CCE Diversity Equity Inclusion Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: April 12, 2022

Attendees: Brian Stoltz, Kim See, Julie Kornfield, Reina Buenconsejo, Stephanie Threat, Paolina Martinez, Lindsey Malcom-Piqueux and Elyse Garlock. Absent: Bil Clemons, Scott Cushing, and Kyle Virgil

_____

Item 1: Approval of the Meeting Minutes for Posting

    Subitem A: Approval of February 22 Meeting Minutes to be done by e-mail.

Item 2: Updates from Committee News:

    Subitem A: E-mail was sent to the Division to remind them of the DEI Funds available at the beginning of the Spring Quarter. We have currently received seven requests for forms.

    Subitem B: Meeting with Candace Rypisi of the WAVE office and Bettie Woods of the Advancement office regarding strategies for connecting with HBCU's to bring Waves to CCE per the specific requirement of the Preer gift. The plan is to contact the Chairs of the relevant departments at HBCUs regarding the Wave gift. If any of you have contacts at HBCU's, let us know. We are targeting next year since it was too late for this year.

    Decision: Contact HBCUs

    Next Steps: Work on ways to connect with multiple HBCUs

Item 4: Assessment of Campus Climate for Learning, Living, and Working at Caltech.

To preface, there were the Townhalls describing the campus climate in general. Lindsey has worked all the data and made it specific to each of the divisions. She presented this to the CCE faculty, however our committee is broader than the faculty and it is probably our committee's responsibility to determine if there are responses required or what next steps should be taken by the committee. This is meant as a beginning to those discussions.

CCE Division: Selected Results – Presentation to the CCE DEI Committee. Summary of Institutional vs Division-Level Findings. Lindsey Malcolm Piqueux

(Please see PowerPoint Presentation on CCE DEI Website)

- Other divisions are posting their secured results on their website. Our contractual obligations require that the document must be secured because it is not to be

printed. Each division's information is presented in comparison to the institution overall. In this way CCE will see how it is doing in comparison to the institute. This presentation identifies areas of success and how to bring those practices to other divisions.

- The four primary items at the heart of the survey guided the focus and what to include in this presentation. The four primary items are:

First item: Perceptions of the Overall Climate at Caltech- CCE Division compared to the Rest of the Institute: I took all those who responded that they were comfortable or very comfortable at CCE next to other areas of the institute. The patterns within CCE are similar to the rest of the institute. With Undergraduates, they had the highest level of comfort with CCE and across the institute. Postdocs, Faculty, and staff were around the same area. Graduate Students had the lowest levels of comfort with the climate at Caltech. How do we calibrate this data, are we having a problem or not? I would venture to say that until everyone feels comfortable, we have challenges to address however, the consultant gave us the benchmark of 70% so we want the individuals who say they are comfortable to meet or exceed 70%. In CCE the Undergraduates and Faculty meet that percentage but just barely for staff. However, graduate students and postdocs are below that benchmark and that is the case throughout the divisions.

Second Item: Personal Experience of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive and/or Hostile Conduct
At the heart of the survey, plus follow up questions that will assist us in opening this item up a bit more. Please notice that the pattern is similar to Caltech at large and not just CCE. Where graduate students were most likely to report having experienced exclusionary or hostile conduct compared to all other constituency groups and undergraduates were least likely. I do want to point out that for all the constituency groups the proportion of the individuals who said they experienced this multiple times far exceeded that of those who said it happened once. Unfortunately, we are thinking of the day-to-day experiences of those individuals experiencing this hostile or exclusionary conduct towards them. It is happening multiple times and creates a large impact on the institute's climate.

Third Item: Observations of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive and/or Hostile Conduct.
Here is the portion of the people who say they have witnessed this type of conduct. The people who say they observed the conduct is higher than those that have experienced it. We see again that the those who have observed this conduct is highest among graduate students and the other groups, undergraduates, postdocs, and faculty are all around similar levels of observing the conduct, staff are the lowest in observing this kind of conduct. The lighter shade of the bar code indicates that those people saw it more than once, this is happening multiple times and is not a one-off incident. This type of conduct is alarming in the data.

