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This year we funded 11 department members with the CIC Diversity Awards!
Dear Members of the Psychology Department,

The core mission of the Psychology Department’s CIC (Committee for an Inclusive Community) is to promote a diverse, inclusive, and healthy community. This year, however, we have faced an unprecedented set of challenges that reflect local, national, and global issues. In this letter, I would like to acknowledge some of the biggest challenges we have faced this year and to also describe how we have addressed, and will continue to address, these challenges.

The COVID-19 pandemic has, of course, radically impacted all of our lives. Having to shift to remote work and teaching has meant that we have been pulled away from many of the activities that we love while simultaneously having to assume new work responsibilities (e.g., re-designing courses) and/or assuming additional responsibilities outside of work (e.g., increased child/family care). For many members of the department, it has meant—and will continue to mean—that we are unable to visit parents, children, siblings, or other loved ones. Consequences of the pandemic have also created incredible uncertainty and stress as some faculty face questions about whether contracts will be renewed and graduating students face uncertainty (or outright panic) about job prospects. These stresses are only compounded by the fact that informal interactions with our friends and colleagues at work have been entirely cut off (or at least shifted to a virtual format). Another consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, and one that is particularly heartbreaking, is that it has also increased discrimination and hostility toward Asian and Asian-American individuals. This is something that has directly touched members of our department. All of these challenges have also adversely affected individuals’ mental health—precisely at a time when it may be more difficult to visit mental health professionals.

There is no positive spin to put on the COVID-19 crisis. It has tested us in ways we probably never expected to be tested. And for all the obvious ways in which it has been difficult, it has affected individuals in many invisible ways, as well. As a general rule, your colleagues and students are probably struggling more than you realize. Yet, as a department, we have done a remarkable job adapting. We have continued to teach, advise, and produce scholarship. Many of us may have limped to the end of the term, but it is something to be proud of if you are still standing. There have also been several incredible examples in our department of people going above and beyond the call of duty to adapt their teaching and to support their students (see “Takeaways from Remote Learning,” below). The shared department Slack workspace has also brought together many members of the department who might otherwise hardly interact and has been a valuable place to learn, share, and express our feelings during these challenging times. I would like to sincerely thank everyone who has contributed. Again, without diminishing the hardship and pain that the pandemic has brought, it is important to acknowledge the inspiring manner in which our department has responded to this crisis.

In addition to the COVID-19 crisis, we have also witnessed several profound examples of racial injustice this past year, with the recent killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and George Floyd adding to a long and painful history of racism in this country. If anything, these examples of racism are even more painful in light of the COVID-19 pandemic given the fact that the pandemic has disproportionately affected people of color in our country. While there are many
examples from the past where acts of racism have invoked condemnation without real change or action, this has the potential to be a watershed moment for our country—a moment where many of us shift from asserting our values to demanding action from ourselves and others. With action in mind, we are in the process of creating a living document that acknowledges several areas in which our department can and must do better. We will use this summer as an opportunity to develop concrete steps that can be taken in each of these areas. The living document will be shared on the department website in order to increase transparency, awareness, and accountability.

As many of you will be aware—from emails sent to the department—another major challenge we have faced is addressing climate issues within our own department. The results from this year’s survey are summarized later in this newsletter. However, as a high-level summary: there were widespread increases in reports of negative experiences (see Table 2). Of particular concern—and as was recently addressed via several emails sent to the department—there was an increase in the frequency of endorsing items on the sexual coercion and assault subscale. These reports are extremely concerning and have received considerable attention by the CIC. We have discussed actions internally and with departmental leadership and have also consulted with the Title IX office, the university ombudsperson, and our colleague Dr. Jennifer Freyd. We have consistently received the same guidance: that because our survey is confidential, we must strongly protect the anonymity of the individual(s) who have reported these experiences. As such, we are not providing details of the experiences that have been reported. I recognize that this leaves many people in the department confused, anxious, or angry. I can assure you that all of us on the CIC share these emotions. However, I wish to emphasize that we are following best practices, and we are also taking action to address these issues. The actions we are taking fall into two categories: (1) increase awareness of reporting options, and (2) develop training and education targeted at prevention. We recently sent a list of reporting resources to the department and we will regularly remind department members of these resources. We have also identified specific training options but the COVID-related closure of campus has complicated scheduling. For now, I would like to assure everyone that we are committed to taking action to address these issues.

Although the results of this year’s climate survey are sobering, the reports of negative experiences only underscore the importance of conducting the survey. Indeed, our survey has been shared with, and has served as a model, for many other units on campus and at other institutions. It is notable that some other departments have outsourced climate surveys to independent companies (at some expense). The fact that we have performed our climate survey ‘in house’ is a testament not only to the expertise that we have in our department but, most critically, to the substantial effort invested by the student GE’s who have served on the CIC (this year: Karlena Ochoa, Ruby Cuellar, and Ana Hernandez). It is difficult and largely thankless work to invest so much time into a survey when the results of that survey are likely to trigger frustration and anger. Thus, I would like to acknowledge and commend the difficult and important work that the GE’s have invested into this survey.

