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Executive summary

This document presents a framework for a joint transnational award scheme to promote both structural change for gender equality and the integration of gender analysis into research content (IGAR). The document is structured into four main different sections:

General Introduction: this section describes the context within the GENDER-NET project for the development of the framework, its methodology and target audience.

Rationale and Principles: the second section is dedicated to the rationale and principles of the proposed award scheme, describing both the importance of gender equality in structural change and in the integration of the gender analysis into research. This section also presents the set of principles: the scheme will recognise and reward those institutions which demonstrate a firm commitment to addressing structural barriers to gender equality in research and on IGAR, through rigorous analysis and the implementation of policies and practices within their own institutions. The proposed principles have been adapted from the Athena SWAN charter award.

Structure and Categories: the third section presents the categories of the award, also for both schemes. These categories or levels of the proposed award scheme are bronze, silver and gold, depending on the level of development of the institutional change and integration of sex and gender analysis into research (IGAR) policies and actions. Also criteria for both schemes are described to guide Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) and Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) to advance institutional change and IGAR.

Processes and Procedures: the last section is dedicated to the operational framework in terms of the ownership and management, and the evaluation instruments.
Introduction

A framework for a joint transnational award scheme to promote both structural change for gender equality and the integration of gender analysis into research content (IGAR) is presented in this document. The document is structured into four main different sections. The first describes the context within the GENDER-NET project on the development of this document, its methodology and target audience. The second presents the rationale and principles of the proposed award scheme. The third presents the categories or levels of the proposed award scheme - bronze, silver and gold depending on the level of development of the institutional change and integration of sex and gender analysis into research (IGAR) policies and actions - and the criteria to guide Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) and Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) to advance institutional change and IGAR. The last section is dedicated to the operational framework in terms of the application process, ownership and management, and evaluation of applications.
1. GENDER-NET Background

This document has been developed as part of the GENDER-NET project (2013-2016): Promoting Gender Equality in Research Institutions and the Integration of the Gender Dimension in Research Contents.

GENDER-NET is an initiative funded by the European Commission under the Science in Society work programme of the seventh Framework Programme (FP7), 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.

GENDER-NET is the first European Research Area Network (ERA-NET) to be dedicated to the promotion of gender equality through structural change in research institutions, as well as to the integration of sex and gender analysis in research. It brings together a partnership of thirteen national programme owners from across Europe 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.

As stated in the Document of Work (DoW) for the GENDER-NET project, this report is part of work package 4 (WP4) which sets out to implement strategic joint activities and policies in two thematic areas:

1. Gendering equality in research institutions to increase the number of research organisations, universities and funding agencies developing and implementing initiatives

2. The integration of gender analysis in research contents and programmes

Particularly, task 3 aims to draw up and implement common criteria to establish a transnational award scheme or another instrument based on both WP2 (the impact of incentives/awards on structural change) and on WP3 (the gender dimension in research) This report is the final output from this task: a framework and methodology to set up a joint award scheme or alternative instrument.

This framework covers the above mentioned dimensions of gender equality:

a) addressing structural barriers to gender equality in research institutions and
b) the integration of the gender analysis in research (IGAR) contents and programmes.

Find more about the outcomes of the GENDER-NET Project from its webpage.
1.1 Methodology

As part of GENDER-NET (D2.7 Deliverable Report2), research was done into the impact of award schemes on structural change in research performing organisations. The report noted that ‘award schemes are an effective mean of driving and creating structural change’ and also made a number of recommendations about a possible joint award scheme framework. The recommendations are based heavily on the Athena SWAN charter award and included:

- guiding principles, rooted in the specific issues that exist across Europe in terms of gender equality in research careers
- continuous progression: merit based levels of award, stringent renewal process, requirements to progress
- academic lead involvement
- requirement for comprehensive gender disaggregated quantitative data, together with qualitative data concerning experiences and barriers
- in consideration of promoting excellence through diversity, requiring data with attention to other equality characteristics, where permitted within national legislative contexts
- a requirement for top-level support
- a flexible self-assessment of management practices and the work environment, that strikes a balance between recognising the unique context of each institution/discipline, and providing measures which rescribe some expectations around good practice
- inclusion that the extent of recognition of academics’ work on the award scheme in the workload model or equivalent
- a requirement of action planning based on the self-assessment, and a monitoring of progress and impact
- a requirement to publish action plans
- assessment by peer review

The report also recommended that IGAR be considered in the proposed framework and that further consideration be given into whether the proposed award scheme should be targeted at RFOs.

