Gender Equality Audit Tool (GEAT)

Project acronym	TARGET
Project name	TARGET - TAking a Reflexive approach to Gender Equality for institutional Transformation
Project type	Coordination and Support Action
Start date of the project	01 / 05 / 2017
End date of the project	30 / 04 / 2021
Contributing WP	3 Knowing and Planning
WP lead partner	9 Notus – Rachel Palmén and Maria Caprile
Authors	10 FGB – Valentina Chizzola, Barbara De Micheli, Giovanna Vingelli
Other partners involved	1 IHS
Deliverable identifier	D3.1. – revised Version
Contractual delivery date	31 / 10 / 2017
Actual delivery date	30 / 11 / 2018
Deliverable type	PU
Dissemination level	PU
	This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 741672.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

CoP: Community of Practice

CSA: Coordination and Support Action

ERA: European Research Area

GEA: Gender Equality Audit

GEAT: Gender Equality Audit Tool (this document)

GEII: Gender Equality Innovating Institution

GEP: Gender Equality Plan

GES: Gender Equality Strategy

HR: Human Resources

HRM: Human Resource Management

IGAR: Integrating Gender Analysis into Research

RFO: Research Funding Organisation

R&I: Research and Innovation

RPO: Research Performing Organisation

Executive Summary

The document presents the Gender Equality Audit Tool (GEAT) of the TARGET Coordination and Support Action (CSA). TARGET aims at implementing customised gender equality plans (GEPs) in six European research performing and research funding organisations (RPOs and RFOs), and a gender equality strategy (GES) in a network of higher education engineering schools, referred to as gender equality innovating institutions (GEIIs).

In the TARGET framework and methodology, the GEAT serves as an instrument for implementing the starting point of a sustained, reflexive and participatory institutional transformation process towards enhanced gender equality in the GEIIs.

The document contains a detailed description of each of the four GEAT steps: Step 1 "Preparing the Participatory Gender Equality Audit"; Step 2 "Defining the Perimeters – Institutional Structure and Context", Step 3 "In-Depth Data collection in the Three TARGET GEA Dimensions" and Step 4 "Taking Stock of Existing Gender Equality Policies". For each step a brief explanation of the purpose and rationale of the GEA is given together with practical suggestions and hands-on tips as to how the GEA step can be implemented. Two additional paragraphs provide an outline of the institutional participatory workshops, and details on additional resources on promoting gender equality in RPOs and RFOs available online.

1   Introduction

This document presents the Gender Equality Audit Tool (GEAT) of the TARGET Coordination and Support Action (CSA): Taking a Reflexive Approach to Gender Equality for Institutional Transformation. The TARGET CSA aims at implementing customised gender equality plans (GEPs) in six European research performing and research funding organisations (RPOs and RFOs), and a gender equality strategy (GES) in a network of higher education engineering schools in what follows referred to as gender equality innovating institutions (GEIIs).

GEIIs are located in countries which to-date have implemented general equality policies but do not show a strong gender equality policy framework for science and research (Country ERA Progress Reports 2014). At the same time, GEIIs have very little experience on gender issues, and GEAT has been specifically tailored to their needs and expertise.

The three RFOs represent a very heterogeneous group: all three of them aim to initiate gender equality policies in RPOs through specific steering instruments which have a direct or indirect influence on funding. RPF (Research Promotion Foundation; Cyprus) is a national research funding organisation. ARACIS (Agentia Romana de Asigurare a Calitatii in Invatamantul Superior; Romania) is a national agency for quality assurance in higher education and its assessment impacts access to funding. FRRB (Fondazione Regionale per la Ricerca Biomedica; Italy) is a regional funding body for biomedical research. The three research performing organisations include two of the most renowned universities in Serbia (Univerzitet u Beogradu - UB) and Morocco (Universite Hassan II de Casablanca - UH2C) and a top research performing organisation in Greece (Hellenic Foundation for European and Foreign policy - ELIAMEP). The six GEIIs and their project coordinators are highly involved in national and international networks which will be used to initiate a national discourse about gender equality in R&I. Additionally, the RMEI network (Réseau Méditerranéen des Ecoles d'Ingénieurs; France) has a great deal of potential for strengthening the discourse on gender equality in R&I in Mediterranean countries as well as disseminating TARGET tools and therefore ensuring the sustainability of TARGET interventions.

In the TARGET framework and methodology, the GEAT serves as an instrument for implementing the starting point of a sustained, reflexive and participatory institutional transformation process towards enhanced gender equality in the GEIIs.

In our understanding, the concept of gender equality is grounded in principles of human rights and social justice. When we use the expression "gender equality", we refer to "the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys." (UN Women 2001). Promoting gender equality in research and innovation (R&I) contexts therefore amounts to

promoting compliance with human rights and social justice principles in those contexts. In addition to human rights and social justice, TARGET's understanding of gender equality is guided by the European Commission's R&I-strategic definition of the concept of gender equality, as developed and put to work in the Horizon 2020 framework: gender equality is to be promoted as a driver of competitiveness, innovation, and excellence in research and teaching in Europe (EC 2016a).

Gender equality is unlikely to be enhanced in RPOs and RFOs if not for a dedicated effort to transform existing explicit and implicit organisational dynamics. Regarding the process of institutional transformation, TARGET pursues a reflexive and participatory approach, with a strong emphasis on self-assessment, stakeholder engagement and institutional self-reflection. Fostering and sustaining reflexivity within RPOs and RFOs is a demanding endeavour which requires the development of specific competences at individual and institutional levels (Wroblewski 2015; Martin 2006). We assume that GEPs can be successful in achieving their desired effects only if they are tailored to the specific organisational characteristics of institutions, and only if they are embedded in a framework that supports reflexivity at the institutional and individual levels. TARGET supports both the development of monitoring and self-assessment procedures, and multi-dimensional capacity building activities to develop gender equality competence within GEIIs. Using a participatory approach to enhancing gender equality in institutions means, in the first place, involving key institutional (and external) stakeholders for gender equality in all the steps of the process. This approach has the advantage of empowering key stakeholders and committing them to the transformation process, also in view of its long-term sustainability.

A key role and responsibility for the involvement of institutional stakeholders and the implementation of the GEAT steps is entrusted to the GEII's appointed change agents and their assistants (cf. Meyerson, Tompkins 2007: 304). The change agents are the TARGET coordinators at GEII level, and they act as the interface between the GEII and TARGET's supporting partners. As "gender equality officers", the change agents' assistants should be involved in data collection on a day-to-day basis and play a prominent role in supporting the development of the GEP. The designation of the change agents' assistants, and the specification of their roles within each GEII, should take place as early as possible, in order to strengthen the capability of the GEII to collect all the necessary data. The change agents' assistants may be persons already working at the involved GEIIs, or they may be recruited specifically by the TARGET project. In some cases it might be appropriate to distribute the tasks assigned to the "gender equality officer" between community of practice (CoP) members.

The GEA prepares the GEP: Implementation of the GEAT is not an end in itself. Rather, it is a means to the end of identifying organisation-specific gender equality challenges, priorities and indicators, as well as to the end of designing customised GEPs for each GEII. GEPs will include, for instance, family-friendly policies (e.g., concerning work schedule flexibility; parental and other care-related leaves; mobility; dual career couples); strategies for gender research planning and budgeting; guidelines for training on gender equality in human resource management (HRM); measures to promote the integration of gender analysis in research content and programmes and/or for mainstreaming gender analysis in higher education curricula; measures to promote the mainstreaming of gender equality into research funding lines and programmes of RFOs.

1.1 How to Read and Use this Document: Overview of the GEAT Steps and Sections

The GEAT presented here builds on and adapts the International Labour Office's gender audit guidelines (ILO 2012), the European Institute for Gender Equality's work on gender equality in research and academia (EIGE 2016), as well as TARGET partners' previous experiences and toolkits elaborated in other institutional change projects. This version has been revised on the basis of partner institutions' feedback on its usability.

The GEAT provides the GEIIs' change agents with guidelines and practical instruments for the implementation of four successive GEA steps in the project's partner institutions. The participating institutions include both research performing and research funding organisations (RPOs and RFOs) and the network. Given the differences among them (size, mission, data collecting methodologies), the GEA process will differ, and the GEAT strives to be useful with regard to all typologies of GEIIs involved in the TARGET consortium. Whenever a particular tool or question is relevant only to a specific type of GEII, this is explicitly indicated. Regarding the network of universities (RMEI) that is among the TARGET GEIIs, the GEAT intends to provide a basis for discussion in view of kinds of data that can be collected at this stage of the project in order to pave the way for the development of a gender equality strategy (GES).

To facilitate usability, sections 1-4 (which describe the four GEA steps in detail), are organised in a uniform way: First, a brief explanation of the purpose and rationale of the GEA step is given. Second, practical suggestions and hands-on tips as to how the GEA step can be implemented are provided.

The first step (sec. 1), "Preparing the Participatory Gender Equality Audit", addresses the question of how to lay the foundations for the audit (and subsequent GEP process) gaining commitment from top and upper-level management and research staff, as well as through the

identification of the organisation's key gender equality stakeholders and their active involvement in a CoP.

The second step (sec. 2), "Defining the Perimeters – Institutional Structure and Context", is designed to facilitate the collection of background information on the overall organisational context of each participating GEII.

The third step (sec. 3), "In-Depth Data collection in the Three TARGET GEA Dimensions", provides tools and guidelines for collecting data on the specific characteristics of each GEII in terms of gender equality in the three TARGET focus dimensions: gender-related institutional barriers to careers, gender equality in decision making, and gender equality in research content and higher education curricula.

The fourth step (sec. 4), "Taking Stock of Existing Gender Equality Policies", describes how the GEIIs' change agents and communities of practice can go about collecting information on the existing gender equality policies within their organisations.

Section 5 of the GEAT provides an outline of the institutional participatory workshops, which will be held in each GEII in January and February 2018 and have the purpose of presenting, and defining the methods of analysis of, the data collected through steps 1-4.

Section 6 details the GEAT's references to other sources and provides a selection of additional resources on promoting gender equality in RPOs and RFOs available online.

1.2   Timeline for the Implementation of the GEAT

GEAT step	Actions	Deadlines and output
1: Preparing the GEA	Committing and involving the top and senior management; appointing the change agent's assistant/gender equality officer; initiating the creation of a community of practice	**1st month -** List of key stakeholders involved
2. Defining the perimeters	Collecting data on the institutional context	**1st Month** - Discussion of collected preliminary data with supporting partner of reference **2nd Month** - Preliminary draft report **3rd month** - Report

3. In depth data collection in the three TARGET dimensions: gender-related institutional barriers to careers, gender equality in decision making, and gender equality in research content and higher education curricula	Further gathering of HR statistical data Interviews	**1st Month** – list of persons to be interviewed **2nd Month** – implementing and reporting on at least 50% of the interviews **3rd month** – Report
4. Survey for academic and research staff	Definition of the survey and mode of administration for each GEII Administration of the survey	**2nd Month** **2nd Month - 3rd month** **3rd month - results included in the report**
5. Analysis of existing gender policies	Collecting information on the existing gender equality policies within each GEII	**2nd Month** – first report on existing policies **3rd month** – existing policies included in draft report
Institutional workshops	Organising and implementing one-day institutional workshop in each GEII	**1st Month** – date of the workshop identified in each GEII **2nd Month** – agenda of the workshop and list of participants agreed in each GEII / with supporting partner **3rd month – 4th month**– implementation of institutional workshop in each GEII (minutes available within two weeks)
Reporting – first draft	Reporting on collected information	**2nd Month** – first draft report on collected information (supporting partner will provide feedback by **the end of the 2nd Month**) **3rd month** – final draft report
Reporting – complete report	Reporting on collected information	**4th month** – the complete GEA report delivered to supporting partners, taking into account the supporting partners' feedback and the inputs emerged from the institutional workshops,

2 First Step: Preparing the Participatory Gender Equality Audit

Laying the foundations for implementing the participatory GEA it is of utmost importance to raise the level of awareness concerning the relevance of gender equality issues across all organisational levels and among all key stakeholders within the participating GEIIs. This is necessary to ensure the practical commitment and readiness to participate of all key stakeholder groups within the organisational structure of the GEIIs. This also creates the conditions for an effective intra-organisational communication of the purposes, benefits, goals and phases of the GEA. (Concerning the importance of stakeholder involvement, cf. EIGE 2016: 38-39).

