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## Sources

HR Reports (CORE database/WiSER database).
Senior Lecturer's Annual Report 2010/2011
Student Records
Recruitment Monitoring reports (Equality Office)
Trinity Access Programmes
College Disability Service
Inclusive Curriculum Project TIC
Gender and Promotions Report
HEA statistics 2010-2011
ECU Equality in Higher Education report 2011
Secretary's Office
College Calendar 2011-2012

Membership of Monitoring Advisory Group 2010-2011
Patricia Daly (Staff Office)
Caroline Roughneen (Director of WiSER)
Lisa Keane (TAP)
Clodagh Byrne (Mature Students' Officer)
Dr Andrew Loxley (School of Education)
Karen Campos McCormack (Equality Officer)

## Key findings

## 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 2011-2012 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 profile

## Gender equality

- In 2011-2012 there is a persistent gender imbalance in the number of women in senior academic and decision-making positions in College. The comparative analysis of academic grades from 2007 to 2012 indicates there has been no noticeable variation in the overall proportion of women and men by academic grade in this period, for example the number of women Professors has remained in the 12-14\% range (table 2.5.2). This gender underrepresentation is also apparent in senior administrative grades. The impact of the employment control framework, which has restricted any promotions from 2009 to 2012 should be taken into account; in 2012 promotional processes have commenced again for academic and administrative grades.
- Faculty variations: The decrease in women's representation as one moves through the academic grades varies greatly by Faculty: while women are a minority in all EMS Schools at all grades, the rate of decrease is more marked in AHSS where women make up approximately $50 \%$ of Lecturers but only $13 \%$ of Professors.
- The overall number of applications for the Merit Bar in 2011 was slightly lower but shows an apparent improvement in the gender balance of applications (table 2.8.1) which is more reflective of the eligible pool. The proportion of eligible female candidates who apply has increased slightly to $34 \%$ (from 29\%) and the proportion of eligible male candidates who apply has decreased. When analysed by Faculty, there is no change in the application rate for women in Health Sciences, at $24 \%$ of eligible candidates, where the main problems regarding progression beyond the Merit Bar had been detected. In fact there was the same number of women applying from Health Sciences in 2011 as in 2010 (table 2.8.3). A working group has been established regarding the Merit Bar and is due to report to the HR Committee.
- Research staff: The overall balance of research staff is $51 \%$ women and $49 \%$ men (Table 2.5.7). 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.
- There are currently 8 female Heads of School out of 24 Schools (3 in 2006-2007) (section 2.5).
- The overall gender proportion of staff in College is $55 \%$ women and $45 \%$ men, however, gender segregation by occupation continues to be very marked, particularly in support staff areas (section 2.6).


## Diversity profile

- Recruitment profile: The number of applicants completing the equality monitoring form has decreased to $14 \%$ in the last year. Equality monitoring is in the process of
being mainstreamed into e-recruitment so it is expected the equality monitoring process will improve and provide more complete data in the next report. The profile of applicants continues to be very international (section 2.10).
- $2.3 \%$ of staff have reported a disability, however achieving disclosure is still a challenge in this area and the figure does not reflect the real number of staff with disabilities. This figure is reported annually to the HEA in compliance with the Disability Act 2005 requirement (section 2.9).
- Other academic roles: there is no consistent data available to profile people who support the College's academic activities as teaching assistants, these are often postgraduate students or postdoctoral students. The Monitoring Advisory group has identified this group as essential to the College functioning and under-recognized in its role. Teaching assistants, clinical tutors and laboratory demonstrators were grouped as minor teaching-related titles and were not considered by the recent Academic Titles working group.


## Students

Widening participation targets:

- In the College Strategic Plan 2009-2014 and College Access Plan 2009-2012 the College set a target for increased participation of students from under-represented groups entering via access routes of $22 \%$ by 2013 - this includes students with disabilities, students from socio-economic disadvantaged backgrounds and Mature students. The monitoring reports indicate a continued increase in the proportion of non-traditional students entering via access routes - $18.8 \%$ in 2011 (up from $15 \%$ in 2009) - however there is a need for greater progress in order to achieve the target. The National Access Plan for Equity of Access 2008-2013 target for non-standard entry routes to higher education is 30 percent of all entrants by 2013.
- In 2011-2012 registered students from non-traditional backgrounds made up over $16.4 \%$ of the whole UG student population (students with disabilities 6.7\%, TAP students 5\%, Mature registered 4.7\%), an increase on 2010-2011 (11\%). 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.


## Flexible and part-time learning

- Trinity has a low proportion of part-time students, $4 \%$ of the UG student body, by comparison to the universities (11\%) and the HE sector (14\%). Part-time and flexible learning opportunities are essential to promoting life-long learning and increasing access to higher education by responding better to the changing needs of diverse learners, particularly students in employment or with caring responsibilities. The HEA target for 2013 is for $17 \%$ UG of students to be enrolled on part-time programmes.


## Socio-economic background

- HEA survey: The TCD response rate to the HEA survey on student background (including ethnicity and socio-economic background amongst others) is $94 \%$.
- $82.2 \%$ of TCD new entrants identify their ethnicity as white Irish (compared to $91.3 \%$ of new entrants across the sector)and the second largest group are other white background $9 \%$ ( $5 \%$ across the sector). In the UK 18.1\% of national students are from black or minority ethnic backgrounds.
- 43.5\% of TCD new entrants were from an Employer and Managers or Higher Professional background (based on father's occupation). These are also the largest categories across the sector.
- Students from socio-economic disadvantaged backgrounds entering College via the Trinity Access Programme routes make up 6\% of the total UG population.


## Disability:

- 7.4\% of TCD new entrants declared a disability (195), compared to $6.4 \%$ in Irish HE and $7.6 \%$ in UK universities.
- There are 911 students (UG and PG) registered with the College Disability service, representing an 11.3\% increase in students registered from 2010-11 to 20111-2012 with 248 new entrants registered this year. The majority of students registered with the service are in the categories of dyslexia/dyscalculia/dysgraphia, mental health and medical disabilities.


## Mature students:

- Mature students (23+ at the time of starting UG degree) who accessed College via the dispensation scheme make up $4.7 \%$ of the UG student population, the number of mature students on age is 921 making up $7.7 \%$ of the UG student population.


## Internationalization

- Trinity's long tradition as an international institution is evident in the high proportion of non-Irish students registered: in 2010-11 there were students from 121 nationalities making up $21.5 \%$ of the undergraduate and postgraduate student body (16\% in 2007-08); this compares to 7.2 \% across the Irish Higher Education sector and $16 \%$ in the UK (Table 3.1.3).


## Gender

- $59.4 \%$ of the total student population in 2010-2011 was female; this compares to $56.6 \%$ in the UK student body and $51 \%$ in the Irish HE student body. The breakdown by UG, PG and Faculty indicates large variations within this: from $75 \%$ female students in UG Health Sciences to 39\% female students in UG Engineering, Mathematics and Science (Table 3.1.5).
- There is an apparent change in the gender profile of new entrants to the School of Medicine since the introduction of the HPAT test in 2009 (from 63\% female in 200809 to 49\% female in 2010-2011).


## Age

- $60 \%$ of the total Trinity student body were aged between 18 and $22,17 \%$ were over 30 , following closely the age distribution across the HE sector (this data is not available separately for the UG and PG population) (Table 3.1.4).


