

The Transnational Applied Research on Gender Equality Training – held its most recent workshop in Madison with the dual goals of first, comparing and contrasting the strategies adopted by EU and US research funding agencies to spur greater engagement in gender equality efforts by universities, departments, and individual researchers and second, identifying the sources and forms of resistance that are most commonly experienced and what strategies are useful in making interventions more effective at a larger scale. The invited participants represented a roughly equal mix between US researchers and research administrators involved with the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE program and European gender equality researchers, program evaluators and administrators of national gender equality initiatives that have benefitted from EU leadership in setting gender equality goals.

The first outcome of the workshop was a sharing of experiences with the different funding programs and priorities, which was especially important in dismantling misconceptions on each side of the Atlantic about the nature of the funding and the extent of evaluation that have taken place. While individual researchers on both sides tend to be tightly focused on the change process in individual universities or departments/faculties, the research evaluation process is much more comparative and extensive in forming empirical generalizations about what works. This body of evaluation research has been less widely circulated so far than is desirable, but the workshop participants established new networks that will facilitate more openness. We concluded that transatlantic sharing is sometimes complicated by the different definitions of "science/scientist" in the US (where it is closely tied to STEM) and in the EU (where knowledge creation of all disciplines is included), and is constrained by universities and departments not wanting potentially discrediting information shared (acquiring "guilty knowledge" about problems of lack of cooperation or of commitment).

A second outcome came from the assessment of resistances, where there was an emerging consensus that much resistance was not directly from administration but from women faculty themselves. Fear of an expanded workload in doing research on researchers rather than going ahead with their own agenda, and resistance to being defined as mothers, as handicapped by their families, or as less engaged in their research than their male counterparts led some women scientists to push back against gender inequality as "their" problem. Drawing more attention to problems both women and men face with intensified competition and administrative accountability could support more institutional change strategies. Administrative turnover also especially important in US, when top administrators leave policy priorities change; in EU member states, the resistance comes in making programs more permanent and ongoing, dynamic rather than one-shot interventions assessed by a fixed evaluation formula. Recognizing the differences among the various types of stakeholders and the differences in national academic cultures matters for addressing institutional change.