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Preface

We created this manual in response to requests from institutions and individuals for guidance and support in establishing or modifying diversity initiatives. Though we offer our own history, structure, and initiatives throughout as a model, we are also aware that context matters; the specific motivations, history, people, and dynamics of a program will shape its Diversity Committee (DC) and which model and focus will be most useful and successful. In each chapter, we provide some reflections on what one might consider about adapting a DC to a different program or context. We begin by describing our program culture and the history of our DC to contextualize how and why our model works for us, so you might better consider how what we write here might be similar or different for your program.

Each section is generally organized as follows:

- **Description and Overview:** A description of the goals, purpose, and nature of that aspect of a DC, sharing our model as an example.
- **Things to Consider for your Program:** Considerations for implementation of each component or initiative.
- **Pearls and Perils: Our Lessons Learned and Changes over Time:** Discusses important lessons we have learned from our process of developing and maintaining our DC and how things have evolved over time.

Terms:

Below we briefly describe our meaning of central terms related to diversity that we use throughout this manual. These concepts are very complex and there is disagreement amongst scholars about the meanings of these terms, especially the finer points or things that vary with different contexts. The definitions offered here are very basic. Our purpose is to present how we are using these terms, so we may have a shared understanding as a foundation; we are not aiming to fully explore the concepts, to suggest that these definitions fully capture the complexity of the concepts, or to present some “truth” in meaning.

Additionally, we want to acknowledge here our views that (a) everything is cultured, (b) power (and privilege) permeate our psychological worldviews, relationships, and organizational structures, and (c) context, both current and historical, matters. Thus, our description of the terms below is affected by the cultures that affect us (U.S., regional, UMass Boston, our program, etc.), by our own positionalities, and by our specific context as noted above, including our understanding of these terms. The purpose of this section is to operationalize our terms; we encourage you to consider your own exploration of these terms within your specific context and how this understanding might affect your implementation of a DC.

**Ally** – a person in a privileged status who is actively working to resist the system of oppression that makes them privileged. Allies are about action and continued growth, not about a static identity. An ally is a person whose commitment to dismantling oppression is reflected in a willingness to continually do the following:
• Educate oneself about oppression
• Learn from and listen to people who are targets of oppression
• Examine and challenge one’s own prejudices, stereotypes, and assumptions
• Work through feelings of guilt, shame, and defensiveness to understand what is beneath them and what needs to be healed
• Learn and practice the skills of challenging oppressive remarks, behaviors, policies, and institutional structures
• Act collaboratively with members of the target group to dismantle interpersonal and systemic oppression

**Diversity** – we are not using this term in the over simplistic “diversity and inclusion” but in the more encompassing meaning of explicitly including equity and social justice.

**Culture** – is a learned and variable (changing) system of meanings that are shared and transmitted by an identifiable group of people and represent a way of living. It is fluid and dynamic. Systems of meanings encompassed include social norms, values, beliefs, and behaviors, as well as more concrete things like food, art, architecture/buildings, music, etc. Culture has modal practices (what “most” people do within a culture that characterizes that culture) as well as individual manifestation (how a particular individual engages with or reflects a culture).

**Ethnicity or ethnocultural experience** – the distinctive cultural patterns shared by a group of people that are unified by a common geographic origin and common history. Ethnicity is differentiated from race (below) by its emphasis on cultural patterns, rather than power hierarchies (see Markus, 2008; Smedley & Smedley, 2005).

**Race** – a social category to which individuals are assigned by themselves and others, usually on the basis of physical characteristics, such as skin color. Although related to physical characteristics such as skin color, racial categories and their distinctions are not biological, genetic, or inherent. Historically, racial categories were created and are maintained to differentiate those who are “entitled” to power and resources and those who are not. See *American Anthropological Association statement on race*.

**Cultural responsiveness** – to us (and many others) “cultural responsiveness” reflects more of a value than a goal. Thus, we do not believe that one is either ‘culturally competent’ or ‘culturally incompetent’ at any given time point. Instead, we believe that cultural responsiveness refers to committing to engage in a lifelong process of gaining a better understanding of areas in which one is privileged and marginalized, and how one advances social justice as an ally or advocate.

**Power** – the ability to exert influence over an outcome, or a person’s actions, feelings or thoughts.

**Privilege** – the power and advantages one holds as a result of belonging to a dominant group or a group that is of higher social status. It is a social phenomenon and not a property of individuals. Here, we are referencing unearned privilege, rather than merit (power earned through effort).
**Oppression** – the combination of prejudice and institutional power and privilege which creates a system that discriminates against some groups (often called “target groups”) and benefits other groups (often called “dominant groups”). Examples of these systems are racism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, classism, ageism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Islamism. These systems enable dominant groups to exert control over target groups by limiting their rights, freedom, and access to basic resources such as health care, education, employments, and housing. Oppression directly acknowledges the painful and detrimental experience of the target group.

**Intersectionality** – a framework used to describe the ways in which oppression within society, such as those based on race, ethnicity, gender, religion, nationality, sexual orientation, class, and ability are interconnected and cannot be examined separately from one another. They create a system of oppression that reflects the intersection of multiple forms of discrimination, where each system affects the basic nature of the experience of other systems.

**Minority** – any group of people having less structural privilege (and, therefore, personal power) in society.

**Bias** – the tendency to think, feel, or behave in a certain way, which arises alongside the natural processes of generalization and categorization influenced by social categories and distinctions related to power.

**Racism** – a system of judgments, beliefs, actions, norms, and social/institutional practices based on race that protect privilege. Racism can be interpersonal, cultural, institutional, or internalized. Racism can be conscious or unconscious, intentional or unintentional. The system of racism is most harmful to those who are in the minority (lacking the privilege and power) but is also damaging to the dominant group. This definition can be generalized to all of the “isms,” such as sexism, classism, ethnocentrism, heterosexism, etc. All of the isms are systems of privilege that are formed from the interaction of power with stereotypes, prejudice, and bias.
SECTION 1

UMASS DC: Context and Positionality

We start here with an orientation to what Diversity Committee (DC) means to us, including our current DC mission statement, how it fits into the context of our program, a brief overview of how our DC started, and what it looks like now.

1A. UMass Boston DC Mission Statement
1B. UMass Boston Program Context
1C. The Emergence of Our DC
1D. An Overview of Our Current DC

1A. UMass Boston DC Mission Statement

The UMass Boston Diversity Committee (DC) is a collaborative committee of self-selected students and faculty, working together to:

1. Create an inclusive environment within the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program in relation to multiple aspects of diversity, particularly those associated with social statuses reflecting systems of power and privilege.
2. Provide a collaborative space to discuss/process issues related to diversity, in order to contribute to the ability of members of our community to explore, understand, and enact understandings related to diversity and the promotion of social justice both within the UMass Boston Clinical Psychology Program and within our professional and personal communities.
3. Empirically assess and address the climate of the program through regularly surveying students’ experiences related to issues of diversity within the program.
4. Create initiatives to engage our broader community in the Clinical Psychology Program in achieving shared goals related to diversity, inclusion, equity, and social justice
5. Collaborate with the greater Clinical Psychology Program to enhance the institutional policies and procedures related to issues of diversity and social justice.

1B. UMass Boston Program Context

A program’s context, mission, and climate shapes the focus and nature of a DC. Knowing our context will help you consider how your process might work similarly to or different from ours.
The Clinical Psychology Program at UMass Boston has a strong focus and emphasis on cultural responsiveness and social justice, and this has influenced the creation of our DC, the ways in which faculty and students participate in our DC, the development of DC initiatives, and how reactions to and impacts from DC initiatives are integrated into the framework and practices of the Clinical Psychology Program. An overall description of the program can be found on the Program website.

The Mission of the Clinical Psychology Program specifically includes aspects related to diversity and social justice.

Our educational mission is to train scientist-practitioner-activist clinical psychologists who will:

- Engage in social science research, critical scholarly inquiry, and educational activities including scholarly analysis that specifically address social and structural inequities affecting psychosocial health and functioning, including but not limited to inequities based on social class, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender, disability, age, language, citizenship, immigration status, and religion.

- Provide affirming and empowering evidence-based clinical services to people across sociocultural groups and statuses.

- Serve as leaders, role models, and change-makers to promote social justice within their organizations, the profession of psychology, and other contexts. We aim to foster students’ capacity to serve as advocates and activists.

- Apply their developed awareness of how the field of clinical psychology is socially situated, reflect critically on the practices and purposes of our field, and understand how it can privilege or marginalize certain identities and lived experiences, treatment and assessment practices, and epistemological and philosophical positions.

The social justice mission of the Clinical Psychology Program and the evolution of DC have symbiotically enriched and strengthened one another and, as such, both represent an ever-evolving process of growth, learning and adaptation.

1C. The Emergence of Our DC

The UMass Boston DC was formed in 2002 by the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program faculty in response to a letter submitted by a group of students from various identity spaces (e.g., in relation to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation) to program faculty, expressing concerns regarding diversity within the program. In response, the faculty sought to actively address student concerns and felt that more information about the climate of diversity within the program was needed in order to do so. The program faculty charged a small group of faculty members and students as the initial DC to develop an assessment of the climate of diversity within the program. Over the course of a year, and through many thoughtful, vulnerable, and process-oriented discussions, these students and faculty collaboratively developed a survey to assess the climate of the program related to matters of diversity, power, privilege and marginalization. The process of exploring how to assess the climate of diversity within the program—characterized by difficult dialogues; exploration of complex dynamics of positionality, intersectionality;
considerations of one’s own possible biases, and so forth—set the precedent for creating a learning environment to discuss topics of systemic marginalization and privilege. The *product* of these discussions was the initial Diversity Survey (see Section 4: Initial and Ongoing Climate Assessment).

After the creation of the surveys, the committee felt that continuing these conversations would be of benefit to the broader clinical psychology community. Thus, this early committee spearheaded the current approach to DC, which includes both *process-oriented goals*, as well as *project initiative goals*. The early DC proposed a more open structure for the continuing committee, particularly for students, which has evolved over time to the current structure where both faculty and students are welcome to join if they commit to regularly attending meetings and participating in initiatives throughout a given semester.

1D. An Overview of Our Current DC

Our DC currently consists of a self-selected group of students and faculty enrolled or teaching in the program who are interested in continual exploration and contributing to initiatives promoting diversity inclusion, equity, and social justice. Students and faculty are diverse in race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, social class, ability, immigration status, religion, and other variables. There are usually students from all cohorts represented in DC, but this varies per year. In the last few years, there have been approximately 15 to 25 students participating and 3 to 5 faculty. DC has always had at least two faculty members, and always had both faculty of color and White faculty. DC meets approximately twice monthly during the academic year. DC is collaboratively co-chaired by three to four DC members: students (two or three) and faculty (one).

Our current DC meets at least once per month during the academic year to address *both process and project initiative goals*.

- **Process-oriented goals** focus on promoting members’ personal and interpersonal growth as advocates and allies for social justice. These goals are met through internal activities and discussions that focus on describing, contextualizing, and processing experiences and identities related to systemic and personal injustices, power and privilege, and related topics that DC collaboratively decides on each year.

- **Project initiative goals** seek to be action components where we move these discussions into action and develop initiatives to promote inclusion and social justice either within the program or in the broader community. DC typically organizes and facilitates at least two diversity-focused program-wide events (one each semester): Potluck and Community Meeting. DC also conducts the ongoing program initiatives of Climate Survey and Recruitment Outreach. A number of other initiatives have begun from discussions at DC.

Our model includes three main components. Each of these is detailed in a separate chapter below.

- **Monthly Meetings**: Our DC meets monthly (or sometimes twice monthly) for 90 to 120 minutes. Monthly meetings are composed of two aspects:
Diversity Discussions within DC: The majority of our monthly meetings include a topical discussion of an issues related to diversity, privilege, oppression, and resistance. These “difficult dialogues” help DC members continue our personal journeys of deepening cultural responsiveness and social justice orientation. These discussions can be a place for support, foster growth and new insights, and contribute to professional skills. These discussions also aim to engage us in deeper and longer conversations (difficult dialogues) that help facilitate skills in talking to others about these issues.

Initiative Planning, Development, and Updates: Monthly meetings are also the time and place where we plan initiatives or receive updates from subcommittees. In the structure and approach of discussions of events and initiatives, we work to create a collaborative, non-hierarchical community organizing approach.

- **Clinical Program Events**: These events help us promote cultural responsiveness and maintain our social justice orientation and mission in the larger program.
  
  *Example events:* Potluck and Community Meeting

- **Outreach and Assessment**: Our outreach and Climate Assessment efforts ensure a diverse and sensitive community.
  
  *Examples:* Ongoing Climate Assessment and active recruitment of diverse students

In addition to these central components of our DC, we have expanded the work we do in order to play a larger role in social action and community impact. Examples of these additional efforts include the development of this handbook, our Interview Day panel, and other committees or initiatives that are now housed under other committees or structures within our Clinical Program.

Our model:

- Focuses on building skills within the DC community and enhances student and faculty engagement in discussions of diversity-related topics.
- Encourages and supports modeling the mission outside of DC.
- Helps to foster dissemination of these skills and the DC mission through individual activism and involvement in courses, meetings, and internal and external practica/training experiences.
- Continues and deepens the process of understanding how individual identities (and the experiences of privilege and oppression related to various identity statuses) affect interactions with others of similar and/or different identities.
- Serves as a springboard and context for the development and piloting of new ideas and initiatives, such as the ones described in the “DC as a Launching Site” (Section 9).

Our DC is fluid and responsive: it has evolved and changed several times to become what it is today, and we expect it will continue to evolve as the professional climate and students call for change. Therefore, we communicate the story and evolutions of our DC as an example of one way to start a DC, but not “THE” way.
SECTION 2

THE WHAT AND WHY

In this section, we aim to overview the purposes of a Diversity Committee (DC) and share reflections on the positive effects of a DC.

2A. What is a DC?
2B. Why Have a DC?

- Our Impact: Student and Faculty Voices from UMass Boston
- “We wish we had…”: Student Voices from Outside UMass Boston

2A. What is a DC?

A Diversity Committee (DC) within a psychology department or training program aims to promote cultural sensitivity, enhance the social justice orientation of the program, and improve the climate of the program in relation to the experiences of students and faculty from marginalized or oppressed statuses. Sometimes the creation or maintenance of a DC is in response to particular issues, identified problems, and/or goals, such as Climate Assessment or recruitment and retention of students and faculty from diverse backgrounds. Often, however, a DC begins or continues because there is a core group of students and/or faculty who wish to advance their own engagement with diversity and social justice and to create a more inclusive climate. A DC can provide your organization/program with a collaborative space to discuss and work through issues related to diversity and members’ experiences related to their various identities, and can promote a mission to emphasize diversity and social justice.

We understand a DC as something different than an affinity group (e.g., People of Color, White allies), or a group that is made up specifically of students or faculty but not both. We understand a DC as a committee of both students and faculty.

2B. Why have a DC?

To answer this question, one should consider the goals of a DC (we talked about ours above in Section 1: UMass DC) and where your organization/program stands in relation to those goals. A DC can provide your organization/program with a collaborative space to discuss and work through issues related to diversity and members’ experiences related to their various identities. It can also be a way in which your institution can enhance the policies and procedures related to issues of diversity and work to engage the broader community in social justice.
We believe that attending to issues of diversity and social justice is a foundational aspect of being ethical psychologists. As scientist practitioners, we also seek to understand the impact and importance from actual participants. We asked students, both from UMass Boston and other clinical psychology training programs, for their perspectives on the impact of having (or not having) a DC.

