

Workpackage 5

Gender Budgeting in Scientific Organisations:

**Analysis of the Budgeting Process at
the University of Augsburg**

Germany

Andrea Rothe

March 2007

GB_management

Content

1.	Essential criteria for the process analysis	3
1.1	Method design for the process analysis	3
2.	The formal budgeting process	5
2.1	Stakeholders of equal opportunities and of the budgeting process	5
2.1.1	Supporters of equal opportunities at the University of Augsburg	5
2.1.2	Stakeholders of the budgeting process at the University of Augsburg	9
2.2	Process of budgeting on state (<i>Länder</i>) level	9
2.2.1	Formal process of budgeting of the university by the ministry	9
2.2.2	Formal process of the inter-universitarian budgeting	10
2.3	Process of budgeting within the university	11
2.3.1	Formal budgeting process of the inner-universitarian budget - until 2006	11
2.3.2	Formal budgeting process of the inner-universitarian budget – as of 2007	12
2.4	Formal budgeting process within the departments	13
3.	Experts' evaluation of the budgeting process	15
3.1	Power structures and decision making structures in the budgeting process	15
3.2	Typical conflicts in the budgeting process	20
4.	Interdependencies between equal opportunities of women and men and budgeting	22
5.	Communicative validation	27
6.	Conclusion	28
7.	References	31
	Appendix	35

1. Essential criteria for the process analysis

As gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting are, among others, strategies for the development of organisations, it was an essential part of the project to observe the budgeting process within scientific organisations with the example of three universities in Austria, Germany and Poland.

With the help of the process analysis we wanted to find out if and which gender-specific or gender-typical collective attitudes and behaviour patterns exist among the stakeholders for budgeting and for equal opportunities. We also wanted to find out if there are basic mindsets towards gender equality and gender budgeting as an instrument to achieve equal opportunities for women and men. This might be seen in an adequate representation of women and men on all levels and in all boards up to a certain extent, however, it should be taken into consideration that an adequate representation of women and men alone does not automatically mean that gender equality is supported.

Furthermore, we wanted to find out how the budgeting process is made in respect to criteria such as democratic structures or transparency concerning decision making and power relations. It seems to be also important if and how the idea of work-life-balance is included in budgeting considerations, that is: are there possibilities to combine private life, children and work and how are they accounted for in budgeting planning?

This was our approach during the observation of the complex and subtle development processes on the micro-level (individual attitudes and motivations) *and* on the meso-level, the organisational culture, which can show starting points for process indicators to promote a gender responsive budgeting.

The budgetary process is obviously strongly influenced by the scientific hierarchies, cultural aspects and the legal framework while equal opportunity measures do not have any sustainable impact on the budgeting process up to now. Nevertheless, interdependencies between budgeting and equal opportunities at the university are existing. On one level there is the budgeting process itself with a formal and an informal course and which is influenced by official and informal stakeholders within the budgeting process and by agents for equal opportunities. This formal process is shown in chapter 2. An evaluation of the formal process in comparison to informal power relationships, as well as the decision making structures by the interview partners, is given in chapter 3.

Apart from the budgeting process itself we will look at the process of negotiating equal opportunity measures and its influences on budgeting. These measures and their impact on budgeting are shown in chapter 4. The process of negotiating future equal opportunity measures is at a critical point now because the new university law from 2003 requires many changes within the universities in Bavaria and this special situation allows the supporters for equal opportunities to formulate new or additional objectives in order to improve the situation of women in science and to change the organisational culture in the scientific organisations towards gender mainstreaming.

1.1 Method design for the process analysis

We chose a method design, in which qualitative approaches dominate in order to study the budgeting process. The choice of qualitative methods results from the research questions, the state of research and the complexity of the process that is to be observed. The methodical

principals of openness, transparency, and communication are the basis for gaining the data as well as for their interpretation.

Thus the methods used for the analysis of the budgeting process are qualitative surveys such as expert interviews, participative observation and document analyses. The guaranteed confidentiality of all statements made by the participants is a basic requirement for this part of the project, which we ensured by anonymising all person-related data. We used a reduced form of a communicative validation in order to communicate our approach to the stakeholders of the budgeting process and to find out and include their opinion on the further process of the project.

The interview partners were selected according to the individual structures of the three universities. In Germany, the interviews were made with:

- the women's representative and her staff,
- the rector of the university (from 2007 on the rector will be called president),
- the prorector for university planning (Hochschulplanung) who is at the same time the gender mainstreaming representative of the university (from 2007 on the prorectors will be called vice-presidents),
- the equal opportunities commissioner
- the head of administration (Kanzler)
- the head of the finances department (administration)
- the head of planning and research (administration)

The interviews were recorded and then transcribed. After the transcription, all partners analysed the data according to a common analysis scheme in order to make comparison possible.

Observations took place during a meeting of the budgeting commission and during a meeting of the supporters for equal opportunities including the women's advisory council (Frauenbeirat), the equal opportunity committee (Senatsausschuss für Gleichstellungsfragen oder Gleichstellungsausschuss), the women's representative and her staff, the equal opportunities commissioner and the gender mainstreaming representative. Important topics were future agreements on objectives for equal opportunities and the mentoring program for women.

The scientists took notes as a kind of personal memorandum during the observations which were transcribed and digitalised. Apart from the documentation of the discussions, getting an impression of the spirit during the meetings was also an important factor. The observations served as a verification and completion of the findings resulting from the expert interviews.

2. The formal budgeting process

Taking a look at the formal budgeting process and later also at the decision making structures and power relations help to find out how the budgeting process works and who is currently participating in which role and also which changes are expected after the university will have adopted the new Bavarian law for universities. This will show if and up to which extent women and how men are generally participating in this process and how efforts to promote women in scientific organisations are included in the budgeting process.

In general, the following budgets which are negotiated within the University of Augsburg, exist:

1. The university's budget, which is financed by the ministry. The negotiations take place every 2 years
 - The university has only limited influence on the overall budget assigned by the ministry. This amount does not change much from one period to the next.
 - A certain percentage of this money is currently nevertheless depending on a formula based system (Leistungs- und belastungsbezogene inter-universitäre Mittelverteilung = performance and expense related inner-universitarian budget distribution) which will be expanded in the following years.
 - The university has influence on this budget according to which extent they manage to accomplish the criteria asked for.
2. The inner-universitarian budget consists of the budget from the ministry, the money from the state according to the formula based system, third-party funds – e.g. from sponsoring from the industry - or public money for specific research projects as well as tuition fees.
 - The inner-universitarian budget planning is done on an annual basis, starting at the end of each year.
3. The tuition fees amount to 10% up to 15% of the overall budget from the ministry. From summer 2007 on, the students at the University of Augsburg have to pay Euro 500 per semester.
4. The major part of the money which the university receives, is spent on the departments¹. This budget is negotiated within the departments on an annual basis.

2.1 Stakeholders of equal opportunities and of the budgeting process

2.1.1 Supporters of equal opportunities at the University of Augsburg

The supporters for equal opportunities at the University of Augsburg will be described in order to get an idea of their powers in the budgeting process. (For further information see workpackage 8.) The supporters for equal opportunities are:

- The women's representative and her staff
- The equal opportunities commissioner
- The representative for gender mainstreaming
- The 5 collective agents (die 5 kollektiven Akteure)

¹ The University of Augsburg has 7 departments, altogether headed by the deans. In each department there are several institutes which are headed by chairs (Grade-A-professors)

The women's representative and her staff (Frauenbeauftragte)

The women's representative is responsible for the university's female scientific staff and the (female) students. Her tasks are stipulated in the university's statutes. Her main focus is the work in the university's bodies, however, she also attends when scientific candidates are selected. In respect to budgeting negotiations she formally has access to the meetings of the budgeting commission and the meetings of the Senate.

In addition, she is responsible for the public representation of equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming.

The women's representative leads a women's bureau and a scientific assistant on a long term engagement. Further more there are two research projects on gender mainstreaming at her chair with three researchers on part-time and terminated jobs and our EU-Project which cooperates closely with her.

The equal opportunities commissioner (Gleichstellungsbeauftragte)

In Bavaria, the equal opportunities commissioner at a university acts on behalf of the non-academic staff, whereas she or he is responsible for the entire female staff in all other scientific organisations. Apart from that she - or he - is not elected in Bavaria, but appointed by the head of the organisation. In case of the universities the representative is appointed by the head of administration (Kanzler).

The equal opportunities commissioner has limited rights, which means that she (he) is not automatically allowed to join all boards or to be included in the budgeting process. This is the reason why a large number of these commissioners accept additional functions such as being member of the employee committee, for example, in order to get sufficient information.

The equal opportunities commissioner at the University of Augsburg is an elected member of the university's senate and takes part in the senate's meetings as well as in the meetings of the budgeting commission, which actually is a commission of the senate. However, the commissioner joins the meetings as a representative of the non-scientific employees, not in her (his) role as the equal opportunities commissioner (who is officially not permitted in those meetings). The head of administration (Kanzler), for example, does not see why it might be a problem if the equal opportunities commissioner is not allowed in this function but only as representative of the non-academic staff. (K 420-433)

The gender mainstreaming representative (Gender Mainstreaming Beauftragter)

The position of a gender mainstreaming representative at the University of Augsburg is relatively newly installed but is not officially constituted in the statutes of the university (Grundordnung). She or he is by definition within the University of Augsburg member of the university's management board (Universitätsleitung), which is why she or he has a very powerful position. In Bavaria this position is unique up to now. Nevertheless, this position is not yet institutionalised legally at the University of Augsburg. After an interview with him, the current representative intends to find out how this position is to be institutionalised in the future. (AL 1024-1037) The women's representative submitted a proposal to the senate in January 2007, which supports the idea of the establishment of a gender mainstreaming representative as a member of the management board in connection with the 5 collective agents (kollektive Akteure), but the ministry has to also accept the changes in the statutes (Grundordnung). The result of the proposal was not yet known in March 2007. In case the institutionalisation will not be approved, it might well be that the position will be abolished as soon as the person occupying the position resigns from the job.

The main task of the representative is currently to support the suggestions of the women's representative in the university management board (Universitätsleitung). The representative does

not develop own or different ideas e.g. concerning the inclusion of men or the development of a new organisational culture. (AL 64-70, 630.648) As the women's representative's tasks are not exactly defined, her (or his) power is more informal because of her (or his) membership in the management board.

The head of the administration (Kanzler) considers the gender mainstreaming representative as an important figure, because she (or he) is the only one in the university management board who takes care that the members observe equal opportunity interests. He refers to her (or him) "reminder". In addition, he is of the opinion that the gender mainstreaming representative is the crossing-point between the management board and the other boards and activities at the university in order to promote equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming. Even though the head of administration (Kanzler) seems to consider the representative as an important position, he does not see any need to legally institutionalise the position (e.g. in the university's statutes (Grundordnung)). (K 323-351) Other interview partners as well consider the gender mainstreaming representative's position as very powerful which in their opinion results partly from his position and mainly from his personality. (S 391-400)

The 5 collective agents (die 5 kollektiven Akteure)

The women's representative succeeded in building up a complex network at the University of Augsburg, which is referred to as the 5 collective agents. All supporters of equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming at the University of Augsburg are interconnected here. As this network follows a strict top-down strategy it is considered as an important instrument and organisational set-up for gender mainstreaming.

