

The Board

MEMORANDUM

MAY 2017

Re: Status for action plan: Career, Gender and Quality – Equal opportunities in research and management – 2016 report

By Ingrid Skovsmose and Martin Dahl Nielsen

**OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND
SAFETY AND COLLABORATION**

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Summary and highlights	3
3. The individual points of the action plan	5
Action plan point 1 – Drawing up action plans in the faculties	5
Action plan point 2 – Management focus	5
Action plan point 3 – Introducing search committees and focusing on recruitment processes	6
Action plan point 4 – ‘Breadth of the field of applicants’	7
Action plan point 5 – Gender equality on assessment and appointment committees and, as a minimum, both genders represented	9
Action plan point 6 – Initiatives after maternity/paternity leave	10
Action plan point 7 – Clear career paths	11
Action plan point 8 – Continuing education and enhanced knowledge about the gender perspective in research	12
Action plan point 9 – Survey of reasons for not choosing UCPH as a place to conduct research.....	13
4. What do the statistics say?	13
Appendix 1 – Percentage of men/women in senior management, January 2015 and January 2017, by faculty	15
Appendix 2 - Academic staff 2007-2016, by gender	17
Appendix 3 - New appointments, Professors 2006–2016, by gender	19
Appendix 4 - Exemption applications 2016, gender and numbers	22
Appendix 5 - Development in professorships 2005-2016	23
Appendix 6 -New appointments, ordinary and MSO professors, 2016	24

NØRREGADE 10

POSTBOX 2177

1017 COPENHAGEN K

TEL.: 35322600

DIR. NO: 35322790

MOB. NO: 28752790

lsj@adm.ku.dk

REF: ISJ

1. Introduction

Since 2008, the University of Copenhagen has been deliberately targeting the recruitment and retention of talented staff by encouraging more women to apply for research and management positions. The first action plan (2008–2013) included financial incentives for faculties to hire women professors. The number of women professors and associate professors rose as a result, but there is still a long way to go, especially at professorship level.

The action plan covers the following areas:

- Gender balance in senior management positions
- Open recruitment processes, including the use of search committees for all management, permanent associate professor and professor positions
- A requirement that there be at least one candidate of each gender before a faculty position¹ is filled
- Gender equality on assessment and appointment committees
- Re-entry initiatives for men and women returning from maternity/paternity leave
- Career paths relating to pre-leadership courses and mentoring programmes
- Continuing education and enhanced knowledge about the gender perspective in research, cf. the HORIZON 2020 requirements
- *Survey of why women do not choose a career at UCPH. The survey will not be conducted due to cost savings, cf. decision by the Board*

An annual progress report will be submitted to the Board. The report is prepared by HR Occupational Health, Safety and Collaboration and will be based on information from faculties about progress on the various themes, and on data from research recruitment statistics and from ScanPas.

The report has been discussed in a reference group in relation to the action plan, and on the Executive Board and the Senior Management Team. The report has also been presented to the General Collaboration Committee for information.

In connection with the 2015 report, the Board asked that for the 2016 report we would also consider the gender balance with regard to tenure track positions, professors MSO (with special responsibilities) and appointments without advertisement for positions as professor and associate professor. This information was passed on to the faculties, which have included it in their work in 2016, just as this report will provide a status of the gender balance in these areas.

¹ Defined as professors (including clinical professors and professors with special responsibilities), associate professors and assistant professors

2. Summary and highlights

The faculties' reports for 2016 show that they are working to fulfil and implement the Board's action plan for equal opportunities in research and management. The action plan aims to create lasting change, which needs to be even more closely integrated into day-to-day practice in research environments. It is very much about cultural changes, and these take time until fully integrated in the organisation.

Development in numbers

Data for the development in population and new appointments for 2016 show a marginal development in the proportion of women. In 2016, 22.8% of professors were women, against 22.2% in 2015. Women also constituted a slightly higher proportion of new professors in 2016 than they did in 2015.

The other academic staff groups also largely maintained status quo, however with a slight increase of the proportion of associate professors where women made up 38.9% in 2016.

In other words, there has been no development, but status quo is maintained.

Management focus, including the distribution of men and women in top management

By January 2017, women accounted for 30% of the top management level, which is an increase. In spite of this increase, it is not considered realistic to reach the target of an increase of 5 percentage points from 27% to 32% at the end of 2017.

Search committees

The Board's emphasis on working with the recruitment process in the form of, for example, search committees and a broader field of applicants does not yet seem to have the desired effect measured on the development of the gender balance. And this is in spite of reports from all of the faculties saying that they have been conducting targeted searches for new staff. They report the use of search committees for all, or at least for the majority, of the posts advertised.

Breadth of the field of applicants (at least one applicant of each gender for faculty posts)

The data from the statistics for recruitment of researchers show ups and downs when we look at the number of posts filled after a gender competition. From 2013 to 2015, the share of posts drawing applicants of only one gender varied between 26% and 38%. In 2016, one third of faculty posts were filled after recruitment processes involving applicants of one gender only (see page 7). It continues to be the case that, mostly, women are absent from the applicant field: 22% of faculty appointments in 2016 had no female applicants, and 10% had no male applicants.

