AGENDA

CSUPERB Faculty Consensus Group (FCG) Winter Meeting
Hall of Cities Room, Santa Clara Marriott
Sunday, January 19th, 2020

7:15 am  Breakfast and Informal Networking

8:15 am  **Call to Order** (Kathie McReynolds, CSU Sacramento & FCG Chair)
  - Welcome and overview of meeting
  - Silent start: 15 minutes to review August FCG meeting notes (attached), supplementary documents, and prepare for discussions
  - Introductions: FCG Representatives and Guests
  - Discussion of FCG Representatives’ Duties (Paula Fischhaber, CSU Northridge & FCG Deputy Chair)

8:45 am  **CSUPERB CURES Network Update** (Fischhaber)
  - Review of activities and plans moving forward

9:00 am  **Student Travel Grant Discussion** (McReynolds)
  - New trend: multiple students from the same group making award
  - Preliminary discussion of issue (FCG)

9:15 am  **CSUPERB Code of Conduct** (McReynolds)
  - Review CSUPERB demographic data (attachments; Baxter, CSUPERB)
  - Review and discuss of Code of Conduct (CoC)-related Symposium activities (Jen Lillig, Sonoma State University)
  - Review and discuss draft CoC (attachments; FCG)
  - Next steps for CoC adoption (McReynolds)

9:45 am  Break

10:00 am  **State of CSUPERB Report**
  - Brief Program Review, including pilot Ideas Lab report (Baxter)
  - Fall Grants & Awards Program Report (James Schmitt, CSUPERB)
  - Spring Grants Submission and Review Preview (Schmitt)

10:30 am  **CSUPERB Alumni Network Discussion** (McReynolds)
  - Review of activities completed
  - Current plans for moving forward
11:00 am **Guest speaker:** Shefali Mistry, Manager, Constituent Engagement | Systemwide Advancement and Associate Executive Director | CSU Alumni Council in the Chancellor’s Office
  o Introduction (Baxter)
  o Presentation
  o Questions, discussion & reflections (FCG)
  o Synthesize other ideas for the CSUPERB Alumni Network (FCG)

12:00 noon **Lunch** (continued discussion and networking)

1:00 PM **2020 Symposium Analysis & Discussion**
  o Comments and Reactions (FCG)
  o 2020 Poster Selection Process & Analysis (Lillig)
  o 2020 Awards Selection Process & Analysis (Matt Escobar, CSU San Marcos)
  o Special Events Reports and Analysis (Fischhaber).
  o Reports: Preliminary 2020 Symposium Budget Report & Implications for 2021 (Schmitt)
  o Synthesize Suggestions for 2021 Symposium (FCG)

2:30 PM **Summer FCG Meeting Planning: Topics of Interest?** (McReynolds)

3:00 PM **Adjourn**
CSUPERB Community Canvas: An informal, “at-a-glance” sketch of “who we are” (last updated summer 2018)
MEETING NOTES
CSUPERB Faculty Consensus Group (FCG) Summer Meeting
Monday, AUGUST 5, 2019
Office of the Chancellor
Long Beach, CA

Kathie McReynolds (CSU Sacramento and FCG Chair) called the meeting to order at 8:00 am. Miri VanHoven (SJSU) took notes. FCG representatives and guests introduced themselves.

Paula Fischhaber (CSUN, FCG Deputy Chair) informed/reminded faculty of their responsibilities as FCG members. These include coming to the annual CSUPERB symposia, summer FCG meetings, and participating in at least one committee, taskforce, and/or peer review committee each year. FCG members should also be the “go-to” people on their campuses, answering questions about grant proposals and possibly coordinating activities on our campuses. FCG members should put forward award nominations. FCG members should also stay informed by reading the CSUPERB emails, reading Susan Baxter’s newsletters, following the Facebook page, following #CSUPERB on Twitter, visiting the CSUPERB website, and gaining familiarity with the Community Canvas (see below).

