



G.A. No. 611034

Project acronym **TRIGGER**

Project title: **TRansforming Institutions by Gendering contents
and Gaining Equality in Research**

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

Specific programme 'Capacity'

Work programme 'Science in Society'

FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2013-1

Deliverable D6.2

Structure of the internal evaluation plan

Due date of deliverable: 30/06/2014

Actual submission date: 03/07/2014

Start date of project: 01.01.2014

Duration: 48 months

Organisation name of the WP leader:

ASDO

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:

ASDO

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission)	x



TRIGGER

**TRansforming Institutions by Gendering contents
and Gaining Equality in Research**
(G.A. No. 611034)

Structure of the internal evaluation plan *Final version*

ASDO

June 2014



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	4
1. Key features of the evaluation model	5
1.1. <i>Aims and objectives</i>	6
1.2. <i>Assumptions and choices</i>	6
1.3. <i>A relational approach to evaluation</i>	10
2. Dimensions and indicators	11
2.1. <i>Dimensions</i>	11
2.2. <i>Indicators</i>	15
3. Methodological issues	19
3.1. <i>Sources of information</i>	19
3.2. <i>Action Plan evaluation procedures</i>	21
3.3. <i>Distribution of responsibilities</i>	22
4. Schedule	22

Introduction

TRIGGER is a project funded by the European Commission under the 7th Framework Programme¹, with co-funding from the Italian IGRUE (Inspectorate General for Financial relations with the European Union, Ministry for Economy and Finance).

The TRIGGER Consortium is composed of the institutions listed in the table below.

Partner	Country	Acronym
* Dipartimento per i diritti e le pari opportunità	Italy	DPO
* ASDO	Italy	ASDO
* Università di Pisa	Italy	UNIP
* Vysoka Skola Chemicko-technologicka v Praze	Czech Republic	VSCHT
* Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic Public Research Institution	Czech Republic	ISAS CR
* Birkbeck College – University of London	United Kingdom	BBK
* Université Paris Diderot – Paris 7	France	UPD
* Universidad Politecnica de Madrid	Spain	UPM

TRIGGER is aimed at consolidating the many and valuable results of the process initiated by the EC for more than ten years now in the domain of gender and science, and contributing to take this same process one step further, also in the perspective of Horizon 2020. This consolidation is pursued by **developing and testing an Integrated Model** in the perspective of the **structural change strategy**, designed to have deep, long lasting and widespread impacts in 5 research organisations. Each of the organisations has developed and is now implementing a self-tailored **Action Plan (AP)**, addressing the **three different areas** of gender inequality in S&T:

- working environment, formal/informal culture and explicit/tacit rules;
- content and methods of scientific research to acknowledge its gender dimension and impact;
- scientific leadership at different levels.

In the APs, special emphasis has been given to the second aspect, i.e., the **gender dimension of research** and its interaction with the other two, given the growing importance recognised to it as a crucial lever for fundamental change in S&T settings ("fixing the knowledge"). Moreover, to develop the **integrated model**, a crucial role has been attributed to discussion and exchange among the players involved in the

¹ The project responded to the topic: "Supporting changes in the organisation of research institutions to promote Gender Equality" (SiS.2013.2.1.1-1).

different structural change initiatives throughout Europe, in order to share their efforts and results.

To pursue this general aim, TRIGGER has been organised in **9 work packages** (WPs), which can be grouped into **two broad categories**:

- the Action Plans of the individual research institutions (work packages 1-5);
- a set of common actions (work packages 6-9).

Among the common actions, a set of joint activities (technical assistance, evaluation, and accompanying research) have in fact been conceived to support and facilitate the implementation of the Action Plans, as well as to draw out from them lessons for the future.

One of these activities is the **evaluation of the APs**. Such an activity is included in WP6, coordinated and implemented by ASDO, with the active involvement of all the partners implementing the APs. The evaluation of the common actions is therefore not considered here, it being the subject of another activity under WP9 (Management).

This document, written by Luciano d'Andrea, illustrates the **evaluation model** adopted to drive the evaluation process. It is composed of **4 sections**.

Section one presents the key features of the evaluation model. **Section two** is focused on the analytical dimensions taken into consideration in the evaluation process and the indicators applied. **Section three** deals with methodological issues, including a description of evaluation procedures, information sources and technical tools. Finally, in **Section four** a schedule of the evaluation activities over the 4-year project is presented.

