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The CIC is our forum for fostering an inclusive culture within the Department of Psychology. Our aims are to promote diversity, equity, and inclusivity in our community, and to integrate and strengthen these values in our research, teaching, and mentoring, as well as in our everyday interactions. The CIC, and the department more generally, remains very much a work in progress with respect to achieving these aims. Nonetheless, we have seen remarkable growth over the past year, as the CIC has expanded its scope and activities.

Our department aspires to embrace diversity, to be a welcoming place to individuals from all backgrounds, cultures, and orientations. Meeting that aspiration requires a community built on mutual respect and trust within and across our constituencies. Strengthening our community in these ways has been one of our central goals in the current year. We have tried to reach that goal in a host of ways including: posting a regular bulletin highlighting community and diversity related events; establishing a dedicated departmental slack channel for community activities, and a social media footprint on both Facebook and Instagram; and organizing a range of other social activities and events. Perhaps most notable among the latter was our screening of Black Panther for the whole department at a local movie theater to celebrate the high level of participation in our annual climate survey. Our survey results (see pp. 4-10) suggest that people have greatly appreciated our community building efforts.

Hand in hand with this community orientation, we have focused on building allyship skills (yes, allyship is a word!). Our aim has been to help individuals develop awareness and skills that will enable them to become more effective allies to those from underrepresented/marginalized groups (for example, bystander intervention skills in situations in which individuals are subject to micro- or macro-aggression from others). CIC and department members have attended trainings on implicit bias, becoming Dreamer allies, and diversity issues in the classroom (see pp. 15-18), to name a few examples. We also contracted with Rehearsals for Life (RfL) to provide participatory diversity workshops for graduate students and for faculty. RfL is a joint project of the Graduate School and the Office of the Dean of Students, geared toward empowering individuals to step in to defuse disrespectful situations.

RfL uses interactive theater techniques to address how we can engage in difficult conversations around issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, disability, religion, or age differences. Both graduate students and faculty found the workshops thought-provoking and informative, and we plan to offer them again next year, adding in a workshop specifically for staff. Finally, with financial support from the Underrepresented Minor Recruitment Fund, we are providing funding opportunities to individuals who wish to attend workshops or conferences that have a diversity/inclusivity theme. The expectation is that those taking advantage of such opportunities will bring back what they have learned for the benefit of the whole community (see link in side panel and pp 19-20).

The CIC has been active external to the department as well as internally. We provided input to the university’s Diversity Action Plans and attended workshops on diversity plan issues run by the Division of Equity and Inclusion, and by the College of Arts and Sciences. We have also recently joined with representatives of diversity committees in other natural science departments in establishing regular meetings with the aim of sharing ideas and joining forces on common diversity goals.
What is on the CIC horizon for the future? In the immediate term, we have just rolled out our first ever survey of department members’ experiences related to gender bias and sexual harassment. Our decision to do so was prompted by a strong desire to engage with the cultural #MeToo movement that has come to a head over the past year. With that in mind, we added a new question on gender bias to our annual diversity climate survey and, for the first time, we broke down responses to other questions by gender. The results were, if not entirely surprising, certainly shocking. Whether they are faculty, staff, or graduate students, females in our department report much higher levels of bias, and negative interactions more generally, than do males. Our new survey will provide a more detailed assessment of potential gender bias, discrimination, and harassment in our community. We aim to use the findings to develop policies and practices in our department that will promote a healthy, positive environment for all genders. We hope you will participate in the survey!

In the longer term, we hope to increase the presence of underrepresented minority groups in our ranks. We already provide “safe spaces” at our graduate admissions visiting weekends where prospective students can learn about the departmental diversity climate. We would like to go beyond that to actively recruit minority students at conferences those students frequently attend (e.g., SACNAS). Looking further ahead, and more ambitiously, we may consider hosting a visiting weekend for talented underrepresented minority students who are planning graduate study in psychology. Many of our comparator psychology departments now hold such events and are more successful than we are at recruiting minority students. The focus of the weekend would be to help these students develop stronger graduate applications, as well as highlighting the strengths of our own graduate program with a view to attracting their applications.

Many individuals have contributed to the CIC’s ramped-up efforts this year. It really does take a village (a community?) to build a community. That said, I would be remiss not to draw attention to the contributions of one individual in particular: our GE, Jennifer Lewis. Jenn has brought to the committee boundless energy, thoughtfulness, and compassion. She works tirelessly day in and day out to strengthen our sense of community, to make sure all are welcomed, and to stand up against oppression. We should all be more like Jenn!

