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**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 driven by shared convictions and ambitions, a strong sense of belonging and an ethos of collegiality.

**Trinity Strategic Plan, 2020-2025**

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 2019-2020, with particular focus on the nine grounds for discrimination in Irish equality law\(^1\), 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.

---

\(^1\) 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 and applies to the provision of accommodation only.
The Relationship with Trinity’s Strategic Goals

Our strong commitment to values of inclusivity and equality also means that we will unrelentingly pursue our ambitious targets towards full gender equality under the Athena SWAN programme and the HEA National Review of Gender Equality in Higher Education Institutions (2016). We will develop a robust Equality, Diversity and Inclusion strategy which will drive these principles.

Trinity Strategic Plan 2020-2025

Trinity has set specific objectives for equality and diversity in the Strategic Plan 2020-2025, in which the university’s commitment to promote equality and inclusivity is clearly articulated.

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.
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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. 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 being made towards more equal and diverse representation in many areas, and the whole university community is to be commended for this. Change is slow or stalled in some areas, however, so continued and targeted work is still required. While several offices exist within Trinity which work specifically to promote equality, diversity and inclusion, 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 an evidence base on which concrete steps will be taken - in central offices, university governance, local departments and Schools, and student bodies.

Comments or queries relating to this report are welcome at equality@tcd.ie

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

- 28% (1,111) of Trinity staff are in their thirties, and 8% (332) are in their sixties
- Academic staff are older than other staff, on average. For example, 11% (114) of academic staff are in their sixties
- Just 2% of recruitment applicants are over 60\(^3\)
- Recruitment applicants aged 31-35 are the most successful, representing 13% of total applicants and 22% of successful applicants

Civil Status

- The civil status of students is not recorded
- 49% (1912) of staff are single, and 43% (1706) 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, 3% of applicants selected it

Disability

- 9.4% (1777) of students are registered with the Disability Service; undergraduates (1613) are over-represented among this total.
- The most common type of disability among students is mental health conditions (27%, 471 students), followed very closely by specific learning difficulties (including dyslexia) (21%, 374 students).
- Students with disabilities are most likely to take courses in the AHSS Faculty (41%, 731 students)
- 3% of Trinity staff have declared a disability; the true figure may be higher

---

\(^3\) This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment
Ethnicity

- No reliable data on staff ethnicity are available. Diversity Detail\(^4\) responses suggest that 65% of staff are White Irish, 25% of other White ethnicity and 10% of other ethnicities.
- White Irish applicants are the most successful in recruitment competitions, representing 31% of total applicants and 46% of successful applicants. Other White applicants are relatively unsuccessful, representing 17% of total applicants and 9% of successful applicants.

Family Status

- The family status of students and of staff is not recorded.
- 40% of recruitment applicants have no caring responsibilities, 17% are the parent of a person under 18, 0.1% are the resident primary carer of a person with a disability and 5% are “other”\(^5\).
- There is no significant difference in recruitment success rates based on family status.

---

\(^4\) Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (11% completion rate for the ethnicity section).
\(^5\) This figure is based on voluntary completion of the Equality Monitoring Form on e-Recruitment.
Gender

Students

- Overall, 60% (11,425) of students are female, broken down to 60% (7,896) female at undergraduate level, and 62% (3,403) at postgraduate level
- Gender breakdown varies by Faculty as follows: HS is 76% (3,313) female, AHSS is 63% (4,920) female and EMS is 60% (2,883) male
- Entrance Exhibition Award recipients are 50% (227) female, new Scholars are 51% (29) female, and Gold Medallists are 50% (92) female
- 52% (64) of Society Chairs are male, the GSU Executive is 58% female, and the SU Union Forum is 70% female. The CSC Chair is male and the SU and GSU Presidents are female.

Staff: Representation

- 55% (2,171) of staff are female
- Women make up 48% (13) of Board, 56% (22) of Council, and 53% (6) of EOG. Each of these bodies is trending towards gender balanced representation.
- Faculty Executive Committees with the exception of Health Sciences are in line with the overall gender balance of the academic staff within the faculties. AHSS is 60% (12) female, EMS is 76% (12) male and HS is 40% (4) female.

Staff: Employment Conditions

- 70% (541) of part-time staff are female
- 55% (1,253) of permanent staff, and 55% (918) of fixed-term/specific purpose staff, are female
Academic Staff

- 54% (522) of academic staff are male
- 50% (223) of Assistant Professors, but 32% (30) of Chair Professors, are women
- Female representation at Chair Professor level has risen from 12% in 2008
- Academic staff are 51% (228) female in AHSS, 65% (138) female in HS and 74% (226) male in EMS; female representation declines towards more senior academic grades in AHSS and HS, but not EMS.
- Three Schools are over 60% female (in terms of academic staff), 9 Schools are over 60% male and the remaining 13 are within a 60/40 split
- 35% of Fellows are women; female representation has risen from 21% in 2010

Research and Professional Staff

- Research staff are well gender-balanced (51% / 472 male), although there are more men (310 / 56%) among Research Fellows than Research Assistants (162 / 43%)
- Library staff are 69% (87) female, and all grades are majority female
- Administrative staff are 73% (756) female, but female representation decreases from 85% (216) female at Executive Officer to 50% female (7) at Senior Admin 1
- Technical staff are 65% (93) male, and all grades are majority male
- Significant gender imbalance exists within support areas. The male-dominated areas are Premises (100% / 50), Stores (100% / 6), Grounds (92% / 12), and Security and Attendants (78% / 118). The female-dominated areas are Nursery (100% / 15), Housekeeping (84% / 153), and Catering (72% / 34)
- Of 21 administrative / service departments, 14 are over 60% female, 2 are within a 60/40 split and 2 are over 60% male
Competitive Processes

- 64% of applicants for appointment to academic roles are male, but female applicants have a higher success rate (8%) than male applicants (5%), leading to very nearly equal academic appointments overall (53% male, 47% female)
- Female applicants make up the majority of applicants (60%) and appointments (69%) for professional recruitment and have a slightly higher success rate than male applicants (7% female and 5% male)
- Applicants for Senior Academic Promotion are 51% (64) male and 49% (61) female. Those promoted are perfectly gender balanced at 50% (20) for both male and female. There is little difference in success rate with female success rate of 33% and male success rate of 31%.
- Those promoted to Chair Professor were 67% (2) female and 33% (1) male. This is in line with the applicant cohort which was 65% female and 35% male.
- Promotions to Professor were 70% (7) male and 30% (3) female, this is in line with the overall applicant cohort which was 67% male and 33% female.
- Promotions to Associate Professor were 56% (15) female and 44% (12) male, again this is in line with the overall applicant cohort which was 55% female and 45% male.
- Success rates are very similar for male applicants and female applicants across all Senior Academic Promotion grades.