As chair of the CIC, I would also like to take a moment to sincerely thank all of the members of the CIC this year. We have greatly benefitted from increased departmental representation on the committee this year. Specifically, the committee consists of faculty (me, Crystal Dehle, Ruth Ellingsen, David Condon, Sarah DuBrow), grad students (Karlena Ochoa, Ruby Cuellar, Ana Hernandez), and a postdoc (Jenn Lewis) that span research areas, buildings, and perspectives. With the number of crises we have faced this year, the members have been called on even more than usual and they have consistently invested their time and emotional energy. If there is one aspect of the committee that has stood out to me—and inspired me—it has been that the members of the committee have readily made time to help others in the department even when they have been facing their own significant challenges and struggles. These efforts—and the tireless efforts of many others in our department—give me optimism that we, as a department, will rise to the serious challenges that we face.
**Takeaways from Remote Teaching**

The unexpected transition to remote teaching due to COVID-19 has been a difficult experience for students, instructors, faculty, and staff. Moreover, in many cases the constraints associated with remote teaching only compound issues of equity and inclusion. Some department members have shared their experiences during these unprecedented times, including specific ways in which they have supported their students.

**Inclusivity**

One of the common themes instructors noted was the importance of asynchronous content for inclusiveness. Dr. Karns emphasized the importance of being vocal about our choices to raise awareness about inclusiveness in remote teaching. Further she emphasized that as instructors we need to consider the needs of parents, working students, students with disabilities, and students who have limited access to computers and internet, etc. In her guidance to other instructors, Dr. Karns recommends acknowledging barriers to learning and openness to work with students to address them. She suggests that this message should be stated clearly and frequently on top of reaching out individually to struggling students. At the same time, it is also important to make our roles clear to students and acknowledge our own limitations.

**Flexibility and Understanding**

Students valued the flexibility, care, and understanding that instructors (particularly in psychology) provided during remote teaching. Students in Dr. Fausey’s class said that she was the only instructor of all their classes who acknowledged the Black Lives Matter movement. Students appreciated that she used remote teaching and learning to speak to them and provide educational resources. Drs. Bala and Weston were included in a special spotlight edition from the Teaching Engagement Program (see here), and they both emphasized the importance of checking in and showing care and support for students. Dr. Bala noted the importance of listening and being flexible with students because, “If we focus on our student’s well-being, engagement, application and learning will benefit, right?” Further, Dr. Weston asked students to write brief journal articles weekly, and she read and responded to EVERY STUDENT! She noted that some students asked for support through these journal entries, and may not have asked otherwise. Dr. Bell also mentioned that he checked in with his students more closely to see how they were coping this term. He said that students would share things, and he said, “I just try to be a human. Sometimes that means putting them in contact with services, other times making some adjustments to scheduling, or just hearing them out.”

**Organization and Structure**

Students in many psychology courses noted that psychology instructors had exceptional organization for their courses. Dr. Srivastava noted that structure is particularly important and that there’s evidence that students benefit from structure and that structure is especially important for narrowing achievement gaps (see here: https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/20190719_inclusive_teaching). Some of the things that instructors can do to create structure include: making deadlines recurring and predictable, being explicit and upfront about expectations, and using Canvas tools and/or checklists to help students keep on top of things. Dr. Srivastava noted that “the more students are preoccupied by wondering what’s going on, the less attentional capacity they have left for learning. Structure can remove that barrier.”
Engagement and Learning

Many students noted their appreciation for being able to engage with learning and class material in different ways. A student in Dr. Fausey’s class mentioned that breakout rooms not only let them work on their class assignments and get to know other students, but also reminded them that “An experience like this is unique… and social distancing is not social isolation”. Dr. Weston mentioned that she had multiple ways for students to practice and learn the material besides watching a video or reading a textbook. Students could take a series of practice quizzes and watch videos of her working through hand calculations for statistics all without worrying about how it may affect their grades. Dr. Bala even surveyed her students to find out what they think the best format, structure, and course set up would be best for their own learning and engagement!

Community

Many Psychology department members also communicated with each other, largely through the UO Teaching Psychology Slack. Instructors asked for advice, provided feedback, shared concerns, and even supported each other through “high fives”. A group of instructors even got together on Zoom to take a photo to send out to Psychology majors to let them know, “We got this!” (see below):
It can feel really tempting to put your mental health on the back burner right now because there's so much happening. But perhaps now more than ever, as we navigate a new reality, it is important to cultivate new mental health tools to support yourself in managing multiple sources of uncertainty and stress. Here are some tips and resources to help you prioritize and manage your mental health.

**Look at your thoughts**
It’s easy for anxiety, grief, anger, etc. to get mashed up together and snowball into something that feels impossible to handle. Taking an intentional look at your thoughts can help you take control of and manage these feelings. Ask yourself: *Exactly what is worrying me/making me angry/making me sad right now?* Write down a list to get your thoughts out of your head and to give them some structure (is a helpful free app for this kind of exercise). You may realize that some things you are worried about are pretty unlikely and you can cross them off your list, freeing up brain space to address the items you do need to take seriously. Then break that list down further into categories of what you can control (at least partially) and what you can’t, and make plans for how you’ll deal with both types of concerns. Change what you can with problem-focused coping strategies. Simply having a plan in place (it doesn’t have to be perfect, and it probably won’t be!) will likely give you a sense of control over what previously felt overwhelming.

