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Trinity College Dublin is committed to promoting equality in all aspects of its activity: employment, education and service provision. Trinity is committed to non-discrimination for students, staff and service users in relation to all of the nine grounds specified in equality legislation. Trinity will seek to identify any barriers to full participation in University life as a student, staff member or service user, and take action to redress these as appropriate.

Equality Policy

Trinity College does not regard Diversity as an end in itself, but as a fact of what we are, as a core value, and as shaping force of what we do. Diversity is not an ‘initiative’ or a ‘project’; it is an ongoing core process.

Diversity Statement

Trinity is proud to be a university working for the public good […]

Trinity Strategic Plan, 2014-2019

Trinity College’s commitment to Diversity and Inclusion, is at the heart of our institutional Mission - to provide a liberal environment where independence of thought is highly valued and where all are encouraged to achieve their full potential, and Vision – to be known for realising student potential and for research and scholarship that benefits Ireland and the world.

Strategy for Diversity and Inclusion
Scope

This report constitutes a snapshot of the diversity profile of staff and students in Trinity in the academic year 2016-2017, with particular focus on the nine grounds for discrimination in Irish equality law, but also examining other diversity aspects such as socio-economic background.

The purpose of the Equality Monitoring Report is to provide a basis for targeted action by the university and its constituent offices to promote equality, diversity and inclusion. Readers are encouraged to consider actions that may be appropriate to take in their own area of responsibility, in light of the evidence presented.

Trinity seeks to mainstream (i.e. embed) equality in its planning processes so as to ensure that an equality perspective is incorporated into all University activities and policies. This will mean taking into account the impact of business, academic or development strategies on staff, students and service users from across the nine equality grounds as part of the usual decision-making process.

Equality Policy

We will achieve this objective [C8.2 Equality, Diversity and the Irish Language] by: embedding the commitment to equality and diversity in all policies and practices [...]

Strategic Plan 2014-2019

---

1 The grounds for discrimination are age, civil status, disability, ethnicity / nationality, family status, gender, membership of the travelling community, religion, and sexual orientation. This report does not deal with the tenth ground of “housing assistance”, which was introduced to the Equal Status Act in December 2015.
The Relationship with Trinity’s Strategic Goals

Trinity has set specific objectives for equality and diversity in Section C8.2 of the Strategic Plan 2014-2019, in which the university’s general commitment is also clearly articulated.

Commitments to equality and diversity are values on which Trinity’s excellence relies. To this end we are committed to creating an inclusive, diverse and pluralist college community and a positive environment in which all can participate, and all are recognized fully for their contributions. We are committed on all equality grounds to protecting staff and students from discrimination and to ensuring that diversity is promoted and celebrated.

Trinity Strategic Plan 2014-2019

Furthermore, Trinity exemplifies its commitment to equality through its Equality Policy and supporting policies and initiatives, as well as through the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy, Athena SWAN institutional Gender Action Plan, and HEA Gender Equality Review Implementation Plan.

The fundamental purpose of this report is to provide an evidence base for strategic action. Therefore, where a data set is particularly relevant to an existing strategic goal, policy commitment or statutory obligation, this will be highlighted within the report. This does not negate the importance of any other theme covered within the report, all of which are equally protected by our general commitments to equality and diversity.
New Features of the Report

Equality Monitoring Reports have been published by Trinity on an annual basis since 2006/07 and all previous reports are available online[^2].

The content of the Annual Equality Monitoring Report is amended each year, taking account of feedback and new information requirements. New features in this year’s report include:

- Ten-year trend graphs on key areas
- Additional national comparative data on key areas
- Data on student processes such as admissions, retention, progression, degree attainment, and Scholarship; disaggregated by gender, nationality and disability
- Gender of student leaders including (G)SU Officers and society Chairs
- More information on students entering via the Trinity Access Programmes
- Statistical findings from staff “Diversity Detail” profiles on CorePortal
- Notes on Athena SWAN achievement
- Extra detail by School and Faculty in areas such as nationality, gender and age of staff; recruitment; etc.
- Detail on the shortlisting stage of the appointment process (by gender)
- Gender representation of all committees of Board and Council, Faculty Executive Committees, and key management groups
- Key findings of the ongoing gender pay audit
- Figures on uptake of parental, unpaid and career break leave by gender
- Reporting on success rates in research grant applications, by gender
- Success rates in recruitment based on the voluntary Equality Monitoring Form

A particular effort has been made to expand the Student Report to a comparable level of detail as is presented in the Staff Report; it is planned to continue this in future reports.
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Key Findings

[...] While we celebrate our inclusive ethos and tradition, we recognise also that we always have room for improvement and that our future success will depend on its ongoing renewal through our people and our actions.

Trinity Diversity Statement

This report shows the great diversity that exists in Trinity College Dublin, examining a wide range of data about staff and students, through which progress towards equality can be measured. It is the considered opinion of the authors that this progress must be measured not only against the existing proportions in the Irish university sector, but also against Trinity’s own strategic goals and policy commitments, which acknowledge that a diverse community in which all have equal opportunity to achieve their full potential is core to the success of the university’s mission.

The data show that progress is ongoing in many areas, but not all, and that such progress is often gradual. Targeted efforts to promote equality, diversity and inclusion are crucial to the continuation and increase of this rate of progress. While several offices exist within Trinity work specifically to promote equality and diversity, whether for one group or for all, true equality can only be achieved when all members of the Trinity community uphold it by their actions. It is therefore hoped that this monitoring report will be used above all as a baseline against which concrete steps will be taken - in central offices, university governance, local departments and Schools, and student bodies.

Comments or queries relating to the Annual Equality Monitoring Report are welcome at equality@tcd.ie.

3 All findings are expressed in present tense for the sake of readability; full detail is given in the body of the report
Age

- 5.9% (751) of Trinity students are mature students. In terms of Faculty, mature students most commonly take AHSS courses (232 students) and are less likely to take EMS courses (75 students).
- 31% (1156) of Trinity staff are in their thirties, and 9% (299) are in their sixties.
- Academic staff are older than other staff, on average. For example, 11% (116) of academic staff are in their sixties, and 27% (276) in their thirties.
- 25% of recruitment applicants are aged 31-35, and this declines with each age bracket, down to 1% of recruitment applicants aged 61-65.

Civil Status

- The civil status of students is not recorded.
- 50% (1843) of staff are single, and 44% (1624) are married. Other categories have very small representation and it is likely that some selecting “single” could equally choose another category; in the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment, where an “other” option is available, 33% of applicants selected it.

Disability

- 7.7% (1364) of students are registered with the Disability Service; undergraduates (653) and men (605) are over-represented among this total.
- The most common type of disability among students is Specific Learning Difficulty (including dyslexia) (27%, 367 students), followed by mental health conditions (22%, 302 students).

---

4 i.e. they have entered Trinity via the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme or other entrance routes to Nursing and Midwifery courses
5 Not including mature students in Nursing and Midwifery
6 This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment
• As with mature students, students with disabilities are most likely to take courses in AHSS (352 students) and least likely to take courses in EMS (168 students)
• New entrants to Trinity through DARE make up 5% of first years and 5% of second years, i.e. they progress to second year in the same proportion as other students
• Three of the 100 students awarded Gold Medals in 2015/16 were in receipt of examination accommodations for disability
• 3.5% of Trinity staff have declared a disability; the true figure may be higher

Ethnicity

• 80% of new entrant students are White Irish; 10% of another White ethnicity (plus 3 Irish Travellers); and 10% of other ethnicities (including 5% Asian / Chinese and 2.2% Black / African). This is a greater representation of non-White new entrants than the Irish universities’ average, which is 5%
• No reliable data on staff ethnicity are available. Diversity Details suggest that 70% of staff are White Irish, 24% of other White ethnicity and 6% of other ethnicities

Family Status

• The family status of students and of staff is not recorded
• 65% of recruitment applicants have no caring responsibilities, 26% are the parent of a person under 18, 0.1% are the resident primary carer of a person with a disability and 9% are “other”

---

7 These data come from voluntary completion of the HEA Equal Access Survey by new entrants at registration
8 Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (9% completion rate for the ethnicity section)
9 This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment
Gender

Students

- 59% (10,412) of students are female, and 59% (7,438) of undergraduate students are female; this compares with a full-time undergraduate population across all HEIs that is 51% female. 60% (2,943) of postgraduate Trinity students are female.
- 54% (67) of Society Chairs are male, and (G)SU decision-making bodies are gender-balanced, although both Presidents are male.
- HS is 76% (3,271) female, AHSS is 62% (4,365) female and EMS is 62% (2,838) male.
- Of undergraduate new entrants who haven’t progressed to their second year, 61% (45) who transfer course are female, while 63% (41) of those who repeat first year, and 54% (76) of those who leave the university are male.
- Students taking the Scholarship examinations were 50/50 male/female, and those awarded Scholarship were 53% (29) male; 60% of students awarded first class degrees are female, and 52% of Gold Medallists are female.

Staff: Representation

- 54% (2,030) of staff are female.
- Women make up 48% (13) of Board, 52% (16) of Council, and 33% (5) of EOG. Each of these bodies is trending towards greater female representation, although female representation on EOG has reduced from 46% in 2016.
- The overall membership of all Committees of Board and Council is 56% male, 44% female, and 8 of the 14 Chairs are male. One committee is more than 60% female, and four committees are more than 60% male.
- Faculty Executive Committees reflect the gender of their academic staff, with HS being 56% (5) female, AHSS 50% (10) of each, and EMS 73% (11) male.
Staff: Employment Conditions

• 76% (52) of part-time staff are female
• 55% (1,204) of permanent staff, and 53% (809) of temporary staff, are female
• 95% (87) of staff taking parental leave, 76% (29) on unpaid leave, and 71% (5) of staff on career break are female
• According to preliminary findings of the ongoing gender pay audit, men are overrepresented on academic pay scales of €85,000 and above, and on administrative pay scales of €60,000 and above

Academic Staff

• 56% (581) of academic staff are male (the Irish university average is 57% male)
• 46% (205) of Assistant Professors, but only 25% (22) of Chair Professors, are women
• Female representation at Chair Professor level has risen from 13% in 2007
• Academic staff are 55% (176) male in AHSS, 66% (111) female in HS and 77% (213) male in EMS; 60% or more of Chair Professors in every Faculty are male
• 3 Schools are over 60% female (in terms of academic staff), 12 Schools are over 60% male and the remaining 8 are within a 60/40 split
• 31% (83) of Fellows are women; female representation has risen from 20% in 2007

Research and Professional Staff

• Research staff are well gender-balanced (53% / 460 male) although there are more men (292 / 56%) among Research Fellows than Research Assistants (147 / 50%)
• Library staff are 64% (88) female
• Administrative staff are 73% (413) female, but female representation decreases from 87% (257) female at Executive Officer to 50% female (8) at Senior Admin 1
• Technical staff are 66% (96) male
• Support staff are 52% female overall, with significant gender imbalance in different areas. The male-dominated areas are Grounds (92% / 12), Premises (90% / 60), Stores (89% / 8), and Security and Attendants (74% / 118). The female-dominated areas are Nursery (100% / 16), Housekeeping (85% / 161), and Catering (71% / 35).
• Of 22 Professional departments, 17 are over 60% female, 3 are within a 60/40 split and 2 are over 60% male

