EFFECTIVE GENDER EQUALITY IN RESEARCH AND THE ACADEMIA

SP4 – CAPACITIES
COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION, SUPPORTING
ACTION FP7 – SCIENCE – IN – SOCIETY – 2013 - 1

DELIVERABLE NUMBER: D.1.3
Summary of experiences shared through AGORA (GEAPs'implementation)

Author(s): Viviane Albenga, Anne Boring, with inputs from all EGERA core teams

Dissemination Level: PU

Deliverable Status: Report

Due date of deliverable:	30/06/2015
Actual date of delivery:	01/07/2015
Start date of project:	01/01/2014
Duration:	48 months
Deliverable lead contractor:	Sciences Po

This deliverable addresses the issue of the implementation of and the resistances to Gender Equality Action Plans in the EGERA institutions. By using the methodology of online forums, we draw on the experiences of the Community of Practitioners being built by EGERA. The exchange of experiences highlights the leverages for gender equality according to each context and facilitates the implementation of tailor-made plans.

Sciences Po led four on-line sessions between the end of May and mid-June 2015. These sessions were structured around as much topics, and a number of discussion questions. The topics were the following: 1) Mobilizing stakeholders; 2) Implementing actions; 3) Identifying resistances and 4) Dealing with resistances. The questions framing the forums as well as the answers and reactions of partners were posted regularly on a software called ProBoards. This technical option was preferred to upgrading the central tool of our project, SARAH-AGORA, which does not offer the possibility to structure "live" forums. It was considered both more cost-effective, and adapted to the needs of these forums.

To elaborate on the questions regarding the involvement of the stakeholders as well as the resistances they face, we drew on the definition of resistance by Lombardo and Mergaert (2013): *"We define resistance as a phenomenon that emerges during processes of change — such as when gender equality policies are implemented — and that is aimed at maintaining the status quo and opposing change"* (Lombardo & Mergaert 2013: 299).[1] Resistance is both individual and institutional, a complexity which we stressed in our questions. Benschop and Verloo[2] (2006) provide an example of institutional resistance concerning a gender mainstreaming initiative with civil servants in the Ministry of the Flemish Community in Belgium. They showed that civil servants can express resistance to gender initiatives both by acting and by non-acting. Institutional resistance has also been emphasized by Stratigaki[3] (2005), who draws attention on institutions that dedicate insufficient economic and human resources to gender equality policies. Institutional resistances will be core to another on-line session of experience exchange, to be carried out at a later stage of EGERA. Yet, preliminary attention has already been paid to this specific type of resistances in the present document, as these were incidentally touched upon by participants to the forums.

Lombardo and Mergaert (2015)[4] cross individual and institutional resistances with their implicit or explicit form: "The individual and the institutional levels are interconnected because institutions are a collective of individuals. […] In this light, it is important to distinguish between implicit individual resistance and implicit institutional resistance. The former manifests itself through non-action or inadequate action, either caused by compliance with the existing gender norms or by a lack of resources (including knowledge and skills, time, financial resources, and power). The latter occurs when the mentioned incapacity is

---

[1] Lombardo, Emanuela and Lut Mergaert (2013) 'Gender Mainstreaming and Resistance to Gender Training: A Framework for Studying Implementation', *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 21(4), 296-311.

[2] Benschop, Yvonne and Mieke Verloo (2006) 'Sisyphus' Sisters: Can Gender Mainstreaming Escape the Genderedness of Organizations?', *Journal of Gender Studies*, 15, 19-33.

[3] Stratigaki, Maria (2005) 'Gender Mainstreaming vs Positive Action: An Ongoing Conflict in EU Gender Equality Policy', *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 12(2), 165-186.

[4] Lombardo, Emanuela and Lut Mergaert (2015), 'Resistance in Gender Training and Mainstreaming Processes', In Bustelo M., Ferguson L. Forest M. (eds.), *The Politics of Feminist Knowledge Transfer: A Critical Reflection on Gender Training and Gender Expertise,* London, Palgrave, 57-83.

detectable at a collective level, and is connected to policy decisions about resources that are taken in the higher ranks of an organization" (Lombardo & Mergaert 2015: 64).

We will show more specifically in topic 3 that these distinctions matter. Moreover, "resistance can also be expressed explicitly, such as when decisions are taken against the goal of promoting gender equality. This overt resistance can take the form of policy discourses that express ideas and aims which distance themselves from the goal of gender equality, or it can take the form of policy actions that go against that goal" *(ibid.).*

Finally, resistances can also be gender specific or not gender specific.

Each topic will be presented and summarized specifically. The two last topics will provide some conclusions for the implementation of the GEAPs.

Topic 1: Mobilizing Stakeholders

<u>Discussion questions:</u>

1. Which categories of stakeholders (in which positions, faculties, research components or other departments) did you identify as crucial for the successful implementation of the GEAP?

2. Which channels, incentives, fora and methodologies do you use for encouraging and securing their active participation in the implementation of GEAPs?

3. How did you proceed for GEAP's validation: which bodies/stakeholders were involved in this process and do you think that the level of endorsement/validation of your GEAP is appropriate and sufficient?

4. To date, how would you describe the degree/extent of stakeholders' mobilization within your institution with regards to GEAP's implementation?

<u>The partners' answers to these questions highlight several trends:</u>

Most partners highlight **the essential role that university leaders** play in helping implement gender equality action plans (GEAPs). For instance, at Sciences Po, support from the Director and Secretary General has been essential to validate and start implementing the GEAP. At University of Vechta, the involvement of the President, the Vice-President, the gender equality commissioner and the coordinator of work-study-life balance have been essential to implement measures of GEAP. At CzechGlobe, the following actors have been crucial for a successful implementation: directors, middle management (leaders of research teams) and members of the Scientific Advisory Board. However, CzechGlobe mentions that team leaders show most resistance to implementing gender equality policies, but notes that their attitude is slightly changing towards a more positive approach. At University of Antwerp, the GEAP was formally endorsed by the rector himself, but the day to day validation lies more with the central administrative departments of HR and Equal Opportunities and Diversity. At Antwerp, the vice rector is part of the Steering Committee Equal Opportunities and Diversity. At METU, the current top administration supports and attends the EGERA team's activities, which has a positive effect on gender equality culture of the institution, especially in the process of the institutionalization/implementation of a mechanism for gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing. At the Radboud University, a very important stakeholder is the Dean of the science faculty. He is very supportive and strongly underlines the importance of EGERA within the faculty. It was him who basically told the management of the 5 science research institutes, that they will participate in the training sessions.

