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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The mission of Young Professionals in Foreign Policy (YPFP) is to build the leaders tomorrow needs. We do not accept, morally, that tomorrow’s leaders should be demographically the same as today’s leaders even as the diversity of individual contributors increases. Foreign policy organizations must embrace diversity not only at their lowest ranks, but also in its pathways for cultivating leaders. Given that YPFP is an organization that strives to build the next generation of global foreign policy leaders, it is therefore integral that the organization espouse diversity, inclusion, and equity in all aspects of its operations. It is essential to the mission of YPFP that all membership and staff feel welcomed, included, and valued in the organization.

The foreign policy space needs exceptional and diverse foreign policy leaders to address complex global challenges and promote peace and security around the world. There is clear evidence that diversity is critical to the development and implementation of robust foreign policy. Promoting diversity, inclusion, and equity in the foreign policy arena is particularly important, as it is a field that features individuals from an array of backgrounds and perspectives, and requires them to collaborate in order to produce impactful and sustainable results. Research also indicates that diversity is one of the greatest assets to the Foreign Policy field.

In June 2020, Aubrey Cox Ottenstein, YPFP’s Global Executive Director, issued a statement condemning systemic racism and police brutality in response to the racial justice protests taking place in the United States and around the world. Shortly after, the YPFP Board and leadership team decided to establish a Diversity and Inclusion Commission tasked with examining if, and how, the YPFP community has lived up to the ideals of racial diversity, inclusion, and equity, and to provide recommendations on improvement.

YPFP values diversity, inclusion, and equity in our community, which is expressed in a number of ways, including race and ethnicity, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, language, culture, national origin, religion, age, (dis)ability status, and political perspectives. Although all of these forms of diversity and inclusion are vital, YPFP established the Diversity and Inclusion Commission to specifically focus on racial equity and inclusion — as this was identified as a pressing need internally as well as externally in the broader foreign policy space.

In addition, YPFP has made positive strides towards addressing other forms of diversity, inclusion, and equity. For example, over the past five years, YPFP has established focused initiatives that aim to make the organization more gender inclusive and increase female leadership. This has resulted in positive outcomes, including increasing the number of discussion groups led by women and creating a dedicated position focused on Gender in Foreign Policy within YPFP’s annual fellowship cohort. However, the organization has not made similar progress when it comes to racial diversity and inclusion. As a result, this was the Commission’s primary focus, although in some instances the Commission also collected data on gender and other demographic categories in order to identify insights related to intersectionality and to offer points of comparison.

Racial diversity and inclusion is a pressing issue around the world. However, racial justice issues around the world are not monolithic, and they carry significant historical and cultural context and weight. As a result, the scope of the Commission’s work was limited to focus on the state of diversity and inclusion in the organization’s U.S.-based branches, with a focus on the Washington, DC branch, which is the organization’s headquarters. The work of the Commission, and this report, is intended to serve as a guiding framework for other branches that wish to conduct similar analyses and institute subsequent recommendations. This model will allow for branches to evaluate problems and introduce solutions in a more locally relevant and culturally specific manner.
2.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMISSION

The Diversity and Inclusion Commission was established to examine the state of racial diversity and inclusion in YPFP and make recommendations on how the organization can make improvements in four areas: programming, community, governance, and advocacy. The analysis and recommendations are based on data-driven research and conversations with the YPFP community. This report outlines the findings of the Commission’s research and analysis and memorializes the recommendations of the Commission for improving racial diversity and inclusion going forward. The Commission’s work focused on assessing and making recommendations on diversity and inclusion, rather than equity, as the Commission recognized that diversity and inclusion are necessary precursors for equity.

We hope the Commission’s work and the subsequent implementation of the Commission’s recommendations ensure that YPFP is a place where people of color are welcomed, different perspectives are not only respectfully heard but amplified, and every individual feels a sense of belonging, inclusion, and opportunity.
3.0 ABOUT THE COMMISSION

The Commission was formally established in October 2020 with 14 participants. It was chaired by Spandana Singh and Victor Marsh. As per the guidelines set out by YPFP’s Board and Leadership Team in the summer of 2020, the Commission was composed of three YPFP volunteer staff members, three YPFP general members, one YPFP leadership team staff member, four external experts on diversity and inclusion, and four YPFP board members. Research and analysis for this report was conducted by a subset of this group, marked with an *. More information on Commission members can be found in Appendix A.