To ascertain commitment from institutional key stakeholder groups, and to involve them from the outset of the process, the participatory TARGET approach focuses on two core elements: gaining commitment from top tier and upper level management and research staff (section 1.1) and creating a community of practice that involves representatives of all staff layers of the institution (section 1.2).

A key role in the realisation of these two core elements of the participatory approach of TARGET's GEA will be played by the GEII's change agents (cf. Meyerson, Tompkins 2007: 304). Change agents act as catalysts for change towards gender equality in their organisations. They can rely on the support of two TARGET partners (NOTUS, FGB) with extensive expertise on gender equality in R&I and institutional transformation. They are responsible for the planning and coordination of the GEA within their institution. The change agent will moreover be supported by an assistant or members of the CoP who is/are responsible for administrative tasks and involved in data collection and handling, reporting and disseminating. Depending on her/his competences, the project assistant may act as a gender equality officer or should be able to take up the function by the end of the project.

A successful GEA requires the development of an efficient communication strategy tailored to the specific institutional setting of each GEII. The GEII staff need to understand why they are being asked to participate in the gender audit process, what is the value of conducting the gender audit process, and what are the gains and benefits that may be expected as a result, both at the organisational and individual levels. Moreover, a clear cut and realistic timeline detailing each step of the audit process should be communicated to the organisation staff.

2.1 Committing and Involving the Top and Senior Management

While the top management of the involved GEIIs have expressed their formal commitment to the activities and the goals of TARGET by means of letters of intent, it will be necessary to

consolidate this commitment, to operationalize it at a practical level and, importantly, to extend it to the upper and senior management levels of the GEII. Indeed, without top-down support, it is unlikely that the audit process will succeed.

Commitment at the upper and highest levels of hierarchy (Board of Directors, Managers, Heads of Research Units) is key for legitimising the time and effort that will have to be invested by the organisation's staff to implement the GEA, for authorising information flows, for addressing problems that may arise during the implementation of the GEA (e.g., internal resistance), as well as for supporting the sustained and iterative institutional learning and reflexivity process that is at the core of the TARGET methodology. Put in a nutshell, strong and explicit commitment of the top and upper level management is crucial for the GEA implementation in three regards:

- increasing the perceived legitimacy of the GEA at the institutional level,
- communication and visibility,
- approval of procedures and activities supporting structural change towards gender equality in the organisation.

Practical suggestions for consolidating and strengthening commitment at the upper and highest organisational levels of the GEII
- Present arguments that link priorities of the organisation in the areas of human resources, communication and EU-wide recognition to gender equality related issues and show how these priorities could be supported by the introduction of gender equality policies (e.g., economic argument of missing potential, media presence and positive image building, gain in legitimacy at EU level).
- Present arguments that link the R&I goals and priorities of the organisation to research that provides evidence for the positive correlation between the level of gender equality and the level of scientific excellence of research institutions.
- Foster the active participation of members of top and upper-level management in institutional activities such as workshops, dissemination and communication activities. Ask representatives of the top-level management to open and, if possible, attend parts of the institutional TARGET workshops (see section 5). This gives visibility to key personnel in top tiers of management in institutional GEA-related activities, thus adding to the perceived legitimacy of the gender audit activities.
- Make sure that the top and upper level management commits to playing a central role in the GEA communication strategy. For instance, it should be the GEII's senior managers who announce the GEA, the goals of initiating a process of structural change towards more gender equality, and the expected institutional opportunities and benefits.

2.2 Creating a Community of Practice

Utilising the existing gender expertise in the institution, among research as well as administrative and managerial staff, the supporting TARGET partners will assist the GEIIs in building up the institutional capacity for a reflexive gender equality policy. This capacity building includes the constitution of a community of practice for gender equality in each participating institution.

Communities of practice are formed by people who engage in a process of collective learning and acting in a shared domain (cf. Wenger 1998, 2000), in our case in the field of implementing gender equality policies at GEII level. Communities of practice define competence by combining three elements (Wenger 2000: 229): First, members are bound together by their collectively developed understanding of what gender equality is about and they hold each other accountable to this sense of joint enterprise. To be competent means to understand the enterprise (here: the enterprise of promoting gender equality within the GEII) well enough to be able to contribute to it. Second, members build their community through mutual engagement. It also means to be able to engage with the community and be trusted as a partner in these interactions. Third, communities of practice share a repertoire of communal resources – language, routines, sensibilities, artefacts, tools, stories, styles etc. To be competent also means to have access to this repertoire and be able to use it appropriately.

While the relevance of the intra-organisational communities of practice goes well beyond the GEA, which initiates the GEP cycle, in what follows we focus on how they should be composed in view of their role in the auditing process.

With regard to the GEA implementation, two aspects concerning the relevance of establishing a community of practice merit emphasis. In virtue of its participatory nature, the community of practice will help to work towards an increased institutional willingness and capacity to identify, reflect on and address gender bias and gender equality issues in a sustained way. Moreover, it will counteract the risk of generating a situation where the GEA – and subsequently the GEP – implementation depends on the change agent and her/his assistant alone.

The GEII's change agents, with the assistance of TARGET's support partners, are responsible for drawing an initial map of potential members of the community of practice (gender equality stakeholders) beyond the top tier and upper-level management within their organisations. The aim of this first round of stakeholder identification is to find strategically important figures within the institution's research departments/units as well as members of the administration who have access to institutional documents and statistics relevant to the implementation of the

GEA. Potential participants might be members of the HR department, strategic working groups, decision-making bodies, researchers etc.

How to identify the relevant stakeholders? In this regard, it is important to keep in mind here that the relevant stakeholders to be involved in the community of practice should not be expected to have specific expertise in gender equality. Even though it is desirable to get the organisation's gender equality experts on board, the main criterion for choosing prospective members of the community of practice should at this stage be their function in the organisation.

To achieve an initial overview of the relevant stakeholders, the change agent and her/his assistant may proceed through a brainstorming session which is guided by the following questions:

Questions for identifying gender equality stakeholders in your organisation	
Who within the organisation may be affected by the TARGET project's outcomes?	
Who are the potential beneficiaries?	
Who might perceive the implementation of gender equality policies as a threat?	
Who has the authority to influence the implementation of the project or its outcome?	
Who exercises influence over other stakeholders?	
Who could offer significant support for mastering particular challenges (e.g., facilitating the information flow for data collection, securing effective intra-organisational communication)?	
Who is in charge of resources, information, or facilities that are relevant to the implementation of the GEA?	

As a first orientation, the following profiles can be expected to provide valuable input to the community of practice in gender equality:

- Change agent + assistant
- Representatives of key decision-making boards
- Professionals of the Human Resources unit
- Experts in the selection of students/staff
- Experts in gender studies and gender in research content
- Persons responsible for gender equality in management (if available)
- Experts on data/statistics of the organization
- People from budget department
- Staff representatives/student representatives

When approaching and inviting people to join the community of practice it is advisable to specify, at least in a preliminary way, the kind of input they may provide and the GEA activities in which they could be involved, according to their function in the institution.

Once a sufficient number of positive responses has been obtained, the second round of the stakeholder involvement can take place in a first meeting of the community of practice that has the aim of validating and extending the list of persons involved. A Venn diagram exercise may be used as a methodological tool for structuring the meeting.

The exercise identifies and analyses internal and external stakeholders in the GEII vis-à-vis promoting gender equality. The participants draw a diagram that indicates actors, their proximity to, or distance from, each other in the GEII and their roles, while also indicating whether the relationship is driven or influenced by gender equality or not. The diagrams give an overview of existing gender expertise and competence, and of how the GEII is linked to national gender bodies and women's organizations.

Text adapted from ILO 2012: 131.

When contacting potential members of the community of practice, and also when conducting community meetings, the goals of and the possible benefits deriving from implementing a GEP cycle in the organisation should be highlighted. As stressed by the European Institute for Gender Equality, it may be useful to "clearly reiterate that gender equality is not a minority, marginal issue but it concerns all who work in an organisation. Gender equality may also need to be framed as key to developing a successful, open and forward-thinking research and higher education institution, that respects and enables all who work and study in it." (EIGE 2016: 30). Whenever the goal is to convince colleagues and stakeholders of the importance of gender equality, it may moreover be conducive to appeal to international and European research and reports on this topic, such as:[1]

- *She figures*, the main European level source comparable statistics on the state of gender equality in research and innovation;
- *GenPort*, an online portal and repository that provides access to research, policy and practical materials on gender, science, technology and innovation;
- *Gendered innovations*, a website that explains practical methods of sex and gender analysis for scientists and engineers, and provides case studies as concrete illustrations of how sex and gender analysis leads to innovation.

The task of identifying stakeholders and possible members of the community of practice within each GEII should be seen as an iterative process to be continued throughout the project life cycle. As the implementations of the GEA, and subsequently the GEP, proceed it is likely that you will be able to find new stakeholders as sources for input and collaboration; and you may also notice the need to adjust and adapt the responsibilities and tasks of those already involved in your organisation's community of practice.

---

[1] For a detailed list of research and policy sources, please refer to section 6 of this document.

3 Second Step: Defining the Perimeters – Institutional Structure and Context

Each one of the GEIIs participating in the TARGET project is a unique organisational entity with a unique internal structure, external context and environment. The aim of the second GEA step is to collect the required background information which will then serve as a basis for the subsequent GEA step 3, whose aim will be to gain an in-depth understanding of the specific characteristics of each GEII in terms of gender equality in the following three focus areas: gender-related institutional barriers to careers, decision making, and research and teaching content.

The output of step 2 will consist of a general description of the organisation covering key quantitative data concerning its structure, level of independence from other organisations (governmental and nongovernmental), size, objectives, core processes, and overall staff composition. It will also provide a repertoire of qualitative data on the organisation's level of institutional awareness of gender equality issues, as researched from core organisational documents, as well as from internal and external communications and institutional self-presentations.

Why is context important? As already stated in the introduction, the implementation of the TARGET GEA is not an end in itself. Rather, it is instrumental to the development and implementation of a process of structural change towards increased gender equality in the involved RPOs and RFOs. The GEA is to provide organisation-specific baseline data which are required as a backdrop against which context-sensitive GEPs, tailor-made for each of the participating GEIIs, can be developed and adopted. Gaining a structural and in-depth understanding of each specific GEII setting and context is crucial for the successful implementation of GEPs and for fostering sustained institutional reflexivity concerning gender equality.

3.1 Key tasks and questions of the second step

In order to collect the data relevant to this GEA step, the change agent and the members of the community of practice will have to:

- access key information on the institutional structure and context
- assess the extent to which gender issues are taken into account in the major institutional documents
- assess the extent to which gender equality considerations have been included in programme planning strategies and activities (as recorded in the documents)

- assess the gender sensitivity of institutional documents and communications (cfr. ILO 2012: 35).

The GEII's change agents and communities of practice will be assisted by the TARGET supporting partners in finding operational solutions to problems that may arise with regard to the implementation of these tasks.

One useful way to start to collect the relevant background information on your GEII is to consult your institution's organigram alongside the initial gender equality assessment for each GEII performed in the preparatory phase of the TARGET project, with the aim of identifying the units, departments or institutional bodies that need to be approached to obtain the desired data. Once an overview is gained, strategic personnel in each of the relevant areas must be identified, contacted and involved in the community of practice. Strategic personnel, in this sense, are staff that have access to, and authority over, up-to-date quantitative and qualitative data on the overall structure of the GEII and its internal and external communications.

Before approaching strategic personnel, consider asking the top-tier management of your institution to send an email to the entire staff, in which they express their support for the TARGET GEA and the work of the GEII change agent, authorising all required information flows and reiterating that standard anonymisation procedures will be strictly complied with whenever sensitive personal data is involved.

"Having an explicit mandate from top management to undertake a baseline assessment is essential to dedicate time, open doors and obtain cooperation." (EIGE 2016: 20)

Regarding the quantitative background information on gender equality to be collected in this step, the key questions are the following:

- What is the overall share of female and male staff (human resources; research teams) in the organisation at different levels and if relevant in different disciplines?

- What are the organisation's key decision-making bodies, and what is the overall share of female and male staff in them?

- If applicable: What is the overall share of female and male students (broken down by disciplines and ISCED levels)?