Fourth Item: Personal Experiences of Unwanted Sexual Conduct or Contact.
This could range from intimate partner violence or stalking, verbal sexual harassment, plus things that cross the line into physical contact as well and all the experiences are aggregated together. The pattern within CCE is similar across the institute. However, the prevalence is somewhat higher within CCE compared to the rest of the institute. The context within higher education is similar at Caltech.

Undergraduates are most likely to report having experienced this and most often the actor or the person engaged in that unwanted conduct is more likely another undergraduate. That is what we see in our data here. CCE is higher than the rest of the institute. I caution you, the actual numbers are lower, and this is not statistically significant. In an additional context, women and trans-spectrum students were more likely to report having had these experience. Given that CCE undergraduates are comprised of more individuals identifying as women compared to another division such as PMA. It is not surprising that there is that association. We are average and would be higher for that constituency group.

- I realize that these questions are somewhat decoupled from one another. When you go back to the other questions about "Observations" the undergraduates were always at the low end of that spectrum. To me it seems that undergrads were not observing these experiences, but in this data, they were experiencing them at a much higher degree.   To me it seems a little bit contrary to that. They are experiencing them at higher portion than anyone else, but they are observing them at a lower portion.
- The earlier slides that I showed you were not inclusive of this kind of conduct. We were very specific on the survey as to what we meant regarding exclusionary conduct, and we gave specific examples of exclusionary conduct. While here there is a different type of behavior and often this includes behavior that has a physical component, they are distinct in that sense. Undergraduates are always interacting with each other. That is something else to keep in mind.

After giving you those four core items related to the survey. I wanted to talk to you specifically about the:

Challenges with the Campus Climate at Caltech...that exist within our institutional climate as evidenced by what we saw in the data. One thing was true across all students both undergraduate and graduate. Caltech exceeded the 70%, threshold and the consultant said that was good relative to some of our peers. However, one person's caveat is another person's headline. For me the headline is the first bullet below:

All Students:

#1 Students with minoritized identities were less likely to indicate that they were comfortable with the climate at Caltech (e.g., LGBTQ+, URM, students with disabilities, gender diverse students.) ***This indicates that there are statistically significant differences in the perception of the climate at Caltech between students with minoritized identities compared to students who are from groups that have not been historically marginalized. This uncovers a glaring inequity that exists within our institutional climate.***

- **#2** Students with minoritized identities were more likely to have personally experienced exclusionary conduct (e.g., LGBTIQ+, URM, students with disabilities.)
- **#3** The data from both undergraduates and graduate students, the most perceived basis for exclusionary conduct were gender/gender identity, racial identity, ethnicity, and mental health/psychological disability or condition. ***When we asked those individuals who experienced this exclusionary conduct, what the conduct was based on, and these were the four areas that were the most identified by students.***

- **#4** Among all students, undergraduates and graduate students, *men felt a stronger sense of belonging than did women students.*
  This reveals another inequitable experience of Caltech as an institution and its environment.

Revisiting the data on the slide of **Student Experiences of Exclusionary**, **Intimidating, Offensive and/or Hostile Behavior**.

I have taken all students together to disaggregate by race and ethnicity. The categories: for international students, we requested that they identify their race and ethnicity, so they are included here. Additional respondents of color, it was not ideal to aggregate, but given the cell sizes and the need to protect confidentiality we had to aggregate and collapse a whole group of racial categories into one overarching category, which includes Black, Latinx, Indigenous and Multiracial students who self-identified as BIPOC. We asked them specifically if they identified themselves as BIPOC. Then we have white students and Multiracial students who did not self-identify as BIPOC. What we see in CCE again, the patterns are similar in what we see across the institute where additional respondents of color including Multiracial BIPOC experienced exclusionary conduct at the highest prevalence. The Multiracial (not BIPOC) 28% within CCE the cell size is very small. We cannot disclose the size, but it is small. But we wanted to present the data to you. This difference is not statistically significant here, but it does point to a circumstance that does need to be investigated further because even though it is not statistically significant it is substantively significant. Additionally, for most people experiencing this it is happening more than one time.