Competitive Processes

• 64% (2,213) of applicants for appointment to professional roles are female, and female applicants have a higher success rate (7.7%) than male applicants (6.3%)
• 67% (2,196) of applicants for appointment to academic roles are male, and male applicants have a slightly higher success rate (2.6%) than female applicants (2.5%)
• Just 38% of research grant applications from Trinity staff are made by women, and 34% of research grants awarded to Trinity staff are awarded to women
• Applicants for Senior Academic Promotion are 60% (50) male, and those promoted are 55% (22) male. The female success rate (55%) is higher than the male (44%). The difference arises particularly in promotion to Associate Professor, which has a lower female application rate than would be expected, and for which 67% of female applicants are successful, as compared with 45% of male applicants
• No significant gender difference is apparent in Junior Academic Progression, Junior Academic Accelerated Advancement, Technical Progression or Administrative and Library Progression
Nationality / Country of Domicile

- 77% (13,600) of students are from Ireland, 5% (828) from the USA and 3% (460) from the UK. Students come from a total of 113 countries
- 86% (15,189) of students are from the EU, as are 91% of students across HEIs
- 54 nationalities are represented among academic staff, and 43% (396) of them are of non-Irish nationality. A significant proportion (14% / 147) of academics are British
- 71% (286) of academic staff are of EU nationality, 10% (39) are North American, 7% (29) are Asian and 6% (24) are European (non-EU)
- Professional staff are more likely to be Irish (65% / 1,752), Asian (15% / 103) or South American (7% / 46) than their academic colleagues
- Irish applicants have the highest recruitment success rate (6%) of any nationality\(^{10}\)

Religion

- Religion of students is not recorded
- No reliable data on staff religion are available. Diversity Details\(^ {11}\) suggest that 47% of staff are Roman Catholic, 39% of no religion, 4% Church of Ireland and 14% of other religions
- Recruitment applicants are 43% Roman Catholic, 34% of no religion, 4% Muslim, 3% Church of Ireland, 3% Hindu, 1% Jewish and 10% of other religions\(^ {12}\)

---

\(^{10}\) This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment

\(^{11}\) Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (9% completion rate for the ethnicity section)

\(^{12}\) This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment
Sexual Orientation

- Sexual orientation of students is not recorded
- No reliable data on staff sexual orientation are available. Diversity Details\textsuperscript{13} suggest that 88% of staff are heterosexual, 9% gay or lesbian, 2% bisexual and 2% other
- Recruitment applicants are 90% heterosexual, 5% gay or lesbian, 2% bisexual and 3% other\textsuperscript{14}

Socio-economic Background

- Socio-economic background of staff is not recorded
- 24% of new entrants to Trinity are from the “Employers and Managers” background, and 22% from a “Higher Professional” background. These are 5 percentage points and 7 percentage points higher, respectively, than the Irish universities average
- The most common background of TAP students is “Non-manual Workers” (31% / 75)
- 8% of undergraduates are TAP students. There were 268 entrants to Trinity via TAP in 2016, the highest number to date
- TAP students are most likely to enter AHSS courses (46% / 463 TAP students)
- The retention rate of first year TAP students in 90%, the progression rate of TAP students is 91%, the completion rate of TAP students is 91% and the most common degree grade awarded to TAP students is 2:1 (50% / 389 of graduates 2010-2016)

\textsuperscript{13} Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (9% completion rate for the ethnicity section)

\textsuperscript{14} This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment
Data Notes

The following data are derived from many stakeholders throughout Trinity, who use diverse systems of data management and who each process data for their own purposes as well as equality monitoring. While staff in many offices work hard to provide the necessary statistics for this report, some limitations are inevitably present.

For example, where data sets are so small that they may foreseeably identify an individual, they may be omitted. Other small data sets are provided but should be analysed with caution as their percentage weightings may not be representative. There are also some limits inherent in categorisation, such as the fact that all staff and students are recorded as either male or female, which does not satisfactorily describe all gender identities. Data provided from different sources, at different times, may not be directly comparable. Not all CoreHR reports were downloaded on the same date, for example. Some data sources come from outside organisations with different collection methods; some of the data sources are voluntary and therefore cannot definitively report on the entire population concerned. An example of both is the HEA Equal Access Survey, which new entrants are invited to complete and for which the completion rate among Trinity students is 95.2%.

These broad points should be borne in mind when considering the data in this report. Further specific data details are provided in the footnotes throughout the report. Original data tables can be provided on request to the Equality Office.

Diversity Detail

Staff may voluntarily complete the “Diversity Detail” section of their personnel profile on Core Portal. Completion rates are currently low but the results are provided within the report as a preliminary indication of the type of findings which are possible using this information, when a reliable completion rate is achieved. Managers are invited to encourage their staff to complete the profile to inform future reports.

\[\text{Non-binary gender will be recorded by the Academic Registry and Human Resources in the near future}\]
Student Report

Overview

Almost 3 in 4 (72%) of Trinity students are undergraduates, and the vast majority (88%) are enrolled full-time. Part-time students make up 10% of the student population.\(^\text{16}\)

\[\begin{array}{|c|}
\hline
\text{Level of Study} & \text{Mode of Attendance} \\
\hline
\text{Undergraduate} & \text{Full-Time} \\
\text{Postgraduate} & \text{Part-Time} \\
\text{Foundation} & \text{Validated for Another Institution} \\
\text{Other} & \text{Module Standalone} \\
\hline
4891 (28\%) & 15480 (88\%) \\
12685 (72\%) & 117 (1\%) \\
54 (<1\%) & 102 (<1\%) \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

Figure 1: Level of Study and Mode of Attendance - All Students (2017)

In 2015/16, 17% of students in Irish HEIs were part-time and 3% were enrolled on remote learning programmes (the remaining 81% were on conventional full-time courses).\(^\text{17}\) These types of enrolments are therefore less common in Trinity than in the higher education sector as a whole.

Alternative attendance options such as part-time and remote learning allow greater access to higher education by people with disabilities, older people, people with caring responsibilities and people who are socio-economically disadvantaged.

---

\(^{16}\) Source: Academic Registry

\(^{17}\) Source: HEA, Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2015/16 (2016), p6
Age

Almost half (48%) of the total undergraduate students in 2016/17 were 18, and almost a quarter (23%) were 19, at their point of entry, while 869 were under 18\textsuperscript{18}.

![Figure 2: Age of Non-mature Undergraduate Students at Point of Entry (2017)](image)

The number of mature students on undergraduate courses declines steadily with age, so that 569 mature students were aged 23-26 at their point of entry, but just 8 were over 65\textsuperscript{19}.

![Figure 3: Age of Mature Undergraduate Students at Point of Entry (2017)](image)

\textsuperscript{18} Source: Academic Registry
\textsuperscript{19} Source: Academic Registry. This figure refers to all registered students including part-time students, students on exchange programmes, etc.
In comparison with Ireland’s higher education sector, Trinity has a high proportion of students who are 18 or younger, and similar proportions of students in their 20s and older.\textsuperscript{20}

![Age of Undergraduate New Entrants: National Comparison](image)

**Figure 4: Age of Undergraduate New Entrants in Trinity (2016/17) and All HEIs (2015/16)**

A similar pattern can be observed among postgraduate students, although they are an older cohort overall, with greater representation among all age brackets except the under-21s\textsuperscript{21}.

![Age of Postgraduate Students](image)

**Figure 5: Age of Postgraduate Entrants at Point of Entry (2017)**

\textsuperscript{20} Source: HEA, *Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2015/16* (2016), p3. Please note that the Trinity and the sectoral data refer to two different academic years.

\textsuperscript{21} Source: Academic Registry
Country of Domicile

Over three-quarters (77% / 13,600) of students are from Ireland. Significant numbers also come from the USA (5%) and UK (3%). Students come from a total of 113 countries\textsuperscript{22}.

![Student Country of Domicile](image1)

**Figure 6: Ten Most Common Student Countries of Domicile excluding Ireland (2017)**

The vast majority (86%) of students are from the European Union, and significant proportions (6% each) come from Asia and North America. Other continents have very small (1% or less) representation\textsuperscript{23}.

![Student Country of Domicile](image2)

**Figure 7: Student Country of Domicile by Continent (2017)**

\textsuperscript{22} Source: Academic Registry

\textsuperscript{23} Source: Academic Registry
91% of full-time students across all HEIs in 2015/16 were from the European Union\textsuperscript{24}, meaning that Trinity is more diverse than average in terms of student continent of origin.

![Student Country of Domicile: All HEIs](image)

*Figure 8: Student Country of Domicile by Continent: All HEIs (2015/16)*

**Retention**

International students made up 15% of undergraduate new entrants in 2014/15. They appear to be more likely to leave the university entirely than they are to repeat first year or transfer to another course – making up 21% of those who left and just 8% / 12% respectively of those who transferred / repeated\textsuperscript{25}.

![Student Retention by Nationality](image)

*Figure 9: Undergraduate new entrants who did not progress to second year, by Nationality (2014/15)*

\textsuperscript{24} Source: HEA Equal Access Survey 2015/16

\textsuperscript{25} Source: Quality Office
Attainment

International students are represented in similar proportions throughout the various degree grades, except for Pass, in which they are over-represented (31%). 103 of the 200 students achieving the Pass grade were MAI (Engineering) and MCS (Computer Science) students.

![Degrees Awarded by Nationality](image1.png)

*Figure 10: Degrees Awarded to Irish v Other Nationality Students (2015-16)*

Students of nationalities other than Irish achieved Scholarship in a similar proportion (22%) to the proportion who sat the Scholarship exams (20%). A greater proportion (28%) registered for the exams than sat them, however.

![Nationality in Scholarship](image2.png)

*Figure 11: Nationality of Students who Registered for / Took / were Successful in Scholarship Exams (2017)*

---

26 Source: Academic Registry

27 Source: Academic Registry
Disability

Trinity College, the University of Dublin is committed to ensuring that students with a disability have as complete and equitable access to all facets of Trinity life as can reasonably be provided [...]  

Trinity Code of Practice for Students with Disabilities

Total Registration

When the Disability Service (DS) was founded in 2001/02, only 222 students (1.5% of the student population) were registered with it. Use of the service has expanded significantly, and 1,364 students were registered in 2016/17. The trend is for continuing increase, although use has remained steady at 7.6% to 7.7% for the last 3 years. This corresponds with the finding that 7.8% of new entrants across HEIs in 2015/16 declared a disability.  

Figure 12: Trend in Percentage of Students Registered with the Disability Service (2007-2017)

28 Source: Disability Service  
29 Source: HEA, Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2015/16 (2016), p21
Level of Study

87% of students registered with the DS are undergraduates and 13% are postgraduates. Postgraduates are under-represented within the DS as compared with the total student population: while 9.3% of undergraduates are registered with the DS, only 3.7% of postgraduate students are registered\(^{30}\).

