URGE Management Plan for Purdue University

This should be a plan to incorporate deliverables into your organization as you continue to develop, assess, and finalize policies and resources. You may want to adjust the format of this for more comprehensive plans, but this covers the essentials.

Deliverable	Existing Policy or Resource?	Initial Point of Contact(s)*	Where It Is or Will Be Posted	Review/Update Interval	Racial Risk Assessment?	Training Recommended?	Approval, Check, and/or Consequence
Complaints and Reporting Policy	Yes	Code of Conduct Committee	Code of Conduct	Reviewed annually	Not planned	Not planned	Yes, see Code of Conduct Committee
Demographic Data	Yes, but need FERPA for full dataset	DEI Committee, URGE POD - Allie Jo, Carlisle W., Dara L.	On EAPS website	Recommend every year	Recommended	Not planned	Not relevant to our pod
Policies for Working with Communities of Color	No	Field Committee, Erin D., Moe M.	Internal	Reviewed as needed	Recommended	Recommended	Yes, see Field Committee
Admissions and Hiring Policies	Yes	Grad comm., Faculty search	Internal currently	No set interval (done to some extent at the	None yet, should be implemented.	Maybe	Approval

		comm., URGE Pod-Hunter V., Stephanie M., Ali M.		college level), recommend annually			
Safety Plan	No (Yes from URGE)	URGE Pod-Alex Kling, James Haber	Field Committee	Annually, but also after any major reported incidents	Not planned	Yes	Approval and Consequence
Resource Map	No (Yes from URGE)	URGE Pod-Adeene Denton, Amanda Rudolph, Kris Izquierdo	Post on EAPS website	Additions once yearly via group meeting and review. Additional changes can be added via interface with Cheryl Pierce	Not planned	The resource map exists as a passive resource for students, staff, and faculty. Training is not affiliated.	Approval

*Note: currently, the initial point of contacts include some URGE members who will not remain at Purdue within the next few years. These should be designated to committees that will be familiar with the deliverable and can make edits/updates on a rotating basis beyond the length of a single PhD student's time in EAPS.

Agreement & Guidelines- TBD how we're moving forward with URGE, who will be involved. In the future, the agreement and guidelines will highlight any meetings with DEI committees, HR, department leadership, etc. It will also detail the expectations of both students, postdocs, administration, and faculty involved.

Complaints and Reporting Policy - These are proposed modifications to the existing Reporting policy. The EAPS department broadly meets the requirements laid out in Deliverable #2. Resources and a flowchart for reporting issues is easily accessible on the EAPS website. The newly developed Code of Conduct (yet to be approved by the College of Science) addresses issues of complaints, reporting, resolution, retaliation, and consequences. The Code of Conduct explicitly states possible consequences for violations as follows:

When necessary, violation reports filed with the department head may be used at the discretion of the department head, the executive committee, and the chairs or members of relevant committees to determine access to departmental resources. For faculty and staff, this can include but is not limited to access to merit raises, awards, seed funds, professional development funds, matching funds, sabbaticals,

departmental space, contract renewals, access to students, TA support, and teaching waivers. For graduate and undergraduate students, this can include but is not limited to travel awards, scholarships, and TA support. For undergraduate students, this also includes participation in research and field activities.

While confidential and anonymous reporting is not guaranteed by the EAPS Code of Conduct, it clearly states that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained whenever possible.

Best efforts will be made to keep all violation reports confidential in perpetuity. However, should the department head deem that the reported behavior is likely to affect the willingness of other department members to support their place in EAPS, the report may be used in the course of other confidential departmental processes (e.g., promotion and tenure).

To prevent retaliation by members of the EAPS community accused of violations of the Code of Conduct, the Code of Conduct includes the following commitment:

In an effort to prevent retaliation, we commit to:
   a) *Make every effort to keep reports confidential*
   b) *When possible, keep reporters anonymous if report violation forms are not filed*
   c) *Evaluate departmental and committee structures to ensure equity and fair treatment (e.g., remove violators from positions of oversight over the reporter)*
   d) *Ombudspeople/head participating in regular follow-ups with the reporters to ensure conditions have improved*

The code of conduct is a living document that will be reviewed annually.

