D2.3 EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology for ICT Research Institutions v1

WP2 – Gender Audits at the involved RPOs

Version 1.1
Disclaimer

Any dissemination of results reflects only the author’s view and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Copyright message

© EQUAL-IST Consortium, 2016
This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both. Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.
D2.3 EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology for ICT Research Institutions v1

Document Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Agreement Number</th>
<th>710549</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>EQUAL-IST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Title</td>
<td>Gender Equality Plans for Information Sciences and Technology Research Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>H2020- GERI-4-2015 Support to research organisations to implement gender equality plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>CSA - Coordination &amp; support action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>1st June 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>36 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project URL</td>
<td><a href="http://www.equal-ist.eu">www.equal-ist.eu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Project Officer</td>
<td>Monica Hoek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Mr. Apostolos Vontas, ViLabs OE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable</td>
<td>2.3. EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology for ICT Research Institutions v1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Package</td>
<td>WP2 – Gender Audits at the involved RPOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Delivery</td>
<td>Contractual M7 Actual 29/12/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature</td>
<td>R - Report Dissemination Level P - Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Beneficiary</td>
<td>UNIMORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Author</td>
<td>Claudia Canali Email <a href="mailto:claudia.canali@unimore.it">claudia.canali@unimore.it</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UniMORE Phone +39 059 2056317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors(s):</td>
<td>All partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Gender audit, quantitative indicators, participatory assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Contributor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17/12/2016</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Circulation of the 1st DRAFT version to all partners for comments (1st level check)</td>
<td>UNIMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>28/12/2016</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>2nd level check – Ready for submission</td>
<td>All Partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table of Contents

1. Executive summary .......................................................................................................................... 6
2. Overall Gender Audit Methodology .................................................................................................. 6
3. Quantitative Indicators ....................................................................................................................... 7
   3.1 Introduction .................................................................................................................................. 7
   3.2 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree amongst Students ......................................................... 8
   3.3 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree in Academic Staff .......................................................... 9
   3.4 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree in Non Academic Staff .................................................. 11
   3.5 Assessment of Gender Equality in Governance: .......................................................................... 12
   3.6 Assessment of Work-life Balance Degree within the Institution .................................................. 12
   3.7 Evaluation of Equal Opportunity Policies and Machineries ......................................................... 14
   3.8 Regional and National Gender Equality Indicators ....................................................................... 15
4. Participatory Tools ............................................................................................................................. 15
   4.1 Individual Semi-structured Interviews ......................................................................................... 15
      4.1.1 Interviews Structure .............................................................................................................. 15
      4.1.2 Interviews Questions ........................................................................................................... 16
   4.2 Workshops .................................................................................................................................. 17
      4.2.1 Workshops Overall Organization ........................................................................................ 17
      4.2.2 Thematic Workshops: Structure and Goals ......................................................................... 18
      4.2.3 Final Workshop: Structure and Goals ................................................................................. 19
      4.2.4 Before the workshops: preliminary questionnaires ............................................................... 20
      4.2.5 Reporting ............................................................................................................................ 20
5. Preliminary questionnaires for thematic workshops ............................................................................. 20
   5.1 Questions List ............................................................................................................................... 21
      5.1.1 Questions common to all workshops (W1, W2, W3, W4) ....................................................... 21
      5.1.2 Questions for W1 - HR practices and management for academic staff ............................. 22
      5.1.3 Questions for W2 - HR practices and management for technical and administrative staff .... 22
      5.1.4 Questions for W3 - Research design and delivery ............................................................... 22
      5.1.5 Questions for W4 - Student services .................................................................................. 23
      5.1.6 Response Scale .................................................................................................................... 23
6. Workshop Core Exercises ................................................................................................................. 23
   6.1 CEX1 - Gender Focus Group ....................................................................................................... 24
   6.2 CEX2 - Historical Timeline ....................................................................................................... 24
7 Workshop Optional Exercises .............................................................. 26
  7.1 OEX1 - Gender knowledge and awareness ........................................... 26
  7.2 OEX2 - Classification of projects and activities ...................................... 27
  7.3 OEX3 - Hofstede’s onion/Organizational culture .................................... 30
  7.4 OEX4 – Institutional Communication Analysis ..................................... 32
8 Ethics and Data Management...................................................................... 34
9 First Capacity Building Session .............................................................. 34
  9.1 Introduction ....................................................................................... 34
  9.2 Agenda ............................................................................................. 35
  9.3 List of Participants ............................................................................. 38
  9.4 Presentations of the Methodology Steps............................................. 44
10 References .............................................................................................. 45
11 Annex A - Glossary on Gender-related Concepts .................................... 45
12 Annex B – Ethics templates ..................................................................... 49
  12.1 Information sheet ............................................................................. 49
  12.2 Consent form ................................................................................... 50
1 Executive summary

The EQUAL-IST project aims at introducing structural changes in research organizations to enhance gender equality within Information System and Technology Institutions. The project will support the seven European Research Performing Organizations (RPOs) of the EQUAL-IST consortium in developing and implementing Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) focusing on four main levels: HR practices and management, research design and delivery, student services and institutional communication. The phase of gender audit internal to each RPOs is a critical step to identify gender bias at the departmental and organizational level and advice accordingly the required measures and actions for enhancing gender equality.

This deliverable presents the EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology guidelines and includes:

- An overview of the overall gender audit methodology
- A set of specific guidelines on how to perform internal assessment towards the identification of gender bias at the partner RPOs
- The detailed description of the two main parts of the methodology:
  - The set of indicators for quantitative assessment
  - The participatory tools and exercises for qualitative assessment

2 Overall Gender Audit Methodology

The design of the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology has been based on the selection and adaptation of existing methods for gender audit previously developed by other European research projects and qualified international institutions. The outcomes of the EQUAL-IST Project Task 2.1 State of the Art Analysis have been very helpful for identifying the most significant gender audit methods and tools to consider for the development of the EQUAL-IST methodology. Specifically, the main identified references in terms of gender audit approaches are the following:

- Guidelines and tools for institutional change – Genis Lab FP7 Project (Genis Lab Project, 2014)
- GEAR Tool for gender equality in academia and research - EIGE European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE GEAR Toolkit, 2016)
- She Figures Handbook - The main source of European, comparable statistics on the state of gender equality in research and innovation (She Figures Handbook, 2015)
- Assessment toolkit of the European FP7 INTEGER project (INTEGER Project, 2015)
- EURAXESS Initiative (EURAXESS, 2016)

The analysis of the above sources evidenced the existence of two main approaches for gender audit: a quantitative approach to the problem, based on measurable indicators, and a qualitative approach, based on participatory techniques and tools. The approaches are complementary in nature and present different advantages with respect to the gender audit process.

Quantitative indicators are computed on gender disaggregated data; they provide measurable information that supports monitor and evaluation processes, and facilitates a comparison between:
- Different institutions (e.g., EQUAL-IST partner RPOs)
- Different geographical levels (local RPOs vs. national and European situation)

Participatory techniques and tools make use of intense interactions with the staff of an organization to carry out a qualitative reflection on individual and collective rules, behaviors, and beliefs, as well as their impact on gender equality; these techniques are essential because they allow the auditors to:

- Investigate areas where quantitative data are not available to analyze
- Probe staff’s perception about gender (in)equalities
- Start a self-reflection process and promote learning about gender audit process and outcomes

Based on the above observations, the developed EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology exploits a **mixed strategy integrating both quantitative and qualitative techniques**. Existing indicators and participatory tools have been selected and adapted based on the need to customize the gender audit methodology to the specific requirements of IST/ICT research institutions and to the four target areas considered in the EQUAL-IST project (HR practices and management, research design and delivery, student services and institutional communication).

The **main components of the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology** are:

1. Set of quantitative indicators
2. Participatory tools
   a) Individual semi-structured interviews
   b) Workshops

The details of the methodology are described in the next sections of this document.

The internal gender audit following the EQUAL-IST methodology will be carried out at each RPO belonging to the EQUAL-IST consortium. Specifically, the GEP Working Groups of each RPO will be responsible for conducting the internal gender audit. To this purpose, the UniMORE research unit trained the RPOs Working Group members during the First Capacity Building Session, which took place in Venice on December 1 – 2, 2016 (a detailed description of the First Capacity Building Session is provided in Section 9 of this document).

## 3 Quantitative Indicators

### 3.1 Introduction

This section presents the system of quantitative indicators on the degree of gender equality that has been constructed and proposed to the different partners in the project to be tested in order to provide a tool that can be used for the assessment of Information System and Technology Institutions gender equality.