Susan Baxter (CSUPERB Executive Director) explained the CSUPERB data dashboards (https://csuperb.org/grants/csuperb-data-dashboard/), which have a wealth of information about CSUPERB, including where students go after graduation. NSF has been supportive of CSUPERB, and is sending another $60K to pilot the Ideas Lab and host the BIO I-Corps Entrepreneurship Workshop during BIO 2020 (in San Diego June 8-11). The CSUPERB Annual Operating Plan and budget were approved by the Chancellor in June 2019. The three strategic pillars of the plan are to expand experiential learning, expand biotechnology-relevant curriculum including CURES, and deepen involvement with alumni. Susan discussed the goal of CSUPERB seed grants, to help faculty obtain follow-on funding or to institutionalize new curriculum/co-curricular programs. She presented follow-on funding data: approximately 40% of faculty awarded CSUPERB New Investigator Seed Grants go on to win external funding for their research programs, over 30% of faculty awarded Curriculum Development Grants, and over 20% of faculty awarded Research Development Grants in 2016-17. The number of New Investigator Grant proposals (application rate) has increased from under 30 to over 70/year between 2010/11 and 2018/19, so success rates dipped to 22-23%. However, the success rate returned to around 30% this year, a rate that literature indicates is encouraging. The President’s Commission Scholars program provides a $6000 student scholarship and $2000 to support the faculty mentor’s research program. It targets first and second-year students who have no research experience and are not already supported by support programs like MARC or RISE. Of the 62 undergrads that have received this award between 2012 and 2015, 100% graduated, and 80% are continuing on in life-science-related career paths, which are similar to Howell Scholar outcomes (who are typically more senior, academically-accomplished students).
James Schmitt (Program Administrator, CSUPERB) said that the 2019 Symposium exceeded the budget by $10,456 because of travel costs and participants’ use of room nights. For the 2020 conference, the Santa Clara Marriot offered the best price so the program office signed a contract for the 32nd Symposium. It will be held from Jan 16-19, 2020, and we will not be sharing the hotel with other conferences. The CSUPERB Strategic Planning Council (SPC) has decided to reduce the size of the conference by 15% because of low session attendance (no more than 62% of attendees came to any session in 2019). To accomplish this, 44 fewer posters will be accepted in 2020. This year the participant support costs to CSUPERB will increase to $749/faculty and $598/student. Poster abstracts are due on Monday September 16th at 5 pm.

Jennifer Lillig (Sonoma State) explained that the FCG asked the SPC to investigate a code of contact for CSUPERB, as recommended by the National Academies report and other professional societies like ACS and ASM have done. An SPC committee (Jennifer Lillig (Sonoma State), Michael Goldman (SFSU), Tomas Gomez-Arias (CSU Stanislaus), Bori Mazzag (Humboldt State University), Aparna Sreenivasan (CSU Monterey Bay)) wrote a draft containing a statement of values and a code of conduct and consequences. The draft is under legal review at the Chancellor’s Office and will be discussed further at the next SPC meeting.

Paula Fischhaber explained that the Course-based Undergraduate Research Experiences (CURES) Network was an outgrowth from January Symposium CURES Workshop. 45 faculty members from 20 campuses (19 CSUs and one community college) are now on the roster. The organizing committee includes Susan Baxter (CSUPERB), Lynn Stauffer (CSU Sonoma), Aparna Sreenivasan (CSU Monterey Bay), and Paula Fischhaber (CSUN). They selected editors who could curate website content, write newsletters, lead webinars, and help plan events: Kelly McDonald (CSU Sacramento), Corin Slown (CSU Monterey Bay), David Rhoads (CSU San Bernardino). Plans for 2019-20 include a subscribable distribution list, a curated website, 1-2 newsletters per semester, 1 webinar per semester, 1 session at the CSUPERB symposium each year with focus on assessment.

**Ideas Lab Update:** Susan Baxter explained that this effort is a response to faculty requests for help building collaborations and is funded by NSF. The first Ideas Lab will be Sept 12-14th at Fresno State. Each year there will be a new research theme or challenge. This year it was the food-health-ecosystem trilemma. CSUPERB received a multi-disciplinary group of applications, but will extend to August 15th to recruit more mathematicians, statisticians, human health, sociology, and community health professors. The goal of the 3-day workshop is to build interdisciplinary teams to compete for follow-on funding. CSUPERB will offer Team Seed Grants ($1000/per person) to teams that form during the Ideas Lab to aid in the cost of generating preliminary data and writing full proposals.

**Special Events RFP:** Susan Baxter said that $10K was set aside for special events programming. Any group that wants to offer a biotechnology-related workshop or symposium session or multi-campus activity can apply for this money. Proposals are reviewed and decided upon on a rolling basis, although proposals for the symposium must be in by Oct 15th. Last year all the proposals were symposium-related. Groups consult with program office about cost, and need to publish after-the-event reports.

Next the FCG took up decisions that needed to be made for the coming academic year.
Symposium posters: Jennifer Lillig reviewed the issue at hand. Due to increased competition over the last three years, on average 16% of research groups do not have any poster abstracts selected for presentation at the annual CSU Biotechnology Symposium. This trend particularly impacts new CSU PIs and research groups.

