

gesis

Leibniz Institute
for the Social Sciences



CEWS Project Report

2012|04

Consideration of Gender Aspects in EU-Funded Research Projects in Germany

Final Report

Project leader: Anke Lipinsky; contributor: Kathrin Samjeske

Funded by:

Contact Point Women into EU Research (FiF) within



CEWS Project Report 2012|04

Consideration of Gender Aspects in EU-Funded Research Projects in Germany

Final Report

Project leader: Anke Lipinsky; contributor: Kathrin Samjeske

Funded by:

Contact Point Women into EU Research (FiF)

CEWS Project Reports

GESIS – Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences
Center of Excellence Women and Science CEWS
Unter Sachsenhausen 6-8
50667 Köln, Germany
Telephone: x49 (0)221 476 94 - 0
Telefax: x49 (0)221 476 94 - 199
E-Mail: anke.lipinsky@gesis.org

Contents

Contents.....	5
Kurzzusammenfassung.....	9
Executive summary	10
1. Introduction	12
2. Application process.....	14
2.1. Initial contact with the application section.....	14
2.2. Answers to CoG on the equality aspect	15
2.3. Answers to CoG on gender in research content	17
2.4. Significance of the application section	18
3. Internal and external application advice	20
3.1. Need for advice	20
3.2. Internal and external advice offerings	21
3.2.1. Internal advice from EU advisors	21
3.2.2. Advice from external institutions.....	23
3.3. Further training of advisors on CoG (including Gender Toolkits)	24
4. Evaluation process	26
4.1. Instructions for evaluators.....	27
4.2. Handling of CoG in compiling individual evaluations.....	27
4.3. Handling of CoG at consensus meetings in Brussels.....	28
5. Project negotiations, project lifetime and reporting	31
5.1. Official Commission regulations	31
5.2. Project negotiations.....	32
5.3. Project lifetime and reporting.....	33
6. Effectiveness of the CoG application section.....	35
6.1. Effectiveness of CoG in terms of the equality aspect	36
6.2. Effectiveness of CoG in terms of gender in research content	37
6.3. Perception of the efforts of the Commission.....	38
6.4. Recommendations for a future instrument.....	38
7. Comparison of national research funding institutions in Europe regarding consideration of gender and equality	43
8. Results.....	46
9. Recommendations	50
9.1. Formal differentiation of objectives	50

9.2.	Structural integration of equality.....	50
9.3.	Structural integration of gender into research content.....	51
9.4.	Information policy: precise specification of contents, conditions and benefits	51
9.5.	Information policy: provision of resources	52
10.	Bibliography.....	53
11.	Appendix.....	54
11.1.	CoG in the Guide for Applicants	54
11.2.	CoG in the Negotiation Guidance Notes	55
11.3.	CoG in the reporting form for the Project Final Report	57
11.4.	Sample description	58
11.4.1.	Project leaders.....	58
11.4.2.	EU advisors	59
11.4.3.	NCP employees.....	59
11.4.4.	Evaluators.....	60
11.4.5.	Commission officials.....	61

Kurzzusammenfassung

Die Studie Berücksichtigung von Gleichstellungsaspekten bei EU-geförderten Forschungsvorhaben aus Deutschland untersuchte im Auftrag der Kontaktstelle Frauen in die EU-Forschung im EU-Büro des BMBF, welche Rolle der Antragspunkt Section 5 - Consideration of Gender Aspects (CoG) in der Praxis der Projektplanung, Antragsberatung, Begutachtung, Projektverhandlung sowie in der Durchführung von EU-geförderten Verbundprojekten unter deutscher Leitung spielt. Im Rahmen der sechsmonatigen Studie wurden 60 themenzentrierte Interviews mit vier Akteursgruppen (Projektleitung, Antragsberater/innen, Gutachter/innen und Kommissionsbedienstete) ausgewertet, in denen die Akteure/innen ihre reale Alltagspraxis schildern und die Wirksamkeit des Berichtspunktes bewerten. Ferner wurden Inhalte, Konsistenz des administrativen Verfahrens und der Aspekt der Verbindlichkeit mit ausgewählten nationalen Forschungsmittelgebern in Europa verglichen.

Die Studienergebnisse belegen, dass CoG im komplexen Ablauf der EU-Forschungsmittelinwerbung und -verwaltung insgesamt eher eine nachrangige Position einnimmt. Für die Mehrheit der Befragten steht dabei der Gleichstellungsaspekt im Vordergrund, obwohl projektbezogene Gleichstellungsaktivitäten selten benannt werden. Geschlechterrollen und Geschlechtsdifferenzen in Forschungsinhalten werden im Projektantrag unter CoG häufig nicht berücksichtigt, da diese Zielsetzung im Leitfaden für Antragstellende nicht explizit genug formuliert ist. Da CoG offiziell kein Evaluationskriterium ist, stellen Gleichstellungsfragen im Beratungsgeschehen der Nationalen Kontaktstellen und EU-Referent/innen einen Randaspekt dar und werden nicht durchgängig besprochen. Die Bewertung von Gleichstellung und Gender in Forschungsinhalten unterscheidet sich nicht entlang der Geschlechtergrenzen. Lebenswissenschaftliche sowie geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Verbundprojekte berücksichtigen Genderinhalte überwiegend gut, da dies in den Ausschreibungstexten gefordert ist bzw. zu den Gepflogenheiten der Fachdisziplinen gehört. Informationsressourcen, welche die Handhabung von CoG erleichtern, sind wenig bekannt und für die Antragstellung bzw. Beratungspraxis zu wenig anwendungsbezogen. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass der Berücksichtigung von Gleichstellungszielen und Gender in Forschungsinhalten weder einheitlich noch nachhaltig in Begutachtungsverfahren und Vertragsverhandlungen durch die Europäische Kommission nachgegangen wird. Individuelles Wissen und Genderkompetenz sind bei allen Interviewten für eine gute Handhabung von CoG entscheidend.

Die Studienergebnisse belegen große individuelle Handlungsspielräume bei allen Akteursgruppen die sich in der Praxis häufig nachteilig auf Berücksichtigung von Gleichstellung und Gender in wissenschaftlichen Inhalten in EU-geförderten Verbundprojekten auswirken. Wichtigste Ursache für die mangelhafte Effektivität von CoG ist die Unverbindlichkeit dieses Antragspunktes. Folgende Maßnahmen könnten die Berücksichtigung beider Aspekte in der Antragspraxis verbessern: 1) Da die doppelte Zielsetzung in einem formalen Antragspunkt nicht wahrgenommen wird, sollte die Sektion 5 auf nur eine Zielsetzung reduziert werden, vorzugsweise auf die Förderung von Geschlechtergerechtigkeit. 2) Gleichstellungsziele sollten stärker formalisiert in den Förderantrag aufgenommen werden, Gleichstellungsmaßnahmen verpflichtend gefordert

und eine Missachtung finanziell sanktioniert werden. 3) Die fachspezifische Bewertung von Genderinhalten muss Teil des wissenschaftlichen Begutachtungsprozesses werden und daher einen expliziten Unterpunkt der Evaluationskriterien „Scientific excellence“ und „Impact“ darstellen, wie auch in den Ausschreibungstexten erwähnt werden. 4) Leitfäden und praxisbezogene Handreichungen, die Verantwortlichkeiten, Bedingungen und Vorteile der Berücksichtigung beider Aspekte darlegen, sollten vor allem durch die Europäische Kommission stärker bekannt gemacht werden. 5) Auf vorhandene Informationsressourcen sollte zu einem früheren Zeitpunkt im Antragsprozess hingewiesen werden. 10 CEWS-Projektbericht 2012|04

Executive summary

The study Consideration of Gender Aspects in EU-Funded Research Projects in Germany on behalf of the Contact Point Women into EU Research (FiF) within the EU-Bureau of the BMBF (German Federal Ministry of Education and Research), examines the role played by Section 5 - Consideration of Gender Aspects (CoG) in practice with regard to project planning, application advice, evaluation, project negotiations as well as in execution of EU supported collaborative projects under German direction. Within the scope of the six-month study, 60 interviews focusing on these topics with four groups of actors involved (project leaders, application advisors, evaluators and commission officials) were reviewed in which the interviewees described their actual everyday practice and assess the effectiveness of these reporting points. Content, consistency of administrative procedures and the aspect of commitment were compared with selected European national research funding providers.

The results of the study document that CoG in total assumes a somewhat lower position in the complex process of EU research funding procurement and administration. For the majority of those interviewed, gender equality was at the forefront, although project-related gender equality activities were seldom explicitly named. Gender roles and gender differences in research content were frequently not considered in project applications under CoG, as this objective is not formulated clearly enough in the Guide for Applicants. As CoG is not an official evaluation criterion, gender equality questions in the advising process represent a peripheral aspect for national contact points and EU advisors, and are not universally addressed. The evaluation of gender equality and gender in research content does not differ along gender lines. Life Sciences as well as the humanities and social sciences collaborative projects generally give due consideration to gender content, as this is required for the tender documents and/or belongs to the practices of the disciplines. Information resources facilitating CoG are little known, and not use-oriented enough for application and consulting in practice. The results show that consideration of gender equality goals and gender in research content is neither consistent nor sustainable in the evaluation procedures and not followed up by the European Commission in contractual negotiations. Individual scientific and gender competence was crucial for good handling of CoG for all interviewees.

The study results document broad individual freedom of action among all groups of actors, which in practice often exerts a negative effect on consideration of gender equality and gender in scientific content in EU-supported collaborative projects. The most significant cause for the lack of effectiveness of CoG is that this section is non-compulsory for the entire

process. The following measures could improve consideration of both aspects in the application process in practice: 1) As the dual objective is not perceived in one formal application section, Section 5 should be reduced to only one objective, preferably on promoting gender equality. 2) Gender equality objectives should be more formalized in the funding application; gender equality measures obligatorily supported and disregard should be financially sanctioned. 3) Discipline-specific evaluation of gender content must be part of scientific evaluation processes and thereby also represent an explicit sub-section of the evaluation criterion “Scientific excellence” and “Impact” as well as be mentioned in the tendering process. 4) Guidelines and practical aids delineating responsibilities, conditions and advantages of considering both aspects should be made better known in particular by the European Commission. 5) Available information resources should flow into the application proceedings at an earlier point.

1. Introduction

The role of gender in European research funding fluctuates at the interface between the importance of projected research funding for the academic system and the evaluation of equality and considerations of gender in producing new knowledge.

Successful acquisition of third-party funding is increasingly considered one of the most important criteria in evaluating the academic performance of researchers (Hornbostel 1997: 211ff). One of the most important providers of third-party funding for German higher education institutions is the European Union with 0.4bn euros in 2011¹.

Since the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, gender mainstreaming is the preferred approach to achieving gender equality in all areas of policy in which the European Union has the authority to issue guidelines. The interpretative documents for the European Framework Programmes (FP) list improving gender equality as an important objective. Gender equality in this context refers particularly to greater participation of female researchers, but also to the integration of the category of gender into research.

At the implementation level of the thematic programmes, two funding instruments permit the creation of a frame of reference using three key points (application, negotiation and final report) within which the objective of improving equal opportunities between men and women in science is examined. Specifically, in the two FP7 funding instruments Collaborative Project and Network of Excellence, the section “Consideration of Gender Aspects”² (CoG) in the Guide for Applicants asks about measures to improve gender equality and the consideration of gender aspects in research content. The Guide points out that the described measures are not a firm criterion for evaluating project applications, but will be discussed during project negotiations³. In addition, both types of project require a report on activities for gender equality at the end of the project⁴.

As the European Commission has carried out no systematic evaluation of how gender issues are considered in projects or research content, no information other than analyses of personnel statistics in EU projects is available on how CoG is actually considered in application practice, i.e. in the project drafts, during project advice, in evaluation and in negotiations with the European Commission. So how relevant to practice is the principle of improving gender equality in EU research funding? The present study aimed to fill this knowledge gap. Its main objective is to develop a valid assessment basis for the significance and fitness for purpose of CoG in EU projects using selected indicators, and on this basis to make recommendations on how to increase the effectiveness of the instrument in practical use. It further aimed to determine whether good case examples can be found that demonstrate how the various actors interact in the various project phases.

¹ German Rectors’ Conference: Hochschulen in Zahlen 2011, p. 2.

http://www.hrk.de/de/download/dateien/Hochschulen_in_Zahlen_2011.pdf (last accessed on 20/06/2012).

² See also the Guide for Applicants, (section B) in Chapter 11.1 of the Appendix.

³ See also Negotiation Guidance Notes in the Appendix, Chapter 11.2.

⁴ See also form for project final report in the Appendix, Chapter 11.3.

The currently available data and knowledge on the integration of gender in EU projects under German management is limited to individual example projects. There is no information regarding a systematic analysis of the quantitative data from the final project reports by the European Commission⁵. In order to examine everyday practice in dealing with CoG we therefore chose a qualitative research approach. We conducted a theme-centred, explorative interview survey of the four groups of actors who are decisively involved in the acquisition process of projects: project coordinators (n=21)⁶, multipliers (EU advisors at higher education institutions and research institutes) (n=10); employees of the national contact points (n=11), evaluators (n=13) and Commission officials (n=6)⁷. In all, 60 guideline-based telephone interviews were conducted. The survey focused on project coordinators from Germany. The interviews lasted up to 30 minutes. The selected method and sample present an insight of how equality and gender are considered in research in FP7, but permit no generalised statements. The primary aim of the study is rather to give an impression and present trends.

