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Executive Summary

This GenPORT deliverable (D4.8) policy brief series is geared to national level policy makers and institutional science leaders in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs). It consists of twenty-six policy briefs.

Twenty of these policy briefs are grouped around five themes: 1) Recruitment and Promotion, 2) Gender Equality Plans, 3) Gender Dimension in Research Content (RPOs), 4) Gender Dimension in Research Content (RFOs) and 5) Gender Balance in Decision-Making. They are targeted at different country groups according to levels of implementation as reported by research organisations and the presence or absence of measures at the national level.

The other six policy briefs focus on: 1) tackling sexual harassment, 2) intersectionality, 3) securing top-level support for gender equality, 4) building gender competence and knowledge 5) statistics and methodology and 6) implementation and resistance. These six individual policy briefs are not targeted at a specific country group.

D4.8 is the second and final update of 25 policy briefs (D4.7) incorporating the contents of online e-discussions held on the GenPORT portal.
Gender and Science Policy Briefs: From “Where to start” to “How to innovate”: An Introduction

This policy brief series is geared to national level policy makers and institutional science leaders in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs). It consists of twenty-six policy briefs.

Twenty of these policy briefs are grouped around five themes: 1) Recruitment and Promotion, 2) Gender Equality Plans, 3) Gender Dimension in Research Content in Research Performing Organisations (RPOs), 4) Gender Dimension in Research Content in Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) and 5) Gender Balance in Decision-Making. Given the variety of policy agendas and implementation levels across European countries, each topic is furthermore subdivided into four briefs, targeting these different national policy levels.

Furthermore, six individual policy briefs focus on: 1) tackling sexual harassment, 2) intersectionality, 3) securing top-level support for gender equality, 4) building gender competence and knowledge 5) statistics and methodology and 6) implementation and resistance. These six policy briefs are not targeted at a specific country group.

The European Research Area (ERA) is at the heart of the Europe 2020 strategy and its Innovation Union (IU) policy flagship.¹ One of the five ERA priorities is gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research.² The 2012 ERA Communication invites Member States to create a legal and policy environment conducive to gender equality and mainstreaming through:

- removing barriers including legal barriers to the recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers
- addressing gender imbalances in decision making processes
- strengthening the gender dimension in research programmes³

It also invites member states to foster partnerships with research funders, research organisations and universities in order to push for institutional and cultural change on gender through charters, performance agreements and awards whilst ensuring that at least 40% of the under-represented sex participate in committees.⁴

Research stakeholder organisations are invited to carry out “institutional change relating to HR management, funding, decision- making and research programmes through Gender Equality Plans which aim to:

- Conduct impact assessment / audits of procedures and practices to identify gender bias
- Implement innovative strategies to correct any bias
- Set targets and monitor progress via indicators⁵
The European Commission has conducted two surveys (2012/3 and 2014) to measure the level of progress made by research organisations in the EU in implementing the policy priorities of the ERA. The ERA surveys include questions that explore the actions taken by research organisations to promote gender equality.\(^6\)

The country clusters that structure twenty of these policy briefs are based on the classification of countries according to the ERA facts and figures 2014 report. Two variables define the clusters. The first regards self-reported levels of implementation (RPOs and RFOs) per country compared to the EU average - for example the percentage of RPOs that are implementing any recruitment and promotion policies for female researchers in a given country-compared to the EU average.\(^7\) The second variable concerns the presence (or absence) of national level policy measures in this field according to the European Commission. On this basis five groups of countries- could be discerned:

- Implementation above EU average, measures identified
- Implementation above EU average
- Implementation below EU average, measures identified
- Implementation below EU average
- No implementation\(^6\)

For each of the policy areas: 1) Recruitment and Promotion Measures; 2) Adoption of Gender Equality Plans in RPOs, 3) Gender Dimension in Research Content (RPOs), 4) Gender Dimension in Research Content (RFOs), and 5) Gender-Balance in Decision-Making – four country groups have been identified. In all policy areas (except Gender Dimension in Research Content [RFOs]) policy briefs are targeted at those four country groups with implementation above/ below EU average with/ without policy measures. We have titled our policy briefs accordingly:

- Implementation below EU average (no measures) – Where to Start?
- Implementation below EU average, measures identified – How to Consolidate?
- Implementation above EU average – no measures – How to Lead?
- Implementation above EU average, measures identified – How to Innovate?

In the case of Gender Dimension in Research Content (RFOs) - we have included the group of countries identified as having 'no implementation'- whilst 'frequent support above EU average' – is absent, as no country forms part of this group.\(^6\)

The policy briefs are structured on the basis of the survey findings despite the limitations of the ERA survey. The limitations of the survey include that it was a self-assessment - so the implementation figures are based on those
organisations that reported that they were implementing certain measures. It also only concerns those RPOs which answered the ERA survey (they employ 515 000 researchers -around 20% of total EU researchers). The sample for the ERA Survey was not randomly selected and the results have not been weighted due to a lack of substantiated information about the sample frame and the whole population of RPOs. It is therefore not possible to infer the statistics to the wider population.\footnote{10}

Despite these limitations, structuring the policy briefs along these lines meant that we were able cover the range of countries from ‘proactive’ countries to ‘inactive’ countries. The EC report on gender equality policies in public research highlights that policy developments over the last five years show a widening of the gap between proactive and relatively inactive countries as regards gender equality policies in R&I (France is the only country which has clearly improved its position from relatively inactive to proactive).\footnote{11} There seems to be a real need for policy briefs to target different country groups according to levels of 'activity' – i.e. ‘proactive’ countries – those with measures and ‘inactive’ countries – i.e. those without measures. Whilst the ERA survey has its limitations – it has enabled us to group countries according to self-reported levels of implementation at the institutional level along with the presence or not of national level measures.

The policy briefs attempt to provide examples of legislation, policies, initiatives and measures that can be taken at both the national and institutional levels. Examples of legislation, policies, initiatives and measures have been taken from a variety of key sources including the GenPORT Policy Environment Report (2015), European Commission (2014) Gender Equality Policies in Public Research Report, the GENDER-NET Analysis Reports (2015), Gender Summit Conference Reports, and the LERU (2015) report. Other valuable sources include the deliverables for various FP7 structural change projects including INTEGER and GENOVATE, and the European Conferences on Gender Equality in Higher Education, altogether eight by 2015, enabling exchange between researchers, practitioners and policy makers across Europe and beyond regularly since 1998. There has been an attempt to include examples from a wide range of national contexts.

These policy briefs are designed to be read by national level policy makers and institutional science leaders and have been updated twice during the course of the project to take the findings of new research into account. The second and final updates of the twenty thematic briefs were undertaken on the basis of online discussions held on the portal. Each partner was responsible for holding a thematic online discussion, inviting key experts on the subject to participate and then integrating the key findings of the online discussion into the relevant policy briefs. The online discussions can be accessed in the following links:

- Recruitment and Promotion of Women Researchers
- The Implementation of Gender Equality Plans
• Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Performing Organisations (RPOs)
• Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Funding Organisations (RFOs)
• Gender Balance in Decision-Making

The GenPORT consortium would sincerely like to thank all those experts that participated in our online discussions and contributed to this GenPORT Policy Brief Series.
2 Ibid. pp. 3-4.
3 Ibid., p12.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid., p13.
7 ERA Facts and Figures 2014 states: “In the absence of targets or identified desirable levels of implementation, it is difficult to identify and assess an adequate level of ERA implementation for each of the actions. Whenever meaningful, the degree of support and the implementation are compared with the average observed at EU level. The use of the EU average does not imply that it should be considered to target a desirable level of implementation.” p9.
8 Ibid.
9 In the case of classifying EU Member States according to the level of provision of support to the inclusion of gender dimension in research content in research agendas by funders – categories were the following: frequent, occasional, none, non-applicable, no answer.
10 European Commission, (2015b). She Figures, 2015, Handbook, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p111. Therefore the percentage of organisations that report implementing policy measure X is not indicative of the overall national situation – in some cases a high percentage of organisations indicated that the measure was not applicable to their organisation.
PB1 - Encouraging the recruitment and promotion of female researchers: Where to start?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no measures and below EU average levels of implementation.

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to improve efforts to recruit and advance more women in the research workforce.

Why is this important?
Despite various national and EU level gender equality policies in science, the research sector in Europe continues to waste and under-utilise highly skilled and talented women: Whilst in 2012 47% of all PhD graduates in the EU 28 were women - they only made up a third of researchers in all sectors.

Europe needs to find a way to ensure the full participation of women in science and technology if it is to maximise its capacity and ability to respond to the challenges facing Europe as well as guarantee its competitive edge in the global arena. It must also make sure that the applications and innovations developed – reflect the needs of all citizens.

Factoring in the different roles that gender plays in science and innovation systems and taking advantage of these new opportunities is essential to improving the effectiveness of research and innovation outcomes for women and men whilst fostering socio-economic progress for all.

National bodies that want to maximise the full innovation potential of their human capital resources must take into account the barriers hindering the participation of women in science and innovation and develop innovative solutions.

What is the extent of the problem?
This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures for recruiting female researchers. In addition, less than 59% (EU average) of their research performing organisations self-report implementing recruitment and promotion measures for female researchers. In concrete terms, this “Where to Start”-brief targets specifically: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Ireland, France, Italy, Cyprus, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and, Slovakia.
In 2013 women represented 47% of grade D academic staff, 45% of grade C academic staff, 37% of grade B academic staff and just 21% of grade A (the highest academic level, full professor level) academic staff in the EU 28. The average proportion of female academic staff in this group of countries— is significantly above average for grade D (57%) slightly higher than average for grade C (46%) slightly higher for grade B (38%) and average for grade A academic staff (21%).

There is a wide variation between countries— for example in Romania (30%) and Bulgaria (32%) the proportion of females at grade A is substantially higher than the EU-28 average— as it is for the total number of researchers. This can be explained by academic science losing prestige in these countries— coupled with growth in the private sector – attracting male scientists. It has been contended that there is a higher proportion of women in research in those countries with a poorer R&D financial investment.

Some Member States have taken a more pro-active approach than others in gender equality and gender mainstreaming in science and the gap between pro-active and inactive Members States is widening. The danger is that those Member States with higher than EU-27 average levels of female representation fail to recognise that providing incentives for the recruitment and promotion of female researchers - as part of a wider push for institutional change - is still needed to achieve gender equality and benefit the entire science system.

**What are the options?**

The 2012 ERA Communication invites Member States to “create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to remove legal and other barriers to the recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers”. This can take the form of:

- enacting legislation requiring provisions for ensuring compliance with existing and new legislation,
- developing ‘soft strategies’, i.e. targets as well as supporting and promoting Concordats that establish principles for organisations to comply with
- Ministries can also initiate specific guidelines and practices.

Legal provisions can establish a number of requirements for recruitment and promotion.

In Austria the Federal finance law of 2013 is a legal provision which specifically regulates a balanced representation of women and men in young scientists positions as well as in academic leadership. The University Act also states that 40% of the staff of universities must be women, whilst gender monitoring must
be implemented in recruitment coupled with a targeted recruitment approach.\textsuperscript{17}

In Spain Law 19/2013 regulates transparency in recruitment and applies to public universities, independent organisations and state agencies\textsuperscript{18} This is designed to support the open recruitment of researchers in publicly funded organisations.\textsuperscript{19} Increased transparency in recruitment, promotion and tenure processes have been demonstrated to create a fairer system for all – as women tend to be excluded from informal networks where valuable professional information is often shared.\textsuperscript{20}

Soft strategies can also encourage the recruitment of more female researchers, for example in Flanders, a regulation adopted in 2012 allocates special research funds for tenure track appointments. This includes a precedence rule for recruitments of the underrepresented sex in order to reach a representation of 2/5 to 3/5.\textsuperscript{21}

In Austria the Elise Richter Programme (implemented by the government agency FWF) is a career development programme that provides funds for female scientists and academics for post-docs and senior post-docs. It aims to enhance their university career after completion of the program a level of qualification should be accomplished to enable the participant to apply for professorship posts.\textsuperscript{22}

In Lithuania- Equal Opportunities in Research (LYMOS) – have awarded 34 scholarships to researchers returning to work after maternity leave.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Recommendations}

- Enact legal provisions specifically regulating gender balance of staff in universities – particularly targeting academic leadership positions.
- Enact legal provisions promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion. This requires a recognition that these are complex processes that need to be thoroughly understood in order to be improved. On the one hand, there are several stages (definition of position, call, selection rounds, interviews and trial lectures, research seminars) that need to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, multiple actors besides academics contribute to the final decision (the department, research group, faculty, boards, scientific committee, equality office...) and need to be made aware of the benefits of promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion. If a gender component is not taken into account at every stage there is a greater risk that women are more likely than men to fall out of the process at a specific phase.
- Whilst implementing gender mainstreaming throughout all policy fields is a must gender mainstreaming should also be implemented specifically in the realm of science.\textsuperscript{24}
- Establish or consolidate organisational structures on gender and science – at the highest possible government level – with sufficient resources, in terms of personnel, expertise and funding – to provide an institutional basis for concerted action in the field.\textsuperscript{25}

- Increase the cooperation between state agencies – in order to more effectively regulate and monitor different activities.\textsuperscript{26}

- Provide competence development for recruitment staff at research performing organisations. Hiring committees need gender expertise to avoid gender bias in the recruitment of academic staff.\textsuperscript{27}

- Offer support for career advancement of women such as training courses, mentoring programmes and actions on empowerment, specially for early careers female academics and for those who are re-entering an academic career after their maternity period.

\textbf{Further Reading}

Further, in-depth reading concerning the recruitment and promotion of female researchers is available through the report \textit{Structural Change in Research Institutions} (see footnote 3) published by the European Commission and \textit{She Figures 2015} (see footnote 9), also published by the EC.

\textbf{Resources shared in the GenPORT e-discussion on Recruitment and Promotion of Women Researchers:}

- \textit{Carrots or Sticks? A Study on Incentives to Attract and Retain Women in Science, Engineering and Technology in South Africa} by Elaine R. Salo, Felix Liersch, Lieketseng Mohlakoana-Motopi, Marinda Maree

- \textit{Women’s Networks in Academia: Practical Advice for Positive Impact} by Women@TUoS

- \textit{GenPORT Research Syntheses on Gender and Science} by Rachel Palmen and the GenPORT Consortium.

- \textit{ADVANCE at a Glance} by National Science Foundation’s (NSF)

- \textit{Strategies for Effecting Gender Equity and Institutional Change (StratEGIC Toolkit)} by ADVANCE programme.

- \textit{COACHE’s Special Reports on Academic Careers in Higher Education} by Harvard University.

- \textit{Tools For Change Project} by AWIS.
Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes by CERCA

Constructing excellence: the gap between formal and actual selection criteria for early career academics by GARCIA Project

Gender Issues in Recruitment, Appointment and Promotion Processes by FESTA Project

Evidence That Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality by Danielle Gaucher and Justin Friesen & Aaron C. Kay

Searching for Excellence & Diversity: Recruiting Resources for Search Committees by University of Wisconsin & Madison.

Mapping organisational work-life policies and practices by GARCIA Project.

Academic duets: On the professional and private life in science by Marta Vohlídalová (ed.)

PLOTINA : Promoting Gender Balance and Inclusion in Research, Innovation and Training Project

Gender Bias Learning Project by Center of WorkLife Law, with support from a NSF ADVANCE

On average the number of women PhD graduates in the EU has been growing by 4.4 percentage points each year between 2003 and 2012, whereas men PhD graduates have grown by 2.3 percentage points annually. European Commission, (2015c). Preliminary Results of She figures, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


Any organisation receiving public subsidies of more than EUR 100,000, or for whom public subsidies represent more than 40% of their annual income, are required to make their procedures public (active dissemination of information) and ensure free access to the related information.


https://www.fwf.ac.at/en/research-funding/fwf-programmes/richter-programme-incl-richter-peek/

Müller, B. (2008). Innovation and Excellence by Women in Science: University recruitment procedures under scrutiny, Swiss Confederation, State Secretariat for Education and Research SER.


Linková, M., Mladeníć, D., Oleksy, H., Palasik, M., Papp, E., Piscová, M. & Velichová, D. (2008). Re-claiming a political voice: women and science in central Europe. This was written in the context of Slovenia – but can be applied to this country group.

PB2 - Encouraging the recruitment and promotion of female researchers: How to consolidate?
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For those countries identified as having national level measures but below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to improve efforts to recruit and advance more women in the research workforce.

Why is this important?

Despite various national and EU level gender equality policies in science, the research sector in Europe continues to waste and under-utilise highly skilled and talented women. Whilst in 2012, 47% of all PhD graduates in the EU 28 were women - they only made up a third of researchers in all sectors.²

Europe needs to find a way to ensure the full participation of women in science and technology if it is to maximise its capacity and ability to respond to the challenges facing Europe as well as guarantee its competitive edge in the global arena.³ It must also make sure that the applications and innovations developed – reflect the needs of all citizens.⁴

Factoring in the different roles that gender plays in science and innovation systems and taking advantage of these new opportunities is essential to improving the effectiveness of research and innovation outcomes for women and men whilst fostering socio-economic progress for all.⁵

National bodies that want to maximise the full innovation potential of their human capital resources must take into account the barriers hindering the participation of women in science and innovation and develop innovative solutions.⁶

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures for recruiting female researchers. In addition, while less than 59% (EU average)⁷ of their research performing organisations self-report implementing recruitment and promotion measures for female researchers. In concrete terms, this “How to Consolidate” -brief targets specifically Belgium, Denmark, Greece, Spain and Croatia.⁸

In 2013 women represented 47% of grade D academic staff, 45% of grade C academic staff, 37% of grade B academic staff and just 21% of grade A
highest academic level, full professor level) academic staff in the EU 28. The average proportion of female academic staff in this group of countries tends to be higher than EU-28 average for grade D academic staff (50%) and slightly lower for grade C (44%) and grade B (36%) and slightly higher for grade A (23%).

Some Member States have taken a more pro-active approach than others in gender equality and gender mainstreaming in science and the gap between pro-active and inactive Members States is widening. Member States who have been identified as having a below average level of implementation of recruitment and promotion policies need to act to close this gap. The danger is that those Member States with higher than EU-27 average levels of female representation at the lower grades fail to recognise that providing incentives for the recruitment and promotion of female researchers - as part of a wider push for institutional change - is still needed to achieve gender equality and benefit the entire science system.

What are the options?

The 2012 ERA Communication invites Member States to “create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to remove legal and other barriers to the recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers”. This can take the form of:

- enacting legislation requiring provisions for ensuring compliance with existing and new legislation,
- developing ‘soft strategies’, i.e. targets as well as supporting and promoting Concordats that establish principles for organisations to comply with
- Ministries can also initiate specific guidelines and practices.

Soft strategies for example may include setting targets for the recruitment of women to senior academic positions, i.e. professorships. This has been the strategy used in Croatia, Sweden and Finland. For example, since 1996, the Swedish government has periodically set up recruitment goals for universities for the proportion of women among new professorial recruitment.

Various practices promoting incentives for the recruitment of female researchers and professors have been initiated by National Ministries. For example in Austria the 'Excellentia programme' increased the percentage of female full professors at Austrian universities from 13% (in 2005) to 18% in 2010 – by offering financial incentives to universities that appoint women to the professoriate.

In Austria an Inter-ministerial group -co-ordinates the fForte initiative- which provides a coordinated and comprehensive approach to women in science. One strand of this offers “Knowledge creates advantages” workshops on career
strategies for women in research and technology and provides targeted information on internal and external events pertaining to career development.\(^{18}\)

In South Africa, universities are compelled to implement equity principles when filling vacant positions.

**Recommendations**

- Enact legal provisions specifically regulating gender balance of staff in universities – particularly targeting academic leadership positions.
- Enact legal provisions promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion. This requires a recognition that these are complex processes that need to be thoroughly understood in order to be improved. On the one hand, there are several stages (definition of position, call, selection rounds, interviews and trial lectures, research seminars) that need to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, multiple actors besides academics contribute to the final decision (the department, research group, faculty, boards, scientific committee, equality office …) and need to be made aware of the benefits of promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion.
- Whilst implementing gender mainstreaming throughout all policy fields is a must gender mainstreaming should also be implemented specifically in the realm of science. Legal provisions regarding the definition, methodology, implementation, monitoring or evaluation of gender mainstreaming must be developed.\(^{19}\)
- Develop a comprehensive approach to ensure inter-ministerial cooperation – for a coordinated effort across several ministries to enable change on a structural level.\(^{20}\)
- Establish or consolidate organisational structures on gender and science – at the highest possible government level – with sufficient resources, in terms of personnel, expertise and funding – to provide an institutional basis for concerted action in the field.\(^{21}\)
- Link funding to performance criteria in gender equality – this has proved a successful strategy –in steering universities and research institutions towards a greater gender equality.\(^{22}\) This however needs to be accompanied with institutional buy-in – or there is a danger that efforts in this field are not seen as legitimate.\(^{23}\)
- Fund further research on recruitment and gatekeeping in the promotion of female researchers.
- Provide competence development for recruitment staff at research performing organisations. Hiring committees need gender expertise to avoid gender bias in the recruitment of academic staff.\(^{24}\)
- Offer support for career advancement of women such as training courses, mentoring programmes and actions on empowerment, specially for early careers female academics and for who are re-entering academic after their
maternity period.

Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the recruitment and promotion of female researchers is available through the report *Structural Change in Research Institutions* (see footnote 3) published by the European Commission and *She Figures 2015* (see footnote 9), also published by the EC.

Resources shared in the GenPORT e-discussion on Recruitment and Promotion of Women Researchers:

*Carrots or Sticks? A Study on Incentives to Attract and Retain Women in Science, Engineering and Technology in South Africa* by Elaine R. Salo, Felix Liersh, Lieketseng Mohlakoana-Motopi, Marinda Maree

*Women's Networks in Academia: Practical Advice for Positive Impact* by Women@TUoS

*GenPORT Research Syntheses on Gender and Science* by Rachel Palmen and the GenPORT Consortium.

*ADVANCE at a Glance* by National Science Foundation's (NSF) Strategies for Effecting Gender Equity and Institutional Change (StratEGIC Toolkit) by ADVANCE programme.

*COACHE’s Special Reports on Academic Careers in Higher Education* by Harvard University.

*Tools For Change Project* by AWIS.

*Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes* by CERCA

*Constructing excellence: the gap between formal and actual selection criteria for early career academics* by GARCIA Project

*Gender Issues in Recruitment, Appointment and Promotion Processes* by FESTA Project

*Evidence That Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality* by Danielle Gaucher and Justin Friesen & Aaron C. Kay

*Searching for Excellence & Diversity: Recruiting Resources for Search Committees*
by University of Wisconsin & Madison.

**Mapping organisational work-life policies and practices** by GARCIA Project.

**Academic duets: On the professional and private life in science** by Marta Vohlídalová (ed.)

**PLOTINA : Promoting Gender Balance and Inclusion in Research, Innovation and Training** Project

**Gender Bias Learning Project by Center** of WorkLife Law, with support from a NSF ADVANCE

On average the number of women PhD graduates in the EU has been growing by 4.4 percentage points each year between 2003 and 2012, whereas men PhD graduates have grown by 2.3 percentage points annually. European Commission, (2015c). Preliminary Results of She figures, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).
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For those countries identified as having no measures but above EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to improve efforts to recruit and advance more women in the research workforce.

Why is this important?

Despite various national and EU level gender equality policies in science, the research sector in Europe continues to waste and under-utilise highly skilled and talented women. Whilst in 2012 47% of all PhD graduates in the EU 28 are women - they only make up a third of researchers in all sectors.²

Europe needs to find a way to ensure the full participation of women in science and technology if it is to maximise its capacity and ability to respond to the challenges facing Europe as well as guarantee its competitive edge in the global arena.³ It must also make sure that the applications and innovations developed – reflect the needs of all citizens.⁴

Factoring in the different roles that gender plays in science and innovation systems and taking advantage of these new opportunities is essential to improving the effectiveness of research and innovation outcomes for women and men whilst fostering socio-economic progress for all.⁵

National bodies that want to maximise the full innovation potential of their human capital resources must take into account the barriers hindering the participation of women in science and innovation and develop innovative solutions.⁶

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures for recruiting female researchers. In addition, more than 59% (EU average)⁷ of their research performing organisations self-report implementing recruitment and promotion measures for female researchers. In concrete terms, this “How to Lead” brief targets specifically: Latvia, Hungary and Finland.

In 2013 women represented 47% of grade D academic staff, 45% of grade C academic staff, 37% of grade B academic staff and just 21% of grade A (the highest academic level, full professor level) academic staff in the EU 28.⁸ The average proportion of female academic staff in Latvia, Hungary and Finland is
average for grade D (46%) yet above the EU-28 average in grade C (49%), grade B (46%) and grade A, (28%).

The danger is that those Member States with higher than EU-27 average levels of female representation, as is the case in Latvia, Hungary and Finland- fail to recognise that stronger incentives are needed to improve the recruitment and promotion of female researchers - as part of a wider push for institutional change -- for gender equality to become reality and benefit the entire science system.

**What are the options?**

The 2012 ERA Communication invites Member States to “create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to remove legal and other barriers to the recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers”. This can take the form of:

- enacting legislation requiring provisions for ensuring compliance with existing and new legislation,
- developing ‘soft strategies’, i.e. targets as well as supporting and promoting Concordats that establish principles for organisations to comply with
- Ministries can also initiate specific guidelines and various practices.

Equal opportunity legislation can impact on gender balance in scientific recruitment. For example “in Sweden and Norway, anti-discrimination acts allow for moderate preferential treatment in recruitment procedures [Cf. Swedish Discrimination Act and Norwegian Gender Equality Act.]”.

Soft strategies can also encourage the recruitment of more female researchers, which can be promoted and supported by Ministries and policymakers.

In the UK The Equality Duty of 2010 introduced positive action provisions through which HEI establishments were expected to voluntarily take up positive action in recruitment and promotion. This is reinforced in the UK Concordat to support the Career Development of Researchers – which is an agreement between employers and research funders. Principle 6 of the Concordat is that diversity and equality must be promoted in all aspects of recruitment and career management of researchers.

In Germany the Female Professors Programme funded by BMBF- the German Ministry for Education and Research promotes outstanding women researchers will be in operation until 2017. Since 2008, 270 additional women professors have been appointed to higher education institutions.
Also in Germany, at the Federal level, the German Pact for Research and Innovation – requires research performing organisations to work towards gender balance – especially in leading positions.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Recommendations}

- Enact legal provisions specifically regulating gender balance of staff in universities – particularly targeting academic leadership positions.
- Enact legal provisions promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion. This requires a recognition that these are complex processes that need to be thoroughly understood in order to be improved. On the one hand, there are several stages (definition of position, call, selection rounds, interviews and trial lectures, research seminars) that need to be taken into consideration. On the other hand, multiple actors besides academics contribute to the final decision (the department, research group, faculty, boards, scientific committee, equality office....) and need to be made aware of the benefits of promoting transparency in recruitment and promotion.
- Implement work life balance measures, promote co-responsibility between women and men in care work and provide care services for children and dependents to break the glass ceiling in female academic careers and to prevent women withdrawing from academia.
- Implement gender mainstreaming throughout all policy fields as well as specifically in the realm of science. Legal provisions regarding the definition, methodology, implementation, monitoring or evaluation of gender mainstreaming must be developed.\textsuperscript{16}
- Develop a comprehensive approach to ensure inter-ministerial co-operation – for a coordinated effort across several ministries to enable change on a structural level.\textsuperscript{17}
- Establish or consolidate organisational structures on gender and science – at the highest possible government level – with sufficient resources, in terms of personnel, expertise and funding – to provide an institutional basis for concerted action in the field.\textsuperscript{18}
- Integrate recruitment and promotion policies into a broader strategy for institutional change.
- Link funding to performance criteria in gender equality – this has proved a successful strategy – in steering universities and research institutions towards a greater gender equality.\textsuperscript{19} This however needs to be accompanied with institutional buy-in – or there is a danger that efforts in this field are not seen as legitimate.\textsuperscript{20}
- Fund further research on recruitment and gatekeeping in the promotion of female researchers.
- Provide competence development for recruitment staff at research performing organisations. Hiring committees need gender expertise to avoid gender bias in the recruitment of academic staff.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the recruitment and promotion of female researchers is available through the report *Structural Change in Research Institutions* (see footnote 3) published by the European Commission and *She Figures 2015* (see footnote 8), also published by the EC.

**Resources shared in the GenPORT e-discussion on Recruitment and Promotion of Women Researchers:**

- **Carrots or Sticks? A Study on Incentives to Attract and Retain Women in Science, Engineering and Technology in South Africa** by Elaine R. Salo, Felix Liersch, Lieketseng Mohlakoana-Motopi, Marinda Maree

- **Women's Networks in Academia: Practical Advice for Positive Impact** by Women@TUoS

- **GenPORT Research Syntheses on Gender and Science** by Rachel Palmen and the GenPORT Consortium.

- **ADVANCE at a Glance** by National Science Foundation's (NSF)

- **Strategies for Effecting Gender Equity and Institutional Change (StratEGIC Toolkit)** by ADVANCE programme.

- **COACHE’s Special Reports on Academic Careers in Higher Education** by Harvard University.

- **Tools For Change Project** by AWIS.

- **Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes** by CERCA

- **Constructing excellence: the gap between formal and actual selection criteria for early career academics** by GARCIA Project

- **Gender Issues in Recruitment, Appointment and Promotion Processes** by FESTA Project

- **Evidence That Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality** by Danielle Gaucher and Justin Friesen & Aaron C. Kay

- **Searching for Excellence & Diversity: Recruiting Resources for Search Committees** by University of Wisconsin & Madison.
Mapping organisational work-life policies and practices by GARCIA Project.

Academic duets: On the professional and private life in science by Marta Vohlídalová (ed.)

PLOTINA: Promoting Gender Balance and Inclusion in Research, Innovation and Training Project

Gender Bias Learning Project by Center of WorkLife Law, with support from a NSF ADVANCE

On average the number of women PhD graduates in the EU has been growing by 4.4 percentage points each year between 2003 and 2012, whereas men PhD graduates have grown by 2.3 percentage points annually. European Commission, (2015c). Preliminary Results of She figures, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


https://www.gov.uk/equality-act-2010-guidance


For more information see http://www.bmbf.de/de/3215.php

Müller, B. (2008). Innovation and Excellence by Women in Science: University recruitment procedures under scrutiny, Swiss Confederation, State Secretariat for Education and Research SER.

Encouraging the recruitment and promotion of female researchers: How to innovate?

March 2017

For those countries identified as having national level measures and above EU average levels of implementation.

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policymakers on how to improve efforts to recruit and advance more women in the research workforce.

Why is this important?

Despite various national and EU level gender equality policies in science, the research sector in Europe continues to waste and under-utilise highly skilled and talented women. Whilst in 2012 47% of all PhD graduates in the EU 28 were women - they only made up a third of researchers in all sectors.

Europe needs to find a way to ensure the full participation of women in science and technology if it is to maximise its capacity and ability to respond to the challenges facing Europe as well as guarantee its competitive edge in the global arena. It must also make sure that the applications and innovations developed – reflect the needs of all citizens.

Factoring in the different roles that gender plays in science and innovation systems and taking advantage of these new opportunities is essential to improving the effectiveness of research and innovation outcomes for women and men whilst fostering socio-economic progress for all.

National bodies that want to maximise the full innovation potential of their human capital resources must take into account the barriers hindering the participation of women in science and innovation and develop innovative solutions.

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures for recruiting female researchers. In addition more than 59% (EU average) of their research performing organisations self-report implementing recruitment and promotion measures for female researchers. In concrete terms, this “How to Innovate”- brief targets specifically Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Austria, Sweden and the UK.

In 2013 women represented 47% of grade D academic staff, 45% of grade C academic staff, 37% of grade B academic staff and just 21% of grade A (the highest academic level, full professor level) academic staff in the EU 28.
average proportion of female academic staff in this country group is average for grade D (47%) and lower than the EU-27 average for grade C (43%), grade B (32%), and average for grade A (21%). There is, however, considerable variation between these countries, ranging from the Netherlands where 16% of grade A academic staff are women to Norway where 25% of grade A academic staff are women.9

Whilst it is generally recognised that a gap is widening between those countries proactive in gender equality and mainstreaming in science and those less active countries –within pro-active countries the under-representation of female researchers persists.

What are the options?

The 2012 ERA Communication invites Member States to “create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to remove legal and other barriers to the recruitment, retention and career progression of female researchers”. 10 This can take the form of:

- enacting legislation requiring provisions for ensuring compliance with existing and new legislation,
- developing ‘soft strategies’, i.e. targets as well as supporting and promoting Concordats that establish principles for organisations to comply with
- Ministries can also initiate specific guidelines and various practices.

This group of countries generally have well developed equality legislation in place and gender mainstreaming in policy. For example, Austria has set up specific laws and actions to implement gender equality in research. Since 2009 objectives to attain gender balance in leadership positions in public research organisations and higher education institutions were put in place by the University Act.11 It has also been committed to gender mainstreaming since 2010.12 In the Swedish legal framework of the higher education sector –gender balance is addressed and gender equality plans are based on legislative provisions.13 Gender mainstreaming is also the de facto binding policy approach and the main strategy used to achieve the national gender equality policy objectives.14

Other initiatives include:

The Talents Programme of the Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology, - administered by the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG) is a comprehensive programme which encourages networking (FEMtech Network), enhances visibility of women experts (FemTech Female Expert Database), and offers career support for women researchers (FEMtech Career Initiative)
amongst other activities.\textsuperscript{15}

The Norwegian Research Council (RCN) has developed the BALANSE initiative (Gender Balance in Senior Positions and Research Management) which supports cultural and structural changes to improve the gender balance at senior level in the research sector through new knowledge, mutual learning and innovative measures.\textsuperscript{16}

The Laura Bassi Centres of Expertise are funded by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy by the programme "w-fFORTE – economic impulses by women in research and innovation" in the scope of the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG). The eight Laura Bassi Centres of Expertise have a term of up to seven years, with a total funding budget of 15 million euros. Headed by highly qualified female experts, it is their task to do innovative research in the natural sciences and technology. A mid-term evaluation according to the programme document was carried out by external experts. The evaluation confirmed the success of centres as a unique impetus programme and all centres were recommended for a second funding period. The eight Laura Bassi Centres conduct research in the areas of medicine, life sciences and IT.\textsuperscript{17}

Moreover, the Austrian Science Fund's programmes targeted at female researchers - Elise Richter for senior positions and Herta Firnberg for earlier stage careers, no longer include an age limit for applicants which alleviates some of the pressures that women with childcare duties face in the qualification processes.

In the US the National Science Foundation’s ADVANCE program aims to increase the participation and success of women in academic science and engineering careers. It consists in support academic initiatives to ensure that policies and procedures regarding hiring, family accommodations, and leadership development are not gender biased.

There are also specific initiatives such as the University of Maryland-Baltimore County (UMBC) plan. In this university all departments have to submit a written plan detailing how each search process will create a diverse and inclusive pool of candidates for a new faculty search. Chairs of departments and search committees attend workshops on conducting an inclusive search process.

**Recommendations**

- Promote a gender inclusive culture in research institutions. This implies examining and working to challenge the forms of experience and practices, behaviors and styles of ‘doing’ academic cultures which in many places can still be seen to reflect the historically dominant construction of the academic as male, middle- or upper-class, and in many cases white.
One example of this is the consideration of the impact of care responsibilities on researchers in the definition of excellence by the selection committees. It is also relevant to take into account how socio-economic class, ethnicity and other inequalities intersect with gender as when detecting the 'unconscious bias' in selection and recruitment processes.

- Implement work life balance measures, promote co-responsibility between women and men in care work and provide care services for children and dependents to break the glass ceiling in female academic careers and to prevent women withdrawing from academia.
- Develop a multi-faceted approach to improving the recruitment and promotion of female scientists- combining different strategies like networking, providing career support and a database of female experts.
- Earmark funding for outstanding research centres carrying out innovative research in science and technology -led by women.
- Write evaluations and monitoring into programme design in order to promote evidence-based policy making.
- Provide competence development for recruitment staff at research performing organisations. Hiring committees need gender expertise to avoid gender bias in the recruitment of academic staff.18
- Encourage and enable policy sharing and learning between initiatives developed by the countries in this group.
- Develop new transnational indicators and criteria for the evaluation of scientific merit in order to counteract the attrition of women from science and unconscious negative bias in the assessment of excellence of women.19

Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the recruitment and promotion of female researchers is available through the report *Structural Change in Research Institutions* (see footnote 3) published by the European Commission and *She Figures 2015* (see footnote 8), also published by the EC.

Resources shared in the GenPORT e-discussion on Recruitment and Promotion of Women Researchers:

- **Carrots or Sticks? A Study on Incentives to Attract and Retain Women in Science, Engineering and Technology in South Africa** by Elaine R. Salo, Felix Liersch, Lieketseng Mohlakoana-Motopi, Marinda Maree

- **Women's Networks in Academia: Practical Advice for Positive Impact** by Women@TUoS

- **GenPORT Research Syntheses on Gender and Science** by Rachel Palmen and the
GenPORT Consortium.

**ADVANCE at a Glance** by National Science Foundation’s (NSF)

**Strategies for Effecting Gender Equity and Institutional Change (StratEGIC Toolkit)** by ADVANCE programme.

**COACHE’s Special Reports on Academic Careers in Higher Education** by Harvard University.

**Tools For Change Project** by AWIS.

**Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes** by CERCA

**Constructing excellence: the gap between formal and actual selection criteria for early career academics** by GARCIA Project

**Gender Issues in Recruitment, Appointment and Promotion Processes** by FESTA Project

**Evidence That Gendered Wording in Job Advertisements Exists and Sustains Gender Inequality** by Danielle Gaucher and Justin Friesen & Aaron C. Kay

**Searching for Excellence & Diversity: Recruiting Resources for Search Committees** by University of Wisconsin & Madison.

**Mapping organisational work-life policies and practices** by GARCIA Project.

**Academic duets: On the professional and private life in science** by Marta Vohlidalová (ed.)

**PLOTINA : Promoting Gender Balance and Inclusion in Research, Innovation and Training** Project

**Gender Bias Learning Project by Center** of WorkLife Law, with support from a NSF ADVANCE

On average the number of women PhD graduates in the EU has been growing by 4.4 percentage points each year between 2003 and 2012, whereas men PhD graduates have grown by 2.3 percentage points annually. European Commission, (2015c). Preliminary Results of She figures, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


See http://www.forskningsradet.no/progrnnett-balanse/Programme_description/1253964606599


PB5 - Implementing gender equality plans in research performing organisations: Where to start?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no measures and below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage the development and implementation of effective gender equality plans in research performing organisations (RPOs).²

Why is this important?

Gender equality and gender mainstreaming is a key priority in the European Research Area.³ The European Commission's approach has shifted from providing direct support to women to a focus on institutional transformation. Despite various policy interventions – targeting female scientists – the proportions of women in science have not sufficiently increased.

Research evidence shows that for real change towards gender equality to occur the focus must be placed on transforming institutional structures, practices and cultures towards more gender awareness, equal treatment and gender balance. This includes the appreciation of gender-sensitive career structures and the concept of lifelong learning beyond a traditional academic career model of uninterrupted employment and continuous career advancement. Sources of implicit gender bias need to be tackled (e.g. in recruitment and promotion of researchers) and need to be accompanied with efforts to integrate the gender dimension into science knowledge and practice as well as into curricular and research content.

Gender equality plans (GEPs) are the main tool promoted by the Commission to effect systematic institutional change through targeting human resource development strategies, institutional governance, research funding allocation, institutional leadership and decision-making and research programmes.

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures (i.e. supporting provisions) for gender equality in public research.⁴ In addition less than 64% (EU average)⁵ of their research performing organisations self-report implementing a gender equality plan. In concrete terms, this “Where to Start” - brief targets specifically Ireland, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Luxembourg, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Romania and Slovakia.⁶
Gender equality plans are one of the most effective and common tools to effect change at the institutional level. There is however a wide variety in their uptake, and how the plans are legislated and regulated by different Member States.

**What are the options?**

Member States are encouraged to foster partnerships with research performing and funding organisations to push for lasting institutional action on gender equality. Member states can play a key role in the push for institutional change in RPOs and RFOs in a variety of different ways – by fostering a favourable legal and political context for institutional change (through enacting legal provisions and developing policies or strategies) or by providing incentives for its’ uptake.⁷

Research performing organisations are asked to develop and implement Gender Equality Plans containing specific actions and targets for institutional change to improve: leadership and governance; data collection, analysis and reporting; recruitment practices; career progression; work environment; salary structures; awareness of gender equality issues among staff and students; compliance with regulations, legislation and guidelines. Gender Equality Plans address the following:

- carrying out audits of procedures and practices – to detect gender bias,
- implementing strategies to combat bias and
- setting targets and monitoring progress with indicators.⁸

The ERA progress report 2014 highlights the “significant correlations between measures taken at RPO level including GEPs and the existence of national laws, strategies and/ or incentives to foster institutional change”.⁹ Gender equality plans are mandatory in law in universities in Austria, Spain and Norway – whilst in Denmark, Sweden Iceland and Finland the law requires that all workplaces over a certain size develop gender action plans.¹⁰ In Germany gender equality in universities and research organisations is regulated by state law, not federal law and whilst most states require universities and research institutions to adopt “women support plans” – “gender equality plans” are only required in some states.

The Spanish 2011 Law on Science, Technology and Innovation is a positive example of how legislative bodies can effect real change in this area.¹¹ Within two years of the passage of this law all universities and other research organisations were required to have Equity Plans that include incentives for improvement. Compliance with the plan however needs to be monitored.