Nationality / Country of Domicile

- 74% (13,449) of students are from Ireland, 6% (997) from the USA and 3% (485) from the UK. Students come from a total of 124 countries
- 16% (2,882) of students are from outside the EU
- 57 nationalities are represented among academic staff, and 39% (407) of them are of non-Irish nationality. A significant proportion (12% / 129) of academics are British
- 70% (287) of non-Irish academic staff are of EU nationality, 10% (39) are Asian, 10% (42) are North American and 3% (12) are European (non-EU).
- Professional & Research staff are more likely to be Irish (72% / 1,825), Asian (17% / 120) or South American (8% / 61) than their academic colleagues
Religion

- Data on student religion cannot currently be shared for data protection reasons\(^6\).
- No reliable data on staff religion are available. Diversity Details\(^7\) suggest that 45% of staff are Roman Catholic, 40% of no religion, 4% Church of Ireland and 11% of other religions.
- Recruitment applicants are 44% Roman Catholic, 33% of no religion, 4% Hindu, 4% Church of Ireland, 2% Muslim, 1% Jewish and 12% of other religions\(^8\).
- 34% of total applicants, but 41% of successful applicants, are of no religion.

---

\(^6\) The data protection issue will be rectified for future reports.
\(^7\) Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (11% completion rate for the religion section).
\(^8\) 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\(^9\) suggest that 89% of staff are heterosexual, 9% gay or lesbian, 1% bisexual and 1% other
- Recruitment applicants are 90% heterosexual, 4% gay or lesbian, 3% bisexual and 3% other\(^{10}\). Successful recruitment applicants are 94% heterosexual and 1% other

\(^9\) Diversity Detail is an optional module in CorePortal (10% completion rate for the sexual orientation section)
\(^{10}\) 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. 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. 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 by the Equality Office on request. Unless otherwise specified:

- Staff data are from CoreHR reports, downloaded on 13 October 2020
- Student data are from Academic Registry, from March 2020 return to the HEA
- 2016 Census data are from the Central Statistics Office website
- Trend graphs are compiled using previous Annual Equality Monitoring Reports

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, once a reliable completion rate is achieved. Managers are invited to encourage their staff to complete the profile to inform future reports. Further information is available at http://www.tcd.ie/equality/reports/annual-equality-monitoring-reports/#detail
Student Report

Overview

There are 18,941 students in Trinity. Almost 3 in 4 (71%) of Trinity students are undergraduates, and the vast majority (90%) are enrolled full-time. Part-time students make up 9% of the student population, and just 0.5% of are formally enrolled as online-only. 11

Across Irish universities, 17% of enrolments in 2019/20 were part-time,12 and 2% were remote (online) learning, so Trinity’s proportion of part-time and online students is below the (university) sectoral average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Study</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Postgraduate</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>13,384</td>
<td>5,496</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated for another institution</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>17,057</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Level of Study and Mode of Attendance - All Students (2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Study</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Validated for another institution</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validated for another institution</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mode of Attendance, Comparison of Trinity Students (2020) and University Enrolments (2019/20)

11 Alternative attendance options allow greater access to higher education by people with disabilities, older people, people with caring responsibilities and people who are socio-economically disadvantaged

Age

Undergraduate

The vast majority (86%) of undergraduate students are younger than 20 at the point of entry to Trinity. A significant percentage (9%) are aged 21 – 25 (inclusive). Only 5% are over the age of 25, and percentage representation drops with each older age bracket.

The oldest undergraduate student was 73 at point of entry.

Across the entire higher education sector, in 2019/20, 7% of undergraduate new entrants were aged 24 and over. This compares with 7% of undergraduate new entrants being 24 or over in Trinity in 2019/20.

Postgraduate

Postgraduate students are much less likely to be under 21 (1% of postgrads), for obvious reasons, and a large percentage (46%) of them are aged 21 – 25, presumably enrolling soon after completing their undergraduate studies.

---

However, postgrads are more diverse in age than undergrads. While Figure 3 shows a decline in percentage representation with each older age bracket, the percentages are higher in every age bracket over 20 than among undergrads (Figure 2).

The oldest postgraduate student was 79 at point of entry.

31% of postgraduate new entrants across Irish HEIs were 30 or over at point of entry\textsuperscript{14}. Trinity appears to have a slightly higher representation of postgrads in their 30s and over, as 35% of postgraduate students in March 2019/20 were 30 or older.

![Postgraduate age on entry 2019/20](image)

\textbf{Figure 3: Age of Postgraduate Students at Point of Entry (2020)}

\textsuperscript{14} Source: \textit{Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2017/18}, HEA, p9
Country of Domicile

Countries

72% of students are from Ireland\textsuperscript{15}, and 28% are international\textsuperscript{16}. Students come from a total of 121 countries (including Ireland).

The USA continues to be the most common country of domicile after Ireland, followed by India and China, and more than twice as many students are arriving from the USA than from Great Britain.

Student Country of Domicile

![Student Country of Domicile](image)

\textbf{Figure 4: Ten Most Common Student Countries of Domicile excluding Ireland (2020)}

Table 2 (overleaf) shows these countries of domicile first as a percentage of the total student population, and then as a percentage of international students. Over one in five international students are from the USA, or 6\% of all students.

\textsuperscript{15}“Ireland” is here defined as the whole island of Ireland; so students from Northern Ireland are counted in the Ireland figures, and students from all other parts of the UK are counted under Great Britain (GB)

\textsuperscript{16}i.e. from a country of domicile other than Ireland
### Number of students, % of all students, % of international students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>% of all students</th>
<th>% of international students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGAPORE</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Ten Most Common Student Countries of Domicile excluding Ireland, with Percentages (2020)

### Continents

82% of students are from Europe. Significant proportions of students come from Asia (9%) and North America (7%). Just 2% of students (total) come from other continents.
The data in Table 3\textsuperscript{17} shows all registered students in 2019-20, compared with all registered students across all Irish HEIs in 2019/20.

The differences suggest that Trinity does indeed have a more international student population than the sectoral average, with 17% of its students coming from outside Europe as compared with 9% of new entrants across HEIs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>All HEIs</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America North</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>+0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America South</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>+0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>+0.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Country of Domicile, Comparison of Trinity Students (2019/20) with all HEI (2019/20)

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

The number and percentage of students registered with the Disability Service (DS) continues to rise. In 2019-20, 9.4% of the total student population – over 1,700 students - were registered with the DS. This suggests that Trinity is meeting the national target (8%) for new entrants. Trinity’s representation of students with disabilities is above average; students with disabilities make up 6.3% of the total student population in Irish higher education, and 6.2% of the total student population in Irish universities19.

