Being a Juno Champion:
Information Sheet 1

Introduction to becoming a Juno Champion

The award of Juno Champion is made when a physics department or school provides evidence that they have embedded the Juno principles across the whole department or school and that the work they are doing is having an impact.

These guides have been developed to provide practical advice and examples to help you, as a department or school of physics, to achieve your goal of Juno Champion.

We have developed a series of information sheets that provide information and advice about the Champion process.

Alongside this, we have developed a series of good-practice guides. These cover each of the six Juno principles in turn, highlighting good-practice extracts from our current Champion departments. These are designed to help you articulate and evidence how you have embedded the Juno principles in your department or school. All of these examples of good practice have been successfully implemented in physics departments or schools.

The information is presented in a way that is easy to access and comprehend, so that you can choose whatever guide suits your current needs most. You can read them in any order.

We recognise that each department will be at a very different point on their Juno journey. Likewise, each of our current Juno Champions has a very different profile and had differing circumstances to address when submitting for Juno Champion. Some Champion departments are small, and could easily demonstrate how well communication worked on an informal level across the whole department; however, these departments also had to evidence how they formalised procedures. Some Champion departments are very large and, while they had the benefit of larger and more visible numbers of women and a higher level of resources for Juno activities, they had to evidence how Juno was embedded across the whole department, sometimes in complicated group structures. Some of our Champion departments had, or still have, very low numbers of women, and had to evidence how their efforts were making a difference in a time of austerity, with recruitment freezes and little staff movement across the higher education sector.

The one thing that all of our Champions have in common is the determination to embed the Juno principles from the highest levels of the department down, and the most junior levels up. They demonstrated how they engaged the whole department in their Juno work and how everyone was benefitting from both practical changes to policies and procedures, and genuine departmental culture change. Our Juno Champions were not afraid to try new initiatives to decide what was going to work for them and what they still needed to improve.

Throughout the Champion process, emphasis is placed on physics action and departmental change, so it is crucial that your data, both qualitative and quantitative, your work to embed the principles and the action plan are physics-specific, and involve action across the whole department. Where you are using central university policies, it is important that you identify the impact of these at the departmental level.

For example, if it is a university requirement that all interviewees have undertaken equality and diversity training, you should comment on how you ensure that this happens in your department. Your department may go beyond the minimum expected by the university and it is important that you highlight where this happens.

We are aware that some departments continue to have issues around accessing central data in a
format that is meaningful to them, and we would advise any department in this position to talk to their senior management about the importance of such data sets in both Juno and Athena SWAN applications.

There are many ways that you can evidence how the principles are having an effect in your department. Much of this will be qualitative as changes to baseline data may take many years.

You can use a variety of methods, including (but not limited to): the results of annual staff surveys; surveying staff on a particular issue (such as a new policy or procedure); asking for informal feedback from particular groups of staff (eg senior managers, women, research assistants), organising focus groups to discuss a particular issue in more depth; or implementing a way of identifying common issues raised during appraisal or promotion processes. Important considerations when evidencing impact include thinking about the added value of what you have done. Have there been unexpected positive outcomes as a result of implementing something new? There may also have been unintended consequences and addressing these is an important part of your application.

The IOP Diversity Team is here to support you through all parts of the process of applying for Champion. We can:

- put you in touch with other similar departments so that you can network and share issues, good practice or concerns;
- provide a buddy or mentor from a Champion department who can attend some of your Juno Committee meetings and help you move forward on some issues;
- come and talk to your Juno Committee informally about Juno and the processes required;
- provide advice, guidance and feedback on draft applications and/or action plans;
- develop further national data sets or good-practice guides as requested.

Not only will all the advice and guidance help you with your Juno journey, but you can use it to further your Athena SWAN ambitions too.

Contact information:
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT, UK
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail juno@iop.org
www.iop.org/diversity
We have outlined below how the best Champion applications are structured. We think that this enables the Juno Assessment Panel to see the full range of work that you have done across the six principles.

**Introduction to the department**
We recommend that you provide an outline of the department, its size and scale, numbers of staff and students, and its structure, including the research group structure (if there is one), the key people in the department and what their role has been in Juno. It is also a good idea to provide brief details of how line management operates in the department. How are line managers assigned? Do the roles rotate? While all of this has been covered in your Practitioner application, it is important that you update the information as appropriate.