As mentioned above, the organisational structure of the 5 collective agents (kollektive Akteure) was passed by the senate in January 2007 but as changes in the statutes (Grundordnung) have to be accepted by the ministry, it is not yet known to us if the structure will finally be integrated in the statutes (March 2007) The collective agents are:

- The university management board
- The task force gender mainstreaming (Projektgruppe Gender Mainstreaming)
- The steering group for gender mainstreaming (Steuerungsgruppe Gender Mainstreaming)
- The "Frauenbeirat" – the women advisory board
- The „Gleichstellungsausschuss“ – The equal opportunities committee

The 5 collective agents seem to have influence on many processes and the fact that men are included is seen as very positive by the women's representative:

„Also ich finde vom Prozess her hat sich das sehr bewährt. Jetzt kommt die Probe aufs Exempel mit den Zielvereinbarungen. Da werden wir dann sehen. Aber wenn Männer in so einem Gremium drin sind, dann wollen die Effekte sehen. Egal welches Thema, da muss was passieren. Und das hat mir gefallen.“ (HM 902-906)

I think the process has proven itself. Now the agreements on objectives will put the rule to the test. Then we will see. However, when men are involved they want to see effects. No matter what the topic is, they want something to happen and this I like a lot.

The university management board (Universitätsleitung)

Having made the management board a part of the collective agents concerning the gender mainstreaming process is a special achievement of the women's representative. This strengthens the top-down process remarkably plus the rector is a committed supporter of equal opportunities. (WB 99-118, 158-169, 244-263). The informal contact with the women's representative or the official objections of the prorector who is the gender mainstreaming rep-

representative, keep the “gender consciousness” alive in the management board during daily work.

The gender mainstreaming task force (Projektgruppe Gender Mainstreaming)

The central women’s representative, the women’s bureau and the scientists who work on projects about gender mainstreaming are the task force’s members. One project of the task force at the University of Augsburg is an evaluation of the success of the equal opportunities measures of the last year, the so called gender mainstreaming complex. (for further information see WP 8).

The steering group for gender mainstreaming (Steuerungsgruppe Gender Mainstreaming)

Head of the steering group is the gender mainstreaming representative who is always a member of the university steering board. Further members are the representatives for women and equal opportunities, one representative of the other scientific employees (Mittelbau), one of the women’s advisory council (Frauenbeirat), one professor and one student of the equal opportunities committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss), one representative of the non-scientific staff and one representative of the employees’ committee. The group usually meets once each semester (AL telephone call, 05.03.07).

The main task of the steering group is the coordination of the top-down process of gender mainstreaming including the definition of objectives for the entire university, the development of ideas and the enforcement of decisions. The steering group is additionally responsible for the agreements on objectives and their coordination and integration within the departments.

The relatively high significance of the steering group was mentioned by the women’s representative and her staff only during our observations and the interviews. Even the head of the group does not see the prominence as he thinks the group has no political influence. (Telephone call, 05.03.07)

The women’s advisory council (Frauenbeirat)

The duties of the Frauenbeirat are to promote equal opportunities within the departments, to support the university’s women’s representative and to do lobby work for equal opportunity measures throughout the entire university.

The women’s advisory council has only very little influence on budgeting decisions but it is always involved when new measures for equal opportunities are to be passed by the central women’s representative. As these might have an impact on the budgeting as well, the influence of the women’s advisory council on budgeting is an indirect one.

The women’s advisory council consists of the women’s representatives from each department, female representatives from the other scientific employees (Mittelbau) and female students. One problem of the women’s advisory council is that in Bavaria the women’s representatives from the departments have a very weak position as most of them are scientific employees with short-term engagements. So basically they do not want to take the risk of ruining their career by acting in opposition to their deans and chairs. The gender mainstreaming representative supports the idea that women’s representatives of the departments should always be professors in order to strengthen their position. (AL 1137-1204)

The equal opportunity committee (Senatsausschuss für Gleichstellungsfragen oder Gleichstellungsausschuss)

The equal opportunities committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss or Senatsausschuss für Gleichstellungsfragen) is stipulated in the “equal opportunities concept” (Gleichstellungskonzept or Frauenförderplan) from 2001. This committee consists of women (at least 50%) and men. The

representatives for women and equal opportunities are consultants, the speaker for equal opportunities issues (Referentin für Gleichstellungsfragen) and at least one member of the employees' committee are members.

The equal opportunities committee may advise the senate in all questions concerning the implementation of equal opportunities and the avoidance of disadvantages for female employees and female students. The board debates about the question of how to achieve actual equality within all levels of the university and is in the position to make proposals for the improvement of equal opportunities. Additionally, the board functions as a consultant concerning the progress of the "equal opportunities concept". Finally, the board develops measures against sexual abuse at the workplace and gives counselling concerning this topic.

2.1.2 Stakeholders of the budgeting process at the University of Augsburg

The stakeholders of the budgeting process at the University of Augsburg are not exactly single persons but boards. Within the boards there are of course persons with more and persons with less power, but this is mainly an informal process. The official ones are:

- The university management board (Universitätsleitung), which consists of the rector, the 3 prorectors and the head of administration (Kanzler)
- The budgeting commission which is a permanent commission of the senate. Members of this board are elected members of the senate. It consists of one professor from each department, two scientific employees (Mittelbau), one representative of the non-academic staff which in the case of Augsburg at the moment is at the same time the equal opportunities commissioner, one student representative and the women's representative. Head of the commission is the head of administration (Kanzler).
- The senate which consists of elected representatives from all groups within the university.

Another unofficial, yet important and powerful board in the budgeting process is the Consilium Decanale (council of deans) which consists of the university's management board and the deans of the 7 departments.

2.2 Process of budgeting on state (Länder) level

Universities in Germany are mainly financed by the federal states (Länder). There is still a fixed sum which each university gets from the respective state, however, the amounts of money distributed according to formula-based provisions are more and more increasing.

2.2.1 Formal process of budgeting of the university by the ministry

The university's management board takes over the budget planning between the university and the Bavarian ministry for science, research and art every 2 years. The budgeting commission debates about the planning before it is forwarded to the ministry (AL 415-419). The ministry for science, research and art represents the university in the negotiations with the Bavarian ministry of finance which has to approve the budget. (K 92-95)

About 60% up to 70% of the total budget which the University of Augsburg receives from the ministry (about 70 Million Euro per year) are bound by human resources. (AL 1040-1056) As per the interview partners' statements, it is rather difficult to acquire new money for the personnel from the ministry. Then there are other so called "title groups"² where the money is also bound, e.g. for construction work. The share which the universities receive and which they can

² Titles are certain items which are connected with corresponding expenditures. (Haushaltstitel mit dazugehörigen Untergruppen)

allocate independently, is defined as title group 73 for research and teaching. This title group amounts to about 6 Million Euro per year at the University of Augsburg which is about 8.3% of the total budget distributed by the ministry (third-party funding and tuition fees are not included).

According to what we could find out so far, only 50% of this “research and teaching budget” goes straight to each Bavarian university following a certain allocation system which we do not know. This budget might well be allocated according to some historical development of the universities. The rest is distributed by a formula based inter-university budgeting. (see below)

A thorough debate within the university, of all circumstances like e.g. budget freezes, necessary construction works or purchases of equipment for the departments etc., is of utter importance during the negotiation of the state budget’s allocation. The calculation is mainly done by the administration and then presented to the university management board. The main object of the budget negotiations with the ministry is to receive enough money in order to provide – according to the head of administration (Kanzler) successful research and education at the university. (K 117-134, 509-515)

Due to being the institution that distributes the money, the Bavarian ministry for science, research and art is generally seen as very powerful. Open conflicts between the universities and the ministry are very rare as both sides try to avoid this. As a single university has only little power, the Bavarian universities formed the union “Universität Bayern e.V.”. (University of Bavaria, registered association / WB 142-154). A single university can only take influence on the ministry’s budget by applying e.g. for certain new positions which then have to be justified or for construction works. (S 80-100 and AS 58-71)

2.2.2 Formal process of the inter-universitarian budgeting

As mentioned above, the second half of the amount of title group 73 is distributed formula based (the percentage will rise to 60% in 2008). The regulations are made by the “Universität Bayern e.V.”, a union of 11 Bavarian universities (AS 107-126). There are performance related and demand orientated criteria (Leistungs- und belastungsbezogene Kriterien) with the result that some universities have to give money from the second half of “their” money while other universities receive money from the others. The most important performance related indicator for which a university gets money in this system is the third-party funding, followed by the number of graduations within the standard time frame and the number of PhD graduates, habilitations and Humboldt scholarships³.

The formula based system also includes equal opportunity aspects. 7.5% of the money from the ministry which is allocated according to performance and demand oriented criteria, is nowadays distributed according to equal opportunity aspects⁴. This amount will increase to 10% as of 2007. This 7.5% amounted to Euro 126,000 at the University of Augsburg in 2006. About 20% of this budget is administered by the central women’s representative who financed e.g. a gender mainstreaming research project with this money. According to the gender mainstreaming representative another 25% of this budget flow into a child care program of the university. (AL 1123-1166). Yet another 30% goes to the departments which are asked to spend the money on the advancement of women in their respective department since 2005 and should report on their success annually (decision of the senate). Where to the rest of this money (about 25%) goes within the university, no data could be obtained. The gender main-

³ For German students, Humboldt scholarships are up to 150 stipends a year for highly qualified scientist with a PhD up to 38 years. There are also stipends for foreign students and awards for excellent scientific research.

⁴ The gender-related criteria include e.g. the number of female students and female professors or how many women passed their PhD.

streaming representative states that there are certain criteria according to which the money which the university got for its equal opportunities efforts within the university, but he is not quite sure of the quality of these criteria. (AL 1112-1121) Additional some departments do not even write the annual report about the use of the money. (further information see Zebisch, 2007, WP 8)

As our interview partners generally observed, there seems to be a tendency that bigger universities get more money which consequently disadvantages smaller ones. Augsburg is usually one of those universities that does not get the 100% according to the formula based budgeting and thus contributes to the higher budget of other universities. (for further information see workpackage 8)

2.3 Process of budgeting within the university

On the level of the university management board and the budgeting commission, only the money from title group 73 for research and teaching is discussed on an annual basis. This amounts to about Euro 6 million a year and makes about 8.3% of the university's state budget. Money from the third party funding flows directly to the person/ chair/ department who or which acquired it. Tuition fees, even though they constitute a major share of a department's money are only discussed within the department board (Fakultätsrat).

The participating boards within the university are the same for the budgeting with the ministry as for the inner-universitarian budgeting. The current formal process functions as described below. The new Bavarian law for universities will change this process as of 2007.

2.3.1 Formal budgeting process of the inner-universitarian budget – until 2006

The budgeting of the previous year according to the strict guidelines fixed in the university's regulations (Richtlinien der Universitätsleitung für die Verteilung von Haushaltsmitteln der Titelgruppe 73 von 2006). (S. 59-60) is always the basis of the budget's planning within the university for the time being as well as in the future.

