

Report on surveys for staff training sessions

Document

Deliverable /Milestone No.:	D5.1	Due Date:	2019-11-30
WP / Task:	WP5 / 5.1.3	Pages:	48

Authors	Name	Organization / Unit
Main Author	Friederike Kunz (FK), Joanna Waniek (JW)	IOW IOW
Contributing Author(s)	All partners	All Baltic Gender partners

Table of contents

1	Summary	1
2	Content, aims and scope of the report.....	2
3	Training sessions held on gender equality for staff in partner institutions	2
3.1	Timeline and budget for the action	2
3.2	Planning, preparation and conduction of the partner-specific training sessions	2
3.3	Overview on sessions held at the partner institutions	4
4	Design of online questionnaires (initial and exit questionnaires)	8
5	Results of the online surveys for staff training sessions	9
5.1	Reply rates	9
5.2	Analysis of answered questions	10
5.2.1	Estonian Marine Institute (UT-EMI)	11
5.2.2	Klaipėda University (KU).....	14
5.2.3	GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel / Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel (CAU) / Kiel University of Applied Sciences (UAS)	16
5.2.4	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE).....	20
5.2.5	Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research (IOW)	22
5.2.6	Lund University (LU)	24
6	Appendix	27
6.1	ICF for D5.1 "Report on surveys for staff training" (Template 5 taken from appendix 5 in the Baltic Gender Ethical Requirement No.1, Version 5, 25/05)	27
6.2	Questions asked in the pre-course questionnaires	29
6.3	Questions asked in the exit questionnaires	33



D5.1 Report on surveys for staff training sessions

1 Summary

In order to engage leaders (as well as other staff members) in promoting gender equality and exploring methods of gender analysis, as well as to demonstrate them the importance of incorporating the gender dimension in research content, custom tailored training sessions have been organized in partner institutions of the Baltic Gender project (Task 5.1).

For the institutions without pre-existing gender equality plans (UT-EMI; KU), the staff training sessions have been the first action in this field and attracted staff members at different organizational levels. It is important to note that there was a strong interest of top management level. These workshops can be seen as initial supporting action during the implementation of gender equality plans. From this starting point, further activities addressing various topics and approaching specific target groups of institutional staff members could be arranged in the future.

At the partner institutions with pre-existing gender equality plans the situation is more diverse. At LU, which has been adopting gender mainstreaming strategies for almost three years now, training sessions on gender issues are performed on a regular basis (once a year). At SYKE, which has a gender equality plan for more than twenty years already, institutional benefits and ideas for the new gender equality plan have been discussed including all staff members. Other partner institutions like GEOMAR, CAU, UAS and IOW which have gender equality plans for few years now, either already had experience with different event formats or defined individual topics for the first time during this Baltic Gender activity.

The organization of the working units for equal opportunities is also different. While the majority has one equal opportunity officer or more (GEOMAR, CAU, UAS, IOW), CAU and LU meet the challenges by equal opportunity committees at the level of faculties (as well as departments in case of LU) and the institution as a whole. Traditionally, at universities, there are more people involved than at smaller institutions with less staff employed. At SYKE, the human resources department coordinates the further development of gender equality issues, whereas at the IOW the equal opportunity committee consisting of representatives of all employee groups and led by the institute's director actively supports the work of the equal opportunity officer.

Considering the individual needs of the institutions in relation to their size, core mission and resources, further trainings in gender issues should be:

- based on needs identified using survey data or other means of monitoring actual requirements and data if possible,
- tailored to serve needs specific for different groups of employees,
- organized in a format (topic, time, place, length, language, material...) that conveys the training (to staff) in a way that follows the vision of the institution,
- interactive by nature so that space is provided for exchange of ideas and mutual learning.

2 Content, aims and scope of the report

Content: This report provides a summary of the training activities, including quality assessment of the individual training sessions held at the partner institutions and summarizes opinions on the activity as a whole.

Objectives: Based on the answers to the questionnaires (as described in section 4) we collected individual opinions and the range of attitudes within the pool of different groups of staff at the partner institutions. Conclusions from these insights may be used for recommendations concerning the planning of future actions of internal training measures in partner institutions (and beyond).

Addressed target group: The report is aimed at/targets the project leaders of the Baltic Gender consortium and the human resources departments at the partner institutions.

Stages: This report was prepared on basis of returned questionnaires for the training sessions that have been held until April 2019 and the available information on further staff training activities until end of November 2019. It includes additional information provided by the persons responsible for organization of the training sessions at the partner institutions. Draft versions of the report were circulated within the consortium. Each involved partner contributed to the final document with a) direct support to the training sessions (communication with high level management & participants, scheduling etc.) as well as discussion of and comments on the draft report and b) direct contributions of workshop participants themselves (via pre-course and evaluation questionnaires).

3 Training sessions held on gender equality for staff in partner institutions

3.1 Timeline and budget for the action

The staff training sessions were held between April 2018 and November 2019.

For this action, a total amount of 28.000,00 € was granted in the proposal. This sum was divided by the number of partners, providing each partner with a budget of 3.500,00 € for conducting the individual training sessions.

3.2 Planning, preparation and conduction of the partner-specific training sessions

For a close communication with the task leader before, during and after the trainings, at least one contact person/representative was named from the partner's side. With respect to the individual institutional situation, setting and experience, each partner was asked to decide about topics and providers for the trainings to be implemented. At this stage the task leader assisted with a list of potential topics and Europe-wide course providers. As soon as the partner had made a decision on the topic(s), the provider and the preferred date, the task leader was informed. The task leader then forwarded detailed information on the contracting and invoicing to the provider and sent the Informed Consent Form (ICF) to the partner along with a draft for the questionnaire, information on the formal procedure, instructions for participants and template lists of participants if needed.

The draft questionnaire was designed individually with respect to the topic(s) of the staff training session. Upon agreement on the questionnaire drafts, the task leader forwarded the link to the online questionnaire to the partner for distribution to all registered participants together with the ICF and all necessary instructions. ICFs were necessary for all actions involving humans, e.g. for interviews, surveys, questionnaires, feedback sheets and focus groups, according to the "guideline on human participation" (protection of personal data requirement no.1 / humans). An ICF template is given in appendix 6.1. Time intervals for completion of the initial (pre-course) and exit (evaluation) questionnaires were set in agreement with the partner depending on the scheduling and registration deadlines for the individual training sessions.