Middle managers are also essential stakeholders, as noted by Czech Globe. At METU, the main target group was the top academic and administrative managers including those in the President's Office and those from Engineering, Science and Literature, and Education Faculties. But the EGERA team at METU also finds that, although the top managers are crucial for implementation, involving middle-level managers from different departments is essential,

i.e. where gender imbalance is present. METU stresses that improving their involvement could be realized with the help of the training which will be given by the Radboud team. Moreover, METU finds that it is important to include PhD students, research assistants and early career academics for a successful implementation of GEAP in terms of women in research, work-life balance and sexual harassment and sexist offences.

The **Human Resources (HR) department in particular has been essential** for several partners. For instance, Antwerp mentions that its "key stakeholders are part of the HR department and the Department for Equal Opportunities. Greet Dielis is head of department for HR regarding academic and scientific staff and is as well consortium board member. This helps very much because it is mostly the HR department that has to implement structural measures. Marjolijn from HR is also involved, especially for the organization of gender trainings. The responsible staff member of Equal Opportunities and Diversity department, Kristien, is another key stakeholder as she wrote the gender action plan in the context of the interuniversity council action plans. Her department can launch ideas and initiatives but they need other departments to structurally imbed these. Sometimes this leads to tensions but EGERA can act as a bridge in this" **(post by @jolien on May 22, 2015 at 11:10am).** Finally, the Radboud team highlights the fact that people from the HR department are important stakeholders. They organized a (formal) meeting to inform people from the HR department about EGERA and talked about how they can support each other. But more important are the informal meetings in which the EGERA team and members of the HR department inform each other about the latest news and developments. That is how the EGERA team also heard about a new diversity policy being developed at central level. The vice president of the board subsequently invited the EGERA team (together with the other structural change project STAGES) to inform her about EGERA results as input for further development of the diversity policy.

The **GEAP has generally been built in partnership with universities' different services**. For instance, at Sciences Po, the GEAP has been built with the collaboration of its main stakeholders. Each main board (Directors, Administrators, Student Life, etc.) has validated it. At University of Vechta, a coordinator for fellowship programs (at the PhD level) has been in charge of coordinating further education and trainings for PhD students and scientific junior researchers in recent months. The university is now discussing the "gendering" of the workshops that are offered to these young researchers. Also, University of Vechta mentions the fact that gathering statistical data relies on the gender equality commissioner; the last comprehensive gendered statistic is from 2012/2013 and will be updated in the near future. To strengthen gender in research and teaching, there are some very active members of the network gender studies in charge.

The implementation of the GEAP has sometimes been made possible thanks to the **hiring of specific employees working on gender equality**. This has been the case for instance at Sciences Po.

Some essential **university heads of departments are also involved in the steering committee or consortium board**. This mix of roles has been especially useful for the implementation of the GEAP. For instance, Antwerp mentions that the head of department for HR regarding academic and scientific staff is also a consortium board member. This is very helpful, because it is mostly the HR department that has to implement structural measures. Czech Globe also

mentions that three EGERA team members are currently active in GEAP's implementation. The Radboud University writes that: "At the Radboud University we have Erik Koelink involved in EGERA as consortium board member. He is the director of a research institute at the Science faculty. The science faculty is where our main EGERA focus is aimed at" **(post by @pleun on June 1, 2015 at 11:23am).**

Communication between different stakeholders is essential, and EGERA members can help facilitate this communication. For instance, the team at Antwerp mentions that most of the times they have meetings and communicate by email and phone calls to discuss (departments and services of the university are located in different campuses). The EGERA team has frequent discussions with members of the administration. They share for instance interesting docs or news, and the administration sometimes asks the EGERA team for advice and help. For instance, it asked EGERA members to give feedback on a note written by Leuven University on part-time work in academia. The team keeps the administration up-to-date on EGERA deliverables and workshops, such as the "train the trainer" workshop.

Creating incentives for participation can be useful, but it is hard to assess the precise impact and effectiveness of these incentives. For instance, Antwerp mentions that it gave away five dinners as an incentive for university members to participate in the Gender Equality Culture Survey, but there was no way to know if this incentive contributed to a higher participation rate.

Active participation can be created by involving different stakeholders. For instance, METU describes how the team "used various channels to encourage and secure the active participation. First of all, through special presentations made for high-level managers, we introduced EGERA project and our action plan. We also organized a public meeting during the Ankara workshop by inviting high-level academic managers mainly to convey the aim of the project and persuade them about their significant roles in the implementation. We also profited from report writing process (conducting interviews) as a part of the GEAP implementation process. Moreover, Gender Equality Training has been taking place in METU for the academic, non-academic personnel in the last several months mainly as an output of the EGERA project. In this respect, Gender Equality Module –based on the participatory team learning after the introduction of key concepts and current situation at METU- was included and implemented in the Academic Development Programme (AGEP) which is for orientation of new faculty members and increase of effective research and education. Similarly, it was incorporated also i nto the Administrative Personnel Development Programme (IGEP) for all levels of the administrative personnel. We can say that we are on our way to meet our main aims which are awareness raising on existing gender inequalities in academia and the benefits of gender equality and gender approach. We must add that the responsiveness of the participants were high" **(post by @basak on May 28, 2015 at 9:57am).** Finally, in another example, the Radboud team presented the EGERA project and its training plans at a faculty board meeting to increase visibility and willingness to participate, which has been very useful.

