



URGE Management Plan for Bayside Ecologists

This is a plan to incorporate deliverables into Smithsonian Environmental Research Center's work to make our institution more just, equitable, diverse, accessible & inclusive. This plan addresses how we will continue to develop, assess, & finalize policies/resources.

Deliverable	Existing Policy or Resource?	Point of Contact(s) – URGE Lead	Targeted SERC DEI Working Group	Accountable SERC/SI Office	Where It Is/ Will Be Posted	Review/ Update Interval	Racial Risk Assessment?	Training Recommended?	Approval, Check, and/or Consequence
Complaints and Reporting Policy	Yes (SI)	L. Haram	Training & Discussions	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: SI Civil, OEESD, OHR	Policies are on Prism/ public online	Determined by SI	Determined by SI	Updated training in the works	Consequences in place per SI
Demographic Data	Yes (SI), but limited.	A. Hruska	All SERC DEI groups & SERC Science Committee	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: OHR, Diversity Officer	Internal currently	Recommend annually	Recommended	Not planned	Unsure of consequences at SI level
Policies for Working with Communities of Color	No policy currently exists. Creation of a relevant resource is underway.	L. McCann	Community Outreach	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: Diversity Officer	Does not currently exist - should be considered.	Not applicable at this time	Not applicable at this time	Not applicable at this time	Not applicable at this time
Admissions and Hiring Policies	Yes (SI). No uniform SERC policy/ Practices.	K. Komatsu	Recruitment	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: OHR, Diversity Officer	SI hiring policies on Prism/ public online	No set interval, recommend annually	Not planned, but recommended?	Yes	Not currently planned
Safety Plan	No uniform policy. Currently by lab.	S. Havard	Field Safety & Equity	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: SI Civil	Internal currently	Annually, & after major reported incidents	Not planned, but recommended	Yes	Consequences of reporting to SI Civil

URGE

Unlearning Racism in Geoscience

Resource Map	No	L. Haram J. Blumenthal	Recruitment? Retention?	SERC: Exec. Officer SI: OHR, Diversity Officer	SERC Shared Drive, SharePoint eventually	Recommend annually	Not planned	No, but should be part of onboarding	Not planned at this time
--------------	----	---------------------------	----------------------------	---	---	-----------------------	-------------	--	-----------------------------

Who is the 'point of contact' in the table above? How is this defined?

- The deliverable leader, depending on availability.
- They act as a bridge between URGE and SERC DEI groups.
- Come to consensus with a poll that the deliverable leader will be the point of contact, i.e. the person moving the conversation forward within SERC DEI and then acting as liaison to the URGE pod to bring the deliverable back for feedback when it's been further finalized.

Additional considerations for each deliverable (use this space to elaborate on table entries, organize it as appropriate for your pod):

- **Agreement** - This agreement can be adapted to outline how we intend our deliverables to feed into SERC DEI groups now that we have a better sense for the URGE workflow. We can further adapt this to identify how we plan to interact with the new Executive Officer when they are hired later this year. SERC DEI groups could also think about adapting something like this to solidify buy-in with PIs.
- **Pod Guidelines** – These pod guidelines (aka community agreement) will continue to be used for future URGE events. Other SERC groups can adapt these guidelines to suit their needs if helpful.
- **Complaints and Reporting Policy** – This document is an attempt to summarize the many existing SI policies. This document and/or our recommendations would need to go to the new Executive Officer in order to be shared widely among SERC staff. If we want a document like this for folks, we should interact with the SI Civil Coordinator (Amanda Jones) and OEESD for approval. Additionally, sharing this with Amanda Jones and OEESD could be a great next step because it could help them identify some of the gaps or misinterpretations that staff may have with from the policies. Them having knowledge of what staff don't know or understand will be essential for better communication and future reporting.
- **Demographic Data** – To get a better sense of how demographic data couples with pay equity, we will need to work with OHR and incoming Executive Officer closely. This would likely take several years. Start making connections with NMNH pod to see if we can leverage our collective voices when the SI Diversity Officer comes on board, who will hopefully be tracking and communicating this with units. As for demographic data for our seminar speakers, we should talk to the privacy office to see how we can track this (can speakers voluntarily disclose race/ethnicity and gender?).

Key questions:

- Can we ask for more data to be made public to staff? Why do we only get a 5-year snapshot?
- Will someone at a higher level, ideally the incoming Diversity Officer, take on tracking SI demographics? Will this data be shared more transparently in the future? If not, we will need to collectively advocate for this!



- Can we save the OHR data each year on the SERC server?

- **Policies for Working with Communities of Color** – This deliverable resulted from URGE and SERC DEI Community Engagement working group crossover. The document detailed the various projects across SERC in which SERC researchers engaged with Communities of Color and made a start at documenting what works and what doesn't work well when working with these communities. No policy is currently in place at SERC, so this is something that we should consider developing in the future following a deeper understanding of current projects and the practices used to ensure collaborative rather than exploitative engagement.

- **Admissions and Hiring Policies** – This document resulted from URGE and SERC DEI Recruitment working group crossover. The document presented results of informational interviews that they did with each of the SERC PIs about their hiring practices, and provides an excellent baseline for our understanding of SERC hiring practices and highlighted room for more standardization in the advertising and interview process across labs. In the future, the SERC DEI Recruitment working group plans to incorporate knowledge from staff about their experiences in the hiring process. SERC does not currently have a hiring policy beyond what is mandated by SI – this is something the SERC DEI Recruitment team and others should explore in the future.

- **Safety Plan** – This document resulted from URGE and the SERC DEI Fieldwork Safety and Equity working group crossover. The document is a draft of guidelines compiled for supervisors to help ensure safe and equitable fieldwork practices. Currently safety guidelines and plans are created and/or communicated on a lab by lab basis. A standardized set of guidelines would promote the use of more inclusive and equitable field practices and culture across SERC. The guidelines also fill a gap in SI's policies about workplace harassment and violence prevention by speaking directly to inclusion, equity, and accessibility. Guidelines would need approval from SERC Directorate before dissemination to SERC staff. The SERC DEI Fieldwork Safety and Equity group plans to engage the SI Civil Coordinator Amanda Jones in this work moving forward. Guidelines should be updated on an annual basis, or after any major incidences. Could consider annual 'training' about good fieldwork practices annually when interns arrive.

- **Resource Map** - There is no current resource map, but it is desperately needed. Our resource map deliverable served as the starting point for what could become an essential part of the onboarding process. This would work well as a SERC SharePoint site, which folks have been advocating for. Approval would likely come from new Executive Officer for SERC. Someone would need to create the site and keep it up to date on an annual basis.