

IUPAP Executive Committee Meeting. Singapore, May 3-4, 2018

Report on Gender related aspects of IUPAP activities Silvina Ponce Dawson, VP and Gender Champion

1. Conferences sponsored or endorsed by IUPAP

1.1 Fraction of women in IUPAP sponsored and/or endorsed Conferences

We observe some improvement over the years in the fraction of women on committees and on the list of invited speakers of conferences that have been sponsored and/or endorsed by IUPAP. I include below the most recent numbers that I could collect and the numbers collected by the previous Gender Champion, Alinka Lépine-Szily.

1.1.1 Conferences sponsored and/or endorsed between 2017 and 2018.

Total number of conferences analyzed: 19 (one of them, Intl Comm on Med Phys)

Average number of attendees: 403

Average number of female attendees: 76 (19%; min= 8%, C4; max= 42%, C19)

Average number attendees giving invited papers: 45

Average number of female attendees giving invited papers: 7 (17%; min=3.6%, C5; max=38%, C19)

Average number of members of International Advisory Committee: 59

Average number of female members of IAC: 15 (25%; min= 5%, C5; max=42%, C14; also, one with 4 IAC members all of them female, C13)

1.1.2 Conferences sponsored in previous years.

Data from 21 conferences in 2015 (collected by Alinka Lépine-Szily):

Female attendees: mean value 18%, and varies between 8% and 50%.

Female invited speakers: mean value 14.5%, and varies between 4% and 27%.

Female members of international advisory/organizing committee: mean value 16%, and varies between 0% and 39%

Data from 35 conferences in 2016 (collected by Alinka Lépine-Szily):

Female attendees: mean value 19% and varies between 5 % and 52%

Female invited speakers: mean value 19% and varies between 2 % and 64% (a conference on physics education in Brazil).

Female members of international advisory/organizing committee: mean value 16% and varies between 0% and 50%.

1.2 Rules for the organization of conferences and their enforcement.

The IUPAP web page where conference policies and the conditions to receive IUPAP endorsement and/or sponsorship are described now says:

IUPAP insists that women should be represented, in reasonable proportions, as organizers, speakers, and attendees of IUPAP sponsored meetings. The presence of women on the local and international committees and as plenary and invited speakers is a condition for IUPAP sponsorship.

On the IUPAP web page there is a document produced by Agencia FAPESP in Oct, 2017 (<http://iupap.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/IUPAP-sets-goal-to-increase-female-participation-in-Physics-meetings.pdf>) with the following statement by the previous Gender Champion: "the 29th General Assembly established, as a recommendation for all affiliated national institutions, that the 20% target (of female participation in conferences) be achieved. And it has been defined, as the hardest rule, that meetings with female participation of less

than 10% are not accepted. The organizers will have a deadline of a few weeks to make the correct corrections". There is no strict rule on the resolutions of the Assembly. It would be good to discuss whether the 10% minimum should be just a recommendation or if it is going to be considered a strict rule. The rules that are to be enforced should be clearly stated on the IUPAP web page and all the documentation that is available should be consistent in this regard.

Another rule that has been approved for sponsored conferences is related to all sorts of harassment. In particular, it requires that IUPAP supported conferences publish a specific statement on the matter on their website and in all publications related to the Conference. Among other things, the statement says: "The conference organisers will name an advisor who will consult with those who have suffered from harassment and who will suggest ways of redressing their problems, and an advisor who will counsel those accused of harassment. The conference organisers may, after due consideration, take such action they deem appropriate, including warning or expulsion from the conference without refund." This is very important. However, there is no item on the conferences report form where the organizers could inform whether there was such a problem at the conference and how they handled it. There is no requirement either for the organizers to describe how they would manage such situations when applying for IUPAP sponsorship or endorsement. We could discuss if there should be such a requirement. On the other hand, it would be good if IUPAP could give a set of guidelines (available on its web page) on how to act in these cases (particularly, how to preserve the privacy and fairness of the whole process). In that regard, the Waterloo Charter that we have drafted with the Working Group on Women in Physics which contains recommendations could be useful.