Albert Fujii*
Bishop Garrison
Colin Wolfgang*
Daniel E. White*
Heather Wild-González Rubio
Joshua Marcuse
Mark Hanis
Merritt Ogle*
Renee Coulouris*
Schuyler Moore
Shalini Rao*
Spandana Singh*
Tina Gaddy
Tony Johnson
Victor Marsh*
4.0 METHODOLOGY

The Commission divided its research and analysis work into two phases. During Phase 1, Commission members focused on community and programming. This included data collection on YPFP panel events, workshops, discussion group meetings, social media operations, and publications, as well as data collection on the demographics of YPFP members. During Phase 2 the Commission focused on governance and advocacy. Research during this period focused on changes in demographics of DC branch members, volunteer staff positions, and leadership positions, YPFP’s hiring practices, and YPFP’s relationships with partners and sponsors. After each Phase, the Commission members leading research and analysis presented their findings to the rest of the Commission, and discussed challenges and potential solutions and recommendations. The Commission members who authored this report also circulated a draft of the report to the broader Commission, the YPFP Board, and the YPFP community at large to solicit feedback. Where appropriate and relevant, the feedback received was integrated into the final draft of this report.

For the most part, the Commission’s research focused on data that was collected beginning in 2019, as this is when YPFP adopted WildApricot as its customer relationship management system (CRM). The single largest challenge that the Commission faced in conducting its research and analysis was that YPFP does not have well-established mechanisms for data collection and as a result it does not regularly collect data. This made it very difficult for the Commission to understand everything from the demographics of YPFP members to what voices YPFP lifts up in its programming and social media to whether YPFP hires and retains diverse candidates. YPFP does store some information on its past operations in a shared Google Drive. However, there has been no comprehensive strategy or consistency around data collection and management. Each branch stores data differently and data is not archived in a common database. As a result, data does not typically survive the lifespan of changing leadership and staff. For example, when the Commission was trying to assess whether YPFP’s events included a diverse panel of speakers, it found that most branches did not have a system in place for tracking past speakers. This made it difficult to evaluate diversity and inclusion in the organization’s event programming.

YPFP does collect some basic data about its members, including name, occupation, and gender. This data is stored in YPFP’s membership management platform WildApricot. However, not all members elect to provide information on gender, creating gaps in data available to the Commission. When the Commission began its work, YPFP did not offer members the option to self-report their racial or ethnic background to the organization. As a result, the Commission had no racial demographic information on YPFP members, or other individuals the organization interacts with such as speakers, authors, etc.

When collecting data on who YPFP features in its programming, the Commission decided to do visual identifications to help estimate gender and racial identity. Assuming an individual’s gender and racial identity based on physical phenotype and names is an approach that is limited, as it can produce unreliable results. Where possible, Commission members tried to mitigate these issues by reaching out to individuals for more information or identifying proxy data that could indicate participation in a racial or gender group. During Phase 2, the Commission tested a different approach, and asked individuals to self-report their racial and gender information. Where this information was not available, the Commission noted the gaps and made recommendations based on the data that was available. In December, the Commission and YPFP staff members introduced the option for YPFP members to self-report their racial demographic information in Wild Apricot. YPFP encourages its members to report this information. Addressing existing data gaps will inform future diversity and inclusion efforts carried out by YPFP.

To ensure that we did not simply copy-and-paste other organizations’ practices without first learning about our own organization, the Commission did not engage in extensive benchmarking of other foreign policy organizations’ D&I plans. The recommendations are tailor-made to fit the D&I challenges identified in YPFP’s own data about diversity and inclusion.
5.0 THE CURRENT STATE OF DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION AT YPFP

5.1 Community

During Phase 1, the Commission sought to understand the gender and racial demographics of YPFP members. As noted above, this was challenging as very few YPFP members self-report their gender when completing the membership intake survey. Additionally, when the Commission began its work, YPFP did not offer members the option to self-report racial demographic information.

As indicated in the chart above, out of the 2,763 YPFP members registered under branches in North America, only 19% or 529 reported their gender.

Out of the North America branch members who reported their gender, the majority were female. One member reported themselves as “other”. However, at the time, this option included the choice to not answer the question. As a result, whether this designation captured gender identity is unclear. At the time of data collection, members had the option to self-identify as either male or female. These options have been since broadened to include categories such as non-binary, agender, gender fluid and gender queer. If individuals feel the category that best fits them is not included, they can contact the YPFP Chief of Staff to request the addition of a category. If an individual does not wish to self-identify, they can also opt out of reporting their gender.
Although self-reporting on gender and other demographic categories lagged significantly, 100% of members reported their occupation when completing the intake survey. This is likely because occupation reporting is key to determining the membership category an individual falls under and the subsequent membership dues an individual must pay. The data reported indicates that the vast majority of YPFP members are professionals, as opposed to students.

Reporting on other categories varied. Reporting on current military experience was high, for example, with 98% of members reporting yes or no when asked about their status as a military veteran or current military status. 92.7% of members (2517 members) indicated that they are not currently active in military service. In comparison, reporting on education was significantly lower, with only 50% of members electing to provide this information. Out of these individuals, 50% had B.A. or M.A. degrees. PhDs were rare.

