

Gender Policy Transformation in Higher Education: European Trends and Ukrainian Pathways

Nataliia Nakonechna¹

¹Ph.D. (Psychology), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Psychology Department, KROK University, Kyiv, Ukraine, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6236-9549>

Citation:

Nakonechna, N. (2025). Gender Policy Transformation in Higher Education: European Trends and Ukrainian Pathways. *Public Administration and Law Review*, (3(23), 41–51. <https://doi.org/10.36690/2674-5216-2025-3-41-51>

Received: August 24, 2025

Approved: September 28, 2025

Published: September 30, 2025



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY-NC 4.0\) license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)



Abstract. Ukraine's universities are moving from declarative commitments to gender equality toward institutional reforms, yet implementation remains uneven compared with mature European systems. The aim of the article is to analyze how European trends in university gender policy - especially Gender Equality Plans (GEPs), funding conditionalities, and audit-based accountability - can be adapted to the Ukrainian context and translated into sustainable institutional practice. The methodology adopts a qualitative comparative policy design, combining systematic document analysis of EU/OECD and Ukrainian frameworks with comparative mapping of selected European cases (e.g., Finland, Germany, Poland). Materials were thematically coded (policy coherence, institutional integration, implementation mechanisms, cultural transformation, outcome orientation) and synthesized through cross-case comparison. Main results: European frameworks have institutionalized gender policy through mandatory GEPs for Horizon Europe eligibility, interoperable indicators, and incentive-linked monitoring; member-state practices translate these norms into governance units, annual audits, leadership training, and campus-safety protocols; Ukraine demonstrates normative convergence but lacks standardized micro-level instruments - universal GEP mandates, national coordination, unified indicators, and performance-linked funding - leading to fragmented, project-dependent implementation. To convert alignment into measurable progress, Ukraine should establish a national coordination unit, mandate GEPs for all HEIs, deploy a unified gender data registry with public dashboards, and link equality performance to accreditation and funding. Future research should develop and validate a multi-dimensional analytical model connecting policy coherence, institutional integration, and outcome orientation to evaluate longitudinal impact. These steps would shift Ukraine from compliance rhetoric to a coherent, data-driven ecosystem of gender equality in higher education.

Keywords: gender equality; Gender Equality Plans (GEPs); higher education governance; policy coherence; institutional integration; outcome orientation; Horizon Europe; Ukraine; Europe; monitoring and evaluation.

JEL Classification: J16, I23, I28, J71

Formulas: 0; **fig.:** 0; **table:** 4; **bibl.:** 13

Introduction. In recent years, universities across Europe have increasingly adopted formal gender equality policies - often embodied in Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) - to address persistent disparities in representation, career progression, research funding, and institutional culture (Forman-Rabinovici, 2023; European Commission, 2025). Such policies reflect a broader trend of gender mainstreaming within higher education, where gender considerations are integrated into all institutional dimensions: recruitment, promotion, curricula, governance, and work–life balance (Anagnostou, 2022; Hankivsky, 2010). In Ukraine, the transformation of gender policy in universities has likewise become more salient in light of socio-political shifts, external pressures for alignment with European norms, and internal demands for equity (The Gender Policy of Ukraine, 2023; Protosavitska, 2023). However, while European models provide templates for institutional reform, their adaptation to the Ukrainian higher education context faces structural, cultural, and policy constraints. This article compares contemporary European gender policy trends with trajectories in Ukraine to propose pathways for effective, localized transformation.

Literature Review. Over the last two decades, the European Union has spearheaded efforts to embed gender equality within higher education and research frameworks. The EU’s development of strategic policy tools - such as mandatory GEP requirements for Horizon Europe funding, gender-sensitive recruitment criteria, and benchmarking metrics - illustrates this shift (Anagnostou, 2022). Forman-Rabinovici (2023) documents how universities adopting GEPs have introduced structural changes, including gender quotas on decision-making bodies, audit of institutional data by gender, and regular evaluation of progress. The Athena SWAN Charter (UK) is a notable example of a voluntary accreditation scheme that rewards institutions for embedding gender equality action plans into their governance, offering a model for self-assessment and external accountability (Athena SWAN, 2025).