## Student information system

- Currently there is no system in place in College to track the progression of UG students who proceed to PG study, although there exist ad hoc surveys conducted by TAP and the Careers Service. This information would be of particular interest in relation to non-traditional students.


## General

- Data consistency and reliability: there can be small discrepancies between total staff figures depending on the source - whether for all staff or by Faculty - since the WiSER database and HR Core database take data snapshots on different dates in the academic year and in some cases include different categories (such as casual staff).

To ensure clarity data sources are specified throughout the report and definitions have been included in the introduction.

## 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 fifth 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.

## About this report

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

The data has been analysed 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 comparative student data in the Irish sector amongst others, but there remain many areas where further equality data collection and analysis would be beneficial.

## 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, the Merit Bar, 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 under-represented sex to a 50:50 ratio ${ }^{1}$.

[^0]
## 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 non-traditional groups; where available comparative data is included to contextualize the information.

## Sources

The staff statistics are mostly based on statistical reports from the personnel database CORE, developed in collaboration with Human Resources. Some reports have been sourced from the WiSER gender indicators 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.

Unless otherwise stated the staff figures include all monthly and weekly paid staff (permanent, contract, indefinite, part-time and temporary) except for casual staff.

Data reliability: There may be small variations in the figures provided depending on the source, due to different sources using data extracted on different dates in the academic year, or the categories included. Further information on staff and student categories can be found under Definitions; the source and date is indicated throughout the report.

## Acknowledgements

The Business Analyst in the Staff Office; the members of the Equality Monitoring Advisory Group -Lisa Keane (TAP), Clodagh Byrne (Mature Students Officer), Caroline Roughneen (WiSER), Patricia Daly (HR), Dr Andrew Loxley (Education);Jade Barrett (Senior Lecturer Area); Cherry Prendergast and other staff in ISS; Michelle Garvey (TIC); Peter Hynes (Student Records); Monica Alcock (Secretary's Office) and everyone else who helped.

## Definitions

Academic staff= staff on academic staff grades (Lecturer, Lecturer Part Time, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor) and medical academic grades.

Administrative staff $=$ staff on the administrative staff grades (Admin 3 to 1 and Senior Admin 3 to 1).

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. 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.

Casual staff= staff on the casual pay register - this might be staff only working for a few hours or more regularly throughout the year, in academic or administrative roles.

Core $=$ Human Resources personnel database. The staff data snapshot used in this report is from 31 J anuary 2012.

Heads of Administrative functions=Chief Operating Officer, Secretary, Director of HR, 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. 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.

## Mature student=

Mature Student on age $=$ A student who commenced an undergraduate programme in TCD via any admission route and was 23 on, or before, January 1st in their year of admission.
Mature Student - Dispensation Scheme = A student who entered an undergraduate programme in TCD via the Mature Students' Dispensation scheme.

Research staff = includes staff on research grades: Research Fellows and Research Assistants (research students are not included as they are included in the postgraduate student category).

Staff= College staff includes all monthly and weekly paid staff on a variety of Full-time and part-time, permanent, indefinite, fixed term and temporary contracts. Where casual staff are included this is clearly indicated. The source of most staff figures is the HR Core database, the date for the data snapshot is 31

January each year. Other data by Faculty is extracted from the WiSER database on the 1 of J anuary each year.

Student= any Full-time or part-time, undergraduate or postgraduate student registered in Trinity College Dublin. This data includes research students on postgraduate programmes who might also fulfil some teaching assistant roles. Student figures will vary depending on the date the data extract is taken - the HEA annual figure is taken on 1 March of each year.

WiSER $=$ 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.

WiSER database $=$ the Centre for Women in Science and Engineering Research (WiSER) manages a database that produces gender disaggregated statistical reports. The database staff data is populated from Core annually on 1 January.

## 2. Staff

### 2.1 Overall staff figures by gender

The overall College staff population, as of the report run January 2012 is 3718 with women making up $55 \%$ of all employees and men $45 \%$. This includes fulltime, 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Male | $\%$ | Female | $\%$ | Total |
| All staff | 1690 | $45 \%$ | 2028 | $55 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 7 1 8}$ |

Report run Jan 2012

### 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 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{2 0 - 2 9}$ | 148 | 187 | $\mathbf{3 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ | 442 | 651 | $\mathbf{1 0 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 9 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | 383 | 445 | $\mathbf{8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9}$ | 303 | 356 | 659 | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ |
| $\mathbf{6 0}$ plus | 183 | 152 | $\mathbf{3 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| no birth date entered | 231 | 237 | $\mathbf{4 6 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 \%}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 6 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 1 8}$ |  |

Report run Jan 2012 includes 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 Management Positions

This table indicates the gender distribution of men and women in senior positions such as Annual or Statutory officers *, Heads of Administrative Areas**, 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* $^{*}$ | 4 | $44 \%$ | 5 | $56 \%$ | 9 |
| Annual/Statutory Officers** | 5 | $33 \%$ | 10 | $67 \%$ | 15 |
| Heads of Administrative functions** | 5 | $36 \%$ | 9 | $64 \%$ | 14 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 8}$ |

Jan-12
*,**,***For definitions of each category see Definitions in section 1.

## 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 31 members in 2010-2011 including elected members, ex-officio members, student members and in attendance members.

Table 2.3b1

| BOARD 2011-2012 | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| BD elected member | 5 | $37 \%$ | 11 | $63 \%$ | 16 |
| BD ex-officio member | 2 | $20 \%$ | 3 | $80 \%$ | 5 |
| BD student members | 3 | $75 \%$ | 1 | $25 \%$ | 4 |
| BD appointed external | 1 | $100 \%$ | 1 | $0 \%$ | 2 |
| BD in attendance | 3 | $50 \%$ | 1 | $50 \%$ | 4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | $45 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $55 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 1}$ |
| Source: Secretary's Office 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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 40 members (2011-2012); 6 of these are student representatives, 2 are student observers.

Table 2.3b2 Council 2011-2012

| Council 2009-2010 | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Council ex-officio member | 4 | $57 \%$ | 3 | $43 \%$ | 7 |
| Council representatives | 5 | $28 \%$ | 13 | $72 \%$ | 18 |
| Council in attendance | 4 | $80 \%$ | 1 | $20 \%$ | 5 |
| Co-opted members | 2 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 2 |
| Student representatives | 4 | $67 \%$ | 2 | $33 \%$ | 6 |


| Student observers (in attendance) | 0 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $100 \%$ | 2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | $48 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $53 \%$ | 40 |

Source: Secretary's Office

## Executive Officers Group

The Executive Officers Group reflects the College management and Faculty design and is comprised of the Provost (m), 3 Faculty Deans ( $2 \mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{f}$ ), Dean of Research (m), COO (f), CAO (f), Treasurer (m), Secretary (f), Director of HR(m) and the Vice-Provost for Medical Affairs/ Head of School of Medicine (m).

## 2.3c Academic Decision-making

Table 2.3c charts the gender proportions for Heads of School, Fellows and Deans in 2010-2011. There are 8 female Heads of School (32\%) in 201-12, an increase on 2008 (3). The proportion of female Fellows has increased minimally at $22 \%$ (20\% in 2008).

