

Implementing the Mindmap into a MoU for collaboration in a beyond GENERA network

With reference to the slides presented by Thomas in Dublin.

Motivations/Aims

These should be addressed in the Preamble of the MoU and/or in a covering letter:

- European Physics Community joins forces for institutional change toward GE
- Sustainability of GENERA activities
- Maximise the impact of GENERA
- Monitoring of the GEPs
- Share knowledge and expertise
- Strategic to enhance attractiveness of the organisation to other groups
- Strategic to fulfill legislation/organizational rules on GE
- Strategic to better perform with more diverse groups
-what else??...

What is the opinion?

6 steps to a GENERA Network 2.0

These could be addressed in the Preamble of the MoU and/or in a covering letter.

- Draft a Letter of Intent (LoI) – done
- Sign the LoI - done and on-going
- 1st Network Event (01/18 in London) - done
- Draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)
- 2nd Network Event (06/18 in London?)
- Sign the MoU

What is the opinion?

Topics of special importance

Include these in the MoU? Should these be mentioned in a covering letter? Could be addressed in topical workshops, but do we have the expertise?

- Gender dimension in research (Gendered innovations), Create a catalogue of good examples from the physics community
- Sexual harassment in the work place of physicists

DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

- Mobility and Gender, map existing measures/strategies

...What is the opinion?....

Tasks

Implementation of the (sub)tasks should be addressed in an Annex to the MoU describing the Network programme (incl. some estimate of a budget for each task). To be generally mentioned in a covering letter.

1. Monitoring (Collect and Publish Data)
→ outcomes for institutions, outcomes for individuals
2. Be a “lobby” for GE in Physics
→ Awareness raising in physical societies and funding; marketing strategy
3. Provide Expertise and Knowledge
→ update GENERA tools; support institutions implementing GEPs
4. Training

For the implementation of the (sub)tasks several instruments possible:

1. Up-to-date website.
2. Active social media accounts.
3. Regular newsletter.
4. Topical workshops: paid, with discount for network members.
5. Customized training workshops for specific organisation(s): paid, with discount for network members.
6. Annual Diversity award for physics departments.
7. Annual Gender in Physics event (incl. ceremonies for the Monitor and the Diversity award); paid, with discount for network members.
8. Speakers bureau

....What else?....What is most important?...Which instruments can we afford? Or are feasible?

For orientation, a matrix of instruments vs tasks below:

		Tasks			
		<i>Monitoring</i>	<i>Be a lobby</i>	<i>Provide expertise</i>	<i>Training</i>
Instruments	1. Website	Results (the ‘Monitor’)	GE in physics ‘news’	GENERA tools	Training material
	2. Social media	Publicity Monitor	Publicity GE in physics ‘news’, also supporting Website updates, workshops, events	Publicity GENERA tools	Publicity training material
	3. Newsletter	Dissemination of GE-related news per email			

DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

	4. <i>Topical workshops (larger)</i>	E.g. mobility measures	E.g. on how to convince leadership about importance of GEPs	E.g. Gender dimension in research	Use training material
	5. <i>Training workshops (smaller)</i>	Idem, but customised for a specific organisation			
	6. <i>Diversity award</i>	Use (a.o.) Monitor for selection of the winner	Give nominees visibility	Show case the winner	Nominees learn from writing application
	7. <i>Gender in Physics event</i>	Presentation of the Monitor	Ceremony of Diversity award	Promotion of speakers bureau	Promotion of training workshops
	8 <i>Speakers bureau</i>	Promote and keep repository of speakers with different expertise: physics, gender, institutional change...			
	...What else?...				

Added value for MoU signatories

The network should provide the participants sufficient added value. This is to be addressed in the covering letter. Not necessarily in the MoU, although possible.

Profits could be:

- Visibility in Europe
- An improved working environment in the organisation
- Hopefully improving the gender balance faster
- Compliance with GE legislations/rules
- Better trained GE officers
- Attractiveness for female students
- An improved selection/assessment procedure
- Staff more aware of unconscious bias
- **....what else?....**

What is the opinion?

Commitment of MoU signatories

In order to make the network effective, signatories must commit to annually provide the statistics of the GENERA minimal data set and an update of the status of GEPs implemented; preferably also the content of the GEPs.

DISCUSSION DOCUMENT

This sounds maybe as a harsh condition, but for the network to be effective, monitoring the gender balance and the performance of GEPs is essential. For this data is needed.

The commitment of the MoU signatories should be addressed in the Articles of the MoU.

Any other commitments expected from signatories?

Commitment should be addresses in the Articles of the MoU.

...What is the opinion?...

Financial model for the network

For the tasks to be implemented resources will be needed. In general there are two models:

1. Signatories of the MoU, pay an annual fee and/or provide in-kind contributions. Participation in any network activity is for free. Most likely, this is not an attractive model.
2. Participation in the network is free, but some services (e.g. training workshops) must be paid for. In-kind contributions are still appreciated (and probably needed). If the income from paid-services, in-kind and perhaps external sponsor contributions could cover the costs of a small (~0.5 fte) 'network supporting office' this might work.

3. ..Other model?..

Which model is preferred?

Organisational structure of the network

The organizational structure of the network should be addressed in the Articles of the MoU.

In Dublin it was stated that the aim was to establish an institutional network. What does this mean? Are the signatories directors of physics institutes? Or will the funding agencies sign and encourage their institutes/departments to join the network?

What is the opinion?

Possible (pretty standard) organisation could be:

Board (representing the signatory organisations)

Executive Committee (appointed by the board)

Advisory Committee to the board (appointed by the board)

Small (~0.5 fte) supporting office (profile: communication, secretarial, event production, acquisition)

Is such a structure appropriate?

Would it be feasible to finance the supporting office: in-kind, revenues of paid services, sponsors....?

...What is the opinion?...