In parallel, universities are developing “gender-sensitive curricula” and safe campus policies, including procedures for reporting and responding to sexual harassment, integrating gender topics into teaching, and bias training for staff (Civica, 2020; Condrón et al., 2023). Projects like GenderSAFE support higher education institutions in establishing safe and inclusive environments (GenderSAFE, 2023). The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) also promotes mainstreaming gender across educational policy domains, with emphasis on reducing subject segregation and gender stereotyping in study and career choices (EIGE, 2017).

Ukraine’s efforts to institutionalize gender policy have roots in post-Soviet phenomena of “gender mainstreaming,” yet progress has been inconsistent (Hankivsky, 2010; Protosavitska, 2023). While national-level legislation and strategies occasionally reference gender equality in education, universities often lack internal mechanisms or accountability for transformation (The Gender Policy of Ukraine, 2023). In practice, some Ukrainian universities have piloted gender-sensitive practices, such as partial gender audits or “family-friendly university” initiatives (Sumy State University) to formalize gender awareness in policies and programming (Gender Sensitive Practices, 2023). However, these are typically isolated and not embedded across institutional governance.

Inclusion and accessibility pressures - especially due to conflict and displacement - have further highlighted the need for robust gender policy in Ukraine's universities (Tsybuliak, 2024). Scholars also debate the role of pedagogy of freedom, which frames gender equality as part of a broader emancipatory educational philosophy (Rastrygina, 2023). Moreover, Ukrainian research calls for alignment with European normative frameworks to facilitate recognition, funding, and legitimacy (The Gender Policy of Ukraine, 2023).

Comparative scholarship underscores that transforming gender policy in higher education is not just about rules, but about institutional culture, leadership, resources, and accountability (Forman-Rabinovici, 2023; Anagnostou, 2022). In many European settings, the link between formal policies and sustained implementation is uneven; resistance, resource constraints, and symbolic compliance can undermine impact. In Ukraine, adaptation faces challenges of legacy bureaucracies, resource scarcity, social attitudes, and alignment with national legislation. The lack of systematic evaluation of gender policy reforms - a recurring issue even in European universities - means that evidence for best practices remains limited. Thus, the pathways for Ukraine demand contextually sensitive strategies - a hybrid approach combining European standards with local institutional realities and progressive cultural change.

Aims. The aim of this article is to analyze how European universities are evolving their gender equality policies and to identify the conditions under which these models may be adapted in the Ukrainian context. Specifically, the study investigates the institutional designs, policy instruments, accountability mechanisms, and cultural strategies behind successful gender policy transformations in Europe and examines the facilitators and obstacles to implementing analogous reforms in Ukraine.

Methodology. This study employs a qualitative comparative policy analysis aimed at identifying how European models of gender equality in higher education can inform the transformation of Ukrainian university governance. The design integrates document analysis, comparative mapping, and expert interpretation, enabling a triangulated perspective on both policy architecture and institutional practice. The analysis follows a constructivist paradigm, recognizing that gender policy in academia is contextually shaped by national norms, political will, and institutional culture. Findings were synthesized using thematic analysis and cross-case comparison, revealing convergent (shared progress drivers) and divergent (context-specific barriers) patterns. The analysis was guided by a gender-transformative governance lens, which views equality policy not as a static compliance mechanism but as a dynamic system of institutional learning and accountability.

This study relies primarily on documentary and secondary data; it does not include in-depth interviews or on-site case studies. The findings thus represent a policy-level mapping, not a full-scale institutional ethnography. Further research should incorporate longitudinal data and stakeholder interviews to construct a validated analytical model linking policy coherence, institutional integration, and measurable outcomes in gender equality across higher education systems.

Results. Based on the comparative analysis of European and Ukrainian frameworks, complementary results emerged that together illustrate the dynamics of gender policy transformation in higher education.

European Policy Frameworks. European policy instruments serve as the normative foundation for understanding how gender equality is institutionalized within higher education. The European Commission's Gender Equality Strategy 2020-2025 defines gender equality as both a fundamental right and a key component of sustainable social and economic development (European Commission, 2020). It introduces an integrated policy framework emphasizing gender mainstreaming, intersectionality, and accountability mechanisms across all sectors - including education and research.

