



19 MAY 2016

## MEMORANDUM

**Re:**                    **Status: Action Plan for Career, Gender and Quality – equal opportunities in research and management – 2015 report**

HR&O  
ARBEJDSMILJØ & SAMARBEJDE

**By:**                    Ingrid Skovsmose Jensen og Martin Dahl Nielsen

10 NOERREGADE  
POSTBOX 2177  
DK-1165 COPENHAGEN K

### 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 UCPH 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 professor level.

TEL 45 35322600  
DIR 45 35322790  
MOB 45 28752790

isj@adm.ku.dk

At UCPH, there is widespread support for maintaining focus on this area, as well as a consensus that a new action plan must be broad-based and encompass the complex web of reasons and possible explanations for why women are not represented at the top of research groups to the same extent as they are lower down in the ‘hierarchies’.

REF: ISJ

Accordingly, the new action plan is based on measures other than financial incentives. It aims to create lasting change and must be even more integrated into day-to-day practice in research environments. It is very much about cultural changes, and these take time.

The plan reflects UCPH’s continued commitment to prioritising gender balance in research, education and management by making talent, not gender, the critical parameter.

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 for at least one candidate of each gender before a faculty position<sup>1</sup> is filled
- Gender equality on assessment and appointment committees
- Re-entry initiatives for men and women returning from maternity/paternity/parental 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 the reasons why women do not choose a career at UCPH

The UCPH Board approved the new action plan in October 2014. It came into force on 1 February 2015 and covers all posts advertised since that date. The plan will be evaluated after three years, i.e. by the end of 2017.

Annual progress reports will be submitted to the Board. These will be based on information from faculties about progress on the various themes, and on data from the Danish National Research Database and ScanPas.

The 2015 report reflects the fact that the action plan is being phased in. A number of the initiatives will take time to implement fully, and the overall impact is difficult to quantify after less than a year.

## Summary

The action plan has been implemented throughout UCPH. One of the characteristics of the first year has been the fact that faculties were required to draw up their own action plans by 1 July 2015 and, in general, to spread knowledge about the initiatives and measures in the action plan.

The Board's emphasis on the recruitment process, e.g. via search committees and widening the field of applicants, has already had an impact during the first year. All of the faculties 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.

The action plan introduced a rule requiring at least one applicant of each gender for all faculty positions. Overall, the trend has been positive since

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined as professors (including clinical professors and professors with special responsibilities), associate professors and assistant professors

2013, and in 2015 there were fewer faculty positions with applicants from only one gender. In 2015, 29% of faculty recruitments received applications from only one gender<sup>2</sup> (cf. page 9 of the report), down from 38% in 2013. It is also worth noting that only nine applications were submitted to the Rector for exemptions from this rule in 2015. There were a total of 129 appointments in this category in 2015.

The target of gender balance on assessment and appointment committees for faculty and management positions had largely been met when the plan was adopted. Attention is being paid to maintaining balance on the committees, as per the targets set in the action plan.

The Board's plan includes requirements for action in relation to maternity/paternity leave. This includes agreements between local management and 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. These measures have been adopted by all of the faculties.

The final part of the action plan is about career paths, an area where there is already quite a lot going on, e.g. to ensure transparency about what it takes to forge a career at a university. The University as a whole and the faculties consider this important, as reflected in the career guidance site for both permanent academic staff and technical and administrative staff launched on the UCPH intranet before the 2016 summer holidays.

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 year of the plan, there was no change to gender balance among **professors**. In other words, the percentage of women was more or less the same in 2015 as it was in 2013 (22.2% in 2015 and 22.7% in 2014 – see Appendix 2).

If we look at **newly appointed** professors instead, there has been an increase in the number of women (24.6% in 2015, 20.3% in 2014 – see Appendix 3). However, the table reveals major 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

plan. The same trend appears to be continuing under this action plan (38.5% in 2015 compared to 36.7% in 2014).

### 1. The individual points in 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 the University'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.

