



Federal  
Anti-Discrimination  
Agency



# Equal Treatment of Genders in Working Life

Brief report on the project to develop the Gender Bias Check (gb-check)

Dr. Andrea-Hilla Carl, Dr. Andrea Jochmann-Döll and Dr. Karin Tondorf





# Contents

<b>1. Starting point, background and objective to the project</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. The gb-check as a review tool</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Overview of review areas and tools	6
2.2 Review areas and tools	7
<b>3. From concept to completion: The scientific project</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4. In practice: The application of gb-check</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1 Operational review procedure	14
4.2 Experiences of pilot companies in carrying out the reviews	16
4.2.1 Time spent and personnel required	16
4.2.2 Results of the analyses	16
4.3 From test to practice: options for transfer and sustainability	18

# 1. Starting point, background and objective of the project

## Starting point

Many women in Germany are still a long way from economic independence: This is the conclusion drawn from statistical surveys on the difference in earnings between women and men. According to the results, the average gross hourly wage for women is a fifth lower than it is for men. No appreciable reduction in the pay gap has been recorded for many years. Lower earnings for women mean that they have to depend economically either on the income of a higher earning partner, on support from relatives or on state benefits. Under these conditions, it is also difficult to change traditionally structured allocations of domestic and family tasks in favour of women.

Salary differences between the genders can also be caused by differences in working and employment conditions which have a negative impact on the economic situation of women:

- Women are found less frequently than men in well paid management positions although they are often well qualified for these. They have to overcome greater obstacles than men when it comes to promotion and to accessing more senior positions, since potential pregnancy, breaks taken to bring up children or care for relatives, along with the associated “double burden” this brings are still regarded as economic “risk factors”.
- Women with family obligations work more frequently in low-paid part-time jobs which are also often below their qualification level, because more qualified and better paid work is often not offered on a part-time basis.
- Because of family-related breaks in work, women are not as able to build up periods of professional experience as men.

- In certain industries, it is mainly women who work in temporary employment or who are marginally part-time employees.
- Part-time working and precarious employment also restrict the opportunities for taking part in continuing vocational training measures.
- In performance appraisals, (part-time employed) women often receive lower grades because their appraisals are characterised by negative gender stereotyping, because their achievements are not perceived or are undervalued or because they find it more difficult to fulfil the company’s expectations in terms of time and geographical flexibility, due to family care duties, than their male colleagues do.

Despite these findings, it is not currently possible to make any concrete statements about how far gender equality in working and employment conditions is guaranteed in companies and in the public sector. Although both European and German employment legislation has long prohibited gender-based discrimination in various areas such as recruitment, career promotion, continuing training and employment and working conditions, there is no systematic check on how far these bans on discrimination are complied with. This may also be due to the fact that there have so far not been any comprehensive tools at operating level that would have made it possible to review equal opportunities in practice. This deficiency has been remedied with the development of the Gender Bias Check (gb-check).

The gb-check allows officials within an organisation to carry out a meaningful status review in various personnel policy areas, to check the results obtained systematically against legal principles, to analyse further aspects of equal opportunities between genders and to examine

individual cases of likely discrimination. In this way, it is possible to detect and close discrimination loopholes and to take measures which are advantageous here. Equality reviews of this type are only recommended by law in Germany in the area of wages, and so a review of equality in working and employment conditions must be carried out on a voluntary basis.

## Background

In order to assist with promoting equality, the Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (FADA) in cooperation with the Harriet Taylor Mill Institute of the Berlin School of Economics and Law (HTMI of the Berlin SEL) carried out an EU-financed project<sup>1</sup> entitled “Promoting the economic independence of women and men – using the Gender Bias Check (gb-check)”. The project started in January 2016 and ends on 31 August 2017.

## Project objective

The project objective was to provide private companies and public bodies with a scientifically supported set of analytical tools which they could use to systematically review the equal treatment of genders in various personnel policy action areas, beyond that of salary. This set of tools was scientifically developed by the academics Dr. Andrea-Hilla Carl, Dr. Andrea Jochmann-Döll and Dr. Karin Tondorf.

A set of tools was developed which would

- highlight any discrimination on the basis of gender in the personnel policy fields of job advertisements, personnel selection (recruitment and promotion), working and employment conditions, continuing vocational training, appraisal of performance, potential and skills and working hours,
- provide ideas and impetus for removing any discrimination found and for preventing measures to avoid unequal treatment, and

- promote equal opportunities for both genders at operating level.