Summarising qualitative content analysis according to Mayring (Mayring 2003: 58) was the method chosen to analyse the data. By means of the sub-sections in the survey guidelines, units of analysis were defined to which paraphrased text passages from the interviews were assigned. In a following analysis step the text material was further reduced and condensed. The data were analysed using common software for qualitative data analysis in sociology (MAXQDA). The report uses verbatim quotes to illustrate typical opinions or behaviours in dealing with CoG.

The main sections of the interviews are:

- Answers to CoG (equality aspect, gender in research)
- Opinion of the effectiveness of the tool
- Suggestions for a future instrument

Actor group specific questions refer to how the application section is handled in the various phases of the project application process:

- Application and application advice
- Evaluation (briefing, individual evaluation, consensus meeting)
- Project negotiation, project lifetime and reporting

A document review was used to draw a comparison with other tools aimed at increasing gender equality in research projects. The main questions in this respect are: Which requirements for taking gender equality into consideration exist in national research funding? How do these differ compared to the 7th EU Framework Programme?

⁵ Enquiries to the Commission and interviews with Commission officials yielded no information regarding the assessment or analysis of the data on the part of the Commission.

⁶ The sample includes no coordinators of Networks of Excellence (only of Collaborative Projects), as there were only two Networks of Excellence under German direction in total.

⁷ See sample description in the Appendix, Chapter 11.4.

2. Application process

This chapter describes how the issue of CoG is handled during the application process. It focuses on the question of how the section is answered in the application, firstly with regard to the equality aspect and secondly with regard to the consideration of gender in research content. It further aims to examine what significance applicants attribute to this section.

The interview results indicate that CoG is considered of subordinate significance in the complex application process. It also appears that the majority of all surveyed groups only perceive this section to refer to the equality aspect, and are frequently unaware of the second aspect, gender dimension in research content, or find its meaning unclear.

Regarding responses to the equality aspect of CoG it is notable that the section is generally not answered extensively: specific project-related equality measures or measures to help reconcile work and family life such as those required in the guide are rarely provided. Frequently, applications merely describe the gender ratio on the project. In some cases, they list equality measures and/or measures to help reconcile work and family life that are implemented at the overall institution, or offer a general commitment to the advancement of women.

The second aspect of the application section, gender dimension in research content, only finds near-universal consideration in individual disciplines such as medicine, the social sciences and humanities. The interview responses suggest that gender is taken into consideration when it is explicitly required in the call for proposals or where it is a standard category of analysis. In natural science or technical applications, the gender dimension of research content is rarely considered. This is on the one hand due to unclear wording in the Guide for Applicants, i.e. applicants frequently fail to perceive this aspect. On the other hand, applicants from natural science and technical fields often lack basic points of approach as to what gender might mean in their research. Applicants are rarely familiar with the Gender Toolkits funded by the European Commission.

The majority of applicants consider the section to be of no great significance because the equality aspect of CoG is not an official evaluation criterion. A fairly small proportion of respondents assumes that it may under certain circumstances be decisive to whether their project receives funding. Overall there is a box-ticking mentality with regard to CoG; the section is formally dealt with because it is required in the application. In addition, a stock response appears to suffice for a successful application. We determined no differences between genders as to how the application section was answered. Some aspects of how applicants deal with the application section are described in more detail below.

2.1. Initial contact with the application section

The majority of applicants first become aware of the requirement to consider gender aspects in their research application through the Guide for Applicants. In some cases, internal or external advisors also apprise applicants of the existence of the CoG application section.

More experienced applicants will already have known since the 6th Framework Programme (FP6) that applications are expected to take gender aspects into account.

2.2. Answers to CoG on the equality aspect

The following section first outlines the interview results on answering the equality aspect (of CoG). The results presented here are based on the 60 interviews with all groups of actors involved in the research funding process.

Their responses agree in that most applications do answer the section, but that specific measures designed for the project are rare exceptions. Examples of well-developed project-related equality concepts were not given or not recalled by respondents. Specific case examples can therefore not be discussed.

A widespread method of answering the CoG section is to list general motivations, e.g. that women are particularly invited to apply and will be appointed preferentially in case of equal qualification, or that women are encouraged to take on management functions within the project or present the project at scientific conferences. Below are examples of such wordings given in the interviews:

- The partner institutions are requested to give equal consideration to applications from women and men when hiring for the project.
- Partner institutions are requested to encourage women to take on management roles in the project (project-leading functions, management of work packages and tasks).
- Talented women are encouraged to present the project at scientific conferences.
- It is to be ensured that women and men are equally able to attend project events (workshops, further training measures, project meetings).
- It is to be ensured that women are represented in equal measure in public relations materials (website, flyers etc.).

If the section is replied to more specifically, responses for example describe the proportion of women in the various roles in the project. This is more likely to be the case if an appropriate proportion of women is participating in the project. If female academics are to have leading roles in the project, this fact is also highlighted. As an additional or sometimes sole response to the section, measures offered at the overall institution (e.g. university), the department or the project to help reconcile work and family life are frequently described. These include for example family-friendly working hours or meeting times, telecommuting, or childcare offerings at conferences.

Measures aimed at increasing the participation of women in certain disciplines, such as participation of the institution in Girls' Day (in technical fields) or mentoring programmes for female academics, are rarely listed.

The interview transcripts moreover show that many applicants do not precisely recall how they responded to CoG in their applications, which also indicates that a fairly low significance is attached to this section (see Chapter 2.4 for details).

Applicants find inspiration and support for answering the CoG section for example by viewing successful project applications and through internal or external advice (on application advice see Chapter 3). The vast majority of interviewed project coordinators were not familiar with the Gender Toolkits⁸ promoted by the European Commission since 2009, which is designed to help applicants consider gender aspects in their applications. Some project leaders were made aware of the Toolkits during the application advice process.

Differences between disciplines, countries and genders

Interview respondents who have an overview of a large number of projects (e.g. evaluators) note significant individual differences regarding the extent to which the section is answered. Most respondents state that the section is replied to at least briefly in the form of one or two standard phrases such as “The project ensures that it appropriately involves women”. Others answer the section more extensively. That the section remains wholly unanswered is reported only in rare individual cases⁹.

Two interviewed evaluators see a connection between applicants’ level of experience and their response. One evaluator (Medicine) believes that it is particularly more experienced applicants who answer the section well:

“There are these large consortia (usual suspects) who answer this aspect and all others well and get their applications through.” (E_15, Medicine)

Another evaluator (restoration science) reports the opposite impression and is of the opinion that it is precisely the more experienced applicants who attach no significance to the CoG section:

“... there are these application-hardened alpha males who don’t bother with CoG and still get the funding if their application is convincing.” (E_11, Restoration science)

Differences between disciplines are also evident from the interviews: the results indicate that applicants from disciplines with a higher proportion of women are more likely to respond to the application section by describing female participation in the project in various positions. In these cases additional measures are rarely named, as the applicants perceive female participation in the project as already satisfactory. It here becomes apparent that applicants mainly understand the aspect of gender equality to mean the advancement of women, and do not consider e.g. work-life reconciliation issues for men in the context of equality measures. Applicants from disciplines with a very low proportion of women on the other hand find it very difficult to answer the section: they state that attempts to find women frequently fail due to the lack of appropriately qualified female researchers, and tend to respond to CoG with stock phrases.

Differences between countries are hard to determine from the point of view of the respondents, as applications are made by consortia. The gender of the project coordinator was not found to systematically affect how the CoG section is answered.

⁸ http://www.yellowwindow.be/genderinresearch/index_downloads.html
(last accessed: 15/05/2012).

⁹ Only two interviewed evaluators stated that not all applicants answer this point.

2.3. Answers to CoG on gender in research content

The CoG application section also requests applicants to explain to what extent gender aspects are taken into consideration in their research content¹⁰.

According to the current state of gender studies, “gender in research content” should consider both biological and social gender. The current study does not make this distinction, but focuses on CoG with its two dimensions of equal opportunities in the consortium and (general) gender in research content.

While the interviews show that in the application section (CoG) most applications include at least some stock phrases on the equality aspect, only a small number of applications cover gender aspects in research content. Whether gender aspects in research content (e.g. research design, analysis) are considered depends largely on the research topics and programme areas: in technical and natural science fields gender aspects are generally rarely considered, whereas in the social sciences and humanities and in medicine most applications cover gender in research content.

The interview responses make clear that applicants from natural science fields usually have no notion of what considering gender in research content actually means: sometimes, considering gender aspects in research content is equated with the equality aspect and answered in the sense of female participation in the project. Other applicants emphasise that their projects aim solely to examine scientific or purely technical questions, and their topics are therefore gender-neutral:

“Gender in research is irrelevant because the project deals with a scientific problem! [...] It’s not a sociological project, it’s a natural science project, there is no gender-specific view.” (PL_12, Energy)

In rare cases, gender is also taken into consideration in technical topics, e.g. when they involve developing medical products or products where sex or gender aspects on the part of the users are relevant¹¹. No statistics are available from the European Commission on this subject.

According to the respondents (all four actor groups), gender aspects are now generally well considered in research applications in medicine. Two interviewees state that in some medical applications gender is frequently considered under the diversity aspect. Some criticise that the term gender is by some applicants understood solely in the sense of “female”. One evaluator reports that she has read the following explanation in applications (e.g. on breast cancer or dementia): “As the project relates exclusively to women, the gender aspect is sufficiently considered.”

¹⁰ For the precise wording please see the original text of the attached Guide for Applicants, Chapter 11.1.

¹¹ Gender may also be taken into consideration in technical projects if the topics have some relation to the social sciences in a wider sense.

In the Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities programme area and in topically related areas such as transport and land use planning, the requirement to consider gender in research content is apparently frequently included in the call for proposals:

“... it was also in the call for proposals, so it was clear that we would write something about it.” (PL_18, Journalism).

Aspects of sex and/or gender are also taken into consideration due to established requirements in the scientific community. One respondent from the discipline of political and social sciences states verbatim:

“Gender as a variable is considered, which is standard in the social sciences and would have been considered anyway.” (PL_3, Political and social sciences)

It is very rare to see an individual work package or task dedicated to the consideration of gender aspects in research content. According to an NCP employee, this will only be the case if the call for proposals refers very clearly to gender aspects, i.e. when gender aspects are a core point of the thematic area. The majority of respondents state that the gender dimension in research content (insofar as it is considered) is part of the project as a horizontal theme or represents a partial aspect of certain work packages. In medical research projects for example, gender aspects are frequently part of the clinical work package with regard to gender difference (biological difference), while in the social sciences and humanities they are frequently part of the empirical work package and a subsection of the project description¹². To what extent consideration of gender roles and/or gender differences as a horizontal theme is reflected in the CoG section cannot be clearly determined.

One interviewee, who works as a project officer at the European Commission (Social Sciences and Humanities programme area), reports that in some projects a “gender working group” was set up to ensure that gender aspects were considered in all work packages. In the methodical work package this group is for example responsible for training researchers for gender-sensitive field work and interviewing, or works to ensure gender-aware public relations and communication strategies.

2.4. Significance of the application section

In addition to the question of how the CoG item is answered, applicants and advisors on the Framework Programme were asked what significance they accorded this section. We asked them what role they believe the section plays in the evaluation of an application, even if it is not an official evaluation criterion¹³. The statements of the respondents refer exclusively to the aspect of equality in the consortium.

The interviews show that opinions regarding this question vary among the respondents. Some applicants and advisors confirm from their experience that the quality of the text section on CoG is in no way evaluation-relevant: they refer to the Guide for Applicants, which

¹² Description of work.

¹³ The Guide for Applicants states that CoG is not evaluated, but discussed during project negotiations (see Appendix Chapter 11.1).

explicitly points out that this aspect is not evaluated. The statement, also contained in the Guide, that consideration of gender aspects in the project will be discussed during project negotiations is assessed and invalidated by individual respondents as follows: these negotiations take place at a time when projects have already been recommended for funding, i.e. the funding decision has already been made. At this point, a project will no longer fail due to a stock response to the CoG section or a gender imbalance in the project. Some of the respondents in addition believe that high-quality projects will and must not fail due to CoG or an insufficient proportion of women. One applicant negates the equality issue:

“When I’m hiring I don’t look at gender. If the quality of my applications is right, I am not concerned that a project will be rejected by the Commission due to an excess of male staff.” (PL_8, Energy)

Other respondents note that CoG (equality aspect) may not be a hard evaluation criterion, but may nonetheless become evaluation-relevant. There are various assumptions as to how this might happen: respondents frequently point to the case where a funding decision has to be made between two equally rated projects, in which case funding will be awarded to the one that has given greater consideration to equality aspects:

“One person from the consortium is an evaluator himself, and he told us that when there are two applications of the same quality, then gender aspects are also considered. As a result, we put more time into our current application.” (PL_14, Production processes).