It is also worth noting that only 31 applications were submitted to the Rector for exemptions from this rule in 2016. In 2015, one application was refused

and one was withdrawn. 18 of the 31 applications for exemption related to positions in the clinical area.

Gender equality on assessment and appointment committees

The target of gender balance on assessment and appointment committees for faculty and management positions has been met. Attention is being paid to maintaining balance on the committees, as per the targets set in the action plan. In 2016, 60% of the committees had gender equality, which is a decline compared to 77% in 2015. However, none of the faculties had less than 50%.

Initiatives in connection with maternity/paternity leave and parental leave

All of the faculties have adopted agreements between local management and assistant professors/associate professors before the end of the period on leave about the next steps and the establishment of schemes funded by faculties to ensure that assistant professors/associate professors get off to a good start with teaching and research following parental leave, e.g. travel grants for research trips, assistance with research projects, purchasing equipment or materials, etc.

Initiatives concerning career paths

There is already quite a lot going on, e.g. to ensure transparency about what it takes to forge a career at a university.

In 2016, a career guidance site for both permanent academic staff and technical and administrative staff was launched on the UCPH intranet, just as HR held pre-leadership courses and set up a mentoring programme for assistant professors. Both have attracted great interest and are assessed to be of value to both the individual participants and the organisation.

Several faculties have initiated their own career development activities. These include seminars on leading research and applications for research funding, but also a focus on how it becomes clear how to forge a career within the individual subjects.

3. The individual points of the action plan

The individual points of the Board's action plan are described in detail below.

Action plan point 1 – Drawing up action plans in the faculties

All of the faculties have submitted their own action plans in line with UCPH's plan 'Career, Gender and Quality – Equal opportunities in research and management'.

Point one of the action plan is: 'Individual faculties are to draw up their own action plans'. These plans are to be published on UCPH websites, and the deans will submit annual progress reports to the Rector. These reports to the Rector must also be published.

The faculties' own action plans and their reports on activities in 2016 can be seen here: www.diversity.ku.dk and on KUNet under diversity.

Action plan point 2 – Management focus

The action plan says: *Targets are set for the proportion of the underrepresented gender in senior management, understood as executive management, deans, heads of department, central administration directors and faculty directors. Once a year, progress is checked in faculties where the proportion of the under-represented gender is less than 40%. These faculties are expected to increase the proportion by a minimum of 5% during the period 2015–2017.*

The goal is an increase in the proportion of the underrepresented gender during the three-year period of 5% to 32%.

% of male/female in senior management, January 2015 and January 2017:

Baseline UCPH TOTAL					
January 2015	Total	F	M	% F	% M
DIR + deans	23	9	14	39%	61%
Fac. dirs & FA dirs	15	4	11	27%	73%
Heads of dept*	43	9	34	21%	79%
TOTAL	81	22	59	27%	73%

** In SUND the heads of AEM, SKT and 3 centres are included under 'heads of department'*

UCPH TOTAL					
January 2017	Total	F	M	% F	% M
DIR + deans	23	10	13	43%	57%
Fac. dirs & FA dirs	14	3	11	21%	79%
Heads of dept**	45	12	33	27%	73%
TOTAL	82	25	57	30%	70%

** In SUND the heads of BRIC, AEM, SKT and 4 centres are included under 'heads of department' (CTN has one male and one female manager).*

See also Appendix 1 for a breakdown of the numbers by faculty.

The Board has set a target of a 5% increase for the overall share of women in senior management positions, from 27% in 2015 to 32% by the end of 2017. Efforts to meet this target are also related to the fulfilment of a legal requirement that the University must have a policy to increase the proportion of the underrepresented gender at other management levels.

Overall there has been a slight progress in the gender composition between the baselines in January 2015 and January 2017 with women making up 30% of the senior management level in January 2017. This covers a large variation between faculties, with 18% female managers in SCIENCE and 44% in SOC.SCI. as the highest share. This means that SOC.SCI. remains above the level of 40% which has been set as the baseline in the action plan. The other faculties should continue their efforts to increase the share of female managers at the top management level by 5 percentage points.

To add to the picture, the majority of managers are employed on contracts, some of which will expire after the end of the period covered by the action plan. A precondition for meeting the target is that for each vacant position within the upper echelons of management, deliberate efforts are made to encourage qualified candidates of both genders to apply.

It does not appear to be realistic to reach the target set by the Board before this plan expires at the end of 2017.

Action plan point 3 – Introducing search committees and focusing on recruitment processes

The action plan says: *Search committees are established prior to filling vacancies at UCPH. These committees should actively seek to identify potential national and international candidates, and to focus on identifying talented individuals, for all managerial posts and permanent posts as associate professors and professors.*

The goal is for search committees to be used for all recruitment processes by the end of 2017 when the Action Plan expires.

