Convention
GENOVATE 2016

April 6 – April 8, 2016
Amersfoort, Netherlands

Francesca Dall'Acqua, Ofelia Pisanti (UNINA)
Introduction

The GENOVATE Convention 2016 was held on 6 – 8 April 2016 in Amersfoort, Netherlands. Annual conventions provide the opportunity for Consortium partners to discuss their achievements at both the Institutional and at the Consortium level, to share information, and to plan and/or refine new actions.

GENOVATE is currently in the fourth and last year of implementation: all partners are now in the final stages of their GEAP actions, and have been completing or have already finalized project deliverables. The Amersfoort Convention has been the space for partners to celebrate the successes of three intense years of collaborative work, but also to define the course of action for the remaining months of the project. The GENOVATE International Advisory Board also attended the Convention and actively participated in all the sessions, providing valuable feedback and support.

6th April – Sharing institutional achievements within a Stop and Share Framework

Each GEAP implementing partner had the opportunity to share with others (during a ten-minute time slot) their achievements in GEAP implementation. This session was designed so as to focus on celebrating achievements exclusively rather than concentrating on the past and future challenges. Here is a brief synopsis of each partner’s contribution in order of appearance:

UNINA

Dr. Ofelia Pisanti (National Project Coordinator) speaks for the UNINA team, and celebrates the Pilot Mentoring Program, the very first Gender Budget ever realized at UNINA, and the National Learning Circles.

The first Gender Budget of UNINA (and the second one in Italy) has finally been completed, it is currently undergoing the revision and editing process, and will be officially presented to the UNINA Faculty and Administration staff in June. The first UNINA Gender Budget has been conceived as a tool providing raw data and a focused context analysis that will have to support the institution’s future decisions relative to gender equality on campus. However, even the first set of data collected in the early stages of gender budget work revealed immediately valuable, for it helped the mentoring team to select the appropriate target for the Pilot Mentoring Program.

The Pilot Mentoring Program has been carried out also thanks to knowledge exchange (both face-to-face and virtual) activities between UNINA and UCC. In 2014 Dr. Caitriona Ní Laoire, scientific coordinator of the UCC team, was invited by UNINA to facilitate training workshops with the mentees and mentors, which resulted in the launch of the first woman-to-woman Pilot Mentoring Program in Italy. The Program consisted in matching young women researchers with senior women professors from a wide range of departments as well as research institutes, and in ongoing monitoring of the mentor-mentee interactions through individual interviews and focus-group discussions. The final evaluation analysis of the Pilot Mentoring Program is expected to be completed soon.

Lastly, the three National Learning Circles, held in February and March 2016, were all well-attended. The NLCs have been a fertile moment for what it pertains to strengthening the national network of experts in the fields of women’s and gender studies, as well as equal opportunities; discussing strategies for the sustainability of UNINA’s GEAP actions; exchanging expertise (mentoring, gender budgeting), shared learning, dissemination.
TU

Dr. Andrej Kállay speaks for the TU team. Gender equality in Slovakia has not received much attention for the last 20 years; for this reason bringing gender issues to the fore has not been an easy task for the TU team. The most important achievement for the TU team has been the introduction of a Career Development Plan (CDP) informed by equal opportunities at the Faculty level. Last month, moreover, the CDP was included as a criterion in the official Quality Assessment of the university. The TU team is also working with the UNIBRAD team to develop a Social Model of Gender Equality, which concerns a new way of thinking about gender equality and how organizations can implement change from a gender-equality perspective.

The other most visible success concerns increased cooperation and sustained dialogue among different departments on campus, which, prior to GENOVATE, had been more isolated from each other.