A quote from an interview highlights a further applicant’s personal view and interpretation:

“I understand its importance to mean that bonus points can be awarded for gender balancing, not in the sense of 50% female participation but adjusted to the subject area (i.e. proportion of women in the relevant subjects). But it’s not an obligatory, hard evaluation criterion. (PL_17, Navigation and transport)

As a reason why she accords CoG a certain significance, a further respondent states:

“...the CoG section has to be answered because the evaluation boards also include women, and they pay attention to it.” (E_8, Environmental sciences)

The interview results show that the significance accorded CoG (equality aspect) in the application phase depends strongly on the evaluation procedure, on informal exchanges of information and on the culture of the discipline. Contradictory impressions among applicants indicate a great degree of uncertainty regarding their assessment of the evaluation relevance of CoG. This uncertainty is seen in all surveyed groups of actors¹⁴.

¹⁴ For details regarding the effectiveness of the instrument see Chapters 6.1 and 6.2.

3. Internal and external application advice

On the basis of the results of the interviews with applicants (n=21) and advisors¹⁵ (n=20), the following chapter describes the extent to which applicants state a need for advice on handling the CoG application section and the form in which advice is given on this section.

Approximately half the interviewed applicants say that they require advice on CoG. The main questions relate to the extent to which the section influences the funding decision and to how it can be answered.

Advice on the application section also concentrates mostly on the aspect of equality in the project; the aspect of gender in research is only discussed in a few thematic areas. The interviews with internal and external advisors show that there is no standard procedure for giving advice, and that advisors too accord the section varying significance. CoG is not always covered in application advice; this is due partly to a negative attitude on the part of the applicants. Where recommendations are made, these frequently refer to illustrating the participation of women in the consortium or listing equality measures and measures to help reconcile work and family life implemented at the overall institution. EU advisors often provide text modules for this purpose. Some respondents see the fact that there is no dedicated budget for specific and project-related measures as an obstacle to developing such measures.

Many advisors are unaware that applicants are also expected to describe how gender aspects are considered in research content in the CoG section, and with the exception of two areas (medicine and social sciences and humanities) they are unlikely to offer recommendations in this respect. We noted a general trend that advisors are likely to more strongly point out the equality aspect in areas where gender aspects are relevant to research content.

Not all advisors take advantage of information and further training offerings on dealing with the CoG application section (Gender Toolkits and training seminar). Some advisors are unaware of these offerings. Others are unwilling to invest time in further training due to the limited significance of CoG in advice, although these offerings are free of charge. The overall conclusion is that awareness of the instruments funded by the European Commission to support applicants and multipliers must be increased. The effectiveness of such information offerings will however presumably be limited as long as CoG is not more obligating. Applicants and advisors will invest time in application sections that are evaluated or for which they can apply for funding.

3.1. Need for advice

Approximately half the surveyed applicants state in the interviews that they require advice on CoG. On the one hand they are uncertain as to the significance attached by the European Commission to this section, i.e. whether answering this section is mandatory or to what

¹⁵ We interviewed EU advisors at universities and research institutes (n=9) and employees of the national contact points (n=11).

extent it is considered in the evaluation. On the other hand applicants frequently do not know how they can reply to this section. There is no generally valid trend as to the side from which the advice process is initiated: it takes place either on request of the applicants or because advisors point out that CoG must be taken into consideration.

Those respondents who require no advice are frequently researchers who already have extensive experience of applications in the EU Framework Programme. Moreover, some applicants are themselves evaluators and are therefore confident in dealing with this section due to their prior experience.

3.2. Internal and external advice offerings

Advice on project applications in FP7 is provided by EU advisors¹⁶ at German universities, universities of applied science and research institutes. They function as points of contact for initial exploration of project ideas and support applicants in handling administrative matters. In the event of detailed content-related questions, applicants and EU advisors may also contact the national contact points (NCP)¹⁷ for the various programme areas of the specific programme “Cooperation”¹⁸. This division of responsibilities is designed to provide an optimal range of information offerings. The following sections illustrate the role that the application section plays in the everyday advisory practice of advisors and NCP employees.

3.2.1. Internal advice from EU advisors

We interviewed EU advisors¹⁹ from various universities (n=7) and research institutes (n=2). The sample includes no EU advisors from universities of applied sciences²⁰. Additional information on the advice process is provided by the interviews with applicants.

The overall conclusion is that CoG (both aspects) is a marginal aspect of advice provision; in some cases this application section played no part in the advice. Insofar as advice is provided, it usually focuses on the aspect of equal opportunities and, respectively, gender participation in the consortium. Whether advice is provided on considering gender in research content appears to depend heavily on the subject areas of the submitted projects: there is a greater likelihood that this aspect will be discussed in application advice in the social sciences and humanities and in medicine, whereas advice on this aspect is the exception in natural science or technology projects.

The advice provided is generally limited to pointing out that CoG also includes gender dimension in research content or the fact that gender in research might be evaluation-relevant. In this context, some advisors refer applicants to the Gender Toolkits²¹.

¹⁶ The precise names of these service points may vary from institution to institution; generally however they are known as “EU advisors”.

¹⁷ See also http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ncp_en.html (last accessed on 14/05/2012)

¹⁸ An overview of the themes can be found at:

<http://www.forschungsrahmenprogramm.de/nks.htm> (last accessed 14/05/2012)

¹⁹ These included three persons who had taken part in the Gender Toolkits training seminar.

²⁰ Employees of research offices at selected universities of applied sciences turned down our interview requests with the stated reason that the institution (currently) coordinates very few or no EU projects and that no advice on CoG was provided.

Equal opportunities/equality aspect

Insofar as EU advisors give advice on the equality aspect, they do so in various ways: sometimes advice on CoG is given by providing applicants with text modules that are copied into the application. These modules generally contain a description of institutional measures to promote equality and work-life reconciliation, such as day-care options for children or childcare at conferences, mentoring programmes for young female scientists or family-friendly schedules for meetings and telephone conferences. These text modules frequently also contain references to existing labour legislation in Germany, such as the regulation that women should be hired preferentially if they are equally qualified.

In some cases the text modules are individually adapted to the project application. One interviewed EU advisor describes her procedure as follows:

“The template provided to the applicants contains a section in which they must enter the proportion of women in various positions on the project. The rest consists of fixed modules and contains a list of equality measures and measures to help reconcile work and family life that are offered at the institution.” (EU_Adv_8, Research institutions)

Another method of giving advice is to provide applicants with suggestions for what they might write in the CoG section, without supplying complete texts. A surveyed EU advisor from a university explains his refusal to use text modules in his advisory practice on CoG as follows:

“... and then [applicants] ask me for text modules, which in my view is nonsense because the answer has to be project-related.” (EU_Adv_1, University)

Suggestions or examples of specific project-related equality measures are not given in most cases. The recommendations are usually limited to describing the participation of women in the various roles²² in the project. This is suggested especially where there is a relatively balanced proportion of women in the project or in management positions. But the opposite may also be the case, as one advisor reports:

“Applicants are pretty confused when it comes to CoG, especially in the natural sciences, because women are very underrepresented there. In this case, giving advice is also difficult, usually we recommend listing women’s involvement in the project – there isn’t really any other advice you can give.” (EU_Adv_9, University)

Other general suggestions consist of listing equality measures and measures to help reconcile work and family life implemented at the overall institution or the institute, and/or considering how women specifically can be better involved or supported in the project.

Some surveyed EU advisors explain why equality aspects are not included in their advice, or only included to a very limited extent. A pivotal reason appears to be the issue of funding: applicants frequently ask whether they can apply for an additional budget for equality measures. As this is not the case, this section is frequently not discussed further in the advice process:

²¹ See also Chapter 3.3.

²² E.g. in project management, among employees, doctoral candidates, laboratory staff etc.

“... consideration of gender aspects regarding equality in the project is a contentious issue. We as advisors give no recommendations in that respect because there is no budget for it. So the only possible measures are those which the institution has in place anyway, and at the institution these measures refer not to women alone, but to general measures to help reconcile work and family life.” (EU_Adv_1, University)

A further reason given as to why CoG (equality) sometimes plays no part in the advice is a negative attitude or irritation on the part of the applicants.

3.2.2. Advice from external institutions

We additionally surveyed a selection of employees and programme coordinators for the ten NCP themes in the specific programme “Cooperation” (n=11). The interview results show that advice on CoG is accorded varying significance at the various NCPs: in some NCP themes no advice whatsoever is given on this section of the application (both aspects), mainly in areas where the research topics are seen as not gender-relevant and advice is provided on technical or scientific aspects.

In NCP themes where the gender relevance of research projects is already better established (medicine, social sciences and humanities) however, this section of the application is almost always covered in the advice process. Applicants are made aware that gender aspects must be taken into consideration both with regard to equality and in terms of research content. It is reported that applicants e.g. in the Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities programme area frequently do not realise that considering gender in research content may be evaluation-relevant. One advisor states:

“... this is also well received, in contrast to advice about considering the equality aspect, which after all is not evaluated.” (NCP_8).

In general, NCP employees tend to offer individually tailored advice, i.e. they do not supply text modules. Specific suggestions are however rarely made. One interviewee explained this with her experience that applicants frequently respond negatively to advice to consider the equality aspect. Recommendations are therefore usually limited to involving women (more strongly) in the external presentation of the project or suggesting that the institutions could take part in Girls’ Day.

Some NCP employees point to the Gender Toolkits to assist applicants in considering gender in research content. One NCP employee (of an engineering science field) forwards detailed questions on the equality aspect to the Contact Point Women into EU Research or requests the required information there himself.

A practical example for the lived implementation of this application section is given in an interview with an employee of an NCP. In FP7, the programme area in question no longer includes CoG as an explicit application section in the Guide for Applicants²³; the Guide merely states that gender aspects will be discussed in project negotiations. Since FP7, advice on gender aspects is therefore rarely provided. Advice is only offered if there is a “specific

²³ This theme (ICT) is an exception with regard to the wording of the CoG application section.

interest” within the project, i.e. if for example a certain female employee is to be enabled to participate in the project and she is due to give birth during the project lifetime. The advisor then assists the applicant in seeking a specific solution. Work packages are for example put together in such a way that they can be worked on by telecommute, or the project schedule is redefined accordingly. The interviews however show that such advice tailored to specific requirements is a rare occurrence among NCP and EU advisors.

Based on the conducted interviews it can further be concluded that application advice on gender aspects is mainly provided by EU advisors (internal) or by the national contact points (external). Only one applicant at a large energy company reports that international project applications are supported by a private-sector company specialising in funding advice and that this company handles the response to CoG. The required information is requested from the applying institution according to a matrix.

3.3. Further training of advisors on CoG (including Gender Toolkits)

The level of professional experience in dealing with the CoG section varies strongly between advisors. Some of the surveyed multipliers themselves only use the text in the Guide for Applicants for orientation and have acquired no additional information beyond that, or attended further training. A further source of information on the relevance of CoG are the Evaluation Summary Reports (ESR)²⁴. Some NCP employees review these to see, among other things, to what extent gender aspects were addressed by the evaluators. This provides an image of the role CoG plays in evaluation. In addition, EU advisors and NCP employees advise on the basis of successful applications. Some respondents are familiar with the Gender Toolkits²⁵ funded by the European Commission and the associated one-day further training course²⁶, and use it in various ways.

Some advisors refer applicants directly to the Gender Toolkits, others use the examples given there for their advisory work. Some advisors state that they do not use the Toolkits because they contain no examples, or none that are suitable, for their respective subject areas (e.g. security, space) or because CoG is not part of the advice process.

Approximately a quarter of the surveyed NCP employees and EU advisors have so far attended the one-day Gender Toolkits Training course. Some report that colleagues from their EU research office or NCP have attended, others say they are registered to attend the course in March 2012²⁷. One EU advisor states that the participation of some of her colleagues in this further training course has led to an exchange of experiences within the department, and the information thus gained has since been included in the advice provided.

²⁴ ESR=Evaluation Summary Report. This report contains the results of the consensus meetings, which are available (at least) to NCP employees.

²⁵ http://www.yellowwindow.be/genderinresearch/index_downloads.html

(last accessed on: 15/05/2012).

²⁶ The Toolkits and the further training measure are aimed at researchers, potential applicants and advisors.

²⁷ The interviews with the respondents in question were held before the seminar date.

The main reason given in the interviews for actually or potentially attending this training course is professional interest in learning what significance is accorded the section in FP7 and in what way it is included in the evaluation:

"I would attend in order to be able to provide better advice, to learn what the Commission expects on this section, whether it is sufficient to use standard texts or whether the Commission requires an individual response. So what would interest me is whether this is only a section that has to be ticked off in the application or whether one can add a further positive aspect or 'punch' to the application through this section."
(EU_Adv_5, University)

Others give a general interest in the gender topic as their reason for attending the course, or state that they personally consider this aspect important. One advisor cites the significant amount of time required as a reason for not attending the seminar:

"As CoG is only a marginal aspect in advice, I would not invest a whole day, but one or two hours at most. If there were a web seminar on the subject, I would make use of that." (EU_Adv_2, University)

The sometimes most important insight that respondents gained from the Toolkits or the offered training seminar is the two-part nature of the CoG application section: many respondents were previously not aware that in addition to the equality aspect, gender aspects in research content are also relevant. Seminar participants report that their newly acquired knowledge has partly been incorporated into their advice, but CoG nonetheless remains a marginal aspect.

Some additionally point out that while the seminar was interesting and raised awareness of the gender topic, the new knowledge was (with the exception of medicine) hard to integrate into their everyday advisory practice.

4. Evaluation process

Based on the interviews with evaluators (n=13) and project officers at the Commission (n=6), the following chapter illustrates the role the CoG section plays in the evaluation process²⁸. We were particularly interested in learning to what extent CoG is addressed in briefings and guidelines and how the section is handled in the evaluation phases, individual evaluation²⁹ and consensus meeting³⁰.

