Reimagining the Broader Impacts Criterion in the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program

Running Head: Reimagining the GRFP's Broader Impacts

Authors: Cesar O. Estien[1], Brandon Quintana[2], & Daniel Olivares-Zambrano[3]

[1] *Department of Environmental Science, Policy, and Management, University of California–Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

[2] *Department of Biological Science, California State University–Fullerton, Fullerton CA 92834, USA*

[3] *Department of Biological Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA 90089, USA*

Orcid ID:

Estien: 0000-0001-8410-7371

Quintana: 0000-0002-5448-7606

Olivares-Zambrano: 0000-0003-2454-622X

Correspondence: cesaroestien@gmail.com

Abstract

For graduate students, securing fellowships provides opportunities to progress in research and be involved in professional endeavors. However, the inequity in fellowship distribution hinders the success of graduate students, especially those who are racially oppressed. The majority of the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship Program (GRFP) is white and attend top-ranked institutions. Within the GRFP, there is a clear disconnect between the grantee's proposed broader impacts and follow-through. To value and support communities, and graduate students of color in the process, the GRFP must be reimagined. In this article, we provide a brief background on the relationship between STEM and marginalized communities, and how broader impacts currently function as a band-aid to the issues of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion in STEM. We then conclude by providing recommendations to improve the broader impacts section and the awardee selection process.

Key Words: NSF GRFP, broader impacts, justice, DEI, marginalized communities

Introduction

For prospective graduate students considering graduate school – especially those from marginalized backgrounds – access to funding is a substantial concern (Kennedy et al., 2016). These concerns can be alleviated by securing funding such as The National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship (hereafter GRFP). The GRFP financially supports awardees pursuing research-based graduate degrees within the United States for three years and is highly competitive (www.nsfgrfp.org). The GRFP scores applicants on two main criteria: 1) intellectual merit (the proposal's potential on advancing the applicant's field) and 2) broader impacts (the proposal's potential to benefit society). Evaluation of these two criteria ensures that the NSF supports high-quality research that advances our current understanding of the natural world and ultimately benefits society. However, the definition of "high-quality" is subjective and can create bias. For example, for National Institute of Health (NIH) funding, researchers found that Black scientists are 13% less likely to receive funding (Ginther et al., 2011) and less likely to receive funding due to topic choice (Hoppe et al., 2019). If reviewers are not as diverse as the applicant, they will fail to understand the barriers marginalized applicants navigate and the practical application for the work outside of basic science.

Applying for the GRFP can be incredibly beneficial for awardees and non-awardees alike. Participants reported feeling more confident in skills needed for success in graduate school such as developing testable hypotheses (Wiener & LeFevre, 2021). However, the chances of receiving this prestigious fellowship are not particularly high, with roughly 2,000 awardees selected from 13,000+ applications in 2020 (NSF GRFP, www.nsfgrfp.org). Moreover, the racial disparities in who is awarded the fellowship and an honorable mention is undeniable. From 1994 to 2011, 79.9% of awardees and 83.3% of honorable mentions were white (NSF, 2014). During this time,

7.9% of awardees were Hispanic, 10.3% were Asian, and 4.2% were Black (NSF, 2014). Within this, it's difficult to further understand the racial/ethnic disparities as 1) the term "Hispanic" hides racial disparities by clumping in Indigenous, Black, and non-Black Hispanic individuals as one, and 2) terms like Asian and Black hide ethnic identity by creating racial monoliths (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2022) and Indigenous applicants are left out altogether. Lastly, we see similar gaps in representation in the educational background and institutions of current fellows, with 8.9% of GRFP fellows attending community college as an undergraduate and 94.5% of awardees attending R1 universities (very high research activity; e.g., Princeton University) (NSF, 2014).

