

**DELIVERABLE #4**

**URGE Policies for Working with Communities of Color for  
the Jackson School of Geosciences (JSG) Pod  
at The University of Texas at Austin**

*The JSG URGE Pod has 87 Members. Therefore, the Pod is split into “Podlets” to accommodate meeting times and foster discussions in smaller groups. Below is the synthesized deliverable for the JSG pod with specific guidelines for each Podlet.*

*Note: there may not be consensus between podlets.*

---

This is what was found by the JSG URGE Pod at the University of Texas at Austin on policies for Working with Communities of Color as well as plans for improved processes and/or needed resources.

**Executive Summary:**

- **Most of us don't have training.**
- **It would be great if we could get training from the university/school (like IRB)**
- **Lots of enthusiasm for being trained/having a better outline of what to do.**
- **Broader Impacts should be Equal to Research Initiatives (like NSF)**
- **UT now has a land acknowledgement** - (I) We would like to acknowledge that we are meeting on the Indigenous lands of Turtle Island, the ancestral name for what now is called North America. Moreover, (I) We would like to acknowledge the Alabama-Coushatta, Caddo, Carrizo/Comecrudo, Coahuiltecan, Comanche, Kickapoo, Lipan Apache, Tonkawa and Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo, and all the American Indian and Indigenous Peoples and communities who have been or have become a part of these lands and territories in Texas.
  - o **The Jackson School should have a discussion about how to implement the acknowledgement in publications and presentations.**
  - o Where should we include this? Papers? Talks? Every JSG meeting? etc.

**Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**

- Chicxulub drilling project in Mexico. We have several Mexican collaborators on the project and had public presentations about what we were doing. None of the collaborators were Mayan which are the indigenous people.
- Sample collection and field work along the US-Mexico border. Had to interact with local law enforcement and US Border Patrol, as well as sample along some of the more heavily watched portions of the border.
- AZ/CA: Various field sites and sample collection on Chemehuevi, Cahuilla, Yavapai Apache, and Quechan ancestral lands (now largely BLM in AZ/CA--Bureau of Land Management)-- Aware of Chemehuevi and Colorado River Indian Tribes reservation boundaries and avoided sample collection within sacred mountains.
- Eastern Siberia--worked with local Yakutian scientists (including 1 indigenous Siberian) on the research plan and trip logistics.
- Field trip locations (for courses--e.g., High Atlas of Morocco in Berber lands, Svalbard?)
  - Peru - women weren't allowed into underground mine
- Field work in Irian Jaya, at a mine owned by Americans, run by ex-pats and Indonesians, and surrounded by native Irians. Certainly meaningful interactions with the Indonesians, but only in a work setting, and at least when I was there, negligible with the Irians (cannot say concerning subsequent work by others on that project).
  - Andean mountains studies, sampling across several towns & interacting with locals. In specific towns, locals were indigenous communities which we reached before we started the work to let them know why we were there and what we were doing.

**What worked well in these interactions?**

- Chicxulub drilling project: We had an outreach day where politicians etc (but not the general public) came out by ship to the drilling platform.
- US-Mexico Border: Most interactions were with local law enforcement, who tended to be quizzical as to our purpose driving slowly and stopping at odd points along the border, and Border Patrol, who like to do vehicle searches. They tended to be pretty painless so I'll go with them because they worked "well".
- Irian Jaya: Unclear if anything worked "well"; it was mostly just coexistence. Irians would migrate to the mine site, probably for a variety of reasons (jobs, resources, probably including negative elements such as drugs). The mine did provide medical clinics, and probably the only (Western-style) economic development the region had ever experienced.
- CA/AZ: No direct interaction with people (in the desert, often don't see anyone for days...).
- Eastern Siberia: collaboration, knowledge of local terrane, and scientific input from local Yakutians was crucial to the trip's success
- Andean mountains study: I think that it worked well that we reached out to the community before we actually started to work because although our research will not take place in the community itself, we would be in the main access road to the community. Thus, we were not seen as intruders but we were seen as visitors, and everyone was friendly.

**What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

- Chicxulub drilling project: The fishing community protested and thought we might be causing harm to the marine community.
- US-Mexico Border: Not sure there is a way to let local law enforcement and US Border Patrol know your field plans ahead of time, but it could help with interacting with the local communities.
- Irian Jaya: Not all natives wanted the mine to be there, and they certainly had no choice. Primary economic benefits went to the company and the Indonesian government; the entire project was impossible without the consent of the government.