Table 2.3c Senior Academic comparative
Table 2.3c Senior Academic Comparative

| Senior Academic Comparative | Female | F\% | Male | M\% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Heads of School | 8 | $32 \%$ | 17 | $68 \%$ | 25 |
| Fellows | 61 | $22 \%$ | 215 | $78 \%$ | 276 |
| Deans | 1 | $33 \%$ | 2 | $67 \%$ | 3 |
| Total | 70 | $23 \%$ | 234 | $77 \%$ | 304 |

Jan 2012 HR report


### 2.4 Staff distribution

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

College employment distribution by area


| Staff Grade Summary Graph | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SUPPORT STAFF (2)* | 35 | $15 \%$ | 191 | $85 \%$ | 226 |
| TECHNICAL and GENERAL | 70 | $35 \%$ | 132 | $65 \%$ | 202 |
| ACADEMIC | 386 | $40 \%$ | 571 | $60 \%$ | 957 |
| RESEARCH staff | 331 | $51 \%$ | 312 | $49 \%$ | 643 |
| ADMINISTRATIVE and LIBRARY | 376 | $63 \%$ | 221 | $37 \%$ | 597 |
| SUPPORT STAFF (1)** | 231 | $85 \%$ | 41 | $15 \%$ | 272 |
| SECRETARIAL/EO | 378 | $95 \%$ | 19 | $5 \%$ | 397 |
| Other/ executive | 4 | $25 \%$ | 12 | $75 \%$ | 16 |
| Total | 1811 | $55 \%$ | 1499 | $45 \%$ | 3310 |

J anuary 2012
Key: Support Staff 1 * Buildings and Grounds and Security. Support Staff 2 ** Catering, Nursery, Housekeeping, Shop, Stores

Graph 2.4.2 (2) Staff grades distribution summary by gender


### 2.5 Academic staff

The table below details the number of women and men in each academic grade, medical and non-medical (J anuary 2012).

Although women make-up 39\% of all academic staff, the under-representation of women in senior grades has been documented in international research and in previous College reports. Currently the proportion of Professors (Chairs) is 13\% (no change since 2006-2007). 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), which was submitted to Board for consideration, see section 2.8.

Table 2.5. (a) Academic Grades
See Definitions in section 1 for definition of academic staff. Below is the graph of academic staff in all Faculties excluding medical academic staff on consultant and clinical contracts, which are detailed in table 2.5.b.

| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| PROFESSOR | 11 | 13 | 77 | 88 | 88 |
| ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR | 25 | 33 | 51 | 67 | 76 |
| SENIOR LECTURER | 57 | 35 | 104 | 65 | 161 |
| LECTURER ABOVE BAR | 93 | 39 | 144 | 61 | 237 |
| LECTURER BELOW BAR (+ new entrant) | 119 | 57 | 90 | 43 | 209 |
| PART TIME LECTURER | 44 | 37 | 71 | 63 | 115 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 4 9}$ | $39 \%$ | 537 | $61 \%$ | $\mathbf{8 8 6}$ |

Report run J anuary 2012
Table 2.5.(b) Medical academic staff by grade

| Table 2.4.a (2) Medical academic <br> staff by grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT | 0 |  | 7 |  | 7 |
| PROFESSOR CONSULTANT <br> OTHER | 3 |  | 4 |  | 7 |
| SENIOR LECTURER CONSULTANT | 0 |  | 6 |  | 6 |
| SNR LECT CONSULTANT OTHER | 6 |  | 3 |  | 9 |
| LECTURER REGISTRAR | 4 |  | 3 |  | 7 |
| SENIOR REGISTRAR | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 |
| SPECIALIST REGISTRAR | 3 |  | 5 |  | 8 |
| NURSE TUTOR (GENERAL) | 16 |  | 2 |  | 18 |
| SENIOR OCCUPATIONAL <br> THERAPIST | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 |
| Total | 37 | $52 \%$ | 34 | $48 \%$ | 71 |

J anuary 2012
Medical academic grades have been included reflecting medical staff employed on a variety of consultant grades, see Definitions in section 1 for definitions.

### 2.5.2 Comparative academic grades 2007-2012

Table 2.5.2 shows the proportion of women in each academic grade from 2007 to the present (2012). The graph indicates vary little variation, for example the proportion of women Professors is currently the same as in 2006-2007 (13\%) and has remained in the $12-14 \%$ range in this period.

Table 2.5.2 Academic grades 2007-2012


Source: Annual Equality Monitoring Reports: 2006/2007, 2008/2009, 2009/2010, 2010/2011.

### 2.5.3 Academic Grades by Faculty

The following tables provide a breakdown of staff academic grades by Faculty. There may be small discrepancies in the figures provided broken down by Faculty as they are sourced from the WiSER database on a different date to the HR Core snapshot which provides the overall College report.

### 2.5.3 A Faculty of Health Sciences



Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2012.

### 2.5.3 B Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science



Grades by faculty- Engineering, Mathematics, and Science

| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 4 |  | 39 |  | 43 |
| Associate Professor | 9 |  | 27 |  | 36 |
| Senior Lecturer | 13 |  | 52 |  | 65 |
| Lecturer above Bar | 19 |  | 66 |  | 85 |
| Lecturer below Bar | 14 |  | 28 |  | 42 |
| Lecturer part-time | 8 |  | 23 |  | 31 |
| TOTAL | 67 | $22 \%$ | 235 | $78 \%$ | 302 |

Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2012.

### 2.5.3 C Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences



Grades by faculty- Arts, Humanities and Social Science

| Grade Description | Female | F \% | Male | M \% | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 4 |  | 28 |  | 32 |
| Associate Professor | 7 |  | 20 |  | 27 |
| Senior Lecturer | 24 |  | 38 |  | 62 |
| Lecturer above Bar | 37 |  | 41 |  | 78 |
| Lecturer below Bar | 50 |  | 50 |  | 100 |
| Lecturer part-time | 27 |  | 30 |  | 57 |
| TOTAL | 149 | $42 \%$ | 207 | $58 \%$ | 356 |

Source: WiSER DB, Jan 2012.

### 2.5.4 UK and Ireland comparative data

The available data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) in the UK is outlined in Table 2.4C. The HESA has indicated the percentage of female professorial staff in their 2010-2011 report is 20\%, with women making up 44\% of all academic staff. Gender disaggregated data is currently not generally available to compare Trinity's performance with that of other Irish universities since this information is not currently collected by the HEA.

The EU Roadmap for Equality has set a 25\% female target for Professorial and senior scientific positions.

Table 2.5.4
UK academic staff by gender and Professor category (2010/2011)

|  | F | M | T | \% F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Professor | 3455 | 14010 | 17465 | $20 \%$ |
| Academic (not Professor) | 76635 | 87080 | 163715 | $47 \%$ |
| All Academic | 80090 | 101090 | 181180 | $44 \%$ |

Source 2010-2011 Staff in Higher Education Institutions
statistics, HESA

### 2.5.5 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. Table 2.4.d indicates little variation in the proportion of women Fellows ( $21 \%$ in 20102011).

Table 2.5.5 Fellows

| Fellows | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Junior and Senior Fellows | 57 | $24 \%$ | 176 | $76 \%$ | 233 |
| Honorary Fellows | 4 | $9 \%$ | 39 | $91 \%$ | 43 |
| Total | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $22 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ | $78 \%$ | 276 |

### 2.5.6 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 $22 \%$ female academics in the School of Education, to $63 \%$ 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 $10 \%$ to $26 \%$ (with a total $22 \%$ 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 78\% (faculty total 59\% female).

