

UC San Diego Political Science Department

Best Practices on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The political science department at UC San Diego strives to foster an equitable, diverse, and inclusive (EDI) environment for all its members.¹ UC San Diego's [Principles of Community](#) acknowledge that our society carries historical and divisive biases based on race, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, age, disability, sexual orientation, religion, and political beliefs. We are committed to overcoming biases faced by members of these and other groups. We are mindful that some groups face additional barriers to inclusion and equity, including under-represented minorities (URM) as defined by UC San Diego.² These barriers might arise, often unrecognized, in a variety of different interactions: faculty and graduate recruitment, promotion, work relationships between faculty and graduate students, mentoring relationships between tenured and untenured faculty, service, professional workshops, talks and seminars, faculty meetings, graduate and undergraduate courses, office hours, interactions with staff, recruiting visits, office sharing, and social events. It is therefore imperative that we are guided in these interactions by a set of norms that reflect the University's Principles of Community, [Strategic Plan for Inclusive Excellence](#), and [Faculty Code of Conduct \(APM-015\)](#). This document is meant to create a shared understanding of these norms as endorsed by the entire faculty of the department, and to suggest a set of best practices. It is important to note that we already aim to implement many of these best practices, although we acknowledge that there remains room for improvement.

These best practices are meant to be consistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States and the State of California, the rules and procedures adopted by the

¹Following [UC Regents policy](#), diversity refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more. [Equity](#) refers to the guarantee of fair treatment, access, opportunity, and advancement for all students, faculty, and staff, while at the same time striving to identify and eliminate barriers that have prevented the full participation of marginalized groups. [Inclusion](#) refers to the act of creating environments in which any individual or group can feel welcomed, respected, supported, and valued.

² According to the Office of Institutional Research, UC San Diego currently defines URM groups as follows: For graduate students, this includes African American/Black, Chicano/Latino, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Filipino. For staff and undergraduate students, this includes African American/Black, American Indian/Native American, and Chicano/Latino. For academic employees, this includes African American/Black, American Indian/Native American, and Chicano/Latino. Note that these distinctions are under consideration by campus leadership and may change in the future.

Regents of the University of California, and the by-laws and policies adopted by the Faculty Senate and the faculty of the department of political science. Any implementation of these guidelines should not infringe on the academic freedoms of individual faculty members explained in [APM-010](#), including the rights to “free inquiry, and exchange of ideas,” “to present controversial material relevant to a course of instruction,” and “enjoyment of the constitutionally protected freedom of expression.” Nothing in these guidelines establishes new requirements or penalties for faculty, staff, or students who do not follow these suggestions.

As it is not possible to predict the effectiveness of these practices or the issues that might arise in the future, we propose that the department consider the following methods for collecting feedback and assessing progress toward our goals:

- Organize two annual meetings to assess progress and recommend changes. One of these should be a community-wide town hall, open to faculty, staff, and graduate and undergraduate students, to be held in the Spring. The second should be a meeting exclusively of faculty members at the start of the academic year.
- Administer surveys to collect feedback on performance on our EDI objectives among faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students.
- Consider creating a standing EDI committee, composed of faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students, charged with overseeing our progress on EDI objectives.

1. **Faculty Recruitment, Promotion, and Service.** Raising the next generation of Political Science scholars is where the impact of EDI best practices is especially important and visible, and it is also where the department can focus its efforts most efficiently. We have already implemented many of the following suggestions, and have found them to be effective.

- a. Faculty Search and Graduate Student Admissions Committees.
 - i. Enlarge the pool of candidates who can make strong contributions to diversity with targeted outreach through the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellow Program, the Ralph Bunche Summer Institute, the UCOP-HBCU Summer Research Program, and similar initiatives that train, among others, scholars from under-represented groups.³

³ To substantiate the importance of enlarging the pool of URM applicants, we report official UCSD data regarding the demographic composition of our aggregate applicant pool from all searches from 2011-2020 (20 searches total): male 66.3% (2352/3546), female 33.0% (1171/3546), African-American 2.7% (94/3546), Hispanic 9.0% (320/3546), Asian 15.6% (554/3546), Native American 0.5% (19/3546), white 72.1% (2558/3546).