Another effective approach to steering institutional change has been to use the implementation of a gender equality plan as eligibility criteria so RPOs can access incentives for recruiting/ promoting female academics to middle and senior
positions (Programme for Senior Professors in Germany, ASPASIA in the Netherlands, BALANSE Norway).  

One example of a national ministry acting in this area is the Czech Republic Ministry for Education, Youth and Sports – they have adopted a mid-term Strategic Plan for Gender Equality in Academia. This includes strengthening equal opportunities for women and men and incorporating the gender dimension in curricula, textbooks and methodology materials for each school grade.

**Recommendations**

- Anchor responsibility for gender equality at the highest levels of RPOs to ensure commitment to gender equality from top level.
- Involve gender experts in all change processes from the start to ensure gender sensitivity and familiarity with concepts of gender.
- Tie gender equality plans to organisational structures and processes to ensure their sustainability.
- Clearly define roles and responsibilities of actors responsible for gender equality plans within RPOs.
- Build networks between RPOs that implement gender equality plans to foster exchange of information.
- Enact legislative provisions for GEPs in RPOs to provide a real stimulus for their uptake. This could occur within a broader legislative framework for gender mainstreaming.
- Provide financial incentives for developing, implementing and monitoring GEPs. This could be carried out by linking gender equality performance or in this case the existence of a GEP to eligibility for funding criteria.
- Make sure any evaluative framework of curricula includes the gender dimension for those national level bodies (for example in Cyprus and Romania) that have responsibility for curricula development.
- Adopt gender equality strategies targeting human resource management in RPOs and integrate the gender dimension in research and teaching content.

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning the implementation of gender equality plans in research performing organisations is available through the European Commission's report on *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research* (see footnote 7) and two publications by the Gender-NET project: *Analysis Report: National Plans and Initiatives Promoting Gender Equality and Structural Change* and *Analysis Report: Plans and initiatives in selected research institutions aiming to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change*. The European Institute of Gender Equality provides the GEAR tool.

According to the ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically research with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


No supporting provisions for gender equality in public research as defined and reported in the ERA Facts and Figures 2014 report.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


Ibid.


PB6 - Implementing gender equality plans in research performing organisations: How to consolidate?
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For those countries identified as having national level measures but below EU average levels of implementation.1

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage the development and implementation of effective gender equality plans in research performing organisations (RPOs).2

Why is this important?

Gender equality and gender mainstreaming is a key priority in the European Research Area.3 The European Commission's approach has shifted from providing direct support to women to a focus on institutional transformation. Despite various policy interventions – targeting female scientists – the proportions of women in science have not sufficiently increased.

Research evidence shows that for real change towards gender equality to occur the focus must be placed on transforming institutional structures, practices and cultures towards more gender awareness, equal treatment and gender balance. This includes the appreciation of gender-sensitive career structures and the concept of lifelong learning beyond a traditional academic career model of uninterrupted employment and continuous career advancement. Sources of implicit gender bias need to be tackled (e.g. in recruitment and promotion of researchers) and need to be accompanied with efforts to integrate the gender dimension into science knowledge and practice as well as into curricular and research content.

Gender equality plans (GEPs) are the main tool promoted by the Commission to effect systematic institutional change through targeting human resource development strategies, institutional governance, research funding allocation, institutional leadership and decision-making and research programmes.

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures (i.e. supporting provisions) for gender equality in public research.4 In addition less than 64% (EU average)5 of their research performing organisations self-report implementing a gender equality plan. In concrete terms, this “How to Consolidate” - brief targets specifically Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Spain, Croatia, Lithuania and Slovenia.6
Gender equality plans are one of the most effective and common tools to effect change at the institutional level. There is however a wide variety in their uptake, and how the plans are legislated and regulated by different Member States. There is a great variation between these Member States from Estonia – where no research performing organisations adopted an equality plan to Spain where just over 60% of research performing organisations have adopted Gender Equality Plans.\(^7\)

**What are the options?**

Member States are encouraged to foster partnerships with research performing and funding organisations to push for lasting institutional action on gender equality. Member States can play a key role in the push for institutional change in RPOs and RFOs in a variety of different ways – by fostering a favourable legal and political context for institutional change (through enacting legal provisions and developing policies or strategies) or by providing incentives for its’ uptake.\(^8\)

Research performing organisations are asked to develop and implement Gender Equality Plans containing specific actions and targets for institutional change to improve: leadership and governance; data collection, analysis and reporting; recruitment practices; career progression; work environment; salary structures; awareness of gender equality issues among staff and students; compliance with regulations, legislation and guidelines. Gender Equality Plans address the following:

- carrying out audits of procedures and practices – to detect gender bias,
- implementing strategies to combat bias and
- setting targets and monitoring progress with indicators.\(^9\)

The ERA progress report 2014 highlights the “significant correlations between measures taken at RPO level including GEPs and the existence of national laws, strategies and/ or incentives to foster institutional change”.\(^10\) National level bodies with policy- making capacities have been instrumental in stimulating RPOs to adopt and implement gender equality plans.

For example in Belgium, the Flemish Interuniversity Council has collaborated with all Flemish universities to draw up action plans on gender equality – which began to be implemented in 2014.\(^11\)

In Switzerland the Federal Programme for Gender Equality at Swiss Universities provides support to research performing organisations to develop gender equality plans and to integrate actions into university structures including gender in teaching, learning and research as well as establishing gender equality indicators and linking these to quality management of the institution.\(^12\)
An effective approach to promoting the take up of gender equality plans has been linking gender equality performance to research funding as is the case in Germany. The German Research Foundation (DFG) established its Research Orientated Standards on Gender Equality in 2008. Universities are encouraged to formulate institutionally specific objectives. The DFG standards are a managerial tool to stimulate universities to design gender equality plans. The DFG then grades institutions – this approach places gender equality high on the policy agenda of German universities.

In the UK the Athena Swan Charter fosters cultural changes across organisations and encourages academic organisations in the fields of STEMM and arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law to build gender equality policies. An institutional gender equality plan forms an integral part of the process. The charter now includes an emphasis on trans staff and students – and addresses gender equality more broadly -not just focusing on barriers to progression that affect women. The Chief Medical Officer announced that the National Institute for Health Research would only shortlist medical schools for biomedical research centre and unit funding if the school holds a Silver Athena SWAN award.

**Recommendations**

- Build networks between RPOs that implement gender equality plans to foster exchange of information.
- Perform internal audits with staff to collect feedback on effectiveness of gender equality plans and perceptions of work-life balance on individual level.
- Ensure implementation and further development of tailor-made gender equality plans for individual organisations based on internal audits and staff feedback.
- Re-evaluate and optimize gender equality plans in place on a regular basis.
- Provide training on gender knowledge for decision-makers to mainstream gender expertise into all levels of the organisation.
- Enact legislative provisions for GEPs in RPOs to provide a real stimulus for their uptake. This could occur within a broader legislative framework for gender mainstreaming.
- Provide financial incentives for developing, implementing and monitoring GEPs. This could be carried out by linking gender equality performance or in this case the existence of a GEP to eligibility for funding criteria.
- Provide support and collaborate with research performing organisations in the development of gender equality plans and the integration of actions into university structures, processes and procedures for long-lasting change.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the implementation of gender equality plans in research performing organisations is available through the European Commission’s report on *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research* (see footnote 8) and two publications by the Gender-NET project: *Analysis Report: National Plans and Initiatives Promoting Gender Equality and Structural Change* and *Analysis Report: Plans and initiatives in selected research institutions aiming to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change*. The European Institute of Gender Equality provides the GEAR tool.

The GenPORT Implementation of Gender Equality Plans Online Discussion

According to the ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically research with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


Supporting provisions for gender equality in public research as defined and reported in the ERA Facts and Figures 2014 report.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


Ibid.

The latter have been included from May 2015.

http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/


Ibid.


Ibid.
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For those countries identified as having no measures but above EU average levels of implementation.

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage the development and implementation of effective gender equality plans in research performing organisations (RPOs).

Why is this important?

Gender equality and gender mainstreaming is a key priority in the European Research Area. The European Commission's approach has shifted from providing direct support to women to a focus on institutional transformation. Despite various policy interventions – targeting female scientists – the proportions of women in science have not sufficiently increased.

Research evidence shows that for real change towards gender equality to occur the focus must be placed on transforming institutional structures, practices and cultures towards more gender awareness, equal treatment and gender balance. This includes the appreciation of gender-sensitive career structures and the concept of lifelong learning beyond a traditional academic career model of uninterrupted employment and continuous career advancement. Sources of implicit gender bias need to be tackled (e.g. in recruitment and promotion of researchers) and need to be accompanied with efforts to integrate the gender dimension into science knowledge and practice as well as into curricular and research content.

Gender equality plans (GEPs) are the main tool promoted by the Commission to effect systematic institutional change through targeting human resource development strategies, institutional governance, research funding allocation, institutional leadership and decision-making and research programmes.

What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures (i.e. supporting provisions) for gender equality in public research. In addition more than 64% (EU average) of their research performing organisations self-report implementing a gender equality plan. In concrete terms, this “How to Lead”- brief targets specifically Malta.

Gender equality plans are one of the most effective and common tools to effect
change at the institutional level. There is however a wide variety in their uptake, and how the plans are legislated and regulated by different Member States.

The ERA facts and figures 2014 identifies that only one country’s share of RPOs that have adopted GEPs is above the EU average (Malta) – despite not having any measures or strategies in place.⁷

What are the options?

Member States are encouraged to foster partnerships with research performing and funding organisations to push for lasting institutional action on gender equality. Member states can play a key role in the push for institutional change in RPOs and RFOs in a variety of different ways – by fostering a favourable legal and political context for institutional change (through enacting legal provisions and developing policies or strategies) or by providing incentives for its' uptake.⁸

Research performing organisations are asked to develop and implement Gender Equality Plans containing specific actions and targets for institutional change to improve: leadership and governance; data collection, analysis and reporting; recruitment practices; career progression; work environment; salary structures; awareness of gender equality issues among staff and students; compliance with regulations, legislation and guidelines. Gender Equality Plans include the following:

- carrying out audits of procedures and practices – to detect gender bias,
- implementing strategies to combat bias and
- setting targets and monitoring progress with indicators.⁹

The ERA progress report 2014 highlights the “significant correlations between measures taken at RPO level including GEPs and the existence of national laws, strategies and/ or incentives to foster institutional change”.¹⁰

Some countries have legislation that requires universities and research institutions develop Gender Equality Plans – this is the case in Spain, Norway, Germany and France.¹¹ In other countries- gender equality plans are not mandatory but other ways are used to incentivise their take up through guidelines, charters/ codes, awards.¹²

In Norway the Ministry of Education and Research requires RPOs to have gender action plans¹³ as a prerequisite for funding.¹⁴ Annually RPOs report the current gender equality picture and planned and implemented measures to the Ministry. Gender equality work carried out by the institution forms an integral part of budgetary discussions with the Ministry.¹⁵

In Germany the Federal Ministry for research and education has developed the Programme for Female Professors (2008-2017) targeting universities.
Universities can apply for funding for a maximum of three professorial chairs – the institution must ensure the recruitment of a female professor. This must be accompanied by demonstration of institutional-wide gender equality measures i.e. by submitting a Gender Equality Plan - for which additional funding is available.\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Recommendations}

- Analyse contextual conditions and possible constraints in individual organisestions prior to planning of gender equality plans.\textsuperscript{17}

- Set up an easily accessible information infrastructure for reference to a common framework for gender equality plans and expert knowledge. This may include online services, institutions, or organisations specifically established to assist RPOs in setting up gender equality measures.\textsuperscript{18}

- Enact legislative provisions for GEPs in RPOs to provide a real stimulus for their uptake. This could occur within a broader legislative framework for gender mainstreaming.

- Provide financial incentives for developing, implementing and monitoring GEPs. This could be carried out by linking gender equality performance or in this case the existence of a GEP to eligibility for funding criteria.

- Provide support and collaborate with research performing organisations in the development of gender equality plans and the integration of actions into university structures, processes and procedures for long-lasting change.

- Adopt regular assessment and monitoring mechanisms in order to efficiently implement cultural and institutional change.

- Develop indicators for the institutional level in order to measure progress and facilitate a comparative analysis- with other institutions nationally. This however should be aligned to developments at the EU level in order to facilitate a comparative analysis of Member States regarding institutional change.\textsuperscript{19} Any kind of policy monitor developed should also be aligned to existing statistics on and indicators for gender balance.\textsuperscript{20}

- Allocate resources for capacity building activities and training to take place within RPOs and for national level decision-makers in R&I to ensure the effective implementation of gender mainstreaming.\textsuperscript{21}

- Facilitate the knowledge sharing of institutional change experiences between institutions.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the implementation of gender equality plans in research performing organisations is available through the European Commission’s report on *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research* (see footnote 8) and two publications by the Gender-NET project: *Analysis Report: National Plans and Initiatives Promoting Gender Equality and Structural Change*\(^\text{22}\) and *Analysis Report: Plans and initiatives in selected research institutions aiming to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change*\(^\text{23}\). The European Institute of Gender Equality provides the GEAR tool\(^\text{24}\).

The GenPORT Implementation of Gender Equality Plans Online Discussion


[5] It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


[12] These are used in Belgium, Croatia, Germany, Estonia, Romania, UK, Switzerland and Turkey.

[13] In order to fulfil the requirements of the Norwegian Gender Equality Act.
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For those countries identified as having national level measures and above EU average levels of implementation.

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage the development and implementation of effective gender equality plans in research performing organisations (RPOs).

Why is this important?
Gender equality and gender mainstreaming is a key priority in the European Research Area. The European Commission's approach has shifted from providing direct support to women to a focus on institutional transformation. Despite various policy interventions – targeting female scientists – the proportions of women in science have not sufficiently increased.

Research evidence shows that for real change towards gender equality to occur the focus must be placed on transforming institutional structures, practices and cultures towards more gender awareness, equal treatment and gender balance. This includes the appreciation of gender-sensitive career structures and the concept of lifelong learning beyond a traditional academic career model of uninterrupted employment and continuous career advancement. Sources of implicit gender bias need to be tackled (e.g. in recruitment and promotion of researchers) and need to be accompanied with efforts to integrate the gender dimension into science knowledge and practice as well as into curricular and research content.

Gender equality plans (GEPs) are the main tool promoted by the Commission to effect systematic institutional change through targeting human resource development strategies, institutional governance, research funding allocation, institutional leadership and decision-making and research programmes.

What is the extent of the problem?
This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures (i.e. supporting provisions) for gender equality in public research. In addition more than 64% (EU average) of their research performing organisations self-report implementing a gender equality plan. In concrete terms, this “How to Innovate”- brief targets specifically: Germany, France, the Netherlands, Austria, Finland, Sweden, the UK.
Gender equality plans are one of the most effective and common tools to effect change at the institutional level. There is however a wide variety in their uptake, and how the plans are legislated and regulated by different Member States. In all of these Member States except in the Netherlands, practically all RPOs (90 % or more) have adopted GEPs.

What are the options?

Member States are encouraged to foster partnerships with research performing and funding organisations to push for lasting institutional action on gender equality. Member states can play a key role in the push for institutional change in RPOs and RFOs in a variety of different ways – by fostering a favourable legal and political context for institutional change (through enacting legal provisions and developing policies or strategies) or by providing incentives for its’ uptake.

Research performing organisations are asked to develop and implement Gender Equality Plans containing specific actions and targets for institutional change to improve: leadership and governance; data collection, analysis and reporting; recruitment practices; career progression; work environment; salary structures; awareness of gender equality issues among staff and students; compliance with regulations, legislation and guidelines. Gender Equality Plans include the following:

- carrying out audits of procedures and practices – to detect gender bias,
- implementing strategies to combat bias and
- setting targets and monitoring progress with indicators.

The ERA progress report 2014 highlights the “significant correlations between measures taken at RPO level including GEPs and the existence of national laws, strategies and/ or incentives to foster institutional change”.

In some countries, such as Sweden and Finland, the national gender equality legislation has for decades included a broad gender equality planning duty concerning all employers, including RPOs; additionally the legislation has in the recent years specified in more detail the equality planning duties for universities and educational organisations. Some countries have legislative demands for universities and research institutions to develop gender equality plans. In other countries- gender equality plans are not mandatory but guidelines, charters/ codes and awards are used to promote their take up. In some countries gender equality performance [demonstrated by a gender equality plan- and its subsequent monitoring] has been directly linked to research funding.

In the UK concrete links between institutional gender equality performance and
research funding have been made by linking funding of Biomedical research - to structural change through the Athena SWAN charter scheme. The UK National Institute of Health (NIHR) is a leading funding body for research in science funded by the Department of Health. Since 2011 all medical schools applying for NIHR Biomedical Research Centres and Units’ funding are required to have achieved a silver rating in the Athena Swan Charter. In order to achieve a bronze award the following is required: a gender equality assessment; a four year gender equality plan based on the assessment; and the development of an organisational structure – including a self-assessment team. In order to achieve a silver award institutions also need to demonstrate: “a significant record of activity and achievement” how this is institutionally embedded coupled with leadership commitment.\(^{15}\)

In the USA the ADVANCE programme was established to (1) develop systemic approaches to increase the representation and advancement of women in academic STEM careers; (2) develop innovative and sustainable ways to promote gender equity in the STEM academic workforce; and (3) contribute to the development of a more diverse science and engineering workforce. ADVANCE also has as its goal to contribute to and inform the general knowledge base on gender equity in the academic STEM disciplines.\(^{16}\) It is a comprehensive programme with three tracks: the Institutional Transformation track to promote institutional change and document it; the Institutional Transformation Catalyst Track – to develop self-assessment, carry out and evaluate a unique change programme; and the Partnerships for Learning and Adaptation Networks (PLAN) track for knowledge exchange either within disciplines or across institutions.\(^{17}\)

The German Research Foundation has developed Research Orientated Standards on Gender Equality. These standards aim to raise awareness of gender equality issues at the level of leadership and increase the number of women at different career levels. To support institutions’ efforts to meet these standards DFG has developed an online “Toolbox for DFGs Research-Orientated Standards on Gender Equality”.\(^{18}\) The toolbox presents quality assured institutional examples of gender equality measures in research and teaching in keeping with the DFG’s Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality.\(^{19}\)

The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) provides the Gender Equality in Academia and Research (GEAR) action toolbox with a step-by-step guide to implement gender equality plans in research organisations and higher education institutions.\(^{20}\)

**Recommendations**

- Create online tools for the implementation of gender equality plans in place to make visible a common framework and empirical background on gender equality landscapes.\(^{21}\)
- Disseminate online tools for the implementation of gender equality plans at RPOs to target groups.22
- Increase the visibility of gender equality plans for actors outside of RPOs.23
- Provide financial incentives for developing, implementing and monitoring GEPs. This could be carried out by linking gender equality performance or in this case the existence of a GEP to eligibility for funding criteria.
- Provide support and collaborate with research performing organisations in the development of gender equality plans and the integration of actions into university structures, processes and procedures for long-lasting change.
- Adopt regular assessment and monitoring mechanisms in order to efficiently implement cultural and institutional change.
- Develop indicators for the institutional level in order to measure progress and facilitate a comparative analysis- with other institutions nationally. This however should be aligned to developments at the EU level in order to facilitate a comparative analysis of Member States regarding institutional change.24 Any kind of policy monitor developed should also be aligned to existing statistics on and indicators for gender balance.25
- Allocate resources for capacity building activities and training to take place within RPOs and for national level decision-makers in R&I to ensure the effective implementation of gender mainstreaming.26
- Facilitate the knowledge sharing of institutional change experiences between institutions.

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning the implementation of gender equality plans in research performing organisations is available through the European Commission's report on *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research* (see footnote 8) and two publications by the Gender-NET project: *Analysis Report: National Plans and Initiatives Promoting Gender Equality and Structural Change*27 and *Analysis Report: Plans and initiatives in selected research institutions aiming to stimulate gender equality and enact structural change*28. The European Institute of Gender Equality provides the GEAR tool29.

[The GenPORT Implementation of Gender Equality Plans Online Discussion](#)

According to the ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically research with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


Supporting provisions for gender equality in public research as defined and reported in the ERA Facts and Figures 2014 report.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


These are used in Belgium, Croatia, Germany, Estonia, Romania, UK, Switzerland and Turkey, EC, 2014.


See: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/athena-swan-resources/ for an Athena Swan action plan based template.

Please see: http://www.nsf.gov/funding/pgm_summ.jsp?pims_id=5383


Please see: http://www.instrumentenkasten.dfg.de/index_en.html


Please see: http://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits/gear
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For those countries identified as having no measures and below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations (RPOs).²

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means integrating sex and gender analysis into research in all its phases.³ It improves the quality, validity and relevance of research and its outcomes that take into account the realities of men and women equally.⁴ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials for drug development. Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process saves human lives and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing the relevance of its outcomes.⁵ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁶

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁷ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁸ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice.

These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
• recommendations and/or models for university STEM curricular development and researcher training in relevant fields.  