**Choose coping strategies that work for you**
For things you can’t really control or change, think about using coping strategies that help you manage your feelings. This might be journaling, baking, watching your favorite show, exercise – it really doesn’t matter what you do so long as you actively do something that helps you both feel and function better. Mindfulness is a particularly helpful strategy in times of stress and uncertainty (two of my favorite free mindfulness apps are [UCLA Mindful](https://uclamindful.org) and [Breathe2Relax](https://www.breathe2relax.com)). For some, it might be helpful to have a mantra or affirmation to come back to when feeling overwhelmed – if you need ideas, [here is a good list](https://www.anxiety-and-depression.org/). The Anxiety and Depression Association of America has [numerous webinars](https://www.adaa.org/ce) hosted by psychologists and mental health clinicians, including topics like [how to cope with financial stress](https://www.adaa.org/ce/how-to-cope-with-financial-stress), how to set [work-life boundaries](https://www.adaa.org/ce) and how [families can manage anxiety](https://www.adaa.org/ce). APA's Div. 35 (Society for the Psychology of Women) also has a helpful [webinar on stress and coping](https://www.div35.org/links).  

**Limit media consumption**
With everything going on, it’s easy to get caught up in the news and social media – to the point that you aren’t even meeting your basic needs. Stick to a daily time limit and devote to checking reliable sources like the CDC. Remind yourself that you can stay informed without being glued to your phone every waking minute. There is a lot of misinformation and conflicting news circulating, which just compounds confusion and stress. It can reduce your stress considerably to limit your exposure to a few intentional news checks a day. Consider setting yourself a schedule for when you’ll check for news updates – for example, morning and evening for no more than 30 minutes at a time.
Replace “social distancing” with “physical distancing”

Do what you can to stay connected to your social support network of family, friends, and colleagues. Be intentional, deliberate, and regular about reaching out to and making time to connect via phone, Facetime, Zoom, etc. Utilize our UO Psychology Teaching Slack channel to tap into peer support.

See a therapist

Everyone can benefit from therapy, now more than ever. Finding a therapist can be daunting, but here are some tips:

- Call your health insurance provider - they should have a database of clinicians who are accepting patients.
- Find a therapist through Psychology Today – it has several search options, including insurance provider.
- UO also has its own counseling center - Counseling Center
- Most therapists now are doing teletherapy (remote therapy by video). One silver lining to this is that you can see any therapist licensed in Oregon, which increases your options. You can search for therapists through organizations that emphasize evidence-based treatment; I recommend ABCT and ADAA. ADAA also has a database of support groups around the country, as well as the organization’s own peer-to-peer support group.
- If you’ve identified a few potential therapists, reach out. A few questions to ask: “Do you offer evidence-based therapy? Have you ever worked with someone like me before? How many sessions should I expect to attend?”
- If you are concerned about cost, ask if there is a sliding-scale option, meaning the therapist works based on what you can afford.
- It’s okay to “break up” with your therapist if it’s not a good fit. Remember, they work for you. Also, therapists want you to get better, even if it’s not in their care; your current therapist might even be able to help identify a colleague who would be a better fit.

If you have any questions about the above resources or need help finding additional tools, please do not hesitate to contact me at rwe@uoregon.edu.
Thank you to all who participated in the 2019-2020 CIC survey. Our goal, consistent with previous years, was to assess attitudes, experiences, hopes, and concerns of members of our community regarding issues of inclusivity and diversity, and when possible to examine any changes in these attitudes since last year’s and previous years’ results. The Climate Survey also included (for the third year in a row), the Gender Harassment and Discrimination survey, which contains multiple subscales related to gender discrimination and harassment as well as sexual coercion and assault. The results from the Gender Harassment and Discrimination Survey are reported, below, in a separate section.

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 always feel comfortable disclosing their demographic status as it puts them at risk of being identified.

Furthermore, it is important to acknowledge that there is a portion of our department who didn’t complete the survey this year or surveys in previous years, and therefore we are missing these persons’ perspectives and experiences and limiting our ability to fully assess the climate of our department, as well as, the overall change from year to year.

**Department Demographics and Sample Size**

Estimating the current size of our department based on faculty, graduate students, and staff, 133 out of 206 people participated in the survey. This represents a 64% increase in participation from last year. Our sample consisted of graduate students (n = 57), faculty (n = 44) and other (e.g., Staff; Post-docs; n = 25). Table 1 shows the demographic breakdown of our sample. All demographic questions were optional and some people chose not to report aspects of their identity.

Of those who chose to report gender, 71% identified as female. About 50% of faculty who participated were female, and about 60% of graduate students and 100% others 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, 42% of people reported that they did. A breakdown of what groups people identified as belonging to and considered underrepresented within the department is displayed in Table 1. Approximately 53% of graduate students
identified as belonging to an underrepresented group within the department and about 32% of faculty did as well.