3.3 Overview on sessions held at the partner institutions

Table 1. Overview on all staff training sessions held at the individual partner institutions

Date	Partner Institution	Topic	Course Provider	Venue, time & target group	no. of Participants	Costs
3 April 2018	Estonian Marine Institute, University of Tartu (UT-EMI)	How to set up and implement GEP; Structures to support gender equality work, Organizational culture and work-life balance; Recruitment, selection and career progression support; Leadership and decision-making	Ülle-Marike Papp and Riina Kütt (EIGE listed gender experts, Tallinn, Estonia)	One day training at the Estonian Marine Institute of the University of Tartu, Tallinn: 9:30am–17:00pm (7.5 h)	15	2,700.00 €
4 September 2018	GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel (GEOMAR), Kiel University (Kiel CAU), Kiel University of Applied Sciences (Kiel UAS)	"Gendered innovations" - How to include gender aspects into research questions/projects (joint workshop of GEOMAR, Kiel UAS and Kiel CAU)	Prof. Londa Schiebinger (Science history; director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender, Stanford University, U.S.)	University of Kiel (CAU), Kiel: 14:30pm-17:00pm (2,5 h), (embedded in a conference upon invitation by SFB/Baltic Gender)	16	3,131.54 €

Date	Partner Institution	Topic	Course Provider	Venue, time & target group	no. of Participants	Costs
1) 29 November 2018 2) 22 January 2019	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)	focus on SYKE-specific challenges in equity promotion (course 29.11.2018: Promotion of equality in management and leadership, legislation, personnel management, problems and issues specific for SYKE)	Sinikka Mustakallio , WoM World of management Ltd. (Helsinki, Finland)	Two-part workshop at SYKE: 1) 13:00pm – 16:00pm (1/2 day) Middle managers gender and equality training, 2) 13:00pm – 14:30pm (1,5 h) Top management gender and equality training	1) 6 2) Not registered ¹	3,472.00 €
1) 14 January 2019 2) 15 January 2019 3) 16 January 2019	The Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research, Warnemünde (IOW)	"Gender equality in research institutions: unconscious bias"	Katrien van der Heyden , NESMA Consulting bvba (Mortsel, Belgium)	3 Workshops in week 3/2019 at IOW: 1) 12:00–16:00pm (4 h) IOW top management, 2) 9:00am–13:00pm (4 h) IOW working group leaders, 3) 9:00am–12:00 (3 h) IOW Bachelor and Master Students, PhD candidates and PostDocs	1) 7 2) 4 3) 11	3,323.50 €

Date	Partner Institution	Topic	Course Provider	Venue, time & target group	no. of Participants	Costs
10 April 2019	Lund University (LU)	"Gender dynamics in academic recruitment and selection"	Mathias W. Nielsen (Assistant Professor, Århus University)	1 workshop at Lund University: (2h), top management of Lund University	37	542.05 €
1) 29 April 2019 2) 30 April 2019 3) 29–30 April	Klaipeda University (KU)	"Raising awareness on gender and diversity issues in research institutions"	Katrien van der Heyden , NESMA Consulting bvba (Mortsel, Belgium)	3 workshops in week 18/2019: 1) mid-management, 13:00–17:00pm (4h) 2) (2 h) top management 3) 29 April 8:30am–12:30pm and 30 April 8:00–11:00am researchers and teachers (7h)	1) 8 2) 4 3) 15	3.543,25 €
By month 39 the remaining budget was, in agreement with the EC, used for the following training:						
1) 2 July 2019 2) 25 October 2019	GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel (GEOMAR), Kiel University (Kiel CAU), Kiel University of Applied Sciences (Kiel UAS)	"Things like this of course do not happen here?!" – workshop series on "sexual harassment in institutions on higher education and research institutes" with:	1) and 3) Dr. Sabine Blackmore , Blackmore Coaching (Berlin, Germany) 2) WING CONCEPTS academy (Kiel, Germany)	1) 09:00–15:30pm marine scientists (in German language) at Kiel University of Applied Sciences (Kiel UAS), Heikendorfer Weg 31 2) 09:00–16:30pm only female scientists (in	1) 13 2) 17 3) 12 ²	1) 1,646.30 € 2) 590.00 € 3) 1,520 € ³

Date	Partner Institution	Topic	Course Provider	Venue, time & target group	no. of Participants	Costs
3) 28 November 2019		1) and 3) "Border violations in academia – How to deal with and prevent sexualized violations" 2) "Assertiveness and Self-Defense Training for women"		German language) at the University of Kiel (CAU), Kiel, Olshausenstraße 80 I 3) 09:00–16:30pm scientific staff from marine sciences (in English language) at GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel (GEOMAR), Düsternbrooker Weg 20		

¹The second part of the two-part workshop at SYKE was carried out on January 22, 2019 as a part of SYKE management forum and it was targeted to all leaders, including the top management (one and a half hours session). Participants were mixed and not registered. The total number of the participants at SYKE management forum was 39 (20 male, 19 female).

²preliminary numbers; registration not yet completed

³estimated costs on basis of actual quote

4 Design of online questionnaires (initial and exit questionnaires)

The impact of the training sessions was assessed by online surveys. As the surveys were aimed at collecting individual opinions, online questionnaires were used for making the procedures as practicable as possible for the participants in each partner institution. Participants should be able to access the questionnaires independent of location and time factors according to their individual needs and availability. Initial (pre-course) questionnaires and exit (evaluation) questionnaires were designed to get feedback from participants on their expectations, preexisting knowledge and usefulness of the training sessions. Alternatively, participants were offered the opportunity to fill out a paper copy of the questionnaires on-site immediately prior to the start or after the end of the workshops. As the topics chosen by the institutions vary widely, the focus of the questions was set rather on qualitative answers/feedback information from participants than on gaining quantitative information.