**OUR IMPACT: STUDENT AND FACULTY VOICES FROM UMASS BOSTON**

- “DC provides me with a safe space. I could imagine [that] a program without one might lead to feeling lonely/isolated. I would want other people to have a DC because I think it signifies that the program is committed to striving for cultural competence.”
- “DC is a place that keeps me accountable to explore my areas of relative privilege. Every month, I have a place to go to learn and stretch my understanding of different injustices. I don’t think I’d be able to do this as regularly and as deeply if DC didn’t provide a space for this. I think it’s important that it exists within this university because it allows me to learn with/from my colleagues, it provides a personal experience to these issues, and it is empowering to see how many students/faculty care about this, too.”
- “[DC] provides a relatively comfortable (as comfortable as it can be) space to increase self-awareness, learn, process, and sometimes ask questions. I always leave feeling a deeper appreciation for the complexity of the lived experience of whatever we are talking about…”
- “The existence of DC keeps us all energized and motivated, and fends off feelings of helplessness, guilt, or despair around the sometimes seemingly insurmountable challenges before us. Also, the power of social modeling means that we all are creating a culture that is one of action, allyship, and advocacy.”
- “… I would want other programs to have DC because I think it shows a high level of commitment to social justice on a community level. I think it is easy for programs to say they emphasize social justice but having a DC is a way to really embody it or, if you want, a way to ‘walk the walk’ as opposed to just ‘talking the talk.’”
- “DC provides me with an open space to be educated and honest about my experiences as a Student of Color in a field where diversity is severely lacking. I think DC enhances the cultural sensitivity of the program and its students. It educated us on real world issues of race, discrimination, and oppression that usually are not included in an academic setting.”
- “It’s important to have a place to work through areas of privilege, to understand marginalization, to share across difference, cultivate empathy and understanding, learn and grow together. It keeps these important issues centered in our lives. It also keeps these issues centered in our own program and provides a body to organize or communicate about diversity related action. Being part of DC helps me develop and act as an ally – helps me stretch my understanding and awareness.”
- “It has developed my empathy, awareness, and skills as an ally. It has allowed me space to process difficult experiences related to issues of marginalization. It has taught me and provided me with important knowledge for my role not only as an ally, but a clinician, researcher, teacher, and community member. It has given me experiential learning that is memorable, transformative, and valuable. I would want other settings to have this same opportunity to regularly ensure these important issues are in their awareness, and that
they are not ignoring, neglecting, or misunderstanding issues related to diversity, power, and privilege. In order to be culturally sensitive, responsive psychologists engaging in such an organization is incredibly helpful, and necessary, even!”

“WE WISH WE HAD…”: STUDENT VOICES FROM OUTSIDE UMASS BOSTON

* I definitely would like to see my program have a DC that involves both students and faculty. A DC should also be concerned with a much broader definition of diversity not just limited to race or ethnicity, and be led by those it claims to represent/who have a personal stake in the cause, but also involve those who are allies.”

* “One of my hopes would be that a DC would help the program to, first of all, deeply examine the organizational values and culture and explore why this is beyond just [the attitude of] (to paraphrase one faculty member): ‘We’d like to have more Students of Color, but they’re not applying, so what can we do?’ I observe a fundamental disconnect between [my] program’s professed values and their ability to put it into practice. I also observe a disconnect between the demographics of the people who are training or being trained as clinicians or researchers, and many of the communities that we see as clients or recruit to our studies.”

* “…the vast majority [in my program] occupy a position where they can distance themselves from this [diversity and social justice] work when it becomes uncomfortable and for whom this work will, just pragmatically speaking, not be a top priority. True, meaningful change is often uncomfortable! Ideally this is where a DC could come in and provide some guidance on how best to work toward this type of change. I couldn't agree more with comments about the damaging effects of ‘change’ that occurs within a ‘safe’ model of diversity that uses it as a buzzword to simply further business as usual.”
SECTION 3:

YOUR DC: GETTING STARTED

In this section, we offer some thoughts on starting a Diversity Committee (DC), drawing from our own experiences in starting our DC, and also in re-envisioning and modifying over the years. We draw also from conversations we have had with students and faculty in other programs who have described frustration and fears, and attempt to address some of the anticipated difficulties. We include specific perspectives and voices about what does and does not work in the “Pearls and Perils” section.

3A. First Steps: Shaping Goals and Mission

- Questions to Consider in Developing and Discussing Goals
- Questions to Consider About Program Climate
- Questions to Consider About Relational Power and Privilege

3B. Things to Consider in Starting a DC

- Perspectives from UMass Boston Students and Faculty
- Student Voices from Outside UMass Boston

3C. Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned about the Nature of DCs

- Perspectives from UMass Boston Students and Faculty
- Student Voices from Outside UMass Boston

3A. First Steps: Shaping Goals and Mission

You may be thinking about starting a Diversity Committee (DC) for several different reasons. You may feel that issues of diversity within your program, your field, and even in daily life are very important. So do we! You may also want to start a DC because these issues are not being addressed adequately, appropriately, or at all. Therefore, a DC may activate and cultivate a dialogue about diversity in a way that can be helpful to the students and culture of the program as a whole.

So where do you start? This can seem daunting because initiating a DC may highlight something lacking in your program, and all members of your program may not share your commitment to diversity and social justice. Logistically, where do you even begin to get a group like this going and off the ground? There are several things to consider about how to approach this endeavor. A critical first step of creating a DC is active consideration and discussion of its goals and mission
statement. These goals might change over time. As we mentioned above, UMass Boston’s DC began with an initial charge to create and implement a climate survey and then evolved over time to address the broader goals reflected below. As DC’s aims and structure solidified, we developed the **mission statement** presented above.

We found that an initial Climate Assessment was a really helpful place to gain a sense of the needs and concerns of our particular program as it gave us information about strengths and challenges students are facing. If you think this might be a good first step for you, then check out **Section 4: Initial and Ongoing Climate Assessment**; you can create a DC with the intent to utilize that space to process and work on a climate survey. However, not every program will start with a Climate Assessment: some may instead wish to focus a DC on process-oriented discussions or developing program-wide initiatives.

A **vital first step** is to be clear about your mission and goals.

**QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER IN DEVELOPING AND DISCUSSING GOALS**

- What are your goals? Are you wanting to provide a space for continued or deeper learning about social justice and systems of oppression? To organize events for the program or organization? To plan events for the broader community/outside the organization? To expand understanding?
- What are the emphases of the DC space? Are you hoping to focus on processing and personal learning related to areas of marginalization and privilege? On collaborative didactic learning about areas of marginalization/oppression? On organizing social justice-related events and actions? How will time be allotted to each emphasis?
- What other groups or initiatives related to diversity already exist in your program? How will your DC be different? What is DC hoping to add?
- What is a reasonable amount for the committee to take on, given other commitments and challenges? Are there some goals that can be met by other groups or initiatives?

**QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER ABOUT YOUR PROGRAM CLIMATE**

The climate of your program will influence the goals of your DC and the structure you create. So, an important first step is to have honest conversations about program climate. A Climate Assessment (see **Section 4: Initial and Ongoing Climate Assessment**) can be one source of information, but active discussions and focused consideration of specific questions by those considering starting a DC can also be very helpful.

The evolution of DC in our program involved deep processing and many stages of trust building. This might not be necessary in all programs, depending on the space your program hopes to create and the goals the committee is working to achieve for its members, the program, or beyond. If it is part of your goal or process, recognize that it is a difficult thing to do, given the socialization towards colorblindness, meritocracy, etc. Consider setting goals for your DC that recognize where the participants and the program is in relation to their knowledge and journey as allies and advocates for social justice.
The questions below include questions we considered when we began our DC, and others that came up over the years. The discussions about these questions shaped our ongoing goals, structures, and relationships.

- Will your program support the development of a DC? Perhaps the more realistic question is *what kind* of DC will your program support? What kinds of support or resistance might come up? Will this look different with different goals or structure? How can your program communicate support for the DC and emphasize the importance of its mission?
- What resources are available to support the DC (e.g., money, space, time)? Consider how the DC will take form (meetings, members, meeting contents, etc.), and what could facilitate or challenge its success. For example, our program makes DC a priority by protecting time in student and faculty schedules to permit attendance (i.e., not having classes or other program meetings scheduled during this time), by the Director of Clinical Training (DCT) and faculty promoting DC membership and event attendance to all members of our community, by reserving space (rather than DC members having to figure out how to do this), and by providing some minor funding for events as needed (e.g., to buy paper goods for a Potluck, or Xeroxing for Community Meeting materials, or online survey access for the Climate Assessment).
- Is there a shared understanding of the meaning of diversity and the purpose of the committee? If not, then this may be one of the goals of your DC. Specifically, for programs that do not offer courses or training on topics such as race, racism, privilege, oppression, and power, we suggest that the first few meetings of your DC focus on defining these topics for your members. We have provided information and resources that may be useful in beginning to have these discussions (See Appendix D). These fundamental definitions and terms are crucial before having deeper dialogue on issues of diversity and identity.
- What’s already in place in your program that addresses diversity and/or social justice? Is it working? What needs to change? How might you assess this? How might your DC be different if you have an existing program that’s not working?
- Think about how your program discusses issues of diversity. In what forums, classes, trainings, seminars, etc.? You might consider how to work collaboratively with these efforts, or how to avoid redundant or competing efforts.
- Consider the safety of proposing this in your program as a student, or as a faculty member, particularly if you are a Person of Color or otherwise from a marginalized background. As a Person of Color or a marginalized person, navigating power and privilege when advocating for a larger focus on cultural responsiveness and social justice can be perceived as a message that the program is lacking in a crucial way, which might bring on defensiveness. What are the costs or burden to those students and faculty who take on the task of developing a DC? Are there supports available via peers, faculty, or the program? Are there White allies or others with role or status power who can be enlisted to support the creation of a DC?
- How will the committee interact with other bodies in the Clinical Program (e.g., newer students, advanced students, and faculty, graduate student associations clinical training)?
Questions to Consider about Relational Power and Privilege

In addition to setting clear goals, another part of getting started is considering the structure of your DC. Effective DCs typically involve some difficult dialogues, because difficult dialogues are part of the growth. Difficult dialogues often occur even when DCs are primarily focused on initiatives, rather than fostering members’ personal growth or processing issues related to oppression and privilege. Therefore, it can be helpful to consider how you will address role and status differences in power and privilege, both specifically within the program as well as in relation to broader social statuses and identities. These things will relate to your goals as well. We talk more about this in later chapters when we discuss our specific model and initiatives, but offer some questions here that we think would be helpful when considering initiating a DC.

- How might you provide a validating, supportive environment, particularly for those holding marginalized identity statuses? How will you ensure that the committee welcomes and listens to input from individuals from marginalized groups?
- How will you run the committee in a way that does not place excessive burden on students and faculty with marginalized identities?
- Relatedly, starting a DC takes a lot of time and effort—how might that slow down progress in program/career for students and faculty that take it on—and what does it mean if DCs are usually started by individuals from marginalized backgrounds? How might the cost be different for a person with relative privilege?

3B. Things to Consider in Starting a DC

- There is no “right” structure for a DC and this handbook is not a “cookbook.” Some of the central components of our DC discussed in Section 2: The What and Why may look very different in your program and may not be very approachable, especially in the beginning. We feel that monthly meetings have been the most central component for us because they have sustained the journey and an immense amount of support. If you utilize anything from our model, we suggest that you utilize the monthly meetings. These meetings can be your hub for development, support, and sustenance.
- Remember this is an ongoing process for us, and it will be for you as well.
- Our current model seeks to balance DC members’ growth and processing issues through difficult dialogues with action components focused on developing initiatives to improve diversity in the program or field more generally. The balance between process and action has shifted from year to year for our DC depending on the needs of the current members. However, given the nature of this committee and its mission, there will likely always be a tension surrounding how much time and space to dedicate to each. We want to acknowledge that tension, and emphasize that the format and structure of DC is not set in stone—it can, and should, flex according to the current needs of its members and issue that are arising within the program, university, local, national, and global context.
3C. Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned about the Nature of DCs

PERSPECTIVES FROM UMass BOSTON STUDENTS AND FACULTY

- “It’s super important to be really clear about what DC is and isn’t. And for the things that it ‘isn’t’ – to be sure that those needs are being met elsewhere… Basically, DC can’t be this catch-all panacea – and the organization as a whole needs to be sure there are other entities.”
- “It’ll never feel perfect. You’ll never be perfect. And that is everyone’s experience with it, no matter how long you’ve done this.”
- “… Consider the dialectic between acknowledging differences and coming together as a group with a shared mission. There is a particular challenge, because people have different needs, different identities, and different experiences. But this work across differences also makes it meaningful and important. The leadership structure is an important consideration. I think it varies a bit by the setting, but I think generally, it is important that leadership represents both allies and marginalized individuals – and those with earned power within the organization (e.g., professors, managers/supervisors) and those without. Diversity is key as always.”
- “… DC can be amazing, but it could also be dangerous if the safe space isn’t actually safe. Leadership should be across different identities and power across student/faculty dynamics/teams should be explored. If the program doesn’t have a strong diversity training, how [will] ‘safe spaces’ be created and how people will be held accountable.”
- “While not intentionally, DC can be an intimidating place to speak up (related to calling in/calling out)… “… Creating an environment where people feel comfortable speaking up, and taking risks, is absolutely vital…. Spend some time working on this as a committee; for instance, by roleplaying and discussing how to respond to others in ways that validate others’ good intentions, etc., rather than in ways that isolate them or make them defensive, can be useful.”
- “[It’s] important to include voices, ideas, input from those with social justice experience and from marginalized backgrounds; to acknowledge and plan for discomfort, disagreement, and difficult conversations; and to have a plan in place if harmful/oppressive ideas/opinions are shared.”

STUDENT VOICES FROM OUTSIDE UMass BOSTON

- “I suggest all efforts should be VERY deliberate… (1) Diversity is not a sideline issue, it is central to science, and should be the driving force of all scientific inquiry. It goes by another name—variability—and science without variability is simply NOT science. (2) It should TRULY be led by the people it claims to represent, but MUST include majority members devoted to the cause as supportive allies. (3) It should TRULY represent diversity and not fall into the false dichotomies of society and academia.
- Opening the question (what is diversity really?) up to the academic community, and organizations devoted to diversity is a great start. It includes race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, but also dis/ability, worldview, etc. Being uncomfortable and questioning business as usual MUST be the accepted norm of an effort like this. Without
these elements, to be brutally honest, it is simply a waste of time. Worse, many minorities in academia, including myself, feel strongly such efforts add to the problem by allowing a ‘diversity bystander effect.’ It is as if a DC pays some diversity bill off and business can continue as usual. Change that occurs with a ‘safe’ model of diversity is very harmful. It is driving very talented people out of academia daily.”