The indicators will be presented according to **different groups of people** involved within the institution:

- Students
- Academic Staff
- Non Academic Staff

and **areas**:
• Gender equality indicators (in terms of access to academic course, position in employment, governance, pay gap)
• Degree of work-life balance
• Equal opportunities dedicated machineries/committees

The system of indicators is developed in order to provide different degree of comparability:
- Between the department and the university/institution the single department is part of
- Between the department and the Information System and Technology Institutions national level
- Between the department and the Information System and Technology Institutions belonging to the network
- Between the department and the Information System and Technology Institutions at European level

Quantitative indicators will be collected by each EQUAL-IST partner institution leading to a wider experimentation of the system.

3.2 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree amongst Students

Data on the distribution by gender, field and level of tertiary education (according to the International Standard Classification of Education - ISCED 2011 - levels 5, 6, 7, 8) within the University & with reference to the same field at Country and EU level will be collected and elaborated to produce the following representation indices:

**Single Representation Index**

\[
F_{ji}/T_{ji} \text{ Representation Index referred to the institution} \\
F_{jw}/T_{jw} \text{ RI for the whole institution} \\
F_{j\text{country}}/T_{j\text{country}} \text{ RI for the Country of the Institution} \\
F_{j\text{network}}/T_{j\text{network}} \text{ RI for the Network of Institutions} \\
F_{j\text{EU}}/T_{j\text{EU}} \text{ RI average EU28}
\]

**Comparative RI indices**

\[
(F_{ji}/T_{ji})/(F_{jw}/T_{jw}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of study with regards to the same level of study at the university the dept. belongs to level]} \\
(F_{ji}/T_{ji})/(F_{j\text{country}}/T_{j\text{country}}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of study with regards to the same area and level of study at national level]} \\
(F_{ji}/T_{ji})/(F_{j\text{network}}/T_{j\text{network}}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of study with regards to the same area and level of study at network of institutions in the project level]} \\
(F_{ji}/T_{ji})/ (F_{j\text{EU}}/T_{j\text{EU}}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of study with regards to the same area and level of study at EU level]}
\]
i = area of degree (Engineering, Economics,...)  
j = ISCED (International Standard Classification of Education) 2011 levels 5, 6, 7 and 8 (short-cycle tertiary education, bachelor’s or equivalent level, master’s or equivalent level, doctoral or equivalent level).

Level 5 – Short-cycle tertiary education  
Level 6 – Bachelor’s or equivalent level  
Level 7 – Master’s or equivalent level  
Level 8 – Doctoral or equivalent level

\[ F_{ji} = \text{female students enrolled in } j \text{ and } i. \]

\[ w = \text{whole institution/university the single dept. belong to.} \]

\[ F_{jw} = \text{female students enrolled in } j \text{ in the whole university.} \]

Data on the **performance of students in tertiary education**, field of study and local university average by gender will be collected to measure the gender in education performance gap.

Two indexes will be computed to measure the students performance.

First, the ratio of the female students’ average final degree grade at Bachelor and Master or equivalent level divided by global (female + male) average degree grade at the same level of tertiary education:

\[ \frac{\text{female average degree grade}_j}{\text{global average degree grade}_j} \]

A value higher than 1 denotes that female’s grades are higher than male students; if lower than 1, male outperform female students in terms of final degree grades.

Second, a measure of the students dropout computed as the ratio of the female dropout rate at Bachelor and Master Degrees or equivalent level divided by the global (female + male) dropout rate at the same level of tertiary education:

\[ \frac{\text{female dropout rate}_j}{\text{global dropout rate}_j} \]

### 3.3 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree in Academic Staff

Data on the **distribution by gender and position** (research contract, research assistant, associate professor, full professor) by area of research in the Dept., with reference to the whole University & with reference to the same area (for example Engineering) in the country the institution belongs to and with reference to EU (and/or partners' in the project's network) average will be collected and representation indices by each academic position will be computed according to:

**Single Representation Index**

\[ \frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}} \text{ Representation Index referred to the institution} \]

\[ \frac{F_{jw}}{T_{jw}} \text{ RI for the whole institution} \]
$F_{\text{country}}/T_{\text{country}}$ RI for the Country of the Institution

$F_{\text{network}}/T_{\text{network}}$ RI for the Network of Institutions

$F_{\text{EU}}/T_{\text{EU}}$ RI average EU28

**Comparative RI indices**

$\left(\frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{jw}}{T_{jw}}\right)$

$\left(\frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{\text{country}}}{T_{\text{country}}}\right)$ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same position and area of research at national level]

$\left(\frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{\text{EU}}}{T_{\text{EU}}}\right)$ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same position and area of research at EU level]

$\left(\frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{\text{network}}}{T_{\text{network}}}\right)$ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same position and area of research at network level]

$\left(\frac{F_{\text{country}}}{T_{\text{country}}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{\text{EU}}}{T_{\text{EU}}}\right)$ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research at country level with regards to the same position and area of research at EU level]

$i =$ research area (topics)

$j =$ position (level in descending order)

$w =$ whole institution/university the single dept. belongs to.

$F_{ji} =$ female employee in position $j$ and area $i$.

Data on the distribution by gender and **term of contract** (part-time, full-time, temporary, permanent) by area of research in the Dept., with reference to the whole University & with reference to the same area (for example Engineering) in the country the institution belongs to and with reference to EU (and/or partners’ network of the project) average will be collected to construct representation indices as below:

**Single Representation Index**

$F_{ji}/T_{ji}$ Representation Index referred to the institution

$F_{jw}/T_{jw}$ RI for the whole institution

$F_{\text{country}}/T_{\text{country}}$ RI for the Country of the Institution

$F_{\text{network}}/T_{\text{network}}$ RI for the Network of Institutions

$F_{\text{EU}}/T_{\text{EU}}$ RI average EU28

**Comparative RI indices**

$\left(\frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}}\right)/\left(\frac{F_{jw}}{T_{jw}}\right)$
\[ \left( \frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}} \right) / \left( \frac{F_{jcountry}}{T_{jcountry}} \right) \] [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same area and term of contract at national level]

\[ \left( \frac{F_{ji}}{T_{ji}} \right) / \left( \frac{F_{jEU}}{T_{jEU}} \right) \] [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same area and term of contract at EU level]

\[ F_{ji} / T_{ji} \] / \left( \frac{F_{jnetwork}}{T_{jnetwork}} \right) [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research with regards to the same area and term of contract at network level]

\[ \left( \frac{F_{jcountry}}{T_{jcountry}} \right) / \left( \frac{F_{jEU}}{T_{jEU}} \right) \] [provides a measure of the representation of women in that field of research at country level with regards to the same area and term of contract at EU level]

i = research area (topics)

j = term of contract (part-time, full-time, temporary, permanent)

w = whole institution/university the single dept. belongs to.

\[ F_{ij} \] = female researchers term of contract j and area i.

Data on **gross wages** by gender and position will be collected in order to compute gender wage gap by level at Dept. and University level. [including also premia or other items]. Computed as by Eurostat:

'The unadjusted gender pay gap (GPG) represents the difference between average gross hourly earnings of male paid employees and of female paid employees as a percentage of average gross hourly earnings of male paid employees.' A positive value say x means that on average women's gross hourly earnings are x% below those of men in the same level. (Eurostat, 2016, metadata)

- Education workload number of credit taught by lecturer and by gender
- Publications by gender/area and evaluation indices
- Fundraising: research funds collected by researcher by gender and year disaggregated by type of fund (local, national, international) and the role of the researcher (unit responsible, coordinator of the project at national or international level).

### 3.4 Assessment of Gender Equality Degree in Non Academic Staff

Data on the distribution by gender, area, and position/level at central level and at the Dept., with reference to the whole University & with reference to the whole Universities average in the country the institution belongs to and with reference to EU (or partners’ of the project) average will be collected to compute the following:

**Single Representation Index**

\[ F_{ji} / T_{ji} \] Representation Index referred to the institution

\[ F_{jw} / T_{jw} \] RI for the whole institution
D2.3 EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology for ICT Research Institutions v1

\[ F_{\text{Country}} / T_{\text{Country}} \text{ RI for the Country of the Institution} \]
\[ F_{\text{Network}} / T_{\text{Network}} \text{ RI for the Network of Institutions} \]
\[ F_{\text{EU}} / T_{\text{EU}} \text{ RI average EU28} \]

**Comparative RI indices**

\[ (F_j / T_j) / (F_{w} / T_{w}) \]
\[ (F_j / T_j) / (F_{\text{Italy}} / T_{\text{Italy}}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in a given sector and level within the University analysed] } \]
\[ (F_{\text{Italy}} / T_{\text{Italy}}) / (F_{\text{EU}} / T_{\text{EU}}) \text{ [provides a measure of the representation of women in that level with regards to the EU level] } \]

\( i = \text{area} \)
\( j = \text{level} \)

\( F_{ij} = \text{female employees in position } j \text{ and area } i. \)

- distribution by gender and term of contract (part-time, full-time, temporary, permanent) by area of in the Dept., with reference to the whole University & with reference to the country the institution belongs to and with reference to EU (or partners’ of the project) average

- representation indices for the Dept./management and at University offices

**Gender wage gap** by level at Dept. and University level. Computed as by Eurostat (as referred to above).

### 3.5 Assessment of Gender Equality in Governance:

In order to assess the degree of gender equality in a given institution it becomes essential to measure the degree of gender equality in governance with the following indicators:

- Rector (M - F)
- ViceRector/s’ gender
- Executive Board composition by gender
- Academic Senate (or other equivalent high level Council) composition by gender
to be collected at department, university and national level.

