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Introduction

Removing gender bias and androcentrism in science is essential in order to improve and innovate in research, since some mistakes are still made when designing projects of important scientific, social, and economic implications. Generalised assumptions with regards to clinical samples; overinterpretations or absence of information about the sex of research participants; absence of knowledge about the effects of medication on women; the use of male animals in pre-clinical research (Wald and Wu, 2010; Zucker and Beery, 2010, in EC, 2012) or the sole use of male reference models in engineering or other fields (Schiebinger, L.; Klinge, I., 2013) are just a few examples of androcentric research, which is not only not socially fair, but also presents problems of accuracy, validity and innovation. Moreover, the absence or low representation of women –and their numerous heterogeneities- in creating research teams or conducting research projects, and their unequal power distribution inside the research groups contributes to reinforce the androcentrism and hinders real scientific innovation.

It is of utmost importance the creation of a database which could provide good examples of **Gender Sensitive Research** in projects and initiatives carried out within a real and localized environment, and inform about the context that favoured such practice and the strategies used to implement it**.** The main goal of the database is to collect, assess and make visible and available to the scientific community a set of good practices to contribute to mainstream or strengthen gender perspective and Gender sensitive research, either by including it in projects, patents or research agreements or by initiatives and actions that contribute and facilitate such inclusion.

The Good practices are being collected by EGERA[[1]](#footnote-1) partner universities and research centres: Science Po (France), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (Spain), Antwerpen Universiteït (Belgium); SKU/University of Radboud (Netherlands), University of Vechta (Germany), METU-Middle East Technical University (Turkey) and CZGZ-Global Change Research Centre (Czech Republic), and those with whom they have formally collaborated at either international, European, national, regional or local levels. The Good Practices will be delivered to the European Commission and will be made available for the purpose of future Awareness Raising Actions. We will especially value good practices in scientific fields, where the implementation of gender perspective is scarce, as the STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics).

The deadline to deliver the Good Practice to the UAB, who is responsible of centralise the collection of the Good Practices, is October 11, 2016. Regardless of this deadline, each EGERA university or research centre can determine a different internal deadline to facilitate the collection.

Following the general criteria, any projects, actions or initiatives likely to be selected as good practices must have been completed over the last five years or still be ongoing. Nonetheless, any initiative and project completed more than five years ago may be considered if it is an excellent example of gender-sensitive research.

What is a Good Practice in Gender Sensitive Research

Good practices allow “to learn from others, to facilitate innovative, successful, sustainable solutions to shared problems, to build bridges between emphirical effective solutions, research, and policies, and to provide orientation for the development of new initiatives and policy definitions” (Organization of American States, n.d.). EIGE (European Institute of Gender Equality) has defined good practices[[2]](#footnote-2) as “(…) a practice that, upon evaluation, demonstrates success at producing an impact which is reputed as good, and can be replicated.” (EIGE, 2013: 10).

**Good practices in gender sensitive research** are any experience or initiative, method or technique that represent, within their environment and discipline, a progress or innovation in mainstreaming gender perspective, women perspective of feminist perspective in research, demonstrating some success and impact that could help others universities or research centres to create gender sensitive research. Included in the definition are three types of iniciatives or actions that should be considered good practices in gender sensitive research.

1. Gender Perspective in Research Contents, in research projects, patents, agreements or product’s design, in any of the aspects defined in this document as a Gender Sensitive Research.
2. Activities and initiatives of training, counseling, awareness-raising, funding, and scientific transfer or dissemination (networks, publication, dissemination texts or webs) that contribute to strenghtening the gender sensitive research.
3. Gender Equality in Research Teams: also included are the activities and actions carried out within the groups to strengthen women’s leadership in research projects, equal distribution of power positions, or the access to resources and to scientific prestige.

Conceptualisation of Gender Sensitive Research

3.1. Conceptualisation of Sex and Gender

The concepts of sex and gender are of key importance so as to understand the extent and significance of mainstreaming gender perspective in research. The term ‘sex’ includes the biological differences (hormonal, genetic and morphological) between females, males or intersex[[3]](#footnote-3).

“Sex" is a biological quality or classification of sexually-reproducing organisms, generally female, male, and/or intersex, according to functions that derive from the chromosomal complement, reproductive organs, or specific hormones or environmental factors that affect the expression of phenotypic traits that are strongly associated with females or males within a given species (…). (Wallen, 2009 in Schiebinger & Klinge, 2013).