In general, the faculty plans describe in greater detail how they intend to implement initiatives within the overall action plan. However some faculties have formulated initiatives to complement the overall plan.

The faculty plans are published on: <http://mangfoldighed.ku.dk>

The salient points of the **special initiatives/factors** in the individual faculties are:

<b>HUM</b>	<p>The overall aim is a greater gender balance among academic staff and management. Any notable imbalances will be discussed once a year in various for a (faculty management, HR managers keeping an eye out for talented individuals, performance and development reviews addressing imbalance in particular staff groups, etc.).</p> <p>Faculty HR offers a range of short courses (seminars/workshops/presentations) to help identify the ambitions and aspirations of the individual. These courses provide tools for building increased career resilience, dealing with competition and so on. The main target groups are PhD students and postdocs.</p> <p>HUM is particularly proactive about the recruitment process and encourages – as per the overall plan – that the decision making process prior to advertising posts takes account of whether there is any imbalance in the field or the choice of topics that lead to gender bias. The process of searching for candidates should therefore be incorporated into the annual staffing plan.</p> <p>The Faculty will follow departmental initiatives closely to</p>
------------	--

	<p>ensure follow-up and active participation. A reference group has been set up for this purpose consisting of management representatives from faculty and department levels, the HR manager and representatives of permanent academic staff.</p>
<b>LAW</b>	<p>Faculty management checks up on the status of the plan twice a year. It is also discussed by the Academic Council and the collaboration committee. The annual status update is published.</p> <p>LAW does not expect to be able to increase the proportion of the underrepresented gender in senior management because the majority of staff was appointed relatively recently.</p> <p>When the next layer of management is included, the split is 53% men and 47% women.</p> <p>A permanent search committee has been set up consisting of the associate dean for education and two members of academic staff. The search committee recommends that the dean gives specific candidates a prod. The goal is to use this approach for all recruitment from 1 February 2015 onwards.</p> <p>LAW also includes assessment committees for PhD positions in the gender-equality requirement.</p> <p>Funds are allocated to support a successful return to work after parental leave. The member of academic staff concerned drafts a plan, which is discussed and recommended for support.</p>
<b>SOC.SCI.</b>	<p>Senior management is currently gender balanced, and the situation is reviewed annually.</p> <p>There is a strong focus on the work of the search committees both prior to and while positions are being advertised. External members may also be appointed to search committees.</p> <p>Both men and women are allowed a period of six months without teaching commitments after parental leave. The faculty pays departments DKK 100,000 per assistant professor, and DKK 150,000 per associate professor.</p> <p>An interdisciplinary meeting forum has been established for young women researchers.</p>
<b>SCIENCE</b>	<p>A series of additional measures and initiatives have been put in place:</p> <p>The dean's office has set up an interdisciplinary committee on gender and equality in research and management. One of its duties is to advise management on initiatives that will help achieve the plan's objectives in the long term.</p> <p>Discussions about gender equality are encouraged through</p>

	<p>meetings, debates, workshops, etc.</p> <p>A special web-forum has been established to facilitate the communication of initiatives, etc.</p> <p>The search committee reports to the associate dean for research, who must be kept informed.</p> <p>The target group for return-to-work agreements following parental leave has been extended to include PhD students.</p> <p>‘Visible Women in SCIENCE’ is about focusing on qualified candidates of both genders for prizes, council seats, committees and management functions, and raising the profile of women associate professors and professors both at the University and elsewhere.</p> <p>Dissemination of knowledge on the phenomenon of 'unconscious prejudice/bias'.</p> <p>Representation of both genders in department management.</p> <p>Theme at section head seminar on 11 November 2015.</p> <p>Publicising the options that characterise SCIENCE as a workplace.</p> <p>Annual satisfaction and well-being assessment – follow-up with relevant focus.</p> <p>Workshop on assessment of ‘quality’ in connection with recruitment.</p> <p>Flexible internationalisation (via PhD schools).</p>
<b>HEALTH</b>	<p>HEALTH has set more ambitious goals than the University action plan about the use of search committees for all posts advertised, as opposed to only for permanent professor and associate professor positions. Search committees have been used for 100% of advertised vacancies since the faculty action plan came into force.</p> <p>The associate dean for research and the department heads work closely together on the composition of the search committee to ensure the requisite academic and international breadth for each job posting.</p> <p>The search committee seeks to identify potential candidates from Denmark and beyond before advertising a post, and job postings are shared through networks.</p>