The results of the ERA survey 2014 indicate that on average 44% of RPOs which are ERA compliant include the promotion of gender dimension in research content.  

**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures to promote the gender dimension in research content. At the same time less than 44% (EU average) of their research performing organisations include such a gender dimension in research content. In concrete terms, this “Where to Start”- brief targets specifically Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Croatia, Cyprus Hungary, Poland, Finland and the UK.

In general progress made to date has been slow and difficult to measure. The ERA Facts and Figures 2014 reports that whilst more countries are including the gender dimension in research content and programmes – the level of implementation is ‘insufficiently supported’. The share of institutions doing so also varies significantly amongst Member States. Of those countries identified as having below average levels of implementation without measures – the percentage of RPOs that include the gender dimension in research content ranges from 2% in Cyprus to almost 44% in the Czech Republic.

**What are the options?**

National level policymakers have real leverage to encourage the integration of the gender dimension into research content and higher education curricular as they can set research and funding priorities.

Some countries have developed legislation- either domain specific or pushing forward a gender mainstreaming approach throughout public bodies. In France, the 2013 Act on Higher Education and Research includes Article 53 which supports gender research in priority areas of research programming.

In some cases ministries and national level agencies carry out the role of approving and undertaking the quality control of curriculum – this can offer real leverage for introducing the gender dimension into curriculum.

Another approach has been taken by the NAS in the U.S – which has developed recommendations for integrating the gender dimension into university curricular development in scientific and technological fields.

The GenPORT e-discussion confirmed that it is often researchers themselves that
are unaware of the fact how important it is to take gender analysis in research into account. Gender training and awareness raising remain important tools to improve the situation. Facilitating the sharing of best practices developed at the institutional level has been an approach taken by some national level agencies. DFG in Germany has developed a ‘good practice’ toolbox – that covers institutional examples of integrating ‘gender in research and academia’ – with sub-levels ‘core research areas’ and ‘knowledge transfer.’

**Recommendations**

- Ensure that sex/gender in research content is taken into account and encouraged in national research programmes, from programme design, throughout implementation and evaluation.
- Encourage the inclusion of the sex/gender dimension into different research topics at the outset and ensure it is dealt with systematically. This is an important part of the research process which will determine whether or not sex/gender is a relevant factor.
- Consider the possible sex/gendered effects of allocating resources to specific areas or topics by for example examining the sex/gender composition of potential beneficiaries.
- Develop a systematic method of assessing the sex/gender dimension in study design and project impact.
- Encourage the integration of the sex/gender dimension in graduate schools and post-doc programmes.
- Take into account who is responsible for quality control of graduate school curricula, and the role of the science education ministry in the formulation of graduate schools curricula in order to best target efforts to include the sex/gender dimension.
- Allocate resources to raise awareness and carry out training for researchers, evaluators and management (top and middle) to promote a gender sensitive research- including integrating it in PhD training curricular and the development of guidelines.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*\(^\text{26}\), the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 15) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 3) as well as the *Gendered Innovations* website\(^\text{27}\).

*The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) Online Discussion*

According to the ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically research with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


For an overview of gendered innovations please see http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/what-is-gendered-innovations.html


These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

ERA Compliant is defined as organisations which are implementing some or all of the ERA actions with high intensity. European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p10.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union. We recalculated the groups presented on p34- taking into consideration the percentage of RPOs that answered ‘yes’ as a percentage of all applicable organizations – and whether or not measures were identified. Please note that the sample for the ERA Survey was not randomly selected and the results have not been weighted due to a lack of substantiated information about the sample frame and the whole population of RPOs. “This means it is not possible to produce inferential statistics about the wider population” . She Figures, 2015, Handbook p111.


Legislation has been passed ranging from domain specific legislation- in health (U.S., Italy), science (Spain), higher education and research (France) to taking a much broader gender mainstreaming approach (Sweden).


The Gender-Net survey of 40 of the most innovative national level and regional organisations – across Europe, and in the United States and Canada – demonstrates how only one of the national level organisations surveyed has developed recommendations/ models of how to integrate the gender dimension into curriculum. 30 out of the 38 organisations that answered “No” to this question actually specify that they do not have any responsibility for for university level curricula and few respondents knew of any universities developing such gendered curricular in the STEM field.

Please see: http://www.instrumentenkasten.dfg.de/search?locale-attribute=en&filtertype=dimension&filter_relational_operator>equals&filter=science
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For those countries identified as having national level measures but below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content in research performing organisations (RPOs).²

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means integrating sex and gender analysis into research in all its phases.³ It improves the quality, validity and relevance of research and its outcomes that take into account the realities of men and women equally.⁴ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials for drug development. Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process saves human lives and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing the relevance of its outcomes.⁵ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁶

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁷ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁸ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
- recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular
development and researcher training in relevant fields.\textsuperscript{9}

The results of the ERA survey 2014 indicate that on average 44\%\textsuperscript{10} of RPOs which are ERA compliant\textsuperscript{11} include the promotion of gender dimension in research content.\textsuperscript{12}

**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures to promote the gender dimension in research content. At the same time less than 44\% (EU average)\textsuperscript{13} of their research performing organisations include such a gender dimension in research content. In concrete terms, this “How to Consolidate”- brief targets specifically Spain, Italy and Slovakia.\textsuperscript{14}

In general progress to date however has been slow and difficult to measure.\textsuperscript{15} The ERA Facts and Figures 2014 reports that whilst more countries are including the gender dimension in research content and programmes – the level of implementation is ‘insufficiently supported’.\textsuperscript{16} The share of institutions doing so also varies significantly amongst Member States. Of those countries identified as having below average levels of implementation but have measures – the percentage of RPOs that include the gender dimension in research content ranges from 20\% in Slovakia to 29\% in Spain.\textsuperscript{17}

**What are the options?**

National level policymakers have real leverage to encourage the integration of the gender dimension into research content and higher education curricular as they can set research and funding priorities.\textsuperscript{18}

The ‘US Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act’ was passed in 2012 in the US. This included a requirement that the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) study the availability of “data on sex, race, age and ethnicity in clinical trials for new drugs and devices.”\textsuperscript{19}

In Germany - despite the lack of legislation to include sex/ gender dimension in the science/ engineering curricular– the Federal Ministry with responsibility for research funded projects support gender/sex analysis in engineering curricula - at the local university level. Whilst RPOs are free to develop this –it is the role of the accreditation agency to certify it.\textsuperscript{20}

**Recommendations**

- Ensure that sex/gender in research content is taken into account and encouraged in national research programmes, from programme design, throughout implementation and evaluation.
- Encourage the inclusion of the sex/gender dimension into different research topics at the outset and ensure it is dealt with systematically. This is an important part of the research process which will determine whether or not sex/gender is a relevant factor.\textsuperscript{21}
- Consider the possible sex/gendered effects of allocating resources to specific areas or topics by for example examining the sex/gender composition of potential beneficiaries.
- Develop a systematic method of assessing the sex/gender dimension in study design and project impact.\textsuperscript{22}
- Encourage the integration of the sex/gender dimension in graduate schools and post-doc programmes.
- Allocate resources to raise awareness and carry out training for researchers, evaluators and management (top and middle) to promote a gender sensitive research- including integrating it in PhD training curricular and the development of guidelines.\textsuperscript{23}
- Share and promote new policy approaches and practices introduced by RPOs that are successfully integrating the sex/gender dimension.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Further Reading}

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net \textit{Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents}\textsuperscript{25}, the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) \textit{Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process} (see footnote 18) and the \textit{Gendered Innovations} project (see footnote 3) as well as the \textit{Gendered Innovations} website\textsuperscript{26}.

\textbf{The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) Online Discussion}

According to ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


For an overview of gendered innovations please see http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/what-is-gendered-innovations.html


These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

ERA Compliant is defined as organisations which are implementing some or all of the ERA actions with high intensity. European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p 10.


These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union. We recalculated the groups presented on p34- taking into consideration the percentage of RPOs that answered ‘yes’ as a percentage of all applicable organisations – and whether or not measures were identified. Please note that the sample for the ERA Survey was not randomly selected and the results have not been weighted due to a lack of substantiated information about the sample frame and the whole population of RPOs. “This means it is not possible to produce inferential statistics about the wider population”. She Figures, 2015, Handbook p111.
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For those countries identified as having no measures but above EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content in RPOs.²

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means integrating sex and gender analysis into research in all of its phases.³ It improves the quality, validity and relevance of research and its outcomes that take into account the realities of men and women equally.⁴ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials for drug development. Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process saves human lives and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing the relevance of its outcomes.⁵ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁶

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁷ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁸ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
- recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular
development and researcher training in relevant fields.⁹

The results of the ERA survey 2014 indicate that on average 44%¹⁰ of RPOs which are ERA compliant¹¹ include the promotion of gender dimension in research content.¹²

**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures to promote the gender dimension in research content. At the same time more than 44% (EU average)¹³ of their research performing organisations include such a gender dimension in research content. In concrete terms this “How to Lead” -brief targets specifically Belgium, Estonia. Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal and Romania.¹⁴

In general progress to date however has been slow and difficult to measure.¹⁵ The ERA Facts and Figures 2014 reports that whilst more countries are including the gender dimension in research content and programmes – the level of implementation is ‘insufficiently supported’.¹⁶ The share of institutions doing so also varies significantly amongst Member States. Of those countries identified as having above average levels of implementation without measures – the percentage of RPOs that include the gender dimension in research content ranges from 58% in Belgium to 78% in Estonia.¹⁷

**What are the options?**

National level policymakers have real leverage to encourage the integration of the gender dimension into research content, and into higher education curricular, as they can set research and funding priorities and targets.¹⁸

In Italy the national parliament adopted legislation in 2013 to regulate the inclusion of gender medicine into teaching, research and healthcare as part of the national health policy – as well as promoting its adoption in regional and provincial health policy.¹⁹ Article four encourages private and state universities to introduce modules in gender medicine as part of degree programmes in medicine and surgery, and specialization courses in specific fields of medicine. An interdisciplinary approach from a gender medicine perspective is promoted through regular training courses, masters and PhDs in gender medicine.²⁰ It also sets up a gender medicine monitoring committee to collate, co-ordinate and share epidemiological and clinical data to achieve equal rights to health care.²¹

In France the CNRS has defined interdisciplinary research and the integration of the gender dimension (including in fields outside social science and humanities) as a strategic priority. In 2014 CNRS included this objective in a Gender Action Plan – and the strategy runs through various programmes. CNRS has also
proposed the inclusion of gendered perspectives into the National Strategy for Research adopted by the ministry where specific measures to promote and disseminate gender research and gender curricular in French universities are defined.  

**Recommendations**

- Consider the potential need for integrating the sex/gender dimension and a gender budgeting approach to define research/ funding priorities whilst allocating resources to national granting agencies, universities and research projects.  

- Ensure that the sex/gender dimension in research content is taken into account and encouraged in national research programmes, from programme design, throughout implementation and evaluation.  

- Encourage the inclusion of the sex/gender dimension into different research topics at the outset and ensure it is dealt with systematically. This is an important part of the research process, which will determine whether or not sex/gender is a relevant factor.  

- Develop a systematic method of assessing the sex/gender dimension in study design and project impact.  

- Make available funding and resources for researchers to further investigate the sex/gender dimensions of their research.  

- Make available gender equality funding to develop teaching on integrating gender into specific disciplines (i.e. health) or establishing a database of gender research contents to supports potential gender researchers.  

- Allocate resources to raise awareness and carry out training for researchers, evaluators and management (top and middle) to promote a gender sensitive research- including integrating it in PhD training curricular and the development of guidelines.  

- Share and promote new policy approaches and practices introduced by RPOs that are successfully integrate the sex/gender dimension.  

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*, the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 15) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 3).  

[The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) Online Discussion](#)

2. According to the ERA, a research performing organisation (RPO) encompasses any organisation conducting public research – specifically research with a ‘public mission’ (DG Research and Innovation, 2013).


6. For an overview of gendered innovations please see http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/what-is-gendered-innovations.html


9. These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.

10. It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


13. It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

14. European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union. We recalculated the groups presented on p34- taking into consideration the percentage of RPOs that answered ‘yes’ as a percentage of all applicable organisations – and whether or not measures were identified. Please note that the sample for the ERA Survey was not randomly selected and the results have not been weighted due to a lack of substantiated information about the sample frame and the whole population of RPOs. “This means it is not possible to produce inferential statistics about the wider population”. She Figures, 2015, Handbook p111.


17. It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employs 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


21. Ibid.


26. Gender Summit 4 Europe 2014 GS7. See: http://gender-
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For those countries identified as having national level measures and above EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content in RPOs.²

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means integrating sex and gender analysis into research.³ It can improve the quality of research and its outcomes.⁴ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials for drug development. Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process saves human lives and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing the relevance of its outcomes.⁵ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁶

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁷ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁸ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
- recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular development and researcher training in relevant fields.⁹
The results of the ERA survey 2014 indicate that on average 44% of RPOs which are ERA compliant include the promotion of gender dimension in research content.

**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures to promote the gender dimension in research content. At the same time more than 44% (EU average) of their research performing organisations include such a gender dimension in research content. In concrete terms, this “How to Innovate”- brief targets specifically: Denmark, Germany, Ireland, France, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden.

In general progress to date has been slow and difficult to measure. The ERA Facts and Figures 2014 reports that whilst more countries are including the gender dimension in research content and programmes – the level of implementation is ‘insufficiently supported’. The share of institutions doing so also varies significantly amongst Member States. Of those countries identified as having above average levels of implementation with measures, – the percentage of RPOs that include the gender dimension in research content ranges from 46% in Ireland to 80% in Austria.

**What are the options?**

National level policymakers have real leverage to encourage the integration of the gender dimension into research content and higher education curricular as they can set research and funding priorities.

Various solutions have been tried including enacting legislation, - either domain-specific or pushing forward a more general gender mainstreaming approach in public agencies.

The Spanish Science, Technology and Innovation Act was passed in 2011- and required a gender dimension to be included in all aspects of the research process. This ensured that the Spanish Strategy on Science, Technology and Innovation 2013 and the State Plan for Scientific and Technical Research and Innovation included the integration of the gender dimension into public RDI policies as one of five main principles.

A different approach has been taken by the Swedish government which has invested SEK 20 million (approximately 2 million Euros)) in a four year gender mainstreaming programme of government agencies–supported by the government-funded Swedish Secretariat for Gender Research. It has carried out gender mainstreaming work with 41 government agencies including, The
Swedish Council for Higher Education (UHR), The Swedish Higher Education Authority (UKÄ), The Swedish innovation agency VINNOVA, and The Swedish Research Council. The Secretariat has also coordinated competence building activities, organised forums for sharing of experiences, identified and disseminated examples of good practices as well as documenting the results of the agencies work. In its budget for 2016, the Swedish government expanded the gender mainstreaming duty in 2016-2018 to all higher education institutions, allocated some funding for the purpose, and gave the National Secretariat for Gender Research the task to be the support organisation in this task.

Competence building activities are also being undertaken in Canada and the U.S. where sex and gender training are being developed for both grant evaluators and researchers according to the specific area of science and technology.

**Recommendations**

- Include and integrate the sex/gender dimension as a key element in research policies and strategic plans for science and technology.
- Consider and assess the potential need for integrating the sex/gender dimension and a gender budgeting approach to define research/ funding priorities whilst allocating resources to national granting agencies, universities and research projects.
- Ensure that the sex/gender dimension in research content is taken into account and encouraged in national research programmes, from programme design, throughout implementation and evaluation.
- Develop a systematic method of assessing the sex/gender dimension in study design and project impact.
- Make funding and resources available for researchers to further investigate and integrate the sex/gender dimensions of their research.
- Make available gender equality funding to develop teaching on how to integrate the sex/gender dimension into specific disciplines (i.e. health, technology) or establish a database of gender research contents to support potential gender researchers.
- Allocate resources to raise awareness and carry out training for researchers, evaluators and management (top and middle) to promote a gender sensitive research- including integrating it in PhD training curricular and the development of guidelines.
- Share and promote new policy approaches and practices introduced by RPOs that are successfully integrating the sex/gender dimension.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents\textsuperscript{35}, the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process (see footnote 15) and the Gendered Innovations project (see footnote 3) as well as the Gendered Innovations website\textsuperscript{36}.

The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) Online Discussion
[1] Please see ‘Gender and Science Policy Briefs: From “Where to start” to “How to innovate”: An Introduction’, for a description of the methodology used. Available at:


[9] These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.

[10] It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


[13] It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

[14] European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union. We recalculated the groups presented on p34– taking into consideration the percentage of RPOs that answered ‘yes’ as a percentage of all applicable organisations – and whether or not measures were identified. Please note that the sample for the ERA Survey was not randomly selected and the results have not been weighted due to a lack of substantiated information about the sample frame and the whole population of RPOs. “This means it is not possible to produce inferential statistics about the wider population”. She Figures, 2015, Handbook p111.


[17] It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employs 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


[19] Legislation has been passed ranging from domain- specific legislation,- in health (U.S., Italy), science (Spain), higher education and research (France) to taking a much broader gender mainstreaming approach (Sweden).


PB13 - Integrating the gender dimension into research content for research funding organisations: Where to start?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and research funders on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content. It does not cover the topic of gender balance in evaluation panels – which is covered in policy briefs 17-20.

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means applying sex and gender analysis methods when formulating research questions, deciding on the methodology, anticipating impacts, and disseminating results.² These action ensure improved quality of research and its outcomes.³ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials in the right proportions to avoid worse adverse effects of drugs for women (or men). Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process improves the benefits of research for women and men and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing societal relevance of science knowledge and its acceptance.⁴ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁵

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content in addition to the objective to improve greater gender equality in science.⁶ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁷ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity to, and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines, standards, and training materials for researchers and research managers
guidelines and training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular development and researcher training in relevant fields.  

Funding agencies play a pivotal role as they prioritise certain research areas to fund and promote. The Global Research Council – which brings together the heads of science and engineering funding agencies from nearly 50 countries from around the world has also recognised the benefits of integrating the gender dimension and recommended that their members promote it as part of a Statement of Principles and Actions Promoting the Equality and Status of Women in Research developed at their fifth annual meeting in May 2016 in New Delhi.

What is the extent of the problem?

According to the ERA survey 2014 research funders in only a few countries support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content when planning research programmes. This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have been identified by the European Commission as having no relevant implementation strategies. In concrete terms, this “Where to Start” brief targets specifically: Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, France, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, and the UK.

What are the options?

There are various ways that national level policy makers and research funders can promote the integration of the gender dimension into research. These can be legislative, ‘soft measures’ or strategies and policies to encourage and promote the integration of the gender dimension. Funding agencies can:

- create research funding programmes aimed at integrating sex/gender analysis in research
- consult and include gender experts when designing research funding programmes
- encourage applicants to consider whether the gender dimension is relevant to the proposed research project and specify how this will be taken into account
- include the gender dimension as an evaluation criterion in project assessment
- develop guidelines and training on the gender dimension for applicants and proposal reviewers
In Italy, in 2013 a parliamentary bill was introduced to implement gender medicine nationally.\textsuperscript{15} This bill paved the way for the Ministry of Health to annually finance key projects on gender medicine as well as introduce tax incentives to encourage and advance scientific, medical and pharmaceutical research into gender medicine.\textsuperscript{16}

In the US, the National Institute of Health has recently published an analysis of public comments on the consideration of sex as a biological variable in biomedical research.\textsuperscript{17} The public’s overall endorsement of pursuing this line of work combined with an analysis of comments gave the NIH a greater mandate to: raise awareness about the inclusion of the gender dimension in research design and analysis, provide training and resources in this field, consider changes to both application and review processes, provide guidance to researchers and the broader scientific community about NIH’s expectations for applicants.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{Recommendations}

- Maximise their own role as research funders in raising the quality of research by creating effective incentives for researchers to integrate the sex/gender dimension into research content.\textsuperscript{19}
- Ensure that call texts are vetted by gender experts in order to guarantee that the gender dimension is properly integrated.
- Integrate into the proposal template a section where applicants are asked to describe, when relevant ‘how sex and gender analysis is taken into account in the projects’ content’.
- Make a greater effort to promote and disseminate research that has successfully integrated the sex/gender dimension.\textsuperscript{20}
- Develop and provide guidelines and/or training materials/workshops to assist applicants to competently integrate the sex/gender dimension into research designs.
- Develop and provide guidelines and/or training materials/workshops to assist proposal reviewers/evaluators to competently assess the gender dimension of applications and research impact.
**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*\(^{21}\), the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 9) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 2) as well as the *Gendered Innovations* website\(^{22}\).

[The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) Online Discussion](#)


[8] These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.


[10] Ibid.

[11] This classification of EU Member States is according to the support to the inclusion of the gender dimension in research programmes and frequent support provided by funders. Unlike in the other policy areas - we have included the group of countries identified as having 'no implementation'. This indicates that greater attention is much needed in this policy area.


[14] These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.


