THE PAST FOUNDATION

Science Alliance Leadership Training (SALT) Atlanta 2017
Bullet Point Report

KNOWLEDGE CAPTURE PROGRAM

PAST Foundation
Monica S. Hunter, Ph.D, Director of Research
Maria Green Cohen, Assistant Director of Research
Kayla Galloway, Research Assistant

November 2017

Science Alliance Leadership Training (SALT) Atlanta 2017: Bullet Point Report

Table of Contents

Bullet Point Reports

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Bullet Point Report
November 2017

INTRODUCTION

The following Bullet Point Reports (11) provide an overview of the New York Academy of Sciences' Science Alliance Leadership Training (SALT) in Atlanta, Georgia. The New York Academy of Sciences previously held two SALT workshops in New York City in 2016 and the summer of 2017, making SALT Atlanta the third cohort to complete this intensive professional development. The training spanned four days from Thursday, September 14 through Sunday, September 17. Graduate students (28) from diverse backgrounds and working in STEM fields attended SALT Atlanta seeking to develop leadership skills to advance their careers. Participants gained leadership skills through improvisational training and by studying group and team dynamics. SALT Atlanta was sponsored by the Lockheed Martin Corporation, which gave participants the opportunity to visit the Lockheed Martin Facility in Marietta, Georgia, network with company executives, and engage with keynote speakers.

Please note that the only pronouns used in this report are they/their/them for all SALT Atlanta participants. This is to ensure privacy, as well as respecting the wishes of SALT Atlanta participants who identify as non-binary gender. The observer acknowledges that this was an important issue for the SALT Atlanta group as a whole, who were committed to creating a safe space to foster personal growth and awareness for all participants.

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Communications and Leadership I Session
Bullet Point Report A
Day 1 – Improvisation Session I
Thursday, September 14, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 8:00pm – 10:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Boyd Branch
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
SALT Atlanta participants had the opportunity to visit the Lockheed Martin Facility in Marietta, Georgia. The provided transportation experienced difficulties navigating the facility grounds, which forced participants to stay on the charter bus for an extended period of time. The situation acted as an icebreaker and gave the participants who were able to attend the site visit a chance to connect. Participants began to foster relationships, which impacted the group dynamics of the training moving forward. The site visit consisted of a brief tour of the welcome center, a presentation organized by the company's diversity outreach division, a tour of the facilities, and a question and answer session. All participants were instructed to not take notes or record during the site visit due to facility protocol.

After the site visit the group returned to the hotel, broke for dinner, and regrouped for the first of three improvisation training sessions: Communications and Leadership I. Boyd Branch facilitated the introduction to the improvisation session. The session began with Yaihara Fortis reviewing logistics for the next day, and urging the participants to take full advantage of the training. One participant asked a question about the presence of an observer on the behalf of the group, and if they were participating in an anthropological study. Yaihara explained the role of the observer was to conduct program evaluation, and in no way were the participants being evaluated or their personal information shared.

Boyd began the session by explaining that improv techniques will help the participants be more dynamic when they communicate and present their work. He encouraged participants to take risks throughout the improvisation training sessions, and if they found that improvisation is not for them to please stay present with the group and contribute with feedback. The facilitator provided a brief background on the training and then had the group start off with a concentric circle activity where they were instructed to give one "boring fact" about themselves as they rotated around the circle. The activity did not go smoothly, but the facilitator explained to the group that this was a demonstration of failure, and that there will be failure during the improvisation training sessions. He assured the group that it was OK to fail, and if an activity

doesn't work the fault was his, not the participants. Boyd ended the activity by instructing the participants to go around the room and introduce someone new they met and include one "boring fact" about their peer. He explained that the goal of the activity was to demonstrate how to bring "life back into conversations."

Before giving the group a break, the facilitator had them participating in two improvisation exercises. First, he instructed the group to simultaneously make a hand motion of a cross with one hand and a circle with the other to demonstrate the existence of mental blocks. As expected, the participants were not successful at this activity even though they are physically capable. Boyd explained that something is getting in the way of them mentally, and blocking the simultaneous hand motions, and instructs the group to be aware of this phenomenon as they move through the other improvisation exercises. Next, the participants gathered in groups of two via the "hug-a-bear" technique to play "Hypnotist vs. Hypnotized". One member of the group was instructed to be the hypnotist and the other the hypnotized. For this particular improv exercise the hypnotized is instructed to place their nose up to the palm of their partner's hand and follow the hypnotist's hand movements. After a few minutes the group members were instructed to switch roles. At the close of the exercise the facilitator allowed the participants to share how they felt in each role. Boyd told the group that the number one rule of improvisation is to make your partner look good.

After returning from break, the facilitator introduced a basic principle of improvisation, to always say "yes". Boyd selected a participant at random to help demonstrate saying "yes" through improv dialogue. He then instructed the group to organize into groups of six via the "hug-a-bear" technique to participate in the Gift Giving improvisation exercise. The participants were instructed to sit in a circle and create a holiday or special occasion in order to give a gift to the person sitting next to them. Boyd directed the participants to say the first thing that comes to mind as they offered gifts to group members, and to try to be "boring not clever." After the exercise, Boyd facilitated a group debrief and Yaihara closed the session by encouraging participants to break the cycle of staying in their comfort zones with people they already know in an effort to get to know the other 27 people in the room. Two participants who were not able to attend the Lockhead Martin site visit earlier in the day seemed to be disinterested in the improvisation session, and at one point removed themselves from the group by sitting down during one "hug-a-bear" grouping activity.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions
- One participant asked the facilitator if the group could take time to introduce themselves with the purpose of familiarizing themselves with their fellow participants
  - The facilitator had planned to do a concentric circle introductory activity
- Questioning the basic principle of improvisation; saying "yes" instead of "no" as it applies to their graduate work
  - What if you are most certainly correct?
  - Do you have the ability to say "no" if you are being tasked with too much work?