Data is from January 2012 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.

### 2.5.6 A Faculty of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences:

Table 2.5.1

| 45 Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 45 Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4035 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 15 \\ 10 \\ 5 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences | Female | \%F | Male | \%M | Total |
| School of Business | 9 | 32 | 19 | 68 | 28 |
| School of Drama, Film \& Music | 8 | 38 | 13 | 62 | 21 |
| School of Education | 4 | 22 | 14 | 78 | 18 |
| School of English | 13 | 50 | 13 | 50 | 26 |
| School of Histories \& Humanities | 14 | 38 | 23 | 62 | 37 |
| School of Lang, Lit. \& Cultural Studies | 21 | 47 | 24 | 53 | 45 |
| School of Law | 21 | 49 | 22 | 51 | 43 |
| School of Linguistic Speech \& Comm Sci | 17 | 63 | 10 | 37 | 27 |
| School of Psychology | 11 | 35 | 20 | 65 | 31 |
| School of Religions Theology \& Ecumenics | 8 | 53 | 7 | 47 | 15 |
| School of Social Science and Philosophy | 16 | 29 | 40 | 71 | 56 |
| School of Social Work and Social Policy | 12 | 63 | 7 | 37 | 19 |
| Total academic staff: | 154 | 42\% | 212 | 58\% | 366 |

Report run January 2012

### 2.5.6 B Faculty of Engineering Mathematics and Science:

Table 2.5.2


| Faculty of Engineering, Mathematics and Science | Female | \% F | Male | \% M |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| School of Biochemistry \& Immunology | 5 | 26 | 14 | 74 |
| School of Chemistry | 5 | 24 | 16 | 76 |
| School of Computer Science \& Statistics | 24 | 27 | 64 | 73 |
| School of Engineering | 12 | 21 | 46 | 79 |
| School of Genetics \& Microbiology | 4 | 16 | 21 | 84 |
| School of Mathematics | 4 | 15 | 22 | 85 |
| School of Natural Sciences | 9 | 23 | 30 | 77 |
| School of Physics | 3 | 10 | 26 | 90 |
| total faculty | $\mathbf{6 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 \%}$ |

Report run January 2012

### 2.5.6 C Faculty of Health Sciences

Table 2.5.3

## Faculty of Health Sciences



| Faculty of Health Sciences | F | \%F | M | \%M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| School of Dental Sciences | 2 | 50 | 2 | 50 | 4 |
| School of Medicine | 85 | 52 | 80 | 48 | 165 |
| School of Pharmacy \& Pharma. Sciences | 11 | 48 | 12 | 52 | 23 |
| School of Nursing \& Midwifery | 61 | 78 | 17 | 22 | 78 |
| total faculty | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ |

Report run J anuary 2012

### 2.5.7 Research

Table 2.5.7(1) shows the profile of College research staff reflecting an approximate gender balance. Research staff make-up a considerable part of the College community (there are over 600 research staff in different categories). Research students are not included in this table since they are included in the postgraduate student reports, for a definition of research staff see Appendix 1.

Graph 2.5.7 (2) shows research staff - Research Fellows and Research Assistants- by Faculty.

Table 2.5.7 (1) Research staff and students

| Research Staff | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| RESEARCH FELLOW | 209 | 48 | 229 | 52 | 438 |
| RESEARCH ASSISTANT | 122 | 60 | 83 | 40 | 205 |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 3 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 3}$ |

Report run Jan 2012
Table 2.5.7 (2) Total Research Staff by Faculty (Research Fellows and Assistants)


Source: WiSER statistics Jan 2012.

### 2.6 Administrative and Support Staff

The overall breakdown of administrative, library and executive staff is provided in table 2.6.1.

Table 2.6.1 Administrative and Library

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Administrative and library | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| Admin total | 281 | $62 \%$ | 175 | $38 \%$ | 456 |
| Library total | 95 | $67 \%$ | 46 | $33 \%$ | 141 |
| TOTAL | 376 | $63 \%$ | 221 | $37 \%$ | 597 |

The distribution of staff through different administrative grades, from most junior (Admin 3) to most senior (Senior Admin 1) is reflected in table 2.6.2

Table 2.6.2 Administrative Grades


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.

### 2.6.3 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 2.6.3 1 Support staff 1

| Support Staff 1 (Nursery, Catering, <br> Housekeping, Shop, Stores) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female | $\%$ F | Male | $\% M$ | Total |
| Nursery | 18 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 18 |
| Catering | 42 | $75 \%$ | 14 | $25 \%$ | 56 |
| Housekeeping | 170 | $88 \%$ | 23 | $12 \%$ | 193 |
| Shop | 1 | $20 \%$ | 4 | $80 \%$ | 5 |
| Total | 231 | $85 \%$ | 41 | $15 \%$ | 272 |

Report run January 2012.
Under Support Staff 2 we have grouped Buildings Office staff, Grounds staff and Security staff. Figures include weekly and monthly paid staff.

Table 2.6.3 2 Support Staff 2

| Support Staff 2 (Buildings and Grounds, Security, Stores) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Female | \%F | Male | \%M | Total |
| Buildings and Grounds | 1 | 1 | 72 | 99 | 73 |
| Security and Guards | 33 | $23 \%$ | 110 | $77 \%$ | 143 |
| Stores | 1 | $10 \%$ | 9 | $90 \%$ | 10 |
| Total | 35 | $15 \%$ | 191 | $85 \%$ | 226 |

Report run January 2012.

### 2.6.4 Library

This table provides data on the distribution of Library staff throughout the different employment grades (data from January 2012). Library staff is predominantly female (66\%) throughout all grades.

Table 2.6.4 (1) Library overview

| LIBRARY STAFF | Female | $\%$ | Male | $\%$ | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Library total | 95 | $67 \%$ | 46 | $33 \%$ | 141 |

Table 2.6.4 (2) Library Grades


Report run Jan 2012

### 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 (fixed-term), temporary, casual, job-share and buy-back (for employees who are retired).
Casual staff are staff on the casual pay register - this might be staff only working for a few hours or more regularly throughout the year, in academic or administrative roles, the figures reflect the number of casual staff on the date of the data snapshot (31 J anuary 2012). See Appendix 1 for definitions.

Table 2.7a Staff distribution by type of contract


| Contract Distribution | F | $\%$ | M | $\%$ | T |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Buy Back | 5 | 29 | 12 | 71 | 17 |
| Permanent Fulltime | 618 | 44 | 799 | 56 | 1417 |
| Permanent Part-time | 297 | 89 | 38 | 11 | 335 |
| Indefinite Contract Fulltime | 198 | 58 | 146 | 42 | 344 |
| Indefinite Contract Part-time | 100 | 69 | 44 | 31 | 144 |
| Contract Fulltime | 391 | 55 | 322 | 45 | 713 |
| Contract Part-time | 86 | 64 | 48 | 36 | 134 |
| Temporary Full-time | 79 | 50 | 79 | 50 | 158 |
| Temporary Part-time | 77 | 65 | 41 | 35 | 118 |
| Casual | 176 | 53 | 159 | 47 | 335 |
| Default | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 2 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 0 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 7 1 8}$ |

Report run J anuary 2012

## 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.

Table 2.7b Part-Time Contract Distribution

| Employee Status | Female | \% F | Male | \% M | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Contract Part-time | 86 | 64 | 48 | 36 | 134 |
| Indefinite Contract Part-time | 100 | 69 | 44 | 31 | 144 |
| Permanent Part-time | 297 | 89 | 38 | 11 | 335 |
| Temporary Part-time | 77 | 65 | 41 | 35 | 118 |
| Total | 560 | $77 \%$ | 171 | $23 \%$ | 731 |

Report run January 2012
Overall proportion of Part-time staff: 77\% female, 23\% 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 2009, 2010 or 2011. Promotional processes have re-commenced in 2012 and this data will be reported in due course.

