# Template for annual reporting on SDU's local gender equality status and initiatives 

## Faculty of Humanities

Report for 2019

This template is meant to help your committee conduct your annual reporting on gender equality initiatives and status at your Faculty and Departments.

NEW! While some aspects of the template resemble previous years' reporting, NEW this year is the structure. As SDU gears up to start implementing gender equality plans in 2020, this template too is now tailored towards this work.

While your reporting should eventually cover all five sections $A$ to $E$, you may not at this time (without a gender equality plan in place) be able to add elaborative information to all sections. Please provide as much information as you can. The coming gender equality plan will be structured along the same sections.

For your annual reporting on representation and recruitment, you can find some relevant data in the SDU Gender Statistics database. See appendix A on how to access the database and find data relevant to this report.

If you have any comments or suggestions to this template and its appendix, please contact GET.
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## A. Follow-up on activities and plans from last year

Looking at your reporting from last year, and the activities you had planned for 2019: did the year pan out as planned? What measures, actions or initiatives did you take to promote gender equality?

- Communication/awareness raising activities?
- Specific measures, policies or strategies at departments or at faculty level? (see also section C)
- Other activities?

Please provide a brief overview and a few elaborating comments.

In the report from 2018, it was stated that there would be continued work with unconscious bias. In collaboration with GET, this was planned at departmental level in the form of communication/awareness activities at departmental staff meetings. GET participated in the staff meetings of two Departments. At the Department of Design and Communication in Kolding, Liv Baisner and Peter Bjelskou gave a presentation about GET's work, including unconscious bias, and engaged in discussion with staff. The presentation was favourably received and introduced people to equality work at SDU, which not all were aware of. At the Department of Language and Communication, a themed staff meeting on unconscious bias was facilitated by 3 members of GET where staff were divided into groups and presented with various scenarios. The exercise provoked interesting discussions and feedback was positive. The Department for the Study of Culture discussed the possibility of GET facilitating activities at a staff meeting, but this proved difficult due to the larger numbers of staff. Activities for the Department of History were planned for 2020.

At Faculty level, issues relating to unconscious bias were the themes of meetings in the Gender Equality Committee. Maj Olsson from HR gave a presentation, based on APV 2018, about an inclusive work environment and well-being, addressing the topic of offensive behaviours. This fed into a discussion about diversity issues, including LGBT concerns. At a later committee meeting, with Peter Bjelskou from GET, further discussion about instances of offensive behaviors at the Faculty were discussed.

In the 2018 report, we had plans to focus on gender representation and recruitment (e.g. leaking pipeline), but this did not happen in any systematic fashion. However, a bottom-up initiative from two, international female researchers concerning the establishment of a feminist network has interests in the gendered hierarchy. This network was launched at the end of 2019, with 45 members across Departments, and a mix of Danish and international employees from a range of job categories, with the majority being women.

Other activities included participation in the Master class with IGAB, where issues of strategy were discussed (SWOT). We also discussed questions of knowledge-sharing across faculties in a meeting with GET and members of the other local gender equality committees.

GET approached the faculty about gender budgeting and relevant materials were sent at the end of 2019. We await further developments as the work by GET in relation to gender budgeting has been delayed due to covid19.

## B. Strategic analyses of the faculty's opportunities and challenges

In the fall 2019, all local gender equality committee participated in a masterclass workshop with SDU's International Gender Advisory Board. During the workshop, you all presented an analysis of your strengths, weakness, challenges and opportunities in a SWOT-analysis: an overview and analysis of your faculty and departments' gender equality and diversity issues, challenges and opportunities. This analysis will be an integral part of your annual reporting from now on and will form the basis for similar masterclass workshop with the international Gender Advisory Board every year.

As in the fall 2019, your analysis should address general in-house aspects at your Departments and Faculty, but can also include wider societal, cultural and market-related contexts relevant to you. You can revisit your SWOT from the 2019-workshop and review, revise and submit that as your analysis from 2019.

If you wish to employ a different analytical model (SCORE, NOISE etc.), you are of course free do to so.