UCC

Dr. Caitríona Nó Laoire speaks for the UCC team. Early in the project GENOVATE, assumptions of gender neutrality in academia and fear about gender equality initiatives were prevalent on campus. A key overarching achievement of the project is our success in challenging gender-neutral assumptions and allaying fears. The second key achievement is the development of UCC’s GEAP. It consists of eight action, each of which are informed by a rigorous investigation of policy and practice. The eight proposed actions were approved unanimously by the university management team. The actions include: integrating gender equality into the university’s five-year strategic plan; gender equality monitoring of recruitment and promotion processes, supporting positive management of maternity-leave policies and strengthening gender balance at least 40% women on decision-making bodies, such as the University Academic Council.

Thirdly, the UCC team is pleased to have contributed to UCC’s application for an Athena Swan Award for promoting women in STEM fields; selected GENOVATE GEAP actions have been incorporated in the action plan agreed by the Athena Swan Committee and by the UCC Management Team.

As a consequence, there is now deeper and more widespread acknowledgement of gender issues as well as official support to gender-equality actions.

LTU

Paula Wennberg, National Project Coordinator in Sweden, speaks for the LTU team. At the beginning of GENOVATE LTU identified three major challenges:
1. Low number of women professors
2. Male-dominated ICT sector
3. Sustainability of project results

LTU’s major achievement is the fact that the share of women professors at the university has increased from 17% to 22% between 2012 and 2015. On-going support to the Human Resources department in implementation of gender-aware recruitment and promotion policies and practices has been and is a central element in LTU’s GEAP with aim to achieve structural change. Involving
both men and women in interventions and engagement of the university’s academic management in GENOVATE are identified as success factors. As well as staff taking over the ownership of the change process, i.e. creating and carrying out own gender activities.

Work with research groups for including gender and diversity in research funding proposals has resulted in active support to twenty-seven gender-sensitive proposals in the ICT sector, and in improving women’s access to male-dominated research and innovation systems and strategic networks. The external attention that LTU has gained at local, national and European level for its gender mainstreaming activities has strengthened LTU’s GEAP implementation. Collaboration with stakeholders has also been productive; in particular, the LTU team has contributed with a gender and diversity perspective into a new European certificate programme in research management. The Gender and Diversity Toolkit to integrate gender and diversity perspectives in research and innovation systems has been completed as joint effort between partners and stakeholders with LTU leading the work. The deliverable document including the toolkit to be submitted to EC is in the final stages of the revision process. The LTU team has also been very active on the GENOVATE Community, and contributed a relevant number of public posts about gender and innovation, stakeholder involvement and sustainable change.

**UNIBRAD**

Prof. Uduak Archibong, GENOVATE International Coordinator, speaks for the UNIBRAD team. GENOVATE has provided the opportunity to implement gender-equality actions on campus. Some of these actions have been embedded in the university system, and this is evidence that GENOVATE has helped UNIBRAD to move forward. The project has also become something that people on campus have to take into account. At the beginning the majority of senior leaders were men, but things have changed. A good portion of UNIBRAD team members has also received some level of promotion, as evidence that GENOVATE has also enhanced individual career progression. The full cycle of the Change Academy Model (CAM) framework has been used at Bradford for the first time.

Also, project sustainability is progressing well: GenCafés for instance will become a permanent legacy of GENOVATE to UNIBRAD and will continue to provide a space for building dialogue around gender equality. Just like UCC, UNIBRAD has committed to the Athena Swan Charter in 2013 and UNIBRAD received the Bronze Award in 2016.

**AU**

Prof. Çiller Dursun speaks for the AU team. The political climate in Turkey is very challenging at the moment, to the point, it may argued, that gender equality work can be considered almost a luxury activity compared to what other people have to do to survive on a daily basis. Some team members have lost friends in the bombings.

Nonetheless, the AU team is very proud of the work done through GENOVATE. While there are other gender projects active in the country at the moment, only GENOVATE@AU has implemented a GEAP and had it endorsed by top management. Further, the Higher Education Council (HEC) has, however informally, sustained a proposal to support GEAP implementation in academic institutions.