- ii. Appoint a faculty committee member tasked with identifying candidates whose Diversity Statements suggest particularly strong potential to contribute to the University's EDI goals, and ensuring that these candidates are given full consideration by the committee.
- iii. Reduce bias in reviewing files. The department has initial successes in developing and deploying rubrics to assess candidates, which aim to increase transparency, accountability, and reproducibility of rankings and recommendations. This practice should become universal and standardized:
 - 1. At the beginning of the search process, the committee should devise a rubric that reflects the objectives of the search as agreed upon by the department and the committee.
 - 2. Rubrics should consist of clear criteria for evaluating applicants along different dimensions, as well as a function for indicating the relative importance of those criteria. If committee members do not agree on a single function, then each committee member should decide on a function that indicates the relative importance of the criteria and apply it consistently in the evaluations of the candidates (different committee members might use different functions). These criteria and dimensions should be sufficiently detailed.
 - 3. Metrics and shortcuts that are known to introduce biases in the evaluations of candidates from under-represented groups – e.g. citation counts and teaching evaluations – should be used with caution and only as part of a more holistic assessment. To avoid internal inconsistencies, faculty should ensure that their personal assessments apply the same criteria, weight, and scrutiny across all candidates in a given search.
 - 4. Any criteria or processes used to evaluate candidates must comply with University Policy. In particular, contributions in all areas of faculty achievement that promote equal opportunity and diversity should be given due recognition in the [academic personnel process](#), and they should be evaluated and credited in the same way as other faculty achievements.
 - 5. For convenience, the committee may opt to set a threshold such that an overall score above the threshold is sufficient, but not necessary, for a file to receive further consideration by the committee. As in the past, any member of the

committee may propose any candidate for consideration irrespective of their overall score. Candidates who are placed on the agenda by request should not receive lesser consideration simply because their overall score is below the specified threshold.

6. To ensure transparency in department-level deliberations, the search committee should share with all faculty and in writing which criteria were used and how those criteria were weighed when evaluating applicants. This information should be shared with the department in two instances: (i) before or at the time when the short list of candidates invited for interviews is circulated, and (ii) before the faculty meeting in which offers are discussed.
- iv. Identify hiring opportunities. When the committee finds multiple above-the-bar candidates, and one or more make especially strong contributions to diversity, the Chair of the Committee should bring this to the attention of the Chair of the Department so that they can jointly explore all potential avenues for pursuing multiple offers at the University, Division, and Departmental levels. It is strongly recommended that this be done as soon as possible during the search.
 - v. Consider longer short lists. Longer lists of candidates tend to be more inclusive, but financial and resource constraints often limit the number of candidates that can be invited for a campus interview to just a few. It is recommended that the committees explore whether University Policy allows for Skype/Zoom interviews and if they do, conduct Skype/Zoom Interviews to pare down the long list before submitting it to the department for campus invitations.
- b. Campus Visits.⁴ The fly-outs of job candidates are often our best recruitment tool and a valuable opportunity to showcase the culture of the department.
 - i. The department should use a standard invitation letter that invites candidates to request special arrangements that accommodate their personal circumstances, for example additional breaks, dietary restrictions, etc. This is to ensure that all candidates can be interviewed in an environment that allows them to demonstrate their true potential. Candidates do not have to explain why they

⁴ UC San Diego's Academic Personnel policy on interviewing can be found [here](#).

- are requesting such accommodations, and if they choose to share such information, it should remain confidential.
- ii. All candidates should be given the option to distribute their interviews across two days.
 - iii. All candidates should be provided with an office for their use throughout their visit, and to rest between meetings.
 - iv. Invitations to dinner with potential recruits should be sent out with an eye toward reflecting the department. However, because it is important that service responsibilities be distributed equitably among faculty, the person sending out invitations should be mindful that some faculty they invite will reasonably decline the invitation to ensure they do not overextend themselves.
 - v. All candidates should be asked if they would like to meet with Affinity Groups, people at UCSD outside the department, or members of the San Diego community, and reasonable effort should be expended to satisfy any resulting requests.
 - vi. All transportation of candidates to and from the airport as well as to and from their hotel should be done either by faculty volunteers or taxis at department's expense. No students can be asked to do this.
 - vii. Faculty members should become familiar with University policies about what questions may or may not be asked during interviews, and follow these instructions fully. The Chair of the Department is advised to circulate, as a reminder, a summary of these policies at the start of each recruitment cycle.
- c. Discussion of Candidates' Research. Since we understand that metrics such as citation and publication counts can be biased, we strive to base our decisions on holistic assessments of candidates with emphasis on the quality of their work.
- i. It is the understanding of the faculty that discussions of candidates should be primarily based on having read the candidate's work and not merely on shortcuts like citation counts, teaching evaluations, and the like. To avoid internal inconsistencies, faculty should ensure that their personal assessments apply the same criteria, weight, and scrutiny across all candidates in a given search.
 - ii. After each candidate's campus visit, the search committee should send out a candidate assessment survey that reflects the objectives of the search. The goal of the survey is to collect direct impressions

