



D3.01 Assessment Report

Document Data	
Report Title	D3.01 Assessment Report
Author(s)	Milica Antić Gaber, Živa Kos, Jasna Podreka, Tjaša Cankar
Other Contributors	IGOT; YW, Maria López Belloso, Maria Silvestre
Responsible Project Partner	UL
Due Date	31. December 2019
Delivery Date	23. December 2019
Type	Report
Dissemination Level	Public
Keywords	Contextual analyses, institutional assessment, participation, self-diagnosis, PGAs, STEM, SSH

History			
Author	Date	Reason for Change	Release

Information in this report that may influence other GEARING-Roles tasks

Linked Task	Points of Relevance
WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8	Preliminary assessment of gender equality at the institutional/national level with the aim of providing recommendations for GEPs
3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2	Data collection and analyses





GEARING-Roles project

GEARING-Roles is a four-year (January 2019 – December 2022) Coordination and Support Action project that brings together a pan-European group of academics and industry professionals to collaborate and exchange knowledge, good practices, and lessons learned on designing, implementing, and evaluating 6 Gender Equality Plans (GEPs). The project therefore has a firm objective of challenging and transforming gender roles and identities linked to professional careers and working towards real institutional change. This multidisciplinary, multinational, and multi-sectorial collaboration will be supported by training in these areas, mentoring activities, awareness raising campaigns as well as bi-annual videos and podcasts and annual networking events.





Table of Contents

_Toc27057075

List of Tables.....	4
List of Abbreviations	5
Introduction	6
1. Background for the deliverable D3.1: summary of WP3 activities	7
2. Introduction to comparative analysis of contextual factors at play that support or limit gender equality in the six GEP implementing institutions	11
2.1. Basic information on the six GEP implementing institutions and possibilities of comparative analysis	12
2.2. Framework for the analysis of institutional reports	16
2.3. How to read the report	16
3. National and regional context	17
3.1. Normative (legal) conditions.....	20
3.2. Place of gender in institutional context.....	22
3.3. The role of EU funding in the advancement in gender equality	24
3.4. Relevant actors and stakeholders.....	25
4. Recruitment, retention, career progression, work-life balance policies	27
4.1. Horizontal and vertical segregation	28
4.2. Equal pay	34
4.3. Recruitment, retention.....	37
4.4. Work-life balance policies	40
4.5. Student population	43
5. Leadership and decision-making.....	44
5.1. Leadership and decision-making.....	45
6. Gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer	48
6.1. Gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer	49
7. Gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment.....	51
7.1. Gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment	52
8. Comparative summary on differences within or between disciplines	57
9. Institutional Participatory Gender Audits, PGAs.....	60
9.1. PGAs	61
10. Conclusion.....	63
I. General conclusions	63
II. Content specific issues and conclusions	65
11. References	70





List of Tables

Table 1: Basic information on the six GEP implementing institutions	12
Table 2: Employment in knowledge intensive activities at the national level, by sex 2018	18
Table 3: Tertiary educational attainment	19
Table 4: Proportion of women academic staff, by grade 2018	19
Table 5: Policies on gender equality	20
Table 6: Data and policies on gender segregation	28
Table 7: Data and policies on equal pay	34
Table 8: Data on recruitment and retention	37
Table 9: Data on work-life balance.....	40
Table 10: Data on students.....	43
Table 11: Practices and policies about leadership and decision-making.....	45
Table 12: Data on policies in research and curricula	49
Table 13: Data on practices and policies on gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment	52
Table 14: Information on PGAs	61





List of Abbreviations

CHANGE	CHAlleNging Gender (In)Equality in science and research
D	Deliverable
Diversity	Improving the gender diversity management in materials research institutions
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
EDI	Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
EIGE	European Institute for Gender Equality
ETAg	Eesti Teadusagentuur (Estonian Research Council)
E-UC	End-User Community
FF UL	Filozofska fakulteta//Faculty of Arts University of Ljubljana
GARCIA	Gendering the Academy and Research: combating career instability and asymmetries
GE ACADEMY	Gender Equality Academy
Gendera	Gender Debate in European Research Area
Genderaction	GENDER equality in the ERA Community To Innovate policy implementation
GENDER-NET	First European Research Area Network
Gender-SMART	Science Management for Agriculture & Life Sciences, including Research and Teaching
GENIS LAB	Gender in Science and Technology
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
GPG	Gender Pay Gap
IBA	Institutional Baseline Assessment
IGOT UL	Instituto de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território, Universidade de Lisboa
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
OBU	Oxford Brookes University
PGAs	Participatory Gender Audits
PLOTINA	Promoting gender balance and inclusion in research, innovation and training
R&I PEERS	Gender balance for innovation
RFO	Research Funding Organization
RPO	Research Performing Organization
SAGE	Systemic Action for Gender
SPEAR	Gender Equality in Academia and Research
SSH	Social Sciences and Humanities
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
SU	Sabancı Üniversitesi
SUPERA	Supporting the Promotion of Equality in Research and Academia
UDEUSTO	Universidad de Deusto
WP	Work Package
YW	Yellow Window





Introduction

The aim of the *D3.1. Deliverable* is to increase understanding with regard to common points and specifics in the current positions of six GEP implementing institutions in relation to gender equality with the aim of preparing and implementing institutional GEPs. The deliverable is a comparative summary of different areas of gender equality, covering a contextual analysis of legal and cultural practices and specific problem areas, as obtained using the SUPERA tool (these areas being national context, recruitment, retention and career progression, leadership, research and curricula, sexual harassment and discrimination).

The gender equality practices established at six GEP implementing institutions were compared, using data and information gathered at the institutional level. Where possible, gender inequalities across disciplines or within Social Sciences and Humanities were compared.

The deliverable concludes with presenting some common issues in relation to gender equality and possible elements for future initiatives related to gender equality at the institutional level.





1. Background for the deliverable D3.1: summary of WP3 activities

The following document is an outcome of the different, intertwined processes and tasks of WP3. Tasks 3.1 (Contextual analyses of legal and cultural practices at the macro level), 3.2. (Collection of gender equality-relevant data at the institutional level), 3.3. (Comparison of gender inequality across disciplines) and 3.4. (Self-diagnosis through Participatory Gender Audits, PGAs) were the basis for outlining the WP3 main working document, ***WP3 Guidelines for contextual analyses and institutional baseline assessment (Guidelines)***.

The aim of the *Guidelines* was to facilitate a proper diagnosis of the situation of women and men in each of the six GEP implementing institution as an essential step in designing equality actions and measures to be included in a Gender Equality Plan. At the same time, the *Guidelines* aimed at providing common axes for six different institutions in their respective environments: Oxford Brookes University, UK (from hereon OBU); Sabanci University, Turkey (from hereon SU); University of Deusto, Spain (from hereon UDEUSTO); Instituto de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território at the University of Lisbon, Portugal (from hereon IGOT); Filozofska fakulteta, at the University of Ljubljana, Slovenia (from hereon UL FF); and Eesti Teadusagentuur, Estonian Research Council (from hereon ETAg).

Thanks to the work that has been already developed by previously financed projects, a number of tools to facilitate the design and structuring of the diagnosis were available. Hence, before starting data collection for the design of the six GEPs in GEARING-Roles, the following tools, besides **GEAR**, were taken into account:

- **INTEGER**: provides practical advice on how to get to know the institution through data collection and surveys. The tool provides practical advice on how to organize surveys, site visits and/or focus groups discussions, and on how to collect data.
- **EGERA**: under this project, three “Gender Equality Reports” have been compiled by partner institutions. Each report aimed at providing updated, state-of-the-art information on themes related to gender equality and issues regarding equality inside the participating institutions through analysis of the data, information and policies available in the associated institutions. The areas approached examined: (i) human Resources and career management, including employment and promotion, (ii) work-life balance and working conditions, (iii) sexual harassment and gender-based violence and (iv) gender in research and in academic curricula.
- **TARGET**: this project elaborated the Gender Equality Audit Tool (GEAT), which is based on the previous construction of communities of practice inside organizations. GEAT provides interesting tools for the inclusion of a gender perspective in talent recruitment, retention and promotion policies. The tool is also of use for studying the research situation. The method used for information collection is centred on the





elaboration of key questions under each item and on the use of the SWOT methodology.

- **SUPERA:** elaborates good guidelines for the collection of quantitative and qualitative data regarding the situation of men and women inside universities and research centres. It establishes clear indicators and, above all, interesting techniques to examine the participation and influence of key agents in organizations. In addition, it describes the various instruments and techniques to be used to achieve this.

From the projects outlined above, the WP3 leaders, UL and IGOT as a WP3 partner institution consulted with the UDEUSTO and Yellow Window experts. Together the decision was made that the instrument developed by SUPERA was the best option to ensure the validity and reliability of data collection in this project.

Nevertheless, in order to adapt SUPERA's instrument to the specificities of GEARING-Roles, two adaptations have been made to the original tool:

First, GEARING-Roles has established three levels for analysis: the Macro level/National Context; the Meso level/Institutional level, and the Micro level/Individual level.

The *macro analysis* refers to the national level, mainly in regard to legal aspects, but includes the collection of data related to the situation of men and women in universities and research centres. Institutions related to decentralized federal structures should provide data for the different territorial levels.

The *meso analysis* focuses on the situation of men and women inside the institutions. At this level, policies for talent attraction, promotion and retention are important, as well as research and education policies, such as those related to the curricula, contents, competence, gender perspective in research, and the development of feminist or gender studies. The mapping of power structures and decision-making bodies and contexts are also relevant.

The *micro level* intends to analyse the values, attitudes, prejudices, behaviours and values that students, teachers, researchers and management hold in relation to gender roles. It is important to highlight latent and conscious gender biases and also formal and informal resistance to the implementation of measures to promote the equality of women and men. The micro level addresses diversity from an intersectional perspective¹.

While the meso and micro levels could be covered through the use of the guidelines developed by SUPERA, we believe that the analysis at the national level (macro) represents an added value to the original tool.

¹During the KOM it was agreed to include the survey as a GEP action during 2020 to gather the information on the microlevel.





A section has been added (see Section I in the *Guidelines*) in order to carry out the macro analysis. In this, details on how the social-legal context of each country shape the possibilities for gender equality are provided.

Secondly, The GEARING-Roles project incorporates an attempt to carry out a comparative analysis of the differences between disciplines in order to analyse gender biases that influence career opportunities and choices. This analysis was additionally tailored as some of the GEP implementing institutions only have SSH departments. In these cases the comparative elements were included within SSH disciplines.

The *Guidelines* were sent to six GEP implementing institutions at the beginning of April 2019. The institutions then had six months (till September the 30th) to gather and analyse data and information and to write their institutional reports. The data and information gathered for the reports were obtained based on a **quantitative and qualitative methodology**, as suggested by the SUPERA tool. For example, HR data and other relevant statistical data, as well as information from websites, previous project activities, etc., were analysed, while interviews, focus groups and workshops were carried out. In addition to the SUPERA tool, mainly envisaged for use in data and information collection, *Guidelines* also provided suggestions for qualitative analyses, outlining the possible structures and questions for the interviews and discussions in focus groups. As all the GEP were at different moments/stages in their process of addressing gender inequalities, in an attempt to enhance this comparative dimension, two types of indicators were established: P1 for those compulsories, and P2 for those optional for institutions who have these data available.

Based on the information collected in task 3.1. to 3.3. each GEP implementing partner was expected to analyse the situation within the institution and then discuss the findings. The data collected was expected to help in diagnosing gender imbalances at the institutional level. As found in previous projects, participation has proven to be an essential element in creating ownership and ensuring institutional commitment. In this light PGAs were, as outlined in the GEAR tool, used in order to obtain an insight into the dimensions that shape the practices and attitudes of the focal organization, including its history, size, leadership, structure and governance, policies, and organizational culture, and contrast these findings with the sex-disaggregated data obtained in the previous tasks with the objective of helping institutions prioritize their goals and also create ownership in terms of a common understanding of the challenges and possible pathways towards gender equality.

In order to assure comparability of the reports, the *Guidelines* also proposed the structure of the Institutional reports with the aim of providing enough common ground for the D3.1 Assessment report, using the SUPERA tool as a basis for the structure.

Incorporating the findings of **Section I** in the *Guidelines*, the institutional report in the first section aimed at providing guidance for the background analysis of the domestic setting in which each organization operates. This analysis was also expected to provide information and





assess how it affects gender equality in higher education, science and research. For inspiration, and to provide possible updates, institutions were referred to the following documents

- Country sheets within the EIGE's GEAR tool; <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits/gear/legislative-policy-backgrounds>,
- ERA progress report, available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/era-progress-report-2018_en and http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_gender_equality/KI-07-17-199-EN-N.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none
- GENDER-NET report describing national initiatives: http://www.gender-net.eu/IMG/pdf/GENDER-NET_D2-5_-_National_plans_and_initiatives_promoting_gender_equality_and_structural_change.pdf
- Guidance to facilitate the implementation of targets to promote gender equality in research and innovation http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_gender_equality/KI-07-17-199-EN-N.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none
- SHE FIGURES (2018) https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/she-figures-2018_en.

For the national aspect, institutions were asked to analyse the related:

Legal framework, to identify the national (regional) legal frameworks that structure practices of gender equality in research and higher education;

Policy framework, to identify the policy measures that are in place for supporting gender equality in research and higher education in each country (ex. national research objectives);

Other stimulatory initiatives, such as grants and other financial or political incentives, or forms of civic engagement;

Key actors, that help facilitate efforts and initiatives towards gender equality in research;

Relevant examples of practices.

Incorporating the findings of **Section II** of the *Guidelines*, the structure of the report followed the structure of topic/problems put forth in the SUPERA tool:

Recruitment, selection and career progression support;

Leadership and decision-making;

Gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer (content and curricula);

Gender basis and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment.

This part also envisaged the participation of staff (academic and administrative) and students in order to help assess gender inequalities such as wage gaps, time lapses in career advancement, educational segregation, work-life balance, decision-making and assumption of leadership roles, among others.





In the concluding part of the Institutional report, the six GEP implementing institutions were asked to summarize the findings in such a way, that the summaries themselves already provided topics for planning PGAs and also provided a first step in the institutional self-diagnosis process (task 3.4.) and the first step in planning and discussing possible actions for GEPs.

The reports on PGA's however are not part of institutional reports. The six GEP implementing institutions attended a project training held by Yellow Window experts at Oxford Brookes University in June 2019. YW trainers presented a few possible approaches to PGAs from which institutions could draw on and adapt to their own institutional purposes and needs. In this light no additional guidelines were given on how to structure and perform PGAs. Nevertheless, institutional assessment was needed beforehand in order to provide an important insight into resistance within the institutions. The decision was made to perform PGAs until October 2019. The six GEP implementing institutions were asked to write a short report on the PGAs performed, setting out the objectives, actors included, techniques used, conclusions, proposed action to be taken, limitations, resistance, etc. with the short summary as a self-diagnosis (which is to be used as the basis for a preliminary action plan for GEP). These reports were uploaded to the project platform HERMIONE², and the six implementing institutions as well as YW experts were asked to comment on possible points of improvement, in the first part of November 2019, in order to provide each institution with appropriate feedback and recommendations for GEPs, (task 3.5.) which are to be included in the D3.2. Recommendations for GEPs report.

2. Introduction to comparative analysis of contextual factors at play that support or limit gender equality in the six GEP implementing institutions

Parallel to the proposed structure of the Institutional reports, as put forth in the *WP3 Guidelines (Guidelines)*, a framework for comparative analyses was outlined by UL FF as the WP3 leading partner, and communicated with, and agreed on by, the other collaborating partners, IGOT, UDEUSTO and Yellow Window in September 2019.