Information about the demographic backgrounds of YPFP members is critical to understanding whether the organization is diverse and to informing subsequent efforts intended to promote inclusion and equity. The Commission hopes that by introducing the option for members to self-report their racial identity and actively encouraging self-identification, YPFP can obtain insights into how racially diverse the organization is. The Commission recommends that YPFP launch targeted efforts that encourage old and new members to voluntarily self-report their demographic information. YPFP leadership should also evaluate the data that has been submitted in 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years, to identify changes in racial diversity in the organization. The organization should also commit to releasing a report assessing the state of diversity, inclusion, and equity in the organization at least every other year, if not annually.

## 5.2 Programming and Events

YPFP hosts a broad range of events including panel discussions, professional development workshops, happy hours, and other social events. Between 2018 and November 2020, YPFP’s branches hosted 247 events. The majority of these events were held by the Washington, DC, branch followed by the Brussels, New York, and London branches.

![Events Hosted by Branch](image)

It was difficult to ascertain whether these events were public or private in nature, and whether they were panel events, professional development workshops, happy hours, or events of other formats as there is no uniform method of collecting and tracking this information. The Commission collected the above data by searching the list of past events in Wild Apricot and looking through event notification emails sent to members about these events.
The vast majority of speakers at YPFP’s events, both globally and in Washington, DC are White men and White women. There is a significant disparity between the number of White speakers at events and the number of non-White speakers at events. Events generally also featured more male speakers. At a global level, events featured 192 male compared to 150 female speakers. DC-branch events featured 73 male speakers and 45 female speakers. One global speaker self-identified as non-binary, and has been listed as so. Some speakers participated in multiple events, so these figures are not a representation of distinct participants.

This demonstrates a fundamental disparity in the types of voices and perspectives that YPFP is lifting up in its events. The Commission reached out to event leads and YPFP branch managers to better understand what resources are utilized when identifying speakers for events. Most branches utilize a combination of “warm invites” to individuals in the YPFP or event manager’s personal network and “cold invites” to those outside of these circles when identifying speakers for events. As a result events reflect the lack of diversity that is often visible within YPFP membership. The YPFP events and leadership team should encourage event managers to seek out a broader range of speakers to make this goal a reality. YPFP’s events team should also create and curate a speaker bank that the YPFP Board, Leadership Team, and other members can contribute to.

Additionally, most of the speakers featured at events work at international organizations, think tanks, NGOs, and universities. However, of the universities and colleges mentioned, there were no mentions of reaching out to Historically Black Colleges and Universities when identifying speakers. Events managers should broaden the types of speakers they reach out to include individuals at these institutions as well as individuals working in other professions, such as journalism and business.

Many organizations in the foreign policy and public policy spaces have addressed the lack of diversity at their events by instituting guidelines which require event organizers to meet minimum threshold for diversity at their events (e.g. including at least one person of color and one non-male panelist depending on the size of the panel). Critics have raised concerns that such an approach could undermine the quality of an event by forcing event managers to include less qualified participants. However, given that the foreign policy space has a plethora of people of color and non-male individuals who are experts in their field, this is not a concern YPFP shares. The Commission recommends that YPFP institute event guidelines that will ensure and promote diversity in event programming.
One of the biggest challenges the Commission faced when conducting research on YPFP’s events was the fact that the organization does not have a central mechanism for collecting information on its events and speakers. Because of this, there was no way to categorize events as panel events, professional development workshops, social events, etc. There was also no central method for identifying past speakers, workshop facilitators, and so on. Therefore, the Commission had to comb through past event announcements and emails in Wild Apricot, and visually estimate listed speakers’ identities or seek proxies which indicated this information. Going forward, YPFP should institute a mechanism for collecting and tracking data on events and speakers which clearly categorizes the types of events being held and the speakers or facilitators that participated. Before or after these events, YPFP should ask speakers and facilitators to voluntarily self-report their demographic information, and the events team should use this information to track diversity in event programming.

### 5.3 Discussion Groups

One of the avenues for professional development and networking that YPFP provides its members is the opportunity to participate in discussion groups. YPFP has 19 discussion groups. There are three types of discussion groups:

1. **Subject area-focused discussion groups** (e.g. cybersecurity and technology, international trade and finance)
2. **Language-focused discussion groups** (e.g. Arabic, French, Spanish)
3. **Region-focused discussion groups** (e.g. East Asia, Latin America)

Before the COVID-19 pandemic, discussion groups primarily catered to YPFP members in Washington, DC, and they typically met in person for meetings once a month. As YPFP has transitioned its programming into the virtual environment during the COVID-19 pandemic, YPFP members based around the world have had the opportunity to participate in discussion groups. As the data below demonstrates, however, the majority of discussion groups members remain within the DC branch. In 2011, YPFP offered members residing in areas that do not have a dedicated YPFP branch to become “Global” YPFP members.