of the quality of the candidate's file while these are fresh, and before they get unintentionally distorted by potentially faulty recollections. The survey should also ask on what basis these impressions were formed: reading the CV, reading parts of the application packet, reading the work, attending the talk, or having a meeting with the candidate. Respondents should have the option to identify themselves if they so choose.

- iii. A similar survey, with appropriate modifications, should be administered to graduate students. This survey should be anonymous, and its results can be summarized by the committee in its presentation to the department, with full results available upon request when permissible under policy and law.
- d. Discussion of Candidates' Teaching. It is the understanding of the faculty that discussions of candidates are generally to be based on holistic measures of teaching quality including syllabi, examples of assignments, peer assessments of teaching, and student teaching evaluations, and that it is well documented that relying solely or primarily on student teaching evaluations is likely to introduce biases in the evaluation of different candidates' teaching quality.
- e. Faculty Mentoring, Promotion and Retention. A crucially important part of promoting and retaining faculty is helping them develop as scholars and as members of the department. All faculty members should receive robust mentorship, both from their official mentor and from others in the department. In particular, untenured faculty face various challenges when navigating their professional careers, with women and URM's often facing unique, and more difficult, ones. It is incumbent on the department to mentor Assistant and Associate Professors and assess them fairly when the time comes.
 - i. After consultation with each newly hired faculty member, the Chair shall assign them a tenured faculty mentor, and transmit the Mentor's Role and Responsibilities (MRR) letter to both parties. (A sample letter is attached.) Assessments of the mentor's performance of these duties should be included in their service evaluation records, where they should be used as part of their promotion and retention cases.

- ii. Other faculty members should also as appropriate play mentorship roles in an informal capacity. Efforts should be made that this mentorship be inclusive.
 - iii. Satisfying established standards for promotion – such as average number of publications in certain venues over a certain period of time – can be sufficient to make the case, but not necessary. For situations where deviations from the sufficient criteria exist, be mindful that some shortcuts commonly used to assess performance may involve biases.
 - iv. If external evaluations mention potentially biased metrics that might affect the faculty member's case negatively, the department should discuss their impact on the case, and include relevant language in its letter to the University Committee.
- f. Service. When combined with inadequate representation of women and URM faculty among the faculty, the effort to be more inclusive and diversify opinions on various committees and initiatives may result in women and URM faculty shouldering a disproportionate share of service responsibilities regardless of tenure status. To address this concern, we recommend the following items:
- i. The Department should develop and implement a points-based system of service evaluation, which accounts for the difficulty and time demand of the various tasks, ranging from attending dinner with job candidates to serving on promotion or ad hoc committees.
 - ii. To ensure that untenured faculty have the time required to develop as researchers and teachers, the Department upholds a norm of minimizing the service burden borne by untenured faculty. As a practical matter, this norm should be operationalized by expecting untenured faculty to accrue fewer service points during a review period than is expected for tenured faculty.
 - iii. The Chair, in consultation with the Advisory Committee, should strive to achieve, whenever possible, an equitable distribution of service tasks under this points system.
 - iv. When achieving such distribution is not possible within a given academic year, it is to be compensated for by an appropriate reduction in the following year.