Participant Comments
- Only a few participants indicated they have had previous experience with improvisation
- The idea of not being good enough resonates with the participants
  - Conditioned to think you are always doing something the wrong way
  - Participants commonly experience this feeling when writing papers
    - Constantly doubting and correcting their work
- Concentric circle activity helped break down barriers
  - Participants acknowledged when introducing themselves to others they commonly open with their research first
  - Participants shared they did not find the facts shared by their peers to be boring, and believed exercise helped them retain information about each individual and foster personal connections
  - One participant shared that everyone is now viewed as a "regular person" after this exercise as opposed to being "prestigious" or "intimidating"
- Difficult to think about multiple things at once
- Hard to resist planning and trying to be clever during improvisation exercises

Accepting the role of the leader vs. follower
- Role of the leader
  - Found it difficult to be in control during improvisation exercises
    - Did not want to be to mean
  - Participants disliked playing the role of the hypnotist the most
- Role of the follower
  - Found it difficult to give up control during improvisation exercises
  - Expected more payback when forced to switch roles during improvisation exercises
  - One participant liked being the hypnotized because of the lack of worries, not being aware of the actions of others in the room, and having the opportunity to let go and enjoy the experience
- One participant found it interesting how their peers' personalities were revealed during the improvisation exercises
  - Daring individuals vs. those more concerned about others
  - Adventure and risk taking vs. responsible

- One participant found it interesting how isolated they could become with their partners during exercises
- Found the improvisation exercises to be enjoyable and fun
- Participants noted they communicated how they would like to be led through body language and physical response
- Real world application
  - Team work requires people to fill both the roles of the leader and the follower
  - Team work requires give and take
  - Situation determines which role a person should take
  - Advisor/mentor vs. mentee relationship

Basic Improvisation Principles
- Saying "yes"
  - Participants admittedly struggled at first because they are used to having to prove themselves to be right in an academic setting
    - Used to combatting resistance, specifically when presenting their work
- Gift giving exercise taught trial and error
  - Participants noted their group members would smile if they liked something, and as the giver were disappointed if their peers disliked the item they were gifting
  - Exercise became easier as the game went on
    - Less filtering while communicating with peers
- Real world/lab application
  - Students have a way of over-committing
    - Learn when it is the appropriate time to say no

Participant Concerns
- Most of the participants admit they are fearful of improvisation
- Dangers of expressing the first thought that comes to mind
  - Potential to damage relationships
  - One participant believes it is more effective to think carefully before communicating how you feel
- Consequences to always saying "yes"
  - Put yourself in a position to get taken advantage of
- One participant admitted to feeling overwhelmed
  - Doesn't feel like they did it right
  - Sees improvisation as *just acting* and not useful

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Improvisation for Public Communication Session
Bullet Point Report B
Day 2 – Improvisation Session II
Friday, September 15, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 9:00am - 12:30pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Boyd Branch
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW

The first session of the second day of training was facilitated by Boyd Branch and focused on improvisation for public communication. Participants learned how to have a better public speaking presence and use their body language to engage with different audiences.

The chairs in the room were placed in a "U" shape at the beginning of the session, and the facilitators began by asking participants to share their observations and feelings at this point in the training. Participants were also asked to share how it feels to be able to talk about their own feelings, as well as having the opportunity to hear from their peers. During the share-out two volunteer participants were invited to share something they are really proud of outside of the training. Yaihara encouraged the group to commit to self-care by finding something they are truly passionate about to avoid burn out.

Next, the individual who asked the facilitators during the first training session to allow the participants to go around the room and state their names asked again to repeat the process for reference. Boyd instructed the group to go around the circle and state their names with the addition of an adjective and a gesture. After the name game, Boyd went over the improvisation workshop goals and had the group play two games to warm-up for the session. Next, the facilitator introduced the concept of "diffused status" for the next activity, and then participants dispersed for a quick break.

Following the break, the group was introduced to the *Party Game* where half the group participated and the other half observed. Participants were given a playing card and the rank of the card indicated the status of the participant. Participants could view the rank of their peers, but not that of their own. The group was instructed to improvise that they were at a party and to play to what they thought their status was based on how their peers treated them. The purpose of the game is to gauge the structures and behavior associated with status. Later, the observers and participants switched roles for the *Body Language Game* where the

facilitator instructed the participants to walk or move in certain ways to demonstrate that the way people learn to move dictates how they feel. Following each game, the facilitator gave the participants the opportunity to share out their observations.

After another break, Boyd discussed high vs. low status and instructed participants to pair up. Participants actively sought new partners on their own accord. Participants took turns playing high and low statuses, and shared with the group how the activity made them feel. The facilitator reinforced the idea that high vs. low status does not equate to good vs. bad status, and explained to the group that there is an opportunity to have more diverse relationships when one can get past that reality. At the close of the session the group participated in the *Expert Interview Game* where two participants volunteered to play the interviewer and the expert, while the rest of the group observed the status exchange.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions

Priming empathetic capacity
- What is the difference between empathy and sympathy
  - Is the point to know exactly how someone is feeling?

Goals
- Participants requested tips on how to deal with surprising situations, such as rudely being interrupted during a presentation
  - *How do you respond to them and still be in control of speech?*
- Participants requested tips on how to embrace the qualities of being a scientist outside the world of science

Status structures
- What do you do when two high status people compete for status?

Participant Comments

Participant overall observations and feelings
- One participant originally thought due to impending deadlines they should not attend the training, but after the first day they found the training enjoyable and worth the time spent away from the lab
- One participant felt they had to sound smart to prove that they belonged in the SALT workshop

- One participant enjoyed having the opportunity to talk about science and to get encouragement from non-scientists because they do not get that from their PI
- Participants enjoyed having conversations with their peers because scientists operate on different levels
    - Science is their world view, not just being in the lab
    - Integrating and using data to solve daily problems
    - Find it fascinating when they talk to complete strangers in the scientific community
- Participants intrigued by their peers' diverse backgrounds
- Participants able to notice similarities with one another through the sharing of mundane personal facts
    - Fostered a sense of comfort amongst the group
- One participant noted that it is important to be cognizant that people have hypothesis all the time about others on the surface level
    - Everyone agrees to change their hypothesis to fit the data, but it's difficult
    - *That's a tool that even if this [training] ended right now that would be a good takeaway*

Experiences
- Participants overwhelmingly feel their talent gets destroyed by advisors
    - Many participants feel their personal growth is being blocked because their PIs will not shift their lab experience to fit them personally
        - Conflict due to cultural difference between them and their PIs
- One participant is concerned they impact their mentees and peers experiences because they have a tendency to get overly excitable and consistently interrupt others
- One participants shared they have a tendency to say "no" to younger students' ideas because of their own past experiences
    - Younger students not given the opportunity to learn from failure

Priming empathetic capacity
- One participant feels it is not usually very helpful to be empathetic

Gauging status structures
- Participants noted during the Party Game, participants who realized they were higher status altered their body language by adjusting their shoulders back and putting their chest out, while the participants who figured out they were lower status began to slouch
- Participants noted that when they observed someone wasn't playing their correct status they wanted to shape them
    - Need to have a sense of security and to know where you belong
    - Want people to stay in their place because it validates your own place
    - Gives structure in an unstructured world
- Participant noted they felt comfortable talking to others before they knew their status
- One participant who was of higher status purposefully talked to someone of low status to see if they could boost their confidence

