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This report is a deliverable of the GENDER-NET ERA-NET, a pilot transnational research policy initiative funded by the European Commission under the Science-in-Society work programme of the seventh Framework Programme, designed to address the common challenges still facing the European Research Area in achieving one of its key priorities, gender equality in research institutions and the integration of the gender dimension in research contents.

The present report (GENDER-NET Deliverable Report D2.6) summarises research undertaken to understand the impact of existing national/regional initiatives and award schemes in selected research institutions that aim to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change. It considers whether institutional initiatives can aid the design of national strategies and initiatives, and identifies successful elements that could be recommended for transnational implementation. Based on these recommendations, work will be carried out in GENDER-NET to develop transnational initiatives and indicators on structural change.

The report provides an overview and analysis of existing institutional gender equality plans, also called gender action plans, (GEPs), central institutional initiatives, decentralised/area-specific institutional initiatives, and summarises the most common and innovative practices (MCIPs), implemented within the framework of existing national/regional initiatives and award schemes.

Based on the essential elements of structural change, the GENDER-NET partners are looking at five areas of intervention, and, therefore, the assessment of institutional initiatives covers these areas:

1. Anchoring gender equality issues at leadership level,
2. Identifying decision making structures and procedures,
3. Recruiting, retaining, and advancement of women researchers, including leading positions,
4. Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers,
5. Facilitating in-/outgoing mobility for women researchers.

This research is based on methodological triangulation. Two steps were involved in the mapping and analysis research into structural change at an institutional level: (1) at selected institutions in Switzerland (CH), and (2) an online survey at selected institutions from GENDER-NET project countries. In addition, the following information sources were also taken into account when compiling this report: secondary research about national and transnational contexts; gender action plans; evaluation and assessment reports provided by

---

1 'Institutional level,' 'institution' and 'research institution' in this report refer to universities, universities of applied sciences and research institutions. 'Selected institution' means that the institution was selected by GENDER-NET project partners to participate in the survey launched for the purpose of this report.
the selected institutions; policy documents, reports, and recommendations for fostering structural change to promote gender equality as defined within the FP7; relevant statistics; and expert interviews.

The summary map of MCIPs implemented in the 52 selected institutions from France (FR), Germany (DE), Ireland (EI), Norway (NO), Spain (ES), Switzerland (CH) and the UK\(^2\) gives an overview of 84 actions classified according to the five key areas mentioned above. It is important to emphasise, however, that although we have tried to categorise the measures within one of the five areas, some measures may also prove effective for the other areas.

This research was undertaken as part of the GENDER-NET project. This European Research Area Network (ERA-NET) brings together a balanced partnership of 12 national programme owners from across Europe and North America joining forces to address the persistent barriers and constraints to the recruitment, advancement and mobility of women in the European scientific system; the lack of women in decision-making, as well as the limited integration of the gender dimension in research programmes and content.

The State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation at the Department of Economy, Education and Research of the Swiss Confederation (WBF/SERI) is a GENDER-NET project partner. Switzerland has implemented the Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities at Universities of Applied Sciences and the Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities at Universities considered in this research report among the others. Both programmes have been progressing towards the paradigm of structural change, and to this end, WBF/SERI has an interest in ensuring that this development is successful and sustainable.

For more information about GENDER-NET please visit [http://www.gender-net.eu](http://www.gender-net.eu)

### Frameworks for fostering structural change

The findings obtained from this research show that a gender-responsive national policy context (i.e. creation of legal and policy frameworks, initiatives, and awards for promoting gender equality in S&T) is a significant driving force for stimulating gender equality and enacting structural change in research institutions. The legal frameworks in FR, ES, and NO, the Athena SWAN Charter in the UK, federal programmes on equal opportunities in CH, and the “Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality” developed by the DFG in DE are a few such examples. Another external factor that activates structural change dynamics and builds critical mass is transnational and inter-institutional cooperation between selected institutions. Of the 52 selected institutions, 20 organisations already work closely together in the context of various alliances and projects to develop or continue to implement GEPs, to share these, to jointly monitor their implementation, and to foster structural change. The sharing of best practices and external networking are key for exchanging experiences of the change process and the lessons learned. Reaching a critical mass of institutions committed to gender equality through structural change is one of the key success factors.

#### Enabling structural change

The evidence presented in this report indicates that structural change is an instrument for addressing gender inequality, and is part of the modernisation process of research institutions. The selected institutions could be considered a core group of "leaders" in promoting gender equality; they vary in size and complexity, yet they demonstrate a number of common challenges and solutions for promoting gender equality through structural change. This group of institutions is relatively small, however.

Structural change has the following prerequisites: strategic management (i.e. vision and strong commitment from top leadership); a strategic gender equality/action plan (GEP) with a clear set of targets; corresponding measures and actions tailored to the challenges of the respective institution; adequate human and financial resources for its implementation; and proper monitoring and accountability mechanisms for achieving these objectives.

A participatory approach to the planning of a GEP, and its approval at the highest level of the institution are two important factors that demonstrate a commitment to action. Results, however, will depend on the transformative and sustainable nature of the GEP: the quality of its measures and actions; the translation of the GEP across the whole institution; the establishment of responsible structures with proper mandate, the allocation of sufficient, strategically-planned resources, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, as well as on the targeted transformation of mind-sets and the institutional culture (e.g. creation of ownership).

As a positive development, we can report that selected institutions have started to create the preconditions for structural change. They are working towards enforcing the essential elements of structural change: through increasing institutional capacity to ensure gender equality; by eliminating organisational and structural barriers, by transforming structures and practices; and by incorporating targeted measures into daily business under the strategic umbrella of GEPs.

Nevertheless, structural change at an institutional level can only be successful and sustainable if it is implemented as an all-encompassing set of measures addressing all the essential elements of structural change (e.g. vertical and horizontal integration of gender equality). The selection of measures could vary and should be tailored to the concrete needs of an institution, and implemented in
A prioritised manner. While some initiatives and measures are low-cost and easily implemented, others will require the dedication of adequate long-term funding; some measures may also be transferable to other countries and contexts.

Structural change is unique and individual for each institution, and is linked to institutional and national frameworks – there is no “one-size-fits-all” model. In addition, the implementation of strategies and policies requires additional support and organisational transformation in some cases. An institutional GEP should therefore be considered as a key instrument for enabling strategic structural change at an institutional level, e.g. by addressing each of its essential elements.

Selected institutions have different structural change dynamics and are at different stages of change processes. It should be also noted, that there are two areas of intervention that remain under-addressed by selected institutions in the context of structural change: facilitating in-/outgoing researcher mobility for women researchers and dual careers. This implies that a lot remains to be done.

Recommendations

Based on the analysis undertaken in this research, and findings obtained, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. GENDER-NET partners should further foster and support structural change at an institutional level in their national/regional policy frameworks, initiatives and award schemes. They must ensure that structural change at an institutional level is sustainable, overcome existing challenges, and accelerate structural change dynamics.

2. National/regional policy frameworks should foresee adoption and further strengthening of GEPs as instrument that allows addressing all the essential elements of structural change at an institutional level. GEPs should support transformation and ensure the quality of measures and actions, their translation across the whole institution, the establishment of responsible structures with a proper mandate, the allocation of sufficient, strategically planned resources, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, as well as the targeted change in mind-sets and institutional culture.

3. National/regional policy frameworks should address the issue of the sustainability of dedicated gender equality structures by ensuring that institutions take financial and organisational responsibility. This should be done through providing a dedicated budget for staffing gender equality offices, by integrating gender equality measures into long-term strategies and planning, by ensuring the institutional anchoring of equal opportunities at department/faculty level, and by establishing gender equality monitoring.

4. Joint indicators for monitoring the state of play and progress of structural change will be developed within GENDER-NET and should also be integrated into the institutional reporting on GEPs and into other national reporting procedures. This kind of reporting could be conducted using a “Structural Change Scorecard (Barometer)” tool, which could combine both institutional and cultural change indicators on gender equality. Indicators developed at an institutional level should be taken into consideration.

5. Based on the experiences of inter-institutional cooperation on structural change, monitoring and assessment of GEPs established by selected institutions, GENDER–NET partners should consider structural change “mentoring models” (e.g. national/transnational/by type of institution). The GESIS evaluation concept could serve as a potential model. This could also require further analysis of the structural change “champions” at an institutional level, who could then form a pool of experts.

6. A GENDER-NET structural change training toolkit should contain recommendations, training concepts and capacity-building materials that have been developed by selected institutions and which target different groups.
1. Introduction

The research presented in the Deliverable report (D2.6) was undertaken within the framework of the GENDER-NET ERA-NET project (2013-2016), as part of Work Package 2 (Gender Equality in Research Institutions through Structural Change), Task 3 (Performing a joint assessment on the promotion of gender equality through structural change at institutional level).

This report summarises research that was carried out in order to understand the impact of existing national/regional initiatives and award schemes in selected research institutions that aim to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change. It provides an overview and analysis of existing institutional initiatives, and also examines whether methods from institutional initiatives can aid the design of national strategies and initiatives.

This research was conducted in parallel with two other reports. Deliverable report D2.5 investigates existing national and regional initiatives undertaken by GENDER-NET project participants to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change with regard to gender equality in research institutions. Deliverable report D2.7 researches the impact of award schemes aimed at creating greater gender equality, and their ability to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change with regard to gender equality in research institutions. Together, the three reports will form the basis of future work in the GENDER-NET ERA-NET project for developing transnational initiatives and indicators on structural change.

GENDER-NET is a pilot transnational research policy initiative funded by the European Commission under the Science in Society work programme of the seventh Framework Programme (FP7).

GENDER-NET is designed to address the common challenges still facing European research institutions in achieving gender equality in research and innovation. These challenges concern the persistent barriers and constraints to the recruitment, advancement and mobility of women in the European scientific system, the lack of women in decision-making, and the limited integration of the gender dimension in research programmes and content. This European Research Area Network (ERA-NET) brings together a balanced partnership of 12 national programme owners from across North and North America (i.e. ministries, national research funding agencies or national organisations) with a shared commitment to gender equality and synergistic expertise in gender and science issues. More information on GENDER-NET can be found on the project’s website: www.gender-net.eu.

The State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation at the Department of Economy, Education and Research of the Swiss Confederation (WBF/SERI) is a GENDER-NET project partner and co-leader of Work Package 2, which is dedicated to “Gender Equality in Research Institutions through Structural Change”. Since 2000, Switzerland has implemented the Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities at Universities of Applied Sciences and the Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities at Universities. Both programmes have been progressing towards the paradigm of structural change, and to this end, WBF/SERI has an interest in ensuring that this development is successful and sustainable.

GENDER-NET Partners:
- CNRS (France) Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (project coordinator)
- MENESR (France) Ministère de l’Éducation Nationale, de l’Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche
- MINECO (Spain) Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness/Secretariat of State for Research, Development and Innovation
- ECU (UK) Equality Challenge Unit
- WBF (Switzerland) Federal Department of Economic Affairs, Education and Research / State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation
- CIHR (Canada) Canadian Institutes of Health Research
- HEA (Ireland) The Higher Education Authority / Irish Research Council
- F.R.S. – FNRS (Belgium) Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique
- RPF (Cyprus) Research Promotion Foundation
- MESS (Slovenia) Ministry of Education, Science and Sport
- NAS (USA) National Academy of Sciences
- RCN (Norway) Research Council of Norway

GENDER-NET Observers:
- DFG (Germany) German Research Foundation
- DNCD (Germany) Dual Career Network Germany
- NSERC (Canada) Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada

Expert Advisory Board:
Core group:
- Anke Lipinsky (Germany) GESIS-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Center of Excellence Women and Science
- Alice Hogan (US), Consultant, former National Science Foundation
- Londa Schiebinger (US) Professor, Stanford University
- Carl Jacobsson (Sweden) Director, Swedish Research Council
- and also:
- Gerd Karin Bjørhovde (Norway) Professor Emerita, UiT The Arctic University of Norway
The GENDER-NET project identified five themes or key indicators, and this report is structured according to these areas:

1. Anchoring gender equality issues at leadership level,
2. Identifying decision making structures and procedures,
3. Recruiting, retaining, and advancement of women researchers, including leading positions,
4. Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers,
5. Facilitating in-/outgoing mobility for women researchers.