The Gender Bias Check refers to the prohibitions of discrimination listed in European Directive 2006/54/EC which were implemented in German law through the General Equal Treatment Act (AGG) in 2006. The gb-check, which analyses working and employment conditions in more detail, supplements the Pay Equality Check (eg-check.de), which has already been developed and tested in practice and which is solely intended for determining gender pay differences. Both sets of tools have similar structures.

Equality between the genders is not only a legal requirement; it is also economically advantageous, for example, when it comes to attracting and retaining qualified staff or during times of structural change. For example, with the gb-check it is possible to

- design job advertisements in such a way that they appeal equally to both women and men,
- make personnel selection decisions more systematic and transparent,
- assess the performance, potential and skills of employees more fairly,
- support managers in managing their staff sensitively and without prejudice,
- make working and employment conditions more attractive for women and men,
- focus the company’s continuing vocational training concept gender-appropriately,
- obtain ideas and impetuses for making working hours more family-friendly.

The gb-check is also useful in further developing a diversity concept or an equality plan and enhancing or consolidating the company’s image as being equality-oriented.

1 EU Commission, General Directorate, Justice and Consumers

# 2. The gb-check as a review tool

## 2.1 Overview of review areas and tools

The gb-check can be used to review six different areas of personnel policy with regard to gender equality. Three types of tools are available for this: Statistics, process analyses and pairwise comparisons.

- **Statistics:** These are direct statistical comparisons of anonymised operating data relating to the review area in question that differ according to gender. These statistics create transparency and provide indications of possible discrimination.
- **Process analyses:** These contain guiding questions about the relevant review area which examine any inequalities in company regulations and procedures and can highlight

any potential discrimination and scope for greater equality opportunities. Every process analysis also contains at the end the headings “Summary” and “Conclusions”, which are to be filled in.

- **Pairwise comparisons:** By directly comparing, on an anonymous basis, a female and a male employee, discrimination at individual level can be highlighted.

The following provides an initial overview of the review areas and tools (cf. Figure 1).

Figure 1: Overview of review areas and tools of the gb-check

Review area	Statistics	Process analysis	Pairwise comparison
<b>Job advertisements</b>		✓	
<b>Personnel selection</b>		✓	✓
Recruitment	✓		
Promotion	✓		
<b>Working and employment conditions</b>		✓	
Employment	✓		
Health	✓		
<b>Continuing vocational training</b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>Appraisals</b>	✓	✓	✓
<b>Working hours</b>	✓	✓	

## 2.2 Review areas and tools

### Review area: Job advertisements

The gb-check is used to carry out a closer examination of the content of job advertisements and the operating processes for drawing up and publishing a job advertisement. In addition, job advertisements can also promote gender equality by expressly mentioning, for example, that the (management) position can also be filled on a part-time basis. In this context, the gb-check not only considers the gender-neutral designation of the job; it also examines other contents and procedures which could make it easier for female or male employees to access a position or which, conversely, could provide an incentive to apply.

A **process analysis** is the only tool available to check the area of job advertisements, since statistics and pairwise comparisons can be applied more usefully in the subsequent personnel selection decision during recruitment or promotion.

### Review area: Personnel selection - recruitment and career promotion

The review area of personnel selection focuses in particular on the standards that are applied in the selection decision. What criteria are used in the evaluation of application documents and the holding of application interviews? Do the same standards apply for all applicants, female and male? Three specific tools are available for reviewing personnel selection decisions: Statistics, process analysis and pairwise comparison.

Any discrimination can be examined using a **process analysis**. The process analysis contains 24 questions relating to aspects such as basing the selection criteria on the job requirement profile, analysing the application documents, recruitment tests, interviews and the ultimate selection decisions. The Explanatory Notes refer not only to legal standards but also to measures to prevent

inequality and promote gender equality. The **recruitment statistics** cover the position to be filled (number and full-time/part-time post), the number of applications received by gender, the male and female applicants participating in the selection process (number and as a percentage of total applicants) and men and women taken on (number and as a percentage of the positions to be filled). In addition, the gender of the previous holder of the position must be given. The **promotion statistics** cover the promotion potential of the vacant position (the internal applicants, by gender, who participated in the selection process), the actual promotions (the new male and female holders of the positions with formerly lower grades to date as a percentage of the promotion potential) and the promotion rate by gender (actual promotions as a percentage of promotion potential). Data can be differentiated by lower, middle and higher salary areas. The **pairwise comparison** can be used to compare two individuals of different genders, e.g. one who has been turned down and one who has been appointed, with regard to the fulfilment of the necessary and desired requirements. However, the tool can be used not only to review a recruitment decision in retrospect, if there are doubts or complaints relating to equality, for example. It can also be used to prepare and document a systematic personnel selection decision and to justify it if necessary afterwards. In this case, more than two people can be compared.

