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Executive Summary

On 30-31 May 2017, a Workshop on Implicit Gender Biases during Evaluations: How to Raise Awareness and Change Attitudes? was organised by the Gender Sector of the European Commission’s Directorate-General Research and Innovation. It aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of what implicit/unconscious gender biases are, how they intervene in evaluative processes, and how they can be addressed within Horizon 2020.

The first day was an opportunity for the participants to share their experience about implicit biases encountered in their professional activities. Key research evidence was also presented by invited experts, and participants discussed practices already put into place by research organisations from various Member States and Associated Countries in order to mitigate the effects of implicit gender biases in evaluations.

The second day was dedicated to examining the evaluation processes of Horizon 2020, including those implemented by the European Research Council (ERC) and Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA). The aim was to collectively identify concrete actions that could be applied across the board in Horizon 2020, and in the following Framework Programme, which would help avoid the impact of implicit gender biases.

The workshop gathered participants from the Horizon 2020 Advisory Group on Gender, Horizon 2020 funded Gender Equality Plans projects, the European Research Area Stakeholder Platform and national funding agencies, as well as from EC services engaged in Horizon 2020 evaluations.

The material and practices collected during the workshop will contribute to the adaptation of the Horizon 2020 evaluation processes aimed at mitigating the impact of implicit gender biases.
Introduction

Equality between women and men is a core value of the European Union (EU), enshrined in the fundamental treaties, and embraced in all EU policies, including research and innovation. Gender equality is a cross-cutting issue in Horizon 2020, and its importance was put forward by the Council of the European Union in its Conclusions of 1 December 2015 on Advancing Gender Equality in the European Research Area (ERA). The Council invited ‘the Commission to continue to strengthen the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all gender equality objectives in Horizon 2020’. Horizon 2020 is indeed the largest EU Research and Innovation Framework Programme to date, with a budget of nearly €80 billion for the 2014-2020 period. It is of the highest importance to make sure that the allocation of these funds — as well as that of future funds in the next Framework Programmes — is fair and impartial, and not affected by gender biases.

A significant body of research has contributed to identifying implicit gender biases and to bringing evidence of their impact on evaluation processes. These gender biases can lead to unfair assessment of women researchers and lower their likelihood of receiving a grant. Such biases, held by individuals but rooted in socio-cultural norms, furthermore accumulate with more structural/organisational gender biases, which still remain pervasive in research institutions.

Several Member States and Associated Countries have started to take initiatives to counteract these effects. The ERC and MSCA are now raising the awareness of their evaluators on the risk of implicit, or unconscious, gender biases. Yet, few actions have been put in place at European level.

Ineke Klinge, chairperson of the Horizon 2020 Advisory Group on Gender (AG Gender), explained that the group had held a preliminary discussion on this matter, led by Anke Lipinsky and Gloria Origgi, at the end of 2016. As a follow-up, the AG Gender suggested to organise a workshop with the involvement of external experts on implicit gender biases.

In her introductory speech to the workshop, Ana Arana Antelo, Head of DG RTD Unit B7 ‘Science with and for Society’, insisted: ‘The workshop should not only help understand how implicit gender biases intervene in evaluations, it should also go a step further. The aim is to design collectively how to reduce significantly the influence of implicit gender biases on evaluations of researchers and research and innovation proposals. We need very concrete measures.’

The workshop gathered a total of 62 participants, including representatives from the AG Gender, European Research Area stakeholders, national funding agencies, Horizon 2020-funded Gender Equality Plans (GEP) projects, and EC staff engaged in Horizon 2020 evaluations (see list of participants in Annex). It was designed in a participatory manner which prompted active participation of all attendees.
Day 1

Session 1: Narratives of Implicit Gender Biases

Aim: Share individual narratives on experienced or witnessed implicit gender biases among the workshop participants.

Eileen Drew, Professor at Trinity College Dublin, and coordinator of the Horizon 2020 Gender Equality Plan project SAGE, introduced the session. She presented numerous examples of gender (and other kinds of) implicit biases that were gathered through an extensive National Online Survey carried out by Irish Higher Education Authority in 2015-2016 (over 4 800 respondents).