### 3.6 Assessment of Work-life Balance Degree within the Institution

This area hosts all the measures that can contribute to **enhance work-life balance** as an essential dimension to be considered given the higher likelihood that women will be involved in unpaid care work within their households that could conflict with their working activities. The indicators will be computed with reference to the specific laws implemented in the countries analysed.
- **Parental leaves by gender** (ideally according to the National Laws and contract one should also compute parental leaves upon eligible employees) + coefficients of representation on the whole employment

  - to compute this index we should know the number of employees who could be eligible (in the case of Italy for childcare employees with children up to 12 years old or with not self-sufficient relatives remind that parental leave are only partially paid: 30% up to 6 yrs old children and unpaid from 6 to 12). The index should then be computed as following Efj taking the leave/Efj eligible for the leave we could then compare the value of the index to compute a gender gap in the take up of parental leave

  - a similar indicator at EU level can be found in Eurostat data base (Ifso_10lparlea) and it is referred to 2010 LFS (Labour Force Survey) ad hoc module on the reconciliation between work and family life. Here the indicator is obtained by computing the number of people who took parental leave to care for their youngest child aged less than 8 distinguishing also by duration of the leave on a sample of 1,000 people.

  - Istat (Istat, 2013) defines an indicator showing the number of people taking up the leave with % of women and men taking up the leave for 2012 (11% men and 89% women). Without finer data needed to compute the correct take up (i.e. % of employees by gender on total eligible) this index can represent the gender disequilibrium in the take up of parental leaves. For example, for UniMORE it should be: 88% by using the available data we can see that for professors/researchers is taken by women and 86% by administrative and technicians - in line with national data but certainly not encouraging in terms of gender equity.

- **Tele-working positions by gender + coefficients of representation amongst non-academic staff**

  - employees can take telework (this could be a first indicator to be used)

  - number of employees in teleworking by gender and compute (as in the representation index) to what extent women and men are represented in this contract

- **Flexible hours arrangements (% by gender on the whole administration)**

  - employees can enjoy flexible work arrangements (this could be a first indicator to be used)

  - number of employees in flexible work arrangements by gender and compute (as in the representation index) to what extent women and men are represented in flexible work arrangements

- **Time bank presence** (this is a dummy variable 0 no 1 yes)

- **Kindergarten**

  0 - no kindergarten and no agreement with local public or private institutions to have reserved access to kindergarten

  1 - agreement with public or private institutions for access at reduced rate

  2 - presence of kindergarten

- **Summer Camp**

  0 - no summer camp and no agreement with local public or private institutions to have reserved access to summer camp
1 - agreement with public or private institutions to access at reduced rates
2 - presence of summer camp

A wider perspective could be envisaged within the project to take into account gender equality in the different dimensions of well-being. For this purpose the research group proposes to take into account the existing surveys on well-being evaluation that are available at each institution level in order to devise a set of indicators on the well-being indicators as well as perceived discrimination within the institution analysed. For example, UniMORE unit has recently acquired microdata on the last available survey on well-being carried out in 2010 and comparable with National survey on well-being evaluation within Public administration institutions and proposes to check the availability of similar surveys in the other institutions.

### 3.7 Evaluation of Equal Opportunity Policies and Machineries

- **Existence of GEP:**
  - since year [0 if it does not exist; then one will specify a discrete indicators increasing in the spell of duration of existence of GEP with regards to the year it should have been implemented according to National Law the larger the delay the lower the index]
  - with a system of target indicators [0 if no target are established for each actions; 1 if at least one action has target to be evaluated; 2 if at least 2 actions; 3 if all actions have targets for a evaluation]
  - containing a system for its evaluation [0 no system of evaluation is established; 1 a system is in force]
  - GEP targets evolve [0: if all actions are repeated year by year showing no evidence of an evolution; 1: if at least 50% of actions are new and there is evidence of achieved targets; 2: if at least 70% of actions are new and there is evidence of achieved targets]

- **Existence of Gender Budgeting:**
  - Existence of GB [0: No; 1: Yes]
  - in experimental phase - score: 1
  - contains analysis of the structure in terms of gender equity indicators - score:2
  - audit - score: 3
  - participatory gender budgeting - score:4
  - part of the administrative machinery - score: 5

- **Equal Opportunity Machineries**
  - since year [0 if it does not exist; then one will specify a discrete indicators increasing in the spell of duration of existence of machinery with regards to the year it should have been implemented according to National Law the larger the delay the lower the index]
  - members [ elected members 2, nominated 1]

We can decide that being elected there will be a higher participation by employees on the implementation of the machineries however not always this can be possible according to the National Law.
- Well-being Service

- Trade unions representatives by gender computed as the other index of representation by gender

### 3.8 Regional and National Gender Equality Indicators

The level of gender equality in a given institution is related to the degree of gender equality and norms in the region and country where the institution is located for this purpose we propose to collect another set of indicators related to the context where the institution is located.

Gender Equality indicators that can be used at country level are:

- the European Institute for Gender Equality Gender Equality Index a synthetic indicator that evaluate equality with regards to work, money, knowledge, power, time and health across EU countries and by each country (EIGE, 2015). When analyzing each country reference will be made to the Gender Equality Index of the country and to the value of the sub-indices.

- At regional level reference can be made to specific regional gender equality indicators. (Addabbo et al., 2013).

### 4 Participatory Tools

The participatory tools included in the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology consists of:

1) Individual semi-structured interviews
2) Workshops

The tools are described in details in the rest of this section.

#### 4.1 Individual Semi-structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews represent a qualitative method of inquiry that combines a pre-determined set of open questions (questions that prompt the discussion) with the opportunity for the interviewer to explore particular themes or responses further.

#### 4.1.1 Interviews Structure

(Minimum) Number of interviews required for EQUAL-IST target area:
HR practices and management – 2/3 people (different sub-areas: academic, non academic, organizational well-being and work-life balance, …)

Research design and delivery – 1 person

Student Services – 1 person

Institutional Communication – 1 person

**Goal:** to identify the main weaknesses and strengths in the target area and the main actions (past and ongoing) carried out to promote gender equality.

**Selection of interviewees:** select key people (e.g., managers, decision makers) directly involved in decision-making process in each target area to capture the vision of the high levels of the hierarchy on gender-equality. It’s important to select people able to provide specific information on the background and future plans of the organization in terms of gender-equality in the specific area, and information to understand to what extent gender mainstreaming fits into the overall direction of the area management.

**Language**

Interviews can be conducted in English or in national language – the suggestion is to use the language that is more familiar to the interviewed.

**Modality**

Interviews can be conducted in presence or online: select the more convenient option depending on time availability and logistical organization. In any case, the interviews should be recorded to allow interviewers to re-listen critical parts of the interviews.

**Reporting**

A written report of each interview should be produced in English. The report should include a brief summary for each question posed to the interviewee. Interviews do not need to be transcribed.

4.1.2 **Interviews Questions**

List of suggested questions for the individual interviews
1. What do you consider to be the main issues regarding gender equality within your institution in the area of [[substitute with the target area]]? In your opinion, how and to what extent are they perceived?
2. On the other hand, which are the most significant achievements in terms of gender equality? And which dedicated resources and machineries/committees are available in your institution?
3. In your opinion, which are possible actions/strategies that could be useful to apply in order to improve gender equality? And which main obstacles do you envisage for their application?
4. Please describe if there is any on-going or planned future action to improve gender equality in your area.

Adaptation to specific RPO context

The above questions represent general suggestions for the interviews. Starting from these suggestions, the facilitation team in each RPO may adapt the questions for each individual interview on the basis of the results for the specific covered area coming from:

- the analysis of gender-disaggregated data presented in the national minireport (EQUAL-IST Deliverable D2.2);
- the answers to the preliminary questionnaires given by the participants to the thematic workshop on the same area.

Indeed, whenever specific weaknesses and issues in terms of gender inequalities emerge from the above results, they should be covered during the interviews.

4.2 Workshops

4.2.1 Workshops Overall Organization

This part of the gender audit includes five workshops - four thematic workshops plus one final global workshop – divided as follows:

- **W1** - HR practices and management for academic staff
- **W2** - HR practices and management for technical and administrative staff
- **W3** - Research design and delivery
- **W4** - Student services
- **W5** - Final workshop

Institutional Communication is considered a cross-workshop topic that is covered in each workshop.

