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## Acronyms \& Abbreviations

| EC | European Commission |
| :---: | :--- |
| EIGE | European Institute for Gender Equality |
| EU | European Union |
| EU MS | European Union Member State |
| F | Women |
| GEA | Gender Equality Audit |
| GEP | Gender Equality Plan |
| GPG | Gender pay gap |
| HC | Head count |
| HEI | Higher education institution |
| ISCED | International Standard Classification of Education |
| ISCO | International Standard Classification of Occupations |
| M | Men |
| n/a | Not applicable |
| PhD | Doctor of Philosophy |
| R\&D | Research and development |
| RFO | Research funding organisation |
| RPO | Research performing organisation |
| SES | Structure of Earnings Survey |
| T | Total |
| W/M | Women/men |
| WP | Work Package |

## Project partners involved in the Gender Equality Audit

| No. | Name | Acronym | Country | GEA QUANTITATIVE | GEA QUALITATIVE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | CONSULTA EUROPA PROJECTS AND INNOVATION SL | CE | ES | n/a | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. | JOZEF STEFAN INSTITUTE | JSI | SI | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. | UNIWERSYTET JANA KOCHANOWSKIEGO W KIELCACH | UJK | PL | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 4. | UNIVERSITATEA DIN BUCURESTI | UB | RO | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 5. | UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS PALMAS DE GRAN CANARIA | ULPGC | ES | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 6. | CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE | CNR | IT | n/a | n/a |
| 7. | USTAV VYSKUMU SOCIALNEJ | UVSK | SK | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8. | UNIVERSITY OF RUSE ANGEL KANCHEV | URAK | BG | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 9. | GOBIERNO DE CANARIAS | ACIISI | ES | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 10. | FUNDO REGIONAL PARA A CIENCIA E TECNOLOGIA | FRCT | PT | $\checkmark$ | n/a |

## Introduction

This report provides data and information collected within the WP2 of the project, namely the Task 2.1 Gender equality audit and assessment at the organisational level. Under this task, the project partners carried out quantitative and qualitative gender audits in their organisations. This collection aimed to provide a solid basis for the development of gender equality plans in project partners' organisations and fulfil the matrix with their data at the organisational level. The data and information collected will fil in a common database for Gender Equality Audit.

The methodology of the gender equality audit (GEA) was prepared by the Institute for Social Communication Research of the Slovak Academy of Sciences (UVSK SAV) team in cooperation with the University of Bucharest (UB) and University Jana Kochanowskiego in Kielce (UJK) teams.

Although the project consortium consists of various types of research organisations, the indicators reflect the RPO/HEl organisation's circumstances primarily, as this type prevails among the partners. However, other types of organisation have been encouraged to collect the indicators adjusted to their conditions or indicate that the calculation of the indicators was not applicable ( $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ ).

Table 1 Overview of the project partners by the type of research organisation

| NO | Name | Acronym | Country | Type of organisation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | JOZEF STEFAN INSTITUTE | JSI | Slovenia | RPO/HEI |
| 2. | UNIWERSYTET JANA <br> KOCHANOWSKIEGO W KIELCACH | UJK | Poland | RPO/HEI |
| 3. | UNIVERSITATEA DIN BUCURESTI | UB | Romania | RPO/HEI |
| 4. | UNIVERSIDAD DE LAS PALMAS DE GRAN CANARIA | ULPGC | Spain | RPO/HEI |
| 5. | USTAV VYSKUMU SOCIALNEJ KOMUNIKACIE SLOVENSKEJ AKADEMIE VIED | UVSK SAV | Slovakia | RPO |
| 6. | UNIVERSITY OF RUSE ANGEL KANCHEV | URAK | Bulgaria | RPO/HEI |
| 7. | GOBIERNO DE CANARIAS | ACIISI | Spain | RFO |
| 8. | FUNDO REGIONAL PARA A CIENCIA E TECNOLOGIA | FRCT | Portugal | RFO |

The statistical data and information in this report are provided as delivered by the project partners. We did not validate them by other studies, neither do we explain or interpret them. Instead, we included all the possible comments or information provided solely by the project partners. The validity of the indicators is, therefore, at the responsibility of the project partners only. The UVSK SAV collected data on the level of the whole Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAV), consisting of 47 independent institutes. Therefore, the presented data are titled as 'SAV' in the tables.

The report is structured according to the gender dimensions areas relevant to the gender equality audit that we chose in the research team. The Pool of graduate talents dimension refers to gender balance among the PhD. applicants, students and graduates presenting the supply of the future researchers. The qualitative assessment indicators at this dimension evaluate the measures encouraging women to pursuit research careers. The second dimension - Gender balance in the research focuses on the gender distribution among the employees, researchers by academic grades and other characteristics, and gender equality policies. The Gender balanced career advancement assesses the HR measures promoting women scientists in their professional development. Dimensions of the Gender balance in decision-making show the distribution of women at the top of departments and decision bodies at the level of the organisations. The Gender balanced working conditions dimension explores various types of measures and policies reconciling the family and work of the researchers, precarious conditions and standards preventing sexual harassment in the workplace. Finally, the Gender balance in research outputs looks, for example, at the distributions of the funding success between the female and male grants beneficiaries and measures like integration of the gender-sensitive approach into the teaching or gender analysis in the research. Each chapter - dimension contains quantitative and quantitative indicators and their values as provided by the project partners. If available, additional information describing the situation at the organisational level is complementing the data.

## 1. Methodology

The teams developed the GEA indicators in a two-stage process of selecting and defining the indicators. A comprehensive handbook and data collection tools circulated to the project partners in February 2021. ${ }^{2}$ Data collection was carried out in the course of March-May 2021.

The GEA indicators are clustered in six gender dimensions presenting areas to be addressed in the gender equality audit. The gender dimensions assemble indicators of the same or similar aspects of the environment relevant to the organisational change. The dimensions also present the structure of the baseline situation analysis for drawing up the Gender Equality Plans:

1. The pool of graduate talents
2. Gender balance in research
3. Gender balanced career advancement
4. Gender balance in decision making
5. Gender balanced working conditions
6. Gender balance in research outputs

Each dimension contains quantitative and qualitative indicators based on the degree of quantification and type of data, respectively. The foundation of the quantitative GEA indicators was the European standardised data collection on women in science She Figures ${ }^{3}$. The indicators also rely on the internationally standardised classification of the OECD Frascati Manual. ${ }^{4}$ The quantitative GEA indicators are divided into core (compulsory), advanced (voluntary) and specific (voluntary) indicators. The core indicators present the minimum indicators that had to be collected by the project partners. They offer standardised and comparative indicators to describe the departure situation in the organisation. The advanced indicators were voluntary and depended on each partner if collected. The specific indicators were also voluntary and not defined, giving each partner space to define specific indicators suitable for their type of organisation, namely RPO, RFO and HEI. The report does not provide the advanced and specific indicators in the full range due to the limited extent of the report. However, the handbook and data collection tool also define some advanced indicators and encourages the proposal of specific indicators for the particular type of research organisation. The unit of analysis for each indicator was the organisation as one entity, i.e. the data were collected at the specific university/organisation level. This did not exclude collecting partial data at the faculties or departments to calculate an overall organisation-level indicator. The reference period of the indicators was the year 2020, or the latest data available. Several indicators also indicate the change in time referring to the last 5-year period. i.e. 2016 and 2020, or the latest data available. The quantitative GEA indicators were collected via

[^1]the GEA data collection tool - a template in excel format with predefined formulas. ${ }^{5}$

The qualitative GEA indicators present unquantified aspects and measures to assess the situation in terms of gender equality at the organisation's level. Most of the indicators were based on the project's pre-proposal assessment stage and complemented by additional indicators inspired by EIGE's Gear tool. ${ }^{6}$ A set of 59 measures and policies relevant to gender equality in research have been assessed at the scale: 1 - Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used. The qualitative GEA indicators have been evaluated via an online assessment tool using the Monkey Survey system. Partners could complement information on the measures and policies in place either by including comments in the survey or the national report on the legislative and policy framework of gender equality in research within Task 2.1. of the project.

Both the quantitative and qualitative GEA indicators were defined in the HANDBOOK containing methodological guidance on the data collection, for example, the definition, purpose/aim of the indicator, particular data needed and unit of measurement, computation formulas and other parameters of the indicators.

The numbering of the quantitative and qualitative indicators in the following chapters is consistent with the numbering in the handbook and data collection tool. The quantitative GEA indicators need to be perceived as preliminary and with modifications, as some project partners need more time to collate the(ir) data.

[^2]
## 2. The pool of graduate talents

## Table 2 Quantitative GEA indicators on the pool of graduate talents

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | FRCT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Proportion of women among PhD applicants (\%) | n/a | n/a | 50 | 51,8 | 39,1 | n/a | 41,1 | n/a |
| 2 | Proportion of women among PhD students (\%): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | all students | 46,8 | n/a | 59,6 | 52,0 | 35,8 | 59 | 42,9 | n/a |
| - | new students in the given year | n/a | n/a | 60,2 | 48,3 | 30,8 | n/a | 40,3 | n/a |
| 3 | Proportion of women among PhD graduates (\%) in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | 2016 | 49,1 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 58,9 | 60,9 | 60,0 | 63 | 53,8 | n/a |
| - | 2020 | 35,7 | n/a | 59,7 | 70,4 | 37,5 | 56 | 50,0 | n/a |
| 4 | Distribution of PhD graduates across fields of study, by sex (W/M) headcounts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | 00 Generic programmes and qualifications | n/a | n /a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 537 | n/a | n/a |
| - | 01 Education | 5/2 | n/a | n/a | 7/0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | 14/0 | n/a |
| - | 02 Arts and humanities | n/a | n/a | n/a | 14/4 | n/a | n/a |  | n/a |
| - | 03 Social sciences, journalism and information | 1/2 | n/a | n/a | 6/5 | n/a | 66 | 14/14 | n/a |
| - | 04 Business, administration and law | 1/4 | n/a | n/a | 0/1 | n/a | n/a | 29/43 | n/a |
| - | 05 Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics | 0/2 | n/a | n/a | 4/4 | 9/10 | 538 | 14/0 | n/a |
| - | 06 Information and Communication Technologies | 1/2 | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0/5 | n/a | 0/0 | n/a |
| - | 07 Engineering, manufacturing and construction | 1/0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 29/43 | n/a |
| - | 08 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary | 2/9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| - | 09 Health and welfare | 5/6 | n/a | n/a | 7/2 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| - | 10 Services | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Table 3 Qualitative GEA indicators on the pool of graduate talents

Legend: 1-Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer.

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Gender as a topic of research | 4 | DK | DK | 4 | 1 | 4 | DK | 4 |
| 2. | Scholarships or career <br> development grants for female <br> scientists | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 3. | Support for dual-career couples | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | DK | 1 |
| 4. | Career coaching for female <br> scientists | 3 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5. | Fellowship for women students and <br> researchers only | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

[^3]| 6. | Specific seminars on academic publishing for women students/scientists | 1 | DK | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. | Gender balance is taken into account in recruitment | 2 | 4 | DK | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 8. | Formulation of the job/position offers are in a gender-balanced form | 5 | 4 | DK | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| 9. | Applicants of all genders invited in a job offer, but underrepresented gender is emphasized | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 10. | The advertisement for internal promotions ensures an equal level of information | 4 | 4 | DK | 4 | DK | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 11. | Policy of non-discrimination in recruitment on the ground of gender. | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 |

## Comments and specified answers

UB: There are research projects and PhD theses on gender or gender-related aspects; There are no specific scholarships, grants, career coaching or seminars devoted to female scientists/students only; Non-discriminatory internal policies/regulations and norms, including those related to gender balance, are being implemented in accordance to the national legislation on gender equality and the non-discrimination principle; however, important UB documents (such as Carta $\mathrm{UB}^{9}$ ) and Rector's Strategy 2020-2023 ${ }^{10}$, make explicit or implicit reference to the need of gendered balanced internal policies; Job offers documents use gender balanced forms (i.e. masculine/ feminine) in some instances. Nevertheless, for the moment, the Romanian official language does not allow the feminisation of professions, so it is a more complex issue.

URAK: The legislation of Bulgarian education is non-discriminative. Supporting one gender against the other gender is discrimination and against the law in Bulgaria.

[^4]
## 3. Gender balance in research

Table 4 Quantitative GEA indicators on gender balance in research

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | FRCT ${ }^{11}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | Proportion of women among total number of employees (\%) | 45,3 | 53,5 | 54,2 | 60,3 | 36,5 | 58 | 54,3 | 61 |
| 6 | Proportion of women among total number of employed researchers (\%) in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - 2016 | 37,8 | n/a | 46,8 | 42,3 | 29,3 | n/a | 47,6 | n/a |
|  | 2020 | 36,9 | 53,5 | 46,2 | 51,2 | 30,1 | 52,9 | 49,2 | n/a |
| 7 | Distribution of researchers employed across fields of R\&D by sex (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - natural sciences (W/M) | 10/12 | n/a | n/a | 18/22 | 75/60 | 48 | 6/7 | n/a |
|  | - engineering and technology (W/M) | 10/30 | n/a | n/a | 0/0,3 | 25/40 | n/a | 32/32 | n/a |
|  | - medical sciences (W/M) | 30/22 | n/a | n/a | 19/21 | n/a | n/a | 6/5 | n/a |
|  | - agricultural and veterinary sciences (W/M) | n/a | n/a | n/a | 0/0 | n/a | n/a | 0/3 | n/a |
|  | - social sciences (W/M) | 30/25 | n/a | n/a | 40/34 | n/a | 54 | 35/33 | n/a |
|  | - humanities and arts (W/M) | 20/10 | n/a | n/a | 23/22 | n/a | 71 | 20/20 | n/a |
| 8 | Distribution of researchers employed across age groups (\%), by sex |  |  | * |  |  | \%W |  |  |
|  | 25-34 (W/M) | n/a | 2/0 | 30/22 | 14/10 | 46/32 | 61 | 8,9/5,6 | 0,5/0,5 |
|  | 35-44 (W/M) | n/a | 2/7 | 27/26 | 29/22 | 27/31 | 59 | 29,8/28,9 | 53,8/50 |
|  | 45-54 (W/M) | n/a | 12/19 | 16/15 | 34/28 | 13/15 | 53 | 23,6/24,9 | 0/12,5 |
|  | 55-64 (W/M) | n/a | 33/19 | 20/18 | 17/25 | 1/16 | 49 | 37,2/37,1 | 0/12,5 |
|  | 65 and over (W/M) | n/a | 5/2 | 7/15 | 6/14 | 3/4 | 26 | 0,5/3,6 | 0/0 |
| 9 | Distribution of R\&D personnel across occupations (\%) and sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Researchers (W/M) | 52/66 | n/a | 58/79 | 66/78 | 67/79 | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ \text { (W) } \end{gathered}$ | 66/80 | n/a |
|  | Teachers (only) (W/M) | n/a | n/a | n/a | 28/20 | 0/0 | n/a | $7 / 2$ | n/a |
|  | Technicians (W/M) | n/a | n/a | 33/12 | 0/0 | 9/12 | $\begin{gathered} 77 \\ (W) \end{gathered}$ | 2/4 | n/a |
|  | Other supporting staff (W/M) | 39/27 | n/a | 8/8 | 6/2 | 24/9 | $\begin{array}{r} 61 \\ (W) \end{array}$ | 34/20 | n/a |
| 10 | Proportion of women among academic staff by academic grade (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grade A (professor) | 18,5 | 36,8* | 24,1 | 29,9 | 23,6 | 43 | 18,9 | n/a |
|  | Grade B (associate professor, Senior researcher) | 40,9 | 50,0* | 41,9 | 46,1 | 26,2 | 47 | 42,5 | n/a |
|  | Grade C (Post doc) | 41,7 | 75,0* | 53,3 | 61,5 | 21,1 | 56 | 43,4 | n/a |
|  | Grade D | 46,2 | 60* | 57 | 59,4 | 37,1 | 60 | 42,9 | n/a |
| 11 | Proportion of A grade women (professors) among all A grade staff by the main fields of R\&D (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - natural sciences | 21,4 | n/a | n/a | 17,4 | 25,6 | 41 | 11,1 | n/a |
|  | - engineering and technology | 20,6 | n/a | n/a | 0,0 | 19,4 | n/a | 40,0 | n/a |
|  | - medical sciences | 17,2 | n/a | n/a | 26,7 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

[^5]| - agricultural and <br> veterinary sciences | 30,4 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 0,0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 20,0 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - social sciences | 39,4 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 47,8 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 98 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | humanities and arts | 40,9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 26,9 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | 47 | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |
| $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table 5 Qualitative GEA indicators on gender balance in research

Legend: 1-Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer.

