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## Summary

## Interpretation of the data

Some of the key findings in this report are outlined below. The report constitutes a snapshot of the diversity profile and distribution of staff and students in College as of 2010-2011 based on available data. Reports have been completed for the Equality Committee since 2006-2007. While the HEA compiles sectoral reports on student profile there is currently no consistent sectoral comparative data in relation to staff.

## Staff

## Gender profile

The issue of gender imbalance and barriers to women's career progression in academe have been highlighted by international research. In College there have been several reports examining women's career progression prepared for the Equality Committee, most recently a gender analysis of progression at the Lecturer Merit Bar.

- In 2010-2011 there is a persistent gender imbalance in the number of women in senior academic and decision-making positions in College (Table 2.3.a and 2.3c) including Annual Officers, Senior administration, Deans, Heads of School and Fellows. While the Employment Control Framework has an impact on the recruitment and promotion of staff in College, there are other areas not limited by the moratorium which show little change, such as the proportion of women Fellows (currently 21\%).
- The gender balance at Board and Council has greatly improved in 2010-2011 compared to previous years, with a $40 \%$ female representation at Board and $45 \%$ at Council. There were Board elections in 2010 and there is a certain amount of fluctuation depending on student and other elected representation.
- The new comparative analysis of academic grades from 2007 to 2011 indicates there has been no noticeable variation in the overall proportion of women and men by academic grade in this period, with women more represented at the lecturer grade and under-represented at the most senior grades (table 2.4.a3). The employment control framework has restricted any promotions since 2009.
- In the case of Research staff, the proportions of Research Fellows and Research Assistants are more balanced across Faculties than is the case with Lecturer staff. Research is the only area where recruitment has continued to be active, dependant on external funding. Overall the balance of research staff is $51 \%$ women and $49 \%$ men (Table 2.4.g2). There are variations across Faculties within the $66 \%$ and $43 \%$ range - in the case of Engineering Mathematics and Science $43 \%$ of research staff are women, compared to $37 \%$ of PG students and $19 \%$ of lecturer academic staff.
- The overall gender proportion of staff in College is balanced with $53 \%$ women and $47 \%$ men, however, gender segregation by occupation continues to be very marked, particularly in support staff areas. The lack of variation may be due to the employment control framework moratorium on recruitment.
- The new section analysing staff in academic grades by Faculty provides insight into the different contexts to women's and men's academic career progression in College. Tables 2.4.B indicate women are a minority across grades in Engineering, Maths and Science (the closest point is below the Bar); a majority across grades except at the most senior level in Health Sciences; while in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences the proportions are quite close up to Senior Lecturer. The overall proportions of women and men by School, including part-time staff, remain similar to previous years (Tables 2.5.1, 2 and 3).
- Data for the Merit Bar in 2010 indicates the proportion of eligible women Lecturers applying for review at the Merit Bar is lower (26\%) by comparison to for their male colleagues (58\%), in a similar trend to the low application rate identified in the 2009 Merit Bar report. In 2010 this lower application rate is apparent across all Faculties. The 2009 analysis indicated the gender imbalance was largely due to a cohort of staff in Health Sciences who repeatedly defer review; the report and action recommendations on this matter have been considered by Board.


## Recruitment profile

The data collected on applicants to employment at recruitment stage has been greatly affected by the Employment Control Framework, the overall number of applicants has decreased markedly, and within that the response rate has decreased to $24 \%$. Equality monitoring is in the process of being mainstreamed into e-recruitment so it is expected the response rate will vary in future reports.

- In 2010 the profile of respondents was very international: just over $1 / 3$ of respondents were Irish, $30 \%$ were from the EU and $30 \%$ were non-EU (table 2.10.2).
- 53\% declared themselves to be Christian, 27\% declared no religion, and the second largest faith was Hindu (6.3\%) (table 2.10.3).
- $2.1 \%$ declared a disability; this compares to the overall College rate of $2.4 \%$ of staff as per the 2009 report to the HEA (table2.10.8).


## Students

The data available provides a snapshot of the student population across different equality grounds and socio-economic background. The key findings refer to the increasingly international profile and progress in achieving access targets for non-traditional students.

## Internationalization

- Trinity's long tradition as an international institution is evident in the high proportion of non-Irish students registered: in 2009-2010 there were students from 115 nationalities making up $22.5 \%$ of the student body ( $16 \%$ in 2007-08), this compares to $11 \%$ across the Irish University sector and $16 \%$ in the UK (Table 3.2.1).


## Age and Gender

- $60.5 \%$ of the total student population in 2009-2010 was female; this compares to $57 \%$ in the UK student body and $56.5 \%$ in the Irish student body. The breakdown by UG, PG and Faculty indicates large variations within this: from $77 \%$ female students
in UG Health Sciences to 39\% female students in UG Engineering, Mathematics and Science (Tables 3.1.1 and 3.1.3).
- $47 \%$ of the total Trinity student body were aged between 19 and $21,11 \%$ were over 30 (this data is not available separately for the UG and PG population).


## Widening participation

- The TCD response rate to the HEA survey on student background (including ethnicity and socio-economic background amongst others) has greatly increased in 2010 up to $93 \%$, improving the accuracy of the resulting data.
- There is a continued increase in the proportion of non-traditional students (students with disabilities, students from socio-economic disadvantaged backgrounds and Mature students) entering via access routes $-17 \%$ in 2010. The College established a target of 22\% of new UG entrants to be from non-traditional backgrounds by 2013 in its Strategic Plan. The National Access Plan for Equity of Access 2008-2013 establishes a target for non-standard entry routes to higher education to account for 30 percent of all entrants by 2013.
- In 2010-2011 registered students from non-traditional backgrounds made up over $11 \%$ of the UG student population (students with disabilities 5\%, TAP students 3.8\%, Mature registered 2.3\%). This data captures students who access College via one of its alternative admission routes, but does not capture Mature students and students from disadvantaged backgrounds who enter College via the standard CAO points.
- $6 \%$ of new entrants to Irish HE declare a disability, 7.3\% in UK universities. There are 818 students registered with the College Disability service, representing a 19\% increase in students registered from 2009-10 to 2010-11 with 309 new students registered this year.
- Mature students (23+ at the time of starting UG degree) who accessed College via the dispensation scheme make up 4.9\% of the UG student population, the number of mature students on age is over 1,000 making up $8.5 \%$ of the UG student population (most mature students are located in AHSS and Health Sciences).
- The total number of students on a TAP course or who accessed College via a TAP route are $639,5.4 \%$ of all UG students. At present it is not possible to track accurately the number of TAP students that progress to PG. The degree completion rate of TAP students is high at $97 \%$ by comparison to the overall College rate of $94 \%$.


## 1. Introduction

## Definition

Equality monitoring is the process of collecting, storing and analysing information that is relevant to, and necessary for, the purpose of promoting equality of opportunity between different categories of persons.

This is the fourth equality monitoring report to be submitted to the Equality Committee by the Equality Officer. The report provides base-line statistics on staff in relation to equality grounds such as gender, age and disability, and provides data on the student profile in relation to gender, age, nationality, and access initiatives. The aim of the report is initially to establish base-line positions and to determine possible inequalities; and secondly, to track developments and the success of different measures. Adequate data is essential to develop evidence-based policy and actions to ensure equality of access and opportunity. In monitoring equality data College is following best practice as seen in UK third level institutions and HEA recommendations. For a full discussion on the rationale for monitoring please see the Annual Equality Monitoring Report 2006-2007.

## About this report

The report is comprised of three sections and provides mainly statistical information on the profile of the staff and student body.

The data has been analysed following the format of the first Annual Equality Monitoring Report 2006-2007 with a focus on the nine equality grounds included in equality legislation and bearing in mind the limitations of available data. The Monitoring Advisory Group reviews and advises on the content of this report, suggesting areas for further development. This report includes new data sections on students by gender and Faculty, on staff on medical grades and comparative student data in the Irish sector amongst others.

