



**INSPIRE**

## **D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies**

**Koen Van Laer (UHasselt)**

**Patrizia Zanoni (UHasselt)**

**Joanna Beeckmans (UHasselt)**

**29<sup>th</sup> of September 2023**



**Funded by  
the European Union**

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

<b>Project no.</b>	101058537
<b>Project acronym:</b>	INSPIRE
<b>Project title:</b>	INSPIRE: Centre of Excellence on Inclusive Gender Equality in Research & Innovation: Creating Knowledge & Engaging in Collaborative Action
<b>Call:</b>	HORIZON-WIDERA-2021-ERA-01
<b>Start date of project:</b>	01.10.2022
<b>Duration:</b>	48 months
<b>Deliverable title:</b>	D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies.
<b>Due date of deliverable:</b>	29.09.2023
<b>Actual date of submission:</b>	29.09.2023
<b>Deliverable Lead Partner:</b>	<b>UHasselt (UH)</b>
<b>Dissemination level:</b>	<b>Public</b>

<b>Authors &amp; contributors name and organisation</b>	<b>Role</b>
Koen Van Laer (UHasselt) Patrizia Zanoni (UHasselt) Joanna Beeckmans (UHasselt)	Lead author(s)
Paola Chaves (Radboud University) Jovana Mihajlović (ZRC SAZU) Maria Karaulova (Fraunhofer) Susanne Bühler-Topcu (Fraunhofer) Carolina Wienand (Fraunhofer) Jörg Müller (FUOC)	Contributor(s)
Lena Weber (GESIS)	Quality assurance editor



The work contained in this document is subjected to a Creative Commons license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>).

## Disclaimer

While INSPIRE is funded by the European Union, views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Executive Agency (REA). Neither the European Union nor the European Research Executive Agency (REA) can be held responsible for them.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101058537.

## Consortium

FUOC	Fundació per a la Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Spain
JR	Joanneum Research Forschungsgesellschaft Mbh, Austria
SDU	Syddansk Universitet, Denmark
UJ	Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Poland
Notus	Notus, Spain
FLACSO	Facultad Latinoamericana De Ciencias Sociales, Argentina
EM	Europa Media Szolgaltato Non Profitkozhasznu Kft, Hungary
Portia	Portia gGmbH, Germany
SRU	Stichting Radboud Universiteit
Fraunhofer	Fraunhofer Gesellschaft zur Forderung der Angewandten Forschung EV, Germany
UH	Universiteit Hasselt, Belgium
ZRC SAZU	Znanstvenoraziskovalni Center Slovenske Akademije Znanosti In Umetnosti, Slovenia
GESIS	GESIS-Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften EV, Germany
INNO	Innosystems Symvouleutikes Ypiresies Kai Efarmoges Pliroforikis Ypsilis Technologias Monoprosopi Idiotiki Kefalaioouchiki Etaireia, Greece

<b>Document History</b>			
<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Summary of changes</b>	<b>Revised by</b>
01	8.05.2023	First draft	Fraunhofer, RU, ZRC SAZU
02	23.05.2023	Second version to be discussed with task contributors	UH
03	17.08.2023	Third version to be discussed with task contributors	FUOC, Fraunhofer, RU, ZRC SAZU
04	1.09.2023	Fourth version submitted to QAE for final review	GESIS
05	29.09.2023	Final version submitted to EC	Koen Van Laer, Patrizia Zanoni, Joanna Beeckmans

# Table of Contents

- List of Acronyms..... 6
- 1 Introduction..... 7
- 2 Definition of the research goals..... 9
- 3 The multiple-case study method..... 11
- 4 The sampling of the cases..... 13
- 5 Timing of case studies and time requirements..... 14
- 6 Data collection..... 16
  - 6.1 Desk research focusing on relevant documents..... 16
  - 6.2 Semi-structured interviews with key informants..... 18
  - 6.3 (Non-)participant observation..... 23
- 7 Data analysis..... 24
- 8 Reporting on the cases..... 25
- 9 Data management and name conventions..... 26
- 10 Glossary..... 27
- References..... 29
- Appendix 1..... 31
- Appendix 2..... 36
- Appendix 3..... 41
- Appendix 4..... 47
- Appendix 5..... 49
- Appendix 6..... 51
- Appendix 7..... 55

## List of Acronyms

D	Deliverable
DEI	Diversity, Equality & Inclusion
DM	Discussion Moment
GEP	Gender Equality Plan
HE&R	Higher Education and Research
KSH	Knowledge & Support Hub
R&I	Research and Innovation
WP	Work Package

## 1. Introduction

This document serves as a practical guide for carrying out the exploratory case studies on intersectional policies. In total, ten in-depth case studies are conducted in order to generate insight in the nature and characteristics, the governance, design and implementation of effective intersectional GEP's and DEI policies in Research & Innovation (R&I) organisations and institutions, as well as on relevant organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting this. Hasselt University will coordinate the case study selection, set up the methodology, and conduct four case studies. Radboud University and FUOC will each conduct one case study and ZRC SAZU and Fraunhofer will each conduct two additional case studies.

These case studies are part of *INSPIRE: European Centre of Excellence on Inclusive Gender Equality in Research & Innovation* which aims to “develop innovative tools and knowledge to address intersecting inequalities across the public and private sectors and geographical regions in Europe” (“INSPIRE” 2023). The case studies are of high relevance for the project because they contribute to form the evidence-based of the *Knowledge and Support Hub (KSH) 3 on Intersectionality* led by UHasselt and Notus and will lead to two deliverables: D3.4 *Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies* and D3.5 *Report on barriers & facilitating factors of effective DEI policies*. However, as they allow for the theorization and operationalization of what an intersectional Gender Equality Plan (GEP) could look like, the case studies are also of relevance more broadly for Research and Innovation (R&I) organisations in Europe and beyond.

The focus on intersectionality reflects the increasing recognition of the importance of ensuring that those who experience multiple, intersecting forms of inequalities and disadvantages do not remain invisible in the design and implementation of equality policies (Garcia and Zajicek 2022). In Horizon Europe, the 9th Framework for Research and Innovation (R&I) of the European Commission, an intersectional approach to gender equality has become a main priority of their Gender Equality Strategy 2020-2025 and their Strategic Plan for Research & Innovation 2020-2024 (European Commission 2020a; 2020b).

This document provides information on:

- The overall research goals
- The overall research design for the multiple-case approach
- The sampling of the cases
- The timing of the case studies
- The sources of data to be collected within each case
- The process of data analysis
- The reporting process of the case studies
- The data management and naming conventions
- A glossary of key concepts

This present document needs to be read in conjunction with the overall Data Management Plan (D1.2), the Strategic guidance and quality assurance (D2.4) and the Policy Brief on Inclusive GEP's (D2.6).



## 2. Definition of the research goals

Based on the *T2.1 scoping report on intersectional equality policies of Higher Education and Research (HE&R) organisations*, we adopt the following working definition on intersectionality:

Intersectionality is a theory, methodology and analytic tool that exposes the interlocking systems of oppression and privilege, power relations and social inequalities that occur on multiple axes including but not limited to gender, ethnicity and race, social and economic status, sexual orientation, disability and age. It focuses on the interlocking nature of inequalities at an individual, interpersonal and structural level and how they mutually reinforce itself (Breslin, Pandey, and Riccucci 2017; Collins 1990; Athena SWAN 2021; Council of Europe 2023; Crenshaw 1989; Holvino, 2010).

The *T2.1 scoping report* allowed us to identify three main gaps in the literature on intersectional equality policies of HE&R organisations:

- The literature mainly offers theoretical discussions on intersectional approaches in HE&R policies. However, there is currently little insight in the way these ideas can be translated into effective intersectional equality policies and plans.
- The vast majority of existing empirical research on intersectional equality policies of HE&R organisations captures individual experiences of students and staff from subordinated groups. While this perspective gives us crucial insights into the oppression and discrimination they experience on multiple, intersecting axes, it does not lead to sufficient insight into the actual governance, design and implementation of intersectional equality policies that are effective to address these inequalities. Moreover, the focus on the individual level provides insufficient insight into the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g., institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors that might affect these experiences.
- A limited number of existing empirical research on intersectional equality policies of HE&R organisations analyses existing policies aimed to address multiple grounds of discrimination. However, they mainly expose the lack of an actual intersectional focus of these policies, and the way they often privilege gender and include other groups in an additive way. In doing so, they offer insufficient insight

in the way effective intersectional equality policies and plans could be governed, designed and implemented.

The goal of this empirical research is to address these gaps and generate theory on the nature and characteristics, the governance, design and implementation of effective intersectional GEP's in R&I organisations and institutions, as well as on relevant organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting this.

Specifically, the research will answer the following research questions:

- What are the nature and characteristics of intersectional equality policies and plans?
- How are intersectional equality policies and plans governed, designed and implemented, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this?
- What are the emerging effects of intersectional equality policies and plans, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors that influence these possible effects?