- **Question:** Should we limit the number of accepted posters per lab to two (2)?
- **Discussion:** Due to increased competition over the last three years, on average 16% of research groups do not have any poster abstracts selected for presentation at the annual CSU Biotechnology Symposium. This trend particularly impacts new CSU PIs and research groups.
- **Consensus:** Passed (32 yes. 15 no. 1 abstention).

Eden/Nagel Nominations: Kathie McReynolds summarized that over the past five years, 20% of Eden nominations and 15% of Nagel nominations came from labs submitting more than one nomination.

- **Question:** Should we limit the number of nominations for each award to one per lab?
- **Discussion:** The 2019 selection committees felt that PIs were better suited to choose between lab members than the committee. One faculty member felt that nominating several lab members allowed students to include the nomination on their CVs. One suggestion was to allow nominations, but require the PIs to rank them. **Consensus:** Failed (17 yes. 30 no).

After a short break, Baxter explained that the goal of this meeting was to update faculty understanding about how we can better prepare students for careers by hearing from CSU alumni working in biotechnology (1 from each CSU). Alumni attending the Summer FCG meeting were a diverse collection of professionals, including entry-level scientists, managers, executives, and professors. (See [https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/research/csuperb/news-announcements/Pages/Alumni2019.aspx](https://www2.calstate.edu/impact-of-the-csu/research/csuperb/news-announcements/Pages/Alumni2019.aspx) for an article reporting on the session and photos).

Panel Chat #1 – Diversity of Biotech Career Paths (Moderator: Baxter)

- Brian O’Roak (Associate Professor, Oregon Health Sciences University, CSU Fresno graduate)
- David Puerta (Chief Operating Officer and co-founder, Forge Therapeutics, CSU Dominguez Hills) - [https://www.forgetherapeutics.com/david-puerta-ph-d/](https://www.forgetherapeutics.com/david-puerta-ph-d/)
- Terry Reyes (Regulatory Affairs, DuPont, San Francisco State University graduate) - [https://www.linkedin.com/in/terry-reyes-ph-d-a059b88/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/terry-reyes-ph-d-a059b88/)
- Kota Kaneshige (Senior Scientist, Process Development, Roche Sequence Solutions, Cal Poly Pomona graduate) - [https://www.linkedin.com/in/kota-kaneshige/](https://www.linkedin.com/in/kota-kaneshige/)

**What was it at CSU that made a difference for you?** Alumni said that research with CSU faculty members, and sometimes summer internships at other institutions, were key to getting into PhD programs and getting jobs in biotech. Presenting their findings at CSUPERB and other conferences also helped them develop communication skills. They appreciated the interactions with and accessibility of CSU professors. One alum also took a course where he interviewed someone in industry, which was useful. Research stipends were critical for first-generation college students.
What were the gaps? Alumni agreed that CSU equipment was frequently outdated, and that there is a pedigree bias against CSUs. One alum also felt that he did not learn how to write grant proposals or raise venture capital.

What surprised you most about your transition from the CSU? Alumni experienced culture-shock coming from nurturing CSU environment where people knew your name and felt like family. However, alumni found that they were at the level they needed to be in PhD programs and in industry.

What would you tell the students today to think about? Learn as much as you can and do research, and you will be just as qualified as any other student. When you go to an interview, be prepared and do your research. When you are writing a cover letter, say why the particular position is of interest to you. On your CV, describe your research, do not just list skills, and list presentations and publications. Network through LinkedIn, career fairs, and contact alumni.

What would you like to say that you didn’t get a chance to? They would like to be part of a directory of combined alumni, and give back to her university by giving talks and talking with current students.

Panel Chat #2 – What is R&D like in a company setting? (Moderator: Fischhaber)

- Vahid Hamzeinejad (Manufacturing Engineer, ViaCyte, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/vahid-hamzeinejad/
- Alex Jacobitz (Scientist, Amgen, CSU Channel Islands graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/alex-jacobitz-18b49a80/
- Manmeet Singh (Research Associate, Genentech, CSU Sacramento graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/manmeet-singh-331b458b/
- Grace Prator (Senior Research Associate, Arsenal Biosciences, Inc., CSU Chico graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/grace-prator-b6bb8ab/
- Sam Tran (Cell Therapy Specialist, Kite Pharmaceuticals, CSU Northridge graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/samuel-tran-a8648311b/

What are the biggest differences between research at the CSU and research in their companies? Academic research is exploratory, while industry research must be conducted in limited time with limited funding. Undergraduate and PhD projects can be individual, however, in industry research is more collaborative and frequently involves interdisciplinary research.

