

**Call identifier:** FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2010-2.1.1.1  
**Funding scheme:** Coordination and Support Action (CSA)  
**Project n°:** 266638  
**Project Acronym:** INTEGER  
**Project title:** INstitutional Transformation for Effecting Gender Equality in Research  
**Project Co-ordinator contact:** anne.pepin@cncrs-dir.fr  
**Start Date of Project:** 01/03/2011  
**Duration of Project:** 52 Months

---

## Deliverable 7.13

### DETAILED EVALUATION CONCEPT

---

**Work Package:** 7 – Evaluation of the Transformational Gender Action Plans  
**Author(s):** Dr. Anke Lipinsky and Maria Schäfer (GESIS)  
**Due date of Deliverable:** 31/05/2013 (Month 27)  
**Actual Submission date:** 22/04/2014 (Month 38)  
**Dissemination level:** PP (Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services))  
**Nature:** R (report)

**The INTEGR Consortium comprises:**

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, CNRS	Coordinator	France
Trinity College Dublin, TCD	Beneficiary	Ireland
Šiauliai University, ŠU	Beneficiary	Lithuania
GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences	Beneficiary	Germany

**Disclaimer**

The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.

The document reflects only the author's views and the Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



## CONTENTS

1. <i>Rationale for the Evaluation of Transformational Gender Action Plans (T-GAPs)</i> .....	4
2. <i>The Evaluation Team</i> .....	6
3. <i>Elements of the Evaluation Procedure</i> .....	6
4. <i>Assessment Methodology</i> .....	12
5. <i>Feedback Procedure</i> .....	14
6. <i>Elements of the Evaluation Toolkit</i> .....	15
7. <i>Annexes and Templates</i> .....	16
8. <i>Literature</i> .....	28

### List of Annexes and Templates:

- a. Definition of Transformational Change
- b. Recommendation of T-GAP elements
- c. Letter to recruit Control Groups
- d. Guideline for Self-Reporting (T-GAP coordinator)
- e. Draft Course for Site-Visits
- f. Draft Course for Toolkit Reality Check



## 1. RATIONALE FOR THE EVALUATION OF TRANSFORMATIONAL GENDER ACTION PLANS (T-GAPS)

The objective of externally evaluating the Transformational Gender Action Plans designed and implemented by INTEGER partner institutions is threefold: Firstly, the evaluation process is designed to provide local program coordinators with an outside view on the implementation process as support means for programme steering and quality assurance with respect to the program's objectives, including sustainability of the advancement of gender equality. Secondly, the external evaluation explores output, outcome and impact of each T-GAP at organisational and subordinate levels for the purpose of making effects of its activities tangible. Lastly, the evaluation methodology intends to supply project partners – and, possibly, higher education institutions which decide to follow the T-GAP implementation model – with tools and guidance on how to use the evaluation methodology for their own programs' quality assurance, to support legitimacy and dialogue, and thus measure institutional performance of implementing gender equality measures.

The evaluation design is oriented towards the practical needs and information needs of the intended users of the evaluation (Widmer 2004; Lee et al. 2010), i.e. INTEGER program coordinators at Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Šiauliai University (ŠU) and Trinity College Dublin (TCD) and their local partners. It combines elements of formative evaluations and summative evaluation courses at different points of time during the implementation process. Methodology used for the evaluation seeks to assess strengths and weaknesses of the overall T-GAP program implementation, to provide evidence for further organisational learning and to assess what works and what does not work under which conditions.

Clearly, the evaluation of the T-GAP implementation process must not be confused with the evaluation or quality assurance of the INTEGER project. These are two different exercises as our evaluation focuses on institutional transformation to advance gender equality rather than covering aspects of EU-project management etc.

Another important factor to consider is the organisational ability and readiness to learn and change during the T-GAP implementation process (Simon und Knie 2013). INTEGER partners represent three autonomous institutions which are very dissimilar from each other and which operate in three different national settings in France, Ireland and Lithuania. In addition, each T-GAP program coordinator operates from a different angle within her institutional setting. For those reasons, drawing direct comparison between CNRS, SU and



TCD concerning outcomes and impacts of the T-GAP implementation processes is not feasible and would not lead to valid results. Thus, the key interest of the summative evaluation is to demonstrate changes over time within the implementing partner institution.

With respect to the proposed formative evaluation, the evaluation team choose to design three slightly different evaluation procedures – respecting institutional and theme-related environments in the assessment methodology and in the weighting of partial results. However, the evaluation processes share common methodology and logic. Purpose of the formative evaluation is to contribute to the organisation’s learning process, i.e. the institutions which undergo the evaluation process are the target group of findings and results. Thus, the evaluation intends to contribute to the optimising and fine-tuning of local partner’s T-GAP implementation as well as – wherever possible – demonstrating causal relationships of its activities and effects (Balthasar 2011).

Instituting transformative gender equality policies in higher education and research organisations is a process over many years. Assessment of a good T-GAP implementation process is not confined to the recording ratios of women and men in staff categories alone. Outcomes and impacts of INTEGER Transformational Gender Action Plans demonstrate as much of the given institutional capacity to launch a transformation process as the suitability of chosen measures to reach specific objectives. Therefore, summative and formative assessment both combine quantitative and qualitative data.