1. Key features of the evaluation model

In this section, the **key features of the evaluation model** are briefly described. In particular, two issues are considered:

- aims and objectives of the evaluation;
- basic assumptions and choices characterising the evaluation model.

1.1. Aims and objectives

As mentioned in the DoW, evaluation is aimed at "fostering the maintenance of high levels of quality in the implementation of the APs throughout the duration of the project".

To this end, the evaluation process has been conceived as characterised by different orientations:

- a **quality** orientation;
- a **problem-solving** orientation.

In the **first perspective**, pertaining to **quality orientation**, evaluation is viewed as a managerial procedure ensuring the systematic collection and analysis of the standard information necessary **to assess the compliance** of the AP implementation activities with schedules and criteria (pertaining to, e.g., expenses or the role assigned to each player involved) established in the detailed plans.

Under the **second perspective**, evaluation is viewed as a procedure aimed at provide AP teams with support in order to **solve problems** they meet, in particular with the objective of:

- identifying emerging problems, bottlenecks, and any factor which could potentially hinder or slow down the implementation of the AP;
- devising effective solutions to deal with, or bypass, obstacles met all along the implementation phase, taking also into account changes occurring in the implementation context of each AP;
- promoting reflexivity and increasing the awareness about strategies, practices, tools and results related to the AP;
- generating knowledge on structural change practices on the basis of the experience made (actually, information from the evaluations will also be used in the accompanying research to be carried out under WP7).

1.2. Assumptions and choices

The evaluation approach adopted is grounded on a set of assumptions and choices which are in consonance with **developmental evaluation**² (**DE**), a model increasingly adopted for evaluating social innovation-oriented programmes.

² See, in this regard: Patton, M.Q. (2006), *Evaluation for the Way We Work*, *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, Spring; Dozois, E., Langlois, M., Blanchet, N. (2010), *DE201: A Practitioner's Guide to Developmental Evaluation*, Montreal, McConnell Family Foundation – IICRD; Gamble, J.A.A. (2008), *A Developmental*

In particular, with DE, the approach adopted under TRIGGER shares **four general assumptions**.

Evaluation as a proactive support activity

As DE, the approach presented here does not consider evaluation to be a **static judgmental procedure** where data are periodically collected to simply express an assessment or, worse, to "give a score" to the APs, to be passively recognised by the implementing teams.

Evaluation is rather understood as a **pro-active support** provided by evaluators to help the teams appropriately cope with the problems met during the implementation of the Action Plans and activate learning processes on the basis of their experience.

In the case of TRIGGER, this aspect primarily emerges in the choice to **merge, under the same WP, evaluation and technical assistance**, with the latter including a wide set of actions (working sessions; biannual teleconferences; intranet for sharing experiences, solutions, materials and products; provision of handouts on common issues; etc.) providing the implementing teams with many opportunities of exchange, mutual learning and common reflection on the APs they are leading.

Non-linear implementation process

Another assumption of the proposed approach which is in line with the Developmental Evaluation model is that **contextual conditions strongly influence project implementation**.

In particular, in contexts characterised by high levels of **uncertainty, innovation and social complexity** (and this is the kind of context the Action Plans are facing), **project implementation processes rarely assume a linear trajectory**, allowing to progressively solve the problems as the project implementation moves forward. Almost always, most implementation processes are nonlinear, characterised by stops and gos, sudden progress and setbacks, unplanned solutions and deviations from the original plan.

In such contexts, **evaluation cannot limit itself to simply recording** in a given time the **gap between a set of established objectives or criteria and the actual project outcomes**. It should be larger in scope including, e.g., key players' orientations, emerging social networks, cognitive and symbolic aspects, conflicts and alliances,

Evaluation Primer, Montreal, McConnell Family Foundation; Preskill, H., Beer, T. (2012), *Evaluating social innovation*, FSG, Centre for Evaluation Innovation.

levels of individual and collective mobilisation (also in emotional terms) as well as other dynamics which actually or potentially contribute to create (or, conversely, to solve) the problems the Action Plans are intended to remove.