Graduate Students:

The key challenges we identified from the data obtained from graduate students are:
- GR women were significantly less likely than GR men to feel comfortable with the climate at Caltech.
- Within CCE, more than one in three (35%) GR women respondents indicated that they personally experienced multiple instances of exclusionary, offensive, or hostile conduct at Caltech.
- A hostile work environment was the most prevalent form of exclusionary conduct experienced ty GRs.
- GR women had lower perceived academic success scores than GR men. We requested students answer a scale we had created asking the questions, how well do you think you are doing in your program and how much do you think you are succeeding? GR women had a lower score in this area.
- GR women also felt a lower sense of belonging than GR men.

In terms of the data, I have disaggregated on the program level and gender identity, however, due to the cell sizes, what I had to do for the trans-spectrum students was disaggregate undergraduate and graduate students together. A function of trying to adhere to our minimal cell sizes without having to suppress the data. What we find here is that women graduate students are having a uniquely bad experience at least within this metric. Additionally, trans-spectrum students are also having similar negative experiences of having multiple incidents of exclusionary or hostile behavior. While within CCE the numbers are kind of comparable to all the divisions aggregated together. It is not necessarily that women or trans-spectrum students in CCE are

better or worse. Across the institution women graduate students and trans-spectrum students are experiencing hostile environments.

Forms of Exclusionary, Intimidating, Offensive, and/or Hostile Conduct Experiences by Graduate Students.

Individuals who indicated that they had had one of those experiences were asked to identify what they had experienced and what happened. They were able to select all the experiences applied. These percentages are of those respondents who said yes that they had experienced exclusionary conduct, and this is the form it came in. In the data I compared CCE to all the other division graduate students. Within CCE the most common experiences of exclusionary conduct came in the form of:

Hostile work environment – CCE 50%
Was ignored or excluded
Was intimidated or bullied
Was isolated or left out – CCE 44%
Felt/was silenced – CCE 50%
Target of workplace incivility- CCE 28%
Target of derogatory verbal remarks – CCE 50%
Singled out as the Target of racial/ethnic profiling
Target of unwanted sexual conduct
Someone assumed I was admitted due to my identity – *We note that CCE is lower in that matrix, but there are areas where CCE is higher than in other divisions.*

Challenges within the Campus Climate at Caltech

Table GR-1. Graduate Student Perceptions of the Campus Climate by Division and Gender, 2021 Caltech Climate Survey.

This table was sent to all the DEI Committee chairs. Here I identified all the questions the students were asked, which ones might be reflective of their experience within the division, because several questions related to where they lived and campus wide experiences. I focused on those items where we might expect to see some variation across divisions if there are differences with the micro-climates within each of the division. This first table I pulled out items to look at graduate students and their perceptions of the campus climate, I disaggregated by pulling out CCE and looking at all other divisions and I also disaggregated by gender. I want to note that given the relatively small number of respondents who identified as trans-spectrum that I am not showing on this table to adhere the best practices around protecting confidentiality and anonymity. It is a matter of protecting that population.

I have highlighted cells where there are statistically significant differences. The numbers in the cells reflect the mean score for that group. The lower values on the Likert scale are more desirable.

First question: Overall how comfortable are you with the climate at Caltech? *We see in CCE and in all the other divisions, among graduate students, women are less comfortable than men.*

Second question: How comfortable are you with the climate in your classes at Caltech? *Within CCE women were less comfortable as well as in other divisions. Additionally, CCE women and in all the other divisions said that the climate was more exclusionary than did men.*

Fifth and Sixth Questions: *When asked to rate the overall campus for men vs for woman, it is interesting to note that there was no gender difference when asked to rate the overall climate for men, so men and women share the perception that it is comfortable for men. But, when we asked about the overall campus climate for women both means go up, so it is a shared perception that it is less comfortable for women. But women were more likely to say it was worse for women than for men.*

Third Question: When asked to rate the campus climate friendly and/or hostile those differences did not emerge as statically significant in CCE, but it was in the rest of the campus.