Number of involved people

In each thematic workshop

- Around **10-20 participants** in each thematic workshop
- 1/2 facilitators - members of EQUAL-IST research unit or WGs
• 2/3 rapporteurs - may be chosen among participants

In the final workshop
• All the participants to the previous thematic workshops
• All facilitators of previous workshops
• 2 rapporteurs

Participant selection
In each thematic workshop, invite participants from different levels of the hierarchy in each targeted area. However, as regards the higher levels of the hierarchy, their presence among the participants should be carefully evaluated based on the specific environment of each institution. Keep in mind that it is important to facilitate an open and free discussion and avoid contrasts among the participants during the workshops: try to evaluate if the presence of high-level managers is compatible with this conditions.

Finally, try to balance women and men among participants and ensure different age groups are represented in the workshops. Consider also aspects related to ethnicity and/or country/region of birth, since they may be important factors especially in terms of work-life balance needs.

For the institutional communication representatives, invite at each thematic workshop at least a couple of people responsible for communication services, leveraging the existence of several different communication services, such as Web site, newsletters, social channels, official documents, etc.

Facilitators Selection
Soft and communication skills of research unit and working group members should be exploited in the selection of the facilitators for the participatory workshops. The main role of the gender audit facilitators consist in creating an encouraging environment for reflection, analysis and open discussions on the challenges and opportunities faced by the participants in mainstreaming gender in their work. Hence, facilitators should promote this climate of openness and participation by keeping the sessions fun and interactive, minimizing personality and vertical differences, and encouraging opinions that differ from those of the “leader”. For these reasons, it is suggested to avoid selecting as facilitators people that belong to the highest level of hierarchy in their institutions.

4.2.2 Thematic Workshops: Structure and Goals
Each thematic workshop includes specific participatory exercises. The proposed exercises are divided into core (mandatory) exercises and optional exercises.

The core exercises form the basis of the workshops. These exercises ensure that:
• certain key concepts are emphasized;
• similar information is gathered from each audit to establish comparative baselines;
• awareness of gender-related issues in the work unit is generated;
valuable information for the audit is obtained.

The workshop’s two core exercises comprise:

- CEX1 - Gender Focus Group – suggested time 90 minutes
- CEX2 - Historical Timeline - suggested time 90 minutes

The workshop’s four optional exercises comprise:

- OEX1 - Gender knowledge and awareness - suggested time 60 minutes
- OEX2 - Classification of projects and activities - suggested time 60 minutes
- OEX3 - Hofstede’s onion/Organizational culture - suggested time 60 minutes
- OEX4 - Institutional Communication Analysis - suggested time 40 minutes

The two core exercises are mandatory for all the four thematic workshops.

The selection and use of the optional exercises is left to the discretion of the gender audit facilitation team in each RPO, and may be based on the specific need for additional information, the skills and preferences of the facilitators, or the time available in the workshop agenda.

The details of each exercise are presented in following sections.

Note: CEX2, OEX1, OEX2, OEX3 are adaptations of ILO (ILO Manual, 2012) core exercises.

The main goals of the thematic workshops are:

1. Raise awareness and start a self-reflection process on gender-related concepts and on the institutional situation in terms of gender equality.
2. Identify the main internal gender issues and collect feedback and personal perception about them.
3. Start thinking about possible actions to improve gender equality and about their applicability within the institution.

4.2.3 Final Workshop: Structure and Goals

The final workshop is basically a conclusive feedback session where the major findings of the gender audit are presented to all members of the audited groups. The final workshop should be carried out as the final step of the internal gender audit and has a suggested duration of 90 minutes.

During the final workshop the facilitation team, after having shared and discussed the output of the thematic workshops, present to the participants the main findings in the different target areas, focusing the attention on:

- Main good practices or important milestones emerged within the institution
- Main weakness emerged and identified areas for improvements within the institution
- Proposed actions towards gender equality identified as locally applicable
After the presentation of the main findings, facilitators should start on open discussion with the participants to collect their comments on the presented results and further ideas on possible improvements in terms of gender equality within the institution.

The main goals of the final workshop are:

4. Present the major findings of the thematic workshops to all members of the audited groups;
5. Agree on commonly identified areas for improvements within the institution;
6. Collect feedbacks on the possible actions towards gender equality

4.2.4 Before the workshops: preliminary questionnaires

Short preliminary questionnaires should be submitted to the participants to the four thematic workshops prior to the workshops, with the following purposes:

- Participants start thinking about gender-related concepts and potential issues
- Capture the initial perception about gender (in)equalities within the organization
- Define a useful baseline for workshops discussion

The suggested list of questions is detailed in the following section.

4.2.5 Reporting

For the workshops, the use of instant reporting is suggested. Instant reporting is a technique, very popular in case of participatory methodologies, based on an immediate summary of the activities that poses particular attention to the communications and to the most significant messages arisen during the workshop, potentially including graphical materials.

It is recommended that during each workshop the rapporteurs record their notes and relevant information in a computer file that will ultimately serve as the basis for the audit report. These notes are taken in the national languages used during the workshop. A brief report in English should be prepared after each workshop – it is recommendation to do that as soon as possible after the end of the workshop.

The report should include the main information about the workshop implementation (number and list of the participants, duration, location, number of facilitators, etc.) and a brief summary of the major points that emerged from the discussion (1-2 paragraphs for each major point). The report should include materials used during the workshop, such as graphs presented by the facilitators during CEX1, pictures of the timeline produced in the CEX2, or pictures taken during the workshop.

5 Preliminary questionnaires for thematic workshops

This section of the documents presents the list of preliminary questions to be submitted to the participants of the thematic workshops. The list consists of questions that are common to all four workshops and a separate set of questions for each specific workshop.
The suggested modality for the preliminary questionnaires is the online submission through Google Forms or other similar available free tools.

5.1 Questions List

5.1.1 Questions common to all workshops (W1, W2, W3, W4)

Questions on Institutional Communication

1. Do you feel that the language used in your university and faculty/department emails, institutional documents and newsletters, press releases, social networks and Web sites is gender-sensitive?
2. Do you think that multimedia content of your university and faculty/department Web site avoids gender stereotype transmission?
3. Do the institutional communications adequately promote the existence and the activities of institutional bodies dedicated to gender equal opportunities?
4. Is the presence in your institution of counselling services for discriminations, mobbing, and sexual harassment adequately promoted?

Questions on Gender Equality

1. Are specific programmes/activities planned in your working unit to promote gender equality?
2. How much do you feel the need to organize activities targeted to favor gender equality in your university or in your faculty/department?

Open Questions

1. Which is in your opinion the main issue in terms of gender inequalities you noticed in your institution? [Mention a significant event or situation that you observed and that you believe represents an obstacle to achieve gender equal opportunities]
2. Which actions do you suggest to undertake to handle the problem(s) you noticed?

5.1.2 Questions for W1 - HR practices and management for academic staff

1. Do you think low rates of female researchers recruited at your Department represents a problem to be tackled?
2. Do you think gender balanced selection committees might be an adequate solution to this?
3. Do you believe that your faculty/department is affected by Glass-Ceiling i.e. limitations to women career advancement?
4. Do parental duties negatively affect career advancement?
5. Is this the case for women more than for men?
6. In your opinion, is gender balance (equal opportunities) actively searched for at all levels of staff, including those whose duties include supervision and management? *(HRS4R Survey)*
7. Are maternity leaves considered in curriculum evaluation processes for career advancement (e.g., extended evaluation period for publications)?
8. In your opinion, are sufficient, specific measures in place to encourage both women and men to combine family and work, children and career (e.g., part-time, tele-working, sabbatical leaves, nurseries, etc.)? *(HRS4R Survey)*
9. In your experience, is female academic personnel frequently the target of undesired (potentially offensive) jokes or allusions by academic and/or non academic staff?

5.1.3 Questions for W2 - HR practices and management for technical and administrative staff

1. Do you believe women need longer to advance in their career compared to male colleagues (even those with children)?
2. Do you believe that your faculty/department is characterized by the presence of Glass-Ceiling effects?
3. Do parental duties negatively affect career advancement?
4. Is this the case for women more than for men?
5. In your opinion, is gender balance (equal opportunities) actively searched for at all levels of staff, including those whose duties include supervision and management? *(HRS4R Survey)*
6. In your opinion, are sufficient, specific measures in place to encourage both women and men to combine family and work, children and career (e.g., part-time, tele-working, sabbatical leaves, nurseries, etc.)? *(HRS4R Survey)*
7. Does your university organize specific training activities to help personnel to return to work after maternity/parental leaves?
8. In your experience, is female non academic personnel frequently the target of undesired (potentially offensive) jokes or allusions by academic and non academic staff?

5.1.4 Questions for W3 - Research design and delivery

1. Are research groups in your faculty/department balanced with respect to gender?
2. How common is having a woman as the scientific responsible of a research group?
3. Do you believe that access to research funds reflects inequalities in terms of gender?