## Staff section

The staff section of the report provides detailed data tables, with particular regard to gender distribution; seniority and decision-making; the achievement of the 3\% disability employment target, senior and junior promotions, and the recruitment monitoring programme.

The staff gender disaggregated reports look at gender imbalance in seniority levels (vertical distribution) and in different areas or type of contract (horizontal distribution). In relation to gender balance and decision-making, it is useful to bear in mind that a 60-40 proportion is often provided as a minimum guideline for representation of both genders in decision-making bodies, although targets and quotas vary in different
contexts from one/third minimum representation for the underrepresented sex to a 50:50 ratio ${ }^{1}$.

## Student section

The student section outlines the student body profile in terms of the available College and HEA data (gender, age, course and nationality) and includes more detailed information on student access initiatives and nontraditional groups.

## Sources

The staff statistics are mostly based on statistical reports from the personnel database CORE, developed in collaboration with the Staff Office. Some reports have been sourced from the WiSER gender indicators database. Unless otherwise stated the reports include all monthly and weekly paid staff (permanent, contract, indefinite, part-time and temporary) except for casual staff. It should be noted that the part-time category includes staff employed on a wide range of contracts varying from nearly full-time to very few hours a week.

The Monitoring Advisory Group established an agreed criteria for reporting on academic grades with the Staff Office based on the report Academic Titles in Trinity College Dublin (Working Group on Academic Titles) - this criteria has been implemented in the equality reports and WiSER database.

The student statistics have been supplied by the HEA, TAP, the Mature Students Officer, the Senior Lecturer's Area, the Disability Service and the Inclusive Curriculum Project.

## Acknowledgements
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## 2. Staff

### 2.1 Overall staff figures by gender

The overall College staff population, as of the report run January 2011 is 3689 with women making up 54\% of all employees and men 46\%. This includes full-time, part-time, permanent, contract, temporary and casual staff in all areas (academic, administrative and other support areas), with the only exception of associate staff.

Table 2.1 Overall staff

| Table 2.1 Overall staff figures |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All staff | Male | $\%$ | Female | $\%$ | Total |

Report run Jan 2011
Based on contract summary report

### 2.2 Overall staff figures by age

The age profile of staff is detailed below.

Table 2.2 Staff Age Profile

| Age range | Male | Female | Total | \% of all <br> staff |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9}$ | 140 | 194 | $\mathbf{3 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ | 485 | 624 | $\mathbf{1 1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | 379 | 441 | $\mathbf{8 2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9}$ | 298 | 332 | 630 | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ plus | 183 | 148 | 331 | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| no birth date entered | 216 | 249 | 465 | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ |
| Total | 1701 | 1988 | $\mathbf{3 6 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Report run Jan 2011 includes associate and casual
staff

### 2.3 Decision-making in College

The following tables outline the participation of women and men in College senior positions and decision-making bodies.

The College management and administrative structure is based on the principle of collegiality. The ownership of the College is vested in the Provost, Fellows and Foundation Scholars, who together with the members of the Board form the 'body corporate' of the institution. The Board is the governing body and the Council superintends the University's academic business. There is also an extensive Committee and sub-committee structure in College. The Executive Officers group develops strategic planning for the Board's consideration.

The 3 Faculty academic structure comprises 24 Schools.

## 2.3a Senior Positions

This table indicates the gender distribution of men and women in senior positions such as Annual or Statutory officers *, Senior Administrative positions**, and Honorary positions***. Annual or Statutory officers are appointed by Board each year on the nomination of the Provost, and work closely with Senior Administrative Officers in the development of policy and management of the College. Annual Officers normally hold office for 3 years.

The Chancellor acts as head of the University on ceremonial occasions, is elected by the Senate and is also the primary Visitor of the College.

Table 2.3a Gender and senior positions in College

| Senior positions in College | F | F \% | M | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Honorary Positions | 2 | $25 \%$ | 6 | $75 \%$ | 8 |
| Annual/Statutory Officers | 3 | $20 \%$ | 12 | $80 \%$ | 15 |
| Senior Administration | 5 | $31 \%$ | 11 | $69 \%$ | 16 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $26 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $74 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 9}$ |

Jan-11


## Key:

* Annual/ Statutory officers: Vice-Provost/CAO, Bursar, Senior Lecturer, Registrar, Senior and Junior Deans, Senior and Junior Proctors, Senior Tutor, Dean of Graduate Studies, Dean of Research, Dean of Students, 3 Faculty Deans. ** Senior Administrative positions: Chief Operating Officer, Secretary, Staff Secretary, Librarian, Treasurer, Academic Secretary, Director of Buildings, Director of ISS, Director of Accommodation and Catering, Director of Careers Advisory Service, Director of College Health Service, Director of College Disability Service, Director of Student Counselling, Associate Director of Trinity Research, Director of International Affairs and the Director of Sport.
*** Honorary Positions: Chancellor, Pro-Chancellors, Visitors to the College.


## 2.3b Board and Council

## Board

The Board of Trinity College is the governing body, responsible for managing the affairs of the College; and is the body which ultimately approves all College policies and procedures. The Board has 30 members including elected members, ex-officio members, student members and in attendance members.

Table 2.3b1

| BOARD 2010-2011 | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BD elected member | 4 |  | 12 |  | 16 |
| BD student members | 3 |  | 1 |  | 4 |
| BD ex-officio member | 1 |  | 4 |  | 5 |
| BD appointed | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 |
| BD in attendance | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | $60 \%$ | 30 |
| Source Calendar 2010-11 and Staff Office |  |  |  |  |  |

## Council

The University Council superintends and regulates the academic business of the University (including course and degree structure), and is the body which makes nominations for all academic appointments. Its decisions and nominations are forwarded to Board for confirmation. The University Council has a total of 38 members (2010-2011); 6 of these are student representatives, 2 are student observers.

Table 2.3b2 Council 2010-2011

| Council 2009-2010 | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Council ex-officio member | 3 |  | 4 |  | 7 |
| Council representatives (1 vacant) | 4 |  | 13 |  | 17 |
| Council in attendance | 4 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| Co-opted members (1 vacant) | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Student representatives | 5 |  | 1 |  | 6 |
| Student observers (in attendance) | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ |

Source: Secretary's Office

## Executive Officers Group

The Executive Officers Group reflects the new College management and Faculty design and is comprised of the Provost (m), 3 Faculty Deans (m), Dean of Research (m), COO (f), CAO (m), Treasurer (m), Secretary (f), Staff Secretary (m) and the Vice-Provost for Medical Affairs/ Head of School of Medicine (m).

## 2.3c Academic Decision-making

Table 2.3 charts the gender proportions for Heads of School, Fellows and Deans in 2010-2011. There are 6 female Heads of School (25\%) in 201011, an increase on 2008 (3). The proportion of female Fellows is remains
stable at $21 \%$ ( $20 \%$ in 2008). The number of women Faculty Deans is unchanged since the 2006-2007 report.

Table 2.3c Senior Academic comparative

Table 2.3c Senior Academic Comparative

| Senior Academic Comparative | Female | F\% | Male | M $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Heads of School | 6 | $25 \%$ | 18 | $75 \%$ | 24 |
| Fellows | 55 | $21 \%$ | 206 | $79 \%$ | 261 |
| Deans | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3 | $100 \%$ | 3 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{7 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 8}$ |



### 2.4 Staff distribution by grade

Table 2.4 summarises the distribution of staff according to the type of function staff belong to. This graph provides us with an overall picture of the gender distribution of staff in different areas of activity, be it academic, research, administrative or Library, secretarial, technical or other support staff. While the overall proportion of staff is quite even between men and women, there are significant differences as we can see in the table below.

The following areas are examined in more detail in the coming sections: academic grades, research grades, administrative and Library.