The J unior Academic Progression Committee (J APC) 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 2010-2011 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. 2010-2011 figures indicate an improvement in the gender imbalance of applications for advancement beyond the Merit Bar. In 2009-2010 the application rate of eligible women Lecturers was much lower than their male colleagues at 29\% - in 20102011 this has increased to $34 \%$; concurrently the application rate of male eligible Lecturers was 58\% in 2009-2010 and has reduced to 39\% in 2010-2011, contributing to narrow the gender gap in application rates to the Merit Bar. It should be noted that the overall number of Lecturers applying for review was lower in 2010-2011 (26) in comparison to 2009-2010 (31). Overall there were more applications by women Lecturers (16) reflecting the composition of the eligible pool of candidates, which is predominantly female ( $66 \%$ across faculties).

Tables 2.8.2, 3 and 4 analyse the Merit Bar data by Faculty. The number of eligible candidates and the application rates vary greatly by Faculty - the highest average application rate is in Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 60\%, but the application rate in Health Sciences continues to be low at 26\% average (24\% women and $30 \%$ men). This would indicate that the issues identified in the 2009 Merit Bar report have not been sufficiently addressed and that there remains a significant cohort of women Lecturers in Health Sciences deferring review.

Table 2.8.1 Merit Bar 2010-2011 by category

| Merit Bar 2010/11 | M | F |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Eligible in 2010/11 |  |  |
| Lecturers of first eligibility | 10 | 16 |
| Lecturers held at Merit Bar | 7 | 8 |
| Lecturers declined review on one or more occasions | 6 | 23 |
| TOTAL ELIGIBLE | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 7}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Applied in 2010/11 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ |


| Applied \% of eligible (m or f) | $43 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Successful | $\mathbf{9}$ | 15 |
| Success rate \% (of applied) | $90 \%$ | $93 \%$ |
| \% (of eligible) | $39 \%$ | $32 \%$ |

Source: Secretary to the JAP Committee.

Table 2.8.2 Merit Bar 2010-2011 Eligible by Faculty

| Merit Bar 2011 Eligible by Faculty | m | f | T | \% F | \% all eligible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arts, Humanities \& Social Sciences | 7 | 13 | 20 | 65\% | 29\% |
| Engineering, Mathematics \& Science | 7 | 8 | 15 | 53\% | 21\% |
| Health Sciences | 10 | 25 | 35 | 71\% | 50\% |
| Total | 24 | 46 | 70 | 66\% | 100\% |

Table 2.8.3 Merit Bar 2010-2011 Applied by Faculty

|  |  |  |  |  | F applic <br> rate |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Merit Bar 2011 Applications by Faculty | M <br> applic <br> rate |  |  |  |  |
| Arts, Humanities \& Social Sciences | 5 | $\mathbf{f}$ | 7 | 12 | $54 \%$ |
| Engineering, Mathematics \& Science | 2 | 3 | 5 | $38 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Health Sciences | 3 | 6 | 9 | $24 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 6}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 2 \%}$ |

Table 2.8.4 Merit Bar 2010-2011 Successful

| Merit Bar 2011 Successful | M | F | T | \% F | Succ <br> rate F | Succ <br> rate M | FProg <br> rate | M <br> Prog <br> rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total | 9 | 15 | 24 | $63 \%$ | $94 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $38 \%$ |

## Merit Bar progression 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 follow-on 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 Junior Academic Progression Committee, the HR Committee and the Equality Committee; a joint proposal from the HR and Equality Committee was submitted to Board for consideration.

A working group was established on foot of this report in 2011, which is due to report to the HR Committee in 2012.

### 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 December 2011 indicated that 75 staff had declared a disability as per the Disability Act definition, representing $2.3 \%$ of all staff.

| 2011 report | Number of staff <br> reporting a disability | \% of staff population |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TCD | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 3 \%}$ |

The return rate for staff completing the initial census form in 2009 was $32.3 \%$; in subsequent years the figures have been updated with new staff joining College and there have been information campaigns encouraging participation; despite these efforts College is far from achieving a $100 \%$ response and for this reason the data is not fully accurate of the number of staff in College with disabilities. Disclosure of a disability remains a challenging issue, as has been documented by extensive research in the UK - the UK average disclosure rate in the university sector was $2.34 \%$ (2004). The College continues to work to encourage disclosure and participation in the disability census and to promote a positive environment for staff with disabilities. The College has established supports for staff with disabilities which are outlined in the Code of Practice Applying to the Employment of Staff with Disabilities.

### 2.10 Recruitment monitoring

Recruitment equality monitoring data has been collected anonymously since January 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 HR 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. HR and the Equality Officer are currently integrating equality monitoring into the online e-recruitment system, due to go live in May 2012. This will enable improved data collection and the tracking of recruitment outcomes, although there will be some changes to the reporting categories.

In the period 1 October 2010 to 30 September 2011464 applicants had completed the monitoring form. It should be noted that the response rate to the equality monitoring form has decreased to a low 14\% in 2010-2011 ( $24 \%$ in the previous year) for reasons unknown. This questions the accuracy of the results and it is hoped that the new integrated monitoring system will help to improve the response rate and accuracy of the data. The overall number of applicants has fluctuated since 2007, taking into account the Employment Control Framework that limited College's recruitment: 5,922 applicants in 2007-2008, to 2,399 in 2009-2010 and more recently 3,246 in 2010-2011. It should also be noted that not all applications in College are processed through the Recruitment Office, in particular research staff are generally recruited by the Principal Investigator directly.

The profile of applicants respondents shown in table 2.10 .2 continues to be very international: Irish applicants now make up just half of respondents, while the proportion of Non-EU applicant respondents is 23\%.

The following tables provide us with information regarding religion, family status and other equality protected grounds.