4. Do you believe women encounter more issues than men in reconciling the pressure of quantitative performance in terms of publications and patents and family life?

5. Do you think gender dimension should be taken into consideration into research content as one of the research variables – indicators?

6. Are you aware of past or on-going research activities/projects about gender-related issues within your institution?

5.1.5 Questions for W4 - Student services

1. In your opinion, is gender equality respected in students evaluations and treatment?

2. Do you think teaching activities help to reinforce non-stereotyped students’ attitudes and behaviors?

3. Do you think there is a balanced students gender representation in your university courses?

4. Do you think female students face specific obstacles while accessing university or during their academic career?

5. Do you think there are effective instruments to help student mothers in their educational process?

6. In your experience, are female students frequently the target of undesired (potentially offensive) jokes or allusions by professors and/or other students?

5.1.6 Response Scale

For all the questions (except the open questions), provide a scale from 0 to 5 with the following meaning for responding, plus an additional answer “do not know / no opinion”.

0 – not at all
1 – insufficiently
2 – partially
3 – sufficiently
4 – pretty much
5 – entirely
n/a - do not know / no opinion

The numeric scale allows to associate a score to each question, facilitating the identification of those questions that arise more critical issues / weaknesses.

6 Workshop Core Exercises

This section described the details of the two core exercises proposed for the workshops.
6.1 CEX1 - Gender Focus Group

Discuss the main weakness emerged by previous internal analysis

This exercise is a good way to warm up participants, raise awareness and self-reflection about the internal situation in terms of gender equality and start a deeper discussion on main relevant issues.

Method

1. The facilitation team members identify some relevant gender-related result emerged from:
   - The national mini-report (EQUAL-IST Deliverable D2.2)
   - The answers to the preliminary questionnaires – choosing for example the issues emerged from the open questions or the answers with the worst score in terms of gender equality
2. Group reflection on the selected results and other gender-related issues that emerge from the discussion
3. To facilitate individual contributions from everybody, the participants are divided in small sub-groups (6-8 people) for the discussion phase

Preparation

1. Facilitator team members prepare a power point presentation with the selected gender-related results (including useful graphs, tables, and percentages/scores of answers) and print them on papers to distribute to the participants
2. Prepare the list of the participants divided in the subgroups, trying to maintain the subgroups as heterogeneous as possible in terms of gender, age, roles, etc.

Suggested time

1 hour and 30 minutes organized as follows:
- 15 minutes for explaining the exercise and present the main issues identified by the facilitation team to be discussed
- 1 hour for the discussion in small groups
- 15 minutes for a wrap-up session in plenary

During the exercise

- Remind participants of the main goal at the start of exercise: raise awareness and self-reflection about the internal situation in terms of gender equality and start a discussion on main relevant issues
- Create a dialogue and ask participants to express their comments about the presented results
- Invite participants to express other gender-related issues that they perceive as relevant and are not included in the initially presented results
- Be sure to have at least one rapporteur in each sub-group

6.2 CEX2 - Historical Timeline

Create the historical timeline of organization’s gender policy

This exercise aims to discuss institutional gender-related policies and start a reflection on possible actions to improve gender equality and on their applicability within the institution.
Method

1. Group reflection on **historical events and milestones** related to gender/women/men in the organization’s programme, such as documents, meetings and events. These are placed in chronological order on a timeline.
2. Group discussion on which **possible actions and changes towards gender equality** may be implemented within the institution and how they can be applied. These are placed in the future in the timeline to evidence the participants opinion on when they could be implemented.
3. The timeline is pinned to the wall for the duration of all the workshop and participants can continually add information.
4. To facilitate individual contributions from everybody, the participants are divided in **small sub-groups (6-8 people)** for the discussion phase.

Preparation

1. The organization’s historical timeline can be constructed by printing a timeline like the one below and by pinning it to the wall.
2. Each sub-group can create its own timeline: long rolls of paper or sheets of flip chart paper can be joined together and taped underneath the organization’s timeline.
3. Prepare the list of the participants divided in the subgroups, trying to maintain the subgroups as heterogeneous as possible in terms of gender, age, roles, etc.
4. The facilitation team members should prepare a list of main relevant milestones to suggest to break the ice or if the participants encounter difficulties in remembering meaningful events.
5. The facilitation team members may need to prepare additional material on national or European best practices to help and support the discussion (see ‘A practical tip).

Example of timeline

![Example of timeline](image)

**Suggested time**

1 hour and 30 minutes organized as follows:

- 15 minutes for explaining the exercise to the participants
- 30 minutes for the discussion in small groups on the institutional milestones
- 30 minutes for the discussion in small groups on the possible actions to improve gender equality and their applicability
- 15 minutes for a wrap-up session in plenary

**During the exercise**

![Equalist logo](image)
• Remind participants of the main goal of the exercise: discuss institutional gender-related policies and start a reflection on possible actions to improve gender equality and on their applicability within the institution
• Invite participants to think about internal milestones, such as gender-related events within the institutions, and to comment on them in terms of importance, effectiveness, consequences, etc. Possible examples are: 1st woman dean elected; inclusion of gender equality in the University Statutes; institution of dedicated committees; specific initiatives entirely or partially dedicated to gender-related topics.
• Invite participants to think about possible actions that could be implemented within the institution and about their applicability (importance of the action, expected resistances, how long it could take to be implemented, etc.). The main gender-related issues identified during the previous exercise CEX1 – Gender Focus Group may be recalled by the facilitators to facilitate focusing on possible solutions.

A practical tip
• For the institutions that do not have an internal history in terms of gender-related milestones, the facilitators can make reference to some national best practices that can be found in the EQUAL-IST Deliverable D2.1 on the state of the art analysis. In this case, the facilitators should prepare before the workshop some example of national best practices that will be presented and explained during the exercise; then invite participants to comment on them.
• In case participants lack ideas on possible actions towards gender equality, the facilitators can bring to the attention of the participants some best practices about specific actions, such as the best practices included in the EIGE’s GEAR Toolkit (EIGE GEAR Toolkit, 2016), or European initiatives, such as EURAXESS (EURAXESS, 2016). Another option is to consider whether a gender perspective can be included in current institutional initiatives, such as internal surveys on different topics.

7 Workshop Optional Exercises

This section described the details of the four optional exercises proposed for the workshops.

7.1 OEX1 - Gender knowledge and awareness

How much does the staff know about gender-related concepts?

This exercise is a good way to encourage gender audit workshop participants to reflect and analyse experience-based knowledge and awareness. As an optional exercise, it is suggested for those institutions where the results from national mini-reports and questionnaires as well as the internal knowledge of the facilitation team members evidence the lack of background in terms gender culture and the need to clarify gender-related main concepts.

Method

1. Facilitators create cards upon which they write one gender-related concept per card. Cards are placed in a container
2. Participants choose a card from the container and read out the concept written on it. They explain their interpretation of the concept to the group.
3. Other participants add to the definition, modify it and comment on the concept’s importance

**Preparation**

1. Facilitation team members read and discuss the concept definitions contained in the glossary of key gender concepts and clarify any questions or interpretations regarding the concepts
2. Prepare cards – one card per concept
3. Make photocopies of gender glossary for participants

**Gender Glossary**

- A brief gender glossary is delivered as Annex A of this document (ILO Manual, 2012)
- Example of gender-related terms: Gender Mainstreaming, Affirmative (Positive) Actions, Women’s Empowerment

**During the exercise**

- State the goal of the exercise at the beginning of the session: to verify how knowledgeable and aware participants are of gender-related concepts
- Create a dialogue and raise awareness of the importance of the concepts
- Ask participants to write down what they have learned, especially as it relates to their daily work
- Try to discuss as many concepts as possible, since there may be a tendency to get caught up in details. Remind the participants to “keep it simple”, and reassure them that they will have a clearer picture once most of the concepts have been covered

**Suggested time**

1 hour for 10 concepts

**A practical tip**

- Make the exercise fun – the atmosphere should be animated and should not resemble an examination

### 7.2 OEX2 - Classification of projects and activities

**Reflect on how different types of activities/projects can contribute to promoting gender equality**

This exercise is considered by the ILO facilitators very useful and well received since it is directly related to work experience and the application of gender concepts. As an optional exercises, it is suggested for these areas more characterized by projects and activities involving people at different levels. For example, seminars or training courses for the personnel, or curricular and extracurricular activities for students.

**Method**

Participants classify the gender approach of activities or projects characterizing their work experience. The considered activities and projects are no necessarily related to gender, but are part of the experience of the audited group within the institution.