- Advantage of playing low status
    - When you don't want to be bothered
    - When you want to feel a sense of community around you rather than putting yourself on a pedestal
- Real world application
    - One participant noted they lower their status unconsciously with their PI because the status offer makes the relationship better

Body mechanics and emotions
- Participant noted that when the facilitator told the group to "be smaller" they felt sadness
- Participant observed that walking fast was more comfortable
- Participant noted being higher status made it easier to breathe
- One observer noted that most people crossed their hands or arms when told to slouch while walking
    - Closing themselves off from the environment

Participant Concerns
- One participant enjoyed hearing from others in the room, but worried they are not that interesting when talking about themselves
    - Another participant forced the individual to reflect on the previous day's session when they learned multiple times that they weren't boring
    - Change of mindset
- Real world application
    - One participant noted that during the improvisation activities participants are going to the extreme and not using tact or compromise that is required in a social setting
        - Facilitator explained that the participants are training like athletes during the workshop sessions and need to go to the extreme to get fit for competition

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics I
Bullet Point Report C
Day 2 – Group and Team Dynamics Session I
Friday, September 15, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 2:00pm – 5:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
After lunch and a presentation from the keynote speaker organized by the workshop's sponsor Lockheed Martin, the participants regrouped for the first of six Group and Team Dynamics training sessions. The room contained five tables, and the participants were not assigned seating. Six of the participants who had been more reserved throughout the training up to this point, including two participants that did not join the group until the first improvisation training, elected to sit at the back two tables. Yaihara briefly went over housekeeping items and introduced the lead facilitator of the training session, Mateo Cruz.

Mateo began the session by sharing his academic background and three personal stories detailing a time when he tried to implement cultural change to a system and failed. He continued the training by introducing the group to the key ways people respond to threats and the "stereotype content model." Next, the facilitator distributed a questionnaire on change and leadership, specifically assumptions about managing change, and instructed the participants to not overthink the questions. After each participant finished responding to the questionnaire, the facilitator had the group stand up and move away from the tables. Mateo had participants share their answers as he guided the group through each question and provided feedback. After the activity, the facilitator dismissed the group for a break.

Following the break, the facilitator explained his belief that it is almost impossible to change an organization's culture, but one can change behavior. He shared a personal anecdote about trying to implement a cultural change at his academic institution, and opened the floor for discussion. Mateo noted that participants should be careful about immediately introducing a cultural change when joining an organization, specifically after graduation, because cultures tend to bring in people like themselves and push out those who are different. This was followed by an introduction to Leadership Theory, and participants were instructed to write down five qualities they think an effective leader should possess. Participants shared the qualities with their tables to see if there were any shared qualities. No table group reported any two people as having the same leadership qualities list; however, the following four qualities

did appear more than once: open-minded, empathetic, visionary, and compassionate. Mateo continued the training session by reviewing leadership approaches and styles. He instructed the group to write down two reasons smart people sometimes fail and had participants share their answers to the group as a whole.

The facilitator closed the training session by introducing the Learning Styles Inventory. Mateo distributed each participants' Kolb's Learning Styles profile. All participants were instructed to take the Kolb's Learning Styles questionnaire before the workshop. The facilitator briefly went over each of the four profiles (Diverging, Converging, Assimilators, and Accommodators) and allowed the participants to share their feelings on their results. Mateo explained that the Learning Styles Inventory would play a key role in teamwork activities in the training moving forward. The SALT facilitators dismissed the group to get ready for the reception and networking opportunity with Lockheed Martin Executives that evening.

Throughout the training session many participants actively took notes and a few captured photos of some of the slides.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions

Implementing Cultural Change
- Can small changes add up to something larger?
- Is it OK to introduce cultural change after six months at an organization?

Learning Styles Inventory
- What does it mean if you are between two learning styles?

Participant Comments

Organizational Behavior
- None of the participants have had experience with courses on organizational behavior
- One participant found it interesting how the training session touched on the system and how to disrupt or break it because in the academic system the focus is tenure and not innovation

Leadership
- Participant believes that not being a leader has a negative connotation
  - Change the conversation
  - Team members have different skillsets
- Participant believes leaders get selected based on technical skills, not soft skills
  - *PI selection based on writing skills*

Causes of Leadership Failure
- Participant believes some intelligent people struggle with leadership due to lack of trust
    - They do not trust their team members when placed in a leadership position
- A leader who is narrow-minded
- Lack of soft skills
- Anxiety

Learning Styles Inventory
- Diverging Profile
    - All five participants recognized as fitting the Diverging learning style were female
    - Participant noted they relate to understanding problems and wanting to listen to everyone to get the team on the same page
    - Participant shared they like to take risk but only to an extent
    - Participant shared they are great at brainstorming new ideas, but finds the implementation piece to be challenging
- Assimilator Profile
    - 10 participants fit this profile
    - One participant noted that when they took the survey they thought of their own research, specifically the logistical challenges the research presents
- Converging Profile
    - 9 participants fit this profile
    - One participant disagreed with their result because they believe they can be indecisive
- Accommodators Profile
    - 3 participants fit this profile
    - One participant recognized that the profile fit their learning style, but does not view themselves as being an extrovert
        - Another participant noted that there is a common misunderstanding between introvert vs. extrovert, and the difference between the two is where one gets their energy
    - One participant believed they fit the strengths of the profile, but recognized they need a plan and view themselves in the middle of accommodating and assimilating
    - One participant believed the profile fit their learning style perfectly
        - Participant noted that they are interested in many different areas, but this is a concern because graduation is approaching and they do not know what area to pursue as a career

Managing Change
- Change is scary
- Change is inevitable
- Majority of the participants noted they are open to change or feel comfortable with change

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Improv Closure
Bullet Point Report D
Day 3 – Improvisation Session III
Saturday, September 16, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 8:50am – 10:08am

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Boyd Branch
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
The Improv Closure training session lead by Boyd Branch kicked off the third day of the workshop. To warm up for the day the facilitator led the group through two improv activities the participants were familiar with from previous training sessions: Pass the Clap and Hypnotist vs. Hypnotized. Boyd explained to participants the goal was to be fully present by the end of the warm-up activities to be ready for the rest of the day. During the improv exercise, Hypnotist vs. Hypnotized, the facilitator instructed the group that the person playing the role of the hypnotist could steal other hypnotists' partners. One participant's partner was stolen and the participant then removed themselves from the game. The participant explained that they did not want to steal anyone else's partner. The facilitator became the disengaged participant's partner, but the facilitator was soon "stolen" by another hypnotist and the participant again removed themselves from the game and stood in an unoccupied corner of the room. After warming up, Boyd reinforced the following three rules of improvisation: say yes, make your partner look good by accepting the reality they are offering you, and blurt out. Next, the facilitator instructed the group to participate in a brief round of Gift Giving. Up to this point in the session, a small group of participants appear disengaged. Arms folded, hands in pockets, fidgeting, and sitting outside of their group circles during the Gift Giving exercise are the physical responses of disengagement observed.

