

Convention report

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
1. GENOVATE Launch	2
2. International Women's Day Round Table	2
3. International Advisory Board meeting	5
4. Change Academy Model	6
4.1 Introduction.....	6
4.2 CAM techniques	6
4.3 CAM application in the University of Bradford	6
5. Consortium Leads' Sessions	7
WP1: Management of the GENOVATE consortium (Lead UNIBRAD)	7
WP2: Development of a social model of gender equality implementation (Lead TU)	8
WP3: Gender Equality in Recruitment, Progression and Research Support (Lead UCC).	8
WP4: Working environment and culture change (Lead AU)	9
WP5: Excellence in research and innovation through gender equality and diversity (Load LTU)	10
WP6: Knowledge exchange and institutional case studies (Lead UNINA).....	11
WP8: Dissemination and sustainability strategy (Lead UNIBRAD)	12
6. Evaluation Workshop (Lead UCM)	13
Evaluation of GENOVATE as a project.....	13
Evaluation of the GEAPs implementation	13
Appendix A. Tables and Diagrams	15

Introduction

The GENOVATE Convention took place at the Bradford University on 6th-8th March. During this Convention, the GENOVATE project was publicly presented to the Bradford University's academic staff and stakeholders and, for the first time, partners had the opportunity to meet personally and discuss in detail the Work Packages (WPs) they are each responsible for.

The present report is aimed at briefly presenting the main topics and most relevant aspects that emerged during the three day meeting. The report is organized as follows: in Section 1 and 2 a brief overview is provided of the presentations at the GENOVATE Launch and at the International Women's Day Round Table. Section 3 reports on the International Advisory Board meeting; Section 4 describes the Change Academy Model presented on the second day of the Convention, while Section 5 is devoted to the consortium Leads' sessions. Finally, Section 6 reports on the Evaluation Workshop led by the Evaluation Team of UCM.

1. GENOVATE Launch

After the welcome and introduction by Professor Shirley Congdon, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) and the opening remarks by the Vice Chancellor Professor Mark Cleary, Prof. Uduak Archibong, Coordinator of the project, presented an overview talk on GENOVATE.

GENOVATE is an action-research program aimed at the implementation of Gender Equality Action Plans (GEAPs) in six European Universities, adopting a contextualised approach. It is based on an on-going knowledge exchange among partners and involves an on-going participatory evaluation. GENOVATE intends to deliver a social model of gender equality implementation underpinned by the Gender Change Academy Model. The main goal of the project consists in ensuring equal opportunities for women and men by encouraging a more-gender competent research, innovation and scientific decision-making culture, with a particular focus on universities.

It was emphasized that GENOVATE will adopt a different perspective on the problem of gender inequality with respect to previous approaches, which were mainly focused on individual factors, where the emphasis has been on changing the individual. Indeed, it is commonly acknowledged that gender inequality exists because of the interplay among individual factors, institutional cultures, and organizational structure. In contrast with previous approaches to gender equality, the GENOVATE emphasis is on transforming institutional cultures and organizational structure. Under this new perspective, individuals should see the barriers to gender equality begin to move organisationally and culturally and the role of GENOVATE with individuals will be to enable them to better embed themselves in the new emerging organisational cultures. An overview of aims, implementation strategies of the Gender Equality Action plans (GEAPs) and of the overall project, expected impact, target audiences and dissemination strategy was shared with the participants.

Afterwards, Dr. Caitríona Ní Laoire of the University College Cork presented an overview on the GENOVATE consortium, describing each partners and underlining the different disciplinary backgrounds and national context of the institutions involved in the project. The GENOVATE Strategic Management, the Co-ordination Structure, as well as the WP structure of the project were illustrated to the audience.

2. International Women's Day Round Table

The International Women's Day Round Table offered to all the partners the opportunity to present the current status of gender equality in research and innovation, highlighting challenges and priorities for each institution and country. In what follows a summary of the presentations given during the round table will be provided. This was chaired by Prof. Jackie Ford, Professor of Leadership and Organization of the University of Leeds - Business School.

- University of Bradford (Prof. Uduak Archibong)

Data on gender representation in the academic sector in the UK indicates a lower selection of women in senior roles: 19% of professors are women, and this is even lower in STEM departments (16% of professors are women with significantly fewer in Computer Science and Engineering), 14% of university Vice-Chancellors are women. In comparison, however, male students are under-represented in disciplines such as Teaching and Nursing. Equality, diversity and inclusion are important concepts in the Research Excellence Framework (REF): they ensure that the staff are treated fairly, which can lead to better retention, satisfaction and performances, and that in the REF processes the obligations of both funding bodies and of the

Bradford University are subject to equality laws. Data analysis¹, however, shows that such inclusive concepts are not informing staff selection:

- the selection rate for staff with a declared disability was lower than for staff without declared disability; all disabled staff were male;
- 67% of male permanent academic staff were selected in comparison to 48% of women; fewer women than men were hired on part time permanent contracts even though the percentage of women working on a part time permanent basis within Teaching and Research was twice that of men;
- the rate of selection for women below age 32 and over age 55 was particularly low;
- the selection rate of staff from the black ethnic group was lower than for staff from other ethnic groups.

GENOVATE will involve all senior managers, teams, directors of support units and students, giving Bradford University staff and students a chance for improved diversity and equality.

- University College Cork (Dr. Caitríona Ní Laoire and Aifric Ó Gráda)

Ireland had the highest/second highest Glass Ceiling Index in Europe for women in higher education in 2007². Some observations can be made about the current situation in Ireland: there is lack of gender-disaggregated data; equality legislation exists but inequality of outcomes is still significant, thus suggesting that discrimination processes, direct or indirect, still exist. The current economic climate has had an impact on the actual trend especially around the issue of maternity leave replacement; the recognition of gendered cultures in Irish universities is an issue, though this varies from institution to institution; it is argued that scientific or managerial masculinism dominates in university cultures (O'Connor, 2008)². Horizontal segregation is significant with women more likely concentrated in humanities, social sciences and health sciences. Science Foundation Ireland figures show a loss of females as they progress up the research career ladder. Very little information exists about the intersections of gender with ethnicity, disability, sexuality; intersection with age seems to be important.