Another efficient way of involving stakeholders is through **training sessions**. Radboud mentions that after the first training sessions at the science faculty, participants informed others about the training and EGERA information was spread. Having people being involved in the project really creates commitment. And it resulted in people now knowing how to find

an EGERA team member for specific questions. The team now receives questions from future participants (not trained yet) on how to tackle gender issues in European projects for example. EGERA has become more visible and it becomes easier to mobilize stakeholders.

Some universities are helped by the fact that **other universities also have to implement gender equality action plans**. For instance, University of Antwerp launched the gender action plan with the other Flemish universities at the start of 2014, which overlaps perfectly with EGERA. The university can therefore use the work provided by EGERA as leverage and as a reference for the GEAP which has been drafted.

Several obstacles have been highlighted by EGERA partners:

Implementing **GEAP requires the goodwill of different stakeholders across services** within each university. For instance, University of Vechta mentions that there is still some improvement to be made on communication between different stakeholders regarding common goals. A common "vision" of EGERA still needs to be communicated. Different stakeholders sometimes adopt the attitude of being responsible for their "own" area. The team at University of Vechta finds that much effort is still needed within the institution to overcome separation and resistance.

Furthermore, **the GEAP does not benefit from the support of all members of academic communities across EGERA partners**. Not every stakeholder at University of Vechta, for example, finds the discussion of gender issues to be attractive. While the GEAP has been endorsed formally by CzechGlobe directors, the level of endorsement within the institution has not been sufficient until now. University of Antwerp also mentions that the degree of mobilization is still rather limited, with the EGERA team's main contacts being with the key stakeholders. For specific activities such as the fora, training Antwerp has reached-out to more members of the university, who could get involved on a voluntary basis. The EGERA team at Antwerp mentions that it needs to invest more in a direct communication to members of the community, who ask about policies to be implemented and their results.

To solve this problem, UAB suggests that it might be important to clearly identify who is responsible for what. Its GEAP (2013-2017) establishes in each measure (there are 48 measures), who is responsible for the implementation as well who is the direct executor of the measure, the instrument and the calendar. For example:

"Measure 2.4. Promote measures to encourage women to apply for research merit and stimulate a growing present of women experts in the management of research groups and projects until a balance is reached Body responsible: Office of Vice-rector for Research (Research Committee), management of departments, institutes and research centres. Execution: Area of Research Management and Office for International Research Projects Instrument: Agreements
Calendar: Permanent"
UAB benefits from the information it has collected through the evaluation of a previous GEAP (2008-2013). This evaluation revealed who had actually implemented the measures and who had not, as well as the resistances that had emerged. In the current plan, in addition to the

responsibility of the governing body, the majority of committees, offices, departments, faculties, areas, etc. are involved in the implementation of one or more measures.

Sometimes, **there is some confusion between the GEAP policies and EGERA**, which may be linked to broader policies. University of Vechta for instance mentions that "EGERA (and/or GEAP) is linked with policies in a broader sense and is somehow more comprehensive and complex as it has different components under "one umbrella". We tried to introduce EGERA goals from the beginning in the since 2014 adopted Gender Equality Plan of UoV. Difficulties arises in identifying "who is responsible for what in implementation"" **(post by @sabine on May 27, 2015 at 6:13pm)**.

At Antwerp, the GEAP overlaps with the Flemish Interuniversity plans, a confusion which sometimes obscures individual responsibilities. For example, the EGERA team at Antwerp organized the GECS and ran a survey that was also part of the GEAP plan. Only one survey was eventually used, which is a good thing, but some useful questions could not be included in this one survey which was given-out (a lot of comments covered other inequality issues). The Antwerp team mentions that the GEAP is now leaving it in the hands of the EGERA team to run the survey. The team highlights the fact that it will be important that the follow up is not only up to EGERA researchers but also to the management themselves to engage with the results. It argues that this increased involvement and shared responsibilities needs to be discussed more clearly.

Some EGERA partners find themselves to be isolated in countries in which there is no other similar ongoing initiative. For instance, Czech Globe mentions that EGERA actions are quite unique in the Czech academic environment. In the Czech Republic, no other regional or national policies have been implemented yet. At Czech Globe, EGERA is the first direct experience with gender equality policies. EGERA therefore does not overlap with other initiatives.

Some **EGERA partners find that it would be necessary to benefit from more instruments to promote participation**. For instance, UAB has decided to support all the community in the process of implementation, and they are also trying to publish the results of the evaluation in the new UAB website, with the aim of monitoring the implementation of the plan (not only at the end of the plan).

Finally, **the UAB team is benefitting strongly from the experience acquired in the implementation of previous GEAP plans**. The participative process they carried out during the elaboration of the III GEAP endorsed the measures, that emerged both from the result of the previous evaluation and the participation (questionnaire, focus groups, meetings...). The governing council of the UAB is the final responsible for the approval. The EGERA team at UAB highlights the fact that the degree of gender equality awareness is higher than two years ago, when the community knew about the Observatory but not about the GEAP. Nonetheless, in a UAB team member's point of view, UAB is highly sensitive in gender equality, even the budget for implementing the plan is low, and the coordination of all the agents could help to achieve the objectives. She finds that not every stakeholder feels concerned by gender issues, and stresses the fact that it is necessary to start changing the organizational culture and

incorporate the discussion about gender equality in the institutional agenda (HR, teaching, research, discrimination, etc.).

Topic 2: Implementing actions

Discussion questions:

1. Within the scope of the 4 main axes of your GEAP, which are the key action you did already implement so far?
2. Did you identify new priorities that were not (sufficiently) contemplated in the genuine GEAP?
3. Can you provide inputs on how foreseen actions are being further detailed in your updated GEAP?
4. How do you communicate (beyond formal consultations aimed at stakeholders' involvement) about your GEAP, both within and outside the organization?
5. Did stakeholders provide inputs to fine-tune the GEAP or further expand it? How these inputs were taken on board at this stage?