Following the Gift Giving activity, the facilitator introduced a new improvisation exercise to the group. The participants were instructed to line up in two parallel lines, and were partnered with person directly across from them. Each set of partners would take turns, where one person came up with a physical activity and then the duo would perform an improv skit based on that initial physical activity. Next, the group participated in three rounds of the Expert Interview Game, which was previously played by two volunteers at the close of the last improv session. Participants were self-selected, and two of the volunteers were participants that previously appeared quiet and disengaged. The other participants reacted to their peers' engagement with cheers of encouragement. The rest of the participants who did not volunteer were instructed to observe the status offerings during the game. After the improv exercise, Boyd led a discussion

on how the understanding of status dynamics can be used to solve conflicts in a lab setting, and encouraged the group to use the behavioral techniques they learned in the improv sessions to create better relationships in their labs.

During improv exercises participants were committed to making their partner look good. If they failed at making their partner look good they would self assess in real time and try again.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions
- How do you navigate a situation if two parties are competing for high status?
- How do we incorporate these behaviors into our daily life?
  - Participant recommends sending an email to oneself to keep track of interactions

Participant Comments
- One participant shared they liked learning about status and body language
  - Participant realize that sometimes they want to "steal the show" from other instructors
  - Physically raises status level by standing and yelling something forcing a shift in status dynamics
- Participants acknowledge they are becoming aware of these behaviors through the improv activities, and want to continue to train themselves to do it everyday so becomes second nature
- Important to constantly remind yourself that being self-critical is not helpful, and instead focus on what went well
- Awareness of the ability to raise or lower someone else's status
  - One participant shared their anxiety about graduate school interviews and to distract themselves from on their own anxiety tried to engage others to lift their status too
    - Felt more connected with people and at ease

Real World Application
- Participants use their understanding of status dynamics to solve conflicts in the lab setting
  - People get worked up during conflicts and only take one side, but to be successful in the lab everyone needs to win
  - Be able to self-reflect, and decide if a team member is actually giving a low status offer or misreading the situation and creating the conflict
  - Understanding that low and high status does not equate to bad vs. good status
    - Being able to accept low status offerings
  - Getting out of the scientific mindset

- o Think of conflict like two different visions or approaches
- o Conflict over methodology is common in the lab, and usually one method is more correct or efficient
  - ▪ Acknowledge team member's idea/methodology
  - ▪ Integrate
- Participants use their understanding of status dynamics to navigate status challenge offers in the lab
  - o One participant noted that this is the biggest issue in their life because of the logistical difficulties of securing a lab to conduct research
    - ▪ Every minute detail must be planned beforehand with team
  - o Arguing over facts is a common conflict in the lab
    - ▪ Recommend both parties go back and review the data

Participant Concerns

- One participant explained they did not feel comfortable "stealing" someone else's partner during the Hypnotist vs. Hypnotized activity
- After being instructed by the facilitator to bring their partner's status down, one participant could not move forward with the improv performance because they felt guilty and thought it was too mean
  - o *"I can't do it anymore. Like that [what the partner suggested] sounds fun."*
- One participant acknowledges it's OK to fail in improv and to look foolish by trying something different, but states it is different in science because people do not want to look uninformed and inexperienced

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics II (Morning Session)
Bullet Point Report E
Day 3 – Group and Team Dynamics Session II (Morning)
Saturday, September 16, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 10:18am – 12:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
The participants returned from break after the Improv Closure training session and began Group and Team Dynamics II facilitated by Mateo Cruz. The facilitator began the morning session by asking the participants to think of a word that captured where they were at this point in the workshop, and each participant was instructed to stand up and share their word to the group. After the share out, Mateo opened the floor for questions.

Following the brief question and answer session, the facilitator separated the participants into six teams based on their Learning Styles Profiles. Each team claimed a table and spent a few minutes getting to know their fellow team members. Mateo instructed the participants to share their learning styles with their team members, discussing how they can best contribute based on their learning preferences, and share one observable behavior of each learning style. Next, the facilitator explained to the group that 80% of conflict in teams starts with not defining and agreeing upon goals, individual roles on a team, and procedures for getting work done. Before introducing the Greater Good Escape Room activity, Mateo distributed a worksheet to each team where participants had to address the goals of their teams, define roles, and outline how to engage in work as a team. The facilitator then instructed two teams to sit at one table creating three tables of two teams each. Each table received a Greater Good Escape Room activity packet to be shared amongst the two teams per table, one team was given the blue puzzle pieces and the other team the green puzzle pieces. Mateo informed the group the instructions for the game were in each packet, and that they had exactly 60 minutes to earn as many team points as possible. Teams were given the option to work with the other team located at their table. When the game came to a close the facilitator dismissed the group for lunch, but informed them that they would debrief after the break during the afternoon session.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions and Participant Comments.

Participant Questions

- One participant asked how the learning styles profile is helpful in academia because the education system isn't interested in students individual learning preferences
    - Facilitator noted that the participants are not going to change their instructors' approach, but it is useful to know yourself and understand where you fit
        - Important to figure out how the members of your team work to avoid failure
- Many participants find the instructions to the Greater Good Escape Room activity to be unclear
    - Recommend game instructions be modified for SALT workshop setting

Participant Comments

Participant Feelings
- Several participants shared they were excited about the upcoming teamwork activities and to learn new things
- Energized and very motivated
- Revitalized
- Positive
- Eager
    - *Looking forward to the day*
- Optimistic and hopeful
- Thankful
- Peaceful and calm
- Reflective, thoughtful, and contemplated
    - *Thinking about a lot*
- Curious
- Tired and cloudy
    - *Trying to wake up*
- Under the weather and disengaged
    - Two participants shared they were not feeling well
- Scattered and flustered
- Two participants shared they were feeling anxious
- Participants categorized the room as a whole as
    - Tired and overwhelmed
    - Reflective
    - Full of anticipation
    - One participant noted that it seemed to be divided in terms of the time of day
        - Participants thinking about the future are excited