The basic aim of the comparative analysis was to compare the situation of gender equality at the six GEP implementing institutions, within different national environments, and in addition to compare the situation between STEM and SSH. The starting point for possible areas and elements of comparison was drawn, keeping in mind what had been asked of institutions

² HERMIONE is a web page launched in the Gearing roles project with the aim of fostering dialogue and exchange amongst project partners.





through the *Guidelines* and the proposed structure for each institutional report, following the SUPERA tool areas for gender equality.

2.1. Basic information on the six GEP implementing institutions and possibilities of comparative analysis

Table 1: Basic information on the six GEP implementing institutions

Institution/ characteristics	Nr. of students	Ratio of academic/ administrative or professional services staff	Previous experience in GEP – level of institution	Established sex- segregated database at institution	Nr. of interviews held	Nr. of Focus groups/workshops performed	Public (PU)/private (PR)
UL FF	4,431	531/153	NO	NO	4	4	PU
OBU	18,000	1,300/900	YES	YES	12	NDA	PU
SU	5,057	405/363	NO	NO	9	6	PR
ETAg	NO	63	NO	YES	7	NDA	PU
IGOT	745	45/16	NO	NO	11	7	PU
UDEUSTO	11,607	817/524	YES	YES	16	5	PR

YES: established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional Baseline Assessments

The basic characteristics of the institutions and an overview of the institutional reports demonstrate a variety of structural elements and the diversity of practices aimed at achieving gender equality in the field of higher education and research.

Starting with the **variety of cultural, political, national contexts** (Turkey, Spain, Estonia, Portugal, England, Slovenia) and based on these concrete, already developed **institutional diversities**, we would like to stress some basic elements of the possibilities and limits of comparability:

Among the five RPOs at the level of the project, three universities (OBU, SU, UDEUSTO) are included in the reports as institutional wholes, while two are included as members of universities (IGOT, UL FF).





The institutions differ with regard to organizational structures and modes of governance and the regulations arising from these structures.

They also differ with regard to the scientific areas and disciplines that they cover; they have different numbers of study programmes, different numbers of students and different relationships among the pedagogical, research staff and the student population, etc.

Among the six institutions five are RPOs and one is an RFO (ETAg)

Out of the six institutions two, UDEUSTO and SU are private institutions while the other four, IGOT, OBU, ETAg and UL FF are public ones.

There are also differences regarding the ways and levels of treatment of the target populations in their analyses (academics, administration, students). While institutional reports mostly concern the academic population, the students and administration are included in the reports in different ways, mostly however only marginally.

The overview of the institutional reports further demonstrates the diversity at **the level of the structure and content of the reports**: while equal starting positions and indicators promise a level of comparability, spaces for adapting the common to the particular prove to be quite important and productive, and institutions use them as such in their reports. This is also why, in order to gain an in-depth understanding of policies and practices, we would at this point need a greater degree of contextualization of the data at hand: to determine what specific data mean in a national context, in the broader institutional context, at the level of universities etc. Sometimes the institutions offer these explanations but mostly this contextualization remains subordinated to presenting data.

The institutions have shifted the institutional reports in a way that expresses their **possibilities and priorities**. Each report demonstrates the variety of already existing mechanisms and practices (formal and informal) of monitoring and assuring gender equality, and the variety of efforts and searches for mechanisms and practices that are still in the process of establishing themselves in certain areas. Consequently, institutional reports differ with regard to the length of content and the data available (level P1 and P2 of SUPERA indicators). In those institutions that have access to data and information the reports are more extensive. Where data and information are not accessible and were first gathered in order to meet the needs of this project, the reports are less extensive or lacking at certain points. Thus, the different levels (macro, meso, micro) are also differently embedded within the content, which can be seen in the reports in the extent and manner of presenting data and information at the specific and already mentioned levels. We can also see that we can, at least partly, explain these important differences between the institutions in relation with the differences **in the continuum of treating issues regarding gender equality**, not only at the institution but also in national contexts. Some institutions (for example OBU) have decades long histories in the field of gender equality. They have been included in many similar projects and Athena Swan Charter, while other institutions are only just at the beginning of this path. In this sense, for example,





United Kingdom was one of the first countries that established a certification system in the field of gender equality, one which places obligations on academic institutions in the national context in the areas of monitoring and assuring gender equality, as well as simultaneously enables and encourages further developments. OBU, for example, began its journey towards greater equality with the founding of the Equal Opportunities Action Group in 1990. This group has developed an action plan to decrease gender and other inequalities.

Similarly, the first document aimed at developing gender equality at UDEUSTO was created in 2008:

“In 2008, a first working document was drawn up that focused on developing an Equality Plan at UDEUSTO, which was subject to limited implementation and monitoring owing to the fact that the plan only covered the area of work with actions related to individual workers, leaving aside other important areas such as teaching and research and also other groups, such as the student community.” (UD IBA, p.33).

ETAg also reports on its involvement in the GENDER-NET Plus project in 2017,

“a project by the European Research Area Network which aims to strengthen transnational collaborations between research programme owners and managers, promote gender equality and help facilitate institutional change” (ETAg IBA, p. 14).

All these activities have in different ways encouraged and contributed to the beginnings of establishing institutional databases on the employees with regard to gender, establishing the first policies and practices in the field of gender equality.

In addition to these structural differences, the reports also differ with regard to contents and also point to **differences in both qualitative and quantitative methodological approaches** used to gather data, indicators and information. These approaches differ across institutions, partly also due to the diversity of policies that, for example, frame promotion procedures, regulate salaries, etc. Other important differences concern databases and other records and information available to the partner institutions in particular countries. The availability of these also determines how different secondary data on gender equality are aggregated in cases when they are not specifically available. SU for examples writes:

“It is important to note that no department or faculty had gender disaggregated data available, but they had to go through their existing statistics to sort with a gender variable or to create statistics from scratch” (SU IBA, p. 7).

In relation to this the partner institutions also point out the different levels of data reliability. As the UL FF warns:

“Data is mainly gathered as records and not as a database for analytical purposes. This, along with the time available for the task, proved to be a challenge for anything beyond basic data analysis. The records are kept in Excel format, where the tables were not framed in a way to allow such analysis, and therefore had to be reframed in order to





provide the data needed for the analysis. Also, these records are kept at different institutional offices (finance, student offices, HR ...) that are not interconnected, so the data is not gathered in a way to allow cross-comparisons” (UL FF, IBA p. 6-7).

Qualitative approaches also differ among institutional reports, for example with regard to the extent and number of interviews, focus groups, and workshops carried out, as well as with regard to other qualitative methods of data gathering (see Table 1 above), the issues included and the questions that arise from them.

Comparing gender equality with regard to management positions demonstrates differences between the **management structures and management practices** at different institutions, the symbolic and economic valuations of different management positions (e.g. UDEUSTO and the combination of the Jesuit and scientific composition of the university bodies).

Differences in **national policy** and differences in the ways they are implemented influence the possibilities of managing gender equality in institutions. Thus, where a particular area is relatively organized (e.g. maternity leave), institutions recognize fewer challenges when providing institutional mechanisms that ease or reduce gender inequalities. However, institutional practices in certain areas are limited precisely because of the lack of national legislation, for example in the case of sexual harassment (see chapter 7).

Research activity in most public institutions is embedded and regulated at the national (macro) level (national and international strategies, the work of national research agencies, etc.). This is also reflected in including the gender dimension in research as well as in the attitudes of national agencies with regard to issues of gender equality when opening calls for and evaluating projects. It appears that alongside the national level, more than the institutional level (meso), it is the level of individual researchers (micro) that include the concept of gender and gender equality in their research and pedagogic work that influences the inclusion of the gender dimension in research.

Furthermore, there also exist differences in the possibilities and extent of including a comparative dimension: comparing **STEM** and **SSH** or comparisons within a specific field. These comparisons appear only marginally in institutional reports, or they are dispersed or missing. Similarly, it is hard to find a comparative perspective in the case of ETAg as the only RFO. However, in the part where this is possible, for example when describing the national context and the indicators related to university life, some contact points can be found. In other cases, we are dealing with the particularity of the organization as the only RFO among the six GEP implementing institutions. In this area including ETAg is limited by the indicators that the SUPERA tool proposes for monitoring gender equality and that sometimes come close to those for monitoring RPOs and sometimes stay specific to the RFO. As the only RFO in the project the related results can only be compared to a limited extent within the framework of this report.





2.2. Framework for the analysis of institutional reports

Bearing what we have stated above in mind, it seems meaningful to consider the comparative dimension alongside the **variety of differences**. We could say that a powerful common element arising from all six reports is the desire and commitment of the institutions (project teams) to search for ways and possibilities within their own contextual conditions. EU projects can thus serve as guidelines, examples of good practice and proposed common goals taking the form of indicators that are of great help with establishing and finding particular paths towards gender equality. They seem especially efficient when and where they are complementary with national developments and institutional efforts in the field of gender equality.

In relation to the above-mentioned objective elements, the comparisons of similarities and common patterns is in this part limited to **comparing the conditions and the already established/not established practices in the field of gender equality**. Due to ethical dilemmas³, methodological barriers and institutional limitations the comparison of statistical data is also limited.

The comparative dimension is composed with regard to particular areas (chapters) that arise from the groups of indicators in the SUPERA tool and takes account of the limitations inherent in the diversity of presenting the data and content that individual institutions included in their reports. The areas and indicators were sometimes combined in groups with regard to their importance in light of gender equality and with regard to the availability and frequency with which certain information appeared in institutional reports.

2.3. How to read the report

At the beginning of each chapter (areas of gender equality) one can find important practices for achieving gender equality in a particular area. They are presented in tables, with markings for each institution, indicating their phase of development with regard to a specific practice. A four-level scale is used, as follows:

YES indicates practices established in an individual institution before entering the GEARING-Roles project; the already existing practices are however established in different ways;

NO indicates that a practice, area, or indicator does not exist at a particular institution, according to what the institutions themselves have presented in their reports;

³ Institutional Ethical agreements prevented some GEP implementing institutions to make data and information gathered in Institutional baseline assessments, public.





GR indicates practices that have been considered or established with the GEARING-Roles project;

NDA indicates no data available in institutional baseline assessment.

We would also like to point out that it was sometimes difficult to make clear distinctions between categories as well as discerning the existence of a practice from the report and that the reports sometimes did not include enough information about the practice. Consequently, deviations can occur.

The tables are followed by comparisons where possible, and by presenting examples of institutional practices that aim at explaining the particularities and/or similarities. They are structured in different chapters, according to the contents available in each particular report. Where possible we have also emphasized common dilemmas and partial conclusions. To provide explanations we have used examples described by the institutions in their reports – sometimes we summarize them, sometimes we quote them directly. We would also like to point out that the presented quotes and summaries were chosen purposefully⁴. However, it must be noted that they are never used in a hierarchical way of comparison or in the context of classifying institutions as more or less successful. The report should at all times be interpreted with regard to the possibilities and limitations of institutions in their national and regional environments. Despite of this, the report does sometimes highlight certain cases of good practice, mostly with the aim of demonstrating all that can be achieved in the field of gender equality if certain fundamental conditions are changed and established.

3. National and regional context

In order to understand how gender roles are constructed and reproduced in different institutional environments, within different disciplines, it is important to understand the national (regional) contexts in which the GEP implementing institutions operate. In line with the project proposal, understanding the unique context that determines the values as well as possibilities within a socio-political and normative context is essential in assessing the possible shifts at the institutional levels (Project proposal, p, 8, 9). As put forth in GENDER-NET report⁵, different regulations (legislation, rules, routines, procedures) at the national level can have a positive influence on women's research careers. Similar to those findings, GEARING-Roles participating countries (Spain, UK, Turkey, Estonia, Portugal and Slovenia), all have legislation

⁴ This means that amongst different elaborations provided by individual institution in their Baseline assessment one amongst few possibilities was chosen to be included in the deliverable.

⁵http://www.gender-net.eu/IMG/pdf/GENDER-NET_D2-5_-_National_plans_and_initiatives_promoting_gender_equality_and_structural_chang_e.pdf (November 2019)





on gender equality and on higher education⁶ and research that provides a general framework, which is a necessary basis for institutional initiatives and the possibility of change. In addition, the countries have reported different kinds of regulations and legislation that are in place specifically for the research sector.

This section outlines how the six GEP implementing institutions function in their respective national and regional environments, which contribute to or hinder possibilities for gender equality at the institutional level. Spain, Turkey, the UK, Estonia, Portugal and Slovenia have different cultural, religious and historical backgrounds that also effect the structuring of gender equality at the macro, meso and micro levels. This section will put forth some elements and axes that have been provided by the institutions themselves in their *Institutional baseline assessment reports*⁷ in order to provide initial insight into the national (and regional) context. However in-depth analysis of the relation between the three levels requires additional information and contextualization on the part of implementing institutions, and that exceeds the scope of this analysis.

Table 2⁸: Employment in knowledge intensive activities at the national level, by sex 2018

Country	Percentage of total population			Percentage of active population		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
European Union - 28 countries	4.8	5.8	3.9	7.4	8.2	6.6
Estonia	5.2	6.3	4.2	7.2	8.1	6.1
Spain	4.1	4.2	3.9	6.3	6.0	6.5
Portugal	5.1	5.3	4.8	7.6	7.5	7.7
Slovenia	5.2	5.8	4.5	7.9	8.3	7.4
United Kingdom	7.4	8.9	6.0	10.7	11.9	9.2
Turkey	1.8	2.0	1.6	3.2	2.6	4.3

⁶ In some countries like in Turkey and is Slovenia, the constitution guarantees equality between men and women and there have been some initiatives towards promoting gender equality in higher education but no specific legislation or national measure to mandate it in higher education.

⁷ The elaboration of national context differs considerably between Institutional baseline assessment reports as well as the level of contextualization of information provided on part of the institutions.

⁸In order to sketch some important national differences from an international comparative perspective, table 2, prepared by our colleagues at OBU for their Institutional report, were used.





Source: Eurostat – Scientists and engineers, from 15 to 74 years old

In the case of knowledge intense activities the numbers are more varied.

Table 3: Tertiary educational attainment

Country	Total	Men	Women
European Union - 28 countries	28.7	26.5	30.8
Estonia	35.9	26.8	44.9
Spain	34.0	31.4	36.6
Portugal	22.5	17.5	27.2
Slovenia	28.7	23.3	34.5
United Kingdom	39.3	37.0	41.5
Turkey	17.3	18.4	16.2

Source: Eurostat – Population by educational attainment level, sex (%)

Table 4: Proportion of women academic staff, by grade 2018

Country	Grade A	Grade B	Grade C	Grade D
EU-28	23.7	40.5	46.4	46.9
Estonia	24.3	:	:	:
Spain	21.3	42.4	48.4	48.8
Portugal	26.3	40.8	47.8	52.5
Slovenia	28.9	35.3	48.9	48.2
United Kingdom	26.4	45.7	51.3	59.4
Turkey	:	:	:	:

Source: SHE figures 2018

Following the structures of EIGE country reports and comparing the institutional reports of the six GEP implementing institutions, four common clusters of practice can be outlined: the existence of a national policy on gender equality, international policy fostering gender equality





at the national level, institutional specific policy and impact of EU project initiatives on gender equality.

Table 5: Policies on gender equality

Practice/Institution	National policy	International/supranational policy	Institutional policy	EU projects
OBU	YES	YES	YES	YES
SU	YES	YES	YES	YES
UDEUSTO	YES	YES	YES	YES
IGOT	YES	YES	NO	YES
ETAg	YES	YES	NO	YES
UL FF	YES	YES	YES	YES

YES: established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments

The basic information provided shows there are some gender equality initiatives at all levels, but further investigation into the reports reveals some differences and commonalities.