The department is in the process of developing exit interviews for graduate students. They are expected to be enacted this semester (Spring 2021). They will be anonymous and confidential. They will be conducted by Bill Fornes, the assistant department head, who has no advisory role over graduate students in this department. Bill Fornes is on the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee and a member of the department leadership team.

Other issues raised in Deliverable #2 include:

- There are no apparent efforts made by the department or the university to make counselors and advisors with diverse racial, ethnic, and gender backgrounds available to students who share these backgrounds
    - See Resources Map (especially Multicultural Science Program; and public list of Geoscientists of Color)
    - Dept. (at least on graduate student side) should make more concerted efforts to engage with graduate students of other departments (mixers, socials, etc) in order to foster a more expansive community, and continue to learn more about resources offered with the graduate school.

- There is no department or university mechanism by which the impact of Code of Conduct violations (or other reported complaints) on a student's academic performance is reviewed and addressed
    - Maybe on case by case basis during exit interviews?
- While the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee and its members are listed in full on the department website, the members and functions of other committees within our department are less accessible.

Demographic Data - There are issues to work through on how demographic data can be collected and made public, but we will need to work closely with HR on this and it may take several years and/or involvement of additional departments for wider aggregation of data. **The graduate students will bring the data dashboard up with the faculty (i.e., during a GSA or faculty meeting) as something we would like to see publicly advertised on our department webpage.**

https://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/ima/data-dashboard.html

EAPS department currently relies on data collected by Purdue (on Data Digest) that is self reported by individuals. Faculty are able to access student demographic data at the departmental level, but graduate students can not access this data unless given special permission. These policies are in place to protect individuals under the FERPA act because at low levels it would be easy to identify individuals. The graduate school provides a percentage breakdown on their website (https://www.purdue.edu/gradschool/ima/data-dashboard.html) where you can see the percentage of people that applied, were accepted, and the amount that accepted the offer.

Our pod proposed that the department have a voluntary new member intake form at the beginning of each year to collect departmental data that will include more inclusive gender identities. This new policy will allow the department to keep in house statistics and track our own progress.

Our pod worked up some goals to achieve (some goals were similar to our DEI committee/current strategic plan, as noted):
1. In the next year, achieve 50% URM seminar speakers (current DEI goal). Spring 2021 had 6 URM speakers out of 14 speakers
2. At least once a semester, invite a non-research/workshop speaker to discuss diversity and inclusion goals (Graduate Colloquium Committee is working on this!)
3. In the next 10 years, achieve graduate student ratio of URM equivalent to Indiana population (EAPS Excellence Scholarship) (faculty also have goals to meet indiana population ratio in 5 years)
4. In the next 20 years, achieve assistant faculty ratio of URM equivalent to Indiana population (faculty also have goals: 20% underrepresented minority faculty in 5 years) (currently at 10% right now)
5. Mentorship training workshop for faculty, post-docs, and graduate students

Data Collection: Strategic plan progress tracking. Similar to scripps accountability checks (could be done on a yearly basis, or 2-3 year basis?), identify which aspects of strategic plan are being met, which are not, why, and what we can do moving forward. Could be done during townhall type events. Also, making hiring rates publicly available (or at least keeping track of who's being hired, demographics, whether its working to accomplish strategic plan goals, etc.)

EAPS currently has a commitment to diversity in their EAPS Diversity Statement:

> "We in Purdue EAPS explicitly and proudly seek to increase the participation of individuals from underrepresented groups in our field. Individuals interested in positions at any level (graduate, postdoctoral, staff, faculty) from any underrepresented group are especially encouraged to reach out to the department for more information."