[18] Ibid.
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PB14 – Integrating the gender dimension into research content for research funding organisations: How to consolidate?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no measures whilst funders provide frequent support for the inclusion of the gender dimension at a rate below the EU average.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and research funders on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content. It does not cover the topic of gender balance in evaluation panels – which is covered in policy briefs 17-20.

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means applying sex and gender analysis methods when formulating research questions, deciding on the methodology, anticipating impacts, and disseminating results.² These action ensure improved quality of research and its outcomes.³ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials in the right proportions to avoid worse adverse effects of drugs for women (or men). Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process improves the benefits of research for women and men and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing societal relevance of science knowledge and its acceptance.⁴ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁵

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁶ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁷ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of sex and gender analysis in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
• guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
• recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular development and researcher training in relevant fields.  

Funding agencies play a pivotal role as they prioritise certain research areas to fund and promote.  

**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries with no national measures supporting the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content/programmes. At the same time the share of funders that frequently support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content in research agendas is lower than the EU average. In concrete terms this “How to Consolidate” - brief targets specifically: Bulgaria, Czech Republic and Finland.  

According to the ERA survey 2014 results, funders in only a few countries support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content/programmes. For this group of countries - that have been identified by the European Commission as having frequent support below EU average and no identifiable measures- it ranges from the Czech Republic where 88% of the research performing organisations (RFOs) provide no support for the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content in research agendas to Finland where 9% of research funding organisations provide no support to the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content by funders.  

**What are the options?**

There are various ways that national level policy makers and research funders can promote the integration of the gender dimension into research. These can be legislative, ‘soft measures’ or strategies and policies to encourage and promote the integration of the gender dimension. Funding agencies can:

• create research funding programmes aimed at integrating sex/gender analysis in research
• consult and include gender experts when designing research funding programmes
• encourage applicants to consider whether the gender dimension is relevant to the proposed research project and specify how this will be taken into account
• include the gender dimension as an evaluation criterion in project assessment  
• develop guidelines and training on the gender dimension for applicants
An example of an action for encouraging the integration of the sex / gender dimension into research is the ‘Roadmap for science, Science Vision 2025’ which was published in 2014 in the Netherlands. It included the promotion of a specific alliance for gender and health in order to integrate the gender dimension into research content. This was foreseen as a prelude to a national programme on gender and health. Similarly, in 2013, the NSF used the occasion of the Gender Summit – North America to produce a roadmap for action for North America: Diversity Fuelling Excellence in Research and Innovation, that targets a variety of stakeholders in science endeavours.

In 2013, the United States Office on Research of Women’s Health (ORWH) (which oversaw the National Institutes of Health (NIH)-wide research agenda related to sex and gender) launched a funding programme to provide supplements to existing grants to add subjects, tissues or cells of the opposite sex – used in the original grant or to add more subjects to a sample that included both sexes. The ORWH co-funds the specialized centres of research on Sex Differences Programme – which promotes interdisciplinary research on sex and gender differences in health research. It also provides training in considering sex and gender in experimental research design and analysis. In 2014 the US NIH required that female and male cells are used in pre-clinical studies and in 2015 it released guidelines on including the sex and gender dimension in research content.

**Recommendations**

- Maximise their own role as research funders in raising the quality of research by creating effective incentives for researchers to integrate the gender dimension into research content.
- Integrate into the proposal template a section where applicants are asked to describe, when relevant ‘how sex and gender analysis is taken into account in the projects’ content’.
- Make a greater effort to promote and disseminate research that has successfully integrated the gender dimension.
- Develop and provide guidelines and/ or training materials/ workshops to assist applicants to competently integrate sex and/ or gender analysis into research designs.
- Develop and provide guidelines and/ or training materials/ workshops to assist proposal reviewers/ evaluators to competently assess the gender dimension of applications.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*\(^{21}\), the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 9) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 16) as well as the *Gendered Innovations* website\(^{22}\).

The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) Online Discussion


For an overview of gendered innovations please see http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/what-is-gendered-innovations.html
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It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


These categories are taken from the classification of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimension in research contents developed by the Gender-Net Project.
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For those countries identified as having measures whilst funders provide frequent support for the inclusion of the gender dimension at a rate below the EU average.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and research funders on how to integrate gender dimension into research content. It does not cover the topic of gender balance in evaluation panels – which is covered in policy briefs 17-20.

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means applying sex and gender analysis methods when formulating research questions, deciding on the methodology, anticipating impacts, and disseminating results.² These action ensure improved quality of research and its outcomes.³ For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials in the right proportions to avoid worse adverse effects of drugs for women (or men). Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process improves the benefits of research for women and men and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing societal relevance of science knowledge and its acceptance.⁴ It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.⁵

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 –2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science.⁶ Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes.⁷ Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of better response to sex and gender analysis gender issues in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
- recommendations and/ or models for university STEM curricular
development and researcher training in relevant fields.\textsuperscript{8}

Funding agencies play a pivotal role as they prioritise certain research areas to fund and promote.\textsuperscript{9}

\textbf{What is the extent of the problem?}

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries with measures supporting the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content/programmes. At the same time the share of funders that frequently support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content is lower than the EU average.\textsuperscript{10} In concrete terms this “How to Lead” - brief targets specifically: Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands, Austria, Spain and Sweden.\textsuperscript{11}

According to the ERA survey 2014 results, funders in only a few countries have recognised the need to include the gender dimension in research content/programmes as a criterion of excellence.\textsuperscript{12}

Within this group of countries in Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden the majority of the RFOs surveyed provide no support for the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content. In Germany and Austria on the other hand, the majority of research funders provide occasional support. 40% of research funders in Austria and 25% in Germany provide frequent support to the inclusion of the gender dimension in research contents in research agendas by funders.

\textbf{What are the options?}

There are various ways that national level policy makers and research funders can promote the integration of the gender dimension into research. These can be legislative, ‘soft measures’ or strategies and policies to encourage and promote the integration of the gender dimension. Funding agencies can:

- create research funding programmes aimed at integrating sex/gender analysis in research
- consult and include gender experts when designing research funding programmes
- encourage applicants to consider whether the gender dimension is relevant to the proposed research project and specify how this will be taken into account
- include the gender dimension as an evaluation criterion in project assessment\textsuperscript{13}
- develop guidelines and training on the gender dimension for applicants and proposal reviewers\textsuperscript{14}

The Irish Research Council requires all applicants to demonstrate that they have
given full consideration to whether there is a potential sex and/or gender dimension in their proposed research. It has also hosted workshops where gender experts facilitated sessions to enable researchers to identify whether a sex/ gender dimension is relevant and if so how to integrate it into the research design, implementation, evaluation and dissemination.\(^\text{15}\)

The Austrian Science Fund (FWF) has integrated gender in research content into grant applications and has also developed guidelines for applicants for specific research programmes.\(^\text{16}\) It includes mandatory gender-related analysis in the FWF’s flagship Special Research Programmes (SFBs) and Doctoral Programmes (DKs).\(^\text{17}\) They have also developed a ‘How to make research gender sensitive’ and a ‘Checklist for Gender in Research’ available for applicants.

**Recommendations**

- Include the sex/gender dimension in research curricular/ content as a criterion for funding in the performance agreements with RPOs and RFOs or when public administrations provide research funding allocated on a competitive basis.\(^\text{18}\)

- Maximise their own role as research funders in raising the quality of research by creating effective incentives for researchers to integrate the sex/gender dimension into research content.\(^\text{19}\)

- Integrate into the proposal template an obligatory section where applicants are asked to describe - when relevant - ‘how sex and gender analysis is taken into account in the projects’ content’.

- Make a greater effort to promote and disseminate research that has successfully integrated the sex/gender dimension.\(^\text{20}\)

- Develop and provide guidelines and/ or training materials/ workshops to assist applicants to competently integrate the sex/ gender dimension into research designs.

- Develop and provide guidelines and/ or training materials/ workshops to assist proposal reviewers/ evaluators to competently assess the sex/gender dimension of applications.

- Integrate the inclusion of the sex/gender dimension into their monitoring and evaluation systems in order to be able to successfully demonstrate the impact of this approach.
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*\(^ {21}\), the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 9) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 1) as well as the *Gendered Innovations* website\(^ {22}\).

*The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) Online Discussion.*
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This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and research funders on how to integrate the gender dimension into research content. It does not cover the topic of gender balance in evaluation panels – which is covered in policy briefs 17-20.

Why is this important?

Integrating the gender dimension into the research process and content means applying sex and gender analysis methods when formulating research questions, deciding on the methodology, anticipating impacts, and disseminating results. These actions ensure improved quality of research and its outcomes. For example in the field of health, both men and women need to be included in clinical trials in the right proportions to avoid worse adverse effects of drugs for women (or men). Integrating sex and gender analysis into the research process improves the benefits of research for women and men and prevents the waste of economic resources. It also helps to ensure that research reflects the needs of a diverse population thereby increasing societal relevance of science knowledge and its acceptance. It may also contribute to opening up more market opportunities by diversifying the experiences and expertise in the innovation process.

The European Commission’s major research funding programme Horizon 2020 (2014 -2020) prioritises the integration of gender/sex analysis in research and innovation (R&I) content as one of its main objectives to improve greater gender equality in science. Member states have been invited to create a legal and policy environment and provide incentives to strengthen the gender dimension in research programmes. Various national initiatives have been already undertaken to encourage greater sensitivity and the integration of better response to sex and gender analysis gender issues in science knowledge and practice. These include developing and providing support for:

- policies and strategies promoting the integration and analysis of sex/gender as research variables and determinant of outcomes
- research funding programmes aimed at advancing cross-cutting impact of sex/gender aware and responsive research
- guidelines and training materials for researchers and research managers
- guidelines/ training for assessment and evaluation of gender as component of excellence and impact in research proposals and projects
• recommendations and/or models for university STEM curricular development and researcher training in relevant fields.\textsuperscript{8}

Funding agencies play a pivotal role as they prioritise certain research areas to fund and promote.\textsuperscript{9} The Global Research Council – which brings together the heads of science and engineering funding agencies from nearly 50 countries from around the world has also recognised the benefits of integrating the gender dimension and recommended that their members promote it as part of a Statement of Principles and Actions Promoting the Equality and Status of Women in Research developed at their fifth annual meeting in May 2016 in New Delhi.

\textit{What is the extent of the problem?}

Funders in only a few countries in Europe support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content/programmes according to the ERA survey 2014.\textsuperscript{10} In Italy 94\% of research funders reported providing frequent support to the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content.\textsuperscript{11}

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries with measures supporting the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content/programmes. At the same time the share of funders that frequently support the inclusion of the gender dimension in research content is above EU average. In concrete terms this “How to Innovate” –policy brief targets specifically: Italy.

\textit{What are the options?}

There are various ways that national level policy makers and research funders can promote the integration of the gender dimension into research. These can be legislative measures, ‘soft measures’, or strategies and policies to encourage and promote the integration of the gender dimension. Funding agencies can:

• create research funding programmes aimed at integrating sex/gender analysis in research
• consult and include gender experts when designing research funding programmes
• encourage or request applicants to consider whether the gender dimension is relevant to the proposed research project, and specify how this will be taken into account
• include the gender dimension as an evaluation criterion in project assessment \textsuperscript{12}
• develop guidelines and training on the gender dimension for applicants and proposal reviewers \textsuperscript{13}

The Research Council of Norway – promotes integration of gender in research
content by including it as mandatory in evaluation criteria for both its project and institutional funding programmes. As well as developing an institutional strategy to include the gender dimension, – the Research Council of Norway recognises the importance of its role at a national level – for promoting the integration of the gender dimension in order to strengthen the knowledge base.

The Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) draws attention to the integration of sex/ and/ or gender considerations in all its funding opportunities. It requires all applicants for grant programmes to respond to mandatory sex and gender relevance questions when filling out application forms. Peer reviewers are also informed to consider applicants’ responses to the sex/gender questions when reviewing grant proposals. CIHR have also integrated the inclusion of the gender dimension into monitoring and evaluation systems. Outcomes from the evaluation show a greater number of researchers including sex/ and/ or gender into their research and a greater awareness of sex/ and/ or gender in health research, - thereby leading to more rigorous research and more equitable and ethical outcomes.

The Austrian Ministry of Transport administers the ‘Talents’ Programme, which includes a research line ‘FEMtech’ that aims to integrate the gender dimension into research & innovation content focused on both genders needs and demands. The criteria for the evaluation of projects includes relevance, i.e. gender aspects in the research topic in terms of adequate research design, team composition and the economic potential / exploitation: customer orientation. The Austrian Ministry of Transport has also integrated the inclusion of the gender dimension into monitoring and evaluation systems. Outcomes include a higher quality of research projects; greater awareness and gender-competence – learning for applicants and evaluators; and guidelines and events.

**Recommendations**

- Include the sex/gender dimension in research curricular/ content as a criterion for funding in performance agreements with RPOs and RFOs or when public administrations provide research funding allocated on a competitive basis.
- Maximise their own role of as research funders in raising the quality of research by creating effective incentives for researchers to integrate the sex/gender dimension into research content.
- Consult and include gender experts in designing research funding programmes and in monitoring and evaluation
- Integrate into the proposal template a section where applicants are asked to describe, when relevant, ‘how sex and gender analysis is taken into account in the projects’ content’.
- Make a greater effort to promote and disseminate research that has successfully integrated the sex/gender dimension.
- Develop and provide guidelines and/or training materials/workshops to assist applicants to competently integrate sex and/or gender analysis into research designs.
- Develop and provide guidelines and/or training materials/workshops to assist proposal reviewers/evaluators to competently assess the sex/gender dimension of applications.
- Integrate the inclusion of the sex/gender dimension into research funders’ monitoring and evaluation systems in order to be able to successfully demonstrate the impact of this approach.

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning the integration of the gender dimension into research content for research performing organisations is available through the following three publications: the Gender-Net *Compendium of national initiatives on the integration of the gender dimensions in research contents*\(^{26}\), the report by the League of European Research Universities (LERU) *Gendered Research and Innovation: Integrating Sex and Gender Analysis into the Research Process* (see footnote 9) and the *Gendered Innovations* project (see footnote 2) as well as the *Gendered Innovations* website\(^{27}\).

[The GenPORT Gender Dimension in Research Content – Research Funding Organisations (RFOs) Online Discussion](#)
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Ibid, p. 47.


Ibid, p. 38.
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PB17 – Gender-balance in decision-making: Where to start?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no measures and below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage gender balance in decision-making positions and boards in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs).²

Why is this important?

Women’s representation in academia decreases the higher up the academic ladder culminating in the very small percentage of women in decision-making posts, on boards and in committees. For example at grade C the difference with men is 10 percentage points – widening to an incredible 58 percentage points at grade A (full professors).³

In 2005 the European Council set a goal for women to be in 25% of leading public research positions. The findings of the 2014 ERA survey however show that– on average only 18% of surveyed RPOs were headed by women, although there is great variation between member states.⁴ This represents a considerable loss and waste of talent for research in Europe. It also detrimentally impacts on optimal institutional decision-making as women have fewer opportunities to shape and influence the research agenda.⁵

In 1999 the European Commission set and recently reinforced a target of 40% for the under-represented sex in groups, panels and committees. This is applied to the European Commission’s main funding programme Horizon 2020 which also raises the target for advisory groups to 50% and stipulates the inclusion of at least one gender expert.⁶ According to She Figures, 2015, only 28% of scientific and administrative board members are women, this drops to 22% of board leaders within the EU-28.⁷ The results of the ERA survey 2014 – show, that only 35.8% of research evaluation panels in research funding organisations include at least the 40% target of the under-represented sex in their composition.⁸ This is of great significance as allocating research funding does not only impact on the scientific community but has much wider societal implications. What gets funding and what does not has real implications for societal development as well as a differential impact on specific groups of people. The diversity of society including gender must therefore be reflected in the allocation of research funds.⁹
**What is the extent of the problem?**

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures to improve gender balance in senior positions, quotas, targets and or awards. In addition less than 18% (EU average)\textsuperscript{10} of their countries’ RPOs are headed by women. In concrete terms this “How to Start” brief targets: Latvia. In Latvia funding support for the implementation of gender balance in RPOs is only occasionally supported in no research funding organisation and is only frequently supported in 7.1%\textsuperscript{11}.

**What are the options?**

The European Commission’s Communication on a renewed European research area invites member states to ensure at least 40% of the underrepresented sex to participate in committees involved in recruitment/career progression and in establishing and evaluating research programmes.\textsuperscript{12}

There are various ways that national level policy makers can improve the gender balance in senior positions in public research institutions and on boards and committees. Legislation can be developed as well as ‘soft measures’ which can take the form of quotas, targets and/ or awards.\textsuperscript{13}

In 1990, the US national Committee on Women in Science, Engineering and Medicine (CWSEM) was established in the National Academy of Science. One of its programmes deals with leadership whereby the under-representation of women in leadership positions and its causes are examined, and combined with encouraging women leaders to mentor and sponsor.\textsuperscript{14}

In Slovenia, the national Research Agency has brought in rules governing the composition of both temporary and permanent evaluation committees. Every committee must include at least a third of each gender – an exception however is made for the technical sciences committee, -which must have a fifth of representation.\textsuperscript{15}

In Poland, the Act on Higher Education stipulates that nominations for the Ministry of Science and Higher Education’s advisory body (main Council of Science and Higher Education) should consider gender balance. It also stipulates that the Minister of Science and Higher Education must ensure that at least 30% of the committee members of the Polish accreditation Committee are women.\textsuperscript{16}
**Recommendations**

- Include gender balance as a criterion for funding in performance agreements with RPOs and RFOs when institutional funding is allocated by public administrations. For example, this could take the form of 40% of the under-represented sex on decision-making boards or in committees.¹⁷

- Include explicit targets to improve gender balance and action plans of how to get there within the overarching gender equality strategy of scientific institutions. Progress should be monitored and be publicly available.¹⁸

- Collect and report sex-disaggregated statistics in leadership and decision-making positions annually as part of the national standard statistical reporting on research and innovation.¹⁹

- Ensure familiarity with relevant overarching European Commission gender equality policy²⁰,²¹ and relevant information at the European level.²²

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading on gender-balance in decision-making is available through the report *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research*²³ published by the European Commission and Gender-Net report on *National Plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and structural change* (see footnote 14).

The GenPORT Gender Balance in Decision-Making in Research Organisations Online Discussion
Gender balance in decision-making has the potential to effect change in both RPOs and RFOs. These briefs have grouped countries according to levels of implementation (share of women who are heads of RPOs) and the presence or not of measures to improve gender balance in the decision-making process based on the results of the survey conducted with RPOs. These briefs however do include findings of the survey carried out with RFOs which looks at whether funders provide support to the implementation of gender balance. This approach attempts to provide a more holistic picture of the situation in each country group.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p31. Strong variations among countries ranging from 5% in EL to 50% in LU. However, it is important to note that the more recent 2015 She Figures record LU as having no women as heads of its two universities.

European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p32. It should be recalled that these figures concern funders who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which represent 34% of total EU GBOARD.


For those countries identified as having national level measures but below EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage gender balance in decision-making positions and boards in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs).²

Why is this important?

Women's representation in academia decreases the higher up the academic ladder culminating in the very small percentage of women in decision-making posts, on boards and in committees. For example at grade C the difference with men is 10 percentage points – widening to an incredible 58 percentage points at grade A (full professors).³

In 2005 the European Council set a goal for women to be in 25% of leading public research positions. The findings of the 2014 ERA survey however show that– on average only 18% of surveyed RPOs were headed by women, –although there is great variation between member states.⁴ This represents a considerable loss and waste of talent for research in Europe. It also detrimentally impacts on optimal institutional decision-making as women have fewer opportunities to shape and influence the research agenda.⁵

In 1999 the European Commission set and recently reinforced a target of 40% for the under-represented sex in groups, panels and committees. This is applied to the European Commission's main funding programme Horizon 2020 which also raises the target for advisory groups to 50% and stipulates the inclusion of at least one gender expert.⁶ According to She Figures, 2015, only 28% of scientific and administrative board members are women, this drops to 22% of board leaders within the EU-28.⁷ The results of the ERA survey 2014 – show that only 35.8% of research evaluation panels in research funding organisations include at least the 40% target of the under-represented sex in their composition.⁸ This is of great significance as allocating research funding does not only impact on the scientific community but has much wider societal implications. What gets funding and what does not has real implications for societal development as well as a differential impact on specific groups of people. The diversity of society including gender must therefore be reflected in the allocation of research funds.⁹
What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures to improve gender balance in senior positions, quotas, targets and or/awards. In addition less than 18% (EU average) of their countries’ research performing organisations are headed by women. In concrete terms this “How to Consolidate” -brief targets: Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Greece, Spain France, Italy, Liechtenstein, Hungary, Poland, and Portugal.

For this group of countries we can see how there is no funding support for the implementation of gender balance in any of the RFOs surveyed in Hungary, and for the majority in France and Portugal. The Czech Republic is the only country in this group where funding support to the implementation of gender balance tends to be occasionally provided. It is frequently supported in Germany in all of the RFOs surveyed followed shortly by Italy. Just over three-quarters of those RFOs in Belgium and Spain surveyed frequently provide funding support to the implementation of gender balance.