3.1. Normative (legal) conditions⁹

Legal conditions at the national level cover basic citizenship rights and the fields of labour, higher education and research, and family affairs. All six GEP implementing institutions report having some national rules and regulations covering basic gender equality (ex. constitutional protections, ratifications of International Human Rights Treaties ...).

Some of the institutions, for ex. SU, IGOT, and UL, put forth their national constitutions as the main documents for equality at the national level. In Turkey:

⁹ This section covers information and data put forth in the Institutional Baseline reports. For further elaboration additional desk research would be needed, which is beyond the scope of the GR project.





“The constitution guarantees the application of equality before law without distinction as to ‘language, race, colour, sex, political opinion, philosophical belief, religion and sect, or any such grounds’. In 2004, the following statement was added to the article: ‘Men and women have equal rights and the State shall have the obligation to ensure that this equality exists in practice’ (SU IBA, p. 12).

The UK introduced the Equality Act in 2010 that replaced and extended earlier anti-discrimination acts for England, Wales and Scotland. In Northern Ireland, the most important Act is the Sex Discrimination (Northern Ireland) Order 1976. The UK also has a Minister for Women and Equalities, who is responsible, among other things, for cross-governmental equality strategy and legislation. It also has the Equality and Human Rights Commission and the Government Equalities Office, with the latter reporting directly to the Minister for Women and Equalities and working across the government. Since April 2019, it has been part of the Cabinet Office.

Amongst other relevant policy initiatives to foster equality at the national level, gender pay gap reporting seems worth noting. Gender pay gap reporting has become a legal requirement in Great Britain since 6 April 2017, and thus employers with more than 250 staff (universities fall within this category) are required by law to publish such figures annually on their own website and on a government website.

In Estonia, the national legal frameworks that structure practices of gender equality in research and higher education are regulated by the Gender Equality Act, which was adopted in 2004. Additionally, all higher education research institutions in Estonia follow the requirements stated in the Higher Education Act and the Organization of Research and Development Act. However, neither of the two acts include concrete goals or activities to achieve gender equality.

In Spain, the regulatory framework in terms of gender equality applicable to higher educational and research establishments is shared between the Spanish State and Autonomous Regions (regional entities). On a national level, attention should first be drawn to the act governing effective equality between women and men as well as the basic statute governing public sector employees, the law governing universities, and lastly, in the field of research, the general aim of the law governing science, technology and innovation which is currently in force, which is to promote the inclusion of the gender. In addition, in the Basque Autonomous Region there is also an act governing equality between men and women that fosters the principle of equality in this area.

In Portugal, there is an interesting practice at the national level. The Commission for Citizenship and Gender Equality (CIG) is a national body responsible of promoting and upholding the principles of equality enshrined in the Constitution of Portugal in response to social and political changes in citizenship and gender equality, and it ensures the implementation of public policies in the field of citizenship: (1) the promotion and defence of gender equality, (2) the fight against domestic and gender violence and (3) the fight against trafficking human





beings, coordinating the respective policy instruments - the National Plans. These are: (i) the National Plan for Equality (PNI), (ii) the National Plan against Domestic Violence (PNCVD), and (iii) the National Plan against Trafficking Human Beings (PNCTSH).

In Slovenia, since its declaration of independence in 1990, different institutions have been established (e.g. the Women's Policy Office, later renamed the Office for Equal Opportunity and currently called the Sector for Equal Opportunities at the Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities) and several policies put in motion aimed at achieving gender equality. Today we can say the basic framework for gender equality in different fields was in place in the 1990s (on the basis of some good regulations that already existed in the socialist period), and has been improved in the process of the harmonization of legislation that occurred as part of the EU accession process.

Since 2002, Slovenia has also had the Equal Opportunities for Women and Men Act (ZEMŽM), a subsidiary regulation that ensures gender balances and adopts special measures in the case of imbalanced gender representation, when the representation of one gender is lower than 40%. The key government document nowadays is in this regard the Resolution on a national programme for equal opportunities of women and men (2015-2020).

Welfare and gender regimes in terms of maternity and paternity provisions are a common practice at the level of national regulation but differ between countries. Some of the reports are scarce on information related to this, so more in-depth analysis is not possible. Nevertheless, overall the reports indicated that, in practice, the sphere of childcare is still feminized regardless of any progressive national policies.

3.2. Place of gender in institutional context

The six GEP implementing institutions report that national laws and regulations shape institutional practice in gender equality in higher education and research in different manners.

In Portugal, national initiatives are reported to have a positive impact on the institutional dimension. Recently, CIG has been established. In addition, the Operator of the Conciliation and Gender Equality Programme in partnership with the Norwegian Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombudsman (LDO), under EEA Grants 2014-2021 was signed in Lisbon on May 2017, as IGOT reports (IGOT IBA, p.20). Through this program, innovative and structuring projects for the country will be financed and aligned with the aforementioned National Strategy for Equality and Non-Discrimination 2018-2030 "Portugal + Igual" (ENIND).

Today CIG helps to promote projects to support gender balance under this national strategy, and specifically the three-year project GE-HEI "gender equality in university institutions". GE-HEI aims to understand why, in the context of increasing numbers of female students, teachers





and researchers, women are still underrepresented in the leadership of research centres and in higher education in Portugal.

At SU, the university management identifies its strategic goals for 5-year periods and the main strategic goal for 2018-2023 is defined as “resolving selected global and regional issues and training individuals to achieve this goal”. Apart from such strategic goals, the academic principles are expected to be adhered to at all times. Among these, the Non Discrimination Statement commits the university to abide by the principles of equal opportunity and equal treatment in education and recruitment. This is stated to include discrimination based on sex, religion, national or ethnic identity, race, colour, physical disability, appearance, marital or familial status, sexual orientation, age and political affiliation. Two significant statements related to action on gender-based issues are the Domestic Violence Prevention and Support Statement and the Sexual Harassment Policy Statement, which derive from the university’s commitment to “provide a positive, egalitarian, safe and affirmative learning, living and working environment for all students and employees”.

OBU notes the growing political interest in addressing disparities in participation and outcomes in the UK, as well as improving social mobility, illustrated by the metrics introduced to the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), as well as the expectations set out for Access and Participation plans by the Office for Students, and a stronger approach to inclusion in the Research Excellence Framework 2021. The UK has played a pioneering role in terms of certification systems for gender equality. The acronym SWAN stands for Scientific Women’s Academy Network, and the charter was established by the then Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) in 2005. The ECU merged with the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE) in 2018, to become Advance HE, which is now leading the process. At the OBU institutional level, there is a long-standing commitment to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) as core values for the institution. Oxford Brookes University pioneered the promotion of gender and other equalities in the early 1990s when it established an Equal Opportunities Action Group.

ETAg reports that several Estonian universities have been taking part in different initiatives to draw more attention to gender inequalities in academia. In the years 2014-2016, Tallinn University was leading the project *Development of the career model of researchers in order to support the women's career path*. Three other universities, the University of Tartu, Tallinn University of Technology and Estonian Business School participated in the project.

The objective of the project was to map the conditions for gender sensitive recruitment and, based on the experiences of other countries, start a programme to support young female researchers in their careers. Additionally, the situation of gender equality in all the universities involved was monitored during the project.

UDEUSTO, as university belonging to the Society of Jesus, accepted that disparities in terms of power and inequalities regarding relations between men and women should be considered one of the “injustices” to be “tackled in complying” with its own mission. And there are many





international, national and local commitments to gender equality that both offer and demand a series of measures and actions to be incorporated into university work and management that UDEUSTO wishes to take on or study in depth, in seeking a better response to society's needs and expectations. UDEUSTO has a special responsibility for putting the right to equality between men and women into effect, whereby it is committed to integrating the gender perspective into all the organizational, teaching, research and transfer processes, as well as improving the management conditions in which daily life is pursued:

"Within the framework of the 2011-2014 Strategic Plan, an initial diagnosis was made about the university regarding the university that covered the years 2013 and 2014. With the new Deusto 2018 Strategic Plan, the objective was set out of "Constituting and consolidating working structures created specifically to promote equality, in addition to collaborating with areas of the university in order to attain equality and assume institutional representativeness in this sphere of activity." The aforementioned Equality-Parity Committee was set up for such purpose in November 2015, responsible for proposing and approving the current Institutional Plan for Equality between Men and Women at the University of Deusto, adopted unanimously at the Equality-Parity Committee held on 22nd May 2017." (UD IBA p.33).

In relation to gender equality at UL, the *Resolution on a national programme for equal opportunities of men and women (2015-2020)* proposes an elaborate a set of indicators for monitoring the equality of women and men. The indicators are clustered into eight groups: (1) equality of economic independence, (2) work-life balance, (3) knowledge-based society without gender stereotypes, (4) social inclusion, (5) women's and men's health, (6) gender balance in decision-making, (7) violence against women, and (8) gender equality in foreign policy and international relations. The resolution also envisages an *Action plan for improving career opportunities of researchers in all stages of their careers*. In relation to this the University of Ljubljana (UL) passed the *Strategy of UL for career development of researchers (2012-2016)*, where gender equality is referred to but not explicitly addressed. Faculties within UL have the autonomy to develop their own gender equality initiatives. Some of smaller research centres, such as that of the Slovenian Academy of Science and Arts (ZRC SAZU), National Institute for Biology (NIB) and National Institute of Chemistry (KI) have already developed their institutional GEP.

3.3. The role of EU funding in the advancement in gender equality

All six GEP implementing institutions report on the positive effects of EU project initiatives and funding for the advancement in gender equality at the national level.





For example, the Estonian Maritime Academy (part of the University of Tartu) is currently participating in the Horizon 2020 project Baltic Gender. In Portugal there are currently some more European projects and the implementation of GEPs or similar initiatives in various universities, including: SUPERA (Supporting the Promotion of Equality in Research and Academia, Horizon 2020 project), in which the Centro de Estudos Sociais of the University of Coimbra participates; SAGE (Systemic Action for Gender) in which ISCTE-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa participates; SPEAR, in which the Universidade Nova de Lisboa is a partner; GENDERSMART; GE ACADEMY; CHANGE; GRANTED: and R&I-PEERS. In Slovenian higher education several different institutions have been involved in European projects, such as: PLOTINA (Promoting gender balance and inclusion in research, innovation and training), GARCIA (Gendering the Academy and Research: combating career instability and asymmetries), R&I PEERS (Gender balance for innovation), CHANGE (CHANGE — CHAlleNging Gender (In)Equality in science and research), Genderaction (GENDER equality in the ERA Community To Innovate policy implementation), Gendera (Gender Debate in European Research Area), GENIS LAB (Gender in Science and Technology), and Diversity (Improving the gender diversity management in materials research institutions).

SU also reports that EU projects constitute effective models for gender equality transformation at universities. There have thus been efforts at many universities to integrate into this framework. Some partners from Turkey who have implemented EU projects on gender equality in higher education are: EGER A- Middle East Technical University, FESTA, Shemera - Istanbul Technical University, SCIENCE EDUCATION FOR DIVERSITY- Pamukkale University, GENOVATE - Ankara University, PLOTINA - Ozyegin University, and SAGE - Kadir Has University.

3.4. Relevant actors and stakeholders

All six GEP implementing institutions report on their activities with regard to establishing gender equality networks.

Apart from the external support mechanisms, such as EU projects, actors such as informal networks of feminist academics and activists, civil society groups and university students are important allies of the gender equality works conducted at universities. One such informal network in Turkey is the Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention Network, which is composed of different units and individuals from many universities in Turkey who work in this field. The Council of Higher Education drafted and communicated a Gender Equality Code of Conduct. SU also notes the importance of raising awareness as a vital starting point for creating an environment where all actors embrace a gender action plan. On a national level, feminist academics in Turkey state that the main issues to address before achieving gender equality in higher education are the lack of a national action plan, lack of institutionalization of the works





done, lack of coordination between efforts in each university and lack of a database where all documents related to gender equality efforts and mechanisms at universities are archived.

ETAg has created a working group that includes representatives of Estonian universities and other research organisations interested in the topic of gender equality to exchange good practices and ideas. Additionally, ETAg considers the Equality Policies Department of the Ministry of Social Affairs a valuable partner.

OBU reports on the already mentioned Athena Swan initiative, the Scientific Women's Academy Network. The charter was established by the then Equality Challenge Unit (ECU). ECU later merged with the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE).

Besides political partners, UDEUSTO mentions the Basque Institute for Women and Equal Opportunities (EMAKUNDE) at the regional level, and Women and Science Unit in addition to the Equality Unit, the function of which is to promote the suitable application of the principle of gender mainstreaming in scientific, technological and innovation spheres of activity at the state level. Also, the Women, Science and Innovation Observatory for Gender Equality was set up in 2008 within the Spanish System of Science, Technology and Innovation. This observatory, formally set up on 10th January 2019 and presided over by the State Secretariat for Universities, Research, Development and Innovation, promotes policies regarding equality, non-discrimination and universal accessibility to the field of science, as well as fostering women's participation in the field of universities, research and innovation within an equality plan. Outside the institutional sphere of activity, UDEUSTO reports that attention should be drawn to the Network of Gender Equality Units for University Excellence (RUIGEU) and, on a less formal level, PRISMA, an association that was set up in Spain in 2019 to achieve affective-sexual and gender diversity in science, and other groups.

UL maps the main actors for gender equality at the national level, and these are: the Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (MDDSZ) and Ministry of Education (MIZŠ). The first established a Sector for Equal Opportunities at the Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, and the second the Commission for Equal Opportunities in Science. One of the important actors in gender equality in higher education is the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS), a public funding organisation which performs tasks relating to the National Research and Development Programme and the creation of the European Research Area. It is also a central national point for the financing of research projects. Other non-governmental actors that are reported to be important are different research institutions, such as: the Peace Institute, Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, National Institute of Chemistry, Science and Research Centre Koper; faculties at the UL (Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Social Science, Faculty of Social Work, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Law, Biotechnical Faculty), and also some faculties or departments from other universities, such as the University of Maribor (UM), Faculty of Arts.





It should be noted that the autonomy and financing of institutions remain unaddressed. It would be beneficial for the institutions themselves to reflect on the possibilities for the establishment of their own gender equality practices, policies, departments, research centres, etc., in the light of the national possibilities related to autonomy and financial mechanisms, especially in connection to the related EU initiatives and financial support.

4. Recruitment, retention, career progression, work-life balance policies

Gender inequalities, as put forth in the GR Project proposal, are only a part of the formal construction of social relations that embed them, although they are central to employment relations. Human Resource Management (HRM) has been seen by some to be at the centre of debates regarding organizational change, and its potential impact on equal opportunities and gender equality. Whilst HRM is seen as promoting equality by valuing individuals along with organizational goals, it is largely a reflection of the organizational culture, and therefore reproduces existing cultural bias. Recent work by Carnes et al. (2012) shows that institutional transformation is required to ensure equal opportunities for the participation and advancement of both men and women in the context of academic science and technology (STEM). In this context Nishii's (2013) notion of a "climate for inclusion" is particularly relevant. Three central dimensions are identified for it: fairness of employment, cultural openness to differences, and inclusion in decision-making. Gender equality and fairness in recruitment involve the need to follow not only the paper traces of equality practices, but also the myriad of ways in which gendered practices are implemented and maintained in academic employment (Project proposal, p. 3-4).

Recruitment, progression and retention cannot be properly addressed if not evaluated in relation to other cultural, national and institutional policies on work-life balance. While progress is being made there are still differences between culturally established gender roles, especially in the sphere of caring activities, which are still seen as predominantly feminine. Women's progression in careers is therefore still determined by the decisions they take in relation to family life.