2. ICSU funded project to analyze the Gender Gap in Science.

The project entitled "A Global Approach to the Gender Gap in Mathematical, Computing, and Natural Sciences: How to Measure It, How to Reduce It?" received a three-year grant award from the International Council for Science in 2016. The project, led by the International Mathematical Union (IMU) with IUPAC (the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics) and IUPAP as executive partners, started in 2017. The total number of partners is 11: IAU (Astronomy), ICIAM (Industrial and Applied Mathematics), IUBS (Biological Sciences), UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), IUHPST (History and Philosophy of Science and Technology), ACM (Computer Science), GenderInSite (Gender in Science, Innovation, Technology and Engineering) and OWSD (Organization of Women for Science for the Developing World). The project has three tasks. The first is a Joint Global Survey whose design has been based on the Global Survey of Physicists of 2009-10 (<https://www.aip.org/statistics/reports/global-survey-physicists>). As in that case, the Statistical Research Center of the American Institute of Physics is in charge of collecting and analyzing the data. It is intended that these results will provide comparisons between scientific disciplines, answering some persistent questions about why one discipline is more attractive than another to women. The second task is a bibliometric survey extended across disciplines, with an ongoing sustainable methodology designed to allow longitudinal studies and updates into the future. The third task is to collect information and evidence to advise on (successful) initiatives that could improve the workplace environment and help reduce the gender gap in mathematics and natural and computer science, taking regional differences into account. It also seeks to provide material aimed at attracting girls into science- with particular emphasis on reaching parents. The Gender Gap partners met for the first time in June 2017 to structure the work to be done. Regional workshops took place by the end of 2017 in Taiwan, South Africa and Colombia. The workshops discussed the three tasks from a regional perspective. In particular, a great effort was put into the critical analysis of the questionnaire of the survey. The survey is ready in English and almost ready in 6 other languages (Spanish, French, Russian, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic). It will be launched on May 1st, 2018. We expect to collect over 45,000 responses. For more information, please visit: <https://icsugendergapinscience.org/>. In the page: <https://icsugendergapinscience.org/2018-global-survey-of-mathematical-computing-and-natural-scientists/> you will find a link to complete the survey once it becomes open.

3. The Waterloo Charter.

The Waterloo Charter was initiated at the fifth IUPAP International Conference for Women in Physics that took place in 2014 in Waterloo, Canada. The Charter is based on the rubrics of the Baltimore Charter (<http://www.stsci.edu/stsci/meetings/WiA/BaltoCharter.html>) and the Pasadena Recommendations (https://cswa.aas.org/Equity_Now_Pasadena.pdf) formulated by the American Astronomical Society in 1993 and 2003, respectively. The document is also shaped and guided by the principles dictated by Project Juno initiated by the Institute of Physics, UK (<http://www.iop.org/policy/diversity/initiatives/juno/index.html>). It contains a series of recommendations for key players of the physics community at all levels to implement strategies that will enable women to succeed within the existing structures of physics, and allow the desired acceptance of diversity to develop fully. During the sixth ICWIP that took place in Birmingham, UK, in July 2017 we had a broad discussion about the Charter and agreed on a set of guidelines on how to finalize it. The previous draft was deemed rather verbose and impractical for dissemination. The new draft, which can be downloaded from: http://wgwip.df.uba.ar/Waterloo%20Charter_Ver7.pdf, lays out the guiding principles highlighting the main points. It lists separately a list of recommendations on how to achieve the desired goals. Feedback and comments from participants of the last ICWIP and of WG5 members have been received in the past months. It would be good to discuss how we should proceed for the IUPAP Executive Council to modify it (or not) and eventually approve it.

4. Gender Champion-WG5 liaison.

I have discussed with the Chair and other members of the Working Group on Women in Physics (WG5) how to coordinate the activities of the working group and of the Gender Champion. Based on some recommendations we decided that the Gender Champion will be an *ex-officio* member of WG5. Now, *ex-officio* members may or may not have voting rights as other members. We decided that the Gender Champion will participate of the discussions and be informed about the decisions but will not have voting rights on these decisions. The Chair of WG5 is planning to put some Terms of Reference together for WG5 that will include this definition of the liaison.