Manual on joint gender equality training scheme
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A. INTRODUCTION

This report is a deliverable of the GENDER-NET ERA-NET, funded by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme (Science-in-Society work programme)\(^1\).

GENDER-NET is a pilot transnational research policy initiative (a European Research Area Network) designed to address the common challenges still facing European research institutions in achieving gender equality and gender mainstreaming 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, but also the limited integration of the gender analysis into research programmes and contents.

GENDER-NET brings together a balanced partnership of 13\(^2\) national research programme owners from across Europe and North America (i.e. ministries, national research funding agencies and research performing organisations, and other types of national organisations – see consortium members on page 2) as well as a number of Observer organisations (10 national organisations as of August 2015) and an Expert Advisory Board, all with a shared commitment to gender equality and synergistic expertise in gender and science issues.

This GENDER-NET Deliverable (D4.13) is one of the outcomes of Work Package 4 (WP4: Strategic Transnational Activities and Policies) co-led by French CNRS and MENESR, and more specifically, of Task 2 of WP4 (Designing and implementing joint gender equality training schemes), co-led by CNRS and Swiss WBF, with instrumental contribution from ECU (United Kingdom).

It was agreed between Task participants that the best approach would be to develop a training programme, and pilot this programme in two of the GENDER-NET partner countries, with lesser experience in the implementation of gender equality measures in research and higher education. As a result, Cyprus and Slovenia were selected as the pilot countries, and the training programmes were delivered as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana, Slovenia</td>
<td>Slovenian Ministry for Education, Science and Sport</td>
<td>2-3 June 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia, Cyprus</td>
<td>Research Promotion Foundation, Cyprus</td>
<td>9-10 June 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Detailed information on the GENDER-NET ERA-NET is available on the project’s web page: http://www.gender-net.eu

\(^2\) As of November 2015, a new late entry partner has joined the project: the Ministry of Science, technology and Space of the State of Israel (MOST). See GENDER-NET partnership here
Training scheme structure:
The GENDER-NET Task partners agreed to organise the gender equality training scheme in two parts:

- **Seminar 1** (developed by CNRS): Formal seminar, of short duration, aimed at senior people in the higher education and research fields (e.g. Minister, University President/Rector, Vice-Rector). The aim of this seminar was to gain the commitment and engagement of high-level individuals in advancing gender equality.

- **Seminar 2** (developed by ECU): Half-day (4 hour) training seminar for senior individuals involved in the management of research and higher education (middle management, e.g. Human Resources Directors, Deans, Department leaders). This audience was considered to be particularly relevant because they are in the best position to take action to advance gender equality within their institution or research organisation, and the seminar aimed to provide them with practical ideas of where they can start with this work.

About this manual:
This manual describes the contents of these two seminars, and in the case of the longer Seminar 2, it presents the exact materials that were used (Powerpoint slides), with notes on how these materials are to be used. Powerpoint presentations shown during Seminar 1, which were delivered by external invited experts, are not reproduced here.

This GENDER-NET manual is intended as an easy reference manual; the materials can be adapted and used by anyone seeking to deliver training on gender equality in research institutions.

Before delivering the gender equality training however, it is important to consider the factors that make training successful, and we would urge anyone using the manual to do this. In developing this programme, there was reflective learning as to considerations for a successful training event. The following key point should be taken into consideration:

- The training has to be targeted to the respective audiences, e.g. top management leaders (strategic lead), middle management (operational lead). For our first audience, the strategic focus has to convince leaders of the importance of gender equality, and showcase how leaders can demonstrate their commitment. For the second target audience, the focus has to be more practical, giving middle managers tools and ideas for practical implementation.

- The organisers have to define whom they want to train, and adapt the training material accordingly. A high level cohort, like university top management and decision-makers have less time in general and are best invited...
in the combination of a working lunch/dinner or other event of interest to them.

■ The term ‘training’ is likely to be off-putting for many, and words like ‘capacity building’ or ‘seminar’ are more palatable. Because gender equality can often be side-lined, events can be made more attractive to higher education leaders if the title refers to ‘excellence in research’ or similar, instead of what many leaders wrongly consider to be ‘women only’ topics.

■ Who delivers the training is also important. The content or message is usually much better understood and accepted if it is delivered by a person of similar standing, e.g. (Vice)-rector, Dean or Professor for top management.

■ The inclusion of information (facts & figures) on the respective situation of the country/region with regard to higher education and if available, specific gender equality data, is helpful and important to include in designing the training. Positive comments on the achievements made as well as indications on where to improve or advance the local situation, tailored to the needs of the Higher Education and Research Institutions (HEI/RI), could be given to the participants to help them apply the training to their own context.

■ Showing easily understandable and transferable good practice examples (including already existing electronic platforms/tools, e.g. INTEGER T-GAP, and upcoming EIGE-EC (DG RTD) GEAR tool on Gender Equality Plans in Academia and Research3, etc.) is key, together with convincing scientific evidence. The presentation of low-resource/high-impact activities can be of great value if resources are limited.

■ The use of personal and interactive training/capacity building sessions is recommended and has more impact on trainees than an on-line training (as highlighted at the 9th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, Paris, France, Sept. 2016).

■ If several lecturers/presenters are involved, who do not work together, it is of value that they discuss the contents of their presentations with each other before the session, so that they can cross-refer and avoid any duplication.

■ It is important to attempt to understand what is important to the audience as this can help increase participation. For example, if the session covers their key driver and how this links to gender equality, and this is advertised in the programme, it may help increase numbers of participants. It is of course important to ensure that the content matches what is advertised.

3 Update: the GEAR Tool is now available here: http://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits/gear
Combination of gender equality training with other training sessions that are of importance or mandatory for the audience is another way to make sure that the training is attended. An option could be the integration of a module on Gender into the regular leadership management trainings of young (incoming) professors at HEI, as mentioned in the example of the University of Bern in the GENDER-NET Work Package 2 D2.6 report.

To understand the value and impact of the training, it is useful to clarify what participants plan to do regarding the input given after the seminar. Where possible, consider asking what duties/tasks are/will be fulfilled/planned and ask for a report back.

Given that the training developed is aimed for transnational use, translations are very helpful in order to facilitate complex discussions on topics where leaders are not specialists, e.g. stereotypes, unconscious bias trainings etc. Translation might help to engage more participants in the process and the respective discussions.
B. SEMINAR 1

1. Framing the issues

The GENDER-NET Task participants designed and carried out two pilot awareness-raising and capacity-building seminars in the framework of designing a joint manual for delivering gender equality training schemes.

The aim of Seminar 1 was to gain the buy-in, engagement and support of high-level research and academic stakeholders, and raise awareness on the use of gender equality plans (GEPs) as implementation tools, as well as introduce the “integration of sex and gender analysis into research programmes and contents” (IGAR) as a key action of any GEP.

Due to CNRS’s longstanding experience in delivering such trainings in the framework of the activities carried out by their Mission for the Place of Women (Mission pour la place des femmes), CNRS was in charge of developing Seminar 1.

In a condensed format, Seminar 1 should present high-level decision-makers with efficient storytelling and key academic research on the relevance of addressing gender equality issues in research, and especially introduce these participants to gender equality as a way to foster the quality of research and be competitive at international/EU level, and should be followed by a lunch or dinner in order to maximize attractiveness and possibilities for interaction.