Table 2.4. (1) Staff Overview by type of employment

| Staff Grade Summary Graph | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SUPPORT STAFF (2) Buildings and Grounds and <br> Security | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 8}$ |
| TECHNICAL and GENERAL | $\mathbf{7 3}$ | $35 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 3 8}$ | $65 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 1 1}$ |
| ACADEMIC | 352 | $38 \%$ | 574 | $62 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 2 6}$ |
| RESEARCH staff | 333 | $51 \%$ | 320 | $49 \%$ | $\mathbf{6 5 3}$ |
| ADMINISTRATIVE and LIBRARY | $\mathbf{3 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 4}$ |
| SUPPORT STAFF (1) Catering, Nursery, | $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 9}$ |


| Housekeeping, Shop, Stores |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SECRETARIAL/EO | $\mathbf{3 7 7}$ | $95 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $5 \%$ |
| Other | 5 | $29 \%$ | 12 | $71 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 7 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 2 7 5}$ |  |  |  |  |

Report run J anuary 2011

## College employment distribution by area



Graph 2.4.2 (2) Staff grades distribution summary by gender

## Staff Grades Distribution Summary



### 2.4.A Academic Grades

The table below details the number of women and men in each academic grade, medical and non-medical (J anuary 2011). The Monitoring Advisory Group established an agreed criteria for reporting on academic grades with the Staff Office based on the report Academic Titles in Trinity College Dublin (Working Group on Academic Titles).

Although women make-up 38\% of all academic staff, the underrepresentation of women in senior grades has been documented in
international research and in previous College reports. Currently the proportion of Professors (Chairs) is 14\% (no change since 2009-2010). The Equality Officer has prepared a more detailed report on this issue for the Provost (Gender and Promotions Report, 2009) as well as a report regarding progression above the Merit Bar to the Vice Provost/CAO (2010), see section 2.8.

Table 2.4.a (1) Academic Grades

| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PROFESSOR | 13 | 14 | 81 | 86 | 94 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 24 | 30 | 56 | 70 | 80 |
| SENIOR LECTURER | 58 | 35 | 106 | 65 | 164 |
| LECTURER ABOVE BAR | 83 | 37 | 142 | 63 | 225 |
| LECTURER BELOW BAR | 119 | 59 | 83 | 41 | 202 |
| PART TIME LECTURER | 34 | 33 | 71 | 67 | 105 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 0}$ |

Report run January 2011


Table 2.4.a (2) Medical academic staff by grade

| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT | 0 | 0 | 7 | 100 | 7 |
| SENIOR LECTURER CONSULTANT | 1 | 17 | 5 | 83 | 6 |
| LECTURER REGISTRAR | 2 | 40 | 3 | 60 | 5 |
| SENIOR REGISTRAR | 2 | 40 | 3 | 60 | 5 |
| SPECIALIST REGISTRAR | 5 | 63 | 3 | 38 | 8 |
| P/T LECTURER MEDICAL | 0 | 0 | 6 | 100 | 6 |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT 1998 TYPE <br> A | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT 1998 TYPE <br> B | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 3 |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT NEW ENTR <br> TYPE A | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| ASSOC PROF CONSULTANT 1998 TYPE <br> A | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 |
| ASSOC PROF CONSULTANT 1998 TYPE | 0 | 0 | 1 | 100 | 1 |


| B |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SNR LECT CONSULTANT 1998 TYPE B | 4 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| SNR LECT CONSULTANT NEW ENTR <br> TYPE A | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| SNR LECT CONSULTANT NEW ENTR <br> TYPE B | 2 | 40 | 3 | 60 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 6}$ |

Medical academic grades have been included reflecting medical staff employed on a variety of consultant grades.

Comparative academic grades 2007-2011 -NEW
Table 2.4. a (3) Academic grades 2007-2011


Source: Annual Equality Monitoring Reports: 2006/2007, 2008/2009, 2009/2010, 2010/2011. Table 2.4.a (3) indicates little variation in the proportion of women in different academic grades since 2006, for example the proportion of women Professors has remained in the 14\%-12\% range.

### 2.4. B Academic Grades by Faculty - NEW

The following tables provide a breakdown of staff academic grades by Faculty.

## 2.4.b 1 Faculty of Health Sciences

| Grade <br> Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 3 | $25 \%$ | 9 | $75 \%$ | 12 |
| Associate <br> Professor | 8 | $73 \%$ | 3 | $27 \%$ | 11 |
| Senior Lecturer | 18 | $58 \%$ | 13 | $42 \%$ | 31 |
| Lecturer above <br> Bar | 35 | $58 \%$ | 25 | $42 \%$ | 60 |
| Lecturer below <br> Bar | 48 | $67 \%$ | 24 | $33 \%$ | 72 |
| Lecturer part-time | 2 | $25 \%$ | 6 | $75 \%$ | 8 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 4}$ |

Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2011.


## 2.4.b 2 Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science

| Grade <br> Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 4 | $9 \%$ | 41 | $91 \%$ | 45 |
| Associate <br> Professor | 9 | $23 \%$ | 31 | $78 \%$ | 40 |
| Senior Lecturer | 13 | $19 \%$ | 55 | $81 \%$ | 68 |
| Lecturer above <br> Bar | 11 | $14 \%$ | 66 | $86 \%$ | 77 |
| Lecturer below <br> Bar | 14 | $38 \%$ | 23 | $62 \%$ | 37 |
| Lecturer part-time | 7 | $20 \%$ | 28 | $80 \%$ | 35 |
| TOTAL | 58 | $19 \%$ | 244 | $\mathbf{8 1 \%}$ | 302 |

Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2011.


## 2.4.b 3 Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

| Grade <br> Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 6 | $18 \%$ | 28 | $82 \%$ | 34 |
| Associate <br> Professor | 7 | $24 \%$ | 22 | $76 \%$ | 29 |
| Senior Lecturer | 27 | $43 \%$ | 36 | $57 \%$ | 63 |
| Lecturer above <br> Bar | 36 | $43 \%$ | 48 | $57 \%$ | 84 |
| Lecturer below <br> Bar | 52 | $58 \%$ | 37 | $42 \%$ | 89 |
| Lecturer part-time | 19 | $44 \%$ | 24 | $56 \%$ | 43 |
| TOTAL | 147 | $43 \%$ | 195 | $57 \%$ | 342 |

Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2011.


### 2.4.C UK and Ireland comparative data

Gender disaggregated data is currently not generally available to compare Trinity's performance with that of other Irish universities.
The available data from the HESA in UK is outlined in Table 2.4C. The HESA has indicated the percentage of female professorial staff in their 2009-2010 report is 19\%, with women making up 44\% of all academic staff. The EU Roadmap for Equality has set a 25\% female target for Professorial and senior scientific positions.

Table 2.4C

| Academic staff by Gender and Professor category <br> (National UK university average 2009/2010) HESA |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $\%$ F | $\%$ M |
| Professor | 19 | 81 |
| Lecturer (all not Professor) | 47 | 53 |
| Overall academic staff | 44 | 56 |

Source HESA online statistics 2009-2010.

### 2.4. D Fellows

Fellows of the College are members of academic staff who have been nominated, deemed to meet the criteria set out in the Statutes for this recognition, and are elected by Board. There are certain privileges attached with being a Fellow, and fellowship is held until retirement.

Table 2.4. d Fellows

| Fellows | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Junior and Senior Fellows | 51 | $23 \%$ | 170 | $77 \%$ | 221 |
| Honorary Fellows | 4 | $10 \%$ | 36 | $90 \%$ | 40 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 5}$ | $21 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 9} \%$ | $\mathbf{2 6 1}$ |

Data from 2010-2011 Calendar and Staff Office.

### 2.4.D Administrative

The overall breakdown of administrative, library and executive staff is provided in table 2.4.D (1).