As a rule, project applications are initially individually evaluated by between three and five experts (individual evaluation); the results are summarised in a report. In a second step, the evaluators consult on their evaluations in a consensus meeting³¹ which is led by a representative of the Commission. The scores and comments are recorded in a consensus report (ESR).

The interviews yield little and inconsistent information regarding the official regulations of the Commission on how CoG is handled in the evaluation phase. The Guide for Applicants states that CoG is not evaluated. In the briefings, evaluators are informed that they are to take equality in the project into account in their individual evaluations. How this can be done apparently lies within the discretion of the evaluators. We were also unable to clearly determine the extent to which there is an obligation on the part of the Commission to discuss CoG at the consensus meetings.

In the individual evaluations the majority of the interviewed evaluators pay attention to how CoG is answered. Here too the focus is on the equality aspect. The majority consider the gender proportion in the consortium. Some evaluators only observe that CoG has been answered. Others will include a positive or negative comment on it in their evaluation. The question of whether and to what extent consideration of the gender equality aspect affects the overall impression or the overall evaluation of an application cannot be clearly answered on the basis of the interview results.

The manner in which CoG is handled at the consensus meetings is similarly diverse. The equality aspect is usually discussed when comments on it are contained in the individual evaluations. The consequences vary: frequently, the aspect is merely discussed; at best, recommendations on it are included in the consensus report. The consideration of gender in research content is only occasionally assessed in individual evaluations or addressed in consensus meetings. The interview responses indicate that where the gender dimension in research content is taken into account in applications and evaluations this is due not so much to the CoG application section, but rather as a result of requirements listed in the call for proposals or inherent in the discipline.

²⁸ The interviewed evaluators and project officers at the Commission work in various programme areas: Health, Industrial Technologies, Transport, Environment, Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities, Biotechnologies, Agriculture and Food.

²⁹ Remote evaluation.

³⁰ Consensus meeting.

³¹ This meeting is held in Brussels or may take the form of an electronic forum.

Evaluators and Commission officials point out that the Commission is very mindful of gender balance in assembling evaluation panels. The significance of CoG (equality, gender in research content) is thus determined not by the gender of the evaluators, but rather by individual attitudes and by gender competence and competence background. Only very rarely do respondents claim to have the impression that female evaluators pay greater attention to gender balance in projects.

4.1. Instructions for evaluators

Individual evaluation

In all, the interviews with evaluators offer little evidence as to whether the documents and guidelines they are furnished with contain specific statements on how to deal with CoG during the individual evaluation. Most respondents report that there were no specific requirements in this respect, but that the documents “presumably” advised them to take gender aspects into consideration. The small number of statements from interviewees regarding instructions on dealing with CoG can be reduced to the following statement: CoG (here: equal opportunities in the consortium) is not an official evaluation criterion but should be noted during the evaluation and may become evaluation-relevant where projects are otherwise equally rated.

Consensus meeting

In preparation for the consensus meeting, evaluators generally receive two briefings. These include a general briefing carried out by the coordinator of the call for proposals and a specific briefing by the project officer. The interviews reveal no obvious trend regarding the extent to which dealing with gender aspects is addressed in these briefings.

The general briefing may contain general information stating that the European Commission aims to increase the proportion of women in research and that equality aspects should be considered in the evaluation. The extent to which equality aspects are addressed in the specific briefing appears to depend heavily on the subject area and the person giving the briefing. Occasionally it is pointed out that while equality aspects are not a (hard) evaluation criterion they may play a part in determining list placement between equally rated projects.

The interviewees make no clear statements regarding official regulations on dealing with the second aspect of CoG, the gender dimension in research content. The interview results indicate that the gender dimension in research content is apparently (more) likely to become evaluation-relevant if this is a requirement of the call for proposals or the discipline.

4.2. Handling of CoG in compiling individual evaluations

As practical instructions, the Commission regulations on how to handle the CoG section in the individual evaluations appear to be worded too vaguely; in addition, the Guide for Applicants explicitly points out that CoG is not evaluated³². Mostly evaluators receive general information that gender aspects (equality/gender balance) should be taken into

³² See also Appendix Chapter 11.1.

consideration. How this is to be done, i.e. whether and how these aspects can be included in the evaluation, remains unclear and is apparently left to the discretion of the evaluators. How do evaluators deal with this section in everyday practice?

The interview results show that the majority of evaluators always note whether and to what extent the CoG section is answered. Their focus is mainly on the equality aspect, i.e. the gender balance in the various project roles is closely examined³³. The results of this assessment are frequently included in the individual evaluation under "Remarks", usually with the aim of discussing this aspect during the consensus meeting in Brussels³⁴. In these remarks evaluators for example positively highlight an appropriate participation of women in the project, or remark negatively on a consortium being very "male-biased" in comparison with levels of female participation in the discipline, or on the fact that the (sub-) project leaders are predominantly male. Specific recommendations for improvement are usually not drawn up. If the section has not been answered, this is also frequently negatively remarked. A minority report that they do not pay attention to CoG during their evaluation.

Some of the surveyed evaluators consider it sufficient if the CoG section has been answered at all; in these cases there is no minimum quality requirement. It is merely noted that female participation in the project has been outlined or a general statement on the aspect of equality provided. Reasons given for this attitude include that at the time of submission, the people who will actually work on the project have not yet been finally determined. In addition, interviewees critically note that outlined equality measures cannot be verified, and that the section is frequently answered with pre-fabricated text modules.

The question of whether the equality aspect can, despite not being an official evaluation criterion, affect the overall impression and is in this way incorporated into the evaluation cannot be unambiguously answered based on the interviews. Some respondents emphasise that (good) applications will not fail due to insufficient consideration of the equality aspect, while on the other hand a balanced gender proportion may positively influence the overall impression. In what way this might affect the evaluation of an application is however not described in greater detail. Other respondents point out that the equality aspect is not an evaluation criterion in FP7 and therefore is not permitted to have any influence³⁵.

Like applicants and advisors, the evaluators understand CoG to mean almost exclusively the equality aspect. Only a small number of evaluators check whether gender has been considered in research content. This is apparently the case if the call for proposals refers to it or the discipline covers such requirements as standard.

4.3. Handling of CoG at consensus meetings in Brussels

The following statements on how CoG is handled during the consensus meeting are based on the interviews with evaluators and Commission officials.

³³ Some evaluators report that if the participation of women in the project is not described under CoG, they look up the details themselves in the description of the partner institutions in the application.

³⁴ Possibly also in case a decision has to be made between two applications with the same score.

³⁵ Consequences of CoG responses for the funding decision are discussed in Chapter 4.3.

The interviews with project officers indicate that there are no standard regulations on the part of the Commission as to how the CoG section is to be handled in the consensus meeting. One Commission official for example reports that there is no official directive to discuss CoG (PO_4, Industrial technologies). In addition, respondents point out that Commission officials have only a moderating and process monitoring function in the process and are not permitted to intervene in the evaluation process by, for example, specifying topics to be discussed. Another respondent on the other hand emphasises that it is mandatory for project officers to ensure that gender and ethics aspects are discussed (PO_5, Health). How CoG is dealt with during the consensus meetings thus depends on the individual participants and organisational units, as there are no standard regulations. This impression is confirmed by the statement of one interviewee:

“Some applicants in the field of materials research also submit project applications to a different directorate [Health]. Different practices and processes seem to apply there.” (PO_2, Industrial technologies).

In connection with this statement the respondent points out that every directorate has its own process manager and its own quality management, and that procedures may therefore differ between programme areas, at least in details.

Mostly, CoG is at least briefly addressed in the consensus meetings. Some respondents point out that whether the section is discussed depends on certain criteria such as the gender relevance of a project or whether gender or equality aspects are addressed in individual evaluations. In very rare cases evaluators state the impression that women pay greater attention to equality in the consortium:

“The gender issue is raised by evaluators or sometimes also by the Commission, or a woman on the evaluation panel addresses it. Women pay greater attention to gender balance.” (PL_23³⁶, Industrial technologies).

There are also consensus meetings in which gender aspects are not addressed. If CoG is discussed, the focus is on the equality aspect. Consideration of gender in research content is apparently rarely a subject of discussion in consensus meetings, and is limited to programme areas (e.g. medicine, social sciences and humanities) in which the research community considers gender in research to be relevant or where it is stipulated in the call for proposals. However, some respondents emphasise that even in these areas the gender dimension in research content could have been discussed more thoroughly.

No general assessment of the differences between disciplines is possible due to the small number of respondents and the fact that not all disciplines are represented equally in the sample. As a general trend it can however be stated that in medical or social science³⁷ topics gender aspects (both aspects) are almost always discussed, while in very technical fields this is rarely the case.

³⁶ This person was interviewed as a project leader and also has experience as an evaluator.

³⁷ In the field of the social sciences and humanities the gender aspect in research content is more likely to be addressed, the equality aspect less so. This may be due to the (already) balanced gender ratio in this field.

In rare exceptions, Commission officials demand to discuss equality aspects. Statements on how CoG is discussed and what the consequences of a satisfactory or insufficient consideration of equality aspects may be remain vague: in individual cases the results of the discussion are included in the consensus report as a comment recommending, for example, that applicants review whether qualified women are available for the project or additional women can be appointed as group leaders. This is mostly accompanied by a note that this aspect will be discussed in project negotiations. There is no legal basis for more specific recommendations or requirements (quotas). Only one Commission project officer reports that specific improvements regarding the consideration of gender in research are sometimes demanded (PO_3, Social Sciences and Humanities).

5. Project negotiations, project lifetime and reporting

The following chapter describes the interview results on dealing with CoG in the project negotiation phase, during the project lifetime and in final reporting, referring to the official regulations of the European Commission in each case. The presented results are based on interviews with project officers at the Commission (n=6) and with project coordinators (n=21).

Based on the small number of interviews with Commission officials it becomes apparent that the various directorates within the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation implement no standard practice for dealing with CoG. According to the respondents, official documents remain vague and are not always known in detail to project officers. The survey results indicate that the CoG section (equality and gender in research) is merely discussed in project negotiations in particular fields (medicine, food, social sciences and humanities). The requirement in the Guide for Applicants and the Negotiation Guidance Notes to discuss CoG in project negotiations is not consistently implemented in practice³⁸.

Equality aspects are rarely relevant during the project lifetime, and are mostly brought up when project employees become unavailable due to maternity or parental leave. Regular reporting keeps project officers informed of equality measures and consideration of the gender dimension in research content in case these aspects form part of work packages, tasks or deliverables. Other than the brief statistical questionnaire in the report on societal implications, no statement on CoG is required in the Project Final Report. Intended measures announced in the application under CoG are not reviewed by the project officers at the European Commission.

Overall, the interview results indicate that CoG is of limited significance in the everyday practice of project officers. Unclear instructions and disparate responsibilities are factors that contribute to this situation. A further result of the interviews is that CoG is not consistently discussed or negotiated at a particular point in the evaluation and negotiation processes, and may not be taken into consideration at all.

5.1. Official Commission regulations

The interviewed project officers at the Commission (n=6) were asked about official guidelines and training measures on handling the CoG section. Their responses are very general: it is stated that guidelines for the evaluation process and for project negotiations exist. With one exception, specific information on how gender aspects are to be dealt with is not provided or not remembered. One project officer from the Health directorate reports that in her area there are recommendations for handling equal opportunities which state that the gender ratio in consortia should be balanced (PO_5, Health). No statements are made in the interviews regarding regulations on dealing with gender in research.

³⁸ See also footnote 41.

All project officers in the Commission are given a one-day training seminar³⁹ on dealing with gender aspects in FP7.

5.2. Project negotiations

Referring to CoG, the Guide for Applicants⁴⁰ states that this aspect is not evaluated but will be discussed in project negotiations. Based on the interviews with applicants (n=21) and Commission officials (n=6) we examine how the CoG application section is dealt with in project negotiations.

The interview results clearly show that matters of gender equality and gender in research are very rarely addressed on the basis of the CoG section during project negotiations. In some areas (e.g. health, food, social sciences and humanities⁴¹), gender in research is frequently integrated into the call for proposals or a relevant research category and may therefore be an evaluation criterion. Project officers at the Commission indicate that if the evaluation reports contain comments on the gender dimension in research, these are discussed in the project negotiations. According to the project officers at the Commission, in the aforementioned disciplines the gender ratio in the project is also occasionally addressed, and improvements are demanded or suggestions made. Project officers for other programme areas and the vast majority of surveyed applicants state that CoG (both aspects) plays hardly any part in project negotiations.

Overall, it appears that Commission officials' handling of this section is very disparate. This is due to the small number of interviews, but also to the varying appreciation of the significance of CoG in the various directorates of the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation and in the research communities. The results indicate a discrepancy between the official rule that CoG will be discussed in project negotiations and how this is actually handled in practice⁴². The interviews further show that on the one hand not all Commission officials are familiar with the details of the policies or the texts of the Guides on dealing with CoG during project negotiations. On the other hand, these texts leave room for interpretation and allow leeway:

"The text in the Guide means that this can be individually handled in every project negotiation, i.e. how it is dealt with depends in part on the person, on the programme area etc. So there is room for interpretation." (PO_1, Industrial technologies).