The information and data presented in this report represent the situation in selected institutions only. The selected institutions vary in size and complexity, however they reveal a number of common challenges and solutions for promoting gender equality through structural change.

The report focuses on institutional action plans, central institutional initiatives, decentralised/area-specific institutional initiatives, i.e. measures, implemented by selected institutions within the framework of existing national/regional initiatives and award schemes undertaken by project participants in CH, DE, ES, FR, EL, NO and UK6 to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change.

This report analyses the impact of existing national/regional initiatives and award schemes at an institutional level, taking into account the factors that contribute to, or hinder, their success. It will also consider whether institutional initiatives can aid the design of national strategies and initiatives, and identify successful elements that could be recommended for transnational implementation.

The report is structured as follows:

1. Chapter 2 provides a brief overview of national and international frameworks that foster structural change at an institutional level and highlights positive changes and results achieved by selected institutions so far.

4 Ibid
5 Ibid

1.2. Key definitions

1.3. Report focus and structure
Chapter 3 presents the main findings and analysis regarding policies and measures that enable structural change at an institutional level, with reference to the five key indicators listed above.

Chapter 4 summarises our main conclusions and recommendations with respect to further national and transnational initiatives and indicators on structural change.

The summary map of measures implemented in the 52 selected institutions from CH, DE, ES, FR, IE, NO and UK (Annex 1) gives an overview of 84 actions classified according to the five key areas. It is important to emphasise, however, that although we have tried to categorise the measures within one of the five areas, some measures may also prove effective for the other areas. The measures are ordered from most common to rare, based on the survey results and answers provided by participating institutions.

In order to disseminate examples of measures and initiatives, some of them are highlighted throughout the report. While some initiatives and measures are low-cost and easily implemented, others require a commitment to sufficient long-term funding.

It should be also noted that the list is not exhaustive: some examples could not be included in the overview of implemented measures. A number of the selected institutions participate in other FP7 projects and are members of various alliances; this means that some of the good practices implemented by these institutions are already described in other reports and research papers. This report aims to avoid duplication and therefore focuses on examples that have not already been described. Nevertheless, some practices will be familiar to readers.

Initiatives and measures concerning the integration of sex/gender analysis in research contents are not covered in this report paper; they will be described in separate GENDER-NET reports (D3.9 and D3.10) about the integration of the gender dimension in research contents.

Though there is evidence that a number of the selected institutions tackle gender equality and diversity issues together, this report covers those aspects relating to gender equality only.

1.4. Methodology

This research is based on methodological triangulation. Two steps were involved in the mapping and analysis research into structural change at an institutional level:

1. At selected institutions in Switzerland:

Research was undertaken into the existing plans, initiatives, and measures for fostering structural change with regard to the promotion of gender equality. It was conducted for 10 cantonal universities and 7 universities of applied sciences in the context of the national legal framework, and because these institutions were participating in corresponding federal equal opportunities programmes. The data analysis also included data from two federal technical universities (ETHs) and from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF). A map of MCIPs of selected institutions in Switzerland was developed.

2. At selected institutions from GENDER-NET project countries:

An online survey was conducted from August to December 2014 in order to map and analyse the plans, initiatives, and measures being taken to foster structural change in selected institutions in other project countries. The selection of institutions asked to answer online survey was facilitated by GENDER-NET project partners according to the following criteria: the institution should be participating in a national/regional programme/initiative/award, and be proactive in enabling structural change at an institutional level. From the total number of 40 selected institutions from DE, ES, FR, IE, NO and UK invited to participate in this survey, 32 institutions completed the questionnaire and provided their gender action plans together with the other information that was requested. Additional research into the public resources of these institutions was also conducted (the questionnaire for the online survey is included in Annex 7).

While mapping and selecting measures, the following research questions were posed:

- Does the measure increase the capacity of the institution to ensure gender equality?
- Does the measure eliminate organisational and structural barriers?
- Is the measure implemented in the framework of a national/regional programme/initiative/award?
- Which changes have taken place concerning gender equality at an institutional level as a result of the respective national/regional programme/initiative/award so far?

The original deadline for completing the online survey was the end of September 2014. However, following requests from project partners, the deadline was extended; the last response to the survey was received on 26 December 2014. This development significantly impacted the overall process of preparing this report.
The following information sources were also taken into account when compiling this report: secondary research about national and transnational contexts; gender action plans; evaluation and assessment reports provided by the selected institutions; policy documents, reports, and recommendations for fostering structural change to promote gender equality as defined within the FP7; relevant statistics; and expert interviews.

As mentioned above, this research was conducted in parallel with the research for D2.7 (WP2 Task 4) and D2.5 (WP2 Task 2). However, on account of its focus, the final report was written when both of these reports had been finalised. This research reflects, where appropriate, the main findings from these two other deliverable reports.

The research findings are limited by data coverage; they represent the current situation in the selected institutions only.

2. Frameworks for fostering structural change at an institutional level

2.1. National policy context

Eliminating gender discrimination in science and technology (S&T) is one of the five key policy priorities of the European Research Area (ERA). To this end, all necessary frameworks, including legal, policy and programme frameworks at national level, as well as measures at the institutional level, are to be promoted. A detailed analysis and description of the national context, e.g. national and regional legal systems, policy frameworks, initiatives and award schemes for promoting gender equality in research institutions, are presented in Deliverable reports D2.5 and D2.7.

When analysing the various factors that impact structural change in the selected institutions, it is important to refer to the most important and up-to-date instruments and frameworks for ensuring and promoting gender equality in the countries under review. Extracted from reports D2.5 and D2.7, the summary table I (Annex 2) provides an overview of the situation in a national context.

The selected institutions view the national framework as a major external stimulus. The legal frameworks in FR, ES, and NO, the Athena SWAN Charter in the UK, federal programmes on equal opportunities in CH, and the "Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality" developed by the DFG in DE are a few such examples.

Although structural change is an individual process for each institution and depends on the respective institutional and national frameworks, the selected institutions reported that transnational and inter-institutional cooperation is essential for activating structural change dynamics and building critical mass.

Of the 52 selected institutions, 20 organisations already work closely together in the context of various alliances and projects to develop or continue to implement gender equality/action plans (GEPs), to share these, to jointly monitor their implementation, and to foster structural change.

The sharing of best practices and external networking are key for exchanging experiences of the change process and the lessons learned. Reaching a critical mass of institutions committed to gender equality through structural change is one of the key success factors.

It is necessary to note that in addition to the GENDER-NET ERA-NET project, some of the selected institutions are/were taking part in various FP7-funded projects and thus have received other incentives for fostering structural change. For example, two of the selected institutions participate in the www.INTEGRER-tools-for-action.eu which aims to tackle the challenge of a gender-equal

9 European Commission’s new Communication on a ‘Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth, EC (2012), COM(2012) 392, p. 4
http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/pdf/research_policies/era-communication_en.pdf
10 State obligations are not included in the international legal and policy contexts
organisation by initiating organisational structural change. The project identifies the best systematic approaches in the participating institutions with the help of tailor-made transformational gender action plans. The selected institutions reported a number of other important inter-institutional initiatives. Cooperation for the purpose of promoting gender equality is gaining importance in the framework of the Conference of European Schools for Advanced Engineering Education and Research (CESAER).11

Another eight selected institutions are also participating in the Human Resource Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) process.13

The lessons learned from all these initiatives, together with the commitments and synergies that were established in the process, are hugely significant for the development of transnational initiatives and indicators for structural change within the GENDER-NET project, in particular:

Synergy among structural change practitioners

To better tailor the implementation of a gender equality plan, CNRS has introduced a set of actions at different levels. These include networking and dialogue between institutional change practitioners in the following capacities: a) exchange of experience between partners through seminars, b) peer-to-peer organisational mentoring, c) exchange of experience with sister FP7-funded projects.

League of European Research Universities (LERU)

LERU members14 commit to undertake actions for producing structural change. These actions include: rectors’ commitment to promoting diversity among academic staff with strong leadership, in accordance with institutional, national and other regulatory frameworks, and in partnership with the LERU universities, the development and implementation of GEPs, and the joint monitoring of their development and implementation.

---

11 CESAER members: Presentation of the first results of the Gender Equality Survey 2013/2014 at European Universities of Science and Technology is available online: http://www.cesaer.org/content/assets/docs/Documents_2014/HORVAT_CESAER_GE_report_Report_Results_141127_final.pdf

12 The «HR Strategy for Researchers» supports research institutions and funding organisations in the implementation of the Charter & Code in their policies and practices. The concrete implementation of the Charter & Code by research institutions will render them more attractive to researchers looking for a new employer or for a host for their research project. Funding organisations implementing the Charter & Code principles will contribute to the attractiveness of their national research systems and to the attractiveness of the European Research Area more generally. The logo «HR Excellence in Research» will identify the institutions and organisations as providers and supporters of a stimulating and favourable working environment

13 Full list of the HRS4R-acknowledged institutions: http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess/index.cfm/rights/strategy4ResearcherOrgs

14 According to the LERU website, its members are: Universiteit van Amsterdam, Universitat de Barcelona, University of Cambridge, University of Edinburgh, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Université de Genève, Universität Heidelberg, Helsingin yliopisto (University of Helsinki), Universität Leiden, KU Leuven, Imperial College London, University College London, Lunds universitet, Università degli Studi di Milano, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, University of Oxford, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, Université Paris-Sud 11, Université de Strasbourg, Universität Ulmrecht, Universität Zürich

---

2.3. Impact of national frameworks at the institutional level

In answer to the survey question, “what has been the major impact of existing national frameworks in promoting gender equality in your institution so far?” respondents15 identified changes that we have tentatively classified as “quantitative” and “qualitative”.

The list of changes below summarises the answers, which do not apply to all of the institutions that responded:

**Quantitative**
- Increased number of women professors;
- Increased number of women researchers in senior leadership/management positions, on government boards, as well as on recruitment and promotion panels;
- Increased number of individual faculty/department action plans on gender equality (including increased number of departments applying for Athena SWAN awards);

**Qualitative**
- More committed and mobilised top leadership adopting the GEP at the highest institutional level;
- Integration of gender aspects in steering mechanisms;
- Institutionalised structures dedicated to gender equality were established, additional personnel resources were being made available to support gender work;
- Better coordination, transparency and exchange between faculties on gender equality issue;
- Greater involvement of academic and non-academic staff in gender equality actions;
- Integration of gender equality issues in overall institutional strategy and annual report;
- Fairer maternity/parental leave;
- More flexible working hours;
- Greater awareness and acceptance of gender policies among top leadership;
- Greater awareness and knowledge of equality (and diversity) issues on the faculties’ boards;
- Better awareness of gender inequalities and gender stereotypes;
- Better awareness of family-friendly ways of working;
- Changing of institutional culture (albeit at a slow tempo).

15 Survey was completed by gender equality/equal opportunities officers (40%), gender equality advisers (40%), elected gender equality leaders (15%), and diversity managers (5%)
Structural change at an institutional level is an instrument for addressing gender inequality, and represents one aspect of the modernisation process of research institutions. Modernisation means making an institution gender-responsive, and modernising its organisational culture by addressing how gender and diversity are managed at an institutional level.16

Gender issues in research and innovation have gained recognition in policy agendas as well as at an institutional level. The “supply side” initiatives (“fix the women”), which target individual women scientists, are increasingly complemented by “demand side” policies, which target institutional change in research organisations with long-term structural effects (“fix the institution”). A more systematic strategy is needed to implement long-term institutional change in the ERA.17

In this context, it is necessary to highlight the strategic priorities identified by the selected institutions regarding gender equality. Institutions provided a list of objectives, based on which the following summary list could be compiled (Figure 1):

Figure 1: Most important objectives for the next five years regarding gender equality

![Graph showing the most important objectives for the next five years regarding gender equality.]

- To increase the number and proportion of women in professional positions (especially full professorships)
- To change structures at all levels towards gender equality
- To increase the number of female students in technology and natural sciences
- To improve work environment and work-life balance
- To change institutional policies towards gender equality
- To extend the gender equality best practices within the whole institution
- To improve gender equality in career paths, including recruitment, promotion, scientific rewards
- To achieve significant progress in closing the GAP
- To include gender dimension in research content
- To introduce gender monitoring mechanisms
- To achieve sustainable structural and cultural change process with respect to gender equality

The following chapter aims to provide an overview of the internal stimuli and MCIPs implemented at an institutional level in order to achieve these changes, and it will highlight the challenges that still exist at an institutional level.