2. **Staff Interactions.** The Department simply cannot function without the support of its staff. The faculty's success as teachers and researchers is heavily dependent on staff work, but there is often confusion about what this work may and may not entail, and what distributional consequences seemingly simple requests and behaviors might have. Healthy staff-faculty interactions require awareness about the potential ways in which the divisive biases that exist in our society can affect both how faculty communicate with staff, and how staff respond to different faculty.⁵ We expect all students and faculty to treat staff with respect and professionalism, and vice versa. Specifically, faculty and students should educate themselves about what tasks and responsibilities fall within and beyond the scope of our administrative colleagues' job responsibilities. Staff, for example, should not be coordinating letters of recommendation for faculty, nor should they be scanning or photocopying instructional material for faculty. Staff are not responsible for cleaning the refrigerator or microwaves in the graduate student lounge, nor are they responsible for fixing AV equipment issues in the conference rooms in SSB. The Department should create, maintain, display, and distribute an organizational chart that guides faculty and graduate students through the process of figuring out the relevant staff or office to assist with various issues that may arise. (It is suggested that a simple online tool complemented by a printed table displayed in the main office would be the best forms of implementation.)
3. **Workshops and Talks.** An educator's effectiveness as a presenter, teacher, or discussant depends on the way they interact with the audience and others around them, and the extent to which they cultivate an inclusive environment. Certain environments promote learning and exchange of ideas while others inhibit these goals. Most of the following best practices will be familiar so this serves mostly as a reminder.
 - a. **General Principles.** Through trial and error, the Department has found that structured Q&A sessions work best in all settings that involve presentations and discussion: workshops, speaker series, and job talks.
 - i. The faculty member chairing the presentation should:
 1. Announce the format of the Q&A session before the talk.

⁵This issue is particularly salient given that among UCSD's career staff employees, approximately [two-thirds](#) are women, and [over a quarter](#) are underrepresented minorities.

2. Keep questions during the talk to clarifying aspects of the presentation, and defer others to the Q&A session, unless the presenter explicitly asks otherwise.
 3. Allow for one question and one follow-up from any given audience member on a specific issue during the talk, and limit the time for such interventions so that the presenter still has most of the remaining allotted time for uninterrupted presentation.
 4. Structure the Q&A by keeping a list of audience members who wish to participate, prioritizing this list to maintain a reasonable equitable distribution of participants and providing graduate students with opportunities to speak in all talks except job talks (where faculty should be given priority, and that fact made clear to graduate students).
 5. Moderate the Q&A by limiting interventions to a single question and disallowing new ones in the guise of follow-ups. Audience members who wish to explore their questions in more detail are welcome to meet with the presenter or send them an email. The presentation is an opportunity to receive feedback from many different people.
 6. Pace the Q&A by limiting interventions to well-defined questions stated succinctly rather than through a 3-minute discourse on the topic. The presentations should not be hijacked by audience members who wish to expound their views on the topic.
- ii. The audience members who wish to participate should:
1. Request an opportunity to participate by raising their hand, and wait for an acknowledgment by the chair.
 2. Ask clarification questions during the presentation, and defer other questions for the Q&A.
 3. Indicate a wish to intervene with a follow-up question by raising two fingers.
 4. Respect the Chair's choices about the order in which requests for interventions are honored.

5. Observe norms of professional conduct when interacting with presenters and audience members.
 - b. Workshops. These are opportunities for graduate students to provide and to receive feedback on their research, as well as to become socialized in the profession. In addition to observing the above best practices, the Chair should remind workshop participants that this is a friendly environment where “half baked” ideas are the norm, and where the purpose is not to show off but to help improve research ideas and presentation skills, as well as to build a community that facilitates that.
 - c. Talks and Seminars. These are the backbone of intellectual life in the department, and provide us with opportunities not only to learn about new research but also to show students and the community what kind of research we value, how to behave professionally, and how to be constructive. In addition to observing the best practices above, the Faculty Organizers should:
 - i. Ensure that the roster of speakers is diverse. This may require partial reliance on Zoom talks if speakers are not available for personal visits.
 - ii. Create opportunities for graduate students to have more personal interactions with the speakers. For example, Theory organizes a post-talk lunch that is attended by both faculty and students. IR has a Student Discussant for the presentation (in addition to a Faculty Discussant), and organizes dinners with speakers, to which students are invited.
4. **Faculty Meetings.** The Department prides itself on the exceptionally friendly and collegial atmosphere its faculty has created and maintained for decades. Many of the practices are guided by informal norms learned through experience. Things many long-time faculty take as obvious and for granted might not at all be transparent to newer faculty, creating unnecessary stress and many missed opportunities for participation. These dynamics are often exacerbated for members of under-represented groups. The purpose of the following is to make these norms more explicit in order to flatten and shorten the learning curve so that new faculty can integrate into departmental life more quickly and efficiently.
 - a. The Department hires untenured faculty with the presumption of tenure. That is, we expect that untenured faculty will receive tenure if they fulfill the potential we saw in them when they were hired. This means that the pre-tenure “probationary” period is not some sort of a trial where they

have to “prove” themselves but is, instead, the time during which this potential can be realized. (This is the reason for the lower service requirements and the mentoring arrangements.) Since untenured faculty are expected to be long-term colleagues, their voices matter from day one. This is not a Department where untenured faculty “must be seen but not heard.” It is very much a Department where they are encouraged to be both seen and heard from the outset.