1. The key actions that have been implemented so far

The Gender Equality Culture Survey is one action that has been implemented by all EGERA partners. However, each institution has started tackling the issue of gender equality by prioritizing and implementing different actions.

For instance, Sciences Po's first main key action has been the **implementation of the action plan against sexual harassment**. University of Vechta has also started to work on sexual harassment and discrimination. It has organized a multi-professional workshop on this topic with invited experts that took place in January 2015. The METU team further stresses the fact that there have been on-going efforts to institutionalize a mechanism for 'gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment and gender-based mobbing' at METU.

The EGERA team at Sciences Po has also started working with the HR department to include **new measures of gender equality** in its annual gender equality survey. Antwerp has mainly focused on HR related measures (WP3): implementation of the survey, some reconciliation measures (more family friendly meeting hours, replacement fund/arrangement for staff on maternity leave). Antwerp has also changed the business intelligence monitoring tool which will give the EGERA team accessible quantitative data.

Collecting data has also been a priority of the Sciences Po team. Thanks to two different databases, the Sciences Po team has been able to conduct an analysis of gender biases in student evaluations of teachers. It is also studying male and female students' trajectories at the university. The Sciences Po team is further collaborating with different departments to study data from students' admissions process to graduation and first employment, from a gender perspective. The Sciences Po team is analyzing data from HR from a gender perspective. Sciences Po has also started conducted interviews on work-life balance.

In terms of **training academic and administrative communities**, METU succeeded to have a systematic training in Gender Equality by including a Gender Equality module in academic and administrative personnel trainings which have been taking place since October 2014. Czech

Globe writes that "[s]o far in CzechGlobe we have conducted surveys among scientific workers and administrative employees, collected gender disaggregated data. We have carried interviews on gender bias in recruitment and have evaluated the information in the form of a WP5 report.
We have organised four trainings (see below):
- Time management IV generation, 30.4.2015, for all target groups
- Key competences for career development, 28.4.2015, young employees
- Scientific career and family, 19.3.2015, young employees
- Gender dimension in Horizon 2020, 7.11.2014, team leaders

We have also analysed internal documents and directives" **(post by @katerina on May 26, 2015 at 1:08pm).** Czech Globe, however, regrets that not many people provide inputs to EGERA and its activities in Czech Globe/CVGZ. Nonetheless, there were spontaneous proposals from two colleagues (one Ph.D. student and one post-doc) regarding topics for trainings and continuous involvement of young female researchers into managerial activities.

The Radboud University implemented 2 of the 5 gender equality trainings according to plan. Organizing these training sessions also involves one of the other GEAP priorities: enhancing gender equality monitoring instruments. They collected sex segregated data concerning the participating institute. Showing this data in graphs over time, always raises a lot of discussion and clearly contributes to more awareness of the existence of gender inequality at the particular institute. It is a valuable starting point for the training. The Radboud University also worked on mainstreaming gender in curricula, by integrating a lecture on gender in methodology courses for master students and PhD students.

Other measures include **student life**. For instance, at Sciences Po, the main parts of the GEAP that have already been implemented involve student life. Sciences Po has created workshops to help female students entering the professional world. It has also participated in student-led meetings on gender equality issues.

Some measures involve **the development of pre-existing measures**. For instance, at Vechta, measures for work-study-life-balance were in place before EGERA started and continue due to the auditing process "family-friendly university". According to Germany law, the university must have a gender equality commissioner. There is a long tradition in monitoring gender (in)equalities and taking action against inequalities in every German university. However, at University of Vechta, there has been no continuous work by this office in the past three years due to changes of staff members. This lack of staff at the university level does not prevent, however, the implementation of GEAP actions in general. Further measures to strengthen gender in research and curricular are under consideration, although the planned online-module on gender and diversity competence has not been further discussed until now.

Finally, UAB has capitalized on actions implemented in previous GEAP. The EGERA team first evaluated the degree to which the measures of the Second Action Plan were applied. The result of this evaluating indicates that: a) 17.5 per cent of measures (less than a quarter) have been fully implemented; b) most of the actions have been partially carried out (45 per cent); c) 10 per cent have not been implemented, and d) in terms of the rest, in 27.5 per cent of cases the degree of application could not be evaluated because of a lack of information (the bodies/stakeholders involved in the execution of some of the measures of GEAP did not

provide the data which were solicited by Observatory.) In terms of the types of the actions that have been applied, most (42.9 per cent) belong to the first line, visibilisation and creation of an opinion. The actions that have not been applied belong especially to line 4. In line 5, balanced representation in the different bodies and levels of decision-making all measures have been applied but partially (*Third Action Plan for Equality Between Women and Men at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona*). The UAB team further mentions that: "In relation to new priorities, at the UAB, in order to draw up the Third Action Plan for Equality between Women and Men, the Observatory for Equality designed two instruments to enable the university community to participate in this process: a) survey evaluating the equality policies at the UAB which was sent to teaching staff, administration and services staff and students; b) focus groups and working sessions with staff and students.