Policies for Working with Communities of Color - Racial risk assessment on this deliverable is recommended, then we will revise the deliverable if necessary. Training is needed for staff, both so they understand the importance of this new policy as well as for how to implement the policy itself. Approval process can be incorporated into travel approval, e.g. check if travel or work will involve communities of color and has this new policy been reviewed and followed in the plans for this trip; consequence of not following policy would be assigned readings and additional training. The EAPS department does not currently meet the requirements laid out in Deliverable #4 although there are plans to address this. The newly developed Code of Conduct (yet to be approved by the College of Science) addresses working with communities of color during field activities as follows:

> *The external impacts of field work also need to be considered. Earth science fieldwork both in the US and abroad has the potential to both negatively impact and benefit indigenous communities, marginalized communities, and communities of color. In order to ensure positive and mutually beneficial relationships with these communities, we recommend that EAPS field activity leads make connections with community leaders in advance of field work to discuss how the field work may impact their environment or culture and how the communities may be enriched by the field activities. This can include: whether or not field work would interrupt important religious or cultural holidays; what areas may be disrespectful to enter or disturb; sample collection; needs of the community related to the field work; current political challenges; and how the community and land should be acknowledged during dissemination of research (publications, presentations, etc.). Leaders should educate students involved in field activities on these practices as well as the culture of the communities.*

While this statement offers a general guideline, our URGE pods feel that the department should go a step further by formalizing the process by which field work with communities of color and on indigenous land is conducted (see Safety Plan as well). These formalized discussions (conducted within the Field Work Committee and/or the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee) should include:

- Permission from local leaders to conduct field work and/or collect samples
- Borders and land usage and ownership in and around field site
- Sample and data ownership and archiving
- Publication rights and authorship
- Long-term community engagement and benefit
- Political, religious, cultural, and language differences and potential barriers
- Potential safety risks to students, researchers, or community members
- Student expectations and education for field trips and during field work

Our URGE pods understand that this policy should be flexible to reflect the nature of field work and the diversity of communities involved. However, we feel that a formal discussion of the above issues should be included in the travel and field work approval processes.

- There should be a centralized system, where the dept. Knows when and where people are conducting fieldwork (form, google calendar?)
- Conducting fieldwork on your own (particularly as a grad student) is very ambiguous
    - Doing some sort of RCR field safety training type thing with people conducting the field work (specific to your field site/location/work, and the team involved, maybe during Gaggle?)
    - What trainings would be beneficial? Field committee could compile resources, see safety plan initiatives below.
    - Requiring lab group or gaggle based discussions that are focused on the disparities involved with fieldwork, and how different identities may have to approach fieldwork with more caution (and how they could do so safely).

Admissions and Hiring Policies - These are proposed modifications to the existing Hiring policy. These are not public currently, but we recommend posting policies (as much information as possible) publicly on the jobs board for potential candidates. Anti-bias training may need to be part of this as the policies are reviewed and updated by staff to ensure bias does not impact the development of these policies, as well as afterward for implementing the policy itself. Approval process would be part of hiring staff (or admitting students), e.g., does your plan to hire a new position adhere to the updated policies.

The admissions and hiring policies within Purdue EAPS are not explicitly stated on the dept website. What is publicly available is: the EEO statement (for faculty hiring only, not for grad admission), the previous strategic plan which details plans for increasing diversity at all career levels (under section 4). Unclear whether the strategies outlined to increase and retain the underrepresented minorities/genders were successful, as the metrics are vague. Proposed changes to the current admissions and hiring policies are:

- Outreach + Recruitment
    1. Reach out specifically to minority serving colleges
    2. Send out advertisements into listservs that reach BIPOC institutions, HBCU's, etc.
    3. Active form of advertisement for underrepresented students or communities, as opposed to passive advertisement (i.e., booths at conferences, going to conferences like SACNAS)
    **The DEI committee is working on increasing outreach to minority-serving institutions
- Increase the number of research opportunities for undergraduates in the dept., with a more long-term goal of implementing an REU program within EAPS. An REU would require a dedicated point of contact for handling NSF budgets, renewal, and programming, and sufficient opportunities for the existing undergrads within the department. However, we're including this as a long-term goal as it is a tangible way for a diverse set of undergraduates to experience Purdue EAPS research first hand, and consider the institution for graduate school.
    - Planetary science undergrad research program being implemented within the dept. (starting Summer 2021)
- Implement cohort hiring: this would require planning amongst the faculty beforehand. Goal is to bring in Black, Indigenous, and students of color in cohorts rather than singular students to help foster a sense of community. Additionally, engaging admitted/current Black,

indigenous, and students of color with underrepresented undergrads in the department (or even outside the department), either in mentorship type roles or just community building.

- Equal Opportunity Employers- include an explicit EOE statement on the graduate admissions page.
- Workshop to prep prospective graduate students for grad school
    1. At course level for undergrads in the dept (or seminar style workshops on a bi-weekly basis)
    2. Currently have info-night session for undergrads
    3. Creating a virtual workshop for prospective graduate students of Purdue, helping them fill out the form, offering additional assistance to things that are not totally clear.
        1. This would require an initial point-of-contact for planning and organizing. Should also gauge beforehand what the interest in this type of event would be, to ensure turn-out would be worthwhile.
        2. Having a page about application process on the EAPS website for prospective students
    4. Reaching out to high school students, professional development, CV/resume mentorship and prep (similar to what is being done with AP Fridays, but reaching out to students who maybe don't attend predominantly white schools that typically engage with AP Fridays).
- Having a more explicit admissions process
    1. Exactly what are you looking for in the essay prompt? Spelling this out, maybe even breaking it up into individual prompts with specific questions.
    2. Including what the diversity statement is used for, and how it is evaluated.
    3. Having a suggested deadline for reaching out/ contacting potential advisors and those advisors graduate students within EAPS, making this clear on the EAPS webpage.
    4. Making it more accessible (application, currently spread across 2 pages)
    5. Encourage faculty to include on their own websites exactly what they're looking for in applicants, when they should reach out, etc.
    6. The department is attempting to conduct an external holistic review of the application process- depends on ability to acquire an external review board.
- Getting rid of optional GRE
    1. Students see optional, they're going to want to do it to set their application apart
    2. For faculty who want it optional, do they tell their prospective students to submit it? Having it optional introduces a lot of ambiguity as to why/how the scores are being used, which is pretty stressful to navigate as a prospective student.
- Faculty retreat
    1. Having anti-bias training in regards to how we engage with and accept prospective graduate students. Who are you developing relationships with? Which emails from prospective students get unread, which make the cut, this is where biases can potentially stem from. Who do you define as a "successful" student, is it someone who looks like you?
- Financial
    1. Drop application fee
        1. Having the option of a fee waiver puts undue burden on the students who need financial assistance

2. This was discussed, but can not be implemented at the dept. Level. Efforts should instead be focused on increasing advertisements of the fee waiver, and also encouraging faculty to share this option with prospective students who reach out.
    2. Re-location stipend, increasing student wages
        1. Relocation is a huge barrier, should discuss with dept. About allocating funds for this purpose
            ● Maybe as a reimbursement?
        2. Increasing student wages
            ● Will be implemented as of Fall 2021, increase of ~$3000/year.
            ● Should continue to address the state of graduate student wages, especially ambiguity in summer funding on an annual basis.
● Retention related items
    1. Offering support to new graduate students by way of curriculum related things
        1. Making new grad seminar/new student orientation more useful/, keeping the graduate student handbook up to date. Topics to be covered:
            ● As a new grad student, how do you fill out relevant forms (i.e., form 100, form 125)
            ● How do you access your W2? General filing taxes related aid as well (advertising workshops that are offered by college)
            ● How do you register for classes, what are the deadlines, unit minimums (for your specific appointment), how much is research/an actual class, etc.
            ● General deadlines (quals, prelims, defense, any other PhD milestones).
            ● Mental health resources, external info that relates to what is offered by purdue health insurance
● Keeping track of strategic plan progress (in regards to faculty hires + increasing diversity).