In the case of TRIGGER, the recognition of the nonlinear nature of the implementation process mainly emerges in the choice to **broaden the evaluation scope** in order to also include **relational dynamics** (e.g., negotiation processes activated by the TRIGGER team or the attitudes of key players towards the Action Plan) which are among the main factors producing uncertainty in and increasing the complexity of the implementation processes. Usually, all these factors are neglected in the results-focused evaluation approaches. Effort has been therefore made, not only to develop evaluation dimensions and indicators able to capture – at least partially – these factors, but also to connect them with other more result-oriented dimensions and indicators.

Iterative nature of evaluation

In view of DE and the approach presented here, evaluation cannot be simply understood as a sort of periodical check on the progress implementing Action Plans between one check and the next.

On the contrary, DE sees evaluation as a **continuous spiral-shaped process**, based on an **iterative sequence** of at least three main steps³:

- actively collecting and documenting feedbacks on the impacts and results of the project implementation;
- adopting an "evaluative thinking" allowing to make sense of such feedbacks;
- developing a new understanding of the situation which could help the project team devise new measures and corrections.

In this perspective, a **continuous and structured interaction between evaluators and project teams** is necessary, providing the basis for connecting evaluation and action in a rapidly changing environment.

In the case of TRIGGER, this assumption resulted in the choice to **strongly intertwine evaluation and monitoring**.

Monitoring is at the core of the technical assistance provided by ASDO. It is not immediately related to evaluation, its function being that of providing the team with a back-up in both managerial and substantive terms. Monitoring entails a systematic analysis, jointly conducted by ASDO and each partner, of all the activities included in

³ *Calgary's Network for Collaborative Social Innovation (2013), Working Document (Version: July 19), Backgrounder Series #7, Calgary.*

the Action Plan, on the basis of a monitoring scheme (which is obviously tailored to each Action Plan). In addition to that, among the technical assistance activities, on-site visits are also conducted at least annually at each partner's institution, which could support the monitoring action.

In this framework, evaluation can therefore assume a dynamic character and continuity otherwise difficult to acquire, since it can count on a large amount of information collected through monitoring activities as well as on a continuous relationships between ASDO and implementing teams.

As we will see below (Section Three), the outputs springing out of the monitoring activities will be one of the key sources of information used in the evaluation process.

Evaluators' intermediate position

Another key assumption shared by DE and the evaluation approach adopted under TRIGGER concerns the **relationships between evaluators and implementation teams**.

Usually, in the evaluation literature, these relationships are dealt with chiefly referring to the basic opposition **external evaluation vs. internal evaluation**.

- in the **external evaluation**, evaluators are not part of the project implementation team and not emotionally concerned with the project. External evaluation is usually considered as ensuring an "objective" assessment of the project, even though it may generate other kinds of problems (difficult access to information by the evaluator, problematic interaction between evaluator and project team, evaluator's limited understanding of the deepest processes underlying the project, etc.).
- in the **internal evaluation**, on the contrary, evaluators are part of the project implementation team and fully concerned with the project. This makes it more difficult for the evaluators to assume a detached position toward the project, but largely facilitates the evaluator's understanding the project and collecting and interpreting relevant data.

Developmental Evaluation does not consider this opposition as significant. Regardless to her/his formal contractual position, the evaluator is required to establish a **partnering relationship with the project team** all along the project, from its very inception to its wrap-up phase and even beyond.

To a certain extent, DE perceives evaluators in an **intermediate position**. They are external to the project team, since they have no direct responsibility for the project implementation. At the same time, they are fully concerned with it, since they work "shoulder to shoulder" with the project team. Therefore, while the evaluators keep a point of view which is different from (and actually external to) that of the project

team, their engagement in the project and, at least to a certain extent, their knowledge of the project dynamics are similar to the project team members’.

Therefore, in this framework, project evaluation is, at least to a certain extent, a self-evaluation process facilitated by a highly coordinated and trust-based relationship between evaluators and team.

In the case of TRIGGER, this specific assumption is epitomized by the peculiar position of ASDO (the partner in charge of the evaluation as well as of all the technical assistance activities). In fact, ASDO is part of the TRIGGER consortium and therefore part of the **partnering relation** involving all the consortium members. Because of that, the ASDO team is fully engaged in the success of the APs, in both technical and emotional terms. However, ASDO **has no direct responsibility** for the AP’s implementation, thus its point of view (we can say, its observation point) is in any case external to the teams.