Planning is done by the university management board

Formally the first planning of the budget is done by the university's management board (Universitätsleitung) consisting of the rector, the head of administration (Kanzler) and the 3 prorectors. One of the prorectors is responsible for research, the support of young scientists and the international relations, one is responsible for the university's strategic planning (this person is also the representative for gender mainstreaming at the same time) and one is responsible for teaching and students.

There are no women within this board – however, as one of the participating prorectors is in fact the representative for gender mainstreaming, this issue has indeed some influence. According to an informal statement of the university's rector, he always asks the opinion of the women's representative in this early stage of the budgeting. (WB: 163 – 164)

Discussion in the budgeting commission

After the management board has finished their planning, the head of administration (Kanzler) presents the outcome to the budgeting commission. Following their debating, the commission gives a recommendation to the management committee. As soon as the management board approves of the proposals, the budget plan goes to the senate for the final approval.

The head of administration (Kanzler) is principally the head of the budgeting commission. (S 170-178) The conferences take place about 4 times a year and every member of the budget-

ing commission has one vote. The head of the unit finances (Haushalts- und Beschaffungsangelegenheiten) sometimes joins the meetings as well in order to give an input on facts. He has no vote though as he is not official member. (AS 36-48, 92-104)

The members of the budgeting commission are elected, as it is a permanent commission of the senate. Only 3 out of 12 persons were women in autumn 2006 - one female professor, one female member of the group of elected regular non-scientific staff (who is equal opportunities commissioner at the same time) and the women's representative.

It is important that all interview partners agreed on the fact that the meetings of the budgeting commission represent the only official opportunity where real changes in the budget can be achieved.

Adoption of the budget in the senate

The university's senate is the board which has to officially accept the budget (S 261-270). In case that the management board's and the budgeting commission's proposals are accepted, the budget plan is submitted to the ministry or the inner-universitarian budget is published and the money transferred to the beneficiary (departments, administration etc.). The meetings take place about 6 times a year.

Head of the senate is always the university's rector. The members of the senate are elected and among the 25 members who are in the board (one professor, one member of the regular scientific staff, one member of the group of non-scientific staff (who is at the moment the commissioner for equal opportunities at the same time), one female student and the women's representative) were 5 women in Autumn 2006. Every member of the senate has one vote. However, the 7 deans have only advisory status. The only person with an official mandate to support equal opportunities is the women's representative.

The senate's current formation will approximately exist only until September 2007. After that the University of Augsburg has to adopt the new Bavarian law for universities and wants to use the "Experimentierklausel" ("experimentation article") to reduce the number of its boards.

2.3.2 Formal budgeting process of the inner-universitarian budget – as of 2007

Some fundamental changes will take place at the University of Augsburg in the future as the new Bavarian university law has to be implemented.

The ***university's management board*** (Hochschulleitung or Präsidium) at the University of Augsburg currently consists of the Rector and up to 3 other professors plus the head of administration (Kanzler). The University of Augsburg will maintain the three persons model as before with the prorectors. In the future, they will represent the 3 competence centers which are fixed in the agreements on objectives with the ministry. The new management board will continue to plan the budget with the ministry and within the university. It is responsible for the distribution of the inner-universitarian budget.

If the gender mainstreaming representative will not be institutionalised as always being a member of the management board there is no woman or official equal opportunities commissioner present in this first and important phase of the budgeting planning process.

The University's of Augsburg ***expanded university management board*** (erweiterte Hochschulleitung) which by law consists of the university's management board plus all the deans as well as the women's representative will be much bigger now than it had been before because it will also include all the university's other status groups which previously used to be part of the senate.

The expanded university's management board has officially no power or responsibility in respect to the budgeting process but can take an indirect influence as it is responsible for the future development of the university (Entwicklungsplanung). (AS 670-674)

Many of our interview partners consider the expanded management board as the official successor of the Consilium Decanale (council of deans). And as the women's representative is an official member of this body now, the change might be seen as an improvement concerning equal opportunity interests.

The expanded management board will have about 25 members in the future and as everybody has only one vote, the women's representative will still have only little power.

It is not yet clear if the **senate** will be maintained after 2007 as the University of Augsburg wants to terminate it with the help of the so called "Experimentation article" (= Experimentierklausel). The "Experimental article" allows the Bavarian universities a certain freedom from the official law.

The **university council** (Hochschulrat) exists already now, however, it will become more powerful in the future, consisting of 8 external people, mainly from the industry but maybe also from science or culture. Also in this case, the University of Augsburg will use the experimentation article and minimize the group of 8 external persons to approximately 6.

The council will have a rather powerful position in respect to the budgeting planning between the university and the Bavarian state as well as concerning the inner-universitarian budget, plus the university council controls the university's budget ex post.⁵ As to equal opportunities there are no regulations about quotas for women and men in this body.

So from 2007 onwards according to the new law a university has the following boards: university management board, expanded university management board and university council and senate. At the University of Augsburg the budgeting commission as a commission of the senate will be maintained as far as known up to now, (AS 771-782) even though the senate itself might be dropped or at least its power will be remarkably limited. The reason for this measure is that the managing board wants to keep the budgeting commission as a democratic forum where discussions about the budget are possible. (AL 1206-1220)

2.4 Formal budgeting process within the departments

The biggest share of the state's budget for human resources, other expenditures and from title group 73 (Titelgruppe 73) flows to the university's departments. The regulation concerning the allocation of budgets is defined as follows:

Die Fakultäten verteilen die ihnen zugewiesenen Mittel im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Vorgaben in eigener Verantwortung. (Richtlinien der Universitätsleitung für die Verteilung von Haushaltsmitteln der Titelgruppe 73, S. 3)

The departments distribute the budgets which they were allocated in their sole responsibility according to the legal guidelines.

This regulation allows a very free allocation of budgets which might additionally vary among the individual departments. Powerful positions within the departments are the dean, the vice-dean (Prodekan), the students'-dean (Studiendekan) and the head of the chairs. The most

⁵ The tasks of the university council are described in the Bavarian university law Art. 26. See appendix.

powerful board is the department board (Fachbereichsrat). The department board elects the deans among the professors.

The department board (Fachbereichsrat) consists of 7 professors, 2 scientific employees (Mittelbau), 1 representative of the group of non-scientific employees, 2 students' representatives and the women's representative of the department, in accordance to the university's statutes. In case the women's representative is not one of the group of elected professors, a further person is added to their group.

As far as we know the budget planning is done by the dean in cooperation with the department board. The students are considered as a quite powerful group within the department board while the women's representatives often have a very weak position.

The interviews might provide us with further information on the process of budgeting planning within certain departments. The respective descriptions are always valid only for the individual department described by the interview partner, as there are no consistent regulations.

3. The Experts' evaluation of the budgeting process

3.1 Power structures and decision making structures in the budgeting process

The University's management board (Universitätsleitung)

Formally, the university's management committee is in the position to plan the budget according to its own ideas. The management even does not need to follow any suggestions of the budgeting commission. Only the senate is required as they have to pass the budgeting planning formally, however, they do not intervene with the budgeting planning. At the University of Augsburg however, an organisational culture has been existing for quite some time that ensures that decisions are made in consensus between the various universitarian groups. This democratic tradition is also valid in case of the budgeting which is why the proposals of the budgeting conference are taken quite seriously by the management board. Plus guidelines are existing for the budget since 1998. (K 117-134)

Both formally and informally the management board is the university's most powerful board. Concerning the topic of equal opportunities it has to be stated that currently there is no woman in the board of the Augsburg University, but the gender mainstreaming representative is considered to be a very committed supporter. (HM 381-386) The gender mainstreaming representative stresses that according to his experience it is not necessarily the case that the presence of women in the board automatically grants the support of equal opportunities interests. (AL 600-626) The head of administration (Kanzler) does not see any problem in the fact that no women are participating in the management board's planning of the budget. (K 164-177)

The rector has, according to his own words, a superior position within the university management board and also concerning the first planning of the budget, but on the other hand he can not take any decision without the board's approval (majority decision). (WB 62 – 67) In reference to the improvement of the women's position within the university, the rector considers it of utter importance that the women's representative is at all stages involved in the budgeting process (WB 183-100). Nevertheless doubts may occur as to the sustainability of a purely informal influence. The equal opportunities commissioner at the University of Augsburg is also trying to become involved in the budgeting planning process. Allowing her to make a statement on the budget at this point of the process would rather be a personal favour by the management board or the rector as her legal position is too weak to permit this.

The new law will provide the universities in the future with the right to give much more power to the rector than ever before. The rector of the University of Augsburg evaluates this as a very negative development as it undermines the university's democratic structures. He advocates consensual decisions. (WB 226-237) This is supported by the women's representative who also fears a loss of democratic structures:

Women's representative: "Es ist ja eine betriebswirtschaftliche Verfassung von xxx abgekupfert. Das hat mit der Wissenschaft nichts zu tun, das hat mit der Struktur der Universität nichts zu tun, mit der demokratischen Verfasstheit der Uni nichts zu tun. Und mit der demokratischen Struktur der Uni haben wir immer noch die Möglichkeit gehabt, solche sagen wir mal wissenschaftsfremden Themen im Senat überhaupt zu diskutieren. Da war immer eine große Bereitschaft so was anzuhören. Aber mit den Gremien Hochschulrat und Dekanen werden die Chancen stark vermindert." (HM 731 – 737)

"It's a managerial constitution which was copied from xxx. This has nothing to do with science and it has nothing to do with the university's structure and its democratic constitution. And based on the university's democratic structure we always were in a position to actually debate about such,

let's say non-scientific topics in the senate. The senate used to be always absolutely open for these discussions. But the university council's (Hochschulrat) and the deans' board, these chances will be remarkably reduced.

Consilium Decanale (council of deans)

The "Consilium Decanale" is an informal board where the deans of the 7 departments and the university management board (rector, 3 prorectors and head of administration (Kanzler)) get together. It was introduced because the deans who are very powerful at the German universities, wanted to have a board where they could articulate their interests. The interview partners all agreed that no decisions can be made at the university against the Consilium Decanale. And the Consilium Decanale is also considered as very powerful in respect to budgeting decisions. Even though the budgeting commission can sometimes make changes, these again must be accepted by the management board (officially) and the Consilium Decanale (informally). Even the senate or the department boards (Fakultätsrat) who formally decide about all affairs concerning the departments, do not have as much power as the Consilium Decanale:

Gender mainstreaming representative: „Was im Consilium Decanale beschlossen wird ... das ist auch nicht mehr im Senat zu beugen.“ (AL 33-39, 1295-1302 see also S 154-158)

„Decisions made by the consilio decanale ... cannot be revised even by the senate“.

Women's representative: „Die Macht der Dekane ist groß und wird immer stärker, weil sie so eine verstärkte Macht jetzt haben durch das neue Hochschulgesetz. Wir haben ja eine Experimentierklausel, das haben Sie ja sicher schon gehört, und demnach werden die dann noch mehr Macht haben und alles entscheiden, mit der Hochschulleitung zusammen. Das bahnt sich jetzt schon an. Das sieht man schon überall, dass die da das Regiment führen.“ (HM 417-421)

The deans have a lot of power and this is even continuously growing due to the new university law which again strengthens it. As you probably know, we have an experimentation article (Experimentierklausel) which again will increase the deans' power and then they will take over all decisions concerning the university in cooperation with the management board. You can notice already now that they are the ones in the leading position.