YPFP’s 19 discussion groups are composed of 517 participants. Some individuals participate in multiple discussion groups so this figure is not a reflection of distinct participant numbers. As illustrated below, there is slightly more male participation in discussion groups. As noted above, while the Commission was conducting its research and analysis, YPFP did not have a system in place which allowed members to self-report their gender identity beyond the male and female binary. As a result, the following gender breakdown of participants is limited to the binary. In cases where participants did not self-report their gender in Wild Apricot, the Commission did additional research to identify an individual’s perceived gender, including by using proxy data.
The vast majority of discussion group participants are White men and White women. The second most represented demographic categories for male participants are East Asian and South Asian and the second most represented demographic categories for female participants are East Asian women and Latina women. This demonstrates a significant disparity in the demographics of discussion group participants and suggests that these groups, regardless of their subject matter or focus area, tend to cater to and serve the interests of predominantly White members. As mentioned in the discussion on methodology, data collection for this segment of research and analysis was limited by the fact that until the beginning of 2021, YPFP did not offer members the opportunity to self-report race or ethnicity-related information. In order to collect this data, the Commission had to conduct research on each individual discussion group member and identify indicators of race or ethnicity. As we note above, this is a limited approach, but was the closest the Commission could get to evaluating racial diversity given the existing data collection challenges. The Commission recommends that once YPFP is able to collect more accurate data on race and ethnicity from its members (perhaps in one year), the organization revisit this data and update it with more accurate insights.

Finally, YPFP discussion groups are typically led by one chair or two co-chairs, who are volunteer staff members. These leaders are responsible for reviewing applications to their discussion groups, admitting members, coordinating meetings, selecting discussion group topics and leading discussions. As demonstrated by the chart below, the majority of discussion group leaders are women.
Unsurprisingly, the leadership of YPFP discussion groups reflects the lack of racial and ethnic diversity of discussion group participants. The majority of discussion group leaders are White men and women. There are no Black male, Latino male, MENA female, and South Asian male discussion group leaders. This raises serious concerns around racial and ethnic diversity among YPFP staff leaders as well as general discussion group participants. This lack of diversity in leadership and membership could also result in a lack of diversity in terms of the topics that these groups focus on. Although the Commission was not able to survey discussion group leaders and members due to time constraints, many YPFP members have anecdotally suggested that the discussion groups often neglect to emphasize issues related to race, ethnicity, and other forms of diversity and inclusion in their discussions. The YPFP Leadership Team should consider developing a guiding framework for discussion groups and other YPFP-led programs which encourages leaders to implement discussions of diversity and inclusion in their programming. Where appropriate, the Leadership Team should also share resources and other forms of support with volunteer leaders so they can lead effective discussions on diversity and inclusion that encourage constructive conversation.

It is important to note that at the time of data collection, two discussion group leadership positions were vacant. The data on gender reflected above and the data on race and ethnicity reflected below therefore reflects leadership of 17 discussion groups, not 19. The participant gender and demographic and ethnicity data included above, however, reflects all 19 groups as the Commission was able to access a list of participants for each discussion group. It is important to note that the data YPFP collects on members in Wild Apricot is not always up to date. For example, if an individual changes their job, they rarely report this change to YPFP. Similarly, if an individual joins a discussion group, but then becomes an inactive member, they can remain listed as a member of a DG. Similarly, if an individual stops participating in a DG, this change is not recorded in Wild Apricot unless a DG chair notes the change. The Commission suggests that YPFP encourage members to update their personal information in Wild Apricot at least once a year. YPFP should also require DG chairs to update their membership rosters at least twice a year to allow for YPFP to track membership shifts.
During Phase 1 of data collection, the Commission reviewed YPFP’s two online publications: Charged Affairs, which is the umbrella publication for every YPFP branch except for the New York branch, and Emerging Voices, which is the New York branch’s publication. The Commission also reviewed YPFP’s newsletter the YPFP Ambassador.

What the data show is that the demographic breakdown of authors whose submissions were accepted and published slightly skewed towards males. When it comes to staff writers for Charged Affairs, it was, however, predominantly White men.

There were a number of challenges in collecting data regarding YPFP’s online publications. In particular, YPFP does not collect enough data on the authors of publications. This makes it difficult to understand the demographic background of authors, beyond the male/female binary set up in Wild Apricot for members. This is an issue that can be addressed by the recently introduced option for members to self-report their demographic information in Wild Apricot. The Commission recommends YPFP leadership revisit the data points the Commission focused on during Phase 1 of data collection on publications after 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years to evaluate racial diversity among publication authors.
During Phase 1 of data collection, the Commission also reviewed how YPFP and its branches demonstrate and value diversity, inclusion, and equity on all of its social media platforms. The aim of this research and analysis was to better assess whose voices YPFP amplifies on social media by either retweeting, sharing, and spotlighting content, as well as who YPFP interacts with the most on these platforms. In general, social media is the main daily source of interaction between YPFP and its wider members. However, it is unclear if YPFP has a general social media engagement strategy across its different branches. The Commission reviewed the following social media platforms for all YPFP branches: Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, Twitter, and LinkedIn.

