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1. Summary and Recommendations

In August 2019, the University of Gothenburg (UGOT) appealed to a panel of independent experts to review the gender equality perspective of the University’s research quality assurance system. They were supplied with material from the latest self-assessment round of Research Evaluation and Development (RED19). The supplied sample consisted of the self-evaluations carried out by nine departments and the University management, as well as their respective sets of background data. Each of the eight faculties of UGOT was represented by one or two departments. Based on the supplied material, the panel examined how the gender perspective was addressed in the research quality evaluation.

While it is widely accepted that gender equality plays a decisive role in the quality and relevance of scientific research, large efforts are still required to deliver the goal of gender mainstreaming and to realise its benefits. In this context, the panel’s observations from the RED19 self-evaluations confirm that there is a need to take steps to address gender perspectives in research quality evaluations – such as by appointing a transverse gender panel. The reviewers concluded that RED19 has not fully succeeded in making the departments demonstrate awareness of gender perspectives in research in their self-evaluations. This review thus presents a series of both specific and general suggestions on how RED19 as a research quality assurance system can provide a more comprehensive perspective on gender, in coherence with the process of gender mainstreaming.

The texts of the departments reveal a high degree of variation in terms of awareness of and interest in gender equality. A minority of the reviewed evaluations provide self-reflective and concrete answers based on the background data provided. A first observation is that departments tend to limit themselves to showcasing achievements rather than reflecting critically on strengths and weaknesses. Acknowledging challenges, analysing lessons-learned, and identifying possible areas of improvement are essential to making evaluations fruitful and ensuring that they contribute to continuous development. A deeper level of analysis on gender will only be possible if departments enrich their data sets and use them to support systematic self-reflection and evaluation.

A second important observation of the panel is that the self-evaluations are omitting important aspects of academic research that have demonstrated gender-specific effects. Aspects of recruitment, performance, funding, support, networks and the presence of women, internationalisation and collaboration were not sufficiently addressed. These shortcomings may partly be due to the absence of questions and background data on gender in certain sections of the form such as facilities and research infrastructure (D.3), internationalisation (D4.2) and collaboration priorities (C.1 and C.2). Regarding the sections that include questions on gender equality, there is also room for enriching the background data to enable in-depth answers. For
example, the panel was missing data on specific aspects of recruitment, performance and funding.

These observed weaknesses are inherent risks of any self-evaluation process. The panel argues that it is possible to reduce these risks by making adjustments on two fronts. One consists of increasing the knowledge base of the departments or evaluation units and their ability to provide reflective answers. This includes increasing awareness on the specific effects of gender imbalances in scientific research, but also building capacity and expertise to actively counter gender bias and to introduce good practices. The second concerns adjusting the research evaluation process, formulation of the self-assessment questions and preparation of background data. While it is crucial to address both fronts, the panel concentrated its observations and recommendations on the latter.

**Self-evaluation method and form**
The method of self-evaluation can be a useful instrument for the departments to reflect on and articulate their approach to pursue gender equality. However, designing a self-evaluation form that results in concrete answers while leaving room for elaboration is a difficult exercise. The panel offers the following suggestions for improvements:

- Address gender systematically in all aspects of research in the evaluation form. This entails removing the open transversal question about gender (D4).
- Replace the recurrent question “Is gender equality taken into account?” with “How do you safeguard against gender-bias?” in future self-evaluations of research quality.
- Inquire description of the position and gender of the team members conducting the self-evaluation. The self-evaluation team at the department level needs to:
  - Be gender equal;
  - Include academic leadership;
  - Include one person with competence in gender issues and a mandate to influence the development at the department.
- Provide guidelines that support constructive reflections on existing challenges and areas of improvements

**Background data**
It is a prerequisite that the university has adequate systems for extracting reliable data as a basis for gender analysis. The panel proposes the creation of a more gender-conscious and developed set of data and to perform a pre-analysis of gender distribution and gender patterns. For example, the panel identified the need for additional quantitative and qualitative data on gender distribution and/or gender patterns in:

- Co-funding required by external funding sources
- Co-authorships in publication (as an indicator of networks and collaborations)
- Use of infrastructure
- Time until promotion
- Recruitment stages: short listed, interviewed and finally selected
- Work satisfaction (employee perception survey)
Perception of gender equality at work (employee perception survey)
All types of positions, roles and units need to be analysed from a gender perspective e.g. leadership positions, PhDs and communication officers. The panel also recommends specific gender analyses, for example on:

- Strategic positions and groups
- Influence at leadership level on decision-making e.g. research funding;
- Level of leadership engagement in gender issues;
- Explicit and implicit demands on internationalisation or “strategic funding”
- Support systems for research and application;

Construction of a quality system for research
To best support the adoption of strong gender equality principles and practice, the panel suggests that the research quality system should:

- Continue to employ a special focus on gender evaluation until it is sufficiently mainstreamed in all parts of research.
- Include key aspects of research that can influence gender bias in research such as recruitment, performance, funding, support, networks and the presence of women, internationalisation and collaboration.
- Consider the possible conflicting goals between gender and other overarching priorities such internationalisation.
- Define and articulate a conscious and systematic way of gathering, analysing and acting-on data related to gender differences.
- Use the self-evaluation as a basis for dialogues with departments.
- Allocate more resources to increase knowledge and awareness of systematic gender imbalance and unconscious bias in the research environment, and take steps to address these.
- Make sure that gender balance is maintained within the evaluation teams and that leadership is represented.

2. Panel Membership and Constitution

The University of Gothenburg (UGOT thereafter) is undertaking an ongoing quality evaluation of research, Research Evaluation for Development (RED19), expected to be completed by the end of autumn 2019. The evaluation focuses on research conditions and processes in order to contribute to the University’s Vision 2020 objective of maintaining research of high international class and quality.

RED19 included a self-evaluation exercise, carried out by the University Management, the eight faculties and their departments to reflect on the existing conditions and processes for ensuring quality of research. In parallel, UGOT has recently developed a plan for gender
mainstreaming\textsuperscript{1} which describes how gender equality will be an integrated part of established activities and operations. In this context, a panel of external experts has been convened to examine the extent to which the RED19 self-evaluation questions adequately address gender perspectives. This especially relates to research conditions such as structures for allocating resources, recruitment, terms of employment and assessment of performance and skills.

Membership of the panel is as follows:

Anna Dubois, First vice president, Chalmers University of Technology
Charlotte Silander, Senior lecturer in Political Science, Linnaeus University
Karin Dahlman-Wright, Professor in Biosciences and Nutrition, Karolinska Institute

The panel benefited from and included the written comments provided before the panel discussion by Svandis Benediktsdottir, Gender equality advisor, Norwegian University of Science and Technology. It is noteworthy that one additional male participant was hindered to attend the panel discussion meeting and could not be replaced in time.

The panel was provided with the self-evaluations and background data for the following selected departments:

- Institute of Neuroscience and Physiology; Physiology and Pharmacology (Sahlgrenska academy)
- Institute of Clinical Sciences, Panel 3 Departments of Radiophysics, Dermatology, Radiology, Otorhinolaryngology (Sahlgrenska academy)
- Department of Physics (Faculty of Science)
- Department of Sociology and Work Science (Faculty of Social Sciences)
- Department of Education, communication and learning (Faculty of Educational Sciences)
- Academy of Music and Drama (Faculty of Fine, Applied and Performing arts)
- Department of Historical studies (Faculty of Arts)
- Department of Business Administration (School of Business, Economics and Law)
- Department of Applied Information Technology (Faculty of IT)

They also received the self-evaluation of the University Management.