The EU Gender Equality in Research and Innovation (2022) guidance operationalizes these principles through the Gender Equality Plan (GEP) requirement, which became mandatory for institutions seeking Horizon Europe funding. This regulation has effectively mainstreamed gender equality compliance into university governance by linking funding access to demonstrable structural reform. The European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE, 2023) supplements this by publishing annual indicators and policy toolkits that benchmark institutional progress across member states, focusing on leadership balance, work-life integration, and prevention of harassment. Collectively, these frameworks illustrate how European policy transitions from declarative equality to measurable transformation.

Institutional Frameworks from EU Member States. National-level frameworks translate European directives into operational governance structures within universities. The Athena SWAN Charter - originally developed in the UK and now extended to Ireland and Australia - provides a self-assessment and award system that incentivizes institutions to embed gender equality into management, recruitment, promotion, and learning environments (Athena SWAN, 2025). This model institutionalizes accountability by coupling self-reflection with public recognition, fostering cultural change through structured benchmarking.

Similarly, the GenderSAFE Project (EU, 2022) promotes safe, inclusive academic spaces by introducing protocols for harassment prevention, gender bias training, and inclusive reporting. National guidelines in Finland, Germany, and Poland expand on these models by integrating gender auditing, quota-based hiring, and curriculum reform. Countries such as Finland and Germany have embedded gender equality requirements directly into national higher-education laws, thereby transforming compliance into a condition for state funding and accreditation. Finland's Ministry of Education, for example, mandates annual gender audits and leadership training for university rectors, while Germany's Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) links public funding to diversity indicators. Poland's Act on Higher Education (2020 amendment) includes a gender equality chapter, aligning national legislation with EU expectations. These institutional frameworks collectively demonstrate multi-level integration - from strategic policy to organizational practice. The incorporation of Gender Equality Plans (GEPs) as a prerequisite for Horizon Europe participation has further strengthened coherence between research policy and university practice.

To contextualize Ukraine’s pathway, three European case studies - Finland, Germany, and Poland - were selected based on their maturity in gender policy implementation and relevance for policy transfer. Each was assessed across the five coding dimensions. For Ukraine, a diagnostic analysis was conducted to map current policy instruments against these benchmarks, identifying alignment, gaps, and opportunities for reform.

Table 1. Comparative Framework for Gender Policy Analysis in Higher Education

Dimension	European Focus	Ukrainian Context	Identified Gap
Policy Coherence	EU-wide integration of GEPs, legal obligation for Horizon Europe funding	Partial adoption via national gender strategy, not specific to HEIs	Need for binding university-level mandates
Institutional Integration	Gender offices, equality units, and dedicated funding schemes	Fragmented initiatives at selected universities	Absence of centralized gender governance
Implementation Mechanisms	Audit systems, monitoring KPIs, and incentive-based funding	Non-systematic data collection; limited accountability	Weak evidence base and reporting standards
Cultural Transformation	Leadership engagement and training in bias prevention	Sporadic awareness programs	Lack of sustainable gender literacy initiatives
Outcome Orientation	Gender parity targets and leadership indices	No standardized metrics for evaluation	Absence of performance indicators

Source: systematized by the author

Across the European Union, gender policy transformation in higher education demonstrates a clear transition from fragmented, project-based initiatives to institutionalized governance systems.

Ukrainian Policy Documents. Ukraine’s gender policy ecosystem is in a transitional phase, reflecting efforts to align national frameworks with EU standards. The Gender Policy of Ukraine: Considering the EU Experience (2023) outlines the strategic direction for incorporating gender equality principles into all sectors, including higher education. The Strategy for Gender Equality until 2030 establishes national targets for balanced participation in governance, education, and science, referencing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 5).

