



athena

gender equality to unlock
research potential

D4.1 GEPs best practices compendium

Transforming HEIs/RPOs/RFOs Through Gender Equality Plans
A Compendium of Best Practices Examples of Transformative GEP
Measures

Project Acronym: ATHENA

Title: Implementing gender equality plans to unlock research potential of RPOs and RFOs in Europe

Grant Agreement n°: 101006416



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101006416



Version history

Version	Date	Comments / Changes	Author/ Reviewer
0.1	10.12.21	Draft submitted to Steering Committee for comments	University of Bucharest ATHENA Team Coordinators: Laura Grunberg, Project Director Irina Costache, PhD, Gender Expert Research & documentation: Corina Ilinca, Lecturer Stefania Chihaiia, PhD Student Research assistants: Alina Silion & Alexandra Dragomir, PhD Students
0.2	21.12.21	Submitted to Coordinator with addressed comments	Steering Committee
1.0	27.12.21	Final Version	Coordinator

Document Information

Project Acronym	ATHENA
Project Title	Implementing gender equality plans to unlock research potential of RPOs and RFOs in Europe
Project Number	101006416
Instrument	CSA - Coordination and support action
Topic	SwafS-09-2018-2019-2020 - Supporting research organisations to implement gender equality plans
Project Start Date	01/02/2021
Project Duration	48 months
Work Package	WP4
Task	T4.1
Deliverable	D4.1 GEPs best practices compendium
Due Date	31/12/2021
Submission Date	27/12/2021
Dissemination Level¹	PU
Deliverable Responsible	University of Bucharest - UB
Version	1.0
Status	Final
Author(s)	University of Bucharest – ATHENA Team Coordinators: Prof. Laura Grunberg and Irina Costache, PhD Gender Expert Research and documentation: Lecturer Corina Ilinca, Stefania Chihaiia, PhD Student Research assistants: Alina Silion and Alexandra Dragomir, PhD Students
Reviewers	Steering Committee

¹ PU= Public, CO=Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services), CL=Classified, as referred in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC



Transforming HEIs/RPOs/RFOs Through Gender Equality Plans

A Compendium of Best Practice Examples of Transformative GEP Measures

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Aim of the Compendium	5
Design/Methodology.....	5
Documented Action Areas: List and General Comments	9
General comments and observations for each area.....	9
Best Practices.....	14
Action Area 1 Leadership for Gender Equality	14
Measure 1 Leadership transformation processes	14
Measure 2 Training and coaching programs for women and academic leadership	15
Measure 3 Eliminate seniority requirements for scientific leaders of research projects	16
Measure 4 Gender quotas across various management positions.....	16
Measure 5 Promote university gender equality commitments in external partnerships and with sub-contractors	18
Action Area 2 Institutional Design for Gender Equality	19
Measure 1 Set up (or not!) a Gender Equality Body/Committee/Board	19
Measure 2 Flexible not binding Gender Equality Plan.....	20
Measure 2 Set up a Gender Equality Office/Gender Equality Officer	20
Measure 3 Gender disaggregated datasets and gender statistics	22
Measure 4 Diversified gender sensitive staff surveys	23
Action Area 3 Human Resources (Recruitment, Retention, Career Progression)	24
Measure 1 Scouting for talent from under-represented gender.....	24
Measure 2 Monitoring of gender disaggregated HR data.....	25
Measure 4 Salary audit to eliminate the gender pay gap	26
Measure 5 Job Shadowing Programs.....	27
Measure 6 Transparency to workload allocation.....	28
Measure 7 Infrastructure support for women's career progress	29
Measure 8 Virtual Office for Research.....	30
Action Area 4 Engendering Research	30
Measure 1 Sponsorships, grants, awards for women researchers.....	30
Measure 2 Guidelines for gender impact assessment for grant reviewers and grant committees.....	31
Measure 3 Trainings for using gender in research and teaching.....	32
Measure 4 Lecture Series for Women Scientists	33



Measure 6 Gender research groups	34
Measure 7 Certification and Awards Schemes (CAs) for RPOs (apply to CAs).....	34
Action Area 5 Engendering Teaching.....	36
Measure 1 Gender in teaching checklist / anti discriminatory assessment of teaching materials.....	36
Measure 2 Gender Mainstreaming Observatory	37
Measure 3 Interdisciplinary program for gender mainstreaming in STEM.....	37
Measure 4 Intersectionality program for gender mainstreaming in STEM.....	38
Measure 5 Tutorial Activities for High-Schools.....	39
Action Area 6 Sexual Harassment and Gender Based Discrimination	40
Measure 1 Implement robust systems for sexual harassment complaints, investigations and victim support.....	40
Measure 2 Campaigns/Educational Projects for prevention and combating sexual harassment	41
Measure 3 Sexual Harassment Surveys.....	42
Measure 4 OmbudPerson or focal point for sexual harassment.....	43
Action Area 7 Work- Life Balance and Care Responsibilities	44
Measure 1 Employee Reintegration After Parental Leave/ Including Grant Support	44
Measure 2 Family friendly grant schemes	44
Measure 3 Child care/ parent friendly work places	45
Measure 4 Compensation policies looking at WLB	46
Measure 5 Making work-life balance a public issue	47
Action area 8 Institutional Communication	48
Measure 1 Adopt Gender Sensitive Language in Internal/External Communication	48
Measure 2 Website for Gender Equality	49
Measure 3 Hold "Information Day/Awareness Raising Week to address gender in STEM .	50
Measure 4 Campaigns about women in science/media profiles of women researchers.....	51
Measure 5 Raising the presence of female researchers through media	52
Measure 6 Book of Life Stories about Gender Inequality	53

Introduction

The Compendium of Best Practices is part of WP4: *GEPS Development and implementation*, Task 4.1: *GEPS Best practices analysis*. UB, as leading partner, with the support of CE, was responsible with performing a best practice analysis among GEPs implemented in RFOs, RPOs and HEIs in Europe. The main objective is to produce a compendium containing a set of effective and relevant provisions, activities, and recommendations in addressing gender equality at the institutional level in academia.

Aim of the Compendium

The long-term aim of the Compendium is on the one hand to support partners institutions from the ATHENA consortium in the development of their own GEPs and on the other hand to work as a useful tool for other HEIs and RPOs looking to develop and to implement a gender equality plan either as part of other projects or independently. It is expected that they will learn from the selected examples, analyse them, and identify common standards and targets within existing GEPs that can be used in each partner's process of designing their tailored institutional plan. The specific objective of the compendium is to act as a useful material in the development of the toolbox (Task 4.3).

Design/Methodology

In the process of elaborating this document, we operated with the EIGE working definition of a good practice. An action is qualified as a good practice if it fulfils at least two of the following criteria: it has the power to impact the policy environment; it demonstrates an innovative approach or it can be replicated across institutions; it demonstrates sustainability; and it can lead to actual change². According to EIGE deliverables, good practices activities are formulated based on empirical baseline assessments; are explicitly meant to contribute to GE objectives; involve relevant stakeholders in their development and implementation; are provided with sufficient funding; produce sustainable and significant results; and their implementation status and impact level is regularly monitored or evaluated.

² EIGE's approach to good practices. Available at <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/good-practices/eige-approach> .

Selection process

A set of preliminary selection criteria have been decided in advance by the Consortium leader and the implementation partner (UB) for the present compendium. The criteria referred to the following aspects:

- balance between examples of best practices from HEIs, RPOs and RFOs;
- representation of each European country in the compendium, or as many as possible;
- inclusion of best practices only from GEPs formulated in the English language and presented on the internet, so that no translation work would be necessary;
- main focus on institutions that developed GEPs as part of previous HORIZON sister projects and expressly on those GEPs already implemented as part of finalized HORIZON projects (due to the increased public availability of project deliverables); in contrast, most of the ongoing sister projects have not yet published their member institutions' GEPs and/or the GEPs are in incipient stages;
- coverage to include universities, but also specialized research institutions, so that a balance could be achieved between the domains of social science, life science, and engineering;
- inclusion of examples where there is national legal frame for implementing GEPs (e.g., Spain) but more importantly, countries with no such national legal frame (see project deliverable '*D2.2 – Report on national status in gender equality in Bulgaria, Spain, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Slovakia*' for some information).