**Preparation**

1. Prepare flip charts
2. Make copies of handouts
During the exercise

- Remind participants of the goal of this exercise: to learn why and how projects or activities can contribute to greater gender equality, and to what extent this is linked to their target group and chosen approach.
- This exercise should be closely facilitated. Participants cannot perform it by themselves and should be led step-by-step through the analysis. For this reason a detailed four-step facilitation process is provided on the following pages.
- Define what is meant by an “activity” and/or a “project” within the institution context and the specific target area of the workshop.
- Remind participants to reflect on the current reality in their project/activity—not the intended outcome.
- Lead participants through the four steps of the classification exercise.
- The questions in step four can be discussed in small groups or in plenary, depending on the available time. If participants have limited gender awareness, step four is best carried out in plenary.
- Divide participants into small groups for work on the four steps of the classification exercise, if possible by project or activity.

Step One: project/activity classification

- Distribute handout on gender perspectives for project/activity classification.
- Participants discuss what type of problem analysis (needs analysis, stakeholder analysis, etc.) was conducted prior to formulating their project/activity.
- Participants consider whether these helped to bring out gender dimensions of the problems to be addressed, and if not, why not.
- Participants discuss whether their project/activity is mainly providing direct support to beneficiaries (for example home-workers) or to external organization (for example companies or other public institutions).
- Participants fill in the flip chart for Table One below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table One: Project/activity classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct support to beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step Two: Classification of beneficiaries and external organizations

- Participants discuss their project/activity.
- If it is direct support to beneficiaries, they should determine whether it is mainly directed at women’s groups, men’s groups, or mixed groups.
• If it is aimed at external organizations, they should determine whether the organization strengthened by the project or activity works mainly with women’s groups, men’s groups, mixed groups or other organizations such as NGOs.
• Participants enter their conclusions into Tables Two A and Two B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two A : Classification of beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predominantly targets women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Two B : Classification of external organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Works with/for women’s groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step Three : Classification project/activity**
• Participants refer back to the handout on gender perspectives for project/activity classification
• They choose the perspective that best reflects the gender dimension of the project/activity and explain why.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Three : Classification of project/activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender-blind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project/activity A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step Four: Perspective and gender relations – change and improvement

- Participants discuss how gender relations have been affected because of the perspective of their project or activity.
- Participants discuss whether or not the project or activity contributes to fulfilling practical gender needs or to realizing strategic gender interests.
- Participants discuss possibilities for changes in perspective and improvement of project performance on gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Suggested time

1 hour

7.3 OEX3 - Hofstede’s onion/Organizational culture

Using an onion as a metaphor for the organization

This exercise is a good way to identify and discover vis-à-vis the organizational culture and its implications in terms of gender equality. Specifically, it aims to discover the unconscious perception of people and the implicit sides of the organization public image and internal culture.

Method

1. Participants “peel away” layers of the work unit to reach the core – the organizational culture.
2. Participants then identify the aspects of this organizational culture that promote or hinder gender equality and women’s empowerment within it.
3. This approach is especially effective with support staff, who are often in the best position to explain how a work unit functions the way it does.

Preparation

Keep the exercise local to make it relevant:

1. Translate terms and/or concepts used during the exercise into the local language, if necessary.
2. Identify practical examples from the local context to help explain what “symbols”, “artifacts”, “expressions”, “champions/heroines”, and “norms” and “values” mean.
3. Prepare cards and flip chart.

During the exercise

- Create an ambience of trust. Remember that organizational culture issues can be sensitive.
- Divide participants into small groups – if possible sharing similar tasks or responsibilities.
- Discuss and write down on cards the symbols/artifacts, champions/heroines/heroes, rituals and values of the work unit. Place these on the appropriate layer of the onion (see definitions and discussion questions below).
Going beyond gender
This exercise may also bring out questions about differential treatment of support and managers/technical staff, and/or international and local staff – hence “beyond gender” issues.

Suggested time
1 hour

A practical tip
Remember participants the goal of this exercise: to uncover aspects of the organizational culture that promote or hinder gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Four layers of the organizational culture
A work unit has layers like an onion. In this exercise, participants peel away the layers to get to the organizational culture at the core. They then identify aspects of this organizational culture that promote or hinder gender equality and women’s empowerment within it.

What do the layers stand for?

- **Layer 1**: Symbols and artefacts are words, images or objects that have a meaning only, or specifically, for the members of the audited group.
- **Layer 2**: Champions, leaders, heroes and heroines are men and women, real or imagined, who have characteristics that are held in high esteem in the audited group or who personify it.
- **Layer 3**: Rituals are the collective activities that are not strictly necessary to realize the organization’s objectives but are considered to be socially essential. Rituals are practices that symbolize what the audited group is: endless – or no – coffee breaks, Friday evening socializing, annual meetings, etc.
- **Layer 4**: Values are the collective preferences of members of the audited group for doing things a certain way.
Some helpful questions

Symbols and artefacts
- What words come to mind when you think of your work unit?
- Do you associate a certain image or metaphor with your work unit?
- Are these words and images as representative for men as they are for women?

Champions, leaders, heroes and heroines
- Who can be considered exemplary individuals inside and/or outside your work unit?
- Do these heroines/heroes convey a certain message on gender?
- What values of the organization do these individuals represent?
- Are there also images of villains in the work unit?

Rituals
- What activities are typical of your work unit?
- What does your work unit do differently from others?
- Who participates in your work unit’s meetings?
- How do staff members communicate during office hours?
- Are there social rituals in the work unit?
- Do staff members regularly participate in activities together?
- Do these activities exclude other people?
- Are you excluded from, or do you dislike, some of the rituals?
- Are there jokes typical to your work unit?
- Is it as possible for women as for men to participate in the work unit’s rituals?
- Do the rituals promote a safe and respectful working environment?

Values
- What do you consider to be the most important values of the organization?
- What organizational value is most important to you? Is this value important enough to determine whether you continue or stop working with the work unit?
- If you were not correctly treated as an employee, would you know where to go to file a complaint?
- Would you feel free to do so?
- Do you think the organization treats all its personnel equally: men, women, management/technical staff, support staff, and national and international staff?
- Does everyone in the organization have opportunities for job-related training and skills enhancement?

7.4 OEX4 – Institutional Communication Analysis

How much the institutional communication is gender-sensitive?

This exercise aims to analyse together with the audited group if the official communication of the organization (both internal and external) is gender-sensitive and gender-balanced
Preparation

1. Facilitation team members analyse the answers to preliminary questionnaires.
2. Based on the answers analysis, the facilitation team should select some significant examples of communication, both internal and external:
   - Public Web pages, institutional pages on social networks, internal and external documents, newsletters, …
   - Documents about open positions announcements within the institution.
3. Print documents and list of Web and social pages.
4. Ask participants to bring mobile devices to connect to the Web / social sites.
5. Prepare and print templates for participants to fill in at the end of the exercise.

During the exercise

- State the goal of the exercise at the beginning of the session: to evaluate whether the institutional communication, both internal and external, is a gender-sensitive and uses gender-balance language and communication style.
- Try to evaluate different communication channels, both internal and external:
  - Since there may be a tendency to get caught up in browsing one single site for a lot of time, remind the participants it is important to evaluate as many kinds of communication channels as possible.

Suggested time

40 minutes: 30 minutes of analysis and discussion about selected documents / online pages + 10 minutes to fill the summary template.

Evaluation Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the language of <em>document_type</em> gender-sensitive?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do multimedia contents of <strong>document_type</strong> avoid gender stereotype transmission?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are references to professional roles expressed in a gender-sensitive way? (e.g., presence of male/female nouns/pronouns in the same quantity and with the same importance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the open position announcements clearly state the conditions about maternity and parental leaves?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Be specific: substitute **document_type** with the specific type of document you selected and submit to participants.
  - One raw for every document type.
• Use the scale of responses 0-5, plus an additional answer “do not know / no opinion”.

0 – not at all, 1 – insufficiently, 2 – partially, 3 – sufficiently, 4 – pretty much, 5 – entirely, n/a – do not know / no opinion

8 Ethics and Data Management

Before the audit, all the participants to the individual semi-structured interviews and to the workshop will receive an information sheet, written in a language that they understand and informing them about the purpose and content of the activity they are involved in, and they will sign a letter of informed consent.

An example of information sheet and informed consent is included in the Annex B of this document.

The information contained in the information sheet and informed consent should be checked locally by each RPO, and possibly adapted, to be consistent with the local/national regulation about privacy and data collection. It is important to note that the privacy of the data and the anonymity of interviewees and workshop participants must be guaranteed in any case, independently from the national regulation.

9 First Capacity Building Session

9.1 Introduction

The First Capacity Building Session is a two days event aimed at presenting the methodological guidelines for internal gender audit within IST-ICT research organizations, and facilitating their adoption and customization by the EQUAL-IST partners. The event took place in Venice on December 1-2, 2016, and was hosted by Università Ca’ Foscari (UNIVE). The event was announced on the EQUAL-IST Web site at the link: https://equal-ist.eu/ist-capacity-building-session/

During the two-days event, the UniMORE research unit presented the EQUAL-IST methodology for internal gender audit to the RPOs Working Group members, who were trained to learn about the details of the developed methods and tools, and about how to apply them within their institutions. The gender audit methodology was divided in different steps; each step was presented and then discussed with the EQUAL-IST partners to clarify doubts and collect their feedbacks and comments in order to improve the gender audit methodology and further customize it for IST–ICT research organizations. The step-by-step presentation and discussion have proved to be very helpful to facilitate the comprehension of the details of the methodology process and to address doubts about its customization and adoption at each EQUAL-IST partner RPO. The feedbacks and suggestions coming from the partners have been exploited to modify the initial version of the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology and develop the updated version presented in this document.