Nevertheless, we would like to remind not to assume a biological conceptualisation of sex without criticism, but to recognise instead the complexity of biological sex and gender among human beings (Fausto-Sterling, 2000).

We propose here a concept of gender that includes structural, cultural, and individual dimensions, as Sandra Harding (1986) specifies:  *“gender as a gender symbolism (or, borrowing a term from anthropology, “gender totemism”), gender structure (o the division of labour by gender) and individual gender”* (Harding, 1986: 18).

|  |
| --- |
|  *“Gender is part of the symbolic and social system, and it provides symbolic and cultural meanings that refer to what can be considered ‘feminine’ or ‘masculine’ in each society, including “behaviours, products, technologies, environments and knowledge"* (Schiebinger & Klinge, 2013:9). These meanings are admitted regardless of whether the action is performed by men or women, but they follow a prestige principle that is generally hierarchical. “Gender as a socio-symbolic system together with other differences that form them, such as social class, ethnic or ‘racial’ group, or even age, orders and places access to power and material and symbolic resources in a hierarchy, as well as the productive and reproductive life of every society. When the social system is based on a gender hierarchy that creates inequalities that especially affect women, by means of symbolic discredit and a “differential valence*”* (Héritier, 1996:23) that concerns public and private activities considered ‘feminine’ and unequal access to resources through the political, legal, social and family system, we can speak of a patriarchal system: “*a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women*” (Walby, 1990:20). Gender creation and social systems based on sexual difference (Rubin, 1975:114) would form part of male domination (Héeritier, (1996 [1986]); Bourdieu, 2000 [1998]). Sexuality is a key concept when defining gender, since heterosexual marriage and heterosexuality as an ideal model of sexual and legitimate behaviour form part of the construction of the sex-gender system in many societies (Rubin, 1986 [1975]: 114). Therefore, it is not possible to understand gender without sexuality, and this is part of gender, although it is not the only element that defines it.Gender as identity: the same sex-gender system provides, through the family, the marital and sexual structure of the sex-gender system (Rubin, 1986 [1975]: 114), as well as the processes of raising, socialisation and enculturation, a structure to form personal identity that includes psychological, corporal, sexual and cultural aspects. The main element of gender identity in people is gender self-attribution (Kessler and McKenna, 1985), although it should be added that this is always from and related to the received social definitions of the social context. Gender identity is not always binary (man/woman), since there can be other intermediate or even changeable categories in different cultures and historical periods. It is neither fixed nor unalterable, since it requires continuous demonstration and active work, which authors like Butler (2000 [1999]) call gender ‘performativity’. Gender includes roles, expectations and foreseeable behaviours for men and women in private and public environments, depending on groups, ages or other social hierarchies. Its key elements include the overlapping relationships between genders and power relationships (Scott, 1986), as well as dealing with gender in political terms (Rosaldo, 1980). (UAB, EGERA Report D.6.2, 2014: 6-7)  |

The gender concept should have an intersectional approachand other different critical perspectives so as to be useful for analysing the diversity of effects of power relations and the different ways in which varied inequalities intersect within the society or institutions, either public or private. An open definition of gender could prevent the reinforcement of marginalising women and men of unprivileged groups. The intersectionality concept (Collins, 1986; Crenshaw, 1989; Cole, 2009) sets the critique of inequality analyses in a sole axis, which risks excluding a variety of oppression and experiences suffered by women from the numerous inequalities that occur in different contexts and historic moments.

3.2. Conceptualisation of Gender Sensitive Research

So as to creating a database of good practices that “promotes the gender perspective in research” (EGERA DoW, 2013:25), the meaning of ‘gender perspective in research’, as an essential part of Gender Sensitive Research, needs further clarification. The term ‘Gender Perspective’, as seen by Women and Gender studies, entails a step beyond the inclusion of the sex and gender variables in research content from the definition in “Gender in Research content” used in documents from the European Comission (EC, 2015)[[4]](#footnote-4). Gender perspective in Science, heir of the feminist epistemology, takes consideration towards the scientific production process as a gendered process itself, infused with power relations and based on hierarchical relationships between different fields of knowledge considered either legitimate or illegitimate (Harding, 1986).

