

This is a preliminary management plan for the Wash U EPSc pod, listing a variety of suggested policy changes and departmental actions in support of AJEDI goals. The list is still in progress, and we intend to present it to and discuss it with the faculty and the whole department in the coming months. Apologies for the slightly janky formatting; the original is in a spreadsheet, which is helpful to us in terms of organizing thoughts but difficult to turn into a pdf.

Session 2: Racism and Individuals

Deliverable theme: complaints and reporting policies

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Update department's "Resources" webpage	The "Resources" page has a lot of useful information but it's a real grab bag of types of info, from course requirements to the DEI statement. This could be reorganized to make it easier to navigate, perhaps by creating resource categories. Also, the resources linked to on the DEI sub-page should be added to the main "Resources" page to make them easier to find (reporting/complaints links). Recommend adding info on grad student and undergrad groups like the Black Grad Student Council, Chinese Students and Scholars Association, etc., both so students can find them and so faculty/staff looking for resources know where to point people.	One of the most basic things we can do to make our department more welcome to BIPOC and other minoritized individuals is to make sure they have all the information they need about resources on campus. The current "Resources" webpage has some good information but is not well-organized to help people actually find things, and some important resources are buried a few pages deep. Updating the page would both help current department members and signal to prospective students that we are aware of some of the needs they might have and are making an effort to connect students with those resources.	Department		Time and effort from whoever manages the website, plus community input to contribute to the	Inertia		grad student group list that would be a good resource: https://gpc.wustl.edu/get-involved/graduate-student-groups/	

Session 2: Racism and Individuals

Deliverable theme: complaints and reporting policies

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Establish a system for reporting/complaints at the departmental level	<p>If an individual experiences discrimination or harassment of any kind, there are a range of university resources for reporting and addressing a complaint. However, individuals may feel that going to a university-wide reporting channel is more than they want to do. The EPS community principles address this in part by stating that "[w]here speech or behavior is deemed offensive by members of our community, those involved should engage meaningfully in further discussion about the contentious issue" (point 11). This is a good idea in theory, but poses a problem in practice due to power differentials between students/staff/faculty. While the department may not legally be able to offer internal options comparable to the university ombudsoffice, we suggest formalizing (or at least adding to the community principles) the option of asking the chair or another department leader to mediate in these situations when meaningful conversation could resolve the issue but initiating that conversation is not feasible for the individual who has been offended, discriminated against, harassed, or otherwise made uncomfortable or unwelcome.</p>	<p>BIPOC and scholars from minoritized groups face both overt and implicit discrimination and harassment in the workplace. Having reporting mechanisms in place at all levels is crucial for ensuring that these community members are supported</p>	Department	~1-3	Time to figure out how to implement	<p>Legal issues associated with reporting, confidentiality, etc., though this could probably be avoided by simply advertising the Chair's availability to talk about any issues people face, and then ensuring the Chair knows all the reporting rules and options across Wash U</p>	<p>Once reporting pathway exists, do people use it?</p>	<p>Basin Research Group lab reporting policy (see "Inclusivity and Diversity" section): https://docs.google.com/document/d/10y7TP48ik1rcQBPA5D08mZM7DJ5EbF0hyWP-csgeb1QE/e/dit</p>	

Session 2: Racism and Individuals

Deliverable theme: complaints and reporting policies

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Inform department about reporting options and University resources	Ensure that department members know about different resources and reporting pathways available to them. Potentially present at grad student orientation? and invite postdocs to join	Knowing options will hopefully help anyone who decides to report discrimination or harassment; explicitly describing reporting options will help remove stigma of using them and convey that reportable behavior will not be tolerated.	Department/WashU		Time, possibly bringing in people from other Wash U offices to speak 2 (ombuds? title IX?)	Who will run this meeting? Grad student president? If so they need to be prepped		Council of Graduate Schools info on orientation best practices: https://cgsnet.org/cgs-occasional-paper-series/university-maryland-baltimore-county/lesson-6	