Table 2.10.1 1 Oct 2010-30 Sep 2011

| Total number of vacancies | 191 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Total number of applications received (SO Recruitment data) | 3246 |
| Total number of applicants who completed the recruitment <br> monitoring form | $\mathbf{4 6 4}$ |
| Response rate | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3 \%}$ |

Table 2.10.2


Table 2.10.3 Religion

|  | - ChristianHinduJewishMuslimNo ResponseNoneOther(Blank)Other(User Defined) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Religion | \% | Count |
| Christian | 53.4 | 248 |
| Hindu | 3.7 | 17 |
| Jewish | 0.9 | 4 |
| Muslim | 5.6 | 26 |
| No Response | 3 | 14 |
| None | 28.9 | 134 |
| Other(Blank) | 0.9 | 4 |
| Other(User Defined) | 3.7 | 17 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.4 Age

| Age Bracket | $\%$ | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $15-19$ | 0.4 | 2 |
| $20-29$ | 27.4 | 127 |
| $30-39$ | 40.3 | 187 |
| $40-49$ | 16.6 | 77 |
| $50-59$ | 11.4 | 53 |
| $60+$ | 0.9 | 4 |
| No Response | 3 | 14 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.5 Family Status

| Family Status | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Caring for children | 27.4 | 127 |
| Caring for other family members | 4.5 | 21 |
| No Response | 2.4 | 11 |
| No caring responsibilities | 65.1 | 302 |
| Other(User Defined) | 0.6 | 3 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.6 Civil Status

| Civil Status | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Divorced | 4.1 | 19 |
| Living with Partner | 11.2 | 52 |
| Married | 34.9 | 162 |
| No Response | 1.3 | 6 |
| Separated | 2.6 | 12 |
| Single | 45.5 | 211 |
| Widowed | 0.4 | 2 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.7

| Sexual Orientation | \% | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Bisexual | 1.7 | 8 |
| Gay/Lesbian | 3.9 | 18 |
| Heterosexual | 89.9 | 417 |
| No Response | 3.9 | 18 |
| Other(Blank) | 0.2 | 1 |
| Other(User Defined) | 0.4 | 2 |
| Transgender |  |  |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.8 Disability

| Disability | $\%$ | Count |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| No | 96.1 | 446 |


| Yes | 2.2 | 10 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| No Response | 1.7 | 8 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.9

| Gender: | $\%$ | Count |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Female | 55.4 | 257 |
| Male | 43.5 | 202 |
| No Response | 1.1 | 5 |
| Total: |  | 464 |

Table 2.10.10 Applicants by Area and Gender


## 3. Students

## Introduction

An outline of the general student body in 2010-2011 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 $59 \%$ 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 (2010-2011), 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.

The UK Equality Challenge Unit has published the Equality in Higher Education Report 2011 which examines staff and student data in relation to gender, age, ethnicity and disability (2009-2010 cohort), these figures are also included where relevant.

## 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, the WiSER database, the HEA and the Equality Challenge Unit. The date for student population data is 1 March 2011 unless otherwise stated.

### 3.1 Student Population

In total, there were 16,747 registered students in 2010/11 (16,807 in 2009/2010). In 2010/11, 59 \% of the student population was female and $41 \%$ was male (in 2009/2010 60.5\% female). 11,844 students were registered on undergraduate programmes, and 4,903 (29\%), on postgraduate programmes.

### 3.1.1 Gender breakdown of student population 2010/11

Table 3.1.1 Student population by category and gender


| Category/gender | Total | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| UG Male | 4694 | $28.0 \%$ |
| UG Female | 7150 | $42.7 \%$ |
| PG Female | 2800 | $16.7 \%$ |
| PG Male | 2103 | $12.6 \%$ |
| Total | 16747 | $100 \%$ |

Total student population (UG and PG): 59\% Female; 41\% Male. This compares to $56.6 \%$ F in the UK student body and $51.3 \%$ in the Irish HE sector student body (UG 50.9\% female, PG 53.5\%).

|  | TCD f \% | HEA f \% | UK f \% |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Undergraduate | $60.4 \%$ | $50.9 \%$ |  |
| Postgraduate | $57.1 \%$ | $53.5 \%$ |  |
| Total | $59.4 \%$ | $51.3 \%$ | $56.6 \%$ |

Source HEA and ECU

### 3.1. 2 Students by category 2010/11

| Percentage of | categor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | $2010 / 11$ | \% of total |
| FT UG Degree | 10,895 | 65\% |
| FT UG Dip/Cert/Occas | 560 | 3\% |
| PT UG Degree/Dip/Cert/Occas | 389 | 2\% |
| FT PG Degree | 2,862 | 17\% |
| FT PG Dip/Cert/Occas | 385 | 2\% |
| PT PG Degree/Dip/Cert/Occas | 1,656 | 10\% |
| TOTAL | 16,747 | 100\% |

### 3.1.3 Geographical distribution of student population 2010/11

$76 \%$ of undergraduate and postgraduate students were from the Republic of Ireland, 11\% from other EU countries, 4\% from North and Central America, 6\% from other parts of the world and 2\% from Northern Ireland. There are students of 121 nationalities, making up over $20 \%$ of the student body. This compares to $16 \%$ of the UK student body and 7.2 \% of the Irish HE student body (Sources Equality Challenge Unit and HEA). The TCD data on geographical distribution derives from student nationality.

Table 3.1.3 Geographical distribution of student population 2010-11

| Nationality | Number of Students | \% Distribution |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Republic of Ireland | 12,797 | $76.4 \%$ |
| Northern Ireland | 352 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Europe (EU) | 1,892 | $11.3 \%$ |
| North \& Central America | 731 | $4.4 \%$ |
| Other | 975 | $5.8 \%$ |
| TOTAL: | $\mathbf{1 6 , 7 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Graph 3.1.3 Geographical distribution of student population 2010-2011


Table 3.1.3b TCD HEA geographical comparative

| Origin | \% Distribution | HEA \% |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Ireland (Republic and North) | $78.5 \%$ | $92.9 \%$ |
| Europe (EU) | $11.3 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| Non-EU | $10.2 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ |
| TOTAL: | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Source HEA report

### 3.1.4 Age distribution

Table 3.1.4 Age distribution of TCD and HEA all student population (UG and PG) 2010-2011

| Age Unk <br> 30 AND <br> 17 and |  | $5.0 \% 10.0 \%$ | $15.0 \%$ | 0\% |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE | TCD |  | HEA |  |  |
|  | Total | \% of total | Total |  | otal |
| 17 and under | 100 | 0.6\% | 1426 |  | 1.2\% |
| 18 | 1226 | 7.5\% | 9864 |  | 8.6\% |
| 19 | 2402 | 14.8\% | 17085 |  | 14.9\% |
| 20 | 2494 | 15.3\% | 17961 |  | 15.6\% |
| 21 | 2205 | 13.6\% | 14316 |  | 12.5\% |
| 22 | 1483 | 9.1\% | 9195 |  | 8.0\% |
| 23 | 804 | 4.9\% | 5249 |  | 4.6\% |
| 24 | 573 | 3.5\% | 4029 |  | 3.5\% |
| 25-29 | 2180 | 13.4\% | 13631 |  | 11.9\% |
| 30 AND OVER | 2801 | 17.2\% | 21927 |  | 19.1\% |
| Age Unknown* | 0 | 0.0\% | 124 |  | 0.1\% |
| TOTALS | 16268 | 100\% | 114807 |  | 100.0\% |

March 2011, HEA report
The College age distribution data has been drawn from the statistics published by the HEA (2010-2011). The HEA student age figures include all HE institutions (ITs and Universities) and all students (UG and PG).

### 3.1.5 Faculty distribution of student population (2011-2012)

Table 3.1.5 a Gender breakdown by Faculty (UG)


WiSER database J anuary 2012
Table 3.1.5 b Gender breakdown by Faculty (PG)


### 3.2 Comparative data: Socio-economic background and ethnicity

The HEA publishes the report Key Facts and Figures (2010-2011) providing comparative information in relation to gender and nationality. 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: overall $87 \%$ of new entrants responded to the Equal Access Survey although response rates to the socio-economic and ethnic cultural questions were lower at $66 \%$ and $69 \%$ respectively; in TCD the response rate was $94 \%$.