Among the narratives collected:

‘At a meeting where a senior manager was explicitly stating his commitment to equality, I have witnessed that same manager single out a male professor who attracted funding and ignore another female academic in the same room who had won a higher level of funding.’

‘Gender inequality is endemic in the language and culture of higher educational establishments in Ireland. If you say the word “professor” or “director” to anyone, they assume it is a ‘he’.’

‘Mostly male colleagues don’t realise their own attitudes [when] arguing for the best person for the job, failing to recognise that the structures and social inequalities that exist often do not permit the best female candidate to emerge… Men just prefer to work with men (subconsciously) and that is a problem.’

Download the presentation of Eileen Drew

Following her presentation, Eileen Drew showed a video clip, produced in the context of the FP7 GEP project INTEGER, displaying another narrative by Yvonne Scannell, recently retired professor in the School of Law in Trinity College Dublin (TCD). She shares her story on the obstacles she has had to face in her career, and which originated from implicit gender biases. The full video featuring her story and that of other women from TCD, can be found here.

The workshop participants were then invited to share their own experiences of implicit gender biases, in small groups.

Some of the stories were shared in the plenary. Among these:

‘I was elected to be part of a Committee. As the only woman and the most junior member, I was asked to take the minutes of the meeting. The same request kept coming up at the next meetings. I said that it would be the last time that I take the minutes’.

‘Women working in women’s and gender studies and/or gender equality promotion are facing double unconscious gender biases. At first, because of their gender (and additionally by some other intersecting social
and, secondly, because of the substance of their expertise, on gender equality. These women have to work hard to be taken into consideration as equal members of the academic community. Furthermore, career opportunities in fields of women’s and gender studies may seem a too risky business for some to plan their career. Unfortunately they are right: women’s and gender studies are still very scarcely resourced and funding very limited. Therefore career paths for these women who choose to work in this field overcoming unconscious gender biases are not easy. There is still surprisingly a lot to do and on an everyday basis.’

Session 2: Unravelling Implicit Biases: Research Evidence

Aim: Provide research evidence for the existence of implicit gender biases and analyse their implications.

The first presentation was given by Gloria Origgi, senior researcher in philosophy of social science at CNRS and member of the AG Gender. She unravelled the notion of implicit biases, which are biases in judgment and/or behaviour that can be based on attitudes (e.g. unconscious preferences for people that are like you), stereotypes (i.e. implicit associations between certain categories of people and certain roles/traits) and prejudices (i.e. negative constructs). She presented results drawn from social and cognitive psychology studies, analysing the effects of implicit biases in various fields. Gloria Origgi also suggested potential strategies for avoiding such biases, stressing the need to encourage alternative associations and alternative behaviours.

The second presentation was given by Carl Jacobsson, Senior Advisor at the Swedish Research Council (SRC). He first recalled the watershed moment of the 1997 paper by Christine Wennerås & Agnes Wold (‘Nepotism and sexism in peer-review’, Nature 387) which revealed gender biases in the evaluation of applications to the then Swedish Medical Research Council. He went on to present analyses of the differential success rates of female and male applicants to SRC project grants over the 2003–2016 period. Finally, he presented results from the gender equality observations carried out in different SRC peer-review panels from 2008 to 2016. These observations showed evidence of gendered group dynamics taking place in several panels, and of implicit gender biases affecting evaluations, e.g. gendered choice of words to describe women/men applicants, different interpretations of the independence of a researcher in the context of scientific collaborations, with women’s personal contributions being more often questioned.

The floor was then opened for questions. Asked about the differential success rates between women and men, and whether these could be related to differences in track records, Carl Jacobsson underlined the fact that the track records of women and men are also affected by gender biases. Women may have faced unconscious biases throughout their careers and it is still more difficult for women to become professors.
Session 3: What is done to tackle implicit gender biases? Examples of current practices

**Aim:** Present case studies of existing practices that help tackle implicit gender biases in evaluations of researchers and research proposals.

Participants were first invited to share, in small groups, their personal experience of actions put into place in their organisation or project to address implicit/unconscious biases.