The interview partners are of the opinion that the Consilium Decanale is involved in the planning of the budget at a very early stage, to make sure that the departments' interests will be protected. According to the rector's opinion, the early and strong participation of the deans makes sense as most of the overall budget which the university gets, is allocated to the departments. (WB 176-193, 402-410) As there is no woman in the management board or the Consilium Decanale at the University of Augsburg, the university's budget is basically planned without any women at all. The only person in the Consilium Decanale who might support the idea of equal opportunities is the gender mainstreaming representative. If the women's representative or the equal opportunities commissioner want to influence the budgeting decisions at this point, they may do this via informal agreements with the rector. (WB 176-193)

Women's representative: „In der erweiterten Hochschulleitung habe ich Stimmrecht. Und bisher wurde ich zwar deutlich gehört, aber das war quasi eine Übereinkunft, die nicht im Gesetz vorgesehen war.“ (HM 245-246)

I have the right to vote in the expanded management board. And up to now I was clearly heard but this was more or less an informal agreement and not according to any law.

A dean's power range corresponds to the money his department receives from the state and from third party funding. Thus formally each dean in the Consilium Decanale has one vote, but informally the department of natural science, information technology and economics seems to

be by far more powerful than the others (HM 206 ff). This tendency is invigorated by the formula based system of both the state and the university which allocates more money to departments with a high amount of third party funding. (AL 571-592, 1012-1022, 1065-1085)

The interview partners assume that the introduction of the expanded university management board in 2007 will give the Consilium Decanale an official platform as the deans will be members of this board. The new law will ensure an increased transparency concerning the influence of the deans because then they will officially be included in the expanded university management board. In contrary to the official law, the University of Augsburg wants to include all other university groups (that is scientific employees (Mittelbau), representatives of the non-academic staff, students' representatives as well as the women's representative) in the expanded university management board and at the same time drop the senate. (experimentation article / Experimentierklausel) (AL 840-865). The deans would amount to only 7 persons under these circumstances - among a group of about 25 people. Thus it remains to be seen if they will indeed give up on the Consilium Decanale as a board where they have the majority and a much more direct influence on the management board. Even though the structures will change it could be that the informal power structures will remain the same. As the formation of the management board and the Consilium Decanale will not fundamentally change within the next years, the female participation on the highest formal and informal power level might remain very limited.

Budgeting Commission (Haushaltskommission)

After the university management board (officially) and the Consilium Decanale (informal) finished the budget planning, the head of administration (Kanzler) presents it to the budgeting commission who debate about it in their meeting and finally formulate a proposal for the management board. The head of administration (Kanzler) is considered as the most powerful person in the commission as he also belongs to the university management board. (AS 471-492)

Even though the budget is for the most part pre-fixed, all interview partners state that it is absolutely possible to thoroughly debate and even to sometimes change the management board's decisions. (AL 372-390 and AS 518-530) As the budgeting commission is a commission of the senate, all different groups of the university participate in the committee (departments, academic staff, non-academic staff, students' and women's representatives).

Equal opportunities are usually not a subject in the meetings of the budgeting commission, only if there are proposals from the women's representative. Formally, she has only one vote among many. Accordingly, she has only little power in case she intends to implement actions which the departments do not consider as an improvement. Therefore she has to informally ally with the university management board plus some of the deans if she wants to push certain actions. Consequently the women's representative considers her influence on the decisions in the budget commission's meetings as relatively weak even though she is an official member. She states that her influence is mainly informally:

„(Einfluss) Nur insofern ich einen günstigen Draht zur Universitätsleitung habe. Und die unterstützt die ganzen Anliegen. Ansonsten wären meine Möglichkeiten, in der Haushaltskommission etwas durchzusetzen, sehr begrenzt.“ (HM 370 – 373)

(Influence) only in the extent up to which I have a good informal contact to the management board. And they support our concerns. Otherwise my possibilities to enforce anything in the budgeting commission would be extremely limited.

The members of the departments represent the strongest group in the budgeting meetings. In spite of the fact, that the committee is formally a democratic platform, some interview partners state that the professors from the different departments informally try to improve their position

by building alliances between certain departments. These alliances generally correspond to the amount of money the individual departments have. On one side there are the philosophical, the historical as well as the social sciences and philology departments together with the department of catholic theology. They proportionally own less money and often even have to struggle for their survival. But these departments do not only have less money and are less powerful. It usually is also those departments with proportionally less money which are predominated by female students whereas those departments with proportionally higher funds are predominated by men. These are the departments for mathematics, physics, information technology and economics. They receive a lot of money from the ministry (human resources and title group 73) because they are major departments which acquire a lot of third-party funding and are additionally fostered by the formula based system between the Bavarian universities. Only the department of law sometimes changes the allies. (HM 193 ff and AL 506-515) According to the gender mainstreaming representative, one reason for the loss of prestige of the humanities is the general tendency of economisation of knowledge and the growing emphasis on short-term benefits. (AL 517-526)

Gender mainstreaming representative: "Es ist eindeutig so, die Männer weichen aus in Bereiche, die gesellschaftlich anerkannter, oder mehr Prestige oder mehr Geld bringen, und da gibt's sicher einen Zusammenhang. Ich sage immer in der Uni-Leitung (lacht), bitte lasst uns doch das Professorengehalt senken, dann haben wir automatisch mehr Frauen. (allgemeine Heiterkeit)" (AL 555 – 559)

It is without any doubt obvious that men switch into areas which have a higher social standing or a better prestige or which are more productive from a financial point of view and I am sure there is a connection. I keep telling the management board (laughs): please let us reduce the professors' income and there will be automatically more women (everybody laughs).

The interview partners' reports about the budgeting commission were affirmed by our observation of the commission's meeting in January 2007. Nearly all points of the budget are already fixed by the management board. The main person speaking is the head of administration (Kanzler). Members of the commission ask questions from time to time and sometimes a discussion arises. At the end of the meeting, if no mutual agreement could be reached, a decision is reached by acclamation. The meetings seemed to be a routine for the members when we were observing and everybody was well informed, accordingly there were just few controversial discussions. Maybe at least the individual departments' professors are instructed by their deans who were involved in the budgeting planning via the Consilium Decanale (council of deans) but this we do not know. The budgeting commission's proposal is returned to the management board.

The Senate

The rector considers the senate as the most democratic board of the university as in this board all the university's groups are represented. (WB 80 – 85) This perspective is supported by the women's representative who describes the senate as being a major board to discuss equal opportunity subjects and the board members are described as open and apprehensive to equal opportunity matters. She too describes the senate as a democratic forum as the members' opinions are not prefixed and as their interests are not focussed on department interests or on pure research matters. (HM 457-477, 733-753)

Women's representative: "Der Senat war ein demokratisches Medium, in dem Meinungen wirklich diskutiert werden konnten. Also ich habe das sehr bedauert und sehr dafür gekämpft, dass man diese demokratischen Struktur im Senat behält. Denn da hatte die Frauenbeauftragte eine gute Wirkungsmöglichkeit. Aber die Dekane haben ja nur die Interessen ihrer Fakultäten im Auge. ... Unter diesen Strukturen mit Hochschulrat und Dekanen wird der Einfluss (der Frauenbeauftragten, Anm. AR) sehr vermindert. (HM 459-467)

The senate was a democratic body in which various opinions could be openly discussed. I regretted this very much and I fought for the preservation of the senate's democratic structure. Because the women's representative had a real chance to affect something. But the deans only see their own departments' interests. ... These structures, i.e. with the university council and the deans, extremely reduce the women's representative's influence.

By including the senate in the expanded university management board (erweiterte Hochschulleitung) in 2007, the senate's tasks will also be transferred to the expanded university management board. (WB 89 – 91) This development strengthens the position of the women's representative – however, as the board will then have more members due to the integrated deans, the women's representative does not consider this development as merely positive and she has doubts as to the future chances for equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming. (HM 755-760)

Neither the rector, nor the women's representative or the equal opportunities commissioner consider the senate as particularly powerful. In respect to the budgeting decision, as in the senate there is no more discussion about the budgeting. However, as the budgeting commission consist of members of the senate, this board does not take a direct, but an indirect influence on the budget.

University council (Hochschulrat)

According to the gender mainstreaming representative, external persons from the private sector, mainly from the industry, will achieve more power as of 2007 because their number will remarkably increase due to the restructuring of the University council. This is supported by the head of finances. (AS 606-612) At the same time the gender mainstreaming representative does not consider this development as an advantage for equal opportunities as there are no legal regulations for the private industry in Germany to do anything for the advancement of women and most of the external people think that the topic of equal opportunities is nonsense or at least dispensable. (AL 890-922, 924-955)

Gender mainstreaming representative: „Ich muss sagen, wenn ich mir den Herrn XXX (derzeitiges Mitglied des Hochschulrats) anschau, dann findet es Herr XXX schon völlig absurd, dass die Frauenbeauftragte da sitzen muss! Der ist gewohnt, er ist der Chef und er sagt, wo die Reise hingehet und die anderen tun halt, was er sagt.“ (AL 954 – 957)

“I have to state that when looking at Mr XXX (current member of the Hochschulrat) it becomes obvious that Mr. XXX considers the fact that the women's commissioner is participating as completely absurd. He is just used to being the boss who tells everybody what to do and that they follow without arguing.

The gender mainstreaming representative does not have any hopes in respect to the question of a gender quota for the external people as it is more or less the rector's sole decision who will be member of the university council. (AL 963-988) And the rector affirms that he has no intention to define a female-male quota when it comes to the participation of internal personal or of external persons in the new boards of the university. (WB 478-487)

According to the gender mainstreaming representative's opinion the new boards will not lead to any remarkable changes in the process of budgeting as most of the money is predetermined to equip the departments and chairs (personnel and material costs). (AL 1039-1063) However, the rector anticipates conflicts in the budget planning because people from outside the university achieve increasing influence. This contradicts the necessary democratic decision-making process within the university according to his opinion. (WB 446-476)

3.2 Typical conflicts in the budgeting process

This part will describe typical conflicts during the budgeting process as well as whether, respectively, in which way these conflicts affect equal opportunity measures.

Typical occasions for conflicts about the budget are arguments among the departments concerning the distribution of money. Each department always tries to get a bigger amount than in the year before even though the university's overall budget has not increased. (K 200-216)

Head of administration (Kanzler): „Es ist so, dass halt, wie das prinzipiell so ist, der Kuchen ist kleiner als der Appetit derjenigen, die ein Stück davon bekommen sollen und es gibt immer das Problem, dass wir zuwenig zu verteilen haben. ... Wenn ich mir das vor Augen halte, dann habe ich wirklich den Eindruck, dass wir es relativ harmonisch schaffen, die zur Verfügung stehenden Mittel aus unserer Sicht vernünftig einzusetzen.“ (K 200-216)

As a matter of fact, the cake is principally too small for the appetite of those who are to receive a piece of it. We always have the problem that we do not have enough to allocate... Facing this, I really get the impression that we succeed in a relatively harmonic way to reasonably distribute the financial means we have.