1.3. A relational approach to evaluation

To sum up, drawing inspiration from Developmental Evaluation, four main choices have been put at the basis of the TRIGGER evaluation plan:

- a. **connecting evaluation and technical assistance**, thus making evaluation part of a broader proactive support system given to the teams;
- b. **broadening the evaluation scope** so as to incorporate in the evaluation process the relational factors feeding uncertainty and causing the non-linear trajectory of the Action Plans’ implementation phase;
- c. **intertwining evaluation and monitoring**, thus making iterative evaluation cycles possible and favouring learning processes;
- d. **setting up a partnering relation between evaluators and implementing teams**, placing ASDO "halfway" between a fully external and a fully internal position.

As it is easy to observe, these four features, taken as a whole, depict, so to say, a **relational approach to evaluation**. In fact, all the key features put at the basis of the evaluation approach proposed for TRIGGER concerns relationships and, namely:

- relationships between **evaluators and teams** (points a., c. and d.);
- relationships between the **teams and the players** directly or indirectly involved with the Action Plans (points b. and c.).

The basic tenets, in this relational approach, are that:

- the **success of a social innovation initiative** is largely dependent upon the capacity of the promoters to establish **new long-term relational configurations** among the different institutional and non-institutional players within the organisation, stable enough to **solidify into specific institutional arrangements, procedures, habits or regulations**;
- the **success of an evaluation exercise** is largely dependent upon the capacity of the evaluator to establish an **intense, long-lasting and trust-based partnering relationships** (i.e., again a new relational configuration) with the implementation teams so as to help them timely and appropriately react to the changing environment they are facing.

This evidently does not mean that, in a relational approach, only relations matter. Rather, it means that focusing on relations is particularly helpful to fulfil both the problem-solving orientation and the quality orientation recognised in the evaluation process, since it makes it easier to detect obstacles and find solutions, as well as to accurately interpret mistakes or problems arising at the managerial level.

2. Dimensions and indicators

Having explained the main features of the approach adopted in this evaluation plan, we can now turn to the analytical dimensions of the evaluation model (paragraph 2.1.) and the corresponding sets of indicators.

2.1. Dimensions

The model uses **five dimensions** as criteria to assess the Action Plans:

- relevance;
- effectiveness;
- efficiency;
- impact;
- sustainability.

In the following points, for each dimension, an operational definition (i.e., a definition whose application scope is limited to TRIGGER) is provided.

Relevance

Relevance refers to the capacity of the planned actions to respond appropriately to the gender equality/diversity management issue identified in the institutions that promote the APs.

In **relational terms**, this dimension can be also understood as an interaction between:

- the **interpretation of gender dynamics** embedded in the Action Plan; and
- the **factors** producing gender inequality in the organisation.

The more the team's interpretation will be appropriate to interpret which factors feed gender inequality, the higher the relevance of the Action Plan.

Undoubtedly, the great majority of these factors are related to attitudes, beliefs and behavioural patterns of the key stakeholders within the organisation.

This means that, **in practical terms**, the appropriateness of the interpretation underlying the Action Plan of gender inequality will be mainly assessed focusing on **negotiation activities between the teams and such stakeholders**. Through negotiation, in fact, there is the possibility to verify day by day if the gap between, so to say, interpretation and reality is large or not.

In this sense, for the purposes of relevance, it is important to verify if and how the different negotiation activities for each Action Plan have been carried out within each of the following dimensions:

- the **interpretive dimension**, aimed at accrediting an interpretation of gender differences in science that recognises the substantial imbalance that exists to the disadvantage of women;
- the **symbolic dimension**, to ensure that the representation and image of science is not one that is asexual or monosexual and that the two genders are present at all levels, avoiding the stereotyping that penalizes both person and science;
- the **institutional dimension**, to transform the regulations and institutional setups that govern the operation of scientific organisations;
- the **operational dimension**, to make the proposed changes effective and operational in the short term.