- What is the share of female and male staff in the different research, administrative and management units of the organisation?

- Which kinds of gender-disaggregated data are available? Who collects them? For which purpose?

Regarding the collection of qualitative background data concerning the level of institutional gender equality awareness, as manifested in the organisation's self-representation the key questions are the following:

- What are the key operative documents of the institution? To what extent are gender equality issues mainstreamed in the institution's key operative documents?

- Does the organisation have an ethics code or code of conduct? If so, does it specifically include gender equality as a key asset?

- To what extent are gender equality issues mainstreamed in the organisation's structure (e.g., is there any dedicated personnel in charge of gender equality issues)?

- What are the key internal and external communication instruments? To what extent are gender equality issues mainstreamed in the organization's internal and external communications?

- What are the main national gender policies / science policies which are relevant as contextual information for the project and may reinforce the development of the GEP?

- Is the organisation in line with the current national level of awareness regarding gender equality, as manifested in national gender equality legislation and national funding provided for the implementation of gender equality initiatives?

More specific and fine-grained quantitative and qualitative indicators and questions will come into play in the third GEA step, which is dedicated to the in-depth analysis of the TARGET project's three focus areas: gender-related institutional barriers to careers, decision-making, and gender in research and teaching content.

3.2 Fact sheet for documents: Practical Tool A

Regarding the level of institutional awareness concerning gender equality, as manifested in the organisation's self-image and modes of self-presentation, the following can serve as an initial list of documents to take into consideration for desk review:

- Founding documents (e.g., the organisation's statute)
- Mission statement
- Code of conduct for staff members
- Annual reports and other self-presentations of the institution in print documents
- Social sustainability reports (if available)
- Other periodic publications such as newsletters
- Occasional publications such as flyers, brochures, posters *etc.*

- the institution's online presentation (institutional website)
- Dedicated gender reports and publications on the situation of women in the organisation (if available)

Please note that institutional policy documents regarding gender equality do not have to be taken into account at this stage. Documentations of existing policies will be collected during the subsequent third GEA step and analysed in the fourth GEA step.

Scan the documents and (audio-)visual items that you choose for review with regard to the question of whether and how they consider gender equality. Are there references to the situation of women in the organisation? Do the documents utilize gender sensitive language? For each reviewed document or (audio-)visual item, please compile the following fact sheet, paying attention both to their text elements and (audio-)visual elements (photos, videos).

Fact sheet for institutional documents and (audio-)visual items

(1) Name of the document and internal reference number or other identifier (if available)	
(2) Date of issue/publication	
(3) Format (print, electronic, online – provide file or link)	
(4) Language of the document	
(5) Target audience/readers (internal/external/both)	
(6) Gender sensitive language used (yes/no/to some extent)	
(7) Does the document contain photos or videos of staff members that aim to be representative of the organisation's (or a particular unit's) personnel? (yes/no)	
(8) If the answer to (7) is "yes", what is the share of female and male persons depicted? And does the female/male share of persons depicted correspond to the actual female/male share of the organisation's (or relevant unit's) staff?	
(9) Content of the document or (audio-) visual item (description or excerpt)	
(10) Contexts in which gender is raised as an issue (excerpts of relevant passages)	
(11) Other comments	

4   Third Step: In-Depth Data Collection in the Three TARGET GEA Dimensions

Within TARGET, change for achieving gender equality in RFOs and RPOs is defined as a three-dimensional construct: 1) addressing gender-related institutional barriers to careers (recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers and staff); 2) addressing gender imbalances in **decision-making processes** and 3) strengthening the gender dimension in **research and innovation content and higher education curricula**. Within these dimensions, the TARGET GEA focuses on the collection of data needed for identifying GEII-specific challenges and for developing GEPs with regard to specific goals in various auditing areas, as shown in following table.

Overview of Data Collection Dimensions, Goals, and Areas

Dimension	Goals	Areas of auditing
(1) Gender-related institutional barriers to careers	Setting up the knowledge base for removing institutional obstacles to, and enhancing, women's career development within GEIIs	RPOs and RFOs: Recruitment, Retention, Promotion (research, teaching, administrative and management staff; if applicable: students - including PhD students - young researchers and grantees);
		RPOs and RFOs: presence of women and men in evaluating panels; applicant teams, research teams
		RPOs and RFOs : gender-sensitiveness and awareness of the whole evaluation process
(2) Decision-Making Bodies and Processes	Setting up the knowledge base for enhancing gender balance and equality in decision-making bodies and processes within GEIIs	RPOs and RFOs: Gender composition of decision making bodies and gender equality in decision-making processes
(3) Research content and higher education curricula	Setting up the knowledge base for strengthening the gender dimension in GEIIs' R&I content, R&I funding programmes, and higher education curricula	RPOs: the gender dimension in R&I projects and higher education curricula
		RFOs: the gender dimension in R&I funding programmes

Kinds of data to be collected in this third step of the GEA: quantitative data on human resource management (HRM) and gender-related institutional barriers to careers, decision making bodies, and budget allocation; qualitative data to be obtained through semi-structured interviews with relevant institutional stakeholders (including top management figures and HR managers); quantitative and qualitative data to be obtained through a survey among the GEIIs' academic and research staff addressing career ambitions, perceptions of working environment in terms of gender equality, teaching and research responsibilities, as well as the level of integration of gender analysis into teaching curricula.

The output of this GEA step will comprise:

- Sex disaggregated statistics for all fields and all hierarchical levels on recruitment, retention, career progression (research, teaching, administrative and management staff; if applicable: students - including PhD students - young researchers and grantees; presence of women and men in evaluating panels, applicant teams and research teams). Statistics will include type of contract, income, tasks etc. and might be differentiated by other social characteristics (e.g., age, care responsibilities, religion or ethnical background);

- Sex disaggregated statistics on top and middle management as well as decision making bodies;

- Information on recruitment processes, career paths, HR policies, work-life-balance policies etc.;

- Information on budget distribution as well as access to personnel and infrastructural resources (gender budgeting).

- Evidence of gender equality mainstreaming (or the lack thereof) in research and innovation contents and programmes as well as in higher education curricula.

The following three subsections address the three TARGET GEA dimensions "Gender-related institutional barriers to careers", "Decision Making Processes", and "Gender Equality in Research Content and Higher Education Curricula", detailing key tasks, questions and indicators, as well as operational tools for the implementation of the third step of the TARGET GEA.

4.1 Gender-related institutional barriers to careers

In order to create the knowledge base for targeted GEP interventions in this regard, the overarching aim of this GEA focus is to describe the horizontal and vertical gender segregation in occupations, as well as other differences in the working conditions of men and women within the participating GEIIs (research, teaching, administrative and management staff; if applicable,

students - including PhD students - young researchers and grantees). To attain this goal, various kinds of data will have to be collected and analysed. The following list (adapted from EIGE 2012: 19) provides an overview of the relevant kinds of data and indicates whether they pertain to recruitment, promotion, retention, or cut across the three fields:

- staff numbers by gender at all levels, by (academic) discipline and function (including administrative and support staff), and by contractual relation to the organisation (permanent, temporary, external collaborator), where possible differentiated by other social characteristics (e.g., age, care responsibilities, religion or ethnical background) (cross-cutting);

- student numbers (including PhD students and grantees) by gender at all levels, by (academic) discipline and year of study, where possible differentiated by other social characteristics (e.g., age, care responsibilities, religion or ethnical background) (cross-cutting)

- average number of years needed for women and men to make an internal career advancement, where possible differentiated as above (promotion);

- gender pay gap by job and function in the organisation, where possible differentiated as above (cross-cutting);

- number of female and male candidates applying for distinct job positions, where possible differentiated as above (recruitment);

- number of women and men having left the organisation in previous years, specifying the number of years spent in the organisation, where possible differentiated as above (retention);

- number of staff by gender applying for/taking parental leave or other care-related leaves, specifying the duration of the leave and the percentage of persons who returned after taking the leave, where possible differentiated as above (retention);

- number of absence days taken by women and men according to absence motive, where possible differentiated as above (retention);

- number of training hours attended by women and men, where possible differentiated as above (promotion).

In the remainder of this section we present a series of tools and questions for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data concerning the Recruitment, Retention, and Promotion areas. Moreover, a SWOT analysis cutting across these areas is introduced, explained and suggested. SWOT analyses will also be part of subsequent GEA steps and sub steps.

4.1.1   Recruitment: Practical Tool B

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender-related institutional barriers to careers

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for removing institutional obstacles to women's professional career and enhancing women's career development within GEIIs

Area of gender equality auditing: Recruitment

Key question	Key quantitative indicators	Source of information	Data collection method
Is there structural gender bias in the GEII's recruitment processes?	Share of women and men among job applicants, broken down by disciplinary field (for researchers and academic teaching staff), job level, temporary or permanent position, part-time or full-time position, and – where possible – by age, care responsibilities, religion and ethnical background	Records of recruitment processes and outcomes held by the HR department, select HRM personnel	Desk analysis of recruitment process records, interview with select HRM personnel
	Share of women and men among shortlisted job candidates, broken down as above		
	Share of women and men among persons recruited, broken down as above		
	Success rate for women and men applicants, broken down as above (The success rate for women applicants is the number of women recruited divided by the total number of women who have applied. Analogously for the success rate of men applicants.)		

Key questions for qualitative data collection on recruitment

Here follows a list of qualitative key questions which are useful both for interpreting the significance of the collected quantitative data with regard to the status of gender equality in the GEII and for gathering further information from select HR personnel. In particular, some of these questions may serve as cornerstones for interviewing human resource managers in order to examine the procedures followed in defining job descriptions and adverts and to obtain basic information on extant measures to counteract gender bias.

- Are there formalised standard procedures for job appointments in place (e.g. guidelines for appointments)? If so, please provide the relevant policy document (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Does the GEII have formalised policies, for counteracting gender bias and promoting gender equality in the GEII's recruitment processes and outcomes, in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- How are job descriptions and adverts defined (broadly or narrowly)? Who is involved in drafting them?
- Are job adverts public?
- Do job descriptions include gender competence according to the respective task and do performance assessments cover relevant gender competences?
- Is there a routine procedure in place to ensure that only explicitly stated criteria have an impact on recruitment decisions and that those criteria are applied equally to every candidate? If so, please specify and/or provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of step 4).
- How does the profile of the successful candidate reflect the (potential, actual and shortlisted) applicant profile?
- What is the composition of the recruitment panel (gender representation and balance/level of responsibility)?
- Do recruitment panels receive gender equality training or briefing?
- Is there a standard format for recording the decisions taken by recruitment panels?
- Are the recruitment criteria explicit, transparent and weighted in a standard way? Are they fixed for the entire process?
- Is expertise in the integration of gender analysis into research and teaching content among the recruitment criteria for academics?

4.1.2 Retention: Practical Tool C

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender-related institutional barriers to careers

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for removing institutional obstacles to women's professional career and enhancing women's career development within GEIIs

Area of gender equality auditing: Retention

Key question	Key quantitative indicator	Source of information	Data collection method
Are there gender differences with regard to the GEII's personnel retention?	Average number of months/years that male and female employees stay with the organisation, broken down by disciplinary field (for researchers and academic teaching staff), job level, temporary or permanent position, part-time or full-time position, and – where possible – by age, care responsibilities, religion and ethnical background	Records of personnel retention held by the HR department, select HRM personnel	Desk analysis of records and aggregated data concerning personnel retention, interview with select HRM personnel
	Number of women and men having left the organisation in previous years, specifying the number of years spent in the organisation, broken down as above		

Key questions for qualitative data collection on retention

Here follows a list of qualitative key questions which are useful both for interpreting the significance of the collected quantitative data with regard to the status of gender equality in the GEII and for gathering further information from select HR personnel through interviews.

- Does the GEII have formalised policies for promoting gender equality in personnel retention in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy document (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Does the organisation provide flexible work arrangements (e.g., part time work, alternate work hours, working from home, etc.) for its employees and collaborators? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Does the organisation provide facilities or benefits regarding work-life balance? (e.g., childcare facilities, healthcare benefits, other organisational welfare measures)? If so, please provide relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Does the organisation have a childcare and dependent care leave policy in place (e.g., paternity leave policy)? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4)

- Are there other family responsive policies with regard to work-life balance in your organisation? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Are staff encouraged to take advantage of flexible work arrangements?
- Are female staff encouraged to take advantage of maternity leave beyond the period prescribed by law?
- Are male parents among the staff encouraged to take advantage of paternity leave?
- Is there a gender pay gap in the organisation?
- Does the organisation promote CV relevant training courses?
- Does the organisation support re-entry paths after career breaks (e.g. maternities)?