According to the rector, conflicts arise mainly when changes are at hand. But if an organisation wants to be innovative it is necessary to shift budgets and it is important to keep an eye on the entire organisation instead of only looking for advantages for individual departments. (WB 275-286, 314-328) The budgeting commission's meetings are the typical platform for conflicts concerning the budget. The rector approves the discussions in this board as he considers them as a part of the democratic process at the university. Communication is the basis for solving conflicts and the rector is positive that up to now it was always possible to find a consensus. (WB 296 – 299)

The head of administration (Kanzler) who is also the head of the budgeting commission, is also convinced that discussing the budget in the budgeting commission is an efficient instrument.

Head of administration (Kanzler): „Und das hat sich schon bewährt in der Universität Augsburg, wenn man diese Streitigkeiten oder Dissense, die da einfach bestehen, dann letztlich doch auflösen kann.“ (K 146-152)

And it has proved of value at the University of Augsburg, that fights and dissents which always exist can in the end be solved.

According to the experience of the head of finances, conflicts often arise between the humanities and the natural sciences because the latter receive by far more money, just as information technology and mathematics plus they acquire considerably higher amounts by third party funding. As third party funding is an important factor for the formula based system, a certain informal power deduced by this fact for the richer departments. The conflicts intensified as the University of Augsburg has experienced losses in the inter-universitarian budget. These conflicts, however, can normally be solved with a discussion between the members of the budgeting commission. (AS 371-421)

Compared to the weighting of third party funding, equal opportunity aspects are but a small share and do neither result in considerable revenues for the university nor do equal opportunity measures cost a lot (they are only a small sum in the expenditures). (AS 371-421) From this point of view they are of no big meaning for the budgeting of the university. It is neverthe-

less rather typical that conflicts arise about money required for equal opportunity measures. In these cases there is no arguing about the amount of money being discussed, but about what it should be spent on. One conflict the women's representative still remembers was the discussion about one of the university's incentive systems for equal opportunities (from title group 73). There was a rather grim conflict between the deans and chairs even though the money in question ranged between about 1,250 and 13,000 per department per year. (HM 281-290)

Another conflict which the head of administration (Kanzler) remembers was about the money which the university receives for output/performance and demand orientated criteria for equal opportunities from the inter-universitarian budgeting. This amount of about Euro 120,000 per annum went to the head of administration (Kanzler) and then to the departments without any specific mandate to use it for the advancement of women. Some departments used it for equal opportunities, some did not. The senate now decided that the money has to be spent on the advancement of women. This created some conflicts and resentments from the deans even though it is comparatively little money for each department. (K 465-495)

Finding an agreement concerning the allocation of the tuition fees seems to be another difficult process. The only existing agreement in the university up to now is the use of the tuition fees for the improvement of the students' studying conditions and the advancement of the identification of the students with their university. The departments with a high number of students will receive the highest amounts which will be an enormous improvement of their financial situation (e.g. philosophical and social sciences). According to the head of administration (Kanzler) their percentage will amount to about 60% of the entire tuition fees. They will be allocated according to the number of a department's students (students' equivalents/ Studierendenäquivalente). About 20% will be used for the administration of the fees. 15% to 20% go to the university, mainly for the improvement of the facilities and conditions, e.g. for longer opening hours of the library or an improved helpdesk for foreign students etc. The students have a relatively powerful position as to the allocation of the tuition fees within the departments. (K 759-770) Definite regulations are not yet known (March 2007).

Women's representative: „Ja, und Verwendung der Studienbeiträge. Das ist ja das andere heiÙe Thema: wie wir das verwenden werden. Und wir kriegen das alle als Fakultäten und wir können dann darüber beschließen, wie wir das verwenden wollen. Und wir haben in der Fakultät beschlossen, dass wir zur Strukturverbesserung der Lehre Stellen beantragen. Ist aber noch nicht weiter beraten worden.“ (HM 336-340)

(Yes and) ... the allocation of the tuition fees. This is another sensitive issue: how we will use the money. The tuition fees will flow to the individual departments and then we can decide on how to use them. And we have decided in my department that we will apply for more positions in order to improve the teaching structures. We did not debate about that any further up to now, though.

There is a conflict at the moment because the representatives for women, equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming want to include the aspect of equal opportunities in the allocation of the tuition fees. The central women's representative submitted the proposal that the tuition fees should be used to pay female students who are in the course of passing their PhD or habilitation in order to advance women on this level of their scientific career. (AL 431-471) The problem is however, that the jobs financed by the tuition fees have a higher percentage of teaching committals (that means that the amount of teaching hours per week is higher) and are more seldom located in research projects than normal positions for qualification. Therefore it would again lead to a disadvantage if these jobs were mainly given to women. This was also stressed in the meeting of the women's representative, the gender mainstreaming representative, the women's advisory board (Frauenbeirat) and the equal opportunity committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss) where the use of tuition fees for the support of women at this career level

were only considered as the “second best” solution as the jobs have worse conditions (high teaching committals and little participation in research projects).

4. Interdependencies between equal opportunities of women and men and the budgeting

In this chapter we will look at important measures for the advancement of women in science and how they influence the budgeting discussions or decisions. This is important as there is not only a process about the budgeting but also an ongoing discussion about measures to improve equal opportunities for women and men which might take a sustainable influence on the budget in the long run. The process of negotiating future equal opportunity measures is at a critical point now because the new university law asks for many changes in Bavaria and this special situation allows the supporters of equal opportunities to formulate new or additional objectives in order to improve the situation of women and men in science and to change the organisational culture in scientific organisations.

One fundamental change in the Bavarian universities is a change in paradigm by an ex post evaluation of the universities' success concerning the **agreements on objectives**. These agreements on objectives influence all aspects of the university. The most important agreements on objectives at the University of Augsburg and the agreements which bind a lot of money are 3 competence centres: „Global Business & Law“ of the department of economics and the department of law which get 4 new regular professors and money, „Innovative Technology: Material Science & Applied information technology“ of the department of mathematics and natural science and the department of applied information technology which gets 7 new regular professors and money, and the “Center of Cultural and Educational Sciences” which will not get any new positions but some money (see agreements on objectives, 8-9). Neither quantitative nor qualitative gender aspects, like e.g. a quota concerning the staff's sex or concerning the scientific qualification of students or e.g. the introduction of gender studies are included in the agreements on objectives for the competence centres

The agreements on objectives on gender mainstreaming between the university and the ministry are very vague and again there are no measurable quantitative or qualitative variables included.

On the level of the university and its departments the agreements on objectives between the ministry and the university have to be transferred to the level of the departments. In autumn 2006 the central women's representative and her staff formulated a draft with agreements on objectives for the departments which included measurable objectives like e.g. quotas for professors or for the academic qualification of students (Mittelbau). This of course would have effected the allocation of budgets within the departments. The women's representatives suggestions were turned down by the departments in the process of negotiating the objectives proposed in 2006. Subsequently the departments made suggestions which were very intransparent and vague so that the women's representative did not accept them.

Women's representative: “Das ist jetzt der Aspekt des Gender Mainstreaming in den Fakultäten. Und da haben die jetzt den Auftrag erhalten von mir Zielvereinbarungen zu formulieren. Und wir haben eine Vorgabe gegeben mit Quote pro Fakultät in Relation zur Anzahl der Studentinnen-Zahl. Das habe ich im Consilium Decanale vorgestellt und da kam es eben zu diesem Widerstand und einzelne Dekane haben signalisiert, dass sie gesprächsbereit sind, andere nicht. Und jetzt habe ich 2 Entwürfe von den Dekanen erhalten und die entsprechen eben nicht unserer Vorgabe und nicht der Quote.“ (HM 659-666)

Now this is the aspect of gender mainstreaming within the departments. And now I ordered them to formulate the agreements on objectives. We gave them a guideline with a quota per depart-

ment related to the number of female students. I presented this to the Consilium Decanale and there was this resistance. And some deans signalled that they are open for a debate and others refused that. And now I have received 2 drafts from the deans and they are neither in accordance with our guidelines nor with our quota.

After having observed a meeting between the women's representative (who was on sick-leave that day, but her deputy attended), the gender mainstreaming representative, the women's advisory board (Frauenbeirat) and the equal opportunity committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss) in December 2006 it became very obvious that the "collective agents" (kollektive Akteure) for equal opportunities do not have common objectives. A vital point in this meeting's discussion were the agreements on objectives for equal opportunities which were to be determined by the Consilium Decanale the next day. The individual departments' women's representatives had been asked to either adopt the proposals made by the central women's representative or to present their own agreements on objectives for their department. Most of the departments' women's representatives expressed their discontent with the work performed by the central women's representative and the women's bureau but did not submit any own proposals. Two or three women's representatives from the humanities and the department of law made suggestions which were for the main part coordinated with their deans. Other women's representatives from the departments were clearly in a dilemma as their deans were against any of the proposals made by the central women's representative - concerning money or quotas for scientific employees or professors - and they tried to defend this attitude with arguments such as for example that the department would lose excellency if there was a quota for professors. This especially applied for the women's representatives of the department for natural science and the one of economics. However, the gender mainstreaming representative, who is professor for physics, also supported this. He is in favour of promoting women during their PhD and habilitation instead of supporting a human resources development policy for female professors as he fears that there might be too few outstanding female professors so the department might lose excellency if there was a quota. (AL 753-783)

In order to avoid any quotas on professors the improvement of the female PhD and habilitation students' (Mittelbau) situation was discussed but again a quota was rejected and it was not clear where the money for the advancement of women should come from as the tuition fees are no good choice (see chapter 3.2). No common and measurable agreements on objectives for equal opportunities were agreed upon in the meeting. The only aspect on which a decision could be achieved was that the departments should agree to spend 1% of the state money for the field of research (which again is only a relatively small part of their overall budget for certain departments) to a university-wide child care program. The collective agents (kollektive Akteure) were ill-humoured when the observed meeting came to an end and most of the participants left the room very quickly. The head of the women's bureau and the gender mainstreaming representative who had to represent the equal opportunity position in the Consilium Decanale the next day appeared rather frustrated.

The agreements on objectives in respect to gender mainstreaming which are now agreed upon between the departments and the university (March 2007) remain for the main part on a very vague level. Most declarations use exclusively terms stating that things "should" or "may" happen. No measurable numbers are fixed concerning the progression or increase of women or men in positions or departments where they are under-represented. Neither are any budgets mentioned with which the equal opportunity measures that "should" or "may" happen could be financed. The only reference to money mentioned in the agreements is that some departments will spend 1% of the money from title group 73 for the child care program. The department of information technology additionally records in the agreements that the money from the inner-universitarian formula-based budgeting for equal opportunities will be used for the advancement of women in science in the future. This regulation, however, had been already fixed in a decision of the senate in 2005. And the philosophical and social science department

emphasize that they want to increase the percentage of men in primary education studies. These agreements are valid until the end of 2008.

The rector evaluates the agreements on objectives as a powerful steering instrument for equal opportunities as they contain the aspect of voluntary commitment. There might be doubts whether voluntary commitments are so strong in a time when economisation and short term profit is of much higher importance than humanistic ideas of democratic and responsible action.