Following the D2.7 report, there was a workshop (WP4 task 3, Milestone MS12) on award schemes and their impact on structural change and on IGAR - “Workshop on gender Award/incentive planning” (Cyprus, September 2015).

During this workshop, project partners as well as observers and invited experts analysed the impact of awards and incentives on both structural change to promote gender equality, and the integration of the gender dimension in research contents, with the aim of making recommendations to develop a framework for a joint award or a similar instrument. Within this workshop there were two presentations: the first was about the structure of the Athena SWAN charter award and the second about the HR Excellence in Research award. Both presentations highlighted the lessons learnt from implementing award schemes. The workshop also explored where there should be awards for both RFOs and RPOs, focussed on two areas:

- **a)** promoting structural change for gender equality
- **b)** promoting the gendering of research content and in the curriculum

The discussions clearly identified that it would be easier to design and promote an award for RPOs covering both of the above two areas.

With regard to an award for RFOs on promoting structural change for gender equality in the institutions they fund, there was consensus that such an award would not be the best instrument. It was agreed that RFOs should consider how they better promote gender equality in employment (within the RFO itself), and within their internal structures (such as gender balance in decision-making committees). But this was considered as outside the scope of the GENDER-NET project, and there are others (like Science Europe) who are exploring this area. What was recommended to be more impactful is for RFOs to make a link to a gender equality award instead. There was also initial scepticism in terms of an award for RFOs on IGAR, but it was eventually agreed that it would be beneficial to develop a framework award scheme on IGAR for RFOs. Additionally it was considered that it would be pioneering to integrate IGAR into the award as this has not been done before.

The current Athena SWAN charter award was discussed to be a suitable example in terms of framework and methodology, considering specially its focus on progress and its experience.

One recommendation of the D2.7 report was that there should be consideration of extending existing successful award schemes Europe-wide to maximise impact. Seeing that many of the recommendations draw heavily from the Athena SWAN charter award, there should be consideration to exploring extending the Athena SWAN charter award beyond its current operation in the UK, Ireland and Australia. Indeed, Athena SWAN is cited as a positive example of an award scheme by the July 2016 Bratislava Declaration of Young Researchers.
An alternative, as recommended by GENDER-NET MS12 workshop, is that if a joint award is created, it should be paired with a nationally implemented award scheme (to create equivalency). This would best allow for national context to be taken into consideration.

The Athena SWAN charter award, the HR Excellence in Research award and the report of the Working Group of the Steering Group of Human Resources Management (SGHRM) under the ERA on *Open, Transparent and Merit-based Recruitment of Researchers* were analysed as a starting point for this report.

This document therefore lays out a framework for a joint award on:

a) promoting structural change for gender equality (for RPOs only)

b) promoting the gendering of research content and of the curriculum (for both RPOs and RFOs)

1.2 Target audience

- **Target audience for the structural change scheme**: this framework is designed to encourage and support RPOs, including Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to actively put in place actions that will create structural change in order to embed gender equality across European institutions. The application for the scheme will be at both institutional and departmental level.

- **Target audience for the IGAR scheme**: this framework is designed to encourage and support Research Funding Organisations (RFOs), Research Performing Organisations (RPOs), including Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), in their drive to pursue excellent research through the promotion of the integration of the gender analysis into research content, at European level. The application for this scheme will only be at institutional level.
2. **Rationale and principles of this award framework**

The overall objective of this joint transnational award is to support at European level, a) the promotion of structural change in research institutions and b) the promotion of IGAR, from the design and implementation of scientific policies, to the production of science conducted by researchers and applied to the whole society.

The award is a tool that will help institutions to implement a set of principles on structural change and IGAR; it will also provide transparency in the access to public information regarding what research is been conducted and how it is conducted. It is based on the own institution commitment to improvement through conducting internal self-assessment and continuous upgrading processes.

### 2.1 Rationale

#### 2.1.1 The importance of structural change

It is recognised that over the last decade, the policy approach on gender equality in research has shifted in general from “fixing the women” to “fixing the institutions”. Experience shows that research institutions are deeply rooted in structures that are not easily “fixed” and thus there needs to be an emphasis on structural change in order to advance gender equality.

