problem: Incentivizing faculty to attend trainings/align behavior with DEI values, has not always worked. Transparent & clear mechanisms needed to hold faculty accountable for transgressions of Title VI and community DEI values

Potential Mechanisms

Transparency

- . Every grad program website will list what trainings/DEI activities faculty have engaged in below bio

Financial punishment? –

- . Tie DEI track record to obtaining 10 yr.?
 - o For the benefit of in-coming students, advocate for transparency at the UCSF or UC-wide level around the university's expectation that demonstrated involvement in DEI trainings and efforts is not only mandatory, but a requirement for advancement to 10-yr
 - o Noted that this needs to be looked at by University-wide committee & is above power that individual grad programs wield
 - o 10-yr. is a one-time event & many faculty don't come up for it for years; may not be most effective tool. DEI mandates need to be continually enforced from day 1
- . Departments Chairs, not programs have prerogative of financial punishment

Remove non-compliant faculty from program

- . Grad programs hold the power of deciding which faculty can mentor their students, and should leverage it; including swiftly removing faculty from a program & preventing them from taking new students, when faculty are in violation of mandated DEI trainings, etc. There is precedent for this!
 - o Having students is a privilege, not a right; and that privilege comes with a responsibility to value all students through demonstrated involvement in DEI activities. A cultural shift is needed to nail home this message
 - o It's critical to immediately message out to all programs when a faculty member is removed from a given program for failure to comply with DEI mandates, so that all programs the faculty is associated with can follow suit
 - o One consideration is ensuring this is done in a manner that is not detrimental to other trainees. Caveat that while you can kick faculty out of programs, they may still create a toxic lab environment for PDs, other trainees and staff

Enhancing DEI support on Campus

Discussion centered on amplifying D'Anne's efforts & shifting burden from students

- . D'Anne is the only person supporting students of color and while there has been a positive sea change since D'Anne was hired, she is but ONE person; it's a travesty that instead of uplifting her and providing her a support team, all DEI initiatives are routed to her and the onus of implementing them falls on her shoulders.
 - o Wide consensus that we need to leverage our collective clout to find resources for D'Anne to move her vision forward at a pace that best suits her
 - o Money is there – we need to come up with action plans to prioritize how we use it
 - o We need to address siloed nature of DEI advocacy at UCSF. How can we leverage funds from across UCSF research entities to unify our efforts?
 - o Perspective from 35+ yrs. at UCSF: University leadership will be on board if efforts are voluntary but is not supportive of grassroots efforts that take money
 - o There's a glaring disconnect between UCSF's rhetoric around the importance of DEI and the lack of resources it earmarks for these efforts
- . URMs tapped or taking initiative to help educate the masses at UCSF around DEI issues should be acknowledged for their invisible labor with compensation (tuition credit/expanding existing leadership/mentoring awards to students)
 - o In order to eliminate power dynamics, support for BIPOC students needs to be guaranteed; one costly initiative would be multi-year a fellowship that can be taken to any lab

3. Meeting outcome & next steps

- 1.) Todd N. & Carol G. volunteered to work on a “Master Doc” enumerating taskforce’s vision of best practices & outlining what is the minimum each faculty would need to do vis-à-vis DEI
 - Google Doc will be set up so that all can contribute
 - Once doc is complete, taskforce 2 will meet to ensure that we’re all on board before the Doc gets disseminated to all of the grad programs
 - 2.) One output from this committee should be a request for \$ from the university
-

August 25, 2020

MEETING MINUTES

Attendees:

Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Sarah Knox, Antara Rao, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wassarman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D’Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Chase Webb, Tejal Desai, Jennifer Thompson, Alexander Johnson, Christina Stephens, Nicole Foti

Carol G. shared three slides that summarize (although not comprehensively, missing certain pieces) the new DEI plan – Google doc put created by Todd N. after last meeting.