## The SWOT matrix

- $\quad$ Strong representation of women at Ph.D and junior lecturer/postdoc levels, suggesting thriving interest in research career among female graduates and postgraduates
- Increase of women in managerial positions (50/50 among Head of Departments at the Faculty)
- Increase of women among research/centre leaders
- Collaboration with GET
- Success of bottom-up initiatives, e.g. establishment of feminist network
- Focus on inclusivity in general

Strengths and success stories

- Leaking gender pipeline between junior and senior research positions
- Possible waning interest in a research career among male graduates and postgraduates
- Areas of research where one gender is strongly represented - both among applicants for positions and staff
- Limited resources to carry out qualitative research at the Faculty to identify and explain problems and challenges and to follow up on initiatives and insights

- To work with unconscious bias, inclusive culture and issues of intersectionality
- Collaboration and knowledge sharing with other faculties to address challenges across SDU
- Increased focus on Interdisciplinary projects with technical, medical and natural sciences opens up options for researchers from Humanities to take part, including those areas that attract female researchers
- Financial challenges which negatively affect capacity building: recruitment, career progression, sustainability of research milieus
- Lack of interest/commitment among colleagues generally in relation to equality and diversity matters; low priority
- The external funding and scope of Interdisciplinary projects is often given to areas that traditionally have more male researchers


## C. Status for selected focal areas and objectives

If you have identified any particular focal areas, please elaborate on their status here. What is the progress, and how are you measuring this? Such selected focal areas could be strategic initiatives on a faculty-wide level as well as measures implemented at local Department levels.

In the work with unconscious bias, we have realised that there is a need for greater concretisation as it is a rather fluffy concept. In discussions with GET at the end of 2019, we identified specific contexts that could be relevant, such as meetings, group relations across different job categories, gender, age etc.

Regarding the leaking pipeline, which we consider an important area, despite limited opportunities for recruitment, it could be interesting to investigate specific initiatives and their effects in relation to career progression for younger researchers at Departmental level.

## D. Status for key indicators

Below, you are asked to report and reflect on key indicators related to your Faculty's gender representation among (1) academic staff and in (2) managerial positions, as well as indicators related to your recruitments of new academic staff in 2019: (3) the gender representation among qualified applicants, (4) the number of applicants for a position, and (5) the composition of your assessment committees.

Data related to these questions are available at SDU's Gender Statistics ${ }^{1}$; appendix A provides information on how to navigate the database.

If you have additional key statistical personnel indicators you wish to report on, but struggle to extract them from the Gender statistics, reach out to dockweiler@sdu.dk for help.

## 1. Gender representation among academic staff

Please report and reflect on the current gender representation in your Faculty.
How are men and women generally represented at your Faculty staff? For example, what is the ratio between men and women at PhD-level and men and women at professor-level? Do you have significant variations in these representations across your departments?

The current gender representation among academic staff is not yet balanced, ( $55 \%$ are men, $45 \%$ are women (see table 1.1), but progress is being made. There is variation across departments: The Department of History has the lowest percentage of female staff (35\%), followed by the Department for the Study of Culture (47\%), Department of Language and Communication (48\%) and Department of Design and Communication (55\%). Across the Faculty, however, there is still a higher percentage of men in senior positions at the Faculty. This is in part due to historical reasons, and the age profile of senior positions, as well as some areas of research (e.g. History and Philosophy) having mainly male representation.

As shown in Table 1.1 below, the percentage of women drops from 62\% at Ph.D. level to $38 \%$ and 32\% at Associate Professor and Professor levels, respectively, whereas the percentage of men increases from $38 \%$ at Ph.D. level to $62 \%$ and $68 \%$ at Associate Professor and Professor levels, respectively. This is evidence of the well-acknowledged "leaking pipeline" for women from junior to senior levels, and it appears to have become a little more pronounced since 2018, although numbers are small at some of the junior levels. Table 1.2 illustrates some fluctuations over the 5 -year period (2014-2019), and there is no sustained pattern of decrease/increase within categories, but the schism between junior and senior levels remains.

| Faculty: Humanities |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YEAR |  |  |  |  | 2019 |
| Position | Number of men | Men \% | Number of women | Women \% | Total |
| PhD | 19 | 38\% | 31 | 62\% | 50 |
| Post.doc | 11 | 39\% | 17 | 61\% | 28 |
| Assistant Pro | 8 | 33\% | 14 | 67\% | 21 |
| Associate Pro | 88 | 62\% | 53 | 38\% | 141 |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 28 | 68\% | 13 | 32\% | 41 |
| Total | 154 | 55\% | 128 | 45\% | 281 |