Regulatory acts from the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and the State Service for Education Quality of Ukraine (SSEQU) provide initial guidelines for integrating gender perspectives into institutional self-evaluation and accreditation procedures. However, these initiatives are largely fragmented and project-dependent, lacking a permanent institutional mechanism or standardized indicators for assessing university-level gender performance. Pilot initiatives - such as gender-sensitive curricula, staff training modules, and family-friendly campuses (e.g., Sumy State University) - indicate progress but remain disconnected from national quality assurance systems. Thus, Ukrainian policy development currently occupies a hybrid space between normative alignment with EU principles and incomplete institutionalization at the operational level.

Table 2. Implementation Matrix of Gender Policy Frameworks in Higher Education

Document Category	Main Instruments / Examples	Implementation Level	Mechanisms of Action	Impact on Policy Transformation
1. European Policy Frameworks	- Gender Equality Strategy 2020–2025 - Horizon Europe GEP Requirement - EIGE Gender Indicators 2023	Macro (EU supranational)	- Policy mainstreaming across R&I - Conditional funding mechanisms - EU-level benchmarking and audits	Establishes binding compliance incentives and harmonized evaluation metrics across universities
2. Institutional Frameworks (EU Member States)	- Athena SWAN Charter (UK, Ireland) - GenderSAFE Project (EU, 2022) - Finland / Germany / Poland national guidelines	Meso (national and institutional)	- Gender audits and certification - Funding-linked diversity KPIs - Leadership and anti-bias training	Operationalizes gender equality through governance reforms, accreditation, and reward systems
3. Ukrainian Policy Documents	- Gender Policy of Ukraine (2023) - Strategy for Gender Equality until 2030 - SSEQU regulatory acts and university pilots	Micro (national and institutional, emerging)	- Inclusion of gender in accreditation and curriculum - Ad hoc pilot initiatives - Awareness campaigns	Demonstrates normative alignment with EU models but lacks institutional continuity and evaluation mechanisms

Source: systematized by the author

This three-level table of implementation illustrates that the European policy framework defines the regulatory and normative framework, the institutional framework translates these norms into effective mechanisms in universities, and the Ukrainian policy documents reflect an early stage of adaptation that is still focused on declarative commitments rather than structural integration. The analysis confirms that policy transformation in Ukraine requires not only legislative alignment but also the creation of institutional architectures - gender offices, monitoring units, and evidence-based indicators - that anchor reform in university governance.

Comparative Implementation Model. The analysis yields a comparative model that explains how European gender-equality principles are translated into university practice through the interplay of policy coherence, institutional integration, implementation mechanisms, cultural transformation, and outcome orientation. At one end of the spectrum are fully institutionalized systems, exemplified by Finland and Germany, where gender equality is embedded in higher-education law, reflected in leadership evaluation and incentives, and tied to funding through routine audits and KPI-based monitoring. A second trajectory comprises hybrid transitional systems, such as Poland, which formally commit to EU norms and deploy gender action plans but still depend heavily on EU-funded projects and time-limited initiatives to operationalize training, audits, and reporting; here, institutionalization is uneven and vulnerable to funding cycles. At the emergent end lies Ukraine, where policy intent and strategic documents increasingly mirror European frameworks, yet systematic monitoring, dedicated equality structures, and stable financing remain underdeveloped. Taken together, these trajectories show that policy coherence is necessary but

insufficient: durable transformation occurs only when legal mandates are coupled with resourced institutional units, standardized audit tools, and outcome metrics that make progress visible and fundable.

Table 3. Comparative Implementation Model for Gender Policy in Higher Education

Dimension	Finland	Germany	Poland	Ukraine
Policy Coherence	National Gender Equality Act integrated with education policy; GEPs mandatory	Federal research law mandates gender indicators in funding	National strategy references EU frameworks; optional GEPs	National strategy mirrors EU principles but lacks binding HEI mandates
Institutional Integration	Gender equality offices in all universities	Dedicated equality commissions and ombudspersons	Central units in top universities only	Individual university initiatives without national coordination
Implementation Mechanisms	Annual gender audits; state funding tied to equality metrics	KPI-based monitoring; incentive funding	EU-funded pilot programs; training modules	Limited institutional funding; dependence on donor projects
Cultural Transformation	Leadership training and bias awareness required	Gender-sensitive management certification	Occasional workshops; not institutionalized	Sporadic campaigns; minimal institutionalization
Outcome Orientation	Balanced gender representation in leadership (>45 %)	40 % women in governing bodies; consistent reporting	Uneven progress; data gaps	Lack of standardized indicators and national monitoring