Moreover, there are indications in the interviews that the responsibilities are not entirely clear. One example of this is the following quote from a Commission official:

"Gender balance in the project is reviewed during evaluation and if it is not satisfactory, then that is noted. In the project negotiations, other matters are discussed [...]. At this point the project has after all already been evaluated and granted." (PO_3, Social Sciences and Humanities)

³⁹ <http://www.yellowwindow.be/genderinresearch/indexcontact.html>

⁴⁰ Guide for Applicants, see Appendix Chapter 11.3.

⁴¹ See also explanation in footnote 36.

⁴² It must be pointed out that the wording of the guides is inconsistent. The Guide for Applicants states that CoG will be discussed during grant negotiations, while the Negotiation Guidance Notes say that applicants are invited to do so.

5.3. Project lifetime and reporting

The survey further examined more closely the role that CoG plays during the project lifetime and in what way CoG (both aspects) is addressed in periodic or final reports. We surveyed both applicants and Commission officials on this point.

Project lifetime

The majority of surveyed applicants state that the equality aspect plays no part during the lifetime of the project. Applications frequently do not contain specific equality measures, therefore there is rarely a need to carry out activities during the project. As already hinted at elsewhere, in the “worst” case CoG is for many respondents only mentioned when submitting a proposal and in the Project Final Report form, and is handled with as little effort as possible at both those points. Gender aspects become relevant in the project if female project employees become unavailable due to maternity and the project schedule or work packages have to be restructured or adjusted. In this case solutions are sought together with the project officer; these changes are then also included in the reports (e.g. under Management).

In some cases project leaders report that projects aim to help reconcile work and family life by for example offering childcare facilities at conferences or reducing travel in the project to a minimum and replacing it with Skype conferences. A further interview with a coordinator recounts attempts to increase the proportion of women in a project: this project (mechanical engineering) actively sought to recruit women and informed female students at the nearest university of employment and doctorate opportunities at the institute. One project officer describes an outstanding equality measure: a number of male project managers on a project were replaced by female scientists after the first half of the project lifetime.

Applicants also report significant differences regarding the support that they receive from Commission officials, e.g. in the event of problems with family-related absences.

Project officers at the Commission are informed of equality activities during the project lifetime if these activities are part of a work package, a task or a deliverable. Due to reporting requirements, project officers are automatically apprised of any measures carried out in these cases. In one case a deliverable consisted of a mentoring programme for young female researchers. In addition, one Commission official reported that she pays attention to whether a sufficient number of women are among the speakers at large project conferences.

In projects where gender is relevant to research content, this is usually a horizontal topic and is thus taken into account in individual work packages or tasks. Project officers are kept informed of this aspect through regular reporting.

Project completion phase

At the end of the project, project leaders are required by the European Commission to comment on the consideration of gender aspects in their report on the societal implications

of the project⁴³. Firstly, in section C) Workforce Statistics, the questionnaire requests information on the participation of men and women in various positions. Secondly, in section D) Gender Aspects it asks whether and how successfully equality and work-life balance measures⁴⁴ were carried out and whether gender aspects were relevant to research content. According to the introduction, these questions serve statistical purposes as well as to create connections to wider societal issues and identify outstanding practical examples. The Commission uses such example projects for its Annual Reports and for further information material on its activities.

It is apparent from the interviews with project coordinators that the CoG section is no longer relevant in the project completion phase. Their statements can be summarised to the effect that they do not specifically remember the question in the reporting form, however the section was surely answered or ticked "as expected". Beyond this statistical questionnaire, further equality aspects are apparently not addressed in the Project Final Report. Gender aspects in research content are, where relevant, described in the appropriate work packages.

The interviews with Commission officials indicate that project leaders are not required to specifically name any measures carried out in the reporting form, and such measures therefore remain unchecked by project officers. The execution or omission of measures also has no effect on the final payment. These statements confirm the impression that CoG is marginalised in the procedures of the Commission and the coordinators.

The interviewed Commission officials have no information on the extent to which the data collected specifically on gender measures are evaluated by the Commission. The statistical reports on FP7 only list the number of women and men participating in the funded projects; they contain no information on gender in research content or on the implementation and effectiveness of equality measures or measures to help reconcile work and family life.

⁴³ In the reporting form for the Project Final Report, project coordinators are requested to submit a report on the societal implications (questionnaire) with the Project Final Report (see also Appendix Chapter 11.3).

⁴⁴ Four categories are available: design and implementation of an equality concept, targets to achieve gender balance in the workforce, conferences/workshops on gender, actions to improve work-life balance.

6. Effectiveness of the CoG application section

As part of the study it was important to illustrate how CoG is handled in the application and advisory process as well as during evaluation and the project negotiation process from the point of view of those involved in European research funding. Based on the 60 interviews with the groups of actors involved in the funding process, the following chapter examines the question of CoG's effectiveness in greater detail. The main question here was how those surveyed perceive the efforts of the European Commission to take gender aspects into account. In addition, recommendations by the interviewees for dealing with gender aspects in the future Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020 are presented. The effectiveness of CoG as instrument can be measured by four indicators: level of obligation, instruction logic, relationship between theory and practice, and knowledge and competence.

A central factor is the level of obligation associated with the application section: the interview results show that applicants consider the equality aspect of CoG to be fairly ineffective because it is not a hard evaluation criterion. The section is frequently answered in empty phrases, project-related equality measures are very rarely listed. In addition, applicants state that in retrospect CoG in no way affected the proportion of women in the project.

A further indicator is the logic of the instructions on the application section: are the specifications detailed and explicit enough, and do the various instructions on dealing with CoG in each funding phase dovetail? The interviews demonstrate various deficiencies in the supporting documents. Applicants frequently hardly realise the dual nature of CoG, i.e. the gender dimension in research content is mostly not noted. Many project coordinators lack clear notion both for suitable project-related equality measures and for ways in which gender can be taken into consideration in research content. A further flaw in the instruction logic is that the equality aspect is not comprehensively addressed or reviewed in the single phases of application and advice, evaluation, project negotiations and reporting. Clear instructions for the actors are also lacking here.

The third factor is closely connected to the instructions and refers to the relationship between theory (supportive documents) and practice (everyday application): the results show a discrepancy between the guidelines and handling in practical terms. The instruction in the Guide for Applicants to take gender aspects (both dimensions) into consideration is not supported with practical advice; these are not listed in the Guide. CoG is not always discussed in project negotiations as is claimed in the Guide for Applicants⁴⁵.

The fourth aspect is the knowledge and competence of the actors regarding equality and gender in research (cf. Wetterer 2009). The interviews indicate that the actors' practical experience with equality measures is limited. Ideas for project-related equality measures are therefore rare. Knowledge on gender in research is also relatively limited among many actors.

⁴⁵ On discrepancies between the requirements in the Guides please see Chapter 5.2, Project negotiations.

The vast majority perceive as positive that CoG creates an awareness of the subject matter and that the European Commission accords significance to equality and gender in research. However, the respondents state that in their view the shape this currently takes in the Framework Programme requires improvement.

6.1. Effectiveness of CoG in terms of the equality aspect

In the following we first consider the equality aspect separately from the gender dimension in research content.

The majority of respondents see it as positive that the application section contributes to creating and maintaining an awareness of the gender issue. It draws interview participants' attention to the fact that the European Commission works to achieve equality between female and male scientists. Some interview partners however critically question whether this is mere lip service on the part of the Commission (see also Chapter 6.3).

The vast majority of survey participants in all four groups however consider the CoG application section in its current format to be ineffective, as indicated by the fact that according to applicants the section has no influence on the actual participation of women in the project or in project management positions and has no effect whatsoever on hiring practices. It is emphasised that project staff are selected solely on the basis of appropriate qualifications. Gender plays no part, according to respondents:

"The section has no effect as it led to no change in behaviour. It is people who are competent who are hired. Women are not hired solely on account of the section [CoG] in the application." (PL_4, Environmental research)

Only in rare individual cases it is stated that the application section creates a certain pressure on applicants:

"Gender is taken into consideration, after all large sums of money are being distributed, that creates a certain pressure or incentive for applicants to also take gender aspects into consideration." (E_15, Medicine)

The measure's limited effectiveness is also indicated by the fact that the vast majority of applicants do not consider gender equality to be relevant for the funding decision. As already described in detail in Chapter 2.2, the CoG section is mostly answered in stock phrases or with statistics on female participation. Effective equality measures or equality plans are rare exceptions in project applications. The reason given for this is mainly that effort is only put into evaluation-relevant application sections. It is also pointed out that no budget is available for carrying out equality measures. The interview responses moreover make clear that many respondents lack knowledge or competence on how to practically respond to CoG in their everyday work and which equality measures or measures to help reconcile work and family life can be carried out within projects at all.

Individual respondents from various groups of actors generally question whether a formalised application section can be an effective instrument. They express the opinion that

the underrepresentation of women in projects in FP7 is due to a lack of qualified women in certain disciplines:

“In my field the instrument is not effective because there is no pool of qualified women. The instrument comes too late in the process. Efforts must begin earlier, ideally already in school (intermediate level). I myself have initiated initiatives with role models, but that too comes far too late. (PL_17, Engineering)”

From the point of view of these respondents, responsibility for change lies with other policy fields such as education or family policy. They see no obstacles in the academic labour market or in project involvement and management. Accordingly, the possibilities to influence equality in projects through measures in European research funding are considered very limited.

Some respondents compare the implementation and the effectiveness of CoG in FP6 and FP7. In FP6, project applications (CP, NoE) had to include a mandatory Gender Action Plan (GAP). On the one hand, the greater level of obligation of the instrument in FP6 is seen as positive. On the other hand, some respondents are critical of precisely this aspect, because many applicants objected strongly to its mandatory nature and found the requirement beyond their capabilities. Overall, the effectiveness of obligatory application sections is however considered to be higher. Measured by its effectiveness, the implementation of the instrument was nonetheless not seen as satisfactory either in FP6 or in FP7.

In summary it can be said that the majority of respondents consider it necessary and right that equality is addressed in research funding through the Framework Programme. Most respondents are in favour of retaining the section as part of project applications. However, respondents are of the opinion that an effective instrument would require a greater level of obligation (see Chapter 6.4).

6.2. Effectiveness of CoG in terms of gender in research content

Only a small number of respondents from the fields of medicine, the social sciences and humanities directly answered the question about the effectiveness of the application section with regard to more firmly embedding gender in research content. These respondents recognise that the Commission is also working to increase the integration of gender aspects into research content. They note as a general statement that they are aware of progress, but overall still see room for improvement in this respect. Individual evaluators from these fields for example emphasise that greater attention should be paid to the subject during the evaluation and improvements could be demanded more frequently.

No further details were given in the interviews. At this point we will therefore summarise the findings that have emerged over the course of the study regarding how CoG is handled in the individual phases of the funding process. The interview results show that gender in research is rather taken into consideration in applications and in the evaluation and negotiation process⁴⁶ in a small number of disciplines (e.g. medicine, social sciences and humanities⁴⁷).

⁴⁶ It plays a role in project negotiations if it is commented on in the evaluations.

This apparently occurs mostly because it is specifically requested in the call for proposals or is an established standard of the specialist community.

In many other programme areas (e.g. Industrial Technologies, Transport, Energy) the gender dimension in research content is not considered in most cases. Two reasons emerge in the interviews with various actors in these fields: on the one hand, many are unaware of this second component of CoG; on the other hand many applicants and advisors lack knowledge of the ways in which gender aspects could be relevant to the content of such projects.

The interview statements suggest that insofar as gender in research content is considered in the funding process this is unlikely to be due to the CoG application section.

6.3. Perception of the efforts of the Commission

All survey participants were requested to assess how they perceive the efforts of the European Commission regarding the consideration of aspects of equality and gender in research. Altogether, many respondents see the Commission's role more as that of a trendsetter: they acknowledge that equality issues have been on the agenda of the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation since the late 1990s. In addition, the following activities were positively highlighted in this context: the aim of 40% female participation in all panels, calls for proposals on gender in research, CoG section in the project application, training courses and information materials on gender (Gender Toolkits and training seminar).

The respondents emphasised that while the European Commission does have an official equality policy, it does not pursue this strategy very forcefully. They see a discrepancy between theory and practice and frequently point out that no vital strategy is detectable:

“The CoG application section shows that efforts are being made, but its implementation shows that while there is a will, there is no knowledge of what an effective instrument should look like. In its current form this section is ineffective.” (EU_Adv_ 6, FE).

“The gender strategy is very general and contains no mandatory measures. It's a kind of 'goodwill declaration'.” (PO_1, Industrial technologies).

As described several times in this report, the interview responses on the efforts of the Commission also refer almost exclusively to the equality aspect. Efforts to consider gender in research content have already been discussed in the previous section (6.2).

6.4. Recommendations for a future instrument

This section summarises the most important recommendations by the surveyed groups of actors for a future instrument to take gender aspects into consideration. A central question in this respect is whether respondents are in favour of a greater level of obligation with regard to the application section.

⁴⁷ The gender dimension in research content may also be relevant in some other disciplines, such as transport and land use planning and nutrition research.

All interview participants were asked whether they would be in favour of making the CoG section more obligating in the form of a mandatory response and/or by including it as an evaluation criterion. As mentioned above, with regard to CoG the majority of those surveyed focus only on the equality aspect, and there in particular on the existing gender ratio in the consortium and less on the implementation of measures. Most respondents therefore understand this question in the sense of whether they would include the gender ratio in the consortium (quota) as a mandatory criterion for evaluating applications.