The past activities of UCC for gender equality were illustrated. In particular, UCC hosted the National Higher Education Equality Unit (HEEU) 1992-2003 which aimed to promote equality for staff and students in Irish higher education institutions. The HEEU was disbanded in 2003. Then, in 2006 UCC was awarded funding from the Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) to explore the position of women in Science, Engineering and Technology in relation to academic and research careers and management. The UCC team coordinated the Through the Glass Ceiling project, during the years 2010-2012. This was a positive action project aiming to enable career progression for female academics and researchers through both training and mentorship programmes and the development of a gender equality action plan for UCC.

The current situation in UCC was also outlined. An Equality Committee, which reports annually to the Governing Body exists. There are some equality policies currently implemented (Equality Strategy 2010-2012, Equality in Recruitment Policy, UCC Duty of Respect & Right to Dignity Policy, UCC Code of Practice on the Employment of People with Disabilities, UCC Equal Opportunities & Diversity Policy). However, there is potential for gender equality awareness to be mainstreamed across the university's policies, strategies and practices.

There were a number of recommendations submitted to the community by a new national network on gender equality, in the line of encouraging gender awareness to be incorporated into all aspects of the activities of HEIs, research agencies and governing organisations.

- Lulea University of Technology (Prof. Ylva Fältholm)

Current data on gender composition of the Swedish academia show that the process of *feminization* is only restricted to the student sector: 60% of students are women (50% at the Ph.D. level) and women perform better than men. However, male academics become established faster than female academics in the labour-market and the percentage of women with PhD's that become professors is largely lower (21% of professors are women). The horizontal segregation in the academic composition is evident: women represent 56% of academics in nursing, but only 10% in engineering/mathematics. The situation is similar at Lulea University, where 17% of professors are women. The studies carried out on this issue indicate that: it is easier for men to gain access to "sponsors", networks and research funding decision bodies. Women and men are evaluated differently, recruitment and promotions processes are informal and subjective indicating that *gate-keepers* limit

¹ Research Assessment Exercise, 2008.

² SHE statistics, 2009.

their selection reproducing consistent or similar groups (which often does not include women). The *crown prince* phenomenon is common with criteria tailored for progression and women are caught in *teaching trap*.

Gender equality interventions are difficult in academia due to the interplay of the equality/equity principle with meritocracy. Indeed the under-representation of women needs to be addressed and interventions targeting women are necessary. On the other side, focusing on women could be perceived as emphasizing that they are a weak category that needs special support.

Over recent years gender equality intervention has focused more towards creating structural changes than at supporting individual women through the project PERSONA. This project, concerning the recruitment and promotion practices, has several aims: to communicate problematic situations and scenarios; to move the focus from individuals to systems and structures; to make the doing of gender visible in academia; to challenge gendered stereotypes of women and men in academia; to create commitment in change processes. A *persona* is a fictional representation of a person, including behaviour, attitudes and motivations observed and identified during an initial inquiry process. This method is used to communicate individual's needs and preferences and hence to reframe practices. Its expected results are: to change the design of research subjects, marketing, instructions to and selection of reviewers, policies; to allow gender aware and sustainable practices of recruitment, promotion and retention; to get more highly qualified women and men.

- Ankara University (Prof. Çiler Dursun)

A widespread opinion at the Ankara University is that there is no gender inequality or that gender inequality is a concern for other women in the institution; moreover, in the university mission and vision documents no mention or reference is made to this matter. However, the percentage of women academics is larger at lower ranked positions such as instructors, experts, lecturers and research assistants, while men are over-represented in higher ranked positions. For example, 78% of the members of the Senate are male and since 1946 only one woman was appointed as Rector. Horizontal segregation manifests in the fact that women are over-represented in sectors like pharmacy, education, health, communication, dentistry, while on the contrary men are favourite in veterinary, agriculture, engineering, arts and sciences, law and divinity. It doesn't exist any institutional unit that provides gender disaggregated statistics to monitor changes in women's status compared to men's one, and report them to university community. In the allocation of funding under the Scientific Research Projects in 2010, 43% of the supported projects have a female PI. Since AU is a large university with many faculties and colleges (and 8 different campuses in both central and distant places of Ankara), different strategies will be needed to achieve a broad participation to the GEAP implementation. On the other hand, a number of encouraging circumstances may determine a positive outcome: a National Action Plan for Gender Equality 2013-2020 has been prepared by the General Directorate of women Status (KSGM); AU offers graduating programs in gender studies, this PhD. program is the first of its kind in Turkey, started in 2012; in AU a new coordinatorship for Equality Policies and petitioning is currently on the way; structures in the University such as the Women Studies Centre (established in 1994), the Domestic Justice Unit (established in 2010) and Against Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Unit (established in 2012) support the sustainability of gender related issues; as a support to the GENOVATE team, a Gender Equality Commission was created where most of the representative of the faculties are deans or vice-deans. The directive aiming to promote the sustainability of Gender Equality Commission was approved by the Senate in April 2013.

- Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II (Dr. Ofelia Pisanti)

The principle of gender equality is stated both in the European and in the Italian laws and recommendations. In Italy gender quotas are envisaged in several political contexts, though only very recently have Italian Universities Statutes included rules to bring equilibrium to gender composition in their relevant bodies. As a consequence, Italy is a typical example of a country where women are under-represented in top research and senior management positions. While at the PhD level there are more women than men (in countertendency with Europe), it is the recruitment phase which is the key point of the female vertical segregation, with the resultant effect that 45% of researchers, 35% of associate professors and 21% of full professors are women. This is worse within the male dominated Science and Technology sectors (horizontal segregation). Women are also under-represented in senior academic and research roles and in senior management key positions. The GENOVATE project in UNINA will be realized as a staged programme: it will start from implementing good practices inside the Science and Technology School (which includes almost half of UNINA staff personnel); new rules and procedures will be then exported to the other schools and departments. GENOVATE represents an opportunity since: 1) a wide range of expertise in gender equality will be gathered resulting in an enhancement of the quality and impacts of the actions developed; 2) new rules on recruitment and progression on the scientific boards of UNINA have to be written during the first

months of implementation of GENOVATE, giving the possibility of influence this process towards a gender-sensitive direction; 3) strategic institutions/associations are involved as key stakeholders.