The background data was provided to the Faculties and Departments before they conducted the self-evaluation exercise, this included:

\textsuperscript{1} During the 2016-2019 period, all Swedish higher education institutions were given a special assignment from the government, Gender Mainstreaming in Academia, to produce an individual plan for their work on gender mainstreaming.

https://www.government.se/493989/contentassets/efcc5a15ef154522a872d8e46ad69148/161219-infokit-uppdatering2.pdf
i. Staff data
   a. Individuals and full-time equivalents (FTEs) employed over 2013-2017 (Sept data) listed by gender and staff category (Professors, Senior lecturers, Lecturers, Research associates, Associate senior lecturers, Postdocs, Other teaching/research staff, PhD studentships, Administrative Staff, Technical staff)
   b. Reported secondary occupations (number of academic staff with)
   c. PhD origins of new employees 2014-2017 (listed by gender and staff category)
   d. Funding sources of full-time equivalents (FTEs) shown as percentages, 2013-2017 (Sept data) listed by gender and staff category
   e. Age groups by staff category (individuals), March 2018

ii. Financial data
   a. Income and expenditure: Research (million SEK)
   b. Income and expenditure: Education (million SEK)
   c. Unused contributions (million SEK)
   d. Largest funders in total 2013-2017 (million SEK)
   e. Retained balance (million SEK)

iii. Bibliometric data
   a. Publication output by document type
   b. Norwegian bibliometric indicator
   c. Open Access
   d. Co-authorship with external organisations
   e. Publication output 2017 based on staff category and gender

iv. Doctoral student data
   a. Number of admissions of doctoral (PhD) students by age group and gender
   b. Number of doctoral (PhD) degrees by age group and gender
   c. Duration of net doctoral (PhD) studies, median (years) by gender

3. Foundations of the Review

Approaches taken by the panel of reviewers

It is important to emphasise that the panel was asked to evaluate the gender perspective of the RED19 research evaluation, and not the overall gender mainstreaming approach of UGOT. The panel reviewed the approach of RED19 to evaluate the gender perspective in research, and considered the content of the self-evaluations only for this purpose. The panel did not assess the degree of gender equality achieved, but how far the present research quality evaluation can lead to progress in this regard.
The panel chose to base the analysis of the evaluation in previous research on the following key factors, which have proven to influence gender at the workplace in the field of scientific research:

1) Recruitment (Van den Brink 2010; Nielsen 2016; Husu 2001; Dobbin et al. 2015; Kalev et al. 2006)
3) Funding, (Statskontoret 2015; Sandström et al 2010),
4) Support, networks and the presence of women (Moss–Kanter 1977; Phillips 2000; Van den Brink 2010) and
5) Internationalisation and collaboration (Zippel 2011; Ackers 2005; Elsevier 2016, Nielsen, 2016; Uhly et al., 2015).

**The importance of evaluating the gender perspective in a research quality evaluation**

UGOT’s ambition is to ensure that gender perspectives are embedded into organisational structures, policies and practices. The panel’s analysis of the RED19 self-evaluation material reveals gaps in how this is currently evidenced, highlighting the need to give special attention to the gender perspective in research quality evaluation.

Research evaluations and research quality assurance systems are important processes that underpin strategic decisions such as allocation of research funding and investments in the research environment. Therefore, an evaluation that considers the gender perspective is needed to reduce the risk that important strategic decisions become gender-biased.

The panel thus welcomes the present initiative of appointing a specific review panel on gender and recommends that this continues until the objectives of gender mainstreaming are achieved.

Specific attention needs to be given to achieve coherence between University-wide overarching priorities and their resulting measures, for example between gender and internationalisation, to reduce the risk of potential conflicts emerging.

**Conditions for self-evaluations to be effective**

The panel supports the method of self-evaluation under the conditions that:

- A relevant set of data is provided in a format that supports reflections and comments i.e. pre-analysis of raw statistical data may be required.
- Guidelines are provided to support constructive reflections.
- There is a concrete plan for how the self-evaluations will lead to improvements and actions.

Creating an environment allowing reflection on challenges and lessons learned is particularly key to successful evaluations.
4. Observations

The panel examined the general quality of the answers against (1) what the self-evaluation form and instructions were asking for; (2) what could be analysed from the background data; and (3) what the reviewers found necessary to be able to assess the quality system as a whole. Based on this approach, the panel agreed on the following observations.