The **dynamic nature of relevance** is to be emphasized. As said above, Action Plans are carried out in contexts where rapid and profound changes often occur. Therefore, the level of relevance of the planned actions may vary over the time. This is also

another reason why, under this dimension, special emphasis is given to negotiation processes, being the most significant means of identifying appropriate adjustments between the plans and the changing environment. This also means that negotiation exercises cannot be entirely scheduled beforehand and that their outcomes cannot be easily forecast.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is understood as the capacity to **achieve the identified set objectives**, carrying out the activities included in the detailed plans established each year for each Action plan, keeping to schedules, even from the formal point of view, meeting targets, adhering to procedures, etc.

It is however to be emphasized that, in highly uncertain environments, attaining effective solutions strongly depends upon the capacity of the team to be flexible and able to timely change, e.g., strategies, tools and even the institutional counterparts in order to keep on pursuing the set objectives. Thus, also effectiveness is at least partially dependent upon the negotiation processes with the key stakeholders enabling the teams to timely detect and manage emerging problems.

Effectiveness entails an evaluation of both the **process** (activities necessary to get the results) and the **outcomes** (the effects, both subjective and objective, of the implemented solutions).

Efficiency

The criterion of efficiency assesses the capacity to **make the best use of available resources**, keeping to planned deadlines and costs.

It is almost needless to say that, in assessing efficiency, it is anyhow necessary to keep a dynamic view of efficiency, taking into account changes and variations introduced in the Action Plans due to unexpected circumstances.

The benchmark for this parameter is managerial capacity, accurate accounting (accountability) and the timely review of budget data in light of possible changes to the project.

This criterion applies to the Action Plan as a whole.

Impact

The dimension of impact usually refers to **all changes produced by an intervention**, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended, positive or negative.

As it is easy to observe, measuring impacts is intrinsically difficult, since it entails a detailed analysis of the causal chains connecting an action with a given set of changes. Moreover, many changes can be observed only in the medium and long run, when the intervention is already completed (this is the reason why impact assessment exercises are often made only some months or even years after the completion of a project).

In this framework, impact is intended to analyse two components of impact which can be respectively referred to as "**subjective**" impact and "**objective**" impact:

- the analysis of the "**subjective**" impact focuses on the **satisfaction** of the direct beneficiaries of the five Action Plans and the **consensus/agreement** of the other stakeholders;
- the analysis of the "**objective**" impact focuses on the **short-term changes** (of both qualitative and quantitative nature) in the five organisations as they can be observed during the project lifespan.

Subjective impact is of relational nature, since it concerns orientations of beneficiaries and stakeholders towards the activities carried out under the Action Plan. **Objective impact** certainly includes elements of prevalently managerial nature, pertaining to the matching between expected and actual changes or the attainment of established targets. However, many aspects related to the objective impact concern the restructuring of the social configurations within the institution (e.g., effects of the AP on leaderships, key actors and stakeholders or spontaneous mobilisation of individuals or groups activated by the APs).

Sustainability

Sustainability is usually concerned with measuring **whether the benefits of an activity** are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn.

In the case of TRIGGER, sustainability assumes a **broader and more relational character**. In fact, the interest is focused on understanding whether the activities launched by the Action Plans are likely **to take root within the organisation**. This entails that new social configurations are established and consolidated enough to activate **permanent institutional changes** able to sustain these activities with appropriate resources (financial, human and organisational, partnerships, networking, and external collaborations) in the medium-long run.

Therefore, a key element in sustainability is the **capacity of the TRIGGER teams to activate social actions** which, once shared by an increasingly wide circle of people, men and women, within the organisation, may result in transferring the responsibility for these actions from the teams to other institutional or non-institutional players.

2.2. Indicators

Below is a list of qualitative and quantitative indicators – referring to both processes and results – which may be used to evaluate the five APs in each of the dimensions described in the previous paragraph.

A. RELEVANCE INDICATORS

Overall indicators

- activities and objectives are consistent with the initial "strategic set up grid" defined in the DoW;
- the specific aims of the actions deal with the questions/issues of gender equality/diversity management identified in the respective organisations (baseline and ongoing);
- the specific aims of the actions deal with the questions/issues of work-life balance identified in the organisation concerned;
- the single actions in the Action Plans deal with the problem identified in the organisations (baseline and during operations);
- the Action Plan addresses the current problems of scientific research bodies (e.g. increase of competitiveness and excellence in Europe);
- the Action Plan addresses the wider social and economic problems of the target area (e.g. unemployment, intellectual brain drain etc);
- the Action Plan addresses issues related to the innovation system of the country;
- the Action Plan addresses issues related to the innovation system of the main scientific areas concerned;
- the gendered research promoted by the Action Plan is recognised by peers as relevant for the scientific area which it refers to.