Slide 1

Taskforce #2: Meeting 2
Goal: Identify commonalities and distinctions across DEI plans

TRAINING

1. Training for faculty: 1 course/yr, starting with DEI Champions
2. Training for students
 - A. Yr 1: Training at retreat + restorative justice + new course + RCR
 - B. Yr 3: PhD reorientation
 - C. DEI leadership course: competitive admission
3. Topics for discussion
 - A. Timing of new student course

Discussion on Slide 1: Training

Restorative Justice Circles:

- Restorative justice has multiple levels; level one is community building, so that's what would happen in Yr 1 training for students
- Recommend that faculty also take part in restorative justice circles, to address trust issue between students and faculty
 - Agreement by others, current limiting factor is staff capacity; it takes multiple staff to facilitate circles
- Idea: add restorative circles in third year orientation in the next couple years for the students who would miss first year training
- Nothing but positive feedback from restorative justice circles

DEI champions training:

- On their website, still no mention of specifically anti-black racism as of now
 - It was mentioned by Michelle (DEI champions trainer) that she will incorporate this, not clear when

New antiracism in science course for students:

- Response to concern that students have too much going on in their first year to take diversity and racism in science course: we need to move things around if there's too much on their plate; first year is when a lot of harm happens and so this should be prioritized early on

Slide 2

NEW EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

1. Book clubs/journal clubs on literature of racism
2. Seminar programs:
 - a. more diverse speakers with BIPOC speakers staying for 2 days
 - b. 1 seminar/yr featuring a speaker who studies or teaches racism
3. Incorporate diversity events into retreats with required attendance
4. Questions for discussion:
 - a. Will all grad programs commit to these actions?
 - b. How to incorporate work of Gilliam Fellows
 - c. Strategies to use retreat events to increase faculty/grad program engagement

Discussion on Slide 2: New Events and Activities

- We should make sure we're not overlapping too much and utilizing resources across schools, e.g. the School of Dentistry is recruiting faculty members of color to give seminars
 - Cross-pollinating, integration across the school is needed and needs to go to Dean's level; continued siloes reproduce racist practices
- It's more than just having a seminar once every quarter or year, needs to be more engaging, more than 1hr lecture; need to offer tools and practices faculty can take away and use; something like the LGTB health forum or half day
- One thing they've done in [missed program or dept – Aparna L.] is to bring in an expert speaker on antiracism or law enforcement, and then later coming together as a community to discuss it
- We have money for speakers, so how can we make this sustainable? Is there a committee to help/formalize a selection process for BIPOC speakers?
 - Recommendation: Black in STEM, 500 Queer Scientist, 500 Women Scientist have been doing visibility campaigns and have curated lists of leaders that could potentially be speakers
 - PSPG are getting speakers that experts in racism, independent of the science speakers series
- Since there is an aspect of emotional labor here, they should be paid more
 - For the Biochem series, that is the plan
- Also need to keep in mind that scientists from historically marginalized background might want to just talk about their science, not other experiences, or is that an expectation imposed on them?
 - Biochem has two people working on these exact questions
- Two forms of speakers
- -One is to have explicit experts to teach on racism, and also to have BIPOC scientist speakers talk about their science (importance of seeing people who look like you) as well as encouraging the option to share their experiences of racism in science
- Thing that ties DEI staff and seminar series; faculty need to pressure institution to hire staff to help D'Anne, we should not leave it for D'Anne to advocate for herself
 - If UCSF agrees anti-racism training is important (response to limitations around staff capacity), then UCSF should invest money to increase capacity
 - There is siloing in the institution, need to make better use of resources; there are DEI representatives at other places within the school
 - A lot of initiatives being built in programs are really going off developments at Grad Division
- Reliance on ORU are philanthropic funds and might not be the best financial support to rely on sustainably
 - How do we talk with philanthropic funders to fund diversity efforts?
 - Development Office is the place to push these initiatives forward
 - Tejal just did a presentation to advocate for students and philanthropic funding, will share this presentation with the committee
 - Any one of these big funders who pay for building could easily fund these effort
 - Students can be a huge help in getting funders to support students
 - Faculty should be more conscientious about asking for students as the first line of labor; faculty should do this work first before asking students
- Students from marginalized background whose mission is to be here to advance science and not diversity and equity work should not be expected to do that work
 - Need to pay students - this cannot be in the form of giftcards; students cannot pay their rent with giftcards

- All programs right now have mechanisms to pay students now, and programs are using these funds; this is an idea/option to pay students now, while we work to develop more sustainable funding mechanisms; need mechanism now as well as sustainable mechanism
- One thing to add to the conversation is to discuss elitism and the coded racist messaging in elitism; what is elitism? What is meritocracy? What is expected of students of who we include in our club?
 - This needs to be unpacked; Assimilation is a tool for racism