As always, the CIC welcomes new members, fresh ideas, and diverse perspectives. If you are interested in joining or learning more about our work, please do get in touch with me, Brice Kuhl (Incoming Chair), or Jenn Lewis (CIC GE).
Annual Climate Survey on Diversity and Inclusivity

Thank you to all who participated in the 2018 CIC survey. As in previous years, our goal was to assess attitudes, experiences, hopes, and concerns of members of our community regarding issues of inclusivity and diversity, and to examine changes in these attitudes since last year’s survey. This was not always possible, however, because we altered the response formats for some questions this year in an effort to provide more refined information. We also added a new section of questions on community in the department. Additionally, some questions were inadvertently omitted last year regarding experiencing and witnessing events related to more subtle forms of discrimination and bias (e.g., “felt as if you were invisible”), and therefore we are not able to make direct comparisons.

There are some inherent limitations to the survey that are important to consider when interpreting the results. Our department lacks diversity in some ways and, therefore, while it’s great to see low percentages of reported negative events or majority satisfaction, it’s critical to recognize that the majority view still doesn’t capture the experiences of all. The fact that even a few members of our community are dissatisfied or have negative experiences is problematic, and we should strive to change that. By including questions about a persons’ role in the department, their gender, and the underrepresented groups with which they identify, we hope to be able to understand these experiences. This is always a challenge, however, in that individuals may not feel comfortable disclosing their demographic status, as doing so puts them at risk of being identified.

**Sample Size and Department Demographics**

Out of an estimated current department size of 160 (including faculty, graduate students, and staff), 145 people participated in the survey. This represents a large increase in participation from last year (91% compared to 53%). Our sample consisted of graduate students (n=81), faculty (n=45), and staff (n=18). Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of the sample. All demographic questions were optional and some people chose not to report aspects of their identity.

Of those who chose to report gender, 69% identified as female. About 50% of faculty who participated were female, and over 80% of both graduate students and staff who took the survey identified as female. In an open question about whether people identified as a member of an underrepresented group (either in the department, in the field of psychology, or in their sub-field of psychology), with group being undefined, 22% of people reported that they did (not including gender). A breakdown of which underrepresented groups people identified with within the department is displayed in Table 1 (percent out of total sample). Note that the categories for underrepresented group are not mutually exclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Department Demographic</th>
<th>Percent/Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Identified Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Binary/Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Identified Underrepresented Group within the Department</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Departmental Views on Diversity and Inclusivity

Caring about Diversity

In 2018, a majority of respondents reported that they believe that graduate students and faculty care “enough” about issues of diversity and inclusivity. However, a notable portion of respondents indicated the opposite, with 20% reporting that graduate students do not care enough, and 30% reporting that faculty do not care enough. These results are very comparable to responses in 2017 (see Figures 1 and 2). The majority of participants (88%) also responded that issues of diversity and inclusivity are important to them, with only 7% in disagreement. While we expanded the scale on this question to allow more variable responding, these results are comparable to 2017, in which 82% reported agreement and 8% reported disagreement that issues of diversity and inclusivity are important to them.

Motivation and Time Limitations

About half (53%) of participants reported that they are highly motivated to work towards goals of inclusivity and diversity in their everyday lives, and 43% expressed they are only slightly motivated. Most participants (76%) reported that time limitations somewhat get in the way of their engagement in activities pursuing efforts in inclusion and diversity.

Department Satisfaction on Issues of Diversity and Inclusivity

Our survey asked questions about department members’ satisfaction with how welcoming the department is of individuals from diverse backgrounds, as well as how well the department is doing in recruiting individuals of diverse backgrounds and perspectives. The majority of respondents are very satisfied (39%) to somewhat satisfied (42%) with the department's performance on welcoming individuals from other backgrounds (Figure 3). In addition, about 60% of respondents were somewhat satisfied to very satisfied with the department’s ability/effort in recruiting diverse graduate students and faculty, as well as in recruiting graduate students and faculty with diverse perspectives (Figure 4). Lastly, respondents were somewhat or very satisfied with the respect that instructors of graduate (68%) and undergraduate (47%) courses demonstrate toward students of diverse backgrounds, although many people felt they were not able to make that assessment about undergraduate instructors (50%; See Figure 5).
In open-ended responses, people frequently mentioned an improving trend in the department’s efforts to recruit more diversely, particularly when it comes to graduate students. Many of the comments, however, asked for a continued priority in recruiting faculty of diverse backgrounds, with a particular emphasis on increasing ethnic and cultural diversity.