Indicators pertaining to institutional negotiation

- active involvement of the organisation's top management (according to their tasks and mandates);
- active involvement of the heads of departments/faculty/institutions in which the activities take place (according to their tasks and mandates);
- active involvement of Human Resources managers in the design and implementation of activities;
- active involvement of the organisation's head of communications in the design and implementation of activities;
- active involvement of researchers and their representatives in the design and implementation of activities;
- activation of stable channels of dialogue with the organisation's top management on issues pertaining to the Action Plan;
- inclusion of relevant outside actors in the planning and implementation of the Action Plan;
- creation of new institutions, groups, networks as a consequence of the implementation of the Action Plan.

Indicators pertaining to interpretive negotiation

- collecting and updating data on the gender gap in the organisation;
- in-house sharing of gender gap data;
- development and sharing of the contents of the activities with the widest possible circle of potential beneficiaries and/or interlocutors;
- sharing the results of activities with the widest possible circle of potential beneficiaries and/or interlocutors;
- sharing the evaluation of ongoing activities aimed at gender equality with the largest possible number of stakeholders in the institution;
- involvement of potentially hostile actors (e.g. young male researchers).

Indicators pertaining to symbolic negotiation

- raising awareness in the institution of the presence and contribution of women in science and academia;
- disseminating information on the presence and contribution of women in science and academia to the public at large (media, etc);
- actions to increase the visibility of female excellence in science;
- widest possible dissemination of the symbols and content of the actions in the plan;
- inclusion of a gender-sensitive view of science (e.g. gender medicine) in the institution's agendas and work programmes.

Indicators pertaining to operational negotiation

- involvement of the heads of departments/faculties/institutions in solving logistical problems;
- involvement of the heads of departments/faculties/institutions in implementing activities (such as speakers, mentors, coordinators of peer review committees, etc);
- involvement of administrative offices in the actual implementation of actions;
- involvement of the broadest possible number of potential stakeholders in the planning of activities;
- involvement of the broadest possible number of people potentially involved in the implementation of activities;
- activation of monitoring procedures with all stakeholders.

B. EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

Process evaluation

- planned activities/implemented activities;
- actual execution of the assigned tasks to the different actors according to the annual detailed plans;
- compliance with planned schedules and deadlines;

- on time submission of deliverables and compliance with other formal duties.

Results evaluation

- actual implementation of the planned activity;
- number of beneficiaries planned/number of actual beneficiaries;
- match between the type of intended beneficiaries and the type of the actual beneficiaries.

C. EFFICIENCY INDICATORS

- presence/absence of financial and administrative management problems;
- capacity to carry out Action Plan activities with TRIGGER project funds;
- human resource time-sheets filled in on time and properly;
- C forms (Financial Statements) filled in on time and properly;
- interim reports to the EC on the use of resources filled in on time and properly;
- occurrence of financial /cash flow problems and their solution.

D. IMPACT INDICATORS

"Subjective" impact

- degree of agreement on the activities of the beneficiaries;
- degree of satisfaction of the beneficiaries of each project action with the ongoing activity and the first/final results achieved;
- degree of agreement on the activities of other concerned actors in the organisation (managers, persons in charge of internal programmes, persons in charge for human resources management; persons in charge of diversity issues/equal opportunities etc.);
- degree of satisfaction of the project staff with the ongoing activity of the Acton Plan and the first/final results achieved;
- degree of satisfaction of the internal Support Committee/board of the Acton Plan with the ongoing activity and the first/final results achieved;
- degree of satisfaction of the IBSA (International board of scientific advisors) national members with the ongoing activity of the Acton Plan and the first/final results achieved;
- degree of agreement of the male component of the staff of the organisation on the project activities.