During the documentation stage, the UB implementation team decided to add some extra selection criteria for a better structuring and synthesis of the document and for avoiding, as much as possible, duplication of other already existing documents, in particular: (i) the *Gender Equality in Academia and Research (GEAR) tool* co-developed by the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) and the European Commission's Directorate General for Research and Innovation and (ii) The Horizon Europe Guidance on Gender Equality Plans³, recent document (September 2021) produced by the European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. Consequently, some good practices have not been included in the present document, as they can easily be consulted in the respective documents.

³ Available at <https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/ffcb06c3-200a-11ec-bd8e-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-232129669>

We have also identified a series of (very) common activities present across most, if not all, the analysed GEPs, such as:

- Trainings, team buildings, sessions, workshops, conferences of different types, dealing with different gendered topics, different formats (online/offline)
- Guidelines on various topics;
- Gathering of documentation/bibliographic references;
- Gender-sensitive target indicators on various topics; targets are usually set at 30-40% presence of the underrepresented gender across institutional bodies and levels;
- Report mechanisms/formal procedures targeting specific topics, such as career promotion, sexual harassment, etc.;
- Networks of various kind.
- Research, studies.

Each of these general activities is important and should doubtlessly be integrated in each GEP to be developed. Nevertheless, we considered them too evident or common to be integrated constantly in our list of best practices. However, some such activities were included on the basis of a special creative or innovative approach that was identified.

Another decision for better structuring the compendium was to bring together, whenever possible, several examples of institutions under one specific best practice, to illustrate the replicability, as well as the various institutional settings in which an activity may be successfully implemented.

Further, many of the documented GEPs contained actions or activities that were laconic, vaguely or cryptically explained, without enough information that would convey the process or the essence of the practice. Because we could not properly assess the significance and relevance these practices might have, we omitted them, and we take responsibility for our selection of the listed practices.

Last, but not least, taking into consideration the EU interest to move from **Gender Equality Plans** to **Gender Inclusive Plans** (e.g. Bocconi's Inclusive Gender Equality Plan⁴), we look carefully to actions and initiatives that demonstrate a special focus on an **intersectional approach to gender equality** in education and research. However, as our documentation progressed, we found that few of the GEPs integrate an intersectional perspective in the formulation of their objectives and in their proposed actions. A key example of best practice here is Oxford Brookes University's GEP,

⁴ Available at https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/5k00w0k0rv4wxw5ie6555/IGEP_Bocconi.pptx?dl=0&rlkey=8tu66tlqoyw7amltdfwfgor40

which takes an intersectional approach to equality. This is manifested in the institution’s policy of systematic data collection and analysis, which proposes as an action the creation of a Data Working Group dedicated to gender, diversity, and intersectional analyses of data sets.

Summing up the selection work, we documented 8 HORIZON sister projects that have already been finalised (SAGE, GENERA, TARGET, LIBRA, EQUAL-IST, Baltic Gender, PLOTINA, GEECCO) and 12 projects that are ongoing (of these, we mainly found published GEPs from partner institutions in CALIPER, Gearing Roles, and SUPERA). Although the total number of institutions we included in our research list was 198, covering 20 HORIZON projects, it quickly became apparent that our efforts would be most efficient if we restrained our attention towards those GEPs that were readily available and written in the English language, as the following section explaining our selection criteria will describe. The Compendium contains also references to some interesting initiatives taken at institutional level, not as part of an EU project implementation. In the final stage of documentation and assembly of the compendium, our in-depth reading and analysis covered around 50 GEPs from HEIs, RPOs and RFOs.

Framework for Documentation

The following table constituted our common frame for documentation:

Title of best practice (as suggestive as possible)

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Name of institution	HEI/RPO/RFO	Name of country	Sister project

Type of practice: Common | Innovative (selection underlined)

Brief description.

Brief comment.

Documented Action Areas: List and General Comments

After consulting a number of GEPs, we selected the following action areas defined across the vast majority of the analysed GEPs (with similar or slightly different names):

1. Leadership for Gender Equality
2. Institutional Design for Gender Equality
3. Human Resources (Recruitment, Retention & Career Progression)
4. Engendering Research
5. Engendering Teaching
6. Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Discrimination
7. Work – Life Balance and Care Responsibilities
8. Institutional Communication

General comments and observations for each area

- *Gender sensitive data gathering approached as a transversal good practice.*

Initially, the topic of gathering gendered data was conceived as a separate area of action to be documented. Upon careful analysis, we identified data-gathering as a transversal theme recurrent across most, if not all, action areas delineated in the GEPs. Since decisions are made at the leadership level, and many decisions are guided by data, we thought it adequate to incorporate under action area 1. *Leadership for Gender Equality* these practices of data-collection and monitoring that concern the institution itself, i.e., data from across institutional levels and departments (students, academic staff, and administrative staff). At the same time, another dimension of data gathering is observed and will be explicated under action area 4 - *Engendering Research*. Even if not explicitly mentioned as good practices in other areas of action, the topic of producing gender sensitive qualitative and quantitative indicators was approached as crucial for all of them, as implicitly part of diverse activities dealing with producing a culture of evidence on the basis of which a GEP can be proposed, implemented and monitored.

When it comes to gender-sensitive indicators, there is also a lack of availability of public information, even though these indicators are essential starting points in any initiative geared towards gender equality. Among the analysed GEPs we found no dedicated sections with explicit details, i.e., selections of clearly listed public indicators, both qualitative and quantitative. With this lapse in information, it is difficult

to measure the degree to which various targets and indicators are achieved throughout GEP implementation. In this respect, we suggest that institutions should make publicly available those indicators related to data gathering which inform all other practices and provisions.

- ***Budgeting for GEPs** – not included as a key action area due to the loosely references within the documented GEPs*

Many GEPs that we documented describe interesting creative activities and actions (as will be presented below). Nevertheless, few of them foresee explicitly a clear budget for the whole GEP construction, implementation and monitoring. Beyond financial provisions for hiring dedicated staff, a solid GEP should be proposed with a coherent stable budget for the whole areas of actions decided. Consequently, we considered that the action area of „Budgeting for GEPs” should have been a key area of good practices to be documented but we could not find evidence that it is so.

- ***Differences among GEPs** (e.g., national contexts, cycles of implementation, etc.) to be considered in evaluation of good practices*

Within the general framework required for all GEPs, there are many variations from one institution to another, from one country to another, depending on a series of factors. For example, the national contexts concerning gender equality policies influence the degree of institutional autonomy, allowing less or more internal initiatives on the part of institutions. On the other hand, the level of experience in implementation of GEPs (first generation or 2nd, 3rd, etc.) is also important. Different institutions are in different stages of GEP implementation process. For example, some institutions from Spain, Italy, and the United Kingdom have long traditions and are at their 3rd or 4th rounds of GEP implementation as part of sister projects. Such institutions, since they are well-versed in the development, monitoring, and evaluation of GEPs, have more ambitious plans (e.g., transformative policies), while others, which are at the first stage in their development of such plans, may incorporate only the most fundamental or common activities and provisions.

Such differences should be taken into consideration when evaluating a “good practice” and considering it as suitable for a specific HEI/RPO. Sometimes, for an institution that is just starting their first cycle of GEP implementation, rather than developing a sophisticated innovative action, it would be a better choice to tailor a common initiative, and it would constitute an honest, feasible practice.