Figure 6: Trend in Percentage of Students Registered with the Disability Service (2008/09 - 2019/20)

18 Source for data in this section: Disability Service
19 Source: Number of Students with Disabilities Studying in Higher Education in Ireland 2018/19, Association for Higher Education Access and Disability (AHEAD), p12
Level of Study

While 12% of undergraduates are registered with the DS, just 3% of postgraduates are. A similar pattern is observed at the sectoral level; 7.1% of undergraduate students but just 2.4% of postgraduate students in higher education in Ireland have a disability.20

Students registered with the DS by level of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Study</th>
<th>Students registered with DS</th>
<th>Students not registered with DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1613 (12%)</td>
<td>11771 (88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>164 (3%)</td>
<td>5332 (97%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Percentage of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students Registered with the DS (2020)

Gender

41% of students registered with the DS are male. While this is a minority of students registered with the DS, it indicates that male students are very slightly more likely to be registered with the DS as men make up just 40% of the total student population (see Figure 12).

Gender Representation in DS-Registered Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Gender Representation in Students Registered with the Disability Service (2020)

---

20 Source: *Number of Students with Disabilities Studying in Higher Education in Ireland 2018/19*, Association for Higher Education Access and Disability (AHEAD), p13
Faculty

DS-Registered students are more likely to be enrolled on a course in AHSS (41% of DS-registered students) than in EMS (23%), HS (21%) or multi-Faculty courses (14%).

Figure 9: Students Registered with the Disability Service by Faculty (2020)

Type of Disability

Mental health conditions are the most common primary disability cited by DS-registered students, with specific learning difficulty (SLD) second.

Nationally, SLD is the most common disability (37.7% of students with disabilities have an SLD) and Mental Health conditions are the second most common (making up 16.1% of students with disabilities)\textsuperscript{21}. Trinity has a much lower relative representation of SLD, and higher representation of Mental Health conditions.

Disability Type of DS-Registered Students

Figure 10: Representation of Disabilities among Students Registered with the Disability Service (2020)

\textsuperscript{21} Source: \textit{Number of Students with Disabilities Studying in Higher Education in Ireland 2018/19}, Association for Higher Education Access and Disability (AHEAD), p14
Gender

Overview

The gender representation of students in 2019/20 was 60% female (11,425), 40% male (7,516). This has been highly consistent for several years, as illustrated in Figure 12. Female representation among undergraduate entrants to Irish universities in 2017/18 was 57%.

Gender of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Trend in Gender Representation among Total Students (2009/10-2019/20)

Level of Study

Female students outnumber male students at every level of study. The female majority increases slightly from Foundation to Undergraduate, and from Undergraduate to Postgraduate – 62% of postgraduate students are female.

Figure 12: Gender of Students at each Level of Study (2020)

---

22 Please see the Staff Report (p93) for gender of PhD students funded by Provost’s PhD Project Awards
23 Source: Higher Education Key Facts and Figures 2017/18, HEA, p3
Faculty

The Faculties of HS and AHSS are outside a 60:40 gender ratio, AHSS is close with 63% female students. Multi-Faculty programmes also have 63% female students. Health Sciences is the most gender-imbalanced Faculty, as over three-quarters (76%) of its students are female.

![Student Gender by Faculty](image)

**Figure 13: Gender Representation among All Students in each Faculty (2020)**

Female representation increases by 1 percentage point in each of HS and AHSS at postgraduate level, and remains the same in EMS.

![Female Representation in Level of Study by Faculty](image)

**Figure 14: Representation of Female Students at Undergraduate / Postgraduate Level in each Faculty (2020)**
**Attainment**

Of those receiving Entrance Exhibition Awards in 2019/20, 50% were female and 50% were male.

![Entrance Exhibition Awards](image)

Of those awarded Foundation or non-Foundation Scholarship in 2020, 51% were male and 49% were female.

![New Scholars](image)

50% of graduands awarded a Gold Medal at Commencements in 2019/20 were male and 50% were female.

![Gold Medals](image)

---

24 Source: Academic Registry Annual Report 2019/20
Leadership Roles

The Students’ Union part-time officer body, the Union Forum, has 14 female and 6 male members. The sabbatical officers are 83% (5) female and 17% (1) male (the total number of positions – 6 – is small). This includes the female President.

Figure 18: Gender Representation in SU Decision-making Bodies (2019/20)

58% of GSU Executive Committee are female, which is in line with the finding in Figure 13 that 62% of postgraduate students are female. The GSU Executive Committee has 8 male and 11 female members, and the President is female.

Figure 19: Gender Representation in GSU Executive (2019/20)

25 Sources: SU, College Calendar and CSC respectively; all relating to 2019/20 academic year
A slight majority (52%) of Chairs of student Societies were male in 2019/20. This is significantly less than was found in 2017/18 (in which 62% of Chairs were male). The CSC Chair in 2019/20 was male.

Gender of Society Chairs

64
52%
60
48%

CSC Chair: Male

Figure 20: Gender Representation among Chairs of Student Societies (2019/20)
Mature Students

A mature student is an undergraduate student aged 23 or over who applies via the Mature Students Dispensation Scheme (MSDS) or via the Nursing Career Centre26.

During the past academic year, the Mature Students’ Office, in collaboration with Academic Registry, has undertaken a data-cleaning exercise to enhance the quality of available data and reporting in the future. While this work is ongoing, data for the year covered by this report are unavailable. Mature Students are a key target group for the university and the absence of this data represents an acknowledged gap in the present report, which will be remedied in the next Annual Equality Monitoring Report.

---

26 An external body which assesses applicants for degree programmes in Nursing and Midwifery
Socio-economic Background

Arising from the stated target in the National Access Plan, the HEA subsequently developed a new approach to socio-economic group data based on Deprivation Index Scores (DIS). DIS measure relative affluence or disadvantage of a particular geographical area based on data compiled from the census.

Deprivation index scores range from around -40 to +40. -10 and less is considered disadvantaged, +10 and greater is considered affluent.

The mean DIS score for new entrants to all Universities in 2019/20 was 3.0 while the mean DIS score for new entrants to Trinity for the same year is 5.7, highlighting there are still problems when it comes to access and disadvantage. Male students in Trinity and across all Universities have a higher DIS than female students (5.1 versus 6.6 in TCD), which suggests lower enrolment rates from males in disadvantaged areas than from females in disadvantaged areas.

---

Trinity Access Programmes

Overview

TAP students, i.e. students entering Trinity via a Trinity Access Programmes entry routes, make up 7% (887) of the total undergraduate student population (13384).