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. | A dedicated organisational <br> arrangement (office, contact <br> person, etc.) aimed at change <br> towards gender equality | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 13. | Gender equality action plan (GEP) | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 14. | Monitoring and continuous <br> evaluation of the GEP | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 15. | Gender budgeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Included comments and specified answers
UB is part of various international networks, some gender-specific, as for example:

- Various international networks, some gender specific, as for example: The International Research Association of Institutions of Advanced Research Studies (RINGS), http://rings.com; https://unibuc.ro/international/colaborari-internationale/afilieriinstitutionale/
- External alliances, such as: CEREFREA- Centre Régional Francophone de Recherches Avancées en Sciences Sociales (CEREFREA, Villa Noël), http://www.villanoel.ro/ (one component dealing also with gender issues);
- University networks, such as https://civis.eu/storage/files/mission-statement-en.pdf (with gender sensitive strategy included);

Workshops, awards and competitions are often organised as GE awarenessraising activities (e.g., yearly, with the occasion of $8^{\text {th }}$ of March). However, these activities are neither compulsory nor organised on a regular basis;

Researchers (both women and men) are invited to participate in round tables and public events on gender equality; yet, for the time being, there are no gender
specific activities dedicated to the rest of the university staff (i.e. for the administrative personnel and maintenance staff).

URAK: The legislation of Bulgarian education is non-discriminative. Supporting one gender against the other gender is discrimination and non-legal in Bulgaria.
gender equality to unlock
research potential

## 4. Gender balanced career advancement

For this dimension, no core indicators have been selected. Five indicators were proposed as advanced and voluntary for the project partners. Only URAK provided the calculations so far. The values are in the following table.

Table 6 Quantitative GEA indicators on gender balanced career advancement

| No. | Title of the indicator | URAK |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | Proportion (\%) of women applicants for the position of a researcher over the last 5 <br> years (2016-2020) | 59,6 |
|  | Proportion (\%) of women who proceed in the recruitment process for the position of a <br> researcher over the last 5 years (2016 - 2020) | 61 |
|  | Proportion of women newly hired as researchers over the last 5 years (2016-2020) | 50,7 |
|  | Sex differences in international mobility during PhD | $1 / 4$ |
|  | Sex differences in international mobility in post-PhD career stages | $0 / 0$ |

Table 7 Qualitative GEA indicators on gender balanced career advancement
Legend: 1 - Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer.

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20. | Age limit extended in calls for <br> female researchers with <br> children under a certain age | 2 | DK | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 21. | Mentoring programmes for <br> female employees | 2 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 22. | Gender training for employees | 4 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 23. | Equal access to internal <br> training | 4 | DK | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 24. | Specific sabbatical for women <br> scientists | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |

Additional information:
UB: There is no sabbatical for women only; sabbatical is regulated for both male and female researchers. ${ }^{12}$ There are neither discriminatory equal access specifications related to internal training nor gender-specific ones.

[^6]gender equality to unlock

## 5. Gender balance in decision making

Table 8 Quantitative GEA indicators on gender balance in decision making

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | FRCT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Women among Directors (at the top) of the university/organisation in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - Previous term | 0 | $0^{*}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \text { out } \\ & \text { of } 20 \end{aligned}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
|  | - Current year | 0 | n/a | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 10 \\ \text { out of } \\ 19 \end{gathered}$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 13 | Proportion of women among Vice-Directors (board of vice-directors) (\%) in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | - Previous term | 40 | n/a | n/a | 63,4 | 11,1 | n/a | 50 | n/a |
|  | - Current year | 40 | n/a | 20 | 52,4 | 100 | 33 | 50 | n/a |
| 14 | Proportion of women on scientific boards (\%) | 0 | n/a | 9,1 | 50,0 | 26,6 | 40 | 46,7 | n/a |
| 15 | Proportion of women among Deans of Faculties/Institutes in the given year (\%) | 41,1 | n/a | 38,3 | 62,5 | 15,8 | 21 | 54,5 | n/a |
| 16 | Proportion of women among Vice-Deans of Faculties in the given year (\%) | 55,6 | n/a | 34,5 | 68,8 | n/a | 57 | 50,0 | n/a |

* Applies with modifications; UJK and FRCT have Board of Directors; FRCT with 2 (F) and 1 President (M)


## Table 9 Qualitative GEA indicators on gender balance in decision making

Legend: 1 - Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25. | Gender-integrated leadership <br> programme | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 26. | Gender training for managers | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 27. | Targets/quotas for gender <br> balance in boards and <br> committees | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Additional information:
UB: There are no specific leadership programmes designed to support women in decision-making positions; however, there is an informal interest in terms of gender balanced boards and commissions.
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## 6. Gender balance in working conditions

Table 10 Quantitative GEA indicators on gender balance in working conditions

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | JRAK | FRCT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | Gender pay gap based on average gross monthly wage (\%) | 0 | n/a | n/a | 12,1 | 13,7 | 18 | 0 | 12,1 |
| 18 | Gender pay gap in the organisation by R\&D occupations (\%): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Researchers | 0 | n/a | n/a | 8,9 | 9,9 | 13 | 0 |  |
|  | Teachers (only) | 0 | n/a | n/a | 3,1 | n/a | n/a | 0 |  |
|  | Technicians | 0 | n/a | n/a | 15,1 | n/a | 4 | 0 |  |
|  | Other supporting staff | 0 | n/a | n/a | 1,6 | -11,6 | 15 | 0 | -25,1 |
| 19 | Gender pay gap in the organisation among A- grade academics (\%) | 0 | n/a | n/a | -1,7 | -2,5 | n/a | 0 |  |
| 20 | Proportion of persons employed part-time among researchers by sex (\%) (W/M) | 47/53 | n/a | 33/67 | 37/63 | 25/75 | 50 | 48/52 |  |
| 21 | Proportion of persons with precarious working contracts among researchers, by sex (\%) (W/M) | 47/53 | n/a | 37/63 | 53/47 | 32/68 | n/a | 60/40 | 58/42 |
| 22 | Annual number of researchers on maternity/paternity or parental leave in the given year by sex (W/M) | 52/48 | n/a | 62/6 | 21/0 | 21/20 | 1/15 | 6/0 | 1/0 |

Table 11 Qualitative GEA indicators on gender balance in working conditions
Legend: 1 - Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28. | Equal pay measures | 1 | 4 | DK | 5 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 29. | Pay transparency policies | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. | Gender pay audits/equality <br> pay reports prepared and <br> publicly available | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | DK |
| 31. | Appropriated workload and <br> content of the work policy | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | DK |
| H2. | Healthy and safe <br> workplace/university <br> environment policy | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 33. | Non-discriminatory equipment <br> necessary for work/research | 4 | DK | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | DK |


| 34. | Possibility to work part-time | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35. | Flexitime | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| 36. | Telework | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | DK | 4 | 4 |
| 37. | Maternity institutional policy | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 38. | Paternity institutional policy | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 39. | Child care support (internal <br> kindergarten, on- <br> demand/flexible child care <br> support, etc.) | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 40. | Support/subsidise childcare <br> services | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 41. | Support for re-entry after leave <br> periods | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| 42. | Teaching free period after <br> returning from parental leave | 1 | DK | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| 43. | Family and baby-friendly <br> environment for <br> employees/students | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 44. | Policy on care for <br> elder/dependent family <br> members of employees | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |

Included comments and specified answers
UB: The salary policies of the university are in accordance with both the labour legislation and the anti-discrimination legislation; wage differences may occur due to differences in 'continuity' at work and/or the leaky pipeline phenomenon. There is an important distinction between teaching, research and other professional activities; beyond the period of pandemic measures, teaching was on-site only. The rest of the activities were more flexible both in terms of working time \& place. - Part-time in UB is possible according to the national legislation in force; however, the part-time system in UB needs further detailed explanations in order to highlight its specificities (for example, being able to work for a limited number of hours with a different salary scheme).

At UB, some maternity support measures go beyond the existing national policy measures (e.g. as a PhD student, one is allowed to freeze the period of studies for three years, for child-raising and parental reasons); There are different informal arrangements because of supporting employees, students or on other situations of care for dependent family members; moreover, they may differ in between faculties.

## Table 12 Indicators on adverse social behaviour at the workplace

Legend: 1-Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45. | Internal guidelines/measures <br> on the use of non-sexist | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 |


|  | language in internal and <br> external communication |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bodies mandated to <br> implement and monitor policy <br> of 'non-discrimination on the <br> basis of gender. | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |
| $46 .$Specific <br> person/committee/commission <br> responsible for harassment at <br> the institutional level | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 |  |
| 48. | Protocol for preventing and <br> tackling sexual harassment <br> and gender-based violence | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 49. | Promotion of awareness <br> measures to prevent <br> harassment, sexist attitudes | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Included comments and specified answers
UB: There is no particular body/commission/person in charge with gender equality aspects in general; nevertheless, there are several bodies within the current UB diagram where issues of discriminatory policies, harassment, genderbased violence can be handled, such as a legal office that deals with all legal aspects regarding employees' work; a Commission of Ethics in Research at UB level; Commissions of Ethics within each of the 19 Faculties; Ombudsman Office; Bureau for Social and Educational Inclusion; Statistical office (offering analysis data).
gender equality to unlock
research potential

## 7. Gender balance in research outputs

Table 13 Quantitative GEA indicators on gender balance in research outputs

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | FRCT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators applying for the national research funds for the given year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Applicants W/M | 18/39 | n/a | 28/26 | 62/63 | 68/157 | n/a | 22/21 | n/a |
|  | Beneficiaries W/M | 6/33 | n/a | 129/262 | 2/7 | 22/50 | n/a | 15/16 | n/a |
| 24 | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators applying for the international research funds for the given year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Applicants | n/a | n/a | 3/14 | n/a | 67/162 | 36/42 | 50/65 | n/a |
|  | Beneficiaries | 4/18 | n/a | 66/90 | n/a | 6/17 | 2/7 | 6/8 | n/a |
| 25 | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and women - principal investigators from national research funds for the given year (EUR): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lead by women | n/a | n/a | n/a | 22786 | 62827 | n/a | 143162 | n/a |
|  | Lead by men | n/a | n/a | n/a | 143135 | 75469 | n/a | 127823 | n/a |
| 26 | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and women - principal investigators (international research funds) for the given year (EUR): |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Lead by women | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 197416 | 185611 | 38836 | n/a |
|  | Lead by men | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 237808 | 629753 | 297061 | n/a |
| 27 | Funding success rate difference between women and men national coordinators within international consortium applying for the international research funds for the given year: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Applicants (W/M) | n/a | n/a | 28/34 | 2/0 | 12/38 | n/a | 50/65 | n/a |
|  | Benefitiaries (W/M) | 1/8 | n/a | 82/187 | 2/0 | 0/2 | n/a | 6/8 | n/a |

Table 14 Qualitative GEA indicators on gender balance in research outputs

Legend: 1 - Was never implemented; 2 - Planned to be implemented; 3 - Was implemented in the past; 4 - Currently being implemented; 5 -In place but not used; DK - Don't know/No information available; N/A; Other (specify) - Include comments or specify your answer

| No. | Title of the indicator | ULPGC | ACIISI | SAV | UJK | JSI | UB | URAK | CE |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 50. | Gender lectureships to assist <br> faculties/departments on how <br> to mainstream gender equality | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | DK |
| Integration of a gender- <br> sensitive approach into <br> teaching | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | DK |  |
| 52. | Integration of gender analysis <br> into research | 1 | DK | DK | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | DK |
| Integration of women's and <br> gender studies into the <br> curriculum of bachelor/Master <br> courses | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | DK | 4 | 1 | DK |  |
| 54. | The gender perspective in the <br> research funding schemes | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | DK |


| 55. | The integration of the gender <br> perspective in submitted and <br> funded projects; | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | DK |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56. | Finances for research projects <br> primarily devoted to gender <br> aspects allocated. | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | DK | 1 | 1 | DK |
| 57. | Sex-segregated data on <br> research funds | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | DK |
| 58. | Sex-disaggregated data about <br> students | 4 | DK | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | DK |
| 59. | Sex-disaggregated data about <br> staff | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | DK |

Additional information on the GEA measures:
UB: Integration of gender analysis into research or teaching is not done systematically or based on institutional guidelines but conjunctural, mainly where there are professors, researchers with gender expertise. For example, at UB there are different approaches within different faculties: - Gender studies are institutionalised as a distinct MA programme (Faculty of Political Science-MA on Equal Opportunities Policies). Gender studies/knowledge are/is strongly integrated within the current curricula: Faculty of Sociology and Social Work, Faculty of Journalism and Media Studies, Faculty of Political Science, Faculty of History, Faculty of Philosophy. Gender studies/knowledge are/is weak within the current curricula: Faculty of Literature; Gender as a subject is not present, but certain courses have the potential to integrate gender aspects: Faculty of Orthodox Theology (Department of Theology and Social Work), Faculty of Geography - Gender as a subject is not integrated within current curricula: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology. Courses on "Ethics in research and academic writing" are compulsory for all MA and PhD students within UB. Within these courses, some gender-specific topics are included (e.g. details about the UB' Code of Ethics offer the possibility to discuss about sexual harassment and other possible forms of discrimination).

## Annexes

## Handbook on the GEA indicators

## 1. General introduction

The UVSK SAV team prepared the Handbook of Gender Equality Indicators in cooperation with UB and UJK teams in the framework of WP2, TASK 2.1. The UVSK team thanks for valuable comments and suggestions also to the lead partner. The indicators have been developed in a two-stage process of selecting and defining the indicators in February 2021. The handbook contains methodological guidance on the data collection and calculation of GEA indicators.

### 1.1. Structure of indicators

The indicators are divided into two main groups based on the degree of quantification, type of data, respectively.

The quantitative GEA indicators are based on statistical data to be collected by each organisation. The majority of the GEA quantitative indicators is based on the She Figures ${ }^{13}$, the European standardised data collection on women in science related to HEls, RPO and RFO. This means that data needed for the indicators might be available and already collected at the national level of each EU MS and assumedly also at your organisation's level. ${ }^{14}$ Moreover, the quantitative indicators use internationally standardised classification mostly from the OECD Frascati Manual. ${ }^{15}$ The quantitative GEA indicators are divided into core (compulsory), advanced (voluntary) and specific (voluntary) indicators. The core - compulsory indicators are minimum indicators to be collected by each partner. They present standardised and comparative indicators to describe the departure situation in the organisation. The advanced indicators are voluntary and depend on each partner if collected. The specific indicators are voluntary and not defined, giving each partner space to define specific institutions' indicators. The unit of analysis for each indicator is the university/organisation as one entity, i.e. the data are collected at the particular university/organisation level. However, this does not exclude to collect partial data at the level of faculties and departments to calculate a university-level indicator. The quantitative GEA indicators are collected via the GEA data collection tool - a template in excel format.

The qualitative GEA indicators present unquantified aspects and measures to assess the situation in terms of gender equality at the organisation's level. Most of the indicators are based on the project's pre-proposal stage of assessment

[^7]and complemented by additional indicators inspired by EIGE's Gear tool. ${ }^{16}$ The qualitative GEA indicators are collected via an online Monkey Survey system. The online assessment tool will be distributed at Gender Audit Indicators assessment

Overview of the structure of GEA indicators

| Quantitative <br> indicators | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Core indicators | Core indicators are compulsory for each partner and present comparative |
| measures for this project |  |$|$

### 1.2. Gender dimensions

Gender dimensions are areas to be addressed in the gender equality audit. They assemble indicators of the same or similar aspects of the gendered environment relevant to the organisational change. The gender dimensions indicate the structure of the baseline situation analysis for drawing up the Gender Equality Plan.

The qualitative and qualitative GEA indicators are structured upon the following six gender dimensions:

1. The pool of graduate talents
2. Gender balance in research
3. Gender balanced career advancement
4. Gender balance in decision making
5. Gender balanced working conditions
6. Gender balance in research outputs

### 1.3. Parameters of the indicators

In the following sections, each indicator will be described by the following parameters:

[^8]| Quantitate indicators | Qualitative indicators |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of indicator | Number of indicator |
| Title of indicator | Type of indicator |
| Type of indicator | Gender dimension of the indicator |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Title of indicator |
| Definition of indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| Purpose/aim | Scope of indicator |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Reference period |
| Reference period | Comments |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 1.4 Practical advice

- We advise collecting aggregated data at the university/organisation level
- If not possible, collect data on the level of faculties and departments and then calculate for the whole university/organisation
- We encourage the partners to preserve all the partial data collected for future assessments or repeated data collection
- The reference period is the year 2020 for most of the indicators; if 2020 is not available, insert the latest available data and specify this in the column "comments" in the data collection tool.
- Few indicators also indicate the change in time (trends), and their reference years are 2016 and 2020. If data for 2020 is not available, use the latest available data within the five years, i.e. 2014 and 2019; 2013 and 2018
- Insert any comment on the indicator, e.g. deviation from the definition or calculation in the column "comments" of the data collection template.
- For each core and compulsory indicator, computation formulas to calculate the value automatically are provided; the formulas are inserted in the column "I, J, K "; the values are rounded to one decimal digit.
- If any of the core indicators cannot be calculated or any partial data is not available, insert n/a (not applicable).
- By some of the advanced indicators not full description is provided but a reference to the She Figures Handbook, where the indicators is detail described.


