

Annual reporting on SDU's local gender equality status and initiatives

Faculty of Humanities 2021

This template provides the structure for your committee's annual reporting on gender equality initiatives and status at your Faculty and Departments.

While your reporting should eventually cover all five sections A to E, you may not at this time be able to add elaborative information to all sections. Please provide as much information as you can. SDU's upcoming gender equality plan (2021-) 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.

Reporting structure and content

A. Follow-up on activities and plans from last year	2
B. Strategic analyses of the faculty's opportunities and challenges	4
C. Status for selected focal areas and objectives	5
D. Status for key indicators.....	6
E. Action plan – short and long term.....	11
F. Overview of work-flow of reporting process.....	12

A. Follow-up on activities and plans from last year

Covid-19 continued to have an impact particularly during the first half of 2021, but notwithstanding, there were several activities carried out. As mentioned in the annual report from 2020, a new HUM gender equality committee was established at the beginning of 2021, still with VIP and TAP representation, including a new representative for Departmental secretaries and new members from all four Departments at the Faculty.

Activities during the year were as follows:

- ✓ The new HUM gender equality committee met 4 times in 2021, updating the committee's terms of reference, commenting on GET's draft process plan on GEP, contributing to the annual report for 2020 in relation to short-term and long-term plans, discussing the possibility of a faculty prize for gender equality/inclusive initiatives and hosting a visit from the TEK Gender Equality committee.
 - ✓ The terms of reference were discussed and updated, putting an increased focus on an inclusive culture, while avoiding the explicit naming of specific categories, and emphasizing the importance of integrating and making visible the work of the committee within the Faculty as a whole. The terms of reference will be translated into English.
 - ✓ It was suggested that a Faculty prize for activities relating to gender equality and inclusivity could be established to raise the profile of these types of initiatives and encourage wider involvement. The committee held preliminary discussions about how such a prize might be organised and evaluated, but the idea is still at the planning stage.
- ✓ As part of a planned cross-faculty knowledge-sharing initiative, 2 members of the TEK gender equality committee - Eva Arnsjang Christensen (chair) and Heidi Maglekjær Jensen (secretary) - participated in a meeting of the HUM gender equality committee in November 2021. They shared some of the topics which are a top priority at TEK, including the lack of women in STEM and the initiatives taken to make girls and young women interested in those areas which are more male dominated to diversify the talent pool. A common interest for the TEK and HUM Gender Equality committees is investigating how to create an inclusive meeting culture among colleagues to ensure that both male/female and junior as well as senior voices are heard.
- ✓ The initiative from SUND aimed at investigating, on a small-scale, gender dimensions of the work conditions of research staff during the Covid pandemic continued in 2021, despite lack of success in securing external funding. Sharon Millar, along with other members of the Central Gender Equality Committee, is a member of the steering committee. Three researchers, each from the three Humanities departments in Odense, participated in interviews conducted by researchers from SUND.

- ✓ A seminar on workplace culture and sexism, in the light of the SoMe jointly organised by the Academic Council, Dansk Magisterforening (trade union) and the chair of the HUM gender equality committee, took place on May 28th 2021. The seminar was led by Søren Bjerregaard Kjær from Dansk Magisterforening and members of the various councils and committees at the Faculty along with Heads of Boards of Study were invited. The seminar, which was held online, was well attended and provoked lively debate.

- ✓ Members of the HUM gender equality committee took part in the annual IGAB Master Class (October 2021)

- ✓ The Feminist Network met monthly in 2021, where members gave short presentations on their research, discussed how to create more inclusive spaces in the classroom re issues of gender identity and inclusive language, invited GET to present their new strategy, and gave input to HUM gender equality committee concerning focus areas.