Session 3: Racism and History

Deliverable theme: demographic data; collecting and reporting that data

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Collect and publish department demographic data	If we don't measure our department's makeup, we can't track our progress in diversifying. We need to increase diversity of colloquium speakers as well as recognize the contributions of researchers from all communities. As the colloquium committee has already been considering, this data collection should probably be done at the end of each semester rather than as part of a speaker's visit, to keep the focus on the speakers' science.	Consistently collected time-series demographic data will enable us to track our progress toward making the department more diverse. Publishing this data will help hold us accountable to pursuing diversity goals.	Department		Someone needs to be responsible for collecting data annually in a consistent fashion	Legal issues with deidentification given small numbers of URM students, faculty, and staff		NSF-funded project looking to collect this kind of data in geoscience departments: https://meem.oucreate.com/nsf-golden-rewards-project/ Bernard and Cooperdock paper on the abysmal progress toward diversity in geosciences: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41561-018-0116-6 LDEO published demographic data: https://diversity.ldeo.columbia.edu/content/ldeo-demographics	
Collect and publish demographic data on invited speakers for colloquia	Colloquium used to be run by one faculty member; since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic it's been run by a committee that takes nominations for speakers. This enables more people to submit speaker nominations, and empowers the committee to select speakers outside the acquaintance of the senior faculty.	"	Department	3	"	Are speakers willing to provide this info?	"		
Maintain colloquium committee, encourage everyone to submit nominations, and empower committee to select speakers who don't already have strong connections to the department	Colloquium used to be run by one faculty member; since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic it's been run by a committee that takes nominations for speakers. This enables more people to submit speaker nominations, and empowers the committee to select speakers outside the acquaintance of the senior faculty.	One way our department can help promote equity and diversity in geoscience is to recognize the scientific contributions of minoritized scientists and help connect ECR from underrepresented communities to potential collaborators/build their professional networks.	Department		Time, from committee members	Thus far nominations have tended to come from a small group of senior faculty; need to strongly encourage others to also nominate speakers	Assess how speaker pool has changed, using the data collected per the previous item ^	Again, LDEO demographic data (particularly showing speaker demographic shifts over time due to intentional changes in their selection process): https://diversity.ldeo.columbia.edu/content/ldeo-demographics	immediate/ongoing

Session 4: Racism and Justice

Deliverable theme: policies for working with communities of color

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Draft some department guidelines for working with communities of color Data management training?	Guidelines should highlight resources at Wash U like Gephardt etc	A guideline for community engagement (specifically for communities of color) will provide scientists interested in community science projects with a solid foundation for conducting such research projects. Additionally, consciously including and treating surrounding communities of color with due respect may increase their involvement with WashU and with the scientific community. It is important to share ideas and knowledge for the benefit of both groups.	Department		Time, potential collaboration with Gephardt	Different communities need different things; coming up with sufficiently general but still useful guidelines may be a challenge	Survey faculty periodically to see how many of them engage in community-centered research projects	AGU's Thriving Earth Exchange: https://thrivingearthexchange.org/ Nature article on respectfully and effectively engaging with Indigenous communities: https://media.nature.com/original/magazine-assets/d41586-021-00022-1/d41586-021-00022-1.pdf Some historical perspective on environmental racism (Bullard, 1993): https://cpb-us-e2.wpmucdn.com/sites.uci.edu/dist/c/3308/files/2020/03/Bullard_Anatomy-of-Env-Racism-and-the-EJ-Mov.pdf	
Provide support for students, faculty, and staff to attend conferences that focus on building community for minoritized groups as well as their science	Resource can be in the form of funding but also in the form of information and sensitization towards the need to do this (also an opportunity for recruitment) The brown bag should be emphasized as an avenue where scientific discussions less formal than those in the colloquium can take place. It can also be a forum where discussions not entirely focussed on a scientific problem but even on allied problems/experiences relevant to life in academia may be conducted.	For students from minoritized groups, supporting their attendance at these kinds of meetings may help them to find community and support a feeling of belonging in science. Discussing these projects in brown bag will up their visibility in the department; hopefully help others interested in community-engaged projects to see what's possible and learn about resources	Department/ individual lab group		2 Money; but people already pay for conference travel, so this should be no different		As part of annual student meetings, check in as to whether they are able to attend the meetings they are interested in	Info on the SACNAS conference: https://www.sacnas.org/what-we-do/conference/	
Encourage people who do work with communities of color to talk about that work in brown bag			Department	1	Encouraging people to do things is free! But said people have to spend the time to present.		Assess topics covered in brown bags over the course of a year		