Table 2.4.D (1) Administrative and Library

| Administrative and library | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Admin total | 262 | $62 \%$ | 164 | $38 \%$ | 426 |
| Library total | 97 | $66 \%$ | 51 | $34 \%$ | 148 |
| TOTAL | 359 | $63 \%$ | 215 | $37 \%$ | 574 |

The distribution of staff through different administrative grades, from most junior (Admin 3) to most senior (Senior Admin 1) is reflected in table 2.4.D (2)

Table 2.4.D (2) Administrative Grades

| Administrative Grades | Female | F | Male | $\%$ M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ADMIN 3 | 53 | 61 | 34 | 39 | 87 |
| ADMIN 2 | 87 | 68 | 41 | 32 | 128 |
| ADMIN 1 | 102 | 64 | 58 | 36 | 160 |
| SENIOR ADMIN 3 | 16 | 46 | 19 | 54 | 35 |
| SENIOR ADMIN 2 | 1 | 17 | 5 | 83 | 6 |
| SENIOR ADMIN 1 | 3 | 30 | 7 | 70 | 10 |
| Total: | $\mathbf{2 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 6}$ |

Report run January 2011



The graph provides a similar outline to that included in the 2006-2007 and later reports, with the step between Admin 1 and Senior Admin 3 proving to be the inflexion point between grades that are predominantly female and senior grades which are predominantly male.

### 2.4.E Other Support Staff

Under Support Staff 1 we have grouped Catering, Housekeeping, Shop and Nursery staff, which are all areas employing mainly female staff. Staff distribution reflects classical occupational segregation.

Table 2.4.E 1 Support staff 1

| Support Staff 1 (Nursery, Catering, <br> Housekeping, Shop, Stores) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female | \%F | Male | $\% M$ | Total |
| Nursery | 19 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 19 |
| Catering | 38 | $67 \%$ | 19 | $33 \%$ | 57 |
| Housekeeping | 175 | $88 \%$ | 25 | $13 \%$ | 200 |
| Shop | 0 | $0 \%$ | 3 | $100 \%$ | 3 |
| Total | 232 | $83 \%$ | 47 | $17 \%$ | 279 |

Report run January 2011.
Under Support Staff 2 we have grouped Buildings Office staff, Grounds staff and Security staff. Figures include weekly and monthly paid staff.

Table 2.4.E 2 Support Staff 2

| Support Staff 2 (Buildings and Grounds, Security, Stores) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female | \%F | Male | $\%$ M | Total |
| Buildings and Grounds | 1 | $1 \%$ | 75 | $99 \%$ | 76 |
| Security and Guards | 28 | $21 \%$ | 105 | $79 \%$ | 133 |
| Stores | 1 | $11 \%$ | 8 | $89 \%$ | 9 |
| Total | 30 | $14 \%$ | 188 | $86 \%$ | 218 |

Report run January 2011.

### 2.4.F Library

This table provides data on the distribution of Library staff throughout the different employment grades (data from J anuary 2011). Library staff is predominantly female (66\%).

Table 2.4.f (1) Library overview

| LIBRARY STAFF | Female | \% | Male | \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Library total | 97 | 66 | 51 | 34 | 148 |

Table 2.4.f (2) Library Grades

| Grade Description | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| LIBRARY KEEPER | 2 | 40 | 3 | 60 | 5 |
| SUB LIBRARIAN | 5 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN 1 | 13 | 59 | 9 | 41 | 22 |
| ASSISTANT LIBRARIAN 2 | 13 | 65 | 7 | 35 | 20 |
| HIGHER LIBRARY ASSISTANT (EXEC 1) | 7 | 58 | 5 | 42 | 12 |
| HIGHER LIBRARY ASSISTANT (EXEC 2) | 13 | 72 | 5 | 28 | 18 |
| HIGHER LIBRARY ASSISTANT (EXEC 3) | 28 | 67 | 14 | 33 | 42 |
| LIBRARY ASSISTANT | 12 | 71 | 5 | 29 | 17 |
| LIBRARY ASSISTANT (50\%) | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| LIBRARY ASSISTANT | 3 | 50 | 3 | 50 | 6 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{9 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | $\mathbf{3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 8}$ |

Report run Jan 2011


### 2.4.G Research

Table 2.4.g (1) shows the profile of College research staff and students reflecting an approximate gender balance. Research staff make-up a considerable part of the College community (there are close to 700 research staff in different categories).

Graph 2.4.g (2) shows research staff - Research Fellows and Research Assistants- by Faculty.

Table 2.4.g. (1) Research staff and students

| Research Staff/Students | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| RESEARCH FELLOW | 193 | 45 | 240 | 55 | 433 |
| RESEARCH ASSISTANT | 137 | 64 | 78 | 36 | 215 |
| RESEARCH STUDENT | 458 | 44 | 585 | 56 | 1043 |
| RESEARCH ASSISTANT | 3 | 60 | 2 | 40 | 5 |
| Total | $\mathbf{7 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 6}$ |



Table 2.4.g. (2) Total Research Staff by Faculty (Research Fellows and Assistants)

| Faculty | Male | Female | Total | \%Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No Faculty associated () | 43 | 45 | 88 | $51 \%$ |
| ARTS, HUMANITIES \& SOCIAL SCIENCE <br> (F01) | 23 | 44 | 67 | $66 \%$ |
| ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS \& SCIENCE <br> (F02) | 192 | 142 | 334 | $43 \%$ |
| HEALTH SCIENCES (F03) | 62 | 103 | 165 | $62 \%$ |
| Report Total: | 320 | 334 | 654 | $51 \%$ |



### 2.5 Academic Staff by School

The following tables indicate the gender distribution of academic staff by Faculty and School, with considerable variations. In FAHSS School proportions range from 27\% female academics in the School of Social Science and Philosophy, to 64\% female staff in the School of Social Work and Social Policy (with a total of $44 \%$ female across the faculty); in FEMS the proportions of female academic staff are consistently low in a range from $4 \%$ to $26 \%$ (with a total $19 \%$ of female academic staff across the faculty), while in the Faculty of Health Sciences the composition of the School of Nursing and Midwifery is highly feminized at 73\% (faculty total 55\% female).

Data is from January 2011 and includes all academic staff - on full time, part time, permanent, indefinite and temporary contracts (the only category excluded is casual and associate staff). Please note the statistics reflect individual staff members rather than Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) as may be used in other reports.

### 2.5.1 Faculty of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences:

Table 2.5.1

| Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences | Female | \%F | Male | \%M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| School of Social Science and Philosophy | 14 | 27 | 38 | 73 | 52 |
| School of Business | 8 | 32 | 17 | 68 | 25 |
| School of Education | 5 | 28 | 13 | 72 | 18 |
| School of Psychology | 12 | 41 | 17 | 59 | 29 |
| School of Drama, Film \& Music | 8 | 38 | 13 | 62 | 21 |
| School of English | 11 | 44 | 14 | 56 | 25 |
| School of Histories \& Humanities | 16 | 44 | 20 | 56 | 36 |
| School of Lang, Lit. \& Cultural Studies | 32 | 57 | 24 | 43 | 56 |
| School of Law | 15 | 44 | 19 | 56 | 34 |
| School of Religions Theology \& Ecumenics | 10 | 50 | 10 | 50 | 20 |
| School of Social Work and Social Policy | 14 | 64 | 8 | 36 | 22 |
| School of Linguistic Speech \& Comm Sci | 17 | 63 | 10 | 37 | 27 |


| Total academic staff: | 162 | 44 | 203 | 56 | 365 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Report run J anuary 2011


### 2.5.2 Faculty of Engineering Mathematics and Science:

Table 2.5.2

| Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science | Female | $\%$ F | Male | $\%$ M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| School of Mathematics | 1 | 4 | 23 | 96 | 24 |
| School of Physics | 3 | 10 | 26 | 90 | 29 |
| School of Genetics \& Microbiology | 3 | 12 | 22 | 88 | 25 |
| School of Biochemistry \& Immunology | 4 | 21 | 15 | 79 | 19 |
| School of Engineering | 13 | 22 | 47 | 78 | 60 |
| School of Natural Sciences | 8 | 21 | 30 | 79 | 38 |
| School of Computer Science \& Statistics | 20 | 23 | 68 | 77 | 88 |
| School of Chemistry | 6 | 26 | 17 | 74 | 23 |
| total faculty | $\mathbf{5 8}$ | $19 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ | $81 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 0 6}$ |