For the detailed set of questions please see the appendix 6.2 and 6.3.

5 Results of the online surveys for staff training sessions

5.1 Reply rates

Since the individual questionnaires were filled out with varying degrees of completeness (i.e. individual questions were skipped), in the following table (table 2), the number of responding persons is given (n = number of persons).

Table 2. Overview on number of participants and the number and proportion of answered questionnaires

Partner Institution (acronym)	Date of staff training	Number of participants			Answered questionnaires*			
		total	thereof		Pre-course		exit	
			male	female	No.	%	No.	%
UT-EMI	03.04.2018	15	5	10	3	20	4	27
GEOMAR/CAU/UAS	04.09.2018	16	1	15	14	88	8	50
SYKE	29.11.2018	6	0	6	4	67	4	67
	22.01.2019	39	?	?	Not applied ¹			
IOW	14.01.2019	7	4	3	3	43	2	29
	15.01.2019	4	2	2	4	100	3	75
LU	10.04.2019	37	15	22	6	16	5	14
KU	29.04.2019	8	0	8	– ²	– ²	7	88
	30.04.2019	4	2	2	– ²	– ²	1	25
	29.+30.4.2019	15	3	12	– ²	– ²	8	54

*Questionnaires filled in partly or wholly

¹The second part of the two-part workshop at SYKE was carried out on January 22, 2019 as a part of SYKE management forum and it was targeted to all leaders, including the top management (one and a half hours session). The total number of the participants at SYKE management forum was 39 (20 male, 19 female).

²Registration of participants was completed the day before the workshops. Due to this short time span between registration and start of the workshops, no pre-course questionnaires were sent out to the participants.

5.2 Analysis of answered questions

Preliminary notes:

For interpretation of the received spectrum of answers, additional information is needed from contact persons (e. g.: Was this action the first of its kind at the institution? Or have there been previous activities on similar topics? If yes, in which format (type, duration, addressed participants)?).

Depending on the institutional situation as a whole, the individual institutional aims and expectations for the workshop sessions were different. Despite these differences, some general observations can be summarized:

- Independent from the size and type of institution, focus, length and audience of the event, the overall feedback from participants and persons being responsible for organizing the event(s) has been positive
- The answers to the exit questionnaires show that there is a wish as well as a need for further actions addressing gender in relation to various aspects of research

GROUP A) Partner institutions without pre-existing gender equality plans

5.2.1 Estonian Marine Institute (UT-EMI)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action:

Size of the institution:

95 employees (as of June 2019), thereof 89 employees in the scientific department (51 male and 38 female) and 6 employees in the non-scientific department (administration), thereof 2 male and 4 female

Existence of a gender equality plan:

First GEP in preparation at the time when the workshop was held (approved in November 2018)

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

No

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

None

B) staff training event:

Event format: capacity building workshop

Topic: How to understand and promote gender equality in the organization

Objectives: To raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for researchers and top management helping to promote gender equality at UT-EMI and move towards institutional change. Specifically, the following topics were covered during the training: ABC of gender equality; gender issues in science and in the organization; Gender Equality Plan (analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring, factors of success, obstacles); mapping the situation, identifying priorities; useful materials for dealing with gender issues within the organization.

Duration: 7.5 hours

Participants: 15 persons, junior and senior researchers, top management (head of UT personnel department, director of UT-EMI)

Expectations of participants: As the topic was relatively new to many participants, the general expectation was to raise awareness and improve knowledge on gender equality issues.

Reflection of participants:

- skills in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating a GEP improved by the workshop: rated with an average score of 4.5 (of a maximum score of 10) before the workshop vs. 7 after the workshop
- skills in developing and implementing structures to support gender equality work improved: rated with an average score of 5 (of 10) before the workshop vs. 7 after the workshop
- skills in promoting organizational culture and work-life balance slightly improved: rated with an average score of 6 (of 10) before the workshop vs. 7 after the workshop
- skills in ensuring gender equality in recruitment / selection processes and career progression support slightly improved: rated with an average score of 6.5 (of 10) before the workshop vs. 8 after the workshop
- skills in promoting gender equality in leadership and decision-making slightly improved: rated with an average score of 6.5 (of 10) before the workshop vs. 7.5 after the workshop
- Relevance of the workshop for participant's job role: rated with an average score of 7 (of 10)
- Confidence about applying the knowledge in own job role: rated with an average score of 7 (of 10)
- Expectancy to apply the knowledge in own job role: rated to be quite often (intermediate) with an average score of 6 (of 10)
- Workshop content:
 - Amount was rated to be good with an average score of 7.5 (of 10)
 - Difficulty was rated to be intermediate to high with an average score of 7 (of 10)
 - Length was rated to be quite good with an average score of 6.5 (of 10)
- Workshop methods:
 - Visual supports and documentation were rated to be useful with an average score of 8 (of 10)
 - Balance between theory and practice was rated quite useful to useful with an average score of 7.5 (of 10)
- Satisfaction with workshop instructor:
 - Knowledge of the subject/activity was rated to be very good with an average score of 9 (of 10)
 - Creating interest in the subject/activity was rated to be good with an average score of 7.5 (of 10)
 - Relating the workshop to own job role was rated to be quite good with an average score of 6 (of 10)
 - Understanding own needs was rated to be quite good with an average score of 7.5 (of 10)

- Responding to questions, offering support and advice was rated to be very good with an average score of 8.5 (of 10)

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

This workshop was the first of its kind at the Estonian Marine Institute. As explained by the Estonian project members, the situation in Estonian higher education institutions is different from what we find in the other partner countries. In Estonia, more women than men are working in science, however, men are dominating in leading positions. Estonian science funding used to be, and mostly is, project based. Universities are not covering neither salaries nor research costs and more men than women are leaving science due to higher salaries in the economics and business sector. This situation has started to change. The Government's target for the coming years is to establish 50% project based (externally funded) research and 50% direct funding to universities.

Apart from this specific setting, the expectations stated in the pre-course questionnaires showed that there is both interest and need for customized offers for continuing education, enhancing the knowledge and awareness about gender equality and how it can be promoted in research organizations.