This is also reflected in gender pay gaps (GPG). While most countries' regulations calls for equal pay, pay gaps are produced and reproduced in relation to different effectiveness criteria, and the possibilities of collaboration in different activities that offer economic remunerations. Therefore, as stated in SHE figures: "The GPG is the consequence of various inequalities in the labour market, such as different working patterns, differences in institutional mechanisms and





systems of wage setting. It is linked to a number of legal, social and economic factors which go far beyond the single issue of equal pay for equal work“(SHE figures, 2018, pp. 102 - 103).

This section addresses specific problem areas, topics suggested by the SUPERA tool which the six GEP implementing institutions used with the aim of gathering data and information for their Institutional Baseline Assessment reports. These are: horizontal and vertical segregation, equal pay, recruitment, retention, work-life balance policies and an additional subsection on students in relation to the challenges outlined above. Students as well as administrative staff are overall unequally addressed in relation to academic staff in all institutional reports.

4.1. Horizontal and vertical segregation

Table 6: Data and policies on gender segregation

Practice/Institution	Collection of sex-disaggregated data	Application of sex-disaggregated data in institutional policy	Affirmative action measures	Monitoring of academic careers	Cross-sectional data	Gender and workload
OBUE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
SU	GR	NO	NO	GR	NO	GR
UDEUSTO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	GR
IGOT	GR	NO	NO	GR	GR	GR
ETAg	YES	NO	NO	NDA	NDA	NDA
UL FF	GR	NO	NO	GR	NO	GR

YES: established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional Baseline Assessments

Addressing the problem of horizontal and vertical segregation is strongly emphasized by the existence of and access to sex-disaggregated data. Horizontal and vertical segregation, as indicated in the SUPERA tool, puts forth indicators of different *sex ratios of academic staff and students in different scientific fields and disciplines, proportion of women among researchers,*





sex ratio of teaching and research staff per rank, seniority, average number of years needed for promotion to the next rank, differences in faculty workload, etc.

4.1.1. Sex-disaggregated data and institutional policy and practice

Institutional reports show that the existence of sex-disaggregated databases is strongly related to the scope of established institutional practices and gender equality policies. Institutional reports also indicate that the initial push for establishing sex-segregated databases depends on the synergy of the national and EU policy initiatives and availability of funding.

Overall information (table 6 above) shows that three of the six institutions had already established practices of sex-segregated data collection prior to the beginning of this project, with the other three beginning to collect and analyse data as part of GEARING-Roles project activities.

All of the three institutions with previously established databases use these data to inform and monitor institutional policies on gender equality in different ways. Institutional practices indicate that monitoring of the development of academic careers is an important issue in gender equality. All five of the RPOs had previously monitored the issue or took the effort to do so as part of the GR project activities. A similar picture emerges in monitoring gender and workload. A cross-sectional data comparison is only carried out at OBU. Preferential gender equality practices are formally established only at one RPO, while all the others report on the existence of different, informal preferential practices.

Starting with **OBU**, the institution with the longest tradition of gender equality practices, dating back to the 1990s, as well as one that had previously been involved in several gender equality projects. Their report shows the rich history of the collection of relevant data and practices and the commitment of different institutional actors. For example, in terms of presenting how established policy and practice can function, we present a case of OBU:

“/.../, relevant documents at the institutional levels were collected, using the minutes of the Equality Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Group (EDIAG) and institutional Athena SWAN Self-assessment Team (ASSAT) since the beginning of 2018. Additional documents were obtained by key informants in the HR department, including the Equality Diversity and Inclusion Adviser. Examples of documents that were compiled at the institutional level include: EDI Annual Reports 2016-2017 and 2017-2018; Gender Pay Gap report 2017; REF2021 Code of Practice; HR Excellence in Research award 2018; the Athena SWAN University Submission Report 2016; Report on staff data for Athena SWAN – 2015/16 to 2017/18; Staff survey; Student survey” (OBU IBA, p. 32-37).

Another example is how institutional data and information are used for examining gender equality at different, interconnected levels at the institution. Basic institutional data at OBU, for example shows that there is a slightly bigger percentage of women (56%) than men (44%)





amongst academic staff and also in administrative services (between 67% and 75%). OBU elaborates:

“It is only when drilling down into specific subject that some disparities appear: women for example are a majority in HLS academic staff (67%) but a minority of TDE staff (33%). This reflects wider segregation patterns in higher education generally with women over-represented in subjects such as nursing (80% are women) but lacking in Engineering, Computing and Mathematics (20%). According to the qualitative interviews, areas which are highly feminized in terms of staff, such as nursing or education present “a challenge ... to encourage men to consider those (integrating intersectional approaches) practices”, and “we don’t engage as much as we should in female-dominated areas. /.../ (OBU IBA, p. 32-37).

The importance of sex-disaggregated data is also set out by UDEUSTO:

“Breaking down data into men and women at the university enables us to maintain that UDEUSTO is feminised, above all taking into account the makeup of its student body and staff from some faculties or technical-administrative areas.” (UD IBA, p. 38).

While the numbers show high level of feminization of the student body (see more on this in section 4.5. on students, below), there is however no correspondence between student feminization and that of teaching and research staff, except at the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences and also that of Psychology and Education, where the percentage of women in teaching and research staff is around 63%. As UDEUSTO reports:

“The faculties that evidence the most parity in terms of distribution are those of Law and Deusto Business School (DBS), although there are more men than women in both cases. Sex rates amongst teaching and research staff and research staff are more evenly distributed (with parity being deemed to mean a distribution of around 60-40). The most masculinized faculties are Theology and Engineering, where the PDI male presence is significantly higher (84.6% and 68.4% respectively). Masculinization among teaching and research staff is also noted in Engineering schools (72.7%).” (UD IBA, p. 41).

UDEUSTO also monitors the distribution of sexes in cases of seniority, and the data shows a stable trend in recent years in comparison to earlier ones. An uneven distribution between men and women emerges when categories such as assistant professors and/or chairs are compared:

“However, gender bias in terms of promotion is shown to us by the categories immediately below these two¹⁰, in which women have a greater presence”, UDEUSTO notes in the report (p. 45). It concludes, “ There is one female professor for every three female associate professors, whereas there is one male professor for less than two male associate professors. Despite this unfavourable data from the woman’s standpoint, the

¹⁰ Categories are provided in Spanish and are as follows: 1. CATEDRATICO/A, 2. TITULAR, 3. DOCTOR/AENCARGADO/A, 4. AYUDANTEDOCTOR/A, 5. LICENCIADO/AENCARGADO/A, 6. PROF. ASOCIADO/A-.





presence of female associate professors (62.2%) at UDEUSTO should nonetheless be considered positive, provided that this does not remain the glass ceiling for promotion of women at the university.” (p.44)

ETAg, in addition to participating in different international projects and networks, which have contributed to institutional practices of gender equality, also considers gender when publishing statistics:

“On the organization’s website, there is a separate section for the topic of gender mainstreaming where an overview of the topic as well as relevant indicators and statistics are brought out.” (ETAg, IBA p. 15)

ETAg, as the only RFO, reports having (74%) female and (26%) male staff.

The three RPO, who had no previously established institutional databases, managed to obtain data that show a similar picture in cases of administrative staff. UL FF and SU also report on the feminization of administrative services, with the exception of technical services, which are masculinized. IGOT also reports on higher percentage of women (68,6%) amongst administrative staff. None of the three institutions with no previously established sex-disaggregated databases report on having gender equality policies at the institutional level, or formal gender preferential mechanisms, although all report on the existence of informal mechanisms. For example: UL FF reports on informal practices at the level of some departments which include different arrangements of the teaching schedule for parents with small children. Some institutions also report informal practices by staff, such as requests for female teaching assistants¹¹. UL FF, for example, reports on the overall sex ratio being in slight favour of women, with the exception of some departments (UL FF, IBA p. 11).

While formal preferential gender practices are only found at OBU, all RPO report on having some kind of informal preferential practices taking place at the institution.

4.1.2. Merit as an objective factor in recruitment and progression

All institutions report issues of gender inequality in relation to recruitment and progression, which again indicates a topic of interest. The recruitment processes for academic staff differ from those used with administrative staff, and the latter is less problematized in the reports. The data on recruitment and progression of academic staff differ amongst institutions and is embedded in national legislations and institutional procedures, and cannot be compared further. The commonality that could be addressed is a strong belief in the **objectivity** of meritocracy, which tends to mask gender inequalities behind the performance and academic excellence criteria. All five RPOs have or have put in motion the monitoring of academic careers, although these are embedded in national and university rules and regulations. SU reports the case of Turkey, where the first title of associate professor is given by the Council of

¹¹ We decided not to elaborate further on these informal practices in order not to publicly disclose institution’s sensitive information.





Higher Education. This indicates the possibility of gender biases at levels beyond individual institutional reach.

The belief in objective criteria could also explain the lack of mechanisms to attract and retain male and female scholars to fields where they are underrepresented and **resistance towards quotas**:

“Our interviews showed that some men in leadership positions hold a common misconception of positive discrimination as being against meritocracy, and that in institutions where quotas are applied women might be selected because they are women are not because they are successful”, SU reports (p. 30).

Similarly, ETAg, sums up the situation as follows:

“When asked about at the interviews, most of the interviewees agreed that getting an equal number of men and women to the committee was the result of conscious work. However, everyone pointed out that no quotas were being used and Estonia as a society is not ready for quotas in general”(p. 30).

UL FF also reports a similar situation:

“Academic recruitment criteria are believed to be strongly based on merit. Qualitative data (interviews, focus groups) has shown that gender equality mechanisms (for ex. quotas,) are still understood as incompatible with academic achievement” (p. 24).

A similar situation is at UDEUSTO, which reports:

“Not only are these measures considered unnecessary but are seen as exclusive and discriminatory in themselves for favouring the selection of women over “the best person” for a certain position. /.../ This is clearly a widespread opinion among the interviewees. They argue that such measures should not be put in place as they may even be counterproductive to women themselves. Only two management-level people interviewed believe that quota systems may be a positive means to promote equality between men and women in decision-making positions” (UD IBA, p. 61).

The data for administrative services shows that this is a highly feminized professional sphere of activity. Administrative staff also face different issues and have different opportunities for progression. For example, as IGOT describes, there are limitations with regard to promotion as there are only a few ranks and directorships. In the case of SU,

“the insufficiency of vertical career advancement options for both men and women in administrative positions is expressed as a matter of unhappiness for administrative staff, but the interviewed women in administrative positions but they still think that it is more relaxed working environment compared to the private sector” (SU IBA, p. 29).

UL FF also reports:





“Employees in support services are part of the public service sector and their possibility of progression in salary and in the internal ladder is regulated differently to that of academic staff. The national systematization of work posts regulates the possibilities of progression in titles and salary ranks, so the possibility for progression at the level of administrative staff at the level of the institution is limited. However, jobs in the public sector still offer a great amount of security in terms of fixed working hours, possibilities to take sick leave, etc. (in comparison to the private sector) and remain attractive for women and men who consider work-life balance important. They usually feel this is a trade off in relation to career progression and career opportunities they could have in other sectors, institutions, etc.” (UL FF IBA, p. 25)

4.1.3. Gender biases in workloads

The distribution of workloads in relation to gender is partly reflected in relation to merit and productivity on the one hand, and on cultural gender biases on the other.

OBU describes their situation as follows:

“The representation of women and men is also very different according to working-time. Women are most likely to work part-time at the grade of lecturer or senior lecturer (and equivalent posts), which probably coincide with care responsibilities in their lifecourse. The take-up of part-time work decreases with seniority, with no one working part-time among senior academic staff. This is problematic in that it can signal that part-time work is incompatible with being in a leadership role, and can de facto exclude more women as they are most likely to work on a part-time basis. It is also interesting to note that nearly one in five men at professorial level work part-time. This might reflect a pre-retirement that is phased, or employment alongside retirement” (OBU IBA, p.37).

As SU puts forth in their report there is a

“mention of discrepancy among interviewed women about workloads in various stages of career and problems arising from inability to balance work and life responsibilities due to the uneven distribution of caring responsibilities between men and women, connecting the issue with the wider problematic of work-life balance” (SU IBA, p. 37).

For academic staff, work-life balance options are different to those who are in office from 9 to 5, as they can work from home or outside the campus when they do not have meetings or classes to teach. Some women see this as the positive side of working in academia, for instance, *“a senior woman professor told us she spent her career working anywhere her laptop is”* (ibid, 37).

However, there is a slightly different picture for administrative staff, as these jobs, as part of the public sector, still seem a safer option compared to the private sector. In administration and support services, women are preferred as employees due to their “natural attributes”, but





are despite their fixed working hours still treated the same as men who do not have any responsibilities outside of work. UL FF notes,

“employees reported that in most cases they are the only ones responsible for the tasks in their offices, meaning their work could not be distributed, passed on to another employee in cases of sick leaves, holidays, etc. This is considered a problem, although one they believe could be solved (in special circumstances) by enabling, for example, working from home” (UL FF, IBA, p. 25).

Similarly, academic staff at UL FF reported women working double the workload in order to give lectures to the generation of students for those semesters when they were absent from work (teaching) due to maternity leave.

4.1.4. The challenges of Intersectional sectional data

Intersectional data were collected only at OBU, where gender equality is part of a wider framework of equality, which monitors different aspects of staff from a BME (Black (Asian) and Minority Ethnic background).

4.2. Equal pay

Table 7: Data and policies on equal pay

Practice /institution	Data on salary comparison	Policies on equal pay	Monitoring sex ratio on type of contracts
OBU	YES	YES	YES
SU	GR	YES	GR
UDEUSTO	YES	YES	YES
IGOT	YES	YES	GR
ETAg	NDA	NDA	YES
UL FF	YES	YES	NO

YES: established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments





The SUPERA tool frames the gender pay gap along the proposed indicators of male/female salary comparison, by rank, by workload, existence of policies on equal pay, maternity status, etc. The possibilities to acquire specific data were therefore limited by the possibilities of accessing national and institutional databases and the possibilities of those in uncovering the dimension of gender equality. The interpretation of gender pay gaps is correlated to the national rules and regulations on the recruitment of staff, and should be interpreted within the limits of this report.

4.2.1. Vertical and horizontal pay gaps

All six GEP implementing institutions report having policies on equal pay at the national level. All the institutions also indicate there are different remuneration scales for academic and administrative staff. The differences, however, cannot be compared due to different national and partly institutional regulations. Where there is an established national wage scale vertically and horizontally, such as at UL FF, salary comparison has not been attempted as every job/work post, depending on the sector and other criteria, has nationally assigned intervals of salary ranks.

Where both axes are monitored at the level of the institution, the possibilities for gender biases are usually found on the horizontal axis, in cases of different awards, access to additional work on contractual basis, etc. This is a possible axis of discrimination even where there are national regulations and indicated the need to be monitored. For example, OBU monitors both axes and reports that, horizontally, data on equal pay shows no significant pay gaps between staff at the same level. However, the preponderance of women in the lower half of the pay distribution creates an overall mean gender pay gap of 11.1% in 2018 for all salaried staff. This reinforces the need to support mid-career progression, as women predominate in lower pay quartiles. This differs from IGOT, whose lowest paid category is dominated by men. This indicates particularities in national and institutional wage scales that influence the possibilities for comparison in this report.

Beside national specificities, data gathered at SU point to institutional practice. In their case programme-based differences in salaries are detected, which could also be connected to gender, but requires further analysis.