	<p>Focus is also placed on gender balance on search committees as well as on assessment and appointment committees.</p> <p>Management holds recurrent theme meetings to ensure that the action plan is included in the faculty's recruitment strategy.</p> <p>Special performance and development reviews are held with employees when they return from parental leave.</p>
<b>THEO</b>	<p>THEO seeks gender balance in its academic staff. In the period 2015-17, the aim is a minimum of 30% representation of each gender.</p> <p>Active searching is used for all permanent professor and associate professor posts.</p> <p>The dean holds career interviews with all professors with special responsibilities, as well as senior reviews and workshops for postdocs and PhD students.</p>

To summarise: all of the faculties are actively engaged in drawing up their own action plans targeting the gender balance situation in their departments and courses. This is reflected in the activities already launched.

HR&O does not think that the extra initiatives the faculties have launched require an exemption from the Gender Equality Act.

## Action plan point 2 – Management focus

The action plan says: *Targets are to be set for the proportion of the under-represented 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 (2015–2017) of 5% to 32%.*

Table showing the male/female distribution in upper management, January 2015 and January 2016:

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

\* In HEALTH the heads of Experimental Medicine, Oral Health Care and three centres are included as 'heads of department'.

<b>UCPH TOTAL</b>					
<b>January 2016</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>% F</b>	<b>% M</b>
DIR + deans' offices	23	9	14	39%	61%
Fac. dirs & CA dirs	14	4	10	29%	71%
Heads of dept.*	46	10	36	22%	78%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>72%</b>

\* In HEALTH the heads of the Biotech Research & Innovation Centre, Experimental Medicine, Oral Health Care and 4 centres are included under 'heads of department'. (CTN has 1 M & 1 F manager).

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

The Board has set a target of a five percentage point 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.

By January 2016, there had only been minimal changes to gender composition compared with the January 2015 baseline.

To add to the picture, the majority of managers are employed on contracts, some of which do not expire until 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.



The trend is monitored via annual reports.

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

The action plan says: *Search committees should be 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 associate professor and professor posts.*

- *The goal is for search committees or other forms of active searching 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. The faculties report that search committees are being used for all, or for the majority of, faculty posts advertised.

It is usually the head of department's responsibility to ensure that qualified applicants of both genders are actively sought out prior to the post being advertised.

A search committee consisting of an associate dean and two professors has been set up at LAW for a period of two years. Its remit is to identify candidates for all posts at professor, associate professor and assistant professor level. SOC.SCI also has a standing committee it can use to identify suitable candidates for all posts.

- In SCIENCE, the recommendation committees function as search committees in relation to recruitment of managers. Departmental management teams are also involved in identifying potential candidates for management positions.

**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.*

**Table showing appointments to permanent faculty posts where all applicants were the same gender – 2013 (baseline), 2014 and 2015<sup>2</sup>:**

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

*\* Figures for assistant professors were not included in the action plan's original baseline.*

<b>2014</b> <b>UCPH TOTAL</b>	Number of appointments	Number without F applicants	Number without M applicants	% with only one gender represented
Professors + professors with special responsibilities	55	10	2	22%
Clinical professors	16	9	5	88%
Associate professors	93	10	7	18%
Assistant professors*	62	6	2	13%
<b>Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>23%</b>

<b>2015</b> <b>UCPH TOTAL</b>	Number of appointments	Number without F applicants	Number without M applicants	% with only one gender represented
Professors + professors with special responsibilities	22	4	0	18%
Clinical professors	14	11	1	86%
Associate professors	56	4	11	27%
Assistant professors*	37	0	6	16%
<b>Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29%</b>