### 3. The multiple-case study method

To reach the research objectives and answer the identified research questions, D3.4 adopts a multiple case study method, involving a systematic, theory-informed analysis within single organisations as well as between organisations across four country-clusters within the European Union.

Robert K. Yin (2003: 13) defines a case study inquiry as one that: “Investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” The case study method lends itself to research that aims to offer an in-depth exploration, taking into account different perspectives, of a complex phenomenon where contextual factors are highly pertinent to the phenomenon of study (Yin, 2003). A multiple case study design further allows the identification of “patterns of relationships among constructs within and across cases and their underlying logical arguments” (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007: 25). As a result, it is very useful to study intersecting inequalities and intersectional equality policies and plans in a way that captures different perspectives and relevant contextual factors.

Defining the “case” is important given that case studies have been carried out about decisions, programs, departments and organisations as a whole. Yin (1994) highlights that as a general guide, the unit of analysis, i.e. the case, should be related to how the initial research questions have been defined. In our research, the unit of analysis or case is an organisation: a higher education institution or research institute with relevant experience on including multiple grounds of discrimination in their Gender Equality Plans (GEP) and/or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) policies and practices.

As intersectional GEP's are still at an early stage of implementation, the case studies will derive insights on them by more broadly exploring existing equality policies and plans that focus on discriminations on multiple, intersecting axes. In each case, we will explore the nature and characteristics, as well as the governance, design, and implementation, and potential emerging effects of Gender Equality Plans (GEP) and/or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) policies and practices. Moreover, we aim to identify the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g., institutional, historical,

cultural, economic) factors that affect them. In doing so, we will explore the interplay between the organisational level and the different national contexts in which the organisations are embedded and attempt to understand what works (and what does not work) in what context and why. We explore emerging effects through focusing on the subjective evaluation by different stakeholders, and possible existing objective measures indicating their effects.

## 4. The sampling of the cases

The cases will be selected through theoretical sampling, that is, based on their suitability to illuminate relationships among key constructs (Eisenhardt & Graebner, 2007). The following criteria will be used when sampling the cases:

- In order to maximise comparability, all cases in the sample will:
  - include multiple grounds of discrimination in their Gender Equality Plans (GEP) and/or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) policies and practices. This should be checked a priori through publicly available information (i.e. extreme case to increase likelihood of finding intersectional policies).
- In order to capture the role of differences in organisational and extra-organisational factors, the sample will consist of cases:
  - **In different geographical locations within 4 country clusters:**
    - Radboud University: 1 case in Central West Europe (current preference the Netherlands)
    - UOC: 1 case in Southern Europe (current preference Spain)
    - Fraunhofer: 1 case in Central West Europe (current preference Germany) and 1 in Northern Europe (current preference Finland)
    - ZRC SAZU: 2 cases in Eastern Europe (current preferences Slovenia and Romania)
    - UHasselt: 2 cases in Northern Europe (current preferences Ireland and Sweden), 1 case in Central West Europe (current preference Belgium) and 1 case in Southern Europe (current preference Malta)
  - **With different characteristics in terms of:**
    - Type of organisation: universities and institutes that are working in the interface between research and valorisation (not private or R&D departments)
    - Size (but: sufficient size is always needed to increase likelihood of finding sufficient data)
- Each of the five partners conducting the case studies recommended cases based on key information (type, location, size, publicly accessible policy, targeted groups, and first contact). Potential cases were compared and discussed in order to ensure that the sampling criteria were met.

## 5. Timing of case studies and time requirements

The case study work will be carried out from 1st of October 2023 until 30th of September 2024. This includes the fieldwork, analysis of the data and writing the reports for each case study as well as the comparative analysis. The first eight case studies (including the single case study report) should be finalised by the 30th of June 2024 and sent to Hasselt University to enable the correct formatting of the reports and their timely delivery. The two last case studies by Hasselt University should be finalised by the 30th of September 2024.

In order to ensure the consistency and comparability of the analyses and results from the different cases, a monthly Discussion Moment (DM) (November 2023 until May 2024) will be held with the researchers from the different INSPIRE partners involved in the case study research. In these meetings, all the partners will discuss the progress of (and potential challenges or questions related to) the data collection and the open and axial coding process.

Each of the ten case studies will be written up in single case reports by the partners. A comparative synthesis report of the ten cases will be compiled by Hasselt University and delivered to the Commission on the 28th of February 2025. This will result in the deliverable *D3.5 Report on barriers & facilitating factors of effective DEI policies*.

The results of the case studies will form the basis for a co-creation workshop held in May 2025 to develop a toolkit for assessing intersectional impact of equality measures and the development of a training unit in WP4. Finally, Hasselt University coordinates the editing of a book based on the case studies of D3.5 in March 2026.



## 6. Data collection

Yin (1994) argues that case study research rests upon multiple sources of evidence in order to be able to ensure triangulation, enhancing the reliability of the data and the analysis. A mix of different research methods will be deployed for each case study:

- desk research focusing on relevant documents
- semi-structured interviews with key informants
- (non-)participant observation

While this document provides guidelines on the data collection, the data collection might somewhat vary between cases due to context-specific factors. The main guiding principles for making specific choices during the data collection process are the overall research goals and the degree to which certain data can give us access to information relevant to answer the research questions. These context-sensitive decisions can be discussed in the monthly Discussion Moment.

### 6.1 Desk research focusing on relevant documents

A first type of data that will be collected are documents. Relevant documents include publicly available internal and external documents, such as DEI plans, Gender Equality Plans and all other material that communicates about policies and practices that aim to promote gender equality, ensure diversity and the inclusion of all members in the organisation, and tackle discrimination. Immediately available documents, such as GEPs and public websites, will be analysed prior to the rest of the data collection guided by a core topic list for analysis (see Appendix 5). This will allow the identification of relevant stakeholders (e.g., those involved in the design, governance and implementation of the GEP and/or DEI policies) to be interviewed. Moreover, it will allow information derived from the documents to inform the interviews and observations. During the interviews, it will be important to consult interviewees about any other relevant documents that should be analysed.



The goal of the document analysis is:

- To understand the nature and characteristics of the organisation's GEP's and DEI policies and plans, the degree to which these (do not) adopt an intersectional approach to tackling inequalities and its intended goals and focus on specific groups or topics.
- To understand the organisation's description of the design, governance and implementation process of its GEP's and DEI policies and plans.
- To get an overview of the main practices adopted by the organisation that focus on multiple groups or have an intersectional approach. This overview can be used to add questions during the interviews on these specific policies.

## 6.2 Semi-structured interviews with key informants

Semi-structured interviews with key informants form a crucial part of the case study work, as they provide insight into the actual experiences of different stakeholders. These interviews primarily will focus on three groups of stakeholders (designers; implementers; potential beneficiaries) based on the research goals. For each of these three types of stakeholders, an interview guide is prepared (see Appendix 1-3). These guidelines provide a list of relevant questions, and for each of them, a number of more detailed questions that can be asked to dig deeper and elicit more specific information. These detailed questions give an indication of the information we are interested in, and do not need to be asked in every interview. The guidelines are organized in a way that the most important questions to ask that type of stakeholder come first. The core sections of the guidelines for each of the types of stakeholders, which deserve the most attention in the interviews, are also indicated in the guidelines. The aim of these interview guides is to outline the core topics to be discussed during the interviews with each type of stakeholder and to ensure that the data that is collected through each interview is in line with the goals outlined below.

Specifically, the following three types of stakeholders will be interviewed:

1. **Designers:** These are stakeholders involved in making decisions on the overall GEP and/or DEI philosophy, policies and plans of the organisation, their specific nature, priorities, focus, and goals. It also includes those designing the specificities of particular practices. Stakeholders in this specific category might (but do not have to) play a role in the governance of the GEP and/or DEI, including the oversight, measurement, evaluation and follow-up of the (the effects of) GEP and/or DEI strategies and policies. Potential examples of such stakeholders are: the HR director, DEI manager, Vice-president responsible for the GEP and DEI, DEI board members, members of the GEP and/or DEI task force, HR professionals responsible for designing particular DEI practices, etc.

The goal of these interviews is:

- To gain an understanding of the (reasons for the) specific nature and characteristics of the organisation's GEP's and/or DEI policies and plans, its focus on specific groups or topics, the degree to which these (do not) adopt an intersectional approach to tackling inequalities, as well as the different organisational and extra-organisational factors shaping these choices.
- To gain an understanding of the different steps in the design process and the role of different organisational and extra-organisational factors in them.
- To gain an understanding of how they experience (their role in) the design process of GEPs and/or DEI practices.
- To gain an understanding of the governance of the implementation and effects on (intersecting) inequalities of GEP's and/or DEI practices.
- To gain an understanding of what the organisation can do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its Gender Equality Plan or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion policies.