- b. It is easier to state this norm than to convey it credibly to untenured or newer faculty who come from a variety of departmental cultures and practices and whose voice may have been silenced many times depending on their life experiences. Many untenured or newer faculty are still intimidated during faculty meetings, hesitant to share their thoughts, and concerned about their opinions having some negative impact on their prospects for tenure. A few are worried about things that most tenured or long-standing faculty could not even imagine:
 - i. Non-binding votes at meetings. These are intended to get a sense of where the Department stands on some issue after a seemingly inconclusive discussion, and are often used to decide what sort of next step might have to be taken. They are an efficient way of moving things along but might appear authoritative to untenured or newer faculty who did not have an opportunity to register their opinion, and as a result end up pressuring them to conform to the opinion of the perceived majority. Accordingly, these should be anonymous and used sparingly and advisedly, only after every effort has been made to ensure that everyone has had an opportunity to speak. (The same principles apply when taking binding votes at meetings.)
 - ii. Informal conversations – especially pertaining to collective decisions – are an important way of generating a consensus before meetings, but they tend to exclude untenured and newer faculty simply because they have yet to develop the requisite social connections in the Department. As a result, decisions made at meetings might end up looking pre-determined and decided without their input, which militates against the inclusion norm. Conscious effort should be made to include all faculty in such conversations, and it is important that the informal aggregation of preferences that results from these conversations give equal representation to each individual faculty.

- iii. Canvassing. The Chair and members of various committees often canvas the Department for opinions before official discussions. The purpose is to generate a sense of the distribution of preferences and structure committee recommendations accordingly. The concerns about informal conversations apply here too, and the same remedy is suggested.
- c. The remedies suggest that everyone be allowed to speak. Practice shows that without some clear rules of order, the most assertive faculty will speak most often and the longest. Because of time constraints, this necessarily silences the voices of others. Therefore, the Chair should appoint a senior faculty member to serve as a Parliamentarian for the present faculty meeting. The Parliamentarian should:
 - i. Propose a topic for discussion from the Chair's agenda in the order in which it appears there.
 - ii. Determine priority of speakers using the principles governing Q&A sessions to ensure an equitable distribution of opportunities to speak among the faculty present.
 - iii. Enforce these priorities with time limits both on the original intervention and any follow-ups.
 - iv. Bring the discussion to a close in a timely manner, especially if faculty have indicated that they might be unavailable for the entirety of the meeting.
- d. General Principles.
 - i. When endorsing an idea expressed in a meeting, give credit where credit is due, not to the last or most prominent faculty member who espoused it. Experience shows that women and URM often have their ideas attributed, incorrectly, to other faculty members who were simply endorsing it or repeating it.
 - ii. When objecting to an idea, do not dismiss it in a way that suggests a hierarchical relationship. Special care should be taken with comments by untenured faculty members, as well as women and URMs, who are often the targets of this sort of "arguments."
 - iii. We are committed to being a department in which all faculty are encouraged to speak their minds and no one is punished for disagreeing with others.

5. **Undergraduate Students.** Our undergraduate courses are where most of the faculty will have their largest impact on real life by shaping new generations of thinking citizens and cultivating them for success. Our undergraduate population is incredibly diverse, and care should be taken that we provide everyone with ample opportunities to realize their potential.
- a. Syllabus. Students treat the course syllabus as a contract, and as such it should lay out clear expectations and standards.
 - i. Define the purpose of office hours.
 - ii. Define the process of requesting accommodations.
 - iii. Make an effort to respect the [Multicultural Calendar](#) that includes various faiths when setting due dates.
 - iv. Avoid reliance on expensive textbooks by (a) entering into arrangements with publishers for cheaper access to the portions used for class, (b) relying on the Library to scan relevant excerpts subject to copyright restrictions, (c) using the Perusall app to request the book (although, in this case, recognize that access is tied to its specific interface).
 - v. Ensure class material is universally accessible regardless of age, class size, or disability of the students. For example, banning laptops might penalize certain students. Videos without closed captioning would be useless to others. Even the use of colors in presentations might make them less effective to others.
 - vi. Make an effort to create an inclusive list of readings that represents the work of scholars from under-represented groups whenever appropriate. For example, if a course addresses particular groups or regions, including perspectives from those very groups or regions covered is especially valuable.
 - b. In-class Discussions. In classes that rely heavily on discussions, faculty should set ground rules from the outset, preferably in the syllabus.
 - i. Participants should not use ad hominem attacks.
 - ii. Participants should not use or reinforce disparaging stereotypical depictions of groups or regions.