Slide 3

NEW POLICIES TO ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY

1. Graduate programs will develop guidelines for admission to program
 - a. Faculty must comply with requirement for mentor training
 - b. faculty who have been sanctioned under Title 9 or Title 7 will be denied access to graduate students by graduate programs
2. Develop and publish on the program website the intervention strategies Used to deal with problematic interactions
3. Develop a Faculty Code of Conduct adopted by all programs, which articulates requirements for membership
4. Yearly program climate surveys (anonymous?) followed by meetings with students
5. Yearly meetings between grad program directors and Dean Watkins: connections to students??

Discussion on Slide 3: New Policies to Ensure Accountability

- What is the mechanism for holding faculty accountable? Faculty code of conduct is not adhered to
- Handway if not in the Academic Senate bylaws, no enforcement mechanism
- There is some enforcement through graduate programs
 - This does not count for postdocs
 - Bare minimum is for these faculty to not have students; but also need to go up against faculty from graduate counsel; some barriers have been lofled by faculty in terms of lawsuits, but school should have more courage to go up against faculty who violate policies
- Enforcement has to happen above grad programs as well; too many conflicts of interest with faculty in programs; there has to be a standardized policy across Grad Division
- How can we engage values of restorative justice vs punitive measures to ensure accountability?
 - If a faculty member is found in violation, is there a mechanism for them to repair the harm and reintegrate back into our communities; code of conduct should have statements on this

- There are systems in place for Title 9 violations, there's OMBUDS; But there are systems of protection for faculty; the level at which it is handled causes issues
 - Faculty are still unable to find out what violations were found about other faculty members
 - Freedom of information act, could go this route
 - Shouldn't be this huge of a burden to find this information out
 - At graduate counsel this was brought up, a couple mechanisms were discussed, where some amount of people could get information on violations
- The faculty code of conduct, could we have faculty sign this on annual basis
 - Unclear how "new" code of conduct would be different
 - Idea: we could go through and add language, such as explicit language against structural racism
 - We should have these values across the university, not just grad div faculty
 - Agreed, but where we have control is over graduate programs
 - Power of code of conduct, in addition to APM, on every individual program website that is it will be transparent; no one can gaslight you and say these things aren't important or required of faculty

Next Steps:

- Task force members will review and clean up DEI Initiatives document by the end of the week
- This document will be sent out next week to program directors
 - Programs will be asked to review, make edits, and ensure that plan can/will be implemented
 - Programs to clarify who will carry the changes (make clear it is not always students, as this is not clear)
- Think about faculty code of conduct across grad programs
 - Will need to come to decision about consequences – put some thought into this (outright dismissal from program, restorative justice, etc.) for next meeting

October 6, 2020

Attendees: Tanja Kortemme, Christina Stephens, Geeta Narlikar, Elizabeth Bond, Roberto Diaz, Lisa Gunaydin, Anna Lipkin, Todd Nystul, Ryan Hernandez, Elizabeth McCarthy, Jason Gestwicki, Douglass Wasserman, Aparna Lakkaraju, Dina Buitrago Silva, Matthew Spitzer, Yewande Alabi, D'Anne Duncan, Carol Gross, , Sandy Johnson, Srikantan Nagarajan, Jasmine King, Tejal Desai, Erin Johnson, Jennifer Thompson (note taker)

Moderators: *D'Anne Duncan & Elizabeth McCarthy*

Agenda:

The over-arching agenda for this mtg. is for students to share broader themes & points of concern to enable success of the final "document" that is the end goal of taskforce 2.

Setting the context

Robbie Diaz reminded us that the public execution of George Floyd was the the initial impetus for this TF; underscored that 19 additional black lives that have been taken at the hands of police since the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee's last meeting in June, & noted the potentially re-traumatizing nature of topics of discussion. He reiterated that, taskforce engagement is work, additional work, and that the educational status of our black students does not protect them from the emotionally traumatizing nature of this taskforce work. Finally, he urged any and all to take the space, if they needed it, to deal with any emotions arising out of our discussion.