The timing of formative and summative evaluation depends on the final approval of T-GAPs in the partner institutions. As a first step towards gaining measurable results, an ex-ante baseline data collection is carried out by all partners by using a data monitoring template provided by the evaluation team. Purpose of the statistical data collection is to create a baseline for the summative evaluation. In order to run a meaningful evaluation round and find evidences for transformational change, the period between institutions’ approval of the T-GAP, i.e. start of the implementation of T-GAP measures, and carrying out the evaluation should be appropriate. Often, quantitative data monitoring in higher education research embraces periods of about three years (Wolter 2011). Thus, the evaluation team does not expect significant changes of sex-ratios in job categories as a result of the T-GAP implementation within the project period. Also, it is deemed unlikely to measure any significant qualitative impact per theme within the first year of implementation of T-GAP measures, i.e. one year after institutional approval of the final T-GAP.



During the course of the INTEGER project, the evaluation team supplied partners with an operational definition of transformational change (see Annex), which has been adapted by each partner. Background of this necessity is the need to agree on a common understanding of structural change – in terms of a basic approach – between implementing partners and the evaluator. In addition, the evaluation team supplied partners with a list of ten basic features of gender action plans (see Annex). Recommended features have been shaped to fit INTEGER partners.

The course and some elements of the evaluation procedure have been discussed during several project meetings prior to the evaluation round, so that implementing partners are aware of the timing of the activities and its general process.

## 2. THE EVALUATION TEAM

The Center of Excellence Women and Science (CEWS) was appointed by the consortium to act as external evaluator at the onset of INTEGER. The evaluation team of INTEGER's Transformational Gender Action Plans consist of senior and junior scientists with theoretical, methodological and practical background in the evaluation of gender equality policies in higher education and research establishments as well as in impact analysis. Members of the evaluation team also have in-depth knowledge about gender equality in higher education governance regimes and policies, implementation processes of gender action plans in higher education institutions and the assessment and monitoring of gender equality measures at universities, as well as profound competencies with collecting, processing and analysing quantitative and qualitative empirical data, and extensive experiences with the management of EU projects in the sixth and seventh EU research framework programme.

## 3. ELEMENTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The evaluation design follows good practices from evaluation research concerning methodological soundness, practical relevance and transparency of the evaluation process (Balthasar 2011; Gülker et al. 2013; Löther und Maurer 2008). It encompasses qualitative and quantitative data collection and assessment in order to provide:



1. External feedback to partner institutions in the course of the implementation of the actions plans (formative evaluation)
2. Information about intended and unintentional outcomes and impacts of the Transformational Gender Actions Plans by theme
3. Measurable findings of the transformation processes at organisational and/or subordinate level, e.g. institute, school, faculty level (summative evaluation)
4. The basis for a toolkit and guidance on how to evaluate impacts of Transformational Gender Actions Plans for sustainable use.

## PREPARATION FOR THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

### Knowing the institution

One objective for the initial period, before implementing the T-GAP, is to understand organizational framework conditions by gathering relevant background information from France, Lithuania and Ireland. Therefore, the evaluation team collects background information about the legal and policy framework in which partner institutions operate to inform the evaluation process, e.g. institutional governance, research and higher education system of each country, information about gender equality policies relating to the four INTEGER themes: engagement of decision-makers, organizational structure, career development and support, and work-life balance.

Before deciding about specific measures of each T-GAP, all three implementing partners carry out statistical (desktop) data collection based on GESIS' data-monitoring templates (see Annex), designed to create an equivalent set of data across institutions. On the basis of all material available, GESIS developed a set of categories for creating a data baseline for each organization. The templates contain, inter alia, a glossary, definitions of job categories, descriptions of decision-making positions, descriptions of university degrees (B.A., Masters, and doctoral positions), forms of employment, description of recruitment processes, promotion and reward systems – depending on the institutional contexts of CNRS, ŠU and TCD. In consultation with the project partners, templates are tailored to each institution.

Data categories for ŠU cover academic staff positions, decision-making positions, graduation degrees and forms of employment. Categories for TCD cover the same areas as for ŠU. Data categories for CNRS cover descriptions of staff positions (permanent and contractual),



decision-making positions, graduation degrees, as well as recruitment, promotion and reward systems. In addition to must-have statistical data, further categories (good-to-have) have been developed and discussed with partners, comprising: staff Full Time Equivalents, salary, funding, publications, and parental leave. Some of the additional categories are included into CNRS' baseline data collection. Some gaps in data were found in each institution, as well as at national level.

All data baselines facilitate the creation of a common starting point by harmonizing definitions of professional staff and educational categories as well as on institutional recruitment, promotion and reward practices existing in the French, Irish and Lithuanian partner institutions.

### **Appointment of a reference group for benchmarking progress**

By using control groups (comparable units within partner institutions which are not involved in a local Transformational Gender Action Plan), the impact of activities is measured in a comparative modus, wherever possible. At institutional level, impact and outcome of T-GAP measures and the overall implementation processes are assessed for the institution as a whole, but also the achievement of objectives according to the complementarity of activities.

As suggested by GESIS, CNRS, TCD and ŠU have recruited reference groups. In ŠU the Faculty of Natural Sciences will be the benchmark for the Faculties of Mathematics and Informatics as well as the Faculty of Technology. TCD chose the School of Computer Science and Statistics (SCSS) as benchmark for measuring impacts at institutional level. And at CNRS the Institute for Engineering and Systems Sciences (INSIS) serves as control group for the local units Institute of Physics (INP) and National Institute for Mathematical Sciences (INSMI).