The Commission also assessed the demographic breakdown of who follows YPFP social media accounts and also who YPFP follows. This was done by conducting research on the organizations and individuals who follow YPFP and identifying proxies and indicators of demographic background. Overall, YPFP social media accounts follow predominantly White men and women at a significantly higher rate than people of color. YPFP social accounts do not amplify diverse voices and are not showcasing people of color in the foreign policy field.
YPFP’s main method of social media interaction with individuals is Twitter. Despite Twitter being the main platform for personal interaction, the YPFP branch Twitter accounts follow more institutions and other organizations than individuals. This has led to the majority of shared and retweeted content to have been posted by institutions instead of individuals. Out of all the retweets in the last year (2019-2020), across all YPFP branches, Black women were retweeted only three times and Black men have never been retweeted. This is a drastic comparison to other demographic groups, for example one branch retweeted White men 97 times and White women 37 times during the same time period. The San Francisco Branch followed both personal and institutional accounts on Twitter, but only retweeted institutions. The importance of retweeting individuals feeds into YPFP’s mission to amplify voices in the foreign policy field and it is particularly lacking in amplifying diverse voices on its social media platforms.

Going forward, YPFP should institute a clear strategy for identifying, connecting with and amplifying racially diverse experts in the foreign policy space. These efforts should be implemented in tandem with the efforts to promote greater diversity in YPFP event programming and publications.
5.6 Governance

During Phase 2 of data collection, the Commission sought to understand the makeup of YPFP volunteer staff members, paid staff members, and board members. DC Staff is inclusive of all individuals who hold a position supporting YPFP in DC. The DC Leadership Team is composed of Staff members who hold titles at the Director-level or above. The Executive Team is a subset of the DC Leadership Team of the Executive Director, Chief of Staff, Senior Director or Finance, and the Senior Director of Programs. Paid Leadership is a subset of the Executive Team and is made up of only two positions: Executive Director and Senior Director of Finance. The Board of Directors is led by a Chairperson and open calls for nominations to the Board occur on a continual basis, with elections usually occurring annually. Terms are two years.

To obtain these insights, the Commission surveyed current YPFP staff and board members about their racial or ethnic identity and gender identity. In total, there were 38 respondents.

The majority of respondents have been a part of YPFP for less than 5 years (73.7%) while 6 (15.8%) have been a part of YPFP for 10 or more years.

Of the 38 respondents, the majority -- 30 (78.9%) -- identify themselves as White, 4 (10.5%) identify as Asian, 3 (7.9%) identify as Black, 2 (5.3%) identify as Hispanic, Latinx, or Spanish origin, 2 (5.3%) identify as Middle Eastern or North African, 1 (2.6%) identifies as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 1 (2.6%) identifies as Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Salvadorian.

The majority of respondents -- 23 -- identify as men, 13 identify as women, 1 identifies as agender, and 1 preferred not to answer. The Commission also asked if respondents are transgender. 37 respondents said they are not transgender, and 1 said they preferred not to answer.
Given the low survey response rate and methodological design, it is challenging for the Commission to make formal conclusions on how YPFP is perceived by its sponsors and partners in terms of diversity, inclusion, and equity. The Commission recommends that YPFP leadership explore alternative methods of obtaining this data from partners and sponsors. In addition, this process also raised many internal questions around how YPFP defines partners and sponsors, and tracks these relationships. The Commission recommends that YPFP create clear designations for these relationships going forward, and institute a mechanism for tracking these collaborations. Additionally, the Commission recommends that the YPFP Leadership team and Board draft a partnership policy that guides how YPFP approaches strategic partnerships, collaborations, and sponsorships.

During Phase 2, the Commission also sought to understand how the organization recruits, interviews, hires, and retains volunteer staff members, paid staff members, and board members, particularly for the Washington, DC branch. However, this analysis was not possible given that YPFP does not currently have any centralized archives of its past hiring materials and processes. Going forward, YPFP should institute a clear method for collecting and tracking hiring information, such as a CRM.

### 5.7 Advocacy

One of the goals of the Commission was to understand how YPFP can become a better advocate for racial diversity, inclusion, and equity in the foreign policy space more broadly. In order to do this, the Commission shared a survey with YPFP’s formal partners to gather feedback from their diversity, equity, and inclusion stances and initiatives, and their perceptions of YPFP’s D&I initiatives. Survey questions included their organizational stance on D&I, initiatives they are conducting, and whether they agreed or disagreed with the notion that YPFP valued diversity, equity, and inclusion. The survey was shared with YPFP’s four formal partners. However, the Commission received only one response.

Given that the rate of survey completion was relatively low, the Commission was not able to obtain a comprehensive view of the demographic background of YPFP staff members and board members. Given the low survey response rate and methodological design, it is challenging for the Commission to make formal conclusions on how YPFP is perceived by its sponsors and partners in terms of diversity, inclusion, and equity. The Commission recommends that YPFP leadership explore alternative methods of obtaining this data from partners and sponsors. In addition, this process also raised many internal questions around how YPFP defines partners and sponsors, and tracks these relationships. The Commission recommends that YPFP create clear designations for these relationships going forward, and institute a mechanism for tracking these collaborations. Additionally, the Commission recommends that the YPFP Leadership team and Board draft a partnership policy that guides how YPFP approaches strategic partnerships, collaborations, and sponsorships.

