

PN-ACH-949

CGIAR GENDER PROGRAM
WORKING PAPER, NO. 20

**TAKING STOCK OF GENDER STAFFING
IN THE CGIAR, 1998**

Prepared by
Sara J. Scherr
Deborah Merrill-Sands

May 1999

CGIAR Secretariat
World Bank
Washington, D.C.

Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO)
Simmons Graduate School of Management
Boston, MA, USA

A

LIST OF GENDER STAFFING PROGRAM WORKING PAPERS

- Working Paper, No. 1 Status of Internationally-Recruited Women in the International Agricultural Research Centers of the CGIAR; Deborah Merrill-Sands and Pammi Sachdeva; October 1992.
- Working Paper, No. 2 Spouse Employment in Organizations Around the World: A Toolkit for Developing Policies and Practices; Madelyn Blair; December 1992.
- Working Paper, No. 3 Spouse Employment at IRRI: A Case Study; Deborah Merrill-Sands; March 1993.
- Working Paper, No. 4 Strengthening the Recruitment of Women Scientists and Professionals at the International Agricultural Research Centers: A Guidelines Paper; Sarah Ladbury; October 1993.
- Working Paper, No. 5 Recruitment Resources in Europe: A List of Professional Organizations; Stella Mascarenhas-Keys and Sarah Ladbury; October 1993.
- Working Paper, No. 6 Filipino Women Scientists: A Potential Recruitment Pool for International Agricultural Research Centers; ISNAR and PCARRD; October 1993.
- Working Paper, No. 7 Recruitment Resources in the United States: A List of Professional Organizations; Bonnie Folger McClafferty and Deborah Merrill-Sands; January 1994.
- Working Paper, No. 9 CGIAR Human Resources Survey: 1991, 1994, Key Observations on International Staffing with a Focus on Gender; Deborah Merrill-Sands; October 1995.
- Working Paper, No. 12 Gender Staffing in the CGIAR: Achievements, Constraints, and a Framework for Future Action; October 1995.
- Working Paper, No. 13 Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: How to Recognize It; How to Deal With It; Joan Joshi and Jodie Nachison; October 1996.
- Working Paper, No. 14 Maximizing Recruitment Resources: Using the World Wide Web; Bonnie Folger McClafferty; January 1997.
- Working Paper, No. 15 1997 CGIAR Human Resources Survey: International Staffing at the CGIAR Centers with a Focus on Gender; Deborah Merrill-Sands; October 1997.
- Working Paper, No. 16 Role of Boards in Addressing Gender Staffing Issues; Joan Joshi and Deborah Merrill-Sands; January 1998.
- Working Paper, No. 17 Strangers in a Strange Land: A Literature Review of Women in Science; Bridgette Sheridan; April 1998.
- Working Paper, No. 18 Toward Gender Equity: Model Policies; Joan Joshi, Elizabeth Goldberg, Sara J. Scherr, Deborah Merrill-Sands; September 1998.
- Working Paper, No. 19 Gender Staffing in the CGIAR: Lessons Learned and Future Direction: Report of an Inter-Center Consultation; Bonnie Folger McClafferty; December 1998.
- Working Paper, No. 20 Taking Stock of Gender Staffing in the CGIAR, 1998; Sara J. Scherr, Deborah Merrill-Sands; May 1999.
- Working Paper, No. 21 Engendering Organizational Change: A Case Study of Strengthening Gender Equity and Organizational Effectiveness in an International Agricultural Research Institute; Deborah Merrill-Sands, Joyce Fletcher, Anne Acosta, Nancy Andrews, and Maureen Harvey; May 1999.
- Working Paper, No. 23 Summary Report, CIMMYT Pilot on Multi-Source Performance Assessment; Linda Spink, Deborah Merrill-Sands, Krista Baldini, Marisa de la O; May 1999.

CGIAR GENDER PROGRAM
WORKING PAPER, NO. 20

**TAKING STOCK OF GENDER STAFFING
IN THE CGIAR, 1998**

Prepared by
Sara J. Scherr
Deborah Merrill-Sands

May 1999

**CGIAR Secretariat
World Bank
Washington, D.C.**

**Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO)
Simmons Graduate School of Management
Boston, MA, USA**

CGIAR Gender Staffing Program

CGIAR

The Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) aims to harness modern science to the sustainable development of agriculture in poor countries. The CGIAR is jointly sponsored by the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP). It is made up of 16 international agricultural research Centers located in 12 developing and 3 developed countries. These research Centers specialize in strategic research on agriculture, food policy and natural resources management and provide research management advice. The Centers employ 1,200 scientists of 60 different nationalities.

CGIAR Gender Staffing Program

The Gender Staffing Program supports efforts of the CGIAR-supported Centers to strengthen the recruitment and retention of highly qualified women scientists and professionals and to create work environments that are equally supportive of the productivity, advancement, and job satisfaction of both women and men. The Program provides funds through small grants, technical assistance and management consulting, training, and information services. The Program, which began in 1991, is coordinated by the CGIAR Secretariat, supported by the members of the CGIAR, and implemented by the Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO) at the Simmons Graduate School of Management at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts, USA. The mission of the Center for Gender in Organizations is to serve as a national and international resource for scholars and practitioners who work at the intersection of gender and strategic organizational issues. The Center's work is based on the belief that organizational performance is enhanced by gender-equitable work environments that allow both men and women to be active and productive contributors. The Center pursues this agenda through education, collaborative research, conferences, and dissemination of information.

CGIAR Centers

CIAT	Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (Colombia)
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research (Indonesia)
CIMMYT	Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (Mexico)
CIP	Centro Internacional de la Papa (Peru)
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (Syria)
ICLARM	International Center for Living Aquatic Resources Management (Philippines)
ICRAF	International Center for Research in Agroforestry (Kenya)
ICRISAT	International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (India)
IFPRI	International Food Policy Research Institute (USA)
IIMI	International Irrigation Management Institute (Sri Lanka)
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (Nigeria)
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute (Kenya)
IPGRI	International Plant Genetics Resources Institute (Italy)
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute (Philippines)
ISNAR	International Service for National Agricultural Research (The Netherlands)
WARDA	West Africa Rice Development Association (Cote d'Ivoire)

d

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
SUMMARY OF CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT IN 1998	iii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF A GENDER EQUITABLE WORKPLACE	3
A. Representation of Women.....	3
B. Recruitment.....	4
C. Parity in Career Development.....	4
D. Retention	5
E. Key Elements Affecting Gender Equity in the Workplace	6
III. METHODOLOGY FOR CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT	9
A. Design	9
B. Implementation	10
C. Analysis And Interpretation	11
IV. MAJOR FINDINGS	13
A. Recruiting IRS Women.....	13
B. Achieving Parity.....	13
C. Retaining Staff: A Supportive Work Environment	14
D. Variation Within Centers	14
V. CONCLUSIONS	17
TABLE 1. CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT: OVERVIEW	19
ANNEX 1: FRAMEWORK FOR TAKING STOCK OF GENDER STAFFING	21
ANNEX 2: RANK DISTRIBUTION FOR INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS*	27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper and the survey data upon which it is based represent a collaborative effort between the CGIAR Centers and the Gender Staffing Program. Appreciation is extended to the Gender Staffing Focal Points in the Centers who devoted considerable time and effort to organizing and evaluating the self-assessment exercises: Elizabeth Goldberg (CIAT), Marielle Paiement (CIFOR), Anne Acosta and Krista Baldini (CIMMYT), Elizabeth Bailey (ICARDA), Edward Sayegh (ICLARM), Roselyne Lecuyer (ICRAF), V. Mahalakshmi (ICRISAT), I'Dafney Green (IFPRI), David Governey (IIMI), Fe Aglipay (IRRI), Howard Elliott (ISNAR), and Nina Lilja (WARDA). Over 150 Center staff members from research, outreach and administration participated directly in the self-assessment survey and discussion groups.