Generally speaking, fewer faculty positions attracted applicants from only one gender in 2015 than in 2013. In 2015, the number was 29%<sup>3</sup>. In principle, these positions should not be filled if all of the applicants are of the same gender, so it may seem surprising that positions were still being filled in 2015 without applicants of both genders. This is due to a number of factors, including the fact that the requirement only came into force for advertised posts on 1 February 2015. A large number of the faculty positions were filled prior to the start of the semester in February 2015 or advertised before then. Applications for exemptions from the rule have also been submitted to the Rector (see below).

It may look as if there was a tendency for professorships to be filled without applications from women than without applications from men more frequently in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Looking at associate professorships, the situation in 2015 was that more positions were filled without applications from men. However, the numbers are relatively small; it may be a one-off and should therefore be taken with some reservations.

There are major variations between faculties. LAW and THEO only advertise a small number of vacancies and all of them have attracted applicants of both genders. In HEALTH on the other hand, 59% of faculty positions only attracted candidates from one gender. The vast majority of these were clinical professorships (86% attracted only one gender): 11 attracted no applications from women, and one attracted no applications from men. The clinical area differs in several ways from other job categories. The University appoints doctors/consultants to posts as clinical research associate professors or clinical professors in the university hospitals while they continue to work as doctors.

If clinical professors are removed from the table, close to 22% of faculty positions only attracted applicants from one gender compared to 34% in the baseline year of 2013.

#### Applications for exemptions

In 2015, the Rector received and processed a total of nine applications for exemptions from the requirement that there be at least one applicant from

---

<sup>3</sup> This statistic is based on data about **recruitment of researchers** (Ministry of Higher Education and Science, 11 February 2016). 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.

The table shows the number of appointments per year in which the decision was made. Only advertised positions are recorded.

**NB:** The figures cannot be compared with Appendix 3: *New appointments, Professors 2006–2015*, which is based on ScanPas (the UCPH personnel system), because the statistics are calculated in two different ways.

each gender for faculty positions. These were two from HUM, two from SCIENCE and five from HEALTH. Six of the cases referred to posts as associate professors, two to clinical professors, and one as a professor. Following careful consideration and dialogue with the faculties about the background for the applications, the Rector granted all nine exemptions.

In three of the cases, no applications had been received from women, in six there had been none from men.

Applications for exemptions 2015			
Faculty	Position	Number of male applicants	Number of female applicants
HUM			
	Associate professor	0	6
	Associate professor	0	1
SCIENCE			
SCIENCE	Professor	5	0
SCIENCE	Associate professor	0	2
HEALTH			
HEALTH	Clinical Professor	2	0
HEALTH	Clinical Professor	0	2
HEALTH	Associate professor	0	3
HEALTH	Associate professor	1	0
HEALTH	Associate professor	0	1

#### 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.*

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 2015, 77% of the committees were gender balanced.

## **Action plan point 6 – re-entry initiatives after maternity/paternity or parental leave**

PAGE 13 OF 23

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 professors/associate professors on how the coming period is to be used.*

All of the faculties have established procedures for conducting such talks before the end of the leave period. In some cases these talks are added to annual performance and development reviews, in some they take the form of extraordinary performance and development reviews (HEALTH). Not all departments in SCIENCE have a set procedure for these talks. THEO and LAW have not yet used the procedures, since no one has been on maternity/paternity/parental leave.

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

In LAW and THEO, these funds are administered by the faculty, although they have not yet been used.

In HEALTH, SCIENCE and HUM it is up to departments to cover the costs.

In SOC.SCI, assistant and associate professors of both genders with maximum five years of service are offered one semester free from teaching duties following maternity/paternity leave of minimum. six consecutive months. The faculty reimburses the departments DKK 100,000 per assistant professor and DKK 150,000 per associate professor. However, the procedure and payments were not invoked in 2015.