1. Leadership for Gender Equality

The first action area concerns best practices that ensure gender equality across the leadership, management, and governance bodies of an institution. Measures aim at the transformation of institutional leadership through the following interventions: gender mainstreaming in decision-making processes; ensuring gender balance across institutional leadership; potentiating and supporting leadership capacity for women; and creating and maintaining gender equality commitments in partnerships with external collaborators. As mentioned above, data gathering is strongly considered as important.

2. Institutional Design for Gender Equality

The institutional structures and measures set in place for supporting the Gender Equality policy provide (1) guidelines for establishing of Gender Equality bodies and Gender Equality Officers and (2) a stable framework for the continuity, monitoring, evaluation, and follow-up of the GEP. These practices are essential when considering the responsibilities assigned to GE representatives, their communication channels with institutional units, and their methods of intervention in leadership and management processes. In this, they delineate a clear baseline upon which the involvement, expertise, and authority of GE responsible can become an integral part of institutional processes, gathering support and ensuring the sustainability of actions oriented towards gender equality.

It is important to note here that budgeting schemes for allocating fundings to the implementation of the GE actions were only rarely explicitly described or accounted for in the GEPs themselves. More specific examples of budget plans and recommendations would be useful in explaining how funding is distributed across the teaching, research, human resources, and communication branches of the strategy for gender equality.

3. Human Resources (Recruitment, Retention & Career Progression)

Common practices regarding recruitment, retention and career progression ensure gender-sensitive recruitment and selection processes, gender-sensitive promotion and performance evaluation, provide online and offline activities to attract and promote women, encourage women to access opportunities for career development, and offer mentoring programs for women. There are proactive as well as retroactive actions that can be planned and taken within the process of GEP implementation to ensure gender equality in HR areas pertaining to recruitment, retention, and career progression.

4. Engendering Research

Although many HEIs in the region are both teaching and research organizations, we opted to maintain Research and Teaching as separate action areas, each with specific kinds of activities, provisions, and recommendations in their pursuit of gender equality.

The dimension of data collection addressed in this section consists in encouraging the academic community to incorporate gender indicators in their processes of data collection, interpretation, and analysis.

Gender mainstreaming the area of STEAM research is of particularly importance, so initiatives in this area have been prioritized within the documentation work. Also, interdisciplinary and intersectional approaches have been carefully looked for and documented.

5. Engendering Teaching

Assessing the gender dimension of the formal curriculum in HEIs is an indispensable step towards gender mainstreaming teaching activities. In both zones (assessing content and gender mainstreaming it) successful initiatives should be adapted and replicated for a more inclusive higher education curriculum.

What counts as knowledge (the curriculum and the teaching practices) is important to be revised within every GEPs. The subjects and the organization of learning are closely linked with patterns of subject specialization and need to be periodically updated with respect to new socio-economic, cultural and political environments. Simple common initiatives (e.g. various types of incentives for GM curriculum or trainings on specific gendered topics) could produce the change towards more inclusive curriculum and teaching.

6. Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Discrimination

The category of measures to combat gender-based discrimination emerges as a focal area in all analysed GEPs. Identified best practices primarily aim, across institutions, to implement robust mechanisms and systems for filing, registering, and addressing sexual harassment complaints and offering support to victims. Measures also take a preventive stance, in that they propose educational campaigns to combat sexual harassment and promote the adoption of gender-sensitive language to sustain and advance a non-discriminatory institutional stance. For some countries the topic is recently approach at public level and even simple questions to be introduced in survey questionnaire will be delicate.



7. Work-Life Balance and Care Responsibilities

In our research, we discovered that the commonly denominated area of *work-life balance* also included *care responsibilities* as an important dimension to be addressed. This area of concern is recognised at the European level. For example, EIGE research projects suggest that we need to address family dynamics, including care for family members and/or civil partners, as an essential aspect of maintaining balanced private lives and of managing stress efficiently. Consequently, this action area addresses both (1) the way we organize our time in order to be able to manage our professional and personal lives wisely and (2) policies and actions that support the specific responsibilities one may have in the roles they play outside work, i.e., as caregivers. Offering provisions that facilitate and support work-life balance and the fulfilment of care responsibilities plays a crucial role in enabling all members of the academia, irrespective of sex or gender, to make significant advances in their studying, research, and teaching activities without sacrificing the quality of their lifestyles. In this frame of thinking we selected the good practices for this area.

8. Institutional Communication

We introduced this area at later stage in the documentation process, as many sister projects' special focus is on institutional communication and the dissemination of gender-sensitive information (e.g., guidelines for gender neutral language). Such gender-sensitive internal and external communication serves to establish an official non-discriminatory institutional stance. The measures proposed have a bearing on the institution's standing and influence within the community, on women's visibility across academic and leadership dimensions, on awareness of the issue of sexual harassment, and on the overall cohesiveness and stability of the institution's commitment to gender equality as implemented on all fronts.



Best Practices

Action Area 1 Leadership for Gender Equality

Measure 1 Leadership transformation processes

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Deusto	HEI	Spain	Gearing Roles

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure is an ample multi-stakeholder diagnosis of the institutional leadership in place with a view to improve gender equality. The diagnosis includes qualitative as well as quantitative assessment tools and integrates views/opinion/inputs regarding the future of the University of Deusto and its leadership. Group reflection sessions with various stakeholders of the institution are used to analyse the existing model of leadership and to gather proposals for improvement. The following step includes a staff survey to better capture the existing leadership model and its areas of improvement.

Comment:

This measure is both innovative and promising for a process of leadership transformation geared towards a more inclusive and more gender equal university. Adequate and targeted trainings on gender equality for top management as well as for new rising leaders can be developed taking the findings of this diagnosis as a baseline.

Measure 2 Training and coaching programs for women and academic leadership

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Brescia	HEI	Italy	SAGE
Kaunas University of Technology	HEI	Lithuania	EQUAL-IST
Sabancı University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles
Institute Curie	RPO	France	LIBRA
Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure covers a variety of training, coaching and mentorship programs for women and leadership in HEIs and RPOs. These programs generally focus on soft skills enhancement such as communication skills, leadership skills, strategic career planning, etc. Under this measure, other actions such as setting up mentorship programs within the university or with external partners (including mentorships with faculty from other universities), organizing networking events for women PhD students, young researchers, women working in STEM or in other male dominated fields are also to be found. Some of the HEIs and RPOs listed above have also set up programs where women can attend coaching sessions, particularly as they step up in a managerial role. One particular observation is that several of the actions reviewed under this measure pay particular attention to work/life balance and leadership roles and often focus on promoting models of inclusive, reflexive leadership.

Comment:

While training programs are a key element to help women develop the necessary skills in accessing management and decision-making roles, they are not the only ingredient needed for enhancing the representation of women at the top echelons of HEIs and RPOs. Some GEPs supplement this measure with actions such as gender quotas across various levels of management, or with actions that target men and

senior scholar to become champions/advocates/leaders of gender equality and to help promote qualified women.

Measure 3 Eliminate seniority requirements for scientific leaders of research projects

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This is an innovative measure that aims to promote young researchers in positions of responsibility by changing the requirements of grant disbursement. When applying for research funding, younger researchers can be considered for positions of scientific leaders of research projects, rather than only offering these positions to full professors. Senior researcher can be assigned as advisors to the younger research project leaders thus developing a project management practice based on shared responsibility and mentorship.

Comment:

This measure seems an interesting pilot measure with a potentially strong impact for improving gender equality and reversing the leaking pipeline phenomenon. The measure aims to create leadership opportunities for women (and not only) from the very early stages of one's career. Possible challenges could appear in the types of funders that will embrace this measure. More information on the outcomes of this measure at University of Turku can be used to fully develop this measure.