Gender

Of all students registered with the DS, 56% are female and 44% are male\(^{31}\).

This is a smaller female majority than is found among the total student population\(^{32}\), indicating that male students are more likely than female students to be registered with the DS.

![Figure 13: Gender Representation in Students Registered with the Disability Service (2017)](image)

Faculty

Of the three Faculties, AHSS holds the most students who are registered with the DS, and EMS holds the fewest. However, more students are multi-faculty than AHSS\(^{33}\).

![Figure 14: Students Registered with the Disability Service by Faculty (2017)](image)

\(^{30}\) Source: Disability Service

\(^{31}\) Source: Disability Service

\(^{32}\) 59% female, 41% male (see Figure 19)

\(^{33}\) Source: Disability Service
Type of Disability

The most common type of disability under which students register with the DS is specific learning difficulty (SLD) (27% of DS-registered students), which includes dyslexia, dyscalculia and dysgraphia. This is also the most common disability across HEIs according to the AHEAD survey 2015/16, which found that 46% of students with disabilities have an SLD\(^{34}\). It will be noted that Trinity representation of students with SLD is lower than average.

Very high proportions of Trinity students register with a mental health condition (22%) or significant ongoing illness (14%)\(^{35}\). Sectorally, these conditions are represented by 12.6% and 10.6% of students respectively\(^{36}\). This shows that Trinity has a higher representation of students declaring a mental health condition than average.

![Disability Type of DS-registered Students](image)

*Figure 15: Representation of Disabilities among Students Registered with the Disability Service (2017)*

\(^{34}\) Source: AHEAD (Association for Higher Education Access and Disability), *Number of Students with Disabilities Studying in Higher Education in Ireland 2015/16*, p19

\(^{35}\) Source: Disability Service

\(^{36}\) Source: AHEAD (Association for Higher Education Access and Disability), *Number of Students with Disabilities Studying in Higher Education in Ireland 2015/16*, p19
Retention

Five percent of first year new entrants\(^{37}\) in 2014/15 applied through the DARE (Disability Access Route to Education) alternative admissions scheme. DARE applicants also made up 5% of new entrants who progressed to second year, i.e. they progressed in equal proportion to other students. Those DARE students who didn’t progress in 2014/15 were more likely to repeat first year than to leave the university or transfer to another course. DARE Applicants were also over-represented (10%) among students who were repeating first year “off books” in 2014/15\(^{38}\).

![DARE Student Retention](image)

**Figure 16: Undergraduate New Entrants (DARE Applicants) who Transferred, Repeated and Left (2014/15)**

Attainment

Three (3%) of the 100 students who were awarded a Gold Medal in 2015/16 were in receipt of examination accommodations for disability\(^{39}\).

None of the 55 students who achieved Scholarship were in receipt of examination accommodations for disability\(^{40}\).

---

\(^{37}\) “New entrants” are the majority of first years but exclude students who are repeating first year, students doing a second / third degree, and students who are coming into Trinity for the first time but not into first year e.g. advanced entry or articulation agreement students.

\(^{38}\) Source: Quality Office

\(^{39}\) Statistics on other degree grades are currently unavailable. Please note that this figure is not directly comparable with the percentage of students registered with the DS, not all of whom are in receipt of examination accommodations

\(^{40}\) Source: Quality Office
Ethnicity

20% of new entrants declared an ethnicity other than Irish. Half of these were of another white ethnicity, a quarter were Asian (including Chinese) and the others were Black (including African) or Irish Traveller (just 3 of respondents). One in ten new entrants were not White.41

Trinity is more ethnically diverse than the Irish universities’ average, in which just 5% of new entrants are not white. Trinity has greater representation of all ethnic categories except for Irish (89% across the universities) and Irish Traveller (0.1% across the universities).

41 Source: HEA Equal Access Survey
Gender

The total population of registered students is 59% female (10,412 students), 41% male (7,218 students). This is quite consistent with previous years and there is no clear trend towards more (or less) equal gender representation in the student population.

This compares with a full-time undergraduate population across all Irish HEIs which was 51% female, 49% male in 2015/16 (and 55% female, 45% male among full-time postgraduates in the same year).

Overall, 3,908 students were admitted to the first year of undergraduate degrees in 2016/17. Of these, 62% were female and 38% were male. The proportion of students who are female may therefore slightly rise again in the next few years (depending on new entrants in other years).

---

42 Source: Academic Registry
43 This figure refers to all registered students and includes those repeating first year, those who already have a third-level qualification, etc.
44 Source: Academic Registry
Leadership Roles

Society Chairs
A slight majority (54%) of society Chairs are male; this over-representation may be more significant when one considers that the majority (59%) of undergraduate students (who tend to be the most active in society activities) are female.

Figure 20: Gender Representation among Chairs of Student Societies (2016/17)

Students’ Union Governance
The Students’ Union Forum is 50/50 gender-balanced, with 11 female and 11 male members. The Graduate Students’ Union Executive Committee is also well gender-balanced, with 9 female and 7 male Officers. Its Class / Course Reps are 39% male (67 students) and 61% female (106 students). The Presidents of both Unions are male.

Figure 21: Gender Representation in SU Forum and GSU Executive Committee (2016/17)

---

45 Source: Students’ Union
46 Source: Graduate Students’ Union. Statistics on the gender of SU Class Reps are unavailable for 2016/17
Level of Study

The majority (57%-60%) of students at each level of study are female, and female representation very slightly increases at the higher levels of study\(^{47}\).

Figure 22: Gender of Students at each Level of Study (2017)

Faculty

The most gender-imbalanced Faculty is Health Sciences, in which 76% of students are female. The AHSS (62% female) and EMS (62% male) Faculties are both gender-imbalanced, in opposite ways\(^ {48}\).

Figure 23: Gender Representation among All Students in each Faculty (2017)

\(^{47}\) Source: Academic Registry
\(^{48}\) Source: Academic Registry
Female representation is higher at postgraduate than undergraduate level in every Faculty – slightly so in AHSS and EMS, and significantly so in HS.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{Female Representation in Level of Study by Faculty}
\end{figure}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Faculty} & \textbf{UG} & \textbf{PG} & \textbf{UG} & \textbf{PG} \\
\hline
\textbf{HS} & 1010 & 838 & 606 & 269 \\
\hline
\textbf{AHSS} & 2745 & 1617 & 1761 & 937 \\
\hline
\textbf{EMS} & 1250 & 473 & 2119 & 719 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Table 1: Representation of Female Students at Undergraduate / Postgraduate Level in each Faculty (2017)}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{49} Source: Academic Registry
Retention

90% of all first year undergraduate new entrants in 2014/15 progressed to the second year of their course in 2015/16. Those who did not progress either transferred to another course, repeated first year, or left the university entirely. More female than male students transferred, while more male than female students repeated or left.\(^{50}\)

![Undergraduate Retention by Gender](image)

**Figure 25: Gender of Undergraduate New Entrants who Transferred, Repeated or Left (2014/15)**

Attainment

Scholarship

Figure 26 shows that the numbers of students registering for the Scholarship examinations, sitting the examinations and achieving Scholarship are all well gender-balanced (although 59% of undergraduates are female, so women are relatively under-represented among Scholarship candidates). Slightly more women than men registered for the exams, while slightly more men than women achieved Scholarship.\(^{51}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Source: Quality Office

\(^{51}\) Source: Academic Registry
Degree Grades

Female students achieve 1st class honours in proportion to their representation among the undergraduate population. They are over-represented among “2nd” degrees, which apply to professional degrees only, many of which are based in the HS Faculty. Male students are slightly over-represented among Gold Medallists and significantly over-represented among students awarded Pass degrees. 103 of the 200 students achieving this grade were MAE (Engineering) and MCS (Computer Science) students52.

---

52 Source: Quality Office
Mature Students

There are 467 registered Mature Student Dispensation Scheme (MSDS) students in Trinity across all years, making up 3.8% of the undergraduate population (12,685). Mature students in the School of Nursing and Midwifery make up a total of 284 students across all years, representing 2.2% of all undergraduates. The combined representation of MSDS and Nursing/Midwifery mature students is therefore 5.9% of undergraduate students.

Admissions

In 2016, 714 mature applicants applied under the MSDS. Of these, 125 are now registered. The ten-year trend is for a gradual overall increase in the number of MSDS applicants. This may be based on particularly high application numbers between 2010 and 2014, while 2015 and 2016 have seen relatively low application numbers. Across the seven universities, there has been a steady decline in the representation of mature students as a percentage of all new entrants (from 11% of new entrants in 2011/12 to 7% of new entrants in 2015/16).

Figure 28: Number of Applicants to Trinity through the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme (2007-2016)

53 Mature students are admitted to the undergraduate degree programmes in Nursing and Midwifery separately to the MSDS; applicants to these courses are assessed externally by the Nursing Career Centre
54 Source: Mature Students Office
55 Source: Mature Students Office
56 There were 749 MSDS applications for 2017/18 entry, a 5% increase on the 2016 application round
57 Source: HEA, Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2015/16 (2016), p24. Mature applications to the CAO map the Central Statistics Office’s Seasonally Adjusted Standardised Unemployment Rate (SUR). When unemployment is high, mature applications and participation is high. We are currently at a nine-year low of 6.2%, and nearing full employment
There were also 66 mature new entrants registered on degree courses in Nursing and Midwifery in 2016. Mature student entry to Nursing and Midwifery courses was high in 2011-2015, similarly to MSDS applicants\textsuperscript{58}.

![Figure 29: Number of Mature Entrants to Degree Courses in the School of Nursing & Midwifery (2007-2016)](image)

**Faculty Distribution**

Exactly half of MSDS students are studying in the Faculty of AHSS; more than twice as many as are studying in HS\textsuperscript{59}, and over three times as many as are studying in EMS\textsuperscript{60}.

![Figure 30: Number and Percentage of MSDS Students in Each Faculty](image)

\textsuperscript{58} Source: Mature Students Office

\textsuperscript{59} This figure does not include mature students who were admitted through Nursing and Midwifery

\textsuperscript{60} Source: Mature Students Office
Gender

The gender representation among mature students (i.e. MSDS and Nursing/Midwifery students) has remained quite consistent over the past five years\(^{61}\), and currently stands at 52.5% female and 47.5% male (Nursing and Midwifery students are 88% female). This is very similar to the gender breakdown of mature students throughout the seven universities, which is 47% male and 53% female\(^{62}\).

---

\(^{61}\) Mature Student data was not included in the 2013/14 Annual Equality Monitoring Report “due to difficulties with the new SITS information system” (Equality Office, Annual Equality Monitoring Report 2013/14, p5)

**Age**

In 2016/17, almost half (49%) of MSDS students are aged between 23 and 30. Almost a quarter (24%) are aged 31-40, with very similar proportions aged 41-50 (13%) and over 50 (14%). Three MSDS students are in their 70s, and our oldest registered MSDS student is 79 years of age.\(^{63}\)

The pattern whereby fewer numbers of MSDS students are in each older cohort has been broadly consistent over the past five years, though percentage weightings have varied.