Structural change is defined as a change in institutions in terms of the representation and retention of women at all levels of their research careers. The pre-conditions for and essential elements of structural change are:

- the creation of an evidence base, e.g. through sex-disaggregated data on recruitment, retention, promotion, pay, and committee representation; gender impact assessments; and staff surveys
- the augmentation of top-level support
- the development of management practices that recognise and aim to mitigate or overcome gender barriers

Structural change thus means:

- making decision-making practices more transparent
- removing unconscious bias from institutional practices
- promoting excellence through diversity
- improving research by integrating a gender perspective (IGAR)
- modernising human resources management and the working environment

---

3 Drawn from: European Commission (2012a) Structural change in research institutions: enhancing excellence, gender equality and efficiency in research and innovation. European Commission, Brussels
2.1.2 The importance of IGAR

The importance of IGAR has already been highlighted in previous GENDER-NET work, among others. As stated in a previous report from this project, *Manuals with guidelines on the integration of sex and gender analysis into research contents, recommendations for curricula development and indicators (GENDER-NET D3.11 report)*:

Still today, the way scientific knowledge is produced, applied and translated to the society is not free from the global and structural system that produces gender inequalities based on organising men and women in hierarchical different roles. Gender-blind and gender-biased research methods produce poor science and miss opportunities, often based in gender stereotypes and the use of male/men as default generic model for all human beings. To tackle this problem, efforts are being made to raise awareness on gender biases and to show other ways of producing more inclusive science, responsive to the needs of everybody, by means of Integrating the Gender Analysis into Research (IGAR, also known as “incorporating the gender dimension into research content”).

The rationale is that the vast majority of research topics do involve human beings either directly or indirectly. That is, when humans are the object of research, IGAR is obviously relevant given the sex and gender differences in their bodies, behaviours, social constrains, etc. But even in cases when humans are not directly involved, for instance, in technological research, men and women (as users, customers, citizens, workers, etc.) can also be affected differently by the results of the study. The exception are few cases where the application of the results may not affect human beings (in)directly. Therefore, the use of sex/gender analysis methods is not only relevant for gender-specific research; it is also an essential quality factor for almost all the research and innovation challenges. IGAR is aimed at ensuring more rigorous, evidence-based and ethical research, applicable to the needs of men, women, and the society as a whole. Given these new standards in quality research, IGAR has been considered a mark of scientific excellence (…).

IGAR helps the STI community to move from gender-biased to gender-competent, gender-inclusive, and gender-transformative science. The sex/gender analysis research outputs can also provide to the society, policy makers, the media and other institutions with useful information and insights to estimate the impact of certain policies/measures and to stimulate the public debate questioning current norms and values in order to transform society into a more egalitarian one. This can also contribute to a better account on the social responsibility of the investments of Research Funding Organizations (RFOs) and Research Performing Organizations (RPOs), particularly in public institutions which are expected to show that public money is used for the benefit of the whole society which is diverse. It is important

---

to remind that IGAR covers the inclusion of both sex and gender analysis (not only gender)\(^5\).

The GENDER-NET D3.11 report presents as well the European normative framework European for education, research and innovation policies and programmes, where is clearly stressed the importance of integrating the gender dimension in research contents. An example of this is the Competitiveness Council Conclusions on advancing gender equality in the ERA of December 1st 2015 (14846/15) which reaffirm the Council’s “commitment to enhance gender equality in the ERA and recognises that the implementation of the ERA Roadmap and the priority on gender equality offers an excellent opportunity to translate national equality legislation into effective action to address gender imbalances in research institutions and decision making bodies and integrate the gender dimension better into R&I policies, programmes and projects” (as stated in the 29th May 2015 Council Conclusions).

This scheme will recognise and reward those institutions which demonstrate a firm commitment to addressing structural barriers to gender equality in research, through rigorous analysis and the implementation of policies and practices within their own institutions. The proposed principles have been adapted from the Athena SWAN charter award.

- We believe that European research and science can reach its full potential only when it can benefit from the talents of all.
- We believe that for gender equality to be advanced in research careers requires addressing the loss of women across the career pipeline and the absence of women from senior positions.
- We believe that obstacles faced by women must be removed, in particular, at major points of career development and progression including the transition from PhD into a sustainable research career.
- We believe that advancing gender equality demands commitment and action from all levels of the organisation and in particular active leadership from those in senior roles.
- We believe that there is a need to mainstream sustainable structural and cultural changes to promote gender equality, recognising that initiatives and actions that support individuals alone will not sufficiently advance equality.