The slide deck collectively developed by the students of TF2 and presented by Robbie, Doug, Anna provides not only an overview of the TF document as it currently stands, but a thorough and thoughtful critique that summarizes broader themes and pinpoints the students' concerns vis-à-vis both the document and the current culture of DEI work within the taskforces; and, more broadly, within UCSF as an institution.

Since the slide deck is invaluable for framing the discussion notes captured below; we will ensure that all TF 2 members receive a copy. The students went a step further than outlining concerns in their presentation; in multiple instances they put forth suggestions to address their concerns which are the bolded bullet points under the sub-theme categories.

The students' identified 3 broad categories of discussion topics. To mirror the gist of their framework I've done my best to map the largely anonymized & paraphrased discussion comments and outcomes to the most relevant topics.

Task Force Document: w/in this theme discussion centered largely around several broad and specific concerns:

The frustration generated by the lack of clarity vis-à-vis who is accountable for what

Specific concern: the heavy lifting is falling to D'Anne and the students, **and will continue to**, until ownership & responsibility for initiatives is clarified.

Specific concern: We need to parse out short term vs. long term initiatives and come to an agreed upon timeline for implementation

Discussion:

- Concern that document is not at an end stage
- the merit of identifying and distilling from the current document those items that could be implemented within a short timeframe without further extensive discussion
 - o It was noted that some programs have already implemented some action items (which may provide a template for other programs) and also that some items have implications for incoming students
 - o Faculty wanted to understand whether we had consensus points that we could move forward with in the short-term
 - Discussion ensued on how to gauge TF consensus & the need to qualify language for any undefined terms used in doc.
 - 2/3 majority vs. unanimity – put more weight on student assessments? Is it premature to develop working def of consensus?

- Erin Johnson, a new Rosenberg Fellow working with D'Anne will work on developing metrics to enable us to measure points of consensus w/in our existing doc & ensure that language is not watered down. D'Anne will pull from her internal glossary re: undefined terms
- o Erin is in the process of packaging our current document in a form that delineates what is already in progress/who is responsible for what/ & assigning a comprehensive timeline for implementation of the various initiatives; it will be disseminated to the group for comment at least a week in advance of our next meeting
 - Anonymize assessments? Sort by faculty vs. students?
 - Make it a living doc w/ caveats reflected in footnotes, that get revisited? Need mechanism to ensure that dissenting ideas don't get lost

Agenda item at our next mtg: - Discuss & vote on latest iteration of the "document"

- Re: Accountability & trainings, RH reported that he working with Isaac & Jason G. to try & come up with an enforcement mechanism for DEI trainings that we will share at an upcoming meeting

Management and Organization Concerns: w/in this theme discussion largely centered on concerns around lack of clarity re: the goals and structure of the TF as well as expectations of TF members at all levels; and the sustainability of DEI work.

Concern: The lack of financial compensation for students engaged in DEI work was brought up: Students noted that this work detracts from their thesis work and is not considered as part of their progress to degree completion.

- o DEI work could be formally included in student theses, which could be beneficial to a host of folks already engaged in this work. Some universities have already made this a requirement
 - **This idea merits further consideration by the TF**

Concern: Lack of full-time experts demonstrates a lack of commitment on behalf of Grad Div.

- o Concerns about bandwidth of D'Anne & other individuals working on DEI
- o Sandy offered to spearhead an effort to approach Basic Sci. Chairs at their next mtg. to enlist them in making it a priority to ask for money for this work (leverage their visibility w/ institutional purse holders)
- o Tejal has been talking w/ Michael Penn about a similar effort
- o Robbie noted that a previous effort to target faculty on Training Grants & HHMI faculty with discretionary funds for an annual contribution to support student groups engaged in DEI work went nowhere

Future TF agenda item: Strategize a coordinated approach to prime Basic Science Chairs for a future ask for \$ to sustain DEI efforts

Concern: No clarity around goals & structure of TF

Substantial discussion re: re-structuring TF, forming sub-groups for specific tasks & defining goals/what is success?