[^0]|  | Table 1.2. Female staff 2014-2019 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Faculty: Humanities |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | YEAR |  |  |  |  | 2019 |
| Share of women in \% | \% 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| PhDs | 66\% | 60\% | 59\% | 59\% | 57\% | 62\% |
| Post.doc | 69\% | 54\% | 54\% | 53\% | 56\% | 61\% |
| Assistant Pro | 52\% | 51\% | 55\% | 66\% | 61\% | 67\% |
| Associate Pro | 39\% | 39\% | 38\% | 40\% | 41\% | 38\% |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 32\% | 39\% | 39\% | 39\% | 38\% | 38\% |

## 2. Managerial positions

Overall, there is gender balance in managerial positions, but women are more strongly represented in relation to research leadership (Table 2.1). Numbers, however, are generally low. The Faculty has achieved an equal gender and national background balance across Heads of Departments. When recruiting new staff for managerial positions, the practice is to gender mainstream the advertisement and to have as broad an assessment committee as possible.

| Table 2.1 Gender representation management |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Faculty: | Humanities |  |  |
| YEAR | Men <br> (number and \%) | Women <br> (number and \%) | Total |
| Level of management | 0 | 1 |  |
| Executive Board | $1(100 \%)$ | 0 | 5 |
| Chef/Head of Dep | $3(60 \%)$ | $2(40 \%)$ | 4 |
| Middle manager | $1(25 \%)$ | $3(75 \%)$ | 50 |
| Head of research unit | $24(48 \%)$ | $26(52 \%)$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 9 ( 4 8 \% )}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 ( 5 2 \% )}$ |  |

These are the figures from SDU's gender statistics, but the category 'head of research unit' is open to interpretation.

## 3. Recruitments: new positions and gender representation among qualified applicants

Table 3.1 gives an overview of overall academic recruitment in 2019. The Faculty of Humanities has limited opportunities for academic recruitment and 2019 witnessed a further decrease compared to 2018 (19 new positions in 2019, 26 in 2018). Overall, women make up $38 \%$ of new recruitments, a decrease from $46 \%$ in 2018. Numbers are small and there is no obvious trend apparent in the data, other than more men were hired as associate professors in 2018 and 2019.

## Table 3.1 Academic recruitment

Faculty: Humanities

| YEAR |  |  | Women hired |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All positions | Men hired | Total hired |  |
|  | 4 | 6 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| Post.doc | 2 | 2 | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Assistant Pro | 2 | 2 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Associate Pro | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 1 | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{7}$ |  |  |

As for the recruitment process, Table 3.2 is an overview of positions where both men and women were among the qualified applicants. We have included postdoc positions that were advertised externally (8) and internally (2).

| Table 3.2 Qualified applicants both genders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Faculty: | Humanities__ |  |  |
| YEAR | Women hired | Men hired | Total hired with <br> qualified app. from <br> both gender |
| Positions with both genders among qualified applicants |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 4 | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| Post.doc | 2 | 1 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| Assistant Pro | 1 | 1 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Associate Pro | 0 | 2 | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 1 | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{4}$ |  |  |

Combining the data in Tables 3.1 and 3.2, the percentage of positions where both men and women are among the qualified applicants is given in Table 3.3. Tables 3.4.1. and 3.4.2 provide percentages of positions where there were only female and male applicants, respectively.

| Table 3.3 Percentage of positions with applicants from both genders |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Faculty: | Tomanities_ |  |  |
| YEAR | Total hired | Hired with qualified <br> app. from both genders | 2019 |
|  | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 \%}$ |
| Post.doc | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |
| Assistant Pro | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |  |
| Associate Pro | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
| Pro/Pro MSO | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9}$ |  |  |


| Table 3.4.1 Only female applicants |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Faculty: | Humanities <br> YEAR <br> Women <br> hired | Out of total hired <br> $(\%)$ |
| Positions with only women among qualified applicants |  |  |
|  | 2 | $20 \%$ |
| Post.doc | 1 | $25 \%$ |
| Assistant Pro | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Associate Pro | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 3 | $16 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |


| Table 3.4.2 Only male applicants |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Faculty: | Humanities |  |  |
| YEAR | Men <br> hired | Out of total hired <br> (\%) |  |
| Positions with only men among qualified applicants |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Post.doc | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ |  |
| Assistant Pro | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ |  |
| Associate Pro | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ |  |
| Pro/Pro MSO | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ |  |

When we look at the data, we can see that most positions attract qualified applicants of both genders, although total numbers are low. There are positions at all levels (except Prof./Prof MSO) where the qualified applicants are either all male or all female. However, there is very little difference (one associate professor position) between positions attracting a higher number of exclusively female qualified applicants than those attracting exclusively male qualified applicants. If we compare to figures from 2018, there are more postdoc positions with applicants from both genders, but fewer assistant and associate professor positions that attract applicants from both genders, and no change for professorial positions. Numbers, however, are very low.