YPFP’s unique strength in North America is that the organization helps people newly-arriving to the foreign policy space to experience a “soft landing,” developing a network of people at a similar life stage just as they arrive. To increase the diversity of a future cadre of leaders in a field, researchers repeatedly demonstrate the effectiveness of targeted recruitment of young people, by race and ethnicity, as a significant predictor of future leadership diversity. YPFP success at increasing dramatically its race and ethnic diversity would benefit the entire ecosystem of foreign policy professionals.

If YPFP wants to explore how it can become a champion and advocate for diversity, inclusion, and equity in the foreign policy space, it could begin by hosting a series of public or private events with organizations in the foreign policy space, including partners and sponsors to discuss goals and proposed solutions. This could help establish a coalition of organizations working on these issues and generate stronger advocacy power.
6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the research and analysis discussed above, the Commission makes the following recommendations for YPFP:

Acting Intentionally to Increase Diversity

1. **Targeted Volunteer and Board Recruitment:** YPFP should intentionally recruit people of color into its volunteer community, including by working in partnership with organizations that explicitly organize people of all ages on the basis of both (a) their identity / affinity and (b) their deep interest in foreign policy (See Appendix C for examples). Likewise, YPFP should recruit non-White members of its board of directors. By enhancing the demographic diversity of its mentorship and volunteer recruitment networks, YPFP would embrace a proven strategy for organizations to increase their demographic diversity: targeted, identity-conscious recruitment.

2. **Speaker Demographic Balance Goal-Setting:** Create and institute demographic goals for event programming that will ensure and promote diversity in speakers and participants. These guidelines should take into account the size of events (e.g. the number of panelists participating).

3. **Targeted Panel Speaker Recruitment:** YPFP should support speaker demographic balance goal-setting efforts by empowering event planners with a speaker bank that the YPFP community (including the YPFP Board, alumni, and member network) can contribute to. The organization’s event managers should also broaden the types of speakers they reach out to to include individuals in other professions, such as journalism, business, or nonprofit organizations in adjacent spaces to foreign policy. The YPFP events team and leadership team should track what helps achieve diverse panel results and what efforts did not help in order to inform future efforts.

Improving Our Data, Assigning Responsibility, and Measuring Our Results

4. **Community Self-identification Over Time:** Encourage members to voluntarily self-report their demographic information in Wild Apricot and in member intake forms. YPFP should also actively campaign for more self-identification through multiple communications channels at least once a year. This communication can happen in a tiered manner, including through org-wide emails and by asking staff such as DG chairs to personally ask their DG members to update their information. YPFP must embrace the fact that the “youth” identity is temporary. By examining its demographic changes, using new reporting options in Wild Apricot, YPFP can better understand its membership base.

5. **Panelist Speaker Self-identification Over Time:** Request panelists and facilitators at YPFP-hosted events voluntarily self-report their demographic information. YPFP’s events team should use this data to inform efforts to promote greater diversity and inclusion at events.
6. **Tracking the Organization’s Internal and Hosted Events Diversity:** Create and maintain mechanisms for collecting and tracking data on the organization and its operations, preferably through the use of a CRM. In particular, YPFP must begin collecting data on:
   a. How the organization recruits, interviews, hires, and retains staff members including a collection of past job applications for open YPFP positions, hiring decisions, and so on.
   b. The kinds of events it hosts (e.g. panel events, professional development workshops, happy hours, etc.)
   c. The speakers and facilitators it invites to events
   d. The authors it features in its publications

7. **Assigning Responsibility to an Existing Leadership Team Member:** Identify clearly a point person to implement each of the above recommendations. To track progress and solve problems along the way, YPFP should designate a Diversity and Inclusion coordination role, with responsibility for tracking progress across the recommendations. YPFP should embed this role in an existing cross-functional position that overlaps with all operational areas of YPFP (e.g. events, publications, hiring, etc.)

8. **Re-evaluate the state of racial diversity and inclusion in YPFP after 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years.** YPFP leadership should retain and evaluate data on events, publications, discussion groups, leadership, and hiring. This will enable the organization to obtain a more comprehensive view of racial diversity in the organization and if and how it is changing. The organization should also commit to publishing a report assessing the state of diversity, inclusion, and equity in the organization at least every other year, if not annually.

9. Require Discussion Group chairs to update their membership rosters at least quarterly to allow for evaluations of membership.

**Amplify Diverse Voices, Push for Broader Change**

10. Institute a clear strategy for identifying, connecting with and amplifying racially diverse experts in the foreign policy space on social media.

11. Create clear designations for how YPFP defines relationships with sponsors and partners and institute a mechanism for tracking these relationships going forward. YPFP should also consider the creation of guidelines which ensure that the organization does not form partnerships or accept financial sponsorship from entities that do not share YPFP’s values on diversity, inclusion, and equity.