### **Ethics approval and data protection**

Wherever necessary, ethics approval to carry out evaluation research on-site is sought from the institution's ethics committee.

Consideration is given to established principles of confidentiality and data protection, specifically in the case of qualitative interviews, group interviews and group discussions. All interviews are documented by digital means, anonymized, archived on local digital storage





and deleted after the end of the project, as soon as GESIS lost legal accountability towards the European Commission. Confidentiality is preserved, and protection of data privacy is guaranteed according to German Law – GESIS complies with highest standards of research ethics and good practice.

All interviewees and participants to the evaluation are invited to visit the German Federal Data Protection Act at [http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch\\_bdsch/index.html](http://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/englisch_bdsch/index.html) for further information.

## CORE ELEMENTS OF THE EVALUATION ROUNDS

In order to provide T-GAP implementing partners with helpful feedback on how the implementation process could be improved, the evaluation tries to provide answers to the following questions:

- How do selected T-GAP measures correspond to the organizational needs identified?
- Have envisaged target groups been reached and got involved?
- To what extent has the T-GAP reached its overall objective? To what extent have objectives for each theme been met?
- What have been the operational objectives, i.e. are T-GAP objectives achievable by dint of the selected measures – and within the given timeframe?
- What have been the priority themes/measures and what is their impact so far on the institution or on the intended target groups respectively?
- For what reasons have certain objectives not or only partly been met?
  - Contextual reasons (timing, organizational setting, legislative framework, ...)
  - Reasons relating to input (resources, knowledge, ...)
  - Reasons relating to the measure itself (wrong tool, wrong target group, no tangible outcome...)
  - Unintended/ adverse outcome (inverse causality, no causality, side effects)
- Is the program monitored in such a way that T-GAP's outputs, outcomes and impacts become visible, concrete and meaningful to the institution?
- How big is the institution's appetite to integrate T-GAP measures into institutional core values and procedures?



- What are the chances for sustainable use of the T-GAP activities within the institution?

### **The Self-reporting Exercise**

As an important step in advance to the interview and group discussion sessions on site, the evaluation exercise foresees that local T-GAP managers produce a self-report which should be made available to the evaluation team 10 working days prior to the site-visit. Purpose of the self-report (see Annex) is to:

- Present a comprehensive statement of the institution's view on set-up, implementation, priorities and achievements of the T-GAP;
- To reflect on strengths and weaknesses throughout the process, including information and other resources, strategies of operationalization of specific objectives, identification of key strategic actors, successes and difficulties;
- Provide quantitative and qualitative evidence to support the analysis;
- Provide information about the current implementation framework;

The self-report summarises the T-GAP implementation process as well as being an opportunity for the institution to present itself to external partners.

### **Visit on-site**

The evaluation team organises, in collaboration with the local project partners, visits to the partner institutions. During the site visit, the evaluation team interviews key personnel of the institution, e.g. representatives of the institution's senior management, members of governing bodies, representatives of the central and de-central administration, members of the T-GAPs implementation teams, research staff and senior academics as well as staff of the appointed control groups.

Whenever necessary, evaluators are accompanied by interpreters to guarantee the "freedom of expression" of each interviewee and to reduce misunderstandings and subsequent misinterpretation of the empirical data collected.



## **The Evaluation report**

The structure of the evaluation report varies per partner institution as T-GAPs priorities, objectives, methods of implementation and framework conditions for implementation vary significantly. However, evaluation reports will share a common structure. The structure of the evaluation report is in line with the “Recommended Elements of the T-GAP” (see Annex), which is made available to partners in the process of creating the Transformational Gender Action Plan, as well as it is in line with the structure of the T-GAP coordinator’s self-report (see Annex). It is envisaged to report back to partners on the following details:

### **1. Initial situation/ starting point for the institutional/ local**

Project context and modalities; Context of the institutions and the institutes/schools; Logic of the T-GAP, objectives, strategies and priority measures

### **2. Formative evaluation**

Operationalization of the T-GAP; Role and position of the coordinator; Information resources to get the T-GAP started; Implementation teams

#### **2.1 For each of the T-GAP themes:**

*Framework Analysis:* Institutional framework for implementation, incl. objectives, actors, existing policies;

*Process Analysis:* Implementation process (resources, structure of teams, timing, institutional and external support and drivers, constraints and solutions, collaboration inside and outside project/institution, coalitions and alliances, quick wins vs. hard wins

*Impact Analysis:* Logic charts for institutional / local level; Effective implementation (input-output, target groups, etc.); Structural change (outcomes); Intended and unintended effects (impacts on target groups)

**2.2 Overall assessment of achievements** (if possible per theme) and overall strengths and weaknesses relating to: T-GAP design, building, institutionalizing, sustaining and communicating gender expertise at different levels, coalitions, quality management and documentation, current and future challenges

### **3. One/ Two cases of good practice (institution and institute/school)**



**4. Summative evaluation for the institutional and local levels:** Contrasting data from monitoring templates, 2011 and 2014; Impact of T-GAP on overall institutional policy (considering operational objectives and long term objectives)

**5. Recommendations:** institution, faculty, institute/school, per theme, and for the remaining duration of INTEGER

#### FEEDBACK PROCEDURE (see also chapter 5)

Outcomes of the evaluation are presented in a two-stage process. Firstly, in form of a presentation of key findings to i) the Partnership Group and ii) in more detail to the implementation teams. Secondly, in form of a written evaluation report to the project partners subsequent to the presentation.