We would particularly like to acknowledge the Center Directors whose commitment to promoting gender equity was so clearly expressed in their allocation of time and financial resources for the participation of their staff in the self-assessment efforts.

Thanks also to Bonnie Gamache for technical editing and publication.

Sara J. Scherr and Deborah Merrill-Sands
Co-Leaders, CGIAR Gender Staffing Program

AUTHORS

Dr. Deborah Merrill-Sands and Dr. Sara J. Scherr are Co-Leaders of the CGIAR Gender Staffing Program. Deborah Merrill-Sands is also the Associate Director of the Center for Gender in Organizations at Simmons Graduate School of Management in Boston, MA and Sara J. Scherr is an Adjunct Professor in the Agricultural and Resource Economics Department at the University of Maryland, College Park.

SUMMARY OF CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT IN 1998

In April 1998, the CGIAR held an Inter-Center Consultation on Gender Staffing to examine lessons learned since the initiation of the Gender Staffing Program in 1991, and to set directions and priorities for the future. A key input into the Consultation was a self-assessment of achievements in gender staffing by 12 Centers, which focused on qualitative aspects of policies, staff skills, leadership, work norms and culture as they affect recruitment, career parity and retention. The self-assessment was intended to complement the quantitative 1997 CGIAR Human Resources Survey. The key findings from Center self-assessments were:

1. ***The number of women is still a critical issue.*** The number of IRS women staff, as well as their proportional representation, is rising steadily and the number of women among nationally-recruited staff has increased significantly. Still, the numbers remain well below a critical mass in most Centers and do not reflect the number of women in the international pool of scientists and professionals. The number and proportion of women managers remain low. Thus women still have limited influence in the decision-making that shapes the strategies, programs, management, and work environments of the Centers.
2. ***Recruitment efforts need to be more proactive.*** Center leaders have a strong commitment to gender staffing, and formal recruitment systems have been widely established. Recruitment efforts are reaching more women. Yet the use of special efforts to “cast the net widely” in recruitment is not institutionalized: recruitment policies are not well known to staff and managers, and committees are not held accountable for gender-equitable recruitment. Further efforts are needed to mobilize applicants and utilize professional networks during international searches; ensure that systematic and transparent policies and procedures are used in selection; and enhance staff skills for interviewing candidates in an effective and gender sensitive manner. Improved practices will enhance the effectiveness of recruitment generally, not only for women.
3. ***Policies to ensure parity in career development need fuller implementation, with attention to advancement issues.*** Women managers and professionals in the Centers are widely reported to receive equivalent respect and resources as male managers. Many Centers have developed formal and more equitable systems of job classification and salary assignment. The skills, concepts and perspectives provided by the Women’s Leadership and Management Course were found to be extremely helpful for participants’ work at the Centers. Policies are not always implemented evenly across the institution, however, and there is inadequate orientation about policies and procedures for new staff members. Performance evaluation systems need to be more effective and unbiased and strengthened to recognize “invisible work.” Internal promotion options and limitations are often not clearly understood by staff. Women managers are still not often found in core center functions. Centers would benefit from developing improved performance evaluation procedures and transparent criteria and systems for promotion and from greater investment in management training.
4. ***Centers’ ability to retain high quality staff—both women and men—depends on the quality of the work environment.*** Center leaders are philosophically committed to creating a work environment supportive of a diverse staff. Almost all Centers now have formal sexual harassment policies and good family and dependent leave policies. However, few Centers reported having put

in place support services to assist professional spouses in finding viable career opportunities. A need to strengthen staff skills for managing a diverse work force was widely noted. More proactive policies are needed to retain good staff, especially women. Key areas for attention are support for dual-career couples, definition of reasonable workloads, and implementation of policies and practices that help staff to better integrate their work and personal lives.

5. ***Greater emphasis is needed to strengthen skills and leadership for gender equity in the Centers.*** Formal policies and procedures are in place or under development in most Centers, and informal practices supporting gender equity are in place to a moderate extent. However, few Centers felt their staff had the necessary skills and knowledge to practice gender equity effectively, and few have mobilized leadership to address gender equity proactively.
6. ***Greater dialogue within Centers is needed on gender staffing issues.*** Centers that implemented the taking stock exercise with diverse staff found large differences on many indicators between the perceptions of senior managers and those of other groups, such as women, middle managers, and international and national staff. Greater dialogue among diverse staff groups could help to identify areas for intervention to improve gender staffing.

I. INTRODUCTION

The CGIAR Gender Staffing Program was initiated in 1991 to help the Centers attract and retain highly qualified women scientists and professionals and to create work environments that support the productivity, career development, and job satisfaction of both men and women. As funding for the previous phase of the Gender Staffing Program came to an end in 1998, Centers requested that the Program organize an Inter-Center Consultation to take stock and chart future directions for what has now become the CGIAR Gender and Diversity Program.¹

A key element of the preparations for this Consultation was an in-depth self-assessment undertaken by the Centers of their own achievements in gender staffing, focusing on qualitative issues of leadership, recruitment, retention, formal policies and procedures, parity in career development, work norms and culture, and staff skills and training. The self-assessment was designed to encourage a process of internal reflection and review in the Centers and to provide a common framework for discussion at the Inter-Center Consultation. This qualitative assessment was intended to complement the quantitative findings of the 1997 CGIAR Human Resources Survey, which assessed the system's progress in recruiting and retaining women at different levels of staff.²

This paper presents the results of the Centers' self-assessment. The next section discusses the conceptual underpinnings for the study design—the qualitative aspects of a gender-equitable workplace. The third section describes the pilot instrument developed to assess organizational progress toward gender equity and its implementation and analysis. The major findings of the self-assessment are then presented, followed by conclusions about the achievements and remaining challenges for the Centers as they seek to build more gender-equitable organizations.

¹ For a summary of the consultation, see Bonnie McClafferty, *Gender Staffing in the CGIAR: Lessons Learned and Future Direction*. CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper No. 19, December 1998.

² The full report of this survey is found in Deborah Merrill-Sands, *1997 CGIAR Human Resources Survey: International Staffing at the CGIAR Centers with a Focus on Gender*. CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper No. 15, October 1997.

II. QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF A GENDER EQUITABLE WORKPLACE

The fundamental proposition underlying the work of the Gender Program is that a culturally and gender diverse staff strengthens the performance of international research Centers, by broadening the pool of skills, talents, perspectives and ideas within the organization. Recent research in organizational management suggests that powerful benefits can accrue to an organization from a diverse workforce, including increased creativity and innovation, stronger intellectual vitality, enhanced organizational learning, and the improved ability to develop effective partnerships and respond rapidly and successfully to changes in the external environment.³

These potential benefits are particularly important to the CGIAR Centers, which are seeking to apply cutting-edge research to the complex and urgent problems affecting poverty, food security and natural resource sustainability in diverse countries of the developing world. To do so, they must harness the talents of staff from all over the world and mobilize collaborative partnerships with a wide range of organizations.