Measure 4 Gender quotas across various management positions

Institution	Type	Country	Project
-------------	------	---------	---------



National Technical University of Athens	HEI	Greece	CALIPER
Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning	RFO	Portugal	Gearing Roles
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	United Kingdom	Gearing Roles
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles
Technische Universität Wien (TUW)	HEI	Austria	GEECCO
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)	HEI	Spain	GEECCO
University of Brescia	HEI	Italy	SAGE
Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA
Brabraham Institute	HEI	UK	LIBRA
Centre for Social Studies of the University of Coimbra	HEI	Portugal	SUPERA
Central European University	HEI	Hungary	SUPERA
University of Tartu	HEI	Spain	Baltic Gender

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This is increasingly a more common measure aimed at reversing gender inequalities across various management positions and across various academic processes. For some universities, gender quotas have been introduced via national legislation, in others quotas have been introduced voluntarily. The gender quota system (40/60) takes many forms: in some universities it applies to top management positions, in others it is extended to include participation in various decision-making committees and boards. Some universities have a quota system in place in recruitment processes and the 40/60 per cent applies to the selection pool of candidates for a certain position through active scouting, it applies to contracting visiting faculty, to the composition of recruitment panels or grant review boards, etc.



Comment:

A gender quota system is a temporary corrective measure with proven results. However, building support for the introduction of a quota system in HEIs can be difficult for countries and cultures that have failed to adhere to a quota system in other fields that required corrective measures such as politics or business. This is increasingly more difficult as universities in new EU member states are faced with a backlash against gender equality.

Measure 5 Promote university gender equality commitments in external partnerships and with sub-contractors

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	GEARING ROLES

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure requires that all sub-contractors entering contracts with the respective HEI have on their turn a gender equality policy which, at a minimum, requires subcontractors to train their personnel on gender equality and track gender disaggregated statistics in HR processes. This measure uses a trickle-down approach to the implementation of gender equality commitments from the level of the university to the level of the local community. This measure places HEIs as a gender equality champion and as an agent of change in the wider community.

Comment:

This is an innovative measure with a potential for major reputational gains for HEIs. It is also a measure that would require a strong gender equality commitment for universities and serious capacity for training and tracking its own institutional progress on gender equality. It is also a measure that requires additional investments for subcontractors and partners that on its turn could raise the cost of services provided to the university or delay partnerships.

Action Area 2 Institutional Design for Gender Equality

Measure 1 Set up (or not!) a Gender Equality Body/Committee/Board

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Université Libre de Brussels	HEI	Belgium	CALIPER
Kaunas University of Technology	HEI	Lithuania	EQUAL-IST
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This is a common measure that consists of setting up a permanent team that leads the implementation of a gender equality policy across HEIs and RPOs, at all levels and across all departments. This body usually has the mandate to support, lead, coordinate and implement gender equality actions, including training initiatives, awareness-raising campaigns, workshops, unconscious bias trainings and any other compliance procedures to tackle discrimination and promote gender equality. It is tasked with updating the GEP and monitoring its implementation, as well as renewing the GEP on a regular basis.

Comment:

The Gender Equality Body/ Committee/Board or the Gender Equality Implementation Committee (GEPI) is often a voluntary activity and part of the many administrative tasks required of researchers, faculty, and other categories of university staff that generally complain about time-consuming bureaucracy. This is part of the reason why membership can vary, personal levels of commitment can fluctuate, and its activity can stall. There are risks associated with approaching gender equality as a technical matter (window dressing approach) and resistances to more innovative gender



equality measure can arise within the board itself. Budgeting the functioning of the respective Body (and the GEP in general) si a must.

Measure 2 Flexible not binding Gender Equality Plan

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy Sciences and Arts	HEI	Slovenia	Institutional level

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This practice looks at GEP as a dynamic process that can have a more flexible structure. It may consist of a set of guiding targets/suggestions that would give to each department from an institution the freedom to choose the best measures to be implemented. For example, the Gender Equality Plan documented here contains a number of maximum 10 indicators for each domain, and a department may be asked to select at least 5 indicators from the list and implement and monitor them.

Comment:

The proposal has the potential of better tailoring the departments' specific problems and needs with respect to gender equality issues. However, as implementation of an institutional-based GEP within a special location and with dedicated human resources is a pre-condition for the future rounds of HORIZON fundings, it is not desirable for certain institutions to take this less bureaucratic path.

Measure 2 Set up a Gender Equality Office/Gender Equality Officer

Institution	Type	Country	Project
-------------	------	---------	---------



Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA
Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research	RPO	Germany	Baltic Gender
Central European University	HEI	Hungary	SUPERA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure establishes an administrative structure tasked with the implementation and monitoring of GEP actions. Some universities designate a single person to handle all GEP tasks while other allocate more human resources for it. For example, The Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research, the Gender Equality Office is made up of a Gender Equality Officer (GEO), a research assistant and a secretary. The GEO is involved in all coordination and decision-making processes and actively participates in management and HR decisions and gets involved in guiding various processes according to the GEP planned outcomes. Institutions allocate an annual budget to finance the Office's actions, workshops, networking events and other communication activities. Some institutions also set up a system of check and balances in order to protect the activity of the GEO from hindrance and obstruction in the performance of its tasks.

Comment:

Setting up a GEO is a standard measure in building the institutional infrastructure necessary for a sustainable implementation of a GEP. However, in order to have impact and solid results the activity of the Gender Equality Office must be in the proximity of HEIs and RPOs top management and must have influence over budgetary decisions of the university administration. To ensure measurable results on GEP measures financial resources allocated for the implementation of GEP actions must go beyond the setting up of the GEO and provide financial resources to all actions described in the GEP. Additionally, the GEO must hire strong and committed professionals in the field of gender equality who have the credentials and experience to push for the needed reforms.

Measure 3 Gender disaggregated datasets and gender statistics

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Fondazione Regionale Per La Ricerca Biomedica	RFO	Italy	TARGET
Centre for Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA
CEMM – Research Centre for Molecular Medicine of the Austrian Academy of Sciences	RPO	Austria	LIBRA
Curie Institute	RPO	France	LIBRA
European Institute of Oncology	RPO	Italy	LIBRA
University Of Copenhagen	HEI	Denmark	LIBRA
Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA
ARACIS (The Romanian Agency for Quality Assurance in Higher Education)	RPO	Romania	TARGET

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure involves changes in the collection and processing of administrative data in order to include/generate gender disaggregated data. HR related data as well as data concerning participation in various decision-making bodies, professional programs, trainings, student admission data all levels, staff and student surveys or any other processes that generate data must be at a minimum sex disaggregated (if not gender disaggregated). Gender statistics must also be introduced and used in gender equality audits or as indicators of GEP actions. In order to monitor progress on gender equality, linking databases in dashboard applications is an increasingly widespread practice as it allows to monitor real time progress and it is more user friendly than statistical reports.

Comment:

Collecting and disseminating gender disaggregated administrative data is fundamental to keeping track of gender equality in an academic context. Moreover, stepping up to include gender statistics as part of GEP or as part of the monitoring of GEP actions expands both the capacity of HEIs, RPOs, RFOs to implement gender equality policies as well as to lead and push forward the academic field of gender statistics. Debates over the inclusion of both sex and gender categories remain on-going, so do the discussions over how to develop gender statistics and which gender indicators should be used in order to monitor progress on GE in academic settings.

Measure 4 Diversified gender sensitive staff surveys

Institution	Type	Country	Project
International University of Sarajevo	HEI	Bosnia and Herzegovina	SAGE
University of Reggio Calabria	HEI	Italy	GEECCO
University of Rijeka	HEI	Croatia	UNIRI

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

Surveys can be carried out across institutional levels and departments to gather concrete insights into university staff's experiences and preferences related to gender equality; can be conducted in individual departments on the academic community's perception of equal opportunities; can investigate committees members' level of awareness of gender issues or staff's awareness of the existence of childcare facilities on campus; and surveys can also be used as follow-up instruments to measure the impact of GE initiatives. For example, the International University of Sarajevo's plan proposes to use findings from their annual *Gender Culture* survey to create and frequently update the university policy. University of Rijeka improved its satisfaction questionnaire for the staff by adding a special section concerning students, professors and administrative employee's satisfaction related to the state of gender equity in their university.