**General Perception of Department Climate**

We include a question asking people to generally rate their perception of the climate of our department. This question was added to the survey for the first-time last year. Using a scale of 0-100, with 0 being the worst climate imaginable and 100 being the best climate imaginable, respondents reported an average rating of 74.20 ($SD = 16.92$), compared to 2019’s 75 ($SD = 15.46$). Given the minor decrease, we will continue tracking this trend moving forward.

**Departmental Views on Diversity and Inclusivity**

*Caring about Diversity*

In 2020, the 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 reported the opposite, with 17% reporting that graduate students do not care enough, and 39% reporting that faculty do not care enough. These results are very comparable to responses the previous years (see Figures 1 and 2). The majority of participants (92%) also responded that issues of diversity and inclusivity are important to them, with 7% in disagreement. These results are comparable to 2019, in which 84% reported agreement and 6% reported disagreement that issues of diversity and inclusivity are important to them.

*Motivation and Time Limitations*

Slightly more than half (64%) of participants reported that they are highly motivated to work towards goals of inclusivity and diversity in their everyday lives, and 33% expressed they are slightly motivated. Most participants (79%) 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 climate 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 (41%) to somewhat satisfied (46%) with the department’s performance on welcoming individuals from other backgrounds (Figure 3). In addition, about 58% of respondents were somewhat satisfied to very satisfied with the department’s ability/effort in recruiting diverse graduate students. Faculty was similar, however, had slightly more very unsatisfied (Figure 4 and Figure 5).

Lastly, 49% of respondents were somewhat or very satisfied with the instructors of graduate courses. Like in past years, in open ended responses a frequent comment was a request to continue to prioritize the recruitment of faculty of diverse backgrounds, with a particular emphasis on increasing ethnic and cultural diversity. This was noted as an area that people continue to be dissatisfied with – suggestions include actively seeking out candidates of color through reaching out to professional networks and listservs such as the Ford Alumni Association and the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. Another important issue raised in the open-ended comments was the acknowledgement that pay inequities still exist in our department (and field) and we need to continue to fight for change in this domain.

Another common theme in open ended responses included the acknowledgement that there is political diversity within the department, but this is not often openly discussed and persons who may fall more on the conservative side feel uncomfortable discussing their views and/or feel criticized at times.
Experiences and Witnessing of Negative Events Within the Department

### Table 2. Experiences of Negative Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experienced</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Offensive Humor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for Personal Safety</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile or Threatening Comments and/or Gestures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Profiling Offensive or Threatening Phone Calls or Emails</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Witnessed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Offensive Humor</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feared for Personal Safety</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 5. Satisfaction with Recruitment of Diverse Faculty](chart.png)
Over the years the CIC has used the climate survey to track negative experiences 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 many of the categories, occurrence percentages in 2020 have increased compared to 2019. Occurrence of these incidences in any frequency is concerning, especially now and if they continue to increase. In that light, it is worrisome that these occurrences have not lowered over the years. The increase in persons experiencing fear for personal safety and being targets of profiling is particularly alarming.

We also asked questions related to subtler negative experiences such as feeling ignored, disrespected, or feeling like there are different privileges or expectations placed on your peers. In these questions, we see our highest percentages of reported incidences (see Figure 6.) with 48% of persons reporting that they have felt as if they are invisible or have been ignored within our department and 42% of persons feeling as if they’ve been disrespected – both of these have increased since last year. About 18% of respondents reported feeling like they have different privileges than their peers and 13% felt like they were given different expectations.

These percentages have slightly increased since 2019 and are still trending towards increasing. We should take this very seriously as a department and make efforts to understand and address these experiences within our department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostile or Threatening Comments and/or Gestures</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Profiling</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive or Threatening Phone Calls or Emails</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over the years the CIC has used the climate survey to track negative experiences 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 many of the categories, occurrence percentages in 2020 have increased compared to 2019. Occurrence of these incidences in any frequency is concerning, especially now and if they continue to increase. In that light, it is worrisome that these occurrences have not lowered over the years. The increase in persons experiencing fear for personal safety and being targets of profiling is particularly alarming.

We also asked questions related to subtler negative experiences such as feeling ignored, disrespected, or feeling like there are different privileges or expectations placed on your peers. In these questions, we see our highest percentages of reported incidences (see Figure 6.) with 48% of persons reporting that they have felt as if they are invisible or have been ignored within our department and 42% of persons feeling as if they’ve been disrespected – both of these have increased since last year. About 18% of respondents reported feeling like they have different privileges than their peers and 13% felt like they were given different expectations.

These percentages have slightly increased since 2019 and are still trending towards increasing. We should take this very seriously as a department and make efforts to understand and address these experiences within our department.