**2. Implementers:** These are stakeholders who are involved in the actual day-to-day translation of GEPs and/or DEI policies into practice. Whether and how they implement the designed GEPs and/or DEI strategy and policies will have an important impact on how they are perceived and whether they will be effective. Potential examples of such stakeholders are: heads of department, managers of specific divisions, deans, HR staff, DEI staff members, etc.

The goal of these interviews is:

- To gain an understanding of how they perceive the nature and characteristics of the organisation's GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans, their focus on specific groups, topics, and its way of tackling (intersectional) inequalities.
- To gain an understanding of how they experience (their role in) the implementation process of actual GEPs and/or DEI practices, as well as the different organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting the implementation process.
- To gain an understanding of how the implementation is monitored, evaluated and whether there are accountability measures.

- To gain an understanding of how they experience the effects on (intersectional) inequalities of the GEPs and/or DEI practices they are involved in implementing, as well as on the different organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting this.
- To gain an understanding of what they believe the organisation could do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans.

**3. Potential beneficiaries:** These are stakeholders who are supposed to be affected or benefit from the GEPs and/or DEI strategy and policies. Potential examples of such stakeholders are: junior researchers, minoritized staff, women in STEM divisions, PhD students and student representatives (if applicable), etc.

The goal of these interviews is:

- To gain an understanding of how they experience the organisation and their work context, their experiences of (in)equality in the organisation due to intersectional identities, and the organisational and extra-organisational factors that contribute to their sense of in/exclusion.
- To gain an understanding of how they perceive the nature and characteristics of the organisation's GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans, their focus on specific groups, topics, and their way of tackling (intersectional) inequalities.
- To gain an understanding of how they experience the usefulness, effects on (intersecting) inequalities, implementation, design, and governance of GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans in the organisation.
- To gain an understanding of what they believe the organisation could do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans.

We expect 20-25 interviews to be conducted in each case in order to gather sufficient data. The division of the interviews will be approximately six interviews with the stakeholders involved in the design and governance, six interviews with the stakeholders involved in the implementation and eight to thirteen interviews with the potential beneficiaries of the policies, depending on whether or not (PhD) students and/or student representatives are present in the organisation. If they are not present, eight interviews will be conducted with other potential beneficiaries. If they are present, these eight interviews will be complemented with five interviews with student representatives and/or PhD students. The number of interviews is a guideline and can vary per case, depending on the number and availability of relevant stakeholders. While the research also aims to gain insight in the governance of GEPs and/or DEI, we assume that sufficient insight in the decision-making, reporting, measurement, oversight and accountability structures and responsibilities will be provided by the three groups of identified respondents. If this is not the case, an additional interview is required. The interviews will take approximately 60-90 minutes, and will be recorded and transcribed.

The respondents will be selected through a process of theoretical sampling. In other words, the sampling approach will be guided by specific criteria that based on the existing literature are considered important to generate theoretical insights. Using a snowballing approach, interviewees will be asked to identify other potential interviewees that are in line with the criteria. Potential interviewees will be first contacted based on their primary (e.g., as officially indicated in the analysed documents) role relating to the GEPs and/or DEI policies and plans in the organisation - as designers, implementers or potential beneficiaries. The actual interview will also primarily focus on this particular role. However, it is possible that they also occupy another role. If this is the case, some additional questions from other interview guidelines on this additional role can be asked at the end of the interview. Information found in the initial document analysis or provided by a main contact person in the organisation will be important to identify individuals and do so according to their primary role.

The sampling of potential beneficiaries will also be based on the intersectional inequalities they might be faced with. The aim is to ensure the group of interviewed potential beneficiaries is diverse in terms of (intersecting) identities. To identify them, the main contact person of the organisation will be asked to provide a list of ten to fifteen potential respondents. The researcher then chooses three respondents to contact and interview based on the predefined criteria. Then the researcher will ask the respondents to provide more potential beneficiaries in the organisation that might want to participate in the interview study. This is to ensure that respondent confidentiality is maintained, that respondents can contribute to the research and that groups of people are reached who might otherwise remain invisible in the organisation.

### **6.3 (Non-)participant observation**

Observation is a third way data might be collected. This can, for example, involve participating in GEPs and/or DEI events, workshops or training. The ability to collect this type of data is dependent on the access to relevant events provided by the organisation. This can involve non-participant observations or participant observations. The former involves being present and observing the practice being implemented, without actual involvement in it (e.g., observing (the participants of) an event organised by the DEI team). The latter involves taking part in the activities involved, allowing the researcher to experience it together with other participants (e.g., participating in a DEI training). The choice for the type of observation will depend on the opportunities provided by the circumstances and the studied organisation. During the (non-)participant observation, notes will be taken, using the observation template (see Appendix 4). This template can be adapted depending on the type of observation, as the content of the notes and the data collected will be different depending on whether it involves participant or non-participant observation.

The goal of these observations is:

- To gain an understanding of the communication about and/or the actual process of the implementation of GEPs and/or DEI practices, as well as the nature and characteristics of these practices, their focus on specific groups, topics, and their way of tackling (intersectional) inequalities.
- To gain an understanding of how (the implementation of) GEPs and/or DEI practices are experienced by those implementing them and by those targeted by them.

## 7. Data analysis

Merriam and Tisdell (2016, 202) define data analysis as “the process of making sense out of the data”. This involves “consolidating, reducing, and interpreting what people have said and what the researcher has seen and read – it is the process of making meaning” (Merriam & Tisdell 2016, 202). Data analysis should be carried out in conjunction with the fieldwork, thereby allowing the research design to respond to developing knowledge.

The qualitative analysis of the transcribed interviews will be carried out using a research software of choice (MaxQDA, NVivo, ATLAS.ti). The analysis will follow an iterative approach (Tracy 2013), alternating between an etic use of existing themes and an emic reading of the data. The initial phase of coding (of the documents, interviews and observations) will be guided by a core topic list based on the research objectives and the central themes of the interview guidelines (see Appendix 5). However, this is not a codebook that a priori identifies and defines a fixed list of codes, thereby allowing specific codes and categories regarding these themes to emerge inductively through the process of analysis. Using this process helps to ensure that the analysis of each case will focus on the same topics, as well as allows context-sensitive insights to be inductively identified for each of these topics.

This initial coding phase will be discussed monthly with the different partners in order to ensure consistency and comparability. This can, for example, result in new shared codes and categories, which capture similarities (and differences) between cases. These will be used in the next step of coding, resulting in a draft version of a coding tree for each case. These coding trees are again discussed with the partners in order to ensure consistency and comparability. After this, the process of coding is further completed, resulting in a final coding tree highlighting the different codes and their relations. The final data analyses will lead to ten single case reports that will be used for a cross-case analysis to identify the barriers & facilitating factors of effective intersectional GEP's (D3.5).



## 8. Reporting on the cases

A single case report is written for each case. The reporting of each case will follow the outline provided in Appendix 6. It starts with a general description of the case and its context. This section includes relevant quotes from documents (and potentially some other material). This is followed by a description of the methodology. The next sections describe the findings on the overall diversity and inclusion of the organisation, the nature and characteristics of the policies and plans, the governance and design of the policies and plans, the implementation of the policies and plans, and the emerging effects of the policies and plans. These sections should include relevant quotes from the different methods of data collection (certainly interviews and documents). The report ends with a conclusion and reflection on the case, providing overarching answers to the research questions.

## 9. Data management and name conventions

The research will work in line with INSPIRE's Data Management Plan D1.1 and the Strategic Guidance and Quality Assurance D2.4. A draft template of research information and informed consent document is added as Appendix 7. Each partner remains responsible to verify that the final document they use is in line with both the data management plan and the regulations of their own legal department/ethics committee.

### *Naming cases*

The reference of each case is codified according to the following template and should be used when creating folders to store relevant files or when referencing the case in reports.

T3.4-[Consortium partner acronym]-C[n]-[2digit Country Code]

For example: a case study carried out by ZRC SAZU in Slovenia would have the code:

**T3.4-ZRCSAZU-C1-SI**

### *Naming interviews*

Individual interviews / interviewees carried out in the context of a case study are codified according to the following template:

[Case-study-code]-I[n]

For example: the fifth interview carried in the previously mentioned case study should be named:

**T3.4-ZRCSAZU-C1-SI-I5**

The name is then used to store the recording of the interview as well as the transcription.

### *Naming policies*

Depending on which policies are available, the case study policy should be named according to the following conception when DEI policies or GEP's are available:

[Case-study-code]-DEI-[DDMMYYYY]

For example: the DEI policy of the first case should be named:

**T3.4-ZRCSAZU-C1-SI-DEI-18052021**

For example: the GEP of the first case should be named:

**T3.4-ZRCSAZU-C1-SL-GEP-18052021**

## 10. Glossary

Diversity, Equality and Inclusion (DEI) philosophy, policies, practices and plans

**DEI philosophy:** The overall vision of the organisation of what DEI is, why it is important for the organisation, and of what the guiding principles are from which it starts.