Comments:

Surveys are crucial instruments for diagnosing the state of affairs concerning gender equality in institutions. Targeted and personalised to the problems and needs of the institution they provide the necessary evidence base expected for further gender specific actions in the stage of designing, implementing and evaluation a GEP.

Action Area 3 Human Resources (Recruitment, Retention, Career Progression)

Measure 1 Scouting for talent from under-represented gender

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University Of Muenster	HEI	Germany	EQUAL-IST
Cracow University of Technology	HEI	Poland	GEECCO
Centre for Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA
Universitat Politècnica De Catalunya (UPC)	HEI	Spain	GEECCO
Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA
University Of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

Under this measure, HEIs and RPOs take various actions to improve the gender representation within new recruitments. Some such measures include active scouting for women candidates for jobs in male dominated fields, 40/60 quotas of candidates at each new hire, affirmative actions and preference systems can be put in place for jobs in departments that either over-feminized or male dominated. Special attention to gender-neutral language in job postings, detailed job descriptions highlighted roles,

responsibilities and available training and mentorship, searches in research databases, networking events, communication campaigns, consultations with external experts are some of the concrete tools/actions available to HR specialists.

Comment:

Scouting for talent to reach gender balance is an effective tool but often fought back by HR specialists due to increases of costs and time. The added value of adopting such a measure is that it can lead to increased transparency in hiring procedures.

Measure 2 Monitoring of gender disaggregated HR data

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Sabancı University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles
Kadir Has University	HEI	Turkey	SAGE
Fondazione Regionale Per La Ricerca Biomedica	RPO	Italy	TARGET

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This is a key measure when tackling gender inequality in recruitment, retention and career progression as well as across other GEP areas. Gender disaggregated data is essential for tracking progress and future planning of corrective measures. This is particularly important in HR processes and should inform HR policies aimed at corrected gender inequalities in recruitment and career progression. Technical

Comment:

This measure can be in itself an action point under GEP or can work as an indicator of an action under the leadership area of intervention (Area 1). The monitoring of HR data can fall not only under the responsibilities of the Gender Equality Office but should be included in the activities of the Gender Equality Commission/Board/GEPI in order to raise awareness of the areas where gender imbalances stagnate or solidify

as they can be indicators of phenomena such as glass ceiling, feminization of certain departments/fields, etc.

Measure 4 Salary audit to eliminate the gender pay gap

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Institute For Research in Biomedicine	RPO	Spain	CALIPER
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	Gearing Roles
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles
University of Deusto	HEI	Spain	Gearing Roles
Cracow University of Technology	HEI	Poland	GEECCO
Open University Of Catalonia	HEI	Spain	ACT
Central European University	HEI	Hungary	SUPERA
Centre For Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure includes a salary audit of all personnel hired in HEIs and RPOs in order to identify the value of the gender pay gap and its sources and factors. The salary audit is a solid analysis upon which concrete remedies can be taken in order to reduce the gender pay gap. Concrete actions taken by HEIs and RPOs based on the findings of salary audits are the following: biannual studies on salary distribution by sex; reorganization of benefits criteria for programme management; ratio of salaries of women/salaries of men, by professional category, ranks and related salary scales transparent, introduce salary bands within ranks, calculate equal pay within administrative and academic units.



Comment:

While this practice is widely present in many of the GEPs analysed, the lack of knowledge or capacity within HEIs and RPOs to produce or to contract a reliable service provider to do a gender salary audit remains a challenge to adopting this measure. In any case working with an external contractor can prove more beneficial as it can better ensure transparency and objectivity of the salary audit as compared to an in-house pay review.

Measure 5 Job Shadowing Programs

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	Gearing Roles

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure is an innovative mentoring program that pairs a mentee, a woman interested in a managerial position, with a top management representative be them a man or a woman. After some initial sessions, the mentee can “job shadow” and take on board some of the routine duties of the mentor for a determined/short period of time. Job shadowing strengthens the mentor-mentee relationship and enhances the exchange of information and skill (the business intelligence) between the two. This is an effective technique for rapid skills transfer.

Comment:

This is a cost-effective measure to increase managerial skills. Job shadowing programs can easily be implemented in HEIs. A job-shadowing program can require some formalizing of its achievement and success through a certification or letter of recommendation.



Measure 6 Transparency to workload allocation

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST
Institut D'études Politiques De Bordeaux	HEI	France	SAGE
Trinity College Dublin	HEI	Ireland	SAGE
University of Copenhagen, Bric	RPO	Denmark	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure is a management process that makes visible the administrative, teaching and research and other types of responsibilities allocated in teams/departments/offices. This measure usually supports women in HEI/RPOs with a fairer distribution of tasks including the administrative tasks that are usually not quantified. A more equal distribution of tasks helps all team members to be aware of the general workload.

Comment:

The system of transparent workload allocation must have buy-in from all HEI levels. A task management system can help support increase transparency to workload allocation but on its turn, it can have its own blind spots meaning that it can obscure the emotional labour involved in some tasks or the additional time required to perform tasks that are not easily quantifiable such as mentoring students, email communication with peers from other universities or preparing publishing material such as academic articles.



Measure 7 Infrastructure support for women's career progress

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Executive Unit for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding	RFO	Romania	CALIPER

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This practice proposes developing external partnerships to beneficially expand infrastructure in support for women's career progress. This action provides membership to *Orange Fab Lab* or *Techhub Bucharest*, which are educational communities that offer trainings in entrepreneurship and global business networking opportunities. This enables women to receive support in start-ups and other professional/business initiatives.

Comment:

Given its dedication to accelerating women's entrepreneurial development, this is an innovative practice that can serve women in their overall professional development outside of academia, providing new opportunities for exposure and connection with global experts.



Measure 8 Virtual Office for Research

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Reggio Calabria (UNIRC)	HEI	Italy	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This is a virtual mentoring and career-planning tool designed to serve under-represented communities on an academic track. The virtual office is set up for mentoring young generations of PhD students/doctors and researchers on topics related to scientific research and academic production. UNIRC, which developed this practice recognized that women young researchers often fall at the intersections of inequalities and that this program will have a strong gender impact.

Comment:

This virtual mentoring program for under-privileged young researchers can prove very effective in times of COVID-19 when one to one interaction with peers and other faculty have become very scarce. Moreover, it is important for young academics in particular women, to benefit from support outside of their direct supervisors in order to be better at negotiating their relationships with their committees and supervisors.

Action Area 4 Engendering Research

Measure 1 Sponsorships, grants, awards for women researchers

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Kaunas University of Technology, Informatics Faculty	HEI	Lithuania	EQUAL-IST



University Of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	Gearing Roles
International University of Sarajevo	HEI	Bosnia And Herzegovina	SAGE
Trinity College Dublin	HEI	Ireland	SAGE
Kiel University	HEI	Germany	Baltic Gender

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure aims to provide financial incentives and recognition to women in academia by setting up various grants, scholarships, awards (SFI Research Professorship Programme 2020, Programme for Women Professors III). The measure is complemented by trainings and mentoring programs that build skills and increase confidence of women in HEIs and RPOs.

Comment:

This is targeted measure at supporting and recognizing the achievements of women academics. However, attention must be paid not to pigeon-hole their academic work solely into the track of grants, awards, and recognitions available to women scientists.