Respondents identified the following additional factors that contributed to policy change at an institutional level:

- Gender-responsive national frameworks (i.e. creation of legal and policy frameworks and initiatives to promote gender equality in S&T)
- Transnational and inter-institutional cooperation on gender equality and GEPs
- Top-leadership support on gender equality issues at an institutional level, including approval of GEP at the top level
- Visibility of women researchers and their active involvement as agents of change
- Adoption of a GEP that transforms institutional culture and which is developed in a participatory way
- Adequate human and economic resources devoted to the implementation of the GEP
- Institutionalised gender equality (and diversity) structures, where the equal opportunities officer holds a decision-making position together with management
- Cooperation between different structural units, especially between top leadership offices and the gender equality officer/adviser at an institutional level
- Collection and dissemination of gender-monitoring data and training activities
- Gender-balanced commissions at all levels (including boards)
- Affirmative policies and actions for the advancement of women researchers
- Systematic awareness raising and capacity-building concerning gender change stereotypes
- Integration of gender-equality aspects into the leadership programme for the management, training courses for academic and non-academic staff
- Patience and perseverance are fundamental factors when undertaking actions for important changes in the evaluation criteria.

The following chapter aims to provide an overview of the internal stimuli and MCIPs implemented at an institutional level in order to achieve these changes, and it will highlight the challenges that still exist at an institutional level.

16 Council of EU (2010), Council conclusions on various issues related to the development in ERA, as adopted by the Competitiveness Council at its meeting on 25.05.2010. Council Conclusions RECH 203 COMPET 177
Structural change at an institutional level has the following prerequisites: strategic management (i.e. vision and strong commitment from top leadership); a strategic gender action plan (GEP) with a clear set of targets; corresponding measures and actions tailored to the challenges of the respective institution; adequate human and financial resources for its implementation; and proper monitoring and accountability mechanisms for achieving these objectives. Each of these elements will work if everyone in the given institution understands, supports and participates in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the change agenda – the “absolutely everybody” approach is the key to success.

As mentioned above, based on the essential elements of structural change, the GENDER-NET partners are looking at five key indicators of the gender equality progress through structural change at the institutional level:

1) Anchoring gender equality at the leadership level
2) Identifying decision making structures and procedures
3) Recruitment, retention and advancement of women, including leadership
4) Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers
5) Facilitating in-/outgoing mobility of women researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of intervention</th>
<th>Sub-groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Anchoring gender equality at the leadership level</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Identifying decision making structures and procedures</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Recruitment, retention and advancement of women, including leadership</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Facilitating in-/outgoing mobility of women researchers</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share of institutions in % 28.0 37.0 25.0 10.0

Table 1: Share of institutions implementing measures per area of intervention

■ – implemented, ■ – measures planned, but not yet implemented.

Source: responses to the WP2 Task 3 survey

However, the majority of selected institutions confirmed that having a GEP does not automatically mean institutional change in terms of leadership, representation and retention of women at all levels of their research careers, i.e. it does not mean that gender equality has been achieved.

As mentioned above, structural change describes some key elements and characteristics. GEPs should also transform the system for the better, and therefore require a comprehensive, systematic and sustainable approach – one that is implemented throughout the entire institution and supported by resources and accountability mechanisms. It is therefore essential that GEPs seek to change policies as well as processes, and that they instigate change in mind-sets and institutional culture (e.g. creation of ownership, the “absolutely everybody” approach).

The findings obtained from this research show that the selected institutions have different structural change dynamics and are at different stages of change processes. This implies that there is still a lot to be done.

One of the five key indicators of gender equality progress through structural change is the degree of anchoring of gender equality issues at the leadership level of the institution.

3.1. Anchoring gender equality issues at the leadership level

All selected institutions have stated that anchoring gender equality issues at the leadership level is an essential element to achieve success. This also
3.1. Top-level commitment

The majority (85%) of selected institutions reported that the overall responsibility for gender equality is anchored at the highest level of their institution. They also confirmed that the strong strategic commitment from the institution’s leadership is crucial to structural change. This is demonstrated by the following examples:

Steering committee for gender equality, CNRS (FR) In 2011, a Steering Committee for Gender Equality at CNRS (Comité de pilotage pour l’égalité professionnelle entre femmes et hommes au CNRS) was created. It comprises all key top-level decision-makers at CNRS and is chaired by the CNRS President. In 2013, it validated the global Transformational Gender Action Plan (T-GAP) proposed by the Mission pour la place des femmes au CNRS, and fully adopted it in 2014. It is worth noting that the Director of the “Mission pour la place des femmes” at CNRS (MPDF – Mission for the Place of Women) is a member of this committee (see also 3.2.2), and is also a member of the “Comité de Direction élargi du CNRS” which includes the entire CNRS Governing Board (President-DG, Chief Resources Officer, Chief Science Officer, all 10 heads of scientific divisions) as well as the heads of the 15 “ Directions Fonctionnelles” (operational departments e.g. departments of Human Resources, of Communication, of European and International Affairs, etc.), and meets once a month.

Academic Gender Strategy Committee, Imperial College London (UK) The Academic Gender Strategy Committee champions and oversees the advancement of gender equality at institutional level. Membership includes Provost, Associate Provost, deans of each faculty, a representative from HR, and the Chair of the Athena Committee. The Athena Committee’s main purpose is to ensure that changes are made to departmental practices and culture so that departments gain (or retain) Athena SWAN awards, increasing the award level where possible. It has representatives from each award-holding department. The College also has an overarching equality and diversity committee. The Academic Gender Strategy Committee has formal responsibility to oversee the College action plan. The Provost’s Envoy for Gender Equality and the College Athena SWAN Coordinator meet regularly (approximately once every two weeks) to discuss progress.

3.1.1. Top-level commitment

Cnrs (Fr) for gender equality, strategy Committee, Academic gender London (UK) regularly (approximately once every two weeks) to discuss progress. The Provost’s Envoy for Gender Equality and the College Athena SWAN Coordinator meet

3.1.2. Leadership education and capacity building

The majority of the selected institutions have introduced training sessions for top leadership in order to further general awareness about gender equality issues and organisational policies, for example:

Training on unconscious bias for the executive officer group, Trinity College Dublin (IE) With the aim to embed gender equity into the governance of institutions, the first exposure to unconscious bias training was conducted. Briefing sessions with the executive officer group, comprising the provost, vice provost, faculty deans and dean of researcher, treasurers, bursars and college secretary.

Targeted data-driven gender equality trainings for decision makers, CNRS (FR) Targeted gender equality trainings for decision-makers have been developed based on comprehensive sex-disaggregated data collected at CNRS and analysed, and on key results from studies carried out on gender issues in research and higher education, and are delivered across CNRS since 2011. Depending of the target group, the duration of the training can vary from one-hour to full day workshops. As a result of targeted efforts in this high impact area, the “STRIDE” committee was established to address inequalities in recruitment, promotion and rewards procedures and practices at CNRS regarding researchers. (see also 3.3, and Deliverable report 2.5)

Obligatory training course on governance, University of Zurich (CH) Following the decision taken by university management, all newly appointed professors and managerial staff have to accomplish obligatory training course on governance. The course aims to explain the university’s policy objectives in the area of equal opportunities as well as empower with knowledge of implementation instruments, e.g. Code of Conduct Gender Policy, guidelines on protection from sexual harassment.

Gender awareness in Academia – from principles to practice, training for leadership, University of Geneva and University of Lausanne (CH) The “Gender Awareness in Academia” project was organised as a set of inter-related events with participation of two internationally renowned gender equality experts from the US. The project was implemented in the framework of a GEP, and was a joint initiative of the equal opportunity offices of the universities of Lausanne and Geneva as well as the Swiss National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) LIVES. It included: 1) Gender Awareness workshops in each of two universities, attended by the rectorate, deans, gender equality commissions, professors from both universities as well as NCCR LIVES senior researchers; 2) “Why So Slow?” public conference moderated by the rector and vice-rector of the University of Lausanne; and 3) best practice seminar for the specialists working in the field of equality measures from all over Switzerland. The project will have follow-up in 2015.

3.2. Identifying decision – making structures and procedures at an institutional level

The range of MCIPs reported as crucial by selected institutions in this area includes: the adoption, implementation and evaluation of a GEP; the creation of structures responsible for gender equality; the dedication of resources; gender equality controlling; gender equality monitoring; the strengthening of accountability mechanisms; and increasing commitment to change throughout the whole institution (involving everyone).

18 The Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting in Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE) Committee was launched in 2001 at the University of Michigan with support from the US NSF ADVANCE programme, and adapted to the CNRS context. For more information, please visit http://stridemission.umich.edu/advance/stride_committee
3.2.1. **Gender action plans**

One of the key instruments in enabling structural change at institutional level is the Gender Action Plan (GEP), also called Transformational Gender Action Plans (T-GAP) and Gender Equality and Diversity Action Plan (D-GEP).

According to the European Research Area Progress Report 2014, the percentage of institutions that have adopted GEPs in the countries under review is as follows: CH - 96.4%, DE - 95.7%, ES - 61.4%, FR - 91.7%, IE - 28.7%, NO - 71.6%, UK - 89.8%.19

Although the development of institutional GEPs is only a legal obligation in DE,20 ES, FR, and NO,21 90% of the institutions answering our survey have adopted GEPs and provided copies of these documents. Other selected institutions have integrated gender aspects into an overall strategy. In the absence of a legal requirement, national programmes for equal opportunities (CH), and Athena SWAN (UK) play an important role in stimulating the adoption of a GEP in institutions, including as part of departmental/faculty plans.

A GEP is also currently being adopted at Trinity College Dublin (IE). As part of the process of applying for an Athena SWAN Institutional Award,22 the College will produce, adopt and implement a GEP, building on the work done as part of the FP7 [www.integer-tools-for-action.eu],23 which anticipates the creation of a T-GAP.

All of these selected institutions were also provided with planning and reporting tools (gender statistics, form sheets and guidelines).

In DE, several of the selected institutions also reported that advice and support is offered by the gender and diversity coordinator during each phase of assessment and action planning, especially with regard to the implementation of appropriate measures and activities. In DE, a “Gender Equality in Research and Academia Toolbox” for gender and diversity-related measures is also available. The toolbox is a freely accessible online information system that presents examples illustrating the possible breadth of gender equality measures in research and teaching in keeping with the DFG’s Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality. The selection of specific strategies and actions, however, is the responsibility of the individual faculty/department.24

Framework for GEPs (CH)

In 2013, the Swiss federal programme on equal opportunities in universities initiated a major system change, and began to provide financial support for implementing GEPs developed by universities, and no longer funded single projects or persons. As a result, all 10 cantonal universities adopted GEPs by autumn 2012, and attempted to cover the seven areas of actions identified by the national programme. In particular: 1) institutional anchoring of equal opportunities, 2) increasing the number and proportion of women in professorial, leadership and decision-making positions, 3) measures in the area of gender-responsive promotion of the younger generation of researchers, 4) framework conditions for students, employees and researchers with family responsibilities, 5) reduction of horizontal segregation ensuring access to subjects of studies, and of vertical segregation in ensuring retention in the subjects of studies, 6) personnel and organisational development, 7) others. An analysis of the GEPs shows that almost all GEPs cover areas 1-5.

Athena SWAN Silver Action Plan, University of Warwick (UK)

The University first implemented a gender equality action plan following the enforcement of the Single Equality Act. This gender-specific plan was subsumed into a wider university equality action plan. The University of Warwick became a member of the Athena SWAN Charter25 in 2009. In September 2013, the University successfully achieved institutional Silver Athena SWAN status, making it the fourth institution in the UK to hold this prestigious award. Eight out of nine STEM departments hold Athena SWAN awards, either at bronze or silver level, and the remaining STEM department is awaiting the results of its submission. The UK’s Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) ran a pilot of the new Gender Equality Charter Mark managed in 2013/14 and Warwick Business School took part in this pilot. It was awarded the bronze level in September 2014.