Experiences and Witnessing of Negative Events Within the Department

Over the years, the CIC has used the climate survey to track negative experiences and events within the department related to issues of diversity and inclusivity and, in recent years, to also track the witnessing of these events.

In Table 2 we compare changes in these personal experiences across years. For some categories, reports of negative experiences were down or stayed constant, but for other categories they increased. Occurrence of these incidences in any frequency is concerning, especially if they continue to increase. In that light, the increase since last year in reports of being the target of profiling, as well as the increase in witnessing persons being the target of offensive humor is concerning.
Table 2. Personal and Witnessed Experiences of Negative Events Within the Department on Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Experience</th>
<th>2016 Experienced</th>
<th>2017 Experienced</th>
<th>2018 Experienced</th>
<th>2017 Witnessed</th>
<th>2018 Witnessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=75</td>
<td>N=84</td>
<td>N=135</td>
<td>N=84</td>
<td>N=129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Offensive Humor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for Personal Safety</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile or Threatening Comments and/or Gestures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Profiling</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive or Threatening Phone Calls or Emails</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscenities/Threats via University-Affiliated Online Community</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New questions to the survey this year included questions related to subtler negative experiences such as feeling ignored, disrespected, or feeling like there are different privileges or expectations placed on you compared to your peers. In these questions, we see relatively high reported incidences (see Figure 6), with 36% of persons reporting that they have felt as if they are invisible or have been ignored within our department and 31% of persons feeling as if they’ve been disrespected. About 15% of respondents reported feeling like they receive different privileges than their peers and 11% felt like they were subject to different expectations.

In open-ended responses asking participants to elaborate on the experiences they endorsed, several trends appeared. Multiple persons reported incidents of being talked over or interrupted, and many reported they believe this had to do with aspects of their identity. Further, almost all of these comments particularly noted that these experiences came from department members who are male and most often male faculty. Other comments that appeared multiple times mentioned persons having their ideas discredited, only to have the same idea suggested by a white-male and then given more credence, or mentioned a feeling that they had to work harder to prove themselves and their intelligence as compared to their male colleagues.
Gender and Underrepresented Group Effects

For the first time, the survey also asked about gender discrimination, with 21% of respondents reporting feeling like they've experienced such discrimination in our department. 85% of persons who reported experiencing discrimination identified as women and the remaining 15% chose not to identify their gender. In addition, 81% of those reporting gender discrimination also identified as members of an underrepresented group.

Overall, women were more likely to report occurrences of negative experiences than men were. In particular, 80% of respondents who reported fearing for their safety in the department identified as female and 100% of respondents who reported receiving offensive messages from within the department were female. Of those who reported having the experience of being ignored in the department, 80% identified as female. Similarly, 72% of persons who reported experiencing disrespect in the department identified as female.

Additionally, approximately 70% of persons who identified as belonging to an underrepresented group reported experiencing negative events in each category except experiencing fear for their safety. The numbers here are difficult to interpret, however, because of partial confounding with gender.

Consequences of Negative Events

It's important not just to assess the frequency of negative events, but also their impact on our community members. Participants were asked to report whether issues of insensitivity (i.e., microaggressions/implicit discrimination) and/or issues of hostility related to diversity in the department within the past 12 months have had any of the following consequences: Made you not want to participate, made you feel like there are people within the department that you can't talk to or can't work with, made you consider dropping a class, made you consider leaving the department or switching majors/careers (Figure 7). Most notably, 42% of respondents reported that issues of insensitivity have made them feel like there are people they can't talk to or work with in the department. Also 34% of people reported that issues of insensitivity related to diversity have made them not want to participate in department activities. Also striking is that 13% of respondents reported that they have actually considered leaving the department because of issues of insensitivity.

From the open-ended responses, it is clear that some people have experienced harm in some way from our department or member(s) of our department. This has had the self-reported consequences of their
withdrawing from the community as well as experiencing hurt and invalidation. As a department, we need to be mindful of these occurrences, and we need to attempt to address each incident regardless of whether it occurs to one or many. When we know of incidents that cause harm, we must take some form of action to acknowledge the harm. When we fail to respond to negative events, and especially when we fail to respond to repeated reports of concerning behaviors or experiences, we generate the risk of institutional betrayal and further harm to those individuals who have already experienced harm.