### Review area: Working and employment conditions

In this review area, the analysis focuses on regulations and operating procedures relating to the topics of maternity protection, parental leave and care periods, marginal part-time employment, risk-free workplaces/health protection and sexual harassment in the workplace. The review tools available are two sets of statistics – on employee

structure and health protection – and a process analysis.

The **employee structure statistics** show the actual status of the workforce, differentiated by gender-relevant criteria such as part-time employees, managers, employees on parental leave, temporary staff and marginally part-time employees. The **health protection statistics** highlight possible hazards at the workplace. They record gender-differentiated data on accidents at work and their causes, occupational illnesses, sick leave, reduced earning capacity, etc. and operational measures to promote health. The **process analysis of working and employment conditions** asks a total of 32 questions on various topics: maternity protection, parental leave and care periods, marginal part-time employment, risk-free workplaces/health protection and sexual harassment at the workplace. The answers can show how far the company fulfils the legal requirements of the AGG and other relevant laws and which corrective measures it has taken or could take in addition in the various action areas.

## Review area: Continuing vocational training

The analysis of continuing vocational training with regard to equal gender opportunities using the gb-check focuses on questions about continuing training planning and also factual and organisational aspects of the measures implemented. Particular importance is attached to the question of how far the continuing training interests of male and female employee groups are taken equally into consideration and whether the different opportunities for participation, e.g. of part-time employees or employees with family duties, are taken into account. The tools available here are statistics, process analysis and pairwise comparison.

The **statistics on continuing vocational training** record the number of people taking part in the individual continuing vocational training measures, differentiated by gender and working hours (full-time/part-time). Continuing vocational

training covers all continuing vocational training measures that companies and/or organisations expressly structure and initiate as such or at least support (financially or organisationally), e.g. seminars and in-house training courses. The **process analysis on continuing vocational training** highlights possible discrimination on the basis of gender and provides ideas for measures which can prevent discrimination against these employee groups. The total of 16 questions considers various aspects of continuing training, the organisation of the training measures, the gender-sensitivity of course contents and methods and operational evaluation. The **pairwise comparison for continuing vocational training** allows a review to be carried out of discrimination in an individual case, e.g. if a complaint has been received from an employee who has not been allowed to take part in a particular vocational training measure. It shows whether there were objective reasons for turning down the employee in question. The pairwise comparison can also be used to prepare systematically for participation decisions taking gender equality into account. More than two employees can then be compared.

## Review area: Appraisal of performance, potential and skills

Private companies and public bodies apply various methods for appraising employees. Reference points may be performance shown, targets achieved, key figures, characteristics, skills or potential. The tools for the review area of appraisals can be used for all methods and reference points. The particular interest here is how far the criteria applied in the company and the operating methods are gender-neutral and guarantee a uniform appraisal standard. The tools available are statistics, process analysis and pairwise comparison.

The **statistics on appraisals** illustrate how the appraisal results are broken down by gender and full-time or part-time working. The **process analysis for appraisals** can show where the possible causes for significant differences lie in the distribution of appraisal results between women and men or full-time and part-time employees. The

31 questions in the process analysis cover aspects such as appraisal principles, appraisal criteria, classification and valuation, training and information, assessment and evaluation. The **pairwise comparison for appraisals** can be used to check the results of the appraisals of performance, potential or skills of two employees for any discrimination. A comparison is made between two employees of different genders, one of whom received a poorer appraisal. On the basis of operationally relevant comparison criteria relating, for example, to the assessed performance results or skills, it is possible to check whether the person receiving the poorer appraisal was disadvantaged compared with the other person. The tool can be used not only to review an appraisal retrospectively, if there are doubts that the appraisal was carried out without discrimination, for example, but also to prepare for an appraisal and thus ensure gender equality. In that case, more than two employees could be included in the comparison. The tool can also be used to check for multiple discrimination, e.g. on the basis of gender and ethnic origin. The people to be compared should then be selected accordingly.

categories to the statistics. This would then show how far current working hours in practice meet the needs of the employees. This comparison could assess current satisfaction with working hours amongst the workforce and provide a further basis for introducing family-friendly, quality-oriented working hours models. The 24 questions in the **process analysis for working hours** can reveal and thus prevent risks of gender-related discrimination in the structuring of working hours. Particular attention should be paid here to the part-time employees, who are predominantly female and who, because of their reduced working hours, are exposed to particular risks of unequal treatment compared with (male) full-time employees. In addition, the analysis also covers family-friendly, non-discriminatory working hours models which could help to prevent discrimination.