Experience within the Centers and in other organizations around the world suggests that gender equity in the workplace will not be achieved simply through increased representation of women. It is also essential to influence the organizational dynamics that affect their recruitment, career parity, and retention. These dynamics reflect the joint influence of formal management systems and procedures, informal work norms and culture, staff knowledge and skills, and leadership.

A. REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN

Research has shown that the proportional representation of women influences organizational dynamics related to gender.⁴ In situations where women are a significant minority (below 15%, as in the case of the professional and managerial cadre of the CG System), and in occupations that have traditionally been thought of as male (such as the agricultural sciences), systemic organizational dynamics come into play that are prejudicial to women's job satisfaction, productivity and career development. In these situations, women typically receive heightened attention or visibility; they are subject to higher performance pressure; they are isolated from informal social and professional networks; their differences from male peers are exaggerated; and they are more subject to gender stereotyping. As the relative percentage reaches the 35% level, women begin to have a stronger voice and to influence the work culture and systems of the organization. These factors are likely to influence organizational dynamics within the CGIAR, where as of 1997 only two Centers had

³ R. Ely and D. Thomas (1996) "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity." *Harvard Business Review*, September-October; T. Cox, Jr. (1993) *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory, Research and Practice*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.; R.M. Kanter (1983) *The Change Masters*. New York: Simon and Schuster; F. Trompenaars (1993) *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

⁴ R. M. Kanter (1997), *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Basic Books; J. Yoder (1991), "Rethinking Tokenism: Looking Beyond Numbers", *Gender & Society*, vol 5, no. 2., June 1991, 178-192; R. Ely (1994) "The Effects of Organizational Demographics and Social Identity on Relationships Among Professional Women," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 203-238.

achieved a level of 25% of internationally-recruited staff (IRS)—the estimated proportion of women among the international supply of researchers.

B. RECRUITMENT

Recruitment is a key leverage point for ensuring that the Centers are tapping effectively into the expanding pool of women scientists and professionals and that Centers are reaching the best possible candidates and not bypassing a major segment of the pool. The representation of women in disciplines relevant to the Centers has expanded dramatically in the past 15 years. Recruitment efforts are also important for increasing the representation of women in the Centers across diverse job categories and levels.

Experience indicates that common constraints in the recruitment process have a significant gender dimension. Fewer women are reached due to lack of targeted advertising and failure to tap networks of women scientists and professionals in the search process. Fewer women are selected due to stereotyping of women's strengths and weaknesses for particular positions and non-diverse selection committees. Fewer women accept position offers, due to lack of support for spouse employment, gender-insensitive interviewing practices, and lack of benefits of particular interest to women (e.g., maternity leave, flexi-place).

Subtle (and often unconscious) gender discrimination in staff selection is also far more common than most scientists realize. For example, a recent Swedish study of the peer-review selection process for a prestigious post-doctoral scientific fellowship discovered a remarkable degree of bias in favor of males. Using regression analysis, the researchers concluded that to be ranked of equivalent competence, women had to be 2 ½ times more productive than the men, in terms of the quantity and quality of journal articles published.⁵ Personal affiliation with a reviewer was nearly as important as male gender as a determinant of reviewers' scores for scientific competence.

C. PARITY IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Ensuring equal opportunities for advancement and career development for men and women is a fundamental element of creating a gender-equitable work environment. While most Centers have explicit policies barring discrimination, research has shown repeatedly that subtle, and often unconscious, bias can influence performance appraisals of women, recognition and appreciation of diverse contributions, and assessments of women's capabilities or appropriateness for specific types of jobs. These in turn may result in lack of parity between men and women in position classification, grade and salary.

The common assumption of meritocracy of science can obscure the need for ensuring equity in the distribution of *opportunities* for career development. These include such elements as resources for research (for example, laboratory space, funding, research assistance), access to mentoring, professional exposure inside and outside the institution, equal opportunities for promotion, and equal opportunities to take on demanding new challenges that contribute to professional development.

⁵ C. Winneras and A. Wold (1997). "Nepotism and Sexism in Peer Review". *Nature*, vol. 387, 22 May, 1997.

This is illustrated by a recent study of the conditions of work for women scientific faculty at the prestigious Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the United States. This research found that women typically were allocated half of the laboratory space, were required to raise twice the level of external funding, received at least 20 percent lower salaries than men of equal standing, and were excluded from the most powerful committees and leadership positions. These factors contributed considerably to lower female morale and productivity, until the university recently instituted major changes.⁶

These biases may be widespread in the scientific community. A study of career patterns of 699 former recipients of prestigious postdoctoral fellowships in science in the United States found significant differences between the career development of men and women. Attrition rates were higher among women and, with the exception of the biological field, the professional ranking of women scientists was lower than that of men, as was the level of career attainment. The study concluded that gender discrimination was the principal factor, mainly in the form of subtle exclusions, marginalization, and difficulties establishing equitable collaborative relationships. Contrary to received wisdom, both men and women regarded marriage as a key career advantage.⁷

D. RETENTION

Retention of high quality male and female staff depends significantly on the work environment. That environment is ideally hospitable and supportive; stimulates staff's fullest productivity and creativity; provides opportunities for professional growth; and engenders commitment to the organization.

Developing such a work environment for a diverse staff entails at least four elements. First is the fostering of inclusion—not privileging one gender, cultural or racial identity group over others. The second is recognizing the value of different contributions and ways of working and seeing this diversity as an asset. The third is by calling upon the ideas and expertise of diverse staff across levels and functions. A fourth key element is to appreciate and address the different constraints faced by men and women in achieving work objectives, for example, that women often have greater responsibility for child care or a greater likelihood of having a spouse with career aspirations. These issues are important both for organizational performance as well as individual job satisfaction. Staff who feel marginalized often do not perform at their highest levels and leave prematurely.

The organizational benefits of paying greater attention to retention may be significant. In the case of the large international accounting firm of Deloitte and Touche, an aggressive initiative to improve conditions of women's employment—including senior manager training, promotion of high-performing women, external accountability, and flexible work arrangements to accommodate childbearing roles—led to high levels of employee satisfaction. Average staff turnover rates dropped to a third of the industry average, saving the business \$150 million.⁸

⁶ Zernike, K. (1999). "MIT Women Win a Fight Against Bias". *The Boston Sunday Globe*, March 21; Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1999), *A Study of the Status of Women Faculty in Science at MIT*". Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

⁷ G. Sonnert and G. Holton (1996). "Career Patterns of Women and Men in the Sciences." *American Scientist*, Vol. 84 (1), January-February, pp. 63-71.

⁸ S.J.Scherr (1998). "Gender Staffing in the Private Sector: Experiences of the Bank of America and Deloitte and Touche". *CG Gender Lens*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, April, p. 10.

E. KEY ELEMENTS AFFECTING GENDER EQUITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Achieving gender equity in the workplace involves changes in formal policies and procedures, informal practices and norms, staff knowledge and skills, and leadership.