- Field locations: Peru mine - we were allowed in, but perhaps after some deliberation General: Mistrust due to previous treatment by oil & gas/mining.
- Accessing without talking to locals ahead of time, or starting to work right away without talking to the Indigenous communities.
- CA/AZ: Some Native Lands boundaries are unclear. For example, part of a range in AZ is part of the Colorado River Indian Reservation, but the boundary is different depending on what map you look at, and there is no obvious signage or fencing to stop people from hiking into the range. More preparedness required by researchers to ensure they are not extracting or exploiting ancestral lands by taking samples. It takes several months to a year, but obtaining sampling permission from tribal councils should also be a priority in the future (and how to include the local community).

**Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

- General: establish the difference between research and oil & gas, funding from partisan sources only?
- I think that a start could be socializing the results of the project and making them accessible for the communities at the end of the project. Always to be open to listen and show respect for the limits that they establish.

**Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**

- **UT Land Acknowledgement** <https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/nais/land-acknowledgement/index.php>: (I) We would like to acknowledge that we are meeting on the Indigenous lands of Turtle Island, the ancestral name for what now is called North America. Moreover, (I) We would like to acknowledge the Alabama-Coushatta, Caddo, Carrizo/Comecrudo, Coahuiltecan, Comanche, Kickapoo, Lipan Apache, Tonkawa and Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo, and all the American Indian and Indigenous Peoples and communities who have been or have become a part of these lands and territories in Texas.

**Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**

- Paleontology and fossil excavation in Chile
- Seismometer deployment in Kenya
- Outcrop studies in southern Argentina/Patagonia

**What worked well in these interactions?**

- Involving people from the local communities and institutions to participate in research efforts
- Working with grassroots organizations that are deeply involved in the community (e.g. NGOs)
- Disseminate research results through infographics and videos on social media
- Talking with local geologists to understand local customs, land rights, history of interactions with geologists/government, etc.
- Forming lasting relationships with land owners and communicating to them our findings (e.g. what's on their land, what's valuable about it)
- Bringing community members/local researchers to campus to give talks

**What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

- Difficulty translating large documents after they are already drafted -- would be better to have a native speaker assist with the translation while documents are drafted
- There needs to be institutional resources for translation so that native speakers aren't asked to do additional, unpaid labor to support community-facing communications
- Can be difficult to assemble funds to pay local assistants for work.

**Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

- Translate results into languages that are used in local communities (e.g. printed materials in Spanish for dominantly Spanish-speaking areas in California)
- Create diagrams or displays that explain the results in local schools and museums
- Discuss with community members how follow-ons to that research could or could not be beneficial to communities or involve the communities prior to pursuing follow-ons

**Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**

- Organizations like NSF could create guidelines that establish whether proposers have done this sort of ground-up thinking about involvement of communities. Their implementation of Broader Impacts is an example of how they helped shift the culture of the research community; they have the opportunity to do this here too.
- How would guidelines for working with local communities differ between disciplines and modes of research within the geosciences (e.g. remote modeling versus field work)
- Plan ahead and be transparent about what can be offered in exchange for services -- i.e. Will collaborators be paid for their field work? Will the project cover their travel expenses? How can volunteers be compensated with non-monetary value?
- [UT's Projects for Underserved Communities \(PUC\)](#) has information on international partners, investors, cultural advisors, etc. They might have practices and guidelines in place for working with local communities that we could adopt.
- Make environmental justice/racism classes, seminars, degrees, etc. more widely available, especially at institutions where there are large research efforts in the earth sciences. Perhaps we should have a short seminar for graduate students to teach best practices in conducting research in an environmentally just/equitable way.

## Tuesday Evening Podlet

### **Audit of previous interactions with communities of color from members of our pod (both at UT and elsewhere):**

- NCED involvement with Fond du Lac tribe looking at similarities and differences between western and indigenous knowledge of Earth system (from grade school level to college level).
- GeoFORCE involvement with recruiting students from underrepresented communities, and leading academies.
- Collaboration between remote sensing groups at UCSD/Scripps and CICESE (Centro de Investigación Científica y de Educación Superior de Ensenada) to measure strain rates along the San Andreas Fault.
- Project in Jamaica working on geoscience education research.
- Project in the Himalayas looking at mountain catchment systems.