## Review area: Working hours

An analysis is carried out on operational working hours models and conditions, especially with regards to part-time employees and employees with family obligations. Important key points here are the working hours interests of employees and family-friendly and non-discriminatory working hours which are defined by different life phases. In this review area, the tools available are statistics and the process analysis.

The **statistics on working hours** show the current situation as regards the structuring of working hours in terms of their position and duration, the place of work and the working hours models applied, broken down by gender and by full-time and part-time employees. The evaluation can provide ideas for making the structure of working hours more family-friendly and more conducive to equality. It is particularly interesting to compare the actual working hours with the working hours that the employees would like. This could be done using a survey which asks about similar

# 3. From concept to completion: The scientific project

The development of the Gender Bias Check was divided into five modules, sometimes running in parallel, which are summarised in the following.

## Module 1: Development of an initial version of the tools

In the first six months of the project, on the basis of research through the relevant legal and business management literature, a set of Analysis Tools was initially prepared which could be used to uncover potentially discriminatory regulations and operating practices in the areas of

- job advertisements,
- personnel selection (recruitment and promotion),
- employment conditions,
- continuing vocational training,
- appraisal of performance, potential and skills and
- working hours.

The aim was to identify meaningful indicators of (un)equal treatment that are relevant for collating statistics, analysing the operational rules and processes in the various areas of action and for pairwise comparisons. The set of analysis options was conceived as a “tool box” containing different “tools” for checking equality from various points of view which could be used individually or in combination, depending on the area to be reviewed.

## Module 2: Testing the tools in pilot companies

To make sure that the gb-check is suitable for use in practice and for various operating situations,

the tool box was tested intensively in eleven pilot organisations in the public and private sector before being completed definitively. The following eleven companies and institutions were selected for the pilot phase:

- AXA Konzern AG
- The Building and Real Estate Management Authority of the state of North Rhine -Westphalia
- Deutsche Welle
- Eberswalde University for Sustainable Development
- IG BAU (Trade Union for Building, Agriculture and Environment)
- Internationaler Bund: Freier Träger der Jugend-, Sozial- und Bildungsarbeit e.V. (Non-profit Association for youth, social and educational work)
- Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG
- Otto Group
- Mainz University Medical Center
- UVEX WINTER Holding GmbH & Co. KG
- Weleda AG

In the company trial, which lasted a good six months from July 2016 to January 2017, a selection of tools was tested in each case, based on the situation in the company or institution and on its interests. The choice was also influenced by the aim of testing every single tool in at least two companies for feasibility. Figure 2 shows that 47 tests of individual tools were carried out in total; the various tools were tested with varying frequency. The aim of using every tool at least twice was largely fulfilled.

Figure 2: Pilot companies and tools used

Areas/tools	Company 1	Company 2	Company 3	Company 4	Company 5	Company 6	Company 7	Company 8	Company 9	Company 10	Company 11	No. of tests per tool
<b>Job advertisements</b>												
Process analysis		✓			✓		✓					3
<b>Personnel selection</b>												
Recruitment statistics		(✓)	✓		✓		✓	✓			✓	5
Promotion statistics										✓	✓	2
Process analysis		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	8
Pairwise comparison					✓							1
<b>Working and employment conditions</b>												
Employee structure statistics				✓		(✓)	✓	✓	(✓)	✓		4
Health protection statistics						✓		✓				2
Process analysis		✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓		7
<b>Continuing vocational training</b>												
Statistics	✓								✓		(✓)	2
Process analysis	✓								✓		✓	3
Pairwise comparison												0
<b>Appraisal</b>												
Statistics												0
Process analysis			✓		✓							2
Pairwise comparison												0
<b>Working hours</b>												
Statistics	✓	(✓)				✓						2
Process analysis	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓		✓			6
No. of tools tested	4	4	4	3	6	4	5	5	4	4	4	47

(✓) = internal statistic without documentation

In the pilot phase one introductory workshop and two analysis workshops were carried out in each case; in addition, preliminary discussions were held and organisational agreements reached with all pilot companies. The results of these workshops were documented. A confidential final report was prepared for every pilot company containing the analysis results, the proposed measures and feedback on the tools and on working with the gb-check.

