

REDI RECOMMENDATIONS ON DEPARTMENT AWARD PROCESSES

These recommendations are aimed at increasing transparency around the availability and eligibility for Dept awards, the nomination process, and the adjudication process ([note: these guidelines do not refer to Faculty of Medicine or other University-level awards](#)).

Also, we recommend that a Dept award is established to recognize 1 individual per year for their contributions to REDI efforts. These individuals may be faculty, students, postdoctoral fellows, or staff.

Award availability and eligibility

1. Develop and distribute an annual survey of Dept members to establish a database of individuals who will be eligible for awards, especially for trainees. This could involve a Qualtrics survey where people who want to be considered will register themselves. The list would then be available to all committees that distribute awards.
2. Develop a list of all Dept awards that is made freely available to all Dept members.

Nomination process

3. Allow self-nomination and/or self-identification of eligibility for awards in addition to traditional nomination processes.
4. Adjust language to avoid use of gendered terms. Tools such as [Gender Decoder](#) may be used to achieve this.
5. Establish a library of past successful applications (with permission from applicants) on the website.
6. Collect demographic data for all awards to monitor trends in individuals receiving awards, and those nominated for awards.
7. Where possible, for Dept awards, remove identifiers such as names from the application and/or recommendation letters to avoid triggering unconscious biases, and rely on initials instead.

Adjudication process

8. Assemble a diverse, equitable and inclusive award committee.
9. Where possible, use standardized nomination forms and/or templates for all applicants to ensure cultural differences in CV format are not a barrier.
10. Where possible, use a standardized assessment rubric. Rubric should be available to all applicants, and used by all individuals adjudicating the awards to assess the applicants.
11. EDI training, including training on [gendered language and stereotype awareness](#) and awareness of one's own [implicit biases](#), to lessen the unconscious bias of individuals adjudicating the awards.
12. Describing authorship and significant contributions to science rather than listing journal names to improve equity, diversity, and inclusion in research assessment¹.

¹ <https://sfdora.org/read/>