5.2.2 Klaipėda University (KU)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action

Size of the institution:

891 employees (as of 20/11/2018), thereof 505 employees in the scientific departments (242 male and 263 female) and 386 employees in the non-scientific departments (infrastructure and administration)

Existence of a gender equality plan:

No. The first Gender equality plan developed during the Baltic Gender project (approved in November 2018)

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

No.

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

None. Training by Katrien Van der Heyden (NESMA Consulting, Belgium) was the first training open for all staff of the University

B) Staff training event

Event format: 3 capacity building workshops

Topic: "Raising awareness on gender and diversity issues in research institutions"

Objectives:

To enhance the preexisting knowledge of scientists, lecturers and members of mid- and top-management and to raise their awareness on gender equality and diversity in relation to research

Duration: 1. Workshop: 2 hours (top-management)
2. Workshop: 4 hours (mid-management)
3. Workshop: 7 hours (scientific and teaching staff)

Participants:

1. Workshop: 4 persons (rector and vice-rectors of KU administration, dean of the Faculty of Marine Technology & Natural Sciences)

2. Workshop: 8 persons, including the director of the Marine Research Institute, the dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences and director of KU Publishing House
3. Workshop: 15 persons (scientific and teaching staff from different faculties and institutes of KU)

Expectations of participants:

The general expectation was to raise awareness and improve knowledge on gender equality issues.

Reflection of participants:

- raised awareness in this topic
- The workshop was very relevant and useful
- The Seminar gave me concrete examples how could I apply Gender issue in my research work
- Themes and similar lesson trainings can be continued in diversity aspects

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

This workshop was very well received by the participants and was reflected to greatly expand their knowledge on how gender and diversity is linked to science.

GROUP B) Partner institutions with pre-existing gender equality plans

5.2.3 GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel / Christian-Albrechts-University Kiel (CAU) / Kiel University of Applied Sciences (UAS)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action:

GEOMAR:

Size of the institution:

- 629 employees (as of June 2019), thereof 310 employees in the scientific department (177 male and 133 female) and 319 employees in the non-scientific department (technology, infrastructure and administration), thereof 150 male and 169 female
- Overall share of women in positions in the scientific department: 42.9%, in the non-scientific department: 52.9%
- proportion of women in leadership positions in the scientific department: 25.8%, with a proportion of women in permanent positions: 24.5%

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- first GEP for 2015–2019 (set in place in March 2015, updated in 2017)
- GEP goals by 2019:
 - to increase the amount of permanent female scientists to 25%
 - increasing the percentage of women in scientific leadership positions to 30%

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

- yes
- new equal opportunities commissioner and deputy equal opportunities commissioner took up their posts on June 1st, 2019

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

- Talk entitled “Gender Diversity als Teil einer neuen Führungskultur: Ziele setzen, Kompetenzen aufbauen, handeln“, Dr. Claudia Neusüß, 03.02.2016, GEOMAR Kiel (for all staff)
- Podium discussion on „Partnerschaftliche Familienmodelle machen Karriere“ 14.11.2018, GEOMAR (for all staff)

Kiel CAU:

Size of the institution:

- 3807 employees (as of 2019), thereof 2314 employees in the scientific department (1408 male and 906 female) and 1493 employees in the non-scientific department (technology, infrastructure and administration), thereof 543 male and 950 female

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- GEP 2012–2016 with qualitative and quantitative targets
 - quantitative targets:
 - 50% women in doctoral research positions and 50% in doctoral graduates
 - 40% women in post-doc positions and 40% of completed post-doc lecture qualifications (habilitations)
 - 40% women in permanent research and teaching positions
 - 50% women in assistant professorships
 - 20% women in full W2 and W3 professorships (at least)
 - 20% women on the University Board (at least)

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

- yes (since 1992)
- One (central) equal opportunities commissioner with three deputies and seven additional persons in the Central Office for Gender Equality, Diversity and Family
- about 20 decentral additional equal opportunities commissioners in all eight faculties

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

Yes:

- For deans:
 - Every two years: training on gender equality, especially on recruitment procedures for professorship positions
 - Special workshops, e.g. on active recruitment of female scientists
- For equal opportunity commissioners on faculty level:
 - Dealing with resistances
 - On a regular basis (every two to three years, last time 2016): Recruitment procedures for professorship positions
- Several activities specific for faculties of institutes (e.g. gender equality days in the Medical Faculty, Physics Department, summer schools in the Institute for Philosophy, gender awareness workshops for members of the Future Ocean).
- On a yearly basis: seminars on the use of gender-fair language in science and administration

- Since 2016 (annually): Diversity day(s) at Kiel University – different workshop on gender and diversity awareness raising (programme of the last diversity days: https://www.diversitaet.uni-kiel.de/de/Programm_DivTage2019.pdf; in German only)

KIEL UAS:

Size of the institution:

- 486 employees (as of 2018), thereof 246 employees in the scientific department (157 male and 86 female) and 246 employees in the non-scientific department (technology, infrastructure and administration). thereof 103 male and 140 female

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- current GEP for 2014–2020
- GEP Goals: to actively support equal opportunities for all members of the higher education institute at all levels; to be achieved by:
 - Structural and organizational development
 - Sensitization

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

- Yes (since 1993)
- One equal opportunities commissioner, a staff assistant in the office of gender equality as well as a staff assistant in the family services office

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

Yes:

- Gender and diversity week (05/11-09/11 2018)
 - Different workshops, lectures and trainings on the topic of gender and diversity (e.g. Gender and Physics/Gender-sensitive language/racism/gender in science/gender and digitalization)
- Workshop on gender and diversity in teaching by Pia Garske, 14–15th June and 28th February – 01st March 2019
- Awareness training on sexual harassment in institutions on higher education for higher management, 29th April 2019
- Counselling in cases of sexual harassment
- Interdisciplinary week – workshops on gender and diversity, May 2019
 - Hatespeech – Cyber Mobbing on women by Amina Youssef
 - Self-Assertive Training

B) Staff training event:

Event format: capacity building workshop

Topic:

Gendered Innovations in Science and Engineering: an exploratory workshop for marine researchers. Workshop on excellence in research with sex and gender analysis

- Introduction of several case studies from various disciplines of science and engineering; for example, stem cells, animal research, machine learning, robotics, climate change, urban design and environmental chemicals
- Can we harness the creative power of sex & gender analysis for discovery and innovation?
- Can we add a new dimension to our research and guide it in new directions by considering gender?