- Trnava University (Dr. Monica O'Mullane)

Gender equality policy for women working in research and science has a good foundation in Slovakia in terms of gender equality law and support, which enables mothers in particular to fully engage in the workforce. The Communist policy legacy emphasised the importance of education, and access to education. This policy has resulted in a large number of highly educated women in all spheres of research and science, even if the suppression of fundamental freedoms during the Communist political regime clearly impacted on the development and enhancement of women's movements in the regions and within country's borders. The percentage of women in professorships at the Slovak Academy of Sciences (a research institution in Slovakia) is 48%. In the medical sciences 39.9% of all the employees were female, but only 7.7% of them were professors, indicating a clear decline of numbers as the grade rises (the *glass ceiling* phenomenon). In the Trnava University the percentage of female heads of Departments is 41% (with 20% in the field of Theology and 83% in the one of Health Care and Social Work). Evidence suggests that, like most universities in the developed world, it experiences a persistence of vertical and horizontal gender segregation, which includes an under-representation of women in higher positions, and an over-representation of women in lower-level, part-time and insecure (temporary) employment. Explicit gender equality policy in Trnava University does not exist: the GEAP to be implemented as the cornerstone of the GENOVATE project is the first such strategy for action. However, some factors (conservatism and homogeneity) need to be taken into account when planning diversity initiatives, including the implementation of the GEAP. The small size of TU is a facilitating factor in implementing change, as it is relatively straightforward to communicate across the university and create change within the institution. Opportunities in terms of dissemination and easy communication are also guaranteed by regular communication and cooperation with the Ministry of Education and with the regional government and with individuals in parallel institutions in the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, Serbia and Germany.

- Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Prof. María Bustelo)

The recently approved Act on Science, Technology and Innovation (June 1st, 2011) introduced changes in the formulation and coordination of science policy: it was a key political action for integrating gender in research policy in Spain. Gender was a little bit *lost* in FP7 compared to FP6 and FP5. So, projects like GENOVATE are really important to promote gender integration in research policies across Europe. The question is: what do we know now, after more than 15 years from the Beijing Declaration on equal rights and inherent human dignity of women and men? Some answers are:

- we are considering theoretical concepts, difficult to implement;
- when implemented, they are very easily technocratised, diluting their depth and political meaning;
- they are Western concepts, not negotiated with other countries and contexts in the world.

So, there is an overall problem of implementation, connected to the fact that it is not only a matter of politics, but it is related to institution and organizational culture. Gender Mainstreaming (GM) "*questions the gender neutrality of organizations; challenges existing norms, power relations and the status quo; requires change in organizational culture and institutions which is a long run strategy and should be sustainable*"³. How to evaluate GM? Many efforts have been made in evaluating the outcomes of GM but not the strategies. Evaluation questions that we propose are: 1) how it is designed? 2) how it is implemented? 3) does it have capacity for transforming all of that which needs to be transformed?

3. International Advisory Board meeting

The International Advisory Board will provide scientific support to the GENOVATE project, giving an international flavour to GENOVATE and promoting an overarching Pan-European approach with international perspectives. The meeting opened with the presentation of each member to the assembly. Then some clarification was made about the role of the International Advisory Board (IAB): it was stressed that the IAB members are not members of the GENOVATE project, but they will have access to all the information in order to form their opinions on the achievements of the project. UNIBRAD will communicate directly with all the IAB members, in order to circulate working documents to obtain meaningful input, while each partner Lead will communicate with its IAB members on national strategic collaboration matters (with the exception of UCM that

³ Mieke Verloo, coordinator of the group of specialists in Gender Mainstreaming in the Council of Europe.

does not have the need of doing this). It was agreed that a mapping of expertise of the IAB members would be undertaken to ensure a more targeted involvement with the project.

4. Change Academy Model

4.1 Introduction

GENOVATE will adopt the Change Academy Model (CAM) "as a framework for managing and facilitating change in the partner institutions."⁴The CAM is based on the recognition that "HE institutions are highly complex social systems which continually change (adapt/invent) in spontaneous and unpredictable ways through the every day conversations and interactions of people. As a result, complex, adaptive and flexible ways of thinking are required in order to create change."⁵

During the GENOVATE Convention Prof. Peter Hopkinson of UNIBRAD presented the CAM concepts and techniques to the GENOVATE collaboration.

Change Academy is a programme adopted in UK Higher Education to:

- help institutional teams to develop projects;
- provide understanding of complex change;
- develop methods to work up and evaluate project outcomes and impacts;
- facilitate networks;
- provide personal and professional development;
- enable institutional and sectorial change.

It is based on some assumptions: 1) universities are complex systems; 2) orchestrating effective change requires a co-ordinated effort by a large number of people; 3) teams of people need time and space to reflect and plan and do; 4) change management is a learning process.

There are several reasons which encourage the belief that CAM can be useful in a project like GENOVATE: it can be focused on the needs of a given project or programme, it is flexible and adaptable and relatively simple, it takes advantage from other institutions experience and insights, and there is clear evidence of what works/does not work in particular institutions.

4.2 CAM techniques

During the presentation, Prof. Peter Hopkinson gave a practical illustration of a technique that can be used in working with CAM, that is the **World Cafe**, which allows to determine what large groups of people think about questions related to a given project, giving them the opportunity of freely contributing to it. The presents were asked to write down their answers on different questions, as depicted in Table 1 in Appendix A. In particular, this technique can be used in meeting of different duration depending of the situation: few hours, one day, several days.

Collecting the feelings of people about a project is the first step in a process that has to continue with action planning. This can be done by using different techniques (questions to groups of people involved in the requested changes using post-it or flip charts), but taking into account the priority of the proposed actions. To this purpose, people can be asked, for example:

- to list up to 5 actions that could be taken to progress the project and achieve its aims and objectives;
- to say how feasible are those actions;
- to order the proposed actions on the basis of their priority.