The faculties' reports show that all of the faculties are working hard to identify suitable candidates. They report that search committees are being used for all, or for the majority of, faculty posts advertised.

Action plan point 4 – ‘Breadth of the field of applicants’

The action plan says: *For all faculty posts there has to be at least one applicant of each gender before a post can be filled. It is possible to apply for an exemption from the above requirement from the Rector so that it does not impede appointments in situations where efforts to encourage at least one applicant from each gender are unsuccessful.*

Appointments to permanent faculty posts when all applicants were of the same gender – 2013 baseline, and 2016:

<u>Baseline</u> <u>UCPH TOTAL</u> <u>2013</u>	Total number of appointments	Number without F applicants	Number without M applicants	% with only one gender represented
Professors + professors MSO	73	21	11	44%
Clinical professors	17	11	4	88%
Associate professors	108	17	12	27%
Total	198	49	27	38%

2016 UCPH TOTAL	Total number of appointments	Number without F applicants	Number without M applicants	% with only one gender represented
Professors + professors MSO	20	1	2	15%
Clinical professors	14	9	2	79%
Associate professors	33	5	3	24%
Total	67	15	7	33%

Data from the research recruitment database generally show that the number of appointments in faculty positions were lower in 2016 than in 2013. This is not surprising, and is due, among other things, to the university's economic situation, with a hiring freeze and a round of adjustments.

The proportion of faculty posts (in this connection professors and associate professors), filled without competition between the genders has improved by 5 percentage points relative to 2013. However, in both 2015 and 2016, one third of these posts were filled without any gender competition.² It is

² This statistic is based on data about recruitment of researchers (Ministry of Higher Education and Science) as per 18 January 2017. The accuracy of the data is open to question, however, as the statistics for recruitment of researchers may be corrected in retrospect as posts are registered. Only appointments to full-time positions with research obligations have to be recorded (although appointments of clinical professors must be reported, regardless of whether the position is full-time). Fixed-term appointments lasting fewer than 12 months and unadvertised extensions are not recorded.

As it is not possible to distinguish between tenured and non-tenured assistant professors in the statistics of recruitment of researchers, the data for assistant professors have been excluded from this calculation. Only advertised positions are recorded.

perhaps worth considering if a greater breadth in the field of applicants could be achieved through an increased focus on the recruitment process and whether the efforts put into choice of subject field, wording of the job ad and identifying qualified candidates are fruitful in terms of attracting all potential candidates to apply for these posts.

Recordings in the recruitment of researchers statistics show a tendency for professorships to be filled without applications from women than without applications from men more frequently in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016. However, again the numbers are relatively small, they may be accidental and should therefore be taken with a pinch of salt.

Applications for exemptions

In 2016, the rector considered 31 applications for exemptions to fill the positions for which there were applicants from only one gender. By way of comparison, nine exemptions were applied for and granted in 2015, however over a period of just six months due to the concrete implementation of the action plan in July 2015.

The applications for exemptions were processed in a particularly thorough way.

In 2015, one application was refused and one was withdrawn. The remaining 29 applications for exemptions were granted after a thorough process. The rector has considered each application and in a number of cases asked for further information before making a decision. In several cases it was pointed out to the faculty/department that the search process must be more thorough, for example include a search for international candidates, considerations concerning expansion of the research field and involve direct contact with potential applicants, etc.

The position for which the application for exemption was refused was subsequently re-advertised after an enhanced search process, which attracted applications from both genders.

	2015		2016		
	Application	Refused	Application	Refused	
SUND	0	0	7	0	
SUND Clinical*	2	0	18	0	1 application withdrawn
SCIENCE	2	0	4	1	
HUM	5	0	2	0	
Total	9	0	31	1	

* Applications for exemptions concerning clinical professors and clinical associate professors in SUND

NOTE: The figures cannot be compared with Appendix 3: *New appointments, Professors 2006–2016*, which is based on ScanPas (the UCPH personnel system), because the statistics are calculated in two different ways.

11 of the 31 applications for exemptions in 2016 related to positions which had only female applicants. Two of these were associate professorships at HUM, three clinical professorships, three clinical associate professorships and two professorship at SUND and one associate professorship at SCIENCE.

Of the 25 applications for exemption from SUND in 2016, the majority concerns clinical associate professorships (5) and clinical professors (13) of which six of the vacancies only had female applicants. Out of the 13 applications for exemptions concerning clinical professorships, the majority (10 out of 13) only received applications from men.

The clinical area differs in several ways from other job categories. The University/SUND appoints doctors/consultants to part-time posts as clinical research associate professors or clinical professors in the university hospitals while they continue to work as doctors. In terms of recruiting international candidates and breadth of the field of applicants, there is a challenge in relation to clinical professorships and clinical research associate professorships because it concerns shared positions between the faculty and the hospitals. SUND searches for potential candidates in Scandinavia and in Europe and, in selected cases, globally. It may concern highly specialised clinical disciplines with only few candidates. The Danish Health Authority's formal requirements for applicants to consultant positions (recognition as a medical specialist and Danish language skills) have a considerable restraining effect on the field of applicants. In relation to clinical research associate professorships, the hospitals will occasionally demand that the position be applied for by persons already employed at the wards when there is a very limited number of qualified applicants to apply for the positions, let alone one of each gender. The University's requirement for at least one of each gender may therefore be more difficult to fulfil in the clinical area. That is why this is also the area with the most applications for exemptions from this requirement.