**Outline the Juno Committee and how its work and profile has changed since Practitioner**, including how it has decided its priorities and how it continues to be resourced. All levels of staff, including senior management and postdocs, should be involved and there should be representation from all groups, sub-divisions or sub-disciplines, depending on your departmental structure. If you are a very large department with a large number of groups, you may not be able to have them all represented on your committee. However, you will have to demonstrate how they all have a way of engaging with the Juno work in the department.

It is important to provide information on how the Juno work feeds into the wider departmental decision-making and how all staff are made aware of the work of the Committee.

**Progress since Practitioner**
We recommend that you include a section that outlines progress since the Practitioner award, together with the key actions from the Practitioner action plan that have been implemented and how they have effected change in the department.

Your Practitioner application will have focused on Principle 1 and we would not expect that information to be repeated directly, although a brief summary of the work is essential. You should remind the panel of your key data and highlight any further quantitative information that you have gathered since Practitioner. This is especially important if you had gaps in your data set.

**It is important to recognise how far you have come on your Juno journey** and reflect on all the positives and progress that you have made, not just worry about the things that you haven’t achieved yet. Evidencing how you communicate progress to the whole department is an important part of the process. It is too easy to make Juno updates a long list of all the things that you still have to do, but by dedicating some time to reflecting on progress and distance travelled, you can keep the momentum and positivity to your work going. Reflecting on the positives will also help you realise why some areas may have stalled completely or where progress has not been as fast as planned, and you can reflect on the reasons why this has happened in a constructive way.

**The six principles**
Address the six principles in turn and describe how you have addressed work for each of these. Refer to our good-practice guides on each of the six principles, which provide information about the expected achievements you have put in place as well as moves towards good practice beyond Champion.

**The Champion action plan**
The aim of your Champion action plan is to detail what the priorities are for your department over the four years of your Champion status, to take you...
CASE STUDY: Progress since Practitioner

Introduction

Our case for progressing to Juno Champion, presented in this document, rests on the advances that we have made since ———, when we made our successful submission for Juno Practitioner. These advances centre on:

• embedding many aspects of the Juno Principles in the working of the school, taking note in particular of the new challenges and opportunities offered by three major changes in the running of the university;
• our efforts in investigating issues of PhD and postdoc satisfaction and career plans; and
• our progress against our Juno Practitioner action plan, including several new initiatives.

The Juno Practitioner submission contained a great deal of statistical and survey information, and statistics are still being gathered and analysed regularly, but in the intervening 18 months we have concentrated on improving our procedures for gathering statistics, further engaging research staff and PhD students in the way that the school works, and understanding the views of the school members via focus groups.

Significant changes in the organisation of three of the main functions of the university have taken place over the last year. These changes, and their impact on and opportunities for Juno, are described below... The restructuring has presented us with opportunities for:

• rethinking and improving our procedures in the school;
• influencing the practice of the university as a whole.

On the negative side, the additional time demands made by restructuring on senior staff meant that some parts of our Juno Champion plan did not proceed as far as we had hoped.

Progress against Juno Practitioner action plan

Our Juno Practitioner submission included a 13-point action plan aimed at improving our procedures, broadening the awareness and involvement of the school in Project Juno, and investigating in more detail the views of more junior members of our school. We have made significant progress against most of these action-plan items. Some activities were delayed by the lack of time available to school senior management, who have been dealing with the fall-out from university restructuring. However, other activities have had a more significant outcome than anticipated, and have led to a better understanding of the factors influencing the careers and career choices of our PhD students and junior staff. This has also produced changes in the running of the school.
The key to becoming a Champion is demonstrating that the whole department is involved and engaged in this work, and to demonstrate real embeddedness across the department. It is important that a range of people are identified and that all of the work for delivering does not simply fall on the Juno Committee or on the Juno lead within your department.

There are two essential elements for an effective action plan – people who are enthusiastic and committed, and a realistic action plan. The best action plans contain S.M.A.R.T. goals:

- **Specific**
- **Measurable**
- **Attainable**
- **Realistic**
- **Timely**

### Specific
There is a much greater chance of delivering a specific goal than a general one. When setting specific goals, bear in mind:

- **Who:** who is involved?
  It is better to assign the responsibility for overseeing and driving action forward to a single named individual, rather than a group or a broad function, such as the Juno Committee. The named individual doesn’t have to do all the work and the responsibilities should be spread around. No one individual, or small group of individuals, should be overwhelmed.