4.3 CAM application in the University of Bradford

In the last part of the seminar, some examples of application of the CAM in the Bradford University were described: Ecovercity and Green Academy.

⁴ GENOVATE proposal, pag. 6, line 39.

⁵ GENOVATE proposal, pag. 6, line 42.

Ecoversity is a University of Bradford's programme that aims at embedding sustainable development into the culture and practices of this institution. "It is an ambitious and visionary programme creating change across the whole of the University. Ecoversity is not just about how we build and run our estate or just the environment - it is also about:

- How we embed sustainable development into the formal and informal learning experience of all our students
- Involving all our staff, students and visitors
- Addressing our social responsibilities
- Fostering a sense of community and engendering wellbeing"

(from the web page of the University of Bradford, <http://www.brad.ac.uk/ecoversity/>)

Green Academy is a pilot scheme run by the Higher Education Academy, in association with the Environmental Association for Universities and Colleges and the National Union of Students, to support sustainability activities across universities. The programme's goal is to embed sustainability into the CORE (Curriculum, Operations, Research and Experience) of Universities, which involves:

- senior management commitment;
- education: equipping graduates for the emerging green economy;
- multi-disciplinary research to address society's grand challenges and recognition of the University's sustainability research excellence;
- walking the talk: reducing the environmental impacts of the estate;
- enterprise: strengthening partnerships with local, regional, national and global bodies.

5. Consortium Leads' Sessions

During this part of the Convention, each team Lead illustrated tasks and plans of the assigned WP.

WP1: Management of the GENOVATE consortium (Lead UNIBRAD)

The tasks of **WP1** involve 1) administrative and financial management and 2) strategic management and coordination structures to support and enable effective delivery of GENOVATE. In relation to these tasks, the project Coordinator made the following communications:

- next money payment will take place in the month 18 of the project;
- in order to produce deliverable **D1.3** (document on rules and procedures, including monitoring and evaluation processes, related to GENOVATE consortium) it is planned to look at the GENOVATE proposal to see whether there are additional rules that it is necessary to take into account;
- it is requested to all the partners to submit each month to UNIBRAD timesheets with the indication of the time spent by each person contributing to a given activity of the project;
- all strategic collaborators that any partner wants to bring in GENOVATE should sign a confidential undertaking for stating that any argument discussed in relation to the project will be confidential: this agreement has already been prepared by the UNIBRAD legal office.

Among the bodies that are part of the strategic management of GENOVATE, the Institutional GEAP Management Boards (IGMB) are fundamental for managing the local implementation of the GEAPs. The IGMB should be contextualized to each institution. It is suggested that they are balanced by gender and are manageable bodies, not necessarily with a departmental or disciplinary representation to avoid fragmentation. In particular, in order to avoid a too large number of people in the IGMB, it is suggested, as in Bradford, that the IGMB nominates *Task and finish groups*, which are boards committed only temporarily until a given task is achieved. Each partner has complete freedom in choosing the composition of the IGMB, taking into account people, at each level in the institution, that are needed for implementing the project, in particular for tasks that require institutional representatives. It is also possible to choose a different name for the IGMB: for example, in Bradford it was decided not to call it Management but Advisory Board, since usually a Management Board is a steering committee, while there is more flexibility in an Advisory Board.

One of the tasks of the **WP1** is to enable fluid communication within the project WP and WP Leads. At this regard, it is recommended that any technical negotiation/discussion on **WP3**, **WP4** and **WP5** be addressed to the GEAP Coordinator, Dr.

Caitríona Ní Laoire, which has a close interaction with UNIBRAD. Any management questions or questions from the other work packages should be directly addressed to UNIBRAD.

WP2: Development of a social model of gender equality implementation (Lead TU)

According to the illustration of the logical structure of the work packages in the GENOVATE project (see Diagram 1 in Appendix A), **WP2** role is central, since its objective is to "document the process of implementation of GEAPs and to develop iteratively a Social Model of Gender Equality Implementation (SMoGEI), which will be locally and contextually-specific and therefore of relevance to universities and other institutions and organisations across Europe"⁶.

To this purpose, it will be necessary to collect (task **2.2**) details on the implementation experiences in each institution, identifying (task **2.1** to be realized in collaboration with the UNINA group), in each partner institution context, the more suitable tools for gathering the data needed for building iteratively the Gender Change Academy Model that is one of the outcomes of GENOVATE.

Society is the main contributor in creating (purposely or inadvertently) unequal barriers, negative attitudes and exclusions: so, the identification of such barriers is the requirement of a programme, which aspires to produce a social model of equality. GENOVATE will use the principles of the CAM, which "is a year-long programme of support for teams from higher education institutions that enables them to develop the knowledge, capacity and enthusiasm for achieving complex institutional changes"⁷ and is a professional development process.

What does successful change depend on?

Some answers are:

- the backing from senior management;
- the degree to which project aligns with other projects or wider initiatives or policies;
- the presence in teams of senior managers (which allows to identify champions, pro's and con's);
- the openness of middle and senior management;
- the degree to which institutions can see beyond the linear model of change, to take into account a more complex understanding of change.

The SMoGEI will be the main outcome of GENOVATE and it will be developed throughout the project in an iterative way, taking into step-by-step account (road map) the project progressions. The input to the SMoGEI, underpinned by the CAM and the social model of equality, will come from the process and outcomes of the GENOVATE project, and especially from the GEAPs implementation (WPs 3, 4, 5).

Key elements in this process are: 1) to establish a consultation model, using suitable mechanisms such as online surveys, online forum, etc. (in discussion with UNINA), or E-portfolios (as foreseen in **WP7**); 2) to document each partner institution perceptions and best practices in implementing the GEAPs, at micro and macro institutional level (personal, team, institutional levels); 3) to discuss with all partners the use of the CAM and the social model of equality for creating the GENOVATE SMoGEI (rationale, applicability, projected outcomes).

In developing the appropriate ways and mechanisms for gathering data, it will be necessary to take into account the superposition and possible duplication with WP 3, 4, and 5.