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

The SWOT matrix

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong representation of women at Ph.D and junior lecturer/postdoc levels, suggesting thriving interest in research career among female graduates and postgraduates • Gender balance in managerial positions (50/50 among Heads of Department at the Faculty) • Collaboration with GET • Success of bottom-up initiatives, e.g. establishment of feminist network • Focus on inclusivity in general • New, revitalized HUM gender equality committee <p style="text-align: center;">Strengths and success stories S</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaking gender pipeline between junior and senior research positions • 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 • GET data collection and information sharing remains in closed circuit <p style="text-align: center;">Weaknesses W</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">O Opportunities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with 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 	<p style="text-align: center;">T Threats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant financial challenges which negatively affect capacity building: recruitment of staff, career progression, sustainability of research milieus • Low priority given to equality and diversity matters in the context of other challenges facing the Humanities generally • The external funding and scope of Interdisciplinary projects is often given to

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• “The times they are a’changin” and messages of equality, inclusion and tolerance are welcomed by younger generations of students and faculty members, encouraging more active involvement• Including an awareness of gender dimensions and bias in the curriculum.	areas that traditionally have more male researchers
---	---

C. Status for selected focal areas and objectives

One objective, namely the revitalisation of the HUM gender equality committee, has been achieved and a goal is to make the committee and its work more visible across the Faculty.

A focal area remains inclusive culture, where a relevant context is meetings and the dynamics of group relations across different job categories as well as gender, age etc. During 2021, we did not work with this issue in any systematic way, but it was a topic of the seminar that was organised on work culture and sexism taking place in May 2021.

D. Status for key indicators

1. Gender representation among academic staff

The current gender representation among academic staff is not yet balanced, (54% are men, 46% are women (see table 1.1). This is the same representation as in 2020, but total numbers of academic staff have decreased since 2020 from 317 to 282, primarily due to financial cutbacks. The pattern of variation across departments is similar to 2020: The Department of History has the lowest percentage of female staff (32%), followed by the Department for the Study of Culture (44%), Department of Language and Communication (51%), and Department of Design and Communication (59%). Across the Faculty, however, there is still a higher percentage of men in senior academic positions. 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 70% at Ph.D. level to 40% and 36% at Associate Professor and Professor levels, respectively, whereas the percentage of men increases from 30% at Ph.D. level to 60% and 69% at Associate Professor and Professor levels, respectively. This is continued evidence of the well-acknowledged “leaking pipeline” for women from junior to senior levels, which appears to have remained more or less stable since 2019, although numbers are small at especially the assistant professor level. Overall recruitment at this level is low, indicating that the recruitment pipeline itself may be under threat.

Table 1.1. Gender representation among academic staff					
Position	Women	Women (%)	Men	Men (%)	Total
Professor	11	31%	25	69%	36
Professor w. special responsibilities	3	100%	0	0%	3
Associate professor	60	40%	89	60%	149
Assistant professor	8	47%	9	53%	17
Postdoc	16	53%	14	47%	30
Ph.d.	33	70%	14	30%	47
Total	131	46%	151	54%	282

Table 1.2 illustrates the development (%) in gender representation between 2016 -2021. Table 1.2.1 expands on this to include numbers for 2020 and 2021. There is no sustained pattern of decrease/increase within categories except for PhD (continual increase in women). The percentage of female assistant professors has decreased slightly since 2020, although numbers are small. The total number of assistant professors has decreased (21 in 2020 and 17 in 2021). The same applies to associate professors, where total numbers have decreased, while the percentage of women has decreased slightly.

Table 1.2. Representation: development in share of women among academic staff in the last 5 years						
Position	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Professor	35%	37%	38%	28%	33%	31%
Professor w. special responsibilities	50%	50%	43%	43%	75%	100%
Associate professor	40%	42%	42%	39%	41%	40%
Assistant professor	59%	68%	68%	68%	50%	47%
Postdoc	52%	57%	53%	59%	61%	53%

Ph.d.	58%	59%	60%	63%	68%	70%
Total	47%	50%	49%	48%	48%	46%

Table 1.2.1 Gender representation among academic staff 2020 and 2021					
Gender representation among academic staff 2020 below					
Position	No. of women	Women (%)	No. of men	Men (%)	Total
Professor	12	33%	24	67%	36
Professor w. special responsibilities	3	75%	1	25%	4
Associate professor	66	41%	96	59%	162
Assistant professor	11	50%	11	50%	22
Postdoc	19	61%	12	39%	31
Ph.d.	42	68%	20	32%	62
Total	153	48%	164	52%	317
Gender representation among academic staff in 2021 below					
Position	No. of women	Women (%)	No of men	Men (%)	Total
Professor	11	31%	25	69%	36
Professor w. special responsibilities	3	100%	0	0%	3
Associate professor	60	40%	89	60%	149
Assistant professor	8	47%	9	53%	17
Postdoc	16	53%	14	47%	30
Ph.d.	33	70%	14	30%	47
Total	131	46%	151	54%	282