For example: the idea that it is important to achieve a gender balance on all levels of the organisation; or become a workplace that is able to attract the best talent, regardless of their identities.

**DEI policies:** The general framework of more specific goals, problems and domains to be addressed, as well as the primary ways to achieve these goals and address these problems.

For example: A work-life policy to ensure that all employees, regardless of their personal circumstances or family situation, can combine their work and their private life; or an anti-discrimination policy aimed to ensure that discrimination does not affect HR-decisions.

**DEI practices:** The specific activities, techniques, interventions and methods that are used to achieve the broader goals of the DEI policies and philosophies and to reach specific outcomes.

For example: The practice to allow teleworking or to provide childcare as part of the work-life policy; or a dedicated contact point to report discrimination or an anti-discrimination training as part of the anti-discrimination policy.

**DEI plans:** The formal documents in which the DEI philosophies, policies and practices are outlined.

For example: A GEP

## **Governance, design and implementation**

**Governance:** Relates to the decision-making, reporting, measurement, oversight and accountability structures and responsibilities of the organisation.

For example: The designation of the person in the organisational hierarchy responsible for overseeing the goals outlined in the GEP or the DEI policies (e.g. the DEI manager). The identification of the actors this person oversees (e.g., a DEI team composed of people from different divisions) who are in charge of translating these goals into policies and practices. The way progress is being measured. The way the DEI team has to report (e.g., progress reports in which they indicate the steps taken, the measurement of progress) to the DEI manager on the practices that are being implemented and on progress that is being made. The procedures that govern the way a lack of progress is followed-up.

**Design:** Relates to the conception of DEI at the level of philosophy, policies, or practices, and of the way the philosophy is translated into particular policies, practices or plans.

For example: the way the DEI-team translates the DEI philosophy in particular policy priorities (e.g., in terms of goals or target groups), which are outlined in a GEP or the way HR-staff translate an anti-discrimination policy into specific training modules.

**Implementation:** Relates to turning the designed policies and practices into 'actual practice', which are experienced by potential beneficiaries (employees and/or students if applicable).

For example: the actual teaching of a designed module on anti-discrimination or the day-to-day organisation of telework by a team leader.

**Organisational members:** Employees as well as students of the organisation (if applicable)

**Organisational and extra-organizational factors:** Any institutional, historical, cultural, economic factors that emerge as relevant for the GEP's and DEI in the specific case study.

## References

- Athena SWAN. (2021). EDI Literacy Glossary: A resource to support understanding of inclusive approaches to equality work in higher education and research in Ireland. [https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/advance-he/Athena-Swan-EDI-Literacy-Glossary\\_1635341774.pdf](https://s3.eu-west-2.amazonaws.com/assets.creode.advancehe-document-manager/documents/advance-he/Athena-Swan-EDI-Literacy-Glossary_1635341774.pdf)
- Breslin, Rachel A., Sheela Pandey, and Norma M. Riccucci. 2017. "Intersectionality in Public Leadership Research: A Review and Future Research Agenda." *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 37 (2): 160–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X17697118>.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. "Black Feminist Thought in the Matrix of Domination." *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* 138 (1990): 221–38.
- Council of Europe. (2023). Intersectionality and Multiple Discrimination. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/gender-matters/intersectionality-and-multiple-discrimination>
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Identity Politics, Intersectionality, and Violence against Women." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99.
- Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., and Melissa E. Graebner. 2007. "Theory Building From Cases: Opportunities And Challenges." *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (1): 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24160888>.
- European Commission. 2020a. "Een Unie van gelijkheid: strategie voor gendergelijkheid 2020-2025." Brussels: European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/NL/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0152&from=EN>.
- . 2020b. "Strategic Plan 2020-2024 Research and Innovation." [https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2020-11/rtd\\_sp\\_2020\\_2024\\_en.pdf](https://commission.europa.eu/system/files/2020-11/rtd_sp_2020_2024_en.pdf).
- Garcia, Teresa C., and Anna Zajicek. 2022. "Incorporating Intersectionality in Public Policy: A Systematic Literature Review." *Humanity & Society* 46 (2): 271–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0160597620988591>.
- Holvino, Evangelina. 2010. "Intersections: The Simultaneity of Race, Gender and Class in Organization Studies." *Gender, Work & Organization* 17 (3): 248–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00400.x>.
- "INSPIRE." 2023. INSPIRE. 2023. <https://www.inspirequality.eu/>.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. 2016. "Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation" (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Tracy, S. J. 2013. Qualitative research methods. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Yin, Robert K. 1994. "Discovering the Future of the Case Study. Method in Evaluation Research." *Evaluation Practice* 15 (3): 283–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109821409401500309>.

#### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

Yin, R. 2003. "Case study research: Design and methods" (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

## Appendix 1

### Interview guideline for designers

Name interviewer	
Date and place of interview	
Duration interview	
Name interviewee	
Organization	
Job interviewee	

- Briefly explain general objective and informed consent.

	Questions	Goal
<b>Role in the organization</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could you describe what you do in the organisation?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is your position in the organisation?</li> <li>○ What are your main tasks?</li> <li>○ What does your typical work day look like?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Can you describe the team or department you are part of?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who do you mostly work with?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What did you do before starting in this position?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Did you have other positions in this organisation?</li> <li>○ What other work experiences do you have?</li> <li>○ What did you study?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Brief introduction of the interviewee, what they do in the organisation, and with whom they work together. This is important basic information to understand the answers to the questions that follow. However, too lengthy explanations about careers and details about their actual work (except for their role in DEI) should be avoided.
<b>Nature and</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can you describe your role in designing DEI policies?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who else is involved in the design of the DEI policy?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CORE OF THIS INTERVIEW

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

<p><b>characteristics + Governance and design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What are the different steps in designing DEI policies?</li> <li>○ Why are you involved in the design?</li> <li>○ Are other people consulted?</li> <li>● How would you describe the organisation's philosophy on diversity and inclusion?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why was this chosen?</li> <li>○ What are some of the factors that influenced the choice for this?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What are the key issues the DEI policies of the organisation focus on?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why was this focus chosen?</li> <li>○ Which policies were chosen to focus on this issue? Why?</li> <li>○ Why was this policy designed in this way?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do DEI policies mainly focus on one specific minority group or on multiple groups?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If so, which ones?</li> <li>○ What was the reasoning behind this choice?</li> <li>○ Why was this policy designed in this way?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Can you give some examples of DEI practices in the organisation that focus on multiple groups?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What was the reasoning behind this choice?</li> <li>○ Why was this policy designed in this way?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● An example of a practice that is also being implemented in the organisation is [practice with a potentially intersectional focus or focus on multiple groups identified from the documents] -[asked if interviewee does not introduce these themselves].             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can you describe this policy?</li> <li>○ Why was this policy designed in this way?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you feel that the management supports the design process and its choices?</li> <li>● What were some of the challenges in the design of DEI practices?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How have they shaped design choices?</li> <li>○ What are some of the reasons for these challenges?</li> <li>○ Are you able to overcome these challenges?</li> <li>○ Do you experience any pushback? From who? Why?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Is it clear who is responsible for which parts of DEI policies and practices?</li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they perceive (their role in) the different steps of the design process of DEI policies and the role of different organisational and extra-organizational factors in them.</p> <p>Understanding how the design process is motivated, followed-up and whether there are accountability measures.</p> <p>Understanding the specific nature and characteristics of the organisation's philosophy on DEI, its focus on specific groups or topics, and the degree to which these (not) adopt an intersectional approach to tackling inequalities, as well as the different organisational and extra-organisational factors shaping this.</p>
---	---	--



### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are there ways in which progress is being reported?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To whom?</li> <li>○ How?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Are there any follow-ups after the policies are designed?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is the progress that is being made monitored and measured?</li> <li>○ If yes, how?</li> <li>○ Do you believe it is important to monitor sensitive data such as race, sexual orientation, disability to include those needs in the implementation of the policies? Why, why not?</li> <li>○ Who is in charge of following up DEI policies once they have been designed? Why?</li> <li>○ Are there accountability measures in case certain goals aren't met?</li> <li>○ Are there resources made available for following up DEI policies?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>INTERSECTIONALITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies take into account the needs of everyone?</li> <li>● Do you feel DEI policies ignore specific topics or groups?</li> <li>● Who or what should be more addressed in the future DEI policies? How?</li> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies acknowledge the experiences of [name intersections between identities mentioned throughout the interview]?</li> <li>● A topic that is drawing increasing attention is intersectionality. Have you ever heard this being used in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In which context?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● An intersectional approach [define]. Do you believe this is being applied in the organisation?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Implementation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What do you think about the way particular policies are being implemented?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do they ensure that everyone feels included?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they experience implementation of DEI policies and practices.</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What do you think are some of the challenges in the implementation of DEI policies?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How could this be overcome?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Emerging effects</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How would you describe the diversity of the workforce in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you see differences between different departments or teams?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, what do you think are the causes of these differences?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Are there groups that are underrepresented in the organisation?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, what do you think are the causes of this underrepresentation?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you think everyone, regardless of their identities, feels at home and respected in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why is that?</li> <li>○ Which factors contribute to this?</li> <li>○ Do you think individuals with specific identities are less likely to feel at home?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Can you give examples of this happening?</li> <li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you feel that the organisation sufficiently recognizes and rewards everyone's expertise and achievements, regardless of their identities,?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why, why not?</li> <li>○ What contributes to this?</li> <li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are less likely to be recognized for their achievements and expertise?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Can you give examples of this happening?</li> <li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they experience the operation and effects on (intersecting) inequalities of DEI policies and practices and how they are being monitored and potential changes are made.</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you think certain people sometimes face barriers or discrimination in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could you describe such situations?</li> <li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are more likely to face barriers or discrimination?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Which effects do you already see emerging from the policies that were designed?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For who? Do you think everyone experiences these effects?</li> <li>○ To what would you attribute it?</li> <li>○ What were important factors that play a role in affecting the effects?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Closing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are other steps you believe the organisation should take in the future to tackle the inequalities that individuals face who identify with more than one minority group?</li> <li>● How do you think the organisation or yourself can improve their GEP or DEI policy for those individuals and groups in the future?</li> <li>● Further information on the interviewee's             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender identity</li> <li>○ Age bracket</li> <li>○ Race/ethnicity/nationality (E.g. white Belgian national with a French background)</li> <li>○ Other relevant identities (E.g. disability, sexual orientation,...)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Is there anything you would like to add, which I did not ask but you think is important for me to know?</li> </ul>	<p>Understanding what they believe the organisation could do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its Gender Equality Plan or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion policies.</p>

## Appendix 2

### Interview guideline for implementers

Name interviewer	
Date and place of interview	
Duration interview	
Name interviewee	
Organization	
Job interviewee	

- Briefly explain general objective and informed consent.

	Questions	Goal
<b>Role in the organisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Could you describe what you do in the organisation?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is your position in the organisation?</li> <li>○ What are your main tasks?</li> <li>○ What does your typical work day look like?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Can you describe the team or department you are part of?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who do you mostly work with?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What did you do before starting in this position?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Did you have other positions in this organisation?</li> <li>○ What other work experiences do you have?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Brief introduction of the interviewee, what they do in the organisation, and with whom they work together. This is important basic information to understand the answers to the questions that follow. However, too lengthy explanations about careers and details about their actual work (except for their role in DEI) should be avoided.
<b>Nature and characteristics + Implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Can you describe your role in implementing the DEI policies and practices?</li> <li>● Which practices related to diversity, equality and inclusion issues are you involved in implementing [ask the following questions for all practices identified by the interviewee]                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can you describe this policy?</li> <li>○ Can you describe your role?</li> <li>○ Do you believe this practice is useful?</li> <li>○ Do you believe the supposed beneficiaries think this policy is useful?</li> <li>○ Is it useful for everyone? Why, why not?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>CORE OF THIS INTERVIEW</p> <p>Understanding how they experience (their role in) the process implementation of actual DEI practices, as well as the different organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting the implementation process.</p> <p>Understanding of how the implementation is monitored, evaluated and whether there are accountability measures.</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An example of a practice that is also being implemented in the organisation is [practice with a potentially intersectional focus or focus on multiple groups identified from the documents] -[asked if interviewee does not introduce these themselves]. Do you have a role in implementing this? If yes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Can you describe this policy?</li> <li>○ Can you describe your role?</li> <li>○ Do you believe this policy is useful?</li> <li>○ Do you believe the staff thinks this policy is useful?</li> <li>○ Do you think this works for the intended group? Why, why not?</li> <li>○ Is it useful for everyone? Why, why not?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you know why you are involved in implementing these policies?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you think it is a good thing that you are involved in the implementation of these policies? Why/why not?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● What are some of the challenges in the implementation of DEI practices?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What are some of the reasons for these challenges?</li> <li>○ Are you able to overcome these challenges?</li> <li>○ Do you experience any pushback? From who? Why?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Does the organisation adequately support you in the process of implementation? What could be improved?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are you informed about the goals of the policy?</li> <li>○ Did you receive training or guidance on how to implement DEI policies?</li> <li>○ Do you get feedback on the process of implementation? From who?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you need to report on the progress that is being made?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To whom?</li> <li>○ How?</li> <li>○ Do you have a deadline for implementing practices?</li> <li>○ What happens if you don't fulfil your role?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>Emerging effects</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How would you describe the diversity of the workforce in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you see differences between different departments or teams?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, what do you think are the causes of these differences?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Are there groups that are underrepresented in the organisation?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If so, what do you think are the causes of this underrepresentation?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they experience the effects on (intersectional) inequalities of the DEI practices they are involved in implementing, as well as on the different organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting this.</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Do you think everyone, regardless of their identities, feels at home and respected in the organisation?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Why is that?</li><li>○ Which factors contribute to this?</li><li>○ Do you think individuals with specific identities are less likely to feel at home?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li></ul></li><li>○ Can you give examples of this happening?</li><li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li></ul></li><li>● Do you feel that the organisation sufficiently recognizes and rewards everyone's expertise and achievements, regardless of their identities?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Why, why not?</li><li>○ What contributes to this?</li><li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are less likely to be recognized for their achievements and expertise?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li></ul></li><li>○ Can you give examples of this happening?</li><li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li></ul></li><li>● Do you think certain people sometimes face barriers or discrimination in the organisation?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Could you describe such situations?</li><li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are more likely to face barriers or discrimination?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li></ul></li></ul></li></ul>	
--	---	--

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you believe that the policies and practices contribute to this [if no problems are identified] - are effective in addressing this [if potential problems are identified]?</li> <li>● Which effects do you already see emerging from the policies you implemented?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For who? Do you think everyone experiences these effects?</li> <li>○ To what would you attribute it?</li> <li>○ What were important factors that play a role in affecting the effects?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>INTERSECTIONALITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies take into account the needs of everyone?</li> <li>● Do you feel DEI policies ignore specific topics or groups?</li> <li>● Who or what should be more addressed in the future DEI policies? How?</li> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies acknowledge the experiences of [name intersections between identities mentioned throughout the interview]?</li> <li>● A topic that is drawing increasing attention is intersectionality. Have you ever heard this being used in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In which context?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● An intersectional approach [define]. Do you believe this is being applied in the organisation?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Governance and design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Ideally, who do you think should be involved in the design of a DEI policy?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who is involved?</li> <li>○ Have you ever been consulted? Or know of others who have been consulted?</li> <li>○ Do you feel that the organisation sufficiently includes the experiences of different minority groups into the design process of their DEI policies? Why/not?</li> <li>○ Do you feel that your needs are included in the design of the DEI policies?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you feel someone is measuring whether these policies are effective?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you think something is being done if they don't work?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they experience the design, and governance of actual DEI practices in the organisation</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

<b>Closing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● What are other steps you believe the organisation should take in the future to tackle the inequalities that individuals face who identify with more than one minority group?</li><li>● How do you think the organisation or yourself can improve their GEP or DEI policy for those individuals and groups in the future?</li><li>● Further information on the interviewee's<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Gender identity</li><li>○ Age bracket</li><li>○ Race/ethnicity/nationality (E.g. white Belgian national with a French background)</li><li>○ Other relevant identities (E.g. disability, sexual orientation,...)</li></ul></li><li>● Is there anything you would like to add, which I did not ask but you think is important for me to know?</li></ul>	Understanding what they believe the organisation could do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its Gender Equality Plan or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion policies.
----------------	--	---



## Appendix 3

### Interview guideline for potential beneficiaries

Name interviewer	
Date and place of interview	
Duration interview	
Name interviewee	
Organisation	
Job/student status interviewee	

- Briefly explain general objective and informed consent.