### **What worked well in these interactions?**

- Developing guidelines for what success looks like.
- Making the science more transparent to the communities involved → important to make clear what the project is on, what it will answer, and what it won't be able to answer.
- Understanding the community values, and working those in as core values to any program as well. I. E. addressing potential issues associated with leaving home for the first time.
- Having the programs be a true partnership, not a one-way street.
- Experiential learning opportunities.
- One-on-one interactions.
- Having local contacts not only at the individual level, but at the local leadership and institutional level.
- Making sure the values of the community are well reflected.

### **What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

- As discussed in Session 3, often these things require champions to run these types of efforts (on both sides), and when these champions move on to other things, the connections and drive become lost.
- Most of the GeoFORCE applicants came from areas with local connections, specifically teachers that pushed their star students to apply. When those teachers retired or left to another school district, often drastically fewer students applied. This can be addressed in the future by actively seeking out multiple connections from the onset.
- Uncertainty surrounding the potential longevity of the program, from any aspect (e.g., funding, logistics, data sharing, involvement, etc. etc. etc.).
- If the local connections are not built in/planned up front, there becomes a power-dynamic where the outsiders may be 'coming in' with an already formed research idea, and not providing space for more collaboration.
  - This also imparts/amplifies a negative stereotype of scientists as 'extractive' workers.

### **Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

- Set up ways to have more consistent or disseminated (?) leadership? Have multiple tiers of leadership.
- Continuing fostering new relationships to find champions
- Setting up long-term plans right from the start to think about what long-term engagement looks like moving into the future.
- Making sure that there are resources and wherewithal to keep projects/programs going for long periods of time (>10 years).

**Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**

- Given the importance of longevity for the success of the programs and relationships etc., long-term funding for long-term types of programs like this (a la LTER) would be a huge benefit.
  - Perhaps partnering with USGS regional offices? Seems there is one in Austin...
- Code of conduct for how best to partner with and interact with local communities of color.

**Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**

Doing field geology, you sometimes REALLY want to find an outcrop no matter what, regardless of private property or local customs/expectations. Some of us have done this in the field in other countries (not worrying about whether we had appropriate permission to look for outcrop in a given area). But this is not the right approach!

On person's experience working in National Parks and monuments on paleontology research: the park service arranged collaborations and exposure for the students in the surrounding Navajo nation and Hopi reservation.

The BEG currently has a formal opinion study run by Dr Kahlor, Stan Richards School, UT that contracts a firm that has a demographically correct (diverse) pool of 1000 paid local residents in the Houston – Port Arthur region. We ask them questions about our research. It is clear that local residents basically have little interest, little knowledge and little motivation to be interested in our research. When we run focus groups, local participants try more politely to get more interested, they are interested in jobs, air quality, political issues, and if we are the ones speeding down their road. All this has been repeated in various forms since 2004 and is published.

**What worked well in these interactions?**

Have to meet people where they are. Give them the PI name and phone number. Deal with them when they call. Have met the most diverse people at churches via invitation of the pastor.

Wherever you go for field work, be a real person and try to make connections with people there. Reach out to local teachers! They will often be interested in having guest speakers come to their classes. Teacher doesn't want to necessarily hear about your research--ask them what they would like to hear about. Make sure the topic is something they're interested in.

**What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

Not succeeding in getting anyone local of any color much interested in our work. Did hear a lot of fun personal stories though. People are polite but are hoping you leave soon so they can talk about something relevant to them. They try, but little overlap in our real interests.

It is important in some places and communities for researchers, especially women and researchers of color, to be careful in interactions. The cultural expectations that academics in the U.S. and other places have women will not be harassed in public (or similar) are not necessarily met in communities in the US and internationally. For example, two people (in our podlet group of 6) had or had direct knowledge of negative experiences of female students in Hawai'i, one specifically associated with trying to reach out to groups from the native Hawai'ian community as part of NSF project outreach.

**Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

Collaborations can be expensive, because in practical terms to have a meaningful collaboration you have to meaningfully share the funding, which may mean that you can't focus a project in the direction you want.