Over the past twenty years, the number of students entering undergraduate degree programmes via TAP has significantly increased, from just 10 in 1998. 2018 had the lowest intake since 2011, but intake increased slightly in 2019. In 2019/20 TAP students made up 7% of new entrants to Trinity, a slight decrease from the 9% in 2017, however the overall trend is upwards.

---

28 Source for data in this section: Trinity Access Programmes
Gender
TAP students are 64% female and 36% male; similar to the general undergraduate population which is 60/40 female and male (see Figure 12).

![Figure 24: Gender Representation among TAP Students (2019/20)](image)

Age
7% of TAP Students entered via the Foundation Course for Mature Students\textsuperscript{29}. This is in line with representation of mature students found in the general undergraduate population (see Figure 2) which showed the 7% of students were aged 24 and over on entry.

![Figure 25: Representation of Mature Students among TAP Students (2019/20)](image)

\textsuperscript{29} i.e. Students over 23 at point of entry to the Foundation Course
Faculty

Similar to general undergraduate population (Figure 13), all Faculties, with the exception of STEM, are outside a 60:40 gender ratio with higher female representation. Health Sciences is the most gender-imbalanced Faculty, as over three-quarters (79%) of its TAP students are female while the Faculty of EMS is the most gender balanced.

Figure 26: TAP Student gender by Faculty (2019/20)

Female students that entered via TAP are more likely to study in the Faculty of HS (37%) while male students are more likely to study in the Faculty of EMS (41%). Only 18% of female students study in EMS and only 17% of male students study HS. The percentage of students studying in Multi Faculty is similar, 13% female and 10% male while AHSS is the same for both female and male students with 32%.

Figure 27: Faculty Distribution of TAP Students (2019/20)
Staff Report

Overview

There are 3,922 staff in Trinity\(^3\). The biggest employment area is academia, comprising 27% of staff, closely followed by administration at 26% of staff.

![Staff Employment Area](image)

**Figure 28: Total Staff by Area of Employment (2020)**

---

\(^3\) Please note that the total number of staff in specific categories such as Age, Civil Status, Gender etc. may be slightly less than 3,922 as those who are “unknown” in any category are removed for the purposes of analysis.
Age

The most common age of Trinity staff members is 41-45 (16% of staff). Around 18% of staff are aged 55 or above. Just 1.4% of staff are over 65.

Trinity’s staff age breakdown is largely similar to the UK higher education sector (data for Ireland is not available)\(^{31}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>UK HEIs</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or under</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or over</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Age of All Staff, Trinity and UK HE Sector Comparative (2020)

\(^{31}\) Source: Equality and Higher Education: Staff Statistical Report 2018, AdvanceHE, p49
Academic Staff

Academic staff tend to have an older profile than the overall staff population; while the most common age is still 41-45 (17% of academic staff), every age bracket above 40 has a higher representation among academic than overall staff, and there are fewer academics than the overall average in the ages of 20-35.

Age of Academic Staff

![Age Representation among Academic Staff (2020)]

Schools

Table 7 provides the age breakdown of academic staff in every School. 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 (“mode”) is somewhere between 36 and 55.

The sparklines in the far-right column are a visual representation of the age of academic staff across the School. Modes are marked with a darker colour. A sparkline with high columns to the left indicates the School has relatively young academic staff (e.g. School of Law); a sparkline with higher columns to the right denotes an older academic team (e.g. School of Linguistic, Speech and Communication Sciences).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Staff by Age and School</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Immunology (24)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (22)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Statistics (61)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts (17)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (26)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (66)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (33)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics &amp; Microbiology (24)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histories &amp; Humanities (51)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang Lit &amp; Cultural Studies (63)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law (45)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Speech &amp; Comm Sci (28)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (22)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (197)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (49)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing &amp; Midwifery (80)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy &amp; Pharma Sciences (29)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics (28)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology (34)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (21)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Philosophy (62)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work &amp; Social Policy (20)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Business School (48)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Age Representation (%) among Academic Staff by School (2020)
Civil Status

Almost half (49%) of Trinity staff are single, and a further 43% are married. Just 2% of staff are divorced, and 2% cohabiting. Further categories, including those relating to civil partnership and to bereavement, each represent 1% or less than 1% of staff.

Figure 31: Civil Status Representation among Total Staff (2020)

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”.

---

32 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”.
Disability

“Trinity is committed to ensuring that people with disabilities are facilitated to perform effectively in the posts that they hold, and that they will not be disadvantaged by reason of having a disability”

**Code of Practice Applying to the Employment of People with Disabilities**

For the first time since 2012, in 2018 Trinity recorded less than 3% of its staff having a disability, missing the statutory target\(^{33}\). In 2019, this figure increased to 3.3% meeting the statutory target. The current statutory target will rise to 6% of staff by 2024.

Data collection methods have changed in the past two years, with a greater emphasis now placed on data protection. A key issue is encouraging disclosure, which must remain voluntary. Managers have a role to play in ensuring staff with disabilities are confident that disclosing their disability will benefit rather than disadvantage them.

![Staff with Disabilities](image)

**Figure 32: Percentage of Total Staff who have Declared a Disability (2009-2019)**

\(^{33}\) Source: Trinity Statutory Report to National Disability Authority (via HEA), April 2018
In UK HEIs, 4.7% of staff have declared a disability\textsuperscript{34}. This is higher than Trinity’s current figure, and lower than the Irish government’s forthcoming target of 6% of public employees to be people with disabilities\textsuperscript{35}.

\textsuperscript{34} Equality and Higher Education: Staff Statistical Report 2018, AdvanceHE, p101
\textsuperscript{35} Ref: Comprehensive Employment Strategy for People with Disabilities 2015-2024, Government of Ireland, p3
Ethnicity

Diversity Detail

The response rate to this question was 18% of total staff.

65% of staff who completed the Diversity Detail are White Irish, and 25% are of another White background, so a total of 90% of respondents are White.

6% of respondents are Asian (including Chinese and other backgrounds), 1% are Black (including African and other backgrounds), less than 1% are Irish Traveller and 3% are of other backgrounds (including mixed background).

![Ethnic Origin of Staff](image)

Figure 33: Ethnic Origin of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2020)

National Comparison

According to the Diversity Detail responses, Trinity has 19 percentage points less White Irish staff than would be present in the national population. However, the overall White population of Trinity staff is similar to that found in Ireland as a whole, due to the greater representation of other White backgrounds among Trinity Staff (+15 percentage points).
There are slightly more Asian (including Chinese) people among Trinity staff than in the general population, slightly fewer Black (including African) people, and fewer Irish Travellers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Trinity Staff</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (Irish)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Any Other Background</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian Irish Any Other Background</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Including Mixed Background</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Black Irish (African)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish Traveller</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian Irish (Chinese)</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/Black Irish Any Other Background</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Ethnic Origin of Staff from Diversity Detail (2020) Compared with Census 2016
Gender

Overview

The majority (55% or 2,171/3,922) of Trinity staff are women. This gender representation has been quite consistent over the past six years.

