



9.3 GEARING Impact Road Map

Document Data	
Report Title	GEARING Impact Road Map
Author(s)	Anell Roos, Mieke Verloo, Inge Bleijenbergh
Other Contributors	
Responsible Project Partner	Radboud University (Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen)
Due Date	30 06 2019
Delivery Date	28/06/2019
Type	Deliverable
Dissemination Level	Public
Keywords	Evaluation, Impact, Roadmap

History			
Author	Date	Reason for Change	Release
Anell Roos, Mieke Verloo, Inge Bleijenbergh	14/06/2019	First Draft	14/06/2019
Humbert, Anne Laure	26/06/2019	Comments on the first draft	26/06/2019
López Belloso, María	26/06/2019	Comments on the first draft	26/06/2019

Information in this report that may influence other GEARING ROLES tasks

Linked Task	Points of Relevance
All	Design and Implementation of GEPs



GEARING ROLES project

GEARING-Roles is a four-year Coordination and Support Action project that will bring 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 work towards real institutional change. This multi-disciplinary, multi-national, and multi-sectorial collaboration will be supported by training in this space, mentoring activities, awareness-raising campaigns as well as bi-annual videos and podcasts and annual networking events.

Table of Contents

GEARING ROLES project	1
Executive Summary	2
1. Introduction	2
Problem analysis and diagnosis:	2
GEP goals and objectives:	4
Key performance indicators as set in the project proposal:.....	4
A guide to measuring and evaluating the GEP implementation:	5
2. GEARING Impact Road Map:	5
Project Implementation and Monitoring of Results:.....	7
Conclusion:.....	8

List of Abbreviations

List of Abbreviations

EIGE	European Institute for Gender Equality
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
WP	Work Packages



This project is funded by the EU. This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union’s H2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 824536 The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.



Executive Summary

This document serves as the impact roadmap for the evaluation of the GEARING ROLES project (Grant Agreement Nr.: 824536), to be used to evaluate the implementation of Gender Equality Plans. It gives an overview of the way the Leaders of the WP on Evaluation will monitor the results of the implementation, and the timelines involved (9.3).

1. Introduction ¹

As a project, GEARING-Roles sets out to make substantial progress in realising gender equality in academic institutions in Europe. GEARING-Roles' main objective is the promotion and realisation of structural change and gender equality in academia and research (Swafs 09-2018: 3). The core element for realising this objective is the GEP that each of GEARING-Roles' six implementing institutions will design and implement. These GEPs will be designed combining context specific information with a common reference tool, the GEAR tool developed by EIGE (<https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/toolkits/gear>). The GEPs are designed and developed to tailor fit the respective institutions' needs and requirements, leading to a coherent and integrated design logic, building on the GEAR toolkit.

This deliverable will establish and describe the evaluation measures to be used by the Work Package 9 leaders of evaluation and assessment, based at Radboud University Nijmegen. The evaluators recognise and acknowledge that the GEP implementation process may be subjected to various changes, challenges, and adaptations throughout its duration. The guidelines in this deliverable thus aim to include attention for such adaptations and changes, anticipating challenges that implementing partners may meet, and address them either directly, or offer tools to mitigate or solve them.

Problem analysis and diagnosis:

The GEPs will be developed by the six implementing partners to promote and realise structural change and gender equality in academia and research. As the primary goal, this includes improving the position of women in academia and research and offering remedial strategies to challenge visible and invisible practices and biases which form obstacles to personal career and research development in academia and research. In order to ensure that the GEPs reach the goals of structural change and gender equality through a successful implementation, and maintain a stronghold in academic and organisational hierarchies beyond the implementation term, an effective evaluation and measurement tool has been developed. The evaluation guidelines developed by Work Package 9 will contribute to the development and implementation of both existing and future gender equality tools.

¹ This text is similar for the Deliverables 9.1, 9.2, and 9.3 because they share a common introduction, and a common goal: the evaluation of the GEPs designed and implemented by six GEARING-ROLES consortium members.





To successfully challenge traditional gender roles, including women’s unequal work representation and the gendered hierarchy within academia, Key Performance Indicators², as described in Swafs 09-2018, will serve to evaluate the implementing partners in their implementation of the GEPs by highlighting objectives to meet throughout, and by the end of its four year run. While the proposal sets a clear number of KPIs to be met by the end of the implementation term, the applicability and feasibility of the KPIs at each implementing partner must be taken into consideration. Positioning and assessing the achievement of the KPIs aims to support the development of an integrated GEP design logic (Swafs 09-2018: 38) which utilises evaluation and assessment indicators to measure if the GEP is an effective tool to challenge deeply entrenched notions on gender roles and identities, and shift approaches to workplace equality.

² Hereafter referred to as KPIs.





GEP goals and objectives:

Following the Swafs 09-2018 (p3-5) proposal, individual GEPs have as their goal the fulfilment and achievement of four main objectives, as explained below:

- a) Female career progression: to remove all barriers that may impede a woman's career path and subsequent success.
- b) Leadership and decision making: to address gender imbalances in the representation, processes, and the promotion of women leadership in research institutions.
- c) Education and research: to promote gender mainstreaming in research (especially in STEM), by including a gender perspective in research programmes, and supporting women's scientific careers.
- d) Promotion of gender equality in research organisations and reinforcing the European Research Area (ERA): to disseminate frameworks and institutional gender assessments and evaluation strategies to establish commitment to gender equality in European organisations, and build sustainable long-term gender equality networks.

Key performance indicators as set in the project proposal:

The Gender Equality Plan Goals and Objectives will be measured with an agreed upon set of KPIs. These KPIs link to the four objectives of the GEARING-Roles project.

For the first expected impact, namely an increase in the participation of women in research and innovation, and improvement of their careers prospects, the KPIs are:

- (1) 60 female researchers participating in mentoring programmes.
- (2) 100 participatory Career Development Plans completed.
- (3) Transfer of good practice in HR recruitment processes: at least 12 lessons learnt and shared, 6 examples of good practice adopted by the other institutions.

For the second expected impact, which is an improvement of the gender balance in decision-making bodies in research, the KPIs are:

- (1) 10% increase in the representation of women in decision making bodies in relation with baseline assessment at different ranks.
- (2) 6 action plans developed with elements to include leadership and female participation in decision making.
- (3) Data collection on increasing awareness.
- (4) number of questionnaires contrasting data in relation to baseline assessment.

For the third expected impact, which is inclusion, where relevant, of the gender dimension in research content and an increase in the quality and societal relevance of produced knowledge, technologies and innovations, the KPIs are:





- (1) 75 people trained (sex disaggregated and ideally broken down to permanent and temporary staff).
- (2) 80% participation satisfaction with training (exit questionnaires).
- (3) Number of courses with gender training embedded.

For the fourth expected impact, which is that the implementation of Gender Equality Plans in the medium to long term will contribute to the achievement of the ERA, the KPIs are:

- (1) 1 training course on the gender dimensions of research per year.
- (2) An increase in the number researchers working on gender issues.
- (3) Number of projects awarded addressing gender topics.
- (4) Number of dissertations and master theses finished addressing gender topics, and/or in which gender dimensions and women as users are explicitly taken into account.
- (5) Percentage of increase in different disciplines of the underrepresented genders.
- (6) Percentage of increase of the number of female young researchers (grant holders) to the total per each scientific discipline with respect to year 0 of the project.
- (7) Percentage of increase of the number of female researchers to the total per each scientific discipline with respect to year 0 of the project.

A guide to measuring and evaluating the GEP implementation:

The following guidelines are developed by Work Package 9 leaders to help evaluate the design and impact of each implementing partner’s GEP, and to refine and contextualise KPIs for their potential to contribute to a successful implementation of GEPs. The guidelines will ensure the continued quality of internal assessment mechanisms to evaluate the GEPs, and will aid in an analysis of the GEPs as key to addressing gender inequality among consortium partners. The report has been divided into three sections, each of which will deal with a specific aspect of the GEP implementation, leading to a coherent and logical strategic plan.

2. GEARING Impact Road Map:

The GEARING Roadmap Table 9.3.1. below shows for specific moments in time which topics will be subjected to the gathering of data for the evaluation, which partners will be involved and what methods for data collection will be used, as well as the final WP 9 Deliverables linked to this.

Table 9. 3.1 GEARING Impact Road Map

Month	Topic	Partners involved	Methods	Deliverable
6	GEP design	Implementing partners	Participant observation	





		WP 3, 4, 5, 6	during project meetings	
10	GEP design Training needs Support Ethics	Implementing partners WP 1, 7	(Skype) interviews Questionnaire regarding the KPIs	
15	GEP design Training needs Support Ethics	WP 9	Content analysis of collected data	9.4 Annual Impact Evaluation Report
16	Awareness Raising Support Leadership GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 3, 5, 7	(Skype) interviews	
22	Awareness Raising Training needs GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 6, 7	(Skype) interviews Questionnaire regarding the KPIs	
28	Support Recruitment Leadership & Decision-making Awareness Raising GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 4, 5, 6, 7	(Skype) interviews	
34	Training Needs Awareness Raising Mentoring scheme GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 4, 6, 7	(Skype) interviews Questionnaire regarding the KPIs	
35	Support Recruitment Leadership & Decision-making Awareness Raising Training needs Mentoring scheme	WP 9	Content analysis	9.4 Annual Impact Evaluation Report



This project is funded by the EU. This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union's H2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 824536 The contents of this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Commission.



	GEP implementation			
40	Gender dimension in Research & Innovation Gender Mainstreaming Teaching & Learning Strategies GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 6	(Skype) interviews	
46	Support GEP implementation	Implementing partners WP 7	(Skype) interviews Questionnaire regarding the KPIs	
47	Gender dimension in Research & Innovation Gender Mainstreaming Teaching & Learning Strategies Support GEP implementation	WP 9	Content analysis	9.4 Annual Impact Evaluation Report
48	Final impact	WP 9	Content analysis, Data analysis	9.5 Final Impact Report

Project Implementation and Monitoring of Results:

Work Package 9 will oversee the progress regarding the GEP implementation at each partner institution, including assessing the usefulness and validity of impact indicators for efficiency and effectiveness. Furthermore, this report will establish guidelines for the periodical and timely submission of progress reports, deliverables data, and comparative data of all participating universities and institutions in order to development yearly progress and evaluation reports. Work Package 9 will be responsible for the establishment of guidelines, principles, and opportunities for the adaptation of the GEP toolkit in light of established results of the GEP. In order to successfully accomplish this, a central question is: were the GEP goals and objectives achieved as a result of the GEP implementation process, or were they achieved outside of defined parameters due to other factors? These answers will inform an analysis of how it impacts not only the implementation of the GEP at each partner, but how it may influence future GEP implementations, based on its current form.





Conclusion:

As the GEP will be implemented at six research institutions, tasks and roles have been divided between all consortium partners. As the evaluation partner in charge of WP9, Radboud will approach all implementing partners at a regular interval of 3-6 months to discuss progress, concerns, and observations. This allows for a clearer and better structured yearly evaluation report.