\(^{63}\) Source: Mature Students Office
Attainment

The 2015/16 completion rate of MSDS students was 94%. This is defined as all final year students who successfully passed their assessments and became graduates.

MSDS students achieved high degree grades, with 47% awarded a 2.1 in 2015/16.

---

Figure 33: Degree Grades of Graduates who Entered Trinity via the MSDS (2015/16)
Socio-economic Background

The HEA Equal Access Survey asks first-time entrants to undergraduate programmes to declare their socio-economic group, as defined by parental profession. Almost half of respondents come from the “Employers and Managers” and “Higher Professional” backgrounds. Only 5% identified their socio-economic group as “semi-skilled” or “unskilled”.

Comparison with the results for all seven universities shows that the Employers and Managers group is over-represented by 5 percentage points in Trinity, and Higher Professional by 7 percentage points. Some under-represented groups in Trinity are Manual Skilled (by 3 points) and Farmers (by 4 points).

![Socio-economic Background of New Entrants](image)

**Figure 34: Socio-economic Background of New Entrants in Trinity and All Irish Universities (2015/16)**

**National Access Plan targets**

New entrants to all HEIs:

- 30% from non-manual worker group
- 35% from semi/unskilled worker group
Trinity Access Programmes

Through its access and admissions policies, Trinity seeks to enrol students with a broad range of talents and with the ability to engage with the kind of education the university offers.

Trinity Strategic Plan 2014-2019

Trinity Access Programmes (TAP) students enter Trinity through the Higher Education Access Route (HEAR) programme, the TAP Foundation Courses for Higher Education (for Young Adults and Mature Students), and the TCD/CDETB Partnership Courses in Liberal Arts.

TAP has 1,009 students registered on undergraduate programmes across all years, comprising 8% of the undergraduate student body.

TAP was officially launched in 1992 and welcomed its first 5 students in 1997 through alternative entry routes to courses in BESS, Law and Philosophy. Ten students entered Trinity via TAP in 1998; 268 students did so in 2016.

Figure 35: Total Entrants to Trinity via the Trinity Access Programmes (1998-2016)

64 Source: Trinity Access Programmes
Faculty Distribution

Almost half (46%) of TAP students are in the AHSS Faculty, while 29% are in EMS and 25% in HS.

Figure 36: Faculty Distribution of TAP Students (2015/16)

Age

11% of TAP students entered by the Foundation Course for Mature Students, while 89% are younger adults.

Figure 37: Representation of Mature Students among TAP Students (2015/16)

Gender

Gender representation among TAP students is 60% female, 40% male, which is very similar to the gender representation among undergraduates overall.

Figure 38: Gender Representation among TAP Students (2015/16)
Retention, Progression and Attainment

The progression rate\(^{65}\) of TAP students in 2015/16 was 91%, the retention rate\(^{66}\) of Junior Fresh TAP students was 90%, and the completion rate\(^{67}\) of TAP students was 91%.

The total number of Trinity graduates who entered via TAP is now 1,094. The most common degree grade awarded to TAP graduates between 2010 and 2016 was 2:1 (389 graduates).

![TAP Graduate Outcomes](image)

**Figure 39: Degree Grades of Graduates who Entered Trinity via TAP (2010-2016)**

---

\(^{65}\) All undergraduate students excepting final year students who progressed on to the next year

\(^{66}\) This includes Junior Fresh students who progressed to the Senior Fresh year, repeated the Junior Freshman year or transferred to another course within Trinity

\(^{67}\) Those who have graduated from Trinity
Socio-economic Background

In terms of socio-economic background, TAP students differ quite significantly from other students. The most common background is Non-manual Workers (31%) while the Employers & Managers (4%) and Higher Professional (2%) backgrounds are much less represented among this cohort. It is also notable that four TAP students have come from state care.

Figure 40: Socio-economic Background of TAP Students (2016/17)

---

68 See Figure 33
Overview

There are 3,731 staff in Trinity. The biggest employment areas are academia and administration, each comprising 28% of staff\textsuperscript{69}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{staff_employment_area.png}
\caption{Total Staff by Area of Employment (2017)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{69} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Age

The most common age of Trinity staff members is 36-40. Only 2% of staff are over 65.70

![Age: Age of Total Staff](image)

Figure 42: Age Representation among Total Staff (2017)

Academic staff are older on average, with 4% over the age of 65, just 4.5% aged 20-30, and a high representation of staff in their 40s and 50s.72

![Age of Academic Staff](image)

Figure 43: Age Representation among Academic Staff (2017)

---

70 This will of course be affected by national law on retirement age
71 The “buy-back” scheme facilitates longer employment for retired academic staff – see Definitions
72 Source for whole page: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Table 2 provides the age breakdown of academic staff in every School\textsuperscript{73}. The total number of academic staff in the School is provided in brackets after the School’s title.

The highlighted cells show the most common age range within each School. The majority of Schools’ most common age range is somewhere between 36 and 55. The School of Creative Arts has the highest representation of staff aged 61-65 (18%), and the highest representation of academic staff aged 30 or under is in the School of Languages, Literatures and Cultural Studies (10%).

The sparklines in the far-right column are a visual representation of the age of academic staff across the School. A sparkline with high columns to the left indicates the School has relatively young academic staff (e.g. School of English); a sparkline with higher columns to the right denotes an older academic team (e.g. School of Chemistry).

\textsuperscript{73} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School (and total academic staff)</th>
<th>20-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>31-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
<th>46-50</th>
<th>51-55</th>
<th>56-60</th>
<th>61-65</th>
<th>66-70</th>
<th>&gt; 70</th>
<th>Sparkline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Immunology (24)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (38)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Statistics (91)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts (17)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Sciences (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (21)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (63)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (30)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics &amp; Microbiology (23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histories &amp; Humanities (43)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages, Literatures &amp; Cultural Studies (60)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (45)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic, Speech &amp; Communication Sciences (30)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (24)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (175)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (41)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery (87)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy &amp; Pharmaceutical Sciences (23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (27)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (32)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religions, Peace Studies &amp; Theology (23)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Philosophy (63)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work &amp; Social Policy (16)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Age Representation (%) among Academic Staff by School (2017)
**Civil Status**

Half (50%) of Trinity staff are single\textsuperscript{74}, and a further 44% are married. Just 2% of staff are divorced, 1% separated, and 1% cohabiting. Further categories, including those relating to civil partnership and to bereavement, each represent less than 1% of staff\textsuperscript{75}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{civil_status_graph.png}
\caption{Civil Status Representation Among Total Staff (2017)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{74} It is likely that many staff members who are actually, for example, cohabiting, describe themselves as “single” for official purposes, in its sense as an umbrella term for all statuses other than “married”.

\textsuperscript{75} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Disability

“We will achieve this objective [C8.2 Equality, Diversity and the Irish Language] by: [...] promoting the employment of people with disabilities, improving their retention and recognizing their contributions”

Trinity Strategic Plan 2014-2019

Disability Act 2005 target
At least 3% of a public body’s employees to be people with disabilities

3.5% of Trinity staff are recorded as having a disability\textsuperscript{76}. Annual fluctuations are likely to result from changes in data collection practices, and the true percentage of staff who have disabilities is almost certainly higher.

\textbf{Figure 45: Percentage of Total Staff who have Declared a Disability (2009-2017)}

\textsuperscript{76} Source: Trinity reports annually to the HEA on the percentage of its staff who have a disability, based on disclosure of disability in (a) staff personnel records and (b) annual online survey. Staff who have not disclosed their disability by one of these two methods were not included in the 2017 report to the HEA.
Ethnicity

The following data are from staff “Diversity Detail” profiles which are a relatively new feature with a low response rate so far (9%). They show that 70% are of White Irish ethnicity (plus further who are Asian or Black Irish), differing somewhat from the findings around Figures 41 and 44 that 57% of academic staff and 65% of professional staff are of Irish nationality. It must be noted, however, that those earlier figures are more reliable as they do not rely on voluntary completion of an online profile by staff.

Figure 46: Ethnicity of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017)

Source: CoreHR staff headcount, June 2017

---

Source: CoreHR staff headcount, June 2017
Gender

Athena SWAN

Athena SWAN is an increasingly important measure of success in advancing gender equality within a higher education institution. From 2023, Irish research funding agencies will require that a funding applicant’s institution has achieved a silver institutional Athena SWAN award in order to consider their application, and the HEA have placed great emphasis on Athena SWAN in their 2016 *National Review of Gender Equality in Irish Higher Education Institutions*. Trinity is one of 5 Irish universities to hold a bronze institutional award, and our 3 bronze-awarded Schools (Chemistry, Natural Sciences and Physics) make up half of the departmental award-winners nationally.

Trend in Total Staff

The majority (54%, or 2,030 of 3,732) of Trinity staff are women. This gender representation has been highly consistent over the past ten years.

---

78 Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017 (2017) and previous Equality Monitoring Reports (2007-2016)
Decision-making Bodies

“We will achieve this objective [C8.2 Equality, Diversity and the Irish Language] by: [...] advancing a structural change process to incorporate gender-balanced representation at all stages and levels, thereby enhancing the quality of Trinity’s institutional decision-making”

Trinity Strategic Plan 2014-2019

Gender Action Plan target
No more than 60% of any one gender to be on any key decision-making body

Board and Council
Trinity’s Board and Academic Council are very well gender-balanced, with as close to equal gender representation on each body as is possible. The Provost (male) chairs both bodies.

![Gender Representation on Board and Council (2016/17)](image)

Figure 48: Gender Representation on Board and Council (2016/17)

---

79 Source: Board Committees’ Website ([www.tcd.ie/committeepapers/](http://www.tcd.ie/committeepapers/)), accessed June 2017
Four of the seven Irish universities have achieved a minimum 40% of female / male representation on their governing authority (Board equivalent), and just two universities have achieved the same on their academic council\textsuperscript{80}.

Both Board and Council show a trend for increasing female representation over the past ten years, although some setbacks have occurred (such as when female representation on Board dropped from 45% in 2012 to 34% in 2014). Since 2008, Council has had higher female representation than Board. Council has been within a 60:40 gender ratio since 2011 and Board, since 2015\textsuperscript{81}.

\[\text{Figure 49: Gender Representation Trend on Board and Council (2007-2017)}\]

\textsuperscript{80} \textit{Source: HEA, Higher Educational Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender (2017), p3 – data referring to December 2016}

\textsuperscript{81} \textit{Source: Board Committees’ Website (www.tcd.ie/committeepapers/), accessed June 2017 (2017) and previous Equality Monitoring Reports (2007-2016)}
The overall membership of all Committees is 56% male, 44% female. A similar breakdown is also seen among Chairs (8 male and 6 female). Eight of thirteen Committees are within a 60/40 gender split – the other (imbalanced) committees are Equality (67% female), Library and Information Policy (63% male), Graduate Studies (63% male), Finance (67% male), and Undergraduate Studies (75% male).