Rector: „Ja, also ich halte was von den Zielvereinbarungen. Weil in jeder Zielvereinbarung steckt ja drin, dass der, der sie unterschreibt, und auch die Institution, für die unterschrieben wurde - meinetwegen jetzt an der Universität, Zielvereinbarungen zwischen Hochschulleitung und Fakultäten - meint dann: Gleichstellung: was macht ihr dort? Das ist eine Selbstverpflichtung. In dem Moment, in dem unterschrieben wird, kann eine Distanzierung nicht mehr stattfinden. Das wäre verlogen.“ (WB 604-616)

Well yes, I believe in agreements on objectives. Because agreements on objectives include that the person or the institution who or which signs them or for whom or which they were signed – for example the agreements on objectives between the university management board and the departments – mean(s): Equal opportunities: what do you do in this respect? That is a kind of self-commitment. An alienation is no longer possible as soon as the document is signed. That would be dishonest.

The gender mainstreaming representative doubts the success of agreements on objectives for equal opportunities as, according to his experience, the deans above all are not willing to agree on measurable objectives concerning equal opportunities. He additionally considers the runtime of 2 years for the gender objectives as way too short to implement e.g. human resource development strategies. In his opinion, the measures, as they are at the moment, can not be sustainable. (AL 672-747, 1252-1339, 1344-1370)

The head of administration (Kanzler) promotes agreements on objectives and considers them an efficient instrument to promote women in science as these agreements make it possible to exactly measure the achievement of objectives (Zielerreichungsgrad). He considers it as very positive that the agreements on objectives are defined between the ministry and the university e.g. about the increase of the percentage of female professors. (K 738-763) Apparently, however, he does not know that no measurable objectives have been fixed – neither in the agreements with the ministry on gender mainstreaming nor in the agreements between the university and its departments.

As we were told in a telephone call with the head of the unit responsible for universities in the Bavarian ministry for science, research and art (Abteilung 9, Universitäten, 05.03.2007), the agreements on objectives on equal opportunities are not meant to contain e.g. accurate quotas on the increase of the number of female professors or the increase of qualifications among female scientists. This is considered as impossible because firstly, there might be not enough excellent women for professorship in a department and secondly, this would mean a too strong intervention in the universities' autonomy. In addition, no qualitative indicators to measure the progress of equal opportunities are planned at the moment.

The universities are asked to report whether improvements could be achieved and if so, which - respectively to explain the reasons if this was not the case in order to get an evaluation of the equal opportunity measures. Sanctions are imposed in case the objectives in the agreements have not been achieved. According to the current situation, however, the ministry does not expect any sanctions due to not achieving the objectives on equal opportunities. This seems a bit

of a tautology as it is of course difficult to fail in achieving any aims when no measurable objectives are formulated in the first place.

Another important feature for the promotion of women in science is a **mentoring program for women**, which has been existing at the University of Augsburg for several years. The departments whose female students had benefited most from the program in the last years were the departments for natural sciences (mathematics and physics) and the department for information technology. The program and the woman who lead it were financed by a federal support programme for the advancement of women in science (HWP) amounting to about Euro 55,000 per annum including staff and everything else. The programme ran out in December 2006. This is why there is a discussion at the University of Augsburg currently how this programme for the advancement of women will be financed in the future. Two of the departments – the department for mathematics and physics – which had profited most from the programme and which are among the richest faculties of the university, refuse to support it - even though the amount of money needed for the programme only amounts to about Euro 20.000 a year. During the interviews and the meeting between the women advisory board (Frauenbeirat) and the equal opportunity committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss) in December 2006 it became obvious that the departments' attitude is considered as not comprehensible and impolite by the women's and the gender mainstreaming representative. Even more so as the work done in the previous years had been very successful. (HM 515-531 and AL 67-81)

Women's representative: „Da haben sich zwei Fakultäten furchtbar aufgeführt, weil die da ein Mentoring-Programm, das bei ihnen durchgeführt wird und das bisher aus HWP-Mitteln bezahlt wurde, finanziell übernehmen sollen. Das kostet 20,000 Euro. Also lächerlich für die naturwissenschaftlichen Fakultät. ... Da hab ich dann die ganz alten Argumente wieder gehört gegen Frauenförderung, die ja gegen die Wissenschaft sei und alles...“ (HM 517 – 522)

Two departments started a real quarrel because they do not want to take over the financial obligations of a mentoring-programme which had taken place in their departments and which up to now had been financed by the HWP. It costs 20,000 Euro, which is ridiculous for the department of natural-sciences. ... There again I heard all the old arguments against the advancement of women which would be counterproductive for science and so on....

This conflict nearly escalated in the meeting of the women advisory board (Frauenbeirat) and the equal opportunity committee (Gleichstellungsausschuss) as a real quarrel broke out on a very personal level which almost brought the leader of the mentoring project to tears. No conformance was found concerning the question by whom and how the mentoring programme should be financed in the future even though it is considered as a good strategy to advance women in science. (Gender representatives during the meeting in December 2006 and AL 785-829)

The University of Augsburg provides an **incentive system** with the aim to promote the advancement of women concerning a career within the university. The incentive of the system is money for the departments and chairs if they succeed to advance women on different career levels (see WP 8). Most of the supporters for equal opportunities evaluate this system as good. The head of the financial department (administration) though evaluates the system as not very powerful because in his opinion there is by far not enough money to really make it a powerful incentive, especially for the richer departments.⁶ (AS 899-950)

⁶ We do not know the total amount and it might vary significantly from one department to another. The amounts for the year 2007 range between 1,500 Euro and 13.500 Euro depending on the individual department.

Child care at the University of Augsburg is not only an intensely discussed subject among the supporters for equal opportunities, the university-wide child care programme is also partially financed with the money from the inter-universitarian formula-based budget for equal opportunities and the advancement of women in science. 25% of this amount from the inter-universitarian formula-based budget for equal opportunities (and according to the inner-university decisions) in respect to child care within the university) flows into the child care programme. Additionally, some departments pay money for the child care programme and summarise the expenses under “Advancement of equality for women and men” in their agreements on objectives. Nevertheless, child care still seems to be considered as a problem of mainly women and not so much as a problem of mothers and fathers or of the university community. We could observe that the question of child care (and its financing) is made the main focus – and the only one all parties involved could agree on – of measures to advance women in science. It is to be doubted that the reason for the continuous under representation of women not only in Grade-A-positions in scientific organisations and universities, is the fact that a woman has a child and/or child care. Because, as the statistics show the “leaky pipeline” – the higher the position gets the more women “leak” out of the career – is true for women with and without children.

The introduction of **gender studies** in all scientific fields is one major demand of gender mainstreaming and an important indicator for the implementation of gender sensible structures. The women’s representative at the University of Augsburg stresses the importance of combining equal opportunity measures with a scientific evaluation of the success. She managed to accomplish an evaluation project concerning the gender mainstreaming process at her chair at the university (for further information see workpackage 8). Gender studies and projects on gender issues should be promoted at further departments and chairs, as recommended in the equal opportunity concept. During our analysis, however, we could not get clear information indicating that additional or new measures for gender studies play a big role in the budgeting process. Nobody ever mentioned for example, that they intend to implement new permanent professorships for gender studies. However, some departments will introduce a visiting professorship for habilitating female students who should lecture gender studies in their agreements on objectives on the advancement of equality for women and men. At numerous departments such as the department for natural sciences, economics or historical sciences, this can be considered as a significant improvement. The agreements do not mention who is going to finance the visiting professorship.

New structures such as **graduate schools, research groups and networks**, etc., will be built at the universities in Bavaria. In our analysis of the budgeting process and the process of introducing gender mainstreaming at universities, no indicators for equal opportunities were mentioned at the University of Augsburg in this connection. We do not know however, whether the University of Augsburg might be engaged in these new structures. For our further work we will take a look at these new structures because they are supposed to make the accessibility easier for women.

5. Communicative validation

A communicative validation was one object of this workpackage to make sure that the stakeholders of the budgeting process as well as of equal opportunities are informed and can respond to the project at a very early stage. While the continuous communication with the main agents of equal opportunities – namely the central women's representative, the women's bureau, the equal opportunities commissioner and the gender mainstreaming representative – proved to work quite easily, a continuous communication with the stakeholders of the budgeting process required a different approach.

We used a reduced form of a communicative validation with the budgeting commission this board is one of the most important official boards concerning the discussion of the budget. This was done in order to communicate our approach to the stakeholders of the budgeting process and to find out and include their opinion on the further process of the project. All status groups of the university are represented in the budgeting commission it is a permanent committee of the senate. As mentioned above, the head of administration (Kanzler) is always the head of the committee. Additionally, there is one professor from each department. In Augsburg there is one woman among the professors who – as became clear during the communicative evaluation – supports equal opportunity efforts at the university. There is one representative from the other scientific staff (Mittelbau), one students' representative and one from the non-scientific staff who in the case of the University of Augsburg is the equal opportunities commissioner at the same time. The women's representative is also an official member of the committee. By selecting the budgeting commission we could make sure that the information reaches all different groups of the organisation and that we get feed back from very different groups within the university at the same time.

A meeting was placed before the regular meeting of the budgeting commission took place. At first we presented the project, who is participating in which country, the itinerary of the project and the important role of the participating universities. The male participants did not seem to be really interested in the beginning. Then we drew the attention to the fact that the University of Augsburg is quite progressive in respect to the advancement of gender mainstreaming and women in science compared to other universities. It was additionally possible to solve some misunderstandings during the meeting plus we were able to communicate that we intended to support the university with the SSA and also that gender budgeting is a unique qualification (Alleinstellungsmerkmal) for a university.

This attracted the interest of all participants and there were several questions which made obvious that the members understood that the project might improve the university's standing. The standing of a university is important nowadays because they have to compete in order to improve their position in rankings and within the formula-based system. An actual increase of the university's budget might be a direct result of its success in doing so and this again is a field which the members of the budgeting commission understand perfectly well and approved of. At the end of the meeting a common understanding was achieved that the project can be accepted and should even be supported by allowing us insight into more data and by allowing us to attend a meeting of the budgeting commission which was previously rejected.

This reduced form of a communicative validation with the stakeholders of budgeting can be considered as successful and makes clear how important it is to make the stakeholders part of the project. Now it will be important to proceed with the continuous communication with all stakeholders. This is the precondition for the SSA's success in its last part, the inclusion of the instruments developed for gender budgeting in the organisation of the universities.

6. Conclusion

Aspects of equal opportunities or gender mainstreaming are generally not very important for the budgeting process at the University of Augsburg. They are only mentioned if there are specific requests from the women's representative like e.g. money for mentoring projects, staff for a project or security measures against sexual harassment against women.

It is the same thing vice versa: the supporters for equal opportunities have only little political impact on and power over the budgeting process. This even applies for the 5 collective agents (kollektive Akteure) – formally, there is a strong network for equal opportunities as it permeates several horizontal and vertical levels. In addition, a strong top-down approach could be achieved with the rector as an outspoken supporter of equal opportunities. In every day work, however, the subject of equal opportunities is of course only one of many important topics for him and he relies on the advice of the women's representative as the main contact person for equal opportunities and the gender mainstreaming representative. So generally this structure has improved the position of equal opportunities within the university.