- Participants who are thinking about the past are tired
- Participants who are concentrating on the present are thoughtful

Team Joining and Observable Behaviors to Use as an Advantage
- It is important to have all four learning styles in a group, but it can also be a challenge
  - Need to be self aware
- It is important to recognize if a team member has not been given the opportunity to contribute
- Leverage the diversity of experience on the team
- One participant noted that one of the pre-workshop assigned readings described being open as a common attribute of feminine leaders, and the participant stated that should be a trait to take advantage of to improve team dynamics
  - One group member noted women are socialized to take care of the people around them
  - One group member noted women tend to be empathetic because they know what it is like to be overlooked and not have their opinion count
- Important to play to the strengths of each team member
  - Need to take inventory of what each team member identifies as strengths
- One team noted that more than one team member shared that they had trouble making decisions and would prefer someone else play the role of decision maker
- One participant believes that society is geared for the extroverted person who always speaks up
- One team noted that most team members are more reflective, while one of their team members prefers to lead
  - Team clearly defined their roles (reflective vs. decision maker)

The point of the Greater Good Escape Room activity was for each team to understand their team dynamics. The following section provides an overview of team dynamics observed.

Observation of Team Dynamics

Observation of Table 1
- The two teams located at Table 1 immediately began to work together from the start of the game
  - Sharing ideas
  - One participant suggested the teams divide and conquer
- All but two participants are standing rather than sitting around the table
  - Very animated
- Two outspoken participants, one from each team, get into a heated debate
  - One participant from each team steps in to help mediate the conflict
  - One of the participants accepted the lower status
    - The participant loudly exclaimed "Fine," while shaking their head and continuously clicking the pen held in their hand

Observation of Table 2
- The two teams located at Table 2 worked independently from each other until the third round when they realized each team can earn more points if they collaborate
- The two leaders from both teams chose to stand throughout the game
  - They began to directly work with each other
- Both teams were so focused on the task at hand that none of the participants were aware that one of the facilitators was standing on a chair next to them while taking a picture

Observation of Table 3
- The two teams located at Table 3 asked each other questions from the beginning of the game, but did not fully collaborate and share puzzle pieces until the third round
  - One team took the lead
  - The other team sat quietly while reading through all the instructions first, and then planned out how they wanted to approach the game
- One participant who shared earlier in the morning that they were feeling ill had disengaged from the team, and shifted their chair back from the table and sat with arms folded
  - Team member recognizes the disengagement and offers to explain what the team's plan is to win the game
- One participant self reflected in real time and shared with the group they noticed the teams should have collaborated earlier in the game to maximize points, but they didn't speak up because of anxiety
  - At school everyone immediately puts the participant down by introducing them as the youngest, which directly impacts confidence level

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics II (Afternoon Session)
Bullet Point Report F
Day 3 – Group and Team Dynamics Session II (Afternoon)
Saturday, September 16, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 1:48pm – 4:05pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW

Participants returned from lunch and the second presentation from a keynote speaker to continue the Group and Team Dynamics II afternoon session. The facilitator, Mateo Cruz, began the afternoon session by instructing the group to debrief the Greater Good Escape Room activity with their team members and discuss what they learned about their team dynamics. The facilitator then brought all the participants together to share comments or ask questions about the game.

Next, Mateo continued his PowerPoint presentation from the morning session. He covered what defines a group, work group, and team, as well as the emotional issues present in groups and group behaviors in response. He introduced Wheelan's Integrated Model of Group Development, and the B.A.R.T (Boundary, Authority, Role, Task) System of Group and Organizational Analysis. Mateo instructed the participants to reflect on team dynamics during the Greater Good activity, and to acts of de-authorization and authorization they observed on their teams. During this time participants were given the option to take a brief break and then regroup for a share out.

After the group share out, the facilitator discussed the types of roles present in each group and how they work together. Teams were then instructed to take a team-role inventory, and to discuss their primary role on their team related to the group activity and how the role affected the team's goals. Mateo allowed time for a whole group share out before the close of the training session.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions

- One team wondered if there was a connection between team roles and socialization
  - Feminine vs. masculine traits

Participant Comments

What Did You Learn?
- Planning and procedures
  - One participant felt the team all had the same goals but were working in different directions
    - Trust needs to be present
    - One participant acknowledged this shortcoming, but explained that the work had to be done fast and the team had to try many different strategies to maximize points
    - Need a base plan, but still have the opportunity to deviate if need be
    - Should have started by clearly defining the rules, goals, and designate roles for each team member immediately after reading instructions
  - Five of the six teams noted they needed to spend more time planning
    - Wasted time backtracking
    - Needed to take a more complete assessment of the resources
    - Needed to spend more time on instructions before touching the pieces
    - Need to slow down process to make sure team members have all the info before proceeding
    - One team noted they rushed through the directions and chose to merely figure it out along the way
      - Need to plan and delegate tasks first
    - One team decided at the beginning of the game to be flexible and to only talk about roles in the abstract
      - The method was unsuccessful and the team determined that they need to change their behavior for the next activity
- Roles and team dynamics
  - One participant felt forced to play the role of the micromanager because of the lack of a dominant personality in their group
    - Could feel old behaviors coming back
    - *"Not who I am now"*
  - One participant felt they were personally too impatient
  - One participant believed their team's strength was creativity
    - Pointed out that they other group at their table developed a plan before starting the puzzle and they had to change too
    - The other group also took some of the team's ideas
  - One participant believed their team's personalities meshed well, and it helped that they defined roles early on in the activity

- One person on the team volunteered to be the time keeper and gave five minute warnings for each round
- One shortcoming was no one wanted to take the role of tracking the points because the rules were a bit unclear
    - One participant noted they have a way of steamrolling people
    - One participant shared they wanted to choose a role to challenge themself and move out of their comfort zone, but quickly fell back on old behaviors
        - Wants to be more vocal and take on more of a leadership role, but tends to be more reflective
        - Observed the negative interaction with the other team at the table caused them to not enjoy the activity, and fall back to old behavior
    - One person noted that they lack confidence with tasks based on spatial reasoning and had a difficult time contributing to their team's goals because of their personal insecurities
    - Participants noted not having clearly defined roles led to miscommunication
    - One participant shared not having a clear role paralyzed the individual with anxiety
    - One participant observed that the members of the team were so focused on their individual roles they forgot they were a team
    - The winning team noted they received the most points because they were a complete team with all learning styles represented and contributing
    - One participant observed that teams defined roles, but in other ways roles came out that didn't necessarily align with an individual's learning style
        - For example one team member identified as being more abstract, but immediately wanted to make a list at the beginning of the game
- Collaboration amongst teams
    - One team noted that it was difficult to work with the other team at the table because they did not know the team's personalities and learning styles
        - Difficult to approach a stranger for help
    - One team corrected a team member for lashing out at other participants at the table
        - The team member stated that the other team at the table created more problems because they tried to assign blame
    - One participant asked team members how they would feel if they tricked the other team to give up one of their pieces
        - All the other team members stated they would feel bad and that it wouldn't have felt like they had won because they "played dirty"
        - The team member then asked the group if they could do something like that to forward their career
            - All other team members resoundingly said no
    - Participants noted they should have collaborated more with the other team at their table
        - *Didn't realize how paramount it was*
    - A participant on the winning team shared it felt great to win, but most members of the team felt they won at the expense of the other group at their table