- iii. Faculty should not allow particular students to dominate the discussion. Faculty should elevate, whenever appropriate, comments that are disregarded by other students.
 - iv. Faculty should encourage comments based on students' own experiences as worthy contributions to the discussion.
 - v. Faculty should remind students that a respectful discussion does not mean that everyone is right, or that one must avoid critically evaluating anyone's claims. Rather, it requires one to acknowledge the possibility that one might be wrong, and consider that someone who thinks differently might be right.
- c. Evaluating Students. All students face external stressors at different points in time, and so any specific snapshot of their performance might be a poor guide for their overall evaluation. Faculty should consider:
- i. Offering the opportunity to drop the lowest grade.
 - ii. Offering multiple media for discussion. For example, students who are not comfortable speaking in class might do well in an online forum.
 - iii. Offering different forms of assessment instead of relying solely on in-class exams.
 - iv. Providing detailed rubrics to clearly communicate their expectations for each assignment. (A sample is attached.)
 - v. Where applicable, assigning students to groups randomly rather than allowing them to self-select.
 - vi. Consider grading written assignments blindly to prevent unconscious biases from affecting the grade, and encouraging TAs to do the same.
- d. Communication. Students learn better when they feel that their instructors are invested in their success. To this end, facilitating communication and demonstrating such investment are important factors in our success as educators. Faculty should consider:
- i. Setting clear grading and feedback timelines, and sticking with them.

- ii. Encouraging students to come to Office Hours. No matter how accessible faculty think they are, students are often too intimidated to come for a direct talk. To overcome this, faculty should provide FAQ about Office Hours: what they are, when they are, how to schedule them, what will they do in them, whether help with assignments is offered, whether they count as participation, why attend them, and so on. Additionally, faculty should consider more accessible alternatives to traditional office hours, e.g. to accommodate students with disabilities or off-campus obligations.
 - iii. Encouraging students to leave Office Hours with some tangible materials: pictures of the whiteboard or the pages used, notes the faculty took while meeting with them, and so on.
 - iv. Inviting students who demonstrate research potential in their assignments to Office Hours to talk about the prospect of graduate school, and to encourage the students to pursue venues they might have never considered or thought to be beyond them.
 - v. Inviting students who are struggling with their assignments to Office Hours to talk about ways of assisting them in overcoming obstacles to learning, and to inform them about relevant resources at the University that can help them cope with the problems they are experiencing.
 - vi. For smaller courses where personal student/instructor interaction is frequent and often less formal, surveying the students about their preferred name, pronouns, and – if desired – phonetic pronunciation of their names. (Qualtrics and Google Forms work best.)
 - vii. Surveying the students mid-course about any difficulties with accessing the materials or barriers to participation. (A running anonymous Google suggestion box works best.)
 - viii. Informing the students about biases in student evaluations of instructors and TAs immediately before these evaluations are administered.
 - ix. Warning students about potentially traumatic content.
- e. Recourse for Students Experiencing Exclusion. Instructors should inform students, preferably through the syllabus, but also in class about the

various resources the University and the Department provide for them to deal with exclusion. Among those are:

- i. The Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) provides procedures for resolving complaints, and assistance without the students having to file a complaint.
- ii. The Department, where faculty members, the DGS, and the Chair may assist them, within certain legal limits (all faculty are mandatory reporters, meaning that they are obligated to forward to OPHD any report of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct). The Department provides an option for anonymous voicing of concerns.
- iii. CARE Advocate and the Office of the Ombuds, where students can consult without the mandatory reporting constraint.

The information is available from the UCSD political science website, and should be disseminated widely, including at department orientations, in the newsletter, in the student advising area, at the PhD Open House, at the town hall meetings, at the bootcamp, and on faculty syllabi.