2. Putting it into practice

Suggested content

- Identify the key thematic areas, and the areas that are easier to handle than others in the hosting country (e.g. leadership and recruitment vs. mobility and work-life balance)
- Identify the specific drivers and "business cases" for the targeted country
- Use inspirational stories, best practices and concrete examples, presented by a leading academic Champion, preferably from an institution which experience is of relevance for the hosting country’s situation
- Focus the training on unconscious bias and gender stereotypes, while also covering conscious bias and institutional sexism (which are more developed in Seminar 2)
- Explain the procedures and processes: how to implement a GEP (and link this to EU regulations – use the legal basis for this and remind them of their obligations)
- Address gender equality, and IGAR, as a way to increase research quality and efficiency.
Suggested structure

- Duration of the Seminar 1: 1 hour to 1.5 hours, followed by lunch/dinner
- 5 minutes: Introduction by local hosts
- 20 minutes: Unconscious gender bias awareness-raising by an eminent researcher on unconscious/implicit gender bias and social stereotypes (social and cognitive psychology)
- 20 minutes: Presentation by one or two inspiring lecturers, i.e. high-level academic champion and/or external experts talking about their experience at implementing a GEP, and the benefits to their institution
- 10-15 minutes: Case study/Good practice: guidance on the procedures and processes for implementation, link with EU and national legislation/regulations, and with the tools developed by the GENDER-NET project
- 5 to 30 minutes (according to availability): Discussion and next steps.

Suggested target audience

Clearly identify the target audience in the hosting country: for e.g. Ministries, Research-performing organisations (RPOs) or Research-funding organisations (RFOs), Heads of organisations/Deans: awareness training in the Seminar 1 format; for e.g. Professors/Researchers/Students: empowerment trainings in the Seminar 2 format.

Identify the levels: both national and institutional (national legislations / institutional legislations).

Target audiences for Seminar 1 in Slovenia and Cyprus included:
- Relevant Ministries and Government Departments responsible for Research portfolio
- University Rectors and Vice Rectors
- Heads/Presidents/Directors of the research offices/services in the RPOs
- Funding Agencies
- General Directors and Directors of Research Organisations

Where to find Good Practices? Experts? Champions?

Two invited speakers – one expert researcher and one high-level academic – were eventually chosen for both pilot Seminars, with profiles that best matched the local contexts (see Seminar 1 agendas in the next section).

Some resources for finding speakers:
- Successful projects on structural/institutional change in research and higher education institutions through the implementation of gender equality plans, funded through the FP7 Science-in-Society and Horizon 2020 Science-with-and-for-Society work programmes (See list established by GENDER-NET, or else access through the CORDIS database).

- Researchers, Academics and Experts from the fields of science, engineering and social sciences, who have successfully implemented structural/institutional change or have relevant experience and expertise on this matter (See list of such experts involved in FP7-SiS project INTEGER, which include leading academics from universities that have been rewarded with Athena SWAN Gold/Silver Awards)

- European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) Eurogender Gender Trainers Database (See database)

- Experts registered in the FP7-SiS-funded GenPORT web portal (Search database here)
“We need to bring democratic equality into science. We need everyone to understand and move forward, as it is not only an EU case but a global issue”.

Dr. Maja Makovec Brenčič, Slovenian Minister for Education, Science and Sport

Seminar 1 Agenda and Speakers (Slovenia):
The event was showcased on the Ministry’s website:
“Specific action is needed to remedy the current gaps as well as provide stimulus and inspiration to take concrete actions”

Dr. Dora Chimonidou, President of the Conference of Heads of Research Centres in Cyprus

Seminar 1 Agenda and Speakers (Cyprus):

The Seminar is being organised under the auspices of the Rectors’ Conference in Cyprus and the Conference for Directors of Research Centres in Cyprus.
What will be done from here in Slovenia?

Maja Makovec Brenčič, Slovenian Minister for Education, Science and Sport: Thank you for enlightening us and sharing good practices. Slovenia is currently in the process of moving forward, and has just adopted its ERA roadmap. Among actions that we plan to implement:

- Enforce a regulatory framework/ provide new regulation to see more results on the public research organization level
- Develop a committee for ethics and a court for ethics
- Develop gender equality at institutional level and across the ministries, and foster cooperation
- Action plan for improving career prospects, and principles for equal opportunities
- Programmes are under discussion on the integration of the gender dimension in contents and programmes
- Work with women associations and committees
- Support publications

What is your opinion on the current discussion in Cyprus about a Law to enforce 50% of women in boards of directors?

Nigel Seaton (Principal, Abertay University): If the objective is to have a balance board it makes sense, if you try to create opportunities for women, then it could be counterproductive as some might believe that the chosen women are there only because of the quotas. In Abertay University, we selected a different approach: effort was led on finding women, instead of using compulsory methods.

Anne Pépin (CNRS, GENDER-NET project Coordinator): There is a need to train people to understand that there are wrongful reasons for fearing quotas. Once women are on the board, the possible negative stigma does not last. In addition, research shows that when you put a quota into place, or some kind of affirmative action, its main effect is that it encourages excellent women to apply which would not have applied otherwise, and do not lower the level. In France, the quota law (40% of the less represented sex on board of trustees, and recruitment juries in the public service) has already proven to be effective.
Did you face any problem in the Abertay University and how did you overcome these?

Nigel Seaton: At Abertay University, one of the problems we saw was the lack of interest for the topic. But there are various ways to tackle this problem at political and top level.

Senior leaders’ implication is really hard and one should not assume that women are more sympathetic to these problems than men. It’s the responsibility of the rectors, but it’s also a matter of interest for the community (students and staff) that elects academic leaders.

Anne Pépin: It is also a long-term process. In universities and research organisations where real change has been experienced (e.g. in US NSF-ADVANCE awardee universities), it took roughly 10 years to get there, with continuous effort. This is why it’s so important to raise the awareness of decision-makers. At CNRS, for instance, showing hard figures and statistics and using our research findings in the field of gender research, and particularly in cognitive and social psychology as was presented to you today, proved to be effective.

Participant (Women Head of Academic Institution): In Cyprus, as in other countries, the problems are still deeply rooted in society, parenting, TV, books, etc. There is a long way to go. Raising awareness is indeed one of the best ways to go.

5. Key lessons learned from delivering Seminar 1

- Do not target only Heads of Universities but also Heads of Research Centers
- If possible, also have some experts/supportive local participants, e.g. involved in related European projects
- In order to reach the target population: prepare briefs, try to integrate the meeting in an existing framework (or under the auspices of another institution/Ministry…)
- Be careful with the dynamics/differences between the academics and administrative officers
- Need to make the Seminar specific to the local context
- Discuss the cultural specificities/cross-cultural matters
- Give practical information on what participants can do in their respective department/organisation
- Give concrete examples from other countries, not so much with regard to geography, but more with regard to the type of institutions the participants will be able to relate to
Consider why gender equality is important for a given institution in a given context.

Foster interactivity among participants as much as possible.

Important to combine dinner/lunch for networking, and to develop the transnational dimension.

Define if you need something quite personal or very formal: small community size makes it easier to have a wider audience.

Ensure that the trainings are embedded, and integrated in the institution (bottom up and top down trainings).

Be careful of the language used: English for audiences for non-native speakers and specialized technical terms for a non-specialist audience.

Reinforce decision-makers’ commitment with EU funding/rewards/legal provisions/sanctions (rules and opportunities).

Best complement the contents of Seminar 1 and Seminar 2 in order to reinforce the impact in the target country.
This training manual includes the following:

- Guidance on training organisation: based upon the experience of organising and delivering the pilot seminars and Cyprus and Slovenia this manual contains recommendations on how to plan and organise a gender equality training scheme.

- Recommendations for preparation: As we will highlight later in this training manual, there is great value in tailoring the gender equality training scheme to the local context. This manual will highlight the research that needs to be conducted in advance to ensure that the training is relevant to the audience.

- Presentation and materials: this manual contains the complete powerpoint presentation from each training session, together with facilitator notes for each slide included in the presentation.

- An appendix on unconscious bias: this contains a handout that you can provide to participants so that they can more deeply understand the field of unconscious bias.

Technical Details

Timings

The training is designed as a half-day / 4 hour workshop. Approximate timings for each section are provided in the outline of the programme below. When we delivered the seminars in Slovenia and Cyprus participants were provided with lunch after the seminar and this provided space for participants to ask informal questions of the trainers and to discuss the issues that had been raised.