## 2. Quantitative GEA indicators

### 2.1. Core GEA indicators

The pool of graduated talents

### 2.1.1 Proportion of women among PhD. applicants

| Number of indicator | 1. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among PhD (ISCED 8 studies) applicants |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension <br> of the indicator | The pool of graduate talents |


| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women applying for PhD study (ISCED 8 <br> - doctoral studies program) out of total number of applications for doctoral studies <br> in the given year. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Purpose/aim of the <br> indicator | This indicator sheds light on the level of progress in increasing women's <br> representation in the top levels of education and research. |
| Data needed and <br> unit of measurement | - Number of women applicants for PhD. Study program (number) (F) <br> - Number of total applicants for PhD. Study program (number) (T) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women applicants among total number of applicants for PhD. Study <br> program = F/T* 100 (\%) |
| Specifications | The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-2011) categorises <br> education programmes by level. ISCED 8 corresponds to studies at Doctoral (PhD) <br> or equivalent level according to the International Standard Classification of <br> Education (ISCED-2011). <br> The number of applicants refers to those filing an application for ISCED8 studies in <br> the reference years. It includes all persons aplied for ISCED 8 studies in the <br> organisation, i.e. non-nationals too. |
| Comments |  |

2.1.2 Proportion of women among all and new doctoral students

| Number of indicator | 2. (consists of 2a.and 2b.) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among all PhD (ISCED 8 studies) students and new PhD (ISCED 8) students in the given year |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| 2a. Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women ISCED 8 students to the total ISCED 8 students studying the ISCED 8 programmes in the given year. The unit of analysis is the whole university or research organisation |
| 2b. Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women who are the new ISCED 8 students in the given year. |
| Purpose/aim of the indicator | This indicator sheds light on the level of progress in increasing women's representation in the top levels of education and research, considering their success in studying for doctoral degrees and as opposed to women applicants for PhD (ISCED 8) studies. |
| 2a. Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of women ISCED 8 students. Unit: Number (F) <br> - Number of total ISCED 8 students. Unit (number) (T) |
| 2b. Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of new ISCED 8 students in the given year (F). Unit: Number ; <br> - Number of new women ISCED 8 students in the given year (T). Unit: Number |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation 2a | Proportion of women students among total number of students for PhD. Study program $=$ F/T*100 (\%) |
| Computation/calculation 2b | Proportion of new women students among new students for PhD. Study program = F/T*100 (\%) |
| Specifications | The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-2011) categorises education programmes by level. ISCED 8 corresponds to studies at Doctoral (PhD) or equivalent level according to the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-2011). <br> The number of students refers to those studying in reference year 2020. It includes all persons studying the ISCED 8 studies programe in the organisation, i.e. nonnationals too. |

2.1.3 Proportion of women among doctoral graduates in 2016 and 2020

| Number of indicator | 3. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among doctoral (ISCED 8) graduates in 2016 and 2020 |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of <br> the indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women ISCED 8 graduates to the total <br> ISCED 8 students in 2016 and 2020. The unit of analysis is the whole university or <br> research institute in the given year. |
| Purpose/aim of the <br> indicator | This indicator sheds light on the level of progress in increasing women's <br> representation in the top levels of education and research, considering their <br> success in studying for doctoral degrees, as opposed to women students of PhD <br> (ISCED 8) studies. The reference period 2016 and 2020 indicate the trend of <br> increase, decrease or stagnation of the women doctoral graduates |
| Data needed and <br> unit of measurement | - Number of women ISCED 8 graduates in 2016. Unit: Number (F) <br> - Number of total ISCED 8 graduates in 2016. Unit (number) (T) <br> - Number of women ISCED 8 graduates in 2020. Unit: Number (F) <br> - Number of total ISCED 8 graduates in 2020. Unit (number) (T) |
| Reference period | 2016 and 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women students among total number of graduates of PhD. Study <br> program = F/T*100 in 2016 <br> Proportion of women students among total number of graduates of PhD. Study <br> program = F/T*100 in 2020 |
| Specifications | The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-2011) categorises <br> education programmes by level. ISCED 8 corresponds to studies at Doctoral (PhD) <br> or equivalent level according to the International Standard Classification of <br> Education (ISCED-2011). <br> The number of graduates refers to those graduating in the reference years 20126 <br> and 2020. It includes all persons graduating in the organisation, i.e. non-nationals <br> too, but does not include nationals graduating abroad. |

2.1.4 Distribution of ISCED 8 graduates across broad fields of study, by sex

| Number of indicator | 4. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Distribution (\%) of ISCED 8 graduates across broad fields of study, by sex |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension <br> of the indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator presents the distribution of ISCED 8 graduates by sex and broad field <br> of study. (For broad study fields classification, see the specifications) |
|  | This indicator identifies horizontal gender segregation in study fields. Horizontal <br> segregation relates to the concentration of women and men around different study <br> fields and has implications for sectors (sectoral segregation) and occupations <br> (occupational segregation). It can occur within both education (e.g. over-/under- <br> representation of one sex in particular subjects) and employment (e.g. over-/under- <br> representation of one sex in particular professions, industries, etc.). The study <br> fields are not ordered by a particular criterion. However, the issue of horizontal <br> segregation may, in turn, lead to greater vertical segregation. For example, the <br> under-valuing of capacities associated with 'women's work' may limit women's <br> prospects for career advancement. |
| Purpose/aim of the <br> indicator | Number of ISCED 8 graduates (all broad fields of study), by sex (Women = F; <br> Men = M). Unit: Number. <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Generic programs and qualifications field <br> study (G), by sex |
| - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Education field study (E), by sex |  |
| Data needed and |  |
| unit of measurement |  |

athena
gender equality to unlock
research potential

|  | - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Business, administration and law (B), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics ( N ), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Information and Communication Technologies (I), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Engineering, manufacturing and construction (EN), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary (A), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Health and welfare (H), by sex <br> - Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Services. (SE) , by sex |
| :---: | :---: |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Distribution of women graduated across the Generic programmes and qualifications $F G / F^{*} 100$; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across the Generic programmes and qualifications MG/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Education FE/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Education ME/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Social sciences...FS/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Social sciences... MS/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Business... FB/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across business MB/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Natural sciences... FN/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Natural sciences... MN/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Information.... $\mathrm{Fl} / \mathrm{F}^{\star} 100$; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Information ...MI/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Engineering... FEN/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Engineering MEN/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across agriculture... FA/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Agriculture MA/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Health..... FH/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Health $\mathrm{MH} / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women graduated across Services... FSE/F*100; <br> - Distribution of men graduated across Services MES/M*100 |
| Specifications | The broad fields of study according to the ISCED-F classification of fields of education and training are the following: <br> Generic programs and qualifications <br> - Education <br> - Arts and humanities <br> - Social sciences, journalism and information <br> - Business, administration and law <br> - Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics <br> - Information and Communication Technologies <br> - Engineering, manufacturing and construction <br> - Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary <br> - Health and welfare <br> - Services |
| Comments | The proportions for each field are shown alongside each other, with $100 \%$ for each sex ni total. The ISCED-F could be re-categorised to six main fields of R\&d of the Frascati Manual (OECD, 2015). This would make the ISCED 8 graduated comparable with the women researchers employed in the organisation/university. The UVSK team will do the re-categorisation in the later phase of the data analysis. |
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## Gender balance in research

2.1.5 Proportion of women among the total number of employees in the organisation

| Number of indicator | 5. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among total number of employees in the <br> organisation |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research <br> Definition of indicatorThis indicator presents the proportion of women in total employment in the <br> organisation |
| Purpose/aim | This indicator presents the proportion of women in total employment as a <br> starting point for considering their share in different occupations. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | - Number of all persons employed in the organisation. Unit: number <br> - Number of women employed in the organisation. Unit: number |
| Reference period | 2020 (ar the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women among total employment = F/T*100 (\%) |

### 2.1.6 Proportion of women among total number of employed researchers in the organisation

| Number of indicator | 6. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion of women among total number of employed researchers in the <br> organisation (2016 and 2020) |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the |  |
| indicator | Gender balance in research |
|  | Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, <br> irrespective of the percentage of teaching or researching in their working <br> contract. Researchers are professionals engaged in the conception or <br> creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop <br> concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentation, software or <br> operational methods (§5.35, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015). <br> encompasses all Grade academics working as researchers (i.e. professor, |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| associate professors, pos-docs, etc.; see the Academic grade classification |  |
| in the legend) |  |

### 2.1.7 Distribution of researchers employed across fields of R\&D, by sex

| Number of indicator | 7. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Distribution (\%) of researchers employed across fields of research and |
| Development, by sex |  |$|$| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |

[^9]| Definition of indicator | This indicator identifies horizontal gender segregation; presents the distribution of female and male researchers across the six major fields of Research and Development (Frascati Manual): <br> - natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) <br> - humanities and arts (H). <br> Definition of researchers: Researchers are professionals engaged in the conception or creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentation, software or operational methods ( $\$ 5.35$, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015) ${ }^{18}$. This indicator encompasses all Grade academics working as researchers (see the Academic grade classification in the legend). Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of researchers in all field of Research and Development by sex. Unit: Head count. <br> - Number of researchers employed in the Natural sciences (NS) by sex <br> - Number of researchers employed in engineering and technology (ET) by sex <br> - Number of researchers employed in medical sciences (MS) by sex <br> - Number of researchers employed in agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) by sex <br> - Number of researchers employed in social sciences (SS) by sex <br> - Number of researchers employed humanities and arts (H) by sex |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Distribution of women researchers employed in NS = FNS/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in ET $=\mathrm{MET} / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in ET = FET/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in ET $=$ MET/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in MS $=F M S / F^{*} 100$; <br> Distribution of men researchers employed in MS $=M M S / M^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in AS = FAS/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in As MAS/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in SS = FSS/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in SS = MSS/M*100 <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in $H=F H / F^{\star} 100$; Distribution of men researchers employed in $H=M H / M^{*} 100$ |

2.1.8 Distribution of researchers employed across age groups, by sex

| Number of indicator | 8. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Distribution (\%) of researchers employed across age groups, by sex; (Age <br> cohorts: 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and over; the unit of analysis- the <br> University as a whole |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator shows the distribution of both male and female researchers across <br> different age groups. Age categories: 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and over. <br> Researchers are employed persons who are teaching and researching, <br> irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |
| Purpose/aim | Considering the age distribution of researchers, it may reveal differences in <br> women and men's career patterns. For example, according to Eurostat, a higher <br> proportion of women are outside of the labour force due to caring <br> responsibilities, including children. This may reduce their participation in the <br> labour market during the key childbearing years of a particular country. On |

[^10]|  | another level, by taking older age as a 'proxy' for seniority, this indicator can be used to gauge women and men's relative presence in the top research positions against a backdrop of far-reaching under-representation of women in decisionmaking roles (EIGE's Gender Statistics Database). |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 25 and over by sex. Unit: Head count. <br> - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 25-34 by sex (1) <br> - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 35-44 by sex. (2) <br> - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 45-54 by sex. (3) <br> - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 55-64 by sex. (4) <br> - Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 65 and over, by sex. (5) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 25-34 = $\mathrm{F}(1) / \mathrm{F}^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged $25-34=\mathrm{M}(1) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 35-54 = $\mathrm{F}(2) / \mathrm{F}^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers employed aged 35-44= $\mathrm{M}(2) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 45-54= $\mathrm{F}(3) / \mathrm{F}^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged $45-54=\mathrm{M}(3) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 55-64= $\mathrm{F}(4) / \mathrm{F}^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged $55-64=\mathrm{M}(4) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ <br> - Distribution of women researchers in the age category 65 and over $=$ $F(5) / F^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged 65 and over $=$ $\mathrm{M}(5) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ |

### 2.1.9 Distribution of R\&D personnel across occupations and sex

| Number of indicator | 9. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Distribution (\%) of R\&D personnel across occupations and sex (researchers, teachers (only), technicians, other supporting staff) |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the distribution of research and development (R\&D) personnel across three occupations (researchers, technicians, and others), by sex; for definitions of the R\&D occupations, see the Frascati Manual. ${ }^{19}$ Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. Teachers (only) are employed persons who are only teaching but are not researchers, i.e. their working position (job title) and content do not include researcher/research/researching. These might apply to some employees in the universities. |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of total personnel (employed persons) in the organisation by sex <br> - Number of personnel employed as researchers by sex (R) <br> - Number of personnel employed as teachers (only) by sex (teachers) <br> - Number of personnel employed as technicians by sex (T) <br> - Number of personnel employed as supporting staff by sex (SS) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Distribution of women researchers among across female personnel = FR/F*100 (\%) <br> - Distribution of men researchers among men personnel $=$ MR/M*100 (\%) <br> - Distribution of women teacher (only) researchers among across female personnel = F(teachers)/F*100 (\%) <br> - Distribution of men teacher (only) among men personnel = M(teachers)/M*100 (\%) <br> - Distribution of women technicians among female personnel = FT/F*100 (\%) <br> - Distribution of men technicians among men personnel $=$ MT/M*100 (\%) |

[^11]|  | -Distribution of women supporting staff among female personnel $=\mathrm{FSS} / \mathrm{F}^{*} 100$ <br> $(\%)$ <br> (\%) <br> Distribution of men supporting staff among men personnel $=\mathrm{MSS} / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100(\%)$ <br> CommentsThe number of all personnel of R\&D are all persons employed in the organisation. <br> The number of total employees should be the same as in indicator no. 5. The total <br> number of researchers should be the same as in indicator no. 6. |
| :--- | :--- |

2.1.10 Proportion of women among academic staff, by academic grade

| Number of indicator | 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among academic staff, by academic grade |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women among the persons occupying positions at different academic career grades for a given year. <br> Definitions of academic grades: <br> A. The single highest grade/post at which research is normally conducted within the institutional or corporate system (Professors) <br> B. Academic grade - All researchers working in positions which are not as senior as the top position (A) but definitely more senior than the newly qualified PhD holders (C); i.e. below A and above C (Associated Professor) <br> C. Academic grade - The first grade/post into which a newly qualified PhD (ISCED <br> 8) graduate would normally be recruited within the institutional or corporate system (Postdoc; newly qualified researcher with PhD ) <br> D. Academic grade - Either postgraduate students not yet holding a PhD (ISCED <br> 8) degree who are engaged as researchers (on the payroll) or researchers working in posts that do not normally require a PhD. (Post-graduate student working as researcher; PhD candidate ${ }^{20}$ |
| Purpose/aim | The academic grades (A, B, C, D) represent a hierarchy in the academic career stage; the higher the level of academic career, the higher the possible power position and access to funding. By looking at the proportion of women present at each grade, one can track their progress in advancing through the academic career stages and identify the levels at which women are lost. It is interesting to monitor the number of women present at each level of academia to observe whether there is progress towards reducing vertical segregation ('the leaky pipeline'). |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of academic staff at grade A (professors) by sex <br> - Number of academic staff at grade B (Associated Professor, Senior researcher;) by sex <br> - Number of academic staff at grade C (Postdoc; junior researcher; newly qualified researcher with PhD ) by sex <br> - Number of academic staff at grade D (Post-graduate student working as researcher; PhD candidate) by sex |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Proportion of women of grade A among academic staff grade $A=F A /(F A+M A)$ *100 (\%) <br> - Proportion of women of grade $B$ among academic staff grade $B=F B /(F B+M B)$ *100 (\%) <br> - Proportion of women of grade C among academic staff grade $\mathrm{C}=$ FC/(FC+MC) *100 (\%) <br> - Proportion of women of grade D among academic staff grade $\mathrm{D}=$ FD/(FD+MD) *100 (\%) |
| Specifications | The classification of academic positions into $A, B, C$ and $D$ grades may vary across countries. This should be taken into account when comparing or aggregating statistics. For national specificities of the academic grades see https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed01aa75ed71a1; p. 194 |