## Wednesday Afternoon Podlet

- **Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**
  - *Member 1: performed geological research abroad in Papua New Guinea and Native Siberia. Partnered with indigenous locals and other researchers from local/non-local universities*
  - *Member 2: performed research in West Africa and in New Orleans (USA). Involved coordination with local universities and natives in those locations.*
  - *Member 3: performed paleontological research in New Mexico (USA)/Chaco National Park with Navajo Nation and Pueblo. Met with tribes to present research results and partnered with San Juan Community College to perform outreach and increase local participation*
- **What worked well in these interactions?**
  - *Spending time extended periods of time together built trust and allowed for cultural exchange*
  - *Having clear guidelines for how to engage with indigenous/native people and include them in research (e.g. presenting research findings to broader public + leadership of indigenous population)*
  - *Prioritizing social engagement and time getting to learn the others' languages*
- **What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**
  - *University folks used a different "grammar" that made it challenging to foster connections with locals/individuals that were part of study.*
    - *A way to improve this would for academic researchers to connect with local non-profit organizations that have already developed in-roads and organic partnerships with locals*
- **Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**
  - *Working closely with non-profits*
  - *Engaging meaningful with indigenous people to understand how science and observations can improve their ways of life + address issues that they currently face*
  - *Understanding that treating indigenous/locals as a monolith is wrong and treacherous, so making sure that a plurality of voices are included during research planning*
- **Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**
  - *Having clear plans on who possesses samples/data and how it is disseminated and used*
  - *Including issues regarding JEDI issues + field work as discussion material for GEO 298T*
  - *Resources for how to effectively initiate and foster connections with indigenous folks*
  - *For natural scientists: finding ways to better connect with social scientists when performing research that either a) engage with local/indigenous people or b) study environments in which they live*
  - *Lists of funding sources (internal to institution and external) that promote work with social scientists + communities of color*

## Thursday Morning Podlet

- Chris shared screen of deliverables doc about experiences with Indigenous communities/communities of color - discussion:
- Nicholas discussed how his research area is of interest to the Pueblo community and the NPS is provided his permit to the Pueblo to review. He offered to have them accompany him on his field work. He does not have experience with it, but would like guidance on how to generate a collaboration, outside of his current experience with NPS. Their community abuts the Valles Caldera National Preserve where Nicholas plans to sample from.
- Kirk discussed an experience during his PhD work and field work in support of a colleague on his project concerning stabilization of train tracks near a culturally significant Indigenous site. They had to avoid the area and ensure their lidar measurements did not capture the site.
- Nicholas is concerned that he will sample rocks that he should not because they might be culturally significant to the Pueblo.
- Chris discussed his coastal research proposal in south Texas and predominantly Hispanic communities. They are coordinating with a university there for their field work focusing on how barrier islands are changing with SLR. The focus of the proposal is to co-design the research with local managers about their needs. First year of the project will involve meetings with local leaders to understand their needs before designing the research. May be a good example of the future of co-designing research with local stakeholders. Chris also mentioned previous proposals and research in international waters working with nearby countries/universities because the work applies to them.
- Kat discussed her regret of not collaborating with local communities in her research in the Bahamas, especially because their water needs are so significant. She plans to incorporate these concerns and collaborate with local communities in her future research on the islands. Kat mentioned that the communities there are used to seeing scientists working there, but she is not sure if they have ever experienced any interactions with scientists.
- Nicholas mentioned his water research project in Indiana while in undergrad in a county with higher poverty levels. The project was focused on trace contaminants in the water and sharing the results with the community. Nicholas said he regrets that there was not a follow-up on the results and how it has impacted the community. Nicholas highlighted the importance of not only gauging community interest, but ensuring access to the data that pertains to the health of the community.

### Chris Podlet Leader Update:

- Chris mentioned the broader goal of the JSG Pod - All of the deliverables will be contained within a larger document to begin discussions with JSG and UT that will likely result in a town hall to discuss the goals of our community. There will be an extra URGE meeting after the sessions are done and we will hopefully reach a consensus over how to implement the actions/changes we have outlined in our deliverables.
- Kirk mentioned the last question about resources: Kirk would like us to make a point of setting aside resources to set up collaboration/discussion prior to the start of research/field work. He wants to incentivize the process within Jackson School to build relationships with communities of color. Chris agreed with the idea and Emily mentioned some specific grants may exist to address that issue. Chris recommended compiling a list just for those resources for JSG scientists to take advantage of. Kirk mentioned Blue Sky proposals, and Chris said those can be used to establish relationships with communities.
- Krista asked about best practices/guidelines for approaching different communities in ways that will not offend them. It would be helpful for geoscientists to have cross-cultural training. Chris agreed and mentioned the importance of de-centering western approaches to knowledge and science.

**Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**

*Situations where we just dropped into another country and didn't have any interaction with the community other than by chance*

- Chile field research - While conducting research in the high Andes, we could have done more to collaborate with the Chilean geologic community and should have done more to acknowledge the local population of the field area. In planning our trip we worked with a Chilean Branch of an international mining company. They provided us with maps and a field truck and we hired one of their drivers, a Chilean, as our field assistant. However, we did not seek collaborations with Chilean geologists. While there, we respected and supported the local population, asking permission to cross property to study outcrops, hiring horses and guides to travel in regions without roads, transporting produce from the farm fields to town, and sharing our food supplies. However, I should have done more to acknowledge the contribution of the local population to our work. They provided lodging, roadside assistance, food, regional guidance (Staci)

*Situations that are intended to benefit community by design*

- Environmental Science Institute: Scientists in Residence (Sci-Res). The Sci-Res program partners STEM graduate students and K-12 science teachers to engage students in the excitement of scientific discovery and help graduate students advance their science communication skills. This program typically partners with insufficiently-funded Title 1 schools with predominantly URM students. (Darrel)
- Environmental Science Institute: Hot Science - Cool Talks (HSCT). HSCT is a science communication program that provides a platform for top scientists to engage a large public audience in a 1-hr presentation format. HSCT occurs six times per academic year, has a 5,000+ member mailing list, so tickets tend to sell out quickly. To ensure that URM students and their families can attend, a specific number of tickets are reserved for K12 students who are currently and previously engaged with the Sci-Res program. (Darrel)

**What worked well in these interactions?**

- Sci-Res and HSCT have been very successful at engaging URM students and community members. They were both designed from the outset to maximize broader impacts by engaging stakeholders, soliciting feedback on the communication process, tracking metrics, and adjusting marketing and partnering efforts as needed. Sci-Res is particularly effective at URM student engagement due to the focus of Title 1 school partner teachers. (Darrel)

**What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

*How can this be better addressed in the future?*

- Planning Broader Impacts in coordination with the original scientific research. Focusing on community impact and involvement as much as we focus on the science.
- Recognizing that community involvement and outreach requires unique knowledge and experience. The Diversity and Outreach Group, directed by Sam Moore, at the Jackson School could play a larger role in developing and executing the Broader Impacts components of research.
- We need to continue to strive for more active inclusion of people of color from communities most impacted by the outcomes of the research. This should include co-design of the research project and co-production of data and knowledge. Future projects would thus benefit from the inclusion of a formal mechanism that promotes a two-way exchange of knowledge early in the ideation stage of a project; scientists must bring

stakeholders up to speed on the research, and the stakeholders must provide cultural and community context with which to frame research goals and apply research results. (Darrel)

**Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

- Including or creating some mechanism for reporting when proposed broader impacts activities are not performed or are performed in an inequitable way. This could include reporting by colleagues, students, and community members who were intended to reap the benefits of the proposed research (Claire)

**Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**

- Sensitivity and Awareness training for researchers working in a field area inhabited by people, akin to the Human Subjects Research Training from the Internal Review Board that is required for people who work with human subjects.
- Internal review and accountability of the impact of proposed research on a local community.
- Use land acknowledgements in presentations and publications.
- Develop a plan on PI and grad student level about outreach to the communities on whose land the research project will be developed. These outreach could potentially be a long lasting relationship with the community as projects often get passed along from one grad student to another.
- Make community outreach parallel to the research and not an afterthought.
- Incorporate the stakeholders in the development of the research. (Examples: Research to develop school curriculum should have teachers, and even students, involved in the development of the funding proposal and creation of the curriculum. Research on the environmental impact of urbanization should include city planners and community leaders.)
- Decrease the publications requirement for young/tenure-track faculty (Assistant-Professors) if they are actively engaged in community outreach. With that, define what kind of outreach qualifies. This action will allow faculty to make community outreach a practice instead of a 'half-page' write-up in a proposal. Also, this will promote actions on University level! It could be a win (PI and the research group) -win(Community) -win(University) type of action.
- Please do not consider this comment disrespectful or insensitive, but would it be better to use 'affected communities' or some other term instead of 'communities of color'? The idea is to be inclusive and considerate, and 'color' as it is mostly being referred to, tends to exclude white communities (white immigrants and other white folk in a tough socioeconomic situation). White is also a color :).