UDEUSTO, presenting its data and findings adds to the complexity and limitation of possible comparative analyses by outlining a specific methodological approach, as follows:

“/.../ below we provide data regarding the pay system at UDEUSTO. This has been done as follows: the database for individuals of reference is the one used in the rest of the Equality Plan tables (workforce as at December 2018). The basis for pay for the month of December is used. For “fixed” concepts, the concept is multiplied by 12 or by 15 in order to obtain the fixed annual salary, whereas for “variable” concepts or “bonuses”, the sum of what is earned throughout the year 2018 is provided. Those individuals who have not





worked throughout the year are excluded from the analysis (new recruits who started their contract during the year in question.” (UD IBA, p. 51).

The resulting data shows that in the case of administrative and research staff the numbers are in favour of men. (p. 51- 54)

4.2.2. Sex ratio and types of contracts

Examining the sex ratio based on type of contract has proven to be a challenge. A fixed term contract still seems to be the dominant mode of contracting for administrative as well as academic posts. Nevertheless, each institution reports on different contractual arrangements related to specific institutional needs and national possibilities.

Where data could be provided it signals that women usually prevail among those having part-time contracts, for example at OBU. Here, work-life balance should also be taken into account as women tend to work part-time in order to provide care for family members.

Nevertheless, OBU reports the result of analysis of the

“gender pay gap identified that part-time contracts (the majority of which are held by women) are less common in senior grades. Whilst 31% of all positions are undertaken on part-time contracts, part-time working is far less likely at level I and in senior positions where the proportion falls to 13% and 10% respectively. Work is planned within Athena SWAN to investigate barriers that prevent part-time staff working at higher grades as this is likely to disproportionately affect female staff” (OBU IBA, p. 53).

The predominant mode of contractual binding among IGOT’s staff is the Employment Contract for Indefinite Term in Public Service (72.1%), followed by the Employment Contract Subject to a Term in Public Service (24.6%) that mainly corresponds to part-time teachers according to the University Teaching Career Statute (Assistants and Guest Teachers). There are also two staff members on a Service Commission, within the scope of the Civil Service Labour Law. In its report IGOT notes:

“With regard to teaching and research staff, it is worth noticing that women are in a more favourable contractual situation than men, as 73.3% have an employment contract of indeterminate duration, i.e. 10 percentage points above men”, but adds, “As mentioned above, in addition to the workers included in the Institute’s staff list, due to its research component, IGOT, through the Centre for Geographical Studies, also includes a large number of researchers with a scholarship contract (not an employment contract)” (IGOT IBA, p. 43).

UDEUSTO reports:

“In terms of the type and duration of contracts, it is noted that, in the case of teaching and research staff (PDI) and research staff (PI), open-ended contracts are more equally





distributed between men and women, at around 50-50. However, temporary contracts and fixed-term contracts are feminised, with a rate of over 60% in the case of women. In the case of administrative and service staff (PAS), both open-ended contracts (71.3%) and fixed-term contracts (69.7%) are agreed with women – perhaps as a consequence of the high level of this category’s feminization” (UD IBA p. 46).

ETAg, from the standpoint of an RFO, explains that while Estonian universities have been addressing the issues of gender inequality, there is still a large gap in the share of women in grade A positions (only 24% of professors in Estonia are women), less than a third of leaders of higher education institutions are women, and there also exists a visible gender pay gap at universities.

“the average size of grant applied for by researchers in 2013-2017 varied between 62 000 € - 70 200 € for women and 67 100 € - 72 000 € for male applicants. The biggest gaps were present in 2013: for example, the average start-up grant applied for by a male applicant was 65 700 € while for female applicants it was , only 57 400 €. Also, the grant sizes awarded were smaller for women. Like for funding applications, the biggest gap for awarded grants was in 2013, especially for exploratory grants for which the average grant awarded to a female researcher was 52 300 € and for a male researcher 64 200 € - nearly 20% more.” (ETAg, IBA, p.23).

4.3. Recruitment, retention

Table 8: Data on recruitment and retention

Practice/-institution	Sex ratio successful job applicants	Gender sensitive protocols for recruitment	Data on nr. of m/w leaving the organization
OBU	YES	YES	YES
SU	GR	NO	NO
UDEUSTO	YES	NO	NO
IGOT	GR	NO	NO
ETAg	NO	NO	NO
UL FF	NO	NO	NO

YES: established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.





Source: Institutional baseline assessments

The SUPERA tool uses a set of indicators such as *sex ratio on type of contracts, existence of gender sensitive protocols for recruitment and hearing, gender success on job applications and data on retention*, etc. in order to evaluate individual institutions with regard to gender equality in recruitment and retention.

4.3.1. Specific processes of recruitment and objective criteria

The main limitation in comparing institutional practices is the difficulty of gaining an in-depth understanding of recruitment processes in their national environments. It is also important to highlight that the possibilities of exploring the above-mentioned indicators is strongly related to the existence of institutional sex-disaggregated databases, addressed in section 4.1 above. Moreover, that interpretations of some indicators suggest the need to be considered against the problems arising in gender equality in the areas of progression, equal pay and work-life balance and in particular the challenges institutions face within their national environments.

As the case of IGOT shows, the recruitment of university professors is done by public external and open national and international bids. That means moving from one category to the next always depends on the public tender for that category, and thus internal candidates always compete with external ones.

This can indicate a level of risk in cases of recruitment/promotion in terms of an individual's economic security, the mechanisms for promotion as well as pay gaps, with IGOT reporting:

"While there is no available on average time required to move to a higher category in academic career, opportunities are limited for career advancement especially for those at the bottom of the career ladder (40% of assistant professors, 30% of associate professors and 25% of full professors). Some of them have been in the same category for 15 years or more" (IGOT IBA, p. 51).

A high level of competitiveness could in some cases facilitate gender blindness, but at the same time believe, candidates selected from a wider pool of applicants run less risk of being judged on a personal/biased manner.

Similar to IGOT, there are no specific protocols for the gender sensitive recruitment of academic staff at SU or UL FF. At UL:

"Institutional practices fall under national laws and regulations. The national legislation prevents discrimination based on gender against candidates who compete for the post. For every new employment (post) a public call must be issued with transparent criteria based on educational merit and job experience" (UL FF IBA, p. 24).





At UDEUSTO and OBU, where sex-disaggregated data basis exists, gender biases in recruitment are noticed and elaborate on at different levels.

UDEUSTO refers to its data and explains:

“In the case of administrative and teaching staff (PDI) /.../ there is a bias in favour recruiting men, if we focus on the ratio between the percentage of male and female finalists and the percentage of men and women recruited. Conversely, in the case of PI and PAS recruitments, it is mainly women and, furthermore, by a higher percentage than that of women’s presence in all the previous phases of the recruitment process (application, interview and finalists): 90% in the case of PI and 85% in the case of PAS” (UD IBA, p. 48).

Data at OBU, on the other hand, show a high level of gender equality with exceptions:

“Within different types of positions, women and men are about equally likely to be shortlisted, with differences of two percentage points at most” (OBU, IBA p. 40). “In all but the lowest academic grades, there were more applications from men than women between 2015 and 2018 unlike for the overall figures across academic and professional service roles. If women academics are more likely to be offered a position, this does not apply across all levels of seniority. For the roles of Professor, Principal Lecturer or Reader – unlike in the other less senior roles – women are less likely to be shortlisted and less likely to be offered the position. The difference between the proportion of women and men that are offered a senior position (9% and 25% respectively) out of those short-listed suggests that women fare much less well during the interview process. This calls for further examination, notably in relation to understanding whether that might stem from different expectations and/or unconscious biases” (ibid).

Despite objective criteria, recruitment processes have been identified many times as an area of gender bias in relation to gender equality. Retention is only marginally addressed.





4.4. Work-life balance policies

Table 9: Data on work-life balance

Practice /institution	National regulation: parental policy, childcare	Formal institutional practices (beyond national level provision): parental policy, childcare	Existence of formal policies to reduce the impact of care responsibilities	Informal institutional practices to reduce care responsibilities	Financial mechanisms for research mobility (researchers and their families)
OBU	YES	YES	YES	YES	NDA
SU	YES	YES	YES	YES	NDA
UDEUSTO	YES	YES	GR	NO	NO
IGOT	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
ETAg	YES	NDA	NDA	NDA	NDA
UL FF	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO

YES established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments

The topic of work-life balance and related policies has been assessed on the basis of the data and information on *parental leave, subsidised childcare, pregnancy care, care for other dependents besides children, existence of policies to reduce the impact of care responsibilities upon careers, flexibility of work, incentives for research mobility of researcher and their families* – as proposed by the SUPERA tool.

4.4.1. Institutional provisions in addition to national regulation

All six institutions follow national regulation on parental policy and childcare. Some of them have also formal institutional mechanisms beyond the national provision, as in the case of OBU, SU and UDEUSTO.

OBU has been at the forefront of progressive practice:





“In the context of the Athena SWAN submission, focus groups were conducted to improve our understanding of issues related to maternity/adoption leave and caring for young children and to see if previous actions had impact. It was found that there is a need to further simplify our policies and provide better guidance for staff/line managers on maternity, shared parental and adoption leave.” Before going on maternity leave, temporary cover for absence is arranged through the line manager with duties being reallocated through Work Load Planning (WLP)” (OBU IBA, p. 49, 50).

OBU and UDEUSTO have established a flexible working time for their staff. OBU operates a long-established and well-developed flexible working policy, including: flexi-time, compressed hours, part-time, part-year, etc. UDEUSTO similarly has an Institutional Plan for Equality with reconciliation measures for administrative and service staff (PAS), which started to be applied in the academic year 2019-2020, including flexible working measures, such as a continuous working day for individuals with a reduction in working hours, continuous working day on Fridays, etc.

OBU has also established a formal institutional policy and practice beyond the national level provision, such as a formal policy for dependants and carers' leave, and applies a broad definition to 'carers', offering domestic care, dependant and emergency care leave (max. 10 days) in addition to annual leave. Part-time staff also reports the positive impact of working part-time on satisfaction with their current patterns of work and work-life balance. OBU also offers a campus nursery. SU reports having an on campus kindergarten and a lactation room and DEUSTO offers summers schools for children.

4.4.2. Work-life balance and childcare

The dominant understanding of work-life balance policies is (still) predominantly connected to childcare.

UDEUSTO, like other institutions besides OBU, has no specific formal practices to modify the maternity and paternity leave provided for by the legislation currently in force. There is also no pregnancy care provided by the institution beyond the national level provision, no care policy/services for dependents (other than children) or any policies to reduce the impact of care responsibilities upon career/study paths (quality, enforcement).

A similar situation is found at UL FF, where work-life balance policies exist at the national level (maternity, parental and paternity leave, childcare services, etc.). For academic staff, especially women, maternity leave usually means a setback in career progression compared to their male colleagues. Parental leave in Slovenia is almost a full year. Although parents can share it equally, the prevailing practice is still that women take it all, except the part that is specially allocated to fathers. Another setback for parents is academic mobility as a criteria for progression in ranks/academic titles. Currently there are no special incentives for the support of “family mobility”, and this means young parents are postponing mobility on account of





family life. At the institutional level, there is some flexibility in the working hours of academic staff, but this is not always in favour of work-life balance, as flexible work for academics means that they tend to work more.

SU reports the provision of maternity leave for temporary contracts which is beyond the national provision.

“In fact, there are also many good practices available at Sabanci University, such as the provision of maternity leaves to employees on temporary contracts, although it is not mandated by law” (SU IBA, p. 39).

4.4.3. Gender biases beyond the institutions

All six institutions report that women still predominate in family care. As seen in the previous section, work-life balance is mainly considered through parental leave and support for dependent relatives, and less as a balance between work and leisure. The feminization of care-giving tasks has an obvious impact on career opportunities among women, who tend to have higher levels of dissatisfaction with work-life balance compared to men. In the absence of formal support mechanisms women tend to rely on informal support by their families, husbands, and friends in order to achieve the same performative standards as men and women without families.

IGOT, for example, collected the average number of working hours per week, per person, for the University of Lisbon. Their survey showed that 47.3% of women and 47.8% of men work more than 45 hours per week, while 29% of women and 27% of men regularly work from home at night and on weekends. This indicates a parallel as well as inherent problem of gender equality, related to what still seems to be a dominate discourse of efficiency and productivity in the workplace.



4.5. Student population

Table 10: Data on students

Practice/institution	Sex-disaggregated data on students	Monitoring progression by sex	Policy on gender for student population	WBL policy/practice for students
OBU	YES	YES	YES	NDA
SU	YES	YES	NO	NO
UDEUSTO	YES	YES	YES	NDA
IGOT	YES	YES	NO	NDA
ETAg	*	*	*	*
UL	YES	NO	NO	YES

YES: established, NO: not established, GR project activities, NDA no data available, *RFO.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments

Student sex-disaggregated data is collected at all five RPOs and used mainly for monitoring the progression of students. The SUPERA tool envisages students as a target population through indicators such as *preferential practice for students, monitoring student careers, student grants, WLB for students, etc.*, but addresses them in an indirect manner, within indicators for academic and administrative staff. Some information also seems to be missing in the reports. That, however, does not imply there is no institutional practice in this regard.

4.5.1. Beyond sex-disaggregated data and beyond progression

Student sex-disaggregated data are predominantly used to follow the progression, recruitment and retention of students. Sex ratios for all three cycles are usually monitored along with the **disparities between STEM and SSH**. Nevertheless only few measures are reported to attract men or women in unrepresented fields.

This also indicates, as UDEUSTO reports, a gender bias amongst the student population.

“Most students attributed this parity to personal choice, rather than any social or gender-based conditions, despite the fact that some of them state having been under family pressure when selecting one particular degree course or another. Broadly speaking,

43





students do not perceive any gender bias, nor any bias in terms of distribution of men and women on degree courses or in terms of their participation in the classroom or treatment given them by teaching staff, despite having quite stereotyped ideas about the behaviour of male and female teachers. The latter are granted a more “maternal” role while the former are afforded a more rigid attitude”(UD IBA, 39).

UL FF reports data on maternity/paternity leave, showing a minor dropout of student mothers (student fathers never took a paternity leave), while there are no support mechanisms to help students who are parents to deal with balancing studies and family life.

In this context ETAg reports a gender bias in the national competition for students and other grant mechanisms. Such issues are not discussed as part of gender biases, and indicate the necessity to look into the institutional and national elements related to grants and other financial mechanisms assuring equal access to higher education.

5. Leadership and decision-making

Discussing leadership and decision-making is important to consider the existing power structures and their relation to gender equality. EIGE measures gender equality in decision-making positions across the political, economic and social spheres, which include data on research-funding organizations. The data show (see also the SHE figures 2018) that women are still underrepresented in different power structures and research fields, despite the fact there are similar proportions of both women and men amongst graduates and postgraduates.¹²

In higher education institutions gender inequalities are often produced, maintained and reproduced in different ways and in different strata, from HRM processes to decision-making bodies, etc.

The GEARING-Roles project sets out two models for shaping decision-making and bureaucratic incentives, using ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ measures. The former establish precise, binding and enforceable rules, whereas the latter employ less precise, nonbinding guidelines and voluntary compliance. Hard measures materially influence the incentives of officials by making individual pay or promotion dependent upon successful integration of gender into the matters handled by those officials. Resistance to mainstreaming could be countered by social pressure or ‘naming and shaming’ through which laggards are shamed for their poor performance and pioneers are praised. Soft incentives rely on persuasion and socialization through training and networking, and discretionary guidelines, informal codes of practice, benchmarking, and the exchange of good practice (Project proposal, p. 45).

¹² <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-equality-index/2019/domain/power>





Gender quotas have proven to be a fast track to gender equality and a successful measure in the field of politics or the economy, and after the long period of rejection are now adopted in one form or another in many European countries. Gender quotas in decision-making processes in the field of research and education could therefore be also considered as one of the ways to deconstruct male domination of this field.