[^12]2.1.11 Proportion of A grade women among A grade staff by main fields of R\&D

| Number of indicator | 11. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of A grade women (professors) among all A grade staff by main fields of Research and Development |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | The A grade is the single highest grade/post at which research is usually conducted within the institutional system. This indicator reveals differences in the distribution of male and female grade A staff across the different fields of Research and Development for a given year, by presenting the relative proportion of grade A staff of given sex and by field. <br> R\&D fields: <br> - natural sciences (NS); <br> - engineering and technology (ET); <br> - medical sciences (MS); <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS); <br> - social sciences (SS); <br> - humanities (H); <br> - unknown (U). |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of total A grade staff in natural sciences T(NS); <br> - Number of A grade women in natural sciences F(NS) <br> - Number of total $A$ grade staff in engineering and technology $T(E T)$; <br> - Number of A grade women in engineering and technology F (ET); <br> - Number of total A grade staff in medical sciences T(MS); <br> - Number of A grade women in medical sciences F(MS); <br> - Number of total A grade staff in agricultural and veterinary sciences T(AS); <br> - Number of A grade women in agricultural and veterinary sciences F(AS); <br> - Number of total A grade staff in social sciences T(SS); <br> - Number of A grade women in social sciences F(SS); <br> - Number of total A grade staff in humanities T(H); <br> - Number of A grade women in humanities $T(H)$ |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Proportion of women A grade in NS =F(NS)/T (NS)*100 (\%) <br> - Proportion of women A grade in $\mathrm{ET}=\mathrm{F}(\mathrm{ET}) / \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{ET})^{*} 100(\%)$ <br> - Proportion of women A grade in MS $=F(M S) / T(M S)^{*} 100(\%)$ <br> - Proportion of women A grade in As $=\mathrm{F}(\mathrm{AS}) / \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{AS})^{*} 100(\%)$ <br> - Proportion of women A grade in SS = F(SS)/T (SS)* 100 (\%) <br> - Proportion of women A grade in $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{F}(\mathrm{H}) / \mathrm{T}(\mathrm{H})^{*} 100(\%)$ |
| Specifications | The classification of academic grades A may vary across countries. This should be taken into account when comparing or aggregating statistics. For national specificities of the academic A grades, see https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1 ; p. 194 |

## Gender balance in decision making

### 2.1.12 Women among Directors of the institution

| Number of indicator | 12. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Women among Directors (at the top) of the university/organisation in the previous <br> term and current year |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the heads of institutions in <br> the previous and current term, resp. current year (2021). |
| Purpose/aim | The under-representation of women in leadership positions has broad implications <br> for scientific advancement and industries with a strong need for a technologically <br> educated workforce |
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| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | - Women - head of the institution in the previous term; Unit: head count <br> $\bullet \quad$ Women - head of the institution in 2021; Unit: head count |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference period | Previous term and current term. respectively in 2021 |
| Computation/calculation | - Women as head of the institution in the previous term (indicate the previous <br>  <br>  <br> - term period .........) (number) <br> Women as head of the institution in 2021 (number) |

### 2.1.13 Proportion of women among Vice-Directors

| Number of indicator | 13. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among Vice-Directors (board of vice-directors) in the previous term and current term |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the Vice-Directors of the institutions for the previous and current term. |
| Purpose/aim | The Vice-Directors usually create a board of Vice-Directors. The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions has broad implications for scientific advancement. |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - The number of Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in the previous term. Unit: head count (T) <br> - The number of women Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in the previous term. Unit: head count (F) <br> - The number of Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in the current term (2021). Unit: head count (T) <br> - The number of women Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in current term (year 2021). Unit: head count (F) |
| Reference period | Previous term and current term (year 2021) |
| Computation/calculation | - Proportion of women among Vice-Directors in the previous term (indicated the previous term period.......) $=\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{T}^{*} 100$ <br> - Proportion of women among Vice-Directors in the current term (year 2021) = F/T*100 |

### 2.1.14 Proportion of women on scientific boards

| Number of indicator | 14. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women on scientific boards (Scientific board of research <br> organisation) |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the proportion of women members of boards, top decision- <br> making committees that have a crucial impact on research orientation in a given <br> year. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | The total number of members of the scientific board by sex; Unit: head count; <br> (T) <br> - The number of women - members of the scientific board; Unit: head count (F) <br> - The number of men members of the scientific board; Unit: head count (M) |
| Reference period | Year 2021 |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women among the members of the scientific board in the given year = <br> F/T*100 |
| Specifications | The number of men members of the scientific board is not needed for the <br> proportion of women out of the total number of members; however, it provides <br> additional value for possible analysis |

2.1.15 Proportion of women among Deans of Faculties in the given year

| Number of indicator | 15. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among Deans of Faculties/Institutes in the given year |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
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| Definition of indicator | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the heads of the <br> Faculties/Institutes |
| :--- | :--- |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | - The total number of Deans of the Faculties/Institutes; Unit: head count (T) <br> - The number of women Deans of the Faculties/Institutes; Unit: head count (F) |
| Reference period | Year 2021 |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women among the heads of Faculties/Institutes in the given year = <br> F/T*100 |
| Specifications | The number of Deans of the Faculties depends on the structure of the organisation. <br> The indicator is based on the sum of all Deans of all Faculties in the organisation <br> and the sum of women Deans of the Faculties |
| Comments | Partners are invited to calculate specific indicator of women among Deans of <br> Faculties by research field. Partners from the universities are encouraged to collect <br> the proportion of women - heads among departments |

2.1.16 Proportion of women among Vice-Deans of Faculties

| Number of indicator | 16. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women among Vice-Deans of Faculties in the given year |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the deputy-directors heads <br> of the Faculties/Institutes |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | - The total number of the Vide-Deans of the Faculties/Institutes (T) <br> - The number of women Vice-Deans of the Faculties/Institutes. Units: Head <br> Counts (F) |
| Reference period | Year 2021 |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women among the deputy-directors of the Faculties/institutes in the <br> given year = F/T*100 |
| Specifications | The number of Vice-Deans of the Faculties depends on the structure of the <br> organisation. The indicator is based on the sum of all Deans of all Faculties in the <br> organisation and the sum of women Deans of the Faculties |
| Comments | Partners are invited to calculate specific indicator of women among vice Deans of <br> Faculties by research field. Partners from the universities are encouraged to collect <br> the proportion of women - heads among departments. |

## Gender balanced working conditions

### 2.1.17 Gender pay gap in the organisation based on gross average monthly wage

| Number of indicator | 17. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation based on average gross monthly earning |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
| Definition of indicator | GPG represents the difference between paid male employees' average gross monthly earnings and paid female employees as a percentage of paid male employees' average gross monthly earnings. All male and female employees should be included : <br> - no restrictions for age and hours worked, <br> - part-timers shall be included, <br> - gross monthly earnings shall include paid overtime and exclude non-regular payments <br> - no restrictions for a type of contract (fixed or indefinite) |
| Purpose/aim | In spite of more than 30 years of equal pay legislation, the gender pay gap has remained persistent across all Member States regardless of the overall level of women's employment, national welfare models or equality legislation. A gendersegregated labour market, the difficulty of balancing work and family life, the |


|  | undervaluation of women's skills and work are some of the complex causes of the <br> persistent gender pay gap |
| :--- | :--- |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | - Average gross monthly earnings of all women employees of the organisation <br> paid in the given year (F); Unit: EUR <br> Average gross monthly earnings all of men employees of the organisation paid <br> in the given year (M); Unit: EUR |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Gender pay gap (GPG) = (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male <br> employees - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female employees) / Average <br> gross monthly earnings of paid male employees (expressed in \%) = (M) F)/M * 100 |
| Comments | Partners are encouraged to propose specific indicators on GPG detailing the <br> structure of earnings., i.e. bonuses, extra pay, etc., or GPG disaggregated by the <br> type of working contract, working time and other variables. |

2.1.18 Gender pay gap in the organisation by R\&D occupations

| Number of indicator | 18. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation by R\&D occupations |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
| Definition of indicator | GPG in researchers, teacher (only), technicians, other staff (see the Frascati Manual). For the ATHENA project, the Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. Teachers (only) are employed persons who are only teaching but are not researchers, i.e. their working position (job title) and content do not include researcher/research/researching. This might apply to some employees in the universities. <br> GPG represents the difference between paid male employees' average gross monthly earnings and paid female employees as a percentage of paid male employees' average gross monthly earnings. All male and female employees should be included : <br> - no restrictions for age and hours worked, <br> - part-timers shall be included, <br> - gross monthly earnings shall include paid overtime and exclude non-regular payments <br> - no restrictions for a type of contract (fixed or indefinite) |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Average gross monthly earnings of researcher paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR (F; M) <br> - Average gross monthly earnings of teachers (only) paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR (F; M) <br> - Average gross monthly earnings of technicians paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR (F; M) <br> - Average gross monthly earnings of the staff paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR ( $\mathrm{F} ; \mathrm{M}$ ) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Gender pay gap (GPG) = (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male researchers - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female researchers) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male researchers (expressed in \%) = (M - F)/M * 100 <br> - Gender pay gap (GPG) = (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male teacher - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female teachers) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male teachers (expressed in \%) $=(M-F) / M$ * 100 <br> - Gender pay gap (GPG) = (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male technicians - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female technicians) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male technicians (expressed in \%) = (M - F)/M * 100 <br> - $\quad$ Gender pay gap $(G P G)=$ (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male other staff - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female other staff) / Average |


|  | gross monthly earnings of paid male other staff (expressed in \%) <br> 100 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Comments | Partners are encouraged to propose specific indicators on GPG detailing the <br> structure of earnings., i.e. bonuses, extra pay, etc., or GPG disaggregated by the <br> type of working contract, working time and other variables. |

### 2.1.19 Gender pay gap in the organisation among A-grade academics

| Number of indicator | 19. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation among A-grade academics |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
|  | Gender pay gap among researchers with A academic degree. The A. The single <br> highest grade/post at which research is usually conducted within the institutional or <br> corporate system - professors. <br> GPG represents the difference between the average gross monthly earnings of <br> paid A grade men and paid A grade women as a percentage of paid A Grade <br> men's average gross monthly earnings. All male and female A grade academics <br> should be included : <br> - no restrictions for age and hours worked, <br> - part-timers shall be included, <br> - $\quad$ gross monthly earnings shall include paid overtime and exclude non-regular <br> payments |
| no restrictions for a type of contract (fixed or indefinite) |  |

### 2.1.20 Proportion of persons employed part-time among researchers

| Number of indicator | 20. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of persons employed part-time among researchers by sex |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator compares the proportion of persons employed part-time among <br> female and male researchers. Part-time is even or less than 50\% of the usual <br> working time. Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and <br> researching, irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working <br> contract. |
| Purpose/aim | Women researchers often work part-time due to uneven distribution of care <br> responsibilities and lack of care facilities for children or other dependent members <br> of family. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Number of researchers working even or less than 50\% of the usual working time <br> by sex |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women working part- time = F/T*100; (\%) <br> Proportion of men working part-time $=\mathrm{M} /$ / $^{*} 100 ~(\%)$ |
| Comments | Partners are encouraged to propose specific indicator of researchers part-timers <br> disaggregated by field of research, age, number and age of children /family status. |

### 2.1.21 Proportion of persons with precarious working contracts among researchers

| Number of indicator | 21. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of persons with precarious working contracts among researchers, <br> by sex |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator compares the proportion of persons with precarious working <br> contracts among female and male researchers. Researchers with 'precarious <br> working contracts' are those with no contracts, with fixed-term contracts of up to <br> one year. Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, <br> irrespective of what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |
| Purpose/aim | Most affected are junior academic positions or other positions relying on third-party <br> funding. The existence and increase of precarious employment are subject to <br> debate throughout the EU. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Total number of employed researchers with no contract or with fixed-term <br> contract of up to one year (T) <br> Number of women - employed researchers with no contract or with fixed-term <br> contract of up to one year (F) |
| Reference period | Number of men - employed researchers with no contract or with fixed-term |
| contract of up to one year (M) |  |

2.1.22 Annual number of researchers on care leave by sex

| Number of indicator | 22. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Annual number of researchers on maternity/paternity or parental leave in the <br> given year by sex |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
|  | Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, <br> irrespective of the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. <br> The indicator shows the number of female and male researchers employed in the <br> organisation taking leave to care for child/children. It could be a maternal/paternal <br> or parental leave dedicated to personal care for children. Maternal or paternal <br> leave is usually a leave which are women and men entitled after the birth of a <br> child; parental leave is usually extended leave dedicated for personal care for a <br> child before starting school. Drawing leave due to the treatment of a child in illness <br> or other leave is excluded. |
| Definition of indicator | Women are disproportionately burdened with caring for children, and much more <br> often take maternity or parental leave, even though fathers are also entitled to <br> child care leave. |
| Purpose/aim | Total number of researchers employed in the organisation on the <br> maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year <br> - Number of women researchers employed in the organisation on the |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year |
| Reference period | Number of men researchers employed in the organisation on the <br> maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year |
| Computation/calculation | 2020 (or the latest available data) <br> - Number of men researchers on paternal or parental leave in the given year; <br> Number of women researchers on maternal or parental leave in the given year |

## Gender balance in research outputs

### 2.1.23 Funding success rate difference between women and men applying for the national funds

| Number of indicator | 23. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators <br> applying for the national research funds at the level of organisation for the given <br> year |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents research funding success-rate differences between women <br> and men principal investigators applying for the national research funds at the level <br> of organisation for the given year. A positive difference means that men have a <br> higher success rate, whereas a negative difference means that women have a <br> higher success rate. To calculate the rate, the number of applicants - principal <br> investigators by sex need to be available and can be used for other indicators. The <br> term principal investigator (PI) refers to the holder of an independent grant and the <br> lead researcher for the grant project (not project manager) |
| Purpose/aim | The European Research Council has recognised that imbalances persist in <br> women's success in their calls for funding. There is also a marked difference in the <br> propensity of women to apply for funding. <br> As such, this indicator looks at the differences in the success rate of men and <br> women when applying for research funding. The calculation of a success rate rather <br> than the use of raw numbers allows one to normalise for the total number of <br> applications. |

- Number of women applicants - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds (FA). Unit: Head count.
- Number of men applicants - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds (MA). Unit: Head count
Data needed and unit of measurement

| Reference period |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Computation/calculation |  |

Specifications
$\square$

Comments

- Number of women beneficiaries - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds; (FB); Unit: Head count.
- Number of men beneficiaries - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds; (MB); Unit: Head count.
2020 (or the latest available data)
Funding success rate in national funds $=(M B / M A)-(F B / F A)$
The list of national research funds taken into account is given in the methodological annex of the main She Figures publication; Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed01aa75ed71a1; p. 201;
No standard definition of funds exists, and the total number of funds varies significantly between the countries and over the time period being considered. However, in an attempt to harmonise the data on funds provided by Statistical Correspondents of different countries, it was requested that data should cover all publicly managed research funds (funds granted by institutions in the public sector, excluding private sector funding). Furthermore, Statistical Correspondents were asked to exclude from reporting any funds which allocate funding exclusively on a first-come, first-served basis, i.e. without other selection criteria; Partners are invited to proposed specific indicator where this indicator will be dissagragated by the R\&D field.
2.1.25 The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects from national funds

| Number of indicator | 25. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men <br> and women - principal investigators from national research funds at the level of <br> organisation for the given year (EUR) |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |


| Definition of indicator | The indicator shows the average amount of sources to awarded research projects conducted by men and women as principal investigators (leaders of the projects) by the national research funds; at the level of organisation for the given year (EUR) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of projects lead by women - principal investigators financially supported by national funds ( F ); Unit: number; <br> - Total amount of grants allocated to projects led by women - principal investigators from national funds ( $T_{f}$ ); Unit: EUR <br> - Number of projects lead by men - principal investigators financially supported by national funds (M); Unit: number; <br> - Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from national funds ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ); Unit: EUR |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Average grant's amount allocated to projects led by women - principal investigators from national funds $=T_{\mathrm{t}} / \mathrm{F}$ (EUR) <br> - Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigators from national funds $=T_{m} / M$ (EUR) |
| Specifications | The list of national research funds taken into account is given in the methodological annex of the main She Figures publication; Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed01aa75ed71a1; p. 201; |
| Comments | No standard definition of funds exists, and the total number of funds varies significantly between the countries and over the time period being considered. However, in an attempt to harmonise the data on funds provided by Statistical Correspondents of different countries, it was requested that data should cover all publicly managed research funds (funds granted by institutions in the public sector, excluding private sector funding). Furthermore, Statistical Correspondents were asked to exclude from reporting any funds which allocate funding exclusively on a first-come, first-served basis, i.e. without other selection criteria. Partners are invited to propose a specific indicator where the R\&D field will disaggregate this indicator. |