- Even though we see that the statistical information indicating that the overall campus climate is more hostile to women. In looking at the previous slides in terms of instances of harassment or experiencing hostile environments, I would expect that these numbers on this slide to be more disparate if that makes sense? Do you know why this happens? Could you explain this disconnect or is it because people cope with all this hostility and maybe at the end of the day, they decide it is not so bad?
- It is difficult to know. It is one of the things we are going to be pursuing in our follow up policy in our data collection. I do think that especially for certain groups on our campus there are areas or spaces where there is a respite, if that makes sense. I know that is a common coping mechanism employed broadly by underrepresented groups on campus our research literature tells us that, but specifically at Caltech, we need to investigate it more deeply. You see the difference in the mean is larger in all the other divisions in comparison to women in CCE and that is something of note.

Table GR-2. Graduate Student Perceptions of Experiences with their Advisor by Division and Gender, 2021 Caltech Climate Survey. *Here again the orange-colored cells indicate the gender differences and are statistically significant and that the highlighted cells are experiencing less desirable outcome. Again, we are using Likert scale 1- Strongly agree to 5 Strongly Disagree.*

Questions: Satisfied with the quality of advising I have received from my department? Advisor provides clear expectations. I feel comfortable sharing my professional goals with my advisor. My advisor actively supports my professional goals. I am comfortable approaching my advisor about conflict within my research group/team.

Women were experiencing statistically fewer desirable outcomes in that space. They were less likely to agree with those statements than men in CCE.

Looking at all the data across all the divisions, there were some items for which there were no significant differences in CCE, but significant differences did emerge in the data across the rest of the campus. It is necessary to understand the nature of these experiences or the reasons for these gendered perceptions. Experiences with their advisors are something we will need to follow up on more to see is this concentrated with specific faculty members. is that driving it or is it distributed across all faculty members, since we did not ask who their advisor was or the gender of the advisor, we cannot tell you anything beyond what you see here. It is something we will pursue with follow-up qualitative work.

Table GR-3. Graduate Student Perceptions of their Academic and Research Experiences by Division and Gender, 2021 Caltech Climate Survey. *These are not specific to your advisor but related to your experience in the division. We see that there are differences where graduate student women are experiencing less desirable outcomes.*

Questions: I am satisfied with my academic experience at Caltech. My department provides clear expectations. I feel valued by Caltech faculty. I feel valued by the faculty in the classroom. **I think that faculty prejudge my ability based on their perception of my identity/background**. *I did reverse coding on this last item to be sure that we could interpret these results in a consistent manner. Essentially what it shows is that within CCE and the other divisions women were more likely to agree that their faculty prejudged their ability based on the identity or background.*

- The last one is interesting, it is the certainly the largest number in terms of the strongest agreement statement, but it is also high for men. It essentially says that all our graduate students believe that our faculty are prejudging them due to their identity/background. Overall, it is unfortunate, it is even more unfortunate that it is even more extreme for women.
- Identity and background can encompass a great deal. It would be interesting to do follow-up work to determine whether it is academic pedigree for example – where they received their undergraduate degree for one versus identity for another. It is something we need to delve into. Unfortunately, it certainly is reflective of what we know about how graduate students feel judged by faculty for their background. That faculty relate to a student's background was identified as being a common experience in the research literature.

Table GR-4. Graduate Student Perceptions of the Availability of Effective Advising and Faculty Mentorship at Caltech by Division and Gender, 2021 Caltech Climate Survey.