## Module 3: Evaluation of pilot phase and revision of tools

In this module, which ran from January to May 2017, the pilot phase was evaluated and the gb-check tools were revised. This process incorporated not only the systematically logged experiences from the practical application of the gb-check but also the feedback from the pilot companies and participants in the round-table discussions and exchanges of experience.

Overall, it was found in the pilot phase that the systematic review of gender equality (with scientific support) was found by the participating companies to be efficient, helpful and supportive. The final reports that were made available were also considered to be useful for further equality work and for implementing the agreed measures. The individual tools were also rated essentially and practical and understandable, but various valuable hints for revising certain part-aspects were also provided. After concluding the pilot phase in January 2017, a meeting of members of the project groups from the pilot companies was organised, which was attended by seven pilot companies. This meeting gave the pilot companies the opportunity to exchange experiences and network.

## Module 4: Cooperation with social partners and professional associations

Social partners and professional associations were included from the beginning of the project so that

they could be informed about the development of the gb-check and provide feedback on the practical feasibility of the gb-check and to promote its acceptance. For this, the tried and tested concept of the round-table discussion was used to integrate and involve various interest groups. Round-table discussions were organised at the beginning of the project, before the pilot phase and at the end of the project. The following were invited: the German Trades Union Federation (DGB), The Federal Association of German Employer Federations (BDA) and the representatives of their relevant individual association, the dbb (German Civil Servants' Association), groups such as the Deutsche Frauenrat e.V. [German Women's Council], the Juristinnenbund e.V. [Association of Female Lawyers], plus equality officers, members of works and staff councils and other interested multipliers and experts. There were three Round Tables in total, each with different objectives:

### First Round Table on 10 May 2016: Providing information about the project and finding pilot companies

The first Round Table was attended by around 40 interested representatives from employer and employee associations, works and staff councils, women's and equality officers and representatives of companies. The primary objective was to introduce the gb-check project. After two expert presentations on the legal and economic aspects of gender-based discrimination in working life and employment, the gb-check project and its content were presented. Social partners and the experts from science and industry were given the opportunity in the final group discussion in a "World Café" format to exchange views and experiences on topics relating to gender-based discrimination in working and employment conditions and to offer recommendations for the gb-check project.

### Second Round Table on 1 February 2017: Report on experience gained in the pilot phase

The second Round Table was primarily intended to present the results from the pilot phase of the gb-check project. It was attended by around 40 people including members of various interest

groups, such as employer and employee associations, women's and equality officers and representatives of companies. After a brief review of the project stages so far, the participants divided into working groups for a presentation of the individual analysis tools in the gb-check and of the results of the pilot phase. In the six working groups, the representatives of the pilot companies reported on their experiences and participants were able to ask them questions. In addition, the strengths and weaknesses of the tools were discussed. Following the event, in preparation for the third Round Table, social partners and interested employers were to be found to draw up position papers on the set of analysis tools. For this, the participants were asked guideline questions about possible aspects of a position paper.

### Third Round Table on 6 April 2017: Position papers of social partners and professional associations and encouraging the dissemination and use of the gb-check

The third and last Round Table was intended for the presentation and discussion of position papers on the gb-check by social partners, professional associations and pilot companies and to work out ideas for disseminating and ensuring the quality of the analysis tools beyond the end of the project. It was attended by around 25 people, including members of various interest groups, e.g. trades unions, women's and quality officers and representatives of companies. Position papers were submitted by the Deutsche Frauenrat e.V., dbb – national women's representative, Deutsche Juristinnenbund e.V., Vereinigung der bayerischen Wirtschaft e.V. [Association of Bavarian Industry] the ver.di [United Services Trade Union], national administration and the NGG [Food, Beverage and Catering Industry Union]. Apart from one exception, the gb-check was rated very positively overall, and the application / use of the tools was generally supported and favoured.

## Module 5: Publicity work, supporting the dissemination and use of the gb-check

To increase the level of awareness of the gb-check tools and to make it more familiar to a broader (professional) public, an accompanying flyer was produced, press releases were issued and general website pages describing the project were created, both for the Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency and for the Harriet Taylor Mill Institute of Berlin SEL as a scientific cooperation partner.