- Over $91.3 \%$ of new entrants to the university sector declare their ethnicity to be Irish, and the second largest group (5\%) is from other white backgrounds.
- The largest group of entrants to the Universities come from the 'employer and manager' parent background, followed by 'higher professional'.
- $6.4 \%$ of all entrants declared a disability, the largest category being students with specific learning disabilities.


## TCD student equal access survey data

The HEA has facilitated this breakdown of data for TCD new entrant students for 2010-2011 by socio-economic background and ethnicity. This data is not currently held locally in TCD. In 2010-2011:

- $43.5 \%$ of TCD new entrants were from an Employer and Managers or Higher Professional background (based on father's occupation). These are also the largest categories across the sector.
- $82.2 \%$ identified as white Irish, and the next largest category are from other white backgrounds ( $9.7 \%$ ). 7 respondents identified as Irish Travellers.
- $7.4 \%$ of new entrants declared a disability (195).

Table 3.2.1 TCD response to new entrant survey 2010-2011

| Number of Respondents Access FT new entrants Prog type 10,11,12,13 | Number of FT new entrants, Prog Type 10,11,12,13, Year 1 | Response Rate as \% of all NE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2642 | 2804 | 94\% |

Source HEA
Table 3.2.2 Ethnicity new entrants 2010-2011

| Irish | Irish Traveller | Any Other <br> White <br> Background | African | Any Other <br> Black <br> Background | Chinese | Any Other <br> Asian <br> Background | Other | No <br> Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2173 | 7 | 257 | 25 | 1 | 22 | 60 | 67 | 30 |
| $82.2 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ |

Source HEA

Table 3.2.3 Socio economic background new entrants 2010-2011

| Employers and Managers | Hr Professional | Lr Professional | Nonmanual | Manual skilled | Semiskilled | Unskilled | Own account workers | Farmers | Agricultural workers | All others occupied, and unknown | No <br> Response |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 585 | 565 | 326 | 223 | 142 | 67 | 21 | 142 | 97 | 6 | 214 | 254 |
| 22.1\% | 21.4\% | 12.3\% | 8.4\% | 5.4\% | 2.5\% | 0.8\% | 5.4\% | 3.7\% | 0.2\% | 8.1\% | 9.6\% |

Source HEA
Table 3.2.4 Number of respondents who declared a disability

| Students with <br> disability |  |
| :---: | ---: |
| 195 | \% of new entrants |
| Source HEA |  |

## UK equality data

The UK Equality Challenge Unit has published the Equality in Higher Education Report 2011 which examines staff and student data in relation to gender, age, ethnicity and disability (2009-2010 cohort).

- $43.4 \%$ of the student population in the UK are male and $56.6 \%$ female, with variations by subject.
- $18.1 \%$ of UK national students are from Black or Minority Ethnic background (increased from 14.9 in 2001/2004).
- $7.6 \%$ of the student population declare a disability, $55 \%$ of these declared a specific learning difficulty.


### 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 underrepresented 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 2011

In 2011, a total of 524 (468 in 2010) new entrant students from underrepresented groups registered on undergraduate degree programmes, representing $\mathbf{1 8 . 8 \%}$ of the CAO intake. Almost forty one percent (40.6\%) of these are mature students (Senior Lecturer's Annual Report).

## Student population 2011-2012

Table 3.3 a Non-traditional students (UG) 2011-2012

|  | Number | As \% of total <br> student UG <br> population* |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Disability (UG only) | 809 | $6.7 \%$ |
| Access (TAP) | 712 | $6 \%$ |
| Mature registered* | 447 | $3.7 \%$ |
| No of registered non- <br> traditional UG students 11- <br> 12 | 1968 |  |

*This is the number of registered mature students, the total number of mature students calculated on age is 968 (604 level 8, 64 cert / dip). Disability as per Disability annual report statistics, TAP as advised by TAP 8/12/11 Mature as per MSO 20/12/11. UG population as per student records March 2012: 11,997.

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.

Table 3.3.b All non-traditional students by Faculty 2011-2012

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | AHSS | EMS | Health <br> Sciences | Other/Cross <br> Faculty |  |
| Disability | 16676 | 6591 | 4236 | 3955 | 1894 |
| TAP | 712 | 321 | 182 | 172 | 24 |
| Mature - <br> Dispensation <br> Scheme | 447 | 275 | 94 | 174 | 123 |
| Mature - AlI | 968 | 364 | 70 | 126 | 79 |

Source: TIC report. Disability as per Disability annual report statistics, TAP as advised 1/12/10, Mature students as per MSO 20/12/12. Mature students figure includes 5 Nursing Access students, 23 Mature TAP Students and 19 Certificate in Contemporary Living students.

## Multiple identities

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 in reporting. For example, out of the students registered with the Disability Service there are 133 students who entered as mature students, via either the mature students' dispensation scheme or the CAO; 37 students registered with the Disability Service entered via a TAP Foundation course, of these 14 students entered via the TAP Mature students Foundation course (crossing over between all three access initiatives).

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

- $13.74 \%$ of mature students have a disability
- $16.6 \%$ of undergraduate students with a disability are mature students

There are 37 students currently registered as both TAP and Disability Service Students. Therefore:

- $5.20 \%$ of TAP students have a disability
- $4.62 \%$ of undergraduate students with a disability entered via TAP

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 | $96 \%$ | $90 \% \#$ | $94 \%$ | $92 \%$ |
| Progression Rate | $91 \% * *$ | $78 \% \#$ | $95.6 \%$ | $89 \%$ |

Source: TIC report. Total TCD data as per Senior Lecturer report 10/11. Disability as calculated using information on DIS November 11, TAP as reported from TAP Database 8/12/11, Mature as per Mature Students' Office 20/12/11,

## Note on definitions:

Completion Rate - All level eight final year students who successfully passed their final year assessments in 10/11.
Progression Rate - All level eight students, excluding final year students, who successfully passed their assessments and progressed onto the next year in 10/11. 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 2011184
students entered Trinity College via TAP entry routes increasing the total of TAP registered undergraduate students in Trinity College to 589.

Table 3.4.1 Total TAP Access students (UG)

|  | Number | As percentage <br> of total UG <br> student <br> population |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Total student UG population | 11,977 |  |
| No. of Students on TAP Course | 123 | $1 \%$ |
| No of students in College through TAP | 589 | $5 \%$ |
| Total Tap | $\mathbf{7 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 \%}$ |

Figure 3.4.2 Entry Route breakdown of TAP Undergraduate Students 2011


The 2011 TAP undergraduate cohort comprised of $61.6 \%$ females ( $n=363$ ) and $38.4 \%$ males ( $n=226$ ). $82.7 \%$ of these students were young adults ( $n=487$ ) and $17.3 \%$ were mature students ( $n=102$ ). The figure below details the faculty breakdown for TAP registered undergraduate students in 2011.

Figure 3.4.3 Faculty Breakdown of TAP UG students

| Arts, Humanities <br> and Social Sciences | Health Sciences | Engineering, Maths <br> and Science |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $54.5 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ | $16.1 \%$ |

## Post-entry support programme

TAP provide a range of post-entry supports in response to student needs. These include tailored pre-university programmes, financial and personal support, extra tuition, career development programmes, 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 reviews.