WP3: Gender Equality in Recruitment, Progression and Research Support (Lead UCC)

WP3 time during the consortium Leads' Session was dedicated to the discussion of partner feelings on the documents presented by the UCC team. The **WP3** team Lead started going through the document "Draft guidelines for WP3 Strategy" (from now on DGWP3S) sent to all partners and commenting all the items contained in it. Several points were discussed:

- It was noted that, in gathering the data requested by **WP3**, it is necessary to adopt the principle of flexibility: some of the institutions have already got data, so that they would not need to do the primary research requested in DGWP3S, and some other institutions collected part of the data. This is in accord with what Prof. Peter Hopkinson said:

⁶ GENOVATE proposal, pag. 11, line 13.

⁷ http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/resources/detail/ipp/Issue3_news

"Change needs not necessarily to be new, change might be adaptation of what we already have". This should be considered by all WPs, but in particular by the ones treating data.

- There are dependencies among the data to be collected by the various WPs: this should be taken into account in order to avoid delays.
- The more data are available, the more GENOVATE can track change: so, partners should provide as much as they can. However, probably some kind of data could not be accessible: for example, in some institutions, there are no data on ethnicity, which is one of the equality variables one would like to consider for cross tabulation.
- The different mechanisms used in the various institutions could prevent the comparison among them. The AU team reported an example: in Turkey recruitment boards do not exist⁸. To apply to an academic position in a given area, the staff member is requested to prepare a *Curriculum Vitae* with a list of scientific publications and send it to three (or five) higher degree academicians in that area under the directive of University. The latter judges the quality of this *Curriculum Vitae* and send a report to the board in the faculty, which only confirm, based on these reports, whether the applicant get the position. The reports are not accessible, but the gendered distribution of the jury is obtainable under special demand.
- There are different ways to achieve gender equality, some aspects are specific and others need to be contextualized. One has to understand what works well or what does not work well in each context, as well as what works everywhere. In order to understand the principles of how the change can happen, it was suggested to consult the outcomes reported on the web site of a UK project that collects examples of best practices in different areas.

WP4: Working environment and culture change (Lead AU)

The tasks of **WP4** are 1) to conduct a gender climate assessment of partner institutions to assess working environments and cultures for female academic researchers; 2) to transform culture, perception and behaviours in academic organisations from the bottom up; 3) to transform culture, perception and behaviours in academic organisations from the top down; 4) to ensure sustainability of culture changes in the workplace.

The discussion focused on the task **4.1** and specifically on the document "Draft preparation for gender equality climate assessment methodology" (from now on DPGE CAM) sent by the AU team to the consortium members. The document starts with the definition of the Organizational Culture and Gender Climate Assessment and the goals of the climate assessment (a template listing the components and tools of a Gender Climate Assessment is attached to the document).

It has been recognized that there are some intersections with the work of **WP3**, as for instance the individuation of the degree at which different genders are represented at the university's management positions and boards, which indeed is a part of the quantitative data also required by **WP3**. However, the AU team believes that these data are also necessary for the climate assessment.

The discussion then focused on the methodological framework and in particular on the Analysing Techniques. AU proposes three different techniques: a survey of men and women academics in different fields (as the very comprehensive questionnaire attached to the document), focus groups for women and men academics according to their positions (on which the AU team has a specific expertise); interviews with the executives (with an example interview questionnaire attached to the document).

The survey has the advantage to furnish a bird's eye view on the institution, by reaching people working in different areas, and can be very useful in describing the current status in different disciplines within the institution, identifying which areas are more problematic than others with respect to the gender climate. On the other hand, the interview technique can be more appropriate in understanding what people feel and how they describe the current situation with their own meaning and words. Finally, it has been emphasized that, since the primary aim of **WP4** is not only to describe the culture, but also to transform it, the focus group technique could be a very useful one. Indeed, it would allow to get information, but also to produce new knowledge: in this respect, it would be an interactive process, during which both data would be collected and

⁸ The assignments for all academic positions are established in accordance with the legislation and respective regulations of the Turkish Higher Education Council; however, in some departments of well-established and institutionalized public universities, commissions are formed by the selection of candidates in practice, similar to recruitment boards. Nevertheless, these commissions have no legislative authority: the enforcement of their decisions is possible only in an enabling working environment, since all recruitments require to be approved by the Higher Education Council, the Rector, Faculty Deans and Department Heads.

the participants internalize the aim of GENOVATE.

The opportunity to realise very extensive surveys has been discussed: here the main risk is the difficulty of managing huge amounts of data. So, a useful suggestion is to use focus groups to identify the main issues and then to perform small surveys around particular areas. In reflecting on the balance between the need to follow the same kind of methodology in the 6 partner institutions and the necessity to contextualise it, the main concept that emerged was that of flexibility: it should be accepted that different institutions might adopt different methodologies to address the same key questions. Indeed, it is a fact that some techniques can work in certain institutions and not in others. As for instance, Unibrad experienced that the Consensus Workshop Methodology worked well than the survey in Bradford.

The main point for **WP4** is that of establishing what are the objectives of the climate assessment and then constructing a list of the things needed to assess the climate for gender equality. This list should include: the perceptions of the present situation and how this perception informs policy, the perceptions of fairness of the organizational procedures, how we undertake performance evaluation, what is the diversity reputation of the organization, the commitment of the top management, etc.

As for the effect of using different methodologies on the comparability of the outcomes within GENOVATE, with particular regard to the work of **WP2** and **WP7**, it has been stressed that there is no problem of comparability as long as one adopts the same methodology in different institutions. On the other side, comparability cannot constrain different institutions to use the same techniques: so, we should ensure the comparability of the issues rather than the methods, letting each institution to develop and adopt the most appropriate methodology to the local context. It was agreed that all institutions will customize these methodologies, if needed, according to their own cultural and social context.

WP5: Excellence in research and innovation through gender equality and diversity (Lead LTU)

The tasks of **WP5** aims to 1) promote the benefits of gender and diversity perspectives in enhancing excellence in research and innovation systems; 2) strengthen research excellence frameworks and policies for gender equality and diversity; and 3) strengthen innovation systems by promoting gender equality and diversity. All six core partners will participate in this work package.