2. Managerial positions

Table 2.1.: Gender representation in management positions					
Faculty	Women	Women (%)	Men	Men (%)	Total
Humanities	2	33%	4	67%	6
Total	2	33%	4	67%	6

In managerial positions, men are more strongly represented (Table 2.1), although the Faculty has achieved an equal gender and national background balance across Heads of Department.

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

Table 3.1 gives an overview of overall academic recruitment in 2021, which has decreased markedly since 2020: 15 new positions in 2021 compared to 37 in 2020. It is worth noting, however, that recruitment in 2020 was higher than in previous years (in 2019 and 2018, recruitments numbered 19 and 26, respectively). Overall, women make up 33% of new recruitments, a decrease from 68% in 2020. Numbers are small, but the decrease may be explained by the high percentage of women who were hired as associate professors in 2020 (79% (11 out of 14)). In 2021, differences between male and female recruitment within job categories

are low in terms of numbers, often a difference of one and mostly in favour of men, although not in relation to associate professors. Given that overall recruitment is low, these small differences have an impact. It is interesting to note that in the postdoc category, all new staff were male, explaining the decrease in female representation in this category from 2020.

Table 3.1.: New recruitment to academic positions					
Position	Women hired	Women hired (%)	Men hired	Men hired (%)	Hired total
Professor	1	33%	2	67%	3
Associate professor	3	60%	2	40%	5
Assistant professor	1	33%	2	67%	3
Postdoc	0	0%	4	100%	4
Total	5	33%	10	67%	15

As for the recruitment process, Table 3.2 is an overview of positions where both men and women were among the qualified applicants. Numbers are of course small, but percentages are notably lower for postdoc and professor positions. In 2020, it was also noted that postdoc recruitment was primarily based on qualified applicants of one gender.

Table 3.2.: Recruitment total compared with recruitment with both men and women among qualified applicants			
Position	Hired total	Hired qf m/w total	Hired qf m/w (%)
Professor	3	1	33%
Associate professor	5	3	60%
Assistant professor	3	2	67%
Postdoc	4	1	25%
Total	15	7	47%

Table 3.3 presents numbers of men and women who were employed from a pool of qualified applicants including both men and women. Again, numbers are small, but more women than men were recruited for the higher-level positions, while the opposite is true for the lower-level positions. Given the gender imbalance from junior to senior positions, this small improvement is to be welcomed.

Table 3.3.: Recruitment of men/women with both men and women among qual. applicants			
Position	Hired women, qf m/w	Hired men, qf m/w	Hired total, qf m/w
Professor	1	0	1
Associate professor	2	1	3
Assistant professor	0	2	2
Postdoc	0	1	1
Total	3	4	7

Table 3.4.1.: Recruitment processes with only women among the qualified applicants		
Position	Hired women, qf women only	% of all hired women
Professor	0	0%

Associate professor	1	33%
Assistant professor	1	100%
Postdoc	0	-
Total	2	40%

Table 3.4.2.: Recruitment processes with only men among the qualified applicants		
Position	Hired men, qf men only	% of all hired men
Professor	2	100%
Associate professor	1	50%
Assistant professor	0	0%
Postdoc	3	75%
Total	6	60%

If we consider recruitment on the basis of a single-sex pool of qualified applicants, we see a change in relation to postdocs; in 2020, most postdocs were recruited from an all-female pool of qualified applicants while in 2021, most recruitment stemmed from an all-male pool of qualified applicants. No assistant professor position had only male qualified applicants; the male applicants employed in this category came from a mixed gender pool of qualified applicants. In contrast, the two male professors were recruited exclusively from an all-male pool of qualified applicants, while the only female professor employed was selected from a mixed gender pool. The gender biases may be related to the research areas of the positions, but this would require further qualitative investigation.