Session 5: Racism and Accessibility

Deliverable theme: hiring and admissions

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Clarify department policy on GRE scores (ie that we don't require them)	The website is unclear on this. On the main graduate program page it does state that GRE scores are not required, but on the "How to Apply" page it only lists the department codes. Simple fix: say explicitly that GRE scores are not required on the "How to Apply" page.	GRE scores are not a good indicator of grad school success; instead, they tend to measure how much money applicants have to spend on test prep and re-taking an expensive standardized test. The department has already taken the excellent step of not requiring the GRE, thus removing the financial barrier of test fees for applicants; to make that step most effective, we need to clearly communicate that we don't require the GRE.	department	1		literally none may lead to discussion over whether advance contact *is* required, which could be an interesting (and difficult to resolve) debate among the faculty. Some faculty may not want to make this explicit because they don't want to get a deluge of emails and only getting emails from the few people who know to send them is an easy way to whittle down an applicant pool		An EoS article on #GRExit: https://eos.org/opinions/geogrexit-why-geosciences-programs-are-dropping-the-gre	As soon as the proposed action is approved by the faculty/Chair
Make grad student application requirements more explicit re: contacting faculty members	If students really need to have prior contact with a faculty member to be considered for admission, then say so! Write it very clearly on the page about graduate admissions!	"Hidden curriculum" elements, like knowing that contacting an advisor in advance is necessary, tend to work against URM students and in favor of those who are traditionally overrepresented in academia	Department / individual lab groups	1-2			Taking feedback survey from applicants?	Luck Lab at UCSD blog post on why and how to email faculty before applying: https://lucklab.ucdavis.edu/blog/2018/9/17/emailing-faculty	

Session 5: Racism and Accessibility

Deliverable theme: hiring and admissions

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Revisit application materials, reconsider statement prompts	Align what we ask for with what we actually want to see. Hone prompts for statements to help applicants; eg, if we want research statements to say what an applicant is interested in and why they want to study those things at Wash U in particular, say that outright.	This is sort of another "hidden curriculum" thing, where clarifying expectations for application materials will help all applicants present their best selves rather than leaving those without prior knowledge of academic systems and norms to guess at what makes a successful application. Different students may be better prepared in different areas; a rubric will allow the fair evaluation of students and will help students who are better prepared in "nontraditional" areas but maybe don't have "traditional" experiences (i.e., significant research experience in undergrad) gain admission. Importantly, opportunities for undergrad research experience are not equally available to all.	Department?	3	Probably requires faculty discussion as it relates to admissions	inertia; difficulty of reaching consensus on how to revise prompts		Equity in admissions tip video from URGE: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xos6sL0ykU	
Rubrics for graduate admissions	create rubrics that can be used to evaluate candidates more objectively		Department	3	Time	Reluctance of faculty to adopt a generalized rubric when different people/labs prioritize different things	Data on diversity amongst new graduate students as well as retention rate for our department show provide some measure of "success" of the rubrics.	Posselt article on "merit" metrics in admissions: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvqghw8s.11	A couple of years, maybe more

Session 5: Racism and Accessibility

Deliverable theme: hiring and admissions

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Rubrics for faculty hiring	create rubrics that can be used to evaluate candidates more objectively	Takes some subjectivity out of hiring committee decisions, and helps mitigate unconscious bias on the part of committee members	Department	4		Faculty hiring tends to include some subjective criteria, like "do I want this person to be my colleague for the next few decades?"	Track new faculty hire demographics over time	UNC ADVANCE resources for search committees, including many example rubrics: https://advance.uncc.edu/programming/programs/faculty-recruitment/resources-search-committees-including-evaluation-rubrics Berkeley published rubric for evaluating candidates' diversity statements: https://ofew.berkeley.edu/recruitment/contributions-diversity-equity Same sort of thing from Brandeis: https://www.brandeis.edu/diversity/dej-recruitment-hiring/rubric-for-evaluating-diversity-statements.html	

Session 5: Racism and Accessibility

Deliverable theme: hiring and admissions

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Revisit format of first year projects and oral examinations	There are many ways that different programs conduct qualifying exams, some are less equitable than others. We should consider how our exam process works, and whether it serves departmental goals,	The current structure is very advisor dependent, meaning that students are disproportionately prepared for these assessments and may be subject to different expectations. The oral exam in particular is a barrier for students because of its effect on students' mental health and because the guidelines for this exam are relatively nebulous. This barrier may cause students to leave the program; the lack of clear expectations favors students who are already initiated into department culture and who are already familiar with these exams. Students without these advantages may choose to leave the program and this may decrease the diversity of the grad student body.	Department	5			Survey students in years immediately following the implementation of any changes and use those survey results to inform further changes	https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2021/05/04/n-eeed-reconsider-qualifying-exams-phd-candidacy-opinion	5 years? Need clear communication from faculty on graduate studies committee on their thoughts on student proposals and their expected steps going forward