Due to systemic barriers, Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) in STEM are highly underrepresented compared to their white counterparts (Garrison, 2013; Riegle-Crumb et al., 2019). In an effort to limit disparity, institutions distributing grants often require an outreach or broader impacts section. This encourages applicants to conduct outreach into marginalized communities to hopefully increase participation in and diversification of their respective fields. Bottom-up approaches like this have been used in academia to remedy inequities in the representation and retention of systematically excluded groups in STEM (Ching et al., 2020). However, one of the issues with this bottom-up approach is the lack of top-down accountability and support in these ventures. The lack of accountability towards outreach for GRFP fellows may lead to detrimental effects such as the tokenization of marginalized communities at the hands of the academy (NSF, 2014). We argue that the current framework of the GRFP, specifically the broader impacts section, does not protect or help our most marginalized and underserved communities. Instead, it creates further inequity and harm.

We do not claim the GRFP to be the sole solution to the many systemic issues in STEM. However, with the positionality that this program holds, this award can serve as a place to begin

the conversation about (in)equity in academia. In this article, we will briefly give a snapshot of the history between STEM and marginalized communities, how broader impacts do not properly address the issues of diversity and inclusion in STEM, and how we see the future of the award, with recommendations for change.

Positionality statement

It is important for us to highlight and center our positionality for this article which is why we interrupted the article rather than end with it. Our positionalities have heavily influenced our decision to produce this work and shed light on this important issue. We all come from marginalized backgrounds with unique lived experiences and identities such as Black, Latin, Queer, first-generation, neurodivergent, and low-income individuals. Because of these identities, we feel a need to address the broader impacts section as a larger issue of justice and equity. We have approached this work with our intersectional identities and recognize that other valuable perspectives may have been missed. We hope that by leveraging our experiences in white-dominated academia we can shed light on inequitable funding and create attainable solutions that ultimately benefit individuals from marginalized backgrounds.

Biosciences and Marginalized Communities:

Colonialism is embedded in the science we practice (Trisos et al., 2021). The colonization of knowledge and its dissemination is maintained by centering white, cisgender, heterosexual male European scientists (Trisos et al., 2021). Many of these men have been deemed the “pioneers” in environmental and naturalist spaces (e.g., John Muir) (Finney, 2014), implying that nature and “correct” ecological knowledge is solely produced by them.

Disciplines like ecology have benefitted the use of colonized land to establish research sites. This legacy can be seen, for example, by the distribution of bird species named after European men (Trisos et al., 2021) and field stations. Most field stations in the Americas (Caribbean, Central, South America) originated after a nation's independence from European colonialism under a brand of neocolonialism that scientists profited from (Ahmad-Gawel et al., 2021; Airhart, 2022). Field stations were typically formed in areas that had lasting colonial infrastructures such as plantations (Ahmad-Gawel et al., 2021; Airhart, 2022). Field stations that were founded on these grounds enable the practice of parachute science, where scientists from higher-income nations conduct research without engaging the community through collaborations like scientific partnerships, education programs, or the sharing of data (Ahmad-Gawel et al., 2021; Airhart, 2022; van Woesik et al., 2022).

The proposals of well-meaning broader impacts often contain ripples of colonization. The issue with proposing broader impacts statements that center on "vulnerable" communities is that these communities are viewed through a savior lens. These "damage-centered" proposals create a fictitious image that these communities are broken and in need of help (Tuck, 2009). Whether communities of marginalized people in STEM are being tokenized or the primary research investigators themselves, how the scientific community values them can be demonstrated by the amount of investment academia put towards their success (Miriti et al., 2020; Schell et al., 2020).

Disparities in representation and funding:

The way we propose broader impacts in Ecology and Evolution is a consequence of who is represented at the graduate and faculty levels. The NSF reports that 42% of baccalaureate and 32% of doctorate degrees in biology are awarded to underrepresented minorities (Wallace &

York, 2020). In comparison, only 25% of tenure-track faculty in biology are minorities, with 15% of that being full professors (Kozlowski et al., 2022; Wallace & York, 2020). Among these numbers, Black (6%) and Indigenous (1%) faculty representation are especially low (Kozlowski et al., 2022). Socioeconomic status is a significant driver of the representation of academic faculty. Children of doctoral recipients that grow up in wealthy urban neighborhoods with parents in academia are 25x more likely to have full support in pursuing academic positions (Morgan et al., 2021). Socioeconomic status coupled with low racial diversity contributes to the lack of adequate representation in the academy (Stevens et al., 2021).