21 For more information, please refer to the GENDER-NET WP2 D2.7 report
22 A description of the Athena SWAN Charter can be found here: [http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan](http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan)
24 “Gender Equality in Research and Academia Toolbox” presents real-life examples of gender equality measures at German higher education institutions which aim to promote the implementation of similar practices elsewhere. For more information, please visit [www.instrumentenkasten.dfg.de/index_en.html](http://www.instrumentenkasten.dfg.de/index_en.html)

---

20 In DE, obligations for GEP are stipulated by law in the majority of federal states
21 For more information, please refer to the GENDER-NET WP2 D2.5 report
22 A description of the Athena SWAN Charter can be found here: [http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan](http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan) For detailed information about the Athena SWAN Institutional Award, please refer to the GENDER-NET WP2 D2.7 report
24 For more information on Athena SWAN, please refer to Deliverable report D2.7: «GENDER-NET Analysis report: Award schemes, gender equality and structural change»
### Gender Action Plan, University of Laguna, ULL (ES)

The first Gender Action Plan of the ULL (2014-2017) was adopted by the ULL Governing Council in December 2013. Alongside other universities in Spain, ULL started building the GEP due to legal requirements. The GEP has nine areas of intervention, and describes corresponding measures and indicators, as well as the evaluation process. The areas of intervention include:

- An institutional equality policy
- Gender equality as a part of institutional social responsibility
- Gender-fair communication, images and language
- Advancing towards a greater balance between women and men in the staff, students, university government, representation roles, and in research teams in funded projects
- Improving gender equality in the opportunities for access and promotion, and in changes and withdrawals to working positions
- Advancing towards greater equality in average salaries for female and male workers
- Improving the prevention and elimination of different kinds of harassment, sexist attitudes, discriminatory treatment based on sex, gender or sexual orientation, and any other gender-based violence
- Improving the consideration of gender perspectives in the assignment of work schedules and in physical working conditions
- Advancing greater institutional co-responsibility in improving the balance between family, professional, personal and academic life. This is achieved through measures to ensure that women and men can develop different spheres of their life in a mutually responsible way, and without differential consequences to their professional careers or working/studying conditions

### Transformational Gender Action Plan (T-GAP), CNRS, (FR)

The CNRS T-GAP was officially adopted in 2014 by the CNRS governance and the «Comité de pilotage pour l'égalité professionnelle entre femmes et hommes au CNRS». This CNRS T-GAP contains a tailored and comprehensive set of around 40 measures, covering four key themes and 16 related objectives. In the four areas of intervention, the T-GAP focuses on key elements of structural change, specifically:

- Organisational structure
- Career progression, development and support
- Work-life balance
- Engagement of decision-makers

The T-GAP wheel in Annex 4 gives a perfect overview and could be highly recommended to other institutions as a way of presentation of the GEPs.

---

27 For more information, please refer to Deliverable report D2.5: «GENDER-NET Analysis Report: Existing national plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and enact structural change»

### Gender Equality Action Plan, University of Oslo, NO)

The University of Oslo's gender equality policy is rooted in its Strategic Plan and is defined in its Gender Equality Action Plan. A full-time Equality Adviser is responsible for the development and follow-up of the University’s gender equality policy. Furthermore, the University has appointed a special Gender Equality Coordination Group with university-wide representatives at leadership level. The primary task of the group is to contribute to strategic discussions and set gender equality objectives. The University of Oslo has four main gender equality initiatives:

- Central funds dedicated to gender equality work
- Recruitment procedures to encourage female and international applicants. Search committees will be used actively to recruit women, particularly to senior positions
- Mentoring programme for female postdocs
- Career development initiatives for female associate professors including promotion seminars, coaching groups and qualification grants

When it comes to the anchoring of gender equality at department/faculty level, many institutions consider department/faculty-specific measures to be a necessary precondition for the proper implementation of the GEP. We can observe that institutional GEPs provide an incentive for the promotion of gender equality throughout the whole structure. For this reason, the selected institutions are working actively to make sure that the GEP is translated across the entire structure, for example:

### Gender Action Plan, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, ETHZ (CH)

The GEP of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich (ETHZ), adopted by the leadership of ETH Zurich in February 2014, requires all faculties (departments) and administrative units to actively engage in the following areas of intervention:

- Career promotion in academia
- Integration of gender aspects in research and teaching
- Work/study-life balance
- Elimination of sexual harassment and gender-based discrimination

In the framework of the UNIL’s GEP, which is called “50/50 Vision”, the Rector of the UNIL asked its faculties – in particular the Dean of the Faculty of Biology and Medicine – to prepare a faculty plan to promote equality. The general objective of the UNIL Rector is to tackle the ‘leaky pipeline’ and to ensure that by 2016, 40% of appointments to a professorial position are women.

### University of Warwick (UK)

Following the success of the STEM department Athena SWAN awards, non-STEM heads of departments expressed interest in working towards the ECU Gender Equality Charter Mark to replicate the success of the best practices implemented in STEM departments.

In the GEPs, the institutions include special actions targeting the promotion of change in organisational culture and formal/informal behaviour, for instance:

---

28 Gender Action Plan, Aktivitäten zur Umsetzung in der Departementen und in der Verwaltung, ETH Zürich, November 2014
3.2.1. Monitoring and evaluation of GEP implementation

All the selected institutions reported that GEP monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are in place. Some of these mechanisms target the implementation of GEPs specifically, whereas in other instances, mechanisms are implemented only when they are a part of a programme carried out with funding support from a national/regional programme/initiative. For example:

- The University oversees an action plan that is monitored by a self-assessment team. The team carries out the relevant actions and records progress. The completed action plan is resubmitted together with outcome measures when the Athena SWAN award is due for renewal. A new action plan is then developed as part of the renewal. The self-assessment team meets at least 4 times a year to monitor and evaluate the results of the implementation.

3.2.2. Dedicated gender equality structures/units/officers

Selected institutions have set up structures dedicated to gender equality and/or the implementation of a GEP. This is a significant factor for transformation, i.e., moving from the ad hoc addressing of the needs of individual women researchers to the comprehensive, systematic and sustainable addressing of the causes and consequences of gender inequality.

The issues relating to the sustainability of dedicated gender equality structures are important. Only a limited number of institutions take full financial and organisational responsibility by creating a dedicated budget for staffing gender equality offices, by integrating gender equality measures into its long-term strategies and planning, by ensuring the institutional anchoring of equal opportunities at department/faculty level, and by implementing gender equality monitoring. We suggest that institutions should make more effort to make progress on this issue.

The percentage of institutions reporting this kind of institutional structure is 85%, which is less than the percentage of institutions with GEPs. This difference could be explained by the varying sizes of the selected institutions.

Gender equality/equal opportunity offices/departments, equality and diversity units and similar number among the structures created at an institutional level. Several institutions have gender equality officers with a clear mandate on gender equality.

The few examples below illustrate what an institutional mandate might entail, and to what extent these structures collaborate and influence institutional decision-making structures relating to gender equality/equal opportunities/diversity:

29 For a more detailed overview on the monitoring and evaluation of national/regional programmes/initiatives, please consult Deliverable report D2.5: «GENDER-NET Analysis Report: Existing national plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and structural change»

30 For more information on Athena SWAN, please refer to Deliverable report D2.7: «GENDER-NET Analysis report: Award schemes, gender equality and structural change»

31 Links to several institutional gender equality webpages are provided in Annex 6 to this report http://www.sagperic.eu/2013/vout/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Andrea-Georgiana-Dumitrascu-Poster-INTEGER-conferences_SAGPERIC21.pdf
Equal Opportunity Office, Reutlingen University (DE)

According to its mandate, the Equal Opportunity Office has a number of responsibilities: to develop concepts and measures for promoting equality between men and women at the University; to improve opportunities for students and teaching staff to combine family and work, and advanced education; to offer liaison services and support in cases of sexual discrimination or harassment in the workplace; to further the interest of women in degree programmes in which they are currently underrepresented and, similarly, to further the interest of men in degree programmes in which women have until now been in the majority; to increase the number of women in teaching positions, committees and official bodies; to provide ongoing support to women in their careers and to facilitate their promotion to management positions; to make information about equality, equal opportunities, gender mainstreaming and diversity management more accessible.

Gender Equality department, Paris Diderot University (FR)

In 2010, Paris Diderot was the first French university to create a specific department devoted to equality between women and men: the “Pôle Égalité Femmes-Hommes” (PEFH). It is still the only university in France that can claim to have this kind of department. PEFH's mission is to promote and encourage equality. It detects, prevents and fights inequalities. Inequalities are detected by carrying out quantitative and qualitative surveys. PEFH publishes gender-based statistics on faculty and administrative staff (appointments, careers and responsibilities) and students (career paths, diplomas, jobs). It also carries out interviews with faculty and staff. To prevent inequalities, PEFH raises awareness among the whole community (students, faculty and administrative staff, governors) and provides detailed information by publishing the results of its statistics and the findings derived from the sociological interviews. Finally, PEFH fights inequalities by implementing measures aimed at eliminating them.

Mission for the Place of Women, CNRS (FR)

The Mission pour la place des femmes at CNRS (MPDF – Mission for the Place of Women), created in 2001, was the first national/institutional structure dedicated to gender equality issues in public research organisation in France, with a dedicated staff and budget, and a direct link to the top governance, i.e. the President-Director General of CNRS. The MPDF is a strategic and operational unit in charge of designing, coordinating, implementing, and assessing all actions aimed at fostering gender equality and gender mainstreaming within the CNRS.

Mission for the Place of Women, CNRS (FR)

To fulfil its mission statement, the MPDF interacts with all CNRS structures, through direct links with their heads (including via high-level committees) and leading teams, as well as via the specific gender equality-related working groups, the gender equality implementation teams, and via gender equality contact points that were implemented in relation to specific situations. These CNRS structures include: the scientific divisions (Instituts CNRS), departments (Directions Fonctionnelles) especially the Departments for Human Resources, Communication, European & International Affairs, and the Mission pour l’interdisciplinarité (the Director of the MPDF is co-director of the Gender Challenge Programme in the DN2 Genère – at the Mission pour l’interdisciplinarité, which funds research projects that integrate gender analysis into disciplines beyond social science and humanities); regional delegations;

Mission for the Place of Women, CNRS (FR)

32 The College was a founder member of the Athena SWAN Charter in 2005, but had been involved in the Athena Project previous to this date. In addition, there had been internal activity relating to gender equality previous to this; Institutional award: silver, held since 2006. For more detailed information on departmental awards, please visit: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan/athena-swan-members

33 http://gesetze.berlin.de/default.aspx?words=BerlHG&btsearch.x=42&filter=

34 The College was a founder member of the Athena SWAN Charter in 2005, but had been involved in the Athena Project previous to this date. In addition, there had been internal activity relating to gender equality previous to this; Institutional award: silver, held since 2006. For more detailed information on departmental awards, please visit: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan/athena-swan-members

35 Institutional award: silver, held since November 2007. For more information on departmental awards, please visit: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan/athena-swan-members
Several institutions reported that they have a dedicated role with significant mandates for gender equality issues, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity Counsellor, University of Cologne (DE)</td>
<td>In accordance with the country’s law on gender mainstreaming, the Equal Opportunity Officer counsels and supports the Board of the University and its members in all issues relating to gender mainstreaming. She/he has free access to all committees and documents, and represents the University on local, communal and national levels via networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Officer, University of Nottingham (UK)</td>
<td>A Policy Officer is in post specifically to support Athena SWAN and the Women in Science, Engineering and Technology (WinSET) group. The post provides support to the University’s Athena SWAN SAT committee by collating and recording information about relevant activities, and assisting in the submitting Athena SWAN University submissions and action plans. The Policy Officer also supports the individual schools and faculties with their Athena SWAN submissions, and collates central staff and student data in an online portal for staff to access. In addition, the role functions as a secretary to the WinSET group, organising meetings, writing agendas and minutes, and performing tasks relevant to the role.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality Officer, Trinity College Dublin (IE)</td>
<td>Trinity College Dublin has an Equality Officer whose aim is: to promote equality for staff and students in all areas of College life, with particular regard to the nine grounds of discrimination in equality legislation, and to support the College in achieving its objectives for diversity and inclusiveness. The Equality Officer advises the Equality Committee and the Board of the University on compliance with equality legislation (Equal Status Acts 2000-2010, Employment Equality Acts 1998-2010, Disability Act 2005 and Universities Act 1997). She/he assists in the development of College policies and practices from an equality perspective, and implements accessibility and inclusion education and diversity awareness programmes for staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3. Transparent, sufficient and long-term funding

Although all institutions under review reported having GEPs/T-GAPs, only half of them indicated having a dedicated budget for implementing the plans.