When you were an undergrad, what would have allowed you to better prepare for that? Internships in industry and the CSUPERB Idea to Product/ CSU I-Corps programs.

How much do people move to different companies in biotech? Frequently, people move to different jobs to get promotions, increase their salary, or to move into jobs that suite them better.

How does your degree affect mobility within companies? In a start-up there is more flexibility for people with Bachelor’s degrees to move around and move up in the company. PhDs afford more mobility at larger companies.

Companies like Google and Apple have said their jobs don’t all require university degrees. Will biotechs go this route too? Will companies develop curriculum instead of depending on universities? Coding is different than science and engineering. You need a lot more resources than just a computer. The most important thing is critical thinking, and students learn that during their university degrees. Most biotech HR directors will only consider people with a certain degree.
What kind of training should faculty have to train students for the job market? Journal club projects in class, teaching proper lab technique, and pushing the students to think on their feet are all helpful.

At noon, McReynolds excused the FCG and alumni for a working lunch at topic tables (see below).
1. What does it take to be successful in a biotech or life sciences career?
2. What are the strengths and limitations of a CSU education?
3. Small vs. Big: What are the differences between employees working at a Start-up vs. those working in Big Biotech companies?
4. Essential Skills: What soft skills matter the most in jobs post-degree completion?
5. Narrow vs. Broad Disciplinary Education: What does industry value most?
6. How does workforce diversity (cultural/gender/ethnic/age) impact your day-to-day work?
7. What will be the hottest “breakout” bio-tech in the next 5 years?
8. What do you wish your professors knew about biotechnology careers when you were a student?
9. What does it take to keep current in your field?
10. What course do you think all biotechnology students should take?
11. The importance of professional social media
12. What’s Next? How can we better connect biotechnology alumni with current students and faculty?

At 1:30 pm, McReynolds called the room back to order for the remaining three panel discussions.

Panel Chat #3 – Beyond the Bench (Moderator: Baxter)
- Stacey Abidayo Chan (Business Development Manager, Zymergen, CSU Bakersfield graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/stacey-chan-mba-6a34b05a/
- Cynthia Ouandji (Process Engineer II, Boston Scientific, San Jose State University graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/cynthiaouandji/
- Mirna Lopez (Associate Director, Regulatory Affairs, Illumina, San Diego State University graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/mirna-lopez-41015755/
- Lauren Ryan (Head of Clinical Services, Color Genomics, Stanislaus State University graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/lauran-ryan-903720a/

How does your research background inform your day-to-day activities? The experimental approach learned in undergraduate research helped with the day to day now.

All of you are working in jobs that don’t map to a degree. How does that work? Many of the alumni started at the bench, which they were qualified for from their degree, then over time, learned skills for different jobs in their companies on-the-job, by talking with others, seeking mentorship, or gaining additional degrees (e.g. MBA).

When you look at your current job, what certifications did you need to get? RAC (regulatory affairs certification) for jobs in regulatory affairs, board exam and licensure for being a certified genetic counselor, certifications are uncommon for researchers working in medical devices/pharma/biotech, MBA for working in marketing.

Where do you think you primarily learned your soft skills? Extra-curricular activities, undergraduate research experiences (including presenting research results), and through the CSU curriculum.
What makes a student a good applicant? Researching the company and what they do so they can talk about how what they do aligns with company goals, developing the required skillsets, and the ability to converse about software.

How do you think resiliency helped you to get where you are now? Resiliency is critical for women and people of color because they are the minority, and frequently also struggle with imposter syndrome. Building a support network can help. When something goes wrong, acknowledge it, but then come back and move on. Don’t concentrate on the failures.

How do you get your foot in the door if you didn’t want to start at the bench? Students can cold-call people to ask about different careers. Many people are happy to have lunch with students who are interested in their line of work. You can also network at different industry association (Biocom, CLSA, etc.) events. Attend the Career Networking Session at the symposium.