**Figure 7. Effects of Diversity-Related Insensitivity and Hostility**

- Make you consider leaving the program/department
- Make you consider dropping a class or requirement
- Make you feel like they are people you can't talk to
- Make you not want to participate

Survey Takeaways

We have some growing to do. There are some things we are doing well: In particular, the majority of respondents believe that issues of diversity and inclusivity are important to them, and the majority also believes that our department cares about these issues. So, the care component is there, and relatively strong, and that is an important catalyst for change to occur. However, there are areas of concern that we need to work on as a community, and it will require change at every level – from the administrative level, to areas, to labs, to individuals. That change will only be possible if we as a community feel motivated to make those changes. About half of individuals reported that they are highly motivated to work on goals related to inclusivity and diversity, but nearly 40% reported they were only slightly motivated. Tipping that 40% into the highly motivated category could generate a lot of momentum to propel these initiatives forward.

Some of the highest incidences of negative experiences involved subtler forms of discrimination and bias, such as feeling ignored, invisible, or disrespected. The data also showed that women and persons identifying as belonging to an underrepresented group within the department report these experiences at higher frequencies. We should consider it a high priority to begin addressing these forms of discrimination within our department.

One thing we can do is to reflect on some our current practices. Some of the feedback the CIC has received through the climate survey as well as other means of communication is that students find it particularly motivating when there is a strong faculty presence at events supporting inclusion, diversity, and community, and that it’s quite disappointing when faculty are not present. Students generally report an understanding of the many time constraints that faculty face but have voiced that attending or not
attending these events indicate priorities. Student presence has also been noted to be an important component of feeling motivated to participate in these efforts, and similarly, students have reported it as disheartening when more of their peers do not attend or participate in events. Time is a scarce resource in our field, but we have repeatedly been able to show-up when for things we prioritize—new faculty hires, FYP presentations, Grad Student Recruitment events, etc. If we really do value and prioritize diversity, inclusivity, and community, we have to start showing up.

Many other thoughtful comments were made in the open-ended responses. Here we list a few examples that we think are worth everyone’s attention.

- **Remember Names/Details:** Remembering important information about persons you interact with regularly can be a key component to making another person feel seen and respected. This is particularly important if you serve in any advisory/mentoring role. Details such as names, project topic, career goals, year in program etc. can be important in helping foster a supportive partnership.

- **Asking Details:** Further, asking for these types of details can also be a step towards making a person feel heard/seen and respected.

- **Don’t Interrupt:** Be conscious of your speaking presence. Listen and wait. Be aware of space, don’t just wait for someone to finish talking but be aware of the whole room, are others waiting to speak? Are there others that haven’t spoken? Have you heard all the voices?

- **Be sensitive to personal differences, don’t assume:** Understand that everyone has different experiences, backgrounds, and beliefs – don’t assume that others experiences are the same as your own and be sensitive of that possibility in interactions with others. Further, don’t assume that one person of a particular background represents everyone with that background: Don’t ask them to be the spokesperson for that group or all underrepresented groups in general.

With conscious efforts of individuals and renewed motivation, these changes are possible. Importantly, growing pains are unavoidable: We accept that mistakes will be made, and this is understandable. We should be humble about our mistakes, avoid defensiveness, and be open to feedback. When mistakes are made, we should also try to give the benefit of the doubt that the mistake was not malicious. Together we can begin to address some of the concerning issues this survey revealed. Doing so will allow us to continue to grow our community and to support for each other.
I think the *community* part of the Committee for an Inclusive Community has been an underemphasized component in past years, and I think it’s an important one that we need to highlight. It may seem like increasing diversity and inclusivity is a separate and distinct goal from creating community, but they really are two goals that go together, and I would argue that creating community is a necessary goal to achieving the former. If we really want to bring more diversity and inclusivity to our department, we need first to make sure that our own community is a place people want to be a part of. And not just because of our scholarly prestige, but because we aspire to be a supportive community that values the well-being and achievement of all, and that puts effort into making others feel like they belong. Sometimes we naturally assume that if we increase inclusion, if we increase diversity, we are creating community or improving community, but I think they are two different, albeit related, things that should be simultaneously cultivated for mutual benefit.

Fostering community is important for improving the well-being and happiness of our department members. Academia is not the typical 9-5 job, it can require or motivate longer hours or weekend work hours, and there is likely to be a high degree of pressure – to publish, to find funding, to meet requirements, to get tenure, etc. For many faculty and staff, this will be or has been their residence for many years, sometimes decades, and for graduate students, for 5-7 years. In a place where so many of us spend the significant portion of our day, where the people around us are likely the people we spend the most time with, it’s important to strive to make that a place in which people feel comfortable and safe, and that ideally they enjoy.

