# Equal Pay Report 2019 Executive Summary 

## Background

As part of the Public Sector Equality Duty, the University has a duty to publish its gender pay gap information (every 2 years) and an Equal Pay statement (every four years). This is University's fifth report and it is based on data obtained from the HR/Payroll System as at 31 August 2019. The data included within this report covers the three equality strands: gender, ethnicity, and disability. The report is produced as part of the University's commitment to eradicating any pay gaps and to help inform our policies and practices.

The University of Aberdeen Equal Pay Report covers all employees on the salary scale Grade 1-9 (including off-scale) - 3074 employees as at 31 August 2019. The University salary scale (Appendix 1 ) spans across 9 Grades, each grade has a minimum and maximum points (except Grade 9 which goes off-scale) with employees progressing up the scale based on annual increments until they reach the top contribution points. The contribution points are awarded in accordance with the University Contributions policy (exceptional performance).

The University salary scale is underpinned by the HERA (Higher Education Role Analysis) job evaluation tool. This tool uses an externally validated uniform scoring system to help allocate employees to grades on the basis of their work responsibilities. Analysis of employees within the 'top' contributions points was also carried out to assess their impact on any pay gaps.

Within this report occupational segregation was analysed on two levels:

1) Vertical segregation (concentration of males and females in different grades)
2) Horizontal segregation (concentration of males and females in different kinds of posts)

## Vertical Segregation

Vertical Segregation refers to unequal distribution of males dominating the highest status / grade jobs in both traditionally male and traditionally female occupations (and employees with other protected characteristics, for example BME vs white employees groups). Vertical segregation can aid in identifying a 'glass ceiling' issue within an organisation whereby a specific demographic (i.e. gender or BME) has a barrier from rising beyond certain level in a hierarchy.

## - Gender

The gender balance for the University population included within this report is $43 \%$ male and $57 \%$ female. The gender balance over the past five reporting periods remained almost unchanged. The overall (mean) Gender Pay Gap is currently 20\% (down from $23 \%$ in 2016). The analysis is based on a mean female salary of $£ 35,121$ per annum and a mean male salary of $£ 44,140$ per annum. The median Gender Pay Gap is $21 \%$ (reduction from $23 \%$ in 2016)

## - Ethnicity and Race

The proportion of black and minority ethnic groups (BME) currently stands at 10\% alongside $86 \%$ white and $4 \%$ unknown groups. The overall Ethnic Pay Gap for 2019 is $3.7 \%$ in favour of White group ( $-3 \%$ reported in 2016 in favour of BME groups). This is based on a mean white group salary of $£ 39,041$ and a mean BME group salary of $£ 37,581$.

## - Disability

The number of employees with a declared disability is currently 149 , representing $4.8 \%$ of the total population. The overall Disability Pay Gap is $18.9 \%$ (an increase from $15.4 \%$ in 2016). The mean gap in each of the grades 1-9 is below the recommended $5 \%$ threshold.

## Horizontal segregation

Horizontal segregation refers to the differences in the number of people of each gender (or other protected characteristics) present across different posts / jobs. For example, females are more likely to work in care or cleaning posts than males. .

- Gender

The horizontal segregation Gender Pay Gap exceeds the recommended 5\% threshold for the overall mean and median pay gaps which are $21 \%$ and $21 \%$ respectively in favour of males (decrease from $23.7 \%$ and $23.3 \%$ in 2016 respectively). Where reporting is possible (>5 member of employees), the mean and median Gender Pay Gaps remain in favour of males within three HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups.

## - Ethnicity and Race

The horizontal segregation Ethnicity Pay Gap is under the recommended 5\% threshold for the overall mean and median pay gaps which are $4 \%$ and $-4.3 \%$ (median in favour of BME) respectively (increase from $-3.2 \%$ and -9.2 in favour of BME in 2016). Where reporting is possible ( $>5$ members of employees), the mean and median Ethnicity Pay Gaps remained above the acceptable $5 \%$ level since 2016 within two Groups (2 \& 4), and an additional Group (3) increased significantly from acceptable level of $4.1 \%$ to $18.4 \%$.

## - Disability

The horizontal segregation Disability Pay Gap exceeds the recommended 5\% threshold for the overall mean and median pay gaps which are $19.3 \%$ and $25.5 \%$ respectively (increase from $15.4 \%$ and $21 \%$ in 2016). Where reporting is possible ( $>5$ members of employees), the mean and median Disability Pay Gaps are above the acceptable $5 \%$ threshold within six HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups.

To ensure the University continues to meet Equal Pay obligations key recommendations have been provided at the end of this report. These recommendations will ensure commitment in avoiding unfair discrimination, rewarding fairly the knowledge, skills, experience of all our employees and thereby increasing competitiveness and enhancing the University's reputation and image.

## University of Aberdeen

## Equal Pay Report - August 2019

## 1. Background

1.1 As part of the Public Sector Equality Duty, the University has a duty to publish its gender pay gap information (every 2 years) and an Equal Pay Statement (every four years). This is University's fifth report and it is based on data obtained from the HR/Payroll System as at 31 August 2019. The data included within this report covers the three equality strands: gender, ethnicity, and disability. The report is produced as part of the University's commitment to eradicating any pay gaps and to help inform our policies and practices. The report is published in addition to the Gender Pay Gap report which has been produced each year since 2018 and follows a different methodology used in data analysis.

The University of Aberdeen four yearly Equal Pay Statement is included within the $\underline{2017}$ Mainstreaming and Equality Outcomes Report.

## 2. Methodology

2.1 This report follows the methodology and data set used in previous Equal Pay reports. The report calculates the pay gap using mean (the method used in previous reviews) and median salaries (minimising the influence of salary extremes especially when employee numbers are small). Figures presented throughout the report correspond to mean and median salary values.
2.2 A horizontal pay gap has also been calculated for employees within the grade structure. For the purposes of this report Grades 1-9 have been considered. The Grade 9 off-scale category refers to those employees who have been evaluated at the Grade 9 level but who are in receipt of salaries in excess of the Spinal Point 54 maximum and are hence considered 'off-scale". In line with previous reports, the data used in this report excludes the salaries of: Principal, Senior Vice-Principal, Vice- Principals, Clinicians and TUPE transfers with protected grades and where there are less than 5 employees in any group the data has been withheld to protect confidentiality.
2.3 An additional analysis has been carried out on employees who are in receipt of the 'top' contribution points within the grade structure. For each equality strand included in this report the number of people on a 'top' contribution point and those who received a contribution point(s) has been calculated and expressed as a percentage of the total population within the group.
2.4 Further analysis was carried out considering Standard Occupational Classification: SOC2010 - HESA. This analysis included the Principal, Senior Vice-Principal and Vice-Principals but excluded clinicians and TUPE transfer with protected grades.

## 3. Gender

3.1 The University employs a total of 3074 employees (as at 31 August 2019) - of this total, 1305 are male ( $43 \%$ ) and 1769 are female ( $57 \%$ ). The gender balance over the past five reporting periods remained almost unchanged.
3.2 The overall Gender Pay Gap based on a mean female salary of $£ 