- o Ea. Sub-group would need a manager (ie. a D'Anne) to create deliverables
- o Effectiveness of sub-groups can go either way
- o If we adopt sub-groups; onus should be on faculty
- o Step-back & re-examine broader structure/define concrete goals/metrics of success? – this could be delegated to a 1st sub-group
- o CG wants to learn from students – what would you see as your role on sub-committees, if we move towards that structure?
 - For funding sub-committee students could be a bridge to help pinpoint & articulate what activities/student groups need funding

- For curriculum or admissions student role could be identifying inclusive language and theories
- For outreach, student input can shape the success of our efforts
- As students, we can comment on our lived experiences; but it's hard for us to make broad spectrum claims for our entire community -that is where we need to seek out, recruit and rely on experts, beyond D'Anne
- o Do we want this TF to deal w/ long-term issues or go back to SFDC; perhaps restructure that group to have them tackle some of the long-term issues? Note – there is quite a bit of overlap in the composition of the 2 groups
- o Or, Would students like to wrap up initial work of TF & tease out longer term action items? – or re-constitute TF with new structure?
- o Can we clarify over-arching & concrete goals of TFs & their relation to Student-Faculty Diversity Comm. – who is ultimately responsible for writing faculty code of conduct? (as FYI several Basic Sci programs already have templates for Faculty Code of Conduct
- o Can we define what we mean by short-term?
- o Faculty want to know where to focus their energy
- o From a theory of group development perspective, seems like we're nearing the performing stage; therefore reconstituting the group might be a step backwards

Future TF agenda item: Further refine goals/structure of TF; expectations of its members (faculty vs. students); as well as its relationship to the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee

Concern: Sense of Urgency/Disconnect (w/o addressing concerns and feedback)

- o Students expressed concern that the sense of **Urgency** with which the TF has attempted to complete this deliverable, has trumped addressing their concerns and feedback
- o Several faculty brought up fear of losing required TF momentum & urgency; and expressed a desire to hear from students re: both where they might best focus their energy; and how to better understand harm/risks of rapid implementation.

Robbie re: risks of rapid implementation:

- Even “easily” implemented actions including inviting seminar speakers from diverse backgrounds can do harm, if not delicately executed (ie. may result in tokenism)
- To lower risk of harm along racial identities, the only initiatives that could be implemented w/in 3-6 mos. are those drawing on existing content & aimed at faculty, and, that would be beneficial to students
- Anything involving student interface/experience represents way bigger endeavor with more potential for harm that is a huge stretch for this admissions cycle
- After hearing comments; Robbie would like explicit moratorium on implementing any changes until next Fall; this could enable us to promote current efforts while preventing further harm
 - o Carol pointed out that there is significant overlap between membership of this TF2 and the Student-Faculty Diversity Committee. She initially set up TFs as an emergency measure to address concerns that came out of last SFDC mtg. The immediate objective was for the TFs to assess/communicate what is currently out there re: DEI in Grad Div & Grad programs. These were short-term initiatives that would report back to SFDC. CG wanted to get back quickly to program directors quickly w set of guidelines to vote on; then have programs monitor each other re: actions implemented and conduct a post evaluation @ 1 yr.
 - Need for clarity around what this group does, what individual programs do and what grad div does, there are many simultaneous efforts; sense that

we are being diffuse which adds to feeling that nothing is getting done.
One of strengths of TF is that it has representation from all the programs
– how do we intersect with other ongoing efforts?

Student Support and Expectations: w/in this theme discussion largely centered on the following concerns:

Concern: Students' perspectives and emotions are not respected

- o Students feel we have to monitor our tone
- o Voices must not only be heard, but valued and honored
- o There is a common assumption that students will implement changes; regardless of whether they've given their explicit approval).
- o Students shouldn't be seen as experts on these topics
- o Be mindful of not piling more responsibilities on students

Concern: There is a lack of engagement in discussion about points of contention and confusion

- o It is commonplace for points of contention/confusion to be truncated or side-lined
- o Discussions focus on why we can't do something, not how we can change things
- o One student having an issue is enough to merit discussion on that point

Concern: There is an assumption that students will implement changes; regardless of whether they've given their explicit approval

- o This is both commonplace and damaging
- o Prioritize explicit approval from students
- o Outline expectations of roles of faculty vs. students

Outcomes - Next Steps: See Agenda items highlighted in red above

Next Meeting: We aim to have our next meeting the week of Nov. 16. Ideally we'll send out mtg. materials a week ahead to allow for initial comments before voting

- **Wanted:** 2 student & 2 faculty reps to meet with D'Anne to collaboratively make a PPT & agenda for next meeting. **Email D'Anne to volunteer**