Andocentric scientific knowledge neglects care and emotions, personal and private affairs, the voices and concerns of women, and allows knowledge to speak with a make voice (Harding, 1986:55). Moreover, scientific institutions, as gendered organisations themselves, favour gendered processes through which gender, sexuality and the body are part of the processes of control in work organisations, specially of women (Acker, 1990: 140), and where issues related to procreation and emotions are abandoned and excluded (Acker, 1990: 151). Gender perspective, and therefore Gender Sensitive Research, are critical perspectives that reconsider the significance of scientific validity, in order to visibilise the hidden hierarchy of organisations that exclude people and groups who do not go with the mainstream from resources (Bleijenbergh, I., Fielden, S.L., 2016).

Gender perspective in research also implies attaching importance in scientific analyses to everything related with gender inequalities and power relationships, either between individuals, groups, within organizations or in society (Bleijenbergh, I., Fielden, S.L., 2016). Categories such as “socialisation and gender roles, sexual division of labour, power relationships, or system of domination-subordination between sexes” (Ariño et al., 2011), among others, are of key importance in gender perspective. Furthermore, we can not pretend gender perspective to be the hard core of the research in which it is applied, or to refer exclusevely to the analysis of issues related to gender. According to “mainstreaing” or the “cross-sectional approach to gender”[[5]](#footnote-5), it is considered that gender should appear in the study of any subject, even if it is not gender-specific. It should also be contemplated the inclusion of the gender variable in the analysis of non-gender-related subjects.

We rely here on the definition of “**Gender sensitive research**” or “Gender-sensitive research Cycle” proposed by the Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research (EC, 2009), which contemplates gender in all stages of research, from approaching to the issue or discussing the indicators to drawing conclusions, and considers it both in the process of research (gender equality in research teams) and the content of research (gender sensitive research).

[Gender Sensitive Research] includes gender equality in the research teams and also as a complex and relevant dimension in approaching the problem, in the theoretical framework, in the object of study, in data collection methodologies, in analysis and in the publication of results, as well as in how people and other key agents participate in the research (Leduc, 2009; Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research, 2009; Schiebinger & Schraudner, 2011). (EGERA D.6.2, 2014: 5)

Nonetheless, we want to add the definition of Gender Sensitive Researchpresented in the previous deliverable by the UAB to the EGERA project, in order to enrich the definition and raise awareness of the dimensions of social justice and structural power relationships in a sex-gender system, inherited from Women’s studies, the different feminist approaches and gender studies. This definition is about reflexivity, inclusion, justice, and respect in research.

Gender Sensitive research empowers participants, making research more participatory, creative and inclusive. It significantly helps to improve people and social groups’ lives and rebalances power, especially in relation to women (UN-INSTRAW, 2012:1, Leduc, 2009) and other marginalised groups. A gender sensitive project is scientifically reflexive and socially responsible. Gender sensitive projects take into account the role of researchers and their relationship with their participants. They are respectful to them, they adapt research tools to the subjects’ language and worldviews (Leduc, 2009), and they collect properly for their opinions, beliefs, practices or behaviours, making their knowledge visible and taking into account their own interests in research and the impact of the results, (Reinharz, 1992; Leduc, 2009; Hesse-Biber, 2014a). (EGERA D.6.2, 2014: 6)

Finally, we also consider the inclusion of legal concepts related to gender and of analysis techniques about mainstreaming gender perspective in public policies, the one on research among them[[6]](#footnote-6), such as assessing the gender impact (Verloo and Roggeband, 1996; Freixes et al. 2013), applying gender social responsibility in research (Gensana, 2015), and the gender sensitive approach when elaborating public budgets (Lombardo, 2006; Benería, L., Sarasúa, C., 2011). The introduction of cross-sectional equality in all policies took place by adopting the Treaty of Amsterdam, and the fact that this concept has been included in all thereafter EU treaties (the current Treaty of Lisbon among them) provides that this dimension has to appear in all polices related to scientific research from the EU and the Member States.

Criteria for the selection of good practices

The background to be considered are the general criteria for good practices of Gender Mainstreaming defined by EIGE[[7]](#footnote-7), and other institutions (United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women)[[8]](#footnote-8), by which criteria we already abide in other selections of good practices in gender equality and other policies.

* 1. Basic criteria

We propose here the basic criteria of EIGE, that are similar to those previously used by other institutions, such as the Spanish Women’s Institute, the European Platform of Women Scientists, the European Council, the Organization of American States or the United Nations for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.