Formal Policies and Procedures

Gender-equitable policies and management systems play a critical role in recruiting and retaining high-quality women professionals and promoting their full effectiveness at work. Policies such as those regarding grade placement, pay and promotion; maternity and paternity benefits; unbiased systems for performance evaluation; and protection from sexual harassment and discrimination ensure gender equity in conditions of employment. Family-related policies such as maternity and paternity leave, support for spouse employment, and marriage between staff members demonstrate that the workplace recognizes the dual role of staff in work and family life. Policies which help all staff to integrate personal and work responsibilities—such as flexible work hours, part-time or shared positions, flexible workplace, quiet time, companion travel and communications with home during travel—are particularly valued by women, who still commonly take on greater responsibilities for the care of home and children. With the growing number of dual-career couples worldwide, such policies are increasingly valued by men as well.⁹

Informal Work Norms and Practices

Modern organizations, having been created largely by and for men, tend to reflect masculine values and life situations in their systems, practices, structures and norms. Many aspects regarded as normal or commonplace—from what is accepted as appropriate workplace behavior to norms about competition, commitment, leadership and authority—tend to privilege traits that have been socially and culturally ascribed to males, such as independence, individuality and rationality, while devaluing or ignoring those that have been socially ascribed to females, such as collaboration, caring, connection and emotionality. When put into practice, these norms create idealized images of work, workers, products and successes that can indirectly maintain gender segregation and gender inequity. For example, some processes and skills which are critical to both efficiency and productivity but tend to be associated with the “feminine”, such as effective interpersonal communications, facilitation, problem prevention and coordination, and are often undervalued and “invisible” in the workplace.¹⁰

Everyday work practices, such as hours of activity, the structure and management of meetings, work planning processes, and means of communication among staff, often have unrecognized gender dimensions. For example, dependence on informal, rather than formal, networks to inform staff about new strategies or activities may leave many women “outside the loop.” Regular scheduling of important meetings after normal working hours may pose serious personal conflicts for staff with greater home responsibilities, more often women. Meetings managed without systematic facilitation to ensure all voices are heard may be dominated by more aggressive speakers, typically men or staff from cultures where verbal dominance is valued (and perceived to be associated with superior thinking), drowning out equally valuable contributions of other staff. By revising such work practices,

⁹ A full discussion of recommended formal policies and procedures may be found in Joan Joshi, Elizabeth Goldberg, Sara J. Scherr, Deborah Merrill-Sands, *Toward Gender Equity: Model Policies*, CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper No. 18, September 1998.

¹⁰ Drawn from J. Fletcher and D. Merrill-Sands (1998), “Looking Below the Surface: The Gendered Nature of Organizations”, *CG Gender Lens*, Vol. 3(1): 3-4. See also J. Fletcher (1998), “Relational Practice: A Feminist Reconstruction of Work”, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 7 (2): 163-186.

Centers may both increase job satisfaction for many staff, and increase organizational productivity and effectiveness.

Staff Knowledge and Skills

To develop a gender-equitable workplace requires the widespread distribution of relevant knowledge and skills among Center staff at all levels. All staff need a basic understanding of organizational systems and to recognize some of their “gendered” aspects. New staff require orientation and information about Center policies and management systems and their gender dimensions. Skill development, particularly for supervisors and managers, is essential in areas such as meeting facilitation, recruitment interviewing, performance evaluation, work planning, and conflict resolution, with attention to the particular needs of a gender- and culturally-diverse workplace. Women operating in a male-dominant environment will often need targeted support in developing leadership and management skills through training and mentoring. All work team members will benefit from skill development in communications and team dynamics.

Leadership

Strong leadership from the top is critical for bringing about organizational change, particularly change aimed at gender equity. Effective leadership involves not only providing clear and frequent public reminders of the importance of gender equity to Center goals. It also entails making the assessment of gender implications a regular part of strategy discussions and follow-up for organizational reforms and management, as well as recruiting women to the senior management team. Organizational change aimed at strengthening gender equity requires regular monitoring to assess progress and identify problems and new strategic challenges. While the Director General sets the direction for change, all managers bear a shared responsibility to create an institution that values men and women equally.

III. METHODOLOGY FOR CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT

A. DESIGN

The design of the Center self-assessment instrument, developed by the Gender Program Co-Leaders, reflects the qualitative elements and organizational dynamics described in the previous section. This first exercise was intended to pilot a new approach to organizational assessment that could eventually be adapted and used by the Centers themselves for periodic monitoring of progress in gender staffing.

Indicators

The self-assessment tool focuses on three of the critical dimensions for addressing gender staffing discussed above: 1) recruitment, 2) parity in career development opportunities, and 3) retention (Annex 1).¹¹ Key indicators of progress toward achieving gender equity in each of these areas were developed based on experience in working with the Centers, experiences of other organizations, and research carried out on gender and organizational change.

A total of 48 indicators were selected. Of these, 21 referred to formal systems (policies and procedures); 16 to informal systems (work practices, behaviors, norms and values); 10 to knowledge and skills; and 11 to leadership and management.

The Centers provided valuable feedback on the selection and definition of the indicators tested in this pilot, which will be incorporated into the design of a revised instrument.¹² As each Center establishes strategic priorities for making progress in gender equity, staff and management may wish to pay particular attention to specific indicators.

System of ranking

A qualitative scale was designed to assess the extent to which the Center as a whole had made progress on particular indicators:

1. Not at all (e.g., no policy in place, system not in place or not effective, little awareness by staff, no women in the senior management team, no training available, no expressed commitment by leadership)
2. To a limited extent (e.g., policy being developed or in place but not often implemented, system somewhat effective, a few women found in senior positions, dialogue on values or norms has begun, minimal training provided, leadership supportive but not proactive)

¹¹ Representation of women was addressed in the 1997 *Human Resources Survey*. The full report of this survey is found in Deborah Merrill-Sands, 1997 *CGIAR Human Resources Survey: International Staffing at the CGIAR Centers with a Focus on Gender*. CGIAR Gender Program Working Paper No. 15, October 1997.

¹² A complete discussion and critique of the Taking Stock instrument, including a new version revised in response to the experience and comments from the Centers and from external experts, may be found in Deborah Merrill-Sands and Sara J. Scherr, *An Instrument for Institutional Self-Assessment of Gender Staffing*, CGIAR Gender Staffing Program Working Paper No. 24 (forthcoming in 1999).

3. To a moderate extent (e.g., policy in place and usually implemented, system fairly effective, some women found in senior positions, values or norms commonly expressed, training available for some staff groups, leadership clearly supportive)
4. To a great extent (e.g., policy fully in place and reliably implemented, system usually effective, many women found in senior positions, values or norms widely shared, training widely implemented, leadership strongly and visibly committed)
5. To the fullest extent (e.g., comprehensive policy fully implemented and monitored, system very clear and effective, women strongly represented in senior positions and equally empowered, values or norms widely shared and evident in actions, well-designed training programs regularly available for a large number of staff, leadership champions the issue)

B. IMPLEMENTATION

Proposed Process

It was suggested that the Centers follow a particular protocol in implementing the self-assessment. They were to bring together a group of 10 to 12 staff from diverse levels and functions within the organization, including the Human Resources Managers, several senior managers, several middle managers and project and/or team leaders from research or other program areas. It was suggested Centers include staff who had been working actively on gender staffing issues (for example, Gender Staffing Focal Points and/or representatives of a workplace, gender or diversity committee). The group was to have a good mix of male and female staff as well as staff of diverse cultural backgrounds and tenures in the Center.

Each person in the group was individually to assess each indicator using the key above. At a subsequent meeting, the range of answers for each indicator would be indicated visibly on cards. On the basis of group discussion to clarify the reasons why staff varied in their assessments, a consensus or majority ranking would be developed and recorded. In addition to the standard form, a narrative was to be written of the key observations raised in the discussion regarding strengths and achievements, concerns and continuing challenges for recruitment, parity in career development and retention.