Objectives:

Participants will explore how gender analysis may be applicable to shaping their research questions in marine research.

Duration: 2.5 hours

Participants:

16 persons, junior and senior researchers including Baltic Gender project members and members of the CAU Office for Gender Equality, Diversity and Family

Expectations of participants:

- to find out what “gendered innovation” means
- to get an overview about methods and their limits with respect to marine science and technology
- to get ideas how to integrate a gender dimension into marine research questions
- learn how to implement these topics in the institute

Reflection of participants:

- workshop enhanced own knowledge about sex & gender analysis in research
- for some participants first contact with the role of sex & gender analysis in research

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

The workshop got a very positive feedback from participants. The workshop was seen as a good starter and inspiration to think about the role of sex and gender in participants’ own research. Also, the importance of neglecting the impact of gender on research results became visible by the examples presented.

5.2.4 Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action:

Size of the institution:

572 employees (as of 2018), thereof 439 employees in the scientific department (229 male and 210 female) and 133 employees in the non-scientific department (technology, infrastructure and administration). Thereof 29 male and 104 female.

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- SYKE's Equality Plan was first published in 1998 (updated in 2014)
- Equality and non-discrimination plan for 2016–2017 (entered into effect on 1 July 2016, replacing the previous plan updated on 1 March 2014); updated in 2019
- GEP goals:
 - Employment
 - Equal distribution of work tasks and career advancement
 - Working group work
 - Personnel competence development and orientation
 - Equal pay
 - Management
 - Reconciliation between work and private life
 - Prevention of sexual and gender-based harassment
 - Employee equality

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

No; Development of gender equality issues is coordinated by the HR department

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

None besides the Baltic Gender grass-root events.

B) Staff training event:

Event format: capacity building workshops

Topic:

1. Workshop: Gender and equality training for SYKE group leaders and mid-management
2. Workshop: Workshop on gender and equality for SYKE top-management; the event was open for all management levels

Objectives:

1. Workshop:
 - Understanding of the different ways gender and equality promotion links to managerial duties
 - Recognition of gender and equality relevant themes and issues
 - Identification of practical means for equality promotion

2. Workshop: motivate managers at all levels to implement SYKE's gender equality and equality promotion plan
 - Recognition of gender related issues while accomplishing daily managerial duties and practices
 - Acknowledgement of unconscious gender biases and their impact on decision-making

Duration: 1. Workshop: 3 hours

2. Workshop: 1.5 hours

Participants: 1. Workshop: 6 persons, three of them of mid-manager level

2. Workshop: 39 (embedded in SYKE management Forum event)

Expectations of participants:

1. Workshop:
 - To discuss the way to gender parity
2. Workshop:
 - To obtain new information, ideas and a better understanding of the topic
 - To get an overview of gender equality in context of international research settings

Reflection of participants:

- valuable information of the key concepts provided by the workshop

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

Concerning the first workshop, it was considered very important to have more workshops like this and to wake up more awareness on gender and equality. The participants got new ideas and they thought that this workshop “lights up the new lamps”. The small group was ideal for profound and open discussions.

Also for the second workshop, participants’ feedback was positive and they found this workshop very useful. The event inspired vivid discussion about unconscious bias, for example. The current plan is to include similar kind of training to the Management Forum events also in the upcoming years so that equity promotion would become an integrated part of management training.

5.2.5 Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research (IOW)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action

Size of the institution:

- 225 employees (in full-time equivalents as of 31.12.2018), thereof 118 employees in the scientific department (60 male and 58 female) and 107 employees in the non-scientific department (technology, infrastructure and administration), thereof 45 male and 62 female

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- no GEPs any more required by equality law of the federal state (valid since 2016)
- preceding GEP expired in 2016
- new gender equality plan, approved in autumn 2019

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

- yes; since 1992
- one equal opportunities commissioner and one deputy equal opportunities commissioner (both elected)

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

- yes; since 2013
- workshops to prepare TEQ applications for board of directors

B) Staff training event

Event format: capacity building workshop

Topic:

1. Workshop: Gender equality workshop for IOW top-management "Gender equality in research institutions: Unconscious bias"
2. Workshop: Gender equality workshop for IOW working group leaders and heads of service units "Gender equality in research institutions: Unconscious bias"

Objectives:

1. and 2. Workshop: to raise the awareness of top and mid management leading staff on gender equality , with special focus on unconscious bias in research institutions

Duration:

1. Workshop: 4 hours
2. Workshop: 4 hours

Participants:

1. Workshop: 7 persons (members of the board of leaders and equal opportunities commissioner)
2. Workshop: 4 persons (working group leaders)

Expectations of participants:

1. Workshop:

- "to get new ideas to promote gender equality"
- "to learn how working groups may work more efficient"
- "to exchange experiences"

2. Workshop:

- "to get latest research information about gender issues"
- "Raising own awareness of where gender issues are hidden"
- to get to know some methods to exclude unconscious biases from decision processes
- to obtain "State of the art knowledge on institutional discrimination e.g. after PostDoc Scholarship and subsequent pregnancy [...], financial tools in the future to circumvent these [...] traps and to better balance a career in science with being the mother or to-be mother of a small kid"

Reflection of participants:

- too little time for discussion in the 1. workshop, more interactive parts and examples needed
- very positive overall feedback for 2. workshop, the open discussion was very well received and found stimulating for promoting thoughts

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

In the responses from participants it became visible that most respondents are supporting their team members by using a wide range of available tools and resources. However, awareness and knowledge about gender equality in research and unconscious bias linked to it differ individually. There were also statements from participants that they much appreciated this opportunity to discuss gender issues with colleagues in such a format and that it should be a must for everyone to educate him- or herself about this topic. These findings underline the general need for further and/or regular continuing education offers for all institutional staff groups on this topic.