Translation services are required in the course of presenting the findings from the evaluation round (evaluation reports include a one-page summary in the language of the respective country), in each round of data assessment, as well as during the preparation of the evaluation toolkit.

## 4. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team uses mixed methods based in social science research for implementing elements of the evaluation. The core interest of the assessment methodology is to carve out causal effects created through the Transformational Gender Action Plan in

- the organisation
- participating schools/ institutes or faculty.

Policies, which existed in the organisation before creating the T-GAP, as well as relevant elements of the legislative national framework, need to be considered as context of the T-GAP and its elements, as they shape the design of the overall plan and may impact the implementation of specific gender equality measures.

In principle, the evaluation assessment pursues a comparison of self-set objectives, formulated in relation to the T-GAP, and the actual situation on site at the point of



evaluating the programme – this comparison is done at different levels (Lipinsky 2009; Roloff et al. 2007).

The summative evaluation contrasts statistical data sourcing from the monitoring template (see chapter 3). The first round of gathering data, i.e. before implementing T-GAP measures, serves as baseline for each adjacent collection of statistics. Statistical data is collected by local partners and made available to the evaluation team for assessment before implementing the T-GAP, during the core evaluation phase of the T-GAP and at the end of the funding period of INTEGER.

Purpose of the **Framework analysis** is to understand the contextual conditions and possible constraints at organisational and local level in relation to each of the four INTEGER themes: engagement of decision-makers; organisational structure; career progression and work-life balance. In order to carry out the framework analysis thorough background research is essential in the fields of: higher education legislation and research governance policy, employment policy in public research, gender equality policy applicable to HEI and research institutions, etc. Results of the framework analysis serve as background for weighting more specific assessments of processes, outcomes and impacts, e.g. the potential of the institution to demonstrate change within a specific area of the T-GAP.

Organisational structures significantly determine the modus operandi of the implementation process of gender equality activities (Löther und Vollmer 2014). In order to assess the operationalization of the T-GAP, the evaluation team applies a **Process analysis**. By looking at key actors involved in T-GAP implementation, as well as the institutional behavior (actors not directly involved but potentially affected) strengths and weaknesses of the institution managing the transformational change process are to be revealed. Due consideration is given to the role and position of the institutional T-GAP coordinator within the institutional hierarchy, who is managing the implementation process on behalf of the owner of the T-GAP (leader of institution) and in relation to the local schools, institutes or faculties.

Core of the assessment of outcomes and impacts created within each theme at the level of each T-GAP, including individual measures is the **Assessment of Impacts**, implemented by dint of a logic chart model (Balthasar 2011; Wyatt Knowlton und Phillips 2009). The logic chart model draws relations within four main categories:

Inputs	Activities/ Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts
Knowledge, financial input, workforce, time,	Lectures, workshops, policy review, booklets,	Change of policy, disaggregated data	Benefit to target groups, improved awareness,



etc.	websites, meetings, consultations, strategic coalitions, etc.	collection, change of procedures, instituting of structures, tangible support/ changes in administration	improved knowledge, gender equality embedded in culture
------	---	--	---

The three complementary models facilitate a comparison of targets and attainment of changes as well as the assessment of effects resulting from activities and bundles of activities. The logic chart model links inputs and activities to outcomes and impacts.

## 5. FEEDBACK PROCEDURE

Results from the external evaluation will be fed back to the implementing organisations at two complementary levels: Firstly, the partnership group, i.e. the consortium leadership committee, will receive information on the evaluation outcomes and effects the T-GAPs have had during the foregoing implementation period. Evaluators will consider future estimated impacts of past actions beyond the project funding period and provide recommendations for the remaining period of the T-GAP implementation phase wherever feasible.

Secondly, the local implementation teams and local coordinators will receive detailed feedback on results from the external evaluation. Implementing partners and external evaluators agreed that feedback will be brought to the attention of the senior management and local coordinators in form of an oral presentation, followed by a written report. The written reports might entail partly confidential information and thus T-GAP owners decide to what extend the reports are made available to the public.



## 6. ELEMENTS OF THE EVALUATION TOOLKIT

### **Preparation of Guidance and Toolkit**

All INTEGER partners create a joint guideline and toolkit which will act as an implementation manual providing templates for peer institutions. Templates to be included in the Guidelines will include e.g. the Action Plans, checklists used, adapted tools as well as monitoring and reporting templates from the project. Training materials to be written by ŠU based on the Transformational Change workshops (WP3) will be presented as well.

The Evaluation Toolkit will be delivered by the GESIS evaluation team. It shall reflect the experiences with evaluating the Transformational Gender Action Plans and make them available as a toolkit for sustainable use: It comprises the evaluation plan and its elements; methods for analysis; tools for monitoring the implementation of transformational action plans; guidelines and templates for self-reports; handling control groups; planning and implementing site-visits; and information on how to implement participative evaluation approaches, how to involve important actors, etc.