The **WP5** presentation highlighted a few examples of the benefits of the gender mainstreaming projects at LTU. Most of the examples are from the field of ICT and innovation. These projects are mainly collaborations between academia and IT industry:

- enhancement of excellence in research and innovation and further development of the IT sector;
- products and services, coming from a diversity of perspectives, more respondent to consumer's needs;
- a higher quality of company and university management;
- broadening of the labour market for both men and women;
- effective and sustainable companies and regions and sustainable growth.

The **task 5.1** was presented by UNIBRAD (the 5.1 task leader is UNIBRAD assisted by UCC). It aims to "develop (a) code of practice for embedding gender equality and diversity into research and innovation excellence standards". In order that promotion panels and research support do not disadvantage women, it is necessary to state in very clear terms that women (and other diverse targets) will not be excluded; so, **deliverable 5.1** of this package would be some kind of guidelines on how to promote inclusion. To do this, it is suggested to analyse for example the situation of institutional funding: who are the people who are getting more support? In fact, very often institutions have selection systems or unwritten rules about who is invited to apply for external or internal funds. Based on the outcomes of this analysis, one could understand the reasons that keep women far from research support, take out all these barriers and let research submission support be dealt in a gender equality perspective.

According to **task 5.2**, tools and methods will be collected and developed to integrate gender and diversity perspectives in research and innovation. The **5.2 task** leader is LTU assisted by UCC. This task will be conducted together with the partners and local stakeholders.

The **WP5 tasks** and activities were discussed, highlighting their connections and contributions from other work packages: for example, a collaboration between **WP2** and **WP5** could be beneficial for the social model to be created in **WP2** and the toolbox development in **WP5**. The whole GENOVATE project could be considered as an innovation system. The first **WP5** working document will be due on Month 12.

Finally, the partners were asked to make a list of their expectations on the **WP5** work and what kind of contributions they are planning for:

- What are your expectations on the **WP5** work and results?
- How will you contribute to the **WP5** work?

The partners' **WP5** ideas will be summarized by the **task 5.2** leader and discussed in a forthcoming telephone conference together with the partners.

After the **WP5** overview, LTU concluded with a to do list for the LTU team: establish a LTU GEAP management board, extend the stakeholder collaboration and organize a local GENOVATE kick-off in Lulea.

WP6: Knowledge exchange and institutional case studies (Lead UNINA)

The first task of **WP6** (Task **6.1**) consists in designing and customizing existing tools for the effective shared learning.

The UNINA team illustrated the idea of the GENOVATE Community: a community with different levels of access and privileges, with an inner level accessible only to the consortium members, a second level that includes the IAB and a third level with the inclusion of stakeholders and institutional members (Chancellors, academic board, decision makers, etc.). All these three levels would be password protected, in order to ensure protection of data. The community will use some standard tools as Forum, Chat, Blog, Database, Webinars, Virtual Interactive Classroom, etc. An outer level, accessible to the institution Academic Staff and Student, could be added to the community, and realized using existing services like Twitter. Since it will serve people from the local institution, it was suggested to adopt for it the local language and host it on the local webpage rather than on the GENOVATE platform.

Blackboard Collaboration is a software employed at UNIBRAD; it was used also during the present Convention to let members of the GENOVATE teams to join the meeting from their own offices out of Bradford. The CSI (Centre for Informative Service) of UNINA is developing a quite similar tool, the Web Collaboration platform. It consists in a virtual classroom that allows to accomplish many different tasks: to show slides, to write on a whiteboard, to allow interactions among the participants and/or selective interactions among some of them, to collect and record questionnaires online. A moderator invites people (max 25) via email, establishing the privileges of each participant, who can then follow the link indicated in the email using different media (pc, tablet, phone with VOIP technology, etc.). It was discussed the opportunity to start using the Blackboard Collaboration software immediately and to coordinate the UNINA CSI with the System Manager in Bradford (Bryan Walkden).

The second task of **WP6** (Task **6.2**) is to coordinate and activate a system of shared knowledge and to promote the learning within and across the consortium with peer-to-peer and bench-learning methods, so that those who have less experience can learn from those who have more. UNINA proposed a 4-step strategy. First, one should identify the expertise necessary to implement the GEAPs as well as the best practice already in use in each institution. From this inspection a matrix of expertise and best practices, highlighting weaknesses and strengths within the consortium, will emerge. By analysing this matrix, the UNINA team will construct the buddy system to share knowledge, identifying the appropriate shared learning tools, organizing workshops, visiting opportunities and online and face-to-face meetings. The best practices and expertise acquired in this phase will be tailored and implemented at local level. All this procedure can be iterated.

Several tools were proposed by UNINA for sharing knowledge on the GENOVATE platform. One of these is the Resource Beehive, which is a database of expertise and resources within the consortium. It appears as a beehive where each cell corresponds to a specific expertise (e.g. Expertise in Research and Innovation, Analysis of diversity, and so on). By clicking on a cell, one would be redirected to a database listing the partners having that specific expertise, as well as the resources related to it. Another tool is the Gender Cloud, which is a Tag cloud similar to those commonly used in the blogs, which allows to visualize the frequency of occurrence (represented by the size of the font) of a specific word/concept; at the same time, by clicking on the word, one is immediately redirected to a repository of documents connected to that word. It was suggested to use the Gender cloud as a visualization tool for a database, for searching findings of open questionnaires on the perception, etc.

The third task of **WP6** (Task **6.3**) consists in defining and designing a suitable format for case studies to be shared across the consortium and that will represent a reconstruction of the process of the GEAPs implementation. This task is also related to the tasks **2.1** and **2.2** described in the **WP2** section.

The partners discussed what the case studies should represent. It emerged that a case study should paint in time a particular story on the GEAPs implementation in each institution; so, they should be reflective of the local GEAPs. Case studies could not necessarily be good practices in the classical sense. They would concern achievements, events, actions but also overcoming battles and changes of context, or reflect how certain institutions resolved specific issues. Each partner should guide the **WP6** team in identifying *example stories* of the GEAPs implementation in each institution. Eventually, this would allow both a within-case analysis, identifying unique patterns within each institution, and a cross-case analysis, identifying similarities and complementarities among institutions. From this work an e-portfolio of case studies should

emerge, including more than one case study for each partner and highlighting the principles that the social model should establish.