### 2.1.26 The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects from international

 funds| Number of indicator | 26. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and women - principal investigators from the international research funds, at the level of organisation, for the given year. |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator shows the average amount of sources to awarded research projects conducted by men and women principal investigators (leaders of the projects, not project managers) from the International research funds; at the level of organisation for the given year. |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | - Number of projects lead by women - principal investigators financially supported by international funds (F); Unit: number; <br> - Total amount of grants allocated to projects led by women - principal investigator from international funds ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{f}}$ ); Unit: EUR <br> - Number of projects lead by men - principal investigators financially supported by international funds (M); Unit: number; <br> - Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from international funds ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}}$ ); Unit: EUR |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | - Average grant's amount allocated to projects led by women - principal investigators from international funds $=T_{f} / F$ (EUR) <br> - Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigators from international funds $=\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{m}} / \mathrm{M}$ (EUR) |


|  | The international research funds are all funds dedicated to R\&D at the EU level <br> and other countries' funds, excluding the national funds of the partners country of <br> residence. The list of national research funds taken into account is given in the <br> methodological annex of the main She Figures publication; Available at: <br> https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed- <br> Specifications <br> O1aa75ed71a1; ; . 201; |
| :--- | :--- |
| Comments | Partners are invited to propose a specific indicator where the R\&D fields will <br> disaggregate this indicator. |

### 2.1.27 Funding success rate difference between women and men national coordinators applying for the international funds

| Number of indicator | 27. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Funding success rate difference between women and men national coordinators <br> within international consortium applying for the international research funds (at <br> the level of organisation) for the given year. |
| Type of indicator | Core and compulsory |
| Gender dimension of the |  |
| indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents research funding success-rate differences between <br> women and men as national coordinators within an international consortium in <br> international funding schemes. A positive difference means that men have a <br> higher success rate whereas a negative difference means that women have a <br> higher success rate. |
| Purpose/aim | The European Research Council has recognised that imbalances persist in <br> women's success in their calls for funding. There is also a marked difference in <br> the propensity of women to apply for funding. <br> As such, this indicator looks at the differences in the success rate of men and <br> women when applying for research funding. The calculation of a success rate <br> rather than the use of raw numbers allows one to normalise for the total number of <br> applications. |
| - Number of women applicants - national coordinators within an international |  |
| consortium of research funding for a given year in international funds (FA). |  |
| Unit: Head count. |  |

### 2.2 Advanced GEA indicators GEA

## The pool of graduate talents

2.2.1 Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of ISCED 8 graduates by sex

| Number of indicator | 1. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of ISCED 8 graduates by sex in last 5 <br> years (2016-2020) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of graduates by <br> sex, meaning the average percentage growth each year for women and men <br> graduates in a given period for graduates at ISCED 8 level. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Number of women ISCED 8 graduates in a start and an end year (F) . Unit: <br> - Number of men ISCED 8 graduates in a start and an end year (M) . Unit: <br> Number. <br> Number of years in reference period (calculated by subtracting the defined <br> start year from the defined end year) (N). Unit: Number. |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |

2.2.2 Ratio of ISCED 8 entrants to ISCED 7 graduates, by sex and field of study

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Ratio of ISCED 8 entrants to ISCED 7 graduates, by sex and broad field of study |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator is the ratio of ISCED 8 entrants to ISCED 7 graduates, broken down <br> by sex, broad field of study and country. The segregation between female and <br> male scientists is already connected to early segregation in education pathways <br> chosen by young women and men. The indicator helps assess the propensity of <br> women and men who graduate from ISCED level 7 to continue to ISCED level 8 <br> studies. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 20 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.3 Ratio of ISCED 8 graduates to ISCED 8 entrants, by sex and broad field of study

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Ratio of ISCED 8 graduates to ISCED 8 entrants, by sex and broad field of study |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator is the ratio of ISCED 8 graduates to ISCED 8 entrants, broken <br> down by sex, broad field of study and country. The indicator shows the level of <br> progress in increasing women's representation in the top levels of education and <br> research, considering their success, as well as that of men, in graduation at <br> ISCED level 8. The broad fields of study according to the ISCED-F classification <br> of fields of education and training are the following: <br> 00 Generic programmes and qualifications <br> 01 Education |


|  | 02 Arts and humanities |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 03 Social sciences, journalism and information |
|  | 04 Business, administration and law |
|  | 05 Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics |
|  | 06 Information and Communication Technologies |
|  | 07 Engineering, manufacturing and construction |
|  | 08 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary |
|  | 09 Health and welfare |
|  | 10 Services. |
| Data needed and unit of | For the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at: |
| measurement | https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c- |
|  | 11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; page 23 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.4 Proportion of women (continuing) in post-doc jobs out of the ISCED 8 graduates

| Number of indicator | 4. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women (continuing) in post-doc jobs out of the ISCED 8 <br> graduates in the given year. |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | The pool of graduate talents <br> Definition of indicator |
| Data needed and unit of <br> to work as researcher in the organisation. |  |
| measurement | Number of all ISCED 8 graduates in the given year (T) <br> Number of women ISCED 8 graduates continuing in the post -doc job in the <br> organisation in the given year (F) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) <br> Computation/calculationProportion (\%) of women (continuing) in post-doc jobs out of the ISCED 8 <br> graduates = F/T*100 (\%) |

## Gender balance in research

2.2.5 Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of people in employment in the organisation, by sex

| Number of indicator | 5. |
| :---: | :---: |
| Title of indicator | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of people in employment in the organisation, by sex in the last 5 years (2016-2020) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the average yearly growth in the number of women and men in total employment. |
| Data needed and unit of measurement | Number of women in employment (aged 25-64) in a start and an end year (F) Unit: Number. <br> Number of men in employment (aged 25-64) in a start and an end year (M) Unit: Number. <br> Number of years in the reference period (calculated by subtracting the defined start year from the defined end year) (N). Unit: Number. |
| Reference period | 2016-2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | The compound annual growth rate shows the average rate of growth per year for a given period. In this case, it shows the average percentage growth of women employees and men employees in a given period: <br> CAGR of women in employment $=(\mathrm{FeFs}) 1 / \mathrm{N}-1$ <br> CAGR of men in employment $=(\mathrm{MeMs}) 1 \mathrm{~N}-1$ <br> where: <br> $s$ refers to the start year; <br> $e$ refers to the end year; <br> $N$ denotes the number of years in the reference period (in other words, $e-s)$; |


|  | Fs denotes the number of women in employment in the start year; |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Fe denotes the number of women in employment in the end year; |
|  | $M s$ denotes the number of men in employment in the start year; |
|  | Me denotes the number of men in employment in the end year. |
| Specifications | For the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at: <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc- <br> 447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en ; PAGE 27. |

2.2.6 Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of researchers, by sex in last 5 years

| Number of indicator | 6. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of researchers, by sex in last 5 <br> years |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the average yearly growth in the number of women <br> and men in total number of researchers in the organisation during the last 5 <br> years |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; <br> PAGE 53 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.7 Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of female researchers by field of R\&D

| Number of indicator | 7. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of female researchers by field of <br> Research and Development |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator shows the average yearly growth in the female researchers in the 6 <br> main fields of R\&D: (Frascati Manual): natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) <br> - humanities and arts (H). |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 62 <br> 2020 the latest available data) |
| Reference period |  |

### 2.2.8 Dissimilarity Index for researchers in the organisation

| Number of indicator | 8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Dissimilarity Index for researchers in the organisation |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator | The Dissimilarity Index (DI) provides a theoretical measurement of the <br> percentage of women and men in a field of R\&D who would have to move <br> to another field of R\&D to ensure that the proportions of women were the <br> same across all the possible fields of R\&D. It can therefore be interpreted <br> as the hypothetical distance from a balanced sex distribution across fields <br> of R\&D, based upon the overriding proportion of women (National Science <br> Foundation, 2000). |


| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; <br> PAGE 87 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference period | 2020 the latest available data) |

2.2.9 Proportion of women among grade A staff, by age group
\(\left.\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { Number of indicator } & 9 \\
\hline \text { Title of indicator } & \text { Proportion of women among grade A staff, by age group } \\
\hline \text { Type of indicator } & \text { Advanced and voluntary } \\
\hline \begin{array}{l}\text { Gender dimension of the } \\
\text { indicator }\end{array} & \text { Gender balance in research } \\
\hline \text { Definition of indicator } & \begin{array}{l}\text { The indicators shows the proportion of female professors or any other the } \\
\text { highest academic grade A. The single highest grade / post at which research is } \\
\text { normally conducted within the institutional or corporate system Age cohorts: 25- } \\
34 ; 35-44 ; ~ 45-54 ; ~ 55-64 ; ~ 65 ~ a n d ~ o v e r ; ~ u n i t ~ o f ~ a n a l y s i s-~ t h e ~ U n i v e r s i t y ~ a s ~ a ~\end{array} \\
\text { whole }\end{array}
$$\right] \begin{array}{l}For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br>
Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br>

/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 127\end{array}\right\}\)| 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| :--- |
| Data needed and unit of |
| measurement |

## Gender balanced career advancement

### 2.2.10 Proportion (\%) of women applicants for the position of a researcher

| Number of indicator | 10 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women applicants for the position of a researcher over the <br> last 5 years (2016-2020) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator presents percentage of women applicants for the position of a <br> researcher over the 5 last years out of all persons applied for the position for <br> the researcher at the university. Position of researchers could involve <br> research and teaching activities, irrespective of s the \% of teaching or <br> researching in the working contract. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Total number of persons applied for the position of a researcher over the last <br> 5 years (T); <br> Number of women who applied for the position of the researcher in the last 5 <br> years (F) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women applicants for the position of a research over the last 5 <br> years = F/T*100 (\%) (2016-2020) |

### 2.2.11 Proportion of women who proceed in the recruitment process for the position of a researcher

| Number of indicator | 11. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion (\%) of women who proceed in the recruitment process for the <br> position of a researcher over the last 5 years $(2016-2020)$ |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator presents the percentage of women who proceed in the <br> recruitment process; i.e. were invited to the second phase of the recruitment |


|  | process, were short-listed, invited for job interviews, invited to testing, etc.) <br> for the position of a researcher out of the all persons proceeding in the <br> recruitment process over the last 5 years (2016-2020). Position of <br> researchers could involve research and teaching activities, irrespective of s <br> the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Total number of persons who proceeded to second phase of the recruitment <br> process for the position of a researcher over the last 5 years (T); <br> Number of women who proceeded to the second phase of the recruitment <br> process for the position of a researcher over the last 5 years (F) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion (\%) of women who proceeded to the second phase of the <br> recruitment process over the last 5 years = F/T*100 (\%) (2016-2020) |

2.2.12 Proportion of women newly hired as researchers

| Number of indicator | 12. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Proportion of women newly hired as researchers over the last 5 years ( 2016 <br> $-2020)$ |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator presents the percentage of women newly hired as researchers <br> over the last 5 years (2016-2020) out of all newly hired persons as <br> researchers in the organisation. Position of researchers could involve <br> research and teaching activities, irrespective of s the \% of teaching or <br> researching in the working contract. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | Total number of persons newly hired as researchers over the last 5 years <br> (T); <br> Number of women who were newly hired as researchers in the last 5 years <br> (F) |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Proportion of women newly hired as researchers over the last 5 years = <br> F/T*100 (\%) (2016-2020) |

### 2.2.13 Sex differences in international mobility during PhD

| Number of indicator | 13 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Sex differences in international mobility during PhD |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |
| Definition of indicator | The indicators show the difference in the percentage of female / male <br> researchers who - during their PhD - moved for at least three months to a <br> country other than that where they attained (or will attain) their PhD. It covers <br> researchers in the early stages of their careers |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE <br> 101 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

### 2.2.14 Sex differences in international mobility in post-PhD career stages

| Number of indicator | 14. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Sex differences in international mobility in post-PhD career stages |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |


| Definition of indicator | The indicators present the percentage point difference in the proportion of <br> female/male researchers who - in the last 10 years - have worked abroad for <br> at least three months in a country other than the country where they attained <br> their highest educational degree. It focuses on researchers in the post-PhD <br> phases of their careers |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE <br> 104 |
|  | 2020 (or the latest available data) |

## Gender balance in decision making

### 2.2.15 Glass Ceiling Index

| Number of indicator | 15. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Glass Ceiling Index |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
|  | The Glass Ceiling Index (GCI) is a relative index comparing the proportion of <br> women in academia (grades A, B, and C) to the proportion of women in top <br> academic positions (grade A positions; equivalent to full professorships in most <br> countries), for a given year. The GCI can range from 0 to infinity. A GCI of 1 <br> indicates that there is no difference between women and men in the chance of <br> being promoted. A score of less than 1 means that women are over-represented at <br> grade A level and a GCI score of more than 1 points towards a glass ceiling effect, <br> meaning that women are under-represented in grade A positions. In other words, <br> the interpretation of the GCl is that the higher the value, the stronger the glass |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en ; PAGE 125 |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |

## Gender balanced working conditions

2.2.16 Number of days the women researchers have been on maternity or parental leave

| Number of indicator | 16. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Number of days the women researchers have been on maternity or parental leave <br> in the given year |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
|  | Total number of working days women researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year. Conditioned by the national policies of maternal <br> and parental leave; researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and <br> researching, irrespective what is the percentage of teaching or researching in their <br> working contract. Researchers are professionals engaged in the conception or <br> creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop <br> concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentation, software or operational <br> methods (\$5.35, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015) |
| Definition of indicator <br> measurement | Total number of working days women researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year; Unit: Number |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Computation/calculation | Total number of working days women researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year |

2.2.17 Number of days the men researchers have been on maternity or parental leave

| Number of indicator | 17. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Number of days the men researchers have been on maternity or parental leave <br> in the given year |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
|  | Total number of working days men researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year. Conditioned by the national policies of maternal <br> and parental leave; researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and <br> researching, irrespective what is the percentage of teaching or researching in <br> their working contract. Researchers are professionals engaged in the <br> conception or creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or <br> develop concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentation, software or <br> operational methods (§5.35, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015) |
| Purpose/aim indicator | Total number of working days men researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year. Unit: Number |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | 2020 (or the latest available data) |
| Reference period | Total number of working days men researchers have been on the maternity or <br> parental leave in the given year. |
| Computation/calculation |  |

## Gender balance in research outputs

2.2.18 Ratio of women to men scientific authorships employed in the organisation

| Number of indicator | 18. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Ratio of women to men scientific authorships employed in the organisation in the <br> given year. |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator is the ratio of publications authored by a woman to those authored <br> by men. It is based on peer-reviewed scientific publications (articles, reviews, <br> conference papers). A score above 1 indicates that women in a given country <br> contribute more to the research output than men whereas a score below 1 <br> means the opposite. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 141 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.19 Ratio of women to men international co-publication rate

| Number of indicator | 19. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Ratio of women to men international co-publication rate |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | It should be noted that international collaboration (i.e., international co- <br> publication) in this report is indicated by articles with at least two different <br> countries listed in the authorship by-line. If both countries are EU Member States <br> or within the 44 countries analysed, the collaboration type is referred to as Intra- <br> EU28 and Intra-EU28+ Collaboration respectively. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 143 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

### 2.2.20 Percent of a country's research output integrating a sex or gender dimension (SGDRC)

| Number of indicator | 20. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Percent of a country's research output integrating a sex or gender dimension in <br> its research content (SGDRC) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | The indicator shows the proportion of peer-reviewed publications that integrate <br> gender or sex-sensitive analysis and the impact of these publications, broken <br> down by field and country. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 152 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.21 Inventors Index - Ratio of women to men invention patenting rate

| Number of indicator | 20. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Inventors Index - Ratio of women to men invention patenting rate (in the last 5 <br> years) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs <br> Definition of indicatorThe indicator shows gender balance in innovation patterning. The indicator could <br> be split into applications and gained patents. |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 161 |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.22 Funding success rate difference from national research funds by field of R\&D

| Number of indicator | 22. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators <br> applying for the national research funds (for the national research funds see <br> legend) (at the level of organisation) by the main fields of R\&D (see Frascati <br> Manual in the Legend) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the core indicator no. 23 by the main fields of R\&D: The <br> following abbreviations are used: <br> - natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) <br> - humanities (H) <br> - multi-disciplinary (MU) <br> • unknown (U). |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.23 Funding success rate difference from international research funds R\&D fields Number of indicator 23.