\(^5\) In some projects mainly a sex analysis is relevant to the research problem, in some other cases, only a gender analysis is necessary (mainly in studies where biological differences do not play a role). And in other cases, both sex and gender interact in a particular study.
The endorsement of these award principles implies the firm commitment of the institution/department to its implementation and action at institutional/departmental level.

2.2.2 Principles of the IGAR scheme

This scheme will recognise and reward institutions which demonstrate a firm commitment to the promotion of IGAR, through the implementation of policies and practices within their own institutions, and through advocating for the principles below in other scientific fora through the exchange of best practices and experiences in the field of IGAR.

This IGAR scheme is based on the following set of principles:

- We believe that European research and science can reach its full potential only when it considers women’s, men’s and gender diverse people’s specific characteristics and needs
- We believe that rigorous and ethical science requires addressing gender biases and inequalities which affect the production of knowledge in order to pursue science for everyone which is relevant to the whole society
- We believe that social justice and excellent science requires the Integration of Gender Analysis into Research (IGAR), both in the funding and research cycles
- We believe that advancing IGAR demands commitment and action from all levels of the organisation and in particular active leadership from those in senior roles
- We commit to support and circulate IGAR recommendations and the evolving knowledge on how IGAR can benefit research

The endorsement of these award principles implies the firm commitment of the institutions to its implementation and action at institutional level.
3. Structure and criteria of the award

3.1 Structure and Categories

3.1.1 Categories of the structural change scheme (RPOs only)

Drawing from the Athena SWAN charter award, the proposed framework has three different categories – Bronze, Silver and Gold – as the award aims to recognise progression and advancement depending on the different starting point situations of different institutions and taking into account the different contexts (size, objectives, composition, etc.) of applicants.

**BRONZE**

To be given a Bronze award, the institution or department should show that the following actions are already being implemented:

- A rigorous assessment of where the institution/department is regarding gender equality, in quantitative (e.g. number of men and women at different grades) and qualitative (policies, practices, systems and arrangements) terms
- Identified challenges and opportunities to address issues of gender inequality
- An action plan that builds on the assessment showing what activities are already being conducted and what else is to be done

In addition, for a departmental award, the department must demonstrate how it is addressing gender equality and challenges particular to the department and discipline.

**SILVER**

In this category institutions/departments should show a substantial impact and advancement in promoting structural change to address gender inequality and in addressing those challenges arising. Applications are expected to concentrate on what has improved since the previous award application, and how the institution/department is acquiring and securing the accomplishments. To apply for a silver award, the institution/department must have previously been awarded with the bronze or silver award.

For an institutional award, the institution must show how it is addressing gender equality challenges across the range of different disciplines in that institution.

**GOLD**

For a gold award, in addition to the above for silver, the institution/department must demonstrate the continuing impact of its work to advance gender equality and also demonstrate that it is actively promoting good practice to the wider academic and research community.
Again, drawing from the Athena SWAN charter award, the proposed framework has three different categories – Bronze, Silver and Gold – as the award aims to recognise progression and advancement depending on the starting point of an institution and taking into account the applicant’s context (objectives, structures, etc.). Initially however, only two categories will be considered for IGAR – Bronze and Silver – due to the fact that the IGAR field is less developed than that of structural change for gender equality. However the Gold category should be applied on a longer term when the IGAR field is more developed at institutional level. This strategy follows the way in which the Athena SWAN charter evolved, with the Gold standard being developed later, in recognition that reaching the standard of a Gold award needs longer-term consideration.

**BRONZE**

To be given a bronze award, the institutions should show that the following actions are already being implemented or should commit to put them in place as next step. Thus they should show a firm commitment in eliminating gender bias in research content by:

- Conducting a sound systematic assessment of IGAR actions in the institution including quantitative data (e.g. the RPO/RFOs monitor their proportion of projects integrating gender analysis\(^6\), Higher Education Institution can also monitor the proportion of syllabus/subjects that integrate gender analysis into university curricula, etc.) and qualitative (policies, systems and practices) evidence and identifying both challenges and opportunities

- The development of an action plan taking into consideration the information collected in the assessment and which will include the current actions taking place in the organization on IGAR and other strategic measures/initiatives to build up on the challenges detected during the assessment

- The appointment of an officer/unit (or the integration of the IGAR mandate into an existing one) aimed at the promotion and advancement of IGAR within the institution as well as to design monitor and evaluate the actions addressing this

**SILVER**

In this category institutions should show a substantial progress and advancement in promoting IGAR and in addressing those challenges arising. Applications are expected to concentrate on what has improved since the previous award application, and how the institution is acquiring and securing the accomplishments. To apply for a Silver category Award, the institution must have previously been awarded with the Bronze category Award.