The subsections that follow address specific problem areas, topics suggested by the SUPERA tool which institutions used in order to collect data and information for their institutional baseline assessment reports in the area of leadership and decision-making. Proposed indicators cover inclusiveness of governing bodies; policies on gender equality and their quality; availability of affirmative measures for women in leadership positions; existence of gender equality hub; gender sensitive data collection and regular monitoring and evaluation of GEP.

5.1. Leadership and decision-making

Table 11: Practices and policies about leadership and decision-making

Practice /institution	Inclusiveness of governing bodies	Policies on GE and their quality	Affirmative measures for women in leadership positions	Gender equality hub	Inclusive decision making	Monitoring of gender equality (GEPs, data,...)
OBU	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
SU	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	GR
UDEUSTO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	GR
IGOT	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	GR
ETAg	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
UL FF	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	GR

YES: established, NO not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments





Institutional assessment reports show that the issue of gender equality in leadership and decision-making is still mostly left to chance. While UDEUSTO and UL FF report currently favourable overall gender balances, IGOT and SU are less optimistic. SU reports:

“the current numbers show a wide gender gap in highest decision-making /.../ there is clearly a need for improvement in women's representation in decision-making positions, however, no quotas or other affirmative policies are applied or considered by the higher administration at this point” (SU IR, p. 40,41) (see also the section on quotas, 4.1).

Top leadership positions are still mostly dominated by men, while mechanisms for assuring equal representation and the inclusiveness of governing bodies are established only at OBU. For example, OBU report on an analysis of previous research frameworks (REF) and the establishment of a code of practice to support the university's approach to REF2021 and ensure that all staff has the opportunity to contribute to the REF. This code adheres to the principles of Transparency, Consistency, Accountability and Inclusivity, and will be widely disseminated and made available on the OBU website. Information on these processes will be communicated to all staff, including those who are absent (for example on sabbatical, sick leave or maternity leave) (OBU IR, p. 61).

At the other five GEP implementing institutions gender equality in leadership seems to be dependent on different and interrelated factors. The first is inscribed in the **structure of the governing bodies** and national/institutional specific procedures in accessing leadership positions that are more or less (gender) inclusive, depending on the specific institutional structure. This issue is recognized as an important element in the development of institutions' equality actions. As IGOT reports: *“Leadership and decision-making, namely accountability, transparency and inclusiveness, are relevant principles to promote equality”* (IGOT IR, p. 12).

UDEUSTO also reports:

“With respect to this last point, it is worth mentioning a discourse on opening up towards management models that include more visible and varied people-oriented approaches and some of the values typically attributed to women such as fairness and well-being. These Ignatian leadership model values that the university has proposed guiding its actions in order to increase the potential for the implementation of more inclusive leadership models. This question is therefore seen as a positive element in the development of equality actions and where they fit in the university's organizational culture” (UD, IR, p. 64).

This is strongly correlated to the second factor, that is **work-life balance and the additional work** that comes from such positions. OBU explains the interrelatedness of both aspects, as follows:





"Committee loads for specific roles and functions may also thereby be extensive for individuals, such that diversifying and widening the compositions of some groups may have further benefit for fairer workload distribution across teams and within stakeholder communities" (OBU IR, p. 32).

Workload is recognized as a problem area in other institutions as well. UL FF reports: *"Work-life balance for persons in leadership positions is not specifically addressed or regulated. There are however mechanisms that regulate academic workload, which usually means less work with students and in research"* (UL FF IR, p. 28). Based on the interviews UDEUSTO similarly concludes,

"With respect to facilities for reconciling one's personal life with a management position, compatibility between job and family is possible as long as one can and is willing to reorganize their family life ("when accepting the position, you have to look both ways and have the support to organize your home life") and adds "leadership positions are now seen in a different way. They are more closely linked to responsibility and workload than to recognition and symbolic value" (UD IR, p.62, 63).

Another important factor is **sex-segregation by discipline**, may partly accounts for gender (in)equality in leadership positions and governing bodies. This is problematized by all institutions. UDEUSTO, for example, interprets its situation as follows:

"Like the deans' teams, the majority of other mid-level decision-making positions like department heads are mostly women or are gender-balanced. Concerning this point, it is remarkable that there is nonetheless a clear segregation by discipline, as we find that there are more women in management positions in stereotypically women-oriented faculties (Psychology and Education or Social and Human Sciences). The more stereotypically men-oriented faculties like Theology or Engineering have no women in management positions (UD, IR, p.61).

In the case of RFOs this is also noticed. ETAg, while addressing the equality of evaluation panels, for example, explains: *"The problem was largely imported into ETAg: it wasn't that ETAg wanted its panels and the committee to be dominated by men but because there were so few women in the top of the top, there just weren't enough women to be included"* (ETAg IR p. 30).

Another element is **gender blindness and biases**. UDEUSTO reports that, in general, the members of the Board of Directors who were interviewed showed no awareness of inequality; the majority believed that men and women occupy decision-making positions equally at their university and there is no discrimination. One of the underlying factors that again appear is the belief in the **objectivity of evaluation, as the assessment and performance criteria** for all candidates are the same, emphasizing absolute neutrality. This is also connected with a reluctance to adopt quotas and other affirmative measures.

The case of OBU shows the ways in which gender equality can be dealt with and not left to chance. Good progress has been achieved in taking forward the EDI Strategy at this institution,





particularly in relation to gender equality and LGBTQ+ inclusion. The university is trying to ensure that there is diversity of representation in university committees and decision-making bodies.

In the institutional reports, information on gender equality in leadership positions and inclusiveness of governing bodies mostly covers issues related to academic staff and researchers, while administrative staff and students are marginally included and leave little room for comparisons. This observation points to a possible gap in available data, which may be addressed through the project.

6. Gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer

It has been more than thirty years since Bell Hooks published *Feminist Theory: from Margin to Center* (1984), but her message, to put gender in the mainstream of research interest, is still very relevant. How to teach feminism and gender equality in order to have a social impact, and the importance of women's study programs in this social and political agenda are still part of gender equality discussions.

Recognizing the growing importance of the gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer, the SUPERA tool defines these issues as problematic areas that need to be addressed. It is suggested that the gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer are monitored with a set of indicators covering: policies and guidelines on integration of gender into research, monitoring of gender sensitive research practices and funding of gender inclusive projects, policies and practices of integration of gender sensitivity in curricula, gender differences in academic achievements of students, etc.



6.1. Gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer

Table 12: Data on policies in research and curricula

Practice /institution	Policies, guidelines on the integration of the gender dimension into research	Gender sensitive research practices – monitoring	Policies and practice for integration of gender in curricula
OBU	NO	GR	NO
SU	NO	GR	NO
UDEUSTO	NO	GR	NO
IGOT	NO	GR	NO
ETAG	YES	*	*
UL FF	NO	GR	NO

YES established, NO not established, GR: project activities, NDA no data available, *: RFO.

Source: Institutional baseline assessments

Analysing the six institutional reports in relation to the integration of gender equality issues in research and curricula, it seems that this is the area with the fewest gender sensitive practices.

The most problematized element in relation to gender equality in research is the gender structure of the related leadership positions. In their reports the institutions note the correlation of men and women in leadership positions and in certain fields, such as STEM, as well as gender content in research, but not in all cases. UDEUSTO explains:

“This relative lack of attention to gender in research is not consistent with the gender distribution in the leadership of these centres, teams and chairs. As can be seen in the table below, the centres and chairs are mainly led by men. However, the number that focuses on gender is lower than the number of leadership positions occupied by women. Furthermore, the two centres that research gender issues are led by men. The research teams, in turn, are mainly led by women. However, there are more teams led by women than the number of teams that do gender research” (UD IBA, p. 68).

On the other hand, the information gathered also shows a tendency of research grants being awarded in favour of men, as reported by ETAG, UDEUSTO and UL FF. IGOT however has a





favourable outcome for women in international research funding, but at the same time that national project grants are awarded mostly to men.

This opens up a second issue, a discrepancy in gender equality research policy between the EU and national levels. The reports indicate the positive impact of EU funding incentives for the gender dimension in research, such as UDESTO's Interdisciplinary Platform on Gender, while OBU's

"commitment is evidenced by holding the European Commission's HR Excellence in Research award. This recognizes the University's commitment to supporting the personal, professional and career development of its researchers and acknowledges its alignment with the principles of the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment. It incorporates both the QAA Code of Practice for Research Degree programmes and the 2008 Concordat to Support Career Development of Researchers" (OBU IBA, p. 56).

Nevertheless national policy and practice on gender equality in research is important. ETAg addresses the importance of connectedness and national actions as follows:

"There are few concrete measures implemented to promote the integration of the gender dimension into research. In certain grants, coming from EU structural funds, it's expected the application will include an explanation on how the proposed research project is contributing to the promotion of equal opportunities. The main, state-provided, national grants have no such requirement. /.../Other than that, there have been no other measures implemented: there are no specifically gender-specific funded projects and also no calls include dissemination materials or guidelines to support applicants and evaluators in the integration of the gender analysis into research proposals. The evaluation and expert panels also don't include gender experts" (ETAg IBA, p.36).

Another issue is again related to **excellence** and merit being promoted in research strategies. Grants are usually awarded on the basis of academic merit (see also sections 4.1 and 4.3), where the criteria are reported to be still gender biased. There are notable differences between researchers in SSH and STEM, the later still being dominated by men.

Institutions also report not having a **strategy for gender in teaching and curricula content**. Overall, it could be summed up that gender content in curricula depends on an individual teacher's sensitivity and research interest with regard to these issues. As a result, there are courses and modules on gender found at each of the five RPOs in SSH, but these are almost absent in STEM. SU reports only one recently established course in STEM, on gender, science and technology, as part of an interfaculty teaching program. In the social sciences, there is more diversity: There are many gender related courses in the faculty of arts and social sciences, a PhD program in Gender Studies and a vibrant research center for gender studies.

UL FF reports on a project founded by the national RFO, looking into gender sensitive curricula at three Slovenian universities. UL's preliminary findings show the gender issues at these three





Slovenian universities are only marginally included in the curricula. The overall situation emerging from the other four RPOs at the level of gender and curricula is, as UDEUSTO for example concludes in its report *“research on the topic a finding out where and how the gender perspective is applied in curricular models calls for a more in-depth study that exceeds the scope of this report”* (UD IBA, p. 76).

No institution reports on having neither a gender studies department, nor guidelines and training for gender sensitivity in teaching.

Discussing gender content in curricula we also have to take into account national regulations. UDEUSTO addresses this issue in Spain:

“Measurement or identification of the specific gender-related content or its cross-cutting inclusion in research results is more complex. This difficulty is not unique to Deusto but is a nation-wide problem. Spain has two organizations that are authorized to certify and accredit official degrees programmes and branches of knowledge. They also evaluate the applications to occupy university-level teaching positions and promotions, among other tasks: ANECA National Agency for Quality Assessment and Accreditation of Spain and the State Research Agency. However, these two organizations do not officially recognize gender or feminist studies as areas of knowledge. This lack of recognition makes it more difficult for specialists in gender or feminist studies to be promoted while also limiting the visibility of works on this issue” (UD IBA, p.70).

7. Gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment

Sexual harassment, sexism and gender biases are still part of higher education, data and experts warn. The entrenched hierarchies of the academic world, the small size of some scholarly fields, the homosocial culture and tight social networks and the dependency inscribed in academic relations (e.g. good references for career advancement) can provide conditions for different aspects of gender victimization¹³. Recent events in other fields, including movements such as “#MeToo”, have promoted the importance of addressing sexual violence and discrimination in academia.

The subsections that follow address specific problematic areas, topics suggested by the SUPERA tool which the institutions used in order to gather data and information for their institutional baseline assessment reports in the area of gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment. Proposed indicators cover *Gender dimension in research content*,

¹³ Phd Meeto: <https://theprofessorisin.com/metoophd-sexual-harassment-in-the-academy-survey/>





Gender sensitive communication, Communicating gender equality, Gender equity in events, Attitudes on gender equality, Sexual harassment.

7.1. Gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment

Table 13: Data on practices and policies on gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment

Practice /institution	Policies, guidelines on gender sensitive communication	Availability of complaint mechanisms	Existence of gender sensitive training (on discrimination, harassment...)	Policy (N – national level, I-institutional level) on sexual harassment	Institutional counselling
OBU	NDA	YES	YES	YES	NDA
SU	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
UDEUSTO	YES	NO	YES	YES	GR
IGOT	GR	NO	NO	GR	NO
ETAg	NO	NDA	NO	NO	NO
UL FF	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO

YES established, NO: not established, GR: GEARING-Roles initiative, NDA: no data available.

Source: Institutional Baseline Assessments

The questions on gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual are of interest in all the institutions involved in the project. Comparing SUPERA indicators and institutional practices, it seems that most of the suggested indicators are not addressed or implemented as a part of institutional protocols. This lack of a mechanism regarding gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment seems to be connected to the attitudes on gender equality.





While harassment issues and sexual violence fall under national legislation, they seem to elude institutional responsibilities in establishing mechanisms and preventive practices. Gender biases and gender discrimination cut across all topics related to gender in academia, as discussed in previous chapters, and are part of wider cultural gender blindness.

Turning to **policies and guidelines on gender sensitive communication**, the findings show that institutions identify issues related to communication and the possibilities inscribed in the national languages. Information provided by the institutional baseline assessments show that only one institution, UL FF, has partly established directions on this issue, reporting on gender sensitive communication in formal documents since 2018. While the Slovene language is gender sensitive, in 2018 the Senate formally passed the initiative to use the female grammatical form instead of the male one in all new UL FF internal laws as the grammatically gender-neutral form. This received wide attention and brought forth a much wider aspect of specific gender biases in the national and academic sphere. As the Dean of the UL FF explained in an interview:

“There was strong resistance to accepting changes on gender sensitive language. There were also professors which put the case for gender sensitive language in the media. There were also a lot of public debates and roundtables of the possible (negative and positive) outcomes of this change, and the consequences for the Slovene language as such. This disagreement was not necessarily split among departments, but among professors. There were professors from within the same department with diametrically opposite opinions” (Internal records of the interview).

UDEUSTO also reports on having guidelines for the non-sexist use of language in Spanish, Basque and English.

Other specific policies or protocols on gender sensitive communication do not yet exist. Gender sensitivity is mostly part of individual efforts (teachers, students, etc.) and also differs between departments.

UDEUSTO reports on the progress being made in terms of establishing policies and guidelines on the non-sexist use of language, and these are still in the process of approval (UD IBA, p. 128).

Based on the analysed reports there seem to be no policies or guidelines on gender sensitive communications in other institutions. Nevertheless most of the institutions recognize the importance of the establishment of such policies and regulations.

For example, at the SU while there are no guidelines or policies on gender sensitive communication, the related field work shows that certain policies and regulations are necessary. The conclusion based on focus groups and interviews is:

“women talked about the importance of teaching students as well as all other members of SU what acceptable behaviour and speech is when communicating with others.





Development of a code of conduct or a code of ethics applying to all Sabanci University members, faculty members, administrative staff, and students alike and adopting a zero-tolerance policy on violence were suggested as possible remedies in focus group discussions” (SU IBA, p. 55).

There has also been a change in practice in the Human Resources team’s announcement emails about newborn children. *“After an anonymous complaint they received, HR no longer announces the newborns’ gender and have also stopped using blue and pink colours to designate it in these announcements” (SU IBA, p. 55).* SU also reports on having a Sexual Harassment committee and also a psychological counselling unit open to everyone.