What are the options?

The European Commission’s Communication on a renewed European research area invites member states to ensure at least 40% of the underrepresented sex to participate in committees involved in recruitment/career progression and in establishing and evaluating research programmes.

There are various ways that national level policy makers can improve the gender balance in senior positions in public research institutions and on boards and committees. Legislation can be developed as well as ‘soft measures’ which can take the form of quotas, targets and or awards.

In Norway the Committee for Gender Balance and Diversity in Research – has a mandate to support and provide recommendations to achieve gender equality mainstreaming at all institutions within the research sector. The committee is an independent body with advisory functions and one of its main tools is the Gender Balance in Research website which collates useful resources, i.e. links, literature, statistics and good practices to facilitate knowledge sharing in this field.

In Austria the Austrian Rectors’ Conference Gender and Diversity Taskforce has been established to implement gender mainstreaming and to support the increase of women’s share in top-level positions at universities in addition to the legislative action (quotas) by offering coaching to prospective women heads of universities.

Legislation has been passed in Spain making it mandatory for research institutions to push for gender balance in committees, on boards and in groups.
For example the Law of Science, Technology and Innovation, recommends that confidential evaluation procedures for recruitment for personnel are established to tackle gender bias and promote a more balanced representation. Research institutions in Spain additionally have to seek gender balanced representation in selection processes for members of expert committee boards for university accreditation.17

**Recommendations**

- Introduce quotas of women in higher positions and panels – accompanied by powerful incentives and or/ sanctions.18

- Include gender balance as a criterion for funding in performance agreements with RPOs when institutional funding is allocated by public administrations. For example, this could take the form of 40% of the under-represented sex on decision-making boards or in committees.19

- Include explicit targets to improve gender balance and action plans of how to get there within the overarching gender equality strategy of scientific institutions. Progress should be monitored and be publicly available.20

  This can also include funding national support structures (for example national helpdesk, services facilities at the rectors conference offices etc.).

- Facilitate the collection and publication of sex-disaggregated statistics in leadership and decision-making positions and committees annually as part of the national standard statistical reporting on research and innovation.21

- Put in place measures to ensure that a balanced representation of men and women in committees must also apply to those bodies that design and evaluate research and innovation public policies.22

- Fund education and training to enhance further the expertise and competence in gender equality policy and practice for decision-making boards, committees and groups in RFOs, RPOs and the authorities which fund research.

- Initiate national policy and monitoring of gender equality in relation to the heads of RFOs and RPOs.

- Ensure familiarity with relevant overarching European Commission gender equality policy23,24 and relevant information at the European level.25
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning gender-balance in decision-making is available through the report *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research* published by the European Commission and Gender-Net report on *National Plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and structural change* (see footnote 14).
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Please see ‘Gender and Science Policy Briefs: From "Where to start" to "How to innovate": An Introduction’, for a description of the methodology used. Available at: http://www.genderportal.eu/sites/default/files/resource_pool/pb_introduction_.pdf

Gender balance in decision-making has the potential to effect change in both RPOs and RFOs. These briefs have grouped countries according to levels of implementation (share of women who are heads of RPOs) and the presence or not of measures to improve gender balance in the decision-making process based on the results of the survey conducted with RPOs. These briefs however do include findings of the survey carried out with RFOs- which looks at whether funders provide support to the implementation of gender balance. This approach attempts to provide a more holistic picture of the situation in each country group.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p31. Strong variations among countries ranging from 5% in EL to 50% in LU. However, it is important to note that the more recent 2015 She Figures record LU as having no women as heads of its two universities.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p32. It should be recalled that these figures concern funders who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which represent 34% of total EU GBOARD.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p31. At the level of decision-making in public research institutions, the Commission identified national initiatives to improve gender balance in senior positions (AT, BE, DE, DK, HR, NL) quotas (AT, BE, EL, ES, FR, LU), targets (AT, DE, DK, EL, ES, FR, HR, IT, SE, SI) and/or awards (AT, BG, CZ, DE, DK, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, NL, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI).


PB19 – Gender-balance in decision-making: How to lead?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having no measures but above EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to encourage gender balance in decision-making positions and boards in RFOs and RPOs.²

Why is this important?

Women’s representation in academia decreases the higher up the academic ladder culminating in the very small percentage of women in decision-making posts, on boards and in committees. For example at grade C the difference with men is 10 percentage points – widening to an incredible 58 percentage points at grade A (full professors).³

In 2005 the European Council set a goal for women to be in 25% of leading public research positions. The findings of the 2014 ERA survey however show that—on average only 18% of surveyed RPOs were headed by women, although there is great variation between member states.⁴ This represents a considerable loss and waste of talent for research in Europe. It also detrimentally impacts on optimal institutional decision-making as women have fewer opportunities to shape and influence the research agenda.⁵

In 1999 the European Commission set and recently reinforced a target of 40% for the under-represented sex in groups, panels and committees. This is applied to the European Commission’s main funding programme Horizon 2020 which also raises the target for advisory groups to 50% and stipulates the inclusion of at least one gender expert.⁶ According to She Figures, 2015 only 28% of scientific and administrative board members are women, this drops to 22% of board leaders within the EU-28.⁷ The results of the ERA survey 2014 – show that only 35.8% of research evaluation panels in research funding organisations include at least the 40% target of the under-represented sex in their composition.⁸ This is of great significance as allocating research funding does not only impact on the scientific community but has much wider societal implications. What gets funding and what does not has real implications for societal development as well as a differential impact on specific groups of people. The diversity of society including gender must therefore be reflected in the allocation of research funds.⁹
What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have no national measures to improve gender balance in senior positions, quotas, targets and or awards, as according to the ERA Facts and Figures 2014 survey. In addition, more than 18% of their countries’ research performing organisations are headed by women. They also have above average support to improve gender balance in the decision-making process of RPOs. In concrete terms this “How to Lead”- brief targets Estonia, Lithuania, Slovakia, Finland and the UK.

For this group of countries, we can see how there is frequent funding support for the implementation of gender balance in almost of the RFOs surveyed in the UK, as well as by just over a third of those RFOs surveyed in Finland. Forty-four percent of the RFOs surveyed in Lithuania state that funding support to the implementation of gender balance is occasionally provided, whilst there is no funding support for the implementation of gender balance in all of the RFOs surveyed in Slovakia, and just over half of RFOs in Lithuania.

In these countries, there may still be a relatively limited approach to gender equality, in terms of gender balance being seen as numbers of women and men represented in decision-making. In addition, there are further key issues to be addressed regarding decision-makers’ competence in gender issues and gender equality, gender in research content, procedures and processes in decision-making, diversity and intersectionality, and gender and sexual diversity.

What are the options?

The European Commission’s Communication on a renewed European research area invites member states to ensure at least 40% of the underrepresented sex to participate in committees involved in recruitment/career progression and in establishing and evaluating research programmes.

There are various ways that national level policy makers can improve the gender balance in senior positions in public research institutions and on boards and committees. Legislation can be developed as well as ‘soft measures’ which can take the form of quotas, targets and/or awards.

The Austrian University Act regulates gender balance in leadership positions and decision-making bodies in public research organisations. Austria is one of the few countries that has set up a fixed female quota of 40% of the underrepresented sex of decision-making bodies in RPOs.

In Spain the governance of Spanish universities is regulated by the Law of Universities, which requires universities to achieve parity in representative/governing bodies. Gender balance is also sought in research groups, selection
committees to appoint researchers to positions in university faculty bodies and committees granting the necessary national accreditation to work in a public university.\textsuperscript{17}

The Spanish National Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunities (2014-2016) includes gender equality objectives and priority areas and requires that the implementation of legislation on gender balance be monitored. Whilst measures to encourage the greater participation of women in research teams are requested – these are not specified.\textsuperscript{18}

In Belgium in Gent University a new decree came into force in 2014. This decree prescribes at least a gender balance of minimum one third to two-thirds to be maintained in the University's decision-making and advisory bodies.\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{Recommendations}

- Include gender balance as a criterion for funding in performance agreements with RPOs when institutional funding is allocated by public administrations. For example, this could take the form of 40\% of the under-represented sex on decision-making boards or in committees.\textsuperscript{20}

- Include explicit targets to improve gender balance and action plans of how to get there within the overarching gender equality strategy of scientific institutions. Progress should be monitored and be publically available.\textsuperscript{21} This can also include funding national support structures (for example, national helpdesk, services facilities at the rectors conference offices etc.).

- Introduce quotas of women in higher positions and panels – accompanied by powerful incentives and or/ sanctions.\textsuperscript{22}

- Facilitate the collection and publication of sex-disaggregated statistics in leadership and decision-making positions and committees annually as part of the national standard statistical reporting on research and innovation.\textsuperscript{23}

- Put in place measures to ensure that a balanced representation of men and women in committees must also apply to those bodies that design and evaluate research and innovation public policies.\textsuperscript{24}

- Fund education and training to deepen further the expertise and competence in gender equality policy and practice, at both formal and informal levels, and both research content and decision-making process, for decision making boards, committees and groups in RFOs, RPOs and the authorities which fund research.

- Develop national policy targets and measures on gender equality in relation to the heads of RFOs and RPOs.

- Ensure familiarity with relevant overarching European Commission gender equality policy\textsuperscript{25,26} and relevant information at the European level.\textsuperscript{27}
Further Reading

Further, in-depth reading concerning gender-balance in decision-making is available through the report *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research*\(^{28}\) published by the European Commission and Gender-Net report on *National Plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and structural change* (see footnote 17).
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Gender balance in decision-making has the potential to effect change in both RPOs and RFOs. These briefs have grouped countries according to levels of implementation (share of women who are heads of RPOs) and the presence or not of measures to improve gender balance in the decision-making process based on the results of the survey conducted with RPOs. These briefs however do include findings of the survey carried out with RFOs- which looks at whether funders provide support to the implementation of gender balance. This approach attempts to provide a more holistic picture of the situation in each country group.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p32. It should be recalled that these figures concern funders who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which represent 34% of total EU GBOARD.


In Finland, there has been no need for developing specific quotas for RPOs and RFOs, or specific funding schemes to promote gender balance in decision-making, due to the general gender quota regulation within the national equality legislation, applied successfully since 1995 (Act on Equality Between Women and Men). The proportion of women as heads of institutions, and gender balance in decision-making boards in Finland are among the highest in the EU.

It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515 000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p31. At the level of decision-making in public research institutions, the Commission could identify national initiatives to improve gender balance in senior positions (AT, BE, DE, DK, HR, NL) quotas (AT, BE, EL, ES, FR, LU); targets (AT, DE, DK, EL, ES, FR, HR, IT, SE, SI) and/or awards (AT, BG, CZ, DE, DK, FR, HR, HU; IE, IT, NL; PL, PT, RO, SE, SI).


PB20 – Gender-balance in decision-making: How to innovate?
March 2017

For those countries identified as having national level measures and above EU average levels of implementation.¹

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers on how to improve and encourage gender balance in decision-making positions and boards in RPOs and RFOs.²

Why is this important?

Women’s representation in academia decreases the higher up the academic ladder culminating in the very small percentage of women in decision-making posts, on boards and in committees. For example at grade C the difference with men is 10 percentage points – widening to an incredible 58 percentage points at grade A (full professors).³

In 2005 the European Council set a goal for women to be in 25% of leading public research positions. The findings of the 2014 ERA survey however show that on average only 18% of surveyed RPOs were headed by women, although there is great variation between member states.⁴ This represents a considerable loss and waste of talent for research in Europe. It also detrimentally impacts on optimal institutional decision-making as women have fewer opportunities to shape and influence the research agenda.⁵

In 1999 the European Commission set and recently reinforced a target of 40% for the under-represented sex in expert and advisory groups, evaluation panels and committees. This is applied to the European Commission’s main funding programme Horizon 2020 which also raises the target for advisory groups to 50% and stipulates the inclusion of at least one gender expert.⁶ According to She Figures, 2015 only 28% of scientific and administrative board members are women, this drops to 22% of board leaders within the EU-28.⁷ The results of the ERA survey 2014 – show that only 35.8% of research evaluation panels in research funding organisations include at least the 40% target of the under-represented sex in their composition.⁸ This is of great significance as allocating research funding does not only impact on the scientific community but has much wider societal implications. What gets funding and what does not has real implications for societal development as well as may have differential impacts on specific different groups of people. The diversity of society including gender must therefore be reflected in the allocation of research funds.⁹
What is the extent of the problem?

This policy brief addresses specifically those countries that have national measures to improve gender balance in senior positions, quotas, targets and or/awards. In addition above 18% (EU average) of their countries’ research performing organisations are headed by women. In concrete terms this “How to Innovate”- brief targets Bulgaria, Croatia, Austria, Slovenia and Sweden.

For this group of countries we can see how there is frequent funding support for the implementation of gender balance in all of the RFOs surveyed in Slovenia, followed closely by Sweden (approximately three quarters) and Austria (nearly two-thirds). However, in these countries, there may still be a relatively limited approach to gender equality, in terms of gender balance being seen as numbers of women and men represented in decision-making. In addition, there are further key issues to be addressed regarding decision-makers’ competence in gender issues and gender equality, gender in research content, procedures and processes in decision-making, diversity and intersectionality, and gender and sexual diversity.

What are the options?

The European Commission’s Communication on a renewed European research area invites member states to ensure at least 40% of the underrepresented sex to participate in committees involved in recruitment/ career progression and in establishing and evaluating research programmes.

There are various ways that national level policy makers can improve the gender balance in senior positions in public research institutions and on boards and committees. Legislation can be developed as well as ‘soft measures’ which can take the form of quotas, targets and/ or awards.

The Norwegian Gender Equality Act stipulates that higher education and public research institutions are obliged to have at least a 4:6 ratio of the sexes on boards and panels or in committees. Also in Norway, the rector in Trondheim University (NTNU) demands that new recruits to top positions should have competence in equality matters.

The Finnish Act on Equality between Women and Men regulates the gender balance in all public committees and bodies, and boards of bodies exercising public authority. Since 1995 these are to have at least 40% both women and men unless there are special reasons for the contrary. In addition, the Act states that authorities and all parties that are requested to nominate candidates for this kind of bodies must, wherever possible, propose both a woman and a man for every membership position.

In Finland there has been no need for developing specific quotas for RPOs and RFOs, or specific funding schemes to promote gender
balance in decision-making due to this general quota regulation which has been applied successfully since 1995. The proportion of women as heads of institutions, and gender balance in decision-making boards in Finland are among the highest in the EU.\textsuperscript{16}

The French Law “Sauvadet” on the reduction of precariousness and professional equality between women and men (2012) includes economic sanctioning if quotas are not met. Progressive quotas have been introduced for yearly appointment/nomination of women and men (% 4:6 ratio of the under-represented sexes by 2018) to high level civil servant positions. Administrations will have to pay 30,000 euros in 2013 progressing to 90,000 euros in 2018 if quotas are not met. The Ministry of National Education, Higher Education and Research, MENESR) monitors this law through its Roadmap for Equality between women and Men” which additionally states that the target percentage for representation of underrepresented sex should be 40%. It also defines specific measures, for example, that the General Directorate for Human Resources will identify women who could be appointed as Director Generals.\textsuperscript{17}

**Recommendations**

- Include gender balance as a criterion for funding in performance agreements with RPOs when institutional funding is allocated by public administrations. For example, this could take the form of 40% of the under-represented sex on decision-making boards or in committees.\textsuperscript{18}
- Include explicit targets to improve gender balance and action plans of how to get there within the overarching gender equality strategy of scientific institutions. Progress should be monitored and be publicly available.\textsuperscript{19} This can also include funding national support structures (for example helpdesk, services facilities at the national rector's conference offices etc.).
- Introduce quotas of women in higher positions and panels – accompanied by powerful incentives and or/ sanctions.\textsuperscript{20}
- Facilitate the collection and publication of sex-disaggregated statistics in leadership and decision-making positions and committees annually as part of the national standard statistical reporting on research and innovation.\textsuperscript{21}
- Put in place measures to ensure that a balanced representation of men and women in committees must also apply to those bodies that design and evaluate research and innovation public policies.\textsuperscript{22}
- Explore sanctions as an effective way of ensuring compliance with quotas.
- Fund education and training to deepen further the expertise and competence in gender in research content and gender equality policy and practice, at both formal and informal levels, and both research content and decision-making process, for decision-making process, for decision-making boards, committees and groups in RFOs, RPOs and the authorities.
which fund research.
- Develop and implement national policy, targets and measures on gender equality on the heads of RFOs and RPOs.
- Promote gender-equal procedures and processes throughout all aspects of decision-making, along with questions of diversity and intersectionality, and all gender and sexual diversity, in RFOs and RPOs.
- Ensure familiarity with relevant overarching European Commission gender equality policy²³,²⁴ and relevant information at the European level.²⁵

**Further Reading**

Further, in-depth reading concerning gender-balance in decision-making is available through the report *Gender Equality Policies in Public Research*²⁶ published by the European Commission and Gender-Net report on *National Plans and initiatives promoting gender equality and structural change* (see footnote 14).
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Gender balance in decision-making has the potential to effect change in both RPOs and RFOs. These briefs have grouped countries according to levels of implementation (share of women who are heads of RPOs) and the presence or not of measures to improve gender balance in the decision-making process based on the results of the survey conducted with RPOs. These briefs however do include findings of the survey carried out with RFOs- which looks at whether funders provide support to the implementation of gender balance. This approach attempts to provide a more holistic picture of the situation in each country group.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p.31. Strong variations among countries ranging from 5% in EL to 50% in LU. However, it is important to note that the more recent 2015 She Figures record LU as having no women as heads of its two universities.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p32. It should be recalled that these figures concern funders who answered the ERA survey in 2014, which represent 34% of total EU GBOARD.


It should be noted that these figures concern RPOs which answered the ERA survey in 2014, which employ 515,000 researchers (around 20% of total EU researchers).

Based on the findings of the survey with RPOs.


European Commission, (2015a). ERA Facts and Figures 2014, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p31. At the level of decision-making in public research institutions, the Commission identified national initiatives to improve gender balance in senior positions (AT, BE, DK, HR, NL) quotas (AT, BE, EL, ES, FR, LU), targets (AT, DE, DK, EL, ES, FR, HR, IT, SE, SI) and/or awards (AT, BG, CZ, DE, DK, FR, HR, HU; IE, IT, NL; PL, PT, RO, SE, SI).


PB21 - How to tackle sexual harassment in Research and research organisations
March, 2017

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and institutional science leaders on how to tackle sexual harassment in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs).

Why is this important?

Making sexual harassment, and indeed gender harassment visible as an obstacle to women's participation and progression in science is both difficult yet necessary given the attrition rates of women in science and the violation of human rights experienced by a substantial number of female scientists.

Research has demonstrated that women scientists who experience more sexual harassment and gender discrimination reported poorer job outcomes.¹ It has also been linked to lower workplace productivity, lower job satisfaction, as well as to negative physical and psychological health consequences.²

What is the extent of the problem?

The European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA) defines sexual harassment as multidimensional:

“ranging from physical forms (unwelcome touching, hugging or kissing) through to verbal acts (offensive sexually suggestive comments or jokes) and non-verbal forms such as cyberharassment (unwanted, offensive sexually explicit emails or SMS messages, or offensive, inappropriate advances on social networking sites)”.²

Sexual harassment is particularly insidious given the difficulties in researching its prevalence. Workplace sexual harassment has been documented as pervasive and under-reported.²

Whilst international survey data demonstrate that the majority of victims are women of sexual harassment, men and people with further gender identities, such as transgender and non-binary, are also subject to sexual harassment. Moreover, harassment can be directed to sex, gender, sexuality and/or gender identity, and can interlink with other dimensions of harassment, such as harassment related to age, class, (dis)ability, race and/or ethnicity. In the remainder of this policy brief, when the term sexual harassment is used, it refers to all the points above in this paragraph.
Victims of harassment tend to be younger, occupy lower position jobs, work with and be supervised by men – whilst female victims tend to work in male-dominated occupations. Perpetrators tend to be male and higher up the occupational ladder than their victims.²

Research has identified certain organisational characteristics that are more conducive to an environment where sexual harassment is prevalent which include: degree of tolerance of sexual harassment, gender composition of the workplace, including sex of the supervisor; if an occupation is considered traditionally male and a hierarchical structure defined by great power differentiations.²

Given the well-documented gendered power dynamics at play in science: a male-dominated workplace culture, advancement facilitated by an ‘old-boys’ network, the organisation of work characterised by vertical segregation and often based on a supervisor relationship, sexual harassment in the science sector is a pernicious problem that needs to be tackled.

What are the options?