![Gender Representation Trend among Total Staff (2015-2020)](image)

**Figure 34: Gender Representation Trend among Total Staff (2015-2020)**

This proportion is exactly in line with the representation of women among core-funded staff across Irish universities, which is 55%.

---

Decision-making Bodies

**Board and Council**

Board was perfectly gender balanced 19/20 although it had one vacant position. Council had 56% female representation and two vacant positions.

![Gender Representation on Board and Council (2019/20)](image)

Both Board and Council have been very evenly gender-balanced for the past 3 years, following a period of increasing female representation. In 2019/20 College had, for the first time, three female Deans within the faculties of HS, EMS and AHSS which, along with the vacant positions, have contributed to the slight increase in female representation.

---

37 Source: Committee Papers website [www.tcd.ie/committeepapers](http://www.tcd.ie/committeepapers)
Five Irish universities (including Trinity) have achieved at least a 40/60 gender ratio on their governing authority, and three (including Trinity) have achieved this on their academic council\(^{38}\).

**Committees\(^{39}\)**

The overall gender representation on Principal, Academic and Compliance Committees of Board and Council is almost perfectly gender balanced at 52% female and 48% male.

---


\(^{39}\) Source: Committee secretaries
Almost all committees (9) are within a 60/40 gender ratio, however Human Resources and Quality Committees are more than 60% female and Audit Committee is more than 60% male.

Gender representation on committees

Figure 38: Gender Representation on Principal, Academic and Compliance Committees (2019-20)
Management Groups

Management groups advise the Provost and are made up of senior university leaders, *ex officio*. Executive Officers Group (EOG) and Chief Officers Group (COG) are each involved in approving items for submission to Board, and other management groups report into them. Planning Group is one of these subgroups, and it deals with major strategic and financial decisions.

EOG[^40] is within a 60/40 gender balance (53% female); COG[^41] is just within the 60/40 gender balance (57% male) and Planning Group[^42] is female dominated (73% female).

![Executive Officers Group](image1.png)

![Chief Officers Group](image2.png)

![Planning Group](image3.png)

**Figure 39: Gender Representation on Selected Management Groups (2019/20)**

[^40]: Source: Provost’s Office website [www.tcd.ie/provost/college-officers/executive/](http://www.tcd.ie/provost/college-officers/executive/)

[^41]: Source: Secretary’s Office website [https://www.tcd.ie/Secretary/assets/pdf/Trinity_Management_Structures_Handbook.pdf](https://www.tcd.ie/Secretary/assets/pdf/Trinity_Management_Structures_Handbook.pdf)

[^42]: Source: Vice-Provost’s Office website [https://www.tcd.ie/academic-services/vpcao стратегический планирование](https://www.tcd.ie/academic-services/vpcao стратегический планирование)
EOG is more gender-balanced in 2019/20 than it has been since 2016 and has now achieved its best gender balance to date, and the overall trend is towards more equal representation of men and women.

**Figure 40: Gender Representation Trend on Executive Officers Group (2010-2019)**

**Faculty Executives**

Faculty Executive Committees (Execs) roughly reflect the gender breakdown of academic staff in the Faculty, although the HS Exec, unlike its overall staff, is within a 60/40 gender split. The EMS Exec, on the other hand, has an over-representation of men (76%). Each Exec is Chaired by its Faculty Dean so all three have female Chairs.

**Figure 41: Gender Representation on Faculty Executive Committees (2017/18)**

---

43 Source: Faculty Executive secretaries
Contract Types

Part-time / Full-time

18% of Trinity staff are part-time. Women are significantly over-represented (77%) among part-time staff.

Figure 42: Gender Representation among Full-time and Part-time Staff (2020)

Female over-representation among part-time staff was stable from 2015-18, but has increased in the last two years with growing staff numbers.

Part-time staff by Gender

Figure 43: Gender Representation Trend among Part-time Staff (2015-2020)
42% of Trinity staff are on fixed-term/specific purpose contracts. There is no discernible gender difference between holders of fixed-term/specific purpose and permanent contracts; both are in line with the 55% female overall workforce (see Figure 34).

Of the 10 academic staff on buy-back contracts, 8 (80%) are male and 2 (20%) are female. This reflects the higher representation of men among academic staff of retirement age, than among the overall academic staff.
Area of Employment

Three of the main employment areas in Trinity are highly gendered, i.e. Administration (73% female), Library (69% female) and Technicians (65% male).

Buildings and Services (50% female), Research (51% male), and Academia (52% male) are relatively well balanced while Senior Management have slightly more female staff (57%).

Figure 45: Gender Representation in Employment Areas (2020)
Research

The majority of Research Assistants (57%) are female, and this reverses among Research Fellows, who are 56% male.

The gender representation among Research staff in each Faculty is broadly aligned with the gender of academic staff in the Faculty (see Figure 61): i.e., HS is female-dominated (71% of research staff are female), AHSS is gender-balanced (51% of research staff are female) and EMS is male-dominated (63% of research staff are male).

![Gender Representation among Research Staff by Faculty](image)

Figure 47: Gender Representation among Research Staff in each Faculty (2018)
Library

A significant majority of Library staff are female at all grades. There is an erratic trend towards higher female representation at more senior grades (75% female at Library Keeper/Sub Librarian grades), though small numbers of staff at this grade have a greater impact on the statistical difference.

Figure 48: Gender Representation among Library Grades (2020)
Administration

The vast majority of staff at Executive Officer and Senior Executive Officer grades are female. The female majority then declines steadily between Senior Executive Officer (93% female) and Senior Admin 1 (50%)

Figure 55 does not include the Provost (male), Vice-Provost (male), Treasurer (male) and Chief Operating Officer (female) who are on individual pay scales.

![Gender of Admin Staff](image)

**Figure 49: Gender Representation among Administrative Grades (2020)**
Table 9 presents 21 administrative and service departments in descending order of female representation (among their administrative staff).

14 have more than 60% female administrative staff; 2 have a 60/40 split; and just two departments have more than 60% male administrative staff.

<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>Health Centre</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counselling</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary's Office</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost's Office</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Gallery</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Revenue</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COO's Office</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Relations</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registry</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP/CAO's Office</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Management</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Enterprise</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates &amp; Facilities</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Services</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Gender of Staff in Professional Departments (2020)
Technical

The majority of technical officers at every grade are male. There is only a very slight, uneven trend towards greater male representation at the higher grades.