A website was designed for the completed gb-check toolbox ([www.gb-check.de](http://www.gb-check.de)), which provides general information about the gb-check and where the individual tools can be downloaded. These are supplemented by a practical manual explaining how to use the tools and draw up a company review project. In addition, it also provides further literature references, extra information and an explanatory film.

The gb-check was presented to the public at a concluding event and the participating pilot companies were presented with a certificate in acknowledgement of their commitment.

# 4. In practice: The application of the gb-check

## 4.1 Operational review procedure

Basically, any company or any administrative body can use the gb-check **on their own**. In the pilot phase, the review was accompanied and moderated by two scientific experts in each case. This **support** was consistently considered by the pilot companies to be sensible and useful, and it is therefore generally recommended that external support and advice are obtained when using the gb-check tools.

Whether implemented independently or with expert support, it is recommended that the company review is carried out in the following **six steps**:

- Step 1: Forming a company project group
- Step 2: Choice of review areas and tools
- Step 3: Collecting and processing data and information

- Step 4: Using the selected tools
- Step 5: Writing a results report
- Step 6: Developing measures beyond the review

Figure 3 below explains these steps in more detail.

The **resources** required to review equality with using the gb-check include, firstly, the staff and time required to carry out the work in the project group, the material and organisational preparation and the follow-up of the various workshops. Secondly, financial resources will be needed for any travel expenses, working materials and hosting the project group plus, if applicable, fees and travel expenses for external consultants.

Figure 3: Procedure for reviews using the gb-check

Step	Notes
1. Forming a company project group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>— Task: Carrying out the review using the gb-check</li><li>— Working atmosphere: Open discussion of different viewpoints and self-critical analysis</li><li>— Composition: Personnel department, works or staff council, equality and/or diversity officer, other committed employees</li><li>— Constitution: Half-day introductory workshop to provide information about the gb-check, to appoint project manager, define responsibilities, deputising rules and other rules for collaboration</li></ul>

Step	Notes
<b>2. Choice of review areas and tools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Done in the introductory workshop</li> <li>— Review areas can be worked through selectively or consecutively at particular time intervals</li> <li>— Selection criteria: Checking the effectiveness of equality policy measures already implemented or presumed need for action or checking planned personnel policy measures or company agreements</li> </ul>
<b>3. Collecting and processing data and information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— For statistics: Personal data in relation to the selected review area</li> <li>— For process analyses: Collective agreements, company or service agreements, guidelines, other internal documents</li> <li>— For pairwise comparisons: Individual, anonymised data</li> <li>— Time needed: Depending on operational data and information management</li> </ul>
<b>4. Using the selected tools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Done in analysis workshops: Analysis of statistics, processing of questions in the process analyses, evaluating pairwise comparisons</li> <li>— Duration: Approx. one day per review area</li> <li>— Chairing and documenting the discussion and results required</li> </ul>
<b>5. Writing a results report</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— By a member of the project group or the external support consultant</li> <li>— Summary of findings from the analysis workshops</li> <li>— Basis for planning and implementing measures and objectives</li> <li>— Mainly for internal use, but also for PR work and as a requirement for a certificate from the FADA</li> </ul>
<b>6. Developing measures beyond the review</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>— Done in concluding workshop</li> <li>— Supplementing the measures proposed in the analysis workshops</li> <li>— Concrete planning of implementation of measures</li> <li>— Planning internal and external communication (publication, discussion)</li> </ul>

## 4.2 Experiences of pilot companies in carrying out the reviews

### 4.2.1 Time spent and personnel required

Project groups were formed in all pilot companies. Except for two companies, each group was made up of four to eight members. In some cases, additional operating experts were called in for individual review areas, or representatives appointed for particular members of the project. The members of the project groups were almost exclusively representatives of the competent departments or divisions from HR or the company management, the works or staff council, plus equality or diversity officers. In one pilot company, two female employees were invited to join the project group to present the point of view of the equality management target group (“people affected”) in the analyses and discussions.

Apart from one exception, two workshop days were sufficient to analyse the selected review areas; in one pilot company, the project group met a third time. The time spent in collecting and processing data, information and regulations varied considerably, but was not recorded by the pilot companies in hours or days. Collecting regulations and information about the review area in question was not a problem for the pilot companies; the information was generally available in the organisation’s intranet system.