A closer look shows, however, that the influence of the women's representative on the university management board is and will remain only informal. Several changes in the university's statutes (Grundordnung) were discussed at the beginning of 2007. One was the inclusion of the women's representative in the university management board with the right to vote or at least as an advisor. Both suggestions were rejected by the expanded senate, the board which decides about these changes.

Officially the women's representative is only involved in the budgeting process as a member of the budgeting commission and the senate. In the budgeting commission she has one vote but she is only one of about 11 people. She has also one vote in the senate who has to pass the budget officially but does not take a real influence, but again her voice is only one among many. The future changes will make her a member of the expanded management board. There she will also have a vote, but again she will be one of about 25 members.

The gender mainstreaming representative is the most powerful agent for equal opportunities at the moment, as he is prorector and a member of the management board. He is a truly committed supporter of the ideas of the women's representative and often succeeds in involving equal opportunity aspects in the two most powerful boards of the university, the management board and the (unofficial) Consilium Decanale (council of deans). It remains to be seen if this position will be affirmed by the ministry in the new statutes (Grundordnung) of the University of Augsburg. Even more so, as his/her tasks are not stipulated so there is no way to foresee which ideas concerning equal opportunities or gender mainstreaming this person will develop and if this is always in consensus with the women's representative and the other supporters of equal opportunities.

One big problem is the fact that there are still only few people who engage themselves for equal opportunities among the powerful participants of the budgeting process, like the deans. Whether or not the fact that all the deans are male is a reason for the lack of support for equal opportunities is an interesting question. It seems worthwhile to analyse this in an additional project, e.g. in comparison with the situation at other universities.

The equal opportunities commissioner who is responsible for the non-scientific staff has a very weak position because of her legal status. She has no official power to intervene in the budgeting process at any point. Her only possibility to act is with informal networks or by taking over other positions (the equal opportunities commissioner at the University of Augsburg is a mem-

ber of the senate as a representative for the non-scientific staff) in order to take indirect influence. This, however, has only little sustainability.

The 5 collective agents (kollektive Akteure) consist of about 25 people and our observation showed that they sometimes do not have a common understanding of the objectives of equal opportunities or gender mainstreaming. It seems to be necessary to improve the communication and the possibilities to find common grounds for this important network. This includes a general discussion about the definition of gender mainstreaming at a university. The main aspect of gender mainstreaming at the University of Augsburg at the moment is seen by the interview partners in the top-down network of the collective agents (kollektive Akteure). As gender mainstreaming aims at the consideration of the output and outcome of all projects and measures on women and men at the outset and in all fields, it remains to be analysed if this structural change is sufficient to achieve the objectives of gender mainstreaming. The process analysis showed that at least for the implementation of gender budgeting additional supporters apart from the collective agents (kollektive Akteure) as well as additional knowledge of all stakeholders of the budgeting process will be necessary.

Looking at universities as scientific organisations we found out that it generally seems difficult to introduce innovations as the power structures are not strictly hierarchical so that a top-down implementation is difficult. This problem is intensified when speaking of equal opportunities or gender mainstreaming to be implemented. Formally the rector is the head of the entire organisation. Then there is the head of administration (Kanzler) and his staff. The administration has a hierarchical organisation and a top-down implementation of innovations is possible; with the "usual" resistance and the need for training, of course. The organisation and structure of the scientific staff is more difficult. Even though the departments are officially subordinated to the rector and the management board, they are informally very powerful and have built up powerful organisational structures over the years such as the Consilium Decanale (the name might change from university to university). The power of the departments makes a top-down implementation of innovations impossible. Their power includes a very strong impact on the allocation of budgets and their inclusion in the budgeting process at a very early stage and as soon as the departments have received the money, a university-wide planning or grasp on this money is literally unavoidable.

As became clear in the analysis, the deans often represent the group which denies the support for equal opportunity measures at university level at the moment. The departments are not ready to actively support equal opportunity measures or gender mainstreaming with the main argument that any such measures might influence their grade of excellence for the worse. It seems that the discussion about "real" excellence will have a high importance if the departments are to be motivated to advance their female scientists in a serious and sustainable way.

In addition, the discussion on a scientific organisational structure which includes long working hours will not be addressed as long as the a.m. problem has not been solved. This includes the question of work-life-balance for women and men alike.

The future alterations within the universities deriving from the new Bavarian university law from 2006 (Bayerisches Hochschulgesetz (BayHSchG)) are not considered as highly influential on the budgeting process even though some important structures will change at the University of Augsburg. The alterations, however, are considered as a mainly negative affect on the improvement of measures to advance women in science and for the process of gender mainstreaming. The main reason for this opinion is the fact that external people from the industry will gain power in the university via the university council (Hochschulrat). As there is no law in Germany which demands equal opportunity measures in the private industry sector, it is feared that the external people will suppress questions on equal opportunities. And moreover, the senate which is considered as an open and democratic forum where equal opportunity

questions can be discussed in an open-minded and supportive way, will presumably be disposed at the University of Augsburg.

Furthermore it is not yet clear which consequences the general tendency that universities in Bavaria are increasingly seen under an economical and market-orientated point of view will have on the advancement of women in science. However, it is already known that the new regulations lead to an increased, decisive importance of third party funding concerning the amount of money which the state spends on the universities. This will penalise departments like the humanities which cannot acquire sufficient third party funding in relation to their size and which have a majority of female students.

The question on how to include men in the gender mainstreaming process also remains to be answered in the long run. This includes questions about the allocation of budgets. For the time being, all supporters of the equal opportunities process focus their concentration on the advancement of women. Discussions about e.g. the lack of male students among primary school teachers or (too) long working hours during qualification have only just commenced. Sometimes it appears as if the notion prevails that when the "problem" of the advancement of women in science is solved somehow, then the problem of a male dominated organisational culture will automatically disappear as well.

The analysis of the budgeting process at this time allowed important insights into power structures and decision making structures which are not only relevant for the allocation of the budget from title group 73, but also for the structure of the entire budgeting process at the university. Additionally, the structures at the University of Augsburg are just now changing a lot because of the new legislation. It was therefore a good moment to start our project as with the restructuring of the organisation the possibilities to take influence might be better than at any other time. On the other hand it is of course difficult to make any precise predictions on the future development of the process in the current situation.

References

References of the documents of the University of Augsburg and the Bavarian ministry for science, research and art see workpackage 8.

Allmendinger, Jutta/Hinz, Thomas (2002), Programmierte (Un-)Gleichheit? Geschlechtsspezifische Chancen bei der Bewilligung von Forschungsanträgen. In: Zeitschrift für Soziologie, Jg. 31, Heft 4, August, 275-293.

Argyris, Chris/Schön, Donald A. (2002; Org. 1996, Die lernende Organisation. Grundlagen, Methode, Praxis. Stuttgart.

Bendl, Regine u.a. (ed.) (2006), Agenda Diversity: Gender- und Diversitätsmanagement in Wissenschaft und Praxis. München und Mering: Rainer Hemp Verlag.

Borgwardt, Rafaela u.a. (ed.) (2003), Festung Fachbereich? Frauen und Gleichstellung in Organisationskultur, Personalauswahl und Lehre des Fachbereichs Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaften der Universität Hamburg 1974 bis 2000. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Burkhardt, Anke, *Was ist Chancengleichheit wert? Zur leistungsorientierten Mittelvergabe im Hochschulbereich*. In: Wüst, Heidemarie (ed.) (2004): Gender konkret! Chancengleichheit von Frauen an Fachhochschulen. Dokumentation der Fachtagung 2003. Berlin, 29-54.

Die Frauenbeauftragten der Berliner Universitäten (2002), Zielvereinbarungen als Instrument erfolgreicher Gleichstellungspolitik. Ein Handbuch, Kirchlinteln: Hoho Verlag Hoffmann & Hoyer.

Döge, Peter (2002), Geschlechterdemokratie als Männlichkeitskritik. Bielefeld.

Döge, Peter (1/2006), Auch Männer haben ein Vereinbarkeitsproblem. Rote Revue.

Kahlert, Heike (2003), Gender Mainstreaming an Hochschulen. Anleitung zum qualitätsbewussten Lernen. Leverkusen: Leske + Budrich.

Kauko, Sylvia u.a. (ed.) (2005), Gendered Academia. Wissenschaft als Geschlechterdifferenz 1890-1945. Göttingen: Wallstein.

Keller, Barbara, Mischau, Anina (ed.) (2002), Frauen machen Karriere in Wissenschaft, Wirtschaft und Politik: Chancen nutzen - Barrieren überwinden. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Klimpel, Melanie/Schütte, Tina (2006), Work-Life-Balance. Eine empirische Erhebung. München und Mering: Rainer Hemp Verlag.

Lind, Inken (2004), Aufstieg oder Ausstieg? Karrierewege von Wissenschaftlerinnen. Ein Forschungsüberblick. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Löther, Andrea (ed.) (2003), Mentoring-Programme für Frauen in der Wissenschaft. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Macha, Hildegard / Handschuh-Heiß, S. (2004), Konzept der Universität Augsburg zur Umsetzung des Gleichstellungsauftrags. März 2004. www.uni-augsburg.de

Macha, Hildegard und Forschungsgruppe (2000): Erfolgreiche Frauen. Wie sie wurden, was sie sind. Ffm/New York: Campus.

Macha, Hildegard (2004), Rekrutierung von weiblichen Eliten, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte. Beilage zur Zeitschrift Das Parlament, 10/2004, 1.3.04, 25-33.

Macha, Hildegard (2006), Bericht der Frauenbeauftragten der Universität Augsburg 2002-2006. www.uni-augsburg.de/gendermainstreaming.

Müller, Ursula (2000), Asymmetrische Geschlechterkultur in Organisationen und Frauenförderung als Prozess. In: Lenz, Ilse et al. (ed.), Geschlecht Arbeit Zukunft. Münster, 126 – 149.

Preskill, H./Torres, R.T. (1999), Evaluative inquiry for learning in organizations. Thousand Oaks.

Russ-Eft, D./Preskill, H.S. (2001), Evaluation in Organziations: A Systematic Approach to Enhancing Learning, Performance, and Chance. Boston.

Savage, Mike/Witz, Anne (1992), Gender and Bureaucracy. Oxford Cambridge.

Stievers, Camilla (2002), Gender Images in Public Administration. Thousand Oaks London New Delhi.

Vogel, Ulrike/Hinz, Christiana (2004), Wissenschaftskarriere, Geschlecht und Fachkultur. Bewältigungsstrategien in Mathematik und Sozialwissenschaften. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Roloff, Christine, Selent, Petra (ed.) (2003), Hochschulreform und Gender Mainstreaming. Geschlechtergerechtigkeit als Querschnittaufgabe. Bielefeld: Kleine.

Wilz, Sylvia (2001), Organisation und Geschlecht. Strukturelle Bindungen und kontingente Kopplungen. Opladen

Methods

Becker, Howard und Blanche Geer, Typologisches Verstehen. Verstehende Soziologie: Grundzüge und Entwicklungstendenzen. In: W. Bühl (ed) (1979). München.

Bohnsack, R. (2003), Rekonstruktive Sozialforschung. Opladen.