In addition, the evaluation team implements a “reality check” of the toolkit and its elements (see Annex). GESIS carries out two workshops: one workshop will convene representatives of organizations which have established standards, checklists and toolkits for gender equality action planning. A second stakeholder workshop will be held with gender equality practitioners with practical experiences of putting into practice gender equality plans.

Results of the two workshops will feed into the refinement of Toolkit and Guidelines as necessary to guarantee best fit for its applicability.



## 7. ANNEXES AND TEMPLATES

### *a. DEFINITION OF TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE*

#### **Transformational Change (TC)**

Transformational Change is a strategic mean which is steered by institutions that employ research staff. Through operating transformational change, research institutions demonstrate significant gender awareness and competency to use gender as a resource to create new knowledge and stimulate innovation by modernizing their organizational culture. The ultimate objective of the change process is to work towards a better gender relation and equal representation of both sexes in all staff categories of the institution. Operating transformational change effectively demands awareness of the statistical base, periodical examination of institutional processes (such as recruitment, promotion, retention), the willingness at the top of the institution to open up discussion and to sustain the process of self-study and change and support the achievement of organizational goals within a supportive climate.

### *b. RECOMMENDATION OF T-GAP ELEMENTS*

#### **Basic Features of successful Transformational Gender Action Plans**

This list aggregates some basic features of successful gender action plans in various higher education institutions. Recommended features have been adapted to fit INTEGER partners rather than incorporating national specifics in designing gender actions. Elements listed below still need to be discussed, detailed and adapted according to national/institutional environments.

- I. Description of the state of play: Strengths and weaknesses of the actual situation regarding gender equality of the institution or school/ institute should be presented. This might take the form of a SWOT-analysis describing strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
- II. Roles of core actors, corresponding rights and responsibilities as regards the overall process





- III. Analysis of the current situation and analysis of deficits regarding equality with respect to the four INTEGER themes: Engagement of decision-makers, Organisational Structure, Career Progression, Development and Support, Work-Life Balance.
- IV. Definition/elaboration of objectives (main and subordinate objectives for thematic fields)
- V. Presentation of the T-GAP's structural ties in context of the organisation's profile and mission statement (gender equality objectives and their value/contribution relating to the organisation's profile, target population/beneficiaries, organisation's key activities, relation to overall mission statement)
- VI. Presentation of activities as a whole; motivation for selecting specific measures and their relation to needs identified, complementarity of measures, references to used resources (gender programs, change tools, equality research), character of activities in terms of commitment
- VII. Personnel and financial resources required for implementation of measures in respect of size, financial ability, capacity (expert knowledge and infrastructure support to reach objectives), specifics of scientific culture concerned (locally-nationally), and complexity of the unit/institution
- VIII. Envisaged schedule of activities and process milestones/achievements, envisaged contribution to reach objectives
- IX. Quality control management (strategies with regard to unmet objectives, documentation of activities, internal and external information and PR, success indicators, monitoring, capacity building, etc.)
- X. Strategies with respect to sustainability

This list gathers components rather than presenting a strict structure of T-GAPs. However, the more elements demonstrated in detail, the more comprehensive and operational the Transformational Gender Action Plan may appear.

### *c. LETTER TO RECRUIT CONTROL GROUPS*

#### **Assignment of Reference Departments in the Course of the Evaluation of INTEGER**

INTEGER stands for INstitutional Transformation for Effecting Gender Equality in Research. Its aim is to initiate a sustainable transformational change process in participating research organisations and universities. Organisational change is needed in order to attract more



talented women to engage in science, engineering, technology and mathematics, but also to allow for more diversity and inclusiveness in professional working climates in science. The project is funded by the European Commission's FP7 for a period of 4 years and stimulates change at CNRS, Trinity College Dublin and Šiauliai University. Throughout the runtime of INTEGER, CEWS evaluates change processes at two levels: at the level of the entire institution and at the level of a local faculty or school.

Reason for this dual-level evaluation is that specific local faculty and schools have agreed to be subject to a review exercise with respect to gender and to implement a tailored, local Transformational Gender Action Plan, at the onset of the project. At the same time, action plans at the institutional level are being created or revised in order to stimulate more gender awareness within the institution.

In order to capture successful change processes at institutional and local levels - as well as detecting factors that hinder changes – it is of great value to assign a local faculty or school as reference group during the evaluation process. The reference group represents processes operated within the entire institution for a certain period of time, and thus serves as a benchmark for the local unit implementing a tailored action plan. The latter is expected to produce different results.

Selected staff of the reference faculty will be asked to participate in a statistical data collection as well as participating in qualitative interviews at the same time as data is collected at the partner local faculty. All participating schools will receive feedback and results of the evaluation survey while protection of data privacy is guaranteed according to national law.

Your local INTEGER project manager may contact you shortly in order to ask for your participation in the evaluation process.

**d. *GUIDELINE FOR SELF-REPORTING (T-GAP coordinator)***

**Self-reporting Guideline for external evaluation purposes (indicative model)**

This self-report shall reflect the situation and activities of (name of the organisation) for the years April 2011 to December 2013. Your report should not exceed 30 pages in total, annexes excluded. Aim of this report is to help providing an overview of problems,



measures, actors, strategies taken and successes at (your school/ university) to advance gender equality.