If we consider the most basic definition of community – a group of people in a shared location with shared interests – our psychology department is that. But we have the choice to build beyond that and to create a *sense of community*. A sense of community goes well beyond the basic definition: It
carries much more personal meaning in that it represents "a feeling that members have of belonging, a feeling that members matter to one another and to the group, and a shared faith that members’ needs will be met through their commitment to be together." So this becomes an important question for our department – are we satisfied with building a basic community or do we want a richer sense of community?

This year the CIC committed to the goal of trying to improve our sense of community and to create more opportunities to build community. We did this through organizing not only more events, but also more diverse types of events at a range of times throughout the week and year. Examples included welcome back events, celebrations after each FYP talk set, small group meet-ups (running group, dog walk groups), as well as a department movie viewing of The Black Panther. We also attempted to create more venues for meet-ups and communication by creating a community slack page (more info below). To assess whether these activities achieved our goal we included questions about community in the survey this year.

We believe that we made good progress toward our goal: 32% of respondents believed the efforts of the CIC this year have definitely improved the community and 43% thought our efforts improved it a little bit. Notably, in the open response comments about the CIC’s community efforts, our weekly bulletin was acknowledged as especially helpful in this regard. This is an activity the CIC plans to continue as we get more participation. Currently the CIC GE has been in charge of releasing these, but in Spring term the primary funding activity for the CIC GE is the climate survey and newsletter, and more help is needed during that time to keep the bulletins coming. We’ll continue to brainstorm ways to make this more efficient and regular.

We also included some specific questions about different aspects of experiencing a sense of community (see Table 3.). The table shows some mixed results, about 30-50% of respondents feel that the department captures most aspects of a sense of community, and about 20-40% feel it somewhat does. In general, persons’ experiences of a sense of community are quite variable. There is room for improvement but it seems we have a good base to build on. As we continue to focus on ways to build community, we hope to see these numbers improve at the next survey.
Ideas for Improvement

The CIC group will plan to continue some of the practices that seemed effective this year, including the small group meet-ups, more department events, and the weekly bulletin. From open-ended comments and discussions throughout the year department members have had other suggestions that we as a department can take to continue to improve our sense of community as well.

- **In Depth Discussions**: Some of the things that were recommended to strengthen our community included providing opportunities for more in depth discussions on important matters – a place to discuss more open feelings and generate actionable ideas.

- **Department Participation and Presence**: Further, as mentioned in the climate survey results increased participation by faculty and students in official, as well as, community events has been noted as an important component to feeling a sense of community and dedication to issues of diversity and inclusivity in the department.

- **Workshops and Training**: More workshop and training on aspects of inclusion, bias, allyship, microaggressions, and culture has also been suggested to help us build more sensitivity, trust, and understanding of each other. It’s important to put effort into understanding the diverse backgrounds that make up our department and understanding how our own actions, intentional or not, may

### Table 3. Sense of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Mostly</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get important needs of mine met because I am part of this community</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members and I value the same things</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has been successful in getting the needs of its members met</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a member of this community makes me feel good</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I have a problem, I can talk about it with members of this community</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in this community have similar needs, priorities, and goals</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can trust people in this community</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can recognize most of the members of this community</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most community members know me</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I put a lot of time and effort into being part of this community</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a member of this community is a part of my identity</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the community care about each other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decrease feelings of support and understanding. Given the results of the climate survey on insensitive types of events, this seems particularly important.

- **Be Sensitive**: There have also been multiple comments suggesting we need to be cautious about how we speak with each other, even when we are advocating for important topics. Some members have voiced that at events organized towards department changes and/or inclusivity and diversity, the atmosphere can sometimes be so argumentative, tense, or even hostile, that members refrain from participation or attending (even though they might agree with the sentiments being expressed). It’s important to remember that even though we can be intensely passionate about these subjects, as we should be, it can sometimes be most effective to communicate our concerns or ideas in more gentle or cooperative ways.

- **Recognize More Aspects of Diversity**: It was also noted that there are certain aspects of diversity that we as a department have not emphasized or discussed enough including religion, SES, and disability (including mental health). To be more inclusive we need to think about and be open to all forms of diversity and work to include and welcome these differences as well.