4. Number of qualified applicants

SDU requires a minimum of three qualified applicants in academic recruitments. Apart from one professor position and one postdoc position (Table 4.1), all externally advertised positions attracted 3 or more qualified applicants (82%). The Faculty strives to attract as many qualified applicants as possible through defining positions in broad terms, to avoid an overly narrow focus, and through appropriate placement of advertisements (nationally and internationally). This practice has been generally successful and will be continued.

Table 4.1.: Announced positions with 3 or more qualified applicants				
Position	Hired total ext. adv.	Hired total ext. adv. 3+ qf appl.	Hired men ext. adv. 3+ qf appl.	Hired women ext. adv. 3+ qf appl.
Professor	3	2	1	1
Associate professor	3	3	1	2
Assistant professor	3	3	2	1
Postdoc	2	1	1	0
Total	11	9	5	4

5. Assessment committee members

SDU requires recruitment processes to employ both men and women in assessment committees. Table 5.1. shows the number of positions which were assessed by a committee of 2+ members that consisted of men and women. It should be noted that postdoc positions financed through external funding are not necessarily advertised if a candidate is named in the funding application.

Table 5.1.: Recruitment processes with both men and women in the assessment committee				
Position	Hired women, m/w committee	Hired men, m/w committee	Hired total, m/w committee	% of all hired
Professor	1	2	3	100%
Associate professor	2	1	3	60%
Assistant professor	1	2	3	100%
Postdoc	0	1	1	25%
Total	4	6	10	67%

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, meaning that through necessity the aim at times becomes finding a suitable committee member regardless of gender who has the time to commit to the work. There has been a decrease from 2020 (95% to 67%) in the percentage of assessment committees with both male and female members. This is due primarily to the nature of committees in relation to postdoc positions, which has skewed the numbers. Greater attention should be given to gender considerations in the composition of assessment committees for this job category.

E. Action plan – short and long term

Short term plans 2022

- In the first half of 2022, the committee will follow up on topics already introduced previously, such as gender and diversity dimensions in teaching, already addressed by the Board of Studies in Philosophy, but which can be further explored with input from SDUUP. Donna Hurford from SDUUP has agreed to participate in a meeting of the committee at the beginning of 2022.
- During the first half of 2022, the committee will also focus on the annual report for 2021
- During the second half of 2022, the Humanities Faculty will start the rollout of GEPs and the HUM gender equality committee will be part of that process, collaborating with GET, the central gender equality committee, the Faculty and the Heads of Departments to lay the groundwork and embark on the new processes involved, including the critical friend visits.

There will be changes in membership of the HUM gender equality committee in the latter half of 2022, specifically the chair and the VIP representative from the Department of Cultural Sciences.

Given the organizational and processual changes, it is premature at this time to develop long term plans. The committee, however, aims to continue to

- address the challenge of engagement with gender and diversity issues and how to encourage greater interest in these issues within 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.
- increase the visibility of the committee's work and activities relating to gender and inclusivity through the development of a communication strategy
- further develop knowledge sharing with the Gender Equality committees from other faculties, in particular to identify common problems that could benefit from cross-Faculty discussions and solutions. Knowledge sharing concerning the implementation of GEPs will also be beneficial
- explore possible focus areas that could be of interest to pursue at faculty level

F. Overview of workflow of reporting process

When	What	Who	Where	Comments
May 11 th	Initial meeting to divide tasks in reporting	Committee chair Sharon Millar and Secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen	Online, confidential	
May the 25 th	Data extraction from Gender Statistics for report	Secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen	Online, confidential	
June 7 th	Data extraction from summaries of committee meetings in 2020	Committee chair Sharon Millar and Secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen	Online, confidential	
June 1 st	Write-up of version 1	Committee chair Sharon Millar and Secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen	Online, confidential	
June 2 nd	Circulation of version for commenting	All committee members and Dean	Online on sharepoint, confidential	Deadline June 8 th for comments
June 9 th	Review of comments and write up	Committee chair Sharon Millar and Secretary Caroline Zoffmann Jessen	Online, confidential	
June 10 th	Report finished, sent off	Sent to GET, sent to Heads of Department and Dean	Online	