Generally, the positions for which an exemption has been applied for will have few applicants, usually one or two, and in one case eight applicants (see appendix 4).

Action plan point 5 – Gender equality on assessment and appointment committees and, as a minimum, both genders represented

The action plan says: *It is a requirement that, as far as possible, assessment and appointment committees for faculty and management positions should be gender balanced and, as a minimum, that both genders are represented.*

*The goal of gender balance on assessment committees is to be achieved in accordance with the following key:
40% to have a balance of (33.33/66.66%) during the period 2015–*

2017. In 2015, only 30% were expected to be gender balanced.

PAGE 10 OF 24

The goal of gender balance on assessment committees has already been met. Due to a calculation error in the statistics for gender balance in assessment committees, the figures looked worse than they actually were.

In 2016, 60% of the committees had gender equality, which is a decline compared to 77% in 2015. However, none of the faculties had less than 50%.

Action plan point 6 – Initiatives after maternity/paternity leave

The action plan says: *Faculty action plans must include requirements for agreements to be made before the end of the leave between local management and associate professors/assistant professors about their return to work.*

All of the faculties have established procedures for conducting such interviews before the end of the leave.

These discussions are typically linked with annual performance and development reviews or they take the form of extraordinary performance and development reviews (SUND). THEO has not yet used these procedures, since no one has been on maternity/paternity leave or parental leave.

The SCIENCE management team has decided that all expectant parents will be systematically encouraged to think about how they intend to organise three months' maternity/paternity leave.

Schemes are to be established funded by faculties to ensure that assistant professors/associate professors regardless of gender get off to a good start with teaching and research following leave, e.g. travel grants for research trips, assistance with research projects, purchasing equipment or materials, etc.

In LAW and THEO the funds are administered by the faculty. THEO has not yet had the need for such funds. LAW has established a scheme under which the funds will be taken from the associate dean's strategic pool to be used for this purpose. In SUND, SCIENCE and HUM it is up to departments to cover the costs. SCIENCE says that it is possible to differentiate in respect of the procedure for agreements on funding for activities based on the department's organisation, since the decision and 'burden' for some departments will be at section and group level and for others at departmental level.

In SOC.SCI, assistant and associate professors of both genders with max. five years of service are offered one semester free from teaching duties following maternity/paternity or parental leave of min. six consecutive months. The faculty reimburses the departments DKK 100,000 per assistant profes-

sor and DKK 150,000 per associate professor. There was one specific reimbursement to a department in 2016.

Other initiatives and considerations regarding maternity/paternity leave and parental leave:

The SCIENCE management will consider how, together with UCPH's management, they can influence politicians as well as public and private foundations to work for better pay during maternity/paternity leave and parental leave.

Action plan point 7 – Clear career paths

The action plan says: *The work done on gender and research at UCPH must be integrated into general HR processes, including performance and development reviews, career/development plans, etc.*

Career development is a priority at UCPH, especially for younger members of academic staff. A new career site on the University's intranet brings together knowledge about and tools for academic careers.

Several of the faculties are working on recruitment/career strategies to exemplify the qualifications expected in order to achieve a position as a permanent member of academic staff.

In HUM, it is expected that the new professor policy will increase the number of professors, including the possibility of more female professors.

SCIENCE has launched two types of initiatives: all departments are to establish and communicate criteria for appointments in their fields and, secondly, one department has held two workshops on academic career paths and mentoring, just as they have subsequently discussed the subject in group performance reviews.

The faculties run their own events and continuing education. In 2016, THEO held a seminar about research management for junior academic staff members and a seminar on research applications for the same group of employees. Initiated by the dean, SOC.SCI set up a meeting forum for junior female researchers from across the faculty. The network is self-running and independent of the faculty.

Pre-leadership courses to identify staff with managerial capabilities and aspirations are to continue.

Pre-leadership courses under the auspices of this action plan have been offered and completed a total of six times in the years from 2011 to 2016.

The first four courses were in Danish, while the last two ones were held in English.

The purpose is to support and retain skilled female researchers with an interest in management, and to develop female leadership talents prior to an actual managerial position in order to encourage them to apply for positions as research group leader, section head, director of studies, department head etc. at an early stage. Another purpose is to ensure that the University has qualified female applicants for every managerial job posting and to equip female researchers who are hired as managers with the best possible skills to exercise good management.

The evaluations are generally favourable. The participants describe that they experience a boost in relation to daring to take on more managerial tasks. They feel that they get a strong network that they want to hang on to. Several of the participants have been appointed to managerial positions at UCPH at departmental or research group level.

There are always more applicants than places on the courses. The faculties decide which applicants should be given priority for a place on the course. In most cases, assistant professors are given priority before postdocs.