- **What:** what is to be achieved?
  Be specific. A broad aim might be “increased awareness of promotion criteria”. A more specific target would be, “an increase to 80% of male and female staff reporting that they understand or understand well the promotion criteria”. Note, the assumption here is that data already exist on staff’s current understanding of the promotion criteria.

Actions might be broken down into separate steps with specific targets. In the example above, if baseline data were not available, then a first step would be to survey staff and then to use the results to set or revise the target. A second step would be a work programme to raise staff awareness of the promotion criteria (perhaps running workshops, improving the materials available on the website). The third step would be to survey staff again.

### Measurable
The use of numbers, percentages, dates and time to be taken are ways to clarify objectives. The above target is based on achieving a set percentage. In some circumstances setting a target date is useful, for example, “investigate the career destinations of PhD students (focusing on the difference between men and women), produce a report on the findings and recommend actions by July XXXX.”

The objective of your Champion action plan is to put in place any further issues that you have identified and to work towards your Champion renewal in four years’ time, Juno Excellence and/or Athena SWAN Gold. As with the Practitioner action plan, it should be ambitious, but achievable with a mix of short-, medium- and long-term actions.

“We set ourselves targets that we don’t know how to achieve and that forces us to think the unthinkable.”

Prof. Robin Ball
University of Warwick
**Attainable**
If targets are not attained, there is a risk that momentum will be lost. The achievement of a target (by its planned date) will depend on the resources that are available. Time is often the most important factor, therefore the staff who are responsible for the action should be given time to do it.

**Realistic**
A way to establish if a goal is realistic is to find out if something similar has been achieved elsewhere; alternatively to think through the “conditions” that are necessary to achieve the goal. A realistic goal is one that people are both “willing” and “able” to work towards. A goal can be both high and realistic. In the example above, a target of 100% of staff reporting that they “understand or understand well the promotion criteria”, although desirable, is probably not realistic, whereas 80% is ambitious but achievable under the right conditions. It may be sensible to amend targets as time passes, especially if targets are date related. It is usually better to do this than to carry on with an unrealistic target. Priorities will change and actions may have to be rescheduled to fit a new focus.

**Timely**
Goals should have a time frame because without this there is no sense of urgency. The time frame for individual goals needs to take account of what else will be going on. Actions may need to be prioritised. Some actions may be dependent on others being completed before they can begin. The need to manage the workload may mean that some goals have to be rescheduled.

You need to ensure that you have a mix of short-, medium- and long-term actions. Set yourself some easy “quick wins” to keep momentum going, as well as some more visionary longer-term goals.

Review the plan regularly – say once a year. The purpose of the review is to assess progress on individual actions. Then, if necessary, revise timescales and targets. The review should re-confirm that the original priorities still hold. If not, timescales may need to be amended to reflect new priorities. New actions may have to be added where new issues have emerged to maintain momentum in other areas and to take forward recommendations from reports.

There are many formats/templates in use for action plans. A suggested template for the action plan with some brief actions is set out below, and you can download this from [www.iop.org/juno](http://www.iop.org/juno) under Documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective or principle</th>
<th>Action already taken and outcome</th>
<th>Further action</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Success measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Reporting from the Equality Committee embedded in committee structures</td>
<td>Reporting from the Equality Committee added to the standing items on the Board of Studies</td>
<td>E&amp;D items added to agenda of other sub-committees of Board of Studies</td>
<td>Chairs of committees</td>
<td>Summer XX</td>
<td>Committees report to Board of Studies on E&amp;D regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 In analysing our data, we found that fewer women were applying for posts than we would expect</td>
<td>Wrote a good-practice guide in advertising document for insertion into the departmental handbook</td>
<td>Set up a Search Committee for new posts above SL level, and ensure that its remit specifically includes diversity. Monitor data to see if more women apply</td>
<td>HoD, HR</td>
<td>By summer term</td>
<td>Search Committee established, data monitored by SMT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Provide induction for all new staff</td>
<td>School induction packs have been introduced for all new staff and new PDRAs</td>
<td>Staff and PDRA feedback to be sought on the induction packs</td>
<td>Head of school, chair of Research Forum</td>
<td>By XX</td>
<td>Staff satisfaction survey shows positive feedback on induction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE FOR CHAMPION:** with some examples

