

Workshop A**Nr of participants:****Most important result of the discussion**

Write here the one most important results of the discussion in Workshop A.

1) Top-down reinforcement

force quota – short list appointment

force explicit discussion of gender bias in committees

2) Rosalind Franklin Fellowship: Not only more women, but also mentality change

Generally felt very successful

Need to communicate the experience

3) Pool promotion reviews with broadly represented committees to become less dependent on case-by-case decisions and on supervisor characteristics

Workshop A Nr of participants:	Addressed? Y/N	Recommendations/comments
<p><i>Question 1.a</i></p> <p>How do you evaluate the effectiveness of positive discrimination programmes such as the FOM/f, Rosalind Franklin Fellowships (RUG) and WISE (NWO) to establish gender balance in physics research, in particular in the leading positions?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Rosalind Franklin is a good programme Why is it called positive discrimination? Acceptance by community? Broad, not a single subject Works well for participant Also seeded change for other position Success! Now it is enough? Transparency of promotion criteria & procedures</p> <p>FOM/f – VENI like future in NWO? (trying to land in Science domain) Bridge to more senior positions under the radar: ‘no, not needed’</p> <p>WISE Try to hire for excellence Fund longer</p> <p>Quota: At least 1 female on short list: good Important: scope and volume</p> <p>NNV on role of IoP? Yes, want to.</p>

Workshop A Nr of participants:	Addressed? Y/N	Recommendations/comments
<p><i>Question 1.b</i></p> <p>How do you interpret the feasibility and effectiveness of the recommendations of the 'Commissie Breimer' for establishing gender balance in the physics research groups in the Netherlands?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Problem of funding is enough to convince incentive</p> <p>Time is short</p>

Workshop A Nr of participants:	Addressed? Y/N	Recommendations/comments
<p><i>Question 2.a</i></p> <p>How could science leadership in the Netherlands be held accountable for improving the gender balance in physics research, in particular in your organisation or at your institute?</p>	Y	<p>Top-down Univ. Pres. should be convincing</p> <p>Enforce treatment Be explicit it about</p>

Workshop A Nr of participants:	Addressed? Y/N	Recommendations/comments
<p><i>Question 5.a</i></p> <p>How do you evaluate the definition of 'excellence' commonly used in the assessments and reviews in physics research organisations?</p>	<p>Y</p>	<p>Showing respect Especially important to have respect shown by top-people/famous/big Excellence is a perception and social construction</p> <p>General promotion committees broadening scope/topics helps Single round of promotions per year Appraisal meetings wider in scope More to help the person Less dependent on individual supervision RUG & LEI do this</p>

Workshop A Nr of participants:	Addressed? Y/N	Recommendations/comments
<i>Other issues</i>		