UNINA team proposed that, within the GENOVATE community, each partner uses a blog or a learning journal (in the form of an online Log or Field Notes), allowing regular reflection and describing the GEAP implementation process. The blogs could record actions, barriers encountered, successes and failures, and include interviews (written, video, audio) to the principal actors of the process. It could be shared with and commented from all the member of the GENOVATE community. It will be organized using some structure, as sections, which will facilitate the final process of picking up the most exemplary stories and constructing the e-portfolio.

Finally, it was stressed the necessity to carefully look at the issue of confidentiality and dignity in the definition of the tools for sharing knowledge and experiences. The services used (over-blog, wiki, e-portfolio, etc.) should allow individuals to choose what to put in the public domain and what to keep confidential, in order to retain people's dignity and to let them feel comfortable in sharing their experience and knowledge.

WP8: Dissemination and sustainability strategy (Lead UNIBRAD)

The tasks of **WP8** involve the dissemination of the findings of GENOVATE to various target groups outside the consortium: policy makers at the European and national level; academics and graduate students; professional bodies; member states and other international audience; decision makers in higher education; research and equality institutions, and other end users; trade unions; non-governmental organisations; journalists – media professionals. The dissemination strategy will be structured according to various activities:

- project website;
- external stakeholder communication;
- on-going stakeholder engagement throughout the project including participation in GENOVATE Conventions;
- in-country learning circles involving gender networks and key stakeholders;
- endpoint international conference for the project;
- scholarly publications;
- *good practice* guides and brochures.

The official GENOVATE web site will be live within month 6 of the project. Thanks to the financial resources made available in the project Employability Program (for helping graduates to gain employment after education and learn additional skills), it will be possible to give three-month contracts to students from different departments for working on some activity related to GENOVATE. At the moment, a student in the field of IT and Media Communications is working on the web site, and in the future similar initiatives are planned in other fields (for example, Social Science). The rules of Bradford University require that its logo is shown in the top banner in the main page of the GENOVATE web site; however, it was negotiated that the bottom banner includes the logos of all the GENOVATE partners. It is planned to pick photos from events (like the present Convention and the future GENOVATE events in the member institutions) to be put in a page where they can be refreshed. Some partners have already added material regarding the GENOVATE project on the web sites of their institutions (for example, the GEAP in Turkish was published on the web site of Human Study Centre of the Ankara University). It is agreed that each partner maintains local web sites in each own language, linked in the main web site, with information about the project, latest news and documents. Concerning this, it is suggested to exploit all possible initiatives for promoting GENOVATE in the local context, like for example translating the brochure in each country language.

Business cards for the Scientific Coordinators were delivered during the present Convention while flexible institutional cards are foreseen for each partner with the address of the local Institutional Secretariats for GENOVATE. The UNIBRAD team prepared pop-up of two dimensions to be used for promoting GENOVATE activities: the smaller one can be used in receptions inside institutions, while the larger one for meetings/conventions. The file corresponding to the large pop-up is so big that it is not possible to exchange it in the normal ways. It was proposed that UNIBRAD prints the large pop-up for partners; other solutions are under study like making it available on some network support like Dropbox.

Other dissemination activities are planned, like permanent student ambassadors and T-shirts.

Finally, the Coordinator reported on the findings of a study on research excellence: women don't get published because people that makes decisions about what goes in particular journals are men. So, the more things women are allowed to share openly, the better the recognitions that women have. This will be guaranteed by the fact that GENOVATE will work in

an open access framework: for example, it is agreed that all publications of GENOVATE will be included in open general systems (like in Bradford, where there is an open access repository system).

The argument of publication policy, rules of engagement, number of publications per each WP, and so on will be discussed in an extraordinary virtual meeting to be held in April.

6. Evaluation Workshop (Lead UCM)

The final part of the Convention was dedicated to the Evaluation Workshop: a training session, led by the UCM team, which started with a brief illustration of ideas, purposes and methods of the Evaluation Process (EP).

Evaluation refers to the process of determining the worth or significance of an activity, policy or program. It consists in an assessment of a planned, on-going, or completed intervention, its design, implementation and results. An evaluation should provide credible and useful information, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process.

The three main purposes of the EP are: 1) to improve the practice, by analysing how the programs are designed and implemented, as well as what their main results are; 2) to enlighten future programs and actions; 3) to be accountable to people involved in the programs in order to be transparent and promote collective learning. The political character of the EP has also been emphasized, which indeed needs to grasp the context and to respond to that context, its main goal being to contribute, in a specific social and political context, to generate useful knowledge for improving public action.

It was stressed that monitoring and evaluation are different processes. Monitoring is a continuous function used to provide information for management and the main stakeholders about the extent of progress and achievement of objectives as well as the use of allocated funds. The aims of monitoring and evaluation are different: the purpose of the monitoring process is to check progress, enable remedial action to be taken and update plans, whereas the evaluation is aimed at learning, accountability, enlightenment. In GENOVATE, each partner will be responsible for the monitoring of the WP that it leads and of its own GEAP. There will be coordination among the consortium members and the evaluation team, but the evaluation will not cover the monitoring activity.

There are three types of evaluation to be considered: 1) the evaluation of program design, which focuses on the design and conceptualization of the program (project, plan, policy); 2) the evaluation of the process, which focuses on the program implementation process, that is, how it functions and is implemented; 3) the evaluation of results, which can be distinguished in *Outputs* (what the program produces and its quality: activities, materials, etc.) and *Outcomes* (the effects and impacts produced by the *Outputs*).

WP7 has two main goals: the first one is to evaluate GENOVATE as a project in a formative and not only summative way, the second one is to work together with the partners in helping them in evaluating their own GEAPs implementation. On the basis of this interactive process, at the end of the project, **WP7** should also produce guidelines for the evaluation of GEAPs implementation.