Questions: % of graduate students indicating that **Effective Academic Advising** IS available at Caltech. % of graduate students indicating that **Effective Faculty Mentorship** IS available at Caltech. *This is the last item related to graduate students. I want to note that the reason I pulled out graduate students, is that we did not see this type of gender differences among undergraduates. That could be because there was not sufficient statistical power to detect those differences that may exist. But I would say that it is probably not that, because when you look at the institutional level data for undergraduates, these differences were not present for undergrads.*

On the Second question: *in CCE, Women were <u>less likely</u> to say Yes that effective faculty mentorship is available at Caltech compared to men.*

On the First question: *You see that in CCE the gender difference is not present in CCE but is present in the other divisions. Women within CCE were more likely to say yes, it is present compared to women in the other divisions. Note that with men those percentages were comparable.*

- Of all this pretty depressing data, the faculty mentorship probably hits the hardest. If you ask the faculty what our job is here, it is to mentor graduate students and the fact that less than half the women in our division think that effective mentoring is available in any context at Caltech. That is really the question. That is unbelievably depressing. I am ready to give up.

  (Lindsey moves to page 24 on power point presentation)

  ## Student Perceptions of Institutional Actions

  Effective faculty mentorship of students

- *Let me show you why should not give up; the reason is because that is the primary way where students say you can improve the climate at Caltech with effective faculty mentorship of students is available to students. That is a clear point intervention and*

there are resources available on campus to help build capacity among faculty to engage in inclusive mentoring practices to know what that takes and what it looks like. It is a matter of making the choice whether this is where I am going to spend my time.

- *Also, the institution has some responsibility with this in terms of whether they incentivize or reward mentoring. It is not entirely on the faculty. I think people are rational (small r) in the economic sense of beings and so they will do what is rewarded. Thinking about incentive structures is a way to address that. This is a point of intervention, there are tools available on campus and beyond to help faculty be responsive to student's needs and be perceived to be more effective in that space. It is just a matter of let's do it. This is an actionable space where we need to intervene.*

Challenges within the Campus Climate at Caltech

<u>Postdocs:</u>

The key challenges that we identified from the data obtained from postdoctoral scholars are:
- Among postdocs, women were less likely than men to indicate that they felt valued by Caltech faculty/staff. ***The staff portion was a little bit of a surprise.***
- Across the Institute, women postdocs were less satisfied than men with the quality of advising that they received from their advisor/mentor(s). ***These gender differences were not significant with CCE.***
- Women were less likely than men to feel comfortable approaching their advisor about their work or conflicts within their research group.
- Postdocs expressed a desire for more opportunities to interact with faculty outside of the primary department *regardless of gender* identity across division experiences
- Postdocs perceived that Caltech does not value postdoctoral teaching/mentoring.
- Women Postdocs were significantly more likely to indicate that Caltech childcare benefits are not competitive.

Postdoctoral Scholar Perceptions of Workplace Climate

CCE: I am satisfied with the quality of advising I have received from my advisor or mentor(s).
Agree or Strongly Agree: Overall 88.8%, Women 87.5%, Men 89.5%. Disagree or Strongly Disagree Overall 3.7% Men 5.3% *Significantly higher in CCE Gender did not exist in CCE*

All Other Divisions: Agree/Strongly Agree: Overall 69.5% Women 61.1%, Men 75.7%. Disagree or Strongly Disagree Overall 17.2%, Women 24.1%, Men 12.2%

CCE: My advisor or mentor(s) promotes an inclusive research group/team. Agree or Strongly Agree: Overall 81.4%, Women 75.0%, Men 84.2%. Disagree or Strongly Disagree Overall 7.4%, Women 12.5%, Men 5.3% *Here there were significant gender differences both in CCE and other divisions. Women were less likely to agree that their advisor /mentor promoted an inclusive research group. The level of agreement was higher in CCE than the rest of the institute. The magnitude of the gender differences in terms of the disagreement was larger across the other divisions compared to CCE.*

All Other Divisions: Agree/Strongly Agree: Overall 71.6% Women 68.5%, Men 74.0%. Disagree or Strongly Disagree Overall 14.9%, Women 24.1%, Men 8.2%

<u>Faculty:</u>
- **#1** Among faculty, women were less likely to feel sufficiently supported and mentored during the tenure-track years.

- **#2** Women faculty were more likely to agree that they performed more work to help students than their colleagues.
- **#3** Faculty perceived that service contributions were not valued and that excellence in teaching is not rewarded at Caltech.
- **#4**. Non-tenure-track faculty were significantly less likely than professorial faculty to feel that their opinions were taken seriously by senior administrators and valued by Caltech committees.