5.2.6 Lund University (LU)

A) Institutional setting & preconditions of the action

Size of the institution (all numbers in full-time equivalents):

6770 employees (as of 2018), thereof 4081 employees in as teachers, researchers and scholars (2387 males and 1694 females) and 2689 employees working with administrative and technical tasks, thereof 1063 males and 1626 females.

Existence of a gender equality plan:

- since 2016 Gender mainstreaming strategies introduced at LU; no more GEPs since then

Availability of equal opportunities commissioner(s):

- yes
- there are Equal opportunity committees at each of the three administrative levels at LU (departments, faculties and LU as a whole).

Preceding events or activities to raise the awareness on gender and diversity competence for staff members:

At LU there is one training session per year with the group targeted with this workshop. That group includes the deans of the faculties and the members of the appointment committees. At the Faculty of Science (the level mainly targeted by the project Baltic Gender) there were three seminars on this topic in 2017 (Prof. Londa Schiebinger, Prof. Paul Walton, Prof. Tomas Brage) targeting the high-level management of the faculty (e.g. head of departments, dean, vice deans, head of HR) as well as three similar seminars directed to the members of the Equal opportunity committees at the faculty. Since more than 10 years there has been awareness trainings (See the human beyond) at the departments.

B) Staff training event

Event format: capacity building workshop

Topic: “Gender dynamics in academic recruitment and selection”

Objectives:

- to critically reflect on current procedures regarding gender perspectives in recruitment:
 - Are the positions widely announced?
 - Is the planning of future recruitments transparent?
 - Is there a pre-selection of candidates or do some get more support for promotion?
 - Who makes the decisions on whom to hire (or to announce a position)?

Duration: 2 hours

Participants: 37 persons, high management (faculty leaders as deans) and members of the faculties' appointment committees at Lund University)

Expectations of participants:

- To learn more about gender perspectives in recruiting. If there are any easy steps we can take to improve our procedures.
- Increase knowledge of present research, get arguments and ideas
- To see a change in practices
- To get some new insights and ideas
- To learn something
- To get tips on how to work more professional with these questions
- To get more informed trying to avoid unconscious bias
- To hear if any new research can explain why gender imbalance remains in departments where there is no obvious cause for them (beyond vague references to bias and "structures")

Reflection of participants:

- "I was not aware that mandatory trainings in unconscious bias could be counter-productive. I realized that our processes are not as transparent that we would like to think. The pre-selection of candidates that could apply for promotion or grants is one areas we should improve in. The late numbers of closed hirings at Arhus University is unfortunately also rather common at our university, and especially the tradition to open a position when there are already identified (internal) candidates that could apply. The speaker mentioned that a transparent schedule is of importance for the wellbeing of the staff"
- "As I suspected, there is not much that a teachers' appointment committee at a Swedish university can do to promote equal opportunities for men and women. The circumstances that affect gender balance among university lecturers and professors occur BEFORE people apply for jobs at this level. But note that gender imbalance is moderate at my faculty, and that we already have several of the procedures in place that were recommended in the workshop."
- "The university needs to address gender imbalance among lecturers and professors, but should perhaps start by encouraging more research on which factors REALLY lie behind this imbalance."

C) Outcomes/Conclusions:

The workshop contained several sessions where the participants discussed in small groups on topics such as "How transparent are the recruitment processes in my department?" or "What can be done to improve out recruitment process?" There were lively discussions and different selection criteria at the different faculties were briefly presented.

The workshop instructor also explained that organizations directed to meritocracy could be more biased than other organizations, maybe because the employees consider themselves objective. He also mentioned that there are studies showing that unconscious bias trainings could lead to even more bias, if the participants are forced to attend. Voluntary trainings are on the contrary positive for decreasing bias and involving top-researchers in gender and diversity workshops or similar was highlighted as a successful strategy to increase the awareness of unconscious bias.

Monitoring of the recruitments and the distribution of women and men in an organization is important as a tool to follow-up on progress and failures.

Finally, it was mentioned that it is not enough to recruit people, universities in general also would like to retain the hired staff. One thing that should be addressed in our workplaces is how we think about our culture; is it competitive and egoistic or is it focusing on collective work? What are we communicating to current and future potential staff?

6 Appendix

6.1 ICF for D5.1 "Report on surveys for staff training" (Template 5 taken from appendix 5 in the Baltic Gender Ethical Requirement No.1, Version 5, 25/05)



Informed Consent Form (ICF)

Project coordinator: GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel

Task leader for the questionnaire: IOW Leibniz Institute for Baltic Sea Research
Warnemünde

Name of the research project: Baltic Consortium on Promoting Gender Equality in
Marine Research Organisations (Baltic Gender)

Funds: EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation – Horizon 2020

Introduction

Your institute is a partner in Baltic Gender which is a consortium of research organisations and higher education institutions from the Baltic Sea Region aiming at reducing gender segregation and gender inequalities in Marine Science and Technology. As a member of the staff of one of the partner institutions, you are invited to participate in a workshop on "Institutional Capacity Building".

The task leader has designed two questionnaires for the participants of the workshops. You will be asked to fill out one questionnaire before and the second one after the workshop. With the information obtained, Baltic Gender will prepare a report on the value of these trainings for raising awareness on gender issues.

Voluntary Participation

It is your choice whether to participate in the questionnaires or not. You will not be put at a disadvantage either way. You will not be placed under any obligation by giving your consent. For example, you may skip questions that you do not want to answer.

Withdrawal of consent

If you wish to withdraw your consent, you can do so by either contacting the Coordinator at GEOMAR (see the contact details below) or the project partner in your institution, who will then immediately forward the request to the Coordinator. The request can be made by any means of communication and does not have to conform to any special format. It is not necessary to give a reason for the withdrawal and you will not suffer any repercussions. Once the Coordinator receives the request for withdrawal, all data relating to you will no longer be processed and all data already collected will be deleted.