## 4. Number of qualified applicants

SDU requires a minimum of three qualified applicants in academic recruitments. All postdoc and professorial positions advertised in 2019 attracted at least 3 qualified applicants; the corresponding percentages for assistant and associate professors were $75 \%$ and $50 \%$, respectively (Table 4.1). This means that $68 \%$ of positions advertised (and filled) were successful in attracting the required minimum number of applicants.

Table 4.1 Number of qualified applicants
Faculty:
Humanities

| YEAR | Total hired <br> based on <br> external <br> Positions advertised externally with 3 or more qualified applicants <br> advertisement | Women <br> hired | Men <br> hired | Total hired with 3 <br> or more qual. <br> applicants based <br> on external <br> advertisement | Out of the <br> total hired based <br> on external <br> advertisement (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Post.doc | 8 | 3 | 5 | 8 | $100 \%$ |
| Assistant Pro | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | $75 \%$ |
| Associate Pro | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | $50 \%$ |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 17 | 6 | 11 | 15 | $88 \%$ |

It is very difficult and not particularly useful to identify patterns in the overall data when numbers are so small. For instance, there were only two associate professor positions, and the data tells us that one was hired with less than 3 qualified applicants and one was hired with only male applicants. The data does not reveal if this was the same individual/position.

The Faculty strives to attract as many qualified applicants as possible through bilingual advertising and wide geographical placement of advertisements. This practice will be continued.

## 5. Assessment committee members

Please report and reflect on your Faculty's ability to have both men and women represented in your assessment committee members. Make sure that you look at recruitments were an actual committee were in play, i.e. committees with more than 1 member. Compare this data with the table where you have already noted the overall data on your newly hired (the table on page 3)

Table 5.1 Assessment committees with male and female members

| Faculty:_ Humanities__ |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| YEAR | 2019 |

Positions with both men and women in the assessment committee (committee with 3 members)

|  | Women <br> hired | Men <br> hired | Total hired with both <br> men and women in <br> committee | Out of the <br> total hired (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Post.doc | 3 | 5 | 8 | $80 \%$ * (committees with 2 <br> or 3 members) |
| Assistant Pro | 2 | 1 | 3 | $75 \%$ |
| Associate Pro | 0 | 2 | 2 | $100 \%$ |
| Pro/Pro MSO | 1 | 2 | 3 | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 4 | 7 | 16 | $84 \%$ |

The majority of the Faculty's assessment committees consist of men and women. The Faculty of Humanities aims to have both genders represented in assessment committees and the Head of Department is always asked to clarify the reason(s) when this is not the case. The reasons usually given are that the research field and specializations are very narrow and that researchers often decline the invitation due to lack of time. There has been an increase from 2018 in the percentage of assessment committees with both male and female members.

## E. Action plan - short and long term

## General considerations

## We plan to

1. continue working with unconscious bias, but to extend this to address issues of inclusiveness in the workplace and the classroom. Areas in focus will be
a. Group dynamics in meetings
i. Awareness raising about how meetings can exclude others, strategies to enhance inclusiveness and to deal with dilemmas of group dynamics
b. Gender dimensions in teaching
i. Choice of topics, reading materials, didactics
2. address the challenge of engagement with gender and diversity issues and how to encourage greater interest in these issues in the Faculty. We will continue to support and collaborate with bottom-up initiatives, such as the feminist network previously mentioned, and encourage students to focus on these issues in projects, dissertations.
3. further develop knowledge sharing with the Gender Equality committees from other faculties, in particular to identify common problems (such as the leaking pipeline) that could benefit from crossFaculty discussions and solutions
4. collate gender and diversity dimensions in research that can feed into teaching activities, new research projects, GET objectives

## Short-term plans (2020-2021)

- GET activities at departmental level (already planned for 2020 but most likely delayed to 2021 due to Covid-19): involves Heads of Department and GET
- Cross-faculty visit from TEK to HUM gender equality committee (end of 2020/beginning 2021) that involves follow-up on a MA dissertation (June 2020) written on gender equality strategies in HUM and TEK; chair of HUM committee, Sharon Millar, visited SUND in September 2020: involves chairs and members of Faculty gender equality committees
- Gender dimensions in reading materials in teaching. Inspired by a presentation to the HUM Gender equality committee in 2020 from the head of studies from Philosophy, who described how they have been trying to tackle gender bias in the teaching curriculum, the committee will facilitate
further dissemination of this initiative to other degree programmes in 2021: involves members of Gender Equality Committee, Heads of Studies, teachers
- Initial meeting between Maria Dockweiler from GET and Sharon Millar to discuss identification of relevant research activities at the Faculty (October 2020); follow-up 2020/2021: involves members of Gender Equality Committee and GET
- Re-consideration of the composition of HUM gender equality committee to ensure greater engagement with issues, and visibility of the committee (2020): involves Dean, heads of Departments, members of gender equality committee