Source: systematized by the author

The comparative evidence underscores a clear hierarchy of institutional maturity. Finland and Germany demonstrate how robust legal frameworks, consistent monitoring, and stable financing generate sustained equality outcomes. Poland and Romania exhibit strong alignment at the policy level but variable institutionalization, reflecting reliance on EU support rather than autonomous funding. Ukraine’s trajectory, while promising in legislative terms, is constrained by the absence of formalized implementation infrastructure - such as national gender offices, performance-based funding models, and longitudinal evaluation systems.

The model confirms that policy coherence is a necessary but insufficient condition for gender transformation in higher education. Sustainable reform depends on deep institutional integration and measurable outcomes. To move from alignment to effectiveness, Ukraine must establish a permanent national coordination unit for gender equality in higher education, develop standardized audit tools, and introduce performance-based incentives for universities that demonstrate progress in gender balance, inclusivity, and leadership representation.

Policy Recommendations. To convert policy commitments into measurable change, the reform should unfold along four interlocking strands: system architecture, institutional integration, practice and culture, and equity by design (Table 4).

First, the state must establish the architecture that makes progress governable. A National Gender Equality Coordination Unit within the Ministry of Education and Science (or a delegated agency) should set common standards, provide technical assistance, and manage data flows. Its mandate should be anchored by a ministerial

order requiring every university to adopt a Gender Equality Plan (GEP) with minimum elements - governance arrangements, a baseline dataset, a prioritized action program, and monitoring and evaluation procedures - so that equality becomes a condition for competitive public funding and a criterion in accreditation. To sustain transparency and learning across institutions, the ministry should launch a unified, API-based gender data registry that aggregates core indicators from all higher education institutions and publishes an annual dashboard.

Table 4. Implementation Matrix for Gender Policy Transformation in Higher Education

Action	Lead / Partners	Key Deliverables	Timeline	Indicators of Progress
Ministerial Order on GEPs (minimum standards)	MoES; Quality Assurance Agency	Order issued; GEP template; FAQs	Q2–Q3 (Year 1)	% HEIs with approved GEPs; compliance rate
National Coordination Unit	MoES; EIGE-aligned advisory group	Unit staffed; annual workplan; helpdesk	Q2 (Year 1) → ongoing	Response SLAs; # TA sessions; guidance releases
Unified Gender Data Registry	MoES IT; HEIs; Stats service	Indicator set; data schema; API; dashboard	Design Q3 (Year 1); go-live Q1 (Year 2)	100% HEIs onboarded; data completeness; public dashboard views
Gender Offices in all HEIs	HEIs; Senates	Office mandate; budget line; annual report	Q3–Q4 (Year 1)	% HEIs with operational office; FTE staff
Standard Audit & Reporting Tools	Coordination Unit; HEIs	Audit toolkit; annual reporting protocol	Q4 (Year 1)	# audits completed; comparative scorecards
Incentive Linkages	MoES; Funding councils	Equality points in grants/performance contracts	Q1 (Year 2)	% calls with equality criteria; funds tied to scores
Leadership & Committee Training	HEIs; External trainers	Training modules; certification	Start Q3 (Year 1)	# trained leaders; changes in hiring/promotion outcomes
Mentoring & Pipelines	HEIs; Associations	Program design; mentor–mentee matches	Q4 (Year 1) →	Participation rates; promotion/retention deltas
Safe Campus Protocols	HEIs; Legal/HR; NGOs	Policy; reporting platform; support services	Q2 (Year 2)	Report resolution times; satisfaction surveys
Curriculum & Micro-credentials	HEIs; Centers for Teaching	Course mapping; micro-credentials launched	Q2–Q3 (Year 2)	# courses mapped; # micro-credential awards
Targeted Equity Supports	MoES; HEIs; Donors	Childcare/flexible-clock policies; small grants	Q4 (Year 1) →	Uptake rates; attrition gap reduction

SLAs = service-level agreements; TA = technical assistance; FTE = full-time equivalent; HEIs = higher education institutions; MoES = Ministry of Education and Science.