## **Action plan point 7 – Clear career paths**

The action plan says: *The work done on gender and research at UCPH is to 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 career site is being developed on the intranet to bring 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.

The faculties run their own events and continuing education. In 2015, HUM held a careers seminar for postdocs and PhD students. SOC.SCI set up a meeting forum for young female researchers from across the faculty.

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

Since 2010, HR&O has held annual pre-leadership/clarification programmes for women on the academic staff. Each team has 16 members and the number of applicants exceeds the number of places each year. The evaluation of these programmes by the participants has been very positive.

*Mentoring programmes to be provided for both genders.*

In 2015, mentoring programmes were not offered for both genders at UCPH level. They will start in 2016.

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

*Workshops are to be undertaken, also in conjunction with R&I, 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.*

In 2015, moves were made to set up workshops of this type but they have been put on hold due to cutbacks. Coordination for Gender Research (affiliated to the Department of Sociology) runs similar events:

<http://koensforskning.soc.ku.dk/english/>

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

*A study and analysis based in HR&O will look into why assistant and associate professors choose not to follow a university career at UCPH. As much data as possible will be acquired from similar studies at Aarhus University and the University of Southern Denmark. The results of the analysis will be applied to other initiatives in the faculties. The study will also incorporate knowledge from workplace assessments and annual well-being surveys.*

The analysis has not been carried out. The Board recommends that it be abandoned, as the University does not have the resources or competences to conduct it at the moment. Please refer instead to the Ministry of Higher Education and Science 2011 report (in Danish).

**Recommendations to the Board from the reference group and the UCPH Senior Management Team:**

PAGE 15 OF 23

The reference group for the action plan and the Senior Management Team recommend that

- future work on the action plan focuses in particular on whether there is gender balance:
  - When UCPH appoints professors without advertising the post
  - When UCPH appoints professors with special responsibilities
  - When UCPH appoints academic staff to tenure track positions
  - When UCPH uses shortlisting

*Appendix 1 – Men/women in senior management, January 2015 and January 2016 – by faculty*

<b><u>Baseline</u></b>					
<b><u>pr. faculty</u></b>					
<b><u>January 2015</u></b>					
<b>HUM</b>	<b>I ALT</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Heads of dept.	8	3	5	38%	63%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>LAW</b>	<b>I ALT</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>
-					
<b>SOC.SIC.</b>	<b>I ALT</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	2	1	67%	33%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Heads of dept.	5	1	4	20%	80%
<b>SAMLET</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>SCIENCE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	5	1	4	20%	80%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Heads of dept.	12	1	11	8%	92%
<b>SAMLET</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>83%</b>

<b><u>Status 2016</u></b>					
<b><u>pr. faculty</u></b>					
<b><u>January 2016</u></b>					
<b>HUM</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Heads of dept.	8	3	5	38%	63%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>LAW</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	1	2	33%	67%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>SOC.SIC.</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	3	2	1	67%	33%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Heads of dept.	5	1	4	20%	80%
<b>SAMLET</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>SCIENCE</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	4	1	3	25%	75%
Fac.dir.	1	1	0	100%	0%
Heads of dept.	12	1	11	8%	92%
<b>SAMLET</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>82%</b>



<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>pr. fakulty</b>					
<b>January 2015</b>					
<b>HEALTH</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	4	2	2	50%	50%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Heads of dept.*	18	4	14	22%	78%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>74%</b>
<b>THEOL</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	1	1	0	100%	0%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>BRIC</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Mænd</b>
Fac.dir.**	1	0	1	0%	100%
Heads of dept.**	0				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>FA</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Mænd</b>
DIR	4	1	3	25%	75%
FA-vice-dir.	8	2	6	25%	75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>

\*\* In HEALTH the heads of Experimental Medicine, Oral Health Care and 3 centres are included under 'heads of department'.