Figure 6. Percentages of Experiences within the Department
Gender and Underrepresented Group Effects

Of the respondents who reported experiencing at least one negative event in the department, 75% were women and 47% identified as belonging to an underrepresented group. Overall, 62% of persons identifying as female and 62% of people identifying as belonging to an underrepresented group reported experiencing at least one negative event in the department over the last year. Whereas, 30% of persons identifying as male and 43% not identifying as belonging to an underrepresented group reported experiencing at least one negative event in the department.

Consequences of Negative Events

It’s important not just to assess the frequency of negative events but 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 and Figure 8). We see an increase in almost all categories from 2019’s survey. Most notably, 36% of respondents reported that issues of insensitivity have made them feel like there are people they can’t talk to or work within the department (increase from 2019’s 30%).

Figure 7. Issues of Sensitivity

![Figure 7. Issues of Sensitivity](image-url)
Also 28% of people reported that issues of insensitivity related to diversity have made them not want to participate in department activities. Even more striking is that 16% of respondents reported that they have considered leaving the department because of issues of insensitivity.

**Climate Survey Take-Aways**

Change is needed. This has been the survey take away for at least three years, and the results of the survey continue to indicate that change is not happening fast enough. The frequency of these events has not decreased across years, and has actually increased in almost every single category. This tells us that we, as a department, are not making the changes that are necessary or sufficient to see improvements in these areas. Reporting these events is the first step in creating change. We need to take this information and use it. Fear of failure or making mistakes should not distract us from the big picture. It is disheartening to read the open-ended comments from members in the department who take the time to fill out this survey and report seeing little to no progress within the last year. Multiple participants in the open-ended comments of this survey have said they are tired of reporting the same events over and over again and seeing limited actionable attempts to change these problems. Our community has been talking – shouting really – and not being fully heard. We, the CIC, the department, faculty, students, we need to listen more carefully and create actionable steps towards change. There are of course members within our community who have and continue to make efforts towards change – we need to acknowledge them, join them, and support them. Continued passivity and silence cannot continue.

Along these lines, 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, change will require engagement at every level – by the administration, by the field, by labs, and by individuals. That change will only be possible if we as a community feel motivated, empowered and supported by our leaders. It is not enough to just care anymore; we need to act.

Some of the highest incidence reports are those of 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 experience these at higher frequencies. We find this to be a serious concern and should consider it a high priority to begin addressing these biases within our department.
Another common theme is that lack of attendance at departmental events. Students generally report an understanding of the many time constraints that faculty face but have also voiced that attendance reflects priorities. Student presence has also been noted to be an important component of feeling motivated to participate in community-building efforts. Similarly, students have reported it as disheartening when more of their peers do not attend or participate in events. Time is a scarce resource, but we have repeatedly been able to show-up when for things we prioritize – job talks, FYP presentations, Grad Student Recruitment events, etc. If we really value and prioritize diversity, inclusivity, and community, we have to start showing up.

We in the CIC take the results of the climate survey extremely seriously. We recommend that we all take some time to honestly reflect on our own behaviors and attitudes and be mindful going forward. Below is a brief list of some tangible practices/behaviors to begin improving the climate in our department. These suggestions were inspired by the various voices who have spoken up through this survey and in other ways, for which we are very appreciative.

- **Don’t Put the Burden on the Person in Need:** The burden of duty should not be put on those in need or with limited power. Rather than having policies/expectations that require a person to approach the department/their mentor/you with problems or needs, systems should be in place to check-in on these things directly. When change needs to happen, don’t put the burden of work on those who are asking for the change – be active, involved, and collaborative.

- **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. Take the extra time to learn about their work and try a mnemonic if you struggle with remembering names.

- **Asking Details:** If you don’t know, don’t shy away. Asking for these types of details can 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. Furthermore, don’t assume that one person of a particular background represents everyone and don’t ask them to be the spokesperson for that group or all underrepresented groups in general.

With conscious effort of individuals and renewed motivation these changes are possible. We should expect growing pains and accept that mistakes will be made. We should be humble about our mistakes, avoid defensiveness, and be open to hearing feedback and updating our future behavior. When mistakes are made, it is our duty to educate ourselves and learn from them. Together, we can begin to address the serious issues that the climate survey has revealed. Hopefully, this will help shed light on specific problems we face and the actions we can take to improve community within our department.
Gender Discrimination and Harassment Survey

Measures Used:
We used the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) and the Gender Experiences Questionnaire (GEQ). We modified some language to be gender neutral. We also collapsed across items in the SEQ and GEQ that were similar to reduce redundancy.

Procedure:
Department members reported the frequency with which they experienced each item on the questionnaire in their interactions with graduate students, faculty, staff, and undergraduate students of our department within the last year. It is important to emphasize that all of the reported experiences refer to interactions with members of our department. Frequency was defined as “Never,” “Once or Twice,” “Sometimes,” or “Many Times.”

Introduction:
It is important to acknowledge that this survey only asked about experiences within the last year and that not everyone in the department took the survey. Furthermore, there is a large amount of missing data in this survey where participants chose not to respond (about 19%). Additionally, to protect confidentiality, we are not reporting data from the sexual coercion and assault subscale. However, as noted in our emails to the department, there has been an increase in reported frequency of events on this subscale, which is an area of critical concern and has been a focus of attention on the CIC.