Panel Chat #4 – Getting your first biotech job (Moderator: McReynolds)
- Lina Ahlberg (Manufacturing Specialist, Illumina, CSU San Marcos graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/linaahlberg1/
- Michael Diaz (Research Scientist, US Analytik Jena AG, CSU Channel Islands graduate)
- Seong Eun (Angela) Kim (HR Manager, Zymo Research Corporation, CSU Fullerton graduate)
- Timothy Chang (Research Associate, Zymergen, CSU Long Beach graduate)
- Samara Munoz (Cell Therapy Specialist, Kite Pharmaceuticals, CSU San Bernardino graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/samara-munoz-385143150/
- Anthony Luu (Research Associate, Zymergen, CSU East Bay graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/anthony-luu-491967139/

How did you find your first job? Talking with old classmates and lab-mates, searching biotech company websites, LinkedIn, Indeed, and Monster for job listings and applying, starting in contract jobs that turned into the full-time jobs, and working with recruiters.

Did you have a clear understanding of what you’d be doing on a day-to-day basis? Some knew the basic techniques they would be using, but did not really understand the job in detail. Others felt they had a good idea of the day-to-day from friends who worked at the companies or from the interview.

What was the most surprising thing? Collaborating with people in science as well as outside science is critical, and soft skills are very important.

What was it about your CSU experience that helped you get your job? Undergraduate and Masters-level research experience and presenting the research at conferences, which taught organizational skills, time management, communication skills, teamwork, how to dissect a research article, project management. Being a TA taught communication skills.

Something that didn’t serve them well from the CSU education? A lack of technical skills set one alum back in graduate school because he switched fields. He spent the first year of graduate school learning the new techniques.

Important skills: Communication and leadership skills for PhD-level applicants. Meeting research goals in the desired timeframe for BS and MS-level applicants.

Common misconceptions: Thinking that they will be promoted instantaneously.

Resume-writing advice: Use one of the many good templates out there, spell-check, make sure the entire document is in the same font. For research experience, applicants frequently just write the date and the professors name. It is better to clearly write a summary of what they did in the
lab. Do not use LinkedIn-generated auto-resumes. Do not include skills that you did once in a class, but instead ones you used in your research projects.

**What kinds of questions did you get at your interviews?** Questions about undergraduate and MS research projects, and equipment used during this research.

Panel Chat #5 – Moving through and into academia (Moderator: Fischhaber)

- Humberto Contreras-Trujillo (NIH Pre-Doctoral Fellow, University of Southern California, Humboldt State University graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/hctrujillo/
- Jesse Garcia Castillo (Doctoral student, University of California, Berkeley, CSU Los Angeles graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/jesse-garcia-castillo-4a363396/
- Kaitlin Fisher (Professor, Mira Costa Community College, Sonoma State University graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/kaitlinmfisher/
- Brian O’Roak (Associate Professor, Oregon Health Sciences University, CSU Fresno graduate) - https://www.linkedin.com/in/brian-o-roak-49447b65/

**What does it take to be successful at your institution type and at your career stage?** As a PhD student, one has to be consistent with experiments. When teaching at an HSI, one needs to stay updated on learning pedagogy, and shifting cultural standards in the classroom. The collaboration and communication skills learned during a CSU education are critical. For a professor at a research university, the key to success is building a team of researchers that can ask and address questions you are interested in.

**How did you find your current job or graduate program?** To teach at a community college, started with temporary teaching positions in as many colleges as possible. Research mentors helped find PhD programs and research positions.

**What is the biggest challenge of their current position?** Trying to manage your budget and trying to get funding, personnel issues, instilling confidence and communication skills in students.

**Advice to current students?** Get over imposter syndrome, be tough and be an advocate for yourself, and find good mentors. Be proud of coming from the CSU, where you have better contact with professors and better undergraduate research experiences.

**Any aspirations to explore other biotech careers?** It’s unwise to stop your professional development because you never know what will come knocking at your door.

Kathie McReynolds led the FCG and alumni discussion on their thoughts and next steps based on this session. Thoughts included an appreciation for the session. Proposed next steps included generating a directory to reach out to CSUPERB alumni, and involving them in seminars, campus events, mentoring, internships. We could create a course offered CSU-system wide that would teach soft-skills and teamwork building. We should work on student confidence issues and imposter syndrome. We should set up working groups between faculty and career centers to get better information out there about careers and resumes. Faculty and students could work on problems suggested by industry. These topics will be discussed further at the next SPC meeting.

McReynolds adjourned the meeting at 4PM. Networking reception followed at George’s Greek Café from 4:30-7:00 pm.
CSUPERB Demographic Data
(Fall 2019)

Notes: In response to the 2019-2020 operating plan (“model a culture of inclusivity and the highest professional standards…”), the CSUPERB Presidents’ Commission asked for benchmarked gender and ethnicity data about the CSUPERB community. The Program Office uses this data to monitor bias (or lack thereof) in CSUPERB competitive selection, grant, and award programs. At this time, the program office does not have access to “STEM-only” CSU-wide demographic data.