Legislation varies by country and includes protection against workplace sexual harassment under both civil and criminal law.³ Ministries and national bodies can initiate various measures like researching its prevalence and awareness raising. There is also much to be done at the institutional level, such as like establishing complaints procedures and monitoring experiences. The European GENDER-NET project reports that participating institutions are carrying out a wide-range of anti-harassment measures including:

- regulations and disciplinary measures;
- policy interventions;
- designing and implementing procedures for improving the reporting of incidents in a safe and confidential setting;
- raising awareness about violence;
- training courses.⁴

In Norway the Gender Equality Act in 2002 included a provision that stipulates that the management of educational institutions must prevent and try to preclude sexual harassment – this is followed up by the Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombud.⁵

In Sweden the Equality Ombudsman has the authority to refer cases to the Swedish Labour Court as well as mediating between the parties in order to either secure an apology or financial compensation.⁶
In France a law on sexual harassment was passed in 2012 which stipulated that employers prevent harassment and that they act on harassment in the workplace. The French Ministry for Higher Education and Research has initiated various anti-harassment measures including raising awareness of legislation in the higher education and research sector as well as carrying out research on the prevalence.  

Very many universities have policies and procedures on sexual harassment; some have policies and procedures on bullying; and less have policies and procedures on violence.

The University of Helsinki, the leading university in Finland, began to pay attention to and monitoring sexual harassment in the mid-1990s, as part of its equality activities, leading on to issuing guidelines on prevention of inappropriate treatment and harassment, as part of its equality activities. In 2014, the University terminated the employment of a very high-performing professor due to sexual harassment and inappropriate behaviour, citing in public that the University applies zero tolerance for this kind of behaviour.

The University of la Laguna (ULL) includes sexual harassment in the Gender Equality Plan (2014-2017). “Improving the prevention and elimination of different kinds of harassment, sexist attitudes, discriminatory treatment based on sex, gender or sexual orientation, and any other gender-based violence” is one of its areas of intervention – and so it subsequently details corresponding measures, indicators and the evaluation process.

The Norwegian University of Science and Technology, (NTNU) has also defined sexual harassment in its Action Plan. It stipulates that the manager is responsible for stopping the harassment whilst it details the support and advice services that can be accessed at the University.

Universities UK established an inter-institutional taskforce in November 2015 to examine violence against women, harassment and hate crime that affects students. Violence against women and sexual harassment is a priority area. The taskforce will bring together students university experts and external organisations to examine the evidence, what universities are currently doing to tackle these issues and what needs to be done. Principles, guidance and recommendations will be developed for the sector.

Oxford University in the UK offers sexual consent workshops – in course induction programmes.
**Recommendations**

National level policy makers:

- Improve national legislation on sexual and other forms of harassment to cover higher education and research sector.

- Raise awareness of legislation tackling sexual harassment including legislation in the higher education and research sector.
- Provide funding for training of science and human resource managers – to inform institutional policies and procedures for tackling sexual harassment.
- Provide funding for support services - which can inform and signpost victims about the implications of reporting, counselling services etc.
- Develop policies directed at increasing reporting help to support law enforcement.  

Institutional Science Leaders:

- Demonstrate and make visible a ‘no tolerance’ of sexual harassment approach.
- Raise awareness and make visible the presence of hostile work behaviours, discrimination, harassment, bullying and violence.  
- Encourage those experiencing harassment to report it- whilst guaranteeing a safe environment.  
- Develop an anti-harassment policy to outline inappropriate behaviour and provide a mechanism for people to report violations.  
- Ensure that the institution has appropriate procedures and processes in place including independent reporting and enforcement mechanisms.  
- Introduce sexual consent workshops as part of course induction programmes– to inform about statistics on rape, sexual assault and sexual harassment, discuss ‘consent’ and offer information on support services.  
- Collect data systematically and monitor and make public collected data.  
- Train staff and research leaders to deal with sexual harassment procedures and available support services.

**Further Reading**


[10] Ibid.
PB22 – How to implement an intersectional approach in academia
July 2016

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and institutional science leaders on how to implement an intersectional approach in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs).

Why is this important?

An intersectional approach highlights the need to take into consideration the interdependencies of various intersecting inequalities – such as age, class, disability, gender, race, and sexuality. Intersectionality – with inspirations from black feminism, amongst other movements – and as an approach factors in both ethnic/racial and gendered (amongst other) systems of oppression. It also enables a focus on how the dynamics of privilege and exclusion arise and operate – when people who are subject to different inequalities are not recognised as such. Although rooted in political activism, intersectionality is sometimes confined to the realm of theory within research, and instead of being applied to the policy process; this is despite its utility for developing more inclusive and better policies. Moreover, many policy processes more widely are now strongly influenced by intersectional thinking and analysis, especially in the light of developing EU directives and laws (see section Further Reading on page 5).

Taking an intersectional approach within science can prove fruitful and be applied to many policy areas. For example in the assessment of academic excellence – evidence suggests that an understanding of the multiple different factors that explain the gendered construction of academia, leadership and diversity issues in higher education is often not adequately taken into consideration.

Approaches that are based on non-biased ways of assessing performance – and their subsequent applications to practices and procedures (selection, recruitment and promotion) that not only depend on limited quantitative ways of measuring quality and excellence (decontextualised use of bibliometrics, journal rankings, citation indexes, grant applications etc.) - are more likely to lead to success.

Enhanced policies related to gender and diversity lead to better science and innovation by increasing the effectiveness of R&D programmes as well as expanding the talent base available for science. The incorporation of the gender dimension – as well as intersectional dimensions related to race, age, sexual orientation, disability and religion or belief – have the potential to integrate better different perspectives into the research process. This not only leads to better quality research but is beneficial in terms of its applications, i.e. innovations which are more likely to benefit a diverse population. It also
contributes to improving the environment in which science is carried out – thereby improving career development opportunities better for all.\(^7\)

**What is the extent of the problem?**

Whilst the European Research Area operates within a much wider context i.e. the global scientific arena, the issue of diversity in Europe is often overlooked.\(^8\) A lack of focus on diversity – in this field in Europe can be seen in contrast to the U.S. – where it has gained ground on the science policy agenda.\(^9\) However, diversity issues in Europe are gaining increased attention at various levels from the institutional, to national, European and international policy making arenas as gender bias and a lack of diversity are increasingly highlighted as important challenges to be tackled.\(^10\)

**What are the options?**

Both legislation and ‘soft’ measures can promote an intersectional approach in science. Within the European Union context an important starting point is to be aware of and learn from non-discrimination legislation and directives. The European Commission website on relevant legislation reads:

“For many years the focus of EU action in the field of non-discrimination was on preventing discrimination on the grounds of nationality and gender. A few years ago, however, the EU countries approved unanimously new powers to combat discrimination on the grounds of racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

New legislation thus has been enacted in the area of anti-discrimination, which is the Racial Equality Directive (implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin in many areas of social life) and the Employment Equality Directive establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation.

European legislation addresses disability in a broad range of areas, Directives on anti-discrimination being only one of them. Other measures for disabled people include sector of transport or telecommunications, regulation on state aid promoting the recruitment of disabled workers or the open method of coordination enabling disability issues to be taken into consideration in employment, social inclusion and protection, pensions, health and long-term care.”\(^11\)

The EC Council Directive of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, and the Council Directive of 27 November 2000 establishing a general framework for equal treatment in employment and occupation, were followed by the EC Proposal for a
Directive against discrimination based on age, disability, sexual orientation and religion or belief beyond the workplace was introduced on 2 July 2008. More detailed information on anti-discrimination legislation is given at the EU-Lex website.\footnote{12}

In the light of this wider European context many countries have introduced broad anti-discrimination legislation and official advice. For example, in Finland 2004 Non-Discrimination (sometimes called Equity Act) (‘Yhdenvertaisuuslaki’) Act translated EU directives on equal treatment into Finnish law. The Act covers such grounds as disability, health, religion, belief, ethnic and national origin, nationality, age and sexual orientation. It prohibits direct and indirect discrimination as well as harassment and giving instructions or orders to discrimination.\footnote{13}

In the UK, the Equality Act 2010 harmonised equality legislation. Equality legislation across the UK protects staff and students with the following protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage or civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, sex, sexual orientation, religion and belief.\footnote{14} The general equality duty requires the University to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act and advance equality of opportunity between people who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not, by removing or minimising disadvantage and by meeting the needs of particular groups that are different from the needs of others.\footnote{15} This is demonstrated by Equality Impact Assessments carried out by each university.

Outside the EU, in Norway the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud aims to “view the various discriminatory grounds [on the basis of gender, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, disability and age] in conjunction with one another, and develop cross-sectoral expertise and an ability to deal with multiple discrimination at the interface between gender and other discriminatory grounds.”\footnote{16}

In Norway, the Ministry of Education and Research has since 2004 appointed a committee to promote gender balance in research. The committee’s mandate was broadened in 2014, when it was appointed to a new term from 2014 up to 2017, and it was renamed as Committee for Gender Balance and Diversity in Research. Its expanded mandate now also includes diversity: “The Committee shall support and give recommendations regarding measures that promote the integration of gender balance and diversity activities at universities, university colleges and research institutes, thus helping to increase diversity among the staff and in research. The Committee shall seek to raise the overall level of awareness of problems related to diversity and inclusion in the research system. Its most important task during the period is to address issues of gender and ethnicity. Its activities are to encompass diversity perspectives, including gender perspectives, in research.”\footnote{17}
In the U.S. the National Institutes of Health are obliged to include women and minorities in funded or supported clinical research by law USC 289a-2.\textsuperscript{18}

The National Science Foundation’s (NSF) Directorate for Biological Sciences in the U.S. includes a policy statement to encourage the inclusion of women and others from underrepresented groups when looking for finance for planning activities and designing the agenda of programmes.\textsuperscript{19}

The Jackson State University’s Advance programme in the U.S. supports the academic careers of women faculty by fostering an inclusive climate and culture which seeks to include a range of people –with diverse characteristics (race, gender and others) – whilst also communicating to the larger academic community – the general challenges facing women as well as those particular challenges facing women of colour.\textsuperscript{20}

The Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) program in the National Science Foundation aims to increase the numbers of underrepresented minorities (URMs), including those with disabilities, entering and completing science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) graduate education and postdoctoral training to levels representative of the available pool.\textsuperscript{21} Institutional measures include working with hiring committees to reduce bias and embrace diversity.\textsuperscript{22}

**Recommendations**

National level policy makers:

- An intersectional approach should be considered as a principle of law – prescribing the pursuit of equality to the greatest possible degree depending on the specific situation.
- An intersectional approach should inform the design of national level policies and measures to promote gender equality in RPOs and RFOs.

Institutional Science Leaders:

- Transform the institutional climate to promote equal opportunities for the advancement of all research staff, administrative staff and students.\textsuperscript{23}
- Promote gender diversity of research teams through a variety of incentives (e.g. quality recognition and allocation of resources) and through transparency in hiring.\textsuperscript{24}
- Involve key stakeholders to develop a code of practise for gender and diversity competent research excellence standards for their institution based on the principles of transparency, consistency, accountability, and inclusivity.\textsuperscript{25}
- Use tools like Equality Impact Assessments (contextualised to local context with reference to equality legislation) to document the efforts
made to ensure institutional practices and processes do not discriminate against people with one or more protected characteristics.  

Funders:

- Examine the peer review process – identify sources of bias that systematically disadvantage women or members of other disadvantaged groups.  
- Promote the development of dedicated training of review panels on the risks of bias when assessing scientists and their work - this is particularly relevant for recruitment of peer reviewers, in the drafting and communication of calls for proposals, development of evaluation criteria and procedures.

Further Reading

Various EU directives and other decisions are relevant to the question of intersectionality, non-discrimination and multiple discriminations. The legal and policy situation is extremely complex and policy implementation is uneven. The Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) introduced in Article 13 a broader anti-discrimination provision than previously, involving appropriate action to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. The Charter of Fundamental Rights of Fundamental Rights of the EU (2000: Article 21) provided further initiatives to tackle discrimination on these different grounds. The Treaty of Lisbon (2008) conferred legal status on the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights and determines that the EU shall accede to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR).


Onufrio states (2014, 128-129): “Council Directive 2000/43/EC (Racial Equality Directive), implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin, refers to the concept of multiple discrimination at recital 14 of its preamble, where it acknowledges the status of women as victims of multiple discrimination stating that “the Community should, in accordance with Article 3(2) of the EC Treaty, aim to eliminate inequalities, and to promote equality between men and women, especially since women are often the victims of multiple discrimination.” ... the operative part of the Directives
does not necessarily oblige Member States to outlaw intersectional discrimination. In its operative part, the Racial Equality Directive bans direct or indirect discrimination based on racial or ethnic origin, and the Employment Equality Directive bans direct or indirect discrimination based on religion, belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation.\textsuperscript{30}

The Employment Equality Directive 2000/78/EC implements the principle of equal treatment in employment and training irrespective of religion or belief, sexual orientation and age.

Onufrio (2014) continues: “The Commission is aware of [the] lack of a harmonized protection as showed by its 2007 Report calling for a new European Directive able to address multiple discriminations and to extend protection against discrimination based on religion, belief, disability, age, or sexual orientation outside the employment field. Nevertheless, the EU legislature is still reluctant to include an explicit provision in this matter and, as a result, most Member States do not address the problem of multiple discrimination.” (p. 129)

The 2008 Commission (COM (2008) 426) Proposal for a Council Directive Implementing the Principle of Equal Treatment between Persons Irrespective of Religion or Belief, Disability, Age or Sexual Orientation does extend the areas covered, but does not provide for multiple discrimination although its Recitals. This is not yet adopted.

In addition, there is also case law of the European Court of Justice on the prohibition of discrimination laid down in the 2000 Equality Directives.\textsuperscript{31}

Also see:


[5] Ibid.
[7] Ibid.
[17] Committee for Gender Balance and Diversity in Research, eng.kifinfo.no
[26] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
PB23 – Securing top-level support for gender equality
July 2016

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and institutional science leaders on how to secure top-level institutional support for gender equality in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs).

Why is this important?

Securing top-level support has been signaled as a crucial component of effective institutional change in Europe and in the US. Without top commitment institutional change strategies can get lost and implementation can just not happen, be circumvented or resisted, actively and directly or passively and indirectly. It is recommended that gender policy be developed in a unit – that is closely aligned to the governing body of research and higher education institutions. This approach attempts to ensure that the design, implementation and evaluation of gender policy is institutionally embedded and strategically supported in order to effect long lasting institutional change.

In most institutions and agencies to secure top-level commitment for gender equality in effect means gathering support from leaders and top managers, who tend most often to be men. This is especially so at the highest levels, such as rectors, heads of research funding organisations, institute and centre of excellence directors. In parallel, men are still so often the unspoken norm, presented as “top managers”, “policy makers”, “science leaders”, and so on. Having said that, since the mid-1990s there have been many interventions at the UN, European, national and local levels on men and gender equality. The European Commission has been investing in this approach since the 1990s. Most recently, The Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality EU expert report was published drawing on expertise from all EU member states and beyond was published in 2013. The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) has also been active in the promotion of debate on men and gender equality, including on questions of gender in top management and leadership, for example, the 2015 ‘Gender Equality in Power and Decision-Making’ Report. The Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality reads:

Vertical hierarchies are basic forms of power, frequently men’s gender power. Management is a major place of men’s advantage and the construction of men and masculinities. There have been significant historical transformations of management, from almost a male monopoly in management, with traditional stereotypes (competition, power) and symbols of masculinity, coming from sports, military, using arguments from socio-evolutionary ideology like, survival of the fittest, to modern forms which include multiple factors and act across national borders. At the same time, male homosociality persists in management, often
involving men’s preference of men’s company, competitiveness, emotional
detachment, exclusion of women and suppression of other men, 
reproducing a hierarchical order among men. Therefore management,
especially where it is seen as being most effective, has often been assumed 
to coincide with characteristics which are traditionally valued with men.
The meta-analysis of Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt and van Engen’s (2003) 7
concluded that women more than men tend to enact transformational 
leadership styles, along with greater effectiveness. However, caution must 
be exercised in generalizing on the impact of sex on leadership style.8

Thus a major task in gaining top-level commitment to gender equality is to 
engage and where necessary change men and masculinities. Yet the mass of 
policies, resources and reports on women’s careers and gender equality in 
science, produced in organisations, as well as nationally and at the EU and 
European Commission level, usually hardly mention men, and make no demands 
at all for men to change. To promote women’s careers and achieve gender 
equality in science means making demands on science leaders at top levels, both 
men and women.9

Measures that target top senior management to foster buy-in and commitment to 
gender policy – have the potential to effect change via the championing of an 
institutional GEP and the power they wield in RPOs and RFOs. It is recognised 
that this is a “difficult but possible target.”10 Worth it however, due to its 
“effective” results: the GENDER-NET report shows how 85% of their selected 
institutions had aligned gender policy at the highest level of their institution and 
identified it as a key component of structural change.11

What is the extent of the problem?

Whilst there has been an increasing recognition that leadership commitment and 
participation in the development of gender equality policies in science and 
research is essential – measures specifically targeting leaders tend to be scarce.12 
On the other hand, there is now a very large academic, policy and practical 
literature and experience in this area more broadly beyond research and science 
organisations, that is, changing leaders and leadership, including men leaders, in 
relation to gender equality.13 So it remains of interest why research and science 
leaders and organisations might be resistant to this kind of research. Moreover, 
science leaders, and men managers in particular, cannot be absolved from 
responsibilities for fairness, equity, equal opportunities policies, well-being, and 
the development and promotion of women staff and women’s careers in science.
What are the options?

Securing institutional leaders’ commitment to gender in research can be done in various ways. For example establishing bodies responsible for gender equality that incorporate top-level decision makers – is one way to ensure that gender in research stays high up on the policy agenda. Another type of effective measure is the provision of training for top leadership – primarily in order to raise awareness about gender in research regarding issues and policies (see Policy Brief 24 for examples of this approach).14

More specifically, there are many ways for men leaders to become committed to the issues of gender equality, and to change current unequal gendered organisations and career structures and arrangements: recognition of how current careers limit people; commitment to women, wives, partners and lovers, mothers and sisters, daughters and nieces, co-workers, and for better lives for them; differences amongst men, such as those marginalized; recognition that men cannot cling to the past; and basic human capacities for justice and to share experiences, feelings and hopes. In changing workplaces from traditional masculinity to gender equal workplaces, the 2013 EU expert report had many recommendations, including, for example:

- **Europe-wide programmes** which support the exchange between organisations to spread and adapt good practices regarding gender equality measures including also male employees.
- **Support offers**, like counselling services and workshops which support implementing new gender equality regulations and developing care friendly workplaces, development of HR management tools in this respect, etc.
- Support **campaigns and research**, so that organisations become aware of the costs of gender inequality and of dominant masculinities (like unhealthy and risky behaviour, lack of common responsibility) and the benefits of gender equality for male and female employees.
- **Recognise care as a key competence in organisations.** This would be another important step towards gender equal workplaces. Recommendable steps could include establishing care as a key competence in the context of quality assurance systems.
- **Combine quotas to reduce vertical segregation** (for example in management, on boards, etc.) **with awareness raising initiatives** also addressing both management and male employees to stimulate a debate about how men benefit from these quotas (like less pressure, more diversity, better work-life balance, etc.).15

In France in CNRS – a Steering Committee for Gender Equality has been created. All top-level decision-makers at CNRS participate – whilst it is chaired by the
CNRS President. Important actions include validating and adopting the Transformational Gender Equality Plan (T-GAP) proposed by the Mission pour la place des femmes au CNRS.\textsuperscript{16}

In the UK in Imperial College the Academic Gender Strategy Committee has been established to champion and oversee the advancement of gender equality at the institutional level. The Committee is comprised of top-level decision-makers (Provost, Associate Provost, deans of each faculty, a representative from HR, and the chair if the Athena Committee)\textsuperscript{17} and meets once a term. Its remit includes: ensuring the College continues its commitment to advance gender equality and enhance the working environment, particularly for those who undertake academic/research roles; consider issues of strategic relevance, plan how best to address issues of concern and how best to optimise and disseminate current good practice; and agree what changes are required and what actions must be taken for the College to achieve the Athena SWAN Gold Award.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{Recommendations}

National level policy makers:

- Demonstrate the benefits of an institutional transformational approach to institutional science leaders.
- Involve science leaders and gender equality experts in policy-making processes for gender in research to ensure optimal take-up and buy in of institutional leaders.
- Promote knowledge exchange forums where institutional leaders can share experiences of the development, implementation and evaluation of gender and research policies.

Institutional Science Leaders:

- Demonstrate to others (internally and externally) the benefits of these policies at the institutional level.
- Make resources available in terms of staff (gender experts) and a budget for internal activities (mentoring programmes, gender awareness courses, data gathering, close interaction with other administrative units as well as the teaching and research units) and external activities (institutional networking, national and international workshops).\textsuperscript{19}
- Engage both men and women in gender equality work and leadership in science
- Address the resistance of many men to the promotion of women’s careers and gender equality; highlight the responsibilities of leaders in the promotion of women’s careers and gender equality; and reach out to those
less interested, less involved or even hostile on these issues.