Strategies from three different institutional/national contexts were presented next:

**Romy van der Lee, Assistant Professor at Leiden University,** presented the first results of a pilot programme designed for evaluators at the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The programme was launched following a study that had shown evidence of gender biases in the NWO Veni granting scheme for early career researchers (R.van der Lee and N. Ellemers, ‘Gender contributes to personal research funding success in The Netherlands’, *PNAS*, 112, 40:12349-12353). The aim of the programme is to avoid implicit gender biases in the evaluation process. She stressed how important it is not only to raise the awareness but also provide strategies to tackle these biases. The 30 min intervention currently tested with evaluators includes an Implicit Association Test (IAT) developed specifically for the NWO context, based on actual (gendered) evaluation materials, as well as other concrete activities to increase bias literacy and self-efficacy, using targeted examples of reference literature (e.g. on unconscious bias in CV evaluation, in interviews). The e-learning module also allows to measure participation and to follow the impact on evaluations procedures by e.g. analysing the awarding rates. Preliminary results show that the intervention is promising in creating awareness of implicit gender biases among evaluators, allowing them to correct for these biases, and thereby fostering the objectivity of the evaluation process.

Download the presentation of Romy van der Lee

**Carl Jacobsson** presented the overall Swedish Research Council (SRC) gender equality strategy, and some examples of good practices implemented by SRC to address implicit gender biases in the peer review process. These include the training of panel chairs and SRC staff, gender equality workshops for new panel members and for scientific boards, as well as pre-determined seating of panel members. He stressed the importance of having concrete operative goals/targets and envisaging consequences in case these goals were not achieved. Carl Jacobsson presented results from the panel observation study carried out in 2014, which have given input to the contents of the trainings. Among other things, the observers found out that applying the above practices had brought clear improvements to the process.

Download the presentation of Carl Jacobsson

**Lenna Cumberbatch, Diversity Manager at the UK Royal Society,** reminded everyone about the importance of having reliable data to support one’s arguments — a key feature of the Unconscious Bias Programme initiated by the Royal Society. The programme covers gender-based as well as other kinds of unconscious biases (ethnicity, disabilities, age, etc.), taking into consideration the intersectional nature of these
biases. It includes a briefing based on scientific literature and a video animation, sent to panel members before the panel meeting. Face-to-face trainings are also offered to panel chairs. Whilst it will not solve biases, creating diverse panels can also provide broader perspectives. She ended her presentation by showing the video entitled ‘Understanding unconscious bias’ which was produced by the Royal Society in 2015 for this purpose. This video is now increasingly being used by research funding and research performing organisations across Europe in their evaluation and recruitment procedures.

Download the presentation of Lenna Cumberbatch

Among questions raised by participants was the potential issue of keeping the attention of evaluators when the training is delivered remotely. Indeed, while agency staff can be trained on the spot and in compulsory manner, training of remote evaluators with a large turnover, as opposed to standing panels, could constitute a challenge, and has to be developed thoughtfully.

Several participants also suggested that evaluators write a self-reflection journal documenting their decision-making process. Such an exercise could be a powerful instrument for deterring implicit biases.

In addition, two other awareness-raising videos recently developed by EU-funded projects were mentioned by participants as being useful and effective tools for training evaluators:

- ‘Eviter les biais de genre lors de nominations professorales’ produced by the Université de Lausanne (Switzerland) as part of the FP7 GEP project GARCIA.
- ‘Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes’ produced by Institució CERCA (Spain) as part of Horizon 2020 GEP project LIBRA. This video is now also in use at the ERC (see here).
**Day 2**

**Session 4: Taking stock of what is done to address implicit gender biases**

**Aim:** Collect suggestions of concrete actions proposed the day before in Session 3 to tackle implicit gender biases, and order them according to the successive phases of the evaluation process.