Actual Process

The self-assessment was implemented during February-April 1998 in 12 of the 16 international Centers: CIAT, CIFOR, CIMMYT, ICARDA, ICLARM, ICRAF, ICRISAT, IFPRI, IIMI, IRRI, ISNAR and WARDA. The number of participants in the individual Centers ranged from three to 40, with an average of 12.5. Over 150 individuals were involved in the self-assessment.

None of the Centers used the suggested protocol, which was viewed as too time-consuming, given the number of indicators. Several approaches were used instead. In one case, only the individual surveys were used, without group discussion. In 8 Centers, a single group session was held, with a cross-section of staff, and in 1 Center the survey was completed by a small group of senior and middle managers. Two Centers applied the instrument with several groups of representative staff, including senior managers, internationally-recruited women, national staff, and/or program leaders. Summary

reports were provided by nearly all Centers, and more detailed reports with histories of gender staffing initiatives by CIAT, CIMMYT, CIFOR, IFPRI and ISNAR.

C. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Rankings reported by each Center were analyzed in several ways. Average rankings were calculated for each leverage point (recruitment, parity, retention) and for each type of organizational characteristic (formal systems, informal systems, knowledge and skills, leadership/management). Calculations across Centers included the average ranking, the range of rankings, and the proportion of Centers with high, medium or low self-assessments on particular indicators. A qualitative synthesis was developed of the findings reported in the Center narratives and reports. Center data are confidential; only syntheses are reported here.

It is important to recognize that these indicators are subjective, based on peoples' perceptions and their particular experience within the organization. For example, while the formal adoption of a particular policy may be easy to confirm objectively, the degree to which that policy is implemented—or that staff are even aware of and guided by the policy—may vary considerably. Staff assessment will also be influenced by their previous experience and expectations. Thus the presence of several senior female managers may be perceived by some as indicating major institutional progress in gender staffing, while for others who worked previously for organizations with large numbers of senior women, progress may seem slow. There is no “correct” answer. Rather, the instrument is designed to elicit the range of differences, and provide an opportunity to discuss them and identify organizational priorities for future attention. To achieve this objective, careful attention must be paid to the composition of the participating group.

For this reason, it is difficult to compare the results of this exercise across organizations. Although absolute rankings are presented in Table 1 to illustrate roughly the self-assessment of the current state of gender staffing in the CGIAR, the relative ranking of different variables within each organization is a more useful guide to action.

IV. MAJOR FINDINGS

Based on average rankings across all indicators (Table 1), a third of the Centers reported having achieved gender staffing equity “to a limited extent” and the other two thirds “to a moderate extent.” None concluded that their overall work environment yet met gender equity goals “to a great extent” or “to the fullest extent.”

One Center did consider that it had achieved gender equity “to a great extent” in the area of recruitment, 1 in retention and 2 in career parity. Average achievement was perceived to be somewhat higher in relation to retention than to recruitment or parity.

Average achievement was higher in relation to informal practices and norms than to other organizational characteristics. Two Centers ranked themselves highly in achieving gender equity in informal practices and 1 in leadership. The most widely noted deficits were in the areas of skills and knowledge and leadership: 7 of the 12 Centers reported having made qualitative progress in these areas only “to a limited extent.”

A. RECRUITING IRS WOMEN

In relation to recruiting IRS women, formal systems were ranked most highly. Most Centers had an explicit equal opportunity policy, position announcements encouraging women to apply, and used interview processes intended to prevent bias. The highest scores among informal systems were for the commitment of staff and managers to equal opportunity by gender, and for the use of a recruitment process that reflects their Center as a desirable workplace. A majority of Centers reported strong management commitment to mobilize applications of women.

A few areas having low average rankings were of particular concern. A majority of Centers had succeeded “to only a limited extent” in mobilizing female resource people to assist in recruitment, including women on search committees, or establishing a search process that “casts the net widely” to ensure that women are reached in the search process. Most staff do not use their own networks to mobilize recruitment, and most feel they do not have adequate skills in interview methods.¹³

In almost no Center were managers held accountable for achieving staff diversity, nor were Search Committees held accountable for finding a diverse group of candidates. Variation among Centers was greatest in relation to their use of processes to identify female resource persons and the degree of assistance provided with spouse employment.

B. ACHIEVING PARITY

Many Centers have put in place formal systems that encourage gender equity in career development. Over half of the Centers now have clear and reliably implemented criteria for defining position classifications and grades and a transparent system for linking salaries to staff grades. Norms for

¹³ This would appear to contradict the point above relating to unbiased interview processes. It seems likely based on the narrative material that explicit sources of bias have been widely removed but that subtle or unconscious bias remain due to lack of training in gender-neutral interview methods.

performance expectations are generally perceived to be clear. In a majority of Centers, respondents believe that women managers and professionals are given equivalent respect and resources as male managers. Most felt that there are equivalent mentoring opportunities for men and women, although opportunities were limited for all. In over half of the Centers, senior managers seek “to a great extent” to develop men and women leaders at lower levels of the organization.

Progress in other areas is less encouraging. Few Centers have transparent criteria and procedures for staff promotion. It is still uncommon for performance assessments to include “invisible work.” Women managers are usually clustered in a few, non-core functions, and women are poorly represented in most senior management teams. Most Centers conclude that their managers and project leaders do not have the skills necessary for working effectively with a diverse staff. This is consistent with the reported low level of investment in management training. Variation among Centers was greatest in relation to the use of clear criteria for position classifications, distribution of women managers across functions, Center investment in training, and opportunities for mentoring.

C. RETAINING STAFF: A SUPPORTIVE WORK ENVIRONMENT

Most Centers concluded that they provide a supportive work environment “to a moderate extent.” Almost all Centers have an explicit sexual harassment policy and family and dependent care policies. In most Centers, the value of diversity is promoted, and leaders are perceived to be committed to creating a work environment in which diverse people thrive. Women are perceived to have equal opportunity with men to participate in external professional activities. Leaders in most Centers are seen to draw widely on ideas of staff of diverse background and expertise in making decisions. Skills and knowledge for managing teams and collaboration effectively are believed to have improved significantly.

Nonetheless, several areas of weakness were identified by Center staff. There is little monitoring of staff retention. Few Centers assist professional spouses in their career maintenance or development. Staff and managers in most Centers do not believe they have the knowledge and sensitivities necessary to build on the contributions of a gender diverse staff. Centers have made little progress in efforts to keep work demands reasonable or to provide flexible work arrangements, and Center leadership is not perceived as effectively controlling work pressures or time demands placed on staff. Associated with this is a general lack of *implementation* of policies that are in place to better integrate work and personal life.

D. VARIATION WITHIN CENTERS¹⁴

Two of the participating Centers applied the questionnaire with multiple groups differing by position in the hierarchy or gender, and a third Center reported the distribution of responses among participants, as well as averages. Their results suggest that there is wide within-Center variation among staff in their assessment of achievements in gender equity.

For example, in 1 Center a group of 12 diverse staff members produced rankings spanning the entire range of options (e.g., ratings of 1 through 5) for 23% of recruitment indicators and 40% of career

¹⁴ The inter-group differences observed and discussed below could not be tested statistically due to the lack of disaggregated data.

parity and retention indicators. Consensus was greatest about the knowledge and skills indicators (the full range of possible responses was recorded for only 10% of indicators). There was least consensus around leadership indicators, where 64% of indicators spanned the full range. The range for formal and informal systems indicators fell in between.