Room setup

The activities will involve group work. Cabaret style seating with 4–6 people around each small table is ideal for encouraging discussions.

Equipment and materials

You will require the following materials:

- Laptop, projector and screen for showing presentation
- Internet connection to enable you to show the Royal Society unconscious bias video
- Presentation handouts for delegates to refer to and take away
- Pens
## Outline of the training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>What we will cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30-9:45</td>
<td>Introductions &amp; getting started</td>
<td>Introduction to facilitators and Equality Challenge Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to the GENDER-NET project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seminar aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45-10:30</td>
<td>Section 1: gender equality in context</td>
<td>EU context for work on gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender equality: picture of Cyprus today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11:15</td>
<td>Section 2: why gender equality is important</td>
<td>The economic case for gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The research quality case for gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15-11:30</td>
<td>Refreshment break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td>Section 3: exploring gender bias</td>
<td>Exploring the conscious and unconscious biases that create inequality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bias in recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Exploring unconscious bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understanding structural sexism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Examining conscious bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taking action to reduce bias: example from GENDER-NET partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Section 4: What can your organisation do to</td>
<td>Exploring change interventions to advance gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advance gender equality</td>
<td>Presentations by the Electricity Authority of Cyprus and the Institute of Neurology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Genetics on their gender equality initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Close and lunch</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introductions & getting started  Slide 1:

Facilitator notes:

- Facilitators to introduce themselves, their roles and the organisation they represent. It may be valuable to highlight any training you have previously delivered as well as previous work on gender equality.

- You may wish to invite the participants to introduce themselves and their roles to at their tables. This will be particularly important if people attending the training have not met previously.

- Housekeeping: make sure participants are aware of where to find the toilets; are alerted to fire safety procedures; also ask participants to refrain from using their telephones during the session.

- Time-keeping: alert the participants to when you will take a break.

Slide 2: introductions
Facilitator notes:

- Provide background information about the origin of this training programme in the GENDER-NET project.
- Provide background information about any of the organisation who are involved in the delivery of the training. For example, when we delivered this training in Slovenia we noted the involvement of the Slovenian Ministry of Education, Science and Sport.

Slide 3: Seminar aims

Facilitator notes:

- Review the aims for the seminar: what will participants have learned by the end of the seminar
  - To increase your knowledge of gender equality and its importance to European research
  - To reflect on the barriers to the recruitment and progression of women in research
  - To identify opportunities and actions to address these barriers
  - To consider learning from GENDER-NET work and other projects
- At this stage you may wish to ask participants if they have any particular aims or issues they would like to discuss as part of the training.
Slide 4: transition slide

Facilitator notes:
We are now going to move on to the first main section of today’s training programme: gender equality in context. We’re going to take time to look at the situation in terms of gender equality here.

N.B. this is the start of a section that requires advance preparation and research into the key issues for gender equality in research in the particular country in which the seminar is being delivered.

Slide 5: background

Facilitator notes:
Slides 5 and 6 provide you with the opportunity to inform participants that advancing gender equality is a key priority within the European Union.

It is important to note that the EU takes a dual-track approach to considering gender equality in research, which we can classify into:
WHO: improving the representation and participation of women in research
WHAT & HOW: consider the gender dimension in research content.

Slide 6: the EU context

Facilitator notes:
Slides 5 and 6 provide you with the opportunity to inform participants that advancing gender equality is a key priority within the European Union.

- **Horizon 2020**: Gender equality is part of the European Research and Innovation policy. There are 3 objectives related to gender in Horizon 2020 (the EU’s research and innovation programme):
  1. Promote equality participation and opportunities for women and men in research careers.
  2. Ensure gender balance in decision-making
  3. Integrate gender/sex analysis in research and innovation content. This helps improve the scientific quality and societal relevance of the produced knowledge, technology and/or innovation.

- **European Research Area**: Gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research is one of the priorities (ERA priority 4) of the European Research Area (ERA) Roadmap.

- **Gender balance at university**: Across Europe the number of women graduating from universities is growing faster than the number of men.

- **Horizontal segregation**: across Europe men and women continue to select different subjects to study at university.

- **Vertical segregation**: while the number of women graduates has greatly increased, there are still gender imbalances at the most senior levels within universities and research organisations.
Additional notes:

What is the ERA Roadmap?

The ERA Roadmap has been developed for establishing the European Research Area. It should serve the purpose of facilitating and reinforcing the efforts undertaken by the Member States. In February 2014 the Competitiveness Council called to develop an ERA Roadmap by deciding on concrete measures. Responding to this request, Member States developed a document by working through ERAC and the ERA Related Groups, in close cooperation with the Commission and the European Stakeholder Organisations.

There is a European ERA Roadmap 2015-2016, and member states were also asked to develop their own Roadmap.

Slide 7-17: The local context

The following slides are drawn from the presentation used during the pilot training that Equality Challenge Unit delivered in Ljubljana in June 2016.

Equality Challenge Unit worked with their key contact at the Slovenian Ministry of Education, science and Sport to create these slides, with the aim of highlighting the key challenges for gender equality that exist in the Slovenian higher education and research sectors.

Our experience from the pilot training sessions was that these slides are particularly valuable as they make clear to participants how the training is relevant for their work. Here are some questions we recommend you consider as you prepare these slides:

- Do you think the audience may reject the idea that there is a problem with gender equality?
- Are there specific gender equality issues that are unique to this country/organisation?
- Do you have access to national statistics on the gender profile of students (undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research) in your higher education system?
- Do you have access to national statistics on the gender profile of academic and research staff (lecturer, senior lecturer, professor or local equivalents)?

Providing this data and information will enable you to show to seminar participants the importance of the seminar for their work.
Facilitator notes:
Although there are some positive figures here (for example, 50% of doctors of science are women), in general we can see that there is still a problem with women being absent from the more senior positions higher education and research in Slovenia. This is the challenge of vertical differentiation.

There also exists the challenge of horizontal differentiation in Slovenian higher education and research. For example, only 17% of PhDs in technical and technological sciences are awarded to women.
Facilitator notes:
This slide shows us the career path of women academics in Slovenia. The chart we have chosen shows what is often called the **scissor diagram**. What we can see is that while more women than men study at university, and equal numbers of men and women graduate with PhDs, as academics move along the career journey, the proportion of men increases and the proportion of women decreases.

Source for data: Source: Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia

Facilitator notes:
This slide shows the long-term funding for research provided by the Slovenian government. What we can see is that in some fields women are receiving a much lower proportion of funds.

There is also a continuation of the challenge of horizontal differentiation – the area where women are managing the smallest proportion of research funding is the field of engineering sciences.

Source for data: Annual report 2014, Slovenian Research Agency
Facilitator notes:
When we look at the Slovenian state awards in research women are not entirely absent. However, we can see that only one woman has ever been awarded the most prestigious research award: the Zois Award for Life Achievements.

Facilitator notes:
There is a gender pay gap in Slovenia. In 2012, average gross annual earnings of researchers amounted to EUR 46,080; for female researchers EUR 42,137 and for male researchers EUR 48,615.
Facilitator notes:
Reflect back on the picture that has been painted by the previous slides: the fact that gender equality is a priority for the European Union’s research and innovation strategy, and that there are still challenges and barriers for achieving gender equality in Slovenia.

Note that the She Figures report from 2015 shows that only 3 out of Slovenia’s 4 universities and 15 public research institutes have adopted a gender equality plan (16%).

Today’s training aims to highlight why taking a strategic approach to advancing gender equality is important, and how you can start that work.