---

**Community Slack Channel and Meet-ups**

One way we hope to continue community growth is through the UO Psych Community Slack Page. Although currently under-used, we hope to build momentum through this means of communicating shared interests and opportunities. The Slack page currently includes discussion channels for dog park and dog date meet-ups, an outdoor channel for those who want to organize group hikes/camps/adventures or get recommendations from other outdoorsy folk, a fitness channel for those who want motivation for the gym and other health activities, and a run/walk channel for regular run meet ups and running/walking questions. You can always add your own channel as well, but we are creating three new channels this summer:

- **Pokémon Go Channel**: meet up with others for raids
- **Recommendations Channel**: A place to ask recommendations for doctors, car maintenance, pet care, food, etc.
- **Working Chats**: A channel to arrange meet-ups in shared spaces for writing time and working time
Regular Meet-Ups Starting in June:

- **Run/walk group** Thursdays 8am beginning June 21st – Meet up locations vary – talk to Jenn or join Slack the channel. Also, contact Jenn if you have any interest in coaching/training plans for a run/walk goal.

- **Fitness accountability** – Student Rec Center M-F 10am – meet at the rec every morning at 10, work out with others or do your own thing – but be accountable to the group! Beginning June 25th

- **Dog Park Tuesdays** – Meet at the Dog Park (various locations) every Tuesday at 4pm – Beginning June 19th

- **Sunrise Hikes** – On the Last Friday of every month join for a sunrise hike up Spencer’s or Pisgah – Meet times at 5am (or earlier!). Join for coffee and chats after. Contact Jenn for info. First Hike June 29th.

*Other Community Events:*

- **Butte to Butte 10k/5k Psych Team:** Run the Eugene classic Butte to Butte race on July 4th, and join the Psych team so we can support and celebrate each other! All welcome! Team Name: UOPsych; Division: Open; Team Captain: Jennifer Lewis. Contact Jenn to let her know you joined the team!

Join Slack Channel Today!

- https://join.slack.com/t/uopsychcommunity/shared_invite/enQtMzA3Mzk4ODk1OTA0LWVTYmJlNzlhOjY0MjEyYlEyZmxMDixMmRlZTkyZTdlMWNmNjgzMTQ2ODUwZGQ5YjdmNjB5NDU1YWUzMTY

---

**Teaching Engagement Program (TEP):**

**Working Group on Difficult Classroom Dialogues**

*Dr. Crystal Dehle and Jenn Lewis*

cdehle@uoregon.edu and jlewis5@uoregon.edu

During winter term, Jenn Lewis and I had the good fortune to participate as a faculty-graduate student pair in a TEP (Teaching Engagement Program) sponsored working group on difficult classroom dialogues. This working group reflected a collaboration between TEP and the Graduate School as part of the University’s upcoming Freedom of Expression series. The
working group of faculty-graduate student pairs from 8 different departments sought to develop strategies for classroom discussions that synthesized openness and rigor, inclusion, and respectfulness. As stated in TEP’s call for applications,

“Research links core goals of university education—developing a disposition toward complex thinking, problem-solving skills, even civic mindedness—to students’ meaningful interactions with diverse peer groups that challenge their preconceptions. But for faculty and GEs teaching in a volatile and divisive national context, asking socially urgent questions and initiating dialogue that may destabilize students’ assumptions may seem risky.”

The objectives of the working group included:

- Developing proactive strategies and tools for cultivating inclusive classrooms with an emphasis on building students’ reflective, critical, and constructive thinking across contexts;
- Developing responsive strategies and tools for facilitating challenging or heated moments in the classroom with an emphasis on balancing development of students’ listening skills with strengthening their agency, voice, and resilience;
- Creating professional development materials for sharing and promoting the above strategies and tools to home departments and programs and then through an open-invitation teaching workshop in spring term.

Our first meeting focused on proactive strategies for engaging with difficult topics that are often associated with strong emotions. Jason Schreiner, Faculty Consultant and Assistant Director for Graduate Programs in the Teaching Engagement Program shared a document with suggestions for discussion guidelines and ground rules for class discussions. You might find these guidelines helpful in your own classroom discussions!