4.1.3   Promotion: Practical Tool D

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender-related institutional barriers to careers

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for removing institutional obstacles to women's professional career and enhancing women's career development within GEIIs

Area of gender equality auditing: Promotion

Key question	Key quantitative indicator	Source of information	Data collection method
Is there a gender bias with regard to career progression or promotion within the GEII?	Number of career progression steps within the GII since 2010, broken down by disciplinary field (for researchers and academic teaching staff), job level, progression to temporary or permanent position, part-time or full-time position, and – where possible – by age, care responsibilities, religion and ethnical background	Records of GEII-internal career progressions held by the HR department, select HRM personnel	Desk analysis of records and aggregated data concerning career progressions, interviews with select HRM personnel
	Share of women and men among applicants or persons shortlisted for promotion since 2010, broken down as above		
	Share of women and men promoted since 2010, broken down as above		
	Success rate for women and men applicants for promotion, broken down as above (The success rate for women applicants for promotion is the number of women promoted divided by the total number of women who have applied for promotion. Analogously for the success rate of men applicants.)		

Key questions for qualitative data collection on promotion

Here follows a list of qualitative key questions which are useful both for interpreting the significance of the collected quantitative data with regard to the status of gender equality in the GEII and for gathering further information from select HR personnel. In particular, some of these questions may serve as cornerstones for interviewing human resource managers in order to

examine the procedures followed in defining career progression steps and to obtain basic information on existing measures to counteract gender bias in this regard.

- Does the GEII have formalised HR policies for promoting gender equality in career progression decisions in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy document (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Are there formalised standard procedures and guidelines for the GEII's internal promotion procedures? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- If so, are they clearly developed and transparent?
- Is promotion in your GEII based on merit?
- Are the criteria for promotion explicit, transparent and weighted in a standard way? Are they fixed for the entire process?
- Is there a routine procedure in place to ensure that only explicitly stated criteria have an impact on promotion decisions and that the criteria are applied equally to every candidate? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Are promotion panels gender-balanced?
- Is the level of authority and responsibility balanced between female and male promotion panel members?
- Is the management committed to promoting female representation at senior and top levels of the GEII?
- Is good performance in the field of gender equality rewarded in the GEII?
- Are there gender awareness initiatives or briefings in place for the members of promotion committees, in particular with regard to career progressions towards influential positions?
- Are there incentives for supporting/promoting early stage career employees?
- Is IGAR expertise included in promotion criteria for academics?

4.1.4   SWOT analysis on Gender-related institutional barriers to careers

To support the reflexivity process, a SWOT analysis for each of the three focus areas in HRM might be performed after the data collection phase. "SWOT" is an acronym for "strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats". A SWOT analysis (sometimes also called SWOT matrix) is a structured planning method that evaluates strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats with regard to the process of fostering specific organisational goals, in our context: the goal of structural change towards enhanced gender equality. For each element that you identify, please

indicate the evidence base, i.e., the relevant quantitative and qualitative data collected through the GEA steps 2 and 3.1.

SWOT Chart 1

Strengths: characteristics of the organisation that give it an advantage concerning the removal of gender-related institutional barriers to careers	Weaknesses: characteristics of the organisation that give it a disadvantage concerning the removal of gender-related institutional barriers to careers
Opportunities: elements that the organisation could exploit to foster the removal of the gender-related institutional barriers to careers	Threats: elements in the organisational environment that could impede structural change towards the removal of the gender-related institutional barriers to careers

4.2 Decision-Making

Balancing the gender composition of decision-making bodies, as well as the gender distribution of top and upper level management positions, is strategic to effectively counteract unconscious gender bias, improve the quality of committee work through diversity and symbolically change institutional culture (cf. EC 2016b). This holds, both with regards to the numbers of men and women in decision-making bodies and upper top and upper level management positions (share of women and men), and with regards to the assigned responsibilities and decision-making capacities (e.g., are the women and men involved in a decision-making body on a par with regards to their decisional responsibilities?). Gender balance and equality in decision-making bodies and processes can be enhanced by different means, e.g. through the use of quotas, targets or other 'softer' strategies. In order to create the knowledge base for customised GEP interventions, and to identify GEII-specific challenges in this regard, the aim of this GEA focus is to achieve a firm understanding of the relevant decision-making bodies and positions within each GEII, focusing on a description of

- the key decision-making bodies,
- their gender composition and the levels of responsibility of men and women members within decision-making committees,
- their functional role within the GEII (areas of decision making powers),
- the procedures by which members of decision-making bodies are selected and appointed,
- the levels of compensation, benefits and prestige associated with top positions and membership in decision-making bodies.

To gain in-depth understanding of gender equality issues in the decision-making processes of a GEII, it is important to keep in mind that such processes can be both formal (i.e., following explicitly acknowledged standard procedures that guarantee a level of transparency) and informal (i.e., not following explicit procedures and thus tending to remain opaque). Alongside the collection of quantitative data on the share of women and men in decision-making positions and bodies, this GEA focus includes semi-structured interviews with members of the top and senior management as well as heads of research departments and/or units (cf. FESTA 2015a, 2015b).

If it is unfeasible to take into account all decision-making bodies and/or top and upper level management positions in your GEII, please select those which are most relevant to the goals of the GEA. The following questions may be useful for focusing the selection:

- Does the decision-making body/top or senior management figure decide on significant budget allocations?

- Does the decision-making body/top or senior management figure take decisions that affect gender equality in the working life of staff? If so, to what extent?
- Is the decision-making-body/top or senior management figure strategic with regard to implementing the subsequent GEP in at least one of the TARGET GEA dimensions human resource management, decision making, gender in research content and higher education curricula?

4.2.1 Decision-Making Bodies and Processes: Practical Tool E

TARGET GEA dimension: Decision Making

Goal: setting up the knowledge base for increasing gender balance in decision-making bodies and processes

Area of gender equality auditing: Gender distribution decision-making bodies and among top and senior level management

Key question	Key quantitative indicators	Source of information	Data collection method
Are the GEII's decision-making bodies and the distribution of top and senior level management positions gender balanced?	Share of women and men among the members of internal decision-making boards, broken down by organisational area (management, administration, research), position in the organisational structure, and – where possible – by age, care responsibilities, religion and ethnical background Share of women and men on top and senior level positions, broken down as above	Documents regarding the organisational structure of decision-making bodies and the definition of their decision capacities, select staff in decision-making positions	Desk analysis of documents regarding the organisational structure of decision-making bodies and the definition of their decision capacities, interviews with select staff in decision-making positions

Fact sheet for decision-making bodies

For each decision-making body of your institution, please compile a separate sheet.

Name of the decision-making body	
Functional description (decision making power, budget decided on)	
Members of the decision-making body (indicate institutional position and work unit/department)	
Composition of the decision-making body (men/women, heads)	
How are members of the decision-making body appointed/selected? Who nominates its members?	

Key questions for qualitative data collection on decision-making boards and processes

Here follows a list of qualitative key questions which are useful both for interpreting the significance of the collected quantitative data with regard to the status of gender equality at the GEII's decision-making level and for gathering further information from select senior and top-level members of the management, research staff and HR personnel. In particular, some of these questions may serve as cornerstones for interviewing select decision makers to examine the role of informal decision-making processes (concerning budget allocation, research strategies and personnel etc.) in your institution. Moreover, some of the questions may be used in interviews with relevant actors in key organisational positions to achieve an overview of existing GEII policies which explicitly address gender equality issues in decision making.

- Does the GEII have formalised policies for promoting gender equality in decision-making bodies and processes in place (e.g., policies regarding the gender composition of decision-making bodies or the gender distribution among senior and top-level staff)? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- If such policies are in place, who was involved in developing them?
- Does the GEII informally promote gender balance in decision-making boards and among senior and top-level personnel?
- Does the GEII allocate dedicated funding to the promotion of women's representation at senior levels of management and professional staff? (cf. ILO 2012: 20)
- How and by whom are decision makers monitored? Is there any reporting or accountability to other relevant units on gender-related issues? (ILO 2012: 20)

- To what degree are people left out or included in decision-making processes, partially or fully informed, and informed in a timely manner? (ILO 2012: 20)
- Are both women and men decision makers involved in developing the budget for different work units?

Specifically for interviews:
- Who decides on the allocation of funds to people and projects in your work unit? Are there transparent criteria for the allocation?
- Do you feel that you have been left out from important decision-making processes in the past? What are the reasons?
- Do you consider yourself to be in the loop of the communication processes on budget allocation, project funding, etc.?
- According to your experiences, what is the role of informal decision-making processes in your organisation?
- Do you have the impression that there is an "inner circle" with strong influence on decision-making processes in your department/faculty/work unit?
- How do you usually get to know about the decisions taken by others?
- Do you have the impression that important decisions concerning the organisation in general and your work unit in particular are generally taken and communicated in transparent ways?
- Are there any aspects in the decision-making processes of your department/faculty/work unit that you take to be particularly relevant to gender equality issues?

4.2.2   SWOT Analysis on Gender Equality in Decision Making

For an explanation of the SWOT analysis tool please refer to section 3.1.4 above. For each element that you identify, indicate the evidence base, i.e., the relevant quantitative and qualitative data collected through the GEA steps 2 and 3.2.

SWOT Chart 2

Strengths: characteristics of the organisation that give it an advantage concerning the promotion of gender equality in the field of decision making	Weaknesses: characteristics of the organisation that give it a disadvantage concerning the promotion of gender equality in the field of decision making
Opportunities: elements that the organisation could exploit to foster the promotion of gender equality in the area of decision making	Threats: elements in the organisational environment that could impede structural change towards gender equality in the area of decision making

4.3 Gender in Research Content and Higher Education Curricula

Strengthening the gender dimension in research and innovation (R&I) content and higher education curricula is strategic to effectively counteract gender bias in knowledge production and transmission: "Our knowledge is the basis on which future generations will build their societies. It is therefore crucial that the knowledge which is created through research and transferred through education is free of gender bias" (EIGE 2016: 48).

With the aim of creating the knowledge base for customised GEP interventions in the fields of research content and curricula, this GEA focus is intended to facilitate understanding of each participating GEII's status quo with regard to the integration of gender analysis into research and teaching. The quantitative data to be collected to facilitate this analysis is:

- the share of research projects whose main focus is on gender analysis (RPOs, quantitative)
- the share of research projects whose main focus is not on gender but which includes gender analysis as a sub-focus (RPOs, quantitative)
- the share of promoted research funding lines/programmes whose main focus is on gender, broken down by scientific discipline/research area (RFOs, quantitative)
- the share of promoted research funding lines/programmes whose main focus is on **not** on IGAR **but which include** IGAR as an aspect (RFOs, quantitative)

- the overall share of funding allocated to programmes including gender analysis either as the main focus or as a sub-focus (RFOs, quantitative)
- the overall share of external funding obtained for research projects including gender analysis either as the main focus or as a sub-focus (RPOs, quantitative)
- the overall share of internal funding provided for research projects including gender analysis either as the main focus or as a sub-focus (RPOs)
- the number and percentage of study and degree programmes that have gender analysis as their main focus (RPOs with higher education degree programmes)
- the number and percentage of study and degree programmes that contain gender analysis as a sub-focus (RPOs with higher education degree programmes)
- the number and percentage of teaching staff that receive training on how to integrate gender analysis into research and teaching (RPOs with higher education degree programmes)
- the number and percentage of graduates that have attended at least one seminar or lecture with a main focus on gender during their course of studies (RPOs with higher education degree programmes)

The remainder of this section presents a series of tools and contextualising questions for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data concerning the extent to which GEIIs integrate gender analysis into research and innovation content, teaching and, in the case of RFOs, funding lines and programmes. Moreover, a SWOT analysis cutting across these areas is again suggested.

