



GenBUDGET Minutes

Online-meeting, April 2, 2020

Participants: María Teresa Alameda (Maite), Peter Bjelskou, Silvia Sansonetti, Scott Taylor, Fiona Carmichael, Sveinn Guðmundsson, Katarina Bååth, Hilde Corneliussen, Julia Morrow, Angela O'Hagan, Finnborg Salome Steinþórsdóttir, Þorgerður Einarsdóttir and Laufey Axelsdóttir

The fourth online meeting agenda

The main focus of the meeting will be to address:

- **Lessons from the gender budgeting TIPs to enhance the capacity of GenBUDGET to achieve gender equality objectives**
 - How to **improve the effectiveness of ACT supportive measures** in gender budgeting.
 - In order to ensure effective discussion, we suggest CoP members prepare the following questions (approx. 5 min per CoP member):
 - How is the progress of your TIP?
 - How is your situation with regard the TIPs and COVID-19?
 - How do you envision the next steps?
 - What support do you think the CoP needs to enhance knowledge and develop shared Gender Budgeting practices in research organisations?
 - Other issues
1. Laufey began to explain how they had to rethink the plan and organise an online workshop no later than May. Everyone understood this and no objections were made.
 2. Everyone discussed their status (approx. 5 min each):
 - a. **Maite:** explained how their research is ongoing. Eva (Regional government) want's to participate in this area, and Patricia Nieto want's to participate in the workshop. Maite and Daniel will attend the workshop in September. They are currently looking at gender budgeting in RO from an analysis and focusing on GE and academic excellence and salary. They will receive more data from the University next month.

- b. **Peter:** He is focusing on two faculties – science and humanities. He is mapping decision making: academic position and gendering of fields. A lot of data has been collected, and he has a student helper that devotes a day to go through the data. Data had already been collected so the Covid19 is not infecting his work much. Although there are some difficulties planning the in-depth interviews. Hopefully he will be back in business in the fall.
- c. **Katarina:** Örebro is looking at internal research funding. Also government assignment they have and have to report it annually in their report to the government. Two institutions have internal fundings, three boards and the rector which she will work with. They will start with mapping and explore types of funding and how is it working and how they are working with gender equality. Then they will analyse. If not equal – what can they do to correct this. She will organise webinar with 5 other universities in Sweden to educate on research funding in the beginning of June. Covid19 has delayed the work.
- d. **Fiona and Scott:** *Fiona* – they have collected data on workload schemes in business school. Athena Swan data that is useful for the ACT work. They have four datasets: Workload sheets, key players interviews, survey data from Athena Swan, focus group interviews. Draft paper ready. They will write a smaller paper/publications – round in terms of meeting in the university. They need to do all this work. Difficult to pin down the gendered implications? If you do not have a statistical difference. How do you get from a lot of data to a saying “this is the way it is”. *Scott:* discussed what is measurable and what is a cultural analysis. The Athena Swan is focused on measurements... the qualitative data is guiding us to a more of a cultural analysis. He find it difficult to bring this together.
- e. **Sveinn:** HÍ is looking into the position of the sessional teachers and PhD holders at the University of Iceland. They are collecting the data at the moment, payroll department, access to survey on students leavers. Human resources... waiting because they are swamped because of the Covid10 and equal pay certificate (Þorgerður described the Equal Pay Certificate.)
- f. **Hilde:** Innovation and environment – uses gender perspective. She has met with more than 100 from different environments and places (Nordwhip?). Their plan was to visit some of the employers and use this perspective in the follow-up meetings. They had to rethink their approach due to Covid-19.
- g. **Silvia:** she is looking into Gender Budgeting and Milan Hospital, that is now at the frontline in their Covid-19. Proposal on gender budgeting on gender equality plans on health care in large hospitals. Involved other hospitals in Europe. She is preparing a proposal for funding. Are also working with Tuscany gender budgeting planning, they will support them in doing this, training for staff and gender capacity building
- h. **Julia:** Is going on a maternity leave next week. Sarah will cover for her. Hasn't dedicated as much time as she wanted.
- i.

3. The group discussed the support they think the CoP needs to enhance knowledge and develop shared Gender Budgeting practices in research organisations.
 - a. Expert comes in to evaluate the projects?
 - b. Laufey discussed the GEAM-survey tool. Fiona mentioned that the whole group would send it out together. Laufey will send the CoP members information about the survey. Following, the CoP members will discuss if they will use it together.
 - c. Finnborg discussed her idea that the CoP would introduce their findings of their analysis in more detail at the meeting in September. She also mentioned that we could have a presentation of equal pay certificate at the University of Iceland in the meeting

End of meeting 10:52

4. Then **Angela** popped in and discussed her situation: TIP has stopped at the moment. REF's will be delayed. Just minor though. Will still have to process to the internal deadlines. She has a lot of meetings in the following weeks. Data on who are selected and put forward by gender and the evaluation process. Speaking with Ella, the PhDs, apply the Favourable Conditions framework to the University level. Hopefully have some time in June. With Elizabeth Klatzer has expanded the framework in a publication. At a proof state. Will send us a copy.

End of meeting 11:00