One of the most important achievements for the AU team concerns the introduction of gender-equality criteria applied to career promotion – this can be considered a revolutionary accomplishment. On-going monitoring of how and to which extent this new policy has been implemented for the past three years shows that indeed gender-equality criteria are being applied
in career promotion processes. Three Gencafés have been organized, and a seminar on gender-competent leadership was held for top management, in line with the top-down approach pursued by the AU team. Also, thanks to GENOVATE, there is now a larger network of people working on gender-equality issues on campus.

UCM

Dr. María Bustelo speaks for the UCM team. Some preliminary feedback on the celebration of achievements is provided. While the academic institutions participating in the GENOVATE project are very different from each other, and so are the challenges that each institution has faced, there have been cases in which information exchange and active support among partners have been fruitful, such as for the Pilot Mentoring Program started by UNINA with the support of UCC. In general, GENOVATE has been a learning experience for all parties involved and a springboard to more inter-departmental and interdisciplinary collaboration and joint work. The project has contributed to upgrade academic institutions in the national context and has also contributed to individual career progression of some GENOVATE members.

After the tea break of this afternoon session, the minutes of VGEN of 15th September 2016 were read and approved by the attendees.

7th April - Consortium Leads’ Sessions

The second day of the Convention was devoted to the WP’s sessions. Each WP, with the exception of WP7 (that as usual led a longer workshop on the evaluation on the third day), is asked to discuss the work in progress to be completed in the final year of the Project and other relevant aspects of their WP tasks.

WP1 - Management of the GENOVATE Consortium
Lead UNIBRAD

The end-project delivery plan is illustrated, and teams are asked to provide feedback re deadlines and other challenging aspects they may envision for the remaining months. Prof. Uduak Archibong emphasizes the importance of collaboration among partners for what it pertains to both the work related to the Work Packages and the work related to institutional GEAPs. All Consortium partners are then asked to think about a GEAP action implemented through the whole GENOVATE research-action cycle, and about the legacy of that particular action. IAB members are asked to move around the room and participate in each team’s discussion. UNIBRAD, for instance, has consistently pushed the Human Resources department to endorse the 50-50 gender ratio principle to the point that the department has now accepted to modify the previous institutional gender-ratio target.
In the boxes below a short synthesis of each partner’s contribution to the WP1 activity is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>Rethinking innovation from a gender perspective.</td>
<td>University staff taking over the ownership of the change process and creating and carrying out own gender activities, e.g. workshop on gamification from a gender perspective organized by male colleagues in ICT recently.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>Promoting gender equality on campus.</td>
<td>Development of the Career Development Plan (CDP). It is a tool connecting Faculty members and top management on campus. Worldcafés and a variety of events have been used to discuss the CDP.</td>
<td>CDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td></td>
<td>A specific unit on campus in charge of funding has been influenced by GENOVATE. Also, gender balance ratio in the University Council is changing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIBRAD</td>
<td>Promoting gender champions in senior-management spheres. Men are targeted.</td>
<td>GENOVATE activities have been embedded in the university ten-year plan and in the excellence framework.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIBRAD</td>
<td>Provision of gender-disaggregated data.</td>
<td>Establishment of the Gender Observatory on campus. The Observatory will support and promote initiatives relative to women’s studies and STEM fields, gender and research evaluation, on-going gender budgeting, women’s academic careers, monitoring of equal opportunities and practices, gender and fund raising.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Synthesis of each partner’s contribution to the WP1 activity.

WP2: Development of a social model of gender equality implementation  
Lead TU and UNIBRAD

The development of the Social Model of Gender Equality Implementation (coordinated by both the TU and the UNIBRAD teams) is illustrated by Dr Andrej Kállay. The model has been developed
through the input of Consortium partners, who have periodically contributed guided verbal (M10, 24, 42) and written reflections (M12, 20, 36) on GEAP implementation. These data have helped the TU team to understand the specificity of each partner’s institutional context.