Mentoring programmes for both genders

HR&O launched a mentoring programme in 2016 for assistant professors of both genders. 38 assistant professors signed up for the programme. HR managed to find 34 mentors, four of which offered to take two mentees, which meant that all of the mentees have been matched with a qualified and relevant mentor. Several mentees have reported back to HR that their mentor is just right for them. The programme will be evaluated around the time of the 2017 summer holidays.

Action plan point 8 – Continuing education and enhanced knowledge about the gender perspective in research

Workshops are undertaken, also in conjunction with Research & Innovation, aimed at increasing awareness of gender perspectives and bias in research, cf. also the HORIZON 2020 requirements. Inspiration for courses/workshops is also derived from Yale University, which has been working on this issue for several years.

SOC.SCI. has held a well-attended seminar about the gender dimension in research under the auspices of the Horizon2020.

Action plan point 9 – Survey of reasons for not choosing UCPH as a place to conduct research

This point has lapsed, cf. the decision taken by the Board in June 2016 when considering the 2015 report.

4. What do the statistics say?

One way to evaluate whether the priorities identified in the action plan have been effective is to look at the trend in gender balance among researchers at the University. During the first two years of the plan, there has been a minimal change to the gender balance among **professors**. In other words, at 22.8%, the share of female professors was more or less unchanged in 2016, compared with 22.7% in 2014 and 22.2% in 2015 (see Appendix 2).

If we look at **newly appointed professors** instead, there was a modest increase with women making up 25.9% in 2016 against 20.3% in 2014 and 24.6% in 2015 (see Appendix 3). However, the table reveals quite large fluctuations from year to year.

The number of women associate professors (Appendix 2) has increased slightly throughout the period from the implementation of the first action plan in 2008. This trend was not seen in 2016, when women's share of the total population of associate professors was basically the same as in 2015, that is 38.9% against 38.5% in 2015.

Women's share of assistant professors and postdocs continues to be slightly increasing and is at a high level, that is around 46-47% of the total population of assistant professors and postdocs.

In this aspect, the University of Copenhagen resembles many other universities where the proportion of women is highest in the first year after obtaining a master's degree, but the curve breaks/leaks (the leaking pipeline) when they reach the level of associate professor.

In connection with the 2015 report, the Board asked us, from 2016, to look at the gender distribution in terms of tenure-track positions, MSO professorships and professors and associate professors appointed without advertising the posts.

We have considered the distribution on professor types, that is the **distribution between professors with special responsibilities (MSO) and ordinary professorships**. The vast majority of professors in 2016 were appointed as ordinary professors. (See Appendix 5). But it should be noted that there is a gender imbalance with 28% of female professors being employed as MSO professors, while the same applies to only 13% of male professors.

There is almost no difference between women and men with regard to their appointment as ordinary professors or MSO professors (table 6). Just under 82% of female professors are employed as ordinary professors and 18% as MSO professors. 83% of male professors are employed as ordinary profes-

sors and 17% as MSO professors. These figures do not include clinical professors.

In December 2016, 21 were employed in **tenure-track positions** in HUM, SCIENCE and SUND (see table below). Overall, women make up one third of the employees in these few positions. However, it is difficult to draw any conclusions on the basis of these very small numbers.

Tenure Track 2016	F	M	Total	F in %	M in %
HUM	1	2	3	33.3%	66.7%
SCIENCE	4	11	15	26.7%	73.3%
SUND	2	1	3	66.7%	33.3%
UCPH TOTAL	7	14	21	33.3%	66.7%

2-4 of the 21 registered tenure-track positions were advertised in 2016.

Source: PeopleXS

Also when looking at **appointments without advertisement** the numbers are very small and show no difference between women and men (see table below). In 2016, there were 19 professorship appointments without advertisement, distributed on SUND, SCIENCE and SOC.SCI. In SUND and SCIENCE, there was an equal number of men and women, while the only appointment at SOC.SCI. of this type was a man.

In 2016, SUND appointed four male professors on the basis of appointment without advertisement. No other faculties have made appointments without advertisement at associate professorship level.

Appointments without advertisement 2016 Faculty VIP	F	M	Total	F in %	M in %
SOC.SCI.	0	1	1	0%	100%
SCIENCE	4	4	8	50%	50%
SUND	5	5	10	50%	50%
UCPH TOTAL	9	10	19	47%	53%

Source: Recruitment of researcher statistic as per 18 January 2017

In May 2015, **shortlisting** was introduced as part of the recruitment of researchers. Shortlisting means that the assessment committee no longer needs to assess all applicants for a researcher position. Instead the assessment committee will be given a shortlist of selected applicants. The intention with the introduction of the shortlisting process is to focus the assessment work on the candidates that best fulfil the criteria of the job advertisement.

The Board recommended in 2016 that it should be investigated whether gender plays a role in cases of shortlisting for the recruitment of researchers. HR&O monitors developments in the shortlisting process, with a view to assessing whether the shortlisting is used gender balanced.