One of the reasons marginalized people are not well represented in academia is due to evaluation criteria for the tenure (Corneille et al., 2019; Miriti et al., 2020; Schell et al., 2020). Publications and grants are valued over the impact of research on, or in collaboration with, local communities. Moreover, service is often overlooked by the academy (Corneille et al., 2019), with women of color taking on a disproportionate amount of service (Corneille et al., 2019; Miriti et al., 2020; Schell et al., 2020).

Biases surrounding how and whose work is valued in the academy often work against talented BIPOC academics that balance producing publications and service work aimed at transforming the academia for BIPOC scholars (Corneille et al., 2019). For example, Black principal investigators are awarded at a rate of 55% compared to that of their white colleagues by NIH (Stevens et al., 2021). In addition to disparities in funding, despite systemic racism pervasiveness in academia, its existence is often denied, leading to the continuation of institutional practices that disproportionately harm Black and Indigenous scholars. Berhe's (2022) "hostile obstacle course" illuminates the constant levels of discrimination awaiting scholars of marginalized backgrounds as they reach for academic success. Academic isolation, bullying, and implicit

biases in fellowship, award, and peer review processes steadily contribute to this hostile obstacle course (Barber et al., 2020; Berhe et al., 2021; McGee & Bentley, 2017). If we are to make any substantial change, academia and funding institutions must prioritize investment in and support the advancement of marginalized scholars.

Broader Impacts as a Band-aid:

The "broader impacts" criterion was meant to replace two of the four previous NSF funding criteria, "utility" and "effect on infrastructure" (Davis & Laas, 2014; Rothenberg, 2010). 89% of proposals in the new system mentioned a broader impact on science, and 66% of proposals mentioned a broader impact on society (Roberts, 2009). Although broader impacts aims are mandated as part of the application, the likelihood of achieving these impacts is not always taken into consideration.

Applicants of the GRFP are encouraged to structure their broader impacts section to check boxes that will obtain higher scores from reviewers. Between 2000 and 2010, 5.5% of applicants proposed more than they were able to accomplish (Watts et al., 2015). Of the 80% of proposals that focused on increasing involvement from marginalized communities, only 40% accomplished the work (Watts et al., 2015). These previous studies underscore how following through on broader impacts has not been a priority over time. The broader impacts section does not properly address the needs of the community or hold accountability for awardees.

The disconnect between broader impact and community needs:

Similar to Hoppe et al's (2019) study, there is a mismatch between what white researchers think marginalized communities need in terms of outreach and what communities *actually* need. When

writing the broader impacts section of the GRFP, individuals may be pushed to create "out the box" solutions to systemic issues, despite simple more community-focused solutions being necessary, leading to a clear separation in the broader impacts of the GRFP and the real impacts on society/communities. This separation stems from a lack of understanding of community needs and the necessity for researchers to articulate broad impacts aims. When researchers write about supporting marginalized communities with no previous relationship to said community, they do nothing more than exploit them to receive grants and fellowships, in turn, creating the notion of academic commodification. NSF's funding history creates a positive feedback loop where successful broader impacts statements stand on a non-existent foundation that does not engage with the communities they aim to impact, does not fulfill its stated goals in any substantive way, and instead reproduces existing inequities.

Previous recommendations to bridge this separation include targeted training of outreach to marginalized communities, encouraging high-quality dissemination of research results to the public, and increasing diverse leadership within research projects (Intemann, 2009; Landry et al., 2001; Roberts, 2009). Targeted mentoring and training of marginalized communities were recommended using the social justice rationale conceptualized by Intemann (2009) to promote participation and interest while diversifying white-dominated STEM spaces. Dissemination of research or project results is key to gaining a sense of how successful broader impacts are. Proposed impacts should be readily available for public view, actively supported by the targeted community, and based on previous successful research (Roberts, 2009). In the next section, we suggest tangible pathways and recommendations to increase liability between proposed and realized broader impacts.

New Directions and Recommendations:

In order to move forward towards true justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI), we must differentiate between "being involved" and "being heard." Going forward, GRFP applicants must *involve* community leaders in their application and thoroughly *listen* to the community's needs. A more inclusive model for the GRFP application should be grounded in this form of inclusivity and horizontal leadership style between applicant and community leader. Moreover, transparency and accountability are needed for progress to occur. To this degree, we bring forward five recommendations, categorized into assessments, implementation, and evaluation, that the NSF and universities hosting GRFP fellows could incorporate to make the first steps towards solving the identified issues.

