

## **Professional Culture and Climate Subcommittee (PCCS) Recommendations to the DPS Committee October 21, 2018**

The DPS charge to the PCCS states its mission: To consider and recommend actions that the DPS Committee can take to promote a broadly inclusive professional community characterized by respect, honesty, and trust, so that people of diverse backgrounds are – and perceive themselves to be – safe, welcome and enabled.

Here we outline our recommendations to the DPS committee based on our deliberations and discussions during the past year.

1. Continue and formalize changes that the DPS has taken in the last few years, which improve inclusivity at the annual DPS meeting and provide DPS leadership with information about and tools for improved practices:
  - Support **yearly** implicit bias training for the DPS Committee, Prize Committee, SOC and LOC chairs. Dena Samuels training was highly regarded and we suggest the DPS set up regular training with her so as to continue to recognize and mitigate the effects of implicit bias.
  - Have members of the PCCS serve on both the LOC and SOC, so as to ensure that plenary speaker at the annual DPS meeting are diverse, foster practices in program development that consider and value diversity, and consider accessibility within meeting planning.
  - Host a diversity plenary session at DPS with the speaker chosen by the PCCS.
  - Have the PCCS involved in the development and analysis of the DPS meeting survey.
  
2. Work with the PCCS to determine how diversity and inclusion will be handled at the 2019 joint DPS/EPSC meeting. The PCCS has already met with Victoria Pearson, who is the chair of the EPSC's diversity group and we will be meeting with her again in November to discuss lessons learned from the 2018 DPS and EPSC meetings. However, we need guidance from the DPS committee on:
  - How much input will the DPS have into this meeting?
  - Will recently implemented inclusivity changes, such as larger badges, pronoun stickers, gender-neutral bathrooms, etc. be implemented at the 2019 meeting?
  - Whose anti-harassment policy/code of conduct will take precedence during the 2019 meeting? And how will this policy, including where to turn for help, be advertised to attendees?
  - Will the PCCS be asked to contribute to selecting a plenary speaker?
  
3. Create or edit a previous document for the membership on best practices for hosting a DPS meeting.

- This document should include:
    - Information for the SOC on how to create diverse sessions and include diverse groups in presentations
    - Information on training session chairs on how to encourage a diverse and inclusive session
    - Information for the LOC and the AAS on how to consider and evaluate accessibility of meeting venues, and how to most effectively share accessibility-relevant information with members and attendees.
  - The PCCS is happy to work with various stakeholders on the development of this document.
4. Create a survey for DPS members on why they did or did not attend DPS. This would enable us to understand any issues with safety or accessibility that might be affecting our members and preventing them from attending the meeting.
- We recommend that the DPS send out an additional survey to every member who has attended a meeting in the past 5 years, but did not attend the 2018 DPS meeting. This survey should have at least the following questions:
    - Why did you not attend the 2018 meeting? (possible answers: nothing to present; too expensive; concerns about the location)
    - Please explain any safety or accessibility concerns you had about the 2018 meeting location.
5. We suggest that the AAS collect detailed demographic information on its members and use these data to understand the barriers for members of underrepresented groups. While the AAS workforce surveys do ask demographic information ([https://aas.org/files/aas\\_members\\_workforce\\_survey.pdf](https://aas.org/files/aas_members_workforce_survey.pdf)), they can not easily be compared to award or author information in the way a member database could. See complete recommendation at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/13Y658VVUFkfrvuso8DCbPArwUQ4Yr98osof2hyfZzrI/edit>. Soon to be posted on the Women in Astronomy blog.
6. Design a rubric to be used by the DPS prize committee when reviewing nominations.
- Rubrics are regularly used in teaching and hiring in academia. Several organizations already use and publish rubrics for their awards (See [https://www.nationalhumanservices.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&catid=19:site-content&id=98:rubrics](https://www.nationalhumanservices.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&catid=19:site-content&id=98:rubrics) for an example) and the AGU is implementing rubrics to address gender disparities in awards (<https://fromtheprow.agu.org/how-will-we>

[address-the-lack-of-gender-diversity-in-agu-medals-awards-and-prizes/](#))

- We recommend that representatives from recent DPS Prize committees, DPS committee, and the PCCS create one or more draft rubrics for consideration by the 2019 DPS Prize committee.
  - Furthermore, in conjunction with recommendation 5 above, the demographics of awardees should be compared from before using the rubric to after (multiple years to avoid small numbers) in order to determine if the rubric is helpful in encouraging diverse awardees.
  - Additionally, once a rubric is chosen, it can be shared with the membership so that the process is more transparent. This would hopefully lead to more nominations, particularly of members of underrepresented groups (this can also be tested). Studies show that men often apply for jobs when they have only some of the qualifications while women generally do not apply unless they have all of them. By being clear about what we are looking for, we will encourage more nominations.