1. **Discussing to Learn**: Contribute ideas and views in the spirit of inquiring and learning together, rather than trying to debate or win arguments (unless the activity is designed as a debate or to assess best arguments).
2. **Mindful Listening**: Listen actively with attention and respect for what others are saying, without interrupting or tuning out to focus on preparing one’s own contribution.
3. **Stepping Up/Stepping Back**: Pay attention to the voices in the room and be mindful of one’s contributions. Are there patterns regarding which voices are being heard and which are not? How do I fit in these patterns? Is there a need to step back and let others have opportunity to contribute? Is there need to step up and contribute more? Do we feel empowered to hold ourselves accountable for our class participation dynamics?
4. **Listening Lenience**: Remember that we are learning together and may not necessarily get something right the first or even second try. Practice being lenient with oneself and with others. Restating what someone just said can provide them an opportunity to clarify or revise their statement. Similarly, it is good practice to state when you say something not quite right and then state it again or ask for help in saying it.
5. **Seek Clarification**: Seek clarification when you are confused or have doubts, and also before you pass judgment on what another is saying. Practice statements such as, “Are you saying that…?” or “What I hear you saying is…” or “If I understand you correctly…”
6. **Ideas Not Individuals**: Focus on engaging others’ ideas, not judging or criticizing individuals. Asking for clarification can be helpful, and using language such as “The idea I hear you saying is…” (rather than “you said”) or “I don’t agree with that idea…” (rather than “I don’t agree with you”).
7. **Support Our Statements:** Offer supporting evidence of some kind to back up your contributions, such as data, clear reasoning, or reference to a text, and be aware that your own experience or an anecdotal story may not fit a larger pattern. Remember than being an exception does not discredit a rule.

8. **Emotional Awareness:** Recognize that emotions are part of learning, and everyone can get emotionally worked up at any time. Remember that feelings are real and common, yet are often temporal and will pass. Feelings also tend to be reactive and shaped by past experiences of other factors not necessarily present in the moment—this means reflecting more deeply about one’s own feelings and why they might be arising, and being compassionate about what may be happening for others who express strong emotions. Feelings are not inferences, meaning that one’s feelings about something is a feeling, not an attribute about something else (e.g., feeling discomfort does not mean another person is trying to make me feel uncomfortable; or, feeling another person’s anger does not mean they are angry at me).

9. **A Part Is Not the Whole:** Remember that your view or experience is your view or experience, a partial opening on the whole, and not necessarily a general view or experience of everyone; nor are the views or experiences of others necessarily going to match your own. And, just as you cannot represent an entire group of people, nor can anyone else represent an entire group of people. It is quite okay for everyone to speak their truth and experience, but working from individual views and experiences to more general ideas or conclusions often requires considerable work.

10. **Complex Issues Are Not Simple:** There are no easy answers or simple solutions for complex issues. The goal is not for one view to prevail over others or to arrive at consensus, but to find ways to inquire and work together to advance inquiry and understanding.

11. **Acknowledge Offense:** If you feel offended or sense others may be offended, speak up and acknowledge that you feel offended or sense that others might be. Agree as a group to pause so that everyone can consider their own feelings and consider what may or may not have been intended by a particular comment or moment.

Our second meeting included an experiential workshop conducted by Rehearsals for Life, an interactive graduate student theater group that facilitates skill building for difficult moments through the use of role-play. Members of RFL shared personal experiences that shape their roles as students, and enacted various scenarios designed to provide opportunities for audience members to discuss and practice various intervention and facilitation skills. It was a valuable learning experience, and we encourage you to attend an RFL workshop when you can! The CIC has already begun to create opportunities within our department to attend RFL workshops. Every fall term, RFL will conduct a workshop in the First Year Seminar that is open to all graduate students to attend. In the spring term, the CIC organized an RFL workshop for faculty that we hope to repeat next year, and we also hope to provide a similar workshop for staff.

Our third meeting focused on developing a specific lesson plan for a course topic that includes classroom discussion. We articulated our goals and challenges for the selected topic, and then discussed and brainstormed ideas with pairs from other departments. The various small groups then reflected back out the discussions to the larger group and discussed ways of taking knowledge and strategies from the working group back to our respective departments. One key take-away from this discussion was that managing differing opinions in a classroom is inherently difficult, and even more so where the topics are emotionally charged. Below are some of the ideas that we generated to manage these tensions, and they are worth considering for your own classrooms.
- **Create Space for Voice:** When you know the topic of discussion is going to include diverse viewpoints, and especially when these viewpoints may be oppositional, provide a space for students to fully voice their own views before a group discussion. This may occur through in-class or out-of-class assignments or written reflections before a discussion that encourage a student to pursue their own views. Creating a space for persons to reflect on their own thoughts and process them is an important part of learning and will allow for better discussion.

- **Include Reflection Times:** Just as it is important to create space for students to explore their views and voice on a matter, it is important to create and foster chances to reflect back on those views after a discussion has occurred. Similarly, this can be in the form of a class assignment or activity.

- **Highlight the Lens:** There are many lenses through which we can approach and examine a topic: narratively, research-based, culturally, historically, aesthetically, whatever. Defining the lens through which your course is looking at the topic at hand and acknowledging that there are other views through which to approach the topic can be helpful in orienting students to the approach of the course and discussions.