“Model a culture of inclusivity and the highest professional standards in biotechnology”

Self-reported Ethnicity
Student Participants at Annual Biotechnology Symposium
(2016-2019, n = 1223)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latina/o</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races / Other race</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to state</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSU Students, By Ethnicity
(2019 CSU Fact Book)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic / Latina/o</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Model a culture of inclusivity and the highest professional standards in biotechnology”

The 2019 CSU Fact Book reports that 43.3% of CSU students are men; 56.7% are women.

As reported at the 2016 CREDITS retreat, 54% of CSU faculty members are men; 46% are women.
BACKGROUND: New Policies on sexual harassment in Science from NIH. To learn more about the issues, follow the embedded links here that lead to informative reports and data.

December 12, 2019

Available online: https://www.nih.gov/about-nih/who-we-are/nih-director/statements/creating-meaningful-reforms-end-sexual-harassment-science

Creating meaningful reforms to end sexual harassment in science

Ending sexual harassment in science is a major priority for NIH leadership. We expressed our commitment to this issue in September 2018 and updated the community on our efforts in February 2019, including the establishment of a Working Group on Changing the Culture to End Sexual Harassment as part of my Advisory Committee to the Director (ACD). I am grateful to the members of this working group, who have been passionate and thoughtful in developing ways to approach this difficult and often contentious issue. The charge asked them to be bold, and not to constrain their recommendations based on the difficulty or complexity of implementation.

Today, after months of intense meetings that included discussions and listening sessions with individuals targeted by sexual harassment, the working group delivered their report to the ACD. The ACD advised me to accept it. I am supportive of these solid recommendations. NIH will make every effort to adhere to the vision of the working group by seeking to implement the recommendations provided. We will work with other federal agencies, such as the HHS Office for Civil Rights (OCR), and explore policymaking options in order to implement some of these recommendations.

Based, in part, on insights provided by the interim report that the working group presented at the June 12-13, 2019, ACD meeting, I’m pleased to say that NIH is well on its way to implementing several of the recommendations, including:

- NIH has developed a means for individuals working on NIH-funded projects who believe their rights to a safe working environment have been violated to contact NIH directly. Information can be found on the NIH Anti-Sexual Harassment and For NIH Awardee Organizations websites. It’s working. To date, we’ve received 105 notifications, which automatically initiates an inquiry by the NIH Office of Extramural Research with the grantee institution, and has resulted in replacement of PIs on grants by institutions and enhanced grants oversight.

- NIH has established and will soon publicize clear agency standard operating procedures that outline the steps NIH takes when a grantee institution or an individual at a grantee institution notifies NIH.

There are several other recommendations that NIH expects to implement over the next year, with the following plans:

- Enhancing safety at conferences that receive NIH funding, directly or indirectly, through conference codes of professional conduct, and advertising the NIH and OCR contact information.
• Creating new incentives and funding opportunities to help individuals who have experienced disruptions of research projects, including those related to sexual harassment, to remain in or to reenter the biomedical workforce.

• Supporting a range of research to inform policies, procedures, training, and other measures that foster respect, civility, and safety.

Several working group recommendations would require new and modified funding mechanisms, and thus will take additional work to implement — but we will pursue these assiduously. That includes programs to support individuals through transition periods (bridge funding), help them reintegrate into the biomedical workforce (potential for modification to existing mechanisms similar for family leave), structure awards to address the power dynamic that puts trainees at high risk, or incentivize grantee institutions to rethink systems to diversify their leadership.

As noted, some recommendations will require NIH to explore policymaking options, and/or work with other government agencies, such as OCR, to implement, such as:

• Requiring institutions to mandate PIs and key personnel named on NIH grants to attest that they have not been found to have violated their institution’s code of professional conduct, including having a finding of sexual harassment.

• Requiring grantee institutions to inform NIH of a harassment investigation involving a PI or key personnel named on a grant award, including allowing NIH to be involved in the selection of a replacement PI while the investigation is underway.

• Creating a parallel process for managing professional misconduct, including sexual harassment, as seriously as research misconduct.

• Requiring grantee institutions to mandate anti-sexual harassment training for all institutional staff, on the same scale as training for responsible conduct of research.