### **1. Statistics /starting point (Section max. 5 pages)**

- Investigation and analysis of disaggregated data
- Brief description of specifics relating to the context (scientific cultures involved, original mandate of initiating unit, national situation etc.)
- Specific successes and challenges relating to equality from the past (at school and organizational level)
- External resources consulted to inform the process/design the concept or specific measures (expert advice, databases, handbooks, guidelines etc.)

### **2. Objectives and overall concept (Section max. 15 pages)**

Guiding question: What objectives do we pursue with our gender equality policy?

#### 2.1 Objectives relating to equality in general and/or the four INTEGER themes in particular

- Objectives and hierarchy of objectives (overarching aim, overall vision, middle targets, objectives relating to operational and implementation aims)
- Objectives in written form (mission statements, organizational principles, organizational development plan, local gender plans, performance agreements regarding gender)

#### 2.2 Target groups

- target groups of measures' correspondence to objectives and overall population of institution (students, scholarship holder, PhD candidates, employees (scientific and support staff), administrators and senior management). Unintended exclusions and specific target groups of activities

#### 2.3 Strategies

- Strategies for operational purposes (choices made in order to safeguard meeting the objectives set; relating to role models, mono-educational approaches; embedding gender aspects in governance mechanisms, newly created or changed roles/mandates, centralization of tasks and duties regarding equality etc.)



- Strategies for overcoming barriers, fatigue and silent resistance (inclusion, attribution of ownership, shaming and blaming, ranking, strategic partnerships, mediation, fun activities, rewards etc.)
- chosen scientific approach (women support action, equalizing support action, gender mainstreaming, diversity, support action for changing persistent men's role models etc.)

#### 2.4 Estimation of strengths and weaknesses of chosen approaches

- In respect of the overall gender equality strategy/ the four themes
- Conflicting and contradictory logic between organizational objectives, approaches and in operationalization

### **3. Structure and Organization of gender equality (Section max 5 pages)**

Guiding question: How is our gender equality policy organized?

#### 3.1 structure of gender policy at central (organizational) and local (institute or faculty) level

- Institutional anchorage of equality policy
- Standing of gender policy in top senior management (chancellor, president...) and in governing mechanisms
- Coordination of central and local equality actors as well as equality staff and gender researchers, and bodies involved in gender policy decision-making
- Key aspects with regards to content of actors and (planning, implementation, monitoring etc.)

#### 3.2 Resources

- Personal resources for gender equality (FTE), active inside and outside the INTEGER project mandate
- Financial resources for gender equality and/or in relation to the four INTEGER themes
- Facilities for gender policy implementation and/or relating to INTEGER themes

#### 3.3 strengths and weaknesses relating to structural and organizational aspects

### **4. Activities and performance (Section max 5 pages plus annexed table)**



Guiding question: What are the results of actions taken/measures implemented since April 2011 until today?

4.1 Implementation of measures deriving from the T-GAP

Please use table attached.

4.2 Strengths and weaknesses relating to activities and performance



INTEGR THEME	RATIONALE/B ACKGROUND (- > survey)	OBJECTIVES	MEASURES	LEVEL(S)	TIMING ("Implementat ion timing/ frequency"; not: deadline)	ACTORS ("Departments and services concerned except MPDF")	TARGET GROUP(S) (Institutes/Lab s)	RESOURCES IN € (Budget for 3 years starting June 2012)	QUANT. INDICATORS	COMMENTS



## **5. Internal quality control (Section max 2 pages)**

Guiding question: How do we measure progress towards objectives?

Instruments for monitoring used (Description)

Integration of gender monitoring/reporting in regular monitoring instruments of the organization

Strengths and weaknesses of internal quality assessment

## **6. Cooperation (Section max 2 pages)**

Guiding question: is gender equality a topic regarding internal and external cooperation?

6.1 Internal cooperation between bodies, institutes, local and central level

6.2 Cooperation with other universities or research bodies, (regional, national, international); cooperation among members of the consortium

6.3 Cooperation with expert group, external expert advisors

6.4 Strengths and weaknesses relating to cooperation

## **7. Strengths and weaknesses-profile (Section max 5 pages)**

Please synthesize all Strengths and weaknesses in form of your organizational gender specific profile

## **8. Future perspectives (Section max 2 pages)**

Sustainability of gender actions and strategies: what actions have been taken in this respect, expected need for refinement, new themes/actors/approaches for gender activities, future key themes?

## **9. Annexes**

- Statistics on the basis of GESIS template
- Section 4 table
- Mission statement, basic constitutional order of your organization



*e. DRAFT COURSE FOR SITE VISITS*

**Trinity College Dublin (TCD), IE**

Time	Type	Participant(s)	Interpreter (y/n)
<b>DAY 1</b>			
09:00-09:45	Indiv. interview	INTEGRER project leader at TCD	
10:00-10:45	Indiv. interview	INTEGRER project manager at TCD	
11:15-11:45	Indiv. interview	Equality Officer	
12:00-12:30	Indiv. interview	Director of HR	
14:00-16:00	Site visit	Convenor of the School of Chemistry implementation team; Convenor of the School of Natural Sciences implementation team	
16:15-17:45	Group interview	2 members of each of the 3 School implementation teams	
16:30-18:00	Group discussion	Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science (FEMS)	
19:30	'Fireside chat'	Vice-Provost; INTEGRER project leader at TCD	
<b>DAY 2</b>			
09:00-09:30	Indiv. interview	Provost	
09:45-10:15	Indiv. interview	Dean of Research	
10:30-11:00	Indiv. interview	Dean of the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science (FEMS)	
11:30-13:00	Group interview	Head of the School of Chemistry; Head of the School of Natural Sciences; Head of the School of Physics	
14:00-15:30	Group discussion	5-6 Academic and Research Staff from the School of Chemistry and the School of Natural Sciences	
16:00-17:30	Group discussion	5-6 Academic and Research Staff from the School of Computer Science and Statistics (SCSS)	

**Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), FR**

Time	Type of interview/visit	Participant(s)	Interpreter (y/n)
<b>DAY 1</b>			
09:30-	Indiv. interview	INTEGRER project coordinator	





10:15			
10:30-11:00	Indiv. interview	INTEGER project manager	
11:30-12:00	Group interview	CNRS President ; Cabinet Director	
13:00-13:30	Indiv. interview	Director of the Institute of Engineering and Systems Sciences (INSIS)	
14:00-14:30	Indiv. interview	Director of the National Institute for Mathematical Sciences (INSMI)	
15:00-16:30	Group interview	Members of the institutional implementation teams at INP/INSMI level	
16:45-18:15	Group interview	Members of the local implementation team at the Jussieu Institute for Mathematics (INSMI)	
19:30	'Fireside chat'	Member(s) of the CoNRS (National Committee)	
<b>DAY 2</b>			
09:00-09:30	Indiv. interview	Director of the Communications Department (DirCom)	
09:45-10:15	Indiv. interview	Director of the Department of Human Resources (DRH)	
10:45-12:15	Group discussion	5-6 researchers and support staff from Jussieu Institute for Mathematics (INSMI)	
14:00-16:00	Site visit	2 members of the local implementation teams	
16:15-17:45	Group discussion	5-6 researchers and support staff from INSIS	
<b>DAY 3</b>			
09:00-09:30	Indiv. interview	Director of Néel Institute (INP)	
10:00-11:30	Group discussion	5-6 researchers and support staff from Néel Institute (INP)	
13:00-14:30	Group discussion	Members of the local implementation team at Néel Institute (INP)	
15:00-16:30	Site visit	2 members of the local implementation team at Néel Institute (INP)	

### Šiauliai University (ŠU), LT

Time	Type of interview/ visit	Participant(s)	Interpreter (y/n)
<b>DAY 1</b>			
09:00-09:30	Indiv. interview	Interim Rector of Šiauliai University	
09:45-10:15	Indiv. interview	Chairman of the Senate of Šiauliai University	
10:30-11:00	Indiv. interview	Dean of the Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics	
11:30-12:00	Indiv. interview	Dean of the Faculty of Technology	



13:00-13:45	Indiv. interview	INTEGER project leader at ŠU	
14:00-14:45	Indiv. interview	INTEGER project manager at ŠU	
15:15-16:45	Group discussion	5-6 members of the local implementation team	
<b>DAY 2</b>			
09:00-09:30	Indiv. interview	Head of the Administrations department	
09:45-10:15	Indiv. interview	Head of the Marketing and Communications department	
11:45-11:15	Group discussion	5-6 researchers from the Faculty of Technology and from the Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics	
12:30-14:00	Group discussion	5-6 researchers from the Faculty of Natural Sciences	
14:30-16:30	Site visit	2 members of the local implementation team	

*f. DRAFT COURSE FOR TOOLKIT REALITY CHECK*

In order to assess and optimize the practical usability of the INTEGER guideline and toolkit, GESIS is organizing two one-day stakeholder workshops.

One workshop will convene representatives of organizations which have established standards, checklist and toolkits for gender equality action planning. A second workshop will be held with gender equality practitioners with practical experiences of putting into practice gender equality plans. Results of the two workshops will feed into the refinement of Toolkit and Guidelines as necessary to guarantee best fit for its applicability.

**Workshop with representatives of organizations which have established standards, checklist and toolkits for gender equality action planning**

*Draft programme:*

10:00-10:15 Welcome and introductory words on the INTEGER project

INTEGER project team at GESIS

10:15-10:30 Overviews of the guidelines and the evaluation toolkit

INTEGER project team at GESIS



10:30-11:30 Discussion on the evaluation concepts developed in the INTEGER project, including indicators to monitor the implementation of Transformational Gender Action Plans

Presentation by the INTEGER project team at GESIS of the evaluation concept developed in the INTEGER project – presentation by a participant of the evaluation concept and indicators developed by her/his organization – plenary discussion

11:30-12:00 Coffee break

12:00-13:00 Discussion on the guidelines and templates for self-reports developed in the INTEGER project

Presentation by the INTEGER project team at GESIS of the guidelines and templates for self-reports developed in the INTEGER project – presentation by a participant of the approach(es) to self-reporting followed by her/his organization – plenary discussion

13:00-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:00 Discussion on the approach to and implementation of site visits

Brief presentation by the INTEGER project team at GESIS of the approach to and implementation of site visits in the INTEGER project – presentation by a participant of the approach(es) to the planning and implementation of site visits followed by her/his organization – plenary discussion

15:00-15:30 Discussion on the handling of control groups

Brief presentation by the INTEGER project team at GESIS of the handling of control groups in the INTEGER project – plenary discussion