Report run J anuary 2011


### 2.5.3 Faculty of Health Sciences

Table 2.5.3

| Faculty of Health Sciences | F | \%F | M | \%M | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| School of Pharmacy \& Pharma. Sciences | 11 | 48 | 12 | 52 | 23 |
| School of Medicine | 85 | 50 | 86 | 50 | 171 |
| School of Nursing \& Midwifery | 45 | 73 | 17 | 27 | 63 |
| School of Dental Sciences | 1 | 33 | 2 | 67 | 3 |
| total faculty | $\mathbf{1 4 2}$ | 55 | $\mathbf{1 1 7}$ | 45 | $\mathbf{2 6 0}$ |

Report run J anuary 2011


### 2.6 WiSER statistics

The Centre for Women in Science and Engineering (WiSER) was established in 2006 with an aim of retaining and advancing women working in sciences, engineering and technology (SET) disciplines where currently they are significantly under-represented. Statistics for 20102011 are not available.

### 2.7 Staff by type of contract

The following tables and graphs detail the distribution of staff in relation to the type of contract and provide a more detailed breakdown of part-time staff.
The types of contract are: permanent, indefinite duration, contract (fixedterm), temporary, casual, job-share and buy-back (for employees who are retired).

Table 2.7a Staff distribution by type of contract

| Contract Distribution - Gender <br> Count | F | \% | M | \% | T |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Buy Back | 2 | 25 | 6 | 75 | 8 |
| Permanent Fulltime | 636 | 43 | 840 | 57 | 1476 |
| Permanent Part-time | 318 | 88 | 43 | 12 | 361 |
| Indefinite Contract Fulltime | 199 | 57 | 153 | 43 | 352 |
| Indefinite Contract Part-time | 96 | 67 | 48 | 33 | 144 |
| Contract Fulltime | 357 | 54 | 309 | 46 | 666 |
| Contract Part-time | 91 | 61 | 57 | 39 | 148 |
| Temporary Full-time | 73 | 57 | 54 | 43 | 127 |
| Temporary Part-time | 57 | 58 | 41 | 42 | 98 |
| Casual | 159 | 51 | 150 | 49 | 309 |
| Default | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 9 1}$ |

Report run J anuary 2011


## 2.7 b Part-time staff

Table 2.7 b analyses the profile of part time staff across different contract types. In most part-time categories women outnumber men, particularly in the case of permanent part-time staff.

Annual Equality Monitoring Report 2010-11

Table 2.7b Part-Time Contract Distribution

| Employee Status | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Contract Part-time | 91 | 61 | 57 | 39 | 148 |
| Indefinite Contract Part-time | 96 | 67 | 48 | 33 | 144 |
| Permanent Part-time | 318 | 88 | 43 | 12 | 361 |
| Temporary Part-time | 57 | 58 | 41 | 42 | 98 |
| Total | 562 | $75 \%$ | 189 | $25 \%$ | 751 |

Report run J anuary 2011
Overall proportion of Part-time staff: $75 \%$ female, $25 \%$ male.

### 2.8 Academic Promotions and the Merit Bar

Due to the Employment Control Framework embargo on recruitment and promotion there were no Senior Promotions in 2010.

The Junior Academic Progression Committee (JAPC) conducts the review of Lecturers at, or approaching, the Merit Bar on the Lecturer scale annually. Advancement beyond the Merit Bar is not regarded as "promotion", since it is advancement along the same Lecturer grade pay scale (the transition beyond the Merit Bar occurs between the 12th and the 13th point of the scale). Lecturers eligible for review in any year are contacted in writing by the Secretary to the JAPC, copied to Head of Discipline and Head of School, providing information on the application process. Candidates and Heads are referred to the Review Procedures for Academic Staff which are available on the Staff Office website and which provide detailed guidance on the requirements, criteria and application procedure for review at the Merit Bar, including definitions of: 'research', 'teaching', 'service to College' and 'Service to discipline or Community'.

## Merit Bar Report 2009

A gender analysis of the Merit Bar was carried out in 2009 at the request of the Vice Provost, in the context of previous reports investigating the barriers to women's career progression and women's under-representation in senior academic grades. This analysis identified the Merit Bar as the inflexion point in women's career progression in College.

The analysis of Merit bar data for the period 2006-2009 revealed there was no appreciable gender difference in the success rates of applications ( $94 \%$ ), but found that eligible women Lecturers were applying for review in a lower proportion to their male counterparts. In 2009 male lecturers eligible for review were twice as likely to apply for review than their female counterparts (55\% application rate by comparison to 27\%), resulting in 22 male Lecturers passing the Bar by comparison to 11 female Lectures. This lower rate of application contributes to the apparent gender imbalance in Lecturer staff above the Bar, which is more pointed in the Faculty of Health Sciences and the Faculty of Engineering Maths and Science than in the Faculty of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences. The report found great variations in the application rate by Faculty, with the largest cohort of staff deferring review occurring in the Faculty of Health Sciences (School of Nursing and Midwifery and School of Medicine); this cohort is predominantly female. The application rate of female academics in the Faculty of Health Sciences is the lowest across College at only 18\% of eligible staff.

Reasons for deferring review
A further qualitative report was completed, including a survey and followon interviews with staff who had elected not to present for review (37 staff), examining the reasons for this deferral.

The key reason reported for not applying for review at the Bar was not being sufficiently research active or not being registered for a PhD. The report indicated a widespread perception amongst respondents that teaching was not valued as much as research, and that the clinical element of the discipline was insufficiently understood. Several respondents cited difficulty getting on the research ladder and accessing the research supports in place in their School, particularly after maternity leave. A majority of respondents highlighted the lack of career guidance and discussion with their Head of Discipline/School regarding progression above the Merit bar. Respondents from some disciplines highlighted the newcomer status of their disciplines and the consequent lack of academic tradition and scarcity of senior academic role models as determining factors; other respondents reported high teaching and administrative loads.

The Gender analysis of the Merit Bar report was considered by three College Committees: the J unior Academic Progression Committee, the HR Committee and the Equality Committee; a proposal from the HR and Equality Committee has been submitted to Board for consideration on foot of this report.

## Merit Bar 2009-2010 statistics

Table 2.8.1 outlines the numbers of eligible staff for review by category, the numbers of staff who applied, application and success rates. 20092010 figures indicate a continuation of gender imbalance in applications for advancement beyond the Merit Bar.
Tables 2.8.2, 3 and 4 analyse the Merit Bar data by Faculty. In 2010 the number of eligible women Lecturers applying for review was lower than their male counterparts across Faculties - overall the female application rate was $26 \%$ by comparison to $58 \%$.