Appendix 1 – Percentage of men/women in senior management, January 2015 and January 2017, by faculty

<i>Baseline per faculty January 2015</i>					
HUM	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads	8	3	5	38%	63%
TOTAL	12	4	8	33%	67%
LAW	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
TOTAL	4	1	3	25%	75%
SOC.SCI.	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	2	1	67%	33%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Dept. heads	5	1	4	20%	80%
TOTAL	9	4	5	44%	56%
SCIENCE	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	5	1	4	20%	80%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Dept. heads	12	1	11	8%	92%
TOTAL	18	3	15	17%	83%

<i>Status 2017 per faculty January 2017</i>					
HUM	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads	8	3	5	38%	63%
TOTAL	12	4	8	33%	67%
LAW	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
TOTAL	4	1	3	25%	75%
SOC.SCI.	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	3	2	1	67%	33%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Dept. heads	5	1	4	20%	80%
TOTAL	9	4	5	44%	56%
SCIENCE	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	4	1	3	25%	75%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads	12	2	10	17%	83%
TOTAL	17	3	14	18%	82%

(Appendix 1 cont.) Men/women in senior management, January 2015 and January 2017, by faculty

<u>Baseline</u> <u>per faculty:</u> <u>January 2015</u>					
SUND	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	4	2	2	50%	50%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads*	18	4	14	22%	78%
TOTAL	23	6	17	26%	74%
THEO	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	1	1	0	100%	0%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
TOTAL	2	1	1	50%	50%
BRIC	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Fac.dir.**	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads**	0				
TOTAL	1	0	1	0%	100%
FA	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
DIR	4	1	3	25%	75%
FA dir.	8	2	6	25%	75%
TOTAL	12	3	9	25%	75%

* In SUND the heads of AEM, SKT and 3 centres are included under 'department heads'

<u>Status</u> <u>per faculty:</u> <u>January 2017</u>					
SUND	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	4	3	1	75%	25%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Dept. heads**	20	6	14	30%	70%
TOTAL	25	9	16	36%	64%
THEO	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Deans	2	1	1	50%	50%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
TOTAL	3	1	2	33%	67%
BRIC	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
Fac.dir.**	0	0	0	-	-
Dept. heads**	1	0	1	0%	100%
TOTAL	1	0	1	0%	100%
FA	Total	Women	Men	% Women	% Men
DIR	4	1	3	25%	75%
FA dir.	8	2	6	25%	75%
TOTAL	12	3	9	25%	75%

* In SUND the heads of BRIC, AEM, SKT and 4 centres are included under 'department heads' (CTN has one male and one female manager).

Appendix 2 - Academic staff 2007-2016, by gender**PROFESSORS**

	Nos.		%	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
2007	75	415.5	15.3	84.7
2008	82.5	445	15.6	84.4
2009	101	475	17.5	82.5
2010	121	506.5	19.3	80.7
2011	132.5	521	20.3	79.7
2012	146.5	566	20.6	79.4
2013	170.5	576	22.8	77.2
2014	183.5	624.5	22.7	77.3
2015	186	650.5	22.2	77.8
2016	190.5	644.5	22.8	77.2

Notes: Incl. clinical professors. Excl. visiting professors.

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

	Nos.		%	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
2007	440	1033.5	29.9	70.1
2008	455	1015.5	30.9	69.1
2009	473	1026	31.6	68.4
2010	465.5	964	32.6	67.4
2011	480.5	951	33.6	66.4
2012	521	990.5	34.5	65.5
2013	494	933	34.6	65.4
2014	552	953.5	36.7	63.3
2015	598.5	958	38.5	61.5
2016	608.5	956	38.9	61.1

Notes: Incl. clinical associate professors. Excl. part-time lecturers.

ASSISTANT PROFESSORS

	Nos.		%	
	Women	Men	Women	Men
2007	92	86.5	51.5	48.5
2008	107	94.5	53.1	46.9
2009	112	103.5	52	48
2010	113.5	106	51.7	48.3
2011	113.5	106	51.7	48.3
2012	121	114.5	51.4	48.6
2013	133.5	123	52	48
2014	150.5	144	51.1	48.9
2015	159	183	46.5	53.5
2016	174	195.5	47.1	52.9

Academic staff 2007–2016, by gender (cont.)

POSTDOCS

	Nos.				%
	Women	Men	Women	Men	
2007	164	224	42.3	57.7	%
2008	193	246	44	56	%
2009	226	299.5	43	57	%
2010	266	370.5	41.8	58.2	%
2011	269.5	336	44.5	55.5	%
2012	322.5	419.5	43.5	56.5	%
2013	345	455	43.1	56.9	%
2014	426.5	573	42.7	57.3	%
2015	462.5	578	44.4	55.6	%
2016	464	540	46.2	53.8	%

PhD STUDENTS

	Nos.				%
	Women	Men	Women	Men	
2007	302	313	49.1	50.9	%
2008	566.5	474.5	54.4	45.6	%
2009	664.5	540.5	55.1	44.9	%
2010	784	594.5	56.9	43.1	%
2011	843	660.5	56.1	43.9	%
2012	841.5	669	55.7	44.3	%
2013	777.5	653	54.4	45.6	%
2014	814.5	665.5	55	45	%
2015	799.5	674.5	54.2	45.8	%
2016	781.5	643	54.9	45.1	%

Notes: PhD students in LIFE and PHARMA are not included in the figures for 2007.