Assessments

(1) Letter of Support and Community Partnership

To support their personal and research statements, individuals applying to the GRFP must solicit three letters of recommendation to support their overall application. We propose that one of the three letters should be from a community representative proposed in the application. This letter should address what the applicant has proposed in their application and detail the letter writer's enthusiasm for the proposed activities, confirm an established relationship, and discuss how the proposed broader impacts section dovetails with or expands on the work the organization is currently doing. This will ensure that all stakeholders, including the community, are aware and agree with the proposed broader impacts. Additionally, researchers should be in constant communication with members of the targeted communities in order for the project to be adjusted if broader impacts goals, and more importantly community aims, are not being met. For example,

if the proposed study is meant to support Indigenous communities, then the inclusion of Indigenous leadership at both project conception and dissemination will increase the likelihood of positive reception and outcomes.

(2) Diversify Reviewers

Diversity leads to a stronger and more robust field of science (AlShebli et al., 2018; Campbell et al., 2013; Plaut, 2010). However, this has not scaled up to the review process. What is considered important in terms of research and impact is left open to reviewers and this has led to inequities in funding success, particularly for Black scientists (Hoppe et al., 2019). We reemphasize that reviewers of the GRFP must be diverse in terms of, but not limited to, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class, neurodivergence, and physical ability in combination with appointment type (e.g., government researchers, non-profits). Diversity in appointment type is needed to ensure that reviewers have experience in applied broader impacts projects to review the proposed broader impact's feasibility and likelihood for success.

(3) Correcting Reviewer Bias

The assumption that tenure-track and tenured faculty members can effectively and holistically evaluate applicants, both on intellectual merit *and* broader impacts, is a blind spot created by the nature of academia. Although reviewers are able to critically evaluate research due to their expertise in their respective fields, not all reviewers are equally equipped to evaluate the impact of broader impacts due to the lack of emphasis and value tenure evaluation places on outreach. Moreover, it is unrealistic to assume that reviewers, who may encompass privileged identities, will not allow any bias in their reviews. Thus, the NSF should require anti-racist training for all reviewers and create an equity-based scoring rubrics to inhibit biases within reviewing. Lastly, to

prevent bias that may occur even with these preventive measures, all reviews should be given feedback by other colleagues to (1) catch wrongful scoring due to potential bias and (2) prevent harmful reviews from reaching applicants.

Implementation

(4) Institutional and NSF Supplemental Funding

Individuals who propose high-quality broader impacts for their GRFP application immediately encounter obstacles in the form of funding. The stipend awarded by the GRFP solely supports the individual's living expenses and does not provide additional funds for broader impacts plans. Although this support is intended to free up time for scholarly pursuits such as applying for grants, publishing articles, and presenting research, funding availability for outreach is harder to come by. Awardees, especially those from marginalized backgrounds with experiences that would create strong service plans, lack appropriate support and infrastructure to accomplish their broader impacts. We suggest that proposals with high-quality broader impacts aims that propose more "for society" be rewarded and provided supplemental funds to engage in these activities.

Evaluation

(5) Publicization of Successful Broader Impacts

Transparency is crucial for moving any field forward to understand what works, what does not, and where there is room to expand. With this in mind, we expand on Roberts (2009) suggestion to strictly require, not encourage, all awardees of the GRFP to publicize their proposed broader impacts and broadcast their actualized broader impacts on an appropriate medium. These mediums could include open-access journal articles, personal websites, and video platforms such

as YouTube. These efforts will promote credibility between the researchers and the targeted community along with providing templates for related community service activities. Lastly, NSF should request survey completion from community leaders that detail proposal completion and realized community impact.