**Contact information:**
Institute of Physics Diversity Team
76 Portland Place
London W1B 1NT, UK
Tel +44 (0)20 7470 4842
E-mail [juno@iop.org](mailto:juno@iop.org)
[www.iop.org/diversity](http://www.iop.org/diversity)
The aim of the Juno mid-Practitioner visit is to have a positive and constructive dialogue with you to enable you to carry out the critical reflection that is crucial as you progress towards Juno Champion status.

The visit is not part of the assessment process; it is designed to provide opportunity for a two-way dialogue, for you to receive feedback on your Juno journey to date and to enable you to identify where the priorities are for your department’s action plan and future work.

The visit is not a compulsory part of the process of applying for Champion, but we strongly advise it, to take advantage of the advice, guidance and reflection on progress that the visit enables. We therefore recommend a visit to provide you with a valuable opportunity for crucial feedback.

The visiting team
The visiting team will be drawn from the Juno Assessment Panel, who all have substantial experience in dealing with the issues raised through the Juno framework. All of our panel members, with the exception of our member representing industry, are drawn from Practitioner or Champion departments because they understand the issues of implementing Juno in the environment of university physics.

The visiting team will ask challenging questions; these are not designed to assess your department, or to criticise your practice, but to enable you to reflect on your current practices and reflect on how embedded processes have actually become. They can also discuss any issues that you have particular concerns about.

As a minimum, the visiting team will meet with the head of department, the Juno Champion or lead for the department and the Juno Committee. If there are no postdocs on the Juno Committee, then the visiting team will also request to meet with some postdocs or postdoc representatives, to gain insights into this group of staff specifically.

Feedback from the visit
On the day of the visit, you will be given informal feedback. Following the visit, a formal, confidential written report addressing your progress against the principles will be provided. The aim of the feedback is to provide positive indications of the work and actions needed to move towards a successful Champion application. This report will remain confidential to your department and will not be seen by the wider Juno Assessment Panel.

How you take on board the feedback from the visit is entirely up to you. We suggest that your Juno Committee works through the feedback to incorporate it into your submission and to carry out sufficient further actions to take you to Champion status. This, with the report, will also enable you to decide when you should submit for Champion.

It is very hard, given panel members’ diaries, to organise a visit at less than around two months’ notice, particularly at busy times in the academic calendar (such as the start of term or exam time). You should discuss your intention to submit for Champion with the Diversity Team as early as possible in the process, so that they can maximise the possible dates for a visit and ensure that you have sufficient time to take on board feedback before the next deadline.

Paperwork for the visit
Prior to the visit you will be asked to provide:
- a short update on the progress you have made since Practitioner (around 2000 words), highlighting any priority areas and any places where work may have stalled;
- an updated action plan;
- an updated evidence base of key data disaggregated by gender.

“Having a mirror held up to ourselves was something of a surprise.”
Prof. Lesley Cohen
Imperial College
“We’re a really small department – how can we make change?”

We know that departmental size can affect issues such as gathering robust quantitative data, preserving anonymity in gender-disaggregated data, having fewer staff to actually undertake the work and potentially having fewer resources to implement any outcomes. In addition, recruitment and promotion opportunities will be more infrequent and policy, procedures and communication may be more informal. We also know that many of the smallest physics departments and groups only have one or two female staff and some have none at all.

In terms of Athena SWAN, it may be easier for smaller departments to join together to submit a school or faculty-level application. However, we hope that as a physics department, you understand that there is a place for you within the Juno award scheme and that you can be recognised for the work you are doing within physics. We want to ensure that you, as a small department, do not feel unduly penalised as a result of participation. Even if you have no female staff, we want to encourage you to consider the Juno award scheme. By working through the principles, you will be future-proofing equality and diversity in your department and you will be ensuring that the department is fair, open and transparent for everyone and for potential female applicants and employees.

Working towards Juno Practitioner
In order to achieve Juno Practitioner, departments must demonstrate that they have met Principle 1: a robust organisational framework to deliver equality of opportunity and reward.