	Questions	Goal
<b>Role in the organisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could you describe what you do in the organisation?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is your position in the organisation?</li> <li>○ What are your main tasks?</li> <li>○ What does your typical work day look like?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Can you describe the team or department you are part of?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who do you mostly work with?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What did you do before starting in this position?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Did you have other positions in this organisation?</li> <li>○ What other work experiences do you have?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Brief introduction of the interviewee, what they do in the organisation, and with whom they work together. This is important basic information to understand the answers to the questions that follow. However, too lengthy explanations about careers and details about their actual work should be avoided.</p> <p><u>Alternative questions for students:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could you describe what you do in the organisation?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What does your typical day as a student look like?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Can you describe the department study at?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Who do you mostly come in contact with?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What did you do before becoming a student here?</li> </ul>

<p><b>Experiences as an employee</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How would you describe the organisation in terms of             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Its diversity?</li> <li>○ Its inclusive nature?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>SENSE OF BELONGING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you think everyone, regardless of their identities, feels at home and respected in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why is that?</li> <li>○ Which factors contribute to this?</li> <li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are less likely to feel at home?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Can you give examples of what happened?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you feel at home in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why, why not?</li> <li>○ What contributes to this?</li> <li>○ How would you describe the relationships with the main people you come in contact with?</li> <li>○ Have you ever not felt at home? Can you give examples of this?</li> <li>○ Have you ever felt that you needed to change something about yourself in order to fit in the organisation? Why, why not?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>RECOGNITION OF EXPERTISE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you feel that everyone’s expertise and achievements are sufficiently recognized and rewarded , regardless of their identities?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why, why not?</li> <li>○ What contributes to this?</li> <li>○ Do you think the expertise of people with certain identities is less likely to be recognized?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Can you give examples of what happened?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>CORE PART OF THE INTERVIEW WITH THIS GROUP:</b></p> <p>Understanding how they experience the organisation in terms of sense of belonging and recognition, their experiences with discrimination and barriers in the organisation, and how this is connected to intersectional identities. Moreover, whether they believe these experiences are shared by others (e.g. with other intersecting identities).</p> <p>These questions give us potential insight in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- emerging effects</li> <li>- relevant organisational and extra-organisational factors</li> </ul>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you feel that your expertise and achievements are sufficiently recognized and rewarded?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Why, why not?</li> <li>○ What contributes to this?</li> <li>○ Have you ever felt a lack of respect for your expertise or achievements?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can you give examples of what happened?</li> <li>▪ What did you do?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>DISCRIMINATION AND BARRIERS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you think people sometimes face barriers or discrimination in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What kind of barriers or discrimination?</li> <li>○ Could you describe such situations?</li> <li>○ Do you think people with certain identities are more likely to face barriers or discrimination?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ if specific identities are named: ask about intersections between them</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Have you ever faced barriers or been discriminated against in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On the basis of what?</li> <li>○ Could you describe a situation in which you were excluded or discriminated against?</li> <li>○ How did you deal with this?</li> <li>○ Was this in some way addressed?</li> <li>○ Are there spaces or people you can go to when you feel excluded or discriminated against?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you believe that existing policies sufficiently protect employees against discrimination? Why, why not?</li> <li>● Have you noticed any changes in the past years within the organisation regarding diversity, equality and inclusion issues?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If yes, can you give an example of positive/negative changes?</li> <li>○ If not, to what do you attribute this?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Nature and characteristics</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are you familiar with policies or practices related to diversity, equality and inclusion issues? [ask the following questions for all practices identified by the interviewee]             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If yes,                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How did you learn about them?</li> <li>○ Did you or anyone you know ever made use of it? How did you/they experience it?</li> <li>○ What did you think of the way it was organised?                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Who was involved?</li> <li>▪ Did you see any downsides with the way it was organised?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Do you think it is useful? Why, why not?</li> <li>○ Do you think it's useful for everyone? Why, why not? Is it effective for individuals who identify with more than one minority group?</li> <li>○ Do you believe this is effective to tackle inequality and promote inclusion?</li> </ul> </li> <li>If not                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Are there certain policies or practices you think would be important in the organisation?</li> <li>○ Why would this be useful?</li> <li>○ For everyone? Why, why not?</li> <li>○ Would you or anyone you know make use of it? Why?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>INTERSECTIONALITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An example of a practice that is also being implemented in the organisation is [practice with a potentially intersectional focus or focus on multiple groups identified from the documents] -[asked if interviewee does not introduce these themselves]. Have you ever heard about this?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If yes, how did you learn about them?</li> <li>○ Did you or anyone you know ever made use of it? How did you/they experience it?</li> <li>○ What did you think of the way it was organised?                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Who was involved?</li> <li>▪ Did you see any downsides with the way it was organised?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Do you think it is useful? Why, why not?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>ANOTHER CORE SECTION FOR THIS GROUP:</b></p> <p>Understanding how they perceive the nature and characteristics of the organisation's approach to DEI, its focus on specific groups, topics, and its way of tackling (intersectional) inequalities.</p> <p>Understanding how they experience the implementation, usefulness, effects on (intersecting) inequalities of practices.</p> <p>Understanding how they experience the implementation of actual DEI practices in the organisation.</p>
--	--	---

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For everyone? Why, why not? Is it effective for individuals who identify with more than one minority group?</li> <li>○ Do you believe this is effective to tackle inequality and promote inclusion?</li> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies take into account the needs of everyone?</li> <li>● Do you feel DEI policies ignore specific topics or groups?</li> <li>● To which extent would you say that the policies acknowledge the experiences of [name intersections between identities mentioned throughout the interview]?</li> <li>● A topic that is drawing increasing attention is intersectionality. Have you ever heard this being used in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ In which context?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● An intersectional approach is [define]. Do you believe this is being applied in the organisation?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Implementation + Governance &amp; design</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What do you think about the way practices are being implemented in the organisation?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you feel that the diversity and inclusion policies and practices are well communicated about?</li> <li>○ Do you think there are specific challenges in implementing policies?</li> <li>○ Do you think there is opposition to certain policies? Why/why not? From whom?</li> <li>○ What do you feel could be done to overcome these challenges in your organisation?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Why do you think DEI policies and practices are designed as they are?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Do you think they focus on the right issues and problems? Why (not)?</li> <li>○ Are there particular issues and problems overlooked?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Ideally, who do you think should be involved in the design of DEI policies?             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Have you ever been consulted? Or know of others who have been consulted?</li> <li>○ Do you feel that the organisation sufficiently includes the experiences of different minority groups into the design process of their DEI policies? Why/not?</li> <li>○ Do you feel that your needs are included in the design of the DEI policies?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Do you feel progress is being monitored and measured?</li> </ul>	<p>Understanding how they experience the design, and governance of actual DEI practices in the organisation</p>

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does this happen?</li> <li>○ Do you think something is being done if they don't work?</li> <li>○ Do you think people are held accountable for a lack of progress?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Closing</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What are other steps you believe the organisation should take in the future to tackle the inequalities that individuals face who identify with more than one minority group?</li> <li>● How do you think the organisation can improve their GEP or DEI policy for those individuals and groups in the future?</li> <li>● Further information on the interviewee's             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Gender identity</li> <li>○ Age bracket</li> <li>○ Race/ethnicity/nationality (E.g. white Belgian national with a French background)</li> <li>○ Other relevant identities (E.g. disability, sexual orientation,...)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Is there anything you would like to add, which I did not ask but you think is important for me to know?</li> </ul>	<p>Understanding what they believe the organisation could do in the future to foster intersectional equality and include an intersectional approach in its Gender Equality Plan or Diversity, Equality and Inclusion policies.</p>

## Appendix 4

### (Non-)participatory observation guideline

Name of observer	
Type of observation	Participatory/non-participatory
Organised by	
Other (key) actors involved (ex. speaker, facilitator, consultant...)	
Targeted audience and how many people present	
Place and time	
Duration	

<b>Nature and characteristics</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Short description of the observed activity/practice (ex. training session, information session, informal networking event...)</li> <li>● Described goal of the observed activity/practice</li> <li>● Indication whether the observed activity/practice is part of a larger series of activities/practices</li> <li>● Relevant social identities mentioned (gender (identity), race, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation, other)</li> <li>● Intersectionality explicitly mentioned             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If yes, describe how</li> <li>○ If no, describe if intersectional approach is used (quotes supporting why it is considered intersectional)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Researcher's evaluation of the general atmosphere during the event</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

<b>Governance and design policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Motivation for the focus on specific goals, specific target groups (if available)</li><li>● Who is in charge of the activity/practice</li><li>● To whom is the activity/practice reported</li></ul>
<b>Implementation policy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Description of the actor(s) involved in the implementation</li><li>● Motivation for the way the practice is implemented</li></ul>
<b>Emerging effects</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Measurement of effects mentioned<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If yes, how</li></ul></li><li>● Reactions of the audience</li><li>● Reactions of the organisers</li></ul>



## Appendix 5

### CORE TOPICLIST FOR ANALYSIS

#### **Diversity and inclusion in the organisation**

- Described diversity of the organisation
- Sense of belonging
  - Also focus on differences between people with different intersecting identities
- Valuation of the expertise and contributions
  - Also focus on differences between people with different intersecting identities
- Barriers and discrimination in organisation
  - Focus on different barriers and discrimination and differences between people with different intersecting identities
- Organisational factors affecting diversity and inclusion
- Extra-organisational factors affecting diversity and inclusion

#### **Nature and characteristics of the (intersectional) DEI policies and plans**

- Characteristics of the organisation's DEI philosophy
  - Focus on: main goals, problems addressed, principles
  - Focus on: whether intersectionality is used and how it is used
- Characteristics of specific DEI policies and practices
  - Make a primary distinction between DEI policies and practices that are intersectional in nature and those that are not
  - Also focus on: main goals, problems addressed