Much like the quota discussion, there are people who are in favour of this demand and others who are strongly opposed to it. Preferences according to actor groups could not be detected. The main argument in favour of evaluating equality in the application procedure is that it would make this aspect of CoG more obligating. Many respondents agree that otherwise responses would remain limited to stock phrases (see Chapter 2.2):

“... the gender issue will only receive greater attention if assessment criteria are found that are also included in the evaluation of applications – and not just as soft skills or a ‘nice to have’ aspect, but as hard criteria.” (NCP_3).

“It’s a double-edged thing but I think I would be in favour of it being evaluated, otherwise it will have no effect. It would after all force projects to look for women, not necessarily 50%, but it would mean efforts were initiated.” (PL_11, Environmental research)

Suggestions as to the criteria and weighting with which the equality aspect could be evaluated are not made, and respondents point out the associated difficulties: these are seen particularly in defining criteria for a balanced gender ratio, where they say the proportion of women in the respective discipline would have to be taken into account. The quality of equality measures and plans is also not easy to evaluate, according to the respondents. A surveyed Commission official suggests that this would have to be done by a competent department because evaluators and project officers usually did not have this competence:

“If for example a project had planned large-scale equality measures and requested funding for them it would be good if there were a department or a person who was competent to evaluate them and support the project officers.” (PO_4, Industrial technologies).

The central argument respondents make against evaluating female participation is that it is scientific quality alone that should be evaluated in projects. If this were not ensured and projects were to be rejected for example due to an insufficient proportion of women, some respondents believe Europe’s competitiveness and its position as a location for research would be in danger:

“The main focus is on making German companies competitive, leading them to success. I don’t believe it would be right to let a project fail due to gender. Placing incentive instruments in the Framework Programme is the wrong way (perhaps better in People).” (NCP_7).

This opinion is held in particular by respondents from disciplines in which women are very underrepresented. Occasionally, interview participants from disciplines with a more balanced female ratio share this opinion. These respondents do not expect scientific performance to be improved by mixed teams.

Another interview participant suggests a third way and is in favour of a greater level of obligation regarding the questions on the equality aspect in the application, but is opposed to an evaluation⁴⁸:

“A more obligating nature – yes, as a sort of hard commitment with mandatory explanation, like the ethics guideline; an obligatory one – no. Science is not a gender playground.”⁴⁹ (E_11, Restoration science)

Another surveyed project coordinator suggests a similar approach:

“The level of obligation [regarding CoG] would have to be increased, because no one will do it voluntarily. But companies must not be punished if it was not possible to involve women. It’s a balancing act, companies would at least have to be required to prove that they were unable to take the aspect into consideration for some reason.” (PO_23, Industrial technologies).

This statement by an interview participant also indicates that an effective instrument to promote equality must involve greater obligation, but must not be too inflexible. It has to allow the possibility of giving reasons for a low female participation in the project.

Recommendations regarding the equality aspect

In addition to including it as an evaluation criterion, many respondents see making a budget available for carrying out equality measures as a further possibility for making the instrument more obligating:

“Additional funding will lead to the instrument being assigned a greater level of obligation, the measures will become specific and people won’t just write blah blah blah.” (PL_2, Medicine).

In this context, some respondents gave examples of effective measures: in areas in which women are heavily underrepresented, funding could for example be made available for an additional PhD post if it were filled by a woman. Many respondents see the issue of work-life reconciliation as the main reason for the underrepresentation of women, especially in project-leading roles. In this respect it is suggested that projects with a female coordinator could apply for extra funding to reduce her workload (e.g. to fund a 25% FTE post to support the female coordinator, or as a subsidy for a home help or for childcare). For dealing with maternity and parental leave in the project, respondents would like to see the project

⁴⁸ See also Chapter 7, “International Comparison”, particularly the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (Österreichische Forschungsfördergesellschaft, FFG).

⁴⁹ This quote is from a written comment from an interview partner; the formatting was changed slightly.

schedule and the budget handled more flexibly⁵⁰, and believe back-to-work programmes are needed.

Other recommendations refer to better integrating the CoG section throughout the funding process: to this end the Guide for Applicants should explain more clearly what CoG entails, which measures can be funded (giving successful examples from practice) and what consequences will result if the aspect is not sufficiently taken into consideration (e.g. loss of points or bonus etc.). Respondents recommend asking in more detail about the equality aspect (similar to the ethics aspect). Such a section could require applicants to describe how both genders can benefit from measures to improve gender equality over the course of the project.

Our analysis of the evaluation and negotiation process (Chapter 4 and Chapter 5) additionally shows a disparate handling of the equality aspect of CoG and a lack of systematic consideration. There is therefore a need for improvement with regard to coordinating how CoG (equality) is handled in the various phases of the funding process. In this context some interviewees demand that the implementation of planned measures should be reviewed by the Commission at the end of a project in order to make CoG more obligating. Where necessary, the Commission could retain a part of the funding if such measures were found not to have been carried out. Some interview participants point out that the Commission should emphasise more strongly the added value for the project created by a balanced participation of women.

In general it is recommended that the Commission should approve projects earlier on so that there is more time to search for qualified female project staff. Better monitoring of how CoG is handled and of its effectiveness is also considered important. If the Commission's objectives regarding the use of the statistics were clearer, this would possibly increase the motivation among project leaders to answer these questions.

Some respondents see a necessity in this context of examining the efficacy of instruments for the effective integration of equality and gender research into research funding.

Recommendations regarding gender in research content

A small number of recommendations refer to the second aspect of CoG, gender in research content. Some respondents see a need to catch up here:

“Consideration of gender in research content should be more strongly included in the content of the funding areas, for example in energy or the life sciences, as is after all already the case in the social sciences and humanities.” (NCP_8)

If gender aspects are to be considered in research, this should be included in the call for proposals. Some respondents however emphasise that they do not consider gender in research content to be important in all research topics. The text of the call for proposals should therefore be individually adapted to specific proposal topics.

⁵⁰ Some respondents are aware that schedules and budgets can already be handled with some flexibility in the Framework Programme, more so than in other funding programmes. This seems to depend very much on the individual project officer.

In addition, respondents felt that applicants should be provided with better information as to what gender-sensitive research means, and examples should be given for various research areas. This could be included in the call for proposals or in the Guide for Applicants. In this context it would then make sense to refer applicants directly to the Gender Toolkits, or to make use of examples found therein.

7. Comparison of national research funding institutions in Europe regarding consideration of gender and equality

To what extent do national research funding providers consider the promotion of gender equality in science and gender as social and biological categories in the sciences in their information materials for project applicants?

A comparison of the collaborative research project funding programmes of selected funding providers from Austria, Germany, Switzerland and Norway was performed by means of guidelines, information sheets and regulations relating to the application and evaluation process. In line with the central questions of the present interview study, this comparison serves to record the documentation available online on the two points of equality and gender in research content, however without being able to offer statements on the actual application practice. Our analysis therefore focuses on questions relating to information provision, the logic of the topic's integration into the application process and the evaluation of project proposals, establishing obligation and the content-related and structural specifications in the provided materials. We evaluated research funding instruments for academic collaborative research provided by the Austrian Science Fund (Wissenschaftsfonds, FWF)⁵¹, the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (Österreichische Forschungsförderungsgesellschaft, FFG)⁵², the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG)⁵³, the Swiss National Science Foundation (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung, SNF)⁵⁴ and the Research Council of Norway (RCN)⁵⁵. The central basis of this comparison is the objective of the funding instrument (collaborative projects) to promote joint research. Science policy or structural circumstances relating to the funding institutions or funding programmes were not within the scope of this comparison.

All examined institutions provide information on application procedures, forms and information sheets on applying for funding for collaborative research projects on their websites. These information materials set out the qualitative and administrative conditions (applicants, structure of funding request, deadlines, eligible costs, evaluation procedures etc.) under which project funding can be granted. All funding providers formulate equality requirements in this context. These may relate to the participation of female scientists in evaluating funding (FWF, FFG, SNF), to the objective of involving female scientists in the project in appropriate ways (FWF – 30% of (sub-)project management roles; FFG – balanced gender ratio; DFG – increasing the number of women in project-leading roles and training young female scientists; SNF – gender balance; RCN – quotas for project leadership roles), or they may require written explanations (FWF, SNF) or active measures to achieve a balanced gender ratio in project teams (RCN) if no appropriate participation is apparent. The

⁵¹ <http://www.fwf.ac.at/index.asp>, particularly Special Research Programmes.

⁵² <http://www.ffg.at/>, general guideline, Bridge programme and Collective Research general programme.

⁵³ <http://www.dfg.de/index.jsp>, especially Collaborative Research Centres and Priority Programmes.

⁵⁴ <http://www.snf.ch/D/Seiten/default.aspx>, SNF Mission Statement, conference funding and National Centres of Competence in Research.

⁵⁵ <http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Home+page/1177315753906>, general guidelines and Strategic Projects. Other RCN guidelines were not publicly available when this evaluation was performed.

consideration of gender (gender differences and social role models) in research content is far more rarely required by funding institutions. The RCN formulates most clearly the importance of gender for knowledge production: “Good research must take into account biological and social differences between women and men, and the gender dimension should be one of the main pillars of the development of new knowledge.”⁵⁶ The FWF application guidelines require that applications must comment on “gender-relevant aspects” of the project and submit an explanation if no “gender-relevant findings” are to be expected from the project’s research. Considerations of gender in research are evaluation-relevant criteria in applications for the Bridge programme and the Collective Research general programme of the FFG and in the evaluation of funding applications at the RCN. No corresponding information is available for DFG and SNF.

Regarding the promotion of equality in projects, DFG and SNF focus on funding equal opportunities measures. The DFG funds projected measures to increase the participation of female scientists in leadership roles, training for young female scientists and measures to make science as a workplace more family-friendly in accordance with measures that are already established at the universities⁵⁷. This takes place through a specific incentive module for equal opportunities measures which provides a flat, ring-fenced sum of €120,000 within a Collaborative Research Centre funding period. The DFG outlines specific requirements and provides examples of practical measures in the sample application for Collaborative Research Centres and on a separate info sheet for the Priority Programmes instrument. In its equality policy requirements as outlined in its guideline documents for National Centres of Competence in Research, the SNF recommends that applicants adopt a coordinated procedure; it requires an “action plan for the advancement of women” when submitting an application and embeds the execution of the measures described in this action plan within the consortium through a “specialist”⁵⁸. Each National Centre of Competence in Research is required to formulate equality targets, demonstrate their implementation through appropriate measures and place them in relation to existing activities at the universities. The RCN elaborates its specifications on observing gender equality in its basic requirements for funding strategy projects in the objectives of striving to recruit women to leadership roles and to natural science and technical disciplines and of taking the gender perspective in research content into consideration in evaluating and ranking funding proposals.

FWF and FFG conceptually combine the criteria of equality and gender in research under “Gender Relevance” (FWF) or “Social Aspects” (FFG) in their funding and evaluation criteria for Special Research Programmes and the General Programme. The FWF offers Special Research Programme applicants further assistance as to how gender content is to be considered in their research approach, in the evaluation and with regard to the expected

⁵⁶ General requirements for Research Institution-based Strategic Project. http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Research_institutionbased_strategic_project/1195592882838.

⁵⁷ see DFG Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality http://www.dfg.de/download/pdf/foerderung/grundlagen_dfg_foerderung/chancengleichheit/forschungsorientierte_gleichstellungsstandards_en.pdf

⁵⁸ See http://www.snf.ch/nfp/nccr/SiteCollectionDocuments/nccr_programme_call_2011_e.pdf. When applying for funding to hold scientific conferences, appropriate participation of female speakers is an evaluation criterion.

results.⁵⁹ Together with ethical and diversity aspects, the evaluation procedure of the FFG summarises a “positive gender impact” (equality and content) under the keyword “Social Aspects”, which is taken into consideration in the assessment procedure. How obligating or how important these points are for the evaluation process is not specified.

A comparison between guidelines and information materials for the listed programmes shows that specifications for both aspects, equality and gender in research content, are integrated with a relatively low level of obligation into the application and evaluation process when they are to be described and evaluated together. An exception is the aforementioned procedure of the RCN, which considers a gender quota and the active advancement of women in certain disciplines to be basic requirements for project funding in addition to the hard evaluation criterion of gender content⁶⁰. The requirements of the DFG and the SNF refer predominantly to equality measures; the SNF specifies requirements regarding management structure and the creation of equality plans, while the DFG offers funding for individual measures and in addition recommends specific measures (further training offers, childcare). The two Austrian research funding providers require written explanations from applicants where an appropriate gender balance in the project group is not apparent, and combine gender in research content with the equality aspect in the application process, more clearly however with the evaluation process of collaborative projects.

⁵⁹ The additional information materials on gender analysis reference the Gender Toolkits of the European Commission.

⁶⁰ “General requirements for Research institution-based Strategic Project.”
http://www.forskningsradet.no/en/Research_institutionbased_strategic_project/1195592882838.

8. Results

This survey examined how CoG is handled in the application and advice process and during evaluation and project negotiation from the point of view of the involved actors.