Procedures

The first questionnaire that you will get prior to the workshop will ask you about your experiences with gender and diversity issues in relation to institutional practices, strategies and cultures and your expectations for the workshop. After the workshop has been held you will be asked to fill out the second questionnaire. This questionnaire will ask you to evaluate the workshop. The answers will be collected through a document, which will have a secret code created by you.

Data protection / confidentiality / privacy

No personal data (name, address, identification number, e-mail, CV, phone number etc.) will be collected with the questionnaires. The secret code (such as the first three letters of your



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 710363. 1 / 2



mother's name and the last four numbers of your cell phone number) on your sheet of answers will be random and only recognizable to you. Your anonymity will be assured by this secret code. Yet, this coding system will ensure that the file can be located and be deleted should you request your withdrawal.

Only staff directly involved in this task will be authorized to get access to the answers. The task leader will be responsible for the analysis of the answers and will ensure that all data is kept strictly confidential, that it will only be used for the report and that no access is given to third parties or unauthorized person. The documents will be stored in locked cabinets and electronic data will be stored in secure servers of the task leader. All data will be deleted at least 5 years after the end of the project (that is unless you request an earlier withdrawal).

Risks and benefits

There are no foreseen risks in participating in this questionnaire. You do not have to answer any question in the survey that you consider as too personal. There will no direct benefit to you, but the information received will help to Baltic Gender to evaluate the value of the workshop.

Expected duration of the survey

This survey will involve you answering a set of questions that should take you approximately 30 minutes.

Who to contact

If you have any questions regarding the questionnaire, please contact Baltic Gender baltic-gender@io-warnemuende.de.

Consent:

- I have read the foregoing information, or it has been read to me. I consent voluntarily to participate in this questionnaire.

Name Surname and Signature



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement no. 710363. 2 / 2

6.2 Questions asked in the pre-course questionnaires

Table 2. Questions asked in the pre-course questionnaires for staff training sessions at the partner institutions. As the first entry to make in each questionnaire was always to create the secret code it was left out here.

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
UT-EMI	1	What is your understanding of the term "gender equality"?
	2	What is your opinion on what characterizes awareness of gender equality issues in the context of marine research?
	3	Briefly describe your experience of dealing with gender equality in your institution. Formal and/or informal.
	4	How do you recognize and address barriers to gender equality at your workplace? Briefly describe the strategies and actions of your institution which address gender inequality and the number of men and women leaders you can identify.
GEOMAR/ CAU/ UAS	1	How do you rate your knowledge of integrating sex and gender analysis into research (gender dimension) connected to marine science & technology? (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills)
	2	What is your understanding of the term "gendered innovations"?
	3	How do you perceive awareness of gender issues in the context of marine research?
	4	Briefly describe your experience of dealing with sex & gender analysis in your institution. Formal and/or informal.
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research?
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
SYKE session 1	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Briefly describe your experience of dealing with gender issues in your current position in your institution (e. g. hiring procedures; allocation of tasks and responsibilities within projects; handling of periods of interruption of employment by maternity, paternity, parental leaves or

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		career breaks; handling of part-time employment, in particular in order to fulfill caring responsibilities for dependent people, ...).
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research /management work (e.g. Do you see any relevant gender aspects in the research content itself? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your project team(s)? ...)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
SYKE session 2	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Briefly describe your experience of dealing with gender issues in your current position in your institution (e. g. hiring procedures; allocation of tasks and responsibilities within projects; handling of periods of interruption of employment by maternity, paternity, parental leaves or career breaks; handling of part-time employment, in particular in order to fulfil caring responsibilities for dependent people, ...).
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research /management work (e.g. Do you see any relevant gender aspects in the research content itself? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your project team(s)? ...)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
IOW Session 1 (for top-level management)	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality on all institutional levels?
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research/management work? (e. g. Do you see any gender relevant aspects in the research content itself, the societal setting, stakeholder's attitudes, planning and

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		conducting of research activities in terms of infrastructure including access to it, advancement of young researchers, recruiting, ...? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your team(s)?
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
IOW Session 2 (for mid-managem ent)	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality on all institutional levels?
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research/management work? (e.g. Do you see any gender relevant aspects in the research content itself, the societal setting, stakeholder's attitudes, planning and conducting of research activities in terms of infrastructure including access to it, advancement of young researchers, recruiting, ...? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your team(s)?
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
IOW Session 3 (for junior researche rs)	Open event without previous registration, therefore no questionnaires; all Bachelor, Master and PhD students as well as Postdocs working at the IOW were invited	
LU	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in recruitment processes (posts, appointments) at your institution? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your general impression, to what extent gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of recruitment processes?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality in recruitment processes?

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	5	How is gender equality addressed and considered in recruitment processes at your institution/your faculty? (e.g. Who is responsible for the texts of posts and appointments and the criteria therein? How and where are job offers published and advertised? What is the composition of the selection committee? How are the members of selection committees chosen? How are roles and tasks distributed within the selection committee? How are applicants for job interviews ranked and selected? How are successful candidates ranked and selected? ...)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
KU Session 1	Short-term registration of participants, therefore no questionnaire sent	
	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality on all institutional levels?
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research/management work? (e.g. Do you see any gender relevant aspects in the research content itself, the societal setting, stakeholder's attitudes, planning and conducting of research activities in terms of infrastructure including access to it, advancement of young researchers, recruiting, ...? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your team(s)?)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
KU Session 2	Short-term registration of participants, therefore no questionnaire sent	
	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality on all institutional levels?

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research/management work? (e.g. Do you see any gender relevant aspects in the research content itself, the societal setting, stakeholder's attitudes, planning and conducting of research activities in terms of infrastructure including access to it, advancement of young researchers, recruiting, ...? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your team(s)?)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?
KU Session 3 (Scientists and teachers)	1	How do you rate your knowledge about how to promote gender equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)
	2	What kind of measures or resources do you use to support your team members in their career and professional development?
	3	What is your impression on how gender issues are recognized, considered or addressed in your institution in the context of environmental research?
	4	Do you think that the institutional performance could benefit from continued efforts to promote gender equality on all institutional levels?
	5	How do you recognize and consider gender in your research/management work? (e.g. Do you see any gender relevant aspects in the research content itself, the societal setting, stakeholder's attitudes, planning and conducting of research activities in terms of infrastructure including access to it, advancement of young researchers, recruiting, ...? How do you distribute roles and tasks within your team(s)?)
	6	What are your main expectations on this course?