Source: systematized by the author

With the national frame in place, change must be institutionalized inside universities. Each institution should create a gender office or designate a senior gender lead with a protected budget and a formal reporting line to top management and the academic senate. To ensure comparable evidence, universities should use standardized

audit and reporting tools that cover workforce composition, proxies for pay equity, recruitment and evaluation processes, harassment reporting pathways, and the extent of gender integration in curricula and research. Critically, results must carry consequences: equality performance should influence access to research funds, student support schemes, and institutional performance contracts, so that incentives reinforce declared priorities.

Sustainable transformation also depends on day-to-day practice. All senior leaders and committee members (rectors, deans, hiring and promotion panels) should complete bias-aware decision-making training tied directly to procedures such as shortlisting rules and evaluation rubrics. Universities should build career pipelines and mentoring programs for early-career academics and track participation, progression, and retention outcomes. Campus safety must be addressed with clear protocols for reporting and responding to harassment, survivor-centered supports, and annually disclosed statistics. Finally, teaching and research should reflect equality goals: institutions ought to map courses for gender content and offer micro-credentials in gender-responsive pedagogy and research design, linking professional learning to curriculum renewal.

Throughout, equity has to be designed in rather than added later. The system should provide targeted supports for under-represented groups - for example, flexible tenure clocks, childcare subsidies, and small research grants for caregivers, war-affected staff, and displaced scholars - so that participation barriers are materially reduced. Where legally permissible, institutions should implement intersectional monitoring (e.g., faculty rank by field and parental status) to identify bottlenecks and tailor interventions. Taken together, these measures turn standards into structures, structures into practices, and practices into outcomes - moving universities from compliance rhetoric to an accountable, data-driven culture of gender equality.

To minimize implementation risks, the reform must counter four predictable failure modes. First, to avoid compliance without change, GEP requirements should be coupled with external audits, funding incentives, and public dashboards so that adherence is both verified and rewarded. Second, to mitigate the data burden, the ministry should supply standardized tools, prefilled templates, and phased onboarding, allowing institutions to reach full reporting capacity without disrupting core operations. Third, to address cultural resistance, the process should begin with leadership training and visible incentives, reinforced by comparative scorecards that normalize progress and encourage peer learning. Fourth, to overcome resource constraints, services should be pooled - shared training, centralized registry hosting - and early phases bootstrapped with donor or EU programs to establish momentum before national funding fully scales.

Progress will be tracked through a results-based monitoring and evaluation framework with annual targets and a 24-month mid-term review. Outputs will capture immediate delivery - such as the share of HEIs with approved GEPs, the number of leaders trained, and the completion of standardized audits. Outcomes will measure institutional change, including increases in women's participation in committees and leadership, reductions in time to resolve harassment cases, and deeper integration of gender content in curricula. Over a 3–5-year horizon, impact indicators will assess

sustained balance in leadership, narrowed promotion gaps, and improved campus-climate indices. Together, these measures convert policy coherence into operational traction - moving the system from statements to structures, from projects to institutionalized practice, and from intentions to demonstrable equality gains in Ukrainian higher education.

Discussion. The comparative analysis demonstrates that gender policy transformation in higher education is contingent upon both structural and cultural mechanisms. European universities illustrate how a coordinated framework - anchored in legal mandates, funding incentives, and institutional accountability - can normalize gender equality as a governance priority rather than a compliance requirement. Finland and Germany exemplify systemic maturity, where gender equality is embedded into university legislation, monitored through standardized indicators, and reinforced through financial and accreditation mechanisms. These findings confirm the argument of Forman-Rabinovici (2023) that sustained equality outcomes rely on policy institutionalization rather than symbolic declarations.