The First Capacity Building Session also included the presentation of the EQUAL-IST State of the Art Analysis Report about how internal assessment has been approached by other EU funded projects on structural change. Additional presentations gave partners the opportunity to learn and discuss about case studies on GEP design and implementation at other EU Universities, and gendered training and teaching methodologies. Finally, a presentation about a preliminary version of the EQUAL-IST Crowdsourcing Platform by WWU gave the partner hints on the overall functioning of the platform that will be used to store the identified gender-related challenges at each RPO and allow a participatory co-design of the GEPs.
9.2 Agenda

Detailed agenda of the two-days First Capacity Building Session.

**Day 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.45</td>
<td>Welcome coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15</td>
<td>The EQUAL-IST Crowdsourcing Platform: Presentation and feedbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50</td>
<td>Welcome Intro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Gender Audits as the first essential steps to design and implement GEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Envisaged challenges and resources towards internal gender audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15</td>
<td>The EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Workshop 1: Gender Audit Methodology and tools- Step 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coffee Break**

---

**Agenda Details**

- **Welcome coffee**
- **The EQUAL-IST Crowdsourcing Platform:** Presentation and feedbacks by Elena Gorbacheva and WWU students.
- **Welcome Intro**
  - A special welcome to the GEP members
  - Objectives and work plan of EQUAL-IST
  - Objectives and plan of the day (agenda)
- **Gender Audits as the first essential steps to design and implement GEPs**
  - Highlights from the State of the Art Analysis
  - Questions and discussion
- **Envisaged challenges and resources towards internal gender audits**
  - Data and information gaps met in preparing the National Mini Reports in: Finland, Germany, Italy, Lichtenstein, Lithuania, Portugal, and Ukraine
  - Questions and discussion
- **The EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology**
  - Overall presentation of the main structure based on a quantitative set of indicators and participatory tools crosscutting the 4 GEPs areas (HR & Management; ICT- IST Research Design & Delivery; Teaching and Student Services; Institutional Communication)
- **How we are going to work together to customize and adapt the audit method to each RPO.**

---

**Light Lunch**

**Workshop 1: Gender Audit Methodology and tools- Step 1**

Set of Quantitative Indicators

UNIMORE will present the quantitative part of the methodology and a set of selected indicators.

Q&A and open discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:15 – 15:45</td>
<td>Gender approaches to resources allocation + Q&amp;A session</td>
<td>Tindara Addabbo (UNIMORE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 - 17:15</td>
<td>Workshop 2: Gender Audit Methodology and tools - Step 2</td>
<td>Claudia Canali - UNIMORE. Discussion moderated by UNIMORE &amp; UNIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual semi structured interviews and short questionnaires</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIMORE will present the initial set of tools for the participatory part of the audit. Small groups will discuss upon the tools and the envisaged scenario when using them at their own institutions. The rapporteur of each small group will present the results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15 - 17:45</td>
<td>Wrap up and closing of the meeting</td>
<td>Moderated by UNIMORE &amp; UNIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Presenter and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Welcome coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:15 – 10:15</td>
<td>Workshop 3: EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology and tools - Step 3</td>
<td>Claudia Canali - UNIMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIMORE will present the second set of participatory auditing tools.</td>
<td>Discussion moderated by UNIMORE and UNIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small groups will discuss upon the tools and the envisaged scenario when using them at their own institution. The rapporteur of each small group will present the results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15 – 11:15</td>
<td>Workshop 4: EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology and tools - Step 4</td>
<td>Alessandro Grandi – UNIMORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNIMORE will present the last set of participatory auditing tools.</td>
<td>Discussion moderated by UNIMORE and UNIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small groups will discuss upon the tools and the envisaged scenario when using them at their own institution. The rapporteur of each small group will present the results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30- 12:15</td>
<td>Case Study presentation &amp; Discussion: Gender Equality Plans at Hasselt University (BE)</td>
<td>Ann Peters &amp; Sara De Clerk (Hasselt University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15- 13:00</td>
<td>Gender Training for raising organizational awareness and triggering change</td>
<td>Ivana Padoan and Sara De Vido (UNIVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session Title</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00 – 14:45</td>
<td>Case Study presentation 2 From Gender Equality Plans to Gender Mainstreaming at University of Ferrara</td>
<td>Cristiana Fioravanti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45 – 15:30</td>
<td>From Gender Audit to Crowdsourcing the GEPs Open discussion</td>
<td>UNIMORE, UNIVE, WWU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45 – 16:30</td>
<td>EQUAL-IST Audits: Reporting &amp; Ethics – Data Management Issues for the participatory tools</td>
<td>Claudia Canali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 – 17:00</td>
<td>Wrap up conclusions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9.4 Presentations of the Methodology Steps

The details of the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology were explained across several presentations during the two days of the First Capacity Building Session. The rest of this section includes a brief description of the presentations related to the methodology steps done by the UniMORE research unit members.

1. The EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology – Day One

Dr. Claudia Canali presented the overall structure of the EQUAL-IST gender audit methodology based on a mixed approach of quantitative indicators and participatory tools. The selected approach was motivated by the analysis of existing gender audit methods and by the need of adapting them to IST-ICT research institution and to the 4 EQUAL-IST GEPs areas (HR & Management; ICT- IST Research Design & Delivery; Teaching and Student Services; Institutional Communication).

2. Workshop 1: Gender Audit Methodology and tools - Step 1 Set of Quantitative Indicators – Day One

Prof. Tindara Addabbo presented the quantitative part of the methodology, consisting of a set of quantitative indicators computed on gender-disaggregated data regarding the 4 EQUAL-IST GEPs areas. The indicators exploit data collected at the department, university and national level. Ing. Alessandro Grandi presented a set of templates developed in the form of excel spreadsheets that will be delivered to the EQUAL-IST partners to facilitate the data collection and the computation of the indicators.

3. Workshop 2: Gender Audit Methodology and tools - Step 2 Individual semi-structured interviews and short questionnaires – Day One

Dr. Claudia Canali presented the initial tools for the participatory part of the audit. Guidelines were given about how to conduct the individual semi-structured interviews and on who to involve as interviewees. Moreover, the list of questions to be included in the preliminary questionnaires to each thematic workshops was presented.

4. Workshop 3: EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology and tools Step 3 – Day Two

Dr. Claudia Canali presented a first set of participatory exercises to be conducted during the workshops. Indications were provided about how the overall structure of the exercises, their main objective, suggested time duration, method and preparation activities. Partners were divided in Small groups to discuss upon the tools and the envisaged scenario when using them at their own institution; the rapporteur of each small group presented the results.

5. Workshop 4: EQUAL-IST Gender Audit Methodology and tools Step 4 – Day Two

Ing. Alessandro Grandi presented a second set of participatory exercises to be conducted during the workshops. Indications were provided about how the overall structure of the exercises, their main objective, suggested time duration, method and preparation activities. Partners were divided in Small groups to discuss upon the tools and the envisaged scenario when using them at their own institution; the rapporteur of each small group presented the results.

6. EQUAL-IST Audits: Reporting & Ethics – Day Two

Dr. Claudia Canali presented some guidelines about the reporting activity and the data management regarding the participatory tools (interviews and workshops). Final feedbacks and comments were collected and discussed with the partners.
Each of the above presentations was followed by an open discussion with the partners moderated by UniMORE to clarify doubts about the methodology steps and their application at each EQUAL-IST partner institution.
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11 Annex A - Glossary on Gender-related Concepts

Affirmative (positive) action Affirmative (positive) action means special temporary measures to redress the effects of past discrimination in order to establish de facto equal opportunity and treatment between women and men. Affirmative action in favour of women should not be considered as discriminatory against...
men in a transitional period. Once the consequences of past discrimination have been rectified, the measures should be removed to prevent discrimination against men.

**Equal opportunity** Equal opportunity means equal access to all economic, political and social participation and facing no barriers on the grounds of sex.

**Equal opportunity in the world of work** means having an equal chance to apply for a particular job, to be employed, to own or run an enterprise, to attend educational or training courses, to be eligible to attain certain qualifications, and to be considered as a worker or for a promotion in all occupations or positions, including those dominated by one sex or the other.

**Equal treatment in the world of work** refers to equal entitlements such as in pay, working conditions, employment security and social security.