#### **Design of the (intersectional) DEI policies and plans**

- Characteristics of the design process
  - Focus on: actors responsible for the design process, different steps involved, organisational support
- Design choices
  - Focus on: main goals, problems addressed, principles
  - Focus on: why intersectionality is (not) used or why specific groups are (not) targeted
- Reasons for design choices
  - Focus on: organisational factors affecting design
  - Focus on: extra-organisational factors affecting design
- Problems & challenges
- Evaluation of design process

#### **Governance of the (intersectional) DEI policies and plans**

- Roles and responsibilities in the governance of DEI
  - Focus on: The individuals and/or groups responsible for different aspects of DEI, their respective roles and responsibilities
- Aspects of DEI governance
  - Focus on: Monitoring of progress/follow-up, accountability measures, organisational support
  - Also focus on: whether attention is paid to people with different intersecting identities
- The reasons for governance framework
  - Focus on: organisational factors affecting design
  - Focus on: extra-organisational factors affecting design
- Problems & challenges
- Evaluation of governance

#### **Implementation of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- Roles and responsibilities in the implementation of DEI
  - Focus on: actors responsible for implementation, organisational support
- The reasons for implementation process
  - Focus on: organisational factors affecting choices for process of implementation
  - Focus on: extra-organisational factors affecting choices for process of implementation
- Problems & challenges
  - Focus on: organisational factors posing challenges
  - Focus on: extra-organisational factors posing challenges
  - Also focus on: potential role of intersectionality
- Evaluation of implementation

#### **Emerging effects of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- The emerging effects:
  - Focus on: The effectiveness of policies and practices in actually addressing the problems they aimed to address
  - Focus on: The changes that are already visible
  - Also focus on: different effects for people with different intersecting identities
- Reasons for emerging effects:
  - Focus on: The organisational factors
  - Focus on: Extra-organisational factors
- The improvements needed for the future:
  - Focus on: The needs and problems that need to be more addressed, the groups that deserve more attention, the potential future policies and practices

## Appendix 6

### CASE REPORTING OUTLINE

#### 1. General information

- Description of the university's or research institute's characteristics. This includes:
  - Type of organisation (and main field of expertise if applicable)
  - Size in terms of personnel (and students if applicable)
  - Overview of the general organogram, including different faculties/divisions,...
  - Brief history of the organisation, indicating important evolutions
- Description of the national context of the case (use GEAR tool and D2.1 report of national experts). This includes important societal elements that might influence GEPs and DEI and DEI-policies in organisations

#### 2. Methodology

- Overview of the data sources
- Overview of the interviews, this includes:
  - Number of interviews and their average duration
  - Process of recording, informed consent, transcription
  - Description of selection procedure and of process of contacting respondents
  - Table providing pseudonymized names, role and socio-demographic information of interviewees
- Overview of the documents analysed, this includes:
  - Table with description of the analysed documents (e.g. Publicly available GEPs and/or equality policies). If publicly available, add the link.
- Overview of the (non-)participant observations, this includes:
  - Table with the observations, providing a description of the observed equality policy (name of the activity, date, organisers, participants, duration, goal)
  - Description of the role of the researcher (non-participant or participant)

#### 3. Diversity and inclusion in the organisation

- Description of the diversity and in/exclusive nature of the organisation. This includes:
  - The diversity of the organisation
  - The (lack of) sense of belonging experienced by individuals with different intersecting identities
  - The (lack of) valuation of the expertise and contributions of individuals with different intersecting identities
  - Barriers and discrimination experienced by individuals with different intersecting identities
  - The reasons for/organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this.

#### **4. Nature and characteristics of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- RQ1: What are the nature and characteristics of intersectional equality policies and plans? -

- Description of the organisation's overall DEI philosophy including the GEP. This includes:
  - Why the organisation believes DEI(-policy) is important (what is the main problem to be addressed, what do they aim to achieve)
  - The general guiding principles characterising the DEI-philosophy
  - The main groups focused on or the main potential beneficiaries identified
  - Whether and how an intersectional approach is adopted / attention is given to intersectionality
- Description of the GEP and the main DEI policies and practices. Including for each policy:
  - The main goal and the main problem addressed
  - The main groups they focus on & whether and how an intersectional approach is adopted / attention is given to intersectionality
  - The main practices that are part of these policies. This includes
    - What their aims are and which problem they aim to address
    - How they work
    - The main groups they focus on & whether and how an intersectional approach is adopted / attention is given to intersectionality
  - The evolution in DEI policies and practices including the GEP over the years
- Add all the DEI policies and practices that adopt an intersectional approach
  - The main goal and the main problem addressed
  - How they work
  - Explanation on how are they intersectional

#### **5. Governance and design of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- RQ2a: How are intersectional equality policies and plans governed and designed and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this? –

- Description of the governance of the DEI philosophies, policies, practices and plans. This includes:
  - The individuals and/or groups responsible for different aspects of DEI (philosophies, policies, practices and plans)
  - Their respective roles and responsibilities
  - The reasons for/organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this governance framework
  - The way progress (in terms of policy, practice development, implementation and effects on different groups) is monitored, reported on, and the way individuals are held accountable for (a lack of) progress.
  - The way changes are being made and/or practices and policies are being improved
  - Attention to intersectionality in governance
- Stakeholders' evaluation of DEI-governance (advantages and disadvantages).
- Description of the design process of the DEI philosophies, policies, practices and plans. This includes:
  - The different steps in the design process of GEP and DEI philosophies, policies, practices and plans
  - The different actors involved in designing GEP and DEI philosophy, policies and practices

### D3.4 Methodological framework for intersectional DEI policy case studies

- The design choices, such as:
  - The choices made in designing the DEI philosophy, policies and practices (what is the main problem to be addressed, what do they aim to achieve)
  - The focus on particular groups
  - (Not) adopting an intersectional approach or for (not) focusing on multiple groups
- The reasons for/organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting these choices
- The main challenges in designing policies & the way they are overcome
- The support received by the organisation
- Organisational member's evaluation of the GEP and/or DEI-design process (advantages and disadvantages).

#### **6. Implementation of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- RQ2b: How are intersectional equality policies and plans implemented, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this? -

- Description of the implementation process of GEP and DEI philosophies, policies, practices and plans. This includes:
  - The people responsible for implementation
  - The organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting the implementation process
  - The role of intersectionality
  - The challenges in the implementation of GEP and/or DEI practices & the way they are overcome
  - The organisational support in the process of implementation
- Organisational member's evaluation of the GEP and/or DEI-implementation process (advantages and disadvantages).

#### **7. Emerging effects of the (intersectional) GEPs and DEI policies and plans**

- RQ3: What are the emerging effects of intersectional equality policies and plans, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors that influence these possible effects? -

- Description of the emerging effects of the DEI philosophies, policies practices, and plans this includes:
  - The effectiveness of policies and practices in actually addressing the problems they aimed to address and reach the intended goals
  - The changes that are already visible (objective data or individuals' experiences) as a result of the GEP and/or DEI policies and practices
  - The difference in effects for people with different intersecting identities
  - The organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors that influence these emerging effects

- The improvements needed for the future, this includes:
  - The needs and problems that need to be more addressed
  - The groups that deserve more attention
  - Potential future policies and practices

#### **8. Conclusion and reflections**

- Overarching answers to the main questions:
  - What are the nature and characteristics of intersectional equality policies and plans?
  - How are intersectional equality policies and plans governed, designed and implemented, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors affecting this?
  - What are the emerging effects of intersectional equality policies and plans, and what are the organisational and extra-organisational (e.g. institutional, historical, cultural, economic) factors that influence these possible effects?

## Appendix 7

### RESEARCH INFORMATION AND INFORMED CONSENT FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

**Project title:** INSPIRE: Centre of Excellence on Inclusive Gender Equality in Research & Innovation: Creating Knowledge & Engaging in Collaborative Action

**Funding organisation:** European Commission, Horizon Europe. Grant Agreement No 101058537

**Principal investigator:** Dr. Rachel Palmén, Gender and ICT Research Programme (IN3 – Universitat Oberta de Catalunya). Email: rpalmen@uoc.edu

I, [insert researcher's first name and surname], hereby inform [insert participant's first name and surname] of the following:

#### 1. Background of the study

INSPIRE is Europe's Centre of Excellence on inclusive gender equality in Research and Innovation (R&I). It brings together cutting-edge knowledge, ambitious policy approaches, and innovative practices to provide a gateway for scholars, equality experts, practitioners and trainers to connect and share resources, as well as co-create new ones. INSPIRE's ambitious research programme develops new, relevant indicators for inclusive GEP development, conducts a GEP monitoring survey throughout Europe and identifies the conditions necessary for GEP impact. It fills key knowledge gaps on intersectionality, whilst building up the evidence base on promising practices in gendered regional innovation policy. INSPIRE counts on 4 Knowledge & Support Hubs (KSHs) led by academics and practitioners to develop cutting-edge knowledge on sustaining change, widening participation, intersectionality and fostering innovation and change in the private sector. These KSHs will provide support to 12 communities of practice to facilitate GEP implementation and to foster mutual support for the co-development of innovative practices, customised training and pan-European data collection.

