Joint MPH-BSPH Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity Committee

November 7, 2019

Agenda

Present: Jae Kim, Susan Eagle, Marina Rust, Amit Patel, Colin Farrell

1. Introductions
2. Review of [Policies and Procedures](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1xLnuffC_wkiIQ-h5l6F2C3lqBiFuG0Ar)
	1. Approve edits to P&P Document
		1. Edits made purely to make P&P consistent with other documents across the program regarding change in committee name – Diversity, Inclusion, and Equity, no longer just Diversity.
			1. Motion: Marina Rust; Second: Susan Eagle
				1. Motion passed unanimously
3. [Proposed Policy](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1NzbpinMoRqmGPhN4n_xG9VlorY-VVbjI) regarding expectations for diversity, inclusivity, and equity practices among MPH/BSPH Internship and Graduate Applied Practice Experience (GrAPEs) organizations
	* 1. Policy was created to formalize the expectations regarding diversity, inclusivity, and equity among organizations that our students work with for Internships and/or Graduate Applied Practice Experiences (GrAPEs), as well as formalize the consequences of organizations not adhering to said expectations.
			1. Practices of the organization should reflect the expectations of the Programs (MPH and BSPH) and University.
		2. Jae Kim proposed that the final statement, “The policy is not expressly prohibiting a student from engaging with said organization. Rather, the program (MPH or BSPH) will merely not actively promote the organization’s opportunities.” should be included as part of the official policy. After having no opposition to the suggestion, the revision was made and the policy was voted on.
			1. Motion: Marina Rust; Second: Susan Eagle
				1. Motion passed unanimously
4. Discuss concept of ‘[Marginalized Population](https://drive.google.com/open?id=1to8Qu1BsBm6v1AKl9UkCtlDyvAYLInJj)’ as it pertains to GrAPEs.
	* 1. At the request of the JDC Chair, Marina Rust brought forth part of the documentation used for reporting GrAPEs, specifically how ‘marginalized population’ is being tracked/measured.
		2. The committee agreed that the ultimate goal/intent is to know whether marginalized populations are being served by the specific project/experience, not solely whether the organization *tends to* serve marginalized populations.
			1. Committee agreed that the current question being asked (“does the organization primarily serve a marginalized population(s)?”) should be revised to focus more specifically on the project itself.
		3. Committee discussed different ways which the MPH program can make the question more specific so that the intent of the term ‘marginalized’ is more clearly articulated.
			1. At the appearance that an agreement on how such a statement should be worded was not going to be reached expeditiously, Marina Rust proposed that she put together multiple examples (as the GrAPEs coordinator) and bring them back to the committee. All members agreed.
5. Discuss the development of a mailing list to target potential faculty
	1. Starting places:
		1. <https://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/slideshows/colleges-with-the-most-hispanic-students>
		2. <http://www.thehundred-seven.org/matchme.php>
		3. <https://www.apha.org/apha-communities/member-sections/sexual-and-reproductive-health/who-we-are/contact-us>
		4. The chair of the committee wants to focus on targeting underrepresented populations for faculty positions. In order to do so, deliberate communication with institutions that are populated, predominately, by those underrepresented populations regarding job postings should be a standard practice for the program. The chair invited someone to take charge of the task of identifying institutions that are predominately populated by racial/ethnic minority individuals that also have, at a minimum, a MPH program, as well as identify organizations that may draw individuals who are members of other minority groups.
		5. Marina Rust indicated that she was already working on identifying such programs for the sake of marketing our MPH program. Marina and Colin will work collaboratively to develop a list of institutions and organizations that will be included on the mailing list.
6. Potential recommendations to discuss
	1. Incorporate pronouns in email signature
		1. <https://assets2.hrc.org/files/assets/resources/TalkingAboutPronouns_onesheet_FINAL.pdf?_ga=2.65350568.726922818.1573146967-2121180280.1568045069>
		2. <https://lgbt.ucsf.edu/signature-samples>
		3. The committee discussed the value of identifying pronouns. There was no opposition to making the recommendation within the program. Discussion was had regarding the ultimate goal, and whether such a recommendation might even be proposed at the department level. While the value of such is unquestionable, the purview of this committee is the BSPH and MPH programs.
			1. Motion to approve recommendation was sought.
			2. Motion: Marina Rust; Second: Susan Eagle
				1. Motion approved unanimously
	2. Gender-neutral restrooms
		1. The committee discussed why it would be important to have gender-neutral/non-gendered restrooms. The chair of the committee has previously sought direction from Facilities Management, and received the following communication from Bryan Russell:
		“I would be happy to investigate this request for Academic Complex, would you mind sharing the floor and location or room numbers for the restrooms that you would like considered. Are the restrooms ADA as well? This information will allow me to take a walk and do an early evaluation of the spaces noting any improvements needed to comply. Looking at our map, it indicates that two All Gender Restrooms are designated on the 2nd floor West Wing of AC.

When the University 1st identified and designated restrooms to “All Gender” pretty basic requirements .

Single Occupancy
Lockable Door
Located off of a public area for anyone’s use

Note: I will have to review original information to see if I have forgotten any other requirements.

You would need to submit a “Project Request Form” to Planning, Design and Construction to start the process. Please note that your Department Head and Dean will need to Sign Off on the PRF and be willing to fund the new signage and other modifications if required.”

* + - 1. Motion was sought from the committee to further explore the options available.
			2. Motion: Marina Rust; Second: Susan Eagle
				1. Motion was unanimously approved by the committee
	1. Accessibility for visually impaired
		1. Discussion within the committee was had regarding what can be done, and where action needs to be taken, to make the physical space more accessible for individuals with visual impairments
			1. Colin Farrell noted that the newly posted fire escape plans are not accessible for visually impaired individuals.
		2. Jae Kim questioned why the recommendation was focused exclusively on those with visual impairments and not other disabilities, as well.
			1. It was mentioned that this was only one potential initiative, and that future initiatives can seek to address additional structural limitations that impact individuals with other disabilities.
		3. Colin questioned what exactly the committee could do, but sought approval from the committee to start the process of figuring out what can be done.
			1. Motion: Marina Rust; Second: Susan Eagle
				1. Motion approved unanimously.