Dependence on external funding (third-party, project funding, etc.) is still very high. This will negatively affect the sustainability of the whole process of structural change.

Sufficient, strategically planned allocation of resources, and not only short-term project funding, is vital for achieving structural change at an institutional level.

Three funding “models” were identified in the selected institutions:

- Model I: Institution provides 100% of resources from its own budget
- Model II: 50%-50% – institution receives co-financing from national programme/initiative
- Model III: 100% of resources provided from an external source, e.g. national or European programmes/initiatives/projects.

For example:

- Gender Equality Budget, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU (NO) NTNU\(^\text{37}\) received its own Gender Equality Budget in 2003, and was the first university in Norway to do so. The annual budget is currently €650,000. Since 2003, department leaders have been discussing gender equality issues as part of the ordinary budgeting process. The Gender Equality Budget makes it possible for women researchers to apply for different activities in the budget, including: a start up package for women in academic positions in Technology and Natural Science (if there is less than 25% women at department level), qualification scholarships (others are paid to teach so that researchers have more time for research and publishing); and a mentoring programme.

- Growing self-financing of gender equality offices by institutions in (CH) As mentioned above, the Swiss federal programme on equal opportunities in universities underwent a major system overhaul in 2013. This shift towards a new paradigm was also intended to stimulate wider support for gender equality at institutional level and to facilitate the gradual integration of gender equality measures and structures into universities’ ordinary budgets. Universities must contribute 50% of resources to the budget provided in the federal programme. There has been significant progress: around half of the institutions provide 100% of the budget dedicated to the gender equality offices, and the positive trend of self-financing is growing. It is also important to note that, in preparation for the integration of measures into their own budgets, a number of institutions have included measures in the GEPs that they will be able to finance themselves at a later stage.

3.2.4. Gender equality controlling and monitoring

Gender equality controlling (GC) is an important instrument in ensuring the long-term, sustainable, and effective institutionalisation of gender equality. GC refers to the integration of gender equality goals into an institution’s everyday planning and steering procedures. It aims to anchor and integrate gender equality in all areas and functions, and to establish the responsibility of leadership and decision makers. It should also include processes for evaluating the system (which areas should be improved?), for setting up strategic goals (what should be achieved in the mid-term?), and for implementing measurable annual goals and related measures (what can I personally achieve in my area of responsibility?). GC is the regulated control of results and reporting. To this end, data and indicators form the basis for implementing GC.\(^{38}\)

37 Brain researchers May-Britt Moser and Edvard Moser at NTNU’s Kavli Institute for Systems Neuroscience received the 2014 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine together with John O’Keefe of University College London. Read more at http://www.ntnu.no/nobelpris2014 http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/athena-swan-members

The systematic and accurate collection and dissemination of data is an important instrument and first step towards GC. Approximately 80% of institutions reported to have monitoring mechanisms in place, which includes the collection of data and gender-specific statistics. The gender equality office/department/unit should be responsible for data collection and analysis, depending on the level of institutionalisation of the gender equality/equal opportunities structures. The vast majority of institutions produce annual gender monitoring reports.

The monitoring of gender equality via gender indicators covers the different aspects of structural change processes, as well as the degree to which gender equality policies are implemented. A crucial part of the implementation of a gender equality strategy such as a GEP is the collection of data and the measurement of its success. This longitudinal data serves to monitor the progress and define those areas requiring additional attention.

To enable structural change at an institutional level, it is strategically important to disaggregate a gender ratio dataset according to research and study fields, i.e. the proportion of women and men in different positions and decision-making bodies, as well as with different qualification levels, at the institutional level as a whole, as well as in each of the departments/faculties.

Key figures and gender equality indicators for gender equality monitoring in UASs (CH)
The Swiss Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities for Women and Men at Universities of Applied Sciences (2013—2016) identified eight overarching output indicators for measuring progress on two programme objectives, e.g. for reducing horizontal and vertical segregation. Swiss UASs use a calculation and display tool for processing the data on an annual basis for their reports. Depending on the focus of their activities, UASs define specific target values alongside selected indicators in their action programmes. The summary table with indicators is provided in Annex 3.

Gender monitoring at the University of Zurich (CH) Since 2007, the Office for Gender Equality at the University of Zurich has published the annual monitoring reports on behalf of the Executive Board of the University. The data in the report shows the University of Zurich’s progress in implementing the Code of Conduct Gender Policy. In particular, the monitoring reports focus on the Code’s emphasis on ensuring that “women and men have equal rights and development opportunities”.

Gender monitoring at the University of Zurich (CH)
The collected data is critically analysed in order to determine which further actions are necessary. The first part of the report addresses each aspect of the Code of Conduct Gender Policy for the university as whole: representation (proportion of women and men in specific positions); qualification and selection process (the patterns of female/male representation at different hierarchical levels); and training and career development regarding PhD students and postdoc researchers. The second part of the annual report contains individual fact sheets with data tables and diagrams for the seven faculties, as well as longitudinal data (since 2010). The monitoring report is available online.

Online Gender monitoring observatory, University Laguna, ULL (ES) The Gender Equality Observatory (GEO) of the University Laguna, ULL provides regularly updated information on gender equality in the ULL. This information is useful for gender equality planning as it provides reports on impact and progress. The GEO was launched as a project and has external project funding. The GEO is available online:

Analysis of statistical data, University of Warwick (UK) Athena SWAN and the Gender Equality Charter Mark (GEC) analyse statistical data according to department in order to highlight areas for improvement, and transform these into suitable action plans. From 2009 onwards, the STEIM and arts and social science departments began conducting a review of the data and implementing initiatives to address what the data is conveying, e.g. women feel less confident in putting themselves forward for promotion. This resulted in an annual promotion workshop. The review entails academic and administrative personnel involvement. Before this kind of data collection, it was not immediately obvious where potential issues occurred. The presentation of the data enabled heads of departments to recognise and act on areas of concern.

Annual reports, CSIC (ES) The Women and Science Commission publishes annual reports assessing and analysing the situation. Members of the Commission give talks to decision-making panels explaining the importance of including gender at different levels. In 2007, a «Gender Action Plan» was developed and published. The publication of sex-disaggregated statistics and the Gender Action Plan was important for raising gender awareness. The situation for female scientists has improved: the proportion of women occupying the highest positions is now 23.8% in comparison with 13.6% in 2002.

3.2.5. Accountability mechanisms Accountability mechanisms in an organisation form part of the overall system that is working towards the achievement of gender equality. They should be clearly stated in administrative frameworks, and should be a tangible process or instrument for showing how a particular goal is being achieved.

40 In 2013, gender equality monitoring was made mandatory for the participating institutions in the framework of the federal programme for equal opportunities in universities. For more details, please refer to the GENDER-NET Deliverable report 2.5
41 Athena SWAN Institutional award silver, held since April 2013. For more information on departmental awards, please visit
http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/athena-swan-members
42 For the purpose of this research paper, accountability is defined as the obligation of decision-makers at different levels to demonstrate and take responsibility against the background of agreed expectations.
Accountability policies hold senior managers responsible for promoting gender equality. However, these are only effective when they are combined with clear monitoring guidelines for specific gender and diversity indicators.

Only a few institutions reported having these kinds of mechanisms in place, and none could provide a best practice example to be shared with other institutions. Elements of accountability mechanisms can however be found in this report (see Chapter 3).

In the commitment to gender equality, the “absolutely everybody” approach – or cultural change – is vital. The commitment and support from top leadership, together with proactive engagement across the board could make gender equality a reality. A targeted set of actions in this area could enable and foster structural change, whilst its absence could nullify all efforts.

Cultural change at institutional level is a complex issue that requires in-depth analysis that falls outside of the scope of this research. Nevertheless, the findings in this research confirmed that there is a need for additional incentives to be offered to institutions, as well as mandatory measures. Compulsory training courses for eliminating gender stereotypes should be introduced, and online platforms should be developed, as these could benefit all institutions.

Selected institutions reported measures for strengthening the university members’ commitment to equality and diversity by raising awareness about the structural and cultural barriers that women in science face.

Gender stereotypes and biases are the biggest barriers to gender equality. The elimination of gender stereotyping is an integral part of non-discrimination.

Introducing compulsory training courses on the elimination of gender stereotypes could be a key instrument to be introduced at national level, together with the development of online platforms that could benefit all institutions.

The majority of institutions (67%) introduced important measures aiming to eliminate gender stereotypes. These measures, anchored in a GEP, could facilitate another important change. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set of actions at the Paris-Diderot University, UPD (FR)</th>
<th>The institutional GEP is planning the following set of actions to challenge gender stereotypes in S&amp;T and the career distortions these cause:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Tests about stereotypes and dissemination of results</td>
<td>- One-day training courses on gender stereotypes for first-year students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non gender-biased language in all internal documents, including job offers and in new student books</td>
<td>- One-day training courses on gender stereotypes for first-year students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The way that gender equality is mainstreamed (e.g., websites, institutional newsletters, training courses) is an essential part of structural change.

Internal communication and institutional media resources for informing the general public – especially gender equality resources – are crucial in structural change.

All the selected institutions have a website, however an analysis of these resources reveals that 1) not all of them have webpages dedicated to gender equality, and 2) few institutions are properly tapping the potential of their websites as an excellent platform for disseminating information and fostering change, i.e., not all of them contain the wide range of information that is critical for structural change.

Synergy with institutional media is another area that contributes to structural change.

The selected institutions offer a number of positive examples. Annex 6 gives a list of links to these, as well as other examples of web portals developed as collaborative projects by different institutions.

Capacity building has huge potential for building critical mass and therefore for impacting on structural change.

Institutions are working towards changing the organisational culture into an organisation where gender equality is a key value, and where everyone is prepared to support the top management. They implement a number of measures for developing skills and tools to put strategies, polices and plans into practice. For example:

| Gender training to staff (academic and non-academic), University of Laguna (ES) | Training topics for academics include: gender mainstreaming in research; gender mainstreaming in teaching; non-sexist communication; prevention and treatment of sexual and sexist harassment; and gender action plans. The topics for other ULL personnel include: gender equality legislation; gender action plans; non-sexist communication; family-friendly policies; and the prevention and treatment of sexual & sexist harassment. Dissemination of the Gender Action Plan and a leaflet on “Sexual and sexist harassment in work and academic environments” to all ULL students and personnel. |

The majority of the selected institutions have introduced a comprehensive set of awareness-raising measures that could be referred to as “Check Your Stereotype!” These measures generally seek to raise public awareness and to reveal which stereotypes come into play when choosing a field of study or profession, or which gender stereotypes are linked with different careers (the Annex 6 provides the list of links to websites of some institutions, and contains a number of useful practices).
### 3.3. Recruiting, retaining and advancement of women researchers, including leadership positions

#### 3.3.1. Recruitment of students of under-represented groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Professors Forum, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, ETHZ (CH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women Professors Forum, WPF, is an independent association under the umbrella of ETH Zurich that is committed to promoting the next generation of female scientists and engineers. WPF unites women professors at ETH Zurich – more than 80% joined within two years of its founding. WPF is, for the ETH Executive Board, a decision maker among the departments, a representative body, and a competent sounding board in the area of promoting women in science. It also creates a platform for exchange through its regular scientific meetings, which are open to all women professors, from young assistant professors to experienced full professors. The association is registered in the commercial register of the Canton of Zurich and is financed by membership fees, donations and other contributions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“I’d like to be…” – a game promoting gender-atypical career choice, Interdisciplinary Centre for Gender Studies, University of Bern (CH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported by funding from SNSF (Agora⁴⁶), the project aims to broaden the vocational perspectives of adolescents and to deconstruct gender stereotypes associated with certain professions by creating a game to acquaint boys and girls with gender-atypical occupations and roles. It is envisioned that the game will show a virtual social milieu in which adolescents encounter gender-atypical role models and notions that are rarely available to them in their immediate environment. The game will be developed in close dialogue with external partners and the target group. It will be available as a smartphone app and it will be promoted and incorporated by various institutions, events and media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gendered factors motivating the selection of study fields, CNRS (FR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a research organisation, CNRS recruits PhD students in its laboratories. Therefore, in cooperation with national associations including “Femmes et Mathématiques” and the “Commission Femmes” of the “Société Française de Physique”, a number of measures have been developed to target female PhD/Masters candidates and high school students. These include: an online media kit about women in physics for high school interventions⁴⁵, mobile exhibitions on women in STEM; an Annual Forum of Young Women Mathematicians.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3.2. Recruitment and retention of academic personnel

Open, transparent and merit-based (OTM) recruitment is a prerequisite for an open and attractive labour market for researchers, and represents an essential component of the ERA. To realise the structural change needed to promote gender equality, creating OTM is crucial.