The interview results indicate that CoG plays a somewhat subordinate role in the complex application process. It also appears that the majority of all surveyed groups only perceive this section as referring to the equality aspect. Respondents are frequently unaware of the second aspect, the content dimension of gender, or find its meaning unclear.

In answering the equality aspect of CoG it is conspicuous that the section is generally not very extensively answered: specific project-related equality measures or measures to help reconcile work and family life, as requested in the Guide for Applicants, are rarely proposed. Applications frequently only describe the gender ratio in the project, list the equality and/or work-life balance measures implemented at the overall institution, or provide stock phrases on the subject of the advancement of women. The second aspect of the application section, gender dimension in research content, only finds near-universal consideration in individual disciplines such as medicine, the humanities and social sciences. This is apparently due to requirements in the respective call for proposals or discipline. In natural science or technical applications, the gender dimension of research content is rarely considered. Most applicants are not familiar with the Gender Toolkits sponsored by the European Commission.

The majority of applicants attribute no great significance to CoG, as the aspect of equality in the consortium is not an official evaluation criterion. A fairly small proportion of respondents assume that this aspect may be decisive to whether their project receives funding. Overall, there is a “box-ticking” mentality with regard to CoG, the item is formally “ticked off the list”. In addition, a stock response appears to suffice for a successful application.

Approximately half the interviewed applicants require advice on CoG. The main questions relate to the extent to which the section affects the funding decision and to how it can be answered. Interviews with advisors show that there is no standard procedure in giving advice, and that the importance advisors accord the point also varies. CoG is not always covered in application advice; this is due partly to a negative attitude on the part of applicants.

Where recommendations are made, these frequently refer to illustrating the participation of women in the consortium or listing equality measures and measures to help reconcile work and family life implemented at the overall institution. EU advisors occasionally provide text modules for this purpose. Some respondents see the fact that there is no separate budget for specific and project-related measures as an obstacle to developing them. Many advisors are unaware that applicants are also expected to describe how gender aspects are taken into consideration in research content in the CoG section. There is a general trend that advisors are likely to more strongly point out the equality aspect in areas where gender aspects are also relevant to research content.

Only a small number of advisors took advantage of information and further training offerings on dealing with the CoG application section (Gender Toolkits and training seminars). Other

advisors were either unaware of these offerings or saw no need for further training due to the low significance of CoG in advice. The overall conclusion is that awareness of the instruments funded by the European Commission to support applicants and multipliers must be improved. However, the effectiveness of such information offerings will presumably be limited as long as CoG does not become more obligating.

The interviews provide little and irregular information regarding official Commission policy on how to deal with CoG in the evaluation phase. The Guide for Applicants states that CoG is not evaluated. In the briefings, evaluators are however informed that they are to take equality in the project into account in their individual evaluations. How this can be done apparently lies within the discretion of the evaluators. We were unable to clearly determine the extent to which there is an obligation on the part of the Commission to discuss CoG at the consensus meetings.

In the individual evaluations the majority of the interviewed evaluators pay attention to how CoG is answered. Here too the focus is on the equality aspect. What is mostly considered is the sex ratio in the consortium. Some evaluators only note that CoG (equality) has been answered. Others include a comment on it in their evaluations. To what extent consideration of the equality aspect may affect the overall impression or the overall evaluation of an application cannot be clearly answered based on the interview results. The manner in which CoG is handled at the consensus meetings is similarly diverse: the aspect is either not addressed at all or merely discussed; at best, recommendations on it are included in the consensus report.

Consideration of gender in research is occasionally assessed in individual evaluations and therefore addressed in consensus meetings. The interview responses indicate that the gender dimension in research content is taken into account in applications and evaluations not so much due to the CoG application section, but rather as a result of requirements listed in the call for proposals or inherent in the discipline.

Based on the small number of interviews with Commission officials it becomes apparent that the various directorates within the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation have no standard procedure for dealing with CoG. According to the respondents, official documents remain vague and are not always known in detail to project officers. The interviews with project officers at the Commission indicate that the CoG section (both aspects) is only discussed in project negotiations in individual areas (medicine, food, social sciences and humanities). The majority of the project coordinators state that CoG was not addressed during project negotiations, but at most mentioned in passing. The requirement in the Guide for Applicants and the Negotiation Guidance Notes to discuss CoG in project negotiations is thus not comprehensively implemented in practice⁶¹.

Equality aspects are rarely relevant during the project lifetime, and are mostly addressed when project employees become unavailable due to maternity or parental leave. Regular reporting keeps project officers informed of equality measures and consideration of the gender dimension in research content insofar as these aspects form part of work packages,

⁶¹ See Chapter 5.2 Project negotiation. The requirements on dealing with CoG in the Guide for Applicants and the Negotiation Guidance Notes reveal inconsistencies in the administrative procedure.

tasks or deliverables. Other than the brief statistical questionnaire in the report on societal implications, no statement on CoG is required in the Project Final Report. Measures announced in the application under CoG are not reviewed by the project officers at the European Commission.

Overall, the interview results indicate that CoG is of limited significance in the everyday practice of project administrators. Factors contributing to this situation are unclear instructions that leave project officers dependent on individual competencies. A further result of this practice is that due to its low level of formalisation CoG is discussed with varying intensity over the course of the evaluation and negotiation process, and may not be considered at all.

In all, the interviews with all groups of actors show that how CoG (equality and gender in research) is handled and the significance accorded to it does not differ along gender lines but is rather determined by individual attitudes, gender competence and experience.

The effectiveness of the instrument was evaluated based on the following four indicators: level of obligation, instruction logic, relationship between theory and practice, and knowledge and competence. The interview results show that applicants consider the equality aspect of CoG to be fairly ineffective because it is not a hard evaluation criterion. The section is frequently answered in stock phrases; project-related equality measures are very rarely listed. In addition, applicants state that in retrospect CoG in no way affected the proportion of women in the project.

The interviews also indicate various deficiencies in the bid supporting documents. Applicants frequently fail to realise the dual nature of CoG, i.e. the gender dimension in research content is mostly not noted. A further flaw in the instruction logic is that the equality aspect is not comprehensively addressed or reviewed in the individual phases of application and advice, evaluation, project negotiation and reporting. There is also a lack of clear instructions for the actors in this respect. The requirement in the Guide for Applicants to take gender aspects (both dimensions) into consideration is not supported with practical tools, or rather, these tools are not listed in the Guide.

It must further be noted that overall, the actors have fairly limited practical experience of equality measures. Ideas for project-related measures are therefore rare. Knowledge on gender in research is also relatively limited among many actors and cannot be transferred into practical application without further support.

The vast majority perceive as positive that CoG creates an awareness of the subject matter and the European Commission accords equality and gender in research significance. The respondents state that in their view the shape this currently takes in the Framework Programme requires improvement.

A comparison between guidelines and information materials for national research funding programmes shows that specifications for both aspects, equality and gender in research content, are integrated with a relatively low level of obligation into the application and evaluation process when they are to be described and evaluated together. An exception is the outlined procedure of the Research Council Norway (RCN), which considers a gender

quota and the active advancement of women in certain disciplines to be basic requirements for project funding in addition to the hard evaluation criterion of gender content. The requirements of the German Research Foundation (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, DFG) and the Swiss National Science Foundation (Schweizerischer Nationalfonds, SNF) refer predominantly to equality measures; the SNF specifies requirements regarding management structure and the creation of advancement plans, while the DFG offers funding for individual measures and in addition suggests specific measures (further training offers, childcare). The two Austrian research funding providers require written explanations from applicants where no appropriate gender balance is apparent in the project, and combine gender in research content with the equality aspect in the application process, more clearly however with the evaluation process for collaborative projects.

9. Recommendations

9.1. Formal differentiation of objectives

The integration of two different objectives (equality and gender in research) in section 5 causes various problems: on the one hand, the dual objective of the instrument is frequently overlooked, so the aspect of gender in research often remains unconsidered. On the other hand this duality makes it more difficult to deal with CoG in the various project funding phases and obstructs tailored procedures for both objectives. While CoG (both aspects) does not represent a hard criterion for evaluating the scientific quality of the project, gender in research (where taken into consideration) is only relevant for the evaluation if it is a requirement of the specific call for proposals or an established category within the discipline. The result of this dual objective in one and the same formal structure is to weaken both aspects, leading to a lack of obligation in practice.

In order to appropriately handle the two items that can be considered under CoG, equality and gender in research, gender content and equality must therefore be dealt with separately on the application forms, in the evaluation process and in project execution. This results in the following recommendation:

- Reduce the reporting section to a single objective, preferably the aspect of gender equality

By dealing separately with these two aspects the European Commission could additionally create subject-specific incentives to consider gender in research content.

9.2. Structural integration of equality

The equality aspect of CoG is mostly answered either by describing the gender distribution among project employees in various roles or by listing the equality measures and measures to help reconcile work and family life implemented at the overall institution. Specific project-related measures to promote equality, as requested by CoG, are the exception. Both types of responses merely illustrate the present situation and do not trigger any activities in the project.

An effective instrument to improve equality in projects must address both points, i.e. it should record the participation of women in the project, but at the same time it should demand the execution of obligatory and specific equality measures. A further reason for the limited effectiveness of the instrument is its low level of obligation. The equality aspect of CoG is not relevant to the evaluation of project proposals. Moreover, there is no additional budget available for carrying out measures. This leads to the following recommendations:

- Formalised description of gender distribution in the consortium
 - In case of underrepresentation: mandatory explanation of causes and suggestions for recruiting the gender that is underrepresented among project employees

- Mandatory explanation if no balanced gender ratio is achieved through active recruitment efforts. Reviewed by project officers of the Commission (based on the proportion of women in the respective discipline)
- Project-related equality measures to be supported by budgeting (earmarked volume adapted to project budget volume; sanctions at the end of the project if no efforts to promote gender equality are apparent)

At least one equality measure should be mandatory over the course of a project. The consortium would decide which measures are effective in the context of the project, and should describe and budget them in the application. Budgeting would cause the equality activities to become part of the reporting requirements, as a result of which they would be reviewed by the European Commission. In addition to budgeting, cost-neutral increases in flexibility regarding project lifetimes are also imaginable.

9.3. Structural integration of gender into research content

Gender in research content is currently not universally considered in all thematic research programmes of the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. For many applicants, the note in the Guide for Applicants under CoG is no incentive to consider gender differences and gender roles in analysis procedures or in evaluating scientific findings. We therefore recommend:

- Consideration of gender in research content should be included in (preferably) all calls for proposals
- Consideration of gender roles and gender differences in developing new knowledge is part of good scientific practice and should be assessed in the Scientific Excellence and Impact evaluation criteria

As part of the Scientific Excellence and Impact evaluation criteria, consideration of gender aspects would become more obligating for all involved parties. Applicants would then be obliged to review the gender relevance of their project idea, i.e. to consider gender differences and societal roles. The responsibility to factually check this criterion would lie with the evaluators and thus be clearly assigned. Gender in the research context should be consistently considered in the evaluation and included in the evaluation reports (ESR).

If no gender relevance can be established in research projects, this should be explained in the application sections Progress Beyond the State of the Art and Expected Impact.

9.4. Information policy: precise specification of contents, conditions and benefits

The interview results indicate deficits in the instructions on dealing with CoG. Responsibilities of evaluators and project administrators at the European Commission are not clearly assigned. Recommendations include:

- Make the content of all information and guidelines more precise and relate them to the administrative framework of the application process and the project negotiations
 - Use unambiguous wordings for the objectives of equality in the consortium and gender in the research context
- Inform applicants as early as possible of specific requirements regarding gender distribution in the project and possible equality measures
 - Offer examples of equality measures in consortia and gender in the research context and describe conditions and benefits

Information materials and guidelines should be worded precisely and consistently for every phase of project administration. Clearly assigned responsibilities for reviewing the equality aspect by the European Commission and the integration of the gender dimension in the research context by evaluators will ensure that both objectives are universally taken into consideration. The benefits of working in mixed research teams should be emphasised.

9.5. Information policy: provision of resources

The majority of involved actors know fairly little about effective equality measures and gender in research. Applicants and advisors lack ideas for taking gender aspects (both aspects) into consideration in projects. Evaluators and project officers at the Commission are frequently just as uncertain how to adequately review projects in this respect. This results in the following recommendations:

Equality aspect

- Provide information resources on equality measures for applicants, evaluators and project administrators and publicise existing resources more widely (equality officers at higher education institutions, online resources, guidelines, databases, advisory offerings)
- Provide project officers in the European Commission with information materials and training on handling equality in projects
- Offer online training on equality in third party funded projects

Gender in research

- Include references to existing information resources in the call for proposals and the Guide for Applicants (Gender Toolkits⁶², Gendered Innovation Database⁶³).
- Gender Toolkits: possibly expand examples for subject areas

Clear requirements demand increased competence in dealing with equality and gender in various research topics. Highlighting information resources early on and publicising them better would help promote gender competence more effectively in all groups of actors.

⁶² http://www.yellowwindow.be/genderinresearch/index_downloads.html.

⁶³ <http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/what-is-gendered-innovations.html>.