---

\(^6\) Proportion of IGAR projects specific for field/discipline, taking into account that IGAR is not relevant to all disciplines (that is, not relevant in disciplines such as pure mathematics, theoretical physics and several branches of experimental physics, astronomy, etc.)
GOLD
For a gold award, in addition to the above for silver, the RPO/RFO must demonstrate the continuing impact of its work to advance IGAR and also demonstrate that it is actively promoting good practice to the wider research and academic community.

3.2 Criteria for the Award
3.2.1 Criteria on the Institutional Change scheme for RPOs

The following are the criteria to evaluate the institution’s/department’s level of advancement to address structural barriers to gender equality. Institutions/departments must address each of the listed areas, or explain why they are not doing so. Institutions/departments should also ensure that they explain their context so as to demonstrate the rationale for actions planned/taken.

a) **High level support:** the institution/department should show a *firm commitment* by institutional/departmental leaders, explaining how the gender action plan is supporting the overall work of the institution/department.

- Evidence of this is required by a statement signed by the head of institution/department

b) **Contextual quantitative data:** gender disaggregated data on the following:

- Academic and research staff (disaggregated by levels – e.g. researcher, associate professor, full professor; and comments on and explanation for any differences between men and women. For an institutional award, all data must be disaggregated by discipline/departments with comments on and explanation for any differences

- Academic and research staff on fixed-termed/permanent contracts by gender and comments on and explanation for any differences between men and women. For an institutional award, all data must be disaggregated by discipline/departments with comments on and explanation for any differences

- Academic and research staff leaving the organisation by gender and comments on and explanation for any differences between men and women, including reason for staff leaving. For an institutional award, all data must be disaggregated by discipline/departments with comments on and explanation for any differences

- For an institutional award, details of any gender equal pay audits/reviews, with comments on the institution’s key priorities to address disparities in gender pay difference

- For an institutional award, data on decision making committees by gender and comments on how committee members are identified, whether any
consideration is given to gender equality in the selection of representatives and what the institution is doing to address any gender imbalances

c) Career development:

■ Recruitment: Academic and research staff recruitment data, disaggregated by gender and job grade, for applications, long- and shortlisted candidates, offer and acceptance rates, with comments on how recruitment processes ensure that women (and men in underrepresented disciplines) are encouraged to apply. For an institutional award, all data must be disaggregated by discipline/departments with comments on and explanation for any differences.

■ Promotions: Data on academic and research staff applying for promotion and comment on applications and success rates by gender, grade and full- and part-time status with comments on any evidence of a gender pay gap in promotions at any grade. For an institutional award, all data must be disaggregated by discipline/departments with comments on and explanation for any differences.

■ Training and development: A description of the training and development available to academic and research staff at all levels with details of uptake by gender and how existing staff are kept up to date with training. Specific focus should be paid to commenting on support given to academic staff including postdoctoral researchers to assist in their career progression.

■ Appraisal/development review: A description of appraisal/development review for academic and research staff at all levels, as well as staff feedback about the process.

■ Workload: the extent of recognition of academic and research staff work on the award scheme is recognised in their workload.

d) Flexible working and managing careers breaks:

■ Cover and support for maternity, adoption and paternity leave: Explain what support the institution/departments offers to staff before/during and after they go on maternity, adoption and paternity leave.

■ Maternity return rate: Data and comment on the maternity return rate in the institution/department.

■ Flexible working: information on the flexible working arrangements available.

■ Childcare/caring responsibilities: A description of any policies and provisions in place to support staff with childcare/caring responsibilities and how the support available is proactively communicated to all staff.
e) Culture
- Details of how the institution/department actively considers gender equality and inclusivity, including any activities to promote awareness of gender equality. Provide details of how the charter principles have been, and will continue to be, embedded into the culture and workings of the institution and how good practice is identified and shared across the institution.

- Human Resources HR policies: For an institutional award, a description of how the institution monitors the consistency in application of its HR policies for equality, dignity at work, bullying, harassment, grievance and disciplinary processes. Proportion of heads of school/faculty/department Representation of men and women on senior management committees.