The following proposals were collected and sorted chronologically:

**Preparing applicants and proposal evaluation:**

- Coach all applicants (help in drafting applications, train on presentation skills)
- Encourage cooperation and co-authorship among applicants
- Pay attention to gendered wording in the evaluation criteria
- Remember that implicit gender biases are not always clear for the evaluators; give real best practice examples
- Present the adoption of a GEP by the applying institutions as a quality criterion
- Anonymise proposals
- Distinguish between individual grants and consortia/collaborative grants
Preparing and organising the evaluation

- Select and train the evaluators
- Train panel chairs and observers
- Ensure a balanced participation of both genders in the panels
- Run face-to-face briefing of chairs
- Propose to take the Implicit Association Test (IAT) to everybody involved
- Ask evaluators to create a self-reflective journal
- Use the Royal Society video, and other videos, on implicit gender bias for the briefing

Implementing the evaluation

- Consider the roles of moderators and observers
- Include gender experts in the panels (see guidelines regarding the choice of gender experts previously developed by the AG Gender)
- Read the implicit bias briefing together
- Keep the timing — How long does each panel member speak?
- Slow down the deliberation and shift implicit impressions
- Organise balanced seating arrangements — Who sits where?
- Avoid comments like ‘I have a bad feeling about this person/proposal…’
- Use individual scoring to avoid ‘Groupthink’
- Use gender balance in the projects’ teams as a ranking factor (with clear rules)
- Consider the applying institutions’ efforts towards institutional change and how to take gender equality more comprehensively into account

Monitoring the evaluation process and results

- Accountability for low women/men ratios (to be calculated)
- Monitoring: following up and gathering evidence
- Real monitoring at the level of implementation (to avoid the simple ticking of ‘checklists’)


Session 5: Evaluation processes in Horizon 2020

**Aim:** Inform on the different processes used in Horizon 2020 to evaluate research proposals.

Utmost attention should be given to ensuring a fair process for all women and men applicants, within each of the existing kinds of evaluation processes in the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation Horizon 2020. For the needs of the workshop, three main evaluation processes were presented: the general scheme, which applies in particular to societal challenges, and two adaptations of the general scheme for the specific objectives of the ERC and MSCA, with the aim to inform about the different steps at which it will be possible to act practically.

Presentations where delivered by EC Officers Stefanie Kalff-Lena, Lisbeth Rossmeissl and Claudia Alves de Jesus highlighting the specificities of each scheme (see respective evaluation process flowcharts below).

**Stefanie Kalff-Lena (DG RTD-A3, Horizon 2020 policy)** presented the standard evaluation process. Each proposal is first evaluated remotely by at least three independent experts (individual evaluation reports with marks). A briefing (set of slides) is sent to the experts prior to their remote evaluations. There are six guiding principles that evaluators must follow (i.e. independence, impartiality, objectivity, accuracy, consistency, confidentiality). As a second step, the same experts are invited in a consensus meeting, which may take place in Brussels or remotely. A briefing session is organised once they arrive in Brussels. One ‘rapporteur’ is assigned to draft the consensus report for each proposal. The discussion is facilitated by a moderator (usually EC staff but can also be an external expert). In either of these steps, implicit gender biases can influence evaluators’ judgments. In some cases, evaluators may hold hearings at which applicants are invited to present their proposal. Such a practice can also open the door to additional implicit gender biases. There are several consensus meetings taking place in parallel for a single topic. A final panel reviews the outputs of all the consensus meetings related to one topic. An external independent observer is responsible for checking the fairness of the process, at call level (several topics considered).

As suggested by workshop participants, in consensus meetings, moderators and observers can also play a crucial role. If appropriately trained, moderators could reduce the effects of implicit gender biases both in terms of making impartial collective decisions. And this should be in addition of organising panel meetings with gender balanced participation. Observers could later give a feedback on witnessed implications of implicit gender biases, in order to draw lessons learned for future meetings.

Regarding the guiding principles for evaluators, participants pointed out that avoiding implicit gender biases was highly relevant for most of them, and especially impartiality, objectivity and accuracy, and that this should be taken explicitly into account.

Download the presentation of Stefanie Kalff-Lena

**Lisbeth Rossmeissl (DG EAC-C2-MSCA):** In the case of MSCA, for proposals submitted to the Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE) and Co-funding of Regional, National and International Programmes (COFUND)
schemes, evaluation is done according to the standard evaluation procedure (i.e. individual evaluations followed by a consensus meeting), while for Innovative Training Networks (ITN) and Individual Fellowships (IF) schemes, evaluation is entirely remote (with the exception of borderline proposals).