Facilitator notes:
When Equality Challenge Unit delivered this seminar in Ljubljana, the Slovenian ERA Roadmap had recently been approved. This provided us with an important national lever for encouraging the seminar participants to focus on gender
equality in their universities and research institutes. The Slovenian ERA Roadmap includes 5 objectives in relation to gender equality:

- Renewed legislative framework that will enhance institutional and cultural change for gender equality in RDI.
- Designing strategies for including the gender equality principle and the plans for gender equality in all research organisations.
- Considering the gender equality principle in financing organisations in the field of RDI in the allocation of funds as in content.
- Ensuring comprehensive and transparent data, separated by gender, to more efficiently design policies and monitor the realisation of measures in gender equality in research.
- Change of culture in institutions and the wider society through raising awareness, education, training and best practices exchange in gender equality.

When preparing to deliver this seminar, it will be valuable to reflect on local drivers for action on gender equality. Review the country’s ERA Roadmap (if one exists), together with other national plans related to higher education and research.

Slide 15: SWOT analysis discussion

Facilitator notes:

It will be valuable at this point to acknowledge that you have just presented a considerable amount of data and information about the European and national context for gender equality. State that you wish to involve participants in a discussion about gender equality in their country and organisation.
This will be an opportunity for you as a facilitator to understand if there is any resistance in the audience to the idea that there continue to be challenges in relation to gender equality.

Ask participants to conduct a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) analysis of gender equality in their country:

- **Strengths**: What are [your country]'s strengths in terms of gender equality in higher education?
- **Weaknesses**: What are the weaknesses? Where are women absent?
- **Opportunities**: what are the areas you might want to prioritise in your gender action plan? Where do you think you can consider gender equality in your organisation?
- **Threats**: what difficulties might you face in your work to create and implement a gender action plan? For example, not having the right data.

You may also wish to use the following questions to prompt discussion:

- Where do you think Slovenia stands in terms of gender equality?
- Where do you think your institution stands in terms of gender equality?
- What challenges have you observed in terms of advancing gender equality?

We have examined the current picture of gender equality in research in [this country], and had an opportunity to discuss your specific context. As the data has shown: gender inequality continues to be a challenge.

Now we need to consider: why is this important? Why should we pay attention to gender equality?

**Slide 17: Why gender equality is important**
Facilitator notes:
There are generally 3 arguments put forward for improving gender equality:

- Gender equality makes economic sense
- If we value a fair society, then advancing gender equality is the right thing to do. This is the moral case.
- Considering gender and advancing gender equality improves the quality of research.

We are going to examine each of these three arguments in turn. We invite you to consider which of the drivers is most important for you, and which drivers you think would be most valuable to you as you make the case for gender equality in your university/organisation.

Slide 18: Fairness and gender equality

Facilitator notes:
Let’s start by examining what some people call the moral case for gender equality.

Do you believe in a society where everyone is treated with dignity and respect? Where everyone has the opportunity to succeed to the best if their abilities? If your answer to these questions is yes then how can we justify what the previous statistics show, that women are absent at senior levels in research?

We know that both men and women are excellent researchers, and so we all have a moral responsibility to address the absence of women from top positions.

As we also saw from the statistics, there are very few women pursuing research careers in certain disciplines (e.g. engineering), and the same is true for men (e.g. in field of social care). Advancing gender equality and tackling stereotypes will
help us to work towards a system in which each individual feels able to pursue studies in their chosen academic field rather than feeling limited by their gender.

In 2014 Equality Challenge Unit conducted research with university leaders in the UK to understand how to create a business case for equality within higher education. Although our research was looking to understand the business/economic case for gender equality what we found was that the moral case was in reality the most important for leaders.

The moral case was the foundation for these leaders’ work to advance equality and diversity. If participants are interested, then you can direct them to the report on ECU’s website: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/ECU_Rationale-for-equality-Report-2014_v8a-FINAL.pdf

Furthermore, Iris Bohnet, a behavioural economist at Harvard University, has recently published a book on how to design systems to improve gender equality. She argues that ultimately it is “simply the right thing to do.”

Slide 19: the economic case for gender equality

Facilitator notes:

The pilot training seminars indicated that the slides that focus on the economic case for gender equality are particularly valuable for engaging leaders and managers who are not yet convinced of the importance of taking action to improve gender equality within their institution.

In preparing for the Slovenian pilot seminar we agreed that it would be valuable to focus on the public funding of higher education. This enabled us to pose the question to attendees: why invest public money in creating highly trained researchers who then leave the system because of the fact that they face discrimination and/or barriers on the basis of their gender?
When preparing the training it will be important to conduct research and speak to individuals working in the higher education and research fields to understand the economic arguments that will resonate with the local audience.

Explanation we provided during Slovenia pilot seminar: We now want to consider the economic case. Let’s start by examining the gender profile of doctoral graduates in Slovenia. As we have previously seen, women are less likely to advance within academia. But they are 50% of doctoral graduates and this is paid for by the Slovenian state if these women don’t utilise their PhD then this is a loss of talent and it could be argued – a loss of the money that the state has invested in these women.

Slide 20: the economic case for gender equality (cont.)

Facilitator notes:
Following on from the previous slide – which makes a local connection to the economic case for gender equality – this slide presents some of the key economic arguments for gender equality.

1. Women staying in the system means you will make full use of all talents, knowledge and experience and making use of their PhD
2. To do this, you have to take steps to ensure that the workplace is attractive to both men and women and where they feel valued.
3. Research also shows that when people feel that they can work to the best of their ability because they are valued, they have better performance, and are less likely to leave – reduces the cost of recruitment and the overall cost of training new researchers
4. Overall this leads to an economic gain to the country as a whole.

In Slovenia we highlighted again that there is a link to the country’s European Research Area (ERA) Roadmap as this was particularly relevant to the audience.
Facilitator notes:
It is useful to draw a connection to the previous section on the economic case for gender equality here. The essence of this section is the concept that giving consideration to gender equality and considering the gender aspect of research can lead to better research.

Research and innovation is built upon knowledge exchange. This is why the core principle of academic freedom is core to the work of our universities and research institutes. Knowledge exchange and academic freedom allow people to debate and discuss ideas freely, and this leads to the formation of new opinions, concepts and ideas.

If we all thought the same way, it would be difficult to build new and innovative knowledge. If your research group is diverse, includes people with different background and life experiences then this will lead to the formation of better ideas.

Note that funders are increasingly interested in this: The promotion of gender equality in research and innovation is a commitment of the European Commission's Horizon 2020 programme. This means that when evaluating research proposals some funder will be interested in:

The gender balance of research teams
Whether gendered analysis is considered within the research itself.

If participants are interested in finding out more about IGAR, recommend they visit the GENDER-NET Online IGAR Tool: the Gendered Innovations website: http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/gendered-innovations/index_en.cfm?pg=home
Slide 22: making the research quality argument

Facilitator notes:
This slide provides a concrete example of why considering gender improves research quality.

Let’s just look at one simple example of how a lack of consideration for diversity can have a negative impact on research and healthcare.

Ischemic heart disease (IHD) is the number one killer of U.S. and European women (WHO, 2008). Nonetheless heart disease has been defined as primarily a male disease, and “evidence-based” clinical standards have been created based on male pathophysiology and outcomes. As a result, women are often mis- and under-diagnosed (Regitz-Zagrosek, 2011; Taylor et al., 2011).

Source: The Woman’s Heart Attack, Martha Weinman Lear, NY Times, 26/09/2014

Slide 23: make the local connection to the arguments for considering gender in research

Slovenian ERA Roadmap

“Only by exploiting the entire range of labour force and talent, Slovenia will be able to contribute to diversity, excellence and the quality of results, to the competitiveness of ERA, economic growth and creating new jobs.”
Facilitator notes:
When Equality Challenge Unit delivered this seminar in Ljubljana, the Slovenian ERA Roadmap had recently been approved. This provided us with an important national lever for encouraging the seminar participants to focus on gender equality in their universities and research institutes. When concluding our presentation on the key arguments for advancing gender equality we returned to the ERA Roadmap, to emphasise that the Slovenian Government is committed to addressing gender equality in research.

When preparing to deliver this seminar, it will be valuable to reflect on local drivers for action on gender equality. Review the country’s ERA Roadmap (if one exists), together with other national plans related to higher education and research.