![Gender of Technical Officers](chart)

**Figure 50: Gender Representation in Technical Officers (2020)**

Experimental Officers have a higher male majority at both grades than is found among any technical officer grade.

![Gender of Experimental Officers](chart)

**Figure 51: Gender Representation in Experimental Officers (2020)**

- **Technical Officers:**
  - Female: 8 (36%)
  - Male: 21 (48%)
  - Female: 9 (30%)
  - Male: 21 (70%)
  - Female: 2 (29%)
  - Male: 5 (71%)
  - Female: 7 (37%)
  - Male: 12 (63%)

- **Experimental Officers:**
  - Female: 2 (14%)
  - Male: 12 (86%)
  - Female: 5 (100%)

- **Legend:**
  - Female
  - Male
Support

Significant gender imbalances exist within different support areas, and these conform to traditional gender roles; there are for example 100% female staff in the Nursery, and 100% male staff in Stores, and Premises and 92% in Grounds.

![Gender of Support Staff by Area](image)

**Figure 52: Gender Representation among Support Areas (2020)**
Academic

Gender representation at the Assistant Professor grade is now almost exactly equal (49% female). The Professor grade is also within a 60/40 split (43% female). Chair Professors remain imbalanced (32% female) and the overall trend is for decline in female representation towards the more senior grades. However, Trinity has more than achieved the target set out in its Gender Action Plan for 26% of Chair Professors to be women by 2020.

Figure 53: Gender Representation in Academic Grades (2020)

Among Irish universities, it appears[^44] that Trinity has a slightly lower than average representation of women the Assistant Professor grade, but a higher representation of women at the Chair Professor and Professor grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Trinity</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair Professor</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>+8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>+6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Gender Representation in Academic Grades, Comparison with Irish Universities Average (2019)

[^44]: Source: *Higher Education Institutional Staff Profiles by Gender*, HEA (2020), p7. These figures refer to core-funded staff only and are based on figures from December 2018 – so they are not directly comparable to the data presented in Figure 59.
Female representation has increased at every (non-medical) academic grade over the past six years. The percentage increase has been relatively small at Assistant Professor (48% → 49%) and Professor (42% → 43%), but more significant at Associate Professor (35% → 40%) and Chair Professor (18% → 32%)

Female Representation in Academic Grades

![Graph showing female representation trend in academic grades from 2015 to 2020.]

**Figure 54: Female Representation Trend in Academic Grades (2015-2020)**

**Faculties**

The AHSS Faculty is well gender-balanced, with 49% male staff, while HS is female-dominated (65% female) and EMS is male-dominated (74% male).

Gender of Academic Staff by Faculty

![Bar chart showing gender distribution of academic staff by faculty.]

**Figure 55: Gender Representation among Academic Staff: Faculty Comparison (2020)**

Assistant Professors in the AHSS Faculty are 54% female but representation declines steadily throughout the more senior grades, to 33% women at Chair Professor level.
The academic staff in EMS is male-dominated at every grade (the highest female representation is 32%, at Professor Grade); however, there is no significant decline in female representation throughout the grades.
The grades of (non-medical) academic staff in HS up to but excluding Chair Professors are female-dominated. The first three grades (Assistant Professor to Professor) are very similar in their gender breakdown (62% - 68% female), but the genders are 50/50 at Chair Professor level.

Medical academic grades do not follow a clear linear career path to the same extent as the four non-medical academic grades. It is notable however that Physiotherapy, Occupational Therapy and Nursing are heavily female-dominated (83% - 89%), while the more senior Professor Consultant grade is male-dominated (71%). Other grades are within a 60/40 gender balance.
Half (13) of Schools are within or close to a 60/40 gender ratio. Nine Schools have more than 65% male staff and three Schools have more than 65% female staff.

The most gender-imbalanced School is Physics, with 89% male staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>% Female</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>% Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF LINGUISTIC SPEECH &amp; COMM SCI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF NURSING &amp; MIDWIFERY</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK &amp; SOCIAL POLICY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF PHARMACY &amp; PHARM SCIENCES</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF LANG LIT &amp; CULTURAL STUDIES</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF MEDICINE</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF CREATIVE ARTS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF EDUCATION</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF LAW</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF HISTORIES &amp; HUMANITIES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF RELIGION</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRINITY BUSINESS SCHOOL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF ENGLISH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES &amp; PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF COMPUTER SCI &amp; STATISTICS</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF DENTAL SCI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF BIOCHEMISTRY &amp; IMMUNOLOGY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF GENETICS &amp; MICROBIOLOGY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL OF PHYSICS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Gender Representation among Academic Staff, by School (2020)
There are currently 15 male and 9 female Heads of School. An apparent trend towards more equal gender representation among Heads of School can be seen between 2010 – 2013. This trend stagnated between 2014-2018 but appears to be increasing again.

Figure 60: Trend in Gender Representation among Heads of School (2010-2019)
Trinity Fellows (Junior and Senior combined) are now 35% female and 65% male. Senior Fellows and Fellows that were elected to Fellowship on Trinity Monday 2020 are perfectly gender balanced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Fellows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Fellows</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL FELLOWS</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>35%</strong></td>
<td><strong>279</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fellows 2020</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Gender Representation among Fellows, including New Fellows (2020)

This continues the ongoing trend towards equal gender representation as illustrated by Figure 67.

Gender of Fellows (Trend)

Figure 61: Gender Representation among All Fellows, 2009/10-2019/20

45 Source: University Calendar 2019/20
2018 was the first year in which part-time staff were eligible to be elected to Fellowship. This is a welcome and important change in terms of equality of opportunity for part-time academic staff.

Honorary Fellows

Two men and one woman were elected to Honorary Fellowship of Trinity College Dublin in 2020. The total gender representation among Honorary Fellows has changed by 1% when compared to 2019.

<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>Honorary Fellows 2019</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary Fellows 2020</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Gender Representation among Honorary Fellows (2019 and 2020)
Recruitment

Academic Recruitment

The majority (61%) of applicants to Assistant Professor positions in 2019/20 were male, but appointees were gender-balanced (52% female). Female applicants were twice as successful (6% success rate) as male applicants (3% success rate).

![Figure 62: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed to Assistant Professor (2019/20)](chart)

Applicants to Associate Professor positions were less gender-balanced (70% male) than applicants to Assistant Professor positions but appointees were within a 60/40 split at 58% male and 42% female. Again, the female success rate (7%) was almost twice as high as the male (4%).

![Figure 63: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed to Associate Professor (2019/20)](chart)

---

46 Source for this section: HR Department, Recruitment section
In 2019/20 there were very few applicants for the position of Professor. The majority (5) of applicants were female, but appointees were gender-balanced (50% female).