• “On one hand, having a stand-alone DC can place additional demands for time and emotional labor disproportionately on those who care about diversity-related issues, while those for whom these issues are not important or less important can distance themselves or avoid the issue altogether. Conceptualizing ‘diversity’ as something that is the purview and responsibility of the program as a whole certainly has a lot to recommend in theory. In practice, I worry that this would mean that diversity-related issues get pushed aside or passed off if no one is actively and intentionally advocating for this to be a priority.”
SECTION 4

INITIAL AND ONGOING CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS

In this section, we describe our process of Climate Assessment. For us, what was most important was the way that developing a responsive, student centered Climate Assessment was a process that was the catalyst for deep exploration of what “diversity” and “social justice” meant to us, as faculty, students, and as a program. It was these discussions that formed the structural and relational foundation of our Diversity Committee (DC)—moving beyond assessment to an initiative that actually affected our program climate in an ongoing way.

4A. Initial Climate Assessment
4B. Ongoing Climate Assessment
4C. Administration and Analysis of Climate Assessment
4D. Things to Consider in Planning a Diversity Climate Assessment
4E. Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned about Diversity Climate Assessments

4A. Initial Climate Assessment

As we noted above, our Diversity Committee (DC) began as a committee charged with developing a diversity Climate Assessment. The initial assessment took a year to develop, as the initial committee recognized that creating a climate survey in a sensitive and inclusive manner required that all the members of the committee share an understanding of the meaning of diversity and being a diversity-sensitive community that promoted social justice; the purpose of the assessment in relation to this meaning; and the challenges of creating a community inclusive of all members, including how these challenges could play out in the process of developing and implementing an assessment that was, itself, responsive to diverse identities and experiences.

As we created the survey, DC worked through some of the questions we encourage others to consider (see Section 3: The What and Why), such as, “What is diversity?” “What is the mission of our program?” and “What are our goals as a program currently and moving forward in relation
to diversity and social justice?” The discussions that led to the creation of the actual survey were central to shaping both the impact of the DC and the current model and formation. Thus, while we provide the initial Climate Assessment in Appendix B, we strongly encourage programs thinking of starting a DC or doing a Climate Assessment to begin with their own discussions.

Our resulting diversity survey sought to assess student’s experiences in classes, relationships between faculty and students, relationships among students, mentoring relationships, and other program-related experiences. The first Climate Assessment survey was not developed to assess change over time. Instead, the first survey was designed to take an initial in-depth climate gauge of the program. Our initial Climate Assessment ended up including two surveys, one focusing on race and ethnicity and the other asking about other marginalized identities. DC wanted the initial survey to obtain in-depth information on race and ethnocultural experiences, while not marginalizing intersectional identities in the process. After considerable discussion, we decided to move away from simple evaluation-based (positive or negative) climate questions, towards questions that would help us identify strengths and areas in need of improvement. This enabled us to consider how we might grow and improve as a program, and to develop a climate survey that accurately reflected all student's’ concerns. Relatedly, the analysis of survey responses focused on identifying areas of concern, and not solely by assessing the mean or modal response. Our view was that if even a single student described an issue that needed improvement, we wanted to know about it, so we could address it.

The initial Climate Assessment was analyzed as described below. After this first administration, we held a Community Meeting to discuss the findings, following initial discussion among the faculty and students. This enabled us to share our impressions and address issues collaboratively.

4B. Ongoing Climate Assessment

While the initial survey contained rich and detailed information, it was cumbersome and could not assess change over time. We subsequently revised the Climate Assessment survey to create a repeatable survey that could assess change over time. The survey has evolved and is currently a mixed methods approach containing short response as well as quantitative questions.

Our current Climate Assessment is an anonymous biennial survey developed to measure how well the program is considering and integrating diversity and equity constructs including power and privilege, marginalized and privileged identities, and systems of oppression. We ask about the integration of diversity issues in multiple contexts—class content and coursework, research, and clinical practica, both on- and off-campus. In addition, the climate survey asks students about their everyday interactions with other students, faculty, and staff with regard to cultural sensitivity and inclusivity. We have included our current biennial Climate Assessment in Appendix C. However, we again encourage programs to engage in substantial discussions of the purpose of ongoing Climate Assessment, the ways in which the data will be analyzed, the intentions for change based on the results, etc.
4C. Administration and Analysis of Climate Assessment

Our biennial climate survey is administered by a subcommittee of the DC that typically includes 2-3 more advanced students and explicitly does not include faculty (except as consultants), in order to protect student confidentiality.

In an administration year, the Climate Assessment subcommittee first consults with the DC as a whole about any possible changes DC might want to make to the survey before administration. Changes might include new considerations in response to political climate changes in the program or country, demographic variables to address newly racialized groups (e.g., Middle Eastern North Africans, or MENA), or new questions to gauge program response to changes previously made to address concerns related to diversity. We are, however, cautious about making too many changes to our current survey, given our aim to look at change over time. Prospective changes are reviewed and approved by the Clinical Program Committee (the overall faculty governance committee for the program). The subcommittee then administers the survey to all students in the program via an online survey platform. DC members encourage students from their cohorts to complete the survey.

On non-administration years, the subcommittee’s role is to analyze, summarize, write up, and present a summary report of the findings from the Climate Survey to the DC as whole for feedback and approval. The subcommittee provides a summary of quantitative answers, with frequencies, means, and standard deviations, as well as graphs. Answers to open-ended questions are presented as themes and/or de-identified. Subcommittee members pay particular attention to ensuring that critical responses cannot be identified as a particular student or cohort.

The subcommittee’s report is first presented to the DC, and DC members discuss the findings and presentation of the findings. Discussion of the findings and summary of results allows for open discussion among DC members regarding the climate of the program and committee, and enables DC members to contribute to any recommendations to address issues or continue strengths. Following any revision from DC member feedback, faculty and student co-chairs of DC then present the summary findings to the faculty (at faculty meetings) and the students (at student meetings).

As needed, the DC, program faculty, or students engage in discussions or develop initiatives to address issues that have been raised in the survey. For example, one year the survey indicated relatively lower (but still high) ratings on addressing social class within coursework. The faculty responded by developing a faculty retreat to review curriculum and discuss revisions that were needed to integrate issues of social class.

4D. Things to Consider in Planning a Diversity Climate Assessment

- Program-specific: Are there experiences specific to your organization that need to be explored?
• **Specificity and accessibility of questions:** Can all the participants (students of all years) answer all of the questions, or will some questions not be applicable to some participants? Are there variations based on identities or year in program? Do these variations affect confidentiality?

• **Assessment time frame:** Consider the time frame you want to assess. For example, “within the last year” or “within the last two years.” Be aware that a smaller time frame often makes de-identification more challenging, especially for qualitative responses. This means that students will be less likely to provide the kind of detailed information that can inform the development of effective initiatives to change climate or address problems. On the other side, too long a time frame means that issues don’t get addressed in a timely manner, or the context may have changed so much that it is difficult to understand aggregated responses. At the end of the academic year we ask students to answer questions about their last two academic years of experiences, but only administer the survey every other year so as to provide more anonymity.

• **Survey administration context:** Consider ways to ensure anonymity of students, such as allowing them to complete the survey online and when most convenient for them, as this will increase honest and open responses. Also consider giving students enough time to complete the survey with a deadline that will maximize the number of students who complete the survey. Letting students know who will have access to the data and how the responses will be used can be helpful in encouraging response.

• **Analysis:** Mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative questions) have been helpful for us to receive both depth and breadth of responses. Quantitative data helps us get an overall “pulse” of the program, while qualitative data helps us understand specific strengths and issues of concern.

• **Don’t forget the positives:** We found that it was important to ask specifically about negative experiences in open ended responses, to encourage students to share their specific concerns. Simultaneously, asking explicitly about positive experiences helps us spread best practices (and balances the overall survey).

### 4E. Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned about Diversity Climate Assessments

- **Ongoing Climate Assessment** can be an invaluable tool in understanding the diversity climate and identifying “hidden” issues that are undermining good intentions. However, this is only effective if the program actually takes action in response to reported issues. Though we have found the survey extremely helpful, we would like to note the risks and challenges that have come with its collection. Gathering data on students’ opinions of the program can be risky both to students and faculty. Students are faced with the difficult decisions of taking risks and being vulnerable in answering these questions truthfully, and faculty may feel defensive when reading survey results. In addition, collecting these data carry subsequent responsibilities of data analysis, presentation of findings, and follow-through of making changes to improve the program.

- **Ways we attempt to minimize risks and challenges:**
- Administer the survey every other year so at least two cohorts are discussing their experiences in any given class.
- Select students to review, de-identify, and summarize the qualitative responses, so others (especially faculty) never see the raw data.
- DC reviews the findings and report to ensure everything is de-identified a second time before presenting findings to the program.
- Prepare faculty and DCT for difficult results by having DC faculty members preview findings and/or speak to other faculty and DCT to help them manage their reactions.

- Given that our survey is anonymous, direct action in response to specific incidents expressed in qualitative answers has been limited, unless the incident is shared in another context. Responses to issues raised are usually programmatic (e.g., new initiatives, shifts in curriculum).
- We have learned that it is important to view the survey as a malleable and flexible measurement tool that can adjust to the ever-changing nature of society, and to how our program fits within that greater context (e.g., including assessment questions about new program initiatives).
SECTION 5

**DC MEMBERSHIP, LEADERSHIP, and STRUCTURE**

This section presents a description of the nuts and bolts of our Diversity Committee (DC), including how we decide on membership and leaders. We also discuss here some of the challenges related to power and privilege for a diversity focused committee consisting of both students and faculty. Sections 6 through 8 present information related to the content of our meetings, including difficult dialogues and our primary events and initiatives.

5A. Membership, Leadership, and Structure
- DC Membership: Defining DC member and associated responsibility
- Leadership: DC Co-Chairs
- Meeting Structure: Frequency & Duration
- Things to Consider about Members, Leaders, and Structure of Your DC

5B. An Overview of Meeting Content

5C. Negotiating Role and Status Power and Privilege
- Things to consider about working across power and privilege

5D. Pearl and Perils: Lessons Learned about DC Membership, Leadership, and Structure

Our Diversity Committee (DC) meetings provide regular opportunities to facilitate DC initiatives and also allow for a shared space to process and engage with diversity-related growth with each other, and with the broader community. An important piece of context for readers to consider about our DC is that we are really large (15 to 25 students and 3 to 5 faculty members). A smaller DC might look quite different.
5A. Membership, Leadership, and Structure

From the beginning, our DC has had both students and faculty with a collaborative leadership model. Initially, our DC was an open ongoing group—people could come whenever they wanted and there was no consistency. We found that this approach made it difficult to develop the kind of trust that we needed to have difficult dialogues, and so eventually moved to the model presented here.

**DC Membership: Defining DC Member and Associated Responsibility**

- Any student or faculty in the Clinical Program can be a member of DC. The one exception to this is the DCT, because of the particular power and obligations the DCT has.
- At the beginning of every academic year, the DC co-chairs send an invitation to the first DC meeting to all students and faculty.
- DC members are required to commit to membership for the full semester, making a commitment to attend every meeting and participate in initiatives. Students and faculty are asked to make this commitment to facilitate membership continuity, continued discussions throughout the year, and contribute to a sense of community for all members making the same commitment. These requirements also foster accountability and connections within our community.
- The exception to this agreement is for first year graduate students. During their first semester, they are allowed to attend as many or few meetings as they choose, giving them the opportunity to get to know DC and consider if they want to be a part of the community going forward.
- In our program, the DC is highly valued by student and faculty committee members, and by the program as a whole. While we encourage students and faculty to participate in DC, we also know that life is complicated, and DC attendance is optional. We explicitly state that not participating in DC does not mean one does not care about diversity. This is particularly important to communicate to first year students.

**Leadership: DC Co-Chairs**

- DC co-chairs are elected at the end of an academic year, to serve the following academic year. This inherently limits co-chairs to 2nd year or more advanced students.
- Co-chairs usually include 1 faculty member and 2 graduate students (one Student of Color and one White student), who commit to the position for one year.
- Faculty and student co-chairs meet regularly. Co-chairs discuss and plan meeting agendas, topics for discussion, and consider how topics should be presented. Co-chairs process the content of DC meeting topics as a group, make adjustments, and consider a variety of potential reactions to the content based on members’ positionalities.
- Co-chairs facilitate DC meetings by presenting the topic for the meeting, information on the topic, sometimes leading an experiential exercise and/or posing questions to ignite conversation. They aim to promote an inclusive and supportive environment for DC members, which may include disseminating resources, news and events related to the mission of DC.
• Faculty co-chairs actively mentor student co-chairs’ leadership skills facilitating dialogues, planning initiatives, and engaging in activism related to diversity.

**MEETING STRUCTURE: FREQUENCY & DURATION**

• Our DC meets regularly once (sometimes twice) a month during the academic year, for 1.5-2 hours during a protected meeting time where no classes, research labs, or competing program meetings are scheduled.
• Our DC always has snacks! We rotate who brings the food—nothing fancy.
• Most meetings consist of some time for discussion/difficult dialogues and some time for initiative planning and updating. The total time is divided, roughly in half, between these areas. See Table 1 below.
• Other than co-chairs, who facilitate the meetings overall, we have additional roles of time keeping and note taking, which are rotated amongst individuals, with different people each meeting.
• Except for the note taker, there are no computers or phones at our meetings.

**THINGS TO CONSIDER ABOUT MEMBERS, LEADERS, AND STRUCTURE OF YOUR DC**

• How might the format, focus, and framing of your meetings contribute to individuals’ experiences in DC, particularly across difference?
• How often should you meet? For how long?
• How should meetings be focused/structured/unstructured?
• How might you determine leadership positions? Who is responsible for what? What might the process of leadership look like for your DC? Consider alternative models other than the use of co-leaders. This could include sharing responsibility for leading meetings among members, rotating who leads/facilitates what portion of the meeting, and/or who facilitates which meeting and/or initiative.

**5B. An Overview of DC Meeting Content**

Our current model balances ongoing initiatives (subcommittees and events) with in-depth processing of important diversity-informed topics (difficult dialogues). We have found that this combination fosters the individual growth of DC members, encourages cohesion within the DC community, and ensures that we simultaneously focus on action, not only reflection. The formation of our specific initiatives and subcommittees came about in response to identified needs within the community. Each year DC committee members and leadership consider whether ongoing initiatives continue to be applicable to the current needs of the members of DC, if new initiatives are desired, and if changes or discontinuation of current initiatives are warranted (e.g., one way we do this is via the Climate Assessment). We strive for DC to be fluid and representative of the current climate of the program.

Our approach to Diversity Discussions is presented below in Section 6. Our current and ongoing initiatives include the Climate Assessment (described above in Section 4), Events including our yearly Potluck and Community Meeting events (described below in Section 7), and Recruitment...
Initiatives (described below in Section 8). In addition, DC is sometimes the catalyst or “launch pad” for initiatives that are taken up by others in our community (Section 9).

The content of our DC meetings is usually split between working with the subcommittees on these events and initiatives, and engaging in diversity focused difficult dialogues (see Table 1, below).