There are currently five admissions initiatives, all of which are part-funded 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


### 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. The number of undergraduate CAO applicants who declared a disability and accepted a place as at $24^{\text {th }}$ October 2011, was 154. This total does not include disabled students who registered subsequently, and who may not have disclosed via the CAO. Consequently the number of registered new entrants with a disability tends to be greater than the numbers declared at registration. During the course of the year 95 additional JF students declared a disability, bringing the total to 249 new entrants registered with the Service.

- $\quad 911$ students registered with the service
- 11.3\% increase in students registered from 2010-11 to 2011-12
- 249 first year students registered as at 20 April 2012

Table 3.5.1 Faculty breakdown students with disabilities by type

| Faculty Breakdown (as per DS 20/04/12) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | FAHSS <br> and <br> TSM | \% of total <br> within <br> category | FEMS |  | F Health <br> Sciences |  | Cross <br> Faculty |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

April 2012 DS statistics
Table 3.5.2 Students registered with the Disability Service 2011-12

|  | 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 | 911 | $5.4 \%$ |
| Undergrads | 772 | $6.4 \%$ |
| Post grads | 102 | $2.1 \%$ |
| Cert/Dip | 37 | $0.3 \%$ |

DS April 2012 statistics
Cumulative Record of Students registered with the Disability Service 2001-2012
Table 3.5.3 Cumulative disability service student figures 2001-2012

*As a percentage of the total student population

### 3.6 Mature students

In 2011, 928 mature applicants applied under the Mature Student Dispensation Scheme (MSDS) of whom 142 are now registered.

Mature students are also admitted to the undergraduate degrees in the School of Nursing and Midwifery. Applicants to these courses are assessed externally by the Nursing Career Centre. Seventy one (71) mature students registered on degree courses in Nursing and Midwifery in 2011. 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 and offers/acceptances are available in the Senior Lecturer's Annual Report 2010-2011.

There are currently 447 registered mature dispensation scheme students in TCD across all years. In addition there are 237 registered mature Nursing and Midwifery students.

## Faculty distribution of mature students

It is important to note that many students who qualify as mature students use the usual Leaving Cert points entry system and do not apply via the MSDS. In total there are 921 mature students on the basis of age (this includes entry 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 <br> and TSM | Eng, <br> Maths <br> and Sys | Health <br> Sciences | Other/Cross <br> Faculty |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  |  |  | Sci |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSDS | 447 | 275 | 70 | 79 | 23 |
| Mature - All | 921 | 345 | 126 | 425 | 25 |

J anuary 2012

## Age profile of mature students

The majority of mature students over the past five years are aged 30 years or over. It is interesting to note that 18\% of new entrants are over 50. This compares with just $0.5 \%$ nationally (HEA, 10/11 Higher Education Facts and Figures).

Table 3.6.2 Age profile of mature students

| Age | MSDS |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 / 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7 / 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 / 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 9 / 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 0 / 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 1 1 / 1 2}$ |
| $23-30$ | $33 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $41 \%$ |
| $31-40$ | $41 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| $41-50$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Over 50 | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $18 \%$ |

January 2012

## Gender breakdown

The gender breakdown of mature students has remained consistent over the past four years and stands at 55\% female and $45 \%$ male. This compares with a 50/50 split nationally (HEA, 10/11 Higher Education Facts and Figures).

Table 3.6.3 Total Mature students, registered and by age

|  | Number | As percentage of total <br> student UG population |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| UG student population | 11,977 |  |
| No of Mature students <br> entering through <br> dispensation scheme and <br> mature nursing route | 684 | $5.70 \%$ |
| All mature students (23+ <br> when starting UG degree) | $\mathbf{9 2 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 . 7 0 \%}$ |

### 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 self-evaluation 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).

## 3. 8 Flexible education/ Part-time education

The National Access Office prepared a consultation document looking at part time higher education in Ireland. Part-time and flexible learning opportunities are essential to promoting life-long learning and increasing access to higher education, in particular for adults who need to combine study with work or caring responsibilities. The proportion of part-time undergraduate students in Higher education in Ireland has increased from $7 \%$ in 2008 to $14 \%$ in 2010, and the HEA target is $17 \%$ by 2013. The proportion of part time postgraduate students is higher, $35 \%$ in the Universities. The percentage of part-time students in the seven Universities is $11 \%$, but this figure is much lower in the case of Trinity College at 4\% (2010-2011).

## References

Council of Europe, Going for Gender Balance (Council of Europe, 2002).
Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, Section 75 Monitoring Guidance for Use by Public Authorities (ECNI, 2006).

Equality Challenge Unit, Equality in Higher Education, Statistical Report 2011 (ECU 2011, UK). http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/equality-in-he-stats-11

Equality Office TCD (Campos McCormack, Karen),
Annual Equality Monitoring Report 2006-2007 - 2010-2011 (TCD); Gender and Promotions Report (TCD, 2009); Gender Analysis of the Merit Bar (Report I\&II) (TCD, 2010).

European Commission, Report on Progress on Equality between Women and Men in 2010 (European Union, 2011).

Higher Education Statistics Agency (UK) online statistics www.hesa.ac.uk .
Higher Education Authority,
Report of the High Level Group on University Equality Policies (HEA, 2004).

Key Facts and Figures 09/10 (HEA, 2010)
National Access Office, Part-time higher education and training in Ireland: current policy, practice and options for the future, consultation paper (HEA, 2012)

Senior Lecturer's Office TCD, Senior Lecturer's Annual Report 2009-2010 (TCD, 2010).

Trinity College Dublin,
Equality Policy; Code of Practice for the Employment of People with Disabilities; Dignity and Respect Policy (TCD, 2012).

## Other reading

Barry, Ursula, Building the Picture (The Equality Authority, 2000).
Drew, Prof. Eileen, Best Practice Models for the Career Advancement of Women in Academe (Report presented to the Equality Committee) (TCD, 2002).

Edinburgh University, EOTAG Fifth Report 2006/2007 (Edinburgh University, 2007).
Schneider Ross Consultants, Equality in the University - Setting a New Agenda, (Cambridge, 2001).

Student Counselling Service, Investigating the Counselling and Support Needs of 'Non-Traditional Students' in Irish Third-Level Education (TCD, 2007).

Wright, Prof. Barbara, Report on Women Academics and Promotions,(report presented to the Equality Committee) (TCD 2002).

## Legislation

Employment Equality Acts 1998-2010
Equal Status Acts 2000-2010
Disability Act 2005
Universities Act 1997

## Useful websites

Cambridge University, Equality Unit, www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/personnel/equality
Equality Authority www.equality.ie
Equality Challenge Unit http://www.ecu.ac.uk/
Equality Commission of Northern Ireland (ECNI) www.equalityni.org
HEA (Higher Education Authority) student statistics www.hea.ie
(http://www.hea.ie/en/node/1312
Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) www.hesa.ac.uk
Leeds University, Equality Unit, www.equality.leeds.ac.uk
National Disability Authority www.nda.ie
Oxford University, Diversity and Equal Opportunities Unit, www.admin.ox.ac.uk/eop/
Trinity College Policies www.tcd.ie/about/policies
Queens University, Equal Opportunities Unit, www.qub.ac.uk


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Going for Gender Balance p17 and p44.
    ${ }^{1}$ http://www.quotaproject.org/aboutQuotas.cfm

