
URGE Anti-Racist Management Plan for Scripps Institution of Oceanography at University of California, San Diego

Members of the SIO community have formed a pod and have been actively participating in URGE during the winter and spring of 2021. Each URGE session has involved reading articles and listening to authors' interviews on identifying and dismantling institutional racism, followed by pod discussions and creation of deliverables for policy reviews and recommendations at our home institution. URGE has given the SIO pod guidance to take action and implement policy change from a bottom-up perspective.

The final URGE deliverable was to make an Anti-Racist Management Plan for SIO. This plan incorporates all past deliverables, by summarizing existing policies and gaps, as well as plans for anti-racist actions. For each deliverable, the plan recommends a timeline for each goal. We would appreciate that this document be reviewed by Keiara Auzenne and others on the SIO EDI team in order to assess which pieces of this document could be helpful to existing diversity efforts. Through doing this, we recognize that there are many robust EDI initiatives at SIO and UCSD, and we would like to collaborate with and support this work. The URGE framework was somewhat rigid in that it was not customized for a specific institution, so we may have reinvented the wheel in some cases. Nevertheless, this was useful research for the individuals in our pod. We see the future of URGE at SIO as becoming more specific to SIO and providing additional support for ongoing EDI initiatives. Specifically, the URGE pod may be able to strengthen EDI efforts in climate science and geology field safety (particularly non-ship-based) especially when working with communities of color. In addition, URGE provides a platform from which EDI collaboration and knowledge exchange can be pursued with other geoscience institutions.

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, checks, consequences ?
Complaints and Reporting Policy	Yes	OPHD (to file official report). Ombudspeople,	Posted: ophd.ucsd.edu	OPHD reporting policies reviewed	Recommend	Yes (& often provided already)	Check: reporting infrastructure is institutionally mandated;

		dept admin, SIO EDI team (unofficial)		every three years			consequences: punitive for formally investigated violations
Demographic Data	Yes, partial	UCSD Institutional Research office; dept administration; SIO EDI team	Posted: ir.ucsd.edu; scripps.ucsd.edu/ diversity	Approx annually	Recommend	N/A	Institution mandate for data collection (even if reporting is aggregated)
Policies for Working with Communities of Color	No	SIO EDI team	Recommendation: SIO website	Recommend every 3 yrs	Recommend	Yes	Nothing in place at this time.
Admissions and Hiring Policies	Yes, partial UCSD Strategic Plan for Inclusive Excellence	Admissions: SIO Graduate Department, Curricular group Admission Chairs, Diversity Admission Committee Academic Hiring: Department Chair and Jennifer Mackinnon for faculty hires; section heads, division directors/PIs for	Rubrics, etc. generally internal Policy & Procedure Manual	Periodic, no set interval, recommend every 3 yrs	Recommend	Faculty search committees receive bias training; admissions does not have firm requirements, require mentors to complete mentor training prior to taking students	Check: Yearly accountability meetings are sponsored by the UCSD Office for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion.

		post-doc hires Staff Hiring: Keiara Auzenne					
Safety Plan	Fragmented safety guidance exists but no comprehensive plan yet	<p>SIO Safety Office: John Semerau (858)-534-8449, Sea Going: Bruce Appelgate</p> <p>If Anti-Bullying/ Harassment Committee gets established, they can be tasked with some of this work.</p>	<p>On lab group /SIO websites as appropriate. Easy to find. Publicly accessible.</p> <p>Provided as part of the welcome package (eg student handbook) add these to the resource map.</p> <p>Include a discussion of the document in orientation.</p>	<p>Annual comprehensive recertification process. Holistically as an institute we can learn from other teams' discoveries of deficiencies. Update also as needed sub-annual on event-based scale.</p> <p>Important to familiarise new members with the document so they know the policies and</p>	Recommend, especially for field	Yes - Implicit Bias, Bystander Intervention, one specific to safety plan, in addition to current requirements (Sexual Harassment, Injury/Illness prevention)	<p>SIO group of mediators - good repository for feedback (also NORMALIZE feedback-good and bad), checking for patterns randomly audit the events reported here, assess redress action, update document when deficiencies are found.</p> <p>Multiple levels of reporting if escalation is needed.</p>

				standards as well as to get their input.			
Resource Map	Yes, but this Resource Map Deliverable could help make these better	SIO EDI team	EDI Resources & Support, EDI Resources & Support, Graduate Student Handbook. Online Student Guide and Resources	Reviewed annually, and when policies revised	Recommend	Brief training for mentors and faculty, New hire notification by HR	Review the draft for completeness and accuracy. Merge URGE resource map with the existing diversity resource map. Reach out to diversity fellows to get more input on what other resources should be there (fill gaps). Keep list of gaps when a map is developed so we can have accountability and continue to improve.

Recommendations

- **Complaints and Reporting Policy** - The Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) is the office responsible for handling harassment and discrimination complaints at our organization, and acts as the Title IX office. OPHD does not publish rates of reporting. Instances of bias and microaggressions can be reported through reportbias.ucsd.edu, and deals with them following [this](#)

procedure; reporting can be anonymous, but is only promised to be investigated to the extent that is feasible. There is no system in place to address repeated complaints/offenders without a formal investigation. Other resources through Scripps and UCSD (including but not limited to counselling services, ombuds, and town halls) are detailed in the deliverable document.