Conclusion

To critically reform our institutions, we must reevaluate the traditions we perpetuate. Many traditions – such as tenure evaluation and graduate student stipends –have dramatic consequences on diversity, inclusion (Marin-Spiotta et al., 2020; Schell et al., 2020), and student mental health (Assembly, 2014; Barreira et al., 2018; Coffino et al., 2021; Evans et al., 2018; Mackie & Bates, 2019). Unsurprisingly, these norms disproportionately harm individuals from marginalized backgrounds (Grogan, 2019; Silbiger & Stubler, 2019; Smith et al., 2007).

The academy has a long way to go before the "hostile obstacle course" is dismantled. This paper contributes to the growing body of literature on routes of reformation by tackling a place where graduate students, especially those from marginalized backgrounds, experience inequity, and discrimination. As graduate students of color who encompass intersecting marginalized identities and that have (applied for) the GRFP, we feel the pain that our colleagues face regarding fellowship inequity and financial hardship. We believe that the broader impacts criterion in the GRFP can be one way to begin repairing the polluted relationship between institutions and marginalized communities but only if these activities are done right and with full engagement and participation by the communities in question. The recommendations put forward in this article are meant to serve as one pillar in a plethora of solutions to move academia forward in academic JEDI work and outreach into marginalized communities.

Acknowledgments

This project's conception and completion were done at the University of California, Berkeley, California State University, Fullerton, and the University of Southern California. These institutions sit on the ancestral and unceded lands of the Ohlone and Tongva people, respectively. These lands of what is now considered Berkeley, Fullerton, and Los Angeles, California continue to be of great importance to their respective Indigenous people, and we recognize that we benefit from the use and occupation of these lands. We would like to thank the many folks who have both created and facilitated these conversations in an effort to make academia a safer space for underrepresented folks like us; we see you, we are in solidarity with you, and we thank you for your hard work. It does not go unseen. We would like to thank Dr. Jorge Ramos, Alexandria Taylor Cervantes, and Ari Perez for their invaluable support and for stimulating discussions around this topic that created this paper. Finally, we would like to thank in no particular order Alycia Ellington, Melissa Edwards, Samantha Krelig, and Dr. Damian Elias for your invaluable feedback on an early version of this manuscript.

Funding

COE was supported by the UC Berkeley's Chancellor Fellowship, and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship under Grant No. 2146752. BQ was supported by the California Sea Grant Graduate Research Fellowship, the National Geographic Level 1 Grant No. EC-93122R-22, and the Council on Oceanic Affairs, Science and Technology Graduate Student Research Award. DOZ was supported by graduated TA funding at USC and the USC Wrigley Institute Summer Graduate Fellowship.

References:

Ahmad-Gawel, M., Farrell, M., & Terebiznik, M. (2021). *The history and legacy of colonialism in tropical field biology*. https://brews.eeb.utoronto.ca/files/2021/06/20210528-BREWS-summary.pdf

Airhart, M. (2022, June 2). *Legacy of Colonialism Influences Science in the Caribbean*. News.utexas.edu. https://news.utexas.edu/2022/06/02/legacy-of-colonialism-influences-science-in-the-caribbean/

AlShebli, B. K., Rahwan, T., & Woon, W. L. (2018). The preeminence of ethnic diversity in scientific collaboration. *Nature Communications*, *9*(1), 5163.

Assembly, U. C. B. G. (2014). Graduate student happiness and well-being report. *Berkeley, CA*.

Barber, P. H., Hayes, T. B., Johnson, T. L., Márquez-Magaña, L., & 10,234 signatories. (2020). Systemic racism in higher education. *Science*, *369*(6510), 1440–1441.

Barreira, P., Basilico, M., & Bolotnyy, V. (2018). Graduate student mental health: Lessons from American economics departments. *Harvard Univ*. https://scholar.harvard.edu/sites/scholar.harvard.edu/files/bolotnyy/files/bbb_mentalhealth_paper.pdf

Berhe, A. A., Barnes, R. T., Hastings, M. G., Mattheis, A., Schneider, B., Williams, B. M., & Marín-Spiotta, E. (2021). Scientists from historically excluded groups face a hostile obstacle course. *Nature Geoscience*, *15*(1), 2–4.

Campbell, L. G., Mehtani, S., Dozier, M. E., & Rinehart, J. (2013). Gender-heterogeneous working groups produce higher quality science. *PloS One*, *8*(10), e79147.