## Long-term plans (2021-2022)

- Work with group dynamics; in collaboration with GET, identify groups from different organizational levels and contexts for activities in relation to inclusive meeting practices and strategies (offline and online): involves GET, HUM Gender Equality Committee, Dean, Heads of Department and other units
- Communication strategy to increase visibility of HUM Gender Equality Committee as well as gender and diversity issues/initiatives at the Faculty: involves HUM Gender Equality Committee, colleagues responsible for communication at faculty and departmental levels
- Better integration of gender and diversity matters across other Faculty and departmental committees where relevant: involves Dean, Heads of Department
- Systemize practices in relation to career progression for younger researchers: Involves Heads of Department, PhD School, supervisors, project leaders
- Continue cross-Faculty knowledge-sharing with an aim to identify common problems that could be addressed together rather than in isolation: involves SDU local gender equality committees, Central Gender Equality Committee
- Facilitate dissemination of relevant research areas in relation to diversity and equality that have been identified with a view to encourage possible networking within and across faculties regarding future research or teaching activities: involves HUM Gender Equality Committee, local faculty Gender Equality Committees


## F. Overview of work-flow of reporting process

Please provide an overview of the process behind your compilation of the 2019-report. This should ideally include all activities that feed into you composing your report. We are asking for this information to get a better understanding of how these reports are produced - when, how, with the involvement of who etc. to learn more about how we may better assist this process.

Date: When did the activity related to the reporting happen?
What: What activity was undertaken? A committee meeting, a data drafting session, writing parts of the report, a write-up of version 1, a write up of version 3 etc.?
Who: Who participated in the activity?
Where: Where did the activity take place, and was it a closed/confidential event or e.g. a public sharing of information?

An example of how such an overview of the work-flow could look is listed below:

| When | What | Who | Where | Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Late spring $2020$ | The template is sent to the members of the gender equality committee | Committee members | Email |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { August } 24^{\text {th }} \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Input to the report is discussed at a meeting in the gender equality committee | Committee members | Online meeting |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { August } 31^{\text {st }} \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Meeting with the chairs of the feminist network, Associate professor Emilie Moore and postdoc Ella Fegitz | Chairs for the network, chairman for the gender equality committee Sharon Millar and secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen | Online meeting | The meeting was initiated by Sharon Millar to gain insights into the activities of the network in 2019 and 2020 |
| Mid- <br> September $2020$ | Data extraction from Gender Statistics for report | Secretary for the committee Caroline Zoffmann Jessen | Online, confidential |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { September 21st } \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | All members of the gender equality committees are reminded to send a short description of local activities relating to gender and diversity | Secretary for the committee Caroline Zoffmann Jessen | Email |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { September } 23^{\text {rd }} \\ & 2020 \end{aligned}$ | Data extraction from summaries of committee meetings in 2019 and 2020 | Chair and secretary | Online meeting between chairman and |  |


|  | Work begun on <br> writing report |  | secretary, <br> confidential |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| September $24^{\text {th }}$ <br> $-25^{\text {th }} 2020$ | Write-up of version 1 | Chair and secretary | Meetings <br> between <br> chairman and <br> secretary, <br> confidential |  |
| September $25^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2020 | Circulation of version <br> for commenting | All committee <br> members | Online, <br> confidential |  |
| September $29^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2020 | Review of comments <br> and integrating <br> comments | Chair and secretary | Online, <br> confidential |  |
| September $30^{\text {th }}$ <br> 2020 | Report finished, sent <br> off | Sent to GET, sent to <br> Heads of Department <br> and Dean | Cone\| |  |

## Appendix A: accessing and using SDU's Gender Statistics

First, make sure you are connected to SDU's intranet, either by being online at campus, connected via your VPN-connection or through https://online.sdu.dk
Go to the webpage https://qv.sdu.dk
It looks like this:


In the drop-down menu "Category", find and click on "Nøgletal" [key figures]. This will take you to a page that looks like this:


Click on the yellow SDUstat logo to enter the database.
This brings you to the database and its (as of January 2019) five data sheets. Two contain Gender Statistics:

| Rekruttering | Rekruttering - ligestilling | Ligestilling 0 | BF1 | PL opregning |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


Here, you find gender
segregated data on
employees (representation).
The data source is SDU's
"Lønbog" and the annual
information on managerial
positions that faculties send
to SDU's HR Development.