When we came to the division level for aggregating faculty, it was very difficult to present the data in a way that would allow us to not have to suppress data and to protect faculty. I decided to present some of the themes that emerged to keep the structure and the presentations consistent across the divisions. If there are specific items that you would like me to go back into the data and do an analysis by request, I would be happy to do it.

In terms of the take aways from the faculty we found that across all divisions that: #1 women felt a lack of support and being mentored, #2 women more likely to help students, #3 faculty more broadly perceived, regardless of gender, that service contributions and excellence in teaching are not valued or rewarded, #4 non-tenure-track faculty believed that their opinions were not taken seriously by senior administrators and CIT committees. (Non-tenure track faculty includes research and teaching faculty instructors and lecturers etc.)

Staff:

- **#1**.75% of staff members within CCE feel valued by their supervisor
- **#2**. Just below 23% of staff within CCE feel that the performance evaluation process is clear compared to 52% of all other staff at Caltech.
- **#3.** Among staff, "position status" was most often perceived as the basis of the exclusionary conduct they experienced.
- **#4**. 41% of staff within CCE indicated that they seriously considered leaving Caltech in the past two years compared to 51% of all other staff at Caltech. The most cited reason was "limited opportunities for advancement."
- **#5.** Nearly 40% of staff within CCE agreed that a hierarchy exists within staff positions that leads some staff voices being valued more than others. (All other areas = 48%)

Here are the highlights, there was so much data we had to choose what to focus on for CCE, I pulled out items that were relevant: #1. 75% of CCE staff feel valued by their supervisor, which is similar across the rest of the institute. #2 Lower than a quarter CCE staff felt that the performance evaluation process is clear compared to a little over half of all the staff across the Institute. I add the caveat that all other institute staff include staff that are in administrative units and offices and not just the academic divisions. I know that being in a supervisor role in an administrative unit, it is much clearer the processes that we need to follow for the annual evaluation. We have tools that exist, and they may not translate well to the divisional environment. That context is important to keep in mind. #3. Among staff across the institute was the perception that there are power dynamics that must be navigated and what is meant by that is when we looked at staff who said they experienced exclusionary conduct, more so than identity or any other element of background, their status as staff was the most commonly perceived basis for the exclusionary conduct. It is important to note. #4. In CCE 41% of staff indicated they had consider leaving Caltech in the past two years across the institute it was 51% and "limited

opportunities for advancement" was the most cited reason. As an aside, I am interested in organizational theory in higher ed institutions, Caltech is organizationally a very flat organization. Here there are not the kind of levels of bureaucracy that exist at larger universities. It is easy to imagine that there are limits for advancement. It has been said at Caltech the only way to advance is if someone vacates their position for whatever reason. #5 In CCE 40% of the staff agreed that there is a hierarchy even within staff that some staff voices are more valued than others. This is lower than the rest of the institute which averaged 48% but is it important to note 4 in 10 staff in the division agree that there is a hierarchy that exists.

- Is there an institutional action plan being developed for staff? For example, the staff performance evaluation is something that our committee has little control over and would be handled by Grace in our front office would be the point person.
- Yes, there is
- Grace mentioned that at the recent faculty meeting.
- I have been working with the lead administrator and their office for each constituency group to start developing that action plan with staff working with the VP for the administration and HR. For Postdocs Joe, my colleague, spoke with the Postdoc representative and the Postdoc Association leadership as well as student affairs. However, the challenges are unique to the position, and we are attempting to figure out what kind of cross institution and/or intervention makes sense. Plus, what kind of specific actions for a particular subgroup need to be taken.

Institutional Actions that Influence the Campus Climate

Institutional Actions to Positively Influence the Campus Climate

To summarize the data on the subsequent slides that are in support of the proposed actions. In terms of what we are doing, the data does provide some guidance on how Caltech should act and how we need to intervene. We asked individuals who responded to the survey to specify institutional actions available at Caltech and if so, do they positively or negatively affect the climate if they said no, they are not here, we asked if they were here would that be a positive or negative affect on the climate.