Ching, C. D., Felix, E. R., Fernandez Castro, M., & Trinidad, A. (2020). Achieving Racial Equity From the Bottom-Up? The Student Equity Policy in the California Community

Colleges. *Educational Policy*, *34*(6), 819–863.

Coffino, J. A., Spoor, S. P., Drach, R. D., & Hormes, J. M. (2021). Food insecurity among graduate students: prevalence and association with depression, anxiety and stress. *Public Health Nutrition*, *24*(7), 1889–1894.

Corneille, M., Lee, A., Allen, S., Cannady, J., & Guess, A. (2019). Barriers to the advancement of women of color faculty in STEM: The need for promoting equity using an intersectional framework. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, *38*(3), 328–348.

Davis, M., & Laas, K. (2014). "Broader impacts" or "responsible research and innovation"? A comparison of two criteria for funding research in science and engineering. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *20*(4), 963–983.

Evans, T. M., Bira, L., Gastelum, J. B., Weiss, L. T., & Vanderford, N. L. (2018). Evidence for a mental health crisis in graduate education. *Nature Biotechnology*, *36*(3), 282–284.

Finney, C. (2014). *Black Faces, White Spaces: Reimagining the Relationship of African Americans to the Great Outdoors*. UNC Press Books.

Garrison, H. (2013). Underrepresentation by race-ethnicity across stages of U.S. science and engineering education. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, *12*(3), 357–363.

Ginther, D. K., Schaffer, W. T., Schnell, J., Masimore, B., Liu, F., Haak, L. L., & Kington, R. (2011). Race, ethnicity, and NIH research awards. *Science*, *333*(6045), 1015–1019.

Grogan, K. E. (2019). How the entire scientific community can confront gender bias in the workplace [Review of *How the entire scientific community can confront gender bias in the workplace*]. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *3*(1), 3–6.

Hoppe, T. A., Litovitz, A., Willis, K. A., Meseroll, R. A., Perkins, M. J., Hutchins, B. I., Davis, A. F., Lauer, M. S., Valantine, H. A., Anderson, J. M., & Santangelo, G. M. (2019). Topic

choice contributes to the lower rate of NIH awards to African-American/black scientists. *Science Advances*, *5*(10), eaaw7238.

Intemann, K. (2009). Why Diversity Matters: Understanding and Applying the Diversity Component of the National Science Foundation's Broader Impacts Criterion. *Social Epistemology*, *23*(3-4), 249–266.

Kennedy, M. S., Lanier, S. K., Ehlert, K. M., High, K. A., Pegues, K. K., & Sharp, J. L. (2016). Understanding the role of knowledge related to financial resources on decisions to attend graduate school. *2016 IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference (FIE)*, 1–5.

Kozlowski, D., Larivière, V., Sugimoto, C. R., & Monroe-White, T. (2022). Intersectional inequalities in science. *PNAS*, *119*(2), e2113067119

Landry, R., Amara, N., & Lamari, M. (2001). Climbing the Ladder of Research Utilization: Evidence from Social Science Research. *Science Communication*, *22*(4), 396–422.

National Science Foundation. 2014. Evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowship Program. Final Report. *Washington DC: National Science Foundation*.

National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program, 2022. National Science Foundation, Available at: https://www.nsfgrfp.org/. Date accessed April 07, 2022.

Mackie, S. A., & Bates, G. W. (2019). Contribution of the doctoral education environment to PhD candidates' mental health problems: a scoping review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *38*(3), 565–578.

Marin-Spiotta, E., T. Barnes, R., Asefaw Berhe, A., G. Hastings, M., Mattheis, A., Schneider, B., & M. Williams, B. (2020). Hostile climates are barriers to diversifying the geosciences. *Advances in Geosciences*, *53*, 117–127.

McGee, E. O., & Bentley, L. (2017). The Troubled Success of Black Women in STEM. *Cognition and Instruction*, *35*(4), 265–289.

Miriti, M. N., Bailey, K., Halsey, S. J., & Harris, N. C. (2020). Hidden figures in ecology and evolution. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, *4*(10), 1282.