1. **It works well**. It means that they meet the needs and priorities of the agents by using the minimum necessary resources to produce results (efficiency); achieve the initial goals on gender equality (effectiveness), and have a demonstrable impact; and finally, that they are sustainable and thus the results are mantained even after the initiative.
2. **It shows a learning potential.** It can be a learning and innovation tool.
	1. Specific criteria
3. **Gender Perspective in Research.** It has led to significant improvement in terms of gender perspective in research or gender sensitive research, in any of the cases listed in the conceptualisation or in any of the specific criteria on Gender Sensitive Research. It has substantially contributed to strenghten, raise awareness, and incorporate gender perspective in research and specialised scientific knowledge about gender, including at least one of the following issues, although there may be others: goals, theorical frameworks, methodologies, and in broad terms, any knowledge on gender perspective in research, gender theory or women theory in research.
4. **Sex-Gender Balance in Research Teams**. It has fostered gender balanced research teams and projects lead by women, in compliance with the regulations on gender and science of each country or region, as well as the change in power relationships or actions to achieve equality between women and men in leadership of research projects. The resolutions on gender equality in research teams by the EC Horizon 2020 programme could be established as benchmark.

*“Fostering gender balance in Horizon 2020 research teams, in order to address the gaps in the participation of women in the Framework Programme’s projects. Ensuring gender balance in decision-making, in order to reach the Commission’s target of 40% of the under-represented sex in panels and groups”.*

*(50% for advisory Groups) (EC, 2014)*

* 1. Possible outlines / Additional input for case selection

This additional input could be helpful to accurately describe in the previous section the extent of the inclusion of gender perspective in your research project or activity.

1. **Gender and equality in the terms to describe the project or action.** Indicators include: the project’s title, team composition, abstract, and conclusions. It will be necessary to analyse not only the title of projects, patents, and agreements, but also the composition of teams by sex, with special emphasis on who is the leader; the abstracts, given that the titles may not relate to gender contents; and conclusions, which sometimes detect gender bias in projects, patents, and agreements although it was not contemplated at the beggining.
2. **Classification and awareness-raising of sex/gender issues** based on the terminology listed within the UAB Second Gender Equality Report, although others have been included.

Androcentric, women, female, feminin, feminism, femininity, gay, gender, heteronormativiy, heterosexims, heterosexual, heterosexuality, men, homoerotism, equality, gender inequalities, gender bias, gender violence, gender roles, gender division of work, interpersonal relations, intersectionality, lesbian –nism, bisexuality, transgender (LGBT), male, masculinity, queer, sex, sexual, sexuality, homophobia, lesbophobia, homosexual, same sex relations, orientación sexual, MSM, homosociability, patriarchy, prejudice, intersex, positive action, equality of women and men, equal representation, non discrimination, multiple discrmination, parity, sexual harrasment, abuse on account of sex, abuse on account of sexual orientation, gender sensitivity, sex + (sex differenciation, sex factors, sex distribution).

1. **Rethink priorities and social interests of research.** Issues on sex and gender have been included, in accordance to the previous paragraph, within the definition of research priorities, considering who will benefit or be ignored by research projects: women, men, or specific groups of women and men. Attention has been drawn to transforming or reinforcing regulations and gender relations, to opportunities that may disappear if sex and gender are not contemplated (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 8), to revealing inequalities and weaknesses not considered to date (Ariño et al. 2011), contributing to increase knowledge about different aspects of women and men’s lives, and a further understanding of social structures relating to the sex-gender system.