In the discussion groups and working sessions, the gender violence, the guarantee of equal opportunities at the promotion and the conciliation were considered the most important topics. For this reason and the first time, the third GEAP adds measures in regards to the violence against women; the incorporation of measures on the participate in the university life and the introduction of focus intersectional are others of the novelties of the current GEAP" **(post by @laura on May 30, 2015 at 4:12pm).**

2. New priorities or issues that need to have more effort invested in

While some partners, such as Antwerp, mention that they have not identified new priorities that were not (sufficiently) contemplated in the genuine GEAP, others do identify some. For instance, as far as University of Vechta is concerned, there are students who are really interested in these topics and are engaged in specific commissions, but most of students have the opinion (there exists some studies on it in Germany), that Gender Equality is not a "hot" topic anymore because everyone has equal chances. Due to the age of most students they might not have experienced inequalities yet and are not aware what could happen in their future or, they do not talk about it. A master study i.e. shows that a lot of female students do not expect any barriers in their future career regarding gender equality or equal opportunity unless they are getting a child and face other circumstances, which really makes a difference in reflection. This study did not focus on other inequalities like i.e. ethnicity, class etc. However, the glass ceiling in the Academia is not in the mind of most of the female students until they are confronted with it. Raising awareness is needed through the offering of specific courses integrated in the regular modules on such topics and of gender & diversity competence seminars which spark student self-reflection. In Germany there is a stronger getting movement on fighting against gender researchers. Also in the media there are some really serious attacks against it like so called "End of the Gender madness" in a high ranking talk-show. High quality and sensitive awareness-raising measures might be helpful to get younger people "on board". Radboud University concurs regarding lack of awareness among the student population: in general the students do not think gender inequality still exists. They are a difficult audience to get really involved when they are not convinced of (or open to) gender inequality.

METU stresses the fact that it has to focus on the implementation of a formal Gender Equality Scheme, concerning especially the promotion of equality between sexes in METU. This issue is not considered as a pressing need even by women academic managers. METU has a

meritocratic system which is believed to offer equal opportunities for women and men by many. Even though the proportion of women top-level managers is satisfactory, the METU team still has to persuade stakeholders about the necessity of women in middle-level management positions too. The team has diagnosed that while top-level managers are appointed by the President of the university, middle-levels are subject to department and other faculty elections. The METU team also plans to focus more on the work/private life conciliation such as the necessity of care services mainly for children under 3 for early career academics. Even though they have to address the education system going back to secondary education, one of METU's main priorities is the dominant male culture mainly valid for STEM. The team addresses this issue during public events, presentations and training for novice academic staff.

3. Communication on GEAP

Sciences Po believes it is **important to build a communication strategy** to make EGERA-driven actions visible to the whole academic community. This task has been quite easy to accomplish when organizing the launching conference, which has drawn a lot of attention. Sciences Po has taken any opportunity it can (for instance with the workshop on gender bias in governance and evaluation) to communicate about EGERA internally and externally. The EGERA team is helped in this task by the fact that Sciences Po's GE officer is now also responsible for internal communication, which provides opportunities to communicate on a more day-to-day basis. And yet, Sciences Po still faces situations or audiences (as among students) in which/for whom EGERA and Sciences Po's commitments to gender equality are insufficiently known or acknowledged.

Workshops and conferences help increase visibility regarding EGERA initiatives. For instance, the Radboud University highlights the fact that the EGERA-STAGES co event held in Nijmegen in March 2015 was a good dissemination opportunity, internally for students and staff, but also externally for gender equality officers and HR of other universities in the Netherlands. After the event, the EGERA team at Radboud received several requests for gender equality training at other universities. Furthermore, they presented EGERA at the science faculty board meeting, the HR department and at other events like the university's research day. The Sciences Po team has also presented some of its research at different conferences and seminars throughout Europe, thus generating visibility for the work conducted as part of the EGERA project. University of Vechta also held a big conference on Gender Competence in the Academia, which was organized by their Gender Equality Commissioner in cooperation with the Association of Gender Equality Commissioners at Universities in Lower Saxony. In the frame of this conference that took place in March at University of Vechta, a workshop on standards of gender equality trainings was carried out by two members of the EGERA team at Radboud University (Pleun and Inge).

Antwerp mentions that it does not have a communication strategy for the GEAP/EGERA yet. They work rather ad hoc with consultations etc. They presented at a Steering Committee for Equal Opportunities and Diversity meeting. When attending events, seminars, etc. they introduce their work. Their main means of communication is then networking. Furthermore, Antwerp stresses the fact that the department of equal opportunities and diversity operates

on its own, and they have communicated in the past on the situation of gender equality (although not in relation to EGERA). This is an option that the EGERA team at Antwerp wants to explore.

METU has been spending time to diagnose inequalities at METU and form new connections to enhance GE (in)equality monitoring and implementing instruments in their GEAP. Thanks to the interviews made for the deliverables and other contacts and talks, they argue that they have been quite successful in getting people to think about the importance of women in academia, STEM, academic management and research.

At Czech Globe there is no regular communication of the GEAP. Instead, communication on the GEAP is done more or less on a random basis. They have not designed any communication plan so far. Results of the survey conducted in Czech Globe on working conditions and WLB were presented in the form of a poster at an annual international institutional conference held in March 2015. However, Czech Globe communicates about the project outside the organization. One member (Jiri) has already presented the GEAP at several events, e.g. at the first workshop of the Working Group for Change of the NKC Club (national network).

The two two topics regarding resistances to the implementation of the GEAPs can be analyzed through two main perspectives. Firstly, Lombardo and Mergaert provide a useful typology to describe the kinds of resistances: individual and institutional; implicit and explicit; gender specific or not gender specific (e.g. the ideal of flexibility at work do not favor women). Secondly, in the deliverable D.5.2., we analyzed the frames expressed by stakeholders regarding gender biases in evaluation and governance.

Five main frames have been defined:

1. Equality in difference

2. Projecting equality in the future

3. Equality as gender balance or parity

4. Equality as a women's issue and choice

5. Equality through inclusive policies regarding academic work and career paths

We will see that these frames explain some resistances because they represent a narrow definition of gender equality and prevent the implementation of structural change. Frames 1 (Equality in difference), 2 (projecting equality in the future) and 4 (equality as a women's issue and choice) appear to justify some resistances. Another frame supporting resistances, "equality as already done", arose clearly in the forums, which shows that all resistances were not expressed when investigating for the diagnosis of gender inequality among the consortium institutions.

Topic 3: Identifying Resistances

1. Can you account of the main individual resistances or obstacles encountered for GEAP's implementation (where are they located, how do they express, how are they framed?)