#### 2. Purpose of the study

The present study explores how R&I organisations and institutions with relevant experience on gender and diversity policies approach intersecting inequalities. It does so by carrying out 10 in-depth case studies throughout Europe. These case studies involve the analysis of relevant documents, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and possible (non-)participant observation. The goal of this analysis is to generate theory on the nature and characteristics and the governance, design and implementation of effective intersectional GEP's in R&I organisations, as well as on relevant organisational and extra-organisational factors affecting this. The results of the case studies will be published as a book. Good practice examples will be uploaded to the GEP database. The findings might also be published in peer reviewed journals.

#### 3. Purpose of this document

This Research Information Document contains detailed information about the purpose and procedures of the interview part of this study. This information will allow you to make an informed decision about your participation. Please read this Document carefully and do not hesitate to ask any questions about the information in it. By signing the Informed Consent Form at the end of this document, you give your consent to participate in this study. You will be given a copy of the Research Information document and the Consent Form to keep in your records.

### 4. Detailed information about the study and the rights of the participants

#### 4.1. The interviews of the case studies

The semi-structured interviews will be conducted by a researcher who is part of the INSPIRE consortium. The study foresees conducting semi-structured interviews with up to 25 stakeholders per organisation. They will be conducted by a researcher who is part of the INSPIRE consortium with stakeholders involved in the governance, design and the implementation of intersectional equality policies and potential beneficiaries of intersectional equality policies, including with student representatives and/or PhD students if applicable.

The interviews will be conducted face-to-face or by telephone/video call. An interview will take no more than 90 minutes. Usually, only one session is foreseen. The interviews will be recorded and transcribed.

#### 4.2 Confidentiality, personal data protection & data storage

The controller of the subjects' data is **[insert name of the partner responsible of carrying out the interview]**. **[Responsible partner name]** contact details are the following:

Postal address: **[insert]**

E-mail: **[insert]**

[if relevant for your institution: [Responsible partner] has appointed a Data Protection Officer to whom you may address any query concerning processing of personal data. You may contact the Data Protection Officer by means of the following contact details [include data of the partner responsible for carrying out the interview]:

Postal address: **[insert]**

E-mail: **[insert]**

Your personal data will be treated in accordance with the **[Insert institution Name]** privacy policy, **[add if relevant: which you can access from the [Institution Name website: [insert link to website link to the privacy policy of the institution carrying out the interview]]** and according to the requirements of the European General Data Protection Regulation "GDPR" (EU 2016/679) **[include the national law on Personal Data Protection of the institution carrying out the interview]**.

Your participation in this study is confidential. Your confidentiality will be protected by following several procedures. The interviews shall be recorded in audio format and stored in a secure folder on the relevant institution's server until 10 years after the start of the interviews. The audio file name will consist of an anonymous ID and will not include any aspect that enables identifying the interviewee. The audio recording will be stored in an institutional cloud that will be encrypted and only the researcher will know the password to decrypt the file.

The interview content will be transcribed and used for empirical analysis. Transcripts will be pseudonymised so that they will not contain any information that might enable the identification of the interviewee. Files containing personal data and information linking data and pseudonym codes will be password protected and stored in secure folders on institutional servers or in the INSPIRE project file sharing area. Only the researcher [or, if relevant for your institution: include other members of the research team of the partner (e.g. supervisor, PI)] will have the passwords required to access these protected files. Transcripts may be shared with consortium partners to carry out the analysis. They will also uphold confidentiality. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the study, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name and personal data are in no way linked to your responses.

Your personal data will not be transferred by the [name of the partner responsible for carrying out the interview] to any third party beyond the INSPIRE consortium [if relevant for your institution, add a clause on collaboration with transcription service].



### 4.3 Discomforts, risks and benefits

You will not be exposed to any physical, psychological, professional or other risks in participating in this research.

You will not receive any economic benefits, other compensation or direct benefits for participating in this study. However, there are some indirect benefits. Participating in this study helps to build the evidence base that will improve the work done by the INSPIRE project, and help it make expected impacts, such as: the advancement of European knowledge of inclusive GEP implementation, the advancement of European knowledge and support on intersectionality and Innovation and an improvement in the reach of critical expertise throughout Europe by involving experts, practitioners and scholars by strengthening the European Research Area and its inclusiveness objective.

### 4.4 Rights of the participants in the study

Participation in the project is voluntary. You have the right to not take part. If you decide to take part, you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time. If you decide to not take part or to withdraw from the project, your decision will not affect your relationship with the research group nor will you be subject to any manner of penalty. The researchers are required to inform you of any change in the project's purpose or in the manner of participation so that you can indicate whether or not you wish to continue to take part in the project.

You may choose to leave the project at any time and, if applicable, request erasure of the data provided and, if applicable, those other data that have been generated until such time.

[please check with your institution whether the following additional information is relevant/should be included:

Data subjects have the right to obtain confirmation as to whether we are processing personal data that concern them at [name responsible partner]. Data subjects have the right to access their personal data, and to request rectification of inaccurate data or, if applicable, request their erasure when, among other reasons, they are no longer necessary for the purpose for which they were collected. In certain situations, data subjects will have the right to request restriction of their data, in which case we will only keep them for the exercise or defense of legal claims. In certain circumstances and for reasons related to their personal situation, data subjects may object to processing of their data. In this case, the [responsible partner] will cease to process them, unless there are compelling legitimate grounds or for the exercise or defense of possible legal claims.

In any case, the [responsible partner] will notify any claim or erasure of personal data, and any restriction of the processing performed, to each of the recipients to whom they have been transferred, unless this should involve or require a disproportionate effort. If the data subjects should request so, the [responsible partner] will inform them who these recipients are. In addition, data subjects have the right to receive the personal data concerning them and which they have provided to the [responsible partner], in a structured, commonly used, machine-readable format, and to transmit them to another controller when the processing is based on consent or a contract, and is performed by automated means. Data subjects will have the right to object at any time, for reasons related with their personal situation, to processing of the personal data concerning them, based on the public or legitimate interest pursued by the [responsible partner] or a third party, including profiling, with the effect that [name of responsible partner] will cease to process the personal data, unless it can demonstrate compelling legitimate interests in the processing that override the data subjects' interests, rights and freedoms, or for the establishment, exercise or defense of legal claims.

Furthermore, data subjects will have the right not to be subject to a decision based solely on automated processing, including profiling, which produces legal effects concerning them or similarly significantly affects them, unless this decision is necessary for entering into or performing a contract between the data subjects and the [responsible partner], is authorised by European Union or Member State law or is based on the data subjects' explicit consent.

The above-stated rights of access, rectification, erasure and objection, and the other rights recognized by current legislation, may be exercised by means of the section for exercising ARCO+ rights in the privacy policy published on the website [include] or by writing to [include contact]. Furthermore, data subjects have the right to submit a claim to [include reference to the national legislation and Data Protection Agency of the partner carrying out the interview]]

**4.5. Rights of the researchers in the study**

The researchers have the right to stop your participation in the project if they decide that your continued participation is not appropriate, if it may be dangerous for you to continue taking part or if you do not follow the instructions given by researchers to enable you to take part in the project.

**4.6. Dissemination of findings**

The findings of this study are part of a European project. Findings can be used for conference presentations and publications in academic journals and/or book chapters. INSPIRE strives to make research data FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable and re-usable), available to the public and other researchers through open access repositories. All dissemination of research findings will follow the requirements of the EU legal framework for privacy, data protection and security of personal data.

**4.7. Feedback**

If you wish so, an electronic copy of any publications resulting from the research will be sent to you.

**4.8. Ethics and complaints**

Any complaints regarding the ethical aspects of this study should be directed to [include data of the Ethics Committee of the partner carrying out the interview]

**4.9. Who to contact if you have any questions**

If you have any questions about this project, please contact Rachel Palmén, the principal investigator, email: rpalmen@uoc.edu, the principal investigator of the partner conducting the interviews [add contact information], or the researcher [add contact information].

**INFORMED CONSENT**

I [participant's name and surname], declare that:

I have read the research information sheet

I have been able to ask questions and I have received sufficient information about the project.

I understand that my participation is voluntary.

I understand that I can withdraw from the project at any time without having to give any justification and without this having any manner of negative effect for me.

I have read carefully the previous basic information about the management and protection of my data.

I confirm that I am 18 years or older.

I freely give my consent to taking part in the project.

I give my consent to having the interview being recorded

I want to be kept informed about the research: Yes/No.

If Yes: the researchers can send this information on the research to the following address:

.....

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Participant's signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Researcher's signature: \_\_\_\_\_