Two slides on unconscious gender bias have been included in the general briefing of evaluators.

Download the presentation of Lisbeth Rossmeissl

Claudia Alves de Jesus (ERCEA-B4, ERC): The ERC evaluations differ from the standard scheme in several aspects:

There are standing evaluation panels (25 panels corresponding to the various scientific areas), each formed of 14-16 members nominated by the ERC Scientific Council.

Evaluations are organised in two steps. At both steps, all panel members are requested to read every proposal prior to a meeting in Brussels. At step 1, each proposal is thoroughly assessed by 3-4 panel members (with comments and numerical scores) and proposals are then ranked in three categories (scores A, B & C) in a meeting in Brussels. Only proposals with an A score are retained for step 2. At step 2, full proposals are assessed by 4-5 panel members and also by at least 2 remote reviewers (i.e. world leading experts in the core scientific area of the proposal). Later, interviews/panel meetings are held in Brussels for potential grantees to defend their proposal (Starting and Consolidator Grant candidates only). Potentially interdisciplinary proposals are reviewed by panel members from more than one scientific area (both at step 1 and step 2). Briefing of panel members takes place before starting the remote evaluation, and at the onset of the meetings in Brussels.

In response to the underrepresentation of women amongst grantees in some categories and disciplines, and following recommendations from the ERC Gender Balance Working Group, the ERC has since 2016 started to more explicitly address unconscious gender biases in evaluation. In particular, the Institució CERCA video is now shown to panel members, and a training on unconscious gender biases for programme officers is just being launched.

Download the presentation of Claudia Alves de Jesus
Standard evaluation process:

- Proposal
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Eligible proposal
- Individual Evaluation Report
  - Consensus group
  - Individual Evaluation Report
- Consensus Report

MSCA Evaluation process:

- Proposal
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Expert
  - Individual Evaluation Report
- Consensus group
  - Individual Evaluation Report

ERC Evaluation process:

- Proposal
  - 2-3 Remote Reviewers Step
  - Individual Evaluation Report
  - Panel meeting in Brussels
  - Discussion+ ranking+ ESRT
  - Individual Evaluation Report
Session 6: How to address implicit gender biases in Horizon 2020

The workshop participants were invited to join one of the three sub-sessions, according to their expertise and interest and discuss concrete actions that could be applied at various stages and levels of the Horizon 2020 research proposal evaluation process.

Sub-session 1: Explaining implicit gender biases to policy makers

Host: Liisa Husu, Professor of Gender Studies, Örebro University (Sweden)

Aim: Discuss what strategies should be used to persuade policy-makers of the importance of addressing these biases in the research proposal evaluations.

Main elements harvested:

- Connect equality between women and men to the core European values, e.g. EU Treaties, European Charter of Human Rights.
- Horizon 2020 is already quite fixed — important to keep gender issues on the European research policy agenda for the future Framework Programmes — risk of a backlash going back to focusing on women instead of organisations and structures.
- It’s relevant to highlight that implicit biases could concern all phases of the framework programme.
- Need to argue why such a focus is put on gender biases — important to show clearly how biases are impacting negatively on gender equality.
- Equality and excellence are linked — biases are a threat to meritocracy.
- Women apply less and ask for smaller budget. They internalise due to biases as well. Policy-makers should be concerned, measures should be taken.
- Evidence needs to be presented clearly and accessibly (e.g. executive summary, visuals).
- Dissemination — visuals — telling examples: use gender experts in designing them.
- Intersectional approaches linking gender and other biases should be used.
- Shifting political situation in some Member States in terms of gender approaches needs to be taken into account— gender is becoming a term which is down-prioritised, and even disqualifying, in some countries. These new political biases should be addressed.
- Ambassadors for tackling gender biases — LERU, Euroscience, other key stakeholders respected in the scientific community should also take up the issue.
- Leader commitment across the higher education and research domain is important — leadership training should include modules on training of implicit gender biases.
Sub-session 2: Explaining implicit gender biases to evaluators

Hosts: Lenna Cumberbatch, Diversity Manager, UK Royal Society
Anke Lipinsky, Member of the Horizon 2020 AG Gender

Aim: Reflect on what to communicate to evaluators. Participants were invited to design a potential training session on implicit gender biases in the evaluation process.