In contrast, transitional systems like Poland underscore the fragility of externally driven reforms. Their dependence on EU funding cycles leads to uneven implementation, echoing Anagnostou's (2022) conclusion that sustainability requires local ownership and consistent national financing. Ukraine's trajectory, while normatively aligned with EU frameworks, remains at the early stages of institutionalization. The fragmentation of initiatives and the absence of national monitoring mechanisms limit progress, reflecting the structural constraints identified by Hankivsky (2010) in post-Soviet governance contexts.

Importantly, the analysis reveals that policy coherence is not sufficient to achieve transformation. Cultural change - manifested in leadership training, gender-sensitive pedagogy, and inclusive decision-making - remains the slowest variable of reform. The research suggests that bridging the gap between legislation and lived practice requires an integrated model combining formal governance instruments with participatory mechanisms such as gender offices, mentoring programs, and continuous professional learning. The Ukrainian context demonstrates both the urgency and opportunity for such a hybrid approach, particularly as universities rebuild their institutional systems amid social and geopolitical transformation.

Conclusion. This study underscores that gender equality in higher education is both a policy and cultural project. European experiences show that durable change emerges from a triad of factors: coherent policy design, institutionalized accountability, and measurable outcomes. Where these dimensions converge - such as in Finland and Germany - gender policy evolves from fragmented interventions into sustainable governance systems. In Ukraine, the alignment with European frameworks has created a promising normative foundation, yet the absence of structural integration, consistent funding, and standardized data systems hampers full implementation.

To advance gender transformation, Ukraine must establish a permanent national coordination mechanism, mandate Gender Equality Plans across all higher education institutions, and embed gender indicators into accreditation and funding models. Equally essential is cultivating leadership commitment, capacity-building, and a

culture of inclusion. Future research should focus on designing a multi-dimensional analytical model to empirically link policy coherence, institutional integration, and outcome orientation, allowing for comparative measurement of progress over time.

Ultimately, transforming gender policy in Ukrainian higher education is not merely an act of compliance with European norms - it is a strategic investment in institutional resilience, social justice, and the intellectual diversity that drives innovation and democratic governance.

Funding. The author declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest. The author declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement. The author declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Publisher's note. All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References:

1. Anagnostou, D. (2022). *EU policy and gender mainstreaming in research and higher education: developments and challenges*. In *Gender equality in research and innovation: reaching gender balance in decision-making* (pp. 1–18). Emerald. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80382-907-220221005>
2. Athena SWAN. (2025). *About Athena SWAN*. In Wikipedia. Retrieved October 2025, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Athena_SWAN
3. Civica. (2020). Towards a gender-inclusive European University. Retrieved from <https://www.civica.eu/news-events/news-blog/detail/towards-a-gender-inclusive-european-university>
4. Condrón, C., et al. (2023). Gender equality training for students in higher education. *PMC*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10551779/>
5. European Commission. (2025). *Gender equality strategy* [Policy framework]. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/gender-equality/gender-equality-strategy_en
6. EIGE. (2017). Education and gender mainstreaming. European Institute for Gender Equality. Retrieved from: <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/policy-areas/education>
7. Forman-Rabinovici, A. (2023). Legislating gender equality in academia: direct and indirect policies. *Higher Education Policy*, (DOI for article). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2023.2260402>
8. Gender Sensitive Practices as Effective Tools for University Change. (2023). *ARMG Publishing*. Retrieved from: <https://armgpublishing.com/journals/bel/volume-2-issue-2/article-10/>
9. Hankivsky, O. (2010). Gender mainstreaming in post-Soviet Ukraine: application, contradictions and prospects. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523279.2010.497752>
10. Protosavitska, L. (2023). Gender (In)equality in Ukraine: structural causes and transformations. *International Journal of Sociology and Questioning*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.3167/ijsq.2023.130203>
11. Rastrygina, A. (2023). A pedagogy of freedom as a viable basis for implementing gender equality in educational policies. *Springer*. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11159-023-09995-9>
12. The Gender Policy of Ukraine: Considering the EU Experience. (2023). RGSA Open Access Publications. <https://rgsa.openaccesspublications.org/rgsa/article/view/3403>
13. Tsybuliak, N. (2024). Inclusion in Ukrainian universities from an inside perspective. *PMC*. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11298518/>