Source: ISOLA staff turnover (November 2015 to November 2016)

New appointments 2016 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	2	3
SUND	9	19
HUM	3	0
SCIENCE	0	14
LAW	0	4
Total	14	40

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	40	60
SUND	32.1	67.9
HUM	100	0
SCIENCE	0	100
LAW	0	100
Total	25.9	74.1

New appointments 2015 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	1
SUND	12	23
HUM	0	4
SCIENCE	5	24
LAW	0	0
Total	17	52

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	0.0	100.0
SUND	34.3	65.7
HUM	0.0	100.0
SCIENCE	17.2	82.8
LAW	-	-
Total	24.6	75.4

New appointments 2014 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	0
SUND	8	31
HUM	5	10
SCIENCE	3	21
LAW	0	1
Total	16	63

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	-	-
SUND	20.5	79.5
HUM	33.3	66.7
SCIENCE	12.5	87.5
LAW	0	100
Total	20.3	79.7

New appointments 2013 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	5	1
SOC.SCI.	7	8
SUND	14	16
HUM	1	1
SCIENCE	7	16
LAW	0	3
Total	34	45

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	83.3	16.7
SOC.SCI.	46.7	53.3
SUND	46.7	53.3
HUM	50	50
SCIENCE	30.4	69.6
LAW	0	100
Total	43.0	57.0

New appointments 2012 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	2	2
SOC.SCI.	0	0
NEW SUND**	5	26
HUM	0	4
NEW SCI-ENCE**	8	18
LAW	0	0
Total	15	50

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	50	50
SOC.SCI.	-	-
NEW SUND**	16.1	83.9
HUM	0	100
NEW SCI-ENCE**	30.8	69.2
LAW	-	-
Total	23.1	76.9

* Professors = professors, professors MSO, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included)

** The figures are for 2013 when PHARMA, LIFE, NAT and SUND were merged into two big faculties: (NEW) SUND and (NEW) SCIENCE.

New appointments 2011 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	0
SOC.SCI.	0	3
SUND	5	26
HUM	2	5
SCIENCE	1	8
LAW	1	2
PHARMA	0	0
LIFE	4	7
Total	14	51

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	0	100
SUND	16.1	83.9
HUM	28.6	71.4
SCIENCE	11.1	88.9
LAW	33.3	66.7
PHARMA	-	-
LIFE	36.4	63.6
Total	21.5	78.5

New appointments 2010 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	1
SOC.SCI.	1	4
SUND	6	13
HUM	1	2
SCIENCE	1	5
LAW	1	6
PHARMA	2	1
LIFE	4	13
Total	17	45

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	50	50
SOC.SCI.	20	80
SUND	31.6	68.4
HUM	33.3	66.7
SCIENCE	16.7	83.3
LAW	14.3	85.7
PHARMA	66.7	33.3
LIFE	23.5	76.5
Total	27.4	72.6

New appointments 2009 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	3	0
SOC.SCI.	3	3
SUND	9	31
HUM	3	4
SCIENCE	3	12
LAW	2	5
PHARMA	1	2
LIFE	3	11
Total	27	68

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	50	50
SUND	22.5	77.5
HUM	43	57
SCIENCE	20	80
LAW	28.6	71.4
PHARMA	33.3	66.7
LIFE	21.4	78.6
Total	28.4	71.6

New appointments 2008 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	0
SOC.SCI.	0	6
SUND	9	21
HUM	3	2
SCIENCE	3	10
LAW	1	0
PHARMA	1	2
LIFE	2	9
Total	20	50

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	0	100
SUND	30	70
HUM	60	40
SCIENCE	23.1	76.9
LAW	100	0
PHARMA	33.3	66.7
LIFE	18.2	81.8
Total	28.6	71.4

* Professors = professors, professors MSO, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included)

New appointments 2007 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	2
SOC.SCI.	0	5
SUND	7	25
HUM	0	2
SCIENCE	0	12
LAW	1	3
PHARMA	0	2
LIFE	3	9
Total	11	60

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	100
SOC.SCI.	0	100
SUND	21.9	78.1
HUM	0	100
SCIENCE	0	100
LAW	25.0	75.0
PHARMA	0	100
LIFE	25.0	75.0
Total	15.5	84.5

New appointments 2006 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	7
SUND	6	25
HUM	1	0
SCIENCE	3	10
LAW	0	0
PHARMA	0	2
LIFE	0	9
Total	10	53

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	0	100
SUND	19.4	80.6
HUM	100	0
SCIENCE	23.1	76.9
LAW	-	-
PHARMA	0	100
LIFE	0	100
Total	15.9	84.1

* Professors = professors, professors MSO, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included)

Notes:

- The figures are based on a list of all professors registered in ScanPas in 2016 but filtered to exclude those appointed previously in the period 2006–2016.
- Appointments that end within four months are not included.