Morgan, A., LaBerge, N., Larremore, D., Galesic, M., Brand, J. E., & Clauset, A. (2021). *Socioeconomic Roots of Academic Faculty*.

Nguyen, K. H., Akiona, A. K., Chang, C. C., Chaudhary, V. B., Cheng, S. J., Johnson, S. M., Kahanamoku, S. S., Lee, A., deLeon Sanchez, E. E., Segui, L. M., & Tanner, R. L. (2022). Who are we? Highlighting Nuances in Asian American Experiences in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. *Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, *103*(1), 1–8.

Plaut, V. C. (2010). Diversity Science: Why and How Difference Makes a Difference. *Psychological Inquiry*, *21*(2), 77–99.

Riegle-Crumb, C., King, B., & Irizarry, Y. (2019). Does STEM Stand Out? Examining Racial/Ethnic Gaps in Persistence Across Postsecondary Fields. *Educational Researcher* , *48*(3), 133–144.

Roberts, M. R. (2009). Realizing Societal Benefit from Academic Research: Analysis of the National Science Foundation's Broader Impacts Criterion. *Social Epistemology*, *23*(3-4), 199–219.

Rothenberg, M. (2010). Making Judgements About Grant Proposals: A Brief History of the Merit Review Criteria at the National Science Foundation. *Technology & Innovation*, *12*(3), 189–195.

Schell, C. J., Guy, C., Shelton, D. S., Campbell-Staton, S. C., Sealey, B. A., Lee, D. N., & Harris, N. C. (2020). Recreating Wakanda by promoting Black excellence in ecology and

391 evolution. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, *4*, 1285-1287.
392 Silbiger, N. J., & Stubler, A. D. (2019). Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm
393 underrepresented groups in STEM. *PeerJ*, *7*, e8247.
394 Smith, W. A., Allen, W. R., & Danley, L. L. (2007). "Assume the Position . . . You Fit the
395 Description": Psychosocial Experiences and Racial Battle Fatigue Among African
396 American Male College Students. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, *51*(4), 551–578.
397 Stevens, K. R., Masters, K. S., Imoukhuede, P. I., Haynes, K. A., Setton, L. A., Cosgriff-
398 Hernandez, E., Lediju Bell, M. A., Rangamani, P., Sakiyama-Elbert, S. E., Finley, S. D.,
399 Willits, R. K., Koppes, A. N., Chesler, N. C., Christman, K. L., Allen, J. B., Wong, J. Y.,
400 El-Samad, H., Desai, T. A., & Eniola-Adefeso, O. (2021). Fund Black scientists. *Cell*,
401 *184*(3), 561–565.
402 Trisos, C. H., Auerbach, J., & Katti, M. (2021). Decoloniality and anti-oppressive practices for a
403 more ethical ecology. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, *5*, 1205-1212.
404 Tuck, E. (2009). Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities. *Harvard Educational Review*,
405 *79*(3), 409–428.
406 van Woesik, R., Shlesinger, T., Grottoli, A. G., Toonen, R. J., Vega Thurber, R., Warner, M. E.,
407 Marie Hulver, A., Chapron, L., McLachlan, R. H., Albright, R., Crandall, E., DeCarlo, T.
408 M., Donovan, M. K., Eirin-Lopez, J., Harrison, H. B., Heron, S. F., Huang, D., Humanes,
409 A., Krueger, T., … Zaneveld, J. (2022). Coral-bleaching responses to climate change across
410 biological scales. *Global Change Biology*, *28*(14), 4229–4250.
411 Wallace, K. J., & York, J. M. (2020). A systems change framework for evaluating academic
412 equity and inclusion in an Ecology and Evolution Graduate Program. *Ecology and*
413 *Evolution*, *10*(20), 10922–10929.

414 Watts, S. M., George, M. D., & Levey, D. J. (2015). Achieving Broader Impacts in the National
415 Science Foundation, Division of Environmental Biology. *Bioscience*, *65*(4), 397–407.
416 Wiener, E. A., & LeFevre, G. H. (2021). Using the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Proposal
417 to Train Original Scientific Writing Skills in First-Year Graduate Students: A Demonstrated
418 Project at the University of Iowa. *Environmental Engineering Science*.