Pursuing most of these recommendations will require a partnership with our grantee institutions to take the necessary actions. NIH has taken extensive actions as an employer to set the example for the broader community by implementing a comprehensive anti-harassment program for the NIH workforce, which are outlined on the NIH Anti-Sexual Harassment webpage for NIH staff.

Science thrives in safe, diverse, and inclusive research environments, and sexual harassment goes against the very core of what NIH and the institutions we fund represent. Ensuring a culture where we are maximizing talent at all levels is at the heart of the NIH mission to improve human lives. This report lays out a framework to make that culture a reality. We are grateful for the members of the working group for putting forward such a clear vision.

Francis S. Collins, M.D., Ph.D.
Director, National Institutes of Health
CSUPERB Statement of Principles on Professional Behavior, Policies, and Procedures

I. CSUPERB Statement of Values

CSUPERB (California State University Program for Education and Research in Biotechnology) is a California State University (CSU) system-wide affinity group. It is comprised of faculty, students, and community members with a shared interest in teaching, learning, research, and entrepreneurship related to biotechnology. We recognize that science and engineering is strengthened by thoughtful, respectful, constructive criticism and discussion.

CSUPERB believes that the best way to engage and help students embark on life sciences careers is to invest in and provide access to experiential learning opportunities in biotechnology research and entrepreneurship. CSUPERB recognizes that biotechnology preparation requires integration of disciplinary knowledge, hands-on practice, and collaborative, team-based projects. We know that these experiences are particularly effective at engaging and retaining students who are the first in their families to attend college or are from communities underrepresented in the life sciences. By working on solutions for real-world problems with CSU faculty teacher-scholars in the classroom and on research teams, all students can build a solid foundation for successful biotechnology careers. CSUPERB partners with industry professionals, alumni, and organizations to participate in the life sciences industry and support California’s regional economies. The California State University plays a critical role in California’s biotechnology ecosystem by providing not only a professional workforce but also innovative ideas that drive the growth and evolution of the entire industry.

This community is dedicated to the inclusion and the support of all its members. We believe that scientists, engineers, and entrepreneurs are equal and competent in our fields, regardless of race, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, LGBTQ, age, or ethnicity. To this end, we pledge that we will strive to combat inequalities in all forms, follow the requirements of Title V, Title IX, and related California State University (CSU) Executive Orders, uphold professional behavior and values; and hold each other accountable should we witness acts that violate these values.

II. CSUPERB Community Definitions
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The CSUPERB community is comprised of CSU faculty, students, and staff in partnership with industry professionals and alumni from across the state of California. For the purpose of this document, CSUPERB participants include, but are not limited to:

- staff and visitors related to the day-to-day operations in the CSUPERB program office;
- attendees and presenters at the annual CSU biotechnology symposium;
- panelists on grant proposal, award, and symposium review committees;
- members of the Faculty Consensus Group (FCG) and Strategic Planning Council (SPC);
- attendees and presenters at FCG and SPC meetings;
- organizing teams, participants, and presenters at taskforce and special events;
- grant and award recipients and supported personnel;
- participants in CSUPERB activities such as ad-hoc committees, meetings, and/or gatherings.

III. CSUPERB Statement of Principles on Professional Behavior

CSUPERB values diverse perspectives where all individuals can flourish. CSUPERB is dedicated to providing an environment that fosters intellectual curiosity and creativity, free and lively debate conducted with mutual respect for individuals, and freedom from intolerance. These values are applicable to any aspect of CSUPERB’s work, including meetings, symposia, and funded activities. Specifically, members of our community value:

- Critical scholarly discourse for the purpose of understanding, advancing scientific ideas, and educating the next generation of science and engineering practitioners;
- Education and research environments where all people are treated equally, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and free of bias, hostility, and harassment of any kind;
- Conversations and discussions where community members can share ideas in a collegial atmosphere that is inclusive and values everyone’s input and opportunity to participate;
- Advocacy for equality and inclusivity in science and engineering;
- The use of inclusive examples, graphics, and stories in presentations and proposals;
- Access for all community members, including traditionally underrepresented groups, to fully participate in and become leaders in science and engineering;
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- Support and promote the education and careers of all scientists, engineers, and bio-entrepreneurs;
● Leadership in our fields to strengthen scientific mentorship and create an atmosphere of collaboration.

IV. Policies

A. All participants in CSUPERB events and activities are expected to follow the requirements of Title V, Title IX, and California State University (CSU) Executive Orders and adhere to the CSUPERB Principles of Professional Behavior and values. Non-CSU participants who do not follow these expectations may be asked to leave a CSUPERB event or activity and/or prohibited from participation in future CSUPERB events or activities.