- Institutional policies, practices and procedures: A description of how gender equality is considered in development, implementation and review of any policies, practices and procedures.

f) Dual career couples and mobility: A description of any support provided to dual career couples and any support to overcome barriers to geographical staff mobility, including explaining the necessity of geographical mobility.

g) Action plan – A detailed action plan presenting prioritised actions to address the issues based on the above data. For each action define an appropriate success/outcome measure, identify the person/position(s) responsible for the action, and timescales for completion. Actions should be distributed to a range of staff (including academic and research staff) and must not rest solely on a few staff (e.g. only with human resources staff). The plan should cover current initiatives and aspirations for the next four years and include details of financial resources. Actions, and their measures of success, should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (SMART).

3.2.2 Criteria on the IGAR scheme for RFOs and RPOs including HEIs

1. Criteria on IGAR for Research Funding Organisations (RFOs)

The following are the criteria to evaluate the institutions level of advancement on IGAR. Please note that not all of them are necessary, but to show a firm commitment on the integration of IGAR, institutions are recommended to use these criteria to guide them in the design and implementation of measures.

a) Policy and/or Strategy: the institution should show it has and implements a specific institutional policy or strategy that facilitates integrating the sex and/or gender analysis into the funding programmes for research, including training mechanisms for staff, grant applicants and peer reviewers/evaluators.

- Details on how it implements its policy on IGAR.
b) High Level Support and Leadership at Institutional Level: the institution should show a firm commitment by institutional leaders to sustain the effective implementation of the policy or strategy within the organisation.

- Details on the level of commitment, and how is this shown at high institutional level

c) Research Funding Programme:

- At the programmes design level: the institution should show which measures are implemented aimed at integrating gender analysis into all programmes as a cross-cutting element

- At call dissemination level: the institution should show that it is making explicit (flag/tag) the pertinent sections/topics where sex/gender analysis is specifically relevant

- At the level of the call for proposals: the institution should show evidence regarding its requirement to applicants to indicate whether sex and/or gender are relevant to their proposed research. If relevant, require applicants to outline how sex/gender analysis will be integrated into all the research cycle. If applicants indicate that sex and/or gender is not relevant, require an explanation for why not

- At proposal peer review/evaluation and project monitoring level: the institution should show that at least one gender expert is included in evaluation panels and/or boards, and that it is made explicit how IGAR is scored in grant proposal

- Details on how IGAR is being embedded in these 4 levels of the research funding program (design, dissemination, calls and evaluation of proposal)

d) Strategic Training Programme, Dissemination Materials and Awareness Raising Activities: the institution should show strategic training opportunities and dissemination materials\(^7\) provided both at general level and by discipline/main field of science to applicants, peer reviewers/evaluators and grant administration staff to equip them with the necessary tools for effective integration of sex/gender analysis.

- Details on how the institution is making sure that applicants, staff and evaluators are aware of the requirements about the IGAR policy and how is assisting them to integrate it into its work

\(^7\) including manuals, relevant instructions, check lists, videos, gender experts databases, face-to-face and on-line seminars, gender studies website or inventory, etc
e) Gender-Specific Research: the institution should show that it has launched a specific funding programme on gender aimed at fostering the production of new knowledge for a better understanding of gender issues.

Details on the results and outputs of the funding program on gender specific research

f) Monitoring and Evaluation: the institution should show it has a systematic monitoring and evaluation approach with appropriate indicators to measure the performance and impact of the implemented policies.

Details on how the monitoring and evaluation system of the IGAR policy is implemented

g) Budget and Resources: the institution should show it dedicates a specific budget line and relevant resources (human, materials, etc.) to ensure implementation and sustainability of the uptake of IGAR. Provide the institution with the structures required to strengthen and properly implement the IGAR policy/strategy.

Details on what types of resources are dedicated to which activities and how the budget dedicated to the IGAR policy is enough to adequately implement the policy

h) Eligible and/or Supplementary Funding: the institution should show how its funding includes eligible costs and/or supplementary funds for exploring how sex/gender analysis can be added to current or proposed research and for providing gender training for the research teams.

Details and comments on its implementation, results and future developments

i) Networking with other institutions: the institution should show it participates in networks oriented to promote IGAR within the research community at national, European or International level.

Details on any network, project, program etc. at the national or transnational level aimed at supporting and promoting IGAR in which the institution is participating

j) Further information: Details and comments on any other measures that may be relevant; for example, other related initiatives not covered in the previous sections.