Measure 2 Guidelines for gender impact assessment for grant reviewers and grant committees

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Fondazione Regionale Per La Ricerca Biomedica	RFO	Italy	TARGET
CEMM - Research Centre for Molecular Medicine of The Austrian Academy of Sciences	RPO	Austria	LIBRA

University Of Copenhagen	HEI	Denmark	LIBRA
--------------------------	-----	---------	-------

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of guidelines that research applications reviewers receive on how to evaluate research project from a gender sensitive perspective. These guidelines include evaluation guidelines such as: the use of gender sensitive language, the gender balance of the research team, the gender equality outcomes of the project proposal.

Comment:

Introducing gender impact assessment in the grant-making processes can prove to be very impactful as it will increase not only women's participation in research teams but it will also help shape a gender knowledge production.

Measure 3 Trainings for using gender in research and teaching

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Centre For Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA
CEMM - Research Centre for Molecular Medicine of The Austrian Academy of Sciences	RPO	Austria	LIBRA
Curie Institute	RPO	France	LIBRA
Brabham Institute	RPO	United Kingdom	LIBRA
European Institute of Oncology	RPO	Italy	LIBRA
University Of Copenhagen	HEI	Denmark	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure proposes the development of a training package on gender sensitive research proposal design. This is a means to mainstream gender in research field which traditionally tend to operate in gender blind ways such as medical research and STEM research. This measure usually includes exchanges between professionals who have used a gender angle in their research for enhanced skills transfer.

Comment:

Inter-disciplinary trainings for highly specialized researchers require a prior scouting and identification of experts who can facilitate skill transfer. The lack of available gender expertise can be an obstacle in implementing this needed measure.

Measure 4 Lecture Series for Women Scientists

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Max Delbrück Centre for Molecular Medicine	RPO	Germany	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure aims at increasing the visibility of women scientists creating a space for women to present their work. A dedicated lecture series for women who work in a highly specialized research field has a strong potential for raising the profile of the women researchers themselves as well as for the topics of their work.

Comment:

While lecture series for women who work in highly specialized fields creates more visibility for their work, the potential risk associated with it can be placing women in a silo within their field. Attention and balance must be kept between various measures such as **panel quotas** and women's only lecture series ensuring that relevant audience gets the chance to listen and comment on women's scientists work. In some national context such good practice is received with hostility by women themselves.



Measure 6 Gender research groups

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Yasar University	HEIs	Turkey	CALIPER
Technische Universität Wien (TUW)	RPOs	Austria	GEECCO
Uppsala University	HEI	Sweden	SPEAR

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of setting up research programs and special groups of experts, such as (Gender Research group-Turkey, team of experts at the Office for Gender Competence-Austria) tasked with conducting research reports on specific gender topics linked with research and teaching, advisory activities for GM and production and dissemination of gender sensitive materials. Uppsala University put great emphasis on the need to include students from all levels of study in specific activities connected with gendering research and measure gender gaps within academia.

Comment:

This type of measure promotes **research hubs** for knowledge production on gender in teaching and research. It contributes to the expansion of the scientific field of gender research and increases the visibility of research outcomes and their contribution to the life of the communities where these groups operate. It is also an invitation for the young generation of students to embark in gendered reflection.

Measure 7 Certification and Awards Schemes (CAs) for RPOs (apply to CAs)

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Oxford Brooks University	RPO/HEI	UK	CASPER

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

In the past two decades, several Certification and Award schemes (CAs) on gender equality and diversity have emerged in the European research landscape and also more generally. Existing CAs have provided an opportunity for systematic efforts in (i) promoting gender equality as a structural issue in Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) including universities and (ii) assessing and standardise quality and excellence in RPOs and HEIs with regard to gender equality. The most well-known certification system for RPOs is Athena **SWAN in the UK**, while other schemes extend beyond research organisations by also considering, or focusing exclusively, on industry. In this context **CASPER- Certification Award Systems to Promote GE in Research**⁵ is a most recent attempt to examine the feasibility of establishing a European award/certification system for gender equality for Research Performing Organizations (the project runs for two years from January 2020 to December 2021). The CASPER project has developed three alternative Gender Equality Certification/Award Schemes (GECAS) to be managed and supported by the European Commission, plus a fourth scenario where the EC would not take directly action, incentivising instead EU member states to set up their own gender equality agenda.

Comment:

A key point to consider before exploring the architecture of a Europe-wide scheme is to understand the grey boundaries between definitions of ‘certification’ and ‘award’ due to inconsistent use of the terms. In CASPER, we consider ‘certification’ as the process of structural change, and the developmental work associated with it. Therefore, certification assesses the intention to improve and advance through progressive approaches and renewals/re-audits and is ongoing. In contrast, an ‘award’ refers to a point in time at which a token of recognition is obtained to recognise achievements in the process of structural gender change. An ‘award’ can be a one-off, or be subject to renewal. In CASPER, we found a few cases where existing certification schemes were combined with one-off awards.

Applying for such CAs is /should be a good practice to follow by more and more HEIs and RPOs in Europe.

⁵ Further information at <https://www.caspergender.eu/>.

Action Area 5 Engendering Teaching

Measure 1 Gender in teaching checklist / anti discriminatory assessment of teaching materials

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	GEARING Roles
Khune-Kharkiv National University Of Economics	HEI	Ukraine	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of various methods of assessing the gender dimension of the teaching curricula. Oxford Brooks University established a checklist of assessing the gender dimension of teaching curricula across the university. In Khune Kharkiv National University of Economics a GEPI team member investigated the gender dimension of teaching materials. A pilot project containing 5 units of teaching materials started in the first stage. The results of the study are discussed at different levels within the institution and then published on the university website. In a later phase of the project special opinion containing proposals for gendering further the teaching materials will be shared with the university administration.

Comment:

The institutional commitments to gender equality should eventually also be reflected in the teaching curricula. Some academic fields are more palatable to include gender as a category of analysis (such as social sciences or the humanities) and have more gender expertise to do so in a coherent manner, other domains such as STEM, engineering and life sciences could prove more resistant to do so. Including a pilot stage, implementing step by step an overall gender assessment is part of this good practice. One critical sub-action that can fall under this measure is to highlight the women scientists to respective disciplines.



Measure 2 Gender Mainstreaming Observatory

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Minho, School of Engineering	HEI	Portugal	EQUAL-IST
Cracow university of Technology	RPOs	Poland	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure refers to the set-up of an observatory with publications and projects focussed on gender equality and diversity. The aim of this measure is to support gender mainstreaming in various fields of teaching and research as well as to increase the participation and exchange of experiences among professors and teachers. Annual reports on gender sensitive indicators and other specific gendered topics will be produced and disseminated to increase awareness of the importance of gender equality topics within the institution.

Comment:

This innovative measure can raise the profile and the quality of gender research across HEIs and RPOs. It is also conducive to the consolidation of a community of practice of gender research. Research outcomes are shared with the wider academic community, which can lead to, improved awareness of gender inequalities and its impact on various groups and various activities.

Measure 3 Interdisciplinary program for gender mainstreaming in STEM

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Minho, School of Engineering	HEI	Portugal	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of setting up a study programme based on an interdisciplinary approach combining STEM topics with topics from social sciences and art. The program plans to involve teaching staff from pedagogy and programme directors from various disciplines.

Comment:

This is an innovative measure bringing together professionals from fields and operating in different scientific frameworks and with, at first sight, irreconcilable academic traditions. However, this combination of fields can prove very promising for introducing gender sensitive approaches in technical disciplines such as engineering.

Measure 4 Intersectionality program for gender mainstreaming in STEM

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Institute for Research in Biomedicine	RPOs	Greece	CALIPER
National Technical University of Athens	HEIs	Greece	CALIPER
Oxford Brookes University	HEIs	UK	GEARING Roles

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of a set of actions that include collection of “gender+” type of data (National Technical University of Athens), awareness campaigns with the aim of constructing a critical intersectional perspective on topics in various areas of research (Institute for Research in Biomedicine), analysis of teaching and research materials and research proposals using a gender+ lens, etc.

