Pleiades Awards: Instructions for Applicants

Overview

The intention of the Pleiades Awards is to recognise the effort and progress of Australian astronomy organisations towards promoting inclusion, equity, and diversity and supporting their community. We are not simply looking for a given level of criteria matching, but a complete report of efforts. We recognise that the work of making an organisation fully inclusive and equitable will be an ongoing task. When responding to the criteria, the main thing to keep in mind is sharing an honest representation of what your organisation has accomplished. We are looking for insight into the thought processes, details of what actions have or will be taken, how those actions were judged to be successful or not, and how you reflected upon these outcomes in planning future efforts. We will not judge your organisation negatively if something has not gone as planned, has been ineffective, or a survey has returned troubling results as long as your organisation demonstrates that they have critically reflected on and explained why they think things happened as they did and describe what actions they are taking to improve for the future. If any of the criteria do not apply to your organisation, then please explain in your response why. We are also looking for sincere, sustained effort from the entire organisation towards achieving the goals of inclusion and equity.

Review Committee

The Pleiades Award applications will be reviewed and scored by the existing IDEA Chapter Steering Committee. We note that no Steering Committee member will grade or be included in the discussion of the application from their own organisation. All application materials and discussions about applications will be kept confidential.

Scoring and Review Process

Each of the criteria will be scored by each unconflicted review committee member on a scale from 0 to 4:

0: Not answered
1: Minimally answered the criteria, or missed significant aspects of the criteria

2: Competently answered, but with one or two missing elements
3: Completely answered, any issues have been clearly explained
4: Exceptional answer

The scoring will be followed with a moderation meeting to review each application, to discuss the scoring for each criterion, and to reach a consensus for the integer score to be assigned to each criterion for each of the applications. The committee will then decide what specific questions to be asked from the applicants for the rejoinder.

A rejoinder will be solicited from each organisation approximately 6 weeks after the application deadline. Applicants will be given ~4 weeks to submit their rejoinder. The committee will send specific questions or requests that were identified during the scoring and first review of the application. A length limit will be given for the response. In addition to the response to the questions, organisations may also include additional data that may have been collected since the application deadline (e.g. results from a survey).

Using the criteria scores as a guide combined with the rejoinder response, the review committee will then assess the whole application and reach consensus on what level to award the organisation. The applicants will then be notified of the results of their application ~4 weeks after the rejoinder submission date. The organisation will be provided with the scores for each criterion as well as a summary of the application review and justification for the level awarded to the application. The full scores will be provided to serve as a guide for organisations to understand where they are doing well and where they could improve. The scores and award decisions will be final.

Assessing unsolicited additional information

The IDEA Steering Committee has in the past received unsolicited comments and thoughts on submitted applications. If this is to happen and the IDEA Steering Committee receives feedback or comments on a submitted application before the review process has begun (~4 weeks after the application submission deadline), then the Steering Committee will contact the designated person for the application with a description of the information that has been communicated. The organisation will be given ~2 weeks to respond to the information and the application will not be reviewed before that time. The organisation will then also have another chance to respond to any remaining comments in the rejoinder stage.

Examples

Below we have included examples of responses that would receive scores of 3 to two different selection criteria (including responses to the bronze and silver/gold criteria):

S1. Established a committee to identify, implement and monitor positive changes in equity and inclusion within the organisation. Planned for committee members to undertake relevant diversity training as soon as possible within the next 2 years.

> **S1.a. Maintained a committed team over the past 2 years (4 years for *Gold*) with a quorum meeting regularly (at least four times a year) to identify, monitor and**

implement positive changes, and ensured that a majority of committee members have undertaken relevant diversity training.

The Diversity Committee was established in October 2014 with the support of the Executive to monitor, encourage and promote equity, diversity and inclusivity. The Diversity Committee meets monthly, with a minimum of 60% members required for a quorum and is comprised of 10 members (~40% women) that represent a cross-section of the community, including science, engineering/operations, administrative staff, senior staff, and at least two PhD student representatives (one of whom is an international student). Members rotate after two year terms (one year for students), and a new Chair, Deputy Chair and Secretary are elected every year.

On 28 March 2018, all 10 members of the committee, plus 15 other staff/students, participated in an Inclusive Practice training workshop (see S2). On 28 September 2018, committee members and other staff/students also participated in a Cultural Intelligence workshop run by PRISMA Cross-Cultural Consultants.

O2. Established the number of reported cases of misconduct, the number resolved and the average time to resolution over the past year. If the applying organisation is a new entity, plans for such reporting should be clearly outlined.

Where an organisation is restricted in what can be reported - or, with reference to criterion O2.b, what support can be provided to complainants - by institutional policy or legal considerations, these constraints should be explicitly stated, and, where appropriate, supported by additional documentation.

The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee Wards keep a confidential record of all confidential complaints and reports made to them, including cases of misconduct, their dates, nature and resolution. The statistics since 2017 are as follows:

Year	Total number of reports	Cases of factual misconduct	Resolved	Resolve time [days] (mean)	Resolve time [days] (median)
2017	5	3	5	15.2	3
2018	3	1	3	5.1	2.5

O2.a. Published, where institutional and legal constraints permit, the number of reported cases of misconduct, the number resolved and the average time to resolution over the past 2 years (4 years for *Gold*) in a public document (e.g., an annual report). The location of the document should be specified in the application.

The numbers of reports since 2014, as well as their nature and resolve time (as shown in O2 for 2017/18) are published online. A more detailed, confidential document is kept by the Wards. The number of reports remained low (~1/year) during the first three years. The reason for the rise in 2017 and 2018 can be attributed to a much more proactive approach of the Wards, who continually motivate all members to report any concerns and cases of misconduct.

O2.b. Demonstrated support for complainants in misconduct cases, including, where institutional and legal constraints permit, the freedom to publicly speak about such cases. Demonstrated unequivocal strong support of complainants when retaliation for a complaint has occurred.

All our reported cases of actual and suspected misconduct have been dealt with confidentially and as quickly as possible. If appropriate and as far as legal constraints permit, the committee chair or Wards officer inform the plenum of resolved cases. Two examples of the last four years, made public without naming the complainants and offenders, are:

    • A student reported a course coordinator for making sexually offensive comments online while identifying themselves as staff. The committee and executive decided to escalate the case to HR who decided to launch a formal investigation. The investigation included long (~60 min) interviews with several members and concluded after 60 days with measures that are kept confidential. The student expressed satisfaction with the process and result.

    • A member of our community received anonymous emails attacking their religion. As soon as this case was reported, the committee, in consultation with the executive, logged a report to the Australian Cybercrime network and IT analysed the emails for traces to the offender. While no individual could be identified, the attack stopped and the complainant was satisfied with the approach. We haven't had any notable cases of retaliation but would, of course, strongly support the complainants. Staff and students trust that the Wards do their best, as shown by the increase in consultations in the past 2 years.