Slide 24: discussion about the arguments for gender equality

Facilitator notes:
The next step in the training is to facilitate a discussion between participants about how they will make construct a case for gender equality in their own organisation.

We posed the following questions:
1. Which argument for gender equality is most important to you?
2. How will you make the argument in your organisation?
3. What actions do you need to take as part of Slovenia’s ERA Roadmap?

The third question will not be relevant in all countries, therefore you will want to consider whether the participants in the training do have any existing obligations to contribute to gender equality? If they do, then this training could help them to prepare for this work.
During the pilot training sessions it was at times difficult to encourage discussion between participants. The fact that English was the delivery language may have contributed to this, and so you may wish to consider how you will encourage discussions during the training. For example, you may wish to divide participants into smaller groups and designate individuals to lead the discussion.

In this next section we are going to explore the reasons why we continue to face gender equality challenges. We are going to explore why there are not more women in senior leadership positions, and what we can do about it. We will look at both the overt discrimination that happens in society, and the interesting, challenging and important area of unconscious bias.

Slide 26: key definitions in relation to sex and gender

Facilitator notes:
Before we go further with our presentation we think it will be useful to look at a couple of important definitions and distinctions in relation to sex and gender. We don’t have time to go into this in much depth, but we will give a brief overview of this complex area.

Sex and gender are not the same. In the English language we have different words for these concepts (although people still regularly confuse the meanings). Today we are focusing on the concept of gender equality, but an understanding of these 2 definitions will facilitate understanding of some of the examples we will be using.

**Sex:** refers to the biologically defined characteristics of men and women. There are a number of indicators of biological sex: chromosomes, internal reproductive organs etc.
Gender: refers to the social construction of women and men. This varies in time and place, and between cultures.

Suggestion for facilitator:
As facilitator you may wish to discuss with participants understanding of these 2 terms, in particular in relation to the language spoken by participants. You may also wish to create additional PowerPoint slides/content that examines some of the key concepts in the field of gender studies in order to deepen participants’ learning. This will depend on the audience and the amount of time available.

Slide 27: exploring gender bias

Facilitator notes:
Start by presenting the data included on the PowerPoint slide:
1970: only 5 % of musicians performing in the top 5 orchestras in the USA were women
It took until 1997 for the Vienna Philharmonic Orchestra to admit its first woman member.

Then ask participants to shout out reasons why this might have been the case. Encourage them to suggest any possible reason, even if they don’t think it’s politically correct!

To prompt discussion, here are some possible reasons people might give for the absence of women from orchestras:
Men are better musicians than women
Women did not apply to be members of the orchestra
Women are not ambitious enough in the music world
Facilitator notes:
Following on from the discussion about the possible reasons why there were so few women members of the world’s top orchestras, note that today women constitute 35% of the most acclaimed orchestras. While there is still progress to be made if parity is to be reached this certainly represents progress on the 1970 figure of 5%.

Explain that a key reason behind this change is the introduction of blind auditions. Note that the Boston Symphony Orchestra was the first to adopt this practice and that this raised the likelihood of women progressing through the competitive selection process by 50%.

This example indicates that prior to blind auditions the assessors were making assumptions – either consciously or unconsciously – about individuals’ because of their gender. In short, they didn’t fairly assess individuals based upon their performance alone.

If people wish to read more about this case and related concepts, then suggest they consult Iris Bohnet’s book, “What works: gender equality by design.”
http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674089037
Facilitator notes:

Following on from the musical example explain that you are now going to share an example which is more directly related to higher education and research.

**How was the study conducted?** Staff in science faculties in US colleges were asked to rate the application of a student for a position as a laboratory manager. The same application was used 127 times and randomly assigned either a female (64 times) or male (63 times) name.

**What did the research find?** Staff in a science faculty rated male applicants for a laboratory manager role as more competent than equally qualified female candidates. They also chose a higher starting salary for male candidates.

Slide 30: discussion around bias
Facilitator notes:
This slide enables you to engage in discussion about how unconscious bias may impact on the recruitment process building on the academic study introduced in the previous slide.

Ask participants to discuss and share reasons why male applicants were more successful than the equally qualified female applicants.

You may wish to use the following prompts to encourage discussion:

Do you think people purposefully choose one gender over the other? Why does this happen?

Have you seen this happen during recruitment?

Is there a possibility that the people involved in the recruitment were not aware of their preference for one gender over the other?

The next PowerPoint slide will provide answers to these questions.

Slide 31: explanation of how bias may influence recruitment

Facilitator notes:
This PowerPoint slide builds on the previous 2 slides. Some of the reasons listed on the slide may have emerged during the discussion. Talk through 3 possible reasons, building on points highlighted during the discussion:

Staff in science faculties have been consciously biased and deliberately chose the male candidate because they wanted a man;

Staff in science faculties have been using policies and procedures that are structurally biased in favour of male candidates;
Staff in science faculties have been biased, but they were unaware they were doing it.

Then explain that in this particular study (Moss-Racusin et al, 2012) the researchers concluded that unconscious bias was the cause - staff in the study associated scientist with male, and therefore were more open to seeing the positives in the male applications. Despite their conscious brain knowing that women can be, and are, scientists, their unconscious brain was still making stereotypical associations which impacted on their interpretation of the CV.

Furthermore, the research found that a person does not have to endorse a stereotype to still be affected by it. For example, recent research found that female academics in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medicine departments were just as likely to discriminate against female candidates for employment as their male colleagues (Moss-Racusin et al, 2012).

This is an example of how unconscious bias can influence our decisions. Let us go onto explore this very interesting field of psychology in more detail.

If participants want to know more about the research cited here, you can draw their attention to Equality Challenge Unit’s literature review on unconscious bias. This is a helpful introduction to this important topic: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/unconscious-bias-and-higher-education.pdf

Slide 32: what is unconscious bias?

Facilitator notes:
In order to vary the content of the training seminar we chose to show an animated video developed by the Royal Society (the UK’s national academy of science) to explain the complex area of unconscious bias. This video can be found on YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVp9Z5k0dEE
We highly recommend that you enable subtitles in YouTube when you show the video to aid comprehension.

**Discussion points:**
What is your reaction to this video from the Royal Society?
Have you seen unconscious bias play a role in decision-making?

**Definition of unconscious bias:**
Following discussion, provide the following definition of unconscious bias:
Unconscious bias refers to a bias of which we are not in conscious control. It is a bias that happens automatically and is triggered by our brain making quick judgments and assessments of people and situations, influenced by our:
- Background
- Cultural environment
- Personal experiences

Unconscious bias has an impact on behaviour and decisions. Our unconscious thoughts often happen instantly and quicker than our conscious thoughts, they can still prevail even after our conscious thoughts have had a chance to catch up. The way we perceive people can continue to be based on those assumptions and stereotypes which we unconsciously associate with them.

In an academic setting, our unconscious biases can have a significant influence in a variety of situations, for example:

**In relation to staff:**
- Who we listen to most intently
- Who we disregard most easily
- How good we think someone is at their job and/or how good we think someone would be at a job for which they are applying
- How encouraging or discouraging our body language is towards different people

**In relation to students:**
- How suitable we think a student is for a particular course
- How well we think a student will perform on a course
- How much effort we perceive a student to be making
- The reasons we assign to students who are performing particularly well and/or who appear to be struggling

Explain that in the next few slides you will be exploring some of the key aspects of unconscious bias:
- In-groups and out-groups
- Confirmation bias
- Stereotype threat


Slide 33: In-groups and out-groups

Facilitator notes:

Note that in-groups and out-groups were mentioned in the Royal Society video.

One function of our brain is to rapidly categorise things and people in order to understand and interpret them quickly and efficiently. However that apparent efficiency can lead to mistakes. Our brain makes assumption based on the limited information we have about a person.