The incidence of negative experiences in interactions with graduate students and faculty are summarized in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Because fewer items were endorsed to occur in interactions with staff or undergraduates, we have not included tables summarizing those experiences. However, below we summarize the most common experiences reported in interactions with staff and undergraduates.

Experiences in Interactions with Staff and Undergraduates:
Reported frequency of gender discrimination and/or harassment in interactions with staff and undergraduates have both increased in the past year. The most frequently occurring events were:

- “Been treated differently (in a negative context) because of your gender” – 6% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with staff and 10% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with undergraduates
- “Felt that you were interrupted by a member of a gender different than your own, because of your gender” – 6% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with staff and 10% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with undergraduates
- “ Noticed that the talking time in meetings/class is dominated by one gender over another” –5% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with staff and 18% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with undergraduates
- “Been treated as if you were stupid or incompetent” – 8% reported this occurring at least once interactions with staff and 5% reported this occurring at least once in interactions with undergraduates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Items Reported to Occur Most Frequently in Interactions with Graduate Student</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been treated differently because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that you were being interrupted by a member of a gender different than your own, because of your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>69.50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11.50%</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that your ideas were dismissed because of your gender or that the very same ideas as yours received greater attention when they came from a different gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13.60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been put down or been treated condescendingly because of your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been treated as if you were stupid or incompetent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>77.50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noticed that the talking time in meetings is often dominated by one gender over another?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Been talked to as if you were a small child instead of being spoken to like an adult?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Items Reported to Occur Most Frequently in Interactions with Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Been treated differently because of your gender (for example, mistreated, slighted, or ignored)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>19.50%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80.50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that you were being interrupted by a member of a gender different than your own, because of your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>14.50%</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt that your ideas were dismissed because of your gender or that the very same ideas as yours received greater attention when they came from a different gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been put down or been treated condescendingly because of your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**GENDER DISCRIMINATION AND HARASSMENT SURVEY TAKE AWAYS:**

The results from the gender discrimination and harassment survey indicate that many negative experiences (including microaggressions) continue to occur within our department. While the reported frequency of the events reported in Tables 3 and 4 have, in most cases, decreased slightly, there are two important caveats to keep in mind. (1) The participation rate has varied substantially across the past three years and this makes it extremely challenging to draw strong conclusions about change over time. (2) In contrast to the experiences described above, there was (as mentioned above) an increase in the frequency of sexual coercion/assault. Thus, addressing these issues remains a critical priority for our department. On the CIC—and in conjunction with department leadership—we are working to increase relevant training within our department (for students, faculty, and staff) and to increase awareness of reporting options for those who have experienced harassment, discrimination, coercion or assault. Below, we summarize some of the reporting options available to our community.
Reporting Options

We have seen some very concerning responses related to sexual assault and/or coercion in our recent climate survey. In fact, the frequency of these reports has increased relative to last year. Whether or not you have personally experienced sexual harassment, coercion, or assault, it is extremely important to be aware of reporting options that are available to all members of our community. I implore all members of the department to take a few minutes to acquaint yourself with UO’s website that contains important information for victims and survivors: https://safe.uoregon.edu. As a starting point, there is a ‘help’ section that reviews available UO resources and specifically addresses the issue of “I don’t know where to start”:

https://safe.uoregon.edu/help

Just to highlight two of the specific resources described in the above link:

- Callisto (https://www.projectcallisto.org/) offers a way to report specific perpetrators while minimizing the risks associated with coming forward. Here is a link to the UO-specific Callisto site: https://uoregon.callistocampus.org/

- UO Ombuds program (https://ombuds.uoregon.edu/) is a fantastic resource for getting advice if you are not sure how to proceed. They provide “confidential, impartial, independent, and informal” advice. You can speak to someone from their office without having to provide your name and they can help you navigate the choices available to you. They can also help mediate discussions while maintaining confidentiality. Several of us on the CIC have worked directly with the Ombuds program and have been impressed with their services. If you feel overwhelmed, conflicted, or unsure how to proceed--whether you have been a victim or have had a victim confide in you--the Ombuds program can provide valuable guidance.

I would also like to emphasize that one of the most serious and debilitating concerns that victims face is the potential for retaliation or other negative consequences associated with reporting. It is therefore important to note that it is the University of Oregon’s policy to “protect from retaliation students and employees who make good faith reports under this policy or who participate in a University process initiated in response to a report of prohibited discrimination.” (https://policies.uoregon.edu/vol-5-human-resources/ch-11-human-resources-other/student-sexual-and-gender-based-harassment-and).

And, again, using the resources described above, you can absolutely get guidance and advice without having to disclose your identity or other potentially sensitive information. The university also has a useful FAQ page which walks through several of the most common questions that survivors/victims might have:

https://safe.uoregon.edu/frequently-asked-questions
Again, using the resources described above, you can absolutely get guidance and advice without having to disclose your identity or other potentially sensitive information. The university also has a useful FAQ page which walks through several of the most common questions that survivors/victims might have:

https://safe.uoregon.edu/frequently-asked-questions

And, the university also has a 24 hour hotline (541-346-SAFE) that can help connect you to relevant resources (including confidential ones).