Designing a self-evaluation form requires finding a balance between, on the one hand, leaving room for free elaborations in the answers and, on the other hand, ensuring that concrete answers are given. The supplied selection of self-evaluations shows wide differences in the ways the form was interpreted and used by the departments. The panel thus concluded that the form allows for a high degree of variability in both the level of analysis and reflection.

The panel makes three main observations and recommendations. First, it is crucial that the self-evaluation form requires gender comments in all sections, according to mainstreaming principles. Second, the reviewers found it difficult to interpret the supplied background data, since the self-evaluations contained very limited data analysis and few references to the background data. Finally, more attention was given to general achievements of objectives rather than to recognition of specific existing challenges and identification of areas where improvements could be made.

**Applying a mainstreaming approach in the self-evaluation form**

Applying a mainstreaming approach requires gender issues to be integrated in all elements of the evaluation and not be treated as a separate issue. The panel welcomes the fact that questions on gender have been included in several sections of the self-evaluation form, but unfortunately not all. Analysis of bibliometric data (D2.2), Facilities and research infrastructure (D3), Internationalisation (D4.2) and Collaboration (C1) are examples of sections in which the questions do not include the gender perspective, despite the fact that these aspects of academic research are known to have significant gender-related implications, as further developed in this report under *Elaborated reflections on core categories*.

The panel also identified an unnecessary additional question at the end of the form where the departments are asked to add a brief summary on how they work with equal opportunities and gender equality (in section D):

“D4. Transverse perspectives / D4.1 Equal opportunities and gender equality: Please provide a brief summary of how you are working with equal opportunities and gender equality. Strengths and weaknesses of your current approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives?”
The inclusion of this open question may stem from a (correctly) perceived risk of missing out on gender equality comments if gender mainstreaming is embedded throughout the form. However, the question is not in line with gender mainstreaming principles and the answers do not provide significant added value: only a few departments mention strengths and weaknesses, specific ideas or plans for the future in their response to this question. The panel considers that the risk that departments oversee commenting on gender equality is thus not mitigated by the inclusion of this question and recommend that it is removed from the form.

All types of positions and all types of units need to be analysed from the gender perspective. Staff data provides gender information by the following categories of staff: Professors, Senior lecturers, Lecturers, Research associates, Associate senior lecturers, Postdocs, Other teaching/research staff, PhD studentships, Administrative Staff, and Technical staff. However, there is no indication as to whether the roles involve responsibility for some aspect of leadership within the department. The panel notes that departments rarely reflect on gender distribution at the leadership level (even if asked in section B1.1 Department leadership but not B1.2 Faculty/University level leadership), as well as for key administrative positions such as communication. In the texts, gender is more often reflected upon in relation to the number of women by academic titles and responsibility for participation in committees. Male underrepresentation in some positions and/or units is not addressed by unbalanced departments, including, for example, amongst doctoral students and various administrative positions across the institution. The general absence of reflections concerning the background data on gender distribution in doctoral education (both students and supervisors) is regrettable. Finally, comments on the gender distribution within the team delivering the self-evaluation and subsequent report at the department-level should be required in section F3.

**Making conscious choices and use of statistical data**

The panel found that the supplied background data was helpful to support gender analysis, but did not feel that this was used to its full potential by the respondents in their self-evaluations. In some cases, statistical data remains unused and in other cases data is mentioned but not commented upon. The panel would have liked to see analysis of the data and identification of patterns regarding important areas such as recruitment, performance, funding, support, networks, and the presence of women, and internationalisation and collaboration priorities – as elaborated in the next section.

