

If you are involved in research with communities of color, in the US or abroad, have you...

• Actively sought out local collaborators / liaisons / guides? Why or why not?

Members of this URGE pod have worked all over the world and have actively sought out local collaborators/liasons/guides. While these efforts require a large investment of time, it has been enormously beneficial and rewarding to connect with locals, resulting in better research and stronger community ties. Pod members have collaborated with members of the Wabanaki Confederacy in Maine to provide documenting evidence to assist with NAGPRA efforts and Wabanaki Youth in Science (WaYS) education curriculums,Sakha scientists and translators in Siberia, Alaskan liaisons who have introduced pod members to communities, Columbian collaborators, and Ugandan local professors, guides and porters.

There was one negative example: one member said when they were studying in New Zealand, the University did not teach anything about the Maori. No relationships were made and no outreach was attempted. Looking back, it seems like a huge oversight. The Pod member did not know why the Maori were excluded.

• Were they included in the early development and/or proposal of the research or project itself, or added at a later stage?

Yes, local collaborators were involved early on. This wasn't always the case, but it is now required as part of the program. This has developed after further education on the issue and is framed around approaching these conversations from the framework of knowledge co-production.

 $\circ\;$ Were any local collaborators included as authors on presentations and/or Papers?

Yes. Much of the discussed research involved co-creating projects and fieldwork. Collaborators are always listed as authors on presentations and in papers.

• Actively sought to include local students in your research? Why or why not? Yes, this seems to be an easy area to integrate local communities. Focus seems to be on getting students involved. This pod is working to include students through WaYS and the local schools in Maine, as well as students in Chile.

• Sought to build trust and form long-term connections and collaborations with local institutions if your project is multi-year / ongoing? Why or why not?

Yes, this is critical in Siberia and the Falklands because we need landowner access and help with logistics. We are working to do the same in Maine, Alaska, Chile, Columbia, and Uganda to form longer lasting connections. We are doing this because the landowners, for example, enjoy hearing about what we have learned from visiting their

homes. They are curious and deserve to share in our knowledge. Using this method, scientific research becomes less extractive and is able to build up communities.

• Were previous negative interactions, whether from inside or outside of your organization, addressed in the plans for building these connections and trust?

There have been some negative past experiences. In the Falklands for example, landowners have said people come in, do their work and they never hear from them again. Acknowledging these issues with the landowners helped rebuild some of the lost trust. The project leader is still sending updates to the landowners years after having completed the work and also just checking in to see how their families are doing during the pandemic.

• Shared data and findings with the local/regional community in a way that is more accessible? (i.e., translating into different languages). Why or why not?

Pod members had many positive examples of information sharing. One researcher followed up with the community by developing public lectures, passing along papers, checking in on people's families, and participating in community events. This way she became more accessible and community members became comfortable approaching her with questions and information. It developed into a knowledge-exchange and positive relationship.

Many researchers are also developing mentorship pipelines for middle school, high school, and college students using virtual learning tools and research trips to help share the knowledge with younger members of the community.

• Educated yourself and your group/team about local politics, culture, customs, and knowledge, including the history of colonialism / settler colonialism in the region? Why or why not?

To an extent. We are all still new to this and are learning more about how we can do better by communities. We learn more with every group of people we interact with. Locals have been important for helping us understand these histories and relationships.

• Was sufficient time allocated to the process of working within the community's governance, customs, and priorities?

Yes, the time allocated was sufficient.

 Is respecting culture and customs included as part of your code of conduct? This will be addressed in Session 6 as well.

Yes. It is included in our codes of conduct.

- Acknowledged local communities / Indigenous tribes in your research results?
- Included local communities in your broader impacts in a meaningful way that builds on the community's identified needs and concerns?

Yes, our group actively shares data and findings with the communities we are involved with. Efforts have been made to understand the culture, customs, and knowledge of the communities, though politics are difficult to disentangle. Respecting the culture and

customs is part of our code of conduct and we thank all collaborators and communities in publications. We are working to find ways to meaningfully contribute to different community needs, but that is ever evolving. We are also including them in our broader impacts.

• Did these efforts leverage community members, and was that work compensated appropriately?

Yes. All guides and porters were paid well for their work. It is unclear how these efforts leveraged community members.

• Considered and prioritized research questions and research locations based on needs of local communities, in addition to how impactful they are seen within academia?

We are working to develop more effective ways of identifying community needs while in the planning process. This has been difficult because many funding agencies will not provide funding without a set research plan. It is difficult to even contact communities about a project before having funding, and it is nearly impossible to get funding without a research plan in place. There's a catch-22.

Plans for an improved process:

For our pod, it would be helpful to identify liaisons and guides within communities further in advance. It would also be helpful to have a standard for guidance on best practices for engaging with communities - a guide at an institutional level so we can all represent and be represented by our institutions well. Writing a collaborator or co-principal investigator that specializes in community engagement into grant applications and then recruiting one would be extremely helpful for this process.