Main elements harvested:

There are now abundant examples of implicit/unconscious biases in the research literature and different tools from which to draw in developing a communication/training. Equally important to what will be introduced, is how, and in which order, it is delivered.

Evaluators first need a wake-up exercise (which will generate an ‘A-ha!' moment) that will make them aware that everyone is biased, and that it is not necessarily with a negative connotation. This startling moment should be personal and make it real for them (cf. examples used in the Royal Society briefing and Project Implicit). It is usually better to have them test themselves this way and take ownership, rather than present them with formal presentations first.

- Examples should be supported by scientific evidence, and hard data, coming from the scientific field(s) of the evaluators, to make it more concrete and relevant to them.
- Tips & tricks in how concretely implicit gender biases can be avoided in the evaluation process could be given to the evaluators.
- Important points to be internalised by the experts are: any criticism should be avoided, the consensus meeting has to be a dialogue, as evaluators are subject to implicit biases like everyone else.
- Monitoring each other, as suggested by the Royal Society, can be presented as a quality assurance mechanism of the panel work. Alternatively, in cases where such peer monitoring could generate tensions — prompting moderators or observers to monitor evaluators may prove more efficient.

Sub-session 3: Where to act in the evaluation process to avoid implicit gender biases

Hosts: Eileen Drew, Professor at Trinity College Dublin
Kirstie Wild, Member of the Horizon 2020 AG Gender
**Aim:** Identify at what stage and how we can intervene in the evaluation process to avoid implicit gender biases. As a basis for the discussion, the flowcharts of Horizon 2020 evaluation processes were used (see above), and the workshop participants were invited to identify the possible interventions in the evaluation process to avoid implicit gender biases.

[Download the presentation of Eileen Drew](#)

**Main elements harvested:**

- Awareness to avoid implicit biases should start as early in the ‘food chain’ as possible within the European Commission.
- Implicit biases should therefore be considered when preparing the Horizon 2020 Work Programme. Training of the Commission staff, including work programme scribes, is critical. They should be informed about implicit biases (gender, ethnicity, age, nationality, etc.). This will have a cascading effect, including for applicants and on the evaluators.
- Programme Committee members (nominated by Member States and Associated Countries) that are involved in the preparation of Work Programmes should be informed of the existence and potential impact of implicit biases too.
- Evaluators should be briefed about gender biases regularly with an initial briefing and follow-up briefings as reminders.
- Use videos and materials in the briefing slides and provide role models.
- Experts should know that being aware of gender biases makes them better evaluators for the EU and their own countries. Promote excellence and gender diversity as a dual ticket: the EC already has had success but can do better by removing implicit biases.
- Other actors in the evaluation process such as observers and moderators also need training on gender biases.
- National Contact Points (NCPs) are key entry points as they guide applicants. They can be more pro-actively targeted and trained on implicit biases. This way, the knowledge will reach the national level.
Conclusions and Next Steps

The ‘Workshop on Implicit Gender Biases during Evaluations: How to Raise Awareness and Change Attitudes?’ prompted fruitful group discussions between representatives from the AG Gender, EC Services (DG RTD, DG EAC, REA, ERCEA, EASME), Gender Equality Plans projects, ERA stakeholders and national funding agencies. The shared expertise and the rich material harvested are valuable resources for further policy actions to address implicit gender biases in evaluation processes in research organisations and universities, at national and EU levels.

The issue of implicit biases is also receiving increased attention among EU networks involved in the ERA Stakeholder Platform. As mentioned by the AG Gender Chairperson Ineke Klinge in her concluding remarks, the League of European Research Universities (LERU) is currently preparing a document on unconscious bias in evaluation processes, with a focus on recruitment processes in universities. Science Europe also published in February 2017 a practical guide which, among other topics, addresses unconscious bias in evaluation procedures in research funding and research performing organisations (‘Practical Guide to improving gender equality in research organisations’).

Building on the outputs of the workshop and further advice from the AG Gender, DG Research and Innovation will consider with the EC services concerned how to mitigate the impact of implicit gender biases in Horizon 2020 evaluation processes.
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