When you need to export data, locate and click on this logo - you'll typically find it in the top right corner:


Exporting data will be useful when you need to compare data, e.g. the number of recruitments with both men and women among applicants compared to total number of recruitments.

Below follows inputs on how to extract data from the database related to the reporting in section $D$ of the annual reporting.

1. Data on gender representation among academic staff Looking for data on representation of men and women among your academic staff?

Go to the data sheet "Ligestilling", and click on "VIP Kønsfordeling" to see your representation data.

Next, mark your Faculty in the "Valg" menu on the left: SUND, NAT, TEK", SAM or HUM. Mark the year you wish to see data from.


You can see data on both Faculty and department levels.

If you press and hold CTRL, you can click on and mark more years from which to see data, as in the illustration below:

[^1]

## 2. Data on gender in managerial positions

Looking for data on representation of men and women among your management positions?

Go to the data sheet "Ligestilling", and click on "Ledelse fordelt på ledelsesstrengen"" to see data on management positions ${ }^{3}$.

Next, mark your Faculty in the "Valg" menu on the left: SUND, NAT, TEK, SAM or HUM. Mark the year you wish to see data from.

3. Data on recruitments: new positions and gender representation among qualified applicants Looking for data on your Faculty's academic recruitments and who your qualified applicants were?

[^2]Go to the data sheet "Rekruttering-ligestilling" to see data on recruitment.

Next, mark your Faculty in the "Valg" menu on the left: SUND, NAT, TEK, SAM or HUM. Mark the year you wish to see data from.


If you are looking for the representation of men and women among your qualified applicants, go to the "Stilling valg" menu, find the "Køn kvalificerede ansøgere" and choose "Begge køn". This gives you an overview of the positions where both men and women were among the qualified applicants.


Looking for data on positions with only women among the qualified applicants? In the "Stilling valg" menu, go to the "Køn kvalificerede ansøgere" and choose "udelukkende kvinder" [only women].

Looking for data on positions with only men among the qualified applicants? In the "Stilling valg" menu, go to the "Køn kvalificerede ansøgere" and choose "udelukkende mænd" [only men].

## 4. Number of qualified applicants

Looking for data on your Faculty's ability to attract at least three qualified applicants when recruiting for academic positions?

Go to the data sheet "Rekruttering-ligestilling". Next, mark your Faculty in the "Valg" menu on the left: SUND, NAT, TEK, SAM or HUM. Mark the year you wish to see data from.

Be sure you also choose "yes" to the choice "stilling opslået eksternt".

In the menu "Grænse for antal kvalificerede ansøgere" on the left side, enter the number 3.


You can always click "Nulstil grænse" to reset the number and see all completed recruitments.

## 5. Data on assessment committee members

Looking for data on your Faculty's ability to have both men and women represented in your assessment committee members?

Go to the data sheet "Rekruttering-ligestilling". to see data on recruitment. Next, mark your Faculty in the "Valg" menu on the left: SUND, NAT, TEK, SAM or HUM. Mark the year you wish to see data from.

Next, make sure you are looking at committees with more than 1 member. Mark all committees with more than 1 member by holding down the CTRL-bottom and clicking on them - they'll turn green.


Now, in the "Bedømmelsesudvalg valg" menu, go to "Køn bedømmelsesudvalg" and choose "Begge køn". This gives you an overview of the positions where both men and women were among the assessment committee members.



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The database contains recruitments reported to the Danish Ministry for Higher Education and Science.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Note that TEK's data is filed jointly under "TEK" and then also in subsections TEK 40*, TEK 42*, TEK 44*, TEK 46* and TEK 48. This is due to TEK's structure with different sections. Make sure you mark either "TEK" or all 6 subsections when looking at the entire Faculty. Click and hold CTRL to mark more than one choice in the "Valg"-menu.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Please note, that these data are self-reported and norms for reporting positions vary greatly from Faculty to Faculty. Comparisons across faculties will therefore not give an adequate picture - only comparisons within faculties apply, for instance across years.