4.3.1   Research Projects: Practical Tool F

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender in R&I content and higher education curricula

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for strengthening the gender dimension in R&I content and higher education curricula

Area of gender equality auditing: Research Projects

Key question	Key quantitative indicators	Source of information	Data collection method
Does the GEII pursue or propose **research projects** that include gender analysis?	overall share of research projects whose main focus is on gender analysis, broken down by scientific discipline/research area (since 2010)	project descriptions, research proposals, relevant research units' web pages, heads of research units and project coordinators	desk review of project descriptions, research proposals, relevant research units' web pages, interviews with heads of research units and project coordinators
	overall share of research projects whose main focus is **not** on gender analysis **but which include** measures aimed at integrating gender analysis into research (IGAR), broken down by scientific discipline/research area (since 2010)		

Key questions on research projects

- Does the GEII have formalised policies for promoting gender-aware research projects in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- Does the GEII provide incentives for gender analysis projects through informal means?
- For each research project in the GEII whose main focus is on gender analysis, what is the budget allocated, the number of human resources allocated, the number and percentage of women and men who are involved in the GEII's research team, and the gender of the principal investigator?
- For each research project in the GEII whose main focus is **not** on gender analysis **but which includes** measures aimed at IGAR, what is the budget allocated, the number of human resources allocated, the number and percentage of women and men who are involved in the GEII's research team, and the gender of the principal investigator?
- For each research project in the GEII whose main focus is **not** on gender analysis **but which includes** measures aimed at IGAR, do the project's outputs comprise research publications focused on gender issues? If so, please specify by research area, type of publication (journal article, article in conference proceedings, book chapter etc.), language of the publication, open access (yes/no), standard peer review in place (yes/no).
- Does your organization use participatory methods to incorporate the views and preferences of both male and female community members in project design?

Specifically for interviews with heads of research units and research-project coordinators (partly adapted from GARCIA 2015):

- Do you take gender balance and equality as something to strive for with regard to your unit/project team? If so, why? If not so, why not?
- Are you actively counteracting hierarchical gendered relations in your unit/project team?
- Are you discouraging gender segregation in your team?
- Do you have both men and women in mind when you formulate research questions and proposals?
- Do you routinely check whether men and women are differently related to the research problem you want to deal with?
- Do you routinely search for gender-sensitive studies when preparing the literature review for your research projects?
- Is the language you use in research proposals and papers gender-sensitive?
- Do you disaggregate data by sex?
- Do you have equal number of both sexes/genders in your samples?
- Does your research relate to gender inequalities in society?
- For each project that either has a main focus on gender analysis or includes measures aimed at IGAR: can you briefly describe the gender concept that is employed in the project? Please also indicate whether intersections between gender and other social characteristics, such as age, care duties, religious or ethnical background, are taken into account.

4.3.2 Research Funding: Practical Tool G

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender in R&I content and higher education curricula

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for strengthening the gender dimension in R&I content and higher education curricula

Area of gender equality auditing: Research Funding

Key question	Key quantitative indicators	Source of information	Data collection method
RFOs: Does the GEII promote research funding lines/ programmes that aim at IGAR?	overall share of research funding lines/programmes whose main focus is on integrating gender analysis into research content (IGAR), broken down by scientific discipline/research area (since 2010)	documents that describe funding lines/ programmes and calls for proposals, grant agreements with beneficiaries, select RFO staff	desk review of documents that describe funding lines/programmes and calls for proposal, grant agreements with beneficiaries, interviews with select RFO staff
	overall share of research funding lines/programmes whose main focus is on **not** on IGAR **but which include** IGAR as an aspect, broken down by scientific discipline / research area (since 2010)		
	overall share of funding allocated to programmes including IGAR either as the main focus or as an aspect, broken down as above		
RFOs: Is the funding emitted by the GEII gender balanced?	overall share of successful women applicants (principal investigators) for funding, broken down by scientific discipline / research area / funding line (since 2010)	records on funded projects and involved research personnel, grant agreements with beneficiaries	desk review of records on funded projects and grant agreements with beneficiaries
	success rate of women applicants for funding as compared to the success rate of men applicants, broken down as above		
	(The success rate for women applicants is the number of women applicants (principal investigators) receiving funding divided by the total number of women applicants		

	for funding. Analogously for the success rate of men applicants.)		
RPOs: Does the GEII pursue externally or internally (institutionally) funded research projects that include gender analysis?	overall share of external funding obtained for research projects including IGAR either as the main focus or as an aspect, by scientific discipline/ research area (since 2010)	successful research proposals, grant agreements with funding institutions, and internal (institutional) funding records	desk review of project descriptions, research proposals, grant agreements, and internal (institutional) funding records
	overall share of internal funding provided for research projects including IGAR either as the main focus or as an aspect, broken down as above		
RPOs: Is there gender balance with regard to the coordination of the GEII's externally and/or internally funded research projects?	overall share of women principal investigators/project coordinators in externally funded research projects (since 2010)	successful research proposals, grant agreements with funding institutions, and internal (institutional) funding records	desk review of successful research proposals, research proposals, grant agreements, and internal (institutional) funding records
	overall share of women principal investigators/project coordinators in internally (institutionally) funded research projects (since 2010)		

Key Questions on Funding for RFOs:[2]

- Does the GEII have formalised policies for promoting gender-awareness in funding programmes in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4).

- Does the GEII provide incentives for gender-awareness in funding programme design through informal means?

- Does the GEII have measures in place that promote higher levels of women's participation and a more gender balanced distribution of funding? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).

- Does the GEII flag sections and/or topics where sex and gender analysis is specifically relevant in the calls? If so, please specify.

---

[2] Complementary questions and indicators for RFOs can be found in GENDER-NET 2016: 106.

- Does the GEII require applicants to indicate whether sex and or gender analysis is relevant to their proposed research as a standard?
- Do the expert evaluation panels nominated by your GEII include at least one gender expert?
- Do members of the GEII's expert evaluation panels receive gender equality training or briefing?
- Does the GEII's evaluation system include specific scoring for the appropriate integration of sex and/or gender analysis in the research?
- Does the GEII provide information and guidelines on promoting IGAR to grant administration staff, applicants, and evaluators?
- Do the GEII's research grants provide supplementary funding/eligible costs for training in, and exploration of, IGAR issues?
- What gender concepts and understandings are employed in the GEII's research funding lines and programmes? Are intersections between gender and other social characteristics, such as age, care duties, religious or ethnical background, taken into account?

Key Questions on Funding for RPOs:
- Does the GEII have formalised policies for providing incentives for grant applications for gender-related projects in place?
- Does the GEII provide incentives for grant applications for gender-related projects through informal (cultural) means? If so, please specify how.
- Does the GEII promote gender-related projects through internal funding? If so, please specify.
- Does the GEII consider IGAR as a strategic priority in research focus planning? If so, why? If not so, why not?
- Does the GEII have measures in place that promote gender balance with regard to the coordination of research projects? If so, please provide the relevant documentation (in preparation of GEA step 4).
- To what extent does the GEII take existing gender-aware project funding schemes at the European and/or national level to be sufficiently attractive to invest time and energy for proposal submission?
- What concepts and understandings of gender are employed in the GEII's research projects that either have gender analysis as their main focus or include it as an aspect? Are intersections between gender and other social characteristics, such as age, care duties, religious or ethnical background, taken into account?

4.3.3   Higher Education Curricula: Practical Tool H

TARGET GEA dimension: Gender in R&I content and higher education curricula

Goal: Setting up the knowledge base for strengthening the gender dimension in R&I content and higher education curricula

Area of gender equality auditing: Higher Education Curricula

Key question	Key quantitative indicators (adapted from Gender-Net 2016: 109)	Source of information	Data collection method
Does the GEII offer study and degree programmes that have gender analysis as their main focus?	Number and percentage of study and degree programmes that have gender analysis as their main focus, broken down by Bachelor/Master/PhD programmes and disciplinary fields	BA/MA/PhD curricula	desk analysis of BA/MA/PhD curricula
Does the GEII offer study and degree programmes that contain gender analysis as a sub-focus?	Number and percentage of study and degree programmes that contain gender analysis as a sub-focus, (modules: obligatory/ eclective) broken down as above	BA/MA/PhD curricula	desk analysis of BA/MA/PhD curricula
Does the GEII offer training on IGAR to its teaching staff?	Number and percentage of teaching staff trained on IGAR, broken down by disciplinary fields (since 2010)	records of training seminars/ workshops for teaching staff	desk analysis of records of training seminars/ workshops for teaching staff, online survey among academic and teaching staff (see section 3.4)
Is gender a cross-cutting subject in the GEII's study and degree programmes?	Number and percentage of graduates that have attended at least one course/seminar/lecture with a main focus on gender during their course of studies, broken down by Bachelor/Master/PhD and disciplinary fields (since 2010)	credit records of Bachelor/ Master/PhD students	desk analysis of credit records of Bachelor/ Master/ PhD students, online survey among academic and teaching staff (see section 3.4)

Key questions on gender in higher education curricula

- Does the GEII have formalised policies for mainstreaming gender analysis in its higher education curricula in place? If so, please provide the relevant policy documents (in preparation of GEA step 4).

- Does the GEII provide incentives to mainstream gender analysis in its higher education curricula through informal (cultural) means? If so, please specify how.

- Are gender issues routinely taken into account and explicitly discussed during curriculum development processes?

- Are working groups and decision-making bodies in curriculum development gender balanced?

- Does the GEII encourage or provide incentives for the use of gender-sensitive teaching methods? If so, please specify how.

- Regarding seminars, lectures or courses with an explicit main focus or sub-focus on gender-analysis, please specify whether they are they are optional or mandatory.

- Regarding each seminar, lecture or course with an explicit main focus or sub-focus on gender analysis, please specify the gender of the lecturer. What is the share of male lecturers?

- Do course descriptions indicate the relation between teaching content and gender issues?

4.3.4 SWOT Analysis on Strengthening the Gender Dimension in R&I Content and Higher Education Curricula

For an explanation of the SWOT analysis tool please refer to section 3.1.4 above. For each element that you identify, please indicate the evidence base, i.e., the relevant quantitative and/or qualitative data collected through the GEA steps 2 and 3. Since the data to be collected by means of the survey among academic and research staff (see section 3.4) will complement the results of the desk analyses performed under 3.3, this SWOT analysis should be carried out after the results of the survey are in.

SWOT Chart 3

Strengths: characteristics of the organisation that give it an advantage concerning the mainstreaming of gender analysis in research content and higher education curricula	Weaknesses: characteristics of the organisation that give it a disadvantage concerning the mainstreaming of gender analysis in research content and higher education curricula
Opportunities: elements that the organisation could exploit to promote the mainstreaming of gender analysis in research content and higher education curricula	Threats: elements in the organisational environment that could impede structural change towards mainstreaming gender analysis in research content and higher education curricula

4.4 Survey among Academic and Research Staff

Given the differences among the GEIIs (size, mission, data collecting methodologies), the structures of collecting information through a survey on the existing gender equality policies within organisations might differ[3]. Surveys are to be implemented differently, and with different timings, according to the specificity of the organisations. Information collected in the TARGET project will be analysed in a Report, and they will feed the GEPs implementation in the GEIIs.

In the following sections, format surveys for RPOs and RFOs are outlined. In addition, and given the specificity of one of the partners (RMEI), the TARGET project promoted a customised survey for the organisation of a network of universities (see section 4.4.3).

4.4.1   Possible survey for RPOs

The survey among academic and research staff that is outlined in this section will include general questions concerning current employment status, career history, aspirations and professional developments, experience and perceptions regarding the level of gender equality in

---

[3] To adapt the survey to the specific settings of the participating GEIIs, its details and mode of administration is defined by TARGET's supporting partners (FGB, NOTUS) in consultation the GEIIs' change agents and their assistants.

the working environment, work/life balance, as well as more specific questions addressed only to academic and research staff with teaching obligations in the GEIIs. The latter set of questions will concern the extent to which teaching staff integrate gender issues into their teaching contents and methodologies, thus complementing the desk analyses of documents regarding the integration of gender analysis into R&I contents and higher education curricula.

The following points regarding personal data protection merit particular emphasis: the supporting partners will not have access to individual data (names, addresses etc.) of the respondents; the implementation of the survey will meet all national standards with regard to data security or data protection; the information gathered will not be traceable to specific individuals (anonymous); data will only be presented in aggregate form.

The following format is based on two of the INTEGER surveys, the GEAT and the LEAP Climate survey.