Table 2.8.1 Merit Bar 2009-2010 by category

| Merit Bar 2009/10 | M | F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Eligible in 2009/10 |  |  |
| Lecturers of first eligibility | 15 | 9 |
| Lecturers held at Merit Bar | 8 | 6 |
| Lecturers declined review on one or more <br> occasions | 10 | 27 |
| TOTAL ELIGIBLE | 33 | 42 |
|  |  |  |
| Applied in 2009/10 | 19 | 12 |
| Applied \% of eligible (m or f) | $58 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Successful | 18 | 10 |
| Success rate \% (of applied) | $55 \%$ | $83 \%$ |
| \% (of eligible) | $24 \%$ |  |
| Source Secre | $24 \%$ |  |

Source: Secretary to the JAP Committee.
Table 2.8.2 Merit Bar 2009-2010 Eligible by Faculty
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| Merit Bar 2010 Eligible by Faculty |  |  |  |  | \% all <br> eligible |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Arts, Humanities \& Social Sciences | 12 | 9 | 21 | $43 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Engineering, Mathematics \& Science | 11 | 7 | 18 | $39 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Health Sciences | 10 | 26 | 36 | $72 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Table 2.8.3 Merit Bar 2009-2010 Applied by Faculty

| Merit Bar 2010 Applications by Faculty | m | f | T | F <br> applic rate | M applic rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arts, Humanities \& Social Sciences | 10 | 3 | 13 | 33\% | 83\% |
| Engineering, Mathematics \& Science | 5 | 2 | 7 | 29\% | 45\% |
| Health Sciences | 4 | 6 | 10 | 23\% | 40\% |
| Total | 19 | 11 | 30 | 26\% | 58\% |

Table 2.8.4 Merit Bar 2009-2010 Successful by Faculty

| Merit Bar 2010 Successful | M | F | T | \% F | Succ rate F | Succ <br> rate <br> M | F <br> Prog <br> rate | M Prog rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 18 | 10 | 28 | 36\% | 91\% | 95\% | 24\% | 55\% |

### 2.9 Disability - 3 \% Employment Target

As a public sector body the College is required to reach a minimum target for at least 3\% of its staff to be people with disabilities, and to report annually on the achievement of the target.

The return report to the Department of Education and Science Monitoring Committee for 2010 was not available at the time of preparing this report and is due to be submitted in May 2011.

The return for 2009 indicated that 95 staff had declared a disability as per the Disability Act definition, representing 7.5\% of all respondents to the survey or $2.4 \%$ of all staff.

The return rate for staff completing the census form was 32.3\%; the College continues to work to encourage disclosure and participation in the disability census.

### 2.10 Recruitment monitoring

Recruitment equality monitoring data has been collected anonymously since J anuary 2008. Employment applicants are requested to fill in an anonymous online monitoring form that collects data on all of the nine equality grounds. This monitoring system was developed by the Equality Officer with the assistance of IS Services and the Staff Office at the request of the Equality Committee. The recruitment monitoring module is located on the equality website and the database and statistical reports are managed by the Equality Officer. The Staff Office is currently liaising with the Equality Officer regarding the integration of equality monitoring in the e-recruitment system.

Currently an employment control framework is in place which greatly affects the recruitment activity and data for 2009-10. The overall number of applicants has decreased in 2009-2010 to 2,399 from 5,922 in 2007-2008. In the period 1 October 2009 to 30 September 2010567 applicants had completed the monitoring form, this represents a lower response rate of $24 \%$ of the overall applicants to employment in that period(37\% response rate in 0809). It should also be noted in this respect that not all applications in College are processed through the Recruitment Office, in particular research staff are generally recruited by the Principal Investigator directly - and the figures below may not represent the full picture regarding research staff.

The profile of applicants shown in table 2.10.2 is very international; Irish applicants now make up just over $1 / 3$ of respondents (48\% in 2008-2009), while the proportion of Non-EU applicant respondents is $30.5 \%$.

Table 2.10.1 1 Oct 2009-30 Sep 2010

| Total number of vacancies | $\mathbf{1 2 3}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total number of applications received (SO Recruitment data) | $\mathbf{2 , 3 9 9}$ |
| Total number of applicants who completed the recruitment <br> monitoring form | $\mathbf{5 6 7}$ |
| Response rate | $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ |

Table 2.10.2

| Irish/EU/Non-EU | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| EU | 30 | 170 |
| Irish | 37.6 | 213 |
| No Response | 1.9 | 11 |
| Non-EU | 30.5 | 173 |
| Total: |  | 567 |



Table 2.10.3 Religion

| Religion | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Christian | 53.8 | 305 |
| Hindu | 6.3 | 36 |
| Jewish | 0.5 | 3 |
| Muslim | 5.6 | 32 |
| No Response | 2.5 | 14 |
| None | 27.2 | 154 |
| Other(Blank) | 0.7 | 4 |
| Other(User Defined) | 3.4 | 19 |
| Total: |  | 567 |



Table 2.10.4 Age

| Age Bracket | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.5 | 3 |
| $20-29$ | 29.8 | 169 |
| $30-39$ | 43.9 | 249 |
| $40-49$ | 16.6 | 94 |
| $50-59$ | 6.7 | 38 |
| $60+$ | 0.5 | 3 |
| No Response | 1.9 | 11 |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.5 Family Status

| Family Status | \% | Count |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Caring for children | 22.8 | 129 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Caring for other family members | 6.5 | 37 |
| No Response | 1.8 | 10 |
| No caring responsibilities | 67.9 | 385 |
| Other(Blank) | 0.2 | 1 |
| Other(User Defined) | 0.9 | 5 |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.6 Civil Status

| Marital Status | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Divorced | 2.6 | 15 |
| Living with Partner | 11.8 | 67 |
| Married | 37.2 | 211 |
| No Response | 0.9 | 5 |
| Other(User Defined) | 0.5 | 3 |
| Separated | 1.8 | 10 |
| Single | 45.1 | 256 |
| Widowed | $*$ | $*$ |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.7

| Sexual Orientation | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bisexual |  | 15 |
| Gay/Lesbian | 2.6 | 23 |
| Heterosexual | 90.1 | 511 |
| No Response | 4.1 | 13 |
| Other(Blank) | 2.3 | 1 |
| Other(User Defined) | 0.2 | 4 |
|  | * | * |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.8 Disability

| Disability | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No | 96.8 | 549 |
| Yes | 2.1 | 12 |
| No Response | 1.1 | 6 |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.9

| Gender: | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Female | 55.9 | 317 |
| Male | 42.9 | 243 |
| No Response | 1.2 | 7 |
| Total: |  | 567 |

Table 2.10.10 Applicants by Area and Gender


## 3. Students

## Introduction

An outline of the general student body in 2009-2010 is provided (gender, course, nationality and age) as well as more detailed information in relation to non-traditional student categories. The changing gender profile of the student population has been noted for some time, with female students making up the majority of UG and PG students, and $60.5 \%$ of the total student population, although proportions vary greatly across disciplines. Trinity has a long tradition as an international institution and this is reflected in the student nationality profile. This report includes a breakdown by Faculty, School and gender.

The College Access and Equality Policy and the College's Access Strategy outline the College's commitment to promoting greater access for students from non-traditional backgrounds. In particular in the College's Strategic Plan 2009-2014 the College commits itself to achieving a $22 \%$ intake of students from non-traditional backgrounds in UG courses. The College provides students from non-traditional backgrounds with supports to avail of a third-level education and equality of opportunity, including a number of programmes under the Trinity Access Programmes, the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme and the Disability Service. The collaborative Inclusive Curriculum project ( TIC ) aims to resource and mainstream inclusive teaching and learning practices in College.

## Comparative sectoral data

The HEA publishes the report Key Facts and Figures (20092010), and, where available, comparable data on gender and nationality for the Irish university sector is included alongside the College statistics.

Data on student socio-economic background, ethnicity and disability of students entering higher education is available from the HEA based on a new entrants survey implemented since 2007. There are variable response rate amongst institutions to the survey, in TCD the response rate was $93 \%$. Over $90 \%$ of new entrants to the university and IT sector declare their ethnicity to be Irish, and the second largest group ( $3.2 \%$ ) is from other white backgrounds. The largest group of entrants come from the 'employer and manager' parent background, followed by 'skilled manual'. 6\% of all entrants declared a disability, the largest category being students with specific learning disabilities.

The UK Equality Challenge Unit has published the Equality in Higher Education Report 2010 which examines staff and student data in relation to gender, age, ethnicity and disability (2008-2009 cohort). $43.1 \%$ of the student population in the UK are male and 56.9\% female, with variations by subject. $17.8 \%$ of UK national students are from Black or Minority Ethnic background, and $7.5 \%$ of the student population declare a disability.