2. Can you account of the main institutional resistances or obstacles encountered for GEAP's implementation (where are they located, how do they express, how are they framed?)

3. Through which means (group discussion, surveys, personal interviews, other) these resistances were identified?

4. How would you describe the degree/extent of both individual and institutional resistances to GEAP implementation at this stage of EGERA?

1. The difficult identification and measure of resistances

When asked about how they identified resistances, partners tend to systematically mention informal communications along with very different means. Czech Globe's answer summarizes the others: "resistances were identified in individual interviews, informal meetings with colleagues, email communication, in meetings of directors and e.g. in the study conducted by Marcela Linkova on gender bias in evaluation and governance." Vechta also mentions the group model building that has already been conducted, which emphasizes the role of training in identifying resistances: "Group discussion, informal meetings, personal communication and the very effective group model building".

Currently, it seems to be difficult to evaluate resistances. The answers are not very precise as institutional resistance seems to be quite low at first sight. For instance, Radboud University posted this analysis:
"We didn't encounter much institutional resistance because the deans of the Science faculty and the Management School are very supportive. The dean of the Management School is particularly in favor of the method we use for the gender equality training and wants to promote this. And the dean of the Science faculty really wants to increase the proportion of women in higher academic positions, as this proportion has continuously decreased over the last five years.
[…] Individual resistance we perceive to be moderate and institutional resistance to be low."

The answer of METU stresses both the leverages and difficulties:

"Post by basak on 6 hours ago

Even though –and surprisingly- we seized an indifference from some women managers, our activities (such as training both for academic and administrative personnel) of Gender Equality

Action Plan are welcomed with pleasure and enthusiasm. After each activity, we realized that people become more interested in the project and ask/wait for more activities in near future. Moreover, new people expressed their interest after they talked with people who were involved in some activities. We can state that we perceive the difference in people's understanding of 'gender equality in the academia and the society' before and after training and/or other activities. The main resistance could be cited as the 'indifference'/gender blindness of some academic and administrative managers (including women) in the necessity of gender equality at METU. They consider some gender-related life events, conditions and under-representation of women as 'personal failures' or 'personal preferences'. Moreover, some women academic and administrative managers distance themselves from other women and they express their blindness and even ignorance without any difficulty.

This attitude/blindness in some people was mainly identified while conducting personal interviews for the Report on Gender Bias in Governance and Evaluation. During the group discussion that we are having before/during training and presentations/talks, we realized that resistance related to gender blindness is very common in each level of both academic and administrative personnel.

We think that we can create awareness during the implementation process of our GEAP and project activities. However, what was both surprising and hard for us is to explain to some academic and administrative managers and personnel the necessity of gender perspective and the existence of gender inequality in the academia."

This post also emphasizes the process of raising awareness by interviews and training groups.

Distinguishing individual and institutional resistances enables to move beyond first impressions as described by this post from University of Vechta: indeed, even if institutional resistances do not appear obviously, resistances appear at the individual level with the idea that "everything in terms of gender equality is already done":

"Post by @sabine on Jun 8, 2015 at 10:19am

At University of Vechta individual resistances or obstacles can be identified when i.e. staff members or students are the opinion that **everything in terms of gender equality is already done**. As Vechta has a high percentage in female professors and also in leadership positions, this argument cannot be denied easily. Discussion in the core group, in informal meetings and also in the sessions of the group model building shows that the focus is on gender (& diversity) equality culture rather than on percentages of male and female staff. To raise awareness on a culture without discrimination means that attitudes and stereotypical opinions should be reflected by staff members and students. This is a process in which it is very difficult to identify resistances as it is based on critical self-reflection by individuals as well as an atmosphere of appreciation.

2. Can you account of the main institutional resistances or obstacles encountered for GEAP's implementation (where are they located, how do they express, how are they framed?) In fact no institutional resistances can be identified as both the president and the vice-president support implementation. However, workload is very high and the timeframe for

"being engaged what is not the core responsibility in the job" seems low. That's why we implement gender trainings in the lifelong learning education."

The same process is at play at the UAB where, interestingly, the existence of previous GEAPs reinforces the idea that gender equality is already done:

"Post by @maria on Jun 8, 2015 at 2:20pm

In my personal opinion, the main individual resistances are that nowadays people (academics, administrative, and students) tend to think that it is not necessary to implement gender actions plans, because they consider that "the problem" is already solved. Apart from that, in Spanish he have an Equality Law, so, it is supposed that University respects the Law and consequently, discrimination doesn't exist.

Related to the institutional resistances, I can appreciate two main ideas: Firstly, my feelings (not contrasted) is that in general UAB community thinks that, the Observatory is "doing well"; So, we already have a Unit who takes care of gender issues, and sometimes that means, "this is not my business" because is this Unit (Observatory) who have the responsibility to work to improve gender issues, and part of the community could tend to avoid to face gender issues as a personal responsibility.

Apart from that, my impression is that perhaps one part of the UAB community could see the Observatory as a kind of "bubble" because don't know enough about it."

"Post by @begonya on Jun 9, 2015 at 3:55pm

The first GEAP at the UAB was designed by the team at the Observatori de la Igualtat (Observatory of Equality), as a Unit structure, since 2005. The UAB is now in the process of implementing the third GEAP. The team at the Observatori has planned actions to involve stakeholders from the whole university (government, deans, faculty, administrative and academic staff, and students). It has been made evident that the implementation of actions contributing to axes 1 (visibilization of sexism and inequalities, and sensibilization and creation of external opinion) and 3 (promotion of gender perspective in teaching and research) has been easier to promote than actions concerning axes 2 (equal conditions for access, promotion and organization of working, and studying conditions) and to a certain extent 4 (equal participation and representation within the academic community). As an example, the Observatori suggested that all Departments and Faculties had a person acting as "gender agent" or "representatives for equality policies at departments and faculties". Many departments and faculties at the UAB have provided a name, but it depends on each structural unit at the university to comply with the demand, and to propose effective actions which do not only have the sign of "political correctness". Some Faculties are more aware of the need of implementing the GEAP because the individuals are more aware of this very need.