Survey targeted at academic and research (including postdoc) staff

Consent form

1. **Current employment status**	
What is your current grade?	[Chair/ Professor/ Professor/ Associate Professor/ Assistant Professor/ Research Fellow/ Senior Research Fellow/ Other (please specify) [Blank Box]]
How long have you been in your current position?	[Blank Box]
What year were you appointed to your first academic position in [university name]?	[Blank Box]
What age were you appointed to this academic position in [university name]?	[Under 30/ 30-39/ 40-49/ 50-59/ Over 60 years]
Which faculty do you currently work in?	[Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences/ Engineering, Mathematics and Science/ Health Sciences]

Which school do you currently work in?	[Blank Box]
What percentage of your working time to you currently spend in each of the following areas?	[Teaching/ Research/ Academic administration/ Pastoral care/ Consultancy/ Other]
To achieve promotion, what percentage of your working time do you think you need to spend in each of the following areas	[Teaching/Research/ Academic Administration/ Pastoral Care/ Consultancy/ Other]
Which of the following academic tasks do you currently engage in?	[Yes/ No boxes for: Publish one or more peer reviewed journal article or equivalent] per annum/ Apply for external research funding/ Supervise Masters research students/ Supervise PhD students/ Present/ chair at conferences]
2. **Career history, aspirations and professional development**	
What factors influenced you to enter academia?	[select 3 ranked by order of importance from 1 to 3, where 1= most important: Permanent position/ Salary level/ Interest in research/ Autonomy/ self-direction/ Intellectual challenge/ flexible working arrangements/ Other [Blank Box]
Do you feel that you have achieved your career ambitions in terms of grade attainment?	[Yes/ No boxes] If yes, how? If no, why? [Blank Box]
Would you be interested in being a [College Office/ Faculty Dean/ Head of School]?	[Yes/no/Don't know/ Already have been] Please give reasons for your answers [Blank Box]
Do you expect to achieve a senior management position [e.g. College Officer, Faculty Dean, Head of School]?	[Yes/no/Don't know/ Already have been] Please give reasons for your answers [Blank Box]
Have you ever served on a committee?	[Please select all that apply: Chair/ Member/

	Never Served]
Which of the following Committees have you served on, if any?	[recruitment-selection committees for academic appointments/ Promotion and Review Committees/ Audit Committee/ Finance Committee/ Heads of Schools Committee/ Human Resources Committee/ Research Committee/ Equality Committee etc.]
In what way(s) if any, did committee membership benefit your career in [University Name]?	[Blank Box]
Have you applied for an academic promotion within [University Name]?	[Yes/ No box] If yes: How many times did you apply? [Blank Box] How many times were you successful? [Blank Box]
What has helped your career progression	[Blank Box] [Or please indicate the five factors that you believe contribute most to a successful career progression at [University Name] [Using professional networks effectively/ Assessment/ Prestige of your laboratory/ Scientific Collaborations/ Teaching skills and experience/ Creativity and risk taking/ Committee experience/ Geographical or thematic mobility/ Volume of peer reviewed articles/ books/ chapters/ Citations of published academic work/ Obtaining internal funding/ Obtaining external funding/ Research management experience/ Awards or prizes/ Proactive support form senior researchers/ Visibility e.g. working on high profile subjects/

	funded projects]
What has impeded your career progression?	[Blank Box] [Or please indicate the five factors that you think have adversely affected your career progression at [University Name]. [Unable to easily move location/ Taking a career break/ Unavailability of flexible working when required/ Partner's career/ Lack of quality affordable childcare and or/ dependent care/ Research field too interdisciplinary/ Research filed too specialised/ Unconventional career path/ Periods of working less than full time]
Are you aware of existing policies or measures within your institution that intend to promote gender equality? If so, do you think that those policies measures could be helpful in obtaining your career goal?	[Yes/ No box] If yes: [Yes/ No box]
3. Work-life balance	
What is your understanding of work-life balance?	[Blank Box]
How satisfied are you with the current balance between your professional and personal life?	[Very satisfied/ Satisfied/ Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied/ Dissatisfied/ Very dissatisfied]
If relevant, what do you think would help you achieve a better work-life balance?	[Blank Box] or [Or in your opinion, which of the following are the 'most important' contributions to good work/ life balance? Please select all that apply: Important meetings/ activities scheduled within core hours/ Regular times/ days for key internal meetings/ events/ Conference call/ Video –conference opportunities for meetings/

	Being able to ask for time off at short notice within leave allocation, without need to give reasons/ Enhanced maternity/ paternity / other parental leave]
Have you ever benefited from any of the following flexible working arrangements in your academic career in [University Name]?	[Career break/ Sabbatical/ Other unpaid leave/ Part-time working/ Job share/ Term-time working/ Other]
Would you like to benefit from any of the following flexible working arrangements in your academic career?	[Career break/ Sabbatical/ Other unpaid leave/ Part-time working/ Job share/ Term-time working/ Other]
Do you regularly work from home?	[Yes/ No box] If so, how often? [Evenings and/ weekends only/ One to several days per month/ half a day to one day a week/ Several days a week/ Other specify: [Blank Box]]
How many hours on average do you work per week?	[Blank Box]
How frequently do you travel for work purposes (for an overnight stay or longer) e.g. for meetings/ conferences?	[Never/ 1 or 2 times per year/ 3 or 4 times per year/ 5-9 times per year/ 10-12 times per year/ more than 12 times per year/ Fortnightly/ Weekly]
Have you ever taken any family related leave while working in [University Name]?	[Yes/ No Box] If yes – please select all that apply and indicate how many leaves you have taken: [maternity leave/ paternity leave/ adoption leave/ parental leave/ leave for other caring responsibilities]
Did you experience any difficulties in returning to work after one or more career breaks?	[Yes/ No box] If yes please elaborate [blank box]

Are you aware of existing policies or measures within your institution that intend to promote work-life balance? If so, do you think that those policies measures could be helpful in obtaining your career goal?	[Yes/ No box] If yes: [Yes/ No box]
Have you ever benefited from the existing policies or measures concerning work-life balance in your institution?	[Yes/ No box] If so please specify: [Blank Box]

4. Department/ School or Research Unit [departments/ laboratories]

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning conditions in your School/ Research Unit by checking the following boxes	[Strongly agree/ agree/ disagree/ strongly disagree/ not applicable/ no views]

I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues in my school.

I feel able to put forward my opinions.

I feel that I do not 'fit in' easily within my school.

I have access to suitable role models.

I work harder than my colleagues do, in order to be perceived as a legitimate scholar.

I seldom have the opportunity to participate in important committees/ meetings/ projects.

I have received encouragement from senior colleagues to apply for a promotion.

I am reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it will affect my career/ promotion.

Colleagues assume I am a spokesperson for others of my gender/ ethnicity.

Colleagues solicit my opinions about their research.

I solicit colleagues opinions about my research.

I network (seek and give advice/ assistance) with colleagues in my department/unit.	
I network with colleagues outside my department/ unit.	
Please rate the culture of your School against the following criteria:	[Strongly agree/ agree/ disagree/ strongly disagree/ not applicable/ no views]
Friendly	
Collaborative	
Supportive	
Cooperative	
Inclusive	
Non-sexist	
Diverse	
Respectful	
Transparent	
How satisfied are you with the following dimensions of your working environment? [include space as a dimension]	[Very satisfied/ satisfied/ dissatisfied/ very dissatisfied]
Opportunities to collaborate with other (non) faculty members	
Degree of social interaction with members of my school	
Levels of funding for my research or creative efforts	
Current salary in comparison with the salaries of my colleagues	
Ability to attract students to work with me	
Sense of being valued for my teaching by members of my school	

sense of being valued for my research, scholarship, or creativity by members of my School.	
In your current working environment have you ever experienced any of the following behaviours?	[sexual/ sexist teasing, jokes, remarks or questions/ pressure for dates/ sexual/ sexist letters, phone calls, emails/ leaning over, cornering, pinching, touching, unwanted physical contacts/ pressure for sexual favours/ stalking/ physical or sexual assault]
Do you have the impression of working in an environment that is inclusive with regard to gender and diversity more generally (e.g. age, religious or ethnic backgrounds, care duties)?	[Strongly agree/ agree/ disagree/ strongly disagree/ not applicable/ no views:] Please elaborate [Blank Box]
To what extent do you agree or disagree that your department/ school is committed to gender equality in the following areas?	[Strongly agree/ agree/ disagree/ strongly disagree/ not applicable/ no views]

In general men and women are equally well represented (in terms of numbers) in my department.
In general men and women are treated equally in my department.
My department is committed to promoting gender equality.
If I had concerns about gender equality in my department, I would know who to approach.
My department is responsive to concerns about gender equality.

Please rate on a scale of 1 to 7 whether you perceive an advantage towards women (scored as 1) or an advantage towards men (scored as 7) across the following items describing the allocation of tasks and resources in your department.	[scale 1 to 7]

Allocation of desirable and sought after tasks/roles.
Distribution of office space.

Receipt of mentoring.	
Attention from senior management.	
Access to informal circles of influence.	
Receiving positive feedback from management.	
Recruitment and selection for academic posts.	
Promotion decisions.	
Allocation of career development opportunities.	
Distribution of laboratory space or equipment.	
Invitations to conferences.	
Appointments to editorships.	
Recognition of intellectual contributions.	
Allocation of administrative tasks.	
Allocation of pastoral care roles.	
Allocation of teaching.	
Please rate on a scale of 1 to 7 whether you perceive an advantage towards women (scored as 1) or an advantage towards men (scored as 7) to reach senior posts within your department?	[scale from 1 to 7]
5. Gender in higher education curricula (only for academic and research staff with teaching obligations)	
Do you think that integrating gender analysis as a cross-cutting topic in curricular is something to strive for?	[Yes/ No box] Please elaborate [Blank Box]

Do you routinely strive to integrate gender analysis into your teaching programmes, reading and writing assignments?	[Yes/ No box] If so, please describe the most frequent social reactions and attitudes to gender analysis aspects of your classes [Blank Box]
When you ask your students to perform teamwork, do you encourage them to work in gender diverse groups?	[Yes/ No box]
Is awareness-raising about gender stereotypes with regard to the field you teach among your teaching goals?	[Yes/ No box]
6. Demographic Information	
What is your sex?	[Female/ Male boxes]
What is your age?	[Under 30 years/ 30-39 years/ 40-49 years/ 50-59 years/ Over 60 years]
Do you have a partner (same or opposite sex) or spouse?	[Yes/ No box] If so is your partner/ spouse currently employed? [Yes – full-time/ Yes- part-time/No] Does your partner/ spouse work in academia or a research institution? [Yes- same/related discipline/ Yes – other discipline/ No- works outside academia]
Do you have caring responsibilities for dependent children and/ or adults?	[Yes/No box] Please select all that apply and indicate number (age groups) [yes – children under 6/ Yes- children aged between 6-18/ Yes- dependent young adults living at home/ Yes- adult dependents (e.g.

	partner, parents)]
If you have any additional comments about this survey and/ or the topics covered please add them here.	[Blank Box]

4.4.2 Possible survey for RFOs

The survey aimed specifically at Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) can be delivered to the national/local 'pool of researchers' and/or the research funded organisations. The survey will include general questions concerning:

- Statistics on the gender distribution in the national/local 'pool of researchers'
- Data on research applications
- Data for gender equality monitoring of research funded organisations
- Data on the recruitment of researchers in research funded organisations
- Data on the (internal) promotion of researchers or staff in the research funded organisation
- Data on the recruitment and/or promotion boards and decision-making bodies in the research funded organisation
- Data on work/life balance in the research funded organisation
- Data on implemented gender equality measures in research funded organisations

Possible survey targeted at research funding organisations

Name of the institution/organisation	[Blank Box]
Number of researchers and staff (total)	[Blank Box]
Number of researchers by gender and position [Temporary position researchers – students; PhD students; post-doc/ Permanent position researchers/ Temporary position principal investigators (senior and junior)/ Permanent position principal investigators (senior and junior)/ Research managers/ Scientific	[Blank Box]

director]	
Age limitations for internal competitions and/ or research application	[Yes/No]
Age adjustment based on parental leave for internal competitions and/ or research application	[Yes/No]
How many Post-docs already affiliated with the Institute/ organisation have become Principal Investigators in the last 5 years (by gender, age group and type of contract)?	[under 30 yrs/ 30-40 yrs/ over 40 yrs; Temporary position/ Permanent position/ Other]
How many Post-docs not previously affiliated with the Institute/organisation have become Principal Investigators in the last 5 years (by gender, age group and type of contract)?	[under 30 yrs/ 30-40 yrs/ over 40 yrs; Temporary position/ Permanent position/ Other]
Number of individuals requesting parental leave in the last 5 years (by gender)	[Blank Box]
Implemented gender equality measures/activities [Specific measures and/or programmes for attracting female researchers/Specific recruitment and promotion policies for female researchers/Measures, including quotas, to ensure a gender balanced composition committees/Flexible career trajectory (e.g. provisions to allow interruptions of career, returning schemes after career interruptions)/Work-life-balance measures (e.g. parental leave, flexible working arrangements for researchers)/Development of gender competences (e.g. training, mentoring, guidelines of best	[Blank Box]

practices)/Networking opportunities for female researchers/ Measures against sexual harassment/Other]	

4.4.3   Survey for network of Universities

Network of universities and network of organisations in general are becoming more frequent as innovative research requires multi-disciplinarity. In this view a survey for this kind of organisations might be very useful.