Students and Postdocs:

The two most identified mechanisms for positively influencing the climate were:

- Effective faculty mentorship of Students
- A process to address complaints of bias by faculty/staff and by other students on campus

Setting up a process for addressing complaints, at this point since we no longer have the ombudsman person that we had in the early 2000's. It will need to be handled within the division or through Title IX and many people feel the situation does not rise to the level of Title IX or perhaps they feel it is a burden that they must go through the investigative process. Having a middle or intermediate process is very important. I believe some of the DEI committees are trying to start systems in place with anonymous reporting, so we are progressing on that front.

- It is complete mystery to me why that position went away. It would be relatively easy to reinstate that position. I do not know if that has been brought up to Tom or not.
- I report to him directly in my capacity as CEO and we have been discussing that and I have been pushing that strategy/approach.

Faculty:
- Clear and fair processes to resolve conflicts
- ***These are faculty to faculty conflicts.***

Staff:
- Career development opportunities
- Clear and fair processes to resolve conflicts
- Supervisory training for faculty and supervisors/managers

These are clear signposts on steps that need to be taken. There are several models that are out there, at both at institutional peers and organizational types. We must always find what will work within our context. But these are the things the community is clearly telling us we need to put it place.

Please note: Due to time constraints Lindsey focused on Slide 26

Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Actions

<u>For the DEI Committee</u>: I know I do not need to tell you this, though it is in the data as well. But when it comes to trying to imbed DEI related metrics, measures, experiences into the work of faculty there is significant potential for pushback. ***Essentially what you see here in these graphs if something is red or pink, people are saying it will negatively affect the climate so the shade of red or pink that means that it is not available and it would be bad for the climate or it is available and it is bad for the climate. The items where you have the most part of the bar you have the negative side of the line***

Fair processes to resolve conflicts

Clear processes to resolve conflicts

<u>Diversity, equity, and inclusivity-related professional experiences included as one of the criteria for hiring staff/faculty</u> *– **This is not quotas, this is just saying do you have professional experience in promoting DEI related activities. This is a great idea and should be done, however, everyone does not feel that way so that is something we must keep in mind.***

Supervisory training for faculty

Toolkits for faculty to create an inclusive classroom environment

<u>Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for faculty.</u> ***The magnitude of the potential backlash for the people who think it would be negative for the climate is smaller, but it is still there, it exists.***

<u>Recognition and rewards for service related to diversity, equity, and inclusivity.</u> ***Here as well.***

<u>Recognition and rewards for including diversity issues in courses across the curriculum</u> ***Here as well.***

- This is across the whole institute.
- Yes, it is.
- Would it be possible to see what CCE looks like compared to the institute?
- Yes, I can pull that for you. CCE has enough faculty respondents for me to do it.
- Not disaggregated by gender just the whole division faculty.
- I will compare a side by side – CCE and the other division.
- It is important that given the DEI committee's role and the creative ways you are using to advance diversity, equity, and inclusion within the division to being aware of the potential for negative reactions. Of which, you are all probably aware of and show you that it is in

the data as well. **The potential for backlash is highest among faculty and smallest among students and postdocs.**