## www.athenaequality.eu

| Title of indicator | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators <br> applying for the international research funds (at the level of organisation) by the main <br> fields of R\&D (see Frascati Manual in the Legend) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension <br> of the indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of | This indicator presents the core indicator no. 24 by the main fields of R\&D: The <br> following abbreviations are used: <br> - natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> indicator |
| - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) <br> - humanities (H) <br> - multi-disciplinary (MU) <br> • unknown (U). |  |
| Reference period | the latest available data) |

2.2.24 The average grants' amounts allocated from national funds by fields R\&D

| Number of indicator | 24. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and <br> women - principal investigators (national research funds) (at the level of <br> organisation) by the main fields of R\&D (see Frascati Manual in the Legend) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of <br> the indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the core indicator no. 25 by the main fields of R\&D: The <br> following abbreviations are used: <br> - natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> • agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) |
| • humanities (H) |  |
| - multi-disciplinary (MU) |  |
| - unknown (U). |  |

2.2.25 The average grants' amounts allocated from international funds by fields R\&D

| Number of indicator | 25. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men <br> and women - principal investigators (international research funds) (at the level <br> of organisation) by the main fields of R\&D (see Frascati Manual in the Legend) |
| Type of indicator | Advanced and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator | This indicator presents the core indicator no. 26 by the main fields of R\&D: The <br> following abbreviations are used: <br> - natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) <br> - social sciences (SS) <br> - humanities (H) <br> - multi-disciplinary (MU) <br> - unknown (U). |
| Reference period | 2020 (or the latest available data) |

### 2.3 Specific GEA indicators

This is a space for specific indicators for your organisation. Please use the prescribe gender dimensions or suggest additional.
2.3.1 The pool of graduate talents

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator |  |
| Type of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | The pool of graduate talents |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 2.3.2 Gender balance in research

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator |  |
| Type of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 2.3.3 Gender balanced career advancement

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Type of indicator | Gender balanced career advancement |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator |  |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 2.3.4 Gender balance in decision making

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator |  |
| Type of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in decision making |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
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| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 2.3.5 Gender balanced working conditions

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Type of indicator |  |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balanced working conditions |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

### 2.3.6 Gender balance in research outputs

| Number of indicator |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator |  |
| Type of indicator | Specific and voluntary |
| Gender dimension of the <br> indicator | Gender balance in research outputs |
| Definition of indicator |  |
| Purpose/aim |  |
| Data needed and unit of <br> measurement |  |
| Reference period |  |
| Computation/calculation |  |
| Specifications |  |
| Comments |  |

## 3. Qualitative GEA indicators

Practical instructions

## The scale to assess the qualitative indicators is as follow:

| 1 | $=$ | Was never implemented |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $=$ | Planned to be implemented |
| 3 | $=$ | Was implemented in the past |
| 4 | $=$ | Currently being implemented |
| 5 | $=$ | In place but not used |
| DK | Don't know/No information available; N/A |  |
| Other (specify) | $=$ | Include comments or specify your answer |

## Parameter

Applies for all qualitative indicators
athena
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| Number of indicator | Indicates the number of the indicator in the online assessment tool. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Title of indicator | Describes the measure, policy or aspect that is the subject to be <br> assessed at the scale |
| Type of indicator | All qualitative indicators are compulsory to be assessed and will <br> complement the core quantitative indicators to describe the baseline <br> situation and help to draft the Gender Equality Plan. |
| Gender dimension of the indicator | The gender dimensions indicate similar aspects of the gendered <br> environment relevant to organisational change. The gender <br> dimensions also indicate the baseline situation analysis structure for <br> drawing up the Gender Equality Plan. |
| Scope of the indicators | The scope of the indicator refers to the overall situation at the level <br> of the whole university/organisation. Nevertheless, the situation <br> might differ by faculties, department or other organisational parts. <br> Please assess the whole university/organisation as a whole; if the <br> situation is significantly different in some faculties or departments, <br> please indicate this in the option "Other (specify)". |
| Frame/explanation/definition of the | Description of the measure, policy or aspect of the gendered <br> environment relevant to the organisational change; outline the essential <br> characteristics of the aspect that is the subject for assessment at the <br> scale. If the description in this handbook does significantly differ from <br> your situation, please indicated this in the option "Other (specify)" of the <br> online questionnaire. |
| indicator | All qualitative indicators refer to the last two years (2019 -2020) to <br> encompass the pre-pandemic situation. When the measure is <br> "planned to be implemented", refer, please, to 2021 and beyond. |
| Reference period | Partners are invited to use the option "other (specify)" to comment on <br> the indicator; include details and specificities; these will help to <br> understand the situation at your university/organisation |
| Comments | The online assessment tool is available at The online assessment tool <br> will be distributed at Gender Audit Indicators assessment |
| Link |  |

### 3.1 The pool of graduate talents

(Questions no. 4 and 5. In the online assessment tool)

| No. | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Gender as a topic of research | Gender as a subject of research is promoted as a topic of dissertations and diploma theses, research project calls. |
| 2. | Scholarships or career development grants for female scientists | Specific scholarships and career development grants devoted to female students/scientists are available |
| 3. | Support for dual-career couples | The support for dual-career couples working as scientists/researcher is established |
| 4. | Career coaching for female scientists | Specific gender-sensitive career coaching for female scientists is available |
| 5. | Fellowship for women students and researchers only | The fellowship specifically offered to female students/researchers only is in place (alternative: specific fellowship for the underrepresented gender in the study/research field (less than $30-40 \%$ ) |
| 6. | Specific seminars on academic publishing for women students/scientists | Training on the specificities on academies publishing for women students/scientists is offered. |
| 7. | Gender balance is taken into account in recruitment | The organisation has an overview/knowledge on the gender in/balance in the academic/research staff and take this into account in the recruitment plans |
| 8. | Formulation of the job/position offers are in a gender-balanced form | The job offers formulation takes into account the grammatical gender and do not use generic masculinum (i.e. term on functions/jobs involving both women and men only by masculine grammatical gender) |
| 9. | Applicants of all genders invited in a job offer, but | The jobs formulation contains a welcoming encouragement to apply for women or men if underrepresented in the field of advertised position |


|  | underrepresented gender is <br> emphasised | (underrepresentation of one gender means less than 40\% representation of <br> one gender) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10. | The advertisement for <br> internal promotions <br> ensures an equal level of <br> information | The formulation of the advertisement of the internal promotions is gender- <br> sensitive, the criteria of promotion are clear, the information of the <br> procedure of the internal promotion is comprehensive, and everything is <br> publicly available and accessible for both genders. |
| 11. | Policy of non-discrimination <br> in recruitment on the <br> ground of gender. | The procedure of recruitment is clearly set, the criteria of assessment are <br> standardised and quantified to the highest possible rate; the gender of <br> applicants is not revealed if possible (assured by anonymisation of the <br> tests and other part or recruitment); the criteria of assessment are not <br> discriminatory for neither of the genders; e.g. the maternity or paternity <br> leave is taken into account in years worked, etc. |

### 3.2 Gender balance in research

(Questions no. 6 in the online assessment tool)

| No. | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 12. | A dedicated organisational <br> arrangement (office, <br> contact person, etc.) aimed <br> at change towards gender <br> equality | The organisation has an institutional background to support gender equality <br> in the organisation and research |
| 13. | Gender equality action plan <br> (GEP) | An essential instrument for progress towards gender equality in the <br> development and implementation of targeted gender equality plans. This <br> requires the development of a comprehensive policy mix, which addresses <br> any problematic aspects (e.g. gender gaps and their origin) revealed in a <br> gender analysis |
| 14. | Monitoring and continuous <br> evaluation of the GEP | The monitoring mechanisms and responsible body for GEP evaluation are <br> set; the period of assessment is set; in case unintended consequences <br> generating further or new gender imbalance or discrimination, the update of <br> the GEP is assured |
| 15. | Gender budgetingGender budgeting is a strategy to achieve equality between women and <br> men by focusing on how public resources are collected and spent. The <br> gender budgeting purposes are: (a) to promote accountability and <br> transparency in fiscal planning; (b) to increase gender responsive <br> participation in the budget process, for example, by undertaking steps to <br> involve women and men equally in budget preparation; (c) to advance <br> gender equality and women's rights (source: EIGE) |  |
| 16. | Women networks <br> established | Women networks of students, researchers/scientists or female employee <br> overall are established at the university/institute level |
| 17. | External alliances of <br> organisations with an <br> outstanding reputation for <br> gender equality created | External networks and alliances with research organisations with an <br> outstanding reputation for GE are created. |
| 18. | GE awareness-raising <br> activities for students | Awareness-raising activities for students on gender equality in the <br> organisation/tertiary education sector (dedicated web-page, campaigns, <br> workshops, awards, competitions, etc.) are in place |
| 19. | GE awareness-raising <br> activities for staff | Awareness-raising activities for employees on gender equality in the <br> organisation/tertiary education sector (dedicated web-page, training, <br> campaigns, workshops, awards, etc.) are in place |

### 3.3 Gender balanced career advancement

(Question no. 7 in the online assessment tool)

| No | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20. | Age limit extended in calls <br> for female researchers with <br> children under a certain age | The programmes and calls for young researcher/staff take into account the <br> parental duties of women that predominantly care for children under <br> three/six years and do not discriminate them based on age limits or years <br> worked. |
| 21. | Mentoring programmes for <br> female employees | The organisation provides mentoring programmes for female employees <br> corresponding to the gender imbalances in the organisation. The mentoring <br> programmes do not employ women employees and put further burden on <br> their workload. |
| 22. | Gender training for <br> employees | Organisation offers training on gender equality in the organisation and <br> research on a regular basis |
| 23. | Equal access to internal <br> training | The organisation assures that both men and women have equal access to <br> internal training, e.g., the adequate timing and form of the training, financial <br> support, etc. |
| 24. | Specific sabbatical for <br> women scientists | The possibility of scientific sabbatical to be taken by women scientists only <br> is in place |

### 3.4 Gender balance in decision making

(Question no. 8 in the online assessment tool)

| No | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 25. | Gender-integrated <br> leadership programme | To support women in decision-making position, specific leadership <br> programmes are provided |
| 26. | Gender training for <br> managers | Training to increase the gender competencies of the managers (heads of <br> faculties/institutes, decision-making committees, etc. ) are provided. |
| 27. | Targets/quotas for gender <br> balance in boards and <br> committees | Quotas or targets for the more gender-balanced representation in boards <br> and committees are set (e.g. the composition of a board should be at least <br> $30 \%$ of the underrepresented gender |

### 3.5 Gender balanced working conditions

(Question no. 9. and 10. in the online assessment tool)

| No | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 28. | Equal pay measures | The organisation has set equal pay measures which are publicly accessible <br> for all employees; the measures assure equal pay for the same work and <br> the work of equal/comparable value |
| 29. | Pay transparency policies | The organisation has clear pay transparency policies to avoid <br> discriminatory remuneration based on sex/gender, age, family status, <br> ethnicity, disability, and other possible grounds of discrimination. |
| 30. | Gender pay audits/equality <br> pay reports prepared and <br> publicly available | The organisation regularly compiles gender pay audits or reports on the <br> pay of the male and female employees (and make the information publicly <br> available) |
| 31. | Appropriated workload and <br> content of the work policy | A policy for assurance is in place that the workload of the employees is <br> reasonable and respect their contracts; it does not constitute precarious <br> and unsafe working conditions, e.g. burnout, disproportionate stress and <br> unfulfillable working tasks, etc. |
| 32. | Healthy and safe <br> workplace/university <br> environment policy | Policy of Health and Safety is in place; The workplace meets the health and <br> safety regulations for all; for example, protect pregnant employees/students <br> from unsafe circumstances; prevent chronic occupational diseases, etc. |
| 33. | Non-discriminatory <br> equipment necessary for <br> work/research measures | The necessary equipment is provided equally for both genders. It does not <br> show any signs of unequal or discriminatory treatment of men and women <br> (e.g. laboratory equipment, access to scientific databases, software, etc.) |
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| 34. | Possibility to work part-time | The employees of the organisation can work part-time ((less than $50 \%$ or <br> $50 \%$ of usual working time) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 35. | Flexitime | The employees of the organisation have a possibility to arrange a flexible <br> working time. |
| 36. | Telework | The organisation employees have a possibility to use telework (i.e. working <br> remotely, home office, etc. ) beyond the period of pandemic measures. |
| 37. | Maternity institutional policy | The organisation has its maternity institutional policy for <br> students/employees (advanced - the maternity support measures go <br> beyond the national policy provisions) |
| 38. | Paternity institutional policy | The organisation has its institutional paternity policy for <br> students/employees (advanced - the fatherhood support goes beyond the <br> national policy provisions) |
| 39. | Child care support (internal <br> kindergarten, on- <br> demand/flexible child care <br> support, etc.) | Organisation provides internal kindergarten services or on-demand/flexible <br> child care support for the employees/students |
| 40. | Support/subsidise childcare <br> services | The organisation financially support/subsidise the internal childcare <br> services; e.g. pays a part of the fee for the services, food for children, the <br> wages for the educators, rent for the premises etc. |
| 41. | Support for re-entry after <br> leave periods | The organisation has in/formal mechanisms to support employees in the re- <br> entry after the leave period (e.g., maintaining contact during the leave <br> period, guaranteeing the re-entry to the same position, etc.) |
| 42. | Teaching free period after <br> returning from parental <br> leave | A period freed from teaching after returning from parental/maternal/paternal <br> leave available for women and men employees |
| 43. | Family and baby-friendly <br> environment for <br> employees/students | The organisation provides baby changing facilities and room for <br> breastfeeding upon demand to facilitate the reconciliation of work/research <br> and family responsibilities |
| 44. | Policy on care for <br> elder/dependent family <br> members of employees | The organisation provides support for caring for employees' elders and/or <br> dependent family members (special days off to accompany an ill family <br> member to hospital, adjusted work arrangement in case of long-term care, <br> etc.) |

(Question no. 11 in the online assessment tool)

| No | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 45 | Internal <br> guidelines/measures on the <br> use of non-sexist language <br> in internal and external <br> communication | The guideline on gender-sensitive language is compiled ; the internal rules <br> on non-sexist language set and publicly available |
| 46 | Bodies mandated to <br> implement and monitor <br> policy of 'non-discrimination <br> on the basis of gender.' | The responsible bodies with the mandate to objectively and independently <br> monitor the anti-discrimination on gender are established. |
| 47 | Specific <br> person/committee/commissi <br> on responsible for <br> harassment at the <br> institutional level | A dedicated committee set; If already set but not effective or not applied, <br> tick the option "In place but not applied". |
| 48 | Protocol for preventing and <br> tackling sexual harassment <br> and gender-based violence | Protocol on how to proceed in the sexual harassment and gender-based <br> violence cases in place; If in place but not effective or not applied, tick the <br> option "In place but not applied" |
| 49 | Promotion of awareness <br> measures to prevent <br> harassment, sexist attitudes | Promotion of awareness measures to prevent harassment and sexist <br> attitudes is in place |

### 3.6 Gender balance in research outputs

## (Question no. 12 in the online assessment tool)

| No | Title of the indicator | Frame/explanation/definition of the indicator |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 50 | Gender lectureships to <br> assist faculties/departments <br> on how to mainstream <br> gender equality | The gender lectureship for faculties/units on the substance and <br> implementing mainstream gender equality is available. |
| 51 | Integration of a gender- <br> sensitive approach into <br> teaching | The principles/ guideline how to integrate a gender-sensitive approach in <br> teaching is available |
| 52 | Integration of gender <br> analysis into research | The organisation has a specific guideline on integration of the gender <br> analysis into the research |
| 53 | Integration of women's and <br> gender studies into the <br> curriculum of <br> bachelor/Master courses | The university offers women's and gender studies courses in the <br> curriculum of bachelor or master study programmes |
| 54 | The gender perspective in <br> the research funding <br> schemes | The gender perspective in the research funding schemes is assured by a <br> guideline/principles to be followed |
| 55 | The integration of the <br> gender perspective in <br> submitted and funded <br> projects; | The integration of the gender perspective in submitted and funded projects; <br> is assured by a guideline/principles to be followed |
| 56 | Finances for research <br> projects primarily devoted <br> to gender aspects <br> allocated. | A financial resource to research projects primarily devoted to gender <br> aspects is allocated. |
| 57 | Sex-segregated data on <br> research funds | The sex-segregated data on research funds is incorporated in the data <br> collection system and regularly collected, processed and publicly available |
| 58 | Sex-disaggregated data <br> about students | The sex-segregated data on students (applicants, enrolled, in <br> bachelor/master/PhD study programs and graduates) are incorporated in <br> the data collection system and regularly collected, processed and publicly <br> available |
| 59 | Sex-disaggregated data <br> about staff | The sex-segregated data on staff and occupation (researchers, <br> technicians, administration) are incorporated in the data collection system <br> and regularly collected, processed, and publicly available |