Funds for women researchers were reported by selected institutions as being a key element for retaining women in scientific positions, where the funds are used for various projects. They cover travel and participation costs for scientific events, for example, or support new research projects.


44 For measures and actions, please consult Chapter 3.2.8, “Absolutely Everybody”

45 Agora supports researchers from all disciplines and career stages who want to communi- cate with the public. The scheme aims to promote the spread of knowledge as well as the exchange of views and perspectives about scientific research. It therefore encourages projects involving two-way processes – with interaction and listening that generate dialogue between researchers and the public

46 www.femmesenphysique.cnrs.fr
Selected institutions reported that gender-balanced recruitment committees, gender-sensitive recruitment guidelines, and targeted recruitments proved to be effective instruments of change, for example:

| STRIDE-like committee, CNRS (FR) | Created in 2013, the STRIDE-like committee (see also 3.1.2 and GENDER-NET Deliverable report D.2.5)) has developed concrete proposals for promoting gender equality and gender balance in the recruitment, promotion and scientific recognition of researchers at CNRS. Implementation of the proposals has begun, and includes: training of all members of the National Committee’s evaluation panels on gender equality issues and gender stereotypes (a growing number of sections are inviting the MPDF to deliver targeted trainings and develop a dialogue with their members); providing comprehensive sex-disaggregated data (tailored fact sheets, with data compiled from 2005 to 2015) to peer-review panels and institutes prior to recruitment and promotion campaigns; taking family-related career breaks and part-time hours into account in evaluations, and changing application forms accordingly; proposing both male and female researchers’ names for scientific awards (CNRS Silver and Bronze Medals, in particular); supporting a policy for temporary CNRS researcher positions to stand in for university professors working in CNRS laboratories and returning from maternity/parental/adoption leave, i.e. six-month relief from teaching duties (so-called CNRS “délégations”); and undertaking a study similar to the Swedish Research Council’s Observers Report on gender aspects of job descriptions, run unconscious bias training, establish search committees for temporary CNRS researcher positions to stand in for university professors working in CNRS laboratories and returning from maternity/parental/adoption leave, i.e. six-month relief from teaching duties (so-called CNRS “délégations”); and undertaking a study similar to the Swedish Research Council’s Observers Report.47 At CNRS, Committee members are officially nominated, and its members include key decision-makers in the researchers’ evaluation process at CNRS, such as the Chief Science Officer at CNRS, the presidents of the different standing peer-review evaluation panels of the Comité National, the Secretary General of the Comité National, the deputy scientific directors from each of the 10 CNRS Institutes, HR officers in charge of following researchers’ careers and collecting and analysing HR data, as well as senior women researchers and gender researchers. |
| Gender-balanced recruitment at departmental level, Imperial College London (UK) | At Imperial College London, many of the activities take place at a departmental rather than institutional level, and so measures and initiatives vary across departments. For example, some departments are very active – as part of their Athena SWAN work – and check the gender aspects of job descriptions, run unconscious bias training, establish search committees and gender checks on shortlisting, establish mentoring (whether formal or informal schemes), and facilitate local training. |
| Targeted recruitment, The Arctic University of Norway, UiT, (NO) | With the aim of finding potential candidates for specific positions, the UiT has established special search committees. Before any permanent academic position is announced, a search committee must be established. The committee identifies qualified women and encourages them to apply. If there are no female applicants, a report on the recruitment pool within the specific academic field and on the search committee’s work is required. A successful application process is defined by a minimum of 40% female applicants. |

3.3.3. Advancement of women researchers

To advance women researchers (e.g. to increase the speed of promotion in scientific positions, in research management, and in scientific communication), the top leadership of research institutions must make gender equality a strategic priority, and integrate gender awareness into their institution’s processes and systems. The commitment of the leadership is required, together with a set of goals and targets. Leadership should lead by example. There is also scope for a proper situation and needs analysis, which would include a retrospective analysis of nomination procedures, the monitoring of nomination and advancement procedures, as well as other relevant research (see also Gender equality controlling and monitoring 3.2.4). |

Plan for advancement of women researchers, Free University of Berlin (DE) | All departments and central units have to develop a plan for the advancement of women for the next few years. They must analyse the situation of gender equality (quantitative and qualitative analyses) and develop targets and measures to improve the situation. The University management makes target agreements with each department and sets out measures – these include gender equality aspects. The performance-based allocation of funds is another steering instrument for evaluating the past performance of departments in various areas, including gender equality. The performance in gender equality is measured by the number of newly appointed women professors, the number of women professors, the number of women appointed to qualification posts, and the number of PhD theses written by women. |


48 Respondent from France
Plan for advancement of women researchers, Free University of Berlin (DE)

All departments and central units have to develop a plan for the advancement of women for the next few years. They must analyse the situation of gender equality (quantitative and qualitative analyses) and develop targets and measures to improve the situation. The University management makes target agreements with each department and sets out measures – these include gender equality aspects. The performance-based allocation of funds is another steering instrument for evaluating the past performance of departments in various areas, including gender equality. The performance in gender equality is measured by the number of newly appointed women professors, the number of women professors, the number of women appointed to qualification posts, and the number of PhD theses written by women.

Promotion of women, Institute for Exploitation of the Sea, IFREMER (FR)

The percentage of women promoted every year should be at least equivalent to the percentage they represent in their category (basic principle). Target groups: women researchers. Objective: to reduce the imbalance between the career development of men and women. Key activities: following the entire process with very precise indicators; and interviews and career analyses with all the managers. This led to an increase in the number of women scientists in the higher category of executive employees (cadres). The indicators used to perform the analyses give managers a clear impression of the situation concerning women and men. Secondary factors: drawing up an overview of the career developments based on existing information and barriers.

Programme of Limited Professorships for Women, Free University of Berlin (DE)

This programme is not part of the national/regional programmes. The programme was launched in 2006, and since then it has been a permanent part of the University’s budget. Objective and target group: career development for women scientists, generating role models, promotion of gender research with €1 Million per year, 50% co-financed from departments. This programme had positive results on different levels. On the individual level: better career promotion of gender research with €1 Million per year, 50% co-financed from departments.

3.3.3.3. Mentoring programmes and networking

Empirical experience from the selected institutions and the large number of evaluation reports show that mentoring is a very powerful and flexible instrument that institutions are using to attract, retain and empower the advancement of women researchers.

Compared with the other measures, mentoring is a measure that is championed by all the selected institutions.

In CH, for instance, there are around 39 different mentoring projects for promoting female junior female researchers – these are implemented in the context of the federal programme for the promotion of equal opportunities for women and men in Swiss universities.

The majority of institutions reported that they have mentoring programmes. In many cases, mentoring programmes and initiatives go hand-in-hand with networking. Mentoring programmes include one-to-one mentoring (85%), peer/group mentoring (75%), combined mentoring (75%), and faculty/depart-
mental mentoring (50%). Increased inter-institutional cooperation through mentoring initiatives also has a positive effect.

The selected institutions offer a number of positive mentoring examples. Annex 6 provides the list of links to web portals where more information can be found about developed projects. The example below illustrates just one of many mentoring programmes and initiatives:

**Mentoring projects, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, NUIP (NO)**

NUIP has launched two programmes for increasing gender equality in senior-level academic and administrative positions, namely:

- Project focusing on promotions and mentoring, with close follow-up to help women researchers to qualify for promotion to the equivalent of professor level.
- Group leadership programme involving mentoring and a focus on competence development.

Increased inter-institutional cooperation in mentoring initiatives was reported by the selected institutions as having a positive effect, for example:

**“ProFil”, DE**

ProFil is a mentoring program for women post-doctoral scientists and junior professors, organised by three universities in Berlin.

Around 70% of the selected institutions are creating networks for promoting early career and senior women researchers, including regional networks and inter-institutional networks and platforms. In very few cases (10%), institutions are setting up internal faculty/department networks.

**Internal faculty networks, Imperial College London (UK)**

To provide internally a platform for networking across departments, faculty networks for women were set up, namely “Women in Engineering Forum” and “Faculty of Natural Sciences Academic Women Network”.

**3.3.4. Databases of women researchers**

Databases can help recruit qualified women researchers for various positions, in particular for leadership positions, professorships, expert reviewer positions, and so on.

**Database of the Centre of Excellence Women in Science (CEWS) DE**

The Centre of Excellence Women in Science (CEWS) has created a database that contains the contact information of several thousand German-speaking women researchers for research and management positions.

**3.4. Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers**

The right to decent work, based on the universal principles of non-discrimination and equality between women and men, requires a research institution to fulfill these principles as an employer.

For more information, please consult the body of instruments provided by the International Labour Organisation here: http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/decent-work-agenda/lang--en/index.htm

51 For example, the pay gap was confirmed in a recent report on equal pay among women and men in public administration in Switzerland (Report on the Monitoring and Revision of Salaries, University Paris-Est Cergy-Pontoise University, 2013-2015), which documents the situation analysis of pay differences among women and men at institutional level.

All the countries under review have legal provisions prohibiting discrimination and guaranteeing equal rights at work for women and men.

To achieve systematic change, institutions have to implement measures that target the elimination of the following major barriers and constraints:

- Working environment and conditions that do not reflect the needs of women and which are not supportive to women
- Employment instability, which is often the case at the beginning of a career
- Insufficient support for dual careers couples, especially during the early stages of marriage. Career development of one partner is often linked to the career break of the other, and it is often the woman’s career break which is pre-programmed

Measures in this area of intervention target both women and men on an equal basis, and the MCIps vary – from the lesser-addressed issue of equal remuneration, to the commonly discussed provisions for childcare (these are regulated in many countries, and provided by the state) and family-friendly meeting times.

Equal pay between women and men is a fundamental right at work, as stipulated in international and national legal frameworks. Nevertheless, statistics from the countries under review confirm that the gender pay gap exists.

Selected institutions have also confirmed what is missing, and where there is a need for progress in monitoring and data collection at an institutional level (data collection on pay should also be included into the annual report at an institutional level).

Measures targeting equal remuneration are planned by 49% of institutions under review. The situation analysis of pay differences among women and men at institutional level is the most common measure implemented so far. For example:

**In its GENDERTIME Action Plan (2013-2015), UPEC sets the objective of revising and monitoring salaries and access to funding fellowships. The plan also identifies measures for reaching the objectives, as well as responsibilities, timelines and indicators of performance.**

52 For example, the pay gap was confirmed in a recent report on equal pay among women and men in public administration in Switzerland (Bericht über die Kontrolle der Lohnpraxis hinsichtlich der Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern in den kantonalen und kommunalen Verwaltungen. Resultate der Umfrage ULPKKV 2014), initiated by the Federal Office for Gender Equality (CH) conducted by University of Lausanne. The report published a wealth of data and recommendations that should be taken into account for further action.

53 The social dialogue and collective bargaining agreements with labour unions is an important instrument for ensuring wage transparency and equal pay. However, this social dialogue was not mentioned by the selected institutions.
3.4.3.1. Systematic approach to the work-life balance (WLB)

Action Plan, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU, (NO)
The action plan for addressing sexual harassment at NTNU clearly defines sexual harassment. It lays out the managers’ responsibility to act quickly and stop the harassment (which they are required to do by law), and informs staff and students of where they should turn for advice and support at the university.