**Gender** Gender refers to the social differences and relations between men and women that are learned, changeable over time, and have wide variations both within and between societies and cultures. These differences and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through the socialization process. They determine what is considered appropriate for members of each sex. They are context-specific and can be modified. Other variables, such as ethnicity, caste, class, age and ability intersect with gender differences.

**Gender analysis** Gender analysis is a systematic tool to examine social and economic differences between women and men. It looks at their specific activities, conditions, needs, access to and control over resources, as well as their access to development benefits and decision-making. It studies these linkages and other factors in the larger social, economic, political and environmental context.

**Gender-aware/sensitive policies** Such policies recognize that within a society, actors are women and men, that they are constrained in different and often unequal ways, and that they may consequently have differing and sometimes conflicting needs, interests and priorities.

**Gender-blind** Gender-blind describes research, analysis, policies, advocacy materials, project and programme design and implementation that do not explicitly recognize existing gender differences that concern both productive and reproductive roles of men and women. Gender-blind policies do not distinguish between the sexes. Assumptions incorporate biases in favour of existing gender relations and so tend to exclude women.

**Gender budgeting**
Gender budgeting is the application of gender mainstreaming in the budgetary process. It means incorporating a gender perspective at all levels of the budgetary process and restructuring revenues and expenditures in order to promote gender equality.

**Gender equality** Gender equality, or equality between men and women, entails the concept that all human beings, both men and women, are free to develop their personal abilities and make choices without the limitations set by stereotypes, rigid gender roles and prejudices. Gender equality means that the different behaviour, aspirations and needs of women and men are considered, valued and favoured equally. It does not mean that women and men have to become the same, but that their rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female.

**Gender equality in the world of work**
Gender equality in the world of work, within the ILO Decent Work Agenda, refers to:
- Equality of opportunity and treatment in employment;
• Equality in association and collective bargaining;
• Equality in obtaining a meaningful career development;
• A balance between work and home life that is fair to both men and women;
• Equal participation in decision-making, including in the constitutive ILO organs.
• Equal remuneration for work of equal value;
• Equal access to safe and healthy working environments and to social security.

Gender equity
Gender equity means fairness of treatment for women and men, according to their respective needs. This may include equal treatment or treatment that is different but which is considered equivalent in terms of rights, benefits, obligations and opportunities. Equity is a means; equality is the goal.

Gender gap
The gender gap is the difference in any area between women and men in terms of their levels of participation, access to resources, rights, power and influence, remuneration and benefits.

Gender mainstreaming
Gender mainstreaming is a globally accepted strategy for promoting gender equality. Mainstreaming is not an end in itself but a strategy, an approach, a means to achieve the goal of gender equality. Mainstreaming involves ensuring that gender perspectives and attention to the goal of gender equality are central to all activities policy development, research, advocacy/dialogue, legislation, resource allocation, and planning, implementation and monitoring of programmes and projects. In 1997, the United Nations Economic and Social Council defined the concept of gender mainstreaming as follows “…the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality.”

Gender-neutral policies
Gender-neutral policies use the knowledge of gender differences in a given context to overcome biases in delivery, to ensure that they target and benefit both genders effectively in terms of their practical gender needs. Moreover, they work within the existing gender division of resources and responsibilities.

Gender and organizational change
Gender and organizational change refers to the fact that organizations are some of the main perpetrators of unequal gender relations. If gender relations in society are to change, organizations should promote gender-sensitive policies and programmes, and ensure gender balance in their structures.

Gender planning
Gender planning consists of developing and implementing specific measures and organizational arrangements (for example, capacity to carry out gender analysis, collect sex-disaggregated data) for the promotion of gender equality, and ensuring that adequate resources are available (for example, through gender budgeting, see above).

Gender sensitive indicators
Gender sensitive indicators are designed to measure benefits to women and men and capture quantitative and qualitative aspects of change. Gender-sensitive indicators are indicators disaggregated by sex, age and socio-economic background. They are designed to demonstrate changes in relations between women and men in a given society over a period of time. The indicators comprise a tool to assess the progress of a particular development intervention towards achieving gender equality. Sex-disaggregated data demonstrates whether both rural women and men are included in the programme or project as
agents/project staff, and as beneficiaries at all levels. The approach allows for effective monitoring and evaluation.

**Glass ceiling** Invisible artificial barriers, created by attitudinal and organizational prejudices that block women from senior executive management positions.

**Occupational sex segregation** Refers to a situation in which women and men are concentrated in different types of jobs and at different levels of activity and employment, with women being confined to a narrower range of occupations (horizontal segregation) than men, and to the lower grades of work (vertical segregation).

**Sex discrimination** Differential treatment of men and women – in employment, education and access to resources and benefits, etc. – on the basis of their sex. Discrimination may be direct or indirect.

**Direct sex discrimination** exists when unequal treatment between women and men stems directly from laws, rules or practices making an explicit difference between women and men (e.g., laws which do not allow women to sign contracts).

**Indirect sex discrimination** is when rules and practices that appear gender-neutral in practice lead to disadvantages primarily suffered by persons of one sex.

**Women’s empowerment** The process by which women become aware of sex-based unequal power relationships and acquire a greater voice in which to speak out against the inequality found in the home, workplace and community. It involves women taking control over their lives: setting own agendas, gaining skills, solving problems and developing self-reliance.
12 Annex B – Ethics templates

This Annex includes a template both for Consent and Information sheet which may be adapted appropriately based on local regulation and activity in order to be communicated to the participants involved in the gender audit process at each RPO.

12.1 Information sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics approval number: XXXX</th>
<th>Version: X</th>
<th>Date: DD/MM/YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Title: EQUAL-IST Internal Gender Audit – Task 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: &lt;Name&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please read the information below carefully before you decide to take part in this research study. Please feel free to ask any questions. If you are happy to proceed and participate, you will be asked to sign a consent form. Your participation is completely voluntary.

What is the study about? This study is part of the EU-funded EQUAL-IST project (Gender Equality Plans for Information Sciences and Technology Research Institutions, URL: http://www.equal-ist.eu) which is supporting the development and implementation of Gender Equality Plans for eight Information Sciences and Technology Research Institutions in Europe. In particular, it is included into Task 2.4 Structural Gender Inequalities analysis and internal policies analysis to perform an internal gender audit at the research institutions that are part of the EQUAL-IST Consortium. Research results will be integrated into Deliverable 2.5 Gender Equality Assessment Report. In addition, a summary of the findings from this research study will be likely to be published also on all Equal-IST partners’ websites. According to the project timeline the Report is expected to be finalized by the end of April 2017. Unless you express the interest in being informed about the study results by providing your contact details, we will not contact you again.

Why have I been chosen? You have been approached because your opinion about the gender equality activities within your institution is valuable for this study. You may only take part if you are a responsible adult able to provide consent.

What will happen to me if I take part in the study? If you decide to participate:

(for interviewees)
- you will be asked to participate in a semi-structured individual interview with a duration of between 40 minutes and 1 hour max which will be recorded
- you will be provided with a set of guiding questions around which the interview will revolve minimum 4 days before the interview will take place. You will have the possibility to communicate to the researcher in charge in case for any reasons any of the questions makes you feel uncomfortable and you prefer not to answer

(for workshop participants)
- you will be asked to participate in two participatory workshops with a total duration of approximately XXX hours
- before the first workshop, you will be asked to fill in an online questionnaire about you perception in terms of gender equality within your institution

What benefits does my participation in the study bring? Your feedback and the results of the internal gender audit will be essential to identify gender-related challenges and for the development of Gender Equality Plans within the EQUAL-IST project.

Are there any risks involved? There are no risks in your involvement in the study
- no sensitive – personal data will be collected
- the participation is anonymous
- interviews and report files will be de-identified and stored on a safe platform owned and managed by [Your University] and accessible only by authorized EQUAL-IST [Your_University] members.

**Will my data be confidential?** All data collected is anonymous, but your responses will be tagged with a random identifier in order to separate them from the responses of other participants.

**What happens if I change my mind to participate in the study?** You may withdraw from participating in the study at any time, without the need to provide any justification. Please note that since your participation is anonymous, we will keep the responses you may have contributed up to the withdrawal time.

**What happens if something goes wrong?** Should you have any concern or complaint, please contact us at info@equal-ist.eu. We will attend to your enquiry within five (5) working days.

### 12.2 Consent form

An online version of this form may be generated so that users can opt in and out of the study dynamically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics approval number: XXXX</th>
<th>Version: X</th>
<th>Date: DD/MM/YYYY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Title: EQUAL-IST Internal Gender Audit – Task 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator: &lt;Name&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please tick the box(es) if you agree with the following statement(s):**

- I confirm that I am a responsible adult able to provide legal consent
- I have read and understood the Participant Information (version X dated DD/MM/YYYY) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time, without the need to provide any justification for it.
- I agree that my responses will be used as part of this study

Date and Place .................................................................
Signature ........................................................................