"Objective" impact

- actual introduction of organisational, regulatory or procedural changes aimed at facilitating women's access to leadership in the five organisations;
- actual introduction of changes within working programmes, policies or procedures in the five organisations;
- permanence of actions (e.g. mentoring programmes, courses for managers etc);

- identification/activation of new programmes, actions, policies in the five organisations following the implementation of the TRIGGER actions;
- adoption or use of some outputs/outcomes of TRIGGER actions in other sectors/areas/departments of the five organisation;
- adoption or use of some outputs/outcomes of TRIGGER actions in other organisations;
- launch of initiatives similar to those in the Acton Plans in other organisations;
- occurrence of unexpected effects concerning involved actors, e.g., direct beneficiaries, Support Committee, staff of the experimentation, male component of the staff of the organisation, managers/leaders of the organisation, other key actors (e.g., new demand of equality measures from the male staff, increasing in number and quality of the professional networks the beneficiaries are inserted in);
- occurrence of unexpected effects on gender equality/diversity not envisaged in the design phase (e.g. creation of internal discussion fora or blogs to discuss such issues);
- occurrence of unexpected effects on organisational policies, measures or actions not envisaged in the design phase (e.g. new committees/initiatives established to address issues not handled before);
- increase in the percentage of women in different roles/positions within the five institutions, in accordance with the targets defined in the initial project (for the areas where targets have been established, see box below).

AREAS WHERE TARGETS CONCERNING THE PRESENCE OF WOMEN HAVE BEEN DEFINED

UNIPI

- Female representation in internal hiring commissions
- Female representation in top-level boards
- Establishment of the Delegate of the Rector on gender issues participating to the top management committee of the University

VSCHT

- Gender balance in educational and research new vacancies
- Gender balance in applications for European research funding
- Female representation in evaluation committees in the Internal Grant Agency

BBK

- Share of women professors in Birkbeck Business, Economics & Informatics School and in the School of Science
- Women scientists profitably commercialising their research (patents, licences, new start-up firms)
- Establishing a Centre for Women and Leadership as an outcome of the actions within the TRIGGER project to promote women’s leadership throughout Birkbeck

UPD

- Share of women applying for full professor positions
- Share of women PhD students

- Female representation in selection (hiring) committees
- Share of women in all scientific communication events
- Female representation in head (top) management at university level
- Share of women as directors of departments
- Share of women asking for a sabbatical

UPM

- Female representation in relevant decision-making positions and university bodies

E. SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS

- identification/acquisition of new resources to continue the activities or parts of them (quantity and number of sources);
- creation of links with key players not previously envisaged in the planned activities;
- creation of links with networks to access additional resources to continue the activities or parts of them;
- activation of interventions or actions to continue those promoted by the Action Plan;
- access to external financial resources (quantity and number of sources);
- creation of stable links with other bodies involved in the implementation of gender equality initiatives in science;
- creation of stable links with other bodies involved in the implementation of gender equality initiatives in enterprises or in other sectors;
- activities to make the new operational setups activated by the actions definitive (e.g. institutionalisation of scholarships, drafting of internal regulations that establish procedures to access certain benefits, etc).

3. Methodological issues

In this section, the main methodological issues related to evaluation are presented. In particular three issues are considered:

- sources of information;
- evaluation procedures;
- distribution of responsibilities.

3.1. Sources of information

Information necessary for the evaluation will be collected through both **monitoring activities** (see Section One above) and **specific technical tools**.

In particular, evaluation will use **first-hand** and **documentary** sources.

First-hand sources include:

- project team (core and extended);
- beneficiaries of the actions included in the plans (direct and indirect);
- staff of implementing organisations not directly involved in the APs;
- members of the international board of scientific advisors (possibly).

These sources will be consulted through a **set of instruments**:

- ongoing evaluation grids, designed by the partner in charge of the evaluation of each Action Plan, to be updated in view of each internal evaluation report (EG = evaluation grid);
- a questionnaire for qualitative interviews with core and extended Action Plan team members, to be given, if necessary, during technical assistance (I = Interviews);
- a questionnaire for interviews or a grid for focus groups with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders when relevant (BEN = interviews with beneficiaries);
- a questionnaire (where applicable) for interviews with members of external experts, members of the International board of scientific advisors (IBSA) and the Advisory Unit for Gendering Research (AUGR) (COM = interviews with members of committees and other experts);
- bilateral monitoring sessions, as reported in the minutes drawn up by the partner in charge of technical assistance (BM = bilateral monitoring);
- mutual learning sessions (ML= mutual learning).