- 1 year:
 - Recommend follow-up with OPHD for more/revised resources (e.g., updated complaint resolution flowchart)
 - Recommend assessment of information/resource accessibility (e.g., should information be added to things like SIO website or student handbooks if not already there?)
 - Recommend
- 5 years
 - Suggest creation of explicit “intermediate” resource at department or lower level that can be a first point of contact (e.g., help determine whether complaint warrants filing official report; determine how to handle complaints outside scope of harassment & bias/discrimination protections)
 - Recommend some level of aggregated data reporting (OPHD ceased doing so publicly after 2015)
 - Continue review of reporting policies to encourage reporter’s sense of safety if filing a complaint, and to ensure reporting infrastructure is/feels equally accessible
- 10 years:
 - Update policies (reporting, disciplinary, etc.) to account for repeat offenses
- **Demographic Data** - Demographic and historical data for Scripps Institution of Oceanography is already available through the UCSD Dashboards and the Black at Scripps Timeline. Further information is necessary to fully address disparity in representation at Scripps, including funding source, speaker data, hiring, and admission data. In addition, Scripps must 1) **assess speaker data** across departments, 2) **adopt measurable quantifiable goals** to increase representation to ensure accountability, 3) **summarize and publish hiring and admissions data**, and 4) **assess and publish retention data**. Further suggestions are included in the deliverable document. Some of these details may be used for internal use but summarized and published to the SIO community every two years to ensure accountability.
 - 1 year
 - Recommend beginning further data collection, e.g., re: who we recognize in the scientific and broader community. Example: demographics of invited speakers. Can collaborate with SIO EDI team to implement this while protecting privacy
 - Recommend better incorporating post-doc data (e.g., aggregate and report through dashboards)
 - Recommend convening review of demographic data surveys to update (e.g., allow for intersectional identities); devising regular review schedule for data surveys
 - 5 years
 - Recommend supporting stated goal from Letter on Anti-Racism that student cohorts mirror CA demographics by 2025
 - Recommend implementation of system to track demographic diversity progress over time
 - Recommend implementation of system to track student retention according to demographics to identify communities that may require more resources (in conjunction with results from racial risk assessment)

- 10 years
 - Recommend supporting stated goal from Letter on Anti-Racism that faculty cohort mirror CA demographics by 2030
- **Policies for Working with Communities of Color** - There are no existing policies at SIO for working with communities of color.
 - 1 year
 - We recommend a committee be formed with input from the Director of Diversity Initiatives and the EDI Fellows. All committee members will have prior experience working with communities of color.
 - This committee will propose an institution-wide policy for working with communities of color.
 - 5 years
 - A second group or committee should then perform a racial equity impact assessment (racial risk assessment) on the proposed policy. The policy should be revised by the original committee as necessary.
 - Training is optional for staff, students, or faculty to both understand the importance of this new policy, as well as how to implement the policy. Feedback will be sought from those who have taken the training.
 - The original committee will annually revise and improve the training process based on feedback and present it to the second committee for approval, with additional revisions until it is passed.
 - 10 years
 - Training is now required for students, staff, and faculty.
 - There is an approval process prior to being granted permission to work with communities of color. The process can be incorporated into travel approval, e.g. if travel or work will involve communities of color.
 - Consequences of not following policy would be assigned readings and additional training.
 - A review process occurs every three years and updates are incorporated.
- **Admissions and Hiring Policies** - UCSD and SIO follow basic affirmative action policies in hiring (e.g. [Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy](#)). Base guidelines exist for admissions, which are used as a minimal template/rubric for assessment of candidates. Improvements to hiring and admissions practices in terms of EDI is an emphasis of the [Strategic Plan for Inclusive Excellence](#), so any URGE recommendations should be congruent with that campus-wide plan. The SIO URGE pod does not know the current status of the SIO department-level planning within the larger SPIE framework, but short-term goals could include making some of the graduate admissions changes instituted this year permanent (e.g. no GRE), normalizing rubrics in graduate admissions, and extending EDI hiring best practices to academic categories like postdocs. Over the longer term SIO should work to incorporate anti-bias training into all aspects of hiring and admissions, with regular review of progress in recruiting (and retaining) diverse students, faculty and staff.
- **Safety Plan** - Create a standard template “code of conduct” for each lab/research group to follow and adapt. The code should leave as little “unspoken knowledge” as possible by clearly outlining expectations and norms. The code should address issues and offer solutions to span the full spectrum of offenses (including microaggressions and general lab culture) rather than focusing on only the most egregious acts. The code should include information about who to contact if an emergency or incident occurs. Suggestions for Labs: Inclusivity and diversity training and implement a template “code of conduct” for each lab. Suggestions for the Field: Implement a field safety guide that

provides suggested risk assessment to be completed as a prerequisite to travel approval, and also includes reporting points of contact (in-field and at the office) and reporting procedures. Implement a post-field survey that all field participants fill out as a way of normalizing the feedback and reporting process, and also to track problems and develop a culture that does not tolerate harassment or bad behavior. A pre-departure checklist of discussions within the field team is also recommended. Additional recommendations: bystander intervention training, a racial risk assessment of all field work sites, and guidance for using multiple approaches for conflict resolution (e.g. restorative, not just punitive).

- 1 year: Administration must be responsible for finalizing a minimum framework for all of SIO.
 - 2 years: Administration is responsible for supporting and requiring groups to develop their specialised safety plans.
 - Every 2 years: survey the climate of each lab/research and amend code of conduct accordingly
- **Resource Map** - There are many good lists of resources available and the S7 deliverable should be used to add to these for students, staff, or faculty. This should be part of onboarding/orientation and incorporated into the handbook provided when first starting at the university. Updates to these resource maps should be widely publicized and posted in places where everyone will see them. 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. Due to “information overload” that is common while onboarding, the resource map should be made easily accessible with easy to find updates. The resource map should include resources, contacts, etc unique to the group interacting with the student/employee.
 - 1 year: Combine the URGE deliverable with the EDI resources and support page and student guide. Initiate a town hall meeting to get suggestions from the larger SIO community, and to bring noted resources to the community as a point of first contact. Focus on using existing resources.
 - Long term: Have a point person in charge of updating this as needed