Data collection: Statistics on: applicant/admitted/accepted diversity, retention rates (via exit interviews?), where/how people hear about Purdue EAPS grad program (collected in application?), # of faculty with trainings (+ review of training efficacy). Climate survey: are undergraduates on pathways they consider successful (i.e., not necessarily academia, but was their experience here what they envisioned and how did it prep them for what they ultimately want to do post-graduation?), do students feel the faculty/administration are promoting a safe/inclusive environment?

Safety Plan - Training should be paired with the training for the deliverable on working with communities of color to emphasize the importance of these new policies, and then also on the details associated with implementing the safety plan policy. Approval process can be incorporated into travel approval, e.g. check if racial risk assessment has been done on this travel location; consequence of not following policy would be additional scrutiny on future travel requests, assigned readings, and additional training.

As of right now, there is no official safety plan adopted within EAPS specific to working with communities of color. However, under section 3 of the new code of conduct (pending revisions), there are explicit sections regarding making fieldwork more accessible/inclusive, and working with communities of color. We propose going beyond this step of stating proper code of conduct, and providing explicit resources and

recommendations for anyone (faculty, graduate students, etc.) engaging in field work. This would include a 'template' of sorts (see safety plan deliverable for what could be included) regarding proactive measures that can be taken to ensure the safety of all participants, tasks to be done during the field trip, and reflection-type steps to be taken post-trip. The idea behind this template is that the field committee could be the initial point of contact for this resource, and anyone engaging in field work would have access to it. The field committee should also have the resources for relevant trainings (stated in the safety plan deliverable) that at least one (ideally all) members of the field trip should have attended.

- Potential way to implement/maintain this template: allocate some time during the spring break field trip class to spend time working on this, such that it has regular (annual) input from graduate students.
- Work towards making this resource accessible on the webpage when it's been approved.

This template requires further editing (with faculty who are more experienced with field work), and then approval to be used as a widespread resource within the dept. Strategies for dealing with deviations from code-of-conduct stated behavior should also be addressed and made public.

Data Collection: Field committee collects information about who uses the safety plan template, get feedback from those who use it on whether it was useful or not (along with those who were on the fieldwork team, and what they felt was missing from their experience).

Resource Map - There is now a resource map (Deliverable #7), but this could be part of onboarding during the new grad seminar, at the first GSA meeting (or a DEI focused meeting). This resource map also must be covered as a resource in the Fall faculty retreat and linked into the employee handbook. The approval can be incorporated along with the admissions and hiring policy, as part of a proposal to hire a staff member or admit a student then HR would check that the person they report to has a plan to go through the resource map with them.

Sharing this resource:
- Need approval for posting on the EAPS website (Cheryl Pierce and Dan Chavas on the DEI Committee).
- Incorporate the Resource Map into the onboarding during the new Graduate Student Seminar and the first Graduate Student Association meeting, as well as briefly reviewing the document and its location in the Fall faculty retreat. Encourage faculty to remind and cover aspects of the Resource Map directly with individual students.
  - We recommend GSA has a specific DEI meeting and covers these materials.
- In these following links we have separated which aspects of the Resource map can go into the EAPs the newsletter versus the complete.
- Need to identify a student responsible for curating the Resource Map
- We recommend that EAPS hires a part-time DEI coordinator to advance all of the above recommendations. This position could be similar to a student TA in collaboration with a faculty member for approval. This may come from funds set aside within the EAPS department budget

- An annual or semiannual Department Townhall to explicitly discuss justice, diversity, equity and inclusion will allow the DEI committee to develop and share these materials and a strategic plan. This will assist in efforts to increase transparency between committees, progress toward goals and align the DEI materials and plan with current department needs.