Evaluation of GENOVATE as a project

In order to discuss the first item, (i.e. the evaluation of GENOVATE as a project) **WP7** team asked the participants to answer to the following question: *Which questions would you like the GENOVATE's evaluation to answer?* This reason for this question was to get an idea on the consortium member expectations on the evaluation, which could be useful to write down a realistic set of evaluation questions in feedback with the partners. It is agreed that such list will not be fixed but will be an on-going list during the course of the project. The answers of partners were collectively discussed and organized in 4 different categories according to the object of evaluation: design, implementation, outputs and outcomes. A list of the main questions proposed is given in Table 2 in Appendix A. Even if most of the questions were concerned with the outcomes, the Evaluator Team emphasized that they will essentially focus on evaluating the implementation process, rather than outcomes and outputs.

Evaluation of the GEAPs implementation

The second part of the workshop was dedicated to the other line of action of **WP7**, i.e. the evaluation of the GEAPs implementation, with a presentation of the EP step by step.

It has been clarified that the first step in the evaluative process of the GEAPs is to delimitate the project to be evaluated. This requires identifying the program theory, the processes carried out and the key structural elements for the implementation of the program.

The second step consists in engaging the stakeholders, which can be individuals and organizations (e.g. program staff, senior staff, university administrators, state-level politicians or policymakers, department, program partners, school officials, and so on). According to Guba and Lincoln (1989), three kinds of stakeholders can be identified: 1) *Agents*, which are people involved in the definition, funding and implementation of the project, 2) *Beneficiaries*, which are those who, directly or indirectly, can get a profit from the project, 3) *Victims*, that is those who can have resistances in relation to the project or who are impacted by the project in a negative way. The UCM team proposed to the partners to make a brainstorming in order to identify the stakeholders and then to perform the exercise to identify the program theory with some specific stakeholder.

The partners are recommended to think strategically in order to promote participation, to enable effective dialogue and discussion, to develop a realistic assessment of stakeholders capacity and willingness to participate, to investigate into the "real" interests and issues of key stakeholders which often differ from those, which are openly expressed, to establish procedures for mediating power imbalances among stakeholders.

The third step consists in identifying the most important questions to be answered through the evaluation, according to stakeholders' interest and features of the project and to organize and prioritize them. Through a brainstorming with the stakeholders, the first evaluation questions will be defined.

At this point, the consortium member were asked to fill in a *program theory map*, indicating the Core Goals of their GEAPs, that is the expected results, to connect these with concrete actions, to identify the key structural elements to implement the actions and finally to identify bottlenecks and opportunities in the implementation of each action.

Similar exercise will be proposed in the Evaluation Workshop that will take place during the next Conventions.

Some final remarks emerged from the discussion:

- In the implementation of the GENOVATE project, it will be extremely important to create a balance between a context specific approach (taking into account the diversity of countries, contexts, institutions and disciplines, expertise, etc.) and the idea of the project as a whole, which can take advance from this diversity.
- As in all research-action projects, in GENOVATE the implementation process will be accompanied with a continuous reflection process, which should be aimed at creating a positive feedback on the implementation itself. On one side the consortium will work on tangible processes (like the implementation of the GEAPs with **WP3**, **WP4** and **WP5** work packages) and, on the other side, it will work on concepts and ideas (**WP2**, **WP6** and **WP8**): so, it will be extremely important to be able to distinguish between the actions related to processes and those related to concepts and ideas.
- In approaching the evaluation of the GEAPs implementation, we should have clear in mind that GENOVATE involves not only complicated but complex processes where the cause-effect relationship is highly non linear and that the main purpose of it is to take away the barriers at the level of institutional cultures and organizational structures.

Appendix A. Tables and Diagrams

Table 1. Questions and answers during the World Cafe

Question	Answers
Things that enable teams to work well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● clarity of tasks ● understanding and sensitivity to how others work ● connection to hierarchies in the institution
Things that stops teams in working well	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● inexperienced or ineffective leadership ● no leadership ● too much leadership ● poor communication ● unready teams ● too small ● too big ● wrong people
Key challenges in teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● how to manage variation in performance ● how to avoid confusion within the team or the institution ● how can project connect to other related and supportive projects ● securing resources and influences ● coping with change – losing team members ● competition from other projects
Least successful attitudes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● external imposition ● chaotic ● scale and speed of change ● no ownership ● fear ● poor leadership ● confused goals, no clarity of purpose ● people not delivering
Most successful attitudes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● involvement ● shared understanding of purposes ● connection to values and purpose ● positive ● clear aims and objectives ● pleasurable

Table 2. Evaluating GENOVATE as a project (Evaluation Workshop)

Category	Question
DESIGN of the Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the strategies appropriated to the goals? ● Feasibility of the actions. ● Has GENOVATE realized its aims and objectives? ● What is the implicit change model that will be used to develop GENOVATE and how this model will change over time?
Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Feasibility of the actions. ● How the on-going evaluation process will contribute to promote learning? ● How the on-going evaluation process will contribute to a more efficient integration of the project activity tasks. ● Is the management governance working for the benefit of the project? ● Are all partners able to participate and contribute fully? ● Is the internal communication system effective? ● What was the weakness of the project and why ? ● Have methods used enabled the appropriate data to be collected?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are there common experiences across partners? ● How effective is the social model? ● How can partnership and collaboration be improved for future programs? ● Is the public image and visibility of GENOVATE strong? ● Have the WPs delivered the contracted outputs and outcomes?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Effectiveness of the bench learning process ● Effectiveness of the actions ● Have similar strategies yielded different outcomes in different political contexts? ● Which partners strategies have been more effective? ● What would success look like and under what circumstances? ● Where are the emerging issues outside of the scope of GENOVATE? ● How to evaluate the raised gender equality awareness? ● Impact of using a Gender Change Academy Model. ● Has GENOVATE created conditions and practices, within the institutions, that allows gender issues to be discussed with more confidence and trust? ● Has the collaborative partnership facilitated development? ● Has the process enabled clarity in creating purposeful outcomes?

Diagram 1. Logical structure of the GENOVATE project