- A participant from the other team stated they won because they took an aggressive approach and stuck together as a team

Team Role Inventory
- One participant shared their teammate noticed their "checker attitude" even though they tried to conceal it
- Communication skills need to improve
  - *"It's not what you say, but how you say it."*
- One participant noted that it was difficult not having a "conductor" in the group, and the team had a hard time assigning roles
- One participant noted they only play the role of the "checker" in stressful situations because they tend to worry about particular details in high stress environments
- One participant observed that people would play their strongest role in the beginning but would fall into the next one if they were not immediately successful
- One participant gravitated toward playing the role of the "change advocate," but shared that in the past they were the opposite
  - Forced to grow up and become an extrovert
  - Strives for personal growth

Participant Concerns

Greater Good Escape Room
- Participants noted that the instructions were unclear or not complete
  - Pages were not together and some teams lost instructions
  - Would have been more effective to use the time focusing on team building rather than on instruction
  - Took away from long term goal
- Hard to focus with another team at the table
  - Constant interference and noise level

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Leadership Develop Plan (LDP)
Bullet Point Report G
Day 3
Saturday, September 16, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 4:05pm – 5:05pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW

Following the close of the afternoon Group and Team Dynamic II training session, participants were given the opportunity to create their individual Leadership Development Plan (LDP) to map out their desired careers. Yaihara informed the participants they would have one hour to work on their LDPs with the goal to have them completed for the following day to share in front of their peers during the closing ceremony. She let participants know the SALT community is supporting them and will hold them accountable in achieving their goals.

Yaihara directed the participants to organize themselves in to six groups based on the following career interests: (1) research (academic and industry), (2) teaching, (3) writing, communication, and outreach, (4) entrepreneurship, business development, and program management, (5) policy and regulation, and (6) academic administration. Participants self-sorted into the groups as follows: eight participants were interested in business, six were interested in writing, communication, and outreach, five were interested in research, four were interested in policy and regulation, three were interested in academic administration, and two were interested in teaching.

Participants were instructed to think about the top three skills they enjoy most and the top three skills they would like at their next job. Yaihara advised the participants to bounce ideas off their group members and to craft a leadership vision by the end of the training session. Many participants chose to partner up with peers in their group, while others chose to work quietly by themselves. During the training session, facilitators Yaihara and Julie went to each table to answer questions and offer suggestions. With ten minutes remaining in the training, Yaihara instructed the participants to work independently to finish their personal leadership visions.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions
- How much independence do you have working in a government lab?

Participant Comments
- One participant wants to be hands-on and in the lab everyday
  - Doesn't want to be stagnant
  - Wants to eventually become a lab manager
- One participant's priority is to work for a company that contributes to the greater good of society
  - Ideally a small company but not a startup
  - Larger companies holding similar values would be attractive because have more resources
- One participant is searching for a dynamic work environment
- One participant stated that the ideal career would be one with a purpose
- One participant didn't know what to write down on the LDP worksheet, but did know what they wanted to do for a career in research
  - Start out with an internship and work into a mentorship position
  - Wants a more big-picture, management focus because not good with performing actual experiments

Participant Concerns
- One participant is concerned about life after academia because there are too many areas of interest they could follow
  - Uncertainty is creating anxiety
  - Participant self sorted into the entrepreneurship and business working group
  - Wants intellectual and economic ownership of research
  - Would like to work in advocacy over policy making

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics II (Evening Session)
Bullet Point Report H
Day 3 – Group and Team Dynamics Session II (Evening)
Saturday, September 16, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 6:45pm – 10:00pm

Participants
27 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
SALT participants returned from the dinner break to find the training room locked and signs on the doors instructing participants to wait for one of the facilitators to provide the group access to the room. While waiting outside of the room participants expressed feelings of anxiety and extreme nervousness. After almost ten minutes of waiting, the students were granted entry into the room where they participated in the Spiral activity. Upon entering the room, participants were greeted with an altered layout, with all the chairs moved to one side of the room and placed in a spiral shape. The three training facilitators, Mateo, Yaihara, and Julie, were already seated and did not provide the group any instructions for the session. One participant did not attend the evening session on account of feeling ill. Due to the sharing of personal information during the Spiral activity, the observer did not enter the room for the first half of the evening training session. The observer was permitted to enter at the end of the Spiral activity to hear participants voluntarily share their life journey and why they chose to attend the Science Alliance Leadership Training.

After the Spiral activity, the participants were permitted to take a break and then regrouped to share out how they felt after the intense session. Half the participants contributed to the share out, while the others were quiet and in a reflective state. Following the brief share out, Mateo redirected the group's focus to the PowerPoint presentation. During the short presentation the facilitator showed two video clips of the television game show "The Apprentice" and asked the participants to study and identify the roles of the group members. The facilitator ended the evening session with a quick, personal anecdote and dismissed the group for the night.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Comments and Participant Concerns.