*Resources:*

- UT Austin Land Acknowledgement: <https://liberalarts.utexas.edu/nais/land-acknowledgement/index.php>

*Thought for the grad student curriculum:*

- Alongside with DeFord technical series, the Introduction to Teaching class, and the Proposal Writing class, add a Community Outreach class? A class to teach graduate students on communication with the stakeholders and science communication. Maybe collaborating with the Broader Impact Office to develop such a course? Perhaps instead of 2(3) Deford; 1-Teaching; and 1- Proposal Writing; change to 1(2) Deford; 1-Teaching; 1- Proposal Writing; and 1-Community Outreach requirements
- Perhaps these could be incorporated into the existing Broader Impacts course?

**Positive experiences at previous institutions that had impact on the community of interest?**

- To enhance appreciation and knowledge of the local environment and to encourage engagement in geology, I created a program to generate and disseminate educational modules for K-12 students. The program was based in California State University in Bakersfield, California, where the school-aged population is dominantly Latinx. Modules, focused on regional geology, were created by teams of local K-12 teachers, college students from CSU Bakersfield and Bakersfield College (local community college), and scientific experts. To more broadly disseminate educational materials we held a workshop where the workgroups that created the modules taught them to local teachers. Local school administrators facilitated implementation and agreed to store and disseminate physical materials for the modules.(Staci)

**Audit of previous interactions with communities of color at our organization:**

- The time it takes to build a relationship can often be a barrier.
  - A long-term PI needs to be the one to build the relationship.
- Lots of international research projects, very few interactions with local BIPOC communities (positive focus on including local collaborators).
- Some attempts to make connections with BIPOC communities, not all successful.
- Put money into the local community. Pay locals to help the research in the field.

**What worked well in these interactions?**

- Talking with communities and finding out what they might need/want.
- Finding a local research colleague. Helpful scientifically and navigating local interactions.
- Finding a local collaborator who knows the language/field sites and includes them as co-authors.

**What did not work well, and how can this be better addressed in future plans?**

- The time it takes to build a relationship can be really difficult for a graduate student!
  - Past failures in this regard... not enough time in grad school.
- There are local people who are geological guides and hiring these local experts could be a way to support locals and the local economy.
- Start with a discussion about how you can help the community or what they might want (anything? nothing?) and provide the time to figure out what this might look like.
- Collaborate with local/indigenous scientists

**Are there ways to improve the outcome of projects already undertaken?**

- Bring in local students for summer programs/internships.
- Collaborate more meaningfully (i.e., scientific collaboration)
- Spend more time in the community and get to know them for getting to know them (and not just for doing science). A lot of scientists come with ideas but don't take the time to listen to the needs of local people.
- Different people learn in unique ways from one another. People from different cultures and backgrounds have different ways of learning and studying and we need to find ways to prioritize this in projects and education.
  - E.g. Community learning (doing things together and working on systems knowledge or in a collaborative fashion) versus individualistic learning where the emphasis is on each individual person.
  - How can we help people share knowledge and collaborative
- Value different types of data (e.g. traditional vs "scientific" data)
- Of places that we work and perform research: Make sure that we properly acknowledge the land, the history within it, and our role in decolonization. Inspire others to think about these topics.

**Are there specific resources or guidelines that are needed to improve the process for planning ahead and working with communities of color?**

- How to initiate contact with local people/communities?
  - Physically being there & talking to people & bringing things to them
  - Go and talk to people & show interest in what they're doing
  - Bring food!!!

- DO NOT INITIATE VIA EMAIL. Ideally, go in person to foster something real and do it with food! Though, be aware of what our presence means in these spaces (make sure it's during times/places that are welcome to people not from that community).
- **Find colleagues with the same values, not just the same scientific goals!**
  - We need to be ok with walking away from a great project when it has the potential to harm people.

Marian's draft of a Land Acknowledgement for an email:

*\*Native American students make up only 0.2% of UT Austin's student body, however, UT Austin occupies the territory of the [Alabama-Coushatta](#), [Caddo](#), [Carrizo/Comecrudo](#), [Coahuiltecan](#), [Comanche](#), [Kickapoo](#), [Lipan Apache](#), [Tonkawa](#) and [Ysleta Del Sur Pueblo](#) nations. I support the [Land Engagements/Commitments](#) from UT's Native American and Indigenous Studies (NAIS) program. As a descendant of settler-colonizers, I believe it is important to self-educate, actively work against Native American erasure, and to support Indigenous sovereignty. [Whose land are you on?](#)*