Table 1: Sample Topic-Focused DC Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>FACILITATOR</th>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:05-4:10</td>
<td>Co-chairs</td>
<td>Announcements—including current events and activism/advocacy opportunities in the University and Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10-4:45</td>
<td>Co-chairs</td>
<td>Check-in with subcommittees /initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45-4:50</td>
<td>Co-chairs or others who co-chairs have invited</td>
<td>Begin discussion topic, provide background/context, what might surprise you about this topic, why is it important? Frame topic within interpersonal, community, and/or social contexts, experiential exercises, share discussion prompts with group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50-5:15</td>
<td>Small groups</td>
<td>Break into groups of 3-5 for discussion of the topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15-5:35</td>
<td>Large group</td>
<td>Rejoin the larger group for an open discussion: share questions, feelings, comments, or action items that came up in small group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:35-5:40</td>
<td>Co-chairs</td>
<td>Wrap up: remind members to continue their exploration of these topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40-5:45</td>
<td>Co-chairs</td>
<td>Logistics: determine facilitator, note taker, time keeper and cohort responsible for snacks for the next meeting; Email community after meeting with questions, ideas, and other information about the next meeting’s topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An overview of the DC meetings for a full academic year is presented in Appendix A.

5C. Negotiating Role and Status Power and Privilege

Having a committee of faculty and students working together poses its own unique benefits and challenges. Having faculty involved in DC maintains the committee’s consistency, legitimacy, and position within the program. It also helps advocate for time and attention in the program since those in a position of power (i.e., faculty) are involved. For example, having faculty involved in our DC has allowed it to be recognized as a program committee, and the Clinical Program gives DC meetings time slots on the official Clinical Program schedule. On the other hand, faculty inherently have power in relation to students, given their role; this can make it difficult for students to voice their honest opinions and poses challenges for everyone to have genuine relationships in this space. Further, there is the question of what role faculty members have in this space (members, mentors, teachers, etc.).

In our DC, we aim to develop authentic relations across structural power and privilege differentials (e.g., White people and People of Color) and across earned power related to roles.
Throughout the years we have had an open DC and have always had White students, Students of Color, and faculty (White and People of Color) as members. The ratio of faculty to students has never been more than 1 faculty to 4 students. This is, in itself, challenging and intersects with the power related to different roles of student and faculty. Faculty in our DC try to hold multiple roles, working as equal/peers collaboratively on tasks that are central to the community, while simultaneously being aware of the faculty role, which includes the power they might have over students, but also includes their responsibility to students. Therefore, faculty work to model engagement in exploration of power and privilege, and mentor students’ leadership development as advocates and allies. Over the years, the faculty members have had multiple discussions about this issue and have actively supported each other in ensuring that they are aware of their power, and checking one other when someone seems to be using that power without careful consideration—e.g., if we are taking up too much “air time,” or pressuring the group to make a particular decision. Even so, the committee as a whole (students and faculty) has, at times, had difficult dialogues and sometimes major tensions related to these challenging goals. Given the challenges of negotiating these power issues, the Director of the Clinical Training is never a member of our DC.

In spite of these challenges, we have chosen to keep DC a combination of students and faculty. A primary reason for this decision is that DC thus becomes a microcosm of what it is like to navigate in the world, interacting with people from diverse positions of structural privilege and marginalization, and earned power within hierarchical systems. Although this is challenging, it gives our community the opportunity to learn and grow together, while working towards a shared mission.

In our experience, it is important to consider these issues of power and privilege in developing the ways in which we have structured and focused the content of our DC. We would encourage you to particularly consider these issues in relation to your specific context. Some programs have strong hierarchies and divisions between faculty and students, while others have a more junior colleague or empowerment of students approach. Some programs have identified issues between People of Color and White people. These issues will hopefully affect how you structure and focus your DC, because they will surely affect how members experience your DC.

**Things to Consider about Working Across Power and Privilege**

- Consider the power differential/imbalance between students and faculty:
  - Think about how power may interact across marginalized and privileged identities (Students and/or Faculty of Color) and role identities (student versus faculty). For example, consider the complexity of a faculty with marginalized identity (Person of Color) interacting with a student with a more privileged identity (White student). What is your understanding of what might play out in this interaction? How will you, as a DC, discuss or address these issues and work together to negotiate them?
  - Whose voice is being heard most? Whose opinions are being valuable and lauded most or least? How will faculty’s opinions be heard by students and vice versa? Think about how to make room for those with less power to have a voice. For example, we sometimes do brief rounds to hear opinions from every member
during the process of making decisions (e.g., what topic the Community Meeting might focus on).

- Consider how you might make decisions about the composition of DC in relation to the interactive power dynamics described above, with particular attention to how these play out in your particular program context. For example, in regard to how many students and/or faculty feel conducive to the needs or goals of the DC for your program. The size and make up of a group should be considered and program initiatives altered with those factors in mind.

- Clarity of expectations and goals for faculty:
  - The role of faculty members is important to clarify. Is their role to be an equal/peer working collaboratively and able to seek support from DC? Or is it primarily as a leader/teacher where they are expected to support students emotionally, rather than seek support or growth themselves?
  - In most academic contexts, faculty of color are often looked to for guidance on diversity issues. They are also often asked to hold the pain of others in the classroom (of oppressed students and of students occupying identities of relative privilege as they engage their own growth). Thus, it is important to consider if a DC would be a place for faculty of color to process and obtain personal support, or if DC is another place where faculty of color are teaching and guiding others. If the latter, it is important to consider how a DC might then place additional burden on faculty of color. And, therefore, how those faculty will be supported.
  - Differences in power among faculty related to tenure status are important to consider as well, as tenured faculty have power over untenured faculty, just as faculty have power over students.

5D. Pearl and Perils: Lessons Learned about DC Membership, Leadership, and Structure

- “Having student and faculty both involved solidifies the idea that there are others, not just students, who share the same values.”
- “Protect the space and time in the meeting, even consider adding benefits for participation by: a) not having it during breaks so people don’t feel they sacrifice one thing for another, and b) gaining some tangible benefit to encourage using the space (at least in the beginning).
- “[I] like that leadership changes hands. I was in another DC where one person led and became ‘the diversity person.’ [There was a] burden on them and gave rest of group less power. There’s fostering of communal ownership.”
- “Voting on topics incorporates everyone and enhances the sense of community and collaboration.”
- “Have folks commit to attend all meetings to help foster community of processing, learning, and working through together in addition to concrete tasks and actions.”
SECTION 6

DC DIVERSITY DISCUSSIONS

This section describes how we approach discussions about diversity across differences, that is, how we engage in difficult dialogues. See Section 5 for a discussion on negotiating power and privilege differences related to role and status identity, which is important to read and consider along with this section.

6A. Diversity Discussion Preparation and Facilitation
6B. Beyond Discussion: Linking Dialogue to Action
6C. Things to Consider about Difficult Dialogues
6D. Pearl and Perils: Lessons Learned about Difficult Dialogues

6A. Diversity Discussion Preparation and Facilitation

The majority of our Diversity Committee (DC) meetings devote time to diversity discussions, aimed at encouraging DC members to further develop their own understanding and awareness, and consider actions they might take in various areas of their lives to further and promote social justice. Topics for these discussions are decided on collaboratively, but all are areas that DC members care deeply about, and want to learn, think, process, and dig more deeply into. The topics can also be timely and relevant to the current sociopolitical context. Topics previously discussed include, but are not limited to: racial identity, racialization of the MENA group, anti-Islamism (aka: Islamophobia); citizenship status; disability (ability status); mental health stigma; intersectionality (ex: race and gender; religion and sexual orientation); social class; internalized stigma; calling in vs. calling out; homelessness; religion/spirituality; allyship and advocacy; and differences between biological sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Topics are usually carefully thought through and then narrowed so that the discussion focuses on the ways in which the topic interacts with our personal identities & experiences, ways power and privilege intersect, and ways the topic impacts our work as clinical psychologists, scientists, practitioners, activists and allies (and vice versa). These discussions aim to explore the complex dynamics of positionality, intersectionality, and the considerations of one’s own biases.
The process of choosing topics for discussion begins in the first meeting of the first semester by asking members to write in 3-5 topics they want to discuss. Once topics are submitted, DC co-chairs create an anonymous online survey including all the topics (combining submissions that are the same, or very closely related). Next, DC members vote, ranking their top 3. Then, the three most voted on topics become the three topics discussed across the first semester of DC (one topic/discussion per month).

Typically, DC co-chairs facilitate each discussion, although occasionally another DC member may be asked or volunteer to do so, based on identity, expertise or other relevant factors. In anticipation of the discussion, DC co-chairs meet to discuss the meaning, history, and sociopolitical background of the topic, which enables them to better facilitate DC members’ ability to do this in the meeting and have a useful discussion. Co-chairs also examine their own positionality, identity, socialization, and how those identities interact with the topic. Co-chairs also prepare any materials (readings, videos, etc.) they believe would be beneficial to deepen the discussion at the upcoming meeting. Typically, we have very limited didactics in discussion introductions to leave more time for DC members’ discussion and reflection.

Discussion usually begins with the facilitator(s) describing the topic, acknowledging the brevity of time and thus limitation of our discussion breadth and depth. Facilitators then give some historical or sociopolitical background, discuss ways in which they personally have thought about the topic, while acknowledging any limitations or exclusion to the discussion (e.g., if oppressed members of the group being discussed are not present, or different perspectives among members that are present), and modeling the consideration of positionality by discussing their own positions in relation to the topic and the process they engaged in to prepare for the meeting. This usually takes no more than 10 minutes.

We have also framed a discussion by doing an activity, such as pairing up and practicing difficult dialogues, or starting with some sort of brief evocative presentation to get members engaged (e.g., personal reflections, videos or images or short narratives of individuals who hold the identity/experience being discussed). Facilitators then lead members into a discussion with the use of a prompt which usually reminds people of guidelines for discussions across difference (speaking from one’s own experience, being mindful of the amount of space one is taking up in a group, considering one’s own positionality, etc.). Members often break up into smaller groups (3-4 people) for a more intimate dialogue during this discussion; which often includes a list of suggested questions for small groups to think about, reflect on, and use to deepen conversation. If we break into smaller groups, we usually have 10 minutes or so to share and debrief.

6B. Beyond Discussion: Linking Dialogue to Action

As a complement to our process-oriented goals of personal and interpersonal growth through difficult dialogues, our DC also seeks to link these dialogues to action. We aim to create actionable tasks or initiatives that promote inclusion and social justice either within the program or in the broader community.

Action items or initiatives are developed during DC monthly meetings and/or Community Meetings in relation to suggestions that emerge during discussions. After small group dialogue
and processing, members are encouraged to bring potential action items or initiatives to the larger group for a discussion among all DC members. For example, during a DC meeting and discussion, DC members mentioned that program events had been scheduled during non-Christian religious holidays. Faculty DC members brought this to the program faculty, which resulted in (a) changing those specific events and (b) the development of a program policy to annually review religious holidays for all major religions (e.g. including Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism, Judaism, Christianity) and avoid scheduling program events and (if possible) classes. Another example came from a Community Meeting on social class, which included discussion of some of the social class and financial inequality within the program and brainstorming possible initiatives. This discussion resulted in faculty and students outside of DC developing a resource-sharing list, where students can both post and request resources such as books, furniture, clothes, funding opportunities, etc. This resource-sharing list is shared with everyone in the program and maintained by both faculty and students. In order to maintain the stability of this initiative there is a group of faculty and students who have volunteered to maintain this list and its presence in the program. It is important to highlight that when action items or initiatives are developed in DC it is imperative for its members to commit to following through with the development and maintenance of the initiative.

6C. Things to Consider about Difficult Dialogues

Often, folks want to jump in to these kinds of discussions because they seem to be a direct route to increased understanding and perspective taking. But dialogues aimed at personal and relational exploration and processing can bring up a lot of responses in participants (hence, the name of difficult dialogues). We have found that discussions can be much more productive if we, as a group, have thought about their purpose and also about the possible risks and difficult reactions.

In our standard coursework, we have difficult dialogues in various classes. As a part of this, we develop discussion ground rules, which are often used implicitly or explicitly in our DC. If your program doesn’t have this experience, you might consider beginning your diversity dialogues with a discussion of ground rules to ensure respect and safety. But remember that safety doesn’t mean comfort—growth is often uncomfortable, and there really is not any way to talk about oppression without engaging the pain of that oppression.

Therefore, the very first question is whether your DC wants to engage in difficult dialogues and, if so, at what level. Is your DC model process-driven or is it more focused on initiatives and outreach? What are the goals of your DC? If you do want to engage in difficult dialogues, here are some questions to collaboratively consider:

- **Are you ready to have discussions** that are more personally oriented and include disclosing?
  - Do your members have a shared awareness of challenges, and a shared trust? Would it be more helpful to build that trust more slowly? As alternatives to the format for difficult dialogues above consider using movies, books, articles, or blog posts as starting points from which to start a discussion. Every program will vary in how
much they want to engage in these difficult dialogues, but it is important that all aspects of these discussions are intentional and done with thoughtful consideration.

- **If there is conflict or tension amongst members, how will this create barriers to the trust that is necessary to these kinds of discussions? How will you work through this tension so that it doesn’t undermine the goals of your DC?**
- **Do faculty have the awareness of power differences due to their role? Are they able to enter this space as learners?**

- **Willingness to learn:** It is important to get a sense of DC members’ willingness to learn and grow in the realm of diversity education and discussions. As we have discussed, this learning process is often painful and difficult. Thus, it is important to assess if members of your DC are in need of education and/or individual learning provided by an initial more didactic focus, or by having initial discussions facilitated by outside consultants before engaging in group-facilitated difficult group discussions. In the beginning, it may be helpful to anonymously evaluate individuals’ experience of DC discussions, and ask for feedback on how the format/structure could be improved.

- **How might the format, focus, and framing** of your meetings contribute to, or threaten, the ability to have difficult dialogues for members, particularly across difference?
  - **Do you have student leaders, faculty leaders, or both?** We have found that having both student and faculty co-chairs can make more space for students to speak and explore topics, despite having relatively less power. In addition, having student and faculty co-chairs leads to more diversity of experience in co-chair meeting discussions, which we have also seen as a strength.
  - **What kind of ground rules do you need for this kind of conversation and how will you generate these?** Carefully coming up with ground rules that are realistic and work for your community can be helpful in increasing ability to have difficult dialogues. The process of doing this, and discussing the challenges of these discussions, with attention to power differences in status and role, might be an initial dialogue. It is also important to continually evaluate these ground rules and meeting structure, to ensure that they are actually working for the group, and to be willing to make changes or adjustments when it might improve the discussion safety, richness, and depth.
  - **Does your DC “report” to other program structures (e.g., to the program faculty or DCT)?** Will the content or process of discussions be related to others? How will you deal with needed confidentiality while also enabling students to process challenging interactions with mentors outside of DC to facilitate their personal growth?

- **The burden of this work and these discussions on individuals in marginalized spaces should be considered,** particularly when discussing issues of power, privilege and discrimination across differences.
  - **Level of experience:** We are all at different stages of our own learning around these topics and when sharing a space for conversations about identity and marginalization, these differences in awareness or learning are likely to become evident and can be
potentially damaging, particularly if they inadvertently collude in the oppression. Having discussions across differences can come at different costs to individuals, depending on their own positionality. It can be helpful to consider (and perhaps assess) where individuals in your community are in terms of their own understanding of the topic (advanced or nascent) and personal identity development process, and to choose discussion topics and framing with this in mind. An open discussion about different levels of experience, how to have discussions, and the differential risks can, itself, be a discussion conversation.