Participant Comments

Feelings After the Spiral Activity
- Calm
- Supportive
- Inclusivity
- Felt trust in the circle
  - Trusted things would calm down and the group would find the purpose
- Initially intrigued by how the activity would unfold
- One participant noted the first five to ten minutes of the Spiral activity was the hardest thing to do because there wasn't a plan or agenda in place
- One participant noted that they did not feel anxious in the spiral even though they usually carry a lot of anxiety
- One participant ran to get tissues outside of the room when group members began to get emotional, sharing they went out the open doors as opposed to the nearest closed doors to communicate their return
  - Another participant noted that they knew the individual was coming back

Reasons for Seating Choice
- One participant initially though about sitting in the middle but chose to sit by one of their peers because they regard the peer as a strong figure and wanted to sit next to them
- One participate noted they first sat by Yaihara, but quickly moved because they were intimidated and then sat by someone else to feel safe
- One participant always chooses to sit in the middle to feel more contained
- One participant noted that they felt like they were in the middle of two personalities
  - On one side sat an extrovert and on the other side an introverted peer
- One participant saw a peer being calm and observant so chose to sit by that peer
- One participant wanted to sit by Mateo
- One participant likes to see the entrance and to not have anyone seated behind them
  - Chose to sit on the outside facing the entrance
- One participant felt nervous and wanted to sit where they could see what Mateo was doing
- One participant noted they just took the closest empty seat, but liked being the calming presence between two active people

Interaction with the Formal Authority in the Spiral
- One participant observed the group was initially mimicking the three facilitators in the spiral by being silent and very serious
  - Participant was the one who pointed out there wasn't anything making them be silent
  - Began to make it a game
- One participant observed all three facilitators had different expressions
  - Noted that Yaihara was sad and Mateo looked angry

- One participant shared they were scared if the facilitators left this *really special thing* would go away
- One participant initially felt paranoid and skeptical
    - Thought perhaps the facilitators did that intentionally
- One participant knew nothing experienced up to the Spiral activity had been at random and felt there had to be a purpose to the activity
- One participant thought the facilitators were testing the "groupness" of the participants

Participant Concerns
- Participants felt concerned that one participant was missing from the activity
    - Reported the group knew the individual was missing immediately
- One participant stated they felt angry if it seemed someone wasn't respecting the activity
    - Values the group and the team building activities

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics (World Event)
Bullet Point Report I
Day 4
Sunday, September 17, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 8:30am – 12:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Liz Richards, Meetings Coordinator for The New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
The lead facilitator began the training session by instructing the participants to regroup with their team members. Mateo then introduced the objective for the day, which was to examine themselves as a social system through the SALT World Event activity. The facilitator established the event boundaries of the World Event by explaining team member roles when meeting with management, and detailing the timeline and tasks. Participants were permitted to use any space in the conference room, the balcony, and the lobby. The facilitator did not elaborate on the minimal instructions displayed on the PowerPoint slide, which caused anxiety among the participants. Many participants looked around the room at their peers, shifted in their seats, and expressed a nervous laugh.

Teams were instructed to select one team member to join the Leadership Council, as well as appoint team members to fill the roles of the Observer, Emissary, and Envoy to the Management of the World Event. The Management of the World Event consisted of Mateo Cruz, Yaihara Fortis, Julie Nadel, and Liz Richards. The role of the Observer when meeting with Management was solely to watch. The team member filling the role of the Observer had no voice in participating directly with Management. The role of the Emissary was to offer messages on behalf of their team and community. The team member filling the role of the Emissary had full authorization to speak on behalf of the team. The team member filling the role of the Envoy was fully authorized to act on behalf of the team and community.

After the introduction teams were instructed to begin to brainstorm and identify the team theme, designate representation, and identify contribution. Each team selected one team leader to join the Leadership Council. After 30 minutes, the Leadership Council met for the first time and appointed one peer to be the Chair of the council, shared their team's ideas, and began to develop a plan. During the first Leadership Council meeting members took turns leaving the meeting to report back to their teams to provide a brief

update. One team experienced a bit of confusion about who was supposed to be the team member on the Leadership Council. During this time teams continued to identify team themes, representation, and contribution. Eventually, teams began sending their selected members to meet with Management. One participant went to sit with another team to observe what they were working on with the goal of providing feedback to the home team. This action encouraged other teams to select a team member to float around the room collecting feedback from the other groups.

Halfway through the training session the Chair of the Leadership Council met with Management while the other participants took a break. After the break, the Chair announced to the room that the goal of the World Event was to ensure the sustainability of SALT Atlanta 2017. The mission was to solidify the STEAM network and change the face of the stereotypical STEAM fields that lack diversity. The Leadership Council returned to their teams to continue working on their contribution. Teams were given one hour to work before the Leadership Council reconvened to finalize the plans. Before breaking for lunch the Chair met with Management to detail the SALT Atlanta mission.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Questions
- What constitutes a successful event?
- What can we take away from this workshop?
    - Participants suggest setting up social media accounts to stay in contact and continue networking with the group
        - Facebook and Slack

Participant Comments
- One team acknowledged they chose their Leadership Council representative to encourage the individual reach their goal of becoming more assertive, more of an extrovert, and develop stronger leadership skills
- After the break, one participant addressed the group as whole to discuss the use of non-binary pronouns
    - Participants went around the room to share their preferred pronouns
    - All participants embraced the use of non-binary pronouns
- One participant implemented the use of a "talking stick" to manage communication at a table with nine participants
    - The participant instructed the participants at his table to hold an umbrella when they would like to speak

Participant Concerns

- After Mateo finished the introduction to the World Event one participant was physically vibrating with anxiety
    - When a team member attempted to ease this anxiety by telling the participant to remain calm, the participant yelled, "I am calm!"
- The winning team of the Greater Good activity began to feel anxious because their partner team went to work with another team during the second work session
    - Power shift
    - Felt it was a power move
    - *"You know they are the most popular."*
        - *"I don't know about that, but it makes me feel angry."*
    - *"I don't understand because we were working with each other earlier."*
        - Participant believed it may have something to do with the makeup of the Leadership Council
- One participant addressed the group to remind all participants to be respectful of their peers and to not speak over anyone
    - This announcement occurred after one participant went to make an announcement and another participant interrupted

The following section provides an overview of team dynamics observed during the SALT Atlanta World Event.

Observations

Group and Team Dynamics
- Teams initially gravitated to collaborating with the team they were paired with during the Greater Good game
    - Teams chose to sit at the same tables
    - The two teams sitting at the winning table of the Greater Good game parted ways while the Leadership Council met for the first time, but the other teams continued to work with their partner groups
- All teams gravitated to the west side of the room during the work sessions
- At the beginning of the second work session many participants gathered around the table of the team that won the Greater Good game (n=7)
    - All participants were standing around the four members of the winning team who sat at the table
- A participant from the team that won the Greater Good challenge self appointed themselves to go around the room and take inventory of each team's identified theme, representation, and potential contribution
- The team that successfully kept time during the Greater Good game volunteered to be time keepers

- o The team voted by a show of hands to select the participant who played the critical role of the time tracker during the Greater Good activity

Leadership
- During the break one team member of the Leadership Council was anxious to bring their group together to debrief before the session reconvened
    - o The team member moved the partition located in the middle of the room and moved chairs to one side of the table to establish boundaries from the rest of the teams

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Group and Team Dynamics Closure
Bullet Point Report J
Day 4
Sunday, September 17, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 1:30am – 3:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Mateo Cruz
Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
After lunch participants returned to their teams to reflect on the World Event. Each team was given a chance to guide their peers through their contribution activity. One team had their peers participate in an activity where they started out lined up shoulder-to-shoulder and then were instructed to take a certain number of steps depending on what career field they would like to go into. At the end, participants could visually identify which members of SALT Atlanta 2017 were planning to take similar career paths depending on how close they were to their position in line. The team encouraged the participants to reach out to at least one other peer via social media within the next week, but many participants chose to connect and exchange contact information with peers in real time.