The panel recommends that UGOT should enrich its set of statistical data on gender distribution and gender effects to enable a more comprehensive analysis of gender perspectives. For example, data on gender distribution in the leadership (and other important assignments) could be added to provide a basis for reflections on influence on decision-making, especially regarding allocation of funding. Other examples of data on gender disparities and gender patterns that future evaluations should include are:
Recruitment
- Recruitment stages: short listed, interviewed and finally selected candidates
- Time until promotion
- Salary disparities

Performance
- Use and management of research infrastructure
- Allocation of research time, administrative duties, teaching and supervision
- Work satisfaction (employee perception survey)
- Perception of gender equality at work (employee perception survey)

Funding
- Co-funding required by external funding sources
- Allocation of internal research funding on departmental and faculty level

Support, networks and the presence of women
- Co-authorships in publication (as an indicator of networks and collaborations)
- Strategic positions and groups, incl. appointment and promotion boards
- Influence at leadership level on decision-making e.g. research funding (survey)
- Support systems for research and applications and early academic career

Internationalisation and collaboration
- Explicit and implicit demands on international mobility (survey)
- External collaborations e.g. co-funding of external projects

The format of the data provided to the respondent for gender analysis is crucial. The purpose of providing background data is to make gender disparities visible to the respondent and thereby to support self-reflections. Raw data may need to be pre-analysed by experienced analysts before it is provided to the departments’ management for self-evaluation.

**Increased awareness and consolidated knowledge for stronger self-reflections**

There is a strong variation of interest in and awareness of gender issues across the departments. The panel also observes that the meaning of the term “equal opportunities” has been interpreted inconsistently.

Lack of awareness of gender effects and strategies to counteract gender biases becomes apparent, for example when departments abstain from commenting on gender or equality of opportunity, even when it is explicitly referred-to in the question. This kind of omission occurs in several of the supplied self-evaluations. The panel thus underlines the need for consolidating pre-knowledge and building capacity on how to address the gender perspective.
The panel also observes that the answers related to gender don’t surpass the level of description of general achievements of objectives and that the majority neglect critical self-reflection and recognition of specific areas for improvements. Across the self-evaluations, strengths and weaknesses are often not clearly identified and there are few examples where specific ideas are explored or plans set-out for the future.

To correct these observed issues, the panel suggests use of the phrase “How do you safeguard against gender bias?” instead of “Is gender equality taken into account?” in order to achieve greater attention and encourage more reflective answers. Asking explicitly about gender bias shifts the focus and thereby facilitates better analysis and reflection on gender perspectives.

Analytical and concrete answers that contain specific challenges, lessons-learned and possible areas for improvements are essential to make evaluations fruitful and contribute to continuous development. Clarifying the objectives against which to evaluate one’s work could also be helpful for the self-evaluation team.

5. Elaborated reflections on core categories influencing gender in academic research

The panel analysed the supplied RED19 material against factors influencing the conditions for equal opportunities in academic research. Recent research findings show that the following aspects are of importance for gender equality: recruitment; performance; funding; support, networks and the presence of women; internationalisation and collaboration priorities.

Each category is illustrated by examples of specific types of gender analyses that UGOT could include in future evaluations: quantitative analysis based on gender distribution/balance and qualitative analysis of gender effects or gender patterns. The second is key to enable departments to go beyond descriptive accounts and provide more in-depth and reflective answers.

Recruitment

Previous research indicates that rules and processes regarding recruitment and promotion are critical in supporting gender equality in higher education (Van den Brink 2010, Nielsen 2016; Dobbin et al. 2015; Kalev et al. 2006). A minority of the departments address gender in their answers to the following question posed in RED19:

“How are you currently working to ensure that recruitment contributes to high quality research and renewal? How do you evaluate the success of your recruitment policy? How do you secure equal opportunities?” (Section B.2 Recruitment).
This may be due to the broad formulation of the question, which neither requires analysis of gender balance in recruitments nor encourages the implementation of positive action measures.

The panel suggested including data and reflections on:
- Gender analysis of recruitments;
- Work to fulfil targets of female professors;
- The gender perspective on support systems in the early academic career;
- Gender balance in appointments and promotion committees;
- The implementation of active measures, e.g. positive action in recruitment;
- The uses of warning systems, e.g. alerting in recruitment processes.