This finding highlights the role of individual or group perception in assessing workplace quality. In some cases, it also reflects differential knowledge of staff about Center policies. For example, several Centers found most staff were unaware of key recruitment policies. Others observed that staff's experience of policies and the workplace environment depended heavily on characteristics of the individual senior manager of their division or unit. There also appears to be systematic variation among staff members according to their position in the hierarchy and their gender.

Variation by position

Staff members' experience of the Center workplace depends in part on where they sit within the organization. In general, senior management team members ranked their Centers significantly higher on most indicators than did other staff members, and international staff rankings were higher than national staff. For many indicators, response differed by 1½ to 2 rank levels between groups defined by position in the hierarchy.

In one Center, when staff were asked whether there were clear criteria for defining position classification and staff grades, senior managers responded that criteria were clear almost "to the fullest extent" (4.7). Yet nationally-recruited staff ranked those criteria as clear only "to a moderate extent" (2.8). This difference may be important for senior managers to address, as it is a basic determinant of staff perception of fairness or equity.

In another Center, the senior management group ranked several indicators as achieved "to the fullest extent," which at least one other staff group ranked as being achieved only to "a limited or moderate extent." While most senior managers think "invisible work" is well recognized and salaries are clearly linked to grades, few others think so. Senior managers believe they are actively developing men and women leaders at lower levels of the organization, but this is not obvious to other staff. It is notable that although the leadership group believes it is committed to creating a work environment in which diverse types of people can thrive and contribute fully, other groups of staff do not always perceive that commitment. Through further discussions with staff to explore these differences in perception, it may be possible to identify interventions which serve the interests of both managers and staff.

On the other hand, for several indicators the senior management team ranking was lower than all other groups. Senior managers graded their Center more poorly on two recruitment indicators—staff commitment to using professional networks to mobilize applications and staff attention to gender-sensitive interview questions.

Interestingly, senior managers also ranked their Centers lower than did other staff on several key leadership indicators. They were less likely to perceive a respect for diversity in management and leadership styles, and most felt manager and project leader skills were inadequate to work with a diverse staff. They were less likely to report a strong and visible commitment from leaders and managers to minimizing the potential for bias in candidate reviews. These findings suggest that senior

managers may be particularly open to gender and diversity interventions that expand their options and skills as managers.

Variation by gender

Men's rankings were generally higher than women's, with the rankings of senior managers (predominately men) often 1 to 2 rank levels higher. In one Center, when asked whether women managers were given the same degree of respect and authority as men, male senior managers' answer was "to a great extent" (4.3) and the average for all groups was "to a moderate extent" (3.4). Yet IRS women felt that women received equal respect only "to some extent" (2.5). As above, this difference of perception might usefully trigger a discussion of more effective ways to demonstrate respect and confer authority, or the unrecognized ways in which respect is undermined.

The average of women's scores were nearly a rank level lower than average Center scores on several other indicators. On recruitment, women saw less progress in monitoring of application rates by gender, recognition of the benefits of a diverse staff, commitment to minimizing bias in candidate review, and manager accountability for gender diversity. In relation to parity, they perceived less progress in managers' skills to harness diversity, the inclusion of women on the senior management team, and senior managers' commitment to fostering gender equity at upper levels. On retention, women perceived less progress in monitoring attrition and in senior manager responsibility for controlling work pressures.

In a second Center, a nearly all-female cross-functional group also ranked several indicators at least 1 rank lower than the Center average. These included the degree to which staff appreciation of the benefits of diversity, clarity of performance norms, managers' commitment to developing leaders at lower levels, reasonable work demands, broad input into decision-making, respect for work-personal life, and leaders' commitment to recruit women at upper levels of the institute. On the other hand, compared to other staff, women more often appreciated their Centers' efforts to recognize diverse styles of management, include women in senior management, consider diversity issues in performance evaluation, control work demands, and make managers accountable for recruiting women.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We draw a number of conclusions from this evidence about the qualitative status of gender staffing in the CGIAR Centers, and system-wide priorities for future work.

1. ***The number of women is still a critical issue.*** The number of internationally-recruited women staff, as well as their proportional representation, is rising steadily and the number of women among nationally-recruited staff has increased significantly as well. Still, the numbers remain well below a critical mass in most Centers and still do not reflect the number of women in the international pool of scientists and professionals. The number and proportional representation of women among managers and senior managers remains low at 10 percent. This means that women still have limited influence in the decision-making that shapes the strategies, programs, management systems, and work environments of the Centers.
2. ***Recruitment efforts need to be more proactive.*** Centers reported that their leaders have a strong commitment to gender staffing and that recruitment efforts are reaching more women. But they also reported that, in general, the use of special efforts to “cast the net widely” in recruitment is not institutionalized; recruitment policies are not well known to staff and managers; and committees are not held accountable for gender equitable recruitment. Further benefits can be expected as Centers mobilize mechanisms and professional networks to “cast the net widely” during international searches; ensure that systematic and transparent policies and procedures are used in selection; and enhance staff skills for interviewing candidates in an effective and gender-sensitive manner. Improvements in recruitment practices to reduce gender bias are likely to enhance the effectiveness of recruitment generally, not only for women.
3. ***Policies to ensure parity in career development need fuller implementation, with attention to advancement issues.*** Many Centers have improved their formal systems of job classification and salary assignment. However, policies are not always implemented evenly across the institution, and there is inadequate orientation about policies and procedures for new staff members. There are relatively clear performance norms, but performance evaluation systems could be made more effective and unbiased and strengthened to recognize “invisible work.” Centers learned that internal promotion options and limitations were often not clearly understood by staff. Although women managers are still not often found in core Center functions (e.g., research), they are perceived to be equally respected and Centers reported that there are no major barriers to female leadership or mentoring. Greater attention needs to be given to performance evaluation procedures, developing transparent criteria and systems for promotion, and management training. The Women’s Leadership and Management Course is greatly appreciated, and some Centers feel that similar opportunities are needed for men.
4. ***Centers’ ability to retain high quality staff—both women and men—depends on the quality of the work environment.*** Centers reported that their leaders are philosophically committed to creating a work environment supportive of a diverse staff. Almost all Centers now have formal sexual harassment policies and good family and dependent-leave policies. Despite considerable attention given to spouse employment by the Gender Program, few Centers reported having put in place support services to assist professional spouses in finding viable career opportunities. The visibility of this problem has increased as more senior male managers in the Centers have working

wives. There is widespread appreciation of the need to strengthen staff skills for managing a diverse work force. More pro-active policies to retain good staff, especially women, are needed.

More attention needs to be paid to supporting dual-career couples, defining reasonable workloads, and implementing policies and practices that help staff to better integrate their work and personal lives. The “time famine” resulting from increasing workloads and pressure are affecting job satisfaction and retention rates for men, as well as women. These time pressures themselves militate against Centers allocating sufficient time for training, communications, mentoring, etc. When considered along with other Center limitations, such as short-term employment contracts, the isolated professional or personal environment and limited schooling availability in some Centers, and in some cases non-competitive salary structures, the CGIAR may be at some risk of losing its reputation as an attractive employer for first-class scientists.