10. Bibliography

- European Commission (2010): Negotiation Guidance Notes (FP7 Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and Support Actions, Research for the benefit of Specific Groups (in particular SMEs). Version 10 September 2010. (URL: ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/negotiation_en.pdf; last accessed 20/06/2012).
- European Commission (2010): Guide for Applicants: Theme 10: Security; Networks of Excellence. Version published January 2010. Call identifier FP7-SEC-2010-1. (URL: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/cooperation?callIdentifier=FP7SEC-2010-1>; last accessed 20/06/2012).
- European Commission (2012): Guidance Notes on Project Reporting. (FP7 Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and Support Actions, Research for the benefit of Specific Groups (in particular SMEs). Version published 2012. (URL: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/ShowDoc/Extensions+Repository/General+Documentation/Guidance+documents+for+FP7/Project+reporting/project_reporting_en.pdf; last accessed 13/08/2012).
- Hornbostel, Stefan (1997): *Wissenschaftsindikatoren. Bewertungen in der Wissenschaft.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Mayring, Philipp (2003): *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken.* Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.
- Wetterer, Angelika (2009): Gleichstellungspolitik im Spannungsfeld unterschiedlicher Spielarten von Geschlechterwissen. Eine wissenssoziologische Rekonstruktion. In: *Gender 1 (2)*, S. 45–60.

11. Appendix

11.1. CoG in the Guide for Applicants

Section B of the project application – Section 5: Consideration of gender aspects

You may give an indication of the sort of actions that would be undertaken during the course of the project to promote gender equality in your project, or in your field of research. (These will not be evaluated, but will be discussed during negotiations should your proposal be successful). These could include actions related to the project consortium (e.g. improving the gender balance in the project consortium, measures to help reconcile work and private life, awareness raising within the consortium) or, where appropriate, actions aimed at a wider public (e.g. events organised in schools or universities)

(Maximum length for section 5 – one page)

Source: Guide for Applicants: Networks of Excellence. Theme 10: Security; Call identifier FP7-SEC2010-1, P. 61.

11.2. CoG in the Negotiation Guidance Notes

Appendix 7: How to consider gender aspects in projects (S: 50-51)

The European Commission/REA attaches considerable importance to gender equality. Articles 19, 153 and 157 of the EU treaty endorse the principles of equal treatment in all activities including research and technological development. Furthermore, in April 2005, the Competitiveness Council invited the Commission to continue improving the participation of women in all areas of research and to further develop the Gender Watch System. The Commission has set targets to have a 40% representation of both sexes on all groups, panels and committees including those associated with the Research Framework programmes.

The lack of women's participation in scientific research, especially at high level, has been documented for many scientific fields. All projects are encouraged to have a balanced participation of women and men in their research activities and to raise awareness on combating gender prejudices and stereotypes.

Sex and / or gender are relevant variables in many research fields and generally referred to as the gender dimension of the research content. When human beings are involved as research subjects or users, and in training or dissemination activities, gender differences may exist. These must be addressed as an integral part of the research to ensure the highest level of scientific quality. The Work Programmes of the different themes may indicate specific topics where gender aspects should be given specific attention. It is easy to understand that sex and gender are variables that must be addressed when considering health research but it might be less easy to understand that gender could also be an important factor in, for example, aeronautical or energy research. As a guideline, wherever human beings are involved in the research, for example as consumers, users and patients, or in trials, gender will be an issue and should be considered and addressed.

The Commission/REA will inform the coordinator, during grant negotiation, of the importance of having a good gender balance within the project. The Commission/REA will also inform the coordinator on whether it considers the gender dimension of the research content an area that should be addressed within the project.

Beneficiaries should note that, in FP7, parental leave costs are eligible costs.

Consideration of Gender Aspects for Collaborative Projects and Networks of Excellence

As indicated in Part B of the Guide for Applicants, beneficiaries will be invited, during grant negotiation, to consider how best to promote gender equality during the lifetime of their projects both in terms of a balanced participation of men and women and in terms of the gender dimension of the scientific research.

Beneficiaries opting to promote gender equality within the project should submit either a dedicated work package or a task within a work package indicating the actions they intend to carry out. These will form part of the grant agreement and will be assessed during subsequent reporting periods, as defined in the Grant Agreement.

The following list gives examples of possible actions that might be considered to promote the higher participation of women in scientific research and FP7 projects. The list is not exhaustive and any other action proposed by the Consortium is welcome.

FP7 Negotiation Guidance Notes – Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and Support Actions, Research for the benefit of specific groups (in particular SMEs) Version 10 September 2010

ACTIONS TO ACHIEVE GENDER BALANCE WITHIN THE WORKFORCE

- Survey the position and the needs of women staff
- Design and implement equal opportunities policy
- Positive actions for women scientists re-entering professional life
- Set targets to achieve gender balance in decision-making positions
- Design and implement mentoring schemes for women
- Promote women's participation in Consortium research activities
- Promote women's participation in committees and working groups
- Design and implement gender awareness training for HR Managers
- Family friendly working conditions

MONITORING ACTIONS

- Appoint gender equality officer
- Create an equal opportunities commission
- Collect sex-disaggregated data on workforce regularly
- Collect data on women's participation in research activities
- Monitor impact of family friendly working conditions
- Disseminate data collection results within workforce
- Studies or analysis of attitudes / priorities of research personnel in the scientific field of the project

ACTIONS TO RAISE GENDER AWARENESS

- Organise conferences, seminars, lectures with gender experts
- Set up a gender awareness group
- Develop information tools (newsletters, websites, etc)
- Network with women's organisations or equal opportunities bodies

ACTIONS TO PROMOTE WOMEN IN SCIENCE

- Organise outreach activities in the school system
- Invite students to visit the research laboratories
- Organise girls' days
- Deliver lectures in universities/higher education institutions
- Offer traineeships to women students

FP7 Negotiation Guidance Notes – Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and Support Actions, Research for the benefit of specific groups (in particular SMEs) Version 10 September 2010

11.3. CoG in the reporting form for the Project Final Report

c) A report covering the wider societal implications of the project, in the form of a questionnaire, including where applicable gender equality actions, ethical issues, efforts to involve other actors and to spread awareness. The content of this report is described in section 4.3.

C Workforce Statistics		
3. Workforce statistics for the project: Please indicate in the table below the number of people who worked on the project (on a headcount basis).		
Type of Position	Number of Women	Number of Men
Scientific Coordinator		
Work package leaders		
Experienced researchers (i.e. PhD holders)		
PhD Students		
Other		
4. How many additional researchers (in companies and universities) were recruited specifically for this project?		
Of which, indicate the number of men:		

D Gender Aspects		
5. Did you carry out specific Gender Equality Actions under the project?	<input type="radio"/>	Yes
	<input type="radio"/>	No
6. Which of the following actions did you carry out and how effective were they?		
	Not at all effective	Very effective
<input type="checkbox"/> Design and implement an equal opportunity policy	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Set targets to achieve a gender balance in the workforce	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Organise conferences and workshops on gender	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="checkbox"/> Actions to improve work-life balance	○ ○ ○ ○ ○	○ ○ ○ ○ ○
<input type="radio"/> Other:	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	
7. Was there a gender dimension associated with the research content – i.e. wherever people were the focus of the research as, for example, consumers, users, patients or in trials, was the issue of gender considered and addressed?		
<input type="radio"/> Yes- please specify	<input style="width: 100%;" type="text"/>	
<input type="radio"/> No		

Source: Guidance Notes on Project Reporting; FP7 Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and Support Actions, Research for the benefit of Specific Groups (in particular SMEs) Version 2012, P. 6 and P. 30 ff.

11.4. Sample description

11.4.1. Project leaders

In FP7, 528 Collaborative Projects and two Networks of Excellence are coordinated under German direction (as of October 2011). After removing duplicates from the sample⁶⁴, 441 project coordinators received a personalised invitation to take part in this survey. Approximately 85 persons declared themselves willing to take part (19.3%). The 23 surveyed project leaders were selected from the pool of those willing to take part in an interview by means of the following criteria: we preferably interviewed persons whose projects were already complete or had already been running for some time, in order to gain information about how gender aspects are handled during the project lifetime and at the end of the project. We also aimed to achieve a gender balance and ensure that the sample included applicants from various types of institutions (universities, research institutes, businesses) and disciplines (life sciences, engineering and natural sciences, social sciences and humanities).

ID	Title	M/F	Institution	Discipline
PL_1	Dr	F	University	Physics
PL_2	Prof	M	University clinic	Medicine
PL_3	Dr	M	University	Political and social sciences
PL_4	Prof	F	Research institute	Environmental research
PL_5		F	Research institute	Communication /navigation
PL_6	Dr	F	Research institute	Agricultural research
PL_7	Dr	M	Research institute	Chemistry
PL_8		M	Business	Energy
PL_9	Prof.	M	University	Medicine
PL_10	Dr	F	Research institute	Astronomy
PL_11	Dr	F	Research institute	Environmental research
PL_12	Dr	M	Research institute	Energy
PL_13	Dr	M	University	Biotechnology
PL_14		M	Business	Production processes
PL_15	Prof	F	University	Medicine
PL_16	Dr	F	Research institute	Medicine
PL_17	Dr	M	Business	Navigation and transport
PL_18		F	Research institute	Journalism

⁶⁴ I.e. persons who coordinate multiple projects were only invited once.

ID	Title	M/F	Institution	Discipline
PL_19		M	University	Electrical and information engineering
PL_20	Prof	M	University of applied sciences	Transport and land use planning
PL_21	Dr	M	Business	Aeronautics
PL_22	Dr	F	University	Environmental research
PL_23		M	Business	Industrial technologies

11.4.2. EU advisors

EU advisors at higher education institutions⁶⁵ were selected according to the following criteria: all federal states were to be represented; technical universities, universities and medical faculties were all to be represented; members of the federal working group of EU-liaison officers, the Bundesarbeitskreis der EU-Referenten/innen (BAK), were to be represented. We wrote to 106 persons, ten persons declared themselves willing to participate (9.4%).

We researched EU advisors at research institutes and universities of applied sciences over the Internet and wrote to a selection of them. The sample includes two EU advisors at research institutes; employees of research offices at selected universities of applied sciences turned down our interview requests declaring that the institution (currently) coordinated few or no EU projects and no advice was provided on CoG.

ID	M/F	Institution
EU_Adv_1	M	University
EU_Adv_2*	F	University
EU_Adv_3	M	University
EU_Adv_4	F	University
EU_Adv_5	F	University
EU_Adv_6	F	Research institute
EU_Adv_7	F	University
EU_Adv_8	F	Research institute
EU_Adv_9**	F	University

*Two persons took part in the interview; **three persons took part in the interview

11.4.3. NCP employees

A total of 25 employees of the various national contact points in the specific programme "Cooperation", among them the programme coordinators and a number of long-term employees, were requested to participate in the survey. 12 NCP employees from all programme areas were willing to be interviewed.

⁶⁵ Selection basis: list of EU advisors at higher education institutions in Germany, <http://www.kowi.de/Portaldata/2/Resources/publikationen/thema/thema-EU-Referentenliste-HS-DE.pdf>.

ID	M/F	Specific programme "Cooperation"
NCP_1	M	Thematic area 3
NCP_2*	F	Thematic area 9
NCP_3	F	Thematic area 6
NCP_4	M	Thematic area 4
NCP_5	F	Thematic area 2
NCP_6	M	Thematic area 10
NCP_7	M	Thematic area 7
NCP_8	F	Thematic area 8
NCP_9	M	Thematic area 5
NCP_10	F	Thematic area 3
NCP_11	M	Thematic area 4

* Two persons took part in the interview.

11.4.4. Evaluators

We wrote to a selection of 70 of the 1284⁶⁶ German evaluators who evaluated research projects in FP7 in the period from 2007 to 2010. The Commission lists did not include information on the funding instrument; in addition, contact addresses had to be researched. We therefore gave priority to those persons who had evaluated several projects, as these were more likely to have included Collaborative Projects or Networks of Excellence. 13 persons who had evaluated projects in these two funding instruments were willing to participate.

ID	Title	M/F	Institution	Discipline
E_1	Prof	F	University	Medicine
E_2	Prof	F	University	Forestry and environmental sciences
E_3		F	Business	Plastics technology
E_4	Dr	M	University (ES)	Biotechnology
E_5	Dr	F	Research institute	Biophysics
E_6	Dr	F	Research institute	Public health
E_7	Prof	F	University	Biochemistry
E_8	Prof	F	University	Environmental sciences
E_9	Dr	M	Research institute	Physics
E_10	Prof	F	University	Medicine
E_11	Prof	M	University	Restoration science
E_12	Dr	M	Business	Physics

⁶⁶ There were duplicates among these because some persons had evaluated multiple projects.

ID	Title	M/F	Institution	Discipline
E_13	Dr	F	Research institute	Technology / futurology

11.4.5. Commission officials

To recruit project officers at the Commission we wrote to 14 heads of units in various directorates of the European Commission's Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, whose names we were able to research in the Commission Directory⁶⁷. We asked them to forward the survey invitations to their staff. In all, six project officers agreed to participate in an interview.

ID	M/F	Institute/directorate
PO_1	F	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation: Directorate Industrial technologies
PO_2	F	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation: Directorate Industrial technologies
PO_3	F	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation; Directorate Social Sciences and Humanities
PO_4	M	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation: Directorate Industrial technologies
PO_5	F	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation; Directorate Health
PO_6	F	European Commission: Directorate-General for Research & Innovation; Directorate Biotechnologies, Agriculture, Food

⁶⁷ http://ec.europa.eu/staffdir/plsql/gsys_www.branch?pLang=DE&pid=987&pDisplayAll=1.