**Performance**

The use of bibliometric indicators and metrics to assess the performance of individual researchers could support the identification and challenging of discriminatory processes in academia. On the other hand, it is known that standardised measures can lead to unintended outcomes and can exacerbate inequalities (Bøtcher Jacobsen & Bøgh Andersen, 2014), including inequality in terms of gender bias (Leathwood & Read, 2013; Nielsen, 2017). The panel recommends that a research evaluation needs take this into account and show awareness of the advantages and disadvantages of the different performance assessment systems.

Performance is addressed by RED19 in relation to feedback and evaluation, the allocation of assignments and publication strategy:

“Do you currently conduct follow-up/assessments of research environments and research outcomes? If so, how? Do individual researchers receive feedback on their performance? If so, how? Strengths and weaknesses of your current approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives?” (Section B.5. Feedback and evaluation)

“How do you distribute assignments (teaching, administration, research, other tasks)? Is gender equality taken into account? If so, how?” (Section B1.1 Department leadership)

“How do you work with equal opportunities and gender equality in your publication strategy?” (Section D.1 Academic culture).

Although gender is explicitly mentioned in the last two questions, a minority of the answers refer to this. The panel proposes to make these questions more specific and provide specific background data to help the respondents provide more developed answers.

Future quality assessments should include other aspects of performance such as:
• Gender effects of the use of publication and citation data within performance-based funding models across all institutional levels.
• Gender patterns of type of positions (not only by academic title, but also leadership or administrative roles).
• Gender effects of systems for allocation of research time, administrative duties, teaching and supervision.

Funding

Previous studies examining the topic of research allocation and gender have revealed that research funding – regardless of which funding system is adopted – is consistently allocated in favour of male applicants (Bondestam and Grip 2015). Basic funds used for co-funding of external projects have been shown to cause a “Matheus effect” favouring men (Statskontoret 2015) and allocation of research funding based on an idea of excellence can also have a negative effect on gender equality (Sandström et al 2010).

RED19 asks about whether gender equality is taken into account within the funding strategy at the departmental level (Section B1.1 Department leadership). These questions are partly answered by a small number of departments. Regarding the self-evaluation section on strategic projects for the University Management, the panel underlines the need to raise awareness of the detrimental effects that increased demands on ‘strategic funding’ can have on gender equality. The form and the answers lack a reflection on internal funding systems and their effects on gender equality. A suggestion is to include data and reflections on:

• Allocation of internal research funding on departmental and faculty level from a gender perspective.
• Gender effects within co-funding of external projects.

Support, networks and the presence of women

Gender distribution can influence the majority culture in a group (Moss-Kanter 1977), thus the presence of women within decision-making and leadership groups is important in ensuring that their interests are represented (Phillips 2000). It is reasonable to expect women to be represented as deans, heads of departments, research leaders and on selection and recruitment committees. Previous research indicates that leadership engagement in gender issues influences gender equality results (Dobbins et al 2015). The indication from most studies is that women are underrepresented in applications for research funding (Bondestsson & Grip 2015). The panel emphasises that internal systems for supporting women in applying for research funding – based on the idea of positive actions – can be important.

There is no direct question in the RED19 self-evaluation form addressing gender representation within strategic positions and groups, but the issue is addressed by three departments. A question is asked in the self-evaluation form about how the departments work to maintain and
develop internal research support in order to promote high quality research and how gender aspects are taken into account (Section E1. Internal research support), but no department from the supplied material answers this question. The University Management addresses support of young scientists through a programme, but it is unclear if this is evaluated from the gender perspective. The panel lacks a reflection on doctoral education (in general and from the gender perspective) and the implications of this for future recruitments of researchers.

Future self-evaluations should include data and reflections on:
- The representation of women and men on strategic positions and groups.
- Gender analysis of the use and benefit of support systems for research and applications.
- Leadership engagement in gender issues.
- Gender perspectives relating to infrastructure use and management.

**Internationalisation and collaboration**

Research has put focus on the gender effects of family status on academic participation in international research collaboration and indicates gender patterns in access to and practices of international research collaborations (Uhly et al 2015; Vabo 2012). Research also shows that women are less likely than men to participate in international collaborations (Elsvier 2016, Nielsen, 2016; Uhly et al., 2015) and that international mobility is related to family responsibilities (Sannino and Vainio 2015).

The RED19 self-evaluation form requests a brief summary of how evaluation units are working to increase internationalisation and collaboration in research. No questions were asked about gender within this context and none of the departments reflect on gender in their answers. This omission is all the more problematic as previous research indicates that increasing demands on internationalisation and mobility have gender effects related, for example, to unequal possibilities to travel (Zippel, 2011). The awareness of possible implications needs to be raised.

The self-evaluations should include data and reflections on:
- Explicit and implicit demands on internationalisation.
- Gender patterns of types of collaboration.
### Table overview of RED19 self-evaluation form sections, background data and suggestions from the panel

The following table provides an overview of to which extent the core categories influencing gender in academic research are addressed in RED19 self-evaluation form and background data, and lists additions suggested by the panel in the present report.

- In **bold** are the sections that included questions on "gender" or “equal opportunities” and gender distribution data made available to the departments in the background data.
- In *italic* are the sections that should include questions on gender and additional data that the panel considers necessary to provide to the departments in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of academic research with gender effects</th>
<th>Corresponding sections of the RED19 self-evaluation form</th>
<th>Corresponding RED19 Background data on gender distribution and suggestions from the panel (data and topics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>B2. Recruitment</td>
<td>• Individuals and full-time equivalents employed over 2013-2017 by staff category and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• PhD origins of new employees 2014-2017 by staff category and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>B1.1 Department leadership</td>
<td>• Recruitment stages: short listed, interviewed and finally selected (gender distribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>B5. Feedback and evaluation</td>
<td>• Time until promotion (gender disparities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appointment and promotion committees/boards (gender distribution)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategies and measures to fulfil targets of female professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support systems in the early academic career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of implemented active measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Types of warning systems used in recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>C3. Research-teaching linkages</td>
<td>• Systems of allocation of research, administrative duties, teaching and supervision (gender effects of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>C3.1 Undergraduate and master’s education</td>
<td>• Work satisfaction (employee perception survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>C3.2 Doctoral education</td>
<td>• Perception of gender equality at work (employee perception survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>D2.1 Publication strategy</td>
<td>• Number of admissions of doctoral (PhD) students by age group and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>D2.2 Analysis of bibliometric data</td>
<td>• Number of doctoral (PhD) degrees by age group and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Duration of net doctoral (PhD) studies, median by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervisors of doctoral education (gender distribution of)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of academic research with gender effects</th>
<th>Corresponding sections of the RED19 self-evaluation form</th>
<th>Corresponding RED19 Background data on gender distribution and suggestions from the panel (data and topics)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>B4. Funding</td>
<td>Funding sources of full-time equivalents shown as percentages, 2013-2017 by staff category and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-funding required by external funding sources (gender effect of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation of internal research funding on departmental and faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, networks and the presence of women</td>
<td>B1.1 Department leadership</td>
<td>Leadership engagement in gender issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1.2 Faculty/University level leadership</td>
<td>Strategic positions and groups (analysis of presence of women and men in)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3. Career structure</td>
<td>Co-authorships in publication (as an indicator of networks and collaborations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D1. Academic culture</td>
<td>Research infrastructure use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3. Facilities and research infrastructure</td>
<td>Support systems for research and applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1. Internal research support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2. Faculty and University-wide support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation and collaboration</td>
<td>C1. Collaboration</td>
<td>Co-authorship with external organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1.1 Collaboration and networks within the University of Gothenburg, with other Swedish universities, and internationally</td>
<td>Explicit and implicit demands on internationalisation (gender analysis of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1.2 Collaboration with external stakeholders</td>
<td>Types of collaboration (gender patterns of)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2. Relevance and impact on society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2.1 Management and support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2.2 Research relevance and impact on society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4.2 Internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>D4.1 Equal opportunities and gender equality</td>
<td>Gender distribution and positions in the self-evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(the panel suggests to take this section away)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3. Organisation of work to complete the self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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