## Sources

The data included in this section has been provided by the Senior Lecturer's Area, TAP, the Mature Students Officer, the Disability Service, the Trinity Inclusive Curriculum project and the WiSER database. The date for student population data is 1 March 2010 unless otherwise stated.

### 3.1 Student Population

In total, there were 16,807 registered students in 2009/10 (16,215 in 2008/2009). In 2009/10, 60.5\% of the student population was female and $39.5 \%$ was male (in 2008/2009 61\% female). 11,472 students were registered on undergraduate programmes, and 5,335 (32\%), on postgraduate programmes.

### 3.1.1 Gender breakdown of student population 2009/10

Table 3.1.1 Student population by category and gender

| Category/gender | Total | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| UG Male | 4395 | $26.1 \%$ |
| UG Female | 7077 | $42.1 \%$ |
| PG Female | 3092 | $18.4 \%$ |
| PG Male | 2243 | $13.3 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 6 8 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |



Total student population (UG and PG): 60.5\% Female; 39.5\% Male. This compares to $57 \% \mathrm{~F}$ in the UK student body and $56.5 \%$ in Irish Universities' student body (source HEA).

### 3.1. 2 Students by category 2009/10

Percentage of students by category 2009/10


### 3.1.3 Faculty distribution of student population (2010-2011)

Table 3.1.3 a Gender breakdown by Faculty (UG)

| Faculty | Male | Female | Total | \%Female |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HEALTH SCIENCES | 663 | 2199 | 2862 | $77 \%$ |
| ARTS, HUMANITIES \& SOCIAL SCIENCE | 1648 | 2661 | 4309 | $62 \%$ |
| ENGINEERING, MATHEMATICS \& SCIENCE | 1643 | 1051 | 2694 | $39 \%$ |
| MULTI FACULTY | 685 | 1135 | 1820 | $62 \%$ |
| Total | 4639 | 7046 | 11685 | $60 \%$ |



Source WiSER database J anuary 2011
Table 3.1.3 b Gender breakdown by Faculty (PG)


Source WiSER database January 2011

### 3.2 Geographical and Age distribution of student population 2009/10

$77 \%$ of undergraduate and postgraduate students were from the Republic of Ireland, 11\% from other EU countries, 4\% from North and Central America, 5\% from other parts of the world and 2\% from Northern Ireland. There are students of 115 nationalities, making up over $20 \%$ of the student body. This compares to $16 \%$ of the UK student body (09-10) and 11\% of the Irish university
student body (2008-2009) (Sources Equality Challenge Unit and HEA). This report derives data on geographical distribution from student nationality.

Table 3.2.1 Geographical distribution of student population 2009-10

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students | \% Distribution |
| Republic of Ireland | 13,013 | $77 \%$ |
| Northern Ireland | 392 | $2 \%$ |
| Europe (EU) | 1,843 | $11 \%$ |
| North \& Central America | 648 | $4 \%$ |
| Other | 911 | $5 \%$ |
| TOTAL: | $\mathbf{1 6 , 8 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Graph 3.2.1 Geographical distribution of student population 2009-2010


The College age distribution data has been drawn from the statistics published by the HEA (2009-2010).
3.2.2 Age distribution of TCD student population (UG and PG) 2009-2010

| AGE | Total | \% of total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 17 and under | 115 | $0.8 \%$ |
| 18 | 1375 | $9.6 \%$ |
| 19 | 2351 | $16.3 \%$ |
| 20 | 2307 | $16.0 \%$ |
| 21 | 2085 | $14.5 \%$ |
| 22 | 1414 | $9.8 \%$ |
| 23 | 742 | $5.2 \%$ |
| 24 | 548 | $3.8 \%$ |
| $25-29$ | 1893 | $13.2 \%$ |
| 30 AND OVER | 1560 | $10.8 \%$ |
| Age Unknown* | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |



Source: HEA

### 3.3 Alternative Admissions and Access Initiatives

Alternative admissions and access applications to the university are categorised into three principal types: (a) students with a disability, (b) mature students applying for admission under the mature student dispensation scheme, and (c) socio-economically disadvantaged students. In addition to applying through the CAO, applicants in these three groups are invited to submit separate applications directly to the university.

College's Strategic Plan is committed to increasing the number of students from under-represented groups to undergraduate programmes. The Strategic Plan (2009-2014) makes a commitment to increase the number of places reserved on undergraduate courses for students from under-represented groups from 15\% to 22\% of CAO new entrants by 2013. In May 2009 the University Council approved the recommendations set out in the Access Plan 2009-2013.

## Non-traditional students overview

## Admissions 2010

In 2010, a total of 468 (427 in 2009) students from underrepresented groups registered on undergraduate degree programmes, representing 17\% of the CAO intake. 45\% of these are mature students. The College's target is for $22 \%$ of new entrants to be from under-represented groups by 2013. The National Access Plan for Equity of Access 2008-2013 establishes a target for non-standard entry routes to higher education to account for 30 percent of all entrants by 2013.

Student population 2010-2011
Table 3.3 a Non-traditional students (UG) 2010-2011

|  | Number | As \% of total <br> student UG <br> population* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Disability (UG only) | 686 | $5.8 \%$ |
| Access (TAP) | 639 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Mature registered* | 391 | $3.3 \%$ |


*This is the number of registered mature students, the total number of mature students calculated on age is 1038. Total UG student population March 2011, Student Records. Disability as per Disability Database $15 / 4 / 11$, TAP as advised by TAP 1/12/11 Mature as per MSO 09/2/11.

The data has been sourced from the Trinity Inclusive Curriculum project and Student Records and reflect total undergraduate student numbers. These figures are a minimum estimate, it is unknown how many students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds enter TCD outside of TAP or how many students choose not to disclose their disability. At present progression to postgraduate level for students who enter via access routes such as TAP or the Mature dispensation scheme is not tracked.

There is cross-over between the students within each cohort. There are students who belong to two or more of the relevant categories, and this leads to duplication. For example out of the students registered with the Disability Service there are 145 students who entered as mature students, via either the mature students' dispensation scheme or the CAO; 36 students registered with the Disability Service entered via a TAP Foundation course, of these 13 students entered via the TAP Mature students Foundation course (crossing over between all three access initiatives).

145 students registered with the Disability Service are mature students. Therefore:

- $13.97 \%$ of mature students are disabled
- $17.45 \%$ of disabled students are mature students

There are 36 students currently registered as both TAP and Disability Service Students.

Therefore:

- $5.63 \%$ of TAP students are disabled
- $4.33 \%$ of disabled students entered via TAP

Table 3.3.b Non-traditional students by Faculty 2010-2011

|  | Total | AHSS | EMS | Health <br> Sciences | Other/Cross <br> Faculty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 16747 | 6411 | 3470 | 3338 | 3528 |
| Disability | 831 | 482 | 168 | 164 | 17 |
| TAP | 639 | 298 | 77 | 140 | 124 |
| Mature - <br> Dispensation <br> Scheme | 391 | 243 | 54 | 70 | 24 |
| Mature - All | 1009 | 368 | 140 | 476 | 56 |

Source: TIC report. Total as per Student Records March 2011. Disability as per DIS 4/4/11, TAP as advised 1/12/10, Mature students as per MSO 9/2/11. Mature students figure includes 28 Certificate in Contemporary Living students.

Table 3.3.c outlines a summary of the completion and progression rates by access category (and overall College rate).

## 3.3.c Student outcomes - progression and completion

|  | TCD total | Disability | Level 8 TAP | Mature - <br> Dispensation <br> Scheme |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Completion Rate | $94 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $97.6 \%$ | $94 \%$ |
| Progression Rate | $90 \% * *$ | $79 \%$ | $90.7 \%$ | $84 \%$ |

Source: TIC report. Total TCD data as per Senior Lecturer report 09/10, Disability as calculated using information on DIS, December Dec 10, TAP as reported from TAP Database 1/12/10, Mature as per Mature Students' Office 09/02/11,

## Note on definitions:

Completion Rate - All level eight final year students who successfully passed their final year assessments in 09/10.
Progression Rate - All level eight students, excluding final year students, who successfully passed their assessments and progressed onto the next year in 09/10. Except for: ** Refers to JF who completed the year successfully and qualified for the SF year.