Anti-discrimination Commission, IFREMER (FR)
A joint commission has been established to ensure compliance with non-discrimination principles based on gender, as well as adherence to the equal opportunities policy for men and women at every stage of the human resources management process.

Anti-harassment support contact scheme, Imperial College London (UK)
An anti-harassment support contact scheme was established. Trained volunteers help members of staff by acting as a listening board and exploring the options available to them through formal and informal College procedures.

3.4.3.2. Flexible working/study schemes

Flexible working schemes are widely implemented. Flexible study schemes are also enforced, but on a case-by-case basis.

Job-sharing program, University of Cologne, (DE)
In the framework of Excellence Initiative, a programme was launched in 2013 that offers women a reduced workload over two years in order to help them gain leadership experience. The programme is designed for young female leaders, and enables them to share responsibilities with another staff member. The programme56: a) allows the regular position holder to reduce his/her workload to care for an elderly family member, or simply to take time off; and b) allows a young female academic to gain leadership experiences for two years. Activity: matching of partnerships. Resources: depending on partnerships and contracts (approx. €15,000 per tandem) and the project coordinator.

3.4.3.3. Childcare services and facilities

Childcare and family care are broad concepts covering the provision of public, private, individual and collective services to meet the needs of parents and children, or members of the immediate family.58 In the majority of countries under review, these services are provided in the context of the national framework (see GENDER-NET Deliverable report 2.5). In addition to state-provided services, many selected institutions have extended the service and introduced additional childcare and family care provisions. For example:

55 The programme flyer can be downloaded here: http://www.familie.uni-konstanz.de/en/programme-fuer-eltern/science-goes-family
56 Read more about the “Total E-Quality” commendation here: www.total-e-quality.de/en
57 Read more about the “Total E-Quality” commendation here: www.total-e-quality.de/en
3.4.4. Dual career couples

A number of institutions, especially in DE and CH, reported that they have policies, programmes and networks to support dual career couples (DCC). It should be noted that this topic remains under-addressed by selected institutions in the context of structural change.

3.4.4.1. Dual career policies

Support for DCC is operationalised in the University’s “Dual Career Policy”, which was adopted by the University’s top leadership in 2011. The Policy lays out rules, and describes support measures offered to partners of professors and young scientists who have just arrived in Konstanz and are seeking advice on professional or scientific opportunities in the region. Module 3 (Compatibility) of the “Science Goes Family” programme includes measures targeting DCC.

There are no special provisions for women researchers – it is aimed at both women and men.

3.4.4.2. Inter-institutional cooperation for developing standards and policies

The research also identified a growing body of inter-institutional initiatives targeting DCC, for example:

Quality standards and ethical guidelines, Dual Career Network (DE)

The network members have developed criteria and structures for high-quality dual career work to be applied nationwide. Specifically, these are standards for support services and ethical guidelines, and are published in the Network’s best practice-paper. In this context, the network also discusses critical issues such as nepotism vs. selection of the strongest candidate, exceptional treatment vs. principle of equality, and transparency vs. data protection.

Dual Career Network (DE)

An increasing number of higher education institutions in Germany are offering a dual career service. This can be a key factor for success when competing (inter) nationally for highly qualified staff. Even though these institutions may compete with each other whilst recruiting, the members believe that cooperating within the Network will provide strategic advantages in supporting dual career couples and set benchmarks for this service. In establishing the DCND, the members want to define the model of German dual career services more precisely. The Network has two key functions: the exchange of best practice examples between the service centres concerning operational and organisational aspects; and the improvement of international visibility of support programmes for dual career couples. The participating institutions hold a variety of differing views and strategic targets concerning dual career services. They are used to increase employer attractiveness, are used as a recruitment tool, and are viewed as a way of implementing equal opportunities. These differences – and recognition of the different ways in which dual career services influence internal processes – are considered mutually beneficial. More information can be found here: http://www.dcnd.org

“Carriere2” (CH)

The Internet platform “Carriere2” is a joint project by universities (CH). More information here: http://www.carriere2.ch

3.5. Facilitating in-/out going researcher mobility for women researchers

Career breaks and career reintegration are important for enabling the mobility of women researchers. Legislation and national funding bodies play a key role by establishing policies and procedures, by providing fellowships, and by integrating flexible worktime schemes into fellowship schemes.

In addition to legal provisions, grants, fellowships, and the subsidies mentioned above, the selected institutions reported the following common measures: additional parental leave and relief from teaching duties.

Selected institutions reported that mandatory maternity leave in Norway is a key factor that influences the institutional situation.
3.5.1. Career breaks

| University Paris-Est Creteil Val de Marne, UPEC (FR) | Additional maternity leave covers one semester of teaching duties, regardless of the date of the birth, and can be taken in a flexible way. |

3.5.2. Career reintegration

| Relief from teaching duties after career interruption, CNRS (FR) | A very important policy helping women to re-enter their careers after a WLB-related career interruption: six months’ relief from teaching duties is awarded by CNRS to university professors working in CNRS laboratories and returning from maternity/paternity/adoption leave (so-called accueil en délégation au CNRS). The policy is currently implemented by the CNRS Institutes of Mathematics and Physics (target institutes for the www.integer-tools-for-action.eu), which have added the above reasons to the criteria for awarding such delegations (previously, the criteria were only thematic mobility, geographic mobility, preparation of the Habilitation à diriger des recherches). It applies to both women and men, but until now, has mostly benefited women returning from maternity leave. |

| Elsie Widdowson Fellowship, Imperial College London (UK) | The Elsie Widdowson Fellowship was established in 2000, and is ongoing. The non-competitive fellowship provides central funding covering 50% of a woman’s salary for 12 months. The purpose of the Fellowship is to allow female academics to concentrate fully on their research work upon returning from maternity/adoption leave. The Fellowship allows the department to relieve the academic of any teaching or administrative duties so that she can concentrate fully on research. The money can be used flexibly, as agreed by the individual and her department. Fellowship holders complete a questionnaire at the end of their Fellowship; the feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. |

4. Main conclusions and recommendations

4.1. Conclusion

This report has provided an overview and analysis of existing institutional action plans, central institutional initiatives, and decentralised/area-specific institutional initiatives. It has outlined some of the measures implemented by selected institutions in order to promote gender equality within the context of national and regional policy frameworks, initiatives and award schemes.

The findings obtained from this research show that a gender-responsive national policy context (i.e. creation of legal and policy frameworks, initiatives, and awards for promoting gender equality in S&T) is a significant driving force for stimulating gender equality and enacting structural change in research institutions. Another external factor that activates structural change dynamics and builds critical mass is transnational and inter-institutional cooperation between selected institutions.

The selected institutions could be considered a core group of “leaders” in promoting gender equality; they vary in size and complexity, yet they demonstrate a number of common challenges and solutions for promoting gender equality through structural change. This group of institutions is relatively small, however. The follow-up survey is required to gain a more comprehensive impression of structural change at an institutional level in other institutions in each GENDER NET project country.

As a positive development, we can report that selected institutions have started to create the preconditions for structural change. They are working towards enforcing the essential elements of structural change: through increasing institutional capacity to ensure gender equality, by eliminating organisational and structural barriers, by transforming structures and practices, and by incorporating targeted measures into daily business under the strategic umbrella of GEPs.

Nevertheless, structural change at an institutional level can only be successful and sustainable if it is implemented as an all-encompassing set of measures addressing all the essential elements of structural change. Selected institutions have different structural change dynamics and are at different stages of change processes; this implies that a lot remains to be done.

Structural change is unique and individual for each institution, and is linked to institutional and national frameworks – there is no “one-size-fits-all” model. In addition, the implementation of strategies and policies requires additional support and organisational transformation in some cases. An institutional GEP should therefore be considered as a key instrument for enabling strategic structural change at an institutional level, e.g. by addressing each of its essential elements.
A participatory approach to the planning of a GEP, and its approval at the highest level of the institution are two important factors that demonstrate a commitment to action. Results, however, will depend on the transformative and sustainable nature of the GEP; the quality of its measures and actions; the translation of the GEP across the whole institution, the establishment of responsible structures with proper mandate, the allocation of sufficient, strategically-planned resources, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, as well as on the targeted transformation of mind-sets and the institutional culture (e.g. creation of ownership, the “absolutely everybody” approach).

The selection of measures could vary and should be tailored to the concrete needs of an institution, and implemented in a prioritised manner; some measures could also be effective in others areas of intervention. While some initiatives and measures are low-cost and easily implemented, others will require the dedication of adequate long-term funding; some measures may also be transferable to other countries and contexts.

4.2. Recommendations

Based on the analysis undertaken in this research and findings obtained, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. GENDER-NET partners should further foster and support structural change at an institutional level in their national/regional policy frameworks, initiatives and award schemes. They must ensure that structural change at an institutional level is sustainable, overcome existing challenges, and accelerate structural change dynamics.

2. National/regional policy frameworks should foresee adoption and further strengthening of GEPs as instruments that allows addressing all the essential elements of structural change at an institutional level. GEPs should support transformation and ensure the quality of measures and actions, their translation across the whole institution, the establishment of responsible structures with a proper mandate, the allocation of sufficient, strategically planned resources, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, as well as the targeted change in mind-sets and institutional culture.

3. National/regional policy frameworks should address the issue of the sustainability of dedicated gender equality structures by ensuring that institutions take financial and organisational responsibility. This should be done through providing a dedicated budget for staffing gender equality offices, by integrating gender equality measures into long-term strategies and planning, by ensuring the institutional anchoring of equal opportunities at department/faculty level, and by establishing gender equality monitoring.

4. Joint indicators for monitoring the state of play and progress of structural change will be developed within GENDER-NET and should also be integrat-
# Annexes

## Annex 1: Mapping Most Common and Innovative Practices (MCIPs) in Selected Institutions

### Table of Common Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional steering committee(s)</td>
<td>Represented group for gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership education on gender equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Setting up targets and/or quotas at leadership level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regular reporting on implementation of GEP/T-GAP/D-GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Setting quantitative targets and quotas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender-balanced recruitment committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender equality officers at an institutional and departmental/faculties level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Targets towards a more balanced representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inclusion of gender officers as members of nomination commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data collection, studies to evaluate success of measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Annual gender monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mentoring programmes for promotion of early and advanced career women researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender equality checks on shortlists by management of institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Targeted gender training for members of nomination committees and panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Integration of gender equality issues into QMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Participation of gender equality officers in QMS accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Surveys on sexual harassment and gender-based discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Policy on support to dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Regular conversations with line-managers on work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Establishment of relevant indicators for GC accountability mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Information and advice services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Special info-days for dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Financial support to dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Agreements for access quotas to external day-care facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. School holidays care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. School afternoons care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Kindergarten for children 4-6 years old set up and managed by institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Day-care models/pool of nannies during conferences/visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Inter-institutional collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Targeted gender training for members of nomination committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Parental trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Professional development training on day-care matters and dual career policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Professional development training on child care and family leave procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Sampling and evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table of Innovative Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional steering committee(s)</td>
<td>Represented group for gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leadership education on gender equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Setting up targets and/or quotas at leadership level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regular reporting on implementation of GEP/T-GAP/D-GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Setting quantitative targets and quotas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Gender-balanced recruitment committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gender equality officers at an institutional and departmental/faculties level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Targets towards a more balanced representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Inclusion of gender officers as members of nomination commissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Data collection, studies to evaluate success of measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Annual gender monitoring reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Mentoring programmes for promotion of early and advanced career women researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender equality checks on shortlists by management of institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Targeted gender training for members of nomination committees and panels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Integration of gender equality issues into QMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Participation of gender equality officers in QMS accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Surveys on sexual harassment and gender-based discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Policy on support to dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Regular conversations with line-managers on work-life balance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Establishment of relevant indicators for GC accountability mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Information and advice services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Special info-days for dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Financial support to dual career couples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Agreements for access quotas to external day-care facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. School holidays care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. School afternoons care services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Kindergarten for children 4-6 years old set up and managed by institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Day-care models/pool of nannies during conferences/visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Inter-institutional collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Targeted gender training for members of nomination committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Parental trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Professional development training on day-care matters and dual career policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Professional development training on child care and family leave procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Sampling and evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Evaluation of GEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEXE 2: SUMMARY TABLE I: NATIONAL CONTEXT ON THE PROMOTION OF GENDER EQUALITY IN HES&Ri EXTRACTED FROM DELIVERABLE REPORTS D2.5 AND D2.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Legal Basis</th>
<th>National Policies/Programmes/ Initiatives</th>
<th>National Award Schemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK The Equality Act (2010) Programme Vitae: realising the potential of researchers, managed by CRAC with support of Research Council of UK and UK HE funding bodies; Programme Aurora by UK Leadership Foundation for Higher Education; Black Sister Network by Black British Academics; The Dorothy Hodgkin Fellowship; The Daphne Jackson Trust; Research Excellence Framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNEXE 3: SUMMARY TABLE II: OVERARCHING OUTPUT INDICATORS OF THE SWISS FEDERAL PROGRAMME FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES BETWEEN WOMEN AND MEN AT UNIVERSITIES OF APPLIED SCIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11: Share of men and women among students (BA+MA) by subject in % =&gt; (see indicator S2 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>FSO students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Share of men and women among assistant professors and specialist employees by subject in % =&gt; (see indicator P3 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>FSO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Share of men and women among lecturers by subject in % =&gt; (see indicator P3 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>FSO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Share of men and women among professors by subject in % =&gt; (see indicator P3 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>FSO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Share of men and women at management level in % =&gt; (see indicator P1, 5 management levels in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>Head offices, rectorates, department and faculty heads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Men and women’s probability of access to management positions in % =&gt; (see indicator P2 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>Head offices, rectorates, department and faculty heads, FSO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Share of men and women at different levels of training and qualification in % (levels of training and qualification: incoming students, Bachelor’s degrees, Master’s degrees, assistants and specialist employees, other lecturers, professors [all in the same calendar year]) =&gt; based on indicator P6 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>FSO students, FSO staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Share of men and women at the different stages of professorship application in % =&gt; (see indicator P8 in the OPET guide on gender equality monitoring)</td>
<td>HR departments, head offices, rectorates, department and faculty heads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: extract from the Swiss Federal Programme for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men at universities of applied sciences (2013-2016), unofficial translation from German
ANNEXE 4: TRANSFORMATIONAL GENDER ACTION PLAN WHEEL