- **Start Right:** Lay out the guidelines ahead of time. Many of the ideas listed above can be great tools for helping to facilitate discussions, but they have to be introduced at the start of the course and consistently reinforced.

- **Provide Tools:** Finally, it’s important to acknowledge that students may not know strategies for good, respectful discussion and providing examples of how to and how not to ask a question or what validation and invalidation looks like can help supply students with guidelines that they can use in those discussions.

Jenn and I chose to write this article as a part of our effort to share our experience more broadly within the department. We hope you find this useful, and that it inspires you to pursue your own teaching workshop opportunities with TEP!! [http://tep.uoregon.edu/](http://tep.uoregon.edu/)

---

**Teaching in Turbulent Times Resources:**

[http://tepblog.uoregon.edu/blog/index.php/teaching-in-turbulent-times-resources/](http://tepblog.uoregon.edu/blog/index.php/teaching-in-turbulent-times-resources/)
Diversity and Inclusivity Awards

This year, we were very excited to introduce the Inclusivity and Diversity Professional Development Awards. These new awards were made possible by funds (generously) given to the Psychology Department through the Underrepresented Minority Recruitment Fund to further our efforts in matters of inclusivity and diversity. The awards, which function as small grants, are designed to support members of our department—including graduate students, faculty, postdocs, or staff—in activities that will enhance inclusivity and/or diversity. These activities can include academic, professional development, and/or training exercises that are outside of the degree program or training requirements for which funding is not otherwise available.

These awards represent a fantastic opportunity to engage in an activity that will benefit both the individual receiving the award and the department as a whole. Indeed, the primary selection criterion is the potential for the activity to advance diversity and/or inclusivity in the department. We encourage everyone to think creatively about activities that would be consistent with these goals!

Some examples of activities that would be consistent with the purpose of these awards include:

- Training, seminars or conferences related to issues of inclusivity and diversity
- Training in unique techniques or methods that will increase diversity or research samples
- Training in topics of inclusion and diversity
- Attending conferences with the goal or recruiting underrepresented students

To date, we are very excited to have agreed to fund the following two activities (with more activities hopefully to be announced soon!):

Lauren O’Neil will attend two events run by Communication Across Barriers. The first event is a conference (The Poverty Institute) intended for educators, social workers, etc. who want to better understand poverty and gain tools for making a difference. The second event is a workshop (The Coaching Institute) to become a ‘poverty coach.’ Coaches can then help educate colleagues (e.g., the rest of the Psychology Department!) on how to break down the barriers that are associated with poverty. This sounds like a fantastic opportunity and Lauren will be preparing a report to share with others after the events.
Grace Binion will attend the Society for the Improvement of Psychological Sciences (SIPS) conference. The SIPS meeting consists of various hands-on, action-focused activities that are organized as small workshops. This year, one of the workshops will be a “Diversity Hackathon!” The goal of this group will be to come up with actions that promote diversity and inclusivity in the open science community and in open science practices. Of particular interest, the group will consider how to increase involvement of underrepresented groups in open science activities. We are eager to hear back from Grace after she attends this conference!

CIC Funding Application: https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9FG4DOTmDVMp9aZ
Closing Statements and Announcements

Thank you to the department for the support throughout the year and to all those who participated and provided their thoughts. We hope this newsletter was informative and inspiring for change, and we look forward to working with everyone on our shared diversity, equity, and inclusivity goals!

JOIN THE CIC! ALL ARE WELCOME! If you want to help support the efforts of increasing inclusivity and diversity in our psychology department community, please consider joining the CIC. As a part of the CIC, you will work on various projects and efforts seeking to meet the goals and mission of the CIC. The amount of work can vary based on current projects but expect to spend about 5-10 hours a month. Responsibilities of CIC members include attending meetings regularly and contributing to projects/efforts. A multiple term commitment is preferred. Please email Jenn Lewis at jlewis5@uoregon.edu if you have questions or interest about membership.

Annual Student Dialogue

Traditionally, the CIC has hosted an annual student-only dialogue during spring term that has provided a space for students to talk about results from the survey, as well as issues of diversity and inclusivity more broadly. We plan to continue this tradition with the change that we will now host the dialogue in the Fall term instead. We believe this to be a good modification for two reasons. First, by doing so we will be able to discuss both the climate survey, as well as the gender discrimination and harassment survey currently collecting data. Second, by moving the dialogue to the beginning of Fall term, we will be able to generate ideas and then immediately begin working on them, rather than have a summer term between the meeting and new school year, a time when initiatives can easily lose momentum.
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