Finally, it is a **moral imperative** to be aware of your responsibilities and appropriate actions in the event of a student disclosure. This link breaks down the different employee categories, each with specific obligations:


Most faculty are student-directed employees, in which case the following link describes your responsibilities and how you can best support students in the event of a disclosure:

https://investigations.uoregon.edu/student-directed-employee-responsibilities-and-required-action

But, again, do not be debilitated by confusion! If you are confused, contact the resources above and people will point you in the right direction.

For **all members of the department**, please keep these resources in mind as a way to support yourself or other individuals who have been directly or indirectly impacted by sexual harassment, coercion, or assault. Cultivating a safe environment should be, for all of us, our highest priority and taking the time to acquaint yourself with the available resources and guidance is an active step all of us can take toward this end. This email is not intended to be a comprehensive list of all resources, but hopefully communicates the key points that (1) there are many resources available to our community and (2) if you are a victim (or someone who a victim has confided in), you can get confidential guidance that helps you navigate your choices.

A few additional resources that may be helpful:

*How to help a friend*
https://www.unh.edu/sharpp/helping-friend

*How to talk about sexual harassment*
https://leanin.org/meeting-guides/how-to-talk-about-sexual-harassment

*Self-care after sexual harassment*

Thank you for your attention to these issues.
The results of this survey suggest that we need to treat questions of gender harassment, discrimination, coercion, or assault with the utmost seriousness.

It also reminded all of us of our moral and institutional obligation to know about our own reporting roles and how to navigate these roles in a manner that does justice to survivors' interests and well-being. Virtually ALL faculty, GEs, and staff are student-directed employees. It is the duty of student-directed reporters to listen, provide support, and make sure students are connected with available resources, but to report only with explicit consent of the student (for details, see https://investigations.uoregon.edu/student-directed-employee-responsibilities-and-required-action). The results of the CIC survey are sobering, and clearly indicate we still have work to do. Going forward, the department and CIC will build into its regular routines (e.g., faculty meetings, graduate training) more opportunities for education and awareness about reporting pathways and roles.

We also know however that an important obstacle to reporting is fear of retaliation, and other, possible negative consequences. The nature of our work is collaborative and the structure of our training model creates inherent power inequities that can put co-authored work products, letters of recommendation, and informal networks at risk. The University has strong anti-retaliation policies, and the department is committed to them. At the same time, it would be irresponsible and disingenuous to guarantee that all negative consequences for someone who reports sexual misconduct can be avoided.

However, I want to affirm: The department leadership is strongly committed to prevent retaliation and to mitigate negative consequences. It is deeply painful that such disturbing events may be occurring in our midst. As a department we will not stand for further increasing the pain! It has to be our charge that we work with survivors or witnesses and find the best possible solutions towards keeping our educational and career-building commitments. When students or other department members are the targets of, or witnesses to sexual misconduct, we need to offer attention and support that is tailored to the individual's situation. All faculty may be called upon to play a role in providing such attention and support.

How we act in this situation is a moral test for our department. As recent examples across the country have shown, institutions and departments who fail this test are defined in a manner that no academic greatness can compensate for!
Diversity and Inclusivity Awards

Dr. Brice Kuhl
bkuhl@uoregon.edu

Over the past several years we have been able to offer a number of Travel Awards for activities related to Diversity and Inclusivity. These 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 and/or 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.

On the CIC, we will use the upcoming summer and fall to re-assess the most effective ways to use CIC funds to support our core goals (particularly in the context of events from the past year), but we encourage everyone to think creatively about activities that would be consistent with our goals!

We are very excited to have made CIC awards in support of the following individuals and activities over the past year:

Incoming graduate students, Anisha Babu, Simone Mendes, and Nathan Young, received awards for writing about ways in which they envision contributing to diversity, equity, and inclusion as a graduate student in the Department of Psychology or in the University of Oregon community more broadly.
Marjolein Barendse had planned to attend a preconference of the Society for Research on Adolescence, on cultural diversity but it was cancelled due to COVID-19. The focus of the preconference was to discuss the role of culture in the formation, content, and practice of moral reasoning, emotions, identity, and behavior across adolescent development.

Ann-Marie Barrett planned to attend the Q-Forward conference hosted by Yale School of Medicine. This conference is geared for individuals who aim to grow LGBTQ+ leadership and presence within their research, clinical work, education, and advocacy. The event was cancelled due to the COVID pandemic but is now being rescheduled for Fall 2020.

Ruby Cuellar had a poster accepted to the American Psychosomatic Society conference in Long Beach, California. Ruby planned to present her FYP/Master’s research on the ethnic variations in the association between sleep quality and social stress response. Although the conference was cancelled due to COVID-19, a virtual poster session can be found at https://apps.psychosomatic.org/abstracts/poster_thumbnail/.

