

Workshop A – Gender equality plans and science management

QUESTIONS

The numbering scheme refers to the [Fields of Action of GENERA](#).

1. Structural integration of gender equality: policies, monitoring, sustainability, compositions & integration

- a) 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?

Issues that could be addressed in the discussion:

FOm/v is for physicists only, while Rosalind Franklin Fellowships and WISE are science-wide. Are customised programmes for physics more effective? Could WISE and Rosalind Franklin be customised as a separate tool for physics? Which type of programme do you prefer?

Would successful applicants to these programmes have been successful also in gender-neutral programmes for tenure-trackers? Do these programmes reduce the number of positions in gender-neutral programmes for tenure-trackers?

Do you think it feasible at the level of an institute to define quota? How flexible should quota be interpreted, e.g. should some physics research areas be exempted, and if so, why?

The JUNO project of the Institute of Physics in the UK aims at rewarding physics departments that can demonstrate they have taken action to address the under-representation of women in university physics. Experience with [Project JUNO](#) will be presented by Dimitri Vvedensky from Imperial College in London in the morning session. The physics department of Imperial College has been awarded the status of JUNO Champion. Would a Project JUNO type of programme be an effective tool in the Netherlands?

- b) 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?

We cite the recommendation on page 28 of the report “[Koersvast](#)” (in Dutch):

*“5.2 Verhoging participatie vrouwen en minderheden in de wetenschappelijke staf
Door het vigerende Sectorplan is het aandeel vrouwen in de vaste staf in de periode 2010 tot 2013 sterk gestegen: bij scheikunde van tien naar vijftien procent, bij natuurkunde van negen naar dertien procent. Door deze ervaring lijkt een groei naar vijftientwintig procent in 2025 haalbaar. Daarvoor is in die periode een instroom van ongeveer honderd nieuwe vrouwen nodig. Dit vergt een budget van M€ 14 per jaar. Wij bevelen aan daarvan de helft ten laste van structurele additionele middelen van OCW te brengen (M€ 7) en de andere helft door de instellingen zelf te laten bekostigen (door bij de herbezetting van vacatures*

diversiteit zwaarder te laten wegen). Aangezien de tot nu toe bereikte toename van het aandeel vrouwen vrijwel geheel toe te schrijven is aan de komst van jonge tenure-track-onderzoekers (grotendeels uit het buitenland), zal in de komende jaren aandacht besteed moeten worden aan de bestending van hun positie in het Nederlandse onderzoeklandschap. Hetzelfde geldt voor de nieuw aan te trekken generatie tenuretrackers en senior staf. Voor zover daarvoor onderzoeksmiddelen nodig zijn, kunnen deze uit budgetten van andere maatregelen geput worden (zie bijvoorbeeld paragraaf 5.1).”

Issues that could be addressed in the discussion:

Do you agree with the statement that the ambition of 25% women in permanent positions in 2015 is feasible? Do you see fields of physics research where this ambition will most easily be met? Would you advise that the 25%-ambition is met at the level of each institute or university group? What is your advice for effectively monitoring the progress toward the 25% in 2025? Do you consider the proposed funding scheme for 25% in 2025 adequate?

2. Engaging leadership: leadership accountability, stakeholder engagement

- a) **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?**

Issues that could be addressed in the discussion:

Is funding a good instrument? Should it be part of a review and assessment of the leadership? Should it be part of a review by external SACs of your organisation or your institute?

5. Gender inclusive/Gender sensitive organisational culture: gender awareness and bias, non-discrimination, deconstructing excellence

- a) **How do you evaluate the definition of ‘excellence’ commonly used in the assessments and reviews in physics research organisations?**

Issues that could be addressed in the discussion:

How transparent is the definition of excellence in your organisation or at your institute? How is excellence measured? Do the assessments procedures provide a level equal playing field for women and men? What differences do you see in the measurement of excellence of women and men? As background a [video interview](#) with Jacques Mairesse (professor at CREST, UNI-MERIT, NBER) about an investigation by CNRS of a possible gender gap in production in physics. And his [presentation](#) about the same subject at an OST SciSci Seminar in April 2016.