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1. The GENOVATE project: an innovative and complex project
An ACTION-RESEARCH PROJECT that aims to ENSURE EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN AND MEN

By encouraging a MORE GENDER-COMPETENT MANAGEMENT in RESEARCH, INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC DECISION-MAKING BODIES, with a particular focus on universities
Key processes in the GENOVATE project

Macro level / Consortium level: Development of the eight Work Packages (WPs)

Micro level / Institutional level: Implementation of Gender Equality Action Plans (GEAPs)

Development of a social model of gender equality implementation

Transfer of learning across the partnership
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2. Aim and roles of the evaluation inside GENOVATE project
The evaluation pursues to inform the decision making processes, facilitate organizational learning and produce a shared knowledge on evaluating GEAPs in research institutions.

The evaluation has a double role inside GENOVATE

- Evaluation of the GENOVATE project as a whole
- Evaluation of Gender Action Plans (GEAPs)
3. The evaluators’ adventure...

A model under construction
Our evaluation model is based on...

- Participatory, empowerment and collaborative evaluation
- Developmental evaluation
- Feminist evaluation and Gender-sensitive & Evaluation from a Gender Perspective
- Responsive evaluation
- Program Theory
## Evaluation approaches and our evaluation model (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation approaches</th>
<th>Contribution to our evaluation model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory, empowerment and collaborative evaluation</td>
<td>- Evaluating together to learning together about evaluation and about gender change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guba &amp; Lincoln, 1989; Fetterman et al., 1997; Monnier, 1996, etc.)</td>
<td>- Empowerment is promoted through capacity building through the evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsive evaluation (Stake, 1976 and onwards)</td>
<td>- Evaluation for understanding programs over summative judging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evaluation to give answer to specific context of each GEAP. There is not an universal model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Theory (Rogers and Funell, 2011)</td>
<td>- Identification of the program theory to help partners to share and understand what we are doing, how and why.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation approaches and our evaluation model (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation approaches</th>
<th>Contribution to our evaluation model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Feminist evaluation (Sharon y Brisolara, 2002; Hay, 2012; Seigart et al. 2014) and Gender-sensitive & Evaluation from a Gender Perspective (UNWomen and UNEG, 2012; Espinosa, 2013; Bustelo, forthcoming 2015, etc.) | - Evaluation as an exercise that pays attention to **structural and systemic gender inequities**  
- Evaluation as a **political activity**  
- **Knowledge** as a powerful and temporally contingent resource that should be created, hold and share with people |
| Developmental evaluation (Patton, 2011; Dickson and Saunders, 2014)                  | - Evaluation as a process to **support innovation** within evolving and dynamic programs and institutions.  
- **Uncertainty and unpredictability** are expected and there is a need to remain mindful of the evolution of the program being evaluated and to respond to those changes. |
What have we done regarding the evaluation of GENOVATE as a whole?

Periodic Rapid Evaluation feedbacks (REF)
Annual On-going Evaluation reports
Evaluation Recommendations Action Plan (ERAP)
General feedback in Annual Conventions

• Collaborative review of GENOVATE program theory and elaboration of the evaluation matrix
• Questionnaires to partner teams
• Skype interviews with partner teams
• Participant observation in Virtual meetings and other activities
• Evaluation seminars, evaluation webinars and on-site visits
What have we done regarding the support to the GEAPs’ evaluation?

Peer Learning Map: basis for developing guidelines for evaluating GEAPs

- ‘Evaluation seminars’ at the GENOVATE annual Conventions: training in evaluation.
- On-site visits (the evaluation team visits each partner institution once).
- Specific follow-up and technical assistance for each partner institution and GEAP.
4. Main lessons learned and resistances
Myths of evaluation

– There are **pre-fixed ideas** about what an evaluation is and how it should be.

– Preference for:
  
  • **Predefined evaluation criteria** (efficiency, effectiveness, impact) and not inclusion of specific criteria or evaluation questions.
  
  • **Quantitative indicators** vs. qualitative indicators.
• **Capacity building** in evaluation is key but not easy to promote.

  – There is not a consolidated *evaluation culture* inside the partner institutions.
  
  – People are very interested in evaluating but they do not have **specific evaluation capabilities**.
  
  – More **time, spaces and resources** are necessary to train in evaluation.
• **Work together in evaluation** implies to pay attention and **give response to the different contexts.**

  – Recognizing **similarities and differences**, **learning** from each other and understanding for **coping with complexity**.
  – Finding ways for working in an “asynchronous” **response model**.
  – **Accompanying, following and adapting** to what we encounter.
  – Evaluator’s role: helping the projects to keep an **overall view** and be attentive to **opportunities for development and improvement**.
• Evaluation of gender equality needs to recognize the different starting points.
Evaluation of organizational change pro-gender equality requires look at the specific organization elements and explore resistances.

Mision/Mandate:
- Policies
- Policy influence
- Organizational culture

Organisational structure:
- Tasks and responsibilities
- Decision-making
- Cooperation and learning

Human resources:
- Expertise
- Skills
- Attitude

Adapted from Mukhopadhyay, Steehouwer and Wong (2006) Politics of Possible. Gender mainstreaming and organisational change
Thank you so much for your attention!
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