IGOT reports on institutional communication not being gender sensitive. All communication in IGOT (on the institutional website and internal/external documents) is written using the generic masculine form, while Portuguese is not a gender-neutral language:

“In IGOT women are invisible in written communication when it is addressed to the whole body of academic staff or students as they are always “included” in the plural/generic form (which is in both cases masculine). This is a classic example of how language use has implicit gender roles for men and women: men are visible, women included/invisible” (IGOT IBA, p. 75).

Another interesting example comes from ETAg. Its report notes that:

“Although there are no official guidelines regarding gender sensitive communication and neither are the published materials checked for gender sensitivity, the general approach is to stay gender-neutral. This is simplified by the fact the Estonian language is very gender-neutral: for example, there are no separate words for “he” and “she” - instead, the word “tema” is used that applies both for women and men. Similarly, the words “scientist” and “researcher” are gender-neutral in Estonian and can be used both as a reference to women as well as men. This makes gender invisible in most of the content produced both at the organization as well as in the country of Estonia in general.” (ETAg IBA, p. 41).

OBU’s institutional assessment report makes no clear reference regarding the issues of policies and guidelines on gender sensitive communication, although the institution does have **established complaint mechanisms**. As stated in the report, OBU has

“recently undertaken a research study on students’ thoughts and attitudes towards harassment, hate crime, sexual violence and reporting mechanisms, and [...] developed a reporting tool for both students and staff to use to report incidents involving students. In 2018, we launched a university-wide campaign (It’s not OK, It’s not Brookes) to encourage reporting of incidents of sexual violence, hate crime and harassment. There are also considerations to introduce a similar reporting system to “Report and Support” for staff apart from the existing formal reporting of the university. However this is a new tool, so it is suggested to monitor the levels of use and nature of reporting to assess its





appropriateness and effectiveness. In addition, a new Student Complaints (Investigation and Resolution) Unit is being established at present. (OBU IBA, p. 65).

Beside SU, none of the other institutions report having established complaint mechanisms. Most of them, however, recognize the necessity for such mechanisms and the need to overcome institutional blindness and lack of sensitivity to such problems, due to their predominately masculine environments. IGOT explains:

“Some academics do not recognize the existence of situations that could be classified as “sexual harassment”. /.../ “The idea persists that “comments with a sexual connotation” are not “sexual harassment”. They are more related to “relaxed conversation” (IGOT IBA, p. 83).

At the UL FF complaint mechanisms against sexual harassment are currently being implemented. The Regulations on measures to protect the dignity of UL employees and UL students call for appointing a person responsible for cases of sexual harassment. Following the above mentioned Regulations, FF is in the process of appointing two contact persons (one from academic and one from administrative staff) who are going to be responsible for cases of sexual harassment.

ETAg provides an interesting case. According to the report’s conclusions it does not need such mechanisms due to the low proportion of men among all employees. As the report notes:

“Although research, especially top research, is highly male-dominated, ETAg as an administrative organization has the opposite issue. As mentioned earlier, there are significantly more women working at ETAg. /.../ Due to the large share of women in the organization, the organization is a safe working space for women. There have been no records of sexual harassment or violence” (ETAg IBA p. 38).

The existence of **gender sensitive training** (on discrimination, harassment...) is part of institutional practice at OBU and SU, while IGOT, ETAg and UL have no training programmes on the issue of gender equality, discrimination or gender-based violence and harassment.

SU for example reports on such programmes for different target groups. For students and faculty members:

“The first extracurricular activities on gender and sexuality on Sabanci campus were carried out by a group of students and faculty members (predominantly from the Cultural Studies program) in 2002, during which the first March 8 activities were held on campus. This was followed by various collaborations, including a multi-year collaboration between two students and two faculty members, which resulted in the publication of a monograph of women’s narratives of sexuality and a handbook for conducting sexuality workshops” (SU IBA p. 51).





SU also frequently organizes conferences and workshops, and holds on campus events to raise awareness on gender bias and discrimination.

OBU reports on having permanently appointed and trained staff harassment advisers. As stressed in the report:

“The Harassment and Bullying Policy (which covers both students and staff) has been revised and we have appointed and trained staff harassment advisers resulting in an increase in staff awareness of the policy by 21% to 73% according to the university’s performance against widening participation milestones reports (see EDI Strategy 2018-22). To contextualize this number, the Staff Survey 2018 shows that 95% of staff are aware of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion policy. We have also developed a Transgender and Gender Identity Equality Policy. The University Staff Survey (every 2 years) has questions relating to awareness of the Policy and Procedure on H&B asking ‘Are you currently being harassed or bullied at work?’ In the 2018 survey 4% of men respondents (20) and 4% of women respondents (38) answered [YES], and 8% of those who preferred not to say gender (20) answered YES”. (OBU IBA, p. 64)

At UDEUSTO such trainings are organized by the People Management Office. They for example organized trainings on the topic of sexual and gender-based harassment, and another five courses on conflict management and harassment themes were also organized (employment-related, and not with a direct gender perspective).

At IGOT and UL FF there is no gender equality training, but both institutions recognize an overall weakness in gender (equality) sensitivity amongst all target groups.

At ETAg they held one gender equality seminar within the past year, organized for the employees of the organization:

“In the seminar, the key concepts were explained and the policies regarding gender equality were introduced. It was also explained why gender equality is important in the context of research. Statistics as well as different studies about women researchers were presented” (ETAg IBA p., 40).

The seminar was organized by a fellow employee of the organization. But as stressed in the report, ETAg does not have regular workshops or trainings on the topics of sexism, gender biases, etc., nor campaigns to challenge gender stereotypes.

Most of the institutions report on having some **policy, national and/or institutional** on sexual harassment. OBU, SU and UDEUSTO, in addition to national legislation, report on specific institutional policies which address the problem of such harassment.

At OBU the Policy and Procedure on Harassment and Bullying covers staff and students and provides details of the channels for each to use. They have also developed a Transgender and Gender Identity Equality Policy.





In its report SU notes that after

“a well-attended panel on sexual harassment, which included outside speakers, an ad-hoc committee was formed to draft a sexual harassment statement and policy document for the university. Since this was the first document of its kind in Turkey, international examples were reviewed before drafting the co-authored by faculty, students and administration. Accepted in 2007 as the first such statement and policy at a Turkish university, and revised in 2013, this policy is still in effect” (SU IBR p. 52).

UDEUSTO’s institutional baseline report notes that the institution has approved harassment protocols for staff and students. Despite the existence of the protocols, no cases have been recorded.

UL FF reports on *The Regulations on measures to protect the dignity of UL employees and UL students*.

Based on the reports from IGOT and ETAg, they have no policies or institutional mechanisms to report such incidents.

Regarding Availability of counseling for gender-based offenses and harassment most of institutional baseline reports provide little information on this.

8. Comparative summary on differences within or between disciplines

The persisting problem of the gendered choices students make in entering higher education was recognized in 2015 by the European Commission. These different choices are highlighted in a recent review of the implementation of the Beijing Platform for Action in the EU Member States by the European Institute for Gender Equality (2018).

As SHE figures (2018) show:

“Women doctoral graduates are still over-represented in the fields of education (68 % of all graduates at the EU-28 level) and health and welfare (60 %). Their share among graduates in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary science is 59%. They are, however, significantly under-represented in the fields of information and communication technologies (21 %), and engineering, manufacturing and construction (29 %)” (p.18).

Nevertheless gender choices still frame the tertiary education pathways that women and men choose, and not only between SSH and STEM but also in various specific fields within STEM.





SHE figures also show how the distribution of the population of female and male doctorate graduates is spread across the different fields. At the EU-28 level, 26.6 % of females and 28.3 % of males that graduated at the doctoral level studied in the field of natural sciences, mathematics or statistics. This was the most popular broad field for both sexes. The second most popular field for women was health and welfare (21.5 % of female graduates) while for men it was engineering, manufacturing and construction (20.2 % of male graduates). For both sexes, services (i.e. personal, hygiene & occupational health, security and transport services) were the least popular field (0.6 % of female graduates and 0.8 % of men).

However, in the six institutional reports insight into this topic is limited, as the reports addressed it in a marginal and non-integrated fashion. This influenced the possibilities in attempting to compare differences between STEM and SSH or within disciplines. Therefore, apart from some basic conclusions and elements of comparison already discussed in other areas, and in line with data in the SHE figures (2019), possibilities for further in-depth information are limited.

Another difficulty for the comparison arose from the fact that six GEP institutions differ in the scope of the disciplines they cover, and moreover there are differences within disciplines and study programmes offered within disciplines.

An outline of the basic structure of the five RPOs is as follows:

UL FF is included as only the Faculty of Arts, and therefore covers 21 departments all in the disciplinary area of SSH (social sciences, humanities and languages). The University of Ljubljana as a whole also covers STEM disciplines, but these were not included in the report, instead a comparison between two departments (Sociology and German, Dutch and Swedish) was carried out at the FF level.

IGOT has a similar situation. Although some of IGOT's degrees are offered in partnership with the engineering school –IST and the architecture school, it is an institute for geography and spatial planning and has no STEM within the institution. While the University of Lisbon is considered in part and as a whole, any comparisons with STEM are limited in the report.

SU is a private university founded by the Sabanci Foundation that has three faculties: the School of Management (SOM), Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASS), Faculty of Engineering and Natural Sciences (FENS) and a School of Languages (SL) offering courses in English-language and other foreign languages instruction.

OBU also has four faculties, the Faculty of Business, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and Faculty of Technology and Design.

UDEUSTO has six faculties, the Faculty of Law, Faculty of Psychology and Education, Faculty of Economics and Business Science, Faculty of Social and Human Sciences, Faculty of Theology, and Faculty of Engineering.





An overall comparison of the institutional reports for four areas of gender equality covered by the SUPERA tool – namely *recruitment, retention, career progression and work life balance; leadership and decision making; gender dimension in research and knowledge transfer; gender biases and stereotypes, sexism and sexual harassment* – shows similar challenges.

In their reports the RPO institutions elaborate sex-segregation by discipline that is related to wider social and cultural factors. None of the institutional reports explain the access to higher education and entrance procedures into the various disciplines in order to address possible gender inequalities there. While there are no institutional mechanisms for affirmative measures to attract women into male dominated disciplines, it seems that this issue is not properly addressed within institutions. Nevertheless, some practices are still reported.

For example, at SU FENS students shot a short video to encourage more women to follow STEM careers and this was shown on the info/recruitment day attended by new high school graduates and their parents.

With regard to situation at the three universities that have STEM courses, the situation in gender equality shows the highest percentage of women in STEM at OBU. In its report it notes that there are:

“slightly more women (56%) than men (44%) academic staff, similar to [the numbers seen for] STEM and AHSSBL subject areas, and also in admin services to those two disciplines there are 60-75% women. As mentioned before, overall at OBU there are slightly more women (56%) than men (44%) employed at OBU as academic staff as of 31 July 2018. This proportion is relatively similar whether STEMM or AHSSBL subject areas are considered. It is only when drilling down into specific subjects that some disparities appear: women for example are a majority in HLS academic staff (67%) but a minority of TDE staff (33%). This reflects wider segregation patterns in higher education generally, with women over-represented in subjects such as Nursing (80% are women) but lacking in Engineering, Computing and Mathematics (20%). According to the qualitative interviews, areas which are highly feminized in terms of staff, such as nursing or education, present ‘a challenge ... to encourage men to consider those (integrating intersectional approaches) practices’, and ‘we don’t engage as much as we should in female-dominated areas’” (OBU IBA, p.21).

OBU also report on the positive impact of Athena SWAN and similar EU initiatives in shifting gender inequalities between and within disciplines. For example:

“Athena SWAN awards were first made in 2006 in the UK, and originally focused only on Science, Technology, Mathematics and Medicine (STEMM). In 2011, it was announced that eligibility for funding from the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) would be dependent on achieving an Athena SWAN silver award. Furthermore, in 2013, Research Councils UK (RCUK) issued a statement which outlined an expectation that funding recipients ‘provide evidence of ways in which equality and diversity issues are managed





at both an institutional and department level'. Participation in Athena SWAN would be considered as part of this evidence" (OBU IBA, p. 18.).

The situation at SU is less favourable:

"According to the National Education Statistics in 2017, gender parity of the gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education was calculated to be 93.8% while for SU female students make up 43%, 45% and 37% of the undergraduate, master's and PhD programmes, respectively. In total, the share of females in the population aged 18 and over in participation in formal education was 8% by 2016, while it was 10.9% for males. As it is possible to see that fewer women attend university than men, it is also apparent that they are less present in STEM fields. In the 2017-2018 school year only 34.4% students enrolled in STEM fields were women, and in fact this figure has been constantly dropping since the 2011-2012 school year, down from 43.4%. At SU, 35% of all FENS undergraduate students were female in the 2018-2019 school year, which is very close to the overall percentage in Turkey. When it comes to the academic staff in higher education, in line with the global trends, women are less present in the higher ranks of faculty, while there are in fact more women at the beginning level, with 50.4% of all research assistants being female. At SU, women make up the 27% (FENS), 40% (FASS), 36% (SOM) and 72% (SL) of the different faculties" (SU IBA, p. 14).

UDEUSTO also outlines a similar picture:

"Educational segregation can clearly be seen /.../. The two faculties with the greatest presence of male students enrolled on degree courses are the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Theology. Attention should be drawn to the high level of masculinization at the Faculty of Engineering (76.4%), in contrast with the evident feminization at other faculties, led by the Faculty of Social and Human Sciences (71.5% female students). The fact should also be mentioned that the Faculty of Psychology and Education has seen an increase in the number of male students since the time of the last diagnosis in 2014, as a result of the inclusion in this faculty of the degree in Physical Activity and Sports (234 males as opposed to 61 females)" (UD IBA, p. 40).

9. Institutional Participatory Gender Audits, PGAs

Based on the data collected as part of institutional assessments described in previous sections of this report, the six GEP implementing institutions were asked to plan and perform participatory gender audits (PGA) with the aim of self-diagnosis, promoting participation and creating ownership. PGAs also aimed at looking into dimensions that shape the practices and attitudes of the organization, including its history, size, leadership, structure and governance,





etc., and contrast them with sex-disaggregated data in the previous tasks with the objective of helping institutions prioritize their goals.

Following the GEAR tool steps for setting up a Gender Equality Plan, available at EIGE webpage, and the participatory methods taught by Yellow Window and presented at the Consortium meeting at OBU, Oxford (June 2019) all six GEP implementing institutions performed their PGAs from September to October 2019.

The institutions were asked to provide key information on every PGA: the objectives, actors included, techniques used, conclusions, proposed action to be taken, limitations, resistance, etc., with the short summary as a self-diagnosis (which is to be used as the basis for a preliminary action plan for GEP and part of the D3.2).

9.1. PGAs

Table 14: Information on PGAs

Practice/Institution	Nr. Of PGAs	Target groups	Self-diagnosis impact
OBU	5	Academic and professional services	Yes
SU	2	Academic and administrative staff and students.	Yes
UDEUSTO	2	GEARING-Roles core and extended group, Equality Commission, Boards of Directors, Rector, Trade Unions	Yes
IGOT	7	Students (MA, BA), Lecturers, Administrative and technical staff, Early-stage researchers and PhD students, Task force	Yes
ETAg	1	ETAg employees	Yes
UL FF	4	Students, Administrative staff, Academic staff, Heads of Departments	Yes





Source: Institutional baseline assessments

Six different reports were uploaded on Hermione with different institution-specific focuses.

OBU performed five PGAs that were in practice two sessions inquiring into leadership in light of perspectives on gender and career paths (choices, opportunity and support), and two sessions inquiring into experiences of part-time and flexible work at OBU. In addition, a session was organised to look at how to systematise sex-disaggregated collection and analysis of data at the institutional level.