Female applicants to Chair Professor positions have a slightly higher success rate (5%) than male applicants (4%). As with all other grades but Professor, the majority of applicants are male.
Academic Recruitment Trends
Looking at total applicants in 2016/17 – 2019/20\textsuperscript{47}, it is clear that the majority (61% - 67%) of applicants have been male each year.

Across the same years, the representation among appointees has been quite gender-balanced overall.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{academic_applicants.png}
\caption{Gender of Total Academic Applicants (2016/17 - 2019/20)}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{academic_appointments.png}
\caption{Gender of Total Academic Appointees (2016/17 - 2019/20)}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{47} Data provided by HR Workforce Planning
Success rates of female applicants have been higher each year, and fluctuate slightly more than male success rates, but both seem to follow a similar trend and rise and fall in line with each other.

![Academic Recruitment Success Rate](image)

*Figure 68: Success Rates of Total Academic Applicants, by Gender (2016/17 - 2019/20)*
Professional Recruitment

The majority of applicants (60%), shortlisted (65%), and appointed (69%) were female. Female applicants had a slightly higher success rate (7%) than male applicants (5%).

![Professional Recruitment Chart]

Figure 69: Gender of Applicants, Shortlisted and Appointed in Total Professional Recruitment (2019/20)

---

48 Source for this section: HR Department, Recruitment section
Promotions

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 Promotions

Promotion outcomes in the 2018 Senior Academic Promotions were well gender balanced. Applications were also gender balanced meaning there is little difference in male and female success rates (31% and 33% respectively).

![Figure 70: Applicants and Promoted in Senior Academic Promotions (2018)](chart)

Women had slightly lower application rates but slightly higher success rates (having applied).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success Rate</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Application and Success Rates in Senior Academic Promotions, by Gender (2018)

49 Source for this section: HR Performance and Review
Chair Professor

There were 17 applications for promotion to Chair Professor in 2018, of which three were successful (two women and one man). Women made up approximately two thirds of applicants and of those successfully appointed.

Promotions to Chair Professor

Figure 71: Applicants and Promoted in Promotion to Chair Professor (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Application and Success Rates in Promotions to Chair Professor, by Gender (2018)

Professor

Three women (30%) and seven men (70%) were promoted to Professor in 2018; this is representative of the cohort that applied (33% female and 67% male).

Promotions to Professor

Figure 72: Gender of Applicants and Promoted in Promotion to Professor (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Application and Success Rates in Promotions to Professor, by Gender (2018)
Associate Professor

56% of staff promoted to Associate Professor in 2018 were female and 44% were male. This is representative of the applicant cohort which was 55% female and 45% male.

**Figure 73: Gender of Eligible Cohort, Applicants and Promoted in Promotion to Associate Professor (2018)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Application and Success Rates in Promotions to Associate Professor, by Gender (2018)**
Female academic staff had slightly higher success rates in applying for research grants in 2019/20 with a 29% success rate compared to 25% success rate for male academic staff. However, the majority of applicants (60%) were male, possibly due to the overrepresentation of men in the STEM faculty.

Figure 74: Gender of Applicants and Successful Applicants for Research Grants (2019-20)

Source of data: Office of the Dean of Research.
Nationality

Academic Staff

59% of academic staff are Irish, and 41% are “international”, comprising 57 different nationalities.

AdvanceHE figures\(^{51}\) show that 30.1% of academic staff in the UK are not UK nationals\(^{52}\). Trinity is therefore more international in terms of its academic staff than the UK higher education sector average.

By far the most common nationality of international staff in Trinity is British (12% of all staff), followed by other Western European, North American and Asian countries.

![Nationality of Academic Staff](image)

*Figure 75: Ten Most Common Nationalities of Academic Staff after Irish (2020)*

This is quite different to the national picture, which has a higher representation of Eastern European nationalities, and lower representation of Western European and Northern American nationalities than in Trinity.

---

51 Comparative data in the Irish HE sector is not available for country of domicile / nationality  
Trinity appears to have seven times as many UK nationals among its staff as are resident in Ireland overall. Furthermore, Trinity staff records include Northern Ireland in “Irish”, and those staff are not included in the “British” in Figure 74 (which by definition does not comprise the whole UK). It is highly likely therefore that Trinity has an even larger proportion of UK nationals among its staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>% of population resident in Ireland</th>
<th>% of Trinity academic staff</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>+10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>+0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Nationality of Academic Staff (2020) Compared with Census 2016

Over two thirds (73%) of the international academic staff are European. Significant proportions are Asian (10%) and North American (10%) and smaller proportions are South American (3%), African (2%) or Oceanian.

International Academic Staff by Continent

Figure 76: Nationality of Academic Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2020)
Schools

Proportions of Irish / international staff vary greatly between Schools, and 8 Schools have more international than Irish staff. The “most international” School is the School of Language, Literature and Cultural Studies, which has 77% international academic staff. There appears to be less international representation in the more vocational disciplines, such as those within Health Sciences, Social Work, Engineering, Law and Education\textsuperscript{53}.

![International Academic Staff by School](image_url)

**Figure 77: Percentage of Academic Staff in each School who are of a Nationality other than Irish (2020)**

\textsuperscript{53} These figures exclude those academic staff whose nationality is not recorded
Professional & Research Staff

31% (828) of Professional and Research staff are not Irish (1856, or 69%, are Irish); these represent 77 different nationalities. Like academic staff, the most common nationality after Irish is British (5%), followed mostly by Western European nationalities. There is a greater representation of Indian staff (3%) and Brazilian staff (2%) than among academic staff.

![Nationality of Professional and Research Staff](image)

**Figure 78: Ten Most Common Nationalities of Professional and Research Staff after Irish (2018)**

Trinity professional and research staff are closer to the national picture than academic staff; they show the same pattern of greater representation of Western European nationalities, and lower representation of Eastern European nationalities, but to a lesser extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>% of population resident in Ireland</th>
<th>% of Trinity professional &amp; research staff</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>+0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>+1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 17: Nationality of Professional and Research Staff (2018) Compared with Census 2016**
39% of international professional and research staff are from outside Europe. Asia (20%), South America (9%), and Africa (4%) all have higher representation among international professional and research staff, than among international academic staff.

**Figure 79: Nationality of Professional and Research Staff - excluding Irish - grouped by Continent (2020)**
Religion

Diversity Detail

The most common religion among staff, according to the Diversity Detail (response rate is 18% to this question), is Roman Catholic (43% of staff). Almost as many (39% of) staff have no religion. 5% of staff are Church of Ireland, Presbyterian or Methodist; 3% are Muslim; 3% are Hindu and less than 1% are Jewish.

National Comparison

In terms of religion, Trinity Diversity Detail categories do not all map directly onto Census categories but some useful comparisons can be made.