1. **Rethink concepts and theories.** Gender sensitive research refers to any research that rethinks concepts or theories from a gender perspective. This may help to address bias in general theoretical frameworks. Research is an example of rethinking the concept of excellence, and several other concepts used in different fields of knowledge. Concepts related to sex or, gender analyses have been included, as exposed in point 4, along with their frameworks in the background review, the research questions, the supposed evidences and their interpretation, and in the review of research assumptions (Schiebinger et al. 2011 en Caprile, 2012: 10). It also may take into account gender roles and relationships, assumptions about power and inequality underneath theories and concepts (UN-INSTRAW, 2009), or reflect experiences from women and men (ICIMOD, 2009).
2. **Formulation of research questions**. Research questions include sex and gender issues, but also related issues like gender bias, gender stereotypical images, intersectionality or work life balance. This may evidenciate the existance or absence of knowledge on sex and gender in the research field, resolve the necessity of questioning assumptions on sex and gender in existing research, and include and explain the inclusion of women or other relevant groups as research subjects (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 11). It may also refer to ways of approaching to technological development that are still unexplored or go unnoticed due to gender bias within the field.
3. **Sex and gender in the samples.** “The composition by sex of the samples has been considered and decided” in accordance with the appropriatness of including one or both sexes, depending on the research target (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 12). The sex of the research subjects has been reported whether they were “people, animals, tissue or cells” (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 12), with special consideration to assessing research assumptions on sex differences in any animal or human sample. Finally, it has been included the analysis of internal differences and common factors of each sex (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 12), and their intersection with other factors or variables (origin, socio-economical level, ethnical origin, race, age, and others), with special consideration to segments of population that go unnoticed or are not studied in relation with the subject of research. This analysis has been clearly stated and explained in the dissemination of the research results. The whole process is envisaged by the framework exposed in point 1.
4. **Analyse the assumptions on gender.** The research has questionedgender assumptions, and behaviours among researchers and their teams themselves have been reviewed; the needs and expectations of research subjects as well as power relationships and gender assumptions (point 1) of both researchers and research subjects have also been considered and included (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 13). Data collecting methods were respondent friendly, and included their opinions even when designing the research instruments. Issues about reflexivity, power, and authority in research have also been contemplated (Hesse-Biber, 2014b). Gender bias and stereotypes have been reviewed, the latter understood as a wrong approach to equality and differences between men and women, regarding their nature, behaviour, and reasoning; (...) (Ruiz Cantero, 2001: 163-4 in Ariño et al. 2011: 3).
5. **Analyse covariates.** Sex differences have been analysed, but other “biological and socio-cultural” have also been taken into account (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 14). The hypothesis of “how sex and/or gender interacts with other biological or socio-cultural variables” describes the variables used and studies the interaction of these factors and variables with sex/gender (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 14) in accordance with point 4. It helps to determine ways of preventing not only simple discrimination, but also double and triple, which can occur in specific groups.
6. **Participation in research.** The research has included or fostered participation of all agents in the process of investigation, so as to facilitate the empowerment of men and women, and other marginalised groups (UN-INSTRAW, 2009). “The participation of women and other agents includes their involvement in the problem, recovering the value of local knowledge and marginalized groups, especially women (Leduc, 2009), as well as subjugated knowledge considered illegitimate by the mainstream knowledge (Hesse-Biber, 2014b).(UAB, 2014). Participative methodologies are used because they take into account the needs and aspirations of research subjects. Research agents and subjects of the different stages are mentioned in the report dissemination (Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research, EC, 2009).
7. **Rethink standards and reference models.** The model of reference has been reviewed regarding the design of products and regulations, as well as usual standards in the field, taking into account factors that affect men and women throughout their lives and the different stages of development (pregnancy, aging…). The review of standards has also been conducted in research of “animals, tissues, and cells” (Schiebinger et al. 2011 in Caprile, 2012: 17). It is also obvious, depending on the scientific field, that gender bias can show unexpected, rare or apparently contradictory results, which will need to be accurately analysed because they might agree with standards and reference models.
8. **Gender-sensitive dissemination**. The analysis of gender has been set out and clearly explained in the dissemination of research results (Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research, 2009), so as to introduce the differences in points of view of women and men (Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research, EC, 2009). Research agents and subjects of the different stages are included in the report dissemination Toolkit Gender in EU-funded Research, EC, 2009), and the results are presented with plain, non-infantilizing language (Pérez-Bustos, 2014). A gender-neutral, non-sexist language has been used, and data has been disaggregated by sex (Ariño et al., 2011; García-Calvente et al., 2010). Results have been equitably published, ensuring a balance of authorship in research teams (García-Calvente et al.; 2010).

Good Practices of Gender Sensitive Research Information Sheet

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **DESCRIPTION OF THE GOOD PRACTICE IN GENDER SENSITIVE RESEARCH – INFORMATION SHEET**  |
| **1** | **TITLE OF THE INICIATIVE**  | Title or name of the research project/initiative/action (As complete as possible, in the original language and with an English translation)  |
| **2** | **TYPE OF INICIATIVE**  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Research Project / Agreements / Patents |
|  | Seminars / Workshops / Training |
|  | Networks , associations, working groups |
|  | Dissemination: articles, web , social media  |
|  | Political Decision Making -Process / institutional Assessment  |
|  | Other initiatives  |