ETAg performed one PGA for its staff which included members of the core group and the extended group and other people interested in the topic of gender.

IGOT performed seven PGAs, with students (MA, BA), with lecturers, with administrative and technical staff, with early-stage researchers and PhD students, and one with the GEARING-Roles task force.

SU performed two PGAs, one with academic and administrative staff, and one with academic and administrative staff and students.

UL FF performed four PGAs, one with students, one with administrative staff, one with academic staff and one with heads of departments.

UDEUSTO performed two PGAs in two consecutive sessions with representatives of the GEARING-Roles core and extended groups, Equality Commission, Boards of Directors, and Rector.

Overall, the institutional PGA summary reports reveal that institutions have successfully adapted the idea of PGA for their own institutional challenges. Using the data and information collected in previous tasks, they have managed to implement gender sensitive reflection at different levels and amongst different target audiences at their respective institutions. Again, institutions which had previous experience with gender equality projects have been able to acquire a more in-depth insight into gender equality gaps and dynamics, while for the others it seemed as a step in the right direction, especially in recognition of important gender equality issues as well as in forming alliances.

All six institutions have produced reported reflections and findings valuable for the preparation of GEPs (to be included in D3.2 as part of recommendations for GEP).





10. Conclusion

In addition to the differences that have been discussed above, the overview of the six institutional reports provides insight into some common intersections that directly or indirectly affect questions regarding the ensuring and monitoring of gender equality. It should be emphasized that despite the diversity of starting positions in the field of institutional gender equality, all GEP implementing institutions have made a significant step forward within the GR project. The insights into institutional policies and practices that have been gathered present a solid basis for further reflected planning of activities aimed at preparing institutional GEPs.

The insights into particular areas of gender equality¹⁴ that have been discussed in detail in this report (deliverable D3.1) demonstrate some common intersections. These are multi-layered and in parts reveal the broader social and contextual considerations while also revealing the possible directions for further developments in the areas of research, practices and policy development regarding the establishment of gender equality.

I. General conclusions

The gender bias and blindness that are embedded in social relations among genders and gender roles persist at different levels and along different axes in the academic field.

The national level:

When discussing gender equality, the **historical, cultural and political contexts** within which higher education institutions function cannot and must not be neglected. Presenting these contexts enables us to understand systemic and institutional circumstances, including the modes of financing and the level of autonomy that higher education institutions have in the national context – including the possibility to pose the problematic of gender. (EIGE, Integrating gender equality into academia and research organisations)¹⁵.

The above-mentioned specific contexts influence the persistence of the gender order in policies and practices. This persistence manifests itself most obviously in the explicit or implicit social expectations with regard to caring activities. These are still understood as predominantly

¹⁴ National context, recruitment, retention and career progression, leadership, research and curricula, sexual harassment and discrimination.

¹⁵ <https://eige.europa.eu/publications/integrating-gender-equality-academia-and-research-organisations-analytical-paper>





women's concerns, even in situations where systemic possibilities for a greater inclusion of men in caring activities, for example with regard to children and families, do exist.

The institutional level:

Specific gender regime¹⁶ persist in HE institutions, mostly visible through the ***division of labour/tasks within the institutions*** – mainly through the feminization of administrative services, feminisation of certain disciplines (e.g. languages) and masculinisation of the leadership positions.

Gender regimes can also be noticed in gender distribution among different faculties and disciplines whereby science and technology are still predominantly male disciplines.

Gender regimes can be seen in **gender specific expectations** concerning the pedagogic staff. The extent to which a teacher is demanding is often interpreted differently with regard to gender (e.g. “men are strict”, “women have issues”). This is also connected to the lack of gender sensitive communication and gender sensitive pedagogic practice which is missing in all the institutions.

An important mechanism in establishing and ensuring gender equality and consequently in revealing the mechanisms reproducing the gender order are the **established institutional databases** (sex-disaggregated databases). These enable insights into patterns of gender segregation at an individual institution and evidence-based considerations of changes necessary in institutional policies and practices.

The institutional reports also demonstrate the **gender blindness** embedded in the culturally and institutionally adopted mechanisms. While we, as members of the academic field, are aware of the biases in some institutional practices that reproduce gender inequality, we still believe in the **objectivity of criteria** regarding employment, promotions, research project grants, financial and other rewards related to scientific achievements and scientific excellence.

The above-mentioned blindness and biases can also be seen in the limited number of **formal affirmative actions** and the scepticism with regard to institutional mechanisms like, for example, gender quotas. This is also related to the culture of **work and productivity**, where the quantity of the work done is not necessarily translated into its quality, and thus shows the limits of such conceptions of academic excellence. Questions of productivity in the context of the existing working conditions in the academic field also influence the possibilities for **balancing work and private life**.

The gender bias and blindness persisting in the structures and practices of higher education point to the need to increase the sensibility towards gender equality at all levels. At the level

¹⁶ In the widest sense, the term ‘gender regime’ is used to describe the entire set of social structures that influence the sexual division of social roles in our case in the institutions in higher education and in the research field.





of institutional practices the issue of gender appears to be least structurally organized with regard to **curricula and research**. It is thus left in the hands of individual initiatives coming from individuals that are sensitive to this problematic.

The individual level:

Gender bias and blindness also persist at the level of individual strategies and practices, which points to the significance and need for qualitative insights (interviews, life stories, biographical research) into different populations inhabiting the academic field (teaching staff and researchers, administrative workers and students). At the same time they also reveal the need to **strengthen the sensibility towards questions of gender and gender equality**. Gender equality is still often overlooked at this level, left to be handled by individual understandings and efforts, and is often imbued with psychological explanations and personality differences and particularities.

II. Content specific issues and conclusions

1. National contexts and their influence on institutional gender equality

The overview of *national contexts* demonstrates that at least a ***fundamental legal arrangement in the field of gender equality*** exists in all six countries and traverses issues of human and civil rights and the foundations of equality, most often in the spheres of work and family. Different national arrangements influence the possibilities and needs of research and higher education institutions.

In cases where gender equality is more extensively managed at the national level, it appears that institutions face fewer challenges when concerned with this problematic. However, the **complex social changes** that accompany the flexibilization of work, working times, the speed and modalities of contemporary life, point to a need to ***manage and soften the pressures at the institutional level as well***. Caring for children, the need for special spaces (for breastfeeding, changing diapers etc.) is one of those areas related to the nature of work and the working times of academics and students that is bound up with the specific needs of the populations at the institution and is inscribed into the possibilities for working from home, for flexible working time among the administrative staff, and for a work-life balance.

In addition to the legal framework at the national level, diversity can also be seen at the level of the different practices ***promoting gender equality*** that are related to different public offices and functions, institutions and networks of public and private institutions, NGOs and individuals, project and other activities related to the promotion of gender equality. In this context it appears that the **collaboration** among all these actors can strengthen institutional





efforts at the national level, as well as at the international level of EU projects concerned with gender equality.

Currently it seems that in the majority of the six countries involved in GR project, ***the EU pays much more attention to financing this area than national financial mechanisms do.*** Financing efforts related to institutional practices of gender equality depend more on EU project funding than on national public finance. Meaningful financial and thematic **project planning** is thus extremely important, along with an in-depth understanding of the possibilities of individual institutions to shape national policies and access to financial resources. Sometimes this is also related to institutional capacities to access EU projects. Initiatives of this sort are more and more often left at the hands of individual researchers who do not have adequate institutional support or strategies to develop European initiatives. Practices in this area demonstrate progress and continuity in the institutional development of policies and practices of gender equality in cases where specific offices concerned with gender equality exist (such as a gender equality office/hub).

2. Recruitment, retention, career progression

The overview of policies and practices in the areas of recruitment, retention and career progression clearly demonstrates the need to establish institutional databases that enable gathering and analysing gender-segregated data. Where databases of this sort already exist, different ways of informing and shaping institutionally specific policies and practices can be noted.

Based on the data and information collected by the institutions for the purpose of the GEARING-Roles project, it can be concluded that gender inequalities exist and persist to different extents and at different levels of institutional practices. This holds equally true in cases where nationally accepted and unified criteria exist, such as for procedures of employment, promotions, equal pay, etc.

Despite the fact that all institutions report on the transparency and objectivity of these procedures, the gender specific structuring remains – most obviously with regard to specific scientific fields/disciplines (SSH, STEM). This can be seen just by looking at the enrolment data for different study programmes by gender. This reveals broader social and educational challenges inscribed in the gendered nature of individuals' choices of study programmes. The GEARING-Roles project does not discuss enrolment procedures and mechanisms related to entering higher education, but they do however appear to be important, since gender relations in individual disciplines are also maintained due to the predominant gender pool of students, which consequently adds to the gender (un)balanced structure of the academic staff.

Institutional reports also point to the predominant adversity or at least scepticism with regard to affirmative action concerning the gender balance of students enrolled in specific faculties and programmes, and the representation of men and women in management positions and





decision-making bodies. These practices do however exist but are mostly informal, which leads to the conclusion that this area of concern is mostly left to chance and enables the persistent reproduction of gender inequality.

Establishing institutional databases needs to overcome some nationally and culturally specific obstacles. It does however seem that an exchange on institutional challenges and practices would be of much help at the beginning phases of consideration and planning, especially when involving institutions that already have specific experiences. When collecting and analysing data attention must be paid to the specifics of particular target groups (academic staff, administrative staff, students) and to their inclusion in practices of monitoring and ensuring gender equality. Institutional reports demonstrate the productivity in terms of cooperation when including different actors in processes concerning gender equality, which can thus become a common, institutional goal.

Objectiveness of criteria appears to be a productive element of ensuring gender equality in the processes of recruitment, retention and career progression. However, it also reveals a blindness, especially with regard to the idea of academic excellence. The criteria of academic promotion contribute to the reproduction of gender inequality and should be reconsidered, especially in areas that the institutions recognize as problematic. Certain common elements appear, for example, in the quantity of work needed for a certain task that is not necessarily translated into academic achievements. At the same time this is also related to the issue of the structure and organization of work in the academic field, to flexibilization of work which also includes the different types of contracts. The issue of the basic security of an individual's employment in the academic field – especially in its relation to the high levels of competitiveness and the criteria of excellence that individuals are expected to meet – particularly where there are inequalities in the basic working conditions related to gender, age, family life, etc., must also not be neglected.

3. Leadership and decision-making

Gender inequality in leadership positions partly depends on the institutional structures and formal procedures of access to these positions. Formally, gender equality and access to leadership positions are supposed to be assured in all institutions, but the data reveal that leadership in this field is still mostly male dominated. It could of course be claimed that this state is also partly the consequence of individual choices made by specific individuals, but it must not be forgotten that these are shaped and made in quite specific circumstances, which means that the choices are not free but are limited by structural possibilities and opportunities, among which the following are especially important: the organization of time and work specific to leadership positions and leadership bodies; as well as the influence of obligations in relation to those positions, on the individual's development of their academic career. The latter, at least in certain environments, also opens the need to rethink the symbolic and economic dimensions of different offices and functions.





4. Gender in research and curricula

Despite the fact that gender equality in research and pedagogic topics and practices is acknowledged as important, it also appears that it is systemically the least organized of the factors considered here. As such, the institutions do not report on formally adopted guidelines in the areas of curricula, pedagogic practices, or including the gender dimension in research. They do however recognize the significance of gender in research topics, directly and indirectly in research practices and in transferring insights from the academic field into the sphere of the broader public. An especially important element of this is the collaboration with national research funding organizations (RFO) and attempting to understand the extent to which they acknowledge the challenges of gender (in)equality in their own structures and procedures, as well as collaborating with already established international projects and practices in this area (Athena SWAN ...).

In addition to the research dimension, the curricular and pedagogic dimension is also important both with regard to content as with regard to gender sensitive pedagogic practices. The latter are still gender stereotyped and reveal both persistent discriminatory practices and sexual harassment.

5. Sexual harassment and discrimination

Gender discrimination, biases and the blindness arising from them are closely related to the cultural context and gender inequality. While sexual harassment and sexual violence are criminalized and part of the national legal framework, it appears that at least to some extent the institutions do not recognize the possibilities for contributing to this problematic with institutionally established mechanisms. However, the institutions do acknowledge the need and possibilities for raising awareness with regard to different sexist and discriminatory practices. Some of them are already systematically developing and implementing educational training for different groups in the academic field. At the level of gender-sensitive language, the practices are bound up with the possibilities inscribed within national languages. Some languages, e.g. Portuguese, Slovene and Spanish, are gendered but the male grammatical forms are perceived as neutral and inclusive, which also conditions the affinity for the male language form that remains dominant. Considering the particularity of work in the academic field the six GEP implementing institutions recognize the need for institutional mechanisms for recognizing, preventing and sanctioning gender discrimination and violence.

6. Capacity for self-diagnosis and participation

To summarize and in addition to what has already been mentioned, the institutional assessments revealed the capabilities of the institutions and their employees to shape important thematic areas/problem areas related to gender equality. Despite this, the extent





of anticipated insights was somewhat, as can be inferred from the reports, too broad and/or too demanding. What was mainly discussed in this part were the academic positions, while the positions of administrative workers and students were only marginally raised. It could be concluded that all six institutional reports speak in favour of the institutions' self-capacity, and that this should be supported and developed as the project continues.

7. Recommendations for policy and research

- * Developing institutional campaigns, materials, etc. on gender equality (for example, encouraging men and women to share their responsibilities in domestic and caring activities) and in this way shifting attitudes towards gender equality in the society as a whole;
- * establishing institutional sex-disaggregated databases. For this a repository of institutional practices on how to set up the basic database and financial incentives for setting up such databases would be valuable;
- * reviewing/analysing criteria in the procedures of: recruitment, progression and equal pay, allocation of research financing in relation to gender inequalities;
- * analysing the possibilities and limits of affirmative actions in academia (for students, administrative staff and academics);
- * inquiring into and enhancing the work-life balance in academia within the possibilities of institutions: the challenges of specific work environments, flexibility of work;
- * stimulating gender research and considering gender in curricula;
- * collaboration with national RFO to, integrate the gender dimension in research content;
- * establishing gender equality offices/hubs at the level of the institution to manage project activities at the institutional level;
- * preparation of institutional strategies for developing gender equality and obtaining the financial means to do so through project activities;
- * establishing EU and national platforms for gender equality projects and initiatives – enabling a transparent and informative insight into activities while also strengthening the networking possibilities for institutions beyond the individual project consortium;
- * building and enhancing the self-capacity of institutions.





11. References

- ERA progress report. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/era-progress-report-2018_en and http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_gender_equality/KI-07-17-199-EN-N.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none.
- Eurostat, Annual data on employment in knowledge-intensive activities at the national level, by sex. Available at: https://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=htec_kia_emp2&lang=en
- Employed HRST by category, age and occupation. Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/en/web/products-datasets/-/HRST_ST_NOCC.
- Eurostat, Population by educational attainment level, sex and age. Available at: http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=edat_lfse_03&lang=en
- GEAR tool. Available at: <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits/gear/legislative-policy-backgrounds>.
- GENDER-NET report. Available at: http://www.gender-net.eu/IMG/pdf/GENDER-NET_D2-5_-_National_plans_and_initiatives_promoting_gender_equality_and_structural_change.pdf.
- Guidance to facilitate the implementation of targets to promote gender equality in research and innovation. European Commission, February 2018. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_gender_equality/KI-07-17-199-EN-N.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Deusto University.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Estonian research Council.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Geographic Institute and Spatial Planning University of Lisbon.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Oxford Brookes University.
- Institutional Baseline Assessment, Sabanci University.
- SHE FIGURES (2018). Available at: https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/she-figures-2018_en.
- WP3 Guidelines for contextual analyses and institutional baseline assessment.