- This was eye opening and sobering. What can we do to improve the experience of graduate women? That strikes me as an outlier that we must address somehow as an institution and particularly as a division. We try to solve these things often at the very local level. Try to do our best on how we run our research groups and clearly that is not working. Any thoughts or guidance for us?
- There is the approach of thinking about preventative education and those types of focus. I know that already exists during graduate orientation. People have these kinds of training, bystander training, learning institutional policy what is and is not appropriate.
- I think that is why that one question hit me hard because is there anyone you can point to who provides mentorship. If I read the question correctly, it seemed that less than half of the women in our division believed there was not anyone that provides mentorship.
- It wasn't framed as was there anyone. Is there effective faculty mentorship? I think they were thinking more broadly.
- Not does it exist in any form, but does it exist generally?
- As I recall the question, it was do you receive academic advising not just faculty. I was thinking not only of my faculty advisor, but of my grad student and postdoc mentors as well.
- We are behind some of our peers in terms of the representation of women and other gender expansive identities among our graduate student population and the nature of the experience itself. What we learned through another study that I did (the report that will be out soon) is that the graduate student experience is tightly tethered to the experiences with your advisor and often time with the postdocs within your research lab or group. It does have to be addressed on the local level as you said. It is necessary to understand where the barriers exist. Additionally, one thing that needs to happen, is in faculty and postdoc education about how power is functioning within that environment and to be aware that even though they think they are giving the student an option, by the very fact of the faculty/postdoc asking, that student interprets it as not having an option.
- There is also qualitative data that is available that I can provide, though it will take a while due to the volume of data, a sematic analysis of some of those written comments for CCE specifically. I can give you some of the themes that emerge, though not the actual data. It would also be interesting to understand whether it is more common among graduate students who work with faculty members with certain identities or faculty members who are at different stages in their career, like junior faculty versus full professors. With these sorts of things, you must delve into using qualitative methods and that is a sensitive issue, so we need to be careful in how we study these kinds of things. This is what came to me without having the rich qualitative data to pinpoint exactly what to do and that is in progress.
- That would be great.
- On the slides you presented on graduate student's responses by gender identity is the sample size large enough for similar slides to do a comparison of URM vs all students?

- I cannot do it by division. I may have to collapse the data even further. I have sociological and theoretical reasons for not collapsing certain categories together. It is frustrating because we need to be able to understand the nature of the experience to be able to do good faith recruiting to an institution that has a positive and inclusive environment and the small "n" limits our understanding to some extent.
- Are there any anecdotal comments that can be pulled out of that group to provide, those would be more anonymous, and you would need to use your best judgement, but anything would be helpful.
- Yes, the qualitative comments there is a lot. Additionally, we did this study that will be coming out in about month or so on the student experience which involved doing focus groups with dozens of graduate students and undergraduate student alumni where there was some clear feedback that emerged from that, which aligned with what I have learned through my experience in interacting with current students. I think there are clear issues that need to be addressed.
- When we are discussing solutions, I believe it is important to think of the data we do have and the data that we do not have. Our conversations are kind of centering around gender identity, but also including what we do know anecdotally about racial and ethnic identities as well, when we are thinking about programming including other groups.
- Yes, that is what the follow-up qualitative research work will enable us to do. To be able to get that in depth understanding and those data are just as valuable and just as actionable as quantitative data, which is what I always emphasize when I speaking to the Trustees or leadership that stories and experiences are also important and provide invaluable insight.
- Since you are standing invited guest. We look forward to your professional advice moving forward.
- If there is any subgroup within the division that you would like me to speak to, I am happy to do so.
- Now, the faculty and committee have seen this, the division should see it as well. The committee will have to decide our next steps.

Remaining slides not discussed.

Student Perceptions of Institutional Actions Slide 24

- Effective faculty mentorship of students
- A process to address student complaints of bias by faculty/staff
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for staff
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for faculty
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for students

Postdoc Perceptions of Institutional Actions Slide 25

- Effective faculty mentorship of Postdocs
- A process to address postdoc complaints of bias by other postdocs
- A process to address postdocs complaints of bias by faculty/staff
- Training postdocs how to work in teams
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for faculty
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for postdocs

Staff Perceptions of Institutional Actions Slide 26

- Career development opportunities for staff
- Fair processes to resolve conflicts
- Clear processes to resolve conflicts
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity-related professional experiences included as one of the criteria for hiring staff
- Supervisory training for supervisors/managers
- Diversity, equity, and inclusivity training for staff
- Staff recognition

Supplemental Slides 30-35

What is Campus Climate?

How do we measure campus climate?

Why does campus climate matter?

Campus Climate Survey Process (Summer-Fall 2020 through May4-28, 2021

Campus Climate Survey Process (Summer 2021 through Winter 2022.

Respondent Summary