Comment:

An intersectional approach to GEPs is key to improve the representation of under-privileged groups within the academic community. Actions that take an intersectional approach also illuminate and offer support to groups (including women) who would otherwise remain invisible to GEP measures. An intersectional approach better responds to the needs of current cohorts of students and ensures that no one is left behind. It is a must have approach for the transition from GEP to Gender Inclusive Plans.

Measure 5 Tutorial Activities for High-Schools

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Modena & Reggio Emilia (Unimore)	HEI	Italy	EQUAL-IST
Wesfalische Wilhelaus Universitat Munster	HEI	Germany	EQUAL-IST
University of Calabria	RPOs	Italy	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of setting up modules on various gender topics as tutorial activities of the university delivered in high schools. This measure was set in place in order to deal with the lack of women as leaders of research programs and to counteract gender segregation and stereotypes mainly in STEM areas. In such activities female speakers are encouraged to participate as positive role models for potential female students and attention is given also to promotion of gender-neutral communication (Open Day, Girls 'Day in Science, etc.)

Comment:

Strengthening the link between higher-education and secondary education institutions is key to ensuring a strong recruitment pool for universities. This type of measures (reaching out) also helps shape communities around HEIs and RPOs. Actions such as those described under this measure increase the reputation of HEIs and RPOs as

institutions embracing European values and have a strong impact among future generations.

Action Area 6 Sexual Harassment and Gender Based Discrimination

Measure 1 Implement robust systems for sexual harassment complaints, investigations and victim support

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava	HEI	Slovakia	CALIPER
Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation	RPO	Georgia	CALIPER
Institute of Geography and Spatial Planning	RFO	Portugal	GEARING ROLES
Sabancı University	HEI	Turkey	GEARING ROLES
Cracow University of Technology (Pk)	HEI	Poland	GEECCO
Open University of Catalonia	HEI	Spain	ACT
Central European University	HEI	Hungary	SUPERA
Kiel University	HEI	Denmark	BALTIC GENDER

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists in the implementation of a robust and transparent mechanism of complaints of sexual harassment. The setting up of this mechanism requires three interlinked components: a reporting channel, an investigation methodology and a

support system for victims. The examples of best practices identified suggest that reporting channel should be easily accessible (online tools can be used) and to provide protection to complainants. The reporting channel must ensure confidentiality, non-retaliation and must admit complaints even if anonymous. The investigation procedure should be efficient (timely) and impartial. Some HEIs use external partners to conduct such investigations in order to ensure objectivity and specialization of the investigation. Whenever needed, the mechanism of protection from sexual harassment must also be able to provide support for victims of sexual harassment such as psychological counselling or legal advice. Again, most HEIs use NGO partners to provide victim support. Lastly, in order to efficiently tackle sexual harassment in the HEIs and RPOs, communication over the number and severity of complaints filed within each institution must be sent out at regular intervals.

Comment:

This is a critical measure for the prevention and fight against sexual harassment in HEIs and RPOs. Human and financial resources must be allocated for the implementation of such a mechanism. HEIs in particular must design and put in place a student friendly mechanism for sexual harassment complaints.

Measure 2 Campaigns/Educational Projects for prevention and combating sexual harassment

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Salento University	HEI	Italy	CALIPER
Yasar University	RPO	Turkey	CALIPER
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	GEARING ROLES
Sabancı University	HEI	Turkey	GEARING ROLES
Universite Libre De Bruxelles	HEI	Belgium	CALIPER

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of various actions targeted at educating students and university staff on the policy around sexual harassment as well as on the reporting mechanism available. Université Libre de Bruxelles set up a permanent poster campaign for preventing and combatting sexual harassment in the university. The campaign is running by a working group (which includes faculty and students) that designs, styles and displays the posters. The materials include key messages, description of ULB policies and available services. This example is innovative in that it includes a visual element and communicates efficiently and constantly to the entire university community.

Comment:

This is a cost efficient, high-impact measure to communicate and prevent sexual harassment in the university. Moreover, the fact that the campaign is community owned (designed by the university working group that includes students) makes it more effective in producing targeted messages that members of the university community can relate to.

Measure 3 Sexual Harassment Surveys

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	GEARING ROLES
Technische Universität Wien	HEI	Austria	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of integrating the topic of sexual harassment in the regular employee and student surveys conducted in HEIs. Some universities are testing out a more comprehensive framework of addressing sexual harassment by integrating sexual harassment with other forms of gender-based violence. For example, the Oxford Brookes University participates in the UniSAFE institutional survey on gender-based violence. The role of including sexual harassment in staff and student surveys is to calibrate the policies and services available to the university community in line with gender equality commitments as well as with legal provisions regarding non-discrimination and sanctioning of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Comment:

Research on sexual harassment in the academic community is a must for designing adequate policies. For top management this type of measures ensures the institution's compliance with the existing legal protections around sexual harassment in the workplace.

Measure 4 OmbudPerson or focal point for sexual harassment

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Salento University	HEI	Italy	CALIPER
Sabanci University	HEI	Turkey	GEARING ROLES
Centre For Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA
Kiel University	HEI	Denmark	BALTIC GENDER

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of setting up a OmbudPerson or Focal Point on sexual harassment, a person who can guide institutional policies in the area as well as a professional who can handle investigations and victim support for victims of sexual harassment. The aim of this measure is to prevent sexual harassment and offer support when/if needed. HEIs and RPOs are looking at hiring experienced psychologist, social worker or other professionals with training and work experience in gender-based violence counselling.

Comment:

Sexual harassment like any type of gender-based violence constitutes a traumatic experience for the victim. It is also a phenomenon with a high impact on the academic community. This is why specialized personnel must be available to guide an objective process of handling complaints of sexual harassment and to provide needed assistance to victims.



Action Area 7 Work- Life Balance and Care Responsibilities

Measure 1 Employee Reintegration After Parental Leave/ Including Grant Support

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava	HEI	Slovakia	CALIPER
University Masaryk	HEI	Czech Republic	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure is a program of work reintegration for academics returning from parental leave. The program assesses the expectations of the employee upon returning to a scientific career, helps plan their professional development goals and provides support measures in attaining those goals. When research is involved, some institutions have a grant support scheme to fund the return of new parents back to scientific careers. In the same spirit, other institution implemented an **individual personal return plan** (upon agreement with workplace supervisor) following maternity/parental leave.

Comment:

This measure is particularly needed in countries that have generous time provisions for parental leave (over 12 months) and where return to a professional life requires support and time to readjust to new life dynamic encompassing work responsibilities and parenthood.

Measure 2 Family friendly grant schemes

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Brabaham Institute	HEI	UK	LIBRA



University of Copenhagen	HEI	Denmark	LIBRA
University of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST
Research Centre for Molecular Medicine of the Austrian Academy of Sciences	RPO	Austria	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of a grant scheme for new parents, independent of the parental benefits that parents are entitled to during a maternity/paternity leave of absence. The grant scheme is designed to match the real financial needs of new parents and can include a grant to compensate for the full pre-birth salary of the parent on parental leave (the missing percentage), or nursery voucher schemes, or other kinds of vouchers and discounts that match the needs of employees who are new parents or who have care responsibilities.

Comment:

This measure requires substantial financial resources and public universities might face administrative barriers for the allocation of grants to compensate for the lost income for employees on parental leave. The vouchering system relies on partnerships with various service providers and could be more easily adapted for the needs of a public university on an austerity budget.