The development of the Social Model has gone through several drafts. Among the challenging aspects of the draft process reported are the differences among the Consortium institutions; for instance, understandings of management roles and tasks vary significantly. For this reason, attention to context has been a key element in the process and translated in efforts to enhance the fluidity of the cycle proposed in the model. The most recent draft of the Social Model is distributed to partners for new feedback. A common remark emerged during the discussion concerns mentioning GENOVATE more explicitly in the Model.

WP 3 - Gender equality in recruitment, progression and research support

Lead UCC

Dr Caítriona Ní Laoire describes Consortium partners’ GEAP areas: data provision and data monitoring, recruitment and promotion processes, setting gender targets, support to women’s career progression.

For the past few months the UCC team has worked on finalizing D3.1, which is based on the learning process on implementing all the WP3 actions. Consortium partners’ actions have been put in each one of the areas (above mentioned), and then actions have been connected to specific measures. Some actions are specific to individual institutions while others are shared by a good number of them. The aim of D3.1 is to make this learning process available also to other institutions.

The activity prepared by the UCC team and illustrated by Caítriona Ní Laoire, Sarah Field, and Nicola Maxwell concerns how actions developed within the GENOVATE framework can continue to have a long-term impact beyond GENOVATE. Each institution is first asked to reflect into their own groups on how WP3 actions may be deepened for sustainable impact; second, institutional teams are asked to share the key discussion points with each other through a cross-institutional knowledge sharing exercise developed by the UCC team; third, each institution is asked to go back into their own groups and share the learning from phase two of the activity.

The UCM team is then asked to briefly anticipate some comments on evaluation of WP3 actions that will be then discussed during the Evaluation Workshop in the last day of the Convention.

WP 4 - Working environment and culture change

Lead AU

Dr Caítriona Ní Laoire speaks on behalf of Dr Çíler Dursun, focussing on D4.2, which is due in May 2016. Partners are asked to update their gender-climate assessment done in the first year of the project so as to provide the data necessary for a comparative analysis between 2013 and 2016. The AU team has circulated the guidelines already. Themes listed in these guidelines are not necessarily prescriptive, but they should be rather understood as basic ideas that may guide the new assessment. Evidence of climate change should be provided through reference to material such as GENOVATE meetings documents, images, other reports, quotations, etc.

Dr Pisanti (UNINA) points out that UNINA’s 2013 gender-climate assessment was very articulate, but that in this case, given the tight deadline (1st May 2016), it will not be possible to provide an equally exhaustive document. Similarly, Dr Dursun mentions that in 2013 they also had done copious individual interviews and focus groups, but for the 2016 update they have significantly
reduced the number of interviewees. Prof. Fältholm (LTU) points out that a fruitful way to assess institutional change is to compare changes regardless of the different methodologies employed to measure change. She also suggests to use inductive methods as well as the deductive methods for data collection suggested in the guidelines. Dr Ni Laoire agrees and says the guidelines were drafted to cope with very tight deadlines.

WP5 - Excellence in research and innovation through gender equality and diversity
Lead LTU, in collaboration with UNIBRAD and UCC

Paula Wennberg, the WP5 Leader and Prof. Ylva Fältholm both illustrate the Gender and Diversity Toolkit, and the proposed structure of the deliverable D5.2. In detail, the face-to-face WP5 slot is utilised as a WP5 working meeting with following agenda items: Toolkit demonstration, D5.2 Proposed structure, WP5 Resources left, D5.2 Time schedule, WD5.2 Final report and Next WP5 monthly meetings. The WP5 work is expected to end in June 2016 according to plan; at the moment there are two scheduled Skype monthly meetings left.