We process a person's ethnicity, gender, age and disability before we even know we've done it. At the same time we also link that person to all the supposed 'knowledge' we have of the category with which have labelled them. The stereotypes and societal assumptions and personal experiences that have framed the category become linked to the individual.

As well as categorising other people we also place ourselves within certain groups and categories.
'The term in-group means a group to which someone belongs, and the term out-group means a group to which someone does not belong. This difference in affiliation has profound and robust effects on people's evaluations of members of the different groups. In-groups appear to have an inherent, and automatic, positivity associated with them, whereas out-groups have an inherent negativity. In other words, people appear to think of their own group in positive terms and of the other group in negative terms, at even preconscious levels (i.e., without even realizing it).’

(Crisp and Nicel, 2004: p247)

We all have natural tendencies towards some people over others. They can be based on many things which may change over the course of our lives and vary depending on where we are, who we are with and what we are doing. Factors of influence might be:

- shared interests and hobbies (for example, sport, music, gardening)
- similar lifestyle (for example, having children, caring responsibilities or pets)
- physical characteristics (for example, age, gender, race)
- similar background (for example, being from the same place, having a similar family background, having studied at the same institution)

Our in-groups are people who we feel safe with and towards whom we have unconsciously warm feelings. Our out-groups are people towards whom we feel less safe and who we can be distrustful and even dismissive or disdainful towards, without even realising.

**Impact on behaviour and decisions**

If we naturally feel warmer towards our in-group members and more cautious towards our out-groups it can impact on our behaviour in various situations. For example:

- Our body language towards different candidates in job/admissions interviews
- Who we sit next to in meetings and at conferences
- Which students we encourage and focus attention on
- Who we listen to more readily and whose judgement we value most highly
- Who we make time for and who we show an interest in
Slide 34: Confirmation bias

Facilitator notes:
You are going to use another YouTube video to explain how confirmation bias happens. It is called the “Monkey business illusion.”

The instructions for participants are included within the video.
You can find the video here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IGQmdoK_ZfY

Confirmation bias means that we will only perceive the information or actions that we expect to see. We receive 11 million bits of information every moment and we can only consciously process 40 bits of it. This means that our unconscious brain steps in – and it screens out things that do not confirm to our stereotype/bias of what we expect.

How does confirmation bias happen?
You meet someone and unconsciously categorise them

The stereotypes and societal norms linked to those categories are linked to that individual

You are more likely to notice and remember their behaviour which is in keeping with the categories into which you have placed them – thereby reinforcing your opinion of them in that category. You are proving yourself to be correct.

You are less likely to notice and remember their behaviour which does not fit within the category
Impact on decision making and behaviour

There is potential for unconscious biases to impact on how we perceive others’ ability and how we remember the work they have undertaken and what they have accomplished. For example:

**Staff**

- Who we talk about as being particularly good/bad at their job
- Who we give credit/blame to
- Who is encouraged/discouraged to apply for promotion
- Who is trusted with the most high-profile work and work opportunities
- Who receives good/bad appraisals

**Students**

- How good/bad aspects of a students’ performance are noticed and remembered
- The marks students are awarded depending on how forgivingly mistakes are looked upon or not
- Which students are encouraged to pursue further study.

**Slide 35: Stereotype threat**

Facilitator notes:

Introduce the study: “Stereotype Threat Among Schoolgirls in Quasi-Ordinary Classroom Circumstances” by Pascal Huguet (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and Aix-Marseille University) and Isabelle Régner (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and University Toulouse-Le-Mirail).

**Explain what girls and boys were asked to do:**

“The children were met individually by a same-gender experimenter in one of their regular classrooms. They were informed that (a) they had been chosen...”
at random among a larger sample; (b) the session would include a “geometry test” (for half of them) versus a “memory game” (for the other half) on which they might do well or poorly, followed by a brief questionnaire; and (c) their data would be kept confidential (they were told not to write their names on the answer sheet or questionnaire). The participants were told that the task they would be given might help develop a new geometry test for a textbook (geometry condition) versus a new game for a fun magazine (memory game condition). Although they were given the opportunity to not participate if they so desired, all students chose to continue with the session. Within each gender, students were assigned at random to one of the two conditions (geometry vs. memory game). They were systematically and explicitly asked to take the test (or game) very seriously and to put in as much effort as they could. After answering any questions, the experimenter asked the student to get ready for the first part of the test or game (figure encoding), put the figure on the student’s desk, and left the room for exactly 50 s. He or she then returned to the room, took the figure, and gave the student a pencil and a sheet of paper for the second part (figure reproduction from memory). Then the experimenter left the room again and allowed 5 min for reproducing the figure (which was sufficient, as a pretest had indicated)."

Slide 36: result of stereotype threat

Facilitator notes:
Provide the findings of the research explained on the previous slide.

Findings of the research: Whereas girls underperformed relative to boys in the geometry condition, they outperformed them in the memory game condition. Despite being provided with exactly the same task, girls under-performed in the area where there is a stereotype of girls being less competent.
**Stereotype threat**: Being/feeling at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group.

Stereotype threat may lead to:
- Poorer performance in assessments
- Poorer performance in other tasks
- Increase in behaviour consistent with stereotype
- Distancing from stereotyped group
- Acceptance of poor performance/distancing from the task
- Redirection of aspirations and career paths

**Slide 37: summarising unconscious bias input**

Facilitator notes:

**In groups and out groups** were already mentioned in the Royal Society video, where our brains quickly categorise people into groups & and this can be because of gender, age, hobbies, family background and so on, and we then very quickly decide if they are in our group or not.

**Confirmation bias**: for example if we are constantly told that women aren’t good at mathematics, when a woman doesn’t perform well in maths, we remember that, but we don’t remember when she does do well.

**Stereotype threat**: using the same example, if women are constantly told that they aren’t good at maths, research evidence shows they do worse in maths tests than they actually can do.

**All this can result in micro-behaviours**: small, almost unnoticeable behaviours such as paying a little less attention to what the other person says, addressing them less warmly or talking less to them. Or going back to the Royal Society video, the example there was that men are more likely to be listened too. Another
example that is commonly cited in terms of gender, is that women are assumed to be in a more junior position (e.g. the secretary) – so they may be asked to get the coffee etc. Repeated behaviour like that make people question their worth and their role.

**Handout:** because unconscious bias is a relatively complex area, we provided seminar participants with a handout with key information about unconscious bias that they could read after the seminar. This is included within this training pack: please see Appendix A.

**Slide 38: discussion about unconscious bias**

![Unconscious bias and academic recruitment](image)

**Facilitator notes:**
Following on from the information about unconscious bias, encourage participants to discuss the impact that it could be having on recruitment with in their own organisation.

**Task:** Think about the example of recruitment for a new Head of Department.

The current Head of Department is a man in his 60s.

How could in groups/out groups influence the decision?

How could confirmation bias influence the decision?

**Slides 39 & 40: pictures of leaders**
The next 2 slides contained pictures of all the university rectors and heads of research institutes for the relevant country. We recommend you create slides for the country you are working in. Depending on the size of country you may want to adopt a different approach.
When we presented the slides in Cyprus and Slovenia during the training pilot, we asked participants to consider the following questions and points:

Do they think that any of the previous discussions have impacted on the make-up of their rectors?

Are there ways we can mitigate this?

Note the value of acknowledging that each of us holds stereotypical images of what a leader looks like. What we need to do is note this stereotype and not let it influence who we consider is the right person for a role.

Here are the slides we used in Cyprus:

![Rectors of Cyprus](image1.png)

![Heads of Research Centres](image2.png)
Slide 41: tackling unconscious bias

Facilitator notes:
To conclude the section on unconscious bias provide some guidance to research participants about what they can to tackle unconscious bias.