### 3.4 Socio-economically disadvantaged students - the Trinity Access Programmes

The Trinity Access Programmes (TAP) are a range of initiatives aimed at increasing the participation rate at third-level of young adult and mature students from under-represented socio-economic groups. In 2010157 students entered Trinity College via TAP entry routes increasing the total of TAP registered undergraduate students in Trinity College to 515.

Table 3.4.1 Total TAP Access students (UG)

|  | Number | As percentage <br> of total UG <br> student <br> population |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total student UG population | 11844 |  |
| No. of Students on TAP Course | 124 | $1.0 \%$ |
| No of students in College through TAP | 515 | $4.3 \%$ |
| Total Tap | $\mathbf{6 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 4 \%}$ |

Source TAP and Student Records, student population March 2011.

Figure 3.4.2 Entry Route breakdown of TAP Undergraduate Students 2010


The 2010 TAP undergraduate cohort comprised of 65.6\% females ( $\mathrm{n}=338$ ) and $34.4 \%$ males ( $\mathrm{n}=177$ ). $80.4 \%$ of these students were young adults $(\mathrm{n}=414)$ and $19.6 \%$ were mature students $(\mathrm{n}=101)$. The figure below details the faculty breakdown for TAP registered undergraduate students in 2010.

Figure 3.4.3 Faculty Breakdown of TAP UG students

| Arts, Humanities <br> and Social Sciences | Health Sciences | Engineering, Maths <br> and Science |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $57.9 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

## Post-entry support programme

TAP has developed a range of post-entry supports in response to student needs. These include tailored pre-university programmes, financial and personal support, extra tuition, a Writing Resource Centre, a Mathematics Help Room, the Studio (learning and IT resource centre), a laptop lending library, a supported accommodation scheme and end-of-term review workshops.

There are currently five admissions initiatives, all of which are partfunded by the Higher Education Authority (HEA) through the Strategic Initiatives Scheme. TAP also receives support from a number of individual and corporate donors.
The programmes are:

- School and Community Outreach Links (SCOL)
- The Higher Education Access Route (HEAR)
- Foundation Course for Higher Education - Mature Students
- Foundation Course for Higher Education - Young Adults
- TAPICDVEC Partnership University Access Courses

Further details are available in the Senior Lecturer's Annual Report.

### 3.5 College Disability Service - student figures

Trinity College established the College Disability Service to meet the requirements of students with a disability, and as a resource to the rest of the University. The brief of the Disability Service has now been expanded to include staff.

This service aims to provide prospective and current students in College with appropriate information relating to disability issues and to outline the relevant resources and services available in College.

Trinity has a supplementary application procedure in place for students from non-traditional learning backgrounds, which includes students with disabilities. This is known as DARE (Disability Access Route to Education). The Disability Access route to Education (DARE) is a third level admissions scheme for school leavers who have a disability or specific learning difficulty.

Applicants with a disability applying for full time undergraduate degree/diploma courses in Trinity College must apply via the Central Applications Office (CAO) indicating on the application form that they have a disability or specific learning difficulty. It should be noted that many applicants with a disability do not disclose this information on the CAO form, and consequently the number of registered new entrants with a disability tends to be greater than the numbers declared at registration ( 56 additional students had declared a disability by $15^{\text {th }}$ April 2011 bringing the total to 190 new entrants registered with the Service). The number of CAO applicants who declared a disability and accepted a place was 134.

- 818 students registered with the service
- 19\% increase in students registered from 2009-10 to 2010-11
- 190 first year students registered this year

Table 3.5.1 Faculty breakdown students with disabilities by type

| Faculty Breakdown (as per DIS <br> 15/04/11) | Total | FAHSS <br> and <br> TSM | \% of <br> total <br> within <br> category | FEMS | \% | F Health <br> Sciences | \% | Cross <br> Faculty | \% |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Medical | 120 | 63 | $52.5 \%$ | 20 | $16.7 \%$ | 36 | $30 \%$ | 1 | $.8 \%$ |
| Mental Health | 123 | 73 | $59.3 \%$ | 29 | $23.6 \%$ | 20 | $16.3 \%$ | 1 | $.8 \%$ |
| Physical | 60 | 41 | $68.3 \%$ | 12 | $20 \%$ | 6 | $10 \%$ | 1 | $1.7 \%$ |
| Sensory | 48 | 37 | $77.1 \%$ | 4 | $8.3 \%$ | 6 | 12.5 | 1 | $2.1 \%$ |
| SPLD* | 467 | 268 | $57.4 \%$ | 98 | $21 \%$ | 91 | $19.5 \%$ | 10 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Total students <br> with disability | $\mathbf{8 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 2}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 6 3}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{1 4}$ |  |

*specific learning difficulty
Table 3.5.2 Students registered with the Disability Service 2010-11

|  | Number <br> (including <br> NIID <br> students) | As <br> percentage of <br> total student <br> population* <br> UG, PG and <br> Cert |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No. of register students | 818 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Undergrads | 686 | $4.0 \%$ |
| Post grads | 87 | $0.5 \%$ |
| Cert/Dip | 45 | $0.3 \%$ |

Using April 2011 data

### 3.6 Mature students

In 2010, 941 mature applicants applied under the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme ( 681 applied in 2009) in addition there were 64 applications for Facilitated Entry, of whom 148 are now registered (14.75\%). Applicants under the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme must be over twenty-three years of age and are assessed on the basis of the complete academic profile of the applicant taking into account work and life experience.

Mature students are also admitted to the undergraduate degrees in nursing. Applicants to these courses are assessed externally by the Nursing Career Centre. 58 mature students registered on degree courses in Nursing and Midwifery in 2010 (68 in 2009).

Further details of students admitted under the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme and by the Nursing Career Centre together with an indication of the trends in mature student applications are available in the Senior Lecturer's Annual Report 2009-2010.

Note that many students who qualify as mature students (are over 23 at the time of entering an undergraduate degree) use the usual Leaving Cert points entry system and do not register with the Mature Student Office. In total there are 1009 mature students on the basis of age (these enter via the mature dispensation scheme, mature student nursing route, direct applications and CAO).

Table 3.6.1 Faculty Breakdown from those who entered through mature student dispensation scheme and mature nursing route

| Total | AHSS | Eng, Maths and <br> Science | Health <br> Sciences | Other/Cross <br> Faculty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 579 | 243 | 54 | 258 | 24 |
| $\%$ of mature students | $42 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $4 \%$ |

Source: Mature students/Student records March 2011.
Table 3.6.2 Total Mature students, registered and by age

| Total Mature Students registered 10-11 |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Number | As percentage of total <br> student UG population |
| UG student population | 11844 |  |
| No of Mature students entering <br> through dispensation scheme <br> and mature nursing route | 579 | $4.9 \%$ |
| All mature students (23+ when <br> starting UG degree) | 1009 | $8.5 \%$ |

Source: Mature students/Student records March 2011.

### 3.7 Inclusive Curriculum

The SIF II funded Trinity Inclusive Curriculum strategy (TIC) commenced in College in 2008. This strategy, developed in partnership between the Centre for Academic Practice and Student Learning (CAPSL), access initiatives and the academic community, runs from the Disability Service and aims to mainstream inclusive principles within the curricula of College.

The TIC project aims to enhance teaching, learning, and assessment procedures within Trinity College so as to enable all students, particularly those from non-traditional learning backgrounds, to participate more fully in the academic life of College. TIC aims to achieve this through the embedding of teaching and learning selfevaluation tools (www.tictool.ie)into College policies and procedures, training and awareness raising activities, and the development of web based resources (www.tcd.ie/capsl/tic).
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