

Earth 194 DE: Readings in Geoscience DEI

Week Seven: Geoscience Doctoral Degrees

What I need to bring:

- Ipad with papers annotated
- These notes printed

Agenda:

- Attendance
- Go over potential final format and get feedback
Each person in class will have a 10 minute slot. Use 5-7 minutes of that slot for a powerpoint presentation on the paper. It would be nice to go over the study, including its sample size, data collection strategy, main findings, and limitations. Any connections you can make to other readings, topics discussed, or UCSB solutions would be great. The remaining time will be used for questions/discussion.

Serial Testimony (2 rounds!)

1st round - any Q1-4

1. Popp et al. used a survey to understand the perceptions of gender bias in geoscience. We have now seen multiple papers utilize large scale surveys - from these collective readings, what makes a successful and impactful survey study for DEI research in your opinion? How compelling was this survey dataset?

I feel like in reading about surveys in these various studies I have this like false confidence in survey design myself. Like oh clearly this type of question would be biased or like I would have done this - but like so many things in research, its so much harder when you are actually sitting down to design the survey itself. You want to minimize bias, but its pretty hard in practice to design a perfect survey. I do think that good surveys minimize bias, or at least talks about how they did that. I think great surveys at least attempt intersectionality of data, even if it ends up that there isn't enough statistical power. This survey was honestly not super compelling to me. The places it was most compelling was where they looked at how subsets of their dataset responded to other questions, but I felt underwhelmed with the survey design - it seemed like a very limited exploration that could have been deeper, but again not sure I could have actually done better in practice!

2. Popp et al. found polarizing opinions on the use of gender quotas for hiring faculty. Would you support or oppose this policy? What about quotas for other identities like race or ethnicity?
3. Dutt et al. argue in their introduction that "postdoctoral years are associated with the largest leak in the pipeline for female scientists." From our readings so far, where would you say is the largest leak for historically racially minoritized groups (i.e., for Black, Latinx, and/or Native scientists)?
4. Dutt et al. found that women were half as likely to receive "excellent" letters of recommendation from letter writers, regardless of the gender of the letter writer. Did this surprise you? Why or why not?

2nd round - what paper you picked and why

5. What paper would you like to present in class for the final presentation in two weeks? Please include the lead author, paper title, year, and journal.

Discussion Questions

- Last week we read about how PhDs were almost at gender parity across geoscience, and then this paper really talks about how that parity sharply declines - what factors are identified in the papers that contribute to this?
- What could follow up studies on letter writing investigate?
- We had a serial testimony on this, but wanted to open the floor up for any other thoughts about gender quotas or even other types of quotas around race like affirmative action - Specifically how could this look at UCSB? Who do we give power to in making decisions about having these policies or not?
- Talk about methods in Dutt et al
- In Popp et al they talk about how important family friendly working conditions are - I feel like this discussion is something that comes up a lot - how is academia structured to allow or not allow women to pursue families?