- Avoiding biased expectations for education: Often, people in marginalized spaces are burdened by the expectation that they will educate others about oppression and marginalization. At a societal level, individuals who hold marginalized identities are often those calling for change, and subsequently asked to “educate” those who are privileged, sometimes having to “prove” that change is needed. Thus, DC members who hold privilege in identities being discussed should acknowledge that history, take the initiative to engage in their own personal learning and development outside of DC, and offer their time to help educate other DC members. During actual discussions, DC co-chairs might remind DC members that we are learning together, but that there are differences in positionality that play out in our interactions.

- Building trust and alliances across difference: With groups mixed across privileged and marginalized identities, there is always a risk, and simultaneous trust that needs to be built. It is important to note that, no matter how “well” it is done, that process of building trust and taking risks is usually painful, and considerations should be made for what that might look like in any setting starting a DC.

**Check yourself & your colleagues: work together as a community.**

- As you embark on dialogues, try to encourage DC members to hold in mind their positionality within each topic. In cases where individuals hold a marginalized identity, make space for them to consider the potential costs of engaging in these difficult dialogues (e.g., being exposed to other people’s bias, micro/macroaggressions, and being asked to educate others or represent a group). In cases where individuals hold privileged identities, encourage them to consider the impacts that their voice can have on others, how much space they are taking up, and if the group as a whole might benefit more from them taking a listening stance, resisting the urge to share all thoughts that come to mind.

- Recognize that people may need to step back, step up, call in or call out. Not everyone will want to or be able to fully engage in all discussions or be expressive all of the time. DC members may have moments of needing to be more quiet or observant. Stepping back may be needed when you are emotionally depleted and unable to engage in a potentially hurtful and emotionally taxing conversations (e.g., in times of frequent oppressive political rhetoric or within community interactions when one holds one or more marginalized identities). In times when individuals are able, discuss ways to step up within difficult dialogues, without taking up all the space. Stepping up could be as simple as checking in and providing/receiving support to/from others. Calling in, when one feels able and safe enough, is a powerful way to provide feedback to others that their actions or statements were (or could have
been) perceived as hurtful or oppressive, in a way that invites them in to learn and discuss and continue the relationship. But calling in from an oppressed status means holding one’s own pain and being able to empathize with the pain and difficulty of those who are more privileged; this takes a lot of energy! Those who are more privileged may be less burdened by calling in others who are similarly privileged. Calling out, on the other hand, refers to sharing how someone’s comments affected you (or others), it expects the other person to also be able to hold some of the pain by being able to hear the message even if as it conveys the damage or anger. Calling out from an oppressed status can be an act of trust or can be an emotional purging that puts less emphasis on starting a conversation or maintaining the relationship (and might take less emotional resources, as it is usually a shorter interaction). Calling out from a privileged status often creates a difficult dynamic that is less conducive to fostering others’ growth.

**6D. Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned about Difficult Dialogues**

Difficult dialogues are a part of our process-oriented goals and part of our mission as a committee to dig deeper than we are able to in other spaces. In this process, DC members use difficult dialogues across marginalized and privileged identities as a space for learning and personal growth. With this comes the inevitability of members making mistakes. These mistakes may be in how we speak about something, the implicit or explicit assumptions we make, and the biases we all hold. For example, individuals with marginalized identities can be left vulnerable to feeling unsafe, unheard, and further marginalized in conversations with those in privileged positions who are not actively conscious of the ways in which their actions and words are affecting those who experience oppression.

Individuals in a place of privilege can unintentionally cause pain to those with marginalized identities in several ways and this varies by person. For example, individuals with privilege may make comments or assumptions about marginalized folks that are harmful or inaccurate. After being called-in or called-out, those with privilege can feel shame, guilt, and pain about their role in perpetuating systems of power and oppression. These are normal emotions, but we shouldn’t expect those who experience oppression to have to take care of us when we are struggling with guilt about being privileged. At the same time, choosing to be part of a DC means choosing to struggle together, so people will less privilege also have relational obligations to others, to trust their good intentions and to recognize that we all have areas of growth, and very, very few people are wholly privileged or wholly oppressed, so these dynamics play out for all of us.

As a committee, we understand that mistakes are a part of the process of growth, understanding, learning, and development. We have found it useful to acknowledge these points explicitly at the beginning of every year, to foster a place of thoughtful expression. However, the recognition or understanding does not necessarily make it easier to experience the mistake, personally or relationally. Negotiating the fear of making mistakes, and the effects of having done so are part of the relational process. We encourage you to think about how you will negotiate or handle the
inevitability of making mistakes, repairing, and learning from the process. We also encourage you to provide your DC with resources about, and a space to practice, having calling-in and calling-out discussions. Further, we encourage you to make your DC increasingly safe for members to share process comments about how other members’ comments made them feel during the meeting (in our experience we have benefitted from faculty members and senior students modeling this, as it is a difficult and usually new type of interaction for people to have). Overall, we encourage you to sit with discomfort and pain when it comes up, not trying to distract or move away from it, as we see it as an important part of the learning process.

We have provided resources about difficult dialogues and struggling with engaging issues of power, privilege, racism, and other “–isms” in Appendix D.
SECTION 7

DC PROGRAM-WIDE EVENTS

This section presents an overview of the two major events our Diversity Committee (DC) sponsors each year, including a discussion of our specific goals, framing, and process.

7A. Potluck
- Things to consider when planning a Potluck
- Pearls and Perils: Lessons learned and changes over time about Potluck events

7B. Community Meeting
- Things to consider in planning a Community Meeting
- Pearls and Perils: Lessons learned and changes over time about Community Meeting

The Potluck and the Community Meeting are two main Diversity Committee (DC) events that occur each year. Potluck is typically held during the first semester and Community Meeting takes place during second semester. Potluck provides DC members with an opportunity to engage in self-reflection and learn from others’ experiences of joy, strength, and connectedness that are central to their cultural identities.

The Community Meeting allows DC members and the broader community (i.e., students/faculty within the Clinical Psychology Program) to engage in a process-oriented community activity and/or discussion that supports exploration of power and privilege in hopes of bringing the learning and expertise developed within DC discussions to the broader Clinical Program community, to further the Program’s social justice mission.

- “I like our balance of tackling hard/difficult topics with other ‘lighter’ ways of sharing positive aspects of our cultures…”

7A. Potluck

Each fall, DC hosts a Potluck for all students and faculty in the Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program. The purpose of the Potluck is to:
• Facilitate deeper interpersonal connections within DC and the broader Clinical Psychology Program through small group discussions and sharing that celebrates and embraces identity diversity.
• Bring positivity, joy, and interpersonal connectedness to the DC and clinical community. Engaging in self-discovery and social justice advocacy related to power and privilege can sometimes be very painful, heavy, and isolating, especially for those with marginalized identities. Potluck offers and opportunity for celebrating strength, resiliency, and the richness of our diverse cultural backgrounds.

Although it varies slightly each year, members of DC typically bring a dish to the Potluck that represents something meaningful about them, their family, or their culture. Non-DC members are invited, but not expected, to bring a dish if they choose. In addition to sharing food, the Potluck focuses on sharing our identities and cultural backgrounds. We envisioned this as a way to learn from and with each other about ethnocultural and other types of cultures with a lighter and more positive approach, given that we focus on privilege and oppression in other places.

The approach to our cultural sharing varies each year, and may include an activity (e.g., a collaborative drawing), sharing items or photos that attendees bring in response to particular prompt and invitation, or engaging in a discussion in relation to questions developed from the committee. Students and faculty may also be invited to share music, which is played in the background; or recipes, which may be compiled and distributed after the event.

During the Potluck, attendees are randomly assigned to a small table and provided discussion and/or creative project prompts that inspire dialogue about aspects of each person’s identity. Faculty are encouraged to distribute among the tables, with awareness of their relative power.

The Potluck is planned collaboratively by the DC, led by members of the Potluck Planning Subcommittee
- Subcommittee members are typically 2-3 students that volunteer at the beginning of the fall semester. Subcommittee members are responsible for organizing and facilitating the Potluck event. This includes:
  o Collaborating with DC members to determine a theme.
  o Developing an activity or discussion prompts to engage Potluck attendees in celebrating and sharing their cultural backgrounds, providing prompts or guidance for discussion in small or large groups.
  o Sharing this with DC for feedback and revising accordingly.
  o Logistics: reserving a space for the event, compiling music and materials needed for the activity, utilizing a system to keep track of food items members are planning to contribute.
  o Facilitating the actual event.

**Things to Consider When Planning a Potluck**
- The framing of this initiative is imperative in the success of its implementation, as any cultural sharing involves a degree of vulnerability, trust, openness, and courage. To this end, making active choices about how the Potluck is intended to connect rather than
divide and create a safe space for all to share is an essential component to the initiative. Lack of consideration around how the purpose of the Potluck is framed to DC members may be a potential barrier to members’ feelings of safety, and thus participation and experiences.

- To determine if a Potluck is appropriate at your institution, taking a “cultural temperature” is a necessary first step. Considerations of how DC can feel “safer” for some and not for others, how the activity is designed and received, and how invested attendees are in this work are particularly important.

- If a Potluck with an emphasis on cultural sharing is appropriate for your institution, be aware of the ways in which some individuals may feel alienated or uncomfortable. We have found it is helpful to clearly state the goals of the activity and Potluck overall, so that people do not make themselves vulnerable in a setting with others who do not share a common purpose and understanding.

- A Potluck is a relatively common activity used to promote diversity and inclusion. However, a Potluck does little to advance equity or social justice, within individuals or a community overall. How will you ensure that a Potluck isn’t just “diversity window dressing”—that is, something that folks can feel good about and point to say that they are valuing diversity, but continue to not engage more difficult issues? How do you see a Potluck fitting into your goals related to equity and social justice?

**PEARLS AND PERILS: LESSONS LEARNED AND CHANGES OVER TIME ABOUT POTLUCK EVENTS**

- The Potluck was one of the last initiatives we implemented (after Climate Assessment, Community Meeting, and Outreach). For us, waiting and not doing a Potluck was a deliberate choice, as we wanted to ensure that we were actually engaging in promoting equity, and developing as allies and advocates. Over time, we found that we were doing more of the hard stuff, and we wanted to be sure we kept in touch with the primary reasons for this work: developing authentic relationships where we could bring our whole selves to the relationship, context, and work.

- The emphasis on the positive aspects of diversity-related work emerged from students’ experiences and desires to explore and engage in more of a balanced process around issues of diversity and identity. Much of the mission of our DC relates to engaging in deep personal and collective emotional processing, which can often be very painful for all members but particularly for students and faculty within marginalized identities. This initiative to purposefully engage in cultural celebration emerged.

- DC noticed that the activity could unintentionally pressure students and/or faculty into feeling a need to represent their cultural background in alignment with stereotyped perceptions held by those within and outside of their cultures. To address this, DC embarked on a new approach to the Potluck, shifting the emphasis to include personally/familial significant food/objects/sharing in hopes of diminishing any pressure individuals felt to “represent” their cultures. Simultaneously, there is the risk of this event becoming just a social occasion, without connection to the specific goals and mission of DC. We are still considering how to negotiate this balance, and check in about it every year.
7B. Community Meeting

In the spring, DC hosts a Community Meeting, where students and faculty in the Clinical Psychology Program are invited to engage in education, experiential activity, and dialogue focused on a specific diversity topic, with a particular emphasis on engaging central issues of power and privilege. Initially, the Community Meeting was explicitly focused on building alliances, on considering the ways that people in privileged positions might take action to address oppression, simultaneously considering the agency and self-determination of those who experience oppression, and engage the complex intersectionality of multiple identities. Over time, we expanded this focus beyond specific alliances, while still maintaining those central goals.

The current purpose of the Community Meeting is to:

- Educate DC members and the broader Clinical Psychology Program Community on central issues related to power and privilege that we would like to further explore and process.
- Facilitate personal growth and exploration within DC and the Clinical Community.
- Improve our ability to understand differences in power, privilege, liberation and oppression so that we may be better allies and advocates for ourselves, each other, and in our professional roles. To do this, Community Meeting emphasizes including exploration of personal positionality and the development of relational empathy.

Our early Community Meetings were panel presentations, where panelists discussed experiences related to a specific area of privilege and oppression, and their development as advocates and allies. Each panel included people from both oppressed and privileged identities. The panel was followed by large and/or small group discussions. Over time, Community Meetings have varied in their level of didactic education versus discussions around individuals’ personal positionalities and experiences with Community Meeting topics. Currently, Community Meetings typically include a short educational presentation, an experiential exercise, small group discussions, and large group discussions. They emphasize and promote components of action taking, ally building, and learning within DC and the broader clinical community. Over time, we have become much more creative, experiential, and open to engaging emotions; this reflects our greater understanding and expertise, as well as a deeper trust in our mission and community.

The topic for the Community Meeting is voted on each year by DC members. Some examples from past years include: mental health stigma within our field, discussing racialized violence in light of increased media coverage, gender identity and transgender experience, nativity (U.S. born) privilege and historical and current oppression of immigrants and refugees.

Preparation and facilitation of the Community Meeting is led by the Community Meeting Subcommittee. However, the entire DC reviews the plan, participates in an initial “piloting” of the presentation/activity/discussion, and provides feedback. All members of DC are considered co-facilitators at the actual event, expected to be ready to provide thoughtful facilitation of smaller group discussions with our larger Program Community, and to support other members of the community in their exploration. Therefore, throughout the spring semester, DC meetings are
used to prepare for the Community Meeting, which includes selecting and processing a topic as a group, and developing a presentation that initiates learning and dialogue across the clinical psychology community.

Community Meeting Subcommittee:
- Volunteer members (typically 3-4 students with sometimes a faculty consultant) are responsible for the detailed planning, organization, and execution of the Community Meeting. This includes:
  o Researching the agreed-upon topic.
  o Designing an activity and/or presentation including:
    ▪ Creating specific learning objectives.
    ▪ Providing necessary background information to educate individuals from all spaces and positionalities, who may have different degrees of exposure to the given topic.
    ▪ Designing an activity or discussion approach including framing statements to convey the objectives and facilitate participation.
    ▪ Piloting the event or presenting the draft within DC, and working within DC to discuss and process anticipated potential reactions to the activity/presentation from marginalized and privileged spaces in order to prepare DC members for these reactions. Such reactions may occur before, during, or after the Community Meeting event and may take the form of providing educational or supportive resources to those who request them.
    ▪ Integrate DC feedback and revising the plan.
    ▪ Organizing/Presenting/Facilitating the Community Meeting.
    ▪ Facilitating post-meeting DC discussion of reactions and post-meeting action items/feedback to community if applicable.

Things to Consider in Planning a Community Meeting
Many of the considerations described above about difficult dialogues within DC apply to discussions in a Community Meeting. These issues can be even more intense in a larger community, where there is likely an expanded range of knowledge, awareness, and skills related to being racially and culturally responsive. At the risk of sounding repetitive, we again encourage others to consider their particular climate, and to make mindful decisions based on specific goals. A Community Meeting can take several forms, and different forms will have different levels of relational and emotional risk. A Community Meeting can be a panel discussion, a training, discussion of an article, and/or a watching a film (just to name a few). These formats can be especially helpful for when your DC is just getting started and needs a springboard from which to have discussions. The panel, video, film, or article can be the catalyst for further inquiry, personal exploration, and learning.

Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned And Changes Over Time About Community Meeting
- One reason we moved away from a panel with student and faculty speakers is the issue of uneven burden. While the small panel format afforded community and DC members an
opportunity to connect and share their experiences and learn about others’, the preparation for panelists was long, intensive, and emotionally taxing. Panelists were often people in marginalized spaces, therefore we questioned whether the onus of educating others of their experience was an aspect of inequity. Although this depth of personal sharing and recognition of both similarities and differences across and within marginalized and privileged identities was powerful, the panelists were tremendously vulnerable to the audience in this format. Experiential activities and small and large group discussions decrease risks of self-disclosure and facilitate sharing on a larger scale.

- **Power Differentials:** Any diversity-related event involving students and faculty together is vulnerable to the influence of power differentials (as described above in Section 6: DC Diversity Discussions), which can deter sharing and/or have negative consequences, depending on the environment. Ensuring that faculty are distributed amongst tables and that students can move amongst tables can be one strategy for enabling students to make active choices about risks and relationships.

- **Processing/Debriefing:** Preparing DC students and faculty for what might come up and how to deal with it before, during, and after the Community Meeting has been useful for our DC. DC members have the responsibility of ensuring a non-harmful experience for other members of the community. We suggest having a list of DC members that will debrief with attendees after the meeting, as well as providing resources and educational materials for continued learning and support.
SECTION 8

DC Program Recruitment Initiatives

This section describes Diversity Committee (DC’s) outreach efforts, to contribute to sharing our program and diversity mission and attracting students who share our particular focus on social justice. DC has committed to this initiative because we (DC) feels that we have a unique voice in outreach.

8. Outreach Letters

- Things to consider about outreach letters

As a program that has a central mission related to cultural diversity and social justice, we hope to increase representation in the field by training clinicians and scientists who hold marginalized identities, and to increase social justice and equity in the field by training psychologists who hold these primary values. One part of this is outreach to diverse students, and another is clearly communicating about our Diversity Committee (DC) and our Program mission.

8. Outreach Letters

Each spring, DC organizes an outreach campaign, sending letters from DC students, specifically, to colleges and universities that have historically diverse populations in terms of race and ethnicity, and to listservs for ethnic minority psychologists. We send these outreach letters to psychology department chairs and administrators of Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic Serving Institutions, McNair schools, and Tribal Colleges and Universities. The letter expresses the program’s commitment to training students who hold diverse identities to strive for cultural competence in research and clinical work. Over time, we initiated networking with the UMass Boston Office of Diversity and Inclusion for help obtaining lists of historically Black colleges, and other Minority Serving Institutions. Each year, before letters are sent, all student members of the DC are invited to sign the letter welcoming new potential applicants.

Our letter attempts to describe our climate in relation to diversity and our Program’s social justice mission. We highlight diversity awards the program has received, and awards that faculty and students have received because of their diversity and social justice related work. We describe our coursework and clinical training, and how it reflects our diversity and social justice emphasis. Finally, we offer contact information, so that prospective students might speak to other students, knowing that questions about the diversity climate would be welcome.
Things To Consider About Outreach Letters

Many programs seek to diversify their student body, but not all programs equally support diverse students. If you, as a DC, seek to diversify the student body, we encourage you to consider how diverse students with specific interests in issues of marginalization are supported in your program. If your central mission as a DC is supporting Students of Color and social justice generally, and if your program doesn’t do this as well as needed, consider whether you might want to wait on outreach efforts and first try to address some of the internal climate issues. In sum, we encourage you to carefully consider the goals and purpose of your outreach efforts, not only for your programs’ students but in relation to your larger goal of promoting social justice and wellbeing for marginalized students and communities.

This kind of letter can be a catalyst from a DC to a program to engage a discussion of diversity climate. For example, our letter includes links to our program website and mission, and to our DC. Many programs contain “diversity statements” on their websites, but if your program doesn’t, then this might become more evident if your DC is working on recruitment. Similarly, your program’s mission statement is highlighted in this kind of letter; the need to maintain a sense of honesty and transparency about this mission statement in such a letter may encourage a discussion of how the program wants to present itself and—thereby—how it actually wants to engage with issues about diversity. Discussions about this as a program might bring up new goals about increasing cultural competence.
SECTION 9

DC AS A LAUNCHING SITE: DEVELOPING NEW INITIATIVES

This section describes some of the initiatives that first came up in Diversity Committee (DC), fostered through discussion within DC, but were not DC initiatives, usually because they were by and for students exclusively.

9A. Admissions Day: Diversity Panel
   • Things to consider about Diversity Panels

9B. Affinity Group: Students of Color Group
   • Things to consider about Affinity groups for Students of Color
   • Pearls and Perils: Lessons learned and changes over time about Affinity groups for Students of Color

9C. Affinity Group: Processing Racism, Allyship, and White Privilege (PRAWP)
   • Things to consider about ally groups
   • Pearls and Perils: Lessons learned and changes over time about ally groups

9D. Dissemination of Resources, Events, and Advocacy Opportunities

The dialogues and yearly initiatives of our Diversity Committee (DC) helps us think deeply about the interaction between marginalized and privileged identities within our program, our own positionality, and how we might continue our individual and community growth in various ways inside and outside of DC. Thus, part of what makes it possible for DC to be a space for processing and learning is that DC is not the only diversity space in our program. There are many other programs and groups that have developed independently or from DC, and each of these meet different needs of the Clinical Psychology Program community. DC has been the birthplace for many of these initiatives, and—importantly—many of them have then been integrated into the program’s structure and mission and are maintained by the program. Many initiatives that involve both faculty and students are kept as subcommittees of DC. Student-run initiatives become program initiatives. This section will briefly describe some of these initiatives as examples.
9A. Admissions Day: Diversity Panel

The Diversity Panel was initially discussed and developed in DC, with the intent to communicate our commitment to training culturally responsive psychologists, and to describe our climate in relation to diversity. This is a student-run panel that offers a non-evaluative space for interviewees to hear more about the program’s commitment to cultural competency and diversity from its current students and to ask questions. DC engaged in the initial discussion about how to conduct the panel and considerations around its implementation, and then the panel moved out of DC and became the responsibility of the Clinical Graduate Students Association (CGSA), as it is a student-only event.

The panel is comprised of graduate students who represent a variety of marginalized and privileged identities. Panel members first share their thoughts and experiences regarding the program’s attention to diversity issues and training in cultural competency. Interviewees are then invited to ask questions about the climate of the program.

Things To Consider About Diversity Panels

- Student-led diversity panels require a level of knowledge, self-reflection, and respect for others. Without this training, students might say or do something harmful to other students who have put themselves in very vulnerable positions, which could be particularly painful in such a public space.
- We believe that the student-only, non-evaluative structure of the Diversity Panel is essential in allowing interviewees a space to gather important information about the program in a way that will not impact their admissions decision (that is, the questions and responses will not be communicated back to faculty). However, we recognize the degree of trust in students that this requires from the faculty, applicants, and Clinical Program as a whole.

9B. Affinity Group: Students of Color Group (SoC)

The Students of Color (SoC) group is an affinity space or support group for SOC in our program to support one another, and process any topics that arise, program-related or otherwise. This group and PRAWP (see below) are not DC initiatives, but complement our DC by offering student-only affinity spaces to share and process issues, and encourage and support each other as peers. We are incorporating descriptions of these groups as a way to provide more context of the culture of the Clinical Psychology Program at UMass Boston. These groups may or may not be necessary or needed in your programs.

This is a self-selected group of Students of Color who meet on an as-needed basis. This group is utilized as an affinity space where Students of Color can support one another around several aspects of their identities, and in particular around being a person of color in the program, the field of psychology, and today’s society. The meetings are always open to all Students of Color in the program, never mandatory, and held off campus. This is a student led, student run initiative. All incoming first years who self-identify as People of Color are emailed about this
affinity space, informed of its purpose, and invited to initiate a meeting whenever they are in need of support. SOC who attend these meetings are expected to maintain confidentiality about topics discussed, as we attempt to make this group as safe as possible for Students of Color who attend. Our group has made the decision to not have an assigned leader or point person, as we want this group to be a collective effort and meetings to be initiated by Students of Color who desire to have support and would like to meet. Attendance and number of meetings throughout the year vary depending on the students’ needs.

**THINGS TO CONSIDER ABOUT AFFINITY GROUPS FOR STUDENTS OF COLOR**

- Do the Students of Color in your program need and/or want an affinity space? This will need to be considered and decided upon the students and students only.
- How will the space and meeting time be used?
- Will your affinity space have a leader or organizer? Consider the pros and cons of this.
- Do you want your program and/or other students within the program to know you have this affinity space? If so, how will you talk about what the space is while maintaining confidentiality of the SoC who attend meetings?

**PEARLS AND PERILS: LESSONS LEARNED AND CHANGES OVER TIME ABOUT AFFINITY GROUPS FOR STUDENTS OF COLOR**

- Need for this support space has fluctuated over time. There have been semesters where Students of Color meet several times and others where they do not meet at all. This is ok as student needs change across time.
- The most recent iteration of the Student of Color group was initiated by a student who was experiencing microaggressions at their practicum site. Previously, SoC groups have met simply to share experiences, or to do things like screen and discuss movies and pertinent general issues, rather than to address specific problems or challenges. Your SoC group can get started for any reason; you do not have to wait for these circumstances to reach out to other Students of Color to get support.
- Having the group decentralized with no official leader or facilitator has its pros and cons. The pros are that it fosters an egalitarian environment and no Student of Color needs to take on more added responsibility of leading the group. Cons are that scheduling and hosting meetings can be challenging without someone taking charge of this task. Usually the student who calls the meeting steps up to organize and host off campus.
- At one point our Clinical Graduate Student Association (CGSA) was checking in with both SoC group and PRAWP to see if they wanted to make any announcements at their monthly meeting. Members of the Student of Color group asked that the group stay separate from any Clinical Program meetings because this group is not a program initiative and students wanted to retain that independent status.
9C. Affinity Group: Processing Racism, Allyship, and White Privilege (PRAWP)

Processing Racism, Allyship, and White Privilege (PRAWP) was initially discussed in DC, and then moved outside of DC as a student-led initiative. The mission of PRAWP is to provide an affinity space for White students to process and discuss issues around race, racism, and White privilege and to support one another in ongoing allyship development and action efforts. This is a self-selected group of White students who meet on an as-needed basis.

PRAWP meets once monthly during the school year and is led by a co-chair board of two White students, ideally one advanced student (3rd year and up) and one first- or second-year student. PRAWP meetings typically have a dual focus: 1) to increase members’ understanding of race, racism, and White privilege through discussions and processing of personal experiences, current events (e.g., the 2016 presidential election, racialized acts of violence), and other relevant topics; and 2) to think together about how best to be an ally to People of Color across contexts, particularly within the Clinical Program.

Things to Consider About Ally Groups

- **Before Initiating a PRAWP group**: Considerations around program climate and White student readiness to engage in discussions about race, racism, and White privilege are highly encouraged; the process of struggling with and holding the pain of one’s role in being complicit in a system of oppression is difficult and different for everyone, and the variation in where each member is in their racial identity process can make implementing this group challenging.

- **PRAWP Goals**: Careful framing of the goals and expectations of the group is crucial in helping members to know what to expect, and might be done by the group itself in the first few meetings. Our PRAWP goals may be different than another PRAWP group; for example, a group might choose to focus largely on allyship efforts, with less emphasis on personal processing, and another group might spend most of their meetings processing.

- **Membership**: Membership commitments have not been traditionally required in our program’s PRAWP. However, requiring a semester commitment for PRAWP members may be useful in fostering ongoing dialogues and more in-depth consideration of issues of privilege and oppression.

Pearls and Perils: Lessons Learned and Changes Over Time About Ally Groups

- In the process of understanding race, racism, and White privilege, there is ample opportunity for White students to make mistakes and to say or do something that would be hurtful or painful for Students of Color to hear or witness. One of the goals of PRAWP is to be a space for White students to make these mistakes, and then for other members to offer corrections and additional information or explanations about how the action is harmful and ways to avoid that harm in the future. Thus, it is important that meeting content and discussions are kept within the PRAWP group and are not communicated outside of PRAWP.
● We suggest that PRAWP email communications (including announcements for meeting dates) be sent on a listserv separate from the one including all students, to maintain confidentiality and to minimize the exposure of Students of Color to possibly painful or harmful communications.

● It is important to consider and acknowledge intersectionality and multiple oppressed statuses so that students are prepared to validate each other’s marginalized identities, while still focusing on the privilege associated with identifying as White. If there are major tensions about an emphasis on race versus on other oppressed statuses among students or in the program generally, then a group like PRAWP could be problematic as it may be experienced as invalidating intersecting oppressions, rather than a relative focus on race and privilege.

9D. Connections to Community and Campus Advocacy Initiatives

Another function of the DC community is to share information about resources, events, and advocacy opportunities related to systems of privilege and marginalization among its members. DC members are encouraged to email the DC community (via listserv) when these opportunities arise.

DC members are also active outside of DC engaging in education and advocacy around social justice. At times, DC members connect to participate in events, or plan involvement within DC to coordinate participation in advocacy. Below are a few examples:

Sharing information and enabling participation in ongoing campus and community actions:

● Using DC listserv to share advocacy and social justice events or connect for such events. For example, DC members participated in petitioning to become sanctuary campus, for the university to officially recognize Indigenous People’s day, and for advocating for gender neutral bathrooms.

● Announcing advocacy actions and events during DC, such as local plays focused on race, sexual minorities, social class, or other oppressions.

● Often, DC members coordinate to attend events and engage in advocacy together. For example, each year in Plymouth, MA in place of Thanksgiving, there is a Day of Mourning, where all individuals are welcome to come as allies or advocates support Indigenous peoples. Each year, our DC creates a carpool list so DC members with cars can provide access to the event.

Taking collective action:

● DC members disseminated information about a university wide Teach In called "Not My Normal: Resisting Systemic Oppression", which was a week long event that offered talks, workshops, movies, and other pertinent information and analysis to understand the rise of White supremacy and other systemic oppressions in the current time and climate. And offered strategies, skills, and models of advocacy to resist oppression and its
normalization. DC was invited to present, and a subset of DC members organized and presented a session on maintaining activism and avoiding burnout.