<b>Status 2016</b>					
<b>pr. fakulty</b>					
<b>January 2016</b>					
<b>HEALTH</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Men</b>
Deans office	4	2	2	50%	50%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
Heads of dept.*	21	5	16	24%	76%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<b>THEOL</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Mænd</b>
Deans office	2	1	1	50%	50%
Fac.dir.	1	0	1	0%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>BRIC</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Mænd</b>
Fac.dir.**	0	0	0	-	-
Heads of dept.**	1	0	1	0%	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>FA</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Kvinder</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>% Women</b>	<b>% Mænd</b>
DIR	4	1	3	25%	75%
FA-vice-dir.	8	2	6	25%	75%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>75%</b>

\* In HEALTH the heads of the Biotech Research & Innovation Centre, Experimental Medicine, Oral Health Care and 4 centres are included under 'heads of department' (at the Center for Basic and Translational Neuroscience 1 M & 1 F manager were registered).

Appendix 2 –  
**Academic staff, UCPH**  
**2007–2015, by gender**

**PROFESSORS**

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

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

**ASSOCIATE  
PROFESSORS**

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

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

**ASSISTANT  
PROFESSORS**

	Nos.			%		
	Women	Men		Women	Men	
<b>2007</b>	92	86.5	<b>2007</b>	51.5	48.5	%
<b>2008</b>	107	94.5	<b>2008</b>	53.1	46.9	%
<b>2009</b>	112	103.5	<b>2009</b>	52	48	%

<b>2010</b>	113.5	106
<b>2011</b>	113.5	106
<b>2012</b>	121	114.5
<b>2013</b>	133.5	123
<b>2014</b>	150.5	144
<b>2015</b>	159	183

<b>2010</b>	51.7	48.3	%
<b>2011</b>	51.7	48.3	%
<b>2012</b>	51.4	48.6	%
<b>2013</b>	52	48	%
<b>2014</b>	51.1	48.9	%
<b>2015</b>	46.5	53.5	%

## POSTDOCS

	Nos.		
	Women	Men	
<b>2007</b>	164	224	
<b>2008</b>	193	246	
<b>2009</b>	226	299.5	
<b>2010</b>	266	370.5	
<b>2011</b>	269.5	336	
<b>2012</b>	322.5	419.5	
<b>2013</b>	345	455	
<b>2014</b>	426.5	573	
<b>2015</b>	462.5	578	

  

	%		
	Women	Men	
<b>2007</b>	42.3	57.7	%
<b>2008</b>	44	56	%
<b>2009</b>	43	57	%
<b>2010</b>	41.8	58.2	%
<b>2011</b>	44.5	55.5	%
<b>2012</b>	43.5	56.5	%
<b>2013</b>	43.1	56.9	%
<b>2014</b>	42.7	57.3	%
<b>2015</b>	44.4	55.6	%

## PHD STUDENTS

	Nos.		
	Women	Men	
<b>2007</b>	302	313	
<b>2008</b>	566.5	474.5	
<b>2009</b>	664.5	540.5	
<b>2010</b>	784	594.5	
<b>2011</b>	843	660.5	
<b>2012</b>	841.5	669	
<b>2013</b>	777.5	653	
<b>2014</b>	814.5	665.5	
<b>2015</b>	799.5	674.5	

  

	%		
	Women	Men	
<b>2007</b>	49.1	50.9	%
<b>2008</b>	54.4	45.6	%
<b>2009</b>	55.1	44.9	%
<b>2010</b>	56.9	43.1	%
<b>2011</b>	56.1	43.9	%
<b>2012</b>	55.7	44.3	%
<b>2013</b>	54.4	45.6	%
<b>2014</b>	55	45	%
<b>2015</b>	54.2	45.8	%

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

New appointments 2015 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	1
HEALTH	12	23
HUM	0	4
SCIENCE	5	24
LAW	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>52</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	0.0	100.0
HEALTH	34.3	65.7
HUM	0.0	100.0
SCIENCE	17.2	82.8
LAW	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>75.4</b>

New appointments 2014 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	0
HEALTH	8	31
HUM	5	10
SCIENCE	3	21
LAW	0	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>63</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	-	-
HEALTH	20.5	79.5
HUM	33.3	66.7
SCIENCE	12.5	87.5
LAW	0	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>79.7</b>