Trinity staff are significantly (35 percentage points) less likely to be Roman Catholic than the general population, and correspondingly (30 percentage points) more likely to have no religion.
Most other religions are somewhat more common in Trinity than among the general population; the exception is Orthodox Christianity, which no staff declared in their Diversity Detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Trinity Staff</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Ireland</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>+1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Religion</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>+0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>+2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostolic / Pentecostal</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Religion of Staff from Diversity Detail (2020) Compared with Census 2016
Sexual Orientation

According to the Diversity Detail (response rate is 16% to this question), almost 9 in 10 (89%) of Trinity staff are heterosexual. A further 8% are gay or lesbian, 2% bisexual and 1% other.

![Sexual Orientation of Staff](image)

**Figure 81: Sexual Orientation of Total Staff from Diversity Detail (2020)**
Recruitment applicants are stratified by age, with 21% of applicants being 31-35 but less than 1% total being from the under 20 or over 65 groups.

Most age groups were roughly equally successful, except the 26-30 group who were underrepresented by 5 percentage points among appointees (see Table 22 overleaf).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age &lt; 20</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20-25</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-30</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 31-35</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-40</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41-45</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 46-50</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 51-55</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 56-60</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 61-65</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>-0.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 66-70</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age &gt;70</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>-0.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Age Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)
Civil Status

49% of recruitment applicants are single, 36% married, 6% cohabiting, and smaller numbers selected another civil status. A further 4% described their civil status as “other”.

There is little difference in success rates by civil status group with the exception of the ‘Single’ and ‘Married’ groups. The single cohort is made up 49% of applicants and 59% of successful applicants while the married cohort is made up of 36% of applicants and 29% of successful applicants.

Table 20: Civil Status Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)
Country of Origin

The response rate to the Country of Origin question on the Recruitment Equality Monitoring Form was 65%.

109 countries were represented among applicants. The countries which each comprise at least 1% of applicants are presented below.

Just under half (45%) of applicants were from Ireland; this is many times more than the next highest country of origin (India, 8%). Irish applicants were also significantly more successful than others, making up 44% of successful applicants.

Applicants from the other most common countries of origin were roughly as successful as each other, with the exception of India (under-represented by 7 percentage points) and the UK (under-represented by 4 percentage points).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>% Applicants</th>
<th>% Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2588</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>-0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran, Islamic Republic Of</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Country of Origin Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)
Disability

2% of applicants disclosed a disability in the Equality Monitoring Form, 85% of applicants stated that they have no disability, and 13% selected “Prefer not to Say”.

This is quite a significant percentage selecting “Prefer not to Say” (rather than simply not answering the question) although it is not an option on other questions on the form, so cannot be compared.

![Disability Status of Recruitment Applicants](image)

**Figure 84: Disability Status Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2019)**

Both those with and without a disability were marginally less successful in the recruitment process, and those who preferred not to say were more successful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability?</th>
<th>% of Applicants</th>
<th>% of Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to Say</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22: Disability Status Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)**
Ethnic Origin

Half of recruitment applicants in 2019-2020 were White Irish, almost one in three (28%) were of another White background, and 0.3% (14 applicants) were Irish Traveller - a total of 78% White applicants. Other recruitment applicants were 3% Asian, 3% Black and 5% Other.

White Irish applicants are by far the most successful, improving their representation by 26 percentage points among successful applicants. On the other hand, Other White applicants drop 14 percentage points. This corresponds with the findings in Table 24.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White (Irish)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Other)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Mixed Background</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (Chinese)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (African)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (Other)</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-0.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (Irish Traveller)</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Ethnic Origin Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)
Family Status

Almost two-thirds (64%) of applicants had no parenting or other caring responsibilities, while just over a quarter were a parent of a person under 18. Very few (5) applicants were the resident primary carer of a person with a disability. 8% selected “other”, suggesting that the legal categories reflected in the form do not cover all family situations.

Parents and applicants with no caring or parenting responsibilities are slightly over-represented (2% and 1% respectively) among successful applicants, and those with “other” family status are under-represented to the same degree (3 percentage points).

No resident primary carer of a person with a disability was successful but given that only 5 applied no reliable conclusions can be drawn from this fact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Status</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Caring/Parenting Responsibilities</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent of A Person Under 18</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Primary Carer (Disability)</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Family Status Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)

Religion

The most common religion of recruitment applicants was Roman Catholic (37%), while other
religions have smaller representation. 6% of applicants were Hindu, 6% were Muslim and
0.4% were Jewish. Christian denominations other than Catholic make up 6% of the total.

The second most common response to the religion question was “none” (33% of
applicants).

Figure 87: Religion Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2019)

Roman Catholic applicants are over-represented among successful applicants by 8% and
applicants of no religion are over-represented by 3 percentage points. Hindu and Muslim
applicants are under-represented by 5 and 3 percentage points respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Of Ireland</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25: Religion Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2019)
Sexual Orientation

87% of recruitment applicants were heterosexual, 5% gay or lesbian, 4% bisexual and 4% other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/Lesbian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Sexual Orientation Comparison between Recruitment Applicants and Successful Applicants (2017)

Heterosexual applicants were successful in proportion to their applicant numbers; bisexual applicants and applicants of “Other” sexual orientation were under-represented to a similar degree (2 percentage points), while gay and lesbian applicants were somewhat (3 percentage points) over-represented among successful applicants.

Figure 88: Sexual Orientation Representation among Recruitment Applicants (2019)
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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 (Administrative 3 to 1 and Senior Administrative 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 and 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.

**Chair Professor** = the highest academic grade, also known as “Professor Of”.

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

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

**Gender balance** = ideal gender balance, from the perspective of the authors, is 50/50 male/female (as other gender identities are not currently covered by the report). However, cohorts may be described as “gender-balanced” if the male/female representation is within a 60:40 ratio, depending on context. For example, a 5-person interview panel could never be 50/50 but would be considered gender-balanced if it has 3 men and 2 women.

**HEA Equal Access Survey** = an optional survey that new entrants are invited to complete during registration. The survey responses go to the HEA, who can provide statistical results back to HEIs

**Headcount data** = Unless otherwise stated, 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 = 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 (p33) concerns only 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; it does not include students who have applied via the CAO and 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

Professor = where capitalised, i.e. “Professor”, this refers to the second-highest academic grade, also known as “Professor In”

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

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

• Research Fellow: the grade reserved for those holding a PhD qualification or other equivalent experience. This is the official Trinity title for research staff who may also be 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.
Acronyms

- AHEAD – Association for Higher Education Access and Disability
- AHSS – Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
- CAO – Central Applications Office
- 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
- GB – Great Britain
- 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
- UK – United Kingdom
- USA – United States of America
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