Name of your university	[Blank Box]
Your name and position in the university	Name [Blank Box] Position [Blank Box] e-mail address [Blank Box] Telephone number [Blank Box]
Please quote if you are female or male.	[female/ male]
How is the topic "Gender Equality" embedded in the organisation of your university?	There is a special organizational unit focusing on "Gender Equality" Gender Equality is dealt with among other issues in a unit with broader responsibilities There is no special organizational unit established in my university, but a single person is • dealing with gender equality only, • dealing with gender equality among other responsibilities. There is no special department or person responsible for this topic Other form of organisation (please, specify)
Does your university have a "Gender Equality	Yes, there is a separate Gender Equality Plan

Plan" (or equivalent)?	(please, provide with the web-link to your plan – or equivalent) No, there is no separate Gender Equality Plan Gender is an integrated part of the university's Human Resource Strategy There are plans to develop an institutional Gender Equality Plan/Strategy At the moment Gender Equality is not a priority topic of my university. Please, specify your answer: [Blank Box]
Does your organisation assess the implementation of the Gender Equality Plan or Strategy?	[Yes/No] If yes, Please specify which measures are used for assessments: [Blank Box]
Which of the following activities were implemented at your university in 2016 and 2017? *(Multiple answers possible)*	Specific measures and/ or programmes for attracting female students to engineering studies. Specific recruitment and promotion policies for female researchers. Measures, including quotas, to ensure a balanced composition of females and males in your organisation's committees (e.g. involved in recruitment, appointment, career progression, or - if applicable - in evaluation of research programmes or projects). Flexible career trajectory (e.g. provisions to allow interruptions of career, returning schemes after career interruptions). Gender aware mobility conditions (e.g. dual career mobility). Work-life-balance measures (e.g. parental leave, flexible working arrangements for

	researchers). Development of gender competence at your university (e.g. specific leadership training, gender/ diversity training for top or middle management, mentoring for female researchers) (if there are activities for the development of gender competence, please specify). Networking opportunities for female researchers. Guidelines of best practices disseminated within your organisation. Measures against sexual harassment. Other (please, specify)
Does your organisation face barriers when setting up activities in connection with gender issues?	[Yes/No]
If your organisation is facing barriers how important are the following barriers to setting up activities in connection with gender issues? (*Please rate accordingly*)	[Important/ Somewhat important/ Not important]
Regulations or policies at national or regional level are not specifically supportive of achieving gender equality at universities.	
Employment and/or labour law or policy at national or regional level do not allow to take action.	
Lack of resources for implementing gender equality in science and technology.	
Internal resistance against implementing measures supporting gender equality.	
If your university faces other barriers, please specify:	[Blank Box]

If possible, please provide some statistics regarding percentages of females at different levels and for different categories of human resources at your university:	
Top academic management of the university. President, Rector, CEO or equivalent leader of the institution?	[female/male]
If there are more equally responsible persons in the top university leadership team:	Number of the persons in the leadership team: [Blank Box] Number of women in the leadership team: [Blank Box]
Academic management level 2: Vice-Rectors (or equivalent)	Number of Vice-rectors (or equivalent): [Blank Box] Number of female Vice-rectors: [Blank Box]
Academic management level 3 (e.g. deans, please define in accordance with the structure of your university)	% of women at academic management level 3 [Blank Box]
Academic management level 4 (e.g. department heads, please define in accordance with the structure of your university)	% of women at academic management level 4: [Blank Box]
Top administrative management of the university: Administrative director (or equivalent)	[female/male]
Administrative management level 2 (please define in accordance with the structure of your university)	% of women at administrative management level 2: [Blank Box]
Women in appointment committees	% of women in appointment committees: [Blank Box]
Is there a requirement for gender diversity in appointment committees?	[yes/no]

If yes, is there a rule for a minimum number or a rate of female members?	Minimum number: [Blank Box] Minimum rate (%):[Blank Box]
Is there personnel available for advising appointment committees on gender equality issues?	[yes/no]
Scientific staff (as of today)	Number of full professors: [Blank Box] % of female full professors: [Blank Box] Number of associate professors: [Blank Box] % of female associate professors: [Blank Box] Number of assistant professors: [Blank Box] % of female assistant professors: [Blank Box] Number of other scientific staff: [Blank Box] % of female other scientific staff: [Blank Box]
Students (academic year 2016/2017)	Number of entry students: [Blank Box] % of female entry students: [Blank Box] Number of bachelor graduates: [Blank Box] % of female bachelors graduates: [Blank Box] Number of master graduates: [Blank Box] % of female master graduates: [Blank Box] Number of doctoral/PhD graduates: [Blank Box] % of female doctoral/PhD graduates: [Blank Box]
Coordinators of R&I projects at your university in the last 5 years	Number of coordinators: [Blank Box] % of female coordinators: [Blank Box]
Which three specific "Gender Equality" initiatives of your university would you define	1. [Blank Box] 2. [Blank Box]

of examples of best practice?	3. [Blank Box]
[If your university has a Gender Equality Strategy] Please mention some positive changes since your university focuses on "Gender Equality".	[Blank Box]
What are the next steps about "Gender Equality" in your university?	[Blank Box]
Any other comments:	[Blank Box]

5 Fourth Step: Taking Stock of Existing Gender Equality Policies

The purpose of the fourth, and final, GEA step is to take stock and prepare the analysis of existing gender equality policies within the participating GEIIs which have been identified in the previous steps 1-3. Moreover, this step serves to identify and analyse additional policies which, though not having an explicit gender equality focus, have a bearing on, or could be adapted to, the promotion of gender equality in GEIIs (e.g., policies supporting the reconciliation of work/study with care duties, policies concerning career progression, mentoring, research grants, travel grants, stipends etc.).

To start the implementation of this GEA step, the GEIIs' change agents should first classify the policies identified in the previous steps 1-3 with regard to the three TARGET GEA dimensions "Gender-related institutional barriers to careers", "Decision Making", and "Gender in Research and Innovation Content and Higher Education Curricula". Keep in mind here that a given policy may concern more than one of these dimensions.

To broaden the scope of the data collection concerning the organisation's policies, the GEIIs' change agents may also want to consult with strategic personnel in human resource management, and with persons involved in the organisation's decision-making bodies concerned with research strategy planning and curriculum development. Such consultations can proceed along the following lines:

> In the course of steps 1-3 of the TARGET gender equality audit that we are implementing, we have identified the institutional policies X, Y, Z, which have a bearing on gender equality issues in our organisation. Are you aware of other policies that may be relevant in this regard (e.g., policies regarding work/life balance, gender considerations in hiring processes, or the gender dimension in research and teaching etc.)? If so, please specify.

An additional means for broadening the scope of the data collection of the organisation's policies consists in desk reviews of available policy documents. Such desk reviews may be useful both for identifying policies and formalised measures which, though not having an explicit gender equality focus, have a bearing on, or could be adapted to, the promotion of gender equality in GEIIs. These reviews could also be used to assess the extent to which gender equality considerations are mainstreamed into the GEIIs' policy measures in general.

> **Tip**: Policy reviews can be accelerated by querying electronic versions of documents for specific words, by using the "Find" function in Word or PDF. For example, a quick search for the expressions "gender", "women", "men", "male", "female", "discrimination", "equality", "equity" can reveal the sections of a given document in which gender has been mainstreamed. Keep in mind, however, that electronic querying does not substitute for reading and understanding the

documents, as it is also important to determine in which sections gender issues have *not* been integrated and to analyse the missed opportunities.

(Adapted from ILO 2012: 36)

5.1 Practical Tool I

TARGET GEA dimension: all three dimensions (Gender-related institutional barriers to careers, Decision Making, Gender in Research Content and Higher Education Curricula)

Goal: Description and analysis of GEIIs' policies which are either explicitly concerned with gender equality issues or have a bearing on gender equality issues

Area of gender equality auditing: Policies

Key question	Source of information	Data collection method
What are the GEII's formalised policies and measures that either explicitly concern gender equality issues or have a bearing on gender equality issues? Policy dimensions: • gender-related institutional barriers to careers, • decision-making bodies and processes, • gender in research content and teaching curricula	strategic and policy documents, reports and guidelines dealing with the three substantive areas	desk review of strategic and policy documents, reports and guidelines dealing with the three substantive areas

Fact Sheet for Existing Policies

For each identified policy or measure, please provide a separate fact sheet.

Name of policy or measure (indicate internal reference number or other identifier, if available)	[Blank Box]
Focus dimension(s) of the policy or measure:	(a) gender-related institutional barriers to careers (b) decision-making bodies and processes (c) gender in research content and higher education curricula
Year of implementation	[Blank Box]
Personnel, working groups, committees involved in the development and drafting of the policy or measure	[Blank Box]
Objective of the policy or measure	[Blank Box]
Gender focus or gender relevance (explicit or implicit)	[Blank Box]
Description of the policy or measure	[Blank Box]
Target group(s)	[Blank Box]
Content (service provided)	[Blank Box]
Resources invested by the GEII (per year)	[Blank Box]
External resources (if any, per year)	[Blank Box]
Results achieved (e.g., number of male/female participants)	[Blank Box]
Evaluation of the policy's effectiveness available	[Yes/No] If an evaluation is available, please provide the relevant document and summarise its

	main results.
References (e.g., program description, yearly reports, evaluation report)	[Blank Box]
Contact for further questions	[Blank Box]

5.2 SWOT Analysis on Existing Gender Equality Policies

For an explanation of the SWOT analysis approach please refer to section 3.1.4 above. For each element that you identify, please indicate the evidence base, i.e., the relevant data collected through the GEA steps 1-4.

SWOT Chart 4

Strengths: characteristics of the organisation that give it an advantage concerning the development and implementation of gender equality policies	Weaknesses: characteristics of the organisation that give it a disadvantage concerning the development and implementation of gender equality policies
Opportunities: elements that the organisation could exploit to promote the development and implementation of gender equality policies	Threats: elements in the organisational environment that could impede the development and implementation of gender equality policies

6 Guidelines on Reporting the Activities and Results of the Four GEA Steps

After the completion of each GEA step, the GEIIs' change agents and their assistants will report on the main practical achievements and data collection results obtained. The TARGET supporting partners (FGB, NOTUS) will provide assistance in preparing the reports. The present section gives a schematic overview of the aspects that should be covered by the reports. The GEIIs' change agents, in collaboration with TARGET's supporting partners, will define the format of the reports in accordance with the specificities of each GEII.

1. Presentation of the activities carried out, and the results obtained, in **step 1** of the GEA: **Preparing the Participatory Gender Equality Audit**. The report should respond to the following questions:

   - Who are the main institutional stakeholders of promoting gender equality that you identified in your GEII?

   - How did you go about involving the top and upper-level management of your GEII in the community of practice (CoP)?

   - Who was invited to join the CoP? Who did not accept the invitation, and why?

   - What arguments did you use to convince potential participants in the CoP of the importance of promoting gender equality in your GEII?

   - Which arguments were most convincing and useful for involving stakeholders in the CoP?