 |
| **3** | **RESPONSIBLE INSTITUTION**  | Main implementing organisation  |
| **4** | **CONTACT IN THE RESPONSIBLE INSTITUTION**  | Name of contact personOrganisation / Institution Department / Research Centre Job position Email / Phone Country |
| **5** | **WEBSITE**  | Link to the website that includes the good practice, if applicable |
| **6** | **OTHER INVOLVED INSTITUTIONS** | Include any other body that collaborates with the responsible institution.  |
| **7**  | **DESCRIPTION, STRATEGY & BENEFICIARY** | Detailed description of the good practice, to include: content, lines of research, strategies, actions carried out, target and final beneficiaries.  |
| **8**  | **INITIAL DIAGNOSIS - CONTEXT**  | The action or project is based on empirical data or diagnosed necessities to be explained here. It has to include the context and the situation and level of inequality that makes the good practice stand out. Describe whether it belongs to higher rank institutional gender equality strategies, gender mainstreaming strategy or other policies.  |
| **9** | **OBJECTIVES**  | General and specific objectives of the good practice. If Gender Sensitive Research is somehow included within the objectives of the action or project, explain how.  |
| **10** | **IMPACT & OUTCOMES**  | Description of impact and outcomes related to gender perspective or gender equality in research. In the case of research projects, an impact may be which aspects have been modified along the research, the inclusion of theoretical frameworks not considered at the beginning, changes in selecting the samples or the data collection and analysis methodologies.  |
| **11** | **FIELD OF KNOWLEGDE / SCIENTIFIC FIELD**  | Could you select one of the UNESCO nomenclature for fields of science and technology? <http://skos.um.es/unesco6/00/html>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Logic  |
|  | Mathematics  |
|  | Astronomy and astrophysics  |
|  | Physics  |
|  | Chemistry |
|  | Life Sciences  |
|  | Earth and Space Sciences  |
|  | Agricultural Sciences  |
|  | Medical Sciences  |
|  | Technological Sciences  |
|  | Anthropology  |
|  | Demographics  |
|  | Economic Sciences  |
|  | Geography  |
|  | History  |
|  | Juridical Sciences and Law  |
|  | Linguistics  |
|  | Pedagogy  |
|  | Political Science  |
|  | Psychology  |
|  | Science of Arts and Letters  |
|  | Sociology  |
|  | Ethics  |
|  | Philosophy  |

 |
| **12** | **ABSTRACT**  | Please include the Abstract of the project or publication (to be found in the project’s description). Has any of the terms related to Gender Sensitive Research or gender perspective been included and set out within the elements that describe a project? These elements could be include in the title, the abstract, keywords or other significant sections of the description research.  |
| **13** | **KEYWORDS**  | Key words (to be found in the description of the institutional project or publication).  |
| **14** | **START DATE**  | Start date of the action, initiative or project |
| **15** | **FINAL DATE**  | End date of the action, initiative or project  |
| **16** | **FUNDING**  | Funding institution / Program / Call and reference  |
| **17** | **PRINCIPAL COORDINATOR**  | Name, position, and university | Women (number)  | Men (number) |
|  |  |
| **18** | **LOCAL COORDINATOR (in case Coordinated projects)**  | Name, position, and university | Women (number) | Men (number) |
|  |  |
| **19**  | **RESEARCH TEAM MEMBERS**  | Name, position, and university | Women (number) | Men (number) |
|  |  |
| **EVALUATION OF THE GOOD PRACTICE**  |
| **20**  | **WORKS WELL**  | Works well means that they meet the needs and priorities of the agents by using the minimum necessary resources to produce results (efficiency); achieve the initial goals (effectiveness), and have a demonstrable impact; (EIGE, 2011:16).  |
| **21** | **SUSTAINABILITY**  | Indicate if the initiative or research are sustainable and if the results are maintained even after the initiative. Assess the level of sustainability (high, medium, low), and detail the factors that contributed to a greater or lower political, social, and economical sustainability (budgets, collaboration between institutions, creation for new calls).  |
| **22** | **LEARNING POTENTIAL**  | Description of learning potential of the good practice for other researchers or institutions.  |
| **23** | **GENDER PERSPECTIVE IN RESEARCH CONTENTS**  | The data and assessment included should demonstrate effectively gender perspective and sex/gender analysis in research contents or mainstreaming gender equality in research teams has been done. See specific criteria (4.2) and additional inputs for case selection (4.3)  |
| **24** | **SEX-GENDER BALANCE IN RESEARCH TEAMS**  | Gender Balanced Research Teams, actions that help achieve research teams and projects lead by women, or a change in power relationships will be valued. See the specific criteria in this Guidelines (4.2)  |
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