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:00 Discussion on the How-To Guides developed in the INTEGER project

Presentation by the INTEGER project team at GESIS of the How-To Guides developed in the INTEGER project – plenary discussion

17:00-17:30 Identification of missing elements (evaluation toolkit)

Plenary discussion

17:30-18:00 Discussion on dissemination strategies

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

## **Workshop with gender equality practitioners**

*Draft programme:*

10:00-10:15 Welcome and introductory words on the INTEGER project

INTEGER project team at GESIS

10:15-10:30 Overview of the guidelines and the evaluation toolkit



INTEGER project team at GESIS

10:30-12:00 Presentation of the How-To Guides, followed by an in-depth discussion on specific topics as well as the overall approach

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

12:00-13:00 Lunch break

13:00-14:00 Presentation of the action plan templates developed in the INTEGER project

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

14:00-15:00 Discussion of approaches to the engagement of stakeholders and gatekeepers

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

15:00-15:30 Coffee break

15:30-16:30 Presentation of the guidelines and templates for self-reports developed in the INTEGER project, followed by an in-depth discussion

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

16:30-17:00 Identification of missing elements (guidelines)

Plenary discussion

17:00-17:30 Discussion on dissemination strategies

INTEGER project team at GESIS – plenary discussion

## 8. LITERATURE

Balthasar, Andreas (2011): Critical Friend Approach: . Policy Evaluation between Methodological Soundness, Practical Relevance, and Transparency of the Evaluation Process. In: *German Policy Studies* 7 (3), S. 187–231.

European Commission (2013): She Figures 2012. Gender in Research and Innovation. Statistics and Indicators. Brussels: European Commission, Directorate-General for Research. Online verfügbar unter [http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document\\_library/pdf\\_06/she-figures-2012\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/she-figures-2012_en.pdf), zuletzt geprüft am 14.05.2013.

Gülker, Silke; Simon, Dagmar; Torke, Marc (2013): Externe Kontrolle und kollegiale Rückmeldung. Zu einer konstitutiven Spannung in institutionellen Evaluationen der Wissenschaft. In: *Zeitschrift für Evaluation* 12 (2), S. 209–234.



- Lee, Lisa; Faulkner, Wendy; Alemany, Carme (2010): Turning Good Policies into Good Practice. Why is it so difficult? In: *International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology* 2 (1). Online verfügbar unter <http://genderandset.open.ac.uk/index.php/genderandset/article/view/64/78>, zuletzt geprüft am 26.03.2010.
- Lipinsky, Anke (2009): Championing Women in Europe's Science? Evaluation of the European Career Support Program 'Encouragement to Advance - Training Seminars for Women Scientists'. In: Anke Lipinsky (Hg.): *Encouragement to Advance - Supporting Women in European Science Careers*. Bielefeld: Kleine (cews.Beiträge Frauen in Wissenschaft und Forschung, No. 5), S. 73–100, zuletzt geprüft am 03.06.2009.
- Löther, Andrea; Maurer, Elisabeth (2008): Evaluation of gender equality policies. International Perspectives. In: Sabine Grenz, Beate Kortendiek, Marianne Kriszio und Andrea Löther (Hg.): *Gender Equality Programmes in Higher Education. International Perspectives*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, S. 53–67, zuletzt geprüft am 26.08.2008.
- Löther, Andrea; Vollmer, Lina (2014): Erfolge durch Strukturen? Hochschulische Gleichstellungsarbeit im Wandel. In: Andrea Löther und Lina Vollmer (Hg.): *Gleichstellungsarbeit an Hochschulen. Neue Strukturen - neue Kompetenzen*. (im Erscheinen). Leverkusen: Barbara Budrich (cews.Beiträge Frauen in Wissenschaft und Forschung), S. 15–53.
- Roloff, Christine; Löther, Andrea; Biffel, Gudrun (2007): Erhebung und Evaluierung der Gleichstellung und Frauenförderung an österreichischen Universitäten - Abschlussbericht. Wien: Österreichische Qualitätssicherungsagentur (AQA). Online verfügbar unter <http://www.aqa.ac.at/download.274.gesamtbericht-glst-ff-endfassung-inklanhang.pdf>, zuletzt geprüft am 22.07.2007.
- Simon, Dagmar; Knie, Andreas (2013): Can evaluation contribute to the organizational development of academic institutions? An international comparison. In: *Evaluation* 19 (4), S. 402–418, zuletzt geprüft am 13.02.2014.
- Widmer, Thomas (2004): Qualität der Evaluationen - Wenn Wissenschaft zur praktischen Kunst wird. In: Reinhard Stockmann (Hg.): *Evaluationsforschung*. 2., überarb. u. aktual. Auflage. Opladen: Leske + Budrich (Sozialwissenschaftliche Evaluationsforschung, Bd. 1), S. 83–109, zuletzt geprüft am 23.07.2007.



Wolter, Andrä (2011): Hochschulforschung. In: Heinz Reinders (Hg.): Empirische Bildungsforschung. Gegenstandsbereiche. 1. Aufl. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden GmbH Wiesbaden, S. 125–136.

Wyatt Knowlton, Lisa; Phillips, Cynthia C. (2009): The Logic Model Guidebook. Better Strategies for Great Results. Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications.