



Universitatea
Transilvania
din Braşov

2022 Report

on the analysis of the relevant indicators
for the implementation of the “Gender Equality Plan”
within Transilvania University of Braşov



Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Relevant indicators for the implementation of the "Gender Equality Plan"	4
3. Results.....	6
3.1. Indicators on the distribution of human resources according to the gender	6
3.2. Indicators on professional activity according to the gender	8
3.3. Indicators on the women's participation in decision-making processes	12
3.4. Indicators on the students' gender distribution.....	15
3.5. Indicators on the students' academic performance according to the gender	17
Conclusions.....	18



1. Introduction

Gender Equality. The **European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE)** - an European Institute for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men¹ believes that **gender equality** refers to the existence of equal rights and responsibilities for both women and men, as well as for both girls and boys. This concept does not simplistically come down to the idea that women and men are equal or the same, but insists that their rights, responsibilities and opportunities for development will not depend on being born as a woman or as a man. Gender equality expresses the recognition of the right to difference and diversity.

Although there still are inequalities, significant progress has been made in the European Union, in recent decades, towards equality between women and men. As shown by the European Commission, the main measures that have yielded results include: legislation on equal treatment, transversal integration of the gender perspective at the level of European policies, specific measures to promote women. Progress is visible, with more and more women working and getting better qualifications. However, the European Commission's reports show that there are still disparities and gender discrimination within the member States. Women still mostly work in lower-paid sectors and hold fewer decision-making positions².

Integrating gender equality concerns into political decisions and implementing them at a practical level is the responsibility of authorities and public institutions. In order to effectively integrate gender equality concerns, it is recommended to consider:

- the identification of gender inequalities and gender gaps;
- the definition of goals on ensuring gender equality;
- the gender perspective in policy planning and implementation;
- progress monitoring;
- evaluation of programmes from a gender perspective.

Gender Discrimination. An analysis of gender equality at the institutional level must begin with details on the forms of its infringement, that is, gender discrimination. Over time, women have faced discrimination, being unequal in terms of rights (social, political, economic, cultural, etc.) for centuries. According to OG 137/2000, **gender discrimination** refers to any type of gender-based distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference, which has as its purpose or effect to restrict or to remove the recognition, use or exercise under conditions of equality of the human rights and fundamental freedoms, or of the rights recognized by law, in the political, economic, social and cultural fields, or in any other fields of public life.

¹ <https://eige.europa.eu/thesaurus/overview>.

² https://ec.europa.eu/info/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/gender-equality/gender-equality-strategy_ro#strategia-privind-egalitatea-de-gen-pentru-perioada-2020-2025



The factors that favour gender discrimination include:

- preservation of traditional social norms (very resistant to change for people who grew up in rural family environments or with submissive maternal figures);
- deficiencies in education and gender awareness;
- socialization paths that reproduce gender stereotypes, in both formal and non-formal education;
- the absence of a legislative framework that prevents gender discrimination and supports social inclusion (for women, ethnic, religious, sexual orientation minorities, etc.);
- the lack of documents and institutional bodies that define and implement concrete actions for sanctioning and discouraging any form of discrimination.

A recent report drawn up by *Filia* Centre on the topic of sexual harassment and gender discrimination in the Romanian university space illustrates several forms of gender discrimination at the level of organizational practices:³

- direct discrimination – refers to the exclusion or unequal treatment of a person based on gender considerations (e.g., rejecting a job applicant because she is a woman);
- indirect discrimination – an apparently neutral practice that disadvantages certain people (e.g., the height limit for a physical test mostly disadvantages women, since women are shorter on average);
- structural discrimination – the lack of representation within a certain structure (e.g., Romania only once had a woman as its prime minister);
- institutional discrimination – occurs within an organization, beyond the individual prejudices of its members, usually because there is no interest in gender policies, and there are no precedents of this nature either (e.g., the lack of a code of ethics to prevent and combat discrimination against women);
- multiple or intersectional discrimination – a person with different identities (ethnicity, race, class, gender, sexual orientation, etc.) can accumulate different discriminatory experiences.

Fighting any form of discrimination and promoting gender equality in academic life are central values and principles for Transilvania University of Braşov. The gender equality plan in UNITBV is the document that establishes strategic directions and the implementation framework of concrete actions to ensure gender equality.

³ <https://centrulfilia.ro/new/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Raport-cercetare-Hartuirea-sexuala-in-universitati-RO.pdf>



2. Relevant indicators for the implementation of the “Gender Equality Plan”

The **Gender Equality Plan** within UNITBV stipulates the identification of a set of relevant indicators for gender distribution within the university, annual data collection and periodic reporting. Table 1 presents a first set of indicators selected according to their significance in the academic environment, the data availability and the recommendations of national and European bodies that promote gender equality in research and education. The indicators included in the current report, however, gain significance through longitudinal analyses.

Table 1. Indicators for gender distribution in the university

Type of indicator	Indicator
1 Indicators on the distribution of human resources by gender	1.1. gender distribution of the human resource within the university 1.2. gender distribution of the human resource within the faculties 1.3. gender distribution of human resources in academic teaching positions
2. Indicators on the professional activity by gender	2.1 gender distribution of the results within the “Appreciated Professor” programme 2.2. gender distribution of the participants in international mobilities 2.3. gender distribution of the merit-pay grantees 2.4. gender distribution of scores for scientific research (Scientific Research Activity Reporting Sheet - FRACS) 2.5. gender distribution of the authors of articles published in ISI Web of Knowledge /Clarivate Analytics-rated journals 2.6. gender distribution of the average impact factor of the journals in which ISI Web of Knowledge /Clarivate Analytics articles have been published 2.7. gender distribution of the academic teaching personnel who request to maintain their status as a holder of discipline after the retirement age 2.8. gender distribution of the positions held by the academic teaching personnel at the time of retirement



3. Indicators on the women's participation in decision-making processes

3.1. gender distribution of people holding managerial positions

3.2. gender distribution of faculty council members

3.3. gender distribution of the coordinators of support structures and coordinators of the study programmes

3.4. gender distribution of the University Senate members

4. Indicators on the students' gender distribution

4.1. gender distribution of the students in the three study cycles

4.2. gender distribution of the graduates from the three study cycles

4.3. distribution of graduates according to the gender of the bachelor's degree/ diploma final paper coordinator

5. Indicators on the students' academic performance by gender

5.1. gender distribution of the State-budgeted students

5.2. gender distribution of scholarship grantees

5.3. gender distribution of valedictorians

3. Results

3.1. Indicators on the distribution of human resources according to the gender

Two categories of personnel were used for the analysis of these indicators:

- (1) academic teaching personnel, research staff and external collaborators (associated teaching personnel who conduct their teaching activity on an hourly-pay basis);
- (2) auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel.

In 2022, 1052 academic teaching personnel, researchers and external collaborators conduct their activity within UNITBV, out of whom 53.5% (563 people) are male and 46.5% (489 people) are female (Table 2). The higher number of male employees is due to the staff gender structure within the technical faculties, such as the Faculty of Civil Engineering, the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, the Faculty of Technological Engineering and Industrial Management, or the Faculty of Silviculture and Forest Engineering (Table 3).

Table 2. Distribution of academic teaching personnel, research staff and external collaborators according to the gender – 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Professor	70	14.3%	105	18.7%	175	16.6%
Associate Professor	100	20.4%	105	18.7%	205	19.5%
Lecturer	144	29.4%	120	21.3%	264	25.1%
Assistant Lecturer	38	7.8%	19	3.4%	57	5.4%
Research staff	24	4.9%	47	8.3%	71	6.7%
External collaborator	113	23.1%	167	29.7%	280	26.6%
Total	489	100%	563	100%	1052	100%

In terms of teaching positions, there is a greater number of male teaching personnel who hold the position of *Professor* (18.7%) compared to female employees (14.3%). Gender differences become even more conspicuous when relating to the category of *external collaborator*, *research staff*, or to the positions of *Lecturer*, *Assistant Lecturer*. A greater number of male employees occupy positions as an *external collaborator* (29.7% men compared to 23.1% women) or *research staff* (8.3% men compared to 4.9% women). Conversely, there is a greater number of female teaching staff with the position of *Lecturer* (29.4%) or *Assistant Lecturer* (7.8%) compared to men: 21.3% *Lecturer*, respectively 3.4% *Assistant Lecturer* (Table 2).

Table 3. Distribution of the academic teaching and research personnel, as well as external collaborators, by gender and faculty – 2022

Faculty	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Food and Tourism	19	47.5%	21	52.5%	40	100%
Civil Engineering	7	19.4%	29	80.6%	36	100%
Furniture Design and Wood Engineering	10	55.6%	8	44.4%	18	100%
Product Design and Environment	26	50.0%	26	50.0%	52	100%
Law	19	54.3%	16	45.7%	35	100%
Physical Education and Mountain Sports	19	43.2%	25	56.8%	44	100%
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	25	21.6%	91	78.4%	116	100%
Mechanical Engineering	17	21.8%	61	78.2%	78	100%
Technological Engineering and Industrial Management	18	36.7%	31	63.3%	49	100%
Letters	64	77.1%	19	22.9%	83	100%
Mathematics and Computer Science	32	49.2%	33	50.8%	65	100%
Medicine	65	58.6%	46	41.4%	111	100%
Music	31	55.4%	25	44.6%	56	100%
Psychology and Education Sciences	30	81.1%	7	18.9%	37	100%
Silviculture and Forest Engineering	10	14.9%	57	85.1%	67	100%
Sociology and Communication	32	62.7%	19	37.3%	51	100%
Materials Science and Engineering	12	33.3%	24	66.7%	36	100%
Economic Sciences and Business Administration	51	67.1%	25	32.9%	76	100%
Total	489	46.5%	563	53.5%	1052	100%

With regard to the external collaborators' employment positions, male employees are found to fill a higher number of *Professor* (18.6%) positions, compared to women (5.3%), whereas female employees fill a higher number of *Assistant Lecturer* positions (47.8% women compared to 34.7% men) (Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of external collaborators according to the gender and teaching positions - 2022

<i>Position</i>	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Professor	6	5.3%	31	18.6%	37	13.2%
Associate Professor	4	3.5%	10	6.0%	14	5.0%
Lecturer	49	43.4%	68	40.7%	117	41.8%
Assistant Lecturer	54	47.8%	58	34.7%	112	40.0%
Total	113	100%	167	100%	280	100%

The structure of auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel has a higher share of women (59.8%), this is due to the fact that this category includes the positions of secretary, which positions are mainly occupied by women within UNITBV (Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution of auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel by gender - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Auxiliary and non-teaching personnel	329	59.8%	221	40.2%	550	100%

3.2. Indicators on professional activity according to the gender

In terms of teaching activity, as it is perceived by the graduates who participated in the internal program "Appreciated Professor" in 2021, there is an equal distribution between female teachers (14.8%) and male teachers (13.2%) nominated for the category "Appreciated Professor" (Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of teaching personnel and external collaborators by gender and nomination in the "Appreciated Professor" programme - 2021

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Nominated by students as an "Appreciated Professor"	69	14.8%	68	13.2%	137	14%
Not nominated by students as an "Appreciated Professor"	396	85.2%	448	86.8%	844	86%



Total	465	100%	516	100%	981	100%
-------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

There are a greater number of male employees who meet the university's standards for retaining their tenure (holder of discipline) after the age of 65, and who have applied in this regard (29 men compared to 8 women) or who, at the time of their retirement, were Professors (22 men compared to 7 women) (Table 7 and Table 8).

Table 7. Gender distribution of the academic teaching personnel who applied in 2021 to retain their tenure (holder of discipline) after the age of retirement

	Women	Men	Total
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Number of people</i>
Applications for tenure (holder of discipline) retention after retirement age	8	29	37

Table 8. Distribution of academic teaching personnel according by gender and position held at the date of retirement in 2021

	Women	Men	Total
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Number of people</i>
Professor	7	22	29
Associate Professor	4	9	13
Lecturer	3	3	6
Total	14	34	48

In 2021, there are no significant differences between female and male academic teaching personnel in terms of their participation in international mobilities (Table 9).

Table 9. Distribution of academic teaching personnel by international mobilities and gender in 2021

	Total external mobilities		Erasmus mobilities		Total academic teaching personnel	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Women	79	48.5%	19	48.7%	352	50.2%
Men	84	51.5%	20	51.3%	349	49.8%
Total	163	100.0%	39	100.0%	701	100.0%

Furthermore, no significant differences were found between the number of female and male academic teaching personnel who receive merit pay in 2022 (Table 10).

Table 10. Distribution of academic teaching and research personnel by gender and merit pay in 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Academic teaching personnel with merit pay	125	33.2%	141	35.6%	266	34.5%
Academic teaching personnel without merit pay	251	66.8%	255	64.4%	506	65.5%
Total	376	100%	396	100%	772	100%

Even in terms of the average score for the research activity - as it is reported in the Scientific Research Activity Reporting Sheet (FRACS) - no significant differences were found according to the academic teaching personnel's gender (Table 11). The average FRACS scores were calculated as follows: for each gender category, the sum of the FRACS points obtained during 2018-2021 was divided by the number of faculty employees (employees who reported research results) (Table 11).

In terms of the projects coordinated in 2021, a slightly unbalanced gender distribution is noticeable, as male employees coordinated a greater number of projects (63) compared to the ones of female gender (48).

Male academic teaching personnel published almost twice as many articles in ISI Web of Knowledge/ Clarivate Analytics-rated journals (897 articles published by men compared to 551 articles published by women) in 2021. The average impact factor of journals is higher for men (0.57), compared to the average impact factor of journals in which female academic teaching personnel publish (0.41) (Table 11).

Table 11. Distribution of academic teaching personnel per faculty by research results and gender

<i>Faculty</i>	FRACS average score 2018-2022		Number of coordinated projects - 2021		ISI articles (number) published 2021		ISI articles (FI average) published 2021	
	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>	<i>Men</i>
Food and Tourism	53.67	51.14	0	2	10	8	0.19	0.15
Civil Engineering	101.44	80.13	0	8	23	29	0.90	0.40
Furniture Design and Wood Engineering	194.87	181.41	2	0	31	44	0.44	0.79
Product Design and Environment	253.94	196.45	9	2	35	26	0.36	0.80
Law	113.55	109.70	0	0	5	17	0.14	0.55
Physical Education and Mountain Sports	30.71	83.54	0	1	7	41	0.27	0.50
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	142.55	142.03	2	12	19	177	0.18	0.34
Mechanical Engineering	237.30	129.07	3	5	46	95	0.81	0.73
Technological Engineering and Industrial Management	79.71	95.89	1	4	13	30	0.60	0.78
Letters	53.27	56.82	5	3	4	0	0.06	0.00
Mathematics and Computer Science	133.95	242.80	0	0	142	91	0.41	0.40
Medicine	115.52	82.56	7	0	61	80	0.57	1.58
Music	78.11	73.68	0	0	8	0	0.05	0.00
Psychology and Education Sciences	115.25	46.35	7	0	16	2	0.59	0.39
Silviculture and Forest Engineering	88.12	133.26	5	21	23	14	0.41	0.33
Sociology and Communication	82.77	82.78	4	1	75	45	0.27	0.31
Materials Science and Engineering	135.95	204.25	2	4	28	143	0.45	0.56
Economic Sciences and Business Administration	108.11	101.30	1	0	5	55	0.18	0.48
Total	112.99	125.65	48	63	551	897	0.41	0.57

As regards the auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel, there is a greater number of female employees who benefit from merit pay (17.9%) (Table 12) and who participated in international mobilities (73.3%) (Table 13).

Table 12. Distribution of auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel by gender and merit pay in 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
They are merit-pay grantees	59	17.9%	14	6.3%	73	13.3%
They are not merit-pay grantees	270	82.1%	207	93.7%	477	86.7%
Total	329	100%	221	100%	550	100%

Table 13. Distribution of auxiliary teaching personnel by international mobilities and gender in 2021

	Total external mobilities	Erasmus mobilities
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Number of people</i>
Women	11	9
Men	4	1
Total	15	10

3.3. Indicators on the women's participation in decision-making processes

It is worth noting that there is a slightly higher number of male academic teaching or research personnel who hold *managerial positions* (15.4%) at the university/ faculty level, who hold positions of coordination within various support structures, who are coordinators of study programmes, or who are members in the University Senate (Table 14, Table 16, Table 17). Moreover, in some faculties (e.g., Faculty of Economic Sciences and Business Administration, Faculty of Medicine), although there is a higher share of female personnel, there are more male employees in the structure of the Faculty Council (Table 15).

Table 14. Distribution of academic teaching and research personnel by gender and managerial position within the university - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
With managerial position	44	11.7%	61	15.4%	105	13.6%
Without managerial position	332	88.3%	335	84.6%	667	86.4%



Total	376	100%	396	100%	772	100%
-------	-----	------	-----	------	-----	------

Table 15. Distribution of academic teaching and research personnel within the Faculty Councils according to the gender – 2022

<i>Faculty</i>		Women		Men		Total	
		<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Food and Tourism	Council	3	42.9%	4	57.1%	7	100%
	Total Faculty	8	42.1%	11	57.9%	19	100%
Civil Engineering	Council	1	20%	4	80%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	6	21.4%	22	78.6%	28	100%
Furniture Design and Wood Engineering	Council	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	10	55.6%	8	44.4%	18	100%
Product Design and Environment	Council	4	50%	4	50%	8	100%
	Total Faculty	24	52.2%	22	47.8%	46	100%
Law	Council	3	60%	2	40%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	16	55.2%	13	44.8%	29	100%
Physical Education and Mountain Sports	Council	2	40%	3	60%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	12	52.2%	11	47.8%	23	100%
Electrical Engineering and Computer Science	Council	4	36.4%	7	63.6%	11	100%
	Total Faculty	20	26.3%	56	73.7%	76	100%
Mechanical Engineering	Council	3	30%	7	70%	10	100%
	Total Faculty	13	21.7%	47	78.3%	60	100%
Technological Engineering and Industrial Management	Council	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100%
	Total Faculty	17	40.5%	25	59.5%	42	100%
Letters	Council	6	66.7%	3	33.3%	9	100%

	Total Faculty	51	75.0%	17	25.0%	68	100%
Mathematics and Computer Science	Council	4	50%	4	50%	8	100%
	Total Faculty	27	54%	23	46%	50	100%
Medicine	Council	4	33.3%	8	66.7%	12	100%
	Total Faculty	57	60%	38	40%	95	100%
Music	Council	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	17	65.4%	9	34.6%	26	100%
Psychology and Education Sciences	Council	5	83.3%	1	16.7%	6	100%
	Total Faculty	21	87.5%	3	12.5%	24	100%
Silviculture and Forest Engineering	Council	0		6	100%	6	100%
	Total Faculty	10	17.9%	46	82.1%	56	100%
Sociology and Communication	Council	3	60%	2	40%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	19	63.3%	11	36.7%	30	100%
Materials Science and Engineering	Council	2	40%	3	60%	5	100%
	Total Faculty	10	37%	17	63%	27	100%
Economic Sciences and Business Administration	Council	4	44.4%	5	55.6%	9	100%
	Total Faculty	38	69.1%	17	30.9%	55	100%
Total	University	376	48.7%	396	51.3%	772	100%

Table 16. Distribution of academic teaching and research personnel by gender and other coordination positions – June 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
With coordinating positions	84	22.3%	99	25%	183	23.7%
Without coordinating positions	292	77.7%	297	75%	589	76.3%
Total personnel	376	100%	396	100%	772	100%

Note: Other coordination positions = coordination roles for support structures, Senate committee presidents, study programme coordinators

Table 17. Distribution of academic teaching and research personnel within the University Senate committees according to the gender - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Senate members	40	43.9%	51	56.1%	91	100%
Senate committee presidents	4		2		6	
Senate committee secretaries	4		2		6	
Total personnel	376	48.7%	396	51.3%	772	100%

The situation changes when we refer to the auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel. For this category, female employees with managerial positions are more numerous (10.3%). This is largely due to the fact that in UNITBV the positions of a secretary are mainly occupied by women, and some of them hold the position of a chief secretary (Table 18).

Table 18. Distribution of auxiliary teaching and non-teaching personnel by gender and managerial position - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
With managerial position	34	10.3%	7	3.2%	41	7.5%
Without managerial position	295	89.7%	214	96.8%	509	92.5%
Total personal	329	100%	221	100%	550	100%

3.4. Indicators on the students' gender distribution

The undergraduate students' gender distribution in 2022 is balanced, 52.1% are female and 47.9% male. However, in the doctoral field, there are more male students (52.8%) compared to the total percentage of male students in the university (47%); whereas in the master's degree programmes, there are more female students (58.7%) compared to the total percentage of UNITBV students (53%) (Table 19). Moreover, at the end of the studies, there is a greater difference in terms of the gender distribution, with approximately 15.4% in favour of the female gender (Table 20).

Table 19. Distribution of students according to the gender and study cycle - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
	Bachelor's degree	8514	52.1%	7843	47.9%	16357
Master's degree	1874	58.7%	1319	41.3%	3193	100%
Doctorate	218	47.2%	244	52.8%	462	100%
Total students	10606	53%	9406	47%	20012	100%

Table 20. Distribution of graduates according to the gender and study cycle - 2021

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
	Bachelor's degree	1843	57%	1391	43%	3234
Master's degree	849	60%	566	40%	1415	100%
Doctorate	22	39.3%	34	60.7%	56	100%
Total graduates	2714	57.7%	1991	42.3%	4705	100%

There is an association between the gender of students and that of coordinators of bachelor's degree/diploma final papers, in the sense that female students show a preference for female coordinators (57.4% of students choose female coordinators), and male students prefer male coordinators (67.6% of male students choose male coordinators) (Table 20, Table 21). However, these data must be considered with caution, because in the technical faculties, there are more male teaching personnel and male students, whereas in the faculties with a socio-humanistic profile, female teaching personnel and female students prevail, which can account for this association.

Table 21. Distribution of female graduates according to the gender of the coordinator of the bachelor's degree/diploma final paper and the study cycle - 2021

	Female scientific coordinator		Male scientific coordinator		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
	Bachelor's degree	872	60.1%	578	39.9%	1450
Master's degree	345	52.0%	319	48.0%	664	100%
Doctorate	8	36.4%	14	63.6%	22	100%
Total	1225	57.4%	911	42.6%	2136	100%

Table 22. Distribution of male graduates according to the gender of the coordinator of the bachelor's degree/diploma final paper and the study cycle - 2021

	Female scientific coordinator		Male scientific coordinator		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bachelor's degree	365	33.6%	720	66.4%	1085	100%
Master's degree	125	30.2%	289	69.8%	414	100%
Doctorate	7	20.6%	27	79.4%	34	100%
Total	497	32.4%	1036	67.6%	1533	100%

3.5. Indicators on the students' academic performance according to the gender

There is a higher share of females in most of the indicators measuring academic performance (Table 23, Table 24, Table 25 and Table 26). If the distribution of State-budgeted places is similar, in terms of gender, to the students' general gender structure, when it comes to merit scholarships, social scholarships or to the status of a valedictorian, females have a significantly higher share. Thus, 65% of the students who receive merit scholarships and 69% of the valedictorians are of the female gender.

Table 23. Distribution of students by gender, study cycle and State-budgeted places - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bachelor's degree	5409	51.8%	5041	48.2%	10450	100%
Master's degree	1628	59.1%	1125	40.9%	2753	100%
Doctorate	100	52.1%	92	47.9%	192	100%
Total students – budgeted place	7137	53.3%	6258	46.7%	13395	100%
Total students	10606	53%	9406	47%	20012	100%

Table 24. Distribution of students by gender, study cycle and merit scholarships – 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bachelor's degree	2169	65.0%	1169	35.0%	3338	100%
Master's degree	516	67.3%	251	32.7%	767	100%
Total students – merit scholarships	2685	65.4%	1420	34.6%	4105	100%

Total students (undergraduate and graduate)	10388	53.1%	9162	46.9%	19550	100%
---	-------	-------	------	-------	-------	------

Table 25. Distribution of students by gender, study cycle and social scholarships - 2022

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bachelor's degree	730	63.3%	424	36.7%	1154	100%
Master's degree	105	68.2%	49	31.8%	154	100%
Total students – social scholarships	835	63.8%	473	36.2%	1308	100%
Total students (undergraduate and graduate)	10388	53.1%	9162	46.9%	19550	100%

Table 26. Distribution of valedictorians by gender and study cycle - 2021

	Women		Men		Total	
	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number of people</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Bachelor's degree	65	68.4%	30	31.6%	95	100%
Master's degree	45	69.2%	20	30.8%	65	100%
Total	110	68.8%	50	31.3%	160	100%
Total students (undergraduate and graduate)	10388	53.1%	9162	46.9%	19550	100%

Conclusions

The data in this report illustrate a fair gender distribution for most of the analysed indicators. There are, however, several indicators that point to slight imbalances, and it is necessary to monitor their dynamics in the coming years. Longitudinal analysis is necessary to confirm/refute the imbalances in terms of gender distribution and to substantiate the lines of action to improve gender equality. Moreover, the set of indicators included in this report can be modified in future reports, especially by including other relevant indicators. Starting from the data in the current report, several lines of action can be identified:



- 1) To provide greater support to female academic teaching and research personnel, for the purpose of a higher performance of the scientific activity, by carefully examining, within research departments and centres, the gender structure of the research groups, of the teams involved in competitions for projects and grants, or of the teams involved in dissemination activities targeting research results.

As the data for 2022 show, it is more difficult for women to access the positions of a *Professor*, and they retire in larger numbers with teaching positions other than that of a Professor.

Data on scientific activity illustrate that women write fewer articles published in ISI Web of Knowledge/ Clarivate Analytics-rated journals, and even when they do so, the impact factor of the journals is lower than that of journals where men publish.

In the case of coordinating research and education projects, the gender imbalance also persists.

- 2) To ensure a higher participation of female personnel in the decision-making processes within the faculties. Although in most faculties women are well represented in positions of management or of study-programme coordination, there are faculties where this aspect can be improved.
- 3) To stimulate male students in order for them to get better academic results (to complete their studies, to be granted merit scholarships) as well as to attract them in larger numbers to master's degree programmes.

In order to reach gender-neutral institutional practices, a learning process in the organizational environment must be completed. The dissemination of content on the importance of gender equality, and emphasis on the organizational and social implications of discrimination are aspects that can come to support this learning approach. Systematically implemented, they can contribute to strengthening gender equality and to generating attitudinal changes.

This report was developed within the project FDI-2022-0061, contributing to the implementation of *Gender Equality Plan within UNITBV*.