The CNRS Transformational Gender Action Plan: a full-fledged Gender Equality Action Plan, targeting all categories of personnel, was adopted by CNRS in 2014, and is based on the INTEGER T-GAP.
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DE, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München: http://www.frauenbeauftragte.uni-muenchen.de/index.html; http://www.uni-muenchen.de/ueber_die_lmu/portrait/gleichstellung/index.html; http://www.uni-muenchen.de/einrichtungen/orga_lmu/leitung/vizepraesidenten/vize_forschung/index.html

DE, Reutlingen University: https://www.reutlingen-university.de/our-profile/acting-responsibly/equal-opportunities/?L=1


DE, University of Cologne: http://www.portal.uni-koeln.de/gender_diversity.html

DE, University Konstanz: http://www.gleichstellung.uni-konstanz.de/en

DE, University of Stuttgart: http://www.uni-stuttgart.de/gleichstellungsbeauftragte/index.en.html

ES, Gender Action Plans of different universities: http://www.igualdad ull.es/planes%20igualdad.html

ES, Spanish National Research Council (CSIC): http://www.csic.es/web/guest/mujeres-y-ciencia

ES, University of Laguna: http://www.igualdad.ull.es

ES, University of the Basque Country: http://www.berdintasuna.ehu.eus/p234-home/es

FR, French National Centre for Scientific Research, CNRS: http://www.cnrs.fr/mission-femmes
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UK, Athena SWAN Factsheet 1: Organisational Culture:
http://www.ceas.manchester.ac.uk/media/eps/schoolofchemicalengineeringändigandanalyticalscience/content/aboutus/athenaswan/pdfs/Organisational-Culture.pdf

UK, Athena SWAN Factsheet 2: Work-life balance:
http://www.ceas.manchester.ac.uk/media/eps/schoolofchemicalengineeringändigandanalyticalscience/content/aboutus/athenaswan/pdfs/Work-Life-balance.pdf

UK, Athena SWAN Handbook 2014:

COST Action Project:
www.cost.eu/COST_Actions

European Commission. Euraxess – Research in Motion web portal:
http://ec.europa.eu/euraxess

European Commission. Women in Science web portal:
http://ec.europa.eu/research/index.cfm?pg=wisaudiobook

European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE).
www.eige.europa.eu

European Institute for Gender Equality. Gender Equality Index:
eige.europa.eu/content/gender-equality-index

European Platform of Women Scientists:
http://www.epws.org

FESTA Project:
http://www.festa.europa.eu

GARCIA Project:
http://garciaproject.eu

GENDER-NET ERA-NET project:
www.gender-net.eu

GenderSTE Project:
www.genderste.eu

GENOVATE Project:
http://www.genovate.eu

GenPORT Project:
www.genderportal.eu/node/1

GENIS LAB project:
http://www.genislab-fp7.eu

INTEGER project:
http://www.projectinteger.com/en/about-the-project

FR, University Paris-Est Creteil Val de Marne:
http://www.u-pec.fr/pratiques/universite/politique-d-etablissement/la-mission-parte-de-l-upec-603821.jsp

IE, Trinity College Dublin:
http://www.tcd.ie/equality; http://www.tcd.ie/wiser

NO, Commission for Gender Balance and Diversity in Research, Norway (KIF):
http://eng.kifinfo.no

NO, Norwegian University of Science and Technology:
http://www.ntnu.edu/studies/phdopportunities/gender_equality

NO, The University of Oslo:
http://www.uio.no/english/for-employees/employment/gender-equality/index.html

NO, Gender Balance in Research:
http://eng.kifinfo.no

NO, The Gender in Norway web portal:
www.gender.no

UK, Imperial College London:
http://www3.imperial.ac.uk/equality

UK, Queen’s University Belfast:
http://www.qub.ac.uk/rqi, http://www.qub.ac.uk/directorates/HumanResources/EqualOpportunitiesUnit

UK, University of Nottingham:

UK, University of Warwick:
http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/equalops

UK, Equality Challenge Unit (ECU):
http://www.ecu.ac.uk

UK, Athena SWAN Award members:
http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan/athena-swan-members

UK, Athena SWAN Charter for Women in Science:
http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charter-marks/athena-swan

UK, Athena SWAN Factsheet 1: Organisational Culture:
http://www.ceas.manchester.ac.uk/media/eps/schoolofchemicalengineeringändigandanalyticalscience/content/aboutus/athenaswan/pdfs/Organisational-Culture.pdf
We would be very grateful if you could complete this survey in relation to your institution.

The survey consists of four sections:

section 1 General information about the institution
section 2 Mapping of gender equality measures implemented at an institutional level
section 3 Best practices to share with other institutions
section 4 National governmental programmes / initiatives and their impact at an institutional level

Each section has a short introduction to help you navigate the survey.

Completion of the survey will require approximately 30-45 minutes per section. However, this does not have to be completed in one sitting, you can save your work and return to continue it at any time.

The questionnaire can be completed online until 5th September 2014.

All information gathered will be treated strictly confidentially and used only in connection with this project. No data will be transferred to third parties.

For further questions, please contact Olga Vinogradova.

We are looking forward to sharing your information and your expertise.

Thank you very much for participation.

In this Section you are invited to provide general information about your institution, key objectives regarding gender equality as well information about your action plan on gender equality and the role/responsibilities of your gender equality unit / officer or equivalent in your institution.

2. Please indicate the name of your institution.
3. Type of institution – please select
4. Please indicate the gender equality website of your institution.
5. Please indicate the person we should contact if there are any queries regarding your answers.
6. What are your institutions three most important objectives for the five coming years regarding gender equality?
7. Does your institution have an Action Plan on Gender Equality?
8-9. Please attach
Example of Best Practice 1:

18. Please provide brief information about the measure: title, period of implementation, objective and target groups, strategy and key activities, resources used for the implementation:

19. Was this measure implemented in the framework of national/regional programme/initiative on gender equality, please provide the title of the latter.

20. Please specify outcomes / specific changes in your institution as result of the implementation.

21. Please explain why this measure/ project could be regarded as best practice.

22. Please explain what was new and unique about this measure/ project.

23. What do you think are the factors contributing to the success of this measure / project?

24. In your opinion, what are the factors hindering the success?

25. What do you think are the possibilities for transferability to other institutions? What factors have to be taken into account in relation to this measure?

26. Please share any other lessons learned from the process of implementation of this measure.

Section II. Mapping gender equality measures implemented at an institutional level

10. If your institution has a gender equality unit / officer or equivalent, please explain her/his role/responsibilities.

11. When did your institution start to participate in governmental programmes / initiatives on gender equality?

Section II focuses on mapping measures that higher education institutions have put in place to achieve gender equality while implementing national/regional programmes/initiatives on gender equality. You are invited to go through the list of measures and specify those that were developed and implemented in your institution. You will also have the possibility to add measures not included in the list. The list of measures is divided into 6 Areas of Intervention and covers:

1. Recruiting, retaining and advancement of women researchers, including leading positions
2. Facilitating in-/out-going mobility for women researchers
3. Improving work environment, work-life balance and dual careers
4. Anchoring gender equality issues at leadership level
5. Identifying decision-making structures and procedures
6. Other

12-17: List of various measures.

In Section III you are invited to share information on 1-3 measures you consider as having been most effective in promoting gender equality, leading to visible and measurable positive change in your institution. You can also describe several measures under one best practice where those measures were implemented as inter-related elements.

Selected best practice measures should be based on those you have provided in the previous Section II (Mapping of gender equality measures implemented at an institutional level).

We would like to ask you to document measures that meet at least two of the following criteria:

■ Impact on policy environment for gender equality – procedures, structures, resource allocation, degree of institutionalisation.
■ Demonstrates an innovative and replicable approach – what is new and unique about this measure and offer opportunities for to be transferable in other countries and contexts.
■ This measure demonstrates sustainability, i.e. commitment to mainstream the measure, to conduct further action and provide resources.

Section III. Best practices to share with other institutions

28. Please give us some basic information about the most recent governmental programme / initiative you are part of.

29. Please specify area(s) of intervention in which this programme/initiative was implemented in your institution?

30. Please describe what criteria your institution had to meet to become a part of these programmes/ initiatives.
31. Please explain what monitoring mechanism has been established to measure progress in implementation of this national / regional programme / initiative in your institution.

32. Please explain what mechanism has been established to evaluate results of implementation of national / regional programmes / initiatives mentioned above in your institution.

33. In your opinion, what are the major achievements in your institution in terms of removing organisational barriers in gender equality so far?

34. In your opinion, what are the major achievements in your institution in terms of removing cultural barriers in gender equality so far?

35. What do you think could be the potential and what could be the constraints in relation to moving forward in implementation of the programme in your institution?

Thank you very much for participation!
The GENDER-NET ERA-NET

GENDER-NET is a pilot transnational research policy initiative funded by the European Commission under the Science-in-Society work programme of the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (2013-2016).

It is the first ERA-NET (European Research Area Network) to be dedicated to the common challenges still facing European research institutions in achieving gender equality in research and innovation i.e. the persistent barriers and constraints to the recruitment, advancement and mobility of women in the European scientific system, the lack of women in decision-making, as well as the limited integration of the gender dimension in research programmes and contents.

Coordinated by French CNRS, GENDER-NET brings together a balanced partnership of national research programme owners (e.g. ministries, national research funding agencies and other national organisations) as well as a number of Observer organisations, from across Europe and North America, all with a shared commitment to gender equality and synergistic expertise in gender and science issues.

Based on the mutual opening of their respective programmes and policies, partners have joined forces to carry out joint assessments of existing national/regional initiatives, to define priority areas for transnational collaborations and implement a selection of strategic joint activities, in an effort to reduce fragmentation across the ERA and help reach a critical mass of ministries, research funders, universities and research institutions across Europe engaging in the implementation of gender equality plans or related initiatives and fostering the integration of sex and gender analysis in research contents.

For more information, please visit our website: www.gender-net.eu
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