A hard copy of the Toolkit is distributed to the attendees. The task T5.2 and the deliverable D5.2 toolkit has been completed as joint effort with all Consortium partners, the toolkit is the result of participatory and interactive work and seeks to promote sustainable change in academia, industry and government organizations. Skype monthly meetings provided the opportunity to discuss gender and innovation, and to produce part of the content of the toolkit. The final version of the toolkit includes a number of methods and tools to raise gender awareness and promote sustainable change. Usability tests have already been administered by partners to a variety of stakeholders, and now efforts are directed at further promoting the usage of the toolkit during and beyond the end of the project. The partners are reminded to record all toolkit presentation events.

Some partners, however, point out that a number of contributions and suggestions proposed have not been inserted in the toolkit version that was distributed. Ylva Fältholm says these can still be added and asks partners to re-send the feedback by email as soon as possible.

Partners are asked to contribute a short paragraph (ten lines approximately) that describes their country context and contribution to the task D5.2 work through their institutional GEAPs. A number of partners suggest to focus on the toolkit process instead; as a consequence, the draft of D5.2 was amended on the spot and, in particular, “toolkit development and implementation process” was inserted in subsection four of the draft.

The final discussion is about the WP5 end date, which is June 2016 according to the description of the work (DoW). The task T5.2 work is on schedule but some partners might need more time to conclude their WP5 related GEAP activities and they propose to move the WP5 end date to December 2016. The WP5 Leader is concerned about the WP5 resources left and says this matter should be further discussed and decided in the next VGEN. The submission date of the working document WD5.2 Final report that will feed the final periodic report to be submitted to EC is moved from June to November 2016.

WP6 - Knowledge exchange and institutional case studies
Lead UNINA

Dr Ofelia Pisanti introduces WP6 work and summarizes the key goals and achievements of this work package. The activity proposed to partners focuses on GEAP sustainability, which is at the core of the last year of the project. Partners are asked to think about what type of expertise can
best help them to ensure GEAP sustainability. Each partner is asked to reflect on:
1) sustainability of what?
2) which strategies for sustainability?
3) which challenges against sustainability?
Subsequently, they have to share their reflections relative to internal sustainability (at the institutional scale) and to external sustainability (at the European scale). A discussion tip is provided and that is partners are invited to think about connections and possible alliances with other European institutions, and about their interest and/or capacity to cooperate with these institutions in the future. A representative for each team then summarizes the key points of their group discussion to all the attendees.

For the UNINA team the two main challenges now are to transform the Pilot Mentoring Program into a permanent institutional program, and to have gender budgeting inserted as a task of the Gender Observatory. The Gender Observatory will have to become the institutional space through which sustainability of both actions can be achieved. The main challenges are related to clarify the differences between CUG (Comitato Unico di Garanzia = Equal Opportunities Committee) and the Gender Observatory for what it pertains to goals and actions.

For the LTU team sharing and disseminating GENOVATE gender knowledge with stakeholder organizations is a very important challenge now. They are writing a large funding application for a northern center of excellence, but they are also involved in the mining industry, and they have liaised with other centers that work on how to transform workplaces. They have also liaised on the European level with EARMA, which is the European association of research managers and administrators.

For the TU team it is important to ensure the sustainability of the Career Development Plan (CDP). The main challenges refer to how to continue to transform ideas into actions, because gender stereotypes persist on campus.

For the UCC team, all their GEAP actions are expected to be sustainable. The team’s sustainability strategy has three strands. First engaging to ensure the implementation of each action is led by a champion from the university management team, supported by the lead technical expert from the GENOVATE team. Second engaging to ensure the establishment of periodic reporting of gender equality actions to the university management on an annual basis. Third taking part in, and influencing, the development and implementation of an Athena SWAN action plan. Additionally, GENOVATE-UCC has recommended that the expert group reviewing gender equality in higher education institution in Ireland establish periodic reporting at national level. Challenges include the possibility of under-enforcement of actions, and the co-option of the periodic reporting mechanisms as a mirage for action.