Measure 3 Child care/ parent friendly work places

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Turku	HEI	Finland	EQUAL-IST
Oxford Brookes University	HEI	UK	Gearing Roles
University of Copenhagen	HEI	Denmark	LIBRA



Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research	RPO	Netherlands	GENERA
Institute of Macromolecular Chemistry, Academy of Sciences	RPO	Czech Republic	University level
University of Luxembourg	HEI	Luxembourg	University level

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of actions such as setting up a nursery or even a kindergarten or a toy-library within the University with hired personnel that care for employee’s children. Some institutions facilitate the use of babysitting services for parents on staff or various forms of financial aid for childcare especially for single parents. Other types of action considered under this measure are actions that transform HEIs and RPOs in parent-friendly workplaces such as: setting up playgrounds for children on institution premises, setting up parent/child programs where children can learn more about their parents’ careers (i.e., “bring your child at work” days), creating flexible work-schedules for employees that need to take care for their family members, etc. Some other institutions introduced facilities to improve the accessibility of pregnant women in the university spaces (creating spaces adapted for pregnant women, in line with national requirements on safety at work).

Comment:

These types of measures ensure a better integration of various roles that employees handle. Some of the actions under this measure require a substantial financial investment from the part of the institution and given the increasingly austere budgets of public HEIs securing funding for such measure could be a challenge. Some other could easily be implemented.

Measure 4 Compensation policies looking at WLB

Institution	Type	Country	Project
King's College London	HEI	United	GENERA



				Kingdom	
Kaunas Technology	University	of	HEI	Lithuania	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This set of practices revolves around the idea of creating an equal opportunity for all to maintain WLB. Such examples include: periodical performance reviews that take into account KPIs and means of enhancing innovation at the workplace regardless of gender or position within the institution, limiting the possibility to work extra hours and allowing flexible schedules to fit the needs of each employee, compensation schemes capitalized by days off and/or extra pay that is nevertheless limited to a certain number of days per year insofar as to not encourage employees to spend more time at the office than the absolute necessary.

Comment:

Including WLB in compensation policies can improve the employer brand of the HEI and RPO introducing this measure. It is a cost-efficient measure and mostly focuses on a better management of flexi-time and of sharing/donating compensatory time off for extra hours put in.

Measure 5 Making work-life balance a public issue

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Plovdiv University	HEI	Bulgaria	SPEAR

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

Experts in different disciplines (sociology, psychology) are invited to propose and deliver friendly events in which various issues of work life balances are explained and promoted through collegial dialogues.

Comment:

This targeted type of event on topics less debated within the academia, organized in friendly and less formal formats with support of experts coming from different disciplines could inform and increase awareness of the academic and administrative staff on the public dimension of some apparent private issues.

Action area 8 Institutional Communication

Measure 1 Adopt Gender Sensitive Language in Internal/External Communication

Institution	Type	Country	Project
National Technical University of Athens	HEI	GR	CALIPER
Estonian Research Council	RFO	Estonia	GEARING ROLES
Sabancı University	HEI	Turkey	GEARING ROLES
Brabham Institute	HEI	UK	LIBRA
University of Copenhagen, Bric	RPO	Denmark	LIBRA
Cracow University of Technology (Pk)	HEI	Poland	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of developing guidelines for gender sensitive language to be used in official communication both inside HEIs and RPOs and externally. The aim of this measure is to eliminate gender stereotypes and to respect non-discrimination principles. Staff training (personnel and academics) is trained in effective use of the guidelines and tasks to adapt all internal documents (e.g., newsletter, intranet, BEC

brief) and external communications (e.g., website, vacancies, profile articles, illustrative materials, press releases, news, twitter/Facebook feed) accordingly.

Comment:

Training university staff on gender sensitive language can be framed as a risk management activity as it protects HEIs and RPOs from potential reputation harm in the case of communication failures where university staff could face accusations of gender-based discrimination, mis-gendering or reinforcement of stereotypes. Special attention must be paid to the training format on gender sensitive communication, as it can be met with resistance from faculty and administrative staff. Oftentimes, in countries that to gender equality policies, gender sensitive vocabulary is interpreted as a means of policing and censoring language.

Measure 2 Website for Gender Equality

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Deusto	HEI	Spain	Gearing Roles
Centre for Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure proposes to set up a webpage from the official website of the institution or a separate website dedicate to gender equality within the HEI or RPO. The website is meant to cover all information related to GE in the institution, including the GEP, the progress reports on GEP, qualitative outcomes of certain measures or actions related to GEP. The platform can also be used as a resource centre with information, links, research report covering various GE topics. Other sections of the website can be used to communicate initiatives, news, publications, conference series, community events, etc. The website is a tool to support other communication channels such as social media, brochures, meetings, and events.

Comment:

This is a measure that is cost efficient and ensures a constant communication and visibility for the gender equality commitments of institutions.

Measure 3 Hold “Information Day/Awareness Raising Week to address gender in STEM

Institution	Type	Country	Project
National Technical University of Athens	HEI	Greece	CALIPER
Universite Libre De Bruxelles	HEI	Belgium	CALIPER
Cracow University of Technology	HEI	Poland	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure refers to setting up events like “Information Day” and “Awareness-raising Week” to address gender in STEM. The topics of these events can vary according to the capacities and needs of the organization promoting them. The main aim is twofold: on the one hand it increases the visibility of gender equality commitments in STEM fields and on the other hand it creates spaces for introducing gender as a relevant category of analysis in STEM.

Comment:

This measure moves beyond events promoting women in STEM and includes more complex conversations about the impact of gender for technical fields.

Measure 4 Campaigns about women in science/media profiles of women researchers

Institution	Type	Country	Project
Universitat Politècnica De Catalunya (Upc)	HEI	Spain	GEECCO
Centre For Genomic Regulation	RPO	Spain	LIBRA
Southwestern "Neofit Rilski" University		Bulgaria	SPEAR

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure includes actions such as information campaigns the role of women in science, the barriers that women face in scientific careers as well as solutions to overcome them. Some examples of such campaigns include: external events such as media articles on women in science, talks, activities in primary and secondary schools, and/or universities as well as internal campaign such as International Women's Day events, Women and Girls in Science Day event, My Life in Science Lecture Series. Naming classrooms, centres and laboratories after important women scientist is also a good practice for celebrating and promoting feminine role models in science.

Comment:

This measure focuses on actions that increase the visibility of women's contribution to scientific research in order to promote role models for new generations. This is a cost-effective measure that requires close collaboration with communications departments in HEIs and RPOs.



Measure 5 Raising the presence of female researchers through media

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Brescia	HEI	Italy	SAGE
International University of Sarajevo	HEI	Bosnia and Herzegovina	SAGE
Trinity College Dublin	HEI	Ireland	SAGE
University of Reggio Calabria	HEI	Italy	GEECCO

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

This measure consists of promoting women scientists and researchers through media appearances. The media feature will be then followed up with dissemination and of the participants scientific publications or of their research projects on social media networks, news portals and other more traditional media channels. The metrics associated with the impact of this campaign will be monitored and reported to the GEPI Committee or GEO team for further fine-tuning. The aim is to promote women in science as role models as well as to promote women led academic research outcomes to the general public.

Comment:

This measure is innovative in that it aims to disseminate both women in science as role models as well as women led research to a general audience. In order to be effective, basic media training must be ensured for the women who participate in such actions.



Measure 6 Book of Life Stories about Gender Inequality

Institution	Type	Country	Project
University of Minho	HEI	Portugal	EQUAL-IST

Type of practice: Common | Innovative

Minho University's proposed an innovate measure for tackling gender inequality in HEI through the "book of life stories" approach. Faculty members were asked to share their experiences with gender inequality in a digital album/platform format. This measure aims to provide practical guidance to tackling situations of gender inequality at work as well as to share with the university community successful coping and mitigation strategies.

Comment:

This measure is a convincing, self-reflexive method of addressing gender inequalities in the university.