Establishing organisational framework
This means putting in place the necessary framework to improve equality and transparency for all staff, regardless of the current number of females or staff in the department. If you cannot establish a new committee for Juno or Athena SWAN work, allocate the responsibility to an existing committee, and ensure that there is a reporting mechanism directly into the senior leadership of the department. Equality and diversity should be standing items on other committees, and responsibility for collecting gender-disaggregated data could be taken on by a number of different committees (eg teaching, research, senior management team, HR committee, etc) rather than just in one place or being collected by one person. This will allow the load to be spread and allow equality to become embedded.

Monitoring and evidence base
Gathering quantitative data
Departments are encouraged to gather and submit as much quantitative data as they can, and there is a list of the minimum data expected from departments. However, smaller departments may wish to concentrate on providing more detail where their numbers are larger (eg undergraduate students) and less detail where numbers are smaller. It may be that you have to rely on more data from your central HR or planning department. Many universities are now gathering central data much more robustly for Athena SWAN – you can use the same physics data for Juno as Athena SWAN.
Analysing quantitative data with small numbers is tricky as percentages can fluctuate dramatically with the addition or removal of one or two people. You may have to aggregate data across several years (say three to five years) where you have the datasets to do this. This provides an outline picture of the department.

Gathering qualitative data

You may wish to spend more time and detail at the Practitioner level focusing on qualitative data. With small numbers of female staff or students, it can often be difficult to preserve anonymity and in some cases it may not be possible to present data disaggregated by gender (e.g., where there is only one female in the department or group). In these cases, you may wish to initiate, for example, a generic questionnaire or focus group of all females in the department (staff, undergraduate students, PhD students, PDRAs, etc) to obtain some data around opinions of the overall culture within the department. This may not elicit as much detailed information as specific questionnaires aimed at particular groups, such as research staff, but it may help the department portray a general picture.

There are a range of culture analysis tools (QuickCAT) available from the National HE STEM programme website: www.hestem.ac.uk/resources/guides-and-publications/culture-analysis-tool. You can download the staff and student culture surveys and use the most appropriate questions for your department. Alternatively, you can use the Juno Good Practice Checklist as a questionnaire (available at www.iop.org/juno) and ask all staff to fill it in, rate the department and describe their experiences, where relevant and appropriate. This will provide a wealth of data for your application. You may wish to use a case-study approach with one or two particularly successful members of your department – for example, males or females who work flexibly, how you have implemented a successful home-working policy, etc.

Other qualitative data could also include:
- reflections on interview procedures for new staff
- female representation in departmental seminars
- perceptions of departmental induction process
- perceptions of appraisal process
- perceived transparency of promotion procedure
- perceptions of career development, including careers guidance
- perceptions of workload allocation

Action plan

One of the major issues with the action plan is the time and resources needed to carry out sufficient actions to take a department to Practitioner and Champion. A good action plan focuses attention on the crucial tasks to be tackled, enables equality to be tackled like any other management task and becomes part of the objectives and responsibilities of named individuals within management.

Spreading the load across the department and embedding it into the functions and work of the departmental committees may be an easier way to ensure that action is taken in smaller departments. It is important that these committees can be held to account and report on their equality objectives. Ensuring that there is a clear link between the data that you have and the work that you are going to undertake will enable you to set realistic and achievable deadlines and spread the load.

School or faculty Athena SWAN Bronze

If your department already has an Athena SWAN Bronze award, as part of a school or a faculty application, we can provide advice on how you can convert this to Juno Practitioner, providing it is a recent award (i.e., in the last year) in order that you can use the same datasets.

Mentoring, advice and help

Smaller departments can and do achieve Juno Practitioner and Juno Champion.

The IOP Diversity Team is here to support you. We can put you in touch with departments in a similar position or of a similar size who have already achieved an award. They can talk through some of the issues you might be facing. We can come to visit your committees or teams to provide advice on action planning or other areas, such as gathering data. We can also provide access to generic training – for example by organising a regional workshop with local partner physics departments on a particular issue (e.g., unconscious bias). We can also provide advice and feedback on draft applications for Juno Practitioner or conversion applications from Athena SWAN Bronze.

If you have any suggestions about what might help you, then please contact us and we can discuss the options.