5. ***Greater emphasis is needed to strengthen skills and leadership for gender equity in the Centers.*** Formal policies and procedures are in place or under development in most Centers, and informal practices supporting gender equity are in place to a moderate extent. However, few Centers felt their staff had the necessary skills and knowledge to practice gender equity effectively or to manage a diverse staff productively, and few have mobilized leadership to address gender equity proactively.
6. ***Center would benefit from greater internal dialogue on gender staffing issues.*** Centers that implemented the taking stock exercise with diverse groups of staff found large differences on many indicators between the perceptions of senior managers and those of other groups of staff, such as women, middle managers, international and national staff. The taking stock process helped to stimulate a valuable exchange of ideas and perspectives among staff, and if implemented on a periodic basis may contribute to monitoring progress and identifying action plan priorities.

TABLE 1. CENTER SELF-ASSESSMENT: OVERVIEW

Indicators of gender equity (averaging each group of indicators)	Center Sample (n=)	# Centers which have achieved "to a limited extent" or "not at all" (<3.0)	# Centers which have achieved "to a moderate extent" (3.0-3.9)	# Centers which have achieved "to a great or to the fullest extent" (4.0-5.0)
All Indicators	11	4	7	-
Recruitment	12	5	6	1
Career Parity	11	4	5	2
Retention	11	3	7	1
Formal Policies and Procedures	12	5	7	-
Informal Practices and Norms	11	2	7	2
Knowledge and Skills	11	7	4	-
Leadership	11	7	3	1

ANNEX 1: FRAMEWORK FOR TAKING STOCK OF GENDER STAFFING

KEY FOR ASSESSING PROGRESS WITH RESPECT TO INDICATORS:

To What Extent.....?

1. *Not at all* (e.g.: no policy in place, system not in place or not effective, little awareness by staff, no women in the senior management team, no training available, no expressed commitment by leadership)
2. *To a limited extent* (e.g., policy being developed or in place but not often implemented, system somewhat effective, a few women found in senior positions, dialogue on values or norms has begun, minimal training provided, leadership supportive but not proactive)
3. *To a moderate extent* (e.g., policy in place and usually implemented, system fairly effective, some women found in senior positions, values or norms commonly expressed, training available for some staff groups, leadership clearly supportive)
4. *To a great extent* (e.g., policy fully in place and reliably implemented, system usually effective, many women found in senior positions, values or norms widely shared, training widely implemented, leadership strongly and visibly committed)
5. *To the fullest extent* (e.g., comprehensive policy fully implemented and monitored, system very clear and effective, women strongly represented in senior positions and equally empowered, values or norms widely shared and evident in actions, well-designed training programs regularly available for a large number of staff, leadership champions the issue)

LEVERAGE POINTS FOR CHANGE	Formal Systems Policies and Procedures	Informal Systems Work Practices, Behaviors, Norms and Values	Knowledge and Skills	Leadership/Management
<p>RECRUITMENT</p> <p>Recruitment is a key leverage point for 1) ensuring that the centers are tapping effectively into the expanding pool of women scientists and professionals; and 2) for increasing the representation of women in the centers across diverse job categories and levels. These efforts are important for ensuring that centers are reaching the best possible candidates and not bypassing a major segment of the pool. They are also important for strengthening the diversity of staff which many view as an asset for organizational performance</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have an explicit equal opportunity policy?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do position announcements express the centers' commitment to gender diversity and encourage women to apply?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are systematic procedures in place to "cast the net widely" in recruitment in order to attract high quality female as well as male candidates?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have a process for identifying female resource people in key disciplines to serve as contacts for recruitment (e.g. a database)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are policies in place to ensure that all candidates for a position are assessed against explicit criteria and exposed to similar interview processes as a means to guard against bias?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are policies in place to ensure that both women and men are on Search Committees or interview panels?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are policies/procedures in place to assist spouses of candidates in acquiring information about employment or professional opportunities?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does the center monitor the application rates of men and women?</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are staff and managers committed in belief and action to ensuring equal opportunity on the basis of gender?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is there understanding and commitment among staff to the advantages of recruiting from a diverse pool of candidates and building a diverse staff?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is there commitment among staff to using their professional networks and contacts to assist in mobilizing applications from diverse candidates?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Does the recruitment process demonstrate respect for candidates and present the center as a desirable place for diverse staff to work?</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers serving on search committees pay attention to the gender implications of certain types of interview questions?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers serving on Search Committees have training and skills in interview methods?</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is there a strong and articulated commitment from senior and middle managers to mobilizing applications from female professionals?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Is there a strong and visible commitment from leaders and managers to minimizing the potential for bias in the review of candidates?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are Search Committees held accountable for generating a diverse and high quality pool of candidates?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Are managers held accountable for building a gender diverse staff in their Units and/or Programs?</p>

LEVERAGE POINTS FOR CHANGE	Formal Systems Policies and Procedures	Informal Systems Work Practices, Behaviors, Norms and Values	Knowledge and Skills	Leadership/Management
<p>PARITY IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND COMPENSATION</p> <p>Ensuring equal opportunities for advancement and career development for men and women is a fundamental element of creating a gender equitable work environment. While most centers have explicit policies barring discrimination, research has shown repeatedly that subtle, and often unconscious, bias can influence performance appraisals of women, recognition and appreciation of diverse contributions, and assessments of women's capabilities or appropriate-ness for specific types of jobs (e.g. regional coordinator). The common belief in the principal meritocracy in science can obscure the need for giving careful attention to ensuring equity in the distribution of opportunities for career development.</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have clear criteria for defining position classifications (e.g. senior scientist, scientist, associate scientist) and staff grades? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have systematic procedures for assigning staff to specific position classes or grades? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the Center have a transparent system linking salaries to staff grades? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have transparent processes for determining salary increments and linking these to performance appraisals? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have transparent criteria and procedures for determining staff promotions? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have systematic and transparent performance review criteria and systems that minimize potential bias from reviewers and provide channels for questioning assessments? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center explicitly value in performance assessments the more "invisible" aspects of work that contribute to organizational effectiveness, e.g. skills and achievements in problem prevention, collaboration, or effective planning? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Are female managers and professional staff as a group given equivalent respect, legitimacy, authority, and resources as male managers? <input type="checkbox"/> Are female managers distributed across diverse functions in the center, including core "business" areas such as research ? <input type="checkbox"/> Are the norms about performance expectations for staff explicit and clearly articulated? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the performance review process used to provide constructive feedback in order to promote staff development and improve performance? <input type="checkbox"/> Do men and women in the center perceive that they have equal opportunities to assume leadership and managerial roles? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center respect and foster diversity in management and leadership styles (e.g. a collaborative leadership style versus an authoritative style)? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Do managers and team and project leaders have training and skills to recognize and harness the benefits of working with a diverse staff? <input type="checkbox"/> Do managers and supervisors have training and skills in doing effective performance assessments and providing constructive feedback to staff? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center invest in management development training for male and female managers and team and/or project leaders? <input type="checkbox"/> Do men and women have equivalent access to opportunities for mentoring? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does the senior management group include both men and women? <input type="checkbox"/> Is the senior management team committed in belief and action to fostering gender equity at the upper levels of the organization? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the senior management group seek to support and develop male and female leaders at lower levels of the organization?

