Learning Experience. In my first two years of being instructor of record, I exclusively taught the first-year Elementary Probability and Statistics course. Now, this class involves a fifty minute long lab section that takes place in an on-campus computer lab once a week. Assignments weren't widely available online like they are now, so if you couldn't come to class you received a zero for that day. This computer lab was managed by administrators, not teachers. Entrance to the computer lab requires swiping a university ID card at a station operated by a student employee.

During a weekly meeting with the other instructors of this course, we were informed of a new policy for the computer lab: students who are more than ten minutes late to class may not enter the computer lab. This policy was to be rigidly enforced with no ifs, ands, or buts. The reader may think "well, I would certainly like it if my students were on time" and indeed, the rule is facially benign. That said, whether this policy promotes equity should be interrogated.

For example, the university buses can *easily* run ten minutes late. I should know, I rode them daily for a year as an undergraduate. So one might ask: compared to a student without a car, does a student who can afford a car note and the annual $275 parking pass have more agency with respect to their arrival time? Then and now, the answer appears to be "yes". Then the result is clear. It is possible for this policy to negatively affect poor students while not affecting wealthy students. Moreover, if this line of reasoning is then carried to its natural intersectional conclusion, the disparity of treatment could also be traced along lines of race. In a separate but more concrete vein, how quickly could a disabled student take an elevator down from the second story of the UNT Gateway Building, make the nearly mile long trek to the building with the computer lab, and then take the elevator up to the fifth floor?

At this point, it should not be left merely implied: I do not like this policy. It is not good. It was enacted in my second semester of teaching. I mildly voiced concerns, but I didn't make a big fuss. In the back of my mind, I figured the people in charge must know something I don't. A friend of mine was teaching the same class, and we both agreed to quietly disregard the rule. Simply leaving it unenforced seemed like the most reasonable course of action. Now, the incredulous reader may respond with "It is the students' responsibility to arrive on time and come prepared". And yes, I agree. However, it is also the responsibility of the instructors to foster an environment that is conducive to success for students of all backgrounds and any level of ability.

A Moral. The reason I have chosen this specific example as a point of discussion for this statement is not because it is some egregious violation of human rights. It's not known if any of the scenarios I outlined above actually took place. In fact, it's entirely possible there were absolutely no ill effects from the ten minute rule. There was no data collected about this, no postmortem analysis, and no student consultation. Its effects are largely unknowable. *That is precisely why it should be scrutinized.* Enforcing a status quo without nuance or careful consideration of marginalized groups is not an institutional value I care to embody. So, the ten minute rule as an example is not necessarily important by itself — it's a microcosm. What we extrapolate from it, and how we use that to inform our day-to-day decision

making and interactions is the point. What this means in a professional setting for myself and my instruction consists primarily of two parts: one institutional and one individual.

The Coin. I've recently had the pleasure of being a graduate student representative on the UNT math department's Inclusivity, Diversity, Equity and Access (IDEA) Committee. We serve as a point of contact and feedback for the department head relating to policy decisions. Participating in (or working to create) such university channels is the institutional side of the equity coin. Now, macroscopic policy shaping is undoubtedly a vital part of affecting change. However, as a standalone effort, it is incomplete. Just by sheer volume of occurrence, the microscopic individual interactions one has every day with their students and colleagues forms the bulk of one's opportunity for praxis. Simple things such as using someone's preferred name or pronouns, addressing individual student accessibility needs in class, and showing due respect to all backgrounds are the practiced, granular reaffirmations of ideology that are dual to institutional work.

In some sense, institutional action is "talking the talk" while concrete, individual action is "walking the walk", but neither is whole without the other. I purpose myself to have the humility to accept feedback and the drive to employ it. I hope to build a community in my future department that reflects my convictions and promotes equity among all groups.