2. Criteria on IGAR for Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) including Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)

a) Policy and/or Strategy: the institution should show it has implemented a specific institutional policy or strategy that facilitates integrating the gen-
under analysis into the research and teaching programmes, including training mechanisms for staff, researcher and faculty members.

b) **High Level Support and Leadership at Institutional Level:** the institution should show a **firm commitment** by institutional leaders to sustain the effective implementation of the policy or strategy within the organisation.

c) **Research Programme:** The institution should show how it promotes IGAR in the research and teaching activities carried out under its responsibility, and how it encourages and supports the integration of sex/gender analysis in the entire research cycle (from grant research approach to literature review and research findings dissemination)

- Details on how the institution promotes IGAR in the research and on how it advises researchers to take into account IGAR in research cycle (design, dissemination, calls and evaluation of proposal)

d) **Strategic Training Programme, Dissemination Materials and Awareness Raising Activities:** the institution should show the strategic training opportunities and dissemination materials provided both at general level and by discipline/main field of science to researchers, faculty members and students to equip them with the necessary tools for effective integration of sex/gender analysis.

e) **Gender Specific Research:** the institution should show that it has a specific research programmes on gender aimed at fostering the production of new knowledge for a better understanding of gender issues.

- Details on how the university or institution is promoting a funding program on gender specific research and about its results and outputs

f) **Monitoring and Evaluation:** the institution should show that it has and implements a sound and systematic monitoring and evaluation approach with pertinent, measurable and appropriate **indicators to measure the performance and impact of the implemented policies.**

g) **Budget and Resources:** the institution should show that it dedicates a specific budget line and relevant resources (human, materials, etc.) to ensure sound implementation and sustainability of the uptake of sex/gender considerations in research and teaching. It should also show how it provides the institution with the structures and bodies required to strengthen and properly implement the IGAR policy/strategy.
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h) **Supplementary and/or Eligible Funding:** the institution should show how its funding includes supplementary and/or eligible funding for exploring how sex/gender analysis can be added to current or proposed research and teaching and for providing gender training for the research teams and faculty members.

i) **Networking with other institutions:** the institution should show it participates in networks oriented to promote IGAR within the research and teaching community at national, European or International level.

j) **Integration of the Gender Analysis into University Curricula (IGAUC), only for HEIs:** the institutions should show that when designing university curricula, at any level (Bachelor, Master, or PhD) and field (including STEM fields) it has both: 1) gender-specific modules/subjects (e.g. “Gender and Space” or “Sex and Gender Research Methods”) within the degree, and 2) cross-cutting gender into the rest of modules/subjects in the degree (mainstreaming the gender dimension by integrating it in the general content (e.g. including gender-sensitive theories, methods, readings, questions, activities, etc. in an “Urban Planning” subject). Additionally, gender-specific degrees (e.g. Masters on “Gender Studies”, “Gender and Development”, etc.) especially in main universities or in inter-universities programmes.

k) **Further information:** Details and comments on any other measures that may be relevant; for example, other related initiatives not covered in the previous sections.
4. Processes and procedures

4.1 Ownership and Management of the Award

As the present transnational award consists in two different schemes (structural change for gender equality and IGAR), and RFOs can only apply to the IGAR scheme, while RPO can apply to both. RPO can apply to the schemes either jointly or separately.

Therefore, in the case of RPOs, it must be noted that there would be a different procedure for each scheme, independent of whether they apply jointly or separately.

The first time an institution/department applies to any of the schemes, it should start by applying to the Bronze category, showing that the three elements required for this category in either structural change for gender equality or IGAR have been undertaken before the application (see section 3.1.1).

The award is conceived as a European tool to support the structural change and IGAR in European research institutions. This will provide a benchmarking framework and will facilitate standards to which institutions can understand their advancement, facilitating broad progress across the academic, research and innovation community in Europe. Gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research constitute one of the priorities of the European Research Area (ERA) which specifically invites Members States to “strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes” as well as showing its commitment to “foster Gender equality and the integration of a gender dimension in Horizon 2020 programmes and projects from inception, through implementation to evaluation, including through the use of incentives”.

For the stability of the award, there needs to be sufficient resource and capacity, and in this regard, we would recommend that the award operate under the auspices of the European Commission (or a similar regional umbrella institution) as this will provide some form of legitimacy. The EC should also consider how the award links to the funding it provides to RFOs and RPOs, and whether some kind of conditionality of the award for receiving EU funding should be a requirement. The EC should also consider how it links to other European award schemes, like the HR Excellence for researchers award scheme, taking into account that that scheme is not gender specific and that gender experts will be needed to fully integrate gender into that award and evaluation process.