The **documentary sources**, and the **instruments** used to analyse them, include:

- official documents and other deliverables produced by the Action Plans, including documentation related to the periodic reports to the European Commission (DE = deliverables);
- reports on common technical assistance sessions at meetings of the steering committee (CTA = Common Technical Assistance);
- working documents on individual actions within the Action Plans, e.g. meetings and minutes of meetings, self-assessment reports, in-house statistics etc. (O = Other working documents).

The **set of sources and instruments** are summarised in the table below.

Sources	Instrument	Acronym
FIRST-HAND SOURCES		
All sources	Evaluation Grid	EG
Teams	Questionnaire for qualitative interviews	I
Beneficiaries/Stakeholders	Questionnaire/Grid for focus groups	BEN
External experts, IBSA members. AUGR members	Questionnaire	COM
Teams	Minutes of the bilateral monitoring sessions	BM
Teams	Minutes of the mutual learning sessions	ML
DOCUMENTARY SOURCES		
Teams	Official documents and deliverables	DE
All Consortium Members	Reports on common technical assistance sessions at meetings of the steering committee	CTA
Teams	Working documents on individual actions within the APs	O

3.2. Action Plan evaluation procedures

With respect to evaluation, WP6 includes three main tasks:

- T6.4. - evaluation plan;
- T6.5. - ongoing evaluation;
- T6.6. - final evaluation report.

T6.4. concerns the development and production of the **evaluation plan**, which is the subject of this document.

T6.5. concerns all the evaluation-related activities to be carried out during the implementation of the Action Plans.

Three internal evaluation reports will be developed. The first two reports will concern a period of 1 year and half (respectively January 2014-June 2015 and July 2015-December 2016). The third one will concern a one-year period (January-December 2017).

The preparation of each report will include **four phases**:

- gathering and organisation of information pertaining to each AP;

- processing and analysis of such information according to the established dimensions and indicators (see Section Two above);
- discussion and exchange between ASDO and the concerned partners about the results emerging from the analysis;
- development and drafting of the internal evaluation report.

The evaluation **results** will be used, not only by the five organisations to successfully complete their Acton Plans, but also by ASDO in the framework of the research accompanying the TRIGGER project (to be implemented under WP7).

T6.6. concerns the production of the **final evaluation report**. The final evaluation will be conducted during the last three months of the project. Besides taking into account the results of the three internal evaluations, it will draw conclusions from the progress of the APs as a whole and will also contain more detailed information about the sustainability of the actions once the TRIGGER project will be completed.

3.3. Distribution of responsibilities

The evaluation process is under the responsibility of **ASDO**, it being the leader of WP6. **DPO**, as project coordinator, provides ASDO with any necessary technical and logistical support.

An active role is evidently played by the **partners in charge of the five APs**, i.e., UNIFI, VSCHT (supported by ISAS CR), BBK, UPD and UPM. Each of them are on the forefront for what concerns the provision of data and information necessary to make the evaluation process reliable and useful for themselves as well. A set of common procedures and tools (see below point 3.2.) will be developed to standardise as far as possible the evaluation process.

The members of the **International Board of Scientific Advisors** (IBSA) are expected to back ASDO, providing their advice on both the evaluation process and the products delivered.

4. Schedule

As said above (Section One), thanks to its close connection with other technical assistance activities and, especially, with monitoring, evaluation tends to assume to a certain extent the character of a continuous process. However, it will be structured in some phases and marked by specific deadlines, according to the following schedule:

June 2014

- development and validation of the evaluation plan for the Action Plans;

July-September 2014

- preparation, pretesting and fine tuning of technical tools and procedures for the collection of evaluation data;

October 2014- March 2015

- collection of data for the evaluation of activities pertaining to the first evaluation period;

April-June 2015

- first ongoing evaluation (planning, implementation and reporting);

August-October 2015

- updating of technical tools for the second evaluation period;

August 2015-September 2016

- collection of data for the evaluation of activities pertaining to the second evaluation period;

October-December 2016

- second ongoing evaluation (planning, implementation - including IBSA consultation - and reporting);

January-March 2017

- updating of technical tools for the third evaluation period;

January-October 2017

- collection of data for the evaluation of activities pertaining to the third evaluation period;

October-December 2017

- third ongoing evaluation (planning, implementation - including IBSA consultation - and reporting) and final evaluation.