## Tool for quantitative GEA indicators collection

| CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | women <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| The pool of graduate talents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. | Proportion (\%) of women among PhD (ISCED 8 studies) applicants | This indicator presents the proportion of women applying for PhD study out of total filed applications for doctoral studies in the given year. | Number of women applicants for PhD. Study program (number) (F) Number of total applicants for PhD. Study program (number) (T) | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women applicants among total number of applicants for PhD. study program $=$ F/T*100 (\%) | 100,0 |  |  |  |
| 2. | Proportion (\%) of women among all PhD (ISCED 8 studies) students and (2b) new PhD (ISCED 8) students in the given year | This indicator presents the proportion of all women ISCED 8 students to the total ISCED 8 students in the given year. The unit of analysis is the whole university or research organisation | Number of all women ISCED 8 students. Unit: Number (F) Number of total ISCED 8 students. Unit (number) ( T ) | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women among ISCED 8 students $=F / T^{*} 100(\%)$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | This indicator is a subindicator of the indicator no. 2 and presents the proportion of women who are the new ISCED 8 students in the given year. | Number of new ISCED 8 students in the given year (T) . Unit: Number ; Number of new women ISCED 8 students in the given year ( F ) | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women among new ISCED 8 students in the given year = F/T*100 (\%) | 100,0 |  |  |  |
| 3. | Proportion (\%) of women among PhD (ISCED 8 studies) graduates in 2016 and 2020 | This indicator presents the proportion of women ISCED 8 graduates to the total ISCED 8 graduates. | Number of ISCED 8 graduates in 2016. Unit: Number. | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women among ISCED 8 graduates = F/T*100 in 2016 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduates in 2020. Unit: Number. | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women among ISCED 8 graduates = F/T*100 in 2020 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
| 4. | Distribution <br> (\%) of ISCED <br> 8 graduates across broad fields of study, by sex | This indicator identifies the horizontal gender segregation; presents the distribution of ISCED 8 graduates by | Number of ISCED 8 graduates (all broad fields of study), by sex. Unit: Number |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | sex and broad field of study (For broad study fields classification go the legend sheet - see the ISCED-F classification) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Generic programmes and qualifications field study (G), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across the Generic programmes and qualifications FG/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across the Generic programmes and qualifications MG/M* 100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Education field study (E ), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Education FE/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across Education ME/M* 100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Social sciences, journalism and information (S), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Social sciences..FS/F*10 0 ; Distribution of men graduated across Social sciences... MS/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Business, administration and law (B), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Business... FB/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across business MB/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics (N), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Natural sciences... <br> FN/F*100; <br> Distribution of men graduated across Natural sciences... MN/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Information and Communication Technologies (I), by sex | , | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Information.... FI/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Information ...MI/M*100 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Engineering, manufacturing and construction (EN) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Engineering... FEN/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across Engineering MEN/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary (A), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across agriculture... FA/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across Agriculture MA/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Health and welfare (H), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Health..... FH/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across Health MH/M* 100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality to un
research potential

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of ISCED 8 graduations in Services. (SE), by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women graduated across Services... FSE/F*100; Distribution of men graduated across Services MES/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  | Gender balance in research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Proportion (\%) of women among total number of employees in the organisation (all types of contract) | This indicator presents the proportion of women in total employment in the organisation in the given year. | Number of all persons employed in the organisation. Number of women employed in the organisation. Unit: number | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women among total employment $=F / T^{*} 100(\%)$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. | Proportion (\%) of women among total number of employed researchers in the organisation (2016 and 2020) | Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the percentage of teaching or researching in their working contract. <br> Researchers are professionals engaged in the conception or creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentatio n , software or operational methods (§5.35, | Number of all researchers employed in 2016. Unit: Head count; Number of women researchers employed in 2016. Unit: Head count | $1$ | 1 |  | Proportion (\%) of women among total number of employed researchers = $F / T^{*} 100$ in 2016 | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Frascati Manual, <br> OECD, 2015). <br> This indicator encompass all Grade academics working as researchers ( i.e. professor, associate professors, post-docs, etc.; see the Academic grade classification in the legend) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of all researchers employed in 2020. Unit: Head count; Number of women researchers employed in 2020. Unit: Head count | $1$ | 1 |  | Proportion (\%) of women among total number of employed researchers = F/T*100 in 2020 | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7. | Distribution <br> (\%) of researchers employed across fields of Research and Development, by sex ; Unit of analysis - the University as a whole | This indicator identifies horizontal gender segregation; presents the distribution of female and male researchers across the six major fields of Research and Development (Frascati manual): natural sciences (NS) <br> - engineering and technology (ET) <br> - medical sciences (MS) <br> - agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) - social sciences (SS) - humanities and arts (H). Definition of researchers: Researchers | Number of researchers in all field of Research and Development by sex. Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | are <br> professionals engaged in the conception or creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentatio n , software or operational methods (§5.35, <br> Frascati Manual, <br> OECD, 2015). <br> This indicator encompasses all Grade academics working as researchers (see the Academic grade classification in the legend) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

gender equality

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in engineering and technology (ET) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in ET = FET/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in ET = MET/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in medical sciences (MS) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in MS = FMS/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in MS = MMS/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in AS = FAS/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in As MAS/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in social sciences (SS) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in SS = FSS $/ F^{* 100 ; ~}$ Distribution of |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | men researchers employed in SS = MSS/M*100 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed humanities and arts (H) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in $\mathrm{H}=$ FH/F*100; Distribution of men researchers employed in $\mathrm{H}=$ MH/M* 100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
| 8. | Distribution (\%) of researchers employed across age groups, by sex; (Age cohorts: 2534; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and over; unit of analysis- the University as a whole | This indicator shows the distribution of both male and female researchers across different age groups. Age categories: 25-34; 35-44; 45-54; 55-64; 65 and over. Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 25 and over by sex. Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equaityto

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 25 - 34 by sex (1) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 25 $34=F(1) / F^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged $\begin{aligned} & 25-34= \\ & M(1) / M^{\star} 100 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 35 - 44 by sex. (2) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 35$54=F(2) / F^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers employed aged 35 $-44=M(2) / M^{*} 100$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 45 - 54 by sex. (3) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 45 $54=F(3) / F^{*} 100 ;$ Distribution of men researchers aged $45-54=$ $\mathrm{M}(3) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 55 - 64 by sex. (4) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers employed in the age category 55 $64=F(4) / F^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged 55-64 = $\mathrm{M}(4) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of researchers employed in the institution aged 65 and over, by sex. (5) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers in the age category 65 and over = $F(5) / F^{*} 100$; Distribution of men researchers aged 65 and over = $\mathrm{M}(5) / \mathrm{M}^{*} 100$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9. | Distribution <br> (\%) of R\&D personnel across occupations and sex (researchers, teachers (only), technicians, other supporting staff) | This indicator presents the distribution of research and development (R\&D) personnel across three occupations (researchers, technicians, and others), by sex; for definitions of the R\&D occupations see the Frascati Manual in the Legend. <br> Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. <br> Teachers (only) are employed persons, who are only teaching but who are not researchers, i.e. their working position (job title) and content does not include | Number of personnel (all employed persons) in the organisation by sex |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | researcher/resea rch/researching. These might apply for some employees in the universities. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of personnel employed as researchers by sex (R) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women researchers among across female personnel = FR/F*100; Distribution of men researchers among men personnel = MR/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  | Some personnel might be | Number of personnel employed as |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women teacher (only) researchers |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | employed only as teachers in the universities; i.e. their contract does not related to any research activity. | teachers (only) by sex (teachers) |  |  |  | among across female personnel = F(teachers)/F*100; Distribution of men teacher (only) among men personnel = M (teachers)/ $\mathrm{M}^{*} 10$ 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of personnel employed as technicians by sex (T) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women technicians among female personnel = FT/F*100; Distribution of men technicians among men personnel = MT/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  |  |  | Number of personnel employed as supporting staff by sex (SS) |  | 1 | 1 | Distribution of women supporting staff among female personnel = FSS/F*100; Distribution of men supporting staff among men personnel = MSS/M*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10. | Proportion (\%) of women among academic staff, by academic grade (for the description of academic grades see the legend) | This indicator presents the proportion of women among the persons occupying positions at different grades of an academic career for a given year. <br> The academic grades (A, B, C, D) <br> represent a hierarchy in the stage of the academic career; the higher the level of academic career, the higher the possible power position and access to funding. By looking at the proportion of women present at each grade, | Number of academic staff at grade A (professors) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women of grade A among academic staff grade A= $\mathrm{FA} /(\mathrm{FA}+\mathrm{MA}) * 100$ | $50,0$ |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | one can track their progress in advancing through the stages of the academic career and identify the levels at which women are lost. As such, it is interesting to monitor the number of women present at each level of academia in order to observe whether there is progress towards reducing vertical segregation ('the leaky pipeline') |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of academic staff at grade B (Associated Professor, Senior |  | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women of grade B among academic staff grade $B=$ $\mathrm{FB} /(\mathrm{FB}+\mathrm{MB})$ *100 | 50,0 |  |  |  |

gender equaity to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { researcher;) by } \\ & \text { sex } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of academic staff at grade C (Post doc; junior researcher; newly qualified researcher with PhD) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women of grade C among academic staff grade $\mathrm{C}=$ FC/(FC+MC) *100 | 50,0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of academic staff at grade D (Postgraduate student working as researcher; PhD candidate) by sex |  | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women of grade D among academic staff grade $D=$ FD/(FD+MD) *100 | 50,0 |  |  |  |

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11. | Proportion (\%) of A grade women (professors) among all A grade staff by the main fields of Research and Development | A - grade staff is the single highest grade / post at which research is normally conducted within the institutional or corporate system. This indicator reveals differences in the distribution of male and female grade A staff across the different fields of Research and Development for a given year, by presenting the relative proportion of grade A staff of a given sex by field. R\&D fields: natural sciences (NS); engineering and | Number of total A grade staff in natural sciences T(NS); Number of A grade women in natural sciences F(NS) | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women A grade in $\begin{aligned} & N S=F(N S) / T \\ & (N S) * 100 \end{aligned}$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | technology (ET); medical sciences (MS); agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS); social sciences (SS); humanities (H); unknown (U). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of A grade staff in engineering and technology T(ET); Number of $A$ grade women in engineering and technology F (ET); | 1 | 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proportion of } \\ & \text { women A grade in } \\ & E T=F(E T) / T \\ & (E T)^{*} 100 \end{aligned}$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of A grade staff in medical sciences T(MS); Number of A grade staff | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women A grade in $M S=F(M S) / T$ (MS)*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | women in medical sciences $F(M S)$; |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of A grade staff in agricultural and veterinary sciences T(AS); Number of A grade women in agricultural and veterinary sciences F(AS); | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women A grade in As $=F(A S) / T$ (AS)*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of A grade staff in social sciences T(SS); Number of A grade women in social sciences F(SS); | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women A grade in $\begin{aligned} & S S=F(S S) / T \\ & (S S)^{*} 100 \end{aligned}$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of A grade staff in humanities T(H);Number of A grade women in humanities $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{H})$ | 1 | 1 |  | Proportion of women A grade in $\begin{aligned} & H=F(H) / T \\ & (H)^{*} 100 \end{aligned}$ | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  | Gender balanced career advancement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gender balance in decision making |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12. | Women among Directors (at the top) of the university/orga nisation in previous term and current year | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the heads of institutions in the previous and current term, resp. current year (2021). The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions has broad implications for scientific advancement and for industries with a strong need for a technologically educated workforce | Women- head of the institution in the previous term ; Unit: head count |  | 1 | x | Women as head of the institution in previous term (indicate the tenure period $\qquad$ (number) | 1 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Women - head of the institution by sex in 2021 ; Unit: head count |  | 1 | x | Women as head of the institution in 2021 (number) | 1 |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13. | Proportion (\%) of women among ViceDirectors (board of vicedirectors) in the previous term and current term | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the ViceDirectors of the institutions for the previous and current term. The ViceDirectors usually create a boards. The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions has broad implications for scientific advancement and for industries with a strong need for a technologically educated workforce. | - The number of Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in previous term. Unit: head count (T) <br> - The number of women ViceDirectors at the level of the organisation in previous term. Unit: head count (F) | $1$ | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women among Vice-Directors in the previous term (indicated the previous term period......) = F/T*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | - The number of Vice-Directors at the level of the organisation in current term (2021). Unit: head count (T) <br> - The number of women ViceDirectors at the level of the organisation in current term (year 2021). Unit: head count (F) | 1 | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women among Vice-Directors in the current term $($ year 2021 $)=$ F/T*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
| 14. | Proportion (\%) of women on scientific boards (Scientific board of research organisation) | This indicator presents the proportion of women members of boards, top decisionmaking committees that have a crucial impact on the orientation of research in a given year. | The total number of members of the scientific board by sex; Unit: head count; The number of women - members of the scientific board; Unit: head count; The number of men members of the scientific board; Unit: head count | 1 | 1 | X | Proportion of women among the members of the scientific board in the given year = F/T*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to un
research potential

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15. | Proportion (\%) of women among Deans of <br> Faculties/Instit utes in the given year | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the heads of the Faculties/Instit utes | The total number of heads of the Faculties/Institutes ; Unit: head count; The number of women heads of the Faculties/Institutes ; Unit: head count | 1 | 1 | X | Proportion of women among the heads of Faculties/Institutes in the given year = F/T*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
| 16. | Proportion (\%) of women among ViceDeans of Faculties in the given year | This indicator looks at the proportion of women among the deputydirectors heads of the Faculties/Instit utes | The total number of the Vice-Deans (deputy-directors) of the Faculties/Institutes . The number of women ViceDeans (deputydirectors) of the Faculties/Institutes Units: Head Counts | 1 | 1 | X | Proportion of women among the Vice-Deans (deputy-directors) of the Faculties/institutes in the given year = F/T*100 | 100,0 |  |  |  |
|  | Gender balanced working conditions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17. | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation based on average gross monthly wage | GPG <br> represents the difference between the average gross monthly earnings of paid male employees and of paid female employees as a percentage of the average gross monthly earnings of paid male employees. In spite of more than 30 years of equal pay legislation, the gender pay gap has remained persistent across all Member States regardless of the overall level of women's employment, | - Average gross monthly earnings of all women employees of the organisation paid in the given year (F); Unit: EUR <br> - Average gross monthly earnings all of men employees of the organisation paid in the given year (M); Unit: EUR |  | 1,0 | 1,0 | Gender pay gap $(G P G)=$ (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male employees Average gross monthly earnings of paid female employees) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male employees (expressed in \%) = ( $M-F$ )/M * 100 | 0,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | national welfare models or equality legislation. A gendersegregated labour market, the difficulty of balancing work and family life, the undervaluation of women's skills and work are some of the complex causes of the persistent gender pay gap. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18. | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation by R\&D occupations | GPG in researchers, teacher (only), technicians, other staff (for classification of the occupations in R\&D see the Frascati manual in legend). For the purpose of ATHENA project, the Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. Teachers (only) are employed persons, who are only teaching but who are not | - Average gross monthly earnings of researcher paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR (F; M) |  | 1,0 | 1,0 | Gender pay gap (GPG) = (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male researchers - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female researchers) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male researchers (expressed in \%) $=$ ( $M-F) / M$ * 100 | 0,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | researchers, i.e. their working position (job title) and content does not include researcher/res earch/researc hing. This might apply for some employees in the universities. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Average gross monthly earnings of teachers (only) paid in the given year by sex; Unit: EUR |  | 1,0 | 1,0 | Gender pay gap (GPG) $=$ (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male teacher Average gross monthly earnings of paid female teachers) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male teachers | 0,0 |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | monthly earnings of paid male other staff (expressed in $\%)=(M-F) / M$ * 100 |  |  |  |  |
| 19. | Gender pay gap (\%) in the organisation among Agrade academics | Gender pay gap among researchers with A academic degree: A. The single highest grade / post at which research is normally conducted within the institutional or corporate system professors). | Average gross monthly earnings of A-grade women employed in the organisation paid in the given year; Unit: EUR (F) Average gross monthly earnings of A-grade men employed in the organisation paid in the given year; Unit: EUR (M) |  | 1,0 | 1,0 | Gender pay gap $(\mathrm{GPG})=$ (Average gross monthly earnings of paid male A academics - Average gross monthly earnings of paid female A grade academics) / Average gross monthly earnings of paid male A grade academics (expressed in \%) = ( $M-F) / M$ * 100 | 0,0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20. | Proportion (\%) of persons employed part-time among researchers by sex | This indicator compares the proportion of persons employed part-time among female and among male researchers. Part-time is even or less than $50 \%$ of the usual working time. Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. | Number of researchers working even or less than $50 \%$ of the usual working time by sex | 1 | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women working part- time $=$ F/T*100; Proportion of men working part-time $=\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{T}^{*} 100$ |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21. | Proportion (\%) of persons with precarious working contracts among researchers, by sex | This indicator compares the proportion of persons with precarious working contracts among female and among male researchers. <br> Researchers with <br> 'precarious working contracts' are those with no contracts, with fixed term contracts of up to one year, or with other contracts. Most affected are junior academic positions or other positions relying on third-party funding. The existence and increase of precarious | Total number of employed researchers with no contract or with fixed term contract of up to one year (T); Number of women employed researchers with no contract or with fixed term contract of up to one year (F) <br> Number of men employed researchers with no contract or with fixed term contract of up to one year (M) | 1 | 1 | 1 | Proportion of women researchers with precarious working contracts = F/T*100; Proportion of male researcher with precarious working contracts = M/T*100 |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | $\begin{gathered} \text { Value in } \\ 2020 \text { (or } \\ \text { latest } \\ \text { data; in \% } \\ \text { or } \\ \text { number) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | employment is subject to debate throughout the EU. <br> Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22. | Annual number of researchers on maternity/pate rnity or parental leave in the given year by sex | Indicator shows the number of female and male researchers employed in the organisation taken maternal/pater nal or parental leave for personal care for children. Researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract. | Total number of researchers employed in the organisation on the maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year Number of women researchers employed in the organisation on the maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year Number of men researchers employed in the organisation on the maternal/paternal or parental leave in the given year | 1 | 1 | 1 | Number of men researchers on paternal or parental leave in the given year; Number of women researchers on maternal or parental leave in the given year |  | 100,0 | 100,0 |  |
|  | Gender balance in research outputs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL (T) | WOMEN (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators applying for the national research funds at the level of organisation for the given year | This indicator presents research funding success-rate differences between women and men principal investigators (not project manager). A positive difference means that men have a higher success rate whereas a negative difference means that women have a higher success rate. | Number of women applicants principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds (FA). Unit: Head count. Number of man applicants principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds (MA) . Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 | Funding success rate in national funds $=(M B / M A)$ (FB/FA) | 0 |  |  |  |