- This involves raising and taking up gender equality and related issues on science and research management and leadership meetings and agendas, at all levels, even if this may appear, at first and to some, unusual questions, and even if this meets initial and continuing resistance.

**Further Reading**


In Europe the Position Paper of the EU Helsinki Group on women and science and in the US the Advance programme – have highlighted the need for top-level support, European Commission, (2012b). Structural change in research institutions: Enhancing excellence, gender equality and efficiency in research and innovation, Luxembourg, Publications Office of the European Union, p.27.

Ibid.

Ibid.


The Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality, op. cit., p. 62.


Ibid.


Study on the Role of Men in Gender Equality, op. cit., pp. 75-76.


Ibid.

http://www.imperial.ac.uk/equality/equality-at-imperial/committees/academic-gender-strategy/

PB24 – Building gender competence and knowledge for institutional transformation
July 2016

This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and institutional science leaders on how to build gender competence and knowledge in research performing organisations (RPOs) and research funding organisations (RFOs) in order to achieve institutional transformation.

Why is this important?

Institutional transformation as a long-term strategic process requires specific competences. Research managers tend not to have gender equality expertise and may lack sufficient knowledge about gender equality issues. The EC report on structural change highlights that, despite the considerable knowledge available on gender one of the main problems as to the lack of progress made in gender equality in research is because a great deal of universities and research institutions “lack the capacity and experience to analyse and transform the rich and often complex knowledge into specific gender management applicable to their structures and procedures”.

Gender training for managers and staff is essential to build institutional capacity to put mainstreaming strategies into practice. Gender knowledge is required in order to understand what and why something should be done as well as to detect and deal with subtle forms of resistance. Gender equality training encompasses: knowledge transfer, competence and capacity building, challenging attitudes and behaviours that obstruct the application of knowledge and competences as well as review of organisational policies and practices for bias and inequity. Insufficient gender knowledge and skills has been identified as one of the main obstacles for implementing gender mainstreaming in the EU.

What is the extent of the problem?

Traditional management practices in science have been identified as negatively impacting on career opportunities -disproportionately affecting women. Standard practices in selection, recruitment and promotion processes and procedures, and in the assessment of excellence- tend to advantage some whilst disadvantage others. These practices are often subject to unconscious bias in decision-making which has been identified as one of the major contributing factors to enduring inequality in the workplace and need to be corrected if the EUs’ talent pool in science is to be effectively utilised.
What are the options?

In Spain, the Equality Law requires Public Research Institutions to include courses on gender and equality in their training programmes for staff. The Law of Science, Technology and Innovation specifies that these programmes include a topic “gender and science”. These programmes are not specifically targeted at management but cover all staff. 

In Austria, the Department for Gender Equality Policies and Legal Matters at the Division for Women and Gender Equality created an inter-Ministerial working group to provide support for the implementation of gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting in all Federal Ministries – at all political levels. It has been recognised that the systematic provision of training and the collection of gender specific data – is a crucial component of the effective implementation of gender mainstreaming.

In Switzerland, the Swiss National Centre for Competence in Research organised an international workshop (Switzerland and the U.S.) for equal opportunity specialists, ‘Gender Awareness in Academia from Principles to Practice’. It was a training the trainers session to exchange ideas, good practices, and teaching materials to multiply the resources available in the Swiss context in order to provide expertise for the future.

In Ireland, Trinity College provided training for the executive officer group in order to embed gender equity into the governance of institutions which included unconscious bias training. Briefing sessions were held with the executive officer group which included the provost, vice provost, faculty deans and dean of researcher, treasurer, bursars and college secretary.

In the UK, Kings College London, is offering a programme of workshops for all staff to raise awareness of unconscious bias and its impacts and to provide colleagues with the practical tools to reduce these. To limit the impact of unconscious bias on key decisions, the university has made attendance at unconscious bias training during the 2015/16 academic session, mandatory for all academics (Senior Lecturer and above) and all Professional Services Staff (Grade 7 and above).

In the UK all key RCUK bodies/ panels agreed to implement unconscious bias training
Recommendations

National level policy makers:

- Develop legislation that includes courses on gender and equality in training programmes for staff including top and middle management.
- Embed the development of gender competence (i.e. training) in national strategies for gender equality and science strategies.
- Allocate sufficient human and financial resources for initial training and follow up activities.
- Put in place accountability mechanisms to guarantee application of new knowledge in practice. For example bodies could be identified to monitor how gender issues are integrated into the full policy cycle (planning, implementing and review).

Institutional Science Leaders:

- Include the development of gender competence (i.e. training) in organisational plans/ strategies for gender equality.
- Allocate sufficient human and financial resources for initial training and follow up activities.
- Make gender and (implicit) bias training mandatory for all academics, professional service staff, management and decision-making posts – including new employees.
- Require gender competence as a selection criterion –by default in all job adverts, selection procedures for management, decision-making roles and other personnel decisions.

Funders:

- Provide training for reviewers and evaluators so that they can identify and reduce bias.
- Require that all funded projects demonstrate proven gender competence in the project team and how this will be developed throughout the research. Research funding organisations will need to build gender competence in their own organisation – but also realign the peer review process – or develop an alternative to this approach.

Further Reading


[12] Ibid.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.


This policy brief provides evidence-based, concrete recommendations for national level policy makers and institutional science leaders on how to conceive, produce and disseminate gender statistics in Science, Technology and Innovation.

**Why is this important?**

Producing gender statistics is important as a means to reflect the realities of the lives of women and men relating to gender equality in a given society. Gender statistics are important because they make visible disparities for example in the distribution of resources or access to power – often countering wide spread bias and stereotypical beliefs that underestimate existing discrimination. In the launch in 2002 of the EU Report on “National policies on women and science in Europe: A report about women and science in 30 countries”, by Teresa Rees, Hilary Rose famously said “No statistics, no problem, no policy. Statistics help identify problems and can monitor the effectiveness of remedies”. The ability to document gender hierarchies in numbers provides evidence of inequalities and thus helps to promote change, formulate and prioritise policies and evaluate the results of the interventions. As such, it relates to all fields of statistics and the increasing proliferation of all forms of data. In developing more gender-aware statistics, the work of the Helsinki Group on Gender in Research and Innovation, comprising experts on gender and statistics in science, is central.

There are some areas of inquiry related to gender and science that definitely require good quality statistics and indicators. An obvious one is pay. The gender pay gap persists in science, as elsewhere, and is remarkably slow to change. To study this, you need reliable statistics. Another area where statistics are essential is monitoring what actually happens in recruitment, appointments and promotions. This is partly about who is appointed at the end of the recruitment process, but it is also about the question of who applies, how do people hear of jobs, who is shortlisted, who does that shortlisting, who is interviewed and by whom, who is offered jobs, who accepts, and then of course on what conditions, and with what pay. To keep track of this, science organisations need to have monitoring systems, at different organisational levels.

There are many further, more specific areas where gender and statistics are important and are becoming more so. One is the use of bibliometrics in evaluations, of individuals, research groups, even whole universities. These kinds of statistics have a very uneven usefulness. They may be more indicative of quality and impact in some disciplines, especially STEM, natural science and medicine, and far less in humanities and social sciences. Using one set of metrics in isolation, such as Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, is very dangerous indeed. This is not least because some metrics focus only or mainly on journals to the neglect of chapters and books, and also have limited coverage of some
disciplines, including those where women are well represented. The study of these metrics, their reliability across disciplines, and their gendering and frequent gender bias, has become a specialist area of scientific research in itself.

**What is the extent of the problem?**

Despite the importance of gender statistics for social justice concerns, several problematic issues have been highlighted. These concern not only the persistent lack of data, the continuing confusion of “sex” and “gender”, but also the production and consumption of statistical “evidence” itself.

First, collecting gender statistics goes beyond disaggregating data by sex. Even though important in its own right and still often lacking, measuring social reality by producing gender statistics is a more complex process. It involves discerning and understanding gender issues in society, the formulation of corresponding indicators, the methods for data collection and finally analysis and dissemination. Engendering statistics implies to be aware that each of these steps can be subject to gender bias perpetuating equally biased results.

Second, since statistical measures condense large amounts of information into single numbers, producers and consumers alike have to make an effort to recognise the multi-layered and complex nature of gender and gender equality behind the data. These kinds of debates on gender and statistics can be located in relation to basic questions on the nature of social categories, and how categories including gender categories intersect with others. Gender statistics often only deal with women and men, girls and boys, and often do not deal well with further gender positions, such as transgender, intersex, non-binary, and queer, with sexualities, or with intersections with other social divisions, such as age, class, and ethnicity. What is more, since quantitative indices are taken for granted to represent “reality” truthfully, these simplified, numeric accounts are taken as clear cut “evidence” and objective reality blending out their constructed nature.

A third problematic aspect concerns the emerging forms of governance connected to statistical data. This refers mainly to the comparative use of indices in benchmarking exercises carried out for example in country rankings of Gender Equality Policies. Benchmarking however de-politicises gender equality agendas by “translating political problems of collective action into statistical issues of quantification”, embedded in a matrix of competitiveness and efficiency that loose track of the complex and contested nature of social injustice.
What are the options?

Producing gender statistics is an ongoing process. Tools and indices need to be revised for bias and adapted to the changing social realities affecting women and men. She Figures, for example, has expanded throughout its consecutive editions from data on horizontal and vertical segregation towards discrepancies in scientific productivity and the incorporation of gender into research content. Improved methodologies have been devised – such as the time use surveys – to measure traditionally “hard to capture” areas of non-remunerated work and gendered resource distributions.[11]

On the institutional level, several tools have been developed to monitor gender equality more precisely and effectively. For example the Data Monitoring Template by the FP7 INTEGER project[12] facilitates the repeated collection of sex-disaggregated data on the representation of women and men in different staff categories and decision-making bodies in the organisation. It is embedded into a whole set of self-assessment tools that steer practitioners through the process of data production and usage for gender equality in academic institutions. The Athena Swan Charter programme in the UK has developed a list of measurements needed when developing gender equality plans (http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/)

On the national level, rich experiences are available from development work on how to setup or reform national statistical systems[13]. Most importantly, as the experiences in Sweden, India, Nepal or Chile demonstrate, a continuous dialog with civil society organisations and interest groups is essential for defining gender issues, developing the adequate indicators and understanding how gender equality intersects with various other issues of social justice[14].

Recommendations

• Make relevant selected indicators by verifying they are up-to-date from a content/policy perspective[15]

• Ensure comparability of data collection by aligning reporting systems and classifications used with existing official classifications, manuals and international standards[16]

• Acknowledge that disaggregated data by “sex” - although still dearly needed in many cases - is not enough to produce gender statistics

• Involve gender experts and collective efforts to define the changing realities of “gender issues” to engender statistics.
Further Reading & Resources

There are many kinds of resources to be considered. Let’s start with those at a very general contextual level. These, amongst others, provide broad gendered societal statistics and more focused gendered statistics on education, science, technology and related fields, for example horizontal occupational and disciplinary distributions, and vertical, hierarchical distributions, by gender. Key institutions here are the United Nations Statistics Division, and UNDP, UNICEF, FAO, ILO, and the World Bank, both in general and in relation to ‘women and science’.

Then of course there are the various sources from the EU member states and the EC.

One of many EC reports that addresses this in terms of research funding is The Gender Challenge in Research Funding. Two further major particular EU resources need to be mentioned here.

First, there is the work of EIGE, and its ‘Gender Statistics Database’ and ‘Gender Equality Index’.

The second is the She Figures reports which summarise the state of gender distributions in science. The She Figures have been a spur to national comparisons. There is, perhaps unsurprisingly, very great variation in the extent national authorities have given full attention to gender statistics in science, technology and innovation.

In addition, it is important to note the resources available at country level in Europe. A good example here is the Norwegian web site kifinfo.no.

Outside Europe, useful sources are: Gender differences in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and computer science (STEM) programs at university, by Darcy Hango, produced from Statistics Canada in 2013; and Gender Differences in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Interest, Credits Earned, and NAEP Performance in the 12th Grade, published by the US National Center for Education Statistics in 2015.

Historical lack of attention to gender statistics means that important gender indicators are missing from the UN SDG Index, and from the Lancet Countdown on Health and Climate change.
Engendering Statistics and Critical Approaches


Bibliometrics

This Policy Brief builds on the work of a blogpost written for GenPORT by Jeff Hearn, please see the original blogpost with active links to resources here: http://www.genderportal.eu/blog/gender-sti-and-statistics
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Please see the bibliometrics section of Further Reading and Resources for useful sources of information.

In addition, monitoring progress is challenged by a severe lack of comparable data of high quality. Many countries are still not producing regular statistics that are of critical importance for gender equality such as time use, asset ownership, women’s participation in decision-making at all levels, or data on gender-based violence and poverty”. See Debusscher, P. (2015). Evaluation of the Beijing Platform for Action +20 and the opportunities for achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women in the post - 2015 development agenda. Brussels.


For a wide range of resources on gender and statistics, see http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Gender_statistics


http://eng.kifinfo.no/c62415/sekksjon.html?tid=62420

Please see: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/75-006-x/2013001/article/11874-eng.htm


Introduction:

A central cross-cutting theme related to all previous GenPORT policy briefs on gender equality measures in science is the process of implementation of the different strategies and actions – and how to overcome the resistance to change.

The efforts to implement gender equality measures in research process and to integrate gender dimension into research content have been an important part of the EU gender mainstreaming strategy since 2001, at national, regional and institutional levels. To advance this cause, the European Commission funded numerous projects through FP7 and Horizon 2020 (e.g. EGERA, FESTA, GARCIA, GENDERTIME, GENERA, GENIS LAB, GENOVATE, INTEGER, LIBRA, PLOTINA, STAGES, TRIGGER).

The focus of these efforts has been to design, develop, implement, monitor and evaluate institutional change processes across institutions throughout Europe through the use of various tools and strategies with the additional remit of documenting the implementation experiences.

The GENDER-NET initiative aims to map and compare the structural changes implemented in EU Members States to advance gender equality within research funding organisations as part of the commitment to European Research Area.

Why is this important?

The persistence of gender inequality in science in Europe and beyond is well evidenced – women account for only 30% of researchers, whilst 60% of all PhD graduates are women, and only 20% of top-level posts in research are occupied by women (European Commission, 2015). Since 2001, following the ETAN report, the European Commission recognised the detrimental effects of this loss of talent and launched its structural change strategy in 2010, to be followed by the ERA gender equality and mainstreaming priorities (more women in RTDI, gender balance in decision-making and integrating the gender dimension). Structural change – later morphed into 'institutional change' to be effected by the development of gender equality action plans. But what have been the effects of these plans? Impact assessments and evaluations of these plans have tended to be ad hoc. Real change is slow and conditions for success difficult to unpick. However, explicit and implicit resistance to the adoption of gender equality plans is common and one of the main challenges to achieving long-lasting institutional change.
What is the extent of the problem?

Gender equality is seldom defined as a priority in organizational processes and practices – which can be compounded by a lack of support from management and a general lack of commitment to change. In times of economic crisis the arguments often used are that there are other ‘more important’ issues on the agenda (STAGES, 2016:80).

Achieving the successful implementation of gender equality policies in research and overcoming resistances to these policies – can be located within broader discussions about gender mainstreaming. The different types and forms of resistance (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013) include: denial of the need for change; trivializing gender equality; and/or refusing to accept responsibility; disbelief about gender data; perceiving traditional gender roles as ‘natural’; appealing to more pressing priorities; disputing relevant of gender equality. These behaviours can be institutional, individual, implicit, or explicit.

The process of transforming policy objectives into concrete practice (Callerstig 2014:72) or desired outcomes is not straightforward. Intervention activities are often contingent on complex interactions between key stakeholders and how each conceptualises the implementation process; including effects of actions and non-actions, decisions and non-decisions, that influence ‘why’ the intervention has (not) been effective.

For example, Lombardo & Mergaert (2013: 301) argue that “Civil servants can express resistance to gender initiatives both by acting and non-acting. In either case, resistance is a manifestation of power... not only when policy-makers make decisions, but also when they make non-decisions, or in this case take non-action, on issues that would not benefit them. The individual and the institutional-organisational levels are interconnected in this kind of ineffective gender mainstreaming implementation because the negative power of inertia on the part of individuals in an organisation can have effects at the institutional level, so that, “collective non-action translates into an effective form of resistance” (Mergaert 2012:57).”

Implicit resistance on an individual level, which can be demonstrated by lack of action or non-events (Husu 2001) blamed on insufficient resources (e.g. time, knowledge), must be distinguished from implicit institutional resistance. The latter occurs at the ‘collective’ level, which affects policy decision-making regarding human and other resource allocation and management support for gender equality actions (Stratigaki 2005). Both individual and institutional resistance can be by distance or by persistence (Collinson 1994).
What can be done?

The Handbook on Resistance to Gender Equality in Academia developed by the FESTA project outlines different forms of resistance towards institutional change [1]. The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) has developed the GEAR (Gender Equality in Academia and Research) action toolbox for institutions – to provide a step-by-step guide on how to set-up, implement, monitor and evaluate (amongst other actions to be taken) a gender equality plan. As part of this work they have developed a ‘Roadmap to Gender Equality Plans in Research and Higher Education Institutions’ [2] – which identifies success factors and common obstacles for implementing gender equality through institutional change. They also provide suggestions on how to overcome obstacles. Please see the table below for a summary:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of obstacle/resistance</strong></th>
<th><strong>How to effectively overcome obstacle/ resistance to effect change</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to gender equality initiatives</td>
<td>Bespoke awareness raising training for different staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit and visible commitment from leadership and senior management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify problems and co-design solutions in participatory process with key stakeholders –to encourage institutional ownership of solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Resources (human and financial) for gender equality work</td>
<td>Present the benefits and concrete results of gender equality (e.g. staff retention, more diverse staff etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify potential funding sources and extra human resource capacity for gender equality work at institutional/ regional/ national / international levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of power at the institutional/ organisational level</td>
<td>Involve and make visible institutional leaders at the very beginning of process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify in GEP stakeholders with key decision-making roles and liaise closely with these actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth that academic excellence and merit is at odds with gender equality initiatives</td>
<td>Unconscious bias training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showcase research that demonstrates how diversity positively impacts on excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of autonomy at institutional level to effect change</td>
<td>Verify lack of compliance with Directive 2006/54/EC – equal opportunities and treatment of men and women in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research European, national or regional (non-)binding regulations to promote gender equality in research and/ Or higher education to advocate for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-design solutions with senior management and leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lack of understanding of importance of gender equality | Need to show how gender equality – is not just a ‘women’s issue’ but effects everyone  
Frame gender equality as key to creating a successful, open, attractive research and higher education institution  
Develop a very visible gender equality plan supported by senior management  
Set up training on gender equality for all staff to create a shared understanding and vision  
Regularly publish sex-disaggregated data to demonstrate imbalances as well as advances in gender equality |
| Lack of available data or access to sex-disaggregated human resource data | Update existing human resource data collection and management systems to enable statistics to be broken down by sex, age, and other intersectional variables  
Allocate resources to facilitate this work  
Ensure data is stored in compliance with data protection regulations |
| Bypassing potential allies/key actors early on in the process | Early recruitment of gender equality allies and enablers of change  
Ensure staff not directly involved in gender equality measures are involved in training, workshops, seminars etc to get them on board with the change process  
Frame the gender equality plan as an institutional effort to ensure cross-departmental and faculty support is harnessed |
| Lack of institutional experience of engaging with gender studies | Tap into existing gender equality networks for support  
Search for gender expertise for increased institutional competence and knowledge  
[Eurogender’s stakeholder directory](#) or [GenPORT’s people](#) to find networks,
practitioners and experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of sustainability of effort</th>
<th>Institutionally embed the gender equality plan and commitment into various organisational structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocate gender equality work to a specific multi-annual budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design and create structures to enable regular monitoring and evaluation – and indicate action to be taken before crisis is reached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table developed from: EIGE Roadmap to Gender Equality Plans in research and higher education institutions: Success Factors and Common Obstacles.

**Useful Resources**


 European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), ‘Roadmap to Gender Equality Plans in research and higher education institutions: Success Factors and Common Obstacles’.


European Projects on structural change in research and higher education institutions through the implementation of gender equality plans:

**EGERA** - Effective Gender Equality in Research and the Academia

**FESTA** - Female Empowerment in Science and Technology Academia

**GARCIA** - Gendering the Academy and Research: combating Career Instability and Asymmetries

**GENDERTIME** - Transferring Implementing Monitoring Equality

**GENER A** - Gender Equality Network in the European Research Area

**GENIS LAB** - Gender in Science and Technology Lab

**GENOVATE** - Transforming Organisational Culture for Gender Equality in Research and Innovation

**INTEGER** - Institutional Transformation for Effecting Gender Equality in Research

**LIBRA** - Leading Innovative measures to reach gender Balance in Research Activities

**PLOTINA** - Promoting gender balance and inclusion in research, innovation and training

**STAGES** - Structural Change Toward Gender Equality in Science

**TRIGGER** - Transforming Institutions by Gendering contents and Gaining Equality in Research