12. Host a series of public or private events with organizations in the foreign policy space, including partners and sponsors to discuss racial diversity, inclusion, and equity goals and proposed solutions. This could help establish a coalition of organizations working on these issues and generate stronger advocacy power.

13. Amplify the work of the young professionals and student subsets of participants in organizations that focus on racial/ethnic diversity in foreign policy, including (partial listing in Appendix C).
APPENDIX A: BIOGRAPHIES OF DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION COMMISSION MEMBERS

Albert Fujii: Albert Fujii is a Communications Officer for YPFP assisting the communications team with outreach and marketing as well as special events, such as the recent Y7. During the day, he is a consultant at Global Strategy Group, a leading progressive public affairs and polling firm. Prior to GSG, he worked for the Fulbright Program for the Middle East and North Africa, the Antiquities Coalition, and Congressman Adam Smith (WA-09).

Bishop Garrison: Bishop Garrison is the Director of National Security Outreach at Human Rights First. In this role, he leads the organization’s efforts to build partnerships with members of the military and national security communities as well as national security-focused think tanks and research institutions. Bishop also leads Veterans for American Ideals, a nonpartisan movement of military veterans who advocate American leadership on human rights. Bishop served two tours in Iraq with the U.S. Army, served in the Obama administration, and was the Deputy Foreign Policy Adviser on the presidential campaign of Secretary Hillary Rodham Clinton.

Colin Wolfgang: Colin Wolfgang is the Managing Director for the New York branch of YPFP, overseeing staff operations and working to enhance membership experience and increase overall membership. He is an independent political and communications consultant with experience working on issues such as healthcare, gun control, and education, as well as directly on political campaigns. Colin received his B.A. in International Relations from Boston University. In his spare time, he enjoys gardening, cooking and tennis.

Daniel E. White: Daniel E. White is a McCain Strategic Defense Fellow assigned to the Space Division in the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force for International Affairs. A former army officer, Daniel served in East Asia, the Middle East and on the staff of the 52nd Field Artillery Commandant. After leaving the army as a captain, he held policy and strategy roles at the German Marshall Fund to the US, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and US Southern Command. Daniel holds a bachelor’s degree from the US Military Academy and a graduate degree from the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University. Daniel is a non-resident fellow at the Modern War Institute researching civil-military affairs and US grand strategy. Additionally, he is affiliated with the Truman National Security Project, Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, and Pacific Forum. In service, Daniel sits on the Advisory Council to the West Point Association of Graduates.

Heather Wild-González Rubio: Heather Wild-González Rubio has served at the U.S. Department of State for 12 years, most recently at U.S. Embassy Baghdad as a Political Military Officer. She has previously worked for the Deputy Secretary of State; the Bureau of Population Refugees Migration on the Syrian refugee and humanitarian crisis; the Office on Trafficking in Persons; the Secretary’s Office of Global Youth Issues; the Bureau of European Affairs; the Under Secretary for Civilian Security, Democracy, and Human Rights; and the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement.
**Joshua Marcuse:** Joshua Marcuse is the founder and chairman of YPFP. By day, Josh serves as the Head of Strategy & Innovation for Global Public Sector in Google Cloud, leading a global team that applies digital technologies to advancing the missions of governments around the world. He also serves as an Advisor to Schmidt Futures, a global philanthropy dedicated to empowering talent who want to work on the hardest problems. Further, Josh serves on the board of the Defense Entrepreneurs Forum, established and co-chaired the Federal Innovation Council at the Partnership for Public Service, and launched the Federal Innovator Network, and started the Charcuterie Club of DC.

**Mark Hanis:** Mark Hanis is the Co-Founder of Inclusive America, a nonprofit focused on increasing diversity in government. Mark is a serial social entrepreneur who has helped launch three successful nonprofit organizations—United to End Genocide, Organ Alliance, and the Beeck Center. He previously served as a White House Fellow working in the Office of Vice President Joe Biden as the National Security Affairs Special Advisor for South America, Africa, and Human Rights.

**Merritt Ogle:** Merritt is Chief of Staff for YPFP. Merritt joined YPFP in May 2019 as the Director of Development & Special Projects. Working with the Executive Director and Finance Director, in her role, she worked to identify and build strategic partnerships for YPFP. Additionally, she has managed additional projects such as the U.S.-China Futures Project, the Emerging as a Global Leader Experience (EaGLE) workshop, and youth summits. In her day job, she is a Senior Associate at Markon Solutions where she supports both corporate strategic growth and client project management. She is also the Director of Growth for #NatSecGirlSquad where she leads coalition building for advancing competent diversity in the national security apparatus. Merritt graduated from The Ohio State University in 2017 with degrees in Public Affairs and International Studies. Her professional passions include innovation for national security, building intrinsically inclusive environments, Eurasian studies, and advancement of LGBTQ+ professionals.