Accept we are all biased

Ensure transparency in decision-making: for example having standard processes in place, making sure there is clear scoring criteria for promotions and a paper trail

Challenge stereotypes and use counter-stereotypical information – for ourselves and others, for example when you pick up a negative issue with a researcher, try and remember other times when they have done something similar in a positive way

Change perception and relationship with out-group members – for example, sitting next to someone you normally wouldn’t at a conference and have a conversation

challege others when you think they are showing unconscious bias, for example in the UK, some peer review evaluation panels have an unconscious bias observer, to pick up points when bias has been shown

Slow down decision making – the faster we make decisions, the more likely we are to revert to bias
Slide 42: conscious bias

Conscious bias

- This can also be called direct discrimination
- This is when a decision is taken to exclude someone because they are a woman
- Example: decision not to employ a young woman researcher because you are worried that they might decide to have children
- It is important to ensure that policies are in place so that this kind of discrimination does not happen

Facilitator notes:
While the study of unconscious bias enables us to tackle some of the reasons why women struggle to advance to senior levels within higher education and research, it is important that we do not forget that conscious bias is still a problem.

An example is consciously not recruiting a young woman researcher because one thinks that they might decide to have a family and that this will have a negative impact on a research project.

Many institutions will feel confident that they have actions in place to eradicate conscious discrimination but worth checking whether this is the case – and if so how do you know they are work.

Slide 43: structural sexism

Institutional sexism

- Definition: having institutional policies that restrict the opportunities for one sex as compared with the other sex.
- It is often so deeply ingrained that it is hard to identify.
- It can become an organisational norm or expectation
- Can include indirect discrimination – where for example a policy which looks neutral is not neutral in practice
Facilitator notes:

What is structural/institutional sexism?

Reflected in organisational cultures. i.e. ‘the way we do things round here’, including the use of authority and discretion

Reflected in ways of describing ‘normality’, e.g. long working hours, culture/expectations.

Results in patterns: incidents of discrimination may appear isolated or random but are part of a wider pattern of events which often may be hidden. Patterns of discrimination can often be surfaced by effective organisational information relating to social identity.

Provide some examples of structural sexism, and ask participants to think of their own:

Women are given more responsibility for teaching because it is a ‘norm’ that women are better at teaching and supporting students (while men are given more time to focus on research), but teaching is not considered in promotions.

Banter – for example making sexist jokes about women because that is the ‘culture’ of the work environment.

Institutions not tackling sexual harassment, because it is just “harmless banter” or because the perpetrator is a senior academic.

Slide 44: challenging structural sexism

Example: Research Excellence (UK)

- 2008 policy: to be considered, all staff must submit 4 peer-reviewed research outputs
- 2008: 67% of eligible male staff selected in comparison to 48% of women
- 2014 policy: consider individual circumstances and reduction in number of outputs
- 2014: 67% of eligible male staff selected in comparison to 51% of women
Facilitator notes:
We used an example from the UK – the Research Excellence Framework. You may find it useful to find another example which is more relevant to your audience.

In the UK, research excellence is assessed every 6 years. The assessment is a peer-review process and affects how much money universities get for research. Staff have to be selected to be assessed and it’s considered prestigious to be selected, as it affects career progression. Each researcher gets 1* to 4* and their score affects the university’s score.

In 2008, every selected researcher had to have 4 research output, produced over the previous 5 years, or face a penalty of a lower score. More eligible men were selected than women.

In 2014, realising that there were issues with this, researchers could be selected and put forward an individual circumstance – so for example if a woman had a period of maternity leave, she could be entered with 3 outputs (and no penalty). The also applied for men who for example took a period of extended leave to care for their children. This is an example of changing structural sexism.

Slide 45: discussion

Facilitator notes:
Provide participants with the opportunity to discuss the conscious bias, discrimination and institutional sexism that they have seen impact negatively on gender equality in their own work. Encourage them to discuss possible responses.
Slide 46: introduction to section 4 which will focus on ways to advance gender equality

Facilitator notes:
Explain that following our discussion of all the problems that exist in terms of gender equality, that we are now going to move on to some solutions. Encourage participants to also provide their own examples, and to consider what they are going to do upon returning to their own institution.

Slide 47: conceptual framework for change

Facilitator notes:
Regarding gender equality, the focus has been on three areas of change intervention - fix the women, fix the organisation and fix the knowledge (Schiebinger, 1999):
- Fix the women - enhancing women’s confidence and self-esteem, empowerment, capacity-building, encouraging women to be more competitive, assertive and risk-taking.

- Fix the organisation - gender mainstreaming, institutional transformation e.g. gender equality policies, processes and practices, challenging discriminatory structures, gender impact assessments, audits and reviews, introducing work/life balance schemes including flexible working.

- Fix the knowledge – identifying bias, the introduction of gender as a category of analysis research.

Morley (2013) believes that approaches that focus on one area, such as fixing the women without addressing organisational cultures that reproduce inequality, can be fundamentally flawed.

Gender scholars have argued that rather than conceptualising the problem in terms of women’s missing agency, the organisations themselves require transformation (Cockburn, 1991; Ely and Meyerson, 2000). Cockburn (1991:12) contrasted the “short agenda” e.g. individual women’s achievement, with the “longer agenda” e.g. an engagement with gender and power. It is my view that a policy mix of interventions is required (Wroblewski and Leitner, 2011).

What we want to focus on in this session is changing the organisation or how we can change the structures in research organisation so that they advance gender equality. Because as leaders, this is where you can have impact.

We believe there is a 3 part approach to structural change:

- Change processes
- Change criteria
- Change practices

In the next few slides we will examine each of these in turn.
Facilitator notes:
Encourage participants to consider what changing processes to advance gender equality would look like in their institution. What processes could they change to enable women to advance to leadership positions?

Provide example to encourage discussion: Annual consideration of all staff for promotion (rather than seeking applications).

Facilitator notes:
Encourage participants to consider what changing criteria to advance gender equality would look like in their institution. What processes could they change to enable women to advance to leadership positions?
Provide example to encourage discussion: Considering what is really needed in promotions: 5 years of publications, or just a range of excellent publications.

Slide 50: what might change look like (part 3)?

Facilitator notes:
Encourage participants to consider what changing practices to advance gender equality would look like in their institution. What processes could they change to enable women to advance to leadership positions?

Provide example to encourage discussion: Introduce a flexible working hours policy for all members of staff (not just those with children).

Providing examples of structural change:

During the training in Cyprus and Slovenia we then provided local examples of structural change projects. We also included an example from the UK – Athena SWAN. When preparing the training we recommend you approach academic institutions or departments that you know are doing positive work to advance gender equality in order to provide practical and meaningful examples.

We have included 2 examples as suggestions:
Athena SWAN from the UK;
INTEGER project example of Šiauliai University.
Facilitator notes:
Athena SWAN is a peer-review award scheme for gender equality in higher education and research in the UK, Ireland and Australia. It is owned and managed by ECU.

Athena SWAN is about:
- Creation of a qualitative and quantitative evidence base in order to understand the experiences of women and men;
- Engaged leadership;
- Development of management practices that recognise/mitigate/overcome barriers to gender equality.

How does the process work?

1. Collect data (quantitative and qualitative)
   - Profile of men and women at different grades
   - Data on what staff actually think of their work environment

2. Critically analyse data

3. Identify reasons for exclusion and under-representation

4. Develop a 4 year action plan to address these

5. Show progress over time

Encourage participants to consider how they could use a similar methodology in the creation of their gender action plans.

Participants can find out more about Athena SWAN here: [http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/](http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/)
Facilitator notes:
Example of how a university department in the UK changed its processes in order to improve the promotions process.

Facilitator notes:
In 2010 no women were elect to the Council of Šiauliai University in Lithuania. As part of the INTEGER project, the university undertook work to ensure that in 2014 at least 25% of Council were women.

As you can see from this slide, in 2014 they were successful and 36% of Council were women.

How did they achieve this? The next PowerPoint slide will provide this information.
Facilitator notes:
There is a video providing comprehensive information about what the university did that you may wish to show to participants (depending how much time you have available):


If your time is limited, you may simply wish to provide a summary of some of their actions:
Detailed analysis of the current regulations related to the Council election; Recruitment and support of women candidates; Design of individual election campaigns; support with publicity and communication.