   - What were the most significant obstacles to initiating the creation of a gender equality CoP in your GEII? Which ones have been overcome, and how? Which ones have not been overcome, and why not?

2. Presentation of the data collection activities carried out, and the results obtained, in **step 2** of the GEA: **Defining the Perimeters – Institutional Structure and Context**. The report should respond to the key questions set out in section 2 above.

   Moreover, reporting on step 2 should include all fact sheets concerning institutional documents and (audio-) visual items that have been compiled, as well as indications regarding the main obstacles and resulting gaps in data collection.

3. Presentation of the data collection activities carried out, and the results obtained, in **step 3** of the GEA: **In-Depth Data Collection in the Three TARGET GEA Dimensions**. The report should present all data collected in accordance with the practical tools B-H and respond to the key questions set out above for each TARGET GEA dimension: Gender-related

institutional barriers to careers (key questions: section 3.1), Decision-Making Bodies and Processes (key questions: section 3.2), Gender in R&I Content and Higher Education Curricula (key questions: section 3.3).

Moreover, reporting on step 3 should cover the results of the preliminary SWOT analyses (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) concerning the three dimensions (SWOT charts 1, 2 and 3), as well as the data collected by means of the survey among academic and research staff outlined in section 3.4. Please indicate also the main obstacles and resulting gaps in data collection.

4. Presentation of the data collection activities carried out, and the results obtained, in step 4 of the GEA: **Taking Stock of Existing Gender Equality Policies**. The report should present all data collected in accordance with practical tool I, as well as the fact sheets on existing gender equality policies that have been compiled (section 4).

Moreover, reporting on step 4 should include the results of the preliminary SWOT analysis (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) concerning the development and implementation of gender equality policies within the GEII (SWOT chart 4). Please indicate also the main obstacles and resulting gaps in data collection.

7   Outline of Institutional Workshops

The main objective of the institutional workshops is to discuss the data collected and agree on how to move forward, building consensus among all the members of the community of practice who have been involved in the data collection or may play a significant role in the analysis of data and the development of the GEII-specific GEPs.

The institutional workshops will be organised by the GEIIs' change agents and their assistants, in cooperation with the respective supporting partner (FGB / NOTUS). The agenda and participants will be agreed upon on the basis of the specificities of each GEII and the preliminary results of the GEA. The workshops may take the form of one-day events or combine a shorter workshop with other meetings/activities with specific institutional stakeholders.

Elements with regard to the GEA process that will be present in the workshop agendas:

(1) Presentation of the data collected in the three focus dimensions and with regard to existing policies. What data has been collected? What data still need to be collected?

(2) Assessment of data quality so far, and obstacles/problems encountered during data collection

(3) Strategies for resolving problems/removing obstacles for data collection

(4) Presentation of data-analysis methods to be employed (change agents & FGB & NOTUS)

(5) Division of tasks between change agents and supporting TARGET partners (FGB & NOTUS), agreement on time-line

(6) Initial assessment of data and SWOT analysis

Aspects to take into account for preparing the institutional workshop:

- Involving top and upper level management. Representatives from top / upper-level management may open the workshop and participate in some of the sessions; specific meetings with senior management or members of decision-making boards can be organised as parallel activities to the workshop itself to raise awareness on gender issues and GEP commitment

- Consolidating the community of practice. The workshop may be an opportunity to strengthen and enlarge the community of practice. The members who have been to a greater or lesser extent involved in the collection of data should play a prominent role. The workshop should also facilitate the involvement of other stakeholders that are considered relevant for the analysis of data in view of the discussion of the GEP at the institution.

- Technical aspects related with the collection of data should have been discussed before the organisation of the workshop between change agents and supporting partners. An important aspect to discuss in the workshop are significant gaps. For instance, lack of sex-disaggregated data on crucial aspects of the institution, which may be included as one of the issues to be addressed through the GEP.

The institutional workshop will provide room for analysis of data and debate about the main challenges to be addressed. It can be an opportunity to discuss the initial assessment of the institution as included in the proposal of the project with all the participants and taking into account the outcome of data collection. The audit report should include a final section where main problems and challenges are identified.

8 References and Resources

8.1 References

EC (2016a). Guidance on Gender Equality in Horizon 2020. Version 2.0. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/h2020-hi-guide-gender_en.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

EC (2016b). Strategic Engagement for gender equality 2016-2019. Directorate-General for Justice, Consumers and Gender Equality, EU Publications Office, Luxemburg. [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/gender-equality/document/files/strategic_engagement_en.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

EIGE (2016). Gender Equality in Academia and Research. GEAR tool. EU Publications Office, Luxembourg. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/mh0716096enn.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017)

FESTA (2015a). Methodologies and measures for analysing informal decision-making and communication processes. [http://www.festa-europa.eu/sites/festa-europa.eu/files/4.2..pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

FESTA (2015b). Gendering decision-making and communications processes. [http://www.festa-europa.eu/sites/festa-europa.eu/files/4.1.1.%20Gendering%20Decision%20Making%20and%20Communications%20Processes.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GARCIA (2015). Toolkit for Integrating Gender-Sensitive Approach into Research and Teaching. Working paper 6.

[http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/garcia_working_paper_6_toolkit_integrating_gender_research_teaching.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Gender-Net (2016). Manuals with guidelines on the integration of sex and gender analysis into research contents, recommendations for curricula development and indicators. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/d3.11_manuals_with_guidelines_on_the_integration_of_sex_and_gender_analysis_into_research.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

ILO (2012). A Manual for Gender Audit Facilitators: The ILO Participatory Gender Audit Methodology, 2nd Edition. International Labour Office, Geneva.

[http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---gender/documents/publication/wcms_187411.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Martin, Patricia (2006). Practicing Gender at Work: Further Thoughts on Reflexivity. In: Gender, Work and Organization, 13(3), 254-276.

Meyerson, Debra; Tompkins, Megan (2007). Tempered Radicals as Institutional Change Agents. In: Harvard Journal of Law & Gender, 30(2), 303-322.

UN Women (2001). Gender Mainstreaming: Strategy for Promoting Gender Equality. [http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/pdf/factsheet1.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Wenger, Etienne (1998). Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, Etienne (2000). Communities of Practices and Social Learning Systems. In: Organization, 7(2), 225-246.

Wroblewski, Angela. (2015). Individual and Institutional Reflexivity: A Mutual Basis for Reducing Gender Bias in Unquestioned Practices. In: International Journal of Work Innovation, 1 (2), 208-222.

8.2   Online Resources on Gender Equality in RPOs and RFOs

EGERA Effective Gender Equality in Research and the Academia [http://www.egera.eu/] (Accessed 16 October 2017) intends to promote a full set of measures to achieve gender equality and fight gender-based stereotypes in research and the academia. EGERA is a tool for achieving two overarching objectives: gender equality in research and higher education; bringing a gender perspective in research contents and outputs

EIGE, European Institute for Gender Equality, As an autonomous body, EIGE operates within the framework of European Union policies and initiatives. EIGE collects, analyses, processes and disseminates data and information on gender equality issues, whilst at the same time making them comparable, reliable and relevant for the users. EIGE provides, among others, toolkits on gender Impact assessment, institutional transformations and Gender Equality in academia & research: http://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits

Equality Challenge Unit (2013) Unconscious bias and higher education. [http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/unconscious-bias-and-higher-education.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Equality Challenge Unit (2012) Mentoring: progressing women's careers in higher education [**http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/mentoring-progressing-womens-careers-in-higher-education.pdf**] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Eument-net The European Network of Mentoring Programmes Promoting Women in Academia and Research Policy Recommendations Establish Mentoring in Europe to Enhance Gender Equality [http://eument-net.eu/Documents/Publications/PolicyRecommendations.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

FESTA Female Empowerment in Science and Technology Academia, **Handbook on Gender Issues in Recruitment, Appointment and Promotion Processes, – Recommendations for a Gender Sensitive Application of Excellence Criteria,** The guideline provides suggestions how recruitment and appointment processes can be made more gender-sensitive. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/festa_gender_issues_recruitment_appointment_promotion.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

FESTA, Gendering Decision Making and Communications Processes (2015). This report, developed in the context of the EU-funded FESTA project, shows how power works in organisations and provides recommendations for more transparency in decision-making processes to progress gender equality. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/festa_gendering_decision-making_communication.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GARCIA – Gender in the Academy and Research: combating Career Instability and Asymmetries. The project plans to map and analyse the gender dimension at different organisational levels in various European research institutions. Part of this project specifically addressed the issue on leaking pipeline in comparative perspective and showed how women's career progress 'evaporate' as they advance in their career: the so called leaky pipeline phenomenon.

[http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/garcia_working_paper_5_academic_careers_gender_inequality.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Moreover, a specific working paper addressed the issue of formal and actual selection criteria for early career academics:

[http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/garcia_working_paper_2_gap_formal_actual_selection _criteria_eca.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GENDER-NET (2016) Report *Manuals with guidelines on the integration of sex and gender analysis into research contents, recommendations for curricula development and indicators*. A useful glossary of terms and concepts relevant to gender equality can be found on pp. 10-14 of [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/d3.11_manuals_with_guidelines_on_the_integration_of_sex_and_gender_analysis_into_research.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GENDER-NET project developed the IGAR tool: Recommendations for Integrating Gender Analysis into Research. Guidelines and Checklists for IGAR have been developed for Research Funding Organisations, Grant Applicants and Peer Reviewers/Evalutors. [http://igar-tool.gender-net.eu/en] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GenPORT is a community sourced internet portal for sharing knowledge and inspiring collaborative action on gender and science http://www.genderportal.eu/

GENIS LAB Gender in Science and Technology Lab, [http://www.genislab-fp7.eu/ developed a paper on 'assessing excellence'. http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/genis-lab_reviewassessingexcellence.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Achieving gender balance at the top of scientific research Guidelines and tools for institutional change:

[http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/genis-lab_achieving_gender_balance_top_scientific_research_guidelines.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Gender in Eu-funded research is a toolkit that clearly explains and provides guidance on how to integrate gender in research. It addresses both the gender dimension of research content (with case examples from nine different scientific fields) and women's participation in research activities.

[https://yellowwindow.com/genderinresearch/downloads/YW2009_GenderToolKit_Module1.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GENOVATE developed a e-learning package on gender competent Leadership in Academia.

Tackling Unconscious Bias in the Workplace, Professor Shirley Congdon, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), University of Bradford: [http://www.genovate.eu/modules/gender-competent-leadership/DVCAShirley.mp4] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

The Gender and Diversity Toolkit, developed under the EU-funded structural change project GENOVATE, presents and explains a set of interesting approaches and participatory techniques to engage stakeholders. [http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/genovate_genderdiversitytoolkit.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

INTEGER, INstitutional Transformations for Effecting Gender equality in Research, EU-funded project, provides some tool based on the experience gathered in the framework of the project, regarding e.g. self assessment, dissemination, stakeholder engagement [http://www.integer-tools-for-action.eu/en/resources] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

INTEGER project developed a checklist with suggestions for engaging with key stakeholders. [https://www.integer-research.com/ifc-nitrogen-chemicals-resource-efficiency-benchmarking-initiative/participation-of-other-stakeholders-in-the-initiative-and-its-benefits/] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

LEAGUE OF EUROPEAN RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES How Gender Analysis Contributes to Research 2013 Directorate General for Research & Innovation EUR 25848 Report of the Expert Group "Innovation through Gender" Chairperson: Londa Schiebinger Rapporteur: Ineke Klinge [http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/gendered_innovations.pdf] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Videos

Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (2013): Sustainable Gender Equality – a film about gender mainstreaming in practice: [https://vimeo.com/77692813] (Accessed 16 October 2017). The film aims at illustrating the principles and benefits of gender mainstreaming through concrete examples.

CERCA created a video on gender bias in recruitment to make panel members aware of the different biases which might come up and how to solve them: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g978T58gELo] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

Caroline Simard, Research Director at Stanford's Clayman Institute for Gender Research, discusses implicit bias and stereotypes in science with Jeff Miller, Berkeley Lab's Head of Public Affairs.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=epALi4ET3PY] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

The Canadian Institutes of Health Research have on their website a number of free training modules on how to deal with sex and gender in health research. [http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/32019.html] (Accessed 16 October 2017).

GENDER-NET IGAR Video GENDER-NET Project. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i672z34vW6A] (Accessed 16 October 2017).