**Appendix 4 - Exemption applications 2016,
gender and numbers**

Applications for exemptions 2016				
Faculty	Position	Number of male applicants	Number of female applicants	
HUM				
	Associate professor	0	2	
	Associate professor	0	1	
SCIENCE				
	Professor	5	0	Refused
	Associate professor	0	2	
	Associate professor	3	0	
	Associate professor	2	0	
SUND				
	Professor	1	0	
	Professor	0	1	
	Professor MSO	2	0	
	Professor MSO	0	1	
	University professor chair	8	0	
	Clinical professor	0	1	
	Clinical professor	2	0	
	Clinical professor	0	2	
	Clinical professor	2	0	
	Clinical professor	1	0	
	Clinical professor	0	1	
	Clinical professor	2	0	
	Clinical professor	4	0	
	Clinical professor	1	0	Application withdrawn
	Clinical professor	2	0	
	Clinical professor	1	0	
	Clinical professor	1	0	
	Clinical professor	1	0	
	Associate professor	1	0	
	Associate professor	1	0	
	Clinical associate professor	0	1	
	Clinical associate professor	0	2	
	Clinical associate professor	0	2	
	Clinical associate professor	1	0	
	Clinical associate professor	1	0	
	Clinical associate professor	1	0	
	Clinical associate professor	1	0	

Appendix 5 - Development in professorships 2005-2016

Ordinary - MSO □

	Nos □		Total gender distribution %	
	F	M	F	M
2016	138.5	507.5	21.4%	78.6%
2015	136.5	517	20.9%	79.1%
2014	138	499.5	21.6%	78.4%
2013	130.5%	459	22.1%	77.9%
2012	112.5	450.5	20.0%	80.0%
2011	101.5	413.5	19.7%	80.3%
2010	94.5	407.5	18.8%	81.2%
2009	80	384	17.2%	82.8%
2008	65.5	364.5	15.2	84.8%
2007	42.5	252	14.4%	85.6%
2006	50	255	16.4%	83.6%
2005	39	241	13.9%	86.1%

Distribution by pay groups 111+113 and 115ⁱ

	Ordinary*		Ordinary* % of all F/M professors:		MSO		MSO% % of all F/M professors:	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
2016	100.5	441.5	72.6%	87.0%	38	66	27.4%	13.0%
2015	89	445.5	65.2%	86.2%	47.5	71.5	34.8%	13.8%
2014	86.5	424.5	62.7%	85.0%	51.5	75	37.3%	15.0%
2013	82	375	62.8%	81.7%	48.5	84	37.2%	18.3%
2012	74.5	367	66.2%	81.5%	38	83.5	33.8%	18.5%
2011	67	338	66.0%	81.7%	34.5	75.5	34.0%	18.3%
2010	60.5	330.5	64.0%	81.1%	34	77	36.0%	18.9%
2009	51.5	316	64.4%	82.3%	28.5	68	35.6%	17.7%
2008	47	308	71.8%	84.5%	18.5	56.5	28.2%	15.5%
2007	33	216.5	77.6%	85.9%	9.5	35.5	22.4%	14.1%
2006	43	227	86.0%	89.0%	7	28	14.0%	11.0%
2005	35	214	89.7%	88.8%	4	27	10.3%	11.2%

ⁱ Clinical professors (pay group 118) are not included in this table.

* Pay group 111 'Professor' and pay group 113 'Professor (fixed-term)'.

Source: ScanPas, 5 April 2017.

Appendix 6 -New appointments, ordinary and MSO professors, 2016
By faculty

	Nos. by faculty		Gender distribution in %	
	F	M	F	M
THEO	0	0	-	-
SOC.SCI.	2	3	40%	60%
SUND□	6	9	40%	60%
HUM	3	0	100%	0%
SCIENCE	0	14	0%	100%
LAW	0	4	0%	100%
Total	11	30	26.8%	73.2%

Distribution by pay groups 111+113 and 115¹

	Ordinary*		Ordinary* percentage of all F/M professors:		MSO		MSO% percentage of all F/M professors:	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
THEO	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-
SOC.SCI.	2	1	100%	33.3%	0	2	0%	66.7%
SUND□	5	7	83.3%	77.8%	1	2	16.7%	22.2%
HUM	2	0	66.7%	-	1	0	33.3%	-
SCIENCE	0	13	-	92.9%	0	1	-	7.1%
LAW	0	4	-	100%	0	0	-	0%
Total	9	25	81.8%	83.3%	2	5	18.2%	16.7%

¹ Clinical professors (pay group 118) are not included in this table.

* Pay group 111 'Professor' and pay group 113 'Professor (fixed-term)'.

Source: ISOLA staff turnover (November 2015 to November 2016)

NOTE: Figures concerning population and new appointments cannot be compared directly as the data are calculated in two different ways.