Slide 55: Final discussion

Activity/discussion
• Based on the examples, what action could you implement, and why those actions?
• If you could only take away one action, what would you do?
• Do you have any questions for us?
Facilitator notes:
The training seminar is now drawing to an end. During the pilot seminars in Slovenia and Cyprus we had an informal discussion with participants about what they plan to do next as a result of participating in the seminar. Depending on your audience and local context, you may wish to ask participants to start creating an action plan for how they will work on gender equality strategically in their institution.

Slide 56: Closing slide/more information

More information

- GENDER-NET project: http://www.gender-net.eu/
- Equality Challenge Unit: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/
APPENDIX: HANDOUT ON UNCONSCIOUS BIAS

This information can be printed out in advance of the meeting and provided to participants. Since there is not a long time to discuss the field of unconscious bias, this will enable them to consider the topic more deeply following the training.

Components of unconscious bias

Unconscious bias refers to a bias that we are unaware of, which happens outside of our control. It is a bias that happens automatically and is triggered by our brain making quick judgments and assessments of people and situations, influenced by our background, cultural environment and personal experiences. (ECU: 2013 Unconscious bias in higher education). There are several ways in which unconscious bias can impact on our behaviours:

1. In-groups and out-groups

One function of our brain is to rapidly categorise things and people in order to understand and interpret them quickly and efficiently. However that apparent efficiency can lead to mistakes. Our brain makes assumption based on the limited information we have about a person.

We process a person's ethnicity, gender, age and disability before we even know we've done it. At the same time we also link that person to all the supposed 'knowledge' we have of the category with which have labelled them. The stereotypes and societal assumptions and personal experiences that have framed the category become linked to the individual.

As well as categorising other people we also place ourselves within certain groups and categories.

‘The term in-group means a group to which someone belongs, and the term out-group means a group to which someone does not belong. This difference in affiliation has profound and robust effects on people’s evaluations of members of the different groups. In-groups appear to have an inherent, and automatic, positivity associated with them, whereas out-groups have an inherent negativity. In other words, people appear to think of their own group in positive terms and of the other group in negative terms, at even preconscious levels (ie without even realizing it).’

(Crisp and Nicel, 2004: p247)

We all have natural tendencies towards some people over others. They can be based on many things which may change over the course of our lives and vary depending on where we are, who we are with and what we are doing. Factors of influence might be:

- shared interests and hobbies (for example, sport, music, gardening)
- similar lifestyle (for example, having children, caring responsibilities or pets)
- physical characteristics (for example, age, gender, race)
- similar background (for example, being from the same place, having a similar family background, having studied at the same institution)

Our in-groups are people who we feel safe with and towards whom we have unconsciously warm feelings. Our out-groups are people towards whom we feel less safe and who we can be distrustful and even dismissive or disdainful towards, without even realising.

If we naturally feel warmer towards our in-group members and more cautious towards our out-groups it can impact on our behaviour in various situations. For example:
- Our body language towards different candidates in job/promotion interviews
- Who we sit next to in meetings and at conferences
- Which researchers we choose to collaborate with
- Who we listen to more readily and whose judgement we value most highly
- Who we make time for and who we show an interest in

2. Confirmation bias

People have a natural tendency to be selective in the evidence we listen to and the evidence we disregard. We do this through the way we:
- Search for information
- Interpret information
- Remembering/recalling information

We prefer information which confirms what we know and believe and are more likely to overlook information which challenges or contradicts (see for example Snyder, M., & Swann, W. B., 1978, Hypothesis-testing processes in social interaction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 1202–1212).
Confirmation bias in the way we view people

You meet someone and unconsciously categorise them

The stereotypes and societal norms linked to those categories are linked to that individual

You are more likely to notice and remember their behaviour which is in keeping with the categories into which you have placed them – thereby reinforcing your opinion of them in that category. You are proving yourself to be correct.

You are less likely to notice and remember their behaviour which does not fit within the category

3. Stereotype threat

The following is taken from the website www.reducingstereotyphemthreat.org, a resource which was created by social psychologists from Barnard College, Columbia University.

Stereotype threat refers to being at risk of confirming, as self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s group. This term was first used by Steele and Aronson (1995) who showed in several experiments that Black college freshmen and sophomores performed more poorly on standardised tests than White students when their race was emphasized. When race was not emphasized, however, Black students performed better and equivalently with White students. The results showed that performance in academic contexts can be harmed by the awareness that one’s behaviour might be viewed through the lens of racial stereotypes.

Since Steele and Aronson’s paper, there has been extensive research into stereotype threat:

- Research has shown that stereotype threat can harm the academic performance of any individual for whom the situation invokes a stereotype-based expectation of poor performance. For example, stereotype threat has been shown to harm the academic performance of students from low socio-economic backgrounds (Croizet & Claire, 1998), females in mathematics (Good, Aronson, & Harder, 2008; Inzlicht & Ben-Zeev, 2000), and even white males when faced with the spectre of Asian superiority in mathematics (Aronson, Lustina, Good, Keogh, Steele, & Brown, 1999).
There can be long term consequences, for example consistent exposure to stereotype threat (e.g., faced by women in mathematics) can reduce the degree that individuals value the domain in question (Aronson, et al. 2002; Osborne, 1995; Steele, 1997). In education, it can also lead students to choose not to pursue the domain of study and, consequently, limit the range of professions that they can pursue. Therefore, the long-term effects of stereotype threat might contribute to educational and social inequality (Good et al., 2008a; Schmader, Johns, & Barquissau, 2004).

Researchers have also focussed on how to reduce negative effect of stereotype threat. Methods range from in-depth interventions to teach students about the malleable nature of intelligence (e.g., Aronson, Fried, & Good, 2002) to simple changes in classroom practices that can be easily implemented by the instructor, such as ensuring gender-fair testing (Good, Aronson, & Harder, 2008; Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999).

Some examples of stereotype threat and gender include:

- Women perform worse on maths tests when they think the test will produce gender differences. (Spencer, Steele, & Quinn, 1999)
- Female chess players perform worse than male chess players when they are aware that they are playing against a male opponent. When they are (falsely) led to believe that they are playing against another woman, they perform just as well as the male players. (Maass, D’Etolle, & Cadinu, 2008)

4. Micro-behaviours

Unconscious bias can impact our behaviours and one way this can happen is through micro-behaviours.

- Unconscious bias operates at a very subtle level, below our awareness. It results in almost unnoticeable behaviours (micro-behaviours), such as paying a little less attention to what the other person says, addressing them less warmly or talking less to them.
- We tend to be less empathetic towards people who are not like us. These behaviours are small and may not be picked up as discriminatory or even consciously by the person on the receiving end - but their long-term effect can be corrosive of confidence and self-esteem and may lead to defensive or even aggressive behaviour.
- Unconscious beliefs and attitudes have been found to be associated with language and certain behaviours, such as eye contact, blinking rates and smiles.
- A person who belongs to a certain group (e.g. women) can anticipate the negative impact of micro-behaviours.
Studies have found that when female students are reminded that women are considered less good than men at maths, their performance worsens.

And in science, technology and engineering contexts, the unconscious bias about performance can affect women interviewers and examiners as well as men.

For ideas about how to provide positive signals to everyone that you interact with professionally, see: https://www.skillboostersvideo.com/downloads/top-5-positive-micro-behaviours/

For additional resources on Unconscious Bias, you can also consult the upcoming Practical Guide to Improving Gender Equality in Research Organisations developed by the Working Group on Gender & Diversity from Science Europe (http://www.scienceeurope.org/policy/working-groups/gender-diversity), to which several GENDER-NET Partners have been contributing, including CNRS4.

---

4 Update: the Science Europe Practical Guide was released in February 2017 and is available here: http://scieur.org/gender-guide
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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