For the next activity, one team instructed all the participants to sit at the four tables in the front of the room. Each table was asked to discuss the following four topics with their table members: (1) Identity in STEAM, (2) SALT Network, (3) Self-care, and (4) Future in STEAM. After the group discussions, participants were instructed to write feedback and positive messages to other participants and then place the notes in the individual's envelope with their name on it. The notes could be anonymous, and the Chair walked around the room challenging participants to write to a peer they had not spoken with much over the four-day workshop. Following the activity, the participants were dismissed for a ten-minute break. After the break, Mateo instructed the group to go through an After Action Review (AAR) for the World Event with the people at their tables. Next, Mateo facilitated a debriefing and then gave the floor to Yaihara to begin the closing ceremony.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Comments and Participant Concerns. Please note that the only pronouns used in this report are they/their/them for all SALT Atlanta participants.

Participant Comments

Identity in STEAM
- Privileged vs. unprivileged
    - Many participants shared that they did not have the same opportunities as most of their peers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels
        - Had to work twice as hard
        - One participant noted that this will be used as motivation to always give back to their community
    - One participant recognized their own privilege, but is also aware of the challenges of being apart of the LGBQT community
        - Self-awareness
- One participant shared that as a female they feel they have a lot more to prove in the STEAM field

Self-care
- Participants noted it is important to balance work with personal interest and hobbies
- One participant noted allowing time for self reflection is important
    - Participant shared resources with the table that helps facilitate self reflection

Future in STEAM
- One participant shared they have given serious thought about leaving the Masters track to go directly into advocacy work

After Action Review
- Participants were pleased with the cause Sustainability of SALT Atlanta 2017
- Participant noted they initially disliked how only one person could represent each team on the Leadership Council
    - One participant observed participants took leadership roles outside of the Leadership Council
- One participant noted it was odd as an Observer to hear Management talk about groups and individuals as if the Observer was not there
- The Chair shared that there was a lot of energy and personalities to contain
    - *Heavy is the head*
- Participants noted they recognized status changes during negotiations, shifts in team dynamics, and de-authorization
    - Only in control of your own behavior
- Participants noted the value of constructing boundaries in a group
    - *Important not to steamroll your teammates*
- Participants noted that systems do what they need to do in order to survive

Participant Concerns

- One participant feels they cannot be themselves in the STEAM field
    - o   Feels forced to assimilate
    - o   Goal is to break the norm
    - o   Practice self-care for by being yourself outside of work
- Many participants shared that they struggle with the idea of *"being the only one"* at their job and in the STEAM field in general
    - o   No one to relate to
    - o   Leads to feelings of inferiority
- Participants who identify as female shared they struggle to move past stereotypes of what a woman's role should be in the workplace
    - o   Will be more assertive

Science Alliance Leadership Training – Atlanta: Presentation and Closing Ceremony
Bullet Point Report K
Day 4
Sunday, September 17, 2017

Location: Atlanta, Georgia
Time: 3:00pm – 5:00pm

Participants
28 graduate student participants
Lead Facilitator, Yaihara Fortis
Julie Nadel, New York Academy of Sciences
Mateo Cruz, Group and Team Dynamics Facilitator
Boyd Branch, Improv Facilitator
Liz Richards, Meetings Coordinator for The New York Academy of Sciences
Kayla Galloway, PAST Foundation

OVERVIEW
At the end of the SALT four-day workshop, Yaihara facilitated the closing ceremony. First Yaihara shared her personal journey to earning a Ph.D. in a STEM field and what led her to create the Science Alliance Leadership Training. After Yaihara shared her story with the group, all students and facilitators participated in one large "hug-a-bear" activity per request of one of the participants. Next, the facilitators distributed SALT pins to all participants indicating the completion of the training. Afterwards, facilitators asked participants to bring their chair to the other side of the room and form a circle. Once the group settled in, each participant stood up and shared their individual LDP Leadership Vision.

To conclude the workshop Yaihara asked all the people in the room to standup and form a circle. The circle was made up of all 28 SALT participants, the four facilitators, a representative from the New York Academy of Sciences, and this observer. She asked participants to close their eyes and clear their minds, and instructed the group to try to count from one to 34 with each participant choosing one number at random. Yaihara noted that the goal of the game was to reach the number 34 without two people saying a number at the same time, and such an occurrence would result in the group having to start over at number one. The SALT Atlanta participants reached the number 34 on their first attempt.

The following section provides an overview of key themes discussed by SALT Atlanta participants, and is organized by the following categories: Participant Questions, Participant Comments, and Participant Concerns.

Participant Comments
- One participant noted the SALT workshop validated their choice to enter the scientific communication field

- One participant shared they are not afraid of change anymore because of the SALT workshop
- One participant shared within the 24 hours leading up to the close of the workshop their leadership goal changed
    - o Plans to focus on growing communication skills, specifically developing assertiveness
    - o Tends to constantly feel overwhelmed by extroverts and wants to change personal behavior
- One participant noted they got a lot from the group and team dynamics training sessions and now wants to find a job with the opportunity to work with a diverse team
- Many participants indicated they would like to stay in contact with the Lockheed Martin representatives they had the opportunity to meet and network with over the course of the four-day workshop

Leadership Vision for Self
- Facilitating workshops
- Advocacy
- Take advantage of networking
- Mentor
    - o One participant noted the importance to always keep learning as a mentee even when holding a leadership position
- Educator
- Advocate
- Life Coach
- Change agent, community advocate, risk taker, and wants to share experiences with others
- Mentor young minorities in STEM
- Community outreach
- Impact human kind positively and improve Emotional Intelligence (EQ)
- Be an advocate for others and for self
- Connect research with community; outreach
- Take ownership
- Conduct cross disciplinary research to solve social problems
- Change scientific conversation
- Improve grant writing skillset

Participant Concerns
- Five participants who identified as being introverted indicated they would have liked to push themselves out of their comfort zones more to take full advantage of the training
    - o Expressed guilt and disappointment
    - o Missed opportunity