LEVERAGE POINTS FOR CHANGE	Formal Systems Policies and Procedures	Informal Systems Work Practices, Behaviors, Norms and Values	Knowledge and Skills	Leadership/Management
<p>RETENTION</p> <p>Retention of high quality staff depends on a work environment that is hospitable and supportive; stimulates staff's fullest productivity and creativity; provides opportunities for professional growth; and engenders commitment to the organization. Developing such a work environment for diverse staff entails: 1) fostering inclusion and not privileging one gender, cultural, or racial identity group over others; 2) recognizing the value of different contributions and ways of working and seeing this diversity as an asset; 3) calling upon the ideas and expertise of diverse staff across levels and functions; and 4) appreciating different constraints faced by men and women (e.g. women's often greater responsibility for child care or greater likelihood of having a spouse with career aspirations). These issues are important both for organizational performance as well as individual job satisfaction. Staff who feel marginalized do not perform at their highest levels and leave pre-maturely.</p>	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center systematically monitor attrition rates of men and women and examine reasons for staff departures? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have policies to ensure that diversity is considered in representation of staff in project teams, staff committees, and task forces? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have an explicit policy and grievance procedure for dealing with sexual harassment <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center provide assistance to professional spouses seeking employment or career development opportunities? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center have and respect family and dependent care leave policies that recognize parenting and other personal life responsibilities of both men and women? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center seek to monitor and keep work demands within reasonable limits and support flexible arrangements so that staff can better balance work and personal life responsibilities? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center promote the value of diversity and ensure that staff of different identity groups are included and supported within the organization? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center promote multiple channels of communication across diverse levels and functions to ensure that staff receive the information required to plan and do their jobs effectively? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center actively seek in decision-making to draw on ideas from men and women with relevant expertise at all levels of the organization ? <input type="checkbox"/> Do men and women have equal opportunities to represent the center, attend conferences and other professional activities, and meet with appropriate visitors? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the center emphasize skills in working effectively with differences and a diverse staff in performance reviews? <input type="checkbox"/> Are policies for work-personal life integration respected for use by both men and women without negative impacts on their professional status? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers have the knowledge and sensitivity required to appreciate and build on the different contributions of a gender diverse staff? <input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers have the facilitation skills to foster the active contribution and participation of staff from diverse background, disciplines, and genders? <input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers have the skills to work with differences in perspectives and opinions and promote constructive debate? <input type="checkbox"/> Do staff and managers have skills and knowledge to build effective teams and foster collaboration across diverse groups of staff? 	<p>To what extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Is the leadership group committed in belief and action to creating a work environment in which diverse types of people, with different skills, perspectives, and ways of working, can thrive and contribute fully? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the leadership and management group monitor and ensure that men and women have equal opportunities for accessing resources, expertise, training, and staff required to perform their work effectively? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the leadership and management have the practice of recognizing and giving feedback to staff for achievements, innovations, and work well done? <input type="checkbox"/> Does the leadership and management accept responsibility for controlling work pressures and time demands on staff so that they can fulfill responsibilities in both their professional and personal lives?

. OVERVIEW How would you generally characterize the progress your center has made on gender staffing in each of the areas below over the past six years? What have been the most important achievements and innovations? What have been the most important constraints? What are the remaining challenges?

RECRUITMENT

PARITY IN CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

RETENTION

ANNEX 2: RANK DISTRIBUTION FOR INDIVIDUAL INDICATORS*

Indicator (Full indicator statements may be found in Annex 1)	# Centers	# Centers < 3.0	# Centers 3.0-3.9	#Centers ≥ 4.0	Range of Center response
Recruitment: Formal Systems					
Explicit equal opportunity policy	12	2	5	5	2-5
Position announcements encourage women to apply	12	1	3	8	2-5
Recruitment "casts net widely"	12	2	9	1	2-5
Female resource persons help recruit	12	6	3	3	1-5
Unbiased interview process	11	-	3	8	3-5
Women on Search Committees	12	6	4	2	1-4
Employment assistance to spouses	12	5	2	5	1-5
Monitor application rate by gender	11	4	4	3	1-4
Recruitment: Informal Systems					
Commitment to equal opportunity	11	1	5	5	2-5
Understand value of diversity	12	3	3	6	2-5
Commitment to mobilize applications	12	3	5	4	2-4
Process respectful and attractive	11	-	2	9	3-5
Recruitment: Knowledge and Skills					
Recognize gender sensitive questions	12	5	5	2	2-5
Search Committee interview skills	12	6	3	3	2-4
Recruitment: Leadership/Mgmt.					
Senior Mgr. commitment	12	2	5	5	2-5
Committed to minimize bias in review	12	2	6	4	2.5-5
Search Committees held accountable	12	8	2	2	1.3-4
Managers held accountable	12	9	3	-	2-3
Parity: Formal Systems					
Clear criteria for position classification	12	1	5	6	1-5
Systematic assignment to class/grade	12	2	5	5	2-5
Transparent link of salaries to grades	12	1	5	6	3-5
Transparent process for salary increase	12	3	4	5	2-5
Transparent criteria for promotion	11	3	6	2	2-4
Systematic performance evaluation	11	4	5	2	2-5
"Invisible work" noted in evaluation	11	4	5	2	2-5,2-4.3

* Progress with respect to indicators:

1 = "not at all" 2 = "to a limited extent" 3 = "to a moderate extent" 4 = "to a great extent" 5 = "to the fullest extent"

Indicator (Full indicator statements may be found in Annex 1)	# Centers	# Centers < 3.0	# Centers 3.0-3.9	#Centers ≥ 4.0	Range of Center response
Parity: Informal Systems					
Female managers equally respected	11	1	4	6	2-5
Female managers in diverse functions	11	7	3	1	1-5
Performance norms clearly articulated	10	4	3	3	2-5
Performance review used for staff dev.	10	2	5	3	2-5
Equal opportunities for leadership	11	3	2	5	2-5
Respect for diverse leadership styles	10	1	5	4	2.9-5
Parity: Knowledge and Skills					
Staff have skills to manage diversity	11	4	5	2	2-4
Staff skilled in performance review	11	3	6	2	2-5
Center invests in mgmt. training	11	2	7	2	1-5
Equal opportunities for mentoring	10	3	2	5	1-5
Parity: Leadership/Management					
Senior management includes women	11	7	2	2	1-4
Senior commitment to gender equity	11	1	6	4	2-5
Senior managers develop staff	11	1	5	5	2.9-5
Retention: Formal Systems					
Center monitors attrition by gender	12	7	4	1	1-5
Diverse staff on teams, committees	11	4	5	2	1.3-5
Sexual harassment policy, procedure	11	3	2	6	2-5
Career assistance to spouses	12	6	4	2	1-4
Family and dependent care policies	12	3	3	6	2-5
Reasonable, flexible work demands	11	6	2	3	1-4
Retention: Informal Systems					
Promote value of diversity	11	1	6	4	2-4
Multiple communication channels	10	-	5	5	3-4
Draw on ideas of both men, women	11	-	6	5	3-5
Equal support. for external exposure	11	-	3	8	3-5
Ability to work w/diverse staff valued	10	4	4	2	2-4
Policies to integrate work/life respected	10	5	4	1	2-4
Retention: Knowledge and Skills					
Staff appreciate gender diverse staff	10	3	6	1	2-4
Staff can foster work of diverse staff	10	1	7	2	2.7-4
Staff skilled to work w/diverse staff	10	1	8	1	2.7-3.3
Staff can build teams w/diverse staff	10	1	6	3	2.7-4
Retention: Leadership/Management					
Leaders committed to Center diversity	11	-	7	4	3-5
Leaders monitor equal opportunity	10	1	6	3	2-5
Leaders recognize staff achievement	10	-	7	3	3-5
Leaders control work demands	10	5	3	2	1-4