For the AU team gender competent leadership is an important issue. They now have a gender-competence program in cooperation with the leadership training coordinator; yet it is difficult to reach leaders in this type of training programs. In terms of external sustainability they plan to share their GENOVATE expertise through seminars with other stakeholders and gender projects in other universities.

For the UNIBRAD team GEAP sustainability is in progress, as they have already integrated GEAP actions into other programs, such as the Athena Swan and the government compact scheme. UNIBRAD has embarked on training leaders, the program is called “Bradford Leader”, which is linked to the Bradford excellence program. They have already started to interact with other universities; there is a network of universities that they are working with to see how they can support each other. One of the challenges concerns recent changes in high education funding in the UK. Therefore it is important to make sure university managers and leaders do not use that as
an excuse not to carry on gender equality actions. The forthcoming Brexit referendum also makes thinking about sustainability at the European scale more difficult at the moment.

WP8 - Dissemination and sustainability strategy
Lead UNIBRAD

Interactive activities are not carried out in this WP session, due to time constraints and fatigue. The key goal of WP8 work is dissemination. Use of social media is the first topic addressed. Partners’ use of YouTube should be substantially improved but use of Twitter has been successful instead. Prof Archibong mentions that there is no point in setting up any social media if we are not going to populate them.

The GENOVATE Final Conference in Brussels is discussed. The aspiration is to make the Brussels conference not like all other conferences, but to target the “unusual suspects” instead, because these are the people who would need GENOVATE products the most. The prospective audience should be the people who would normally not go to this kind of conferences.

D8.4 is discussed. Instructions will be given about updating and revising the NLC reports so as to focus also on the things that have had impact on the institution. The intention is to pull six NLC impact case studies from the reports so as to show the impact of GENOVATE on each institution. Emphasis should be put on elements of strong impact that can support GEAP sustainability. A member of the UCC team voices concern over NLCs being framed as shared learning experiences, and now being reframed as a GENOVATE-only work instead. This may not be fair to NLC participants. Prof Archibong says they would not say that they “derived something from this or that NLC.” They only want to focus on what has had a major impact in each institution.

8th April: WP7 Evaluation workshop

The third day of the Convention was devoted to a workshop on the Evaluation led by Prof. Maria Bustelo, Dr. María Velasco and Dr Julia Espinosa of the UCM team.

“Evaluation refers to the process of determining the merit worth and significance of an activity, policy or program. An assessment, as systematic and objective as possible, of a planned, on-going, or completed intervention, its design, implementation and results. An evaluation should provide credible and useful information, enabling the incorporation of lessons learned into the decision-making process.”

Purposes of evaluation:
• To learn from and improve our practice, analysing how the programs are designed and implemented as well as what its main results are.
• To enlighten future programs according to the implemented ones.
• To be accountable to people involved in the programs in order to be transparent and promote collective learning

The so-called “flower exercise” is then illustrated. The whole flower has to be completed in order for the UCM team to have all the data for evaluation. Each petal refers to a specific aspect of evaluation work, so delimitation of GEAP was addressed in the first year of the project, then after the Trnava Convention emphasis was on designing questions and identifying indicators, and so forth. In this last year of the project the focus in on creating a strategy for data collection, on data analysis, and on creating new understandings. Once the evaluation process is concluded, whereby successes and failures of the project have been analysed, recommendations and lessons learned
ensue that could be useful to other projects. Partners are asked to participate in two activities. In the first one each team has to distribute a total of 200 points across different GEAP areas, thus providing quantitative data relative to the different value of different GEAP areas in general. Partners will be subsequently asked, after the Amersfoort Convention, to repeat the same exercise with their own institutional GEAP. In the second activity each team is assigned a petal of "the flower exercise" and to each team is asked to share tips re “what would you recommend to others?” The goal of this activity is to include GEAP-implementing partners’ tips into the guidelines. At the end of the evaluation workshop the list of post-Amersfoort actions is illustrated, followed by final remarks and goodbye greetings.