encerch potentia

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of women beneficiaries principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds; (FB); Unit: Head count. Number of men beneficiaries - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in national funds; (MB); Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24. | Funding success rate difference between women and men principal investigators applying for the international research funds (at the level of organisation) for the given year. | This indicator presents research funding success-rate differences between women and men as principal investigators (not project manager) in international funding schemes. A positive | Number of women applicants principal investigators of research funding for a given year in international funds (FA). Unit: Head count. Number of men applicants principal investigators of research funding for a given year in international funds (MA). Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 | Funding success rate in international funds $=(M B / M A)$ (FB/FA) | 0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | difference means that men have a higher success rate whereas a negative difference means that women have a higher success rate. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Number of women beneficiaries principal investigators of research funding for a given year in international funds (FB) Unit: Head count. Number of men beneficiaries - principal investigators of research funding for a given year in international funds (MB) Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25. | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and women principal investigators from national research funds at the level of organisation for the given year (EUR) | The indicators shows the average amount of sources to awarded research projects conducted by men and women as principal investigators (leaders of the projects, not project managers) by the national research funds; at the level of organisation for the given year (EUR) | Number of projects lead by women - principal investigators financially supported by national founds (F); Unit: number; Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by women - principal investigators from national funds (Tf); Unit: EUR | 1 | 1 |  | - Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by women - principal investigators from national funds $=$ $\mathrm{Tf} / \mathrm{F}$ (EUR) | 1,0 |  |  |  |

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of projects lead by men - principal investigators financially supported by national founds (M); Unit: number; Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from national funds (Tm); Unit: EUR | 1 |  | 1 | - Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from national funds = Tm/M (EUR) | 1,0 |  |  |  |
| 26. | The average grants' amounts allocated to research projects conducted by men and women principal investigators (international research funds) (at the level of organisation) for the given year (EUR) | The indicators shows the average amount of sources to awarded research projects conducted by men and women principal investigators (leaders of the projects); International research funds | Number of projects lead by women - principal investigators financially supported by international founds (F); Unit: number; Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by women - principal investigator from international funds (Tf); Unit: EUR | $1$ | 1 |  | Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by women - principal investigators from international funds $=\mathrm{Tf} / \mathrm{F}$ (EUR) | 1,0 |  |  |  |

ender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number of projects lead by men - principal investigators financially supported by international founds (M); Unit: number; Total amount of grants allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from international funds (Tm); Unit: EUR | 1 |  | 1 | Average grant's amount allocated to projects lead by men - principal investigator from international funds $=\mathrm{Tm} / \mathrm{M}$ (EUR) | 1,0 |  |  |  |
| 27. | Funding success rate difference between women and men national coordinators within international consortium applying for the international research funds (at the level of organisation) for the given year. | This indicator presents research funding success-rate differences between women and men as national coordinators within an international consortium in international funding schemes. A positive | Number of women applicants - <br> national coordinators within an international consortium of research funding for a given year in international funds (FA). Unit: Head count. Number of men applicants national coordinators within international consortium of research funding for a given year in |  | 1 | 1 | Funding success rate in international funds $=(M B / M A)$ (FB/FA) | 0 |  |  |  |

gender equality to

CORE INDICATORS (COMPULSORY AND COMPARATIVE ACROSS ALL RPO AND RFO IN THE PROJECT)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | difference means that men have a higher success rate whereas a negative difference means that women have a higher success rate. | international funds (MA). Unit: Head count. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28. |  |  | Number of women beneficiaries national coordinators within international consortium of research funding for a given year in international funds (FB) Unit: Head count. Number of men beneficiaries - national coordinators within international consortium of research funding for a given year in international funds (MB) Unit: Head count. |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

## ADVANCED INDICATORS (VOLUNTARY)

| No | Indicator | Definition | Data needed/unit of measurement | TOTAL <br> (T) | WOMEN <br> (F) | MEN <br> (M) | CALCULATION | Value in 2020 (or latest data; in \% or number) | Distribution of women (\%) | Distribution of men (\%) | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The pool of graduate talents |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of ISCED 8 graduates by sex in last 5 years (20162020) | This indicator presents the compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of graduates by sex, meaning the average percentage growth each year for women and men graduates in a given period for graduates at ISCED 8 level. | Number of women ISCED 8 graduates in a start and an end year (F). Unit: Number. Number of men ISCED 8 graduates in a start and an end year (M). Unit: Number. Number of years in reference period (calculated by subtracting the defined start year from the defined end year) (N). Unit: Number. |  |  |  | CAGR for women graduates; CAGR for men graduates |  | X | x | For the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: https://publicat ions.europa.e u/en/publicatio n-detail//publication/09 d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed01aa75ed71a 1/languageen; page 8 |
| 2 | Ratio of ISCED 8 entrants to ISCED 7 graduates, by sex and broad field of study | This indicator is the ratio of ISCED 8 entrants to ISCED 7 graduates, broken down by sex, broad field of study and country. The segregation between female and male scientists is already connected | For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/ en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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|  |  | humanities <br> 03 Social sciences, journalism and information 04 Business, administration and law <br> 05 Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics 06 Information and Communication Technologies 07 Engineering, manufacturing and construction 08 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary 09 Health and welfare 10 Services. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | Proportion (\%) of women (continuing) in post-doc jobs out of the ISCED 8 graduates in the given year. | The indicator shows the percentage of the female ISCED8 graduates continuing to work as researcher in the organisation. | Number of all ISCED 8 graduates in the given year <br> (T) ; Number of women ISCED 8 graduates continuing in the post -doc job in the organisation in the given year (F) | x | $\mathbf{x}$ | Proportion (\%) of women (continuing) in post-doc jobs out of the ISCED 8 graduates = F/T*100 (\%) |  |  |  |
| Gender balance in research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of people in employment in the organisation, by sex in the last 5 years (2016-2020) | This indicator presents the average yearly growth in the number of women and men in total employment in the organisation during the last 5 years | Number of women in employment (aged 25-64) in a start and an end year (F) Unit: Number. <br> Number of men in employment (aged 25-64) in a start and an end year (M) Unit: Number. Number of years in the reference period (calculated by subtracting the defined start |  |  | CAGR of women in employment = (FeFs) $1 / \mathrm{N}-1$ CAGR of men in employment = (MeMs) $1 \mathrm{~N}-1$ |  | x | For the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at: https://publicat ions.europa.e u/en/publicatio n-detail/- |
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Gender balance in decision making

| 15 | Glass Ceiling Index | The Glass Ceiling Index $(\mathrm{GCl})$ is a relative index comparing the proportion of women in academia (grades A, B, and C) to the proportion of women in top academic positions (grade A positions; equivalent to full professorships in most countries), for a given year. The GCl can range from 0 to infinity. A GCl of | For data needed and the calculation see the She <br> Figures Handbook 2018; <br> Available at: <br> https://publications.europa.eu/ <br> en/publication-detail/- <br> /publication/09d777dc-447c- <br> 11e9-a8ed- <br> 01aa75ed71a1/language-en ; <br> PAGE 125 |  | $1$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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Gender balanced working conditions

| 16 | Number of days the women researchers have been on maternity or parental leave in the given year | Total number of working days' women researchers have been on the maternity or parental leave in the given year. Conditioned by the national policies of maternal and parental leave; researchers are employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the percentage of teaching or | Total number of working days women researchers have been on the maternity or parental leave in the given year; Unit: Number | x | Total number of working days women researchers have been on the maternity or parental leave in the given year |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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Ratio of women to men international co-publication rate

Percent of a country's research output integrating a sex or gender dimension in its research content (SGDRC)

Inventors Index Ratio of women to men invention patenting rate (in the last 5 years)

It should be noted that international collaboration (i.e., international copublication) in this publication) in ind report is indicated by articles with at least two different countries listed in the authorship byline. If both countries are EU Member States or within the 44 countries analysed, the collaboration type is referred to as IntraEU28 and Intra EU28+ Collaboration respectively. The indicator shows the proportion of peer-reviewed publications that integrate gender or sex-sensitive analysis and the impact of these publications, broken down by field and country

The indicator shows gender balance in innovation
patterning. The indicator could split into could be split into applications and gained patents

For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at:
https://publications.europa.eu/ en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 143

## For data needed and the

 calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018;Available at:
Available at: en/publication-detail/-
/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-
01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 152

For data needed and the calculation see the She Figures Handbook 2018; Available at:
https://publications.europa.eu/ en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c 11e9-a8ed-
01aa75ed71a1/language-en; PAGE 161
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## LEGEND - CLASSIFICATIONS

## The broad fields of study according to the ISCED-F classification of fields of education and training are the following:

00 Generic programmes and qualifications
01 Education
02 Arts and humanities
03 Social sciences, journalism and information
04 Business, administration and law
05 Natural sciences, mathematics and statistics
06 Information and Communication Technologies
07 Engineering, manufacturing and construction
08 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary
09 Health and welfare
10 Services.

## The Frascati Manual (OECD, 2015) provides definitions for the six main fields of R\&D:

natural sciences (NS)
engineering and technology (ET)
medical sciences (MS)
agricultural and veterinary sciences (AS)
social sciences (SS)
humanities and arts $(\mathrm{H})$.

## R\&D Occupations:

The Frascati Manual (OECD, 2015) provides an international definition for R\&D personnel, §5.6: 'All persons employed directly on R\&D should be counted, as well as those providing direct services such as R\&D managers, administrators, and clerical staff.' R\&D personnel comprise three categories of occupations:

## athena

gender equality to unlo
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Researchers are professionals engaged in the conception or creation of new knowledge. They conduct research and improve or develop concepts, theories, models, techniques instrumentation, software or operational methods ( $\$ 5.35$, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015). For the purpose of ATHENA project, the researchers are also employed persons, who are teaching and researching, irrespective what is the \% of teaching or researching in the working contract.

Teachers (only) are emploeyd proffesionals who are engaged in teaching activities (lectoring). For the purpose of ATHENA project the teachers (only) are personnel who are employed only as teachers in the univerisities; i.e. their working contract does not related to any research activity; their working contract involves only teaching (lectoring) without any \% of researching

Technicians (and equivalent staff) are persons whose main tasks require technical knowledge and experience in one or more fields of engineering, physical and life sciences or social sciences and humanities. They participate in R\&D by performing scientific and technical tasks involving the application of concepts and operational methods, normally under the supervision of researchers. Equivalent staff performs the corresponding R\&D tasks under the supervision of $r$
Other supporting staff includes skilled and unskilled craftsmen, secretarial and clerical staff participating in R\&D projects or directly associated with such projects (§5.43, Frascati Manual, OECD, 2015)

## Academic grades (DG Research and Innovation - WiS - Women in Science database)

A. The single highest grade / post at which research is normally conducted within the institutional or corporate system (Professors and/or Senior researcher with PhD.)
B. Academic grade - All researchers working in positions which are not as senior as the top position (A) but definitely more senior than the newly qualified PhD holders (C); i.e.
below A and above C (Associated Professor and/or Senior researcher with PhD.)
C. Academic grade - The first grade/post into which a newly qualified PhD (ISCED 8) graduate would normally be recruited within the institutional or corporate system. (Post - doc; newly qualified researcher with PhD).
D. Academic grade - Either postgraduate students not yet holding a PhD (ISCED 8) degree who are engaged as researchers (on the payroll) or researchers working in posts that do not normally require a PhD or PhD candidate).

## National research funds: see https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1 p. 201

## BULGARIA: National Science Fund

## SPAIN: Funds from National R\&D plan - DGIC INNCORPORA

Funds from National R\&D plan - DGICT - Granted Research Projects: Non-guided fundamental research projects (2011-2012) \& R\&D projects, complementary actions and RDI Programmes for Strengthening Centres and Units of Excellence (2013-2014)
Funds from National R\&D plan - DGICT - Fellowships: Ramón y Cajal, Torres Quevedo, Juan de la Cierva, FPI, and Técnicos de apoyo; Ayudas para incentivar la incorporación estable de doctores and "Doctorados industriales"
research potential

ITALY: FIRST-PRIN (Research Projects of National Interest) - (Co-financing MIUR+Universities+RPO)
FIRST-FARE (Framework per l'Attrazione e il Rafforzamento delle Eccellenze per la ricerca in Italia) - (Co-financing MIUR+Universities+RPO)
FFO - Programma "Rita Levi Montalcini" (Programme for the recruitment of young researchers "Rita Levi Montalcini") - (funded by MIUR)
FIRST-SIR (Scientific Independence of young Researchers) - (Co-financing
MIUR+Universities+RPO)
POLAND Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Government grants:"National Programme for the
Development of Humanities";"luventus Plus"; "Diamond Grant")
National Science Centre
PORTUGAL Programmes of Advanced Training of Human Resources (Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia
(FCT))
ROMANIA HUMAN RESOURCES - Research projects to stimulate the establishment of young independent research teams
BILATERAL CO_OPERATION COMPETITIONS - Mobility Projects(PM) P3-PM-RO-BE
BASIC AND FRŌNTIER RESEARCH Exploratory research(PCE) P4-PCE
BILATERAL CO_OPERATION COMPETITIONS - Mobility Projects(PM) P3-PM-RO-MD
BILATERAL CO OPERATION COMPETITIONS - Bilateral Co-operation Romania-France (Brancusi Integrated Action Program) -P3-PM-RO-FR RESEARCH,DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION-Bridge Grant (Transfer of knowledge to the trade) (BG) P2-BG
RESEARCH,DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION-Experimental demonstration project(PED)
RESEARCH,DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION Solutions (SOL) P2-SOL
RESEARCH,DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION Checks innovation (CI) P2-CI
INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE Complex projects completed in consortia (CDI) P1-PCCDI

## SLOVENIA F1 (Slovenian Research Agency) <br> F2 (Slovenian Research Agency)

F3 (Slovenian Research Agency)
SLOVAKIA Funds from Slovak Research and Development Agency
Funds from Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport: Incentives for Research and Development


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ PU= Public, CO=Confidential, only for members of the Consortium (including the Commission Services), CL=Classified, as referred in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ See the Annex.
    ${ }^{3}$ EC (2019). She Figure 2018; Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019; Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1; EC (2019). She Figures Handbook 2018; Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019; Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1//anquage-en
    ${ }^{4}$ OECD (2015), Frascati Manual 2015; Available at: http://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm

[^2]:    ${ }^{5}$ See the Annex.
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[^3]:    At UB, Generic programmes and qualification category refers to Humanities
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[^7]:    ${ }^{13}$ EC (2019). She Figure 2018; Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019; Available at: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/9540ffa1-4478-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1; EC (2019). She Figures Handbook 2018; Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2019; Available at: https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/09d777dc-447c-11e9-a8ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en
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    ${ }^{5}$ OECD (2015), Frascati Manual 2015; Available at: http://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm

[^8]:    ${ }^{16}$ EIGE (2016). Gender Equality In Academia And Research, Gear Tool; Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2016; Available at: https://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/mh0716096enn 1.pdf

[^9]:    ${ }^{17}$ OECD (2015), Frascati Manual 2015; Available at: http://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm

[^10]:    ${ }^{8}$ OECD (2015), Frascati Manual 2015; Available at: http://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/frascati-manual.htm
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