- DC members organized with The Stand Against Racism Campaign to promote awareness of racism and ways to resist racism for the UMass student body through tabling and conversations in the Campus Center.
- The Stand Against Racism Campaign is where DC members engage undergraduate students and other community members in conversations about how they stand against and resist racism.
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Appendix A: OVERVIEW OF A DC YEAR

FALL SEMESTER OVERVIEW

- **First meeting**: Full committee brainstorms a list of topics to explore and process more deeply over the semester
- Final meeting topics are decided via an online anonymous vote by members of the committee; the three most voted-for are the semester’s meeting topics
- Each topic is introduced and framed by the co-chair board, often with some kind of experiential exposure, such as brief videos, and then the committee is invited to process and discuss the topic through individual reflection and small- and large-group formats
- Members are encouraged to continue these discussions outside of the meeting context with committee members who self-identify as being willing and open to having additional or more in-depth conversations
- **Final meeting**: Potluck with broader program community

SPRING SEMESTER OVERVIEW

- **First meeting**: Debriefing and comments about the Potluck; brainstorming list of potential topics for the Community Meeting (see the point on Community Meeting below); condensing full list of brainstormed topics into the 10 or so that the committee is most interested in pursuing
  - While discussing potential topics, we aim to continue to build our skills in having cultural/diversity-based discussions within and across marginalized and privileged identities
- **Community Meeting topic decision process**: full committee vote AND consideration of which topics have members willing to plan the meeting
  - Members vote for their top three choices amongst the condensed list topics via an online poll
  - Members willing to serve on the Community Meeting Planning Committee indicate this at the time of voting
  - Co-chair board reviews the topics voted for most often and whether the most voted-for topics have 2-3 members willing to be on the Planning Committee
  - Community Meeting topic and the Community Meeting Planning Committee members are announced at the second meeting
- **Second and third meeting**: Focused on processing the Community Meeting topic, giving ideas and input on the types of discussions and activities the committee would like to be included or represented in the Community Meeting, and giving feedback on the planning committee’s ideas, activities, and plans
- **Fourth meeting**: A trial run of the full Community Meeting agenda; gives opportunity to identify areas of the meeting that might be difficult, painful, or challenging for others, to problem-solve and adjust logistics like the amount of time allotted for each part of the meeting
- **Community Meeting**: This event does not replace one of the DC monthly meetings; it is scheduled outside of the monthly meeting times
- **Final meeting**: Processing, debriefing, and comments about the Community Meeting, including action items when appropriate; discussion of the year in DC as a whole; saying goodbye to exiting students; potential plans, thoughts, and additions for the following year’s DC

**Challenges and Considerations of Current Structure:**
- Having an already-established structure invites less opportunity for change, both within a particular year and between years (as new students enter or exit DC and/or the program). Prior to the development of the current structure, reinventing the meeting process was much more common, but also came with downsides
- The core structure should be flexible and amenable to change according to what works for the current DC community
- There will likely always be a tension between the amount of emphasis placed on processing vs. planning/outreach in DC meetings
- The ratio of faculty to students in the DC warrants consideration in terms of how it affects feelings of safety, the risks of being vulnerable in this type of context, etc.
Appendix B. Sample Initial Climate Survey

NOTE: For any question where a specific scale and anchors is not included, the following standard scale and anchor was used:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Massachusetts Boston
Clinical Psychology Doctoral Program
Diversity Committee Survey
Part I: Race and Ethnic Culture

The UMass Boston Clinical Psychology Diversity Committee was formed to explore and address issues of culture and diversity that we all encounter in our academic and clinical environments. The purpose of this survey is to inform us about the current state of students’ thoughts and feelings about their experiences with cultural competence and sensitivity, as well as how race, ethnicity and/or culture impact student, faculty, and staff relationships.

The survey was designed to protect student confidentiality. For this reason, we do not ask about potentially identifying information (e.g., year in the program). However, we do include a space for comments at the end of each section of the survey. We will ask you whether you are comfortable with the details of your experience being shared verbatim. If you are not, these details will be masked to protect your confidentiality. Only a subgroup of students from the DC will have access to the individual open-ended responses. These students will be responsible for aggregating this information and creating a report for faculty.

We are seeking information from students to improve the program. The surveys will be reviewed after student evaluations have been completed. The following definitions are offered so that students will have some uniformity in how they approach the survey questions.

DEFINITIONS:

Race: Race is a social construction functioning to group people based on physical characteristics such as skin color, eye shape, hair type, etc. (e.g., Black, Asian, Native American, and Latino, and White). Its socio-historical roots are as a categorizing schema that can be used to justify oppression and the creation of differences in privilege and access to resources. Race is not the same as ethnicity or culture.

Ethnicity: Ethnicity is identification with a cultural background related to a common national or geographic origin. It is commonly confounded with race. However, ethnicity is actually a type of culture.

Culture: Culture is “learned and variable systems of meanings (values, beliefs, behaviors) shared and transmitted by an identifiable group of people representing ways of living.” There are many types of culture, such as gay culture, lesbian culture, a culture of disability, etc. as well as various ethnic and religious cultures (e.g., Haitian culture or Lakota culture).
Sensitivity (e.g., racial sensitivity, cultural sensitivity): Sensitivity involves awareness, knowledge, and skills. Awareness includes that of self and others. For example, it includes basic awareness of the range and importance of individual differences and also implies placing one’s own experiences, values, and behaviors within a social and socio-historical context that acknowledges that one’s intentions and desires are not the only influences on meanings and experiences. Sensitivity also includes knowledge and skills in the following areas:

- Current and historical social meanings and experiences of one’s own group(s) and those of others
- The heterogeneity of one’s own group(s) and those of others
- The role and place of psychology
- Using the awareness and knowledge of individual differences to affect one’s behaviors in ways that enable people from diverse backgrounds and experiences to feel connected across contexts (e.g., therapy, research, teaching, etc.)

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO RACE AND ETHNIC CULTURE.

GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

1. How much exposure to issues related to race and ethnicity in psychology did you have before you became a student at UMass Boston?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>A Great Deal</td>
<td>An Extensive Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How satisfied are you with the program in terms of providing a racially and ethnically sensitive environment?

3. What proportion of your courses do you feel have been racially and ethnically sensitive?

| ____ 0-10% |
| ____ 10-24% |
| ____ 25-49% |
| ____ 50-74% |
| ____ 75-89% |
| ____ 90-100% |

4. To what degree do you feel that other students in the program could be described as racially and ethnically sensitive? (standard likert scale described at beginning of appendix)

5. To what degree do you feel that the faculty in the program could be described as racially and ethnically sensitive? (standard likert scale)

6. How responsive do you think the program is to issues of racial and ethnic diversity? (standard likert scale)
7(a). How much influence has the program had on your level of racial and ethnic self-awareness? 
(standard likert scale)

7(b). What has been most influential? (open ended)

______________________________________________________________________________

8. What is the most positive aspect about the general environment in relation to racial and ethnic 
sensitivity?

______________________________________________________________________________

9. What is the most negative aspect about the general environment in relation to racial and ethnic 
sensitivity?

______________________________________________________________________________

CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE

1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the instructors’ level of knowledge of racial and ethnic 
issues in relation to the topic of the courses? (standard likert scale)

2. To what extent do you feel that the readings offered in courses are sufficient in addressing 
issues related to racial and ethnic diversity? (standard likert scale)

3. How satisfied are you with the quality and quantity of racially and ethnically sensitive 
examples that are used in classes (e.g., case studies, teaching examples, etc.)? (standard likert 
scale)

4. How comfortable do you feel sharing and addressing racial and ethnic issues in the classroom? 
(standard likert scale)

5. To what degree do you feel encouraged to explore and discuss your understanding of race and 
ethnicity (e.g., your own or others’ values, experiences, biases, privileges, statuses, etc.)? 
(standard likert scale)

6. To what degree do you feel encouraged to explore and discuss your understanding of the way 
you identify in relation to race, ethnicity, and culture? (standard likert scale)

7. How comfortable do you feel revealing and thinking about your personal racial and ethnic 
experience/background in the classroom? (standard likert scale)
8. To what extent do you feel that instructors are open to the discussion of racial and ethnic issues in the classroom? (standard likert scale)

9. To what extent do you feel that the faculty is open to hearing feedback about the need to be more inclusive or sensitive to issues related to racial and ethnic diversity? (standard likert scale)

10. To what extent do you feel like the feedback or evaluations that you receive on assignments is delivered in a racially and ethnically sensitive way in which you feel comfortable? (standard likert scale)

11. What is the most positive experience you have had in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity in your courses?

______________________________________________________________________________

12. What is the most negative experience you have had in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity in your courses?

______________________________________________________________________________

RELATIONSHIPS WITH FACULTY

1. To what extent do you feel comfortable pursuing issues related to racial and ethnic diversity in your research? (standard likert scale)

2. How frequently have you felt that faculty expected you to speak for or represent your racial or ethnic group in a manner that was not comfortable for you (i.e. put on the spot by faculty)? (standard likert scale)

3. If an event occurs related to race or ethnic culture that makes you feel uncomfortable, to what extent do you feel comfortable addressing the issue with faculty members? (standard likert scale)

4. To what extent do you think faculty members are sensitive when approached about potential conflicts related to race or ethnic culture? (standard likert scale)

5. Do you feel like faculty members recognize any potential personal biases and/or limitations of their perspectives in relation to race or ethnicity? (standard likert scale)

6. How frequently have you felt that there was any differential treatment in relation to evaluation (e.g., feedback on your writing, verbal comments, grading, etc.) in any academic setting by faculty members based on your race or ethnicity and/or that of the faculty member?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>All the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. To what extent do you feel that your race and/or ethnic background and that of your advisor has affected your mentor/mentee relationship? *(standard likert scale)*

8. If you feel that your or your advisor’s race and/or ethnic background has affected your mentor/mentee relationship, has it affected the relationship in a positive or negative way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completely negative</td>
<td>Somewhat negative</td>
<td>Somewhat positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Completely positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. To what extent do you feel that effects from any difference or similarity in race and/or ethnic background between yourself and your advisor have been well addressed in your advising relationship? *(standard likert scale)*

10. To what extent do you feel that your advisor has played a role in fostering your racial and/or ethnic identity? *(standard likert scale)*

11. What is the most positive aspect about the faculty at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

12. What is the most negative aspect about the faculty at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

**RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEERS IN PROGRAM**

1. To what extent are you comfortable meeting exclusively with other students in the program who share a racial or ethnic background that is similar to your own (e.g., meeting in an affinity group of People of Color)? *(standard likert scale)*

2. How comfortable are you when people of other ethnicities meet as affinity groups without you present? *(standard likert scale)*

3. How comfortable do you feel exchanging perspectives about race, ethnicity, and culture with others in class? *(standard likert scale)*

4. How comfortable do you feel exchanging perspectives about race, ethnicity, and culture as they relate to your experience with other students outside of class? *(standard likert scale)*
5. To what extent do you feel that other students have the ability to respect different perspectives and opinions about race, ethnicity, and culture? (standard likert scale)

6. How comfortable do you feel challenging other students’ perspectives and opinions about race, ethnicity, and culture? (standard likert scale)

7. How often do you feel that other students assume they know your perspective based on your culture, race, or ethnicity? (standard likert scale)

8. To what extent do you feel that other students support and foster your own racial and/or ethnic identity growth? (standard likert scale)

9. What is the most positive aspect about other students at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

10. What is the most negative aspect about other students at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?
______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________
_______________________________________

EXPERIENCES IN PRACTICUM

1. Did you do the practicum at the counseling center? ____YES  ____NO

If YES, please answer the following question(s) in SECTION A: If no, skip to SECTION B.

SECTION A

2. To what extent do you feel that the counseling center environment is sensitive to issues of race and ethnic culture? (standard likert scale)

3. How satisfied are you with the level of racial and ethnic cultural sensitivity/awareness in your training at the counseling center? (standard likert scale)

4. To what extent did you feel that you were able to see a racially and ethnically diverse clientele at the counseling center? (standard likert scale)

5. To what extent do you feel that supervisors are open to discussing personal issues of race, ethnicity, and culture as they relate to clinical work? (standard likert scale)

6. To what extent do you feel comfortable bringing up personal issues of race, ethnicity, and culture as they relate to your clinical work with supervisors? (standard likert scale)
7. To what extent do you feel that there are enough resources (both within and outside of the university) at the counseling center to do clinical work that is related to race, ethnicity, and culture? *(standard likert scale)*

8. To what extent do you feel that supervisors are knowledgeable and aware of the important role race and ethnicity plays in clinical work? *(standard likert scale)*

9. To what extent do you feel that clinical coursework prepared you to work with racially and ethnically diverse populations at the Counseling Center? *(standard likert scale)*

**SECTION B**
Please answer only if you have begun or completed external practica.

1. To what extent do you feel that your external practica are sensitive to issues of race and ethnic culture? *(standard likert scale)*

2. How satisfied are you with the level of racial and ethnic cultural sensitivity/awareness in your training in external practica? *(standard likert scale)*

3. To what extent do you feel that you were able to see a racially and ethnically diverse clientele at your external practica? *(standard likert scale)*

4. To what extent do you feel that supervisors are open to discussing personal issues of race, ethnicity, and culture as they relate to clinical work? *(standard likert scale)*

5. To what extent do you feel comfortable bringing up personal issues of race, ethnicity, and culture as they relate to your clinical work with supervisors? *(standard likert scale)*

6. To what extent do you feel comfortable informing supervisors and fellow trainees in your external practica about issues of race, ethnicity and culture as they are relevant to clinical work? *(standard likert scale)*

7. To what extent do you feel that clinical coursework prepared you to work with racially and ethnically diverse populations at your practicum site? *(standard likert scale)*

8. What has been the most positive aspect about your practicum experiences in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

9. What has been the most negative aspect about your practicum experiences in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF IN AND OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT

1(a). How frequently have you felt any sort of discomfort related to your race or ethnicity when interacting with the staff members in the psychology department (e.g., technology support, administrative assistants)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>All the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1(b). If so, please describe.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2(a). How frequently you felt any sort of discomfort related to your race or ethnicity interacting with the staff members in the larger university community (e.g., financial aid, health services, library)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>All the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2(b). If so, please describe.

______________________________________________________________________________

3. What is the most positive aspect about your interactions with staff at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4. What is the most negative aspect about your interactions with staff at UMass Boston in relation to racial and ethnic sensitivity?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. What suggestions do you have for the program that would help us improve our sensitivity to issues related to race and culture (suggestions for faculty, peers, classes, practicum, staff, or any other area)? Please be as specific as possible:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO IMPROVE OUR PROGRAM!!!

YOU ARE NOW DONE WITH THE OFFICIAL SURVEY. If you have any suggestions for improving the survey (e.g., changing wording, adding additional questions, dropping specific questions), please write them here

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
The UMass Boston Clinical Psychology Diversity Committee was formed to explore and address issues of culture and diversity that we all encounter in our academic and clinical environments. As you know, psychology as a field has been emphasizing its development and awareness of ethnic culture and race, which was addressed in part one of the survey. However, we feel that this emphasis should not be to the exclusion of other important cultural issues and diverse experiences. Therefore, we would like to give students the opportunity to share their experience in the program in relation to additional issues of diversity. The purpose of this survey is to inform us about the current state of students’ thoughts and feelings about their experiences with cultural competence and sensitivity, as well as how various issues of diversity influence student, faculty, and staff relationships.

The survey was designed to protect student confidentiality. For this reason, we do not ask about potentially identifying information (e.g., year in the program). However, we do include a space for comments at the end of each section of the survey. We will ask you whether you are comfortable with the details of your experience being shared verbatim. If you are not, these details will be masked to protect your confidentiality. Only a subgroup of students from the DC will have access to the individual open-ended responses. These students will be responsible for aggregating this information and creating a report for faculty.

We are seeking information from students to improve the program. The surveys will only be reviewed after spring student evaluations have been completed.

The following definitions are offered so that students will have some uniformity in how they approach the survey questions.

**DEFINITIONS:**

**Race:** Race is a social construction functioning to group people based on physical characteristics such as skin color, eye shape, hair type, etc. (e.g., Black, Asian, Native American, and Latino, White). Its socio-historical roots are as a categorizing schema that can be used to justify oppression and the creation of differences in privilege and access to resources. Race is not the same as ethnicity or culture.