Kathryn Denning attended two symposiums related to diversity at the Society for Personality and Social Psychology conference. One of the symposia focused on how research can be improved by including understudied racial/ethnic populations in the sample, which is especially relevant for Katie as human subjects coordinator. Katie said, “One speaker discussed a meta-analysis they conducted in which they found most articles studying race and racism focused on the relations between white and black participants, typically focusing on how white participants were responding to black targets. The authors examined the demographics of college campuses across the United States and found that these results overrepresented the white population at college campuses in their results, demonstrating that there is bias within research studying intergroup relations and racial bias”. The authors gave three suggestions of how to combat this bias:

1. Collaborate with researchers at universities that have more diverse participant pools
2. Increase diversity of researchers in the field
3. Increase the scope of high-impact journals to include more diverse articles, as it is possible these top journals are systematically excluding more diverse research due to bias in the research they decide to publish.

Stephanie Gluck attended the Cognitive Development Society (CDS) conference and participated in a workshop on “Promoting Diversity in Cognitive Developmental Science”. Further, she stated that she “hoped to learn about development through a socio-cultural context, gain new techniques to study children’s social cognition, and understand the role of gender and race in children’s perception of intelligence and friendship." At the workshop, Stephanie learned from developmental scientists on ways to creatively increase diversity in one's study sample by recruiting in place of worships (e.g., churches, temple,
synagogue, etc...), conducting study in public spaces such as squares and parks, and running developmental studies online. At the conference, symposium speakers also encouraged developmental scientists to expand beyond classically recognized behaviors of sociality such as joint attention to consider actions such as touch and posture as potential meaningful expressions of connection between caregiver and child.

Karlena Ochoa also attended Cognitive Development Society (CDS) and attendee talks and panels that relate to topics of diversity, equity, and inclusivity. One of the panels specifically discussed successful strategies for working with diverse populations. Specific suggestions included recruiting from local churches, parks, camps, and children’s museums (which Team Duckling does).

Victoria Guazzelli Williamson presented a poster at the health pre-conference of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) entitled “Resilience as a moderator for the relationship between experimentally manipulated social status and dietary intake among Hispanic American adolescents”. Victoria would like to express her gratitude to the CIC for supporting her poster presentation and attendance at the conference. Victoria is grateful for the valuable feedback on her presentation on this topic that she received from the Developing Brain in Context lab at UO, Drs. Kate Mills, Elliot Berkman, Sara Weston, and the SPSP 2020 attendees. Victoria has incorporated their feedback into the paper accompanying this study which has undoubtedly strengthened this research.

Andrew Zavala presented a poster on sensory processing and alpha brain wave frequencies at SACNAS (Society for the Advancement of Chicanos and Native Americans in STEM) conference. He also received invaluable diversity training about the inspirational triumph of challenges by people of a similar background. He said he can't wait to get started on bringing these skills to the University of Oregon.

Xiaoning Sun attended the 48th Annual Meeting of International Neuropsychological Society (INS) in Denver, CO. The topic of cultural neuropsychology was highlighted throughout the conference. Xiaoning co-presented a poster titled “Systematic Review of Normative Neuropsychological Data for People Speaking Chinese Languages.” The poster presentation allowed for connections with the Asian Neuropsychological Association (ANA) and collaborations with ANA are on the way, including (a) developing a Chinese neuropsychology tools inventory and (b) conducting a similar review with a pediatric neuropsychology focus.

To Apply:
https://oregon.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_eu4E7bt0E2OUPAx
Promoting Anti-Racism in our Department

The recent killings of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, and George Floyd add to a long and shameful legacy of racism in our country. These events have also acutely increased the pain felt by black individuals in our department, university, and country. The Department of Psychology stands in solidarity with the Black Lives Movement and with black students, faculty, and staff at the University of Oregon.

To better promote antiracism within our department, we will be developing a set of specific actions we plan to take. These actions will be described in a living document, shared on our department’s website. As a living document, it is intended to grow and to be refined over time. As specific actions are identified and implemented, they will be described in this document. With this approach, our goal is to increase transparency, awareness, and, ultimately, accountability. As a starting point, we have identified the following areas of action. For each of these areas, our goal is to have concrete actions, and a timeline for those actions, identified by fall of 2020.

1. Better incorporate contributions toward diversity and equity into our merit review and promotion processes for faculty.
2. Develop specific, internal guidelines describing how contributions to diversity will be evaluated in faculty hiring. Identify specific recruitment and retention processes that will promote a diverse faculty.
3. Identify specific recruitment and retention processes that will promote a diverse graduate student body.
4. Increase research/training opportunities for undergraduates from underrepresented groups.
5. Diversify curriculums. Specifically, increase representation and awareness of scholars from diverse backgrounds. This can be addressed both in undergraduate and graduate teaching.
6. Increase diversity of colloquium speakers and develop specific guidelines describing how diversity of colloquium speakers will be ensured.
7. Identify/organize/promote opportunities for education, awareness, and training related to antiracism. Develop strategies to incentivize or require participation in these opportunities.
8. Within our clinical program, expand training in (a) mental health services that reach more diverse communities and (b) cultural competency for supervisors and students.
9. Push for dedicated staff support for activities and training related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.