B. Individuals found in violation of a Title V or IX or CSU Executive Orders 1096 or 1097 are not eligible to receive CSUPERB funding or participate in CSUPERB program activities for a period of 5 years from the final substantiation of the violation or the end of any current grant award, whichever is later.

Relevant CSU Executive Orders include: 1) Executive Order 1095 Revised (Systemwide Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking Policy); 2) Executive Order 1096 Revised (Systemwide Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking against Employees and Third Parties and Systemwide Procedure for Addressing Such Complaints by Employees and Third Parties); and 3) Executive Order 1097 Revised (Systemwide Policy Prohibiting Discrimination, Harassment and Retaliation, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking against Students and Systemwide Procedure for Addressing Such Complaints by Students) may be found at the following website address: [http://www.calstate.edu/ eo/](http://www.calstate.edu/eo/).

V. Certifications and Reporting

A. Certifications

1. CSUPERB will include the Statement of Principles on Professional Behavior (section III above) in event registration processes. Event participants will be asked to acknowledge the principles.

2. Applications for CSUPERB funding, award opportunities, or event registrations will include the following certifications:
   i. Applicants will indicate whether they have been found in violation of Title V, Title IX, or CSU Executive Orders 1096 or 1097 in the last 5 years.
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ii. Applicants will allow the campus to disclose to the CSUPERB program office any substantiated violations of Title V, IX, or CSU Executive Orders 1096 or 1097.

B. Reporting Procedures:

1. Incidents that involve CSU faculty, staff, or students only
   
   i. Individuals who believe there has been a violation of Title V, IX, or Executive Orders 1096 or 1097 at a CSUPERB event or activity should report the event following CSU policy and procedures on their home campus.

   ii. Prior to transfer of grant or awards to campus, CSUPERB will ask for campus confirmation that the awardee has not been found in violation of Title V, Title IX, or Executive Orders 1096 or 1097 in the prior 5 years. The campus information provided will include only the existence of a final, substantiated violation and the date of the violation. The information will be kept confidential in the CSUPERB program office.

2. Incidents that involve non-CSU individuals

   i. Suspected violations of Title V, Title IX, or Executive Orders 1096 or 1097 by participants not affiliated with the CSU should be reported to CSUPERB administration immediately. Participants may also e-mail CSUPERB administration to report at a later date, if so desired.

VII. Acknowledgements

This policy was prepared with review of national and local statements and policies from:

1. American Chemical Society Code of Ethics
2. National Science Foundation
3. American Society Human Genetics
4. American Society for Microbiology
5. 500 Women Scientists
6. American Association of University Professionals
8. Campus policies from: Sonoma State University, CSU Stanislaus, San Francisco State, CSU Monterey Bay, and Humboldt State University
9. CSU EO1096/1097, Title IX, Title V
Draft: July 26, 2019
The FCG asked the SPC to form a committee to investigate current CSU policies, align with national reports, consult with general counsel, and draft a CSUPERB Code of Conduct. The SPC formed a Code of Conduct Committee: Jennifer Whiles Lillig (Sonoma State University), chair; Michael Goldman (San Francisco State University), Tomas Gomez-Arias (CSU Stanislaus), Bori Mazzag (Humboldt State University), Aparna Sreenivasan (CSU Monterey Bay)

Draft: August 1, 2019
Committee sent initial draft to Susan Baxter with questions and for formatting and editing. Main note: All CSUPERB programs and activities involve a transfer of funds to campus to cover participant costs. All CSUPERB award programs and activities come with a monetary award or travel reimbursement.

Draft: August 15, 2019
Lillig made the adjustments to the document based on discussion at the August 6, 2019 SPC meeting.

Draft: October 1, 2019
Code of Conduct Committee revised document in response to review and comments from legal counsel, Jennifer Glad (Office of General Counsel, CSU Office of the Chancellor).

Draft: October 7, 2019
Lillig reformat ted the document based on suggestions from Glad, she cleaned up the parts of the document the committee planned to delete after legal review, and accepted Baxter edits.

Draft: October 9, 2019
Baxter cleaned up formatting in transfer from Google Docs to Word.

Implementation Notes (from SPC leadership meeting Oct. 10, 2019):
• Section III will be used as part of event registrations starting Nov. 1
• Policies must be approved by SPC and FCG (on agenda, Summer 2020)
• Implementation of policy IVb depends greatly on campus’s ability to report out violations - this will not be implemented until that process is worked out system-wide.