At the same time, the award will also require expert knowledge of the topics, and strong management expertise. As noted above, from the findings of D2.7, management of the award must take into consideration the different context at country level and therefore, there continues to be merit in exploring pairing
the transnational award with other national awards by creating a form of equi-
valency (see section 1.2 above).
The validity of the award is recommended to be of 4 years.

In order for the joint award to be successful, the owner/manager will need to
provide support and advice to applicants. Amongst other methods, this may
take the form of workshops which should be provided by the organisation ma-
naging the award or the national equivalent scheme (especially to take into
account language and other logistical issues).

4.2 Application Process

The proposed process draws heavily of the Athena SWAN charter applica-
tion and self-analysis process. For an institutional award, applicants must
ensure engagement from all departments directly or indirectly responsible
for conducting research. This should include high level decision making per-
sonnel within the institution, personnel in charge of scientific management
(scientific committees, operational or working groups committees…) together
with structures responsible for the integration of gender equality policies in
the institution (equality units or similar). There should be a process to involve
academic and research stakeholders within the institution in order to inform
and consult about the relevant criteria from section 3. To manage the process,
a working group must be established to conduct a self-assessment against the
relevant criteria from section 3, and to oversee the activities and actions result-
ing from it. This working group should have representation of the above men-
tioned personnel of the institution, representation from a range of seniority
(e.g. senior leaders and also early stage researchers), and have a mix of both
men and women.

For a departmental award, the working group should have representation from
across the range of seniority in that department as well as a mix of both men
and women.

For the award on structural change, the institution/department must commit
to:

- Creating a working group to conduct the self-assessment on gender equa-
  lity and structural change in the institution/department; the working group
  should meet regularly
- Identifying actions already in place which address gender equality and iden-
  tify gaps and barriers to gender equality
- Engaging and consulting with the required range of relevant stakeholders
- Developing and implementing a 4-year action plan that arises from the self-
  assessment
Continuously monitoring during the life of the plan and in case of need, to develop new corrective measures to facilitate advancement

Evaluating the plan of action and of the process

For the IGAR award, the institution must commit to a process which will include:

- Creating a working group with the mandate of promoting, designing, monitoring and evaluating IGAR policies and actions; the working group should meet regularly
- Conducting a self-assessment process about IGAR in the institution
- Identifying those actions already in place on IGAR as well as those gaps, obstacles and resistances to advance on the full integration of IGAR in the institution
- Elaborating a plan of action (with a duration and resources which will enable the institution to implement it appropriately) which will include those measures already in place and new measures oriented to overcome the gaps, obstacles and resistances detected
- Continuous monitoring process during the life of the plan and in case of need, to develop new corrective measures to facilitate advancement
- Evaluation of the plan of action and of the process

4.3 Evaluation instruments

The proposed process draws heavily of the Athena SWAN charter evaluation process. All applications will be evaluated by a panel of independent peer reviewers (with a maximum of 5 reviewers and a minimum of 3) which will be, among other issues experts on institutional change and IGAR and its implementation. The evaluations will be a mixture of face-to-face with ideally at least one field visit and remote assessment. The management of the evaluation will be responsibility (in term of resources, budget and administration) of the owner.

The evaluation of the structural change award will seek to see evidence of a rigorous and thorough evaluation process which consist of:

- the clarity of the evidence provided of what has been done and what is planned
- the rationale for what has been done and what is planned, linked to the data collected
- how successful the actions taken have been and how that success was measured and evaluated
- the longer term sustainability, embeddeness and impact on the organisation/department, its processes and its culture
the level of input, investment, involvement, commitment and support the range of staff (men and women) across the institution/department

consultation with input from all academic and research staff (men and women), particularly encouraging women’s participation

how innovative and ambitious the actions are.

The evaluation for the IGAR award will take into account the following aspects:

the level of commitment of the institution with the implementation of IGAR and the principles of this award

the composition, mandate and work agenda of the working group on IGAR set up to manage this process

the self-assessment process (outputs and finding but also methodology)

the action plan designed to address the findings of the self-assessment process

the relevance of the measures and actions in respect to the objectives of the IGAR policy; how well the actions are designed to implement the policy

the feasibility of the IGAR measures and actions considering the balance between objectives, means and deadlines

the coordination with similar actions carried out by other institutions or organizations, especially in the same fields

the involvement of staff and researchers in the whole process

The Award “Gender Equality in Research” is strictly honorary, with no economic compensation, in both the institutional change and IGAR schemes.
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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