Also, the fact of counting on the structure, does not grant for the actual functioning of it. I is still a challenge to cope with gender issues in collective terms in everyday academic practices, either because the responsibility of taking gender into account becomes strictly enclosed in academic work, where personal relationships and institutional structures are not necessarily

involved, or because coping with gender in collective terms happens outside institutional frames, in a more activist context.

In our context, that is, a context where both individuals and institutions are aware of the need, also in strategic terms, of taking gender into account also by means of implementing a specific GEAP, resistances are very often not explicitly manifested, and they are therefore not easy to identify nor to measure. And this means that there is a significant yet not always evident gap between the resources institutions provide for and the level of compromise of concrete individual actions with those resources in order to give not only shape and content, but also consistency to gender policies."

The last sentences put into light the implicit nature of resistances when a process of transformation towards gender equality has already been engaged.

Finally the link between institutional and individual resistances highlighted by Lombardo and Mergaert describes Sciences Po's context quite well. Indeed, a few but significant stakeholders are reluctant or lack time, which is both individual and institutional resistances:

"Post by @viviane on May 27, 2015 at 10:28am

In Sciences Po we had to deal with the resistances of the HR Department. We did not face them directly in order to have access to their data. We know that we can be supported by the General Director in case of too much resistance but it will be the latest "weapon" to be used."

"Post by @@hperivier on Jun 4, 2015 at 4:50pm:

At Sciences Po, the GEAP has been ratified and validated at the very high level of our institution, but we face difficulties in implementing some measures, or at least to go as fast as expected, for different reasons

1. lack of time and/or the unadjusted schedule of different stakeholders, for whom busy periods are not necessary synchronized

2. for some specific aspects, we need more time as expected because negotiations with social partners. They are organized in a certain way by the French law and we need to stick to the negotiation calendar as it has been previously scheduled
3. even with a clear involvement of the direction of Sciences Po on EGERA agreement, some stakeholders might not be totally aware of the challenges raised by EGERA But this specific point is less and less important thanks to the increased dissemination and communication on EGERA."

2. The frames explaining resistances

We have shown that the frame that "gender equality has already been achieved" represents

a resistance. Furthermore, the post of Czech Globe highlights the weight of three frames: equality in difference; projecting equality in the future; and equality as a women's issue.

"Post by @katerinahodicka

In CVGZ/Czech Globe we often come across individual resistances. Some employees believe it is not necessary to implement gender equality measures as there are no inequalities/problems in the institution and some measures (concerning work-life balance) are already implemented even if there are no formal rules in this respect (flexible working time, home-office etc .). The problem of under-representation of women in leadership positions and the "leaking pipeline" is often perceived as a question of a natural development.

I do not see any problem anywhere in CVGZ/Czech Globe, women have the same opportunities as men. Nobody discriminates here. You cannot have a female team leader immediately, it's a long process, it takes about 15 years to become a leader." Several CVGZ/Czech Globe top managers express openly their gendered notions of skills. Whereas men have a synthetic approach to matters, women are analytical. This deeply rooted stereotypical thinking thus hinders women from acquiring leadership positions. The same male managers find mothering care and scientific work mutually exclusive. According to their belief, women – mothers have to slow down and are immobile.

There is also a major distaste at all levels against institutionalization. Institutionalization of rules is seen as at variance with freedom and flexibility; allegedly, there can't be rules for everything and rules can be enforced to the point, which may pose new obstacles. This is related to CVGZ being perceived by top management as a family with friendly ties. Therefore, institutionalization of rules and procedures is not necessary because in the family people can rely on one another.

> How would you describe the degree/extent of both individual and institutional resistances to GEAP implementation at this stage of EGERA?

Despite the verbal support for the project, for "being modern" and doing things right, we consider the situation as very difficult in terms of resistances. We can find a lot of benign sexism (women as caring, mothers, diligent and precise, analytical – all this precludes women from reaching leadership positions).

Furthermore, mid-level management (team leaders) and some women also express resistances quite strongly. If women pursue their careers, then they will not give birth that much. And these days we are well aware of a low birth rate. The population is decreasing which presents a significant problem."

"Fixing women" rather than fixing the institution tends to lay the responsibility of change on women, which is also a resistance to change as expressed by METU:

"Post by @basak

1) Individual resistance mainly concerns the stakeholders' own interpretations of gender equality. Particularly women academic and non-academic administrators have the tendency to believe that, since they have succeeded and climbed up the ladders in their own career, all women employees can do the same. That is, they think that if they have been successful in overcoming all the obstacles in terms of pregnancy, childcare, etc., everybody can, that these are not issues to constitute problems for women. Male employees, on the other hand, tend to think that they suffer disadvantage because women employees under the same contract are not asked to fulfill duties that require physical strength or that women are given significant privileges in conducting their own jobs (i.e. nursing leave, leaves related to childcare, etc.). Both groups, therefore, display a reluctance to recognize the problems of gender equality as they are to be tackled with effectively.

2) The main institutional resistance concerns the idea that all operations related to recruitment, promotion, etc. in METU are based on the 'merit' principle. Therefore, the same criteria applies to all employees, women and men, academic and administrative, with the belief that this creates neutrality and objectivity. However, particularly concerning academic positions, it can be said that women face with significantly more obstacles concerning promotion since the biggest move in their career from non-tenured to tenured position comes up during the particular period of the life cycle in which they give birth and take care of their young children. The merit principle creates a general belief that all procedures aim at equality among employees, and operates, in fact, as an important resistance point to the achievement of gender equality.

Another institutional resistance concerns the physical and infrastructural facilities that are available to METU staff. The limited working hours of the childcare facility, the absence of play rooms, after-school or extra-curricular study centres for children, the absence of nursing rooms, the limitations concerning free shuttle buses, etc. are pointed as causing difficulties particularly for women employees.