In the view of the pilot companies, the time spent on the review using the gb-check was balanced by the benefit to the organisation from the review, which was considered by the pilot companies to lie, for example, in the help provided in objectively and effectively analysing equal opportunities within the company and in the useful ideas for equality and diversity work. In addition, if the results are communicated internally and externally, the company’s own reputation as an equality-oriented company could be consolidated (or developed). This in turn, it

was stated, is an important factor in attracting and keeping qualified staff in the employment market.

### 4.2.2 Results of the analyses

The results of the analyses in the individual pilot companies is summarised, for confidentiality reasons.

The **review area of job advertisements** was covered in three pilot companies. In summary, it can be stated that operating routines that meet the legal requirements of the AGG have generally been developed here already. However, the review also identified scope for formulations and procedures which could encourage women (or men) to apply for jobs where one gender is under-represented.

The **review area of personnel selection** was covered in eight pilot companies. As a summary of the analyses in these companies, it can be stated that recording the necessary data proved difficult for some of the participating pilot companies. Essentially, but not exclusively, the reason for this was the requirement under data protection legislation to delete personal data. However, most companies had no problem, on the whole, with basing personnel selection on requirements profiles drawn up on the basis of job descriptions and used for the systematic derivation of the profile of the applicants. The task orientation of tests, the (part-) standardisation of job interviews and the avoidance of prohibited questions were also described as a matter of course. Subjective personnel selection decisions were not completely excluded; in fact, it was felt possible that the choice of applications, the formulation of decision-making criteria and the determination of suitability could also be influenced by gender-based standards, values and stereotypes.

The **review area of working and employment conditions** was covered in eight pilot companies. The summary of the reviews shows that the provisions of the law on maternity protection and parental leave were very largely complied with in these pilot companies. The laws on caregiver leave, on the other hand, were overwhelmingly considered to be unattractive and generally replaced or supplemented by individual agreements. All three areas produced indications for the need for more comprehensive information and advice and thus room for further improving the compatibility of a family and a career. This also includes stronger integration of men and fathers in these areas. No discrimination against marginally part-time and temporary employees was found, even if systematic transfer to secure employment was rarely reviewed or even desired. The gender-sensitive evaluation of risk assessments and the corresponding derivation of measures still seem to be in their infancy. There is also room for improvement as regards rules for dealing with cases of sexual harassment.

The **review area of continuing vocational training** was covered in three pilot companies. In summary, it can be stated that the number of people participating in continuing training measures is generally not yet recorded and evaluated on a gender-differentiated basis as a matter of course, although it was clear, from the example of one pilot company, that this could provide valuable results and ideas for continuing training courses. As a positive factor for equal opportunities in continuing training, it was found that systematic continuing training planning and the provision of comprehensive, easily accessible information about training opportunities to all employees were well-established standards in all the pilot companies. It was also possible to record examples of measures to make it easier for employees with family obligations to take part in continuing training measures. On the other hand, the possibility of continuing vocational training being used to increase the proportion of women in management positions or to expand the gender competence and awareness of employees was very rarely seen or used. In the choice of seminar leaders or the design of continuing training measures, gender aspects have so far not been considered systematically and comprehensively.

The **review area of appraisal** was covered in two pilot companies. The requirements for the appraisal procedures were largely felt to be unproblematic in terms of gender equality, but the risk of possible discrimination was also identified in some aspects. This potential for discrimination was found in all instances where the subjectivity of the appraisal process was not limited systematically, but allowed to have a major influence on the appraisal result, such as in the assessment of skills and their classification into vaguely defined appraisal categories or the unsystematic, barely understandable derivation of the overall result of the appraisal. No reports were received of measures to promote awareness of the risks of discrimination in the appraisal, whether this is by training the assessors or through a gender-based analysis and the (internal) publication of this analysis.

The **review area of working hours** was covered in six pilot companies. They recorded a wide range of working hours models and attitudes to the various aspects of structuring of working hours. It can be concluded for all the participating pilot companies that the statutory provisions for the structuring of working hours and part-time working are generally followed, although, for example, a more consistent approach would be desirable when advertising, part-time jobs and the preferred filling of full-time jobs by part-time employees with a desire to extend their working hours a more consistent approach would be desirable. A tendency to place a time limit on part-time working was discerned. In the structuring of non-discriminatory, family-friendly working hours, the companies tended to go more for flexible, individual negotiations and agreements than for systematic concepts in which the rights and obligations and framework conditions for defining working hours could be defined uniformly and reliably.

