

Proposal Evaluation Form

	EUROPEAN COMMISSION Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme	Evaluation Summary Report - Coordination and support actions
---	--	---

Call: H2020-GERI-2014-1
Funding scheme: Coordination & support action
Proposal number: 666008
Proposal acronym: PLOTINA
Duration (months): 48
Proposal title: Promoting gender balance and inclusion in research, innovation and training
Activity: GERI-4-2014

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	ALMA MATER STUDIORUM-UNIVERSITA DI BOLOGNA	IT	456,875	19.90%	456,875	19.90%
2	THE UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK	UK	345,625	15.05%	345,625	15.05%
3	KEMIJSKI INSTITUT	SI	156,250	6.80%	156,250	6.80%
4	INSTITUTO SUPERIOR DE ECONOMIA E GESTAO - ISEG	PT	157,125	6.84%	157,125	6.84%
5	MONDRAGON UNIBERTSITATEA, S.COOP.	ES	161,563	7.04%	161,563	7.04%
6	Ozyegin University	TR	155,938	6.79%	155,938	6.79%
7	ZENTRUM FUER SOZIALE INNOVATION GMBH	AT	210,625	9.17%	210,625	9.17%
8	MINERVA CONSULTING & COMMUNICATION	BE	260,000	11.32%	260,000	11.32%
9	Centro Studi Progetto Donna e Diversity Mgmt	IT	185,563	8.08%	185,563	8.08%
10	Elhuyar-Zubize	ES	206,625	9.00%	206,625	9.00%
	Total:		2,296,189		2,296,189	

Abstract:

The overall objective of PLOTINA is to enable the development, implementation and assessment of self-tailored Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) with innovative and sustainable strategies for the Research Performing Organizations (RPOs) involved. This objective will be achieved by: i) Stimulating a gender-aware culture change; ii) Promoting career-development of both female and male researchers to prevent the waste of talent, particularly for women; iii) Ensuring diversification of views and methodologies (in this case by taking into account the gender/sex dimension and analysis) in research and teaching. PLOTINA is a partnership of RPOs, Professional Associations and Partners with specific expertise in monitoring the progress of the project and in the dissemination. The consortium represents the diversity of European RPOs as well as the diversity of European social and cultural environments. The workplan will proceed in four overall stages: i) Assess the current situation in all Partner RPOs; ii) Design GEPs for each RPO, iii) Design, implement and evaluate Actions in the Partner RPOs to address the targets of the GEPs, iv) Create a platform of resources that can be used by RPOs across Europe to implement their own GEPs suited to their own situations. The GEPs Actions will support systemic and sustainable changes at the institutional and departmental of the PLOTINA's RPOs. The end results will be a set of modular and adaptable resources for other RPOs at the starting stage in the setting up of GEPs, in particular: Tools, GEPs Library of Actions, research and teaching Case Studies and Good Practices. Strongly aligned with a European Research Area (ERA) objectives on gender equality, PLOTINA will contribute to increase the number of female researcher, promote their careers and integrate of the gender dimension into the design, evaluation and implementation of research, to enhance its quality and relevance foster excellence and the social value of innovations.

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 12.50 (Threshold: 10.00)

Form information

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

Interpretation of the score:

- 0- The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1- Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2- Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4- Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring, and explained in the comments.

- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- Credibility of the proposed approach

Soundness of the concept

Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures

Objectives are clear and directly meet the call objectives. The six implementing partners are institutions in various EU countries with a good geographical and disciplinary balance, two of them are very big institutions in term of size. The "fundamental aims" of the proposal highlight that gender issues are always embedded within research cultures.

The choice of giving attention to history, local culture, local priorities seems very relevant. The core WP address appropriately the three main issues: careers, decision-making and gender dimension of research.

The consortium is well informed about previously funded projects and initiatives in the same area, and will build on these results and experiences. The objectives are well anchored in policy documents, statistics and relevant research literature. The consortium partners have already cooperated and taken part in programs of direct relevance to the proposed proposal.

Clear descriptions of the current situation are provided, the consortium has already carried out a preliminary gender gap analysis and a first assessment of gender issues in the organisations involved.

The concept seems to be well structured. The methodology is mentioned and is well-thought-out. PLOTINA aims to develop several resources to be used by other institutions and organizations, and description of this are provided in convincing detail.

The strong point of this proposal is the fact it actually addresses the issue of gendering the knowledge and dedicates a full WP to this aim.

A minor shortcoming was noticed: The research teams are not gender-balanced and involve very few men (except one partner).

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:

The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic

Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant

Impact is well explained and described. The overall strategy is to mainstream gender at all levels and to promote a reflective learning process, which ensures a good sustainability.

Due to the diversity of partners, other RPO in Europe will find inspiration to implement GEP in the presentation of case studies based on the experiences described in the proposal.

The dissemination strategy is a standard and well-described strategy. The two biggest partners in terms of size are in two gender pro-active countries, where some GEP have already be implemented in other institutions.

Dissemination activities and tools offered to the public seem relevant and efficient. The cooperation at different levels and the support of research-related bodies is an important and positive asset of the proposal. Details of communication and outreach activities are described in depth.

There are minor shortcomings:

- *The impacts are not described in detail.*
- *No measurable targets are provided.*

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

The consortium is well balanced in terms of geography and disciplines, but focused mainly on HE institutions (Universities) with no RFO as partners, even if they are involved in another way.

All partners have a long experience in gender and in EU projects and the constant knowledge exchange inside the proposal will have positive effects. The proposal shows an organizational approach and know-how in terms of implementing change management. The approach and division of responsibilities is well planned. The work plan is appropriate and efficient. Detailed and measurable deliverables are provided. Learning loops, such as workshops, are included within the different work packages.

Impartial monitoring can be assumed as an external evaluator is involved.

A detailed dissemination plan and strategy is provided.

A risk management plan is provided.

An international advisory board will function at the strategic level.

All implementing institutions are committed and provided a letter of intent.

One shortcoming is the fact that technical partners (not implementing GEP) represent more than one third of the budget.

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

Not provided

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: **Yes**

Not provided