Dietzinger, Angelika, Hedwig Kitzer, Ingrid Anker, Irma Bingel, Erika Haas und Simone Odier-na (ed.) (1994), Erfahrung mit Methode. Freiburg: Kore Verlag.

Flick, Uwe (2004), Triangulation. Eine Einführung. Wiesbaden.

Geertz, Clifford (1983), Dichte Beschreibung. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Hurlemann/Ulrich (ed.) (1980), Handbuch der Sozialisationsforschung. Weinheim.

Lamnek, Siegfried (1995), Qualitative Sozialforschung. 2 Vol. München.

Mayring, Philipp (1990), Einführung in die qualitative Sozialforschung. München.

Webb, Eugene J./Lück, Helmut (ed.) (1975), Nicht reaktive Messverfahren. Weinheim: Beltz.

Appendix

Bayerisches Hochschulgesetz (BayHSchG) Vom 23. Mai 2006

Art. 4

Gleichberechtigung von Frauen und Männern, Frauenbeauftragte

(1) Die Hochschulen fördern bei der Wahrnehmung ihrer Aufgaben die tatsächliche Durchsetzung der Gleichberechtigung von Frauen und Männern und berücksichtigen diese als Leitprinzip; sie wirken auf die Beseitigung bestehender Nachteile hin. Zur Durchsetzung der Gleichberechtigung von Frauen und Männern werden Frauen unter Beachtung des Vorrangs von Eignung, Befähigung und fachlicher Leistung (Art. 33 Abs. 2 des Grundgesetzes) gefördert. Ziel der Förderung ist eine Steigerung des Anteils der Frauen auf allen Ebenen der Wissenschaft.

(2) Frauenbeauftragte achten auf die Vermeidung von Nachteilen für Wissenschaftlerinnen, weibliche Lehrpersonen und Studierende; sie unterstützen Hochschule in der Wahrnehmung ihrer Aufgabe nach Abs. 1. Frauenbeauftragte werden für die Hochschule vom Senat, für die Fakultät vom Fakultätsrat aus dem Kreis des an der Hochschule hauptberuflich tätigen wissenschaftlichen und künstlerischen Personals gewählt. Für die Hochschule gewählte Frauenbeauftragte gehören der Erweiterten Hochschulleitung und dem Senat, für die Fakultäten gewählte Frauenbeauftragte dem Fakultätsrat den Berufungsausschüssen (Art. 18 Abs. 4 Satz BayHSchPG) als stimmberechtigte Mitglieder an. Im Übrigen regelt die Grundordnung die Mitwirkung der Frauenbeauftragten in sonstigen Gremien; sie kann vorsehen, dass für Frauenbeauftragte stellvertretende Frauenbeauftragte bestellt werden.

(3) Die Hochschule stellt den Frauenbeauftragten zur wirksamen Erfüllung ihrer Aufgaben in angemessenem Umfang Mittel zur Verfügung. Frauenbeauftragte sollen für die Dauer ihrer Tätigkeit unter Berücksichtigung des Umfangs ihrer Aufgaben von anderen dienstlichen Aufgaben entlastet werden.

(4) Eine angemessene Vertretung von Frauen und Männern in den Gremien ist anzustreben.

(5) Gesetzliche Bestimmungen für Frauenbeauftragte gelten auch für männliche Frauenbeauftragte.

Art. 20 besagt, dass die Frauenbeauftragte der Hochschule als Mitglied der Hochschulleitung mit **beratender** Stimme berufen werden kann.

Abschnitt II

Aufbau und Organisation der Hochschulen

Art. 19

Organe und Organisationseinheiten

(1) Zentrale Organe der Hochschule sind

1. die Hochschulleitung,
2. der Senat,
3. der Hochschulrat.

Art. 20

... Die Hochschulleitung ist insbesondere für folgende Angelegenheiten zuständig:

4. Aufstellung der Voranschläge zum Staatshaushaltsplan oder Aufstellung des Wirtschaftsplans,

5. Vollzug des Haushaltsplans oder des Wirtschaftsplans,
6. Verteilung der der Hochschule zugewiesenen Stellen und Mittel einschließlich Räume nach den Grundsätzen von Art. 5 Abs. 2 Sätze 1 und 2,

Art. 25

Senat

(1) Dem Senat gehören an:

1. fünf Vertreter und Vertreterinnen der Hochschullehrer und Hochschullehrerinnen (Art. 17 Abs. 2 Satz 1 Nr. 1),
2. ein Vertreter oder eine Vertreterin der wissenschaftlichen und künstlerischen Mitarbeiter und Mitarbeiterinnen (Art. 17 Abs. 2 Satz 1 Nr. 2),
3. ein Vertreter oder eine Vertreterin der sonstigen Mitarbeiter und Mitarbeiterinnen (Art. 17 Abs. 2 Satz 1 Nr. 3),
4. ein Vertreter oder eine Vertreterin der Studierenden und
5. die Frauenbeauftragte der Hochschule.

Art. 25

(4) Der Senat kann beratende Ausschüsse einsetzen. In diesen Ausschüssen sollen die in Abs. 1 Satz 1 Nrn. 1 bis 4 genannten Mitgliedergruppen in dem dort festgelegten Verhältnis vertreten sein und bei der Bestellung der Mitglieder des Ausschusses beteiligt werden; die Frauenbeauftragte der Hochschule ist Mitglied dieser Ausschüsse.

Art. 25

(4) Der Senat kann beratende Ausschüsse einsetzen. In diesen Ausschüssen sollen die in Abs. 1 Satz 1 Nrn. 1 bis 4 genannten Mitgliedergruppen in dem dort festgelegten Verhältnis vertreten sein und bei der Bestellung der Mitglieder des Ausschusses beteiligt werden; die Frauenbeauftragte der Hochschule ist Mitglied dieser Ausschüsse.

Art. 26

Hochschulrat

(1) Dem Hochschulrat gehören an:

1. die gewählten Mitglieder des Senats (Art. 25 Abs. 1 Satz 1 Nrn. 1 bis 4) und
2. acht Persönlichkeiten aus Wissenschaft und Kultur und insbesondere aus Wirtschaft und beruflicher Praxis (nicht hochschulangehörige Mitglieder).

Der Hochschulrat

9. nimmt zu den Voranschlägen zum Staatshaushalt oder zum Entwurf des Wirtschaftsplans Stellung,
10. nimmt den Rechenschaftsbericht des Präsidenten oder der Präsidentin entgegen und kann über ihn beraten,
11. stellt den Körperschaftshaushalt fest,

Grundordnung der Universität Augsburg

§ 4

Erweiterter Senat

Dem erweiterten Senat gehören an:

1. die stimmberechtigten Mitglieder des Senats, und zwar

a) als Mitglieder kraft Amtes der Rektor, die Prorektoren und der Kanzler sowie die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität,

b) als von den Gruppen gewählte Mitglieder:

- sieben Vertreter der Professoren,
 - zwei Vertreter der wissenschaftlichen und künstlerischen Mitarbeiter,
 - ein Vertreter der sonstigen Mitarbeiter und
 - zwei Vertreter der Studenten;
- gehört die Frauenbeauftragte nicht zur Gruppe der Professoren, so erhöht sich die Zahl der Vertreter der Gruppe der Professoren um eins (§ 5 Abs. 2);

§ 5

Senat

(1) Dem Senat gehören an:

1. der Rektor als Vorsitzender, die Prorektoren und der Kanzler sowie die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität als Mitglieder kraft Amtes,

2. als von den Gruppen gewählte Mitglieder:

- a) sieben Vertreter der Professoren aus den sechs Fakultäten,
 - b) zwei Vertreter der wissenschaftlichen und künstlerischen Mitarbeiter,
 - c) ein Vertreter der sonstigen Mitarbeiter,
 - d) zwei Vertreter der Studenten und
3. die Dekane mit beratender Stimme

§ 6

(5) Der Ständigen Kommission für Haushalts-, Raum- und Bauangelegenheiten gehören an

1. der Kanzler als Vorsitzender,

2. je ein Vertreter der Professoren jeder der sechs Fakultäten sowie zwei Vertreter der wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter, ein Vertreter der sonstigen Mitarbeiter und ein Vertreter der Studenten als vom Senat bestellte Mitglieder und

3. die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität.

(Sie ist auch bei allen anderen Kommissionen offiziell dabei (Anm. A.R.))

§ 12 b

Förderung der Frauen, Frauenbeauftragte +) Protokollnotiz

(1) Die Förderung aller weiblichen Hochschulmitglieder ist Anliegen der gesamten Universität. Die Förderung muß auch im Hochschulentwicklungsplan verankert werden.

(2) Die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität und ihre Vertreterinnen werden vom Senat, die Frauenbeauftragten der Fakultäten und ihre Vertreterinnen werden von dem jeweiligen Fachbereichsrat für die jeweilige Amtszeit des Kollegialorgans aus dem Kreis des an der Universität hauptberuflich tätigen wissenschaftlichen und künstlerischen Personals gewählt.

(3) Die jeweilige Frauenbeauftragte achtet in ihrem Bereich auf die Vermeidung von Nachteilen für Wissenschaftlerinnen, weibliche Lehrpersonen und Studierende; sie unterstützt die Universität in der Wahrnehmung ihrer Aufgabe, die Durchsetzung der Gleichberechtigung von Frauen und Männern zu fördern und auf die Beseitigung bestehender Nachteile hinzuwirken.

§ 12 c

Mitgliedschaft der Frauenbeauftragten in Kollegialorganen und Gremien

(1) Die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität gehört kraft ihres Amtes den folgenden Kollegialorganen und Gremien als stimmberechtigtes Mitglied an:

1. dem erweiterten Senat,
2. dem Senat,
3. den Ständigen Kommissionen für Lehre und Studierende, Forschung und wissenschaftlichen Nachwuchs, Hochschulplanung und Haushalts-, Raum- und Bauangelegenheiten
4. der Kommission für Lehrerbildung.

Die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität wird von der Universität in die Vertreterversammlung des Studentenwerks Augsburg entsandt.

(2) Die Frauenbeauftragte der Fakultät gehört kraft ihres Amtes dem Fachbereichsrat der Fakultät als stimmberechtigtes Mitglied an, in den Berufungsausschüssen ist sie Mitglied mit beratender Stimme.

(3) In beratenden Ausschüssen des Senats wirkt die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität, in beratenden Gremien des Fachbereichsrates wirkt die Frauenbeauftragte der Fakultät mit Stimmrecht mit.

(4) Wenn die Frauenbeauftragte der Gruppe der Professoren und die stellvertretende Frauenbeauftragte einer anderen Mitgliedergruppe angehört, nimmt im Vertretungsfalle die stellvertretende Frauenbeauftragte an den Sitzungen von Kollegialorganen und Gremien mit

Protokollnotiz der Versammlung:

"Die Frauenbeauftragte der Universität und die Frauenbeauftragten der Fakultäten werden von einem Frauenbeirat unterstützt, der sich zahlengleich aus den Fakultäts-Frauenbeauftragten, Vertreterinnen der Studentinnen und Vertreterinnen der sonstigen Mitarbeiterinnen zusammensetzt. Die Universitäts-Frauenbeauftragte wirkt mit beratender Stimme mit." (Sitzung der Versammlung vom 17. January 1990)