**Ethnicity:** Ethnicity is identification with a cultural background and it is commonly confounded with race. However, ethnicity is related to a common national or geographic origin. Ethnicity is a type of culture.

**Culture:** Culture is “learned and variable systems of meanings (values, beliefs, behaviors) shared and transmitted by an identifiable group of people representing ways of living.” There are many
types of culture, such as gay culture, lesbian culture, a culture of disability, etc. as well as various ethnic and religious cultures (e.g., Haitian culture or Lakota culture).

**Sensitivity** (e.g., racial sensitivity, cultural sensitivity): Sensitivity involves awareness, knowledge, and skills. Awareness includes that of self and others. For example, it includes basic awareness of the range and importance of differences and also implies placing one’s own experiences, values, and behaviors within a social and socio-historical context that acknowledges that one’s intentions and desires are not the only influences on meanings and experiences. Sensitivity also includes knowledge and skills in the following areas:

- Current and historical social meanings and experiences of one’s own group(s) and those of others
- The heterogeneity of one’s own group(s) and those of others
- The role and place of psychology
- Using the awareness and knowledge to affect one’s behaviors in ways that enable people from diverse backgrounds and experiences to feel connected across contexts (e.g., therapy, research, teaching, etc.)

**Area of diversity**: In the second part of this survey, we invite you to consider the survey questions in relation to an area of diversity that is important to you. By “area of diversity” we mean a social category that you identify as having both individual and social significance. Although every person is unique and there are infinite important differences amongst us all, we distinguish these individual differences from an “area of diversity” in that the latter has current and historical social significance as a category used to distinguish people in creating hierarchies that maintain differential privileges in society.

**PLEASE CHOOSE AN AREA OF DIVERSITY ABOUT WHICH YOU WOULD LIKE TO SHARE YOUR EXPERIENCES. PLEASE DESCRIBE THAT AREA AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW IN RELATION TO THAT AREA**

Sexual Orientation

Gender

Social class

Ability/disability

Other (please describe):

Please note that the list above is not meant to be exclusive in any way, and we fully expect it will expand as we increase our awareness and sensitivity through this survey.
GENERAL ENVIRONMENT

1. How much exposure to issues related to this area of diversity in psychology did you have before you became a student at UMass Boston?

   1  2  3  4  5  6
   None  Some  A Great Deal  An Extensive Amount

2. How satisfied are you with the program in terms of providing a sensitive environment in relation to area of diversity? (*standard likert scale*)

3. What proportion of your courses do you feel have been sensitive in relation to this area of diversity? (*standard likert scale*)

4. Do what degree do you feel that your peers in the program could be described as sensitive in relation to this area of diversity? (*standard likert scale*)

5. To what degree do you feel that the faculty in the program could be described as sensitive in relation to this area of diversity? (*standard likert scale*)

6. How responsive do you think the program is to issues in relation to this area of diversity?

7(a). How much influence has the program had on your level of self-awareness in relation to this area of diversity? (*standard likert scale*)

7(b). What has been most influential?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

8. In your experience, what is the most positive aspect about the general environment in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

9. In your experience, what is the most negative aspect about the general environment in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE

1. Overall, how satisfied are you with the instructors’ level of knowledge of in relation to this area of diversity as related to the topic of the courses? (*standard likert scale*)
2. To what extent do you feel that the faculty is open to feedback about need to be more inclusive or sensitive to issues in relation to this area of diversity? *(standard likert scale)*

3. To what extent do you feel that the readings offered in courses are sufficient in addressing issues in relation to this area of diversity? *(standard likert scale)*

4. To what extent do you feel that instructors are open to the discussion of issues in relation to this area of diversity in the classroom? *(standard likert scale)*

5. How satisfied are you with the quality and quantity of examples sensitive in relation to this area of diversity that are used in classes (e.g., case studies, teaching examples, etc.)? *(standard likert scale)*

6. To what extent do you feel like the feedback or evaluations that you receive on assignments is delivered in a way that is sensitive in relation to this area of diversity and in which you feel comfortable? *(standard likert scale)*

7. How comfortable do you feel sharing and addressing issues in the classroom in relation to this area of diversity? *(standard likert scale)*

8. How comfortable do you feel revealing and thinking about your personal experience/background in the classroom in relation to this area of diversity? *(standard likert scale)*

9. To what degree do you feel encouraged to explore and discuss your understanding in relation to this area of diversity (e.g., your own or others’ values, experiences, biases, privileges, statuses, etc.)? *(standard likert scale)*

10. To what degree do you feel encouraged to explore and discuss your understanding of the way you identify in relation to this area of diversity?

11. In your experience, what is the most positive aspect about the courses offered in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

12. In your experience, what is the most negative aspect about the courses offered in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?
RELATIONSHIPS WITH FACULTY

1. To what extent do you feel comfortable pursuing issues related to this area of diversity in your research? (standard likert scale)

2. Have you ever felt that you were asked to speak for or represent your group in relation to this area of diversity in a manner that was not comfortable for you (i.e. put on the spot by faculty)?

___ Yes ___ No

3. If an event occurs related to this area of diversity that makes you feel uncomfortable, to what extent do you feel comfortable addressing the issue with faculty members? (standard likert scale)

4. To what extent do you think faculty members are sensitive when approached about potential conflicts related to this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)

5. Do you feel like faculty members recognize any potential personal biases and/or limitations of their perspectives in relation to this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)

6. Have you ever felt that there was any differential treatment in relation to evaluation (in any academic setting) by a faculty member based on your status in relation to this area of diversity and/or that of the faculty member?

___ Yes ___ No

7. To what extent do you feel that difference in background in relation to this area of diversity between yourself and your advisor has affected your mentor/mentee relationship? (standard likert scale)

8. To what extent do you feel that effects from any difference in background in relation to this area of diversity between yourself and your advisor have been well addressed in your advising relationship? (standard likert scale)

9. In your experience, what is the most positive aspect about the faculty at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________

10. In your experience, what is the most negative aspect about the faculty at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________
RELATIONSHIPS WITH PEERS IN PROGRAM

1. To what extent are you comfortable meeting with other students in the program who a background in relation to this area of diversity that is similar to your own (e.g., meeting in an affinity group of GLB students)? (standard likert scale)

2. How comfortable are you when people of other status in relation to this area of diversity meet without you present (i.e., affinity groups that you are excluded from)? (standard likert scale)

3. How comfortable do you feel exchanging perspectives about this area of diversity with others in class? (standard likert scale)

4. How comfortable do you feel exchanging perspectives about this area of diversity related to your experience with peers outside of class? (standard likert scale)

5. To what extent do you feel that your peers have the ability to respect different perspectives and opinions about this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)

6. How comfortable are you challenging your peers’ perspectives and opinions about this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)

7. How often do you feel that your peers assume they know your perspective based on your background/status in relation to this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)

8. In your experience, what is the most positive aspect your peers at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

_______________________________________________________

9. In your experience, what is the most negative aspect about your peers at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________

EXPERIENCES IN PRACTICUM

1. Did you do the practicum at the counseling center? ____YES   ____NO

If YES, please answer the following question(s) in SECTION A: If no, skip to SECTION B.

SECTION A

2. To what extent do you feel that the counseling center environment is sensitive to issues related to this area of diversity? (standard likert scale)
3. How satisfied are you with the level of sensitivity/awareness related to this area of diversity in your training at the counseling center? *(standard likert scale)*

4. To what extent did you feel that you were able to see a clientele that was diverse in relation to this area at the counseling center? *(standard likert scale)*

5. To what extent do you feel that supervisors are open to discussing personal issues related to this area of diversity as they relate to your clinical work? *(standard likert scale)*

6. To what extent do you feel that clinical coursework prepared you to work with racially and ethnically diverse populations at the Counseling Center? *(standard likert scale)*

7. To what extent do you feel comfortable bringing up personal issues related to this area of diversity as they relate to your clinical work with supervisors? *(standard likert scale)*

**SECTION B**

Please answer only if you have begun or completed external practica.

1. To what extent do you feel that your external practica are sensitive to issues related to this area of diversity? *(standard likert scale)*

2. How satisfied are you with the level of sensitivity/awareness in relation to this area of diversity in your training in external practica? *(standard likert scale)*

3. To what extent did you feel that you were able to see a clientele that was diverse in relation to this area at your external practica? *(standard likert scale)*

4. To what extent do you feel that supervisors are open to discussing personal issues related to this area of diversity as they relate to your clinical work? *(standard likert scale)*

5. To what extent do you feel comfortable bringing up personal issues related to this area of diversity as they relate to your clinical work with supervisors? *(standard likert scale)*

6. What has been the most positive aspect about your practicum experiences in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity? 

______________________________________________________________________________

7. What has been the most negative aspect about your practicum experiences in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity? 

______________________________________________________________________________
RELATIONSHIPS WITH STAFF IN AND OUTSIDE THE DEPARTMENT

1(a). Have you ever felt any sort of discomfort related to your background/status in relation to this area of diversity when interacting with the staff members in the psychology department (e.g., technology support, administrative assistants)?

_____YES     _____NO

1(b). If so, please describe.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

2(a). Have you ever felt any sort of discomfort related to your background/status in relation to this area of diversity when interacting with the staff members in the larger university community (e.g., financial aid, health services, library)?

_____YES     _____NO

2(b). If so, please describe.

______________________________________________________________________________

3. In your experience, what is the most positive aspect about your interactions with staff at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4. In your experience, what is the most negative aspect about your interactions with staff at UMass Boston in relation to sensitivity to this area of diversity?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. What suggestions do you have for the program that would help us improve our sensitivity to issues related this area of diversity (suggestions for faculty, peers, classes, practicum, staff, or any other area)? Please be as specific as possible:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO IMPROVE OUR PROGRAM!!!
Appendix C: Continuing Climate Survey

1. Please indicate your year in the program:
   - □ 1st or 2nd
   - □ 3rd or 4th
   - □ 5th and beyond

   For the following questions, please rate your degree of satisfaction on a 5-point scale:
   1 = Very Dissatisfied
   2 = Somewhat Dissatisfied
   3 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
   4 = Somewhat Satisfied
   5 = Very Satisfied
   N/A

2. How satisfied have you been in the last two academic years with the way that racial and ethnic diversity issues were included or addressed in…
   a. Classes
   b. Meetings (e.g., CGSA, CEC, CPC, Community Meetings)
   c. The Counseling Center
   d. Your research team
   e. Your mentor-mentee relationships
   f. Practicum experiences outside the university community

3. How satisfied have you in the last two academic years with the way that racial and ethnic diversity issues were included or addressed in your day-to-day interactions with:
   a. Clinical program faculty
   b. Clinical program students
   c. Your mentor(s)
   d. Program and department staff
   e. Counseling Center supervisors
   f. Community practicum supervisors
   g. University staff outside the department
   h. Undergraduate students

4. Overall, how satisfied are you with the way that each of the following areas of diversity were included or addressed in the program over the course of the last two academic years?
   a. Race and ethnicity
   b. Sexual orientation
   c. Gender
   d. Disability
e. Religion
f. Social class
g. National origin (including immigration status or citizenship)

Open-ended Responses

Our program sets a very high standard for ourselves. You can be very satisfied and still tell us ways to improve. Responses from students have resulted in tangible department-wide changes, such as the creation of Diversity Committee (DC), creation of Bridging Perspectives, faculty teaching retreats, and religious policy changes. Further, all responses are anonymous and cohorts are combined to encourage open feedback without fear of individual retaliation.

1. Describe up to three areas/experiences that contribute most strongly to the program's provision of a sensitive environment with regard to race and ethnicity or other diversity issues.
2. Describe up to three areas for improvement.
3. Please describe a problem or issue you have encountered that leads you to identify this as an area for improvement.
4. Do you have specific suggestions of ways the climate could be improved?
5. Please elaborate on anything that is particularly important to you and has not been addressed above. This may include issues that came up in the quantitative questions or issues that were not asked about at all.
RECOMMENDED READINGS AND RESOURCES

1. Multicultural, Social Justice and Anti-Oppressive Education & Teaching
2. General Readings on Discrimination, Inequality, and Difficult Dialogues (with a relative emphasis on race)
3. Readings on Developing as Allies
4. Compilations of Exercises:
5. Some Examples of Sources for Personal Narratives and Reflections or short essays:
6. Sample and Example Videos and Movies
7. Websites

See also: https://membic.com/RaceJustice: A curated list of websites, videos, and other resources

Readings on Multicultural, Social Justice and Anti-Oppressive Education & Teaching


Case, K. Deconstructing Privilege: Teaching and learning as allies in the classroom


Note: ¹ are resources from “White People Challenging Racism” workshop compiled by Barbara Beckwith, 2007.


**General Readings on Discrimination, Inequality, and Difficult Dialogues (with a relative emphasis on race)**


**Readings on Developing as Allies**


**Compilations of Exercises:**


**Some Examples of Sources for Personal Narratives and Reflections or short essays:**


Priester, P. E. Dirty secrets and unholy unions: Disability-based oppression and privilege.


Majaj, L. S. Boundaries, borders, horizons.

Kinsley, C. H. Questions people have asked me. Questions I have asked myself.


King, Y. The other body: Reflections on difference, disability, and identity politics.

Neuborne, E. Imagine my surprise.

Bornstein, K. The hard part and Which Outlaws.


Sample and Example Videos

- Brave New Voices: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tv00xjClbx0
- Crystal Valentine “Black Privilege”: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7rYL83kHQ8Y
- Suheir Hammad: “First Writing Since…” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3LxKI1HJ06E
- Ken Tanaka: What kind of Asian are you? https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWynJkN5HbQ
- Alex Dang: “What kind of Asian are you?”: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VoP0ox_Jw_w
- I am not Latina: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qa1R7_DSQRA
- Yesika Salgado "Brown Girl": https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jC7flQUggS8&list=PLjbF5xud0N2l0K00VVMlgyxu2J442GZa
- Chescaleigh: “5 tips to being an ally”: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dg86g-QlM0
- “Born Rich”: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4tmpuyiJYB4
- People Like Us" http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nU5MtVM_zFs
- Toni Morrison: Classism in the Community: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K0Q1iW_Hhfc
- Breaking the Gender Binary: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jg6pyBNh8Fs&feature=related
- trans* enough project: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gukzQ5eLrVc&list=UURj7HXvKV3AXGTbGeOX5Wzw&index=21
- Searching for Sexism: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YX4KYXOb1tQ
- It Gets Better - Story of a Muslim American: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fSGDN3u2_5E
- “It Gets Better”:

• “Preacher Phil Snider gives interesting gay rights speech”
  http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=A8JsRx2lois

• black.womyn: www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z-nEMrl5ZMg

Websites

Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) website lists many good resources that we have not reproduced here:

Teaching Tolerance (www.tolerance.org/teach/) - about teaching tolerance to children and adolescents (ages 2-17). Includes activities, reading lists, and project ideas for teachers and parents.

Media That Matters Film Festival (http://www.mediathatmattersfest.org/) - Do it Yourself Film Festival ideas and media resources on social justice, environment, family & society, human rights, immigration, politics/government.

Understanding Race by American Anthropological Association. (http://understandingrace.org/) - provides useful multi-media presentations on various topics related to race.