6.3 Questions asked in the exit questionnaires

Table 3. Questions asked in the exit questionnaires for staff training sessions at the partner institutions. As the first entry to make in each questionnaire was always to create the secret code it was left out here.

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
UT-EMI	1	Please rate your skills in developing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating a GEP (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • before the workshop • after the workshop

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	2	Please rate your skills in developing and implementing structures to support gender equality work (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • before the workshop • after the workshop
	3	Please rate your skills in promoting organizational culture and work-life balance (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • before the workshop • after the workshop
	4	Please rate your skills in promoting gender equality in leadership and decision-making (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills):
	5	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	6	How confident do you feel about applying your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	How did you find the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	9	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice
	10	How satisfied are you about the trainer: Please rate your trainer in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	GEOMAR/ CAU/ UAS	1

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To improve my skills or knowledge I have been invited to take part New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced It may be of some use in the future Other, please specify
	2	<p>How do you rate your knowledge of integrating sex and gender analysis into research (“gender dimension”) connected to marine science [&] technology? (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before the workshop: After the workshop:
	3	<p>How do you rate your knowledge of developing, implementing and evaluating a sex and gender analysis for analyzing the significance (if any) of sex and gender in your research. (1 = No skills, 5 = Very good skills)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before the workshop: After the workshop:
	4	<p>If you have further comments on how far the workshop did help to improve your skills or knowledge of integration of sex and gender analysis in research, please add them here.</p>
	5	<p>How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)</p>
	6	<p>If you have any further comments on the relevance of the training, please add them here.</p>
	7	<p>How confident do you feel about applying in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)</p>
	8	<p>How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)</p>
	9	<p>What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to apply the theoretical knowledge gained from the workshop to your job practice?</p>
	10	<p>How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good)</p>
	11	<p>If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.</p>
	12	<p>How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual supports Documentation

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance between theory and practice
	13	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	14	Please rate your trainer in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	15	If you have any further comments on the trainer, please add them here.
	16	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	17	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
SYKE session 1	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future • Other, please specify
	2	How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.

Institution	Question		
	No.	Text	
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)	
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)	
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?	
	9	How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length 	
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.	
	11	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice 	
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.	
	13	Please rate your trainer in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered 	
	14	If you have any further comments on the trainer, please add them here.	
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?	
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?	
	SYKE session 2	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan • My job or responsibilities have changed

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future • Other, please specify
	2	<p>How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?
	9	<p>How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.
	11	<p>How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	<p>About the trainer Please rate your trainer in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the trainer, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
IOW Session 1	1	<p>What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future <p>Other, please specify</p>
	2	<p>How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?
	9	How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.
	11	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	About the trainer Please rate your trainer in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the trainer, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
IOW Session 2	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future Other, please specify
	2	How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?
	9	How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.
	11	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation Balance between theory and practice

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	Please rate your workshop instructor in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the workshop instructor, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
IOW Session 3	Open event to which were invited without previous registration, therefore no questionnaires	
LU	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future • Other, please specify
	2	How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in recruitment processes? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?
	9	How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.
	11	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	Please rate your workshop instructor in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the workshop instructor, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
KU Session 1	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future • Other, please specify
	2	<p>How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
	4	How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
	5	If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?
	9	<p>How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.
	11	<p>How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	Please rate your workshop instructor in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the workshop instructor, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?
	KU Session 2	1
2		How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
3		How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.
4		How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)
5		If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.

Institution	Question		
	No.	Text	
	6	How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)	
	7	How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)	
	8	What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?	
	9	How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length 	
	10	If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.	
	11	How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice 	
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.	
	13	Please rate your workshop instructor in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs • Responding to questions, support and advice offered 	
	14	If you have any further comments on the workshop instructor, please add them here.	
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?	
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?	
	KU Session 3	1	What were your main reasons for taking part in the workshop? Please choose as many as apply. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is part of my personal development plan

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My job or responsibilities have changed • To improve my skills or knowledge • I have been invited to take part • New institutional strategy or work processes have been introduced • It may be of some use in the future • Other, please specify
	2	<p>How do you rate your knowledge on measures to promote equality in management and leadership? (1 = No knowledge, 5 = Very good knowledge)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before the workshop: • After the workshop:
	3	<p>How far did the workshop help you to extend your knowledge on how to equally provide career support for staff members? Please add your comments here.</p>
	4	<p>How relevant was the workshop for your job role? (1 = Not relevant, 5 = Very relevant)</p>
	5	<p>If you have further comments about the relevance of the workshop, please add them here.</p>
	6	<p>How confident do you feel about applying the knowledge you have gained or extended in this workshop in your job role? (1 = Not confident, 5 = Very confident)</p>
	7	<p>How often do you expect to be able to apply your knowledge in your job role? (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very often)</p>
	8	<p>What (e.g. people, equipment, skills) might you need to put into practice what you have learned in the workshop?</p>
	9	<p>How did you like the content of the workshop? (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount • Difficulty • Length
	10	<p>If you have any further comments on the content of the training, please add them here.</p>
	11	<p>How useful did you find the following in helping you to learn? (1 = Not useful, 5 = Very useful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual supports • Documentation • Balance between theory and practice

Institution	Question	
	No.	Text
	12	If you have any further comments on the training methods, please add them here.
	13	Please rate your workshop instructor in the following areas (1 = Very poor, 5 = Very good) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of the subject/activity • Creating interest in the subject/activity • Relating the workshop to your job role • Understanding your needs Responding to questions, support and advice offered
	14	If you have any further comments on the workshop instructor, please add them here.
	15	Would you recommend this workshop to your work colleagues?
	16	Other than what you have already told us, how could the workshop be improved, e.g. to fit your needs, make the workshop more relevant to your job role or provide a better learning experience?