New appointments 2013 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	5	1
SOC.SCI.	7	8
HEALTH	14	16
HUM	1	1
SCIENCE	7	16
LAW	0	3
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>45</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	83.3	16.7
SOC.SCI.	46.7	53.3
HEALTH	46.7	53.3
HUM	50	50
SCIENCE	30.4	69.6
LAW	0	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>57.0</b>

New appointments 2012 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	2	2
SOC.SCI.	0	0
NEW	5	26

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	50	50
SOC.SCI.	-	-
NEW	16.1	83.9

HEALTH**		
HUM	0	4
NEW		
SCIENCE**	8	18
LAW	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>50</b>

HEALTH**		
HUM	0	100
NEW		
SCIENCE**	30.8	69.2
LAW	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>76.9</b>

\* Professors = professors, professors with special responsibilities, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included).

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

### New appointments 2011 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	0
SOC.SCI.	0	3
HEALTH	5	26
HUM	2	5
SCIENCE	1	8
LAW	1	2
PHARMA	0	0
LIFE	4	7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>51</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	0	100
HEALTH	16.1	83.9
HUM	28.6	71.4
SCIENCE	111	88.9
LAW	33.3	66.7
PHARMA	-	-
LIFE	36.4	63.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>21.5</b>	<b>78.5</b>

### New appointments 2010 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	1
SOC.SCI.	1	4
HEALTH	6	13
HUM	1	2
SCIENCE	1	5
LAW	1	6
PHARMA	2	1
LIFE	4	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>45</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	50	50
SOC.SCI.	20	80
HEALTH	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
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27.4</b>	<b>72.6</b>

### New appointments 2009 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	3	0
SOC.SCI.	3	3
HEALTH	9	31
HUM	3	4
SCIENCE	3	12
LAW	2	5

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	50	50
HEALTH	22.5	77.5
HUM	43	57
SCIENCE	20	80
LAW	28.6	71.4

PHARMA	1	2
LIFE	3	11
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>68</b>

PHARMA	33.3	66.7
LIFE	21.4	78.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28.4</b>	<b>71.6</b>

### New appointments 2008 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	1	0
SOC.SCI.	0	6
HEALTH	9	21
HUM	3	2
SCIENCE	3	10
LAW	1	0
PHARMA	1	2
LIFE	2	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>50</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	100	0
SOC.SCI.	0	100
HEALTH	30	70
HUM	60	40
SCIENCE	23.1	76.9
LAW	100	0
PHARMA	33.3	66.7
LIFE	18.2	81.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>71.4</b>

\* Professors = professors, professors with special responsibilities, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included).

### New appointments 2007 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	2
SOC.SCI.	0	5
HEALTH	7	25
HUM	0	2
SCIENCE	0	12
LAW	1	3
PHARMA	0	2
LIFE	3	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>60</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	100
SOC.SCI.	0	100
HEALTH	21.9	78.1
HUM	0	100
SCIENCE	0	100
LAW	25.0	75.0
PHARMA	0	100
LIFE	25.0	75.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>84.5</b>

### New appointments 2006 (by gender)

Nos.

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	0	0
SOC.SCI.	0	7
HEALTH	6	25
HUM	1	0
SCIENCE	3	10
LAW	0	0
PHARMA	0	2
LIFE	0	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>53</b>

%

Professors*	Women	Men
THEO	-	-
SOC.SCI.	0	100
HEALTH	19.4	80.6
HUM	100	0
SCIENCE	23.1	76.9
LAW	-	-
PHARMA	0	100
LIFE	0	100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15.9</b>	<b>84.1</b>

\* Professors = professors, professors with special responsibilities, clinical professors (visiting professors are not included).

PAGE 23 OF 23

**Notes:**

- The figures are based on a list of all professors registered in ScanPas in 2015 but filtered to exclude those appointed previously in the period 2006–2015.
- Appointments that end within four months are not included.