6. **Graduate Students.** Recruitment practices at the graduate student level and the efforts we make to teach, train, and mentor graduate students can be important avenues for advancing EDI goals. We have already implemented many of the following suggestions, and have found them to be effective. Nonetheless, recent evidence suggests that today's graduate students - including ours - are struggling with anxiety and mental health. We should continue to strive to foster an inclusive environment that recognizes and is open to learning more about the various stressors in the lives of our graduate students.

- a. Graduate Student Admissions Committees.
 - i. Enlarge the pool of candidates who can make strong contributions to diversity with targeted outreach through the UCOP-HBCU Summer Research Program and similar initiatives to recruit URM scholars.
 - ii. Appoint a faculty committee member tasked with identifying candidates whose applications suggest particularly strong potential to contribute to the University's EDI goals, and ensuring that these candidates are given full consideration by the committee.
 - iii. Reduce bias in reviewing files. The department should continue to use the rubric provided by the UCSD Division of Graduate Studies for assessing applicants to our graduate program.

1. For convenience, the committee may opt to set a threshold such that an overall score above the threshold is sufficient, but not necessary, for a file to receive further consideration by the committee. As in the past, any member of the committee may propose any candidate for consideration irrespective of their overall score. Candidates who are placed on the agenda by request should not receive lesser consideration simply because their overall score is below the specified threshold.
- b. The best practices for Workshops and Undergraduate Courses apply for graduate courses as well. Since graduate courses are small, the initial survey about names, pronouns, and pronunciations are especially relevant.
- c. Graduate course syllabi often shape the field by training students' sense of what is recognized as the best or foundational work. As these are also often simply reproduced from one's own graduate school training or borrowed from colleagues, they tend to perpetuate parochial views of the discipline and often fail to reflect its actual diversity. Faculty should also be mindful that works by women and URMs are often marginalized for no other reason that they simply did not appear on that syllabus someone copied twenty years ago. Faculty are strongly encouraged to make efforts to design their syllabi from the ground up, and periodically revisit them to ensure that they reflect the state of the art in the relevant field. (APSA provides a repository of syllabi that can be especially useful in that regard.)
- d. Faculty should also be aware of stereotypes that limit the research areas that students are, often unconsciously, steered into. For example, "women are not interested in studying international security," or "Black students are interested in studying Black politics" perpetuate stereotypes that have discouraged women and URMs from conducting research in various areas, resulting in a noticeable asymmetry in the distribution of scholars and subsequently in the composition of applicant pools. Faculty should do what we do best: help students identify their research interests, and then help them become the best scholar that they can be whatever these interests are.
- e. Graduate students share offices where they work on their own research, study for exams, and advise undergraduates. This can be a stressful situation that needs careful management. The Graduate Student Council

should create, in consultation with the entire graduate student body, a document with best practices for office sharing, and submit it to the Department for approval. Topics it should address include, but are not limited to, coordinating with office mates to ensure that Office Hours are held at mutually convenient times, maintaining a clean workspace, and developing an agreement about bringing pets to the office.

- f. The division of labor among TAs is sometimes unequal because some TAs offer more convenient Office Hours, others are perceived as more approachable, and yet others do a better job pedagogically. Faculty should keep track of the actual division of labor among their TAs and devise ways to rectify any imbalances.
 - g. Faculty should follow the rules of TA employment. For example, they cannot ask TAs to perform any work prior to the start of the term, and they should craft a TA workload that is consistent with their labor contract.
 - h. Faculty should be clear with students that they do not expect them to respond to emails outside working hours.
 - i. When setting deadlines, faculty should keep in mind work-life balance.
 - j. Faculty should encourage students to explore alternatives to academic careers. We have exceptional graduates who have succeeded in diverse fields, in both private and public employment. The recent creation of a new Placement Director position in our department should help convey this message.
7. **Social Events.** Many of us have great friendships with colleagues and enjoy hanging out with each other's families outside Departmental life. We have generally made efforts to promote inclusivity and enable everyone to interact with others in a more informal setting.
- a. Social events should be as accessible as possible, e.g. scheduled during working hours and/or open to family members when appropriate, and in ADA-compliant locations.
 - b. Social events with professional development and networking opportunities should be scheduled during working hours, with graduate students being invited to related dinners.

- c. Events should be publicized as far in advance as possible, and accommodate those who are differently abled, as well as those with diverse cultural, religious, and dietary preferences.

Attachments:

- a. [Mentor's Role and Responsibilities Letter](#)
- b. [Sources on inequity and bias](#)
- c. [Data appendix](#)