## 4.3 From test to practice: Options for transfer and sustainability

Ideas for promoting equal opportunities for women and men in companies or public administrative bodies are developed even in the analysis workshops; these are then documented and incorporated into the results report. These ideas are discussed again, evaluated and prioritised in the concluding workshop. In the time between the analysis workshops and the concluding workshop, new aspects may be determined or other additional proposals may be submitted. These may be presented by individual project group members or developed jointly by the project group.

After the project group has selected measures to promote the equality of women and men, specific steps must be agreed to implement these equality policy measures. These can basically involve three implementation levels:

### Including other people and functions

The people and functions in the company or administrative body that should be included in the implementation of equality measures depends partly on the decision-making competence that has been assigned to the project group. It is conceivable, for example, that decisions about individual equality measures must be made by particular hierarchical levels or functions in the company and administration, such as the Management Board or Board of Directors, responsible managers, committees or institutions. On the other hand, the group may also need to be expanded from the point of view of content. If the measures, for example, relate to the training of managers, the project results should be discussed with the people responsible for continuing training.

### Informing others about the results of the analysis and the planned measures

The way in which the review project, its results and the measures to be taken are communicated plays a major part in achieving a lasting positive effect. Internal and external communication should therefore be carefully planned.

If the review has shown that “everything is absolutely fine”, communication internally will pay tribute to the performance, in terms of equality policy, of the people responsible; inwardly and outwardly, this information can help improve the company’s image. If measures to improve the equal treatment of both genders have been developed and planned, internal and external communication about this shows that the company or administrative body is keen to improve equal opportunities or to prevent inequality.

### Planning the implementation of measures: Who, what, when, how?

A specific implementation plan is required for the equality measures that have been adopted. With more extensive measures, it may be necessary to form separate project groups and to approach these measures using project management methods and techniques. In this way, it is also possible to initiate and specifically control a process of increasing the awareness of all employees of equality matters and developing an equality-focused organisation.

Most of the companies involved in the pilot phase have planned or already implemented measures after the review using the gb-check. Here are a few examples from these companies:

- Analysis of further review areas using the gb-check: The review areas will be gradually expanded in order to achieve more broadly based information about the equality status in the company
- Repeating the review in the same review area in order to be able to check on progress, e.g. in increasing the proportion of female managers
- Improving internal information on equality topics such as maternity protection, parental leave, caregiving leave and health protection
- Improving the provision of advice, e.g. by including the relevant (external) partner in questions to do with parental leave
- Incorporating the results into existing equality plans
- Providing information about existing provisions and tools to promote gender equality
- Revising company documents with a view to using gender-neutral formulations and issuing guidelines and notes on this
- Improving existing tools, e.g. appraisals of performance, potential and skills
- Introducing statistics, for example, on personnel selection decisions
- Advertising all jobs as part-time posts where this is possible
- Improving a works agreement e.g. concerning flexible working hours models
- Increasing awareness of specific themes in training courses for managers

The sustained promotion of equality between women and men in companies or administrative bodies can be supported if, in addition to reviewing work and employment equality using the gb-check, gender pay equality is also reviewed using eg-check.de. The two sets of review tools are complementary in terms of content. While the gb-check concentrates on various areas of working life, eg-check.de focuses solely on pay and on realising the pay equality principle of “equal pay for equal work and for work of equal value”.

This publication is part of the Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency's public relations work; it is offered free of charge and not intended for sale.

**Publisher:**

Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes  
11018 Berlin

[www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de](http://www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de)

**Contact Counselling:**

Phone: +49 (0) 30 18555-1865

(Mon–Fri, 9 a.m.–12 p.m. and 1 p.m.–3 p.m.)

Fax no.: +49 (0) 30 18555-41865

E-mail address: [beratung@ads.bund.de](mailto:beratung@ads.bund.de)

Visiting hours by appointment

**Headquarters:**

Phone: +49 (0) 30 18555-1855

E-mail address: [poststelle@ads.bund.de](mailto:poststelle@ads.bund.de)

**Design:** [www.avitamin.de](http://www.avitamin.de)

**Current at:** August 2017

In collaboration with Berlin  
School of Economics and Law



Hochschule für  
Wirtschaft und Recht Berlin  
Berlin School of Economics and Law

Scientific support from  
Dr. Andrea-Hilla Carl, Dr. Andrea Jochmann-Döll and Dr. Karin Tondorf

Supported by  
the European Union