Session 6: Racism and Inclusivity

Deliverable theme: lab codes of conduct, field safety plans

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Draft a generic field safety plan that field leaders can adapt	Have a template/model document available to anyone leading field work or field trips, based on peer-reviewed literature on how to approach these things, so that anyone planning a trip has a reference for factors to consider for field safety (for everyone, and for BIPOC/minoritized field participants in particular)	Fieldwork is sometimes conducted in places where not all people are equally safe (eg places where laws prohibit homosexuality, places where overt racism can and does lead to violent confrontations). It is important for field leaders to recognize this, and plan to mitigate risk for all involved. Having a draft field safety plan available would help ensure that field leaders consider the challenges faced by minoritized individuals in the field; improve field safety for those people and for everyone; and make minoritized individuals feel more that they belong and their contributions in the field are valued	Department		Time for someone to go through sample plans and literature, and compile draft		See if people who lead fieldwork (or course field trips) actually use it	Morales et al. article on inclusion in fieldwork: https://doi.org/10.1002/bes2.1742 Demery and Pipkin preprint on safe fieldwork strategies: https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202008.0021.v1 EoS article on changing the culture of fieldwork: https://eos.org/features/changing-the-culture-of-fieldwork-in-the-geosciences	
Draft a generic lab code of conduct that PIs can adapt	Have a template/model document available to all PIs that they can adapt to their individual lab groups, based on available examples.	Having a lab code of conduct (and enforcing it) sets clear expectations and boundaries for all lab members, which (a) helps discourage peer-to-peer bad behavior, (b) promotes a welcoming environment, and (c) makes explicit more of those "hidden curriculum" things (communication norms, etc) that URM scholars may have less prior knowledge of.	Department/lab groups		Time to compile examples and build a template	PIs may not actually adopt it/may not see the point of having a CoC	BRG code of conduct, which is licensed as CC-BY includes links to other examples/sources at the end: https://docs.google.com/document/d/10y7TP48ik1rcQBPA5Do8mZM7DJ5EbF0hyWP-csGb1QE/edit		

Session 6: Racism and Inclusivity

Deliverable theme: lab codes of conduct, field safety plans

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Individual mentorship compacts between advisor and student	Not a research progress update, a mentorship-focused check-in		Individual lab groups		3 Time	The stigma that mentorship is not a problem/something that needs to be addressed.		NASA FINESST document (see sections 4.1.6 and Explanatory Note E): https://nspires.nasaprs.com/external/viewrepositorydocument/cmdocumentid=733105/solicitationId=%7B3E72ED7E-1FBD-F815-5A4E-2DA033EF7449%7D/viewSolicitationDocument=1/E.5%20FINESST_clarify012621.pdf%20(Explanatory%20note%20E) BRG code of conduct, which includes info on mentor/mentee communications and expectations: https://docs.google.com/document/d/10y7TP48ik1rcQBPA5Do8mZM7DJ5EbF0hyWP-csGb1QE/edit	

Session 7: Racism and Self Care

Deliverable theme: resource map

Action item	In more detail, what needs to be done?	Add more info about how this action advances JEDI goals	Scope of action: individual lab groups, department, Wash U?	Rate the difficulty of doing this thing from 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Resources needed (money, dedicated time)	Possible barriers	How can we measure the success/failure of this action?	References relevant to this action (papers, articles, websites)	Expected timeline for implementation
Build on resource map and set up as a living document	The resource map we drafted is incomplete (particularly with respect to resources for people of color), but having this kind of list compiled and available to everyone would be valuable. We propose expanding on our draft in some form (possibly as a document that would be updated annually or as a wiki site), having it accessible to department members, and making sure it is regularly updated.	This would make incoming people feel more welcome, and help pass down knowledge of local and university resources so people don't need to rediscover them over and over (lessens burden on students and others looking for community support). It would also give department members a starting point to help students and colleagues find resources when they ask for help or recommendations.	Department and/or lab groups (some lab groups may already have things like this?)		Time, space on website	Getting people to contribute; maintaining and updating over time; finding and adding resources specifically useful to BIPOC department members, given that our pod (and department) is majority white	Assess community participation level in editing, and amount of community usage?	an example of a resource wiki: wiki.wholedu.edu There is also an example welcome packet from the Wash U psych department in the URGE pod box folder	