**Renee Coulouris:** Renee Coulouris is currently a Senior Program Officer at Freedom House working on programs focused on supporting Sudan’s democratic transition and on leveraging the African Growth and Opportunity Act for human rights focused advocacy. She was the 2018 Gender in Foreign Policy YPFP Fellow and has worked at Women in International Security and the United Nations. She is passionate about instituting reforms and mainstreaming gender into her daily work.

**Schuyler Moore:** Schuyler Moore is currently Senior Defense & Foreign Policy Advisor at the U.S. House of Representatives. Prior to this, she was the Director of Science & Technology (S&T) on the staff of the Defense Innovation Board (DIB) in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research & Engineering. She led DIB reports and projects on 5G, microelectronics, cybersecurity, biotechnology, and AI test & evaluation. Schuyler was also a Senior Analyst at an aerospace & consulting firm, with a special focus on defense budget forecasting and emerging technologies.

**Shalini Rao:** Shalini is a public sector consultant at Booz Allen Hamilton currently working with a federal client in global health security. Prior to beginning consulting, Shalini interned at the Federal Reserve Board conducting community development research, and a microcredit non-profit in Peru administering loans and conducting economic development programming. Shalini holds interests in international relations at the intersection of development and national security. Outside of work, Shalini is an avid dancer; she has danced Bharatnatyam for 18 years, and most recently, dances and performs Salsa and Tango. She is also an avid book club enthusiast, community volunteer, and foodie.
**Spandana (Spandi) Singh:** Spandi Singh is one of two Co-Chairs of YPFP’s Diversity and Inclusion Commission. She is also the Chair of YPFP’s Cybersecurity and Technology Discussion Group, as well as an events manager who focuses on technology and cybersecurity policy. In her day job, Spandi is a Policy Analyst at New America’s Open Technology Institute (OTI) where she leads the organization’s work on content moderation, algorithmic fairness, accountability, and transparency, and also works on issues of disinformation, intermediary liability, surveillance, and platform accountability. Spandi is also the current Vice-President of the Internet Law and Policy Foundry and a former Public Policy Fellow at Twitter.

**Tina Gaddy:** Tina Gaddy is currently the Assistant Director for Undergraduate Professional Development at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. Tina has previously served as Director of Development and subsequently an award-winning President of the Metropolitan Board of the Chicago Urban League, the first Young Professionals affiliate of the National Urban League.

**Tony Johnson:** Anthony (Tony) Johnson is the Co-Founder and was the Co-Director of the Truman National Security Project’s TruDiversity Initiative which seeks to expand the diversity of Americans contributing to every level of the U.S. national security and foreign policy apparatus in order to enhance the U.S.’ security and global leadership. Tony is a U.S. Navy veteran, a U.S. foreign policy and national security researcher who focuses on the intersection of religion and identity-based conflict, and contemporary U.S. foreign and national security policy. He is currently the Chief of the Strategic Red Team in the Joint Advanced Warfighting Division at the Institute for Defense Analyses.

**Victor Marsh:** Vic Marsh is a PhD candidate (expected May 2021) in Organizational Behavior at the University of Colorado Boulder’s business school. He studies the challenge of innovation in organizations that face intense pressure to conform to existing diversity program templates. Vic opposes turnkey diversity training approaches, and strongly supports tailor-made task force and in-house innovation processes in diversity and inclusion work. Prior to joining the University of Colorado, he was a Foreign Service Officer in Hong Kong, the Ops Center, the Haiti desk, and Cyprus. Vic is a fan of all Star Trek spinoffs and of all cooking shows.
APPENDIX B: FULL LIST OF YPFP DISCUSSION GROUPS

- Arabic Language
- Chinese Language
- Combating Terrorism
- Cybersecurity and Technology
- Defense
- East Asia
- Energy and Environment
- Europe and Eurasia
- French Language
- Gender in Foreign Policy
- Grand Strategy
- Human Rights
- Intelligence and Information Warfare
- International Development
- International Trade and Finance
- Latin America
- Middle East
- Nuclear Weapons
- Spanish Language
APPENDIX C: DIRECTORIES AMPLIFYING RACIAL / ETHNIC DIVERSITY IN FOREIGN POLICY

Functional Topic Groups
1. Black Professionals in International Affairs (@iabpia)
2. Diplolatinx (@diplolatinx)
3. Diplonoire (@diplonoire)
4. Diversity In National Security Network (@NatSecDiversity)
   a. Asian-American & Pacific Islander NatSec NextGen List (NewAmerica)
   b. Black American NatSec NextGen List (NewAmerica)
   c. Middle Eastern & North African American NatSec NextGen List (New America)
5. ICAP: https://www.icapaspen.org/ and https://korbel.du.edu/content/international-career-advancement-program

Regional Topic Groups
1. The Black China Caucus (@BLKChinaCaucus)
2. Black Voices on China (@BlkVoiceOnChina)
3. Latinx in the China Space (Directory)
Latina and non-binary Latinx Scholars of Asia (Directory)

###