Also, work culture should be pointed as another resistance point, implying informal channels of decision-making, late-hour meetings, discriminatory and / or patriarchal attitudes of managers / administrators, etc."

Topic 4: Dealing with resistances

Discussion questions:

1. Did you secure time and resources to deal with resistances so far? Can you briefly account of these resources?
2. How stakeholders have been mobilized to deal with identified resistances: did they provide assistance or recommendations on this? Through which channels?
3. How do you plan to deal with resistances over the next months/years of EGERA?

This forum did not have many followers, as the answers often referred to the previous topics. The posts highlight the role of training, individual communication and interviews. Training has already been experienced by Radboud University and University if Vechta, as expressed in the following exchange:

"Post by @pleun on Jun 11, 2015 at 2:19pm

We experienced some resistance during organizing the training sessions, when invited participants declined due to other priorities or framing it as too much an effort. By increasing the scope of our invitations and by personal communication, we ensured sufficient participation, including the management level.

During the sessions, we also encountered resistance. For example by non-verbal communication (of a male full professor) showing a lack of interest. We addressed this by friendly and directly asking this participants for his opinion, hereby involving him into the group discussion again. This worked well.

We also encountered verbal resistance, for example a male manager emailing us referring to the result of the group discussion as shoddy work. We discussed this personally with him and found out he wanted to have more scientific proof of the existence of gender bias. The team started him academic publications on the issue. He involved the team in a gender working group to implement the policy recommendations of the training and finally he advocated the gender equality action plan at the board level. The gender equality action plan heavily emphasizes academic publications on gender equality, mainly from Nature and Science. To summarize he transformed from a participant with resistance to a change agent.

If in the future more resistance will emerge, we will address this by personal communication and providing information and advice fitting their needs."

"Post by @sabine on yesterday at 10:38am

As Pleun stated above at UoV we also experienced some resistances when inviting HR management and lead of person- and organisation development leader to the GMB. Although the invitation was sent by president, both staff members did not attend the sessions excusing it by not having the time for it.

Other resistances i.e. implementing the gender equality culture survey has been overcome by personal communication and explanation. We had to drop off the question concerning the affiliation to department or institute in the survey as the concern arouse that the anonymity is not guaranteed when including such a question.

Last year we developed an internal communication strategy (presenting EGERA in different commissions, departments etc.) in order to disseminate the aims and objectives at University and to overcome resistances. We also publish regularly news of EGERA in the internal newsletter.

However, the partnership in an international consortium is a main argument to highlight activities and increase commitment. As I mentioned before many staff members at UoV are the opinion that everything has already been done in terms of gender equality."

Individual negotiation has been used by Czech Globe, tending towards a communication plan:

"Post by @katerinahodicka on Jun 5, 2015 at 10:18am

We use mainly individual negotiation, it is both time- consuming and haphazard. […]

> How do you plan to deal with resistances over the next months/years of EGERA?

In CzechGlobe/CVGZ we have not dealt with resistances in a systematic way so far. Nevertheless from the beginning of the project we have been using the so-called brief comments on the current situation and we have been analyzing the comments. The preparation of a communication plan is foreseen in CzechGlobe/CVGZ including e.g. designing a subsection on the EGERA project and its activities on the CzechGlobe/CVGZ website. It should inter alia increase the project visibility.

We plan to emphasize over and over again that the project is for everyone, not just for women."

Finally, METU insists on raising awareness through interviews for the diagnosis as well as the trainings. More interviews are to be conducted:

"Post by @basak

1) With EGERA project, an extensive data collection and analysis process has started, which is closely followed by the University administration. Moreover, interviews were conducted with the top academic and non-academic administrators, including Vice Presidents, Assistants to the President, Deans, and key administrators of the Secretary General and Personnel Office, with a view to identifying the main resistance points, and to developing policies and strategies to effectively tackle the latter. Also, training programmes on gender equality have started since April 2015 and are conducted by the METU EGERA team, targeting both academic and

administrative staff. These trainings aim to raise awareness on gender issues across all levels and types of employees. So far, around 200 employees received the training. The trainees mostly provided positive feedback and displayed a significantly higher level of awareness on the issue.

2) The stakeholders involved in the process through interviews and / or training programmes are invited to provide their recommendations and suggestions for strategies and measures to improve the existing situation, which they effectively do. Moreover, particularly the academic and non-academic administrators who have been interviewed have been displaying a collaborative attitude and providing all kinds of assistance and interest in the implementation of the project.

3) More interviews will be conducted with mid-level managers (i.e. department chairs, etc.) as well as with other stakeholders involved in the University decision-making processes, such as union representatives. Also, the training programmes will continue with the academic and administrative staff. We are also planning to expand the training programmes to high and mid-level administrators from both academic and non-academic scale."

Concluding notes

As a conclusion, we can highlight the fact that resistances are emerging as the process of implementation has just begun. Many stakeholders are involved in each institution. While some stakeholders are very supportive, others still do not feel that gender equality is an issue. The EGERA partners are also implementing different types of communication strategies to promote the project.

The tools for raising awareness have been put into light by the partners. The challenge remains to promote structural change beyond the frames that provide a narrow definition of equality or deny the need for changing institutions. Interestingly, institutions where GEAPs have already been implemented such as the UAB, or where the direction supports the implementation such as Sciences Po, the University of Vechta and University of Antwerp, have to face subtle resistances. The sense that "equality is already done", that the institution is "doing well", can slow the implementation of GEAPs. Individual resistances are based on the frames of gender equality as "equality in difference" that insists on motherhood for women or the complementarity of sexes, as well as the frames of "projecting equality in the future" and "equality as a women's issue" that prevent from implementing structural policies regarding work life balance for example or regarding work life conditions as emphasized by University of Antwerp.

Training sessions and interviews have highlighted these resistances but have also taken part into an awareness-raising process that has to be deepened by other interviews, the generalization of training sessions as well as communication plans.