Figure 50: Gender Representation on Principal, Compliance and Academic Committees of Board and Council (2016/17)

---

82 Source: Direct reporting from Committee secretaries. No response was received from the Safety Committee. Those who are “in attendance” are not included in membership figures.
Management Groups

Management groups advise the Provost and are made up of senior university leaders, *ex officio*. Executive Officers Group and Chief Officers Group are each involved in approving items for submission to Board, and other management groups report into them. Planning Group and Capital Review Group are two of these subgroups, and both deal with major strategic and financial decisions. The larger and more senior management groups (i.e. Executive and Chief Officers) are both 67% male.\(^{83}\)

\[\text{Figure 51: Gender Representation on Selected Management Groups (2016/17)}\]

\(^{83}\) Source: [https://www.tcd.ie/provost/college-officers/executive/](https://www.tcd.ie/provost/college-officers/executive/), accessed June 2017 (Executive Officers); Vice-Provost’s Office (Planning); Secretary’s Office (Chief Officers, Capital Review)
There was a strong trend towards more equal gender representation in EOG between 2008 (91% male) and 2016 (54% male). Between 2015/16 and 2016/17 a new Vice-Provost (male) replaced the previous Vice-Provost (female) and two new roles were added to the group, both of which are currently filled by men (Director of Communications and Public Affairs, and Chief Innovation and Enterprise Officer).

![EOG: Gender Representation Trend](image)

**Figure 52: Gender Representation Trend on Executive Officers Group (2008-2017)**

**Faculty Executive Committees**

The Faculty Executive Committees roughly reflect the gender mix of their academic staff, although the HS Executive Committee has fewer women than one might expect. Both HS and AHSS are as gender-balanced as possible, while EMS is 73% male. Each Executive is chaired by the Faculty Dean, so HS has a female Chair and AHSS and EMS have male Chairs.

![Faculty Executive Committees](image)

**Figure 53: Gender Representation on Faculty Executive Committees (2016/17)**

---

84 Source: Equality Monitoring Reports 2006/07 – 2015/16
Contract Types

82% of Trinity staff work full-time, and 18% work part-time\(^85\). The majority (76%) of part-time staff are female, while full-time staff have 50/50 gender representation\(^86\).

There is no trend for change in the gender representation among part-time staff\(^87\).

---

\(^{85}\) Not including Buy-Back Contracts – please see Definitions section for more detail

\(^{86}\) Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017

\(^{87}\) Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017 (2017); previous Equality Monitoring Reports (2007-2016)
Permanent contracts\(^{88}\) are held by 59% of Trinity staff while 41% are on temporary\(^{89}\) contracts. There is no significant gender difference in the holding of permanent / temporary contracts: 55% of permanent contract holders and 53% of temporary contract holders are female, which corresponds to the 54% representation of women among the Trinity staff.

![Figure 56: Gender Representation among Permanent and Temporary Staff (2017)](image)

However, HEA figures indicate that significantly more women hold temporary than permanent contracts in every category except part-time non-academic\(^{90}\). This discrepancy may relate to the differences in data collection practices between our organisations\(^{91}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (full-time)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic (part-time)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic (full-time)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic (part-time)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Female Representation in Various Temporary / Permanent Contracts (2016)

Buy-back contracts are held by 8 women (31%) and 18 men (69%). The over-representation of men is almost certainly due to the gender composition of academic staff who would now be over the ordinary retirement age.

---

\(^{88}\) Including Contracts of Indefinite Duration – please see Appendix: Definitions for more detail

\(^{89}\) Including Fixed Term Contracts – please see Appendix: Definitions for more detail

\(^{90}\) Source: HEA, *Higher Education Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender* (2017), p10

\(^{91}\) Most notably, that Trinity’s Equality Monitoring Reports use a headcount of all staff, while HEA reporting uses whole-time equivalent (WTE) figures relating to core-funded posts only. The different dates on which the data were collected are unlikely to be the cause as the same discrepancy was observed between the 2015/16 Annual Equality Monitoring Report and the HEA’s *Higher Education Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender* (2016)
Leave

Figure 61 shows that 95% of staff availing of parental leave are women. The majority of staff taking unpaid leave or career breaks (which are also unpaid) are also women\(^{92}\).

![Uptake of Leave by Gender](image)

Figure 57: Gender Representation in Staff taking Parental Leave, Unpaid Leave and Career Breaks

Pay

Trinity is undertaking a gender pay audit to be published in the 2017/18 academic year. Some of its preliminary findings are presented below\(^{93}\).

Among academic staff, no consistent gender pattern is apparent, although there seems to be some over-representation of men at pay scales of approximately €85,000 and above.

![Gender Representation across Academic Pay Scales](image)

Figure 58: Gender Representation across Academic Pay Scales (2016)

---

\(^{92}\) Source: Human Resources

\(^{93}\) Source for whole section: CoreHR payroll data, December 2016
A clearer gender difference is evident among administrative staff, with significantly more men than women in all pay brackets from approximately €60,000.

![Figure 59: Gender Representation across Administrative Pay Scales (2016)](image)

No systemic pattern of gender pay difference has been identified among research or support staff. The pattern in the total staff\(^{94}\) therefore most likely reflects the gender disparities identified among administrative staff, and among senior academic staff.

![Figure 60: Gender Representation across All Pay Scales (2016)](image)

\(^{94}\)“All staff” includes library and technical staff. No data on library or technical staff as separate cohorts was available at the time of reporting.
Area of Employment

Men predominate in technical, academic and research areas while women are more numerous in support, library and administrative areas. The technical (66% male), library (64% female) and administrative (73% female) areas are not within a 60/40 gender balance.\(^95\)

The gender representation among academic staff in Trinity is very similar to the Irish university average (57% male, 43% female).\(^96\)

\(^95\) Source: CoreHR staff headcount as at March 2017
Female representation decreases significantly at the higher academic grades. 46% of Assistant Professors, but only 25% of Chair Professors, are women\(^7\).

This trend is replicated across the Irish universities. While the two data sets are not directly comparable\(^8\), it is clear that the sector as a whole has an issue with low female representation in the higher academic grades.

---

\(^{7}\) Source: WiSER database, January 2017

\(^{8}\) The source of the Irish universities data is the HEA’s Higher Education Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender (2017) which refers to December 2016, relates to core-funded staff only, uses Whole-Time Equivalent (WTE) data, and presents a three-year average.
Female representation has increased at all academic grades since 2007. The most obvious progress has been made at the Chair Professor grade, at which female representation has almost doubled from 13% in 2007 to 25% in 2017 – although it must be noted that 25% is still a significant under-representation of women.

Female staff have been in the minority at all academic grades in all years except for Assistant Professor in 2015 (51% female). Interestingly, female representation has at times been higher in the Professor than the Associate Professor grade.

Overall, female representation has increased more quickly among Professors (+13 percentage points in 10 years) and Chair Professors (+12 percentage points in 10 years) than Assistant and Associate Professors (+5 and +4 percentage points respectively).

Female representation has decreased at Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor grades since 2015 while increasing by 8 percentage points among Chair Professors, possibly indicating that qualified women are being promoted to the highest grade but without sufficient numbers of women rising through the ranks below.

Figure 64: Female Representation Trend in Academic Grades (2007-2017)

99 Source for whole page: Annual Equality Monitoring Reports 2006/07-2015/16
**Academic Staff by Faculty**

The academic staff of the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (FAHSS) is 55% male. While Assistant Professors in FAHSS are precisely gender-balanced (50% male, 50% female), female representation steadily declines to 30% at the Chair Professor grade.\(^\text{100}\)

![Gender of Academic Staff in FAHSS](image)

**Figure 65: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FAHSS (2017)**

77% of academic staff in the Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science (FEMS) are male – the largest overall gender imbalance in any Faculty – however, there is just a gap of 6 percentage points between female representation at Assistant Professor and Chair Professor level. The highest female representation is among Professors.\(^\text{101}\)

![Gender of Academic Staff in FEMS](image)

**Figure 66: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FEMS (2017)**

---

\(^{100}\) Source: WiSER database, January 2017

\(^{101}\) Source: WiSER database, January 2017
The Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS) is 66% female. Like FEMS the highest female representation in FHS is at the Professor grade. It is also noteworthy that even in this highly female-dominated Faculty, the majority (60%) of Chair Professors are male\textsuperscript{102}.

![Gender of Academic Staff in FHS](image)

*Figure 67: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FHS (2017)*

The figures above for academic staff in FHS do not include medical academic staff\textsuperscript{103}, who are 50% male and 50% female overall, but do show a similar pattern of higher male representation in more senior grades as 64% of Lecturer Registrars are female, but Senior Lecturer Consultants and Professor Consultants are 100% male\textsuperscript{104}.

![Gender of Medical Academic Staff](image)

*Figure 68: Gender Representation among Medical Academic Grades (2017)*

\textsuperscript{102} Source: WiSER database, January 2017

\textsuperscript{103} Please note that the medical academic grades do not follow a clear linear pattern of progression such as other academic careers might.

\textsuperscript{104} Source: WiSER database, January 2017
The Schools are presented below in descending order of female representation. Half of Schools (12 of 24, highlighted orange) have more than 60% men on their academic staff, and an eighth (3 of 24, highlighted blue) have more than 60% women. Nine Schools are gender-balanced, i.e. within a 60/40 male/female split.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head School</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F Nursing &amp; Midwifery</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Linguistic, Speech &amp; Communication Sciences</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Medicine</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Languages, Literatures &amp; Cultural Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Social Work &amp; Social Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Pharmacy &amp; Pharmaceutical Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Dental Sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Creative Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Histories &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Law</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Religions, Peace Studies &amp; Theology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Psychology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Social Sciences &amp; Philosophy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Natural Sciences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Biochemistry &amp; Immunology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Genetics &amp; Microbiology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Computer Science &amp; Statistics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Gender Representation among Academic Staff by School (2017)

Heads of School tend to reflect the gender composition of their School, as 2 of the 3 Heads of female-dominated Schools are women, and 10 of the 12 Heads of male-dominated Schools are men. Overall, however, men are over-represented as the Heads of School are 33% (8) female and 67% (16) male. Figure 69 overleaf shows that an early trend towards greater female representation among Heads of School\textsuperscript{105} has slowed, and possibly reversed.

\textsuperscript{105} These data begin in 2010 as that was when the 24-School system was introduced
Approximately two-thirds (69%, or 182 out of 265) of Fellows are male. To date, the significant majority of Fellows have been male, although female representation has been steadily increasing, more quickly in recent years\textsuperscript{107}.

**Trinity Gender Action Plan target**

Female representation among Fellows to be 35% by 2018

---

\textsuperscript{106} Please see Appendix: Fellows for data on the gender representation among Fellows in 2017/18

\textsuperscript{107} Source: Provost’s Office (2017); previous Annual Equality Monitoring Reports (2007-2016)
Research Staff

A slight majority (56%) of Research Fellows are men, but Research Assistants are 50/50 gender-balanced.

Much like the gender representation among academic staff in each Faculty, the representation among research staff is balanced in FAHSS, male-dominated in FEMS and female-dominated in FHS\textsuperscript{108}.

\textsuperscript{108} Source: WiSER database, January 2017
Female representation is higher among research than academic staff – and male representation is higher among academic than research staff - in every Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Female Research</th>
<th>Female Academic</th>
<th>Male Research</th>
<th>Male Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAHSS</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMS</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHS</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Gender Representation among Academic and Research Staff in each Faculty (2017)

Library Staff

Women predominate throughout the Library grades, with an uneven trend towards increased female representation at the more senior grades.109

Figure 73: Gender Representation among Library Grades (2017)

109 Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Administrative Staff

The majority of staff are women at all administrative grades, except for Senior Admin 2 (15 men, 6 women). The over-representation is particularly pronounced in the Executive Officer grades. Female representation decreases throughout the Administrative 3 – 1 grades, and Senior Admin 3 – 2, with a return to parity at Senior Admin 1 (8 men, 8 women)\(^\text{110}\).

![Gender Representation among Administrative Grades (2017)](image)

The table does not include the Provost (male), Vice-Provost (male), Treasurer (male) and Chief Operating Officer (female) who are on individual pay scales.

\(\text{110\ Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017}\)
Technical Staff

Men comprise the majority of staff at all technical officer grades, and this majority shows only a very slight and erratic increase with seniority of grade.

The vast majority (83% - 88%) of Experimental Officers are male. As with Technical Officers, there is no significant change in female representation at the more senior grade.\(^{111}\)

\(^{111}\) Source for whole page: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Support Staff

Support staff, despite being well gender-balanced overall (52% female, 48% male), are highly imbalanced by area, from 100% female in Nursery to 92% male in Grounds\textsuperscript{112}. 

![Figure 77: Gender Representation among Support Areas (2017)](image)

Professional Staff Overview

The majority of professional staff in every Faculty are female – significantly so in FAHSS and FHS, and less so in FEMS.

![Figure 78: Gender Representation among Professional Staff by Faculty (2017)](image)

\textsuperscript{112} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
Of the 22 departments presented in descending order of female representation in Table 6, 17 (highlighted blue) are over 60% female, just 2 (highlighted orange) are over 60% male, and 3 are within a 60/40 male/female ratio. This overall finding is most likely related to the significant over-representation of women among administrative staff (see Figure 79).

Women are particularly over-represented in the Nursery (100% female), Health Centre (94% female), and Trinity Teaching and Learning (90% female). Men are over-represented, albeit to a lesser degree, in IT Services\textsuperscript{113} (63% male)\textsuperscript{114}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Office</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/CAO's Office</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Gallery</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counselling</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Relations</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registry</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary's Office</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COO's Office</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Revenue</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Service</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management Office</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Gender of Staff in Professional Departments (2017)

\textsuperscript{113} The Programme Management Office is not highlighted here as it has only 3 staff
\textsuperscript{114} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017
The HEA have reported on the representation of men and women in certain pay bands among full-time non-academic staff\textsuperscript{115}, and made recommendations to increase female representation in non-academic roles whose pay scale meets or exceeds €76,000. Trinity appears to be less gender-segregated than the average – its fall is less steep in Figure 83 - but still has an under-representation of women in the highest-paid roles\textsuperscript{116}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure79.png}
\caption{Female Representation among Non-Academic Salary Bands (2016)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{115} The “non-academic” cohort in HEA figures includes research staff, so is not directly comparable to our “professional staff” term.

\textsuperscript{116} Source: HEA, \textit{Higher Education Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender} (2017), p3 (universities) and p10 (Trinity)
Recruitment

Professional Appointments

Female applicants for professional roles outnumbered male applicants by almost two to one (64:36), and were appointed in a slightly higher proportion (69:31), with a 7.7% success rate as compared with a 6.3% success rate among male applicants.

Figure 80: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed in Professional Competitions (2016)

The number of appointments in most areas was small, particularly in FSD and HS. Women had higher success rates than men in all divisions / Faculties except Health Sciences\(^{117}\).

Figure 81: Success Rates in Professional Recruitment Competitions by Gender / Faculty (2016)

---

\(^{117}\) Source for whole page: Human Resources. Please note that gender statistics are collated manually in the Recruitment department and should therefore be treated with some caution
**Academic Appointments**

The pattern observed in professional appointments is reversed in academic appointments, for which 67% of applicants were male. In this case, the success rates for male and female applicants were almost identical (2.6% and 2.5% respectively). Women were more often shortlisted than men in these competitions, but were relatively less successful at interview.

![Academic Appointments by Gender](image)

**Figure 82: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed in Academic Competitions (2016)**

Appointments to all academic grades were majority (68%) male in 2016: 80% of Assistant Professors, 53% of Associate Professors and both of the Chair Professor appointments. Most appointments were male even in the female-dominated Faculty of Health Sciences.

![Table 7: Gender of Academic Appointees by Grade (2016)](image)

---

118 Source for whole page: Human Resources. Please note that gender statistics are collated manually in the Recruitment department and should therefore be treated with some caution; for example the total academic appointments in Figure 82 and Table 7 do not precisely align.
Research Grant Applications\textsuperscript{119}

Success rates are similar for male and female Trinity academic and research staff applying for research grants, with 35\% of men and slightly fewer (31\%) of women being awarded grants. Women are also under-represented among applicants; only 38\% of grant applications are made by women even though they are 44\% of academic staff (see Figure 65) and 44\% of Research Fellows (see Figure 75). These two factors compound so that just 34\% of research grants awarded to Trinity staff are awarded to women.

![Research Grant Applications](chart.png)

\textbf{Figure 83: Gender of Applicants and Successful Applicants for Research Grants (2016)}

Lower female success rates are also seen in European Research Council statistics\textsuperscript{120}, which show that 31\% of applicants\textsuperscript{121} but 27\% of awardees were female in relation to the Starting Grant (2007-2016), 29\% of applicants but 28\% of awardees in relation to the Consolidator Grant (2013-2016), and 15\% of applicants but 13\% of awardees in relation to the Advanced Grant (2008-2015).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{119} Source: Trinity Research and Innovation. Figures relate to 1 January – 31 December 2016
  \item \textsuperscript{120} European Research Council, Gender Statistics 2016: \url{https://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/Gender_statistics_Dec_2016.pdf}
  \item \textsuperscript{121} It is reasonable to assume that this also represents a low female application rate, but the percentage of women in the potential applicant pool for the European Research Council is not readily available
\end{itemize}
Promotions and Progression

Trinity will [...] ensure that all staff enjoy equal access to progression and promotional opportunities regardless of any of the nine equality grounds

Equality Policy

Senior Academic Promotion

While the majority (60%) of applicants for promotion to the grades of Chair Professor, Professor and Associate Professor in 2016 were male, the gender gap lessened among those promoted and female applicants had a higher success rate (55%, as compared with 44% for male applicants). As academic staff are 56% male in 2017, this may suggest a slightly lower application rate by female staff, although the cohorts are not directly comparable.

Figure 84: Gender of Total Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016)

Source for whole section: Human Resources
Senior Academic Promotions by Grade

There were ten applications for promotion to Chair Professor in 2016, of which four were successful. Both the total applicants and the successful applicants were precisely gender-balanced.

![Promotions to Chair Professor](image)

*Figure 85: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Chair Professor (2016)*

Given that 38% of Associate Professors are female in 2017 (see Figure 66), it seems proportionate that 38% of applicants for promotion to Professor were women in 2016. The male and female success rates were very similar (38-40%).

![Promotions to Professor](image)

*Figure 86: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Professor (2016)*
There were fewer female applicants (38%) for promotion to Associate Professor in 2016 than might be expected given that 46% of Assistant Professors are female in 2017 (see Figure 66). However, female applicants had a higher success rate (67%) than male applicants (45%) and the successful applicants were gender-balanced (52% male, 48% female).

![Promotions to Associate Professor](image)

**Figure 87: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Associate Professor (2016)**

**Senior Academic Promotions by Faculty**

The academic staff of the AHSS Faculty is 55% male in 2017 (see Figure 69) and the gender breakdown of applicants for promotion is similar (59% male). Female applicants for Senior Academic Promotion were disproportionately successful in the 2016 call with a success rate of 69% (the highest for any Faculty or gender) as compared with 42% for male applicants.

![Senior Academic Promotions (AHSS staff)](image)

**Figure 88: Gender of AHSS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016)**

84
Male representation among academic staff in the EMS Faculty is 77% in 2017 (see Figure 69) so in this Faculty too, there appears to be an equal application rate between women and men. The female success rate was slightly lower (43%) than the male (50%).

![Figure 89: Gender of EMS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016)](chart)

The Faculty of Health Sciences has 66% female academic staff in 2017 (see Figure 69), suggesting a slightly lower female application rate for promotion in 2016. Women made up 75% of those promoted from the HS Faculty however, with a success rate (50%) twice that of male applicants (25%).

![Figure 90: Gender of HS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016)](chart)
Junior Academic Progression

Applicants for review at the Merit Bar were 50/50 male/female in 2016. All male applicants, and all but 3 female applicants, progressed beyond the bar.

![Junior Academic Progression](image1)

**Figure 91: Gender of Total Applicants and Progressed in Junior Academic Progression (2016)**

Junior Academic Accelerated Advancement

As 54% of Assistant Professors are male in 2017 (see Figure 66), this 56% male applicant cohort seems proportionate. Male and female success rates were exactly equal (54%).

![Junior Academic Accelerated Advancement](image2)

**Figure 92: Gender of Total Applicants and Advanced in Junior Academic Accelerated Advancement (2016)**
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**Technical Progression**

Technical staff are 66% male in 2017 (see Figure 65) so the 75% male representation among technical applicants for progression may be an over-representation. All female applicants and all but 3 male applicants were progressed.

![Technical Progression](image_url)

*Figure 93: Gender of Total Applicants and Progressed in Technical Progression (2016)*

**Administrative and Library Progression**

Administrative staff are 75% female, and Library staff are 64% female, in 2017 – so women appear to be over-represented among applicants for Admin and Library progression (88% female). All applications were successful.

![Admin & Library Progression](image_url)

*Figure 94: Gender of Total Applicants and Promoted in Administrative and Library Promotions (2016)*
Nationality

Academic Staff

A total of 54 nationalities are represented among Trinity’s academic staff, and 43% of academic staff have a nationality other than Irish. The most common nationalities other than Irish are British (14%); German, American and Italian (all 3%); French and Spanish (both 2%); Russian, Canadian and Polish (all 1%)\textsuperscript{123}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{nationality_of_academic_staff.png}
\caption{Ten Most Common Nationalities of Academic Staff after Irish (2017)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{123} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017. Excludes 52 academic staff whose nationality is not recorded.
When academic staff nationalities are grouped by continent (excluding Irish), we see that the vast majority (71%) are of EU nationality, while significant proportions have North American (10%), Asian (7%) and other European (6%) nationality. African, South American and Oceanian / Australasian nationalities are less common (2% each)\textsuperscript{124}.

\textbf{Figure 96: Nationality of Academic Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2017)}

\textsuperscript{124} Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017. Excludes 52 academic staff whose nationality is not recorded
Proportions of Irish / international staff vary greatly between Schools, and 9 Schools have more international than Irish staff. The “most international” School is the School of Mathematics, which has 79% international academic staff. There appears to be less international representation in the more vocational disciplines, such as Health Sciences, Social Work, and Engineering.

Figure 97: Percentage of Academic Staff in each School who are of a Nationality other than Irish (2017)

Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017. Excludes 52 academic staff whose nationality is not recorded.

---

125 Source: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017. Excludes 52 academic staff whose nationality is not recorded.
Professional Staff

The most common nationality of professional staff, after Irish (65%), is British (4%), although the predominance of British staff is less pronounced among professional than among academic staff (see Fig 41).

![Bar chart showing the ten most common nationalities of professional staff after Irish (2017)](chart1)

**Figure 98: Ten Most Common Nationalities of Professional Staff after Irish (2017)**

Compared with academic staff, fewer professional staff are of EU (61%) or North American (7%) nationality, but more have Asian (15%) and South American (7%) nationality.

![Pie chart showing international professional staff by continent (2017)](chart2)

**Figure 99: Nationality of Professional Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2017)**

---

126 Source for whole page: CoreHR staff headcount, March 2017. Excludes 263 professional staff whose nationality is not recorded.
Religion

The following data is from staff “Diversity Detail” profiles. Despite its low completion rate of 9% (356 respondents), it shows very similar proportions to the Recruitment Diversity Monitoring question on religion (Figure 106). According to these data, almost half (47%) of staff are Roman Catholic, while 39% are of no religion, 5% “other”, 4% Church of Ireland and 1% or less of other religions.

Figure 100: Religion of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017)
Sexual Orientation

The following data is from staff “Diversity Detail” profiles. The response rate for this question is slightly lower (8%) than the response rate for other questions. More than 1 in 10 Trinity staff are of a sexual orientation other than heterosexual, according to these data, with “gay/lesbian” (9%) being more common than “bisexual” or “other” (2% each).

Figure 101: Sexual Orientation of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017)
Equality Monitoring on e-Recruitment

Trinity will [...] proactively ensure that its recruitment activity is inclusive [and] select candidates on the basis of merit

Equality Policy

The following data refer to applications made to Trinity recruitment competitions from 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016. These appointments include new recruits and existing staff appointed to new roles, but not promotions. Information was provided via the Equality Monitoring Form, an optional, confidential module in the e-Recruitment process. In that year there were a total of 11,506 applicants through e-Recruitment. The response rate to each question is noted within the relevant chart. The success rate is calculated by dividing the number of successful applicants (given in brackets) by the total number of applicants in each cohort.
Age

The most common age of an applicant was 31-35 (25% of applicants). Just over 4% of applicants were over 55.\(^{127}\)

![Figure 102: Age Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)](chart)

Success rates were spread quite evenly across the different age cohorts, with the highest (5%) in the 51-55 age bracket.

![Figure 103: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Age (2016)](chart)

\(^{127}\) A common definition of “older adult” is a person who is over 55
**Civil Status**

The most common civil status of applicants was “single” (33% of applicants). 24% of applicants were married, 6% were cohabiting and just 1% or fewer were of each of the other available civil status categories. A large proportion (33%) of applicants selected “other”.

![Civil Status of Applicants](image.png)

**Figure 104: Civil Status Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)**

The success rate of different civil status groups is broadly similar – where anomalies in the percentages appear, these relate to small numbers of appointees.

![Success Rate by Civil Status](image.png)

**Figure 105: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Civil Status (2016)**

---

128 A number of the “other” respondents may be applicants in a relationship who are not cohabiting.
Country of Origin

Altogether, 124 different countries of origin were noted on the Equality Monitoring Form, with a 63% response rate to this question. 49% of applicants were from Ireland, plus 7% from the United Kingdom, 6% from the United States, 4% from Italy and India, and smaller percentages from other countries.

Table 8 shows all countries represented by 50 or more applicants who completed this question on the Equality Monitoring Form, in descending order of the number of applicants from that country. Applicants from Ireland have the highest success rate (6%); applicants from other countries have mixed success rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>% of Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>% of Successful</th>
<th>Success Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3571</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Number of Applicants and Success Rates of Recruitment Applicants by Country of Origin (2016)
Disability

Only 1% of applicants in 2016 declared a disability in e-Recruitment, however, people with disabilities make up at least 3% - 4% of Trinity staff (see Figure 49). A significant proportion (13%) of applicants who answered this question selected “Prefer not to say”.

![Disability Status of Applicants](image1)

Figure 106: Disability Status Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)

Applicants declaring a disability had a lower success rate (2%) than applicants declaring that they have no disability (4%). Just 2 of those appointed had declared a disability on the Equality Monitoring Form.

![Success Rate by Disability Status](image2)

Figure 107: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Disability Status (2016)
Ethnicity

A majority (53%) of applicants were White Irish. A further 32% were of other White background, and 9% were Asian (any background). Just over 2% of applicants were Black, and 0.2% (15 applicants) were Irish Traveller – a threefold increase on 2015 (5 applicants).

![Ethnicity of Applicants](image)

**Figure 108: Ethnicity Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)**

White Irish applicants had the highest success rate (5%) followed by Black (background other than African) at 4% (just one appointee). No Irish Travellers were appointed.

![Success Rate by Ethnicity](image)

**Figure 109: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Ethnicity**
Family Status

Almost two-thirds (65%) of recruitment applicants had no caring or parenting responsibilities. Just over a quarter (26%) stated that they were parents to children under 18, and 0.1% (7 people) were the resident primary carer of a person with a disability. A significant proportion (10%) selected “other”.

Success rates were roughly similar for each family status group. No resident primary carers of a person with a disability were appointed, but there were just 7 applicants of this status.
Religion

The most common religion among applicants was Roman Catholic (43% of applicants), and other Christian denominations made up 5% of the applicant total. The second-largest cohort in the religion category was “None” (34% of applicants), and 10% described their religion as “Other”. The remaining applicants were Muslim (4%), Hindu (3%) and Jewish (1%).

![Religion of Applicants](image)

**Figure 112: Religion of Applicants (2016)**

The success rates of all religions were similar. Of the two groups with large enough numbers to compare, Roman Catholics were slightly more successful than applicants of no religion.

![Success Rates by Religion](image)

**Figure 113: Success Rates of Recruitment Applicants by Religion (2016)**
Sexual Orientation

The vast majority (90%) of applicants were heterosexual; a further 5% were gay or lesbian, 2% were bisexual and 3% selected “Other”. This is a slight increase in non-heterosexual applicants from 2015 (in which 92% of applicants were heterosexual).

![Sexual Orientation of Applicants](chart1.png)

**Figure 114: Sexual Orientation of Recruitment Applicants (2017)**

Gay and lesbian applicants had the highest success rate (4%), although it is difficult to make a firm comparison due to the small numbers in all orientations other than heterosexual.

![Success Rates by Sexual Orientation](chart2.png)

**Figure 115: Success Rates of Recruitment Applicants by Sexual Orientation**
Appendix: Fellows

The following data are from the 2017/18 University Calendar, and include those who were nominated to Fellowship in 2016/17. They show that women make up 33% of Junior Fellows, and 32% of Fellows overall (not including Honorary Fellows). All seven of the Senior Fellows are male.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Female (%)</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Male (%)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Fellows</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Gender Representation among Fellows (2017/18)

This is a slight increase (one percentage point) on female representation among Fellows in 2016/17, and so the trend of increasing female representation is continuing. However, the target in the university’s 2015 Athena SWAN bronze institutional award application (gender action plan) for 35% of Fellows to be women by 2018 has not yet been met.

Further developments (new Fellows elected, current Fellows retiring, etc.) in 2017/18 may lead to a further increase of female representation among the 2018/19 Fellows; this will be reported on in the 2017/18 Annual Equality Monitoring Report.
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Definitions

For the purposes of this report the following definitions apply:

**Academic staff** = those staff on academic grades (Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Chair Professor) and medical academic grades (see “Medical academic staff”)

**Administrative staff** = those staff on Administrative grades (Admin 3 to 1 and Senior Admin 3 to 1), Secretarial grades and (Senior) Executive Officer grades.

**Administrative and Library promotions** = Administrative and Library Promotions concern the more senior Library grades not covered in Library Promotions, as well as the Administrative Officer/Senior Administrative grades.

**Casual staff** = those staff on the casual pay register. They may work for a few hours, or more occasionally, throughout the year, in academic or administrative roles.

**Core HR** = the Human Resources information system.

**Core Portal** = the online programme through which staff manage their personal information on CoreHR

**HEA Equal Access Survey** = an optional survey that new entrants are invited to complete during registration. Trinity completion rates are around 90% for each question. The survey responses go to the HEA, who can provide statistical results back to HEIs

**Headcount data** = Most of the staff data presented in this report use the “headcount” system, in which two individual staff members (whether working part-time or full-time) are counted as “2” staff members in the figures.

**Junior Academic Progression** = The Junior Academic Progression Committee manages progression within the Assistant Professor Grade.

In the context of this report, “progression” refers both to applications to pass the Merit Bar, and accelerated advancement within the Assistant Professor grade.
**Library Promotions** = The “Library” promotions system deals with a specific range of Library grades, namely Library Assistant; Library Executive 3, 2 and 1; Library Shop Assistant; Library Laboratory Attendant; and Library Technical Officer.

**Mature students** = are defined as first time new entrants who were aged 23 years on, or before, the 1st January in their year of admission into an undergraduate programme. The “Mature Students” section of this report (p37) deals with those mature students who have applied via the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme (MSDS) or a similar scheme for entry to the School of Nursing and Midwifery. The “Access” section (p20), when referring to “mature students”, also includes other students who have been accepted via the mainstream CAO process who happen to meet the mature student age criterion.

**Medical academic staff** = staff who are employed jointly by Trinity and partner hospitals, and are remunerated on the academic clinical scales as determined by the Department of Health.

**New entrant** = a first-time undergraduate student registering with a higher education institution at the beginning of their first academic year

**Professional staff** = staff employed in administrative, library, support or technical grades

**Research staff** = staff employed as Research Fellows or Research Assistants.

- *Research Fellow*: this is the grade reserved for those holding a PhD qualification or other equivalent experience. This is the official Trinity title for research staff who may be informally called “postdoctoral researchers” or “research scientists” – it includes Research Fellows and Senior Research Fellows.
- *Research Assistant* refers to research staff holding a Bachelors or Master’s degree.

**Secretarial and Executive Promotions** = The Secretarial and Executive Promotions facilitate promotion to Executive Officer and Senior Executive Officer grades (which are administrative in nature).

**Senior Academic Promotions** = The Senior Academic Promotions process facilitates promotion to the Associate Professor, Professor and Chair Professor grades.
**Staff/Total Staff** = all monthly- and weekly-paid staff who work full-time or part-time on permanent, indefinite, fixed term and temporary contracts. This does not include casual staff.

**Students/Total Students** = all full-time or part-time students at undergraduate, postgraduate and foundation levels who are registered in Trinity. The data include research students on postgraduate programmes who may also fulfil some teaching assistant roles.

**Whole-time equivalent (WTE) data** = Some staff data in the report refer to “whole-time equivalents” (WTE) in which two or more part-time staff members completing full-time hours per week between them would be counted as “1”. Footnotes indicate where the WTE system is in use.

**Trinity Centre for Gender Equality and Leadership (TCGEL)** = originally established as the Centre for Women in Science and Engineering Research (WiSER) in 2006 to promote the recruitment, retention and advancement of women working in science, technology, engineering, mathematics and medical (STEMM) disciplines, TCGEL now works to advance gender equality across the University as a whole, and among all its populations.

**WiSER (now TCGEL) database** = the database established and managed by TCGEL to produce gender-disaggregated statistical reports. Its staff data is populated from Core.
Acronyms

- AHEAD – Association for Higher Education Access and Disability
- AHSS – Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
- BESS – Business, Economics and Social Sciences
- CAO – Central Applications Office
- CDETB – City of Dublin Education and Training Board
- DARE – Disability Access Route to Education
- DS – Disability Service
- EMS – Faculty of Engineering, Maths and Science
- EOG – Executive Officers’ Group
- EU – European Union
- FT – Full-time
- HEI – Higher Education Institution
- HEA – Higher Education Authority (Ireland)
- HEAR – Higher Education Access Route
- HR – Human Resources
- HS – Faculty of Health Sciences
- IUA – Irish Universities Association
- MF – Multi-faculty
- MSDS – Mature Students Dispensation Scheme
- MSO – Mature Students’ Office
- PG – Postgraduate
- PT – Part-time
- TAP – Trinity Access Programmes
- TCD – Trinity College Dublin
- TCGEL – Trinity Centre for Gender Equality and Leadership
- TSM – Two-subject Moderatorship
- UG – Undergraduate
- WiSER – now TCGEL
Table of Figures

Figure 1: Level of Study and Mode of Attendance - All Students (2017) ........................................21
Figure 2: Age of Non-mature Undergraduate Students at Point of Entry (2017) .........................22
Figure 3: Age of Mature Undergraduate Students at Point of Entry (2017) .............................22
Figure 4: Age of Undergraduate New Entrants in Trinity (2016/17) and All HEIs (2015/16)...23
Figure 5: Age of Postgraduate Entrants at Point of Entry (2017) ..............................................22
Figure 6: Ten Most Common Student Countries of Domicile excluding Ireland (2017)........24
Figure 7: Student Country of Domicile by Continent (2017) ....................................................24
Figure 8: Student Country of Domicile by Continent: All HEIs (2015/16).................................25
Figure 9: Undergraduate new entrants who did not progress to second year, by Nationality (2014/15) ..................................................................................................................25
Figure 10: Degrees Awarded to Irish v Other Nationality Students (2015-16) .....................26
Figure 11: Nationality of Students who Registered for / Took / were Successful in Scholarship Exams (2017) ...........................................................................................................26
Figure 12: Trend in Percentage of Students Registered with the Disability Service (2007-2017) ....................................................................................................................................................27
Figure 13: Gender Representation in Students Registered with the Disability Service (2017) ..................................................................................................................................................28
Figure 14: Students Registered with the Disability Service by Faculty (2017) .........................28
Figure 15: Representation of Disabilities among Students Registered with the Disability Service (2017) ..........................................................................................................................29
Figure 16: Undergraduate New Entrants (DARE Applicants) who Transferred, Repeated and Left (2014/15) .................................................................................................................30
Figure 17: Ethnicity of New Entrants to Trinity (2015/16) .........................................................31
Figure 18: Ethnicity of New Entrants to Irish Universities (2015/16) .....................................31
Figure 19: Trend in Gender Representation among Total Students (2006/07-2016/17) ........32
Figure 20: Gender Representation among Chairs of Student Societies (2016/17) ..............33
Figure 21: Gender Representation in SU Forum and GSU Executive Committee (2016/17) ..33
Figure 22: Gender of Students at each Level of Study (2017) ..................................................34
Figure 23: Gender Representation among All Students in each Faculty (2017) ......................34
Figure 24: Representation of Female Students at Undergraduate / Postgraduate Level in each Faculty (2017) ...................................................................................................................................................................... 35
Figure 25: Gender of Undergraduate New Entrants who Transferred, Repeated or Left (2014/15) ........................................................................................................................................................................................................... 36
Figure 26: Gender of Students who Registered for / Took / were Successful in Scholarship Exams (2017) ..................................................................................................................................................................................................... 37
Figure 27: Gender of Students Awarded each Undergraduate Degree Grade (2014/15) ...... 37
Figure 28: Number of Applicants to Trinity through the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme (2007-2016) .......................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 38
Figure 29: Number of Mature Entrants to Degree Courses in the School of Nursing & Midwifery (2007-2016) .................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................. 39
Figure 30: Number and Percentage of MSDS Students in Each Faculty ........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 39
Figure 31: Gender Representation among Total MSDS Students ........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................ 40
Figure 32: Percentage Representation of MSDS Students in each Age Bracket (2012/13 - 2016/17) ........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 41
Figure 33: Degree Grades of Graduates who Entered Trinity via the MSDS (2015/16) ........ 42
Figure 34: Socio-economic Background of New Entrants in Trinity and All Irish Universities (2015/16) ........................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 43
Figure 35: Total Entrants to Trinity via the Trinity Access Programmes (1998-2016) ........ 44
Figure 36: Faculty Distribution of TAP Students (2015/16) ................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................... 45
Figure 37: Representation of Mature Students among TAP Students (2015/16) ............... 45
Figure 38: Gender Representation among TAP Students (2015/16) .................................. 45
Figure 39: Degree Grades of Graduates who Entered Trinity via TAP (2010-2016) .......... 46
Figure 40: Socio-economic Background of TAP Students (2016/17) ............................... 47
Figure 41: Total Staff by Area of Employment (2017) ......................................................... 48
Figure 42: Age Representation among Total Staff (2017) .................................................... 49
Figure 43: Age Representation among Academic Staff (2017) ......................................... 49
Figure 44: Civil Status Representation Among Total Staff (2017) ...................................... 52
Figure 45: Percentage of Total Staff who have Declared a Disability (2009-2017) .......... 52
Figure 46: Ethnicity of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017) ........................................ 54
Figure 47: Gender Representation among Total Staff (2007-2017) .................................. 55
Figure 48: Gender Representation on Board and Council (2016/17) ............................... 56
Figure 49: Gender Representation Trend on Board and Council (2007-2017)
Figure 50: Gender Representation on Principal, Compliance and Academic Committees of Board and Council (2016/17)
Figure 51: Gender Representation on Selected Management Groups (2016/17)
Figure 52: Gender Representation Trend on Executive Officers Group (2008-2017)
Figure 53: Gender Representation on Faculty Executive Committees (2016/17)
Figure 54: Gender Representation among Part-time and Full-time Staff (2017)
Figure 55: Gender Representation Trend among Part-time and Full-time Staff (2007-2017)
Figure 56: Gender Representation among Permanent and Temporary Staff (2017)
Figure 57: Gender Representation in Staff taking Parental Leave, Unpaid Leave and Career Breaks
Figure 58: Gender Representation across Academic Pay Scales (2016)
Figure 59: Gender Representation across Administrative Pay Scales (2016)
Figure 60: Gender Representation across All Pay Scales (2016)
Figure 61: Gender Representation in Employment Areas (2017)
Figure 62: Gender Representation in Academic Grades (2017)
Figure 63: Gender Representation in Academic Grades in all Irish Universities (2016)
Figure 64: Female Representation Trend in Academic Grades (2007-2017)
Figure 65: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FAHSS (2017)
Figure 66: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FEMS (2017)
Figure 67: Gender Representation among Academic Grades in FHS (2017)
Figure 68: Gender Representation among Medical Academic Grades (2017)
Figure 69: Trend in Gender Representation among Heads of School (2010-2017)
Figure 70: Gender Representation among Fellows (2007-2017)
Figure 71: Gender Representation among Research Assistants and Research Fellows (2017)
Figure 72: Gender Representation among Research Staff in each Faculty (2017)
Figure 73: Gender Representation among Library Grades (2017)
Figure 74: Gender Representation among Administrative Grades (2017)
Figure 75: Gender Representation in Technical Officers (2017)
Figure 76: Gender Representation in Experimental Officers (2017)
Figure 77: Gender Representation among Support Areas (2017)
Figure 78: Gender Representation among Professional Staff by Faculty (2017) ................. 76
Figure 79: Female Representation among Non-Academic Salary Bands (2016) ...................... 78
Figure 80: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed in Professional Competitions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 79
Figure 81: Success Rates in Professional Recruitment Competitions by Gender / Faculty (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 79
Figure 82: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed in Academic Competitions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 80
Figure 83: Gender of Applicants and Successful Applicants for Research Grants (2016) ...... 81
Figure 84: Gender of Total Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 82
Figure 85: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Chair Professor (2016) ......................... 83
Figure 86: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Professor (2016) ................................. 83
Figure 87: Gender of Applicants and Promoted to Associate Professor (2016) ..................... 84
Figure 88: Gender of AHSS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 84
Figure 89: Gender of EMS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 85
Figure 90: Gender of HS Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 85
Figure 91: Gender of Total Applicants and Progressed in Junior Academic Progression (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 86
Figure 92: Gender of Total Applicants and Advanced in Junior Academic Accelerated Advancement (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 86
Figure 93: Gender of Total Applicants and Progressed in Technical Progression (2016) ....... 87
Figure 94: Gender of Total Applicants and Promoted in Administrative and Library Promotions (2016) ........................................................................................................................................ 87
Figure 95: Ten Most Common Nationalities of Academic Staff after Irish (2017) ............... 88
Figure 96: Nationality of Academic Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2017) .... 89
Figure 97: Percentage of Academic Staff in each School who are of a Nationality other than Irish (2017) ........................................................................................................................................ 90
Figure 98: Ten Most Common Nationalities of Professional Staff after Irish (2017) .......... 91
Figure 99: Nationality of Professional Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2017). 91
Figure 100: Religion of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017)........................................92
Figure 101: Sexual Orientation of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2017).................................93
Figure 102: Age Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)..................................95
Figure 103: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Age (2016)........................................95
Figure 104: Civil Status Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016).........................96
Figure 105: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Civil Status (2016)..............................96
Figure 106: Disability Status Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)...............98
Figure 107: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Disability Status (2016).....................98
Figure 108: Ethnicity Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2016)............................99
Figure 109: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Ethnicity............................................99
Figure 110: Representation of Family Status among Recruitment Applicants (2016)..............100
Figure 111: Success Rate of Recruitment Candidates by Family Status...................................100
Figure 112: Religion of Applicants (2016)................................................................................101
Figure 113: Success Rates of Recruitment Applicants by Religion (2016)...............................101
Figure 114: Sexual Orientation of Recruitment Applicants (2017).............................................102
Figure 115: Success Rates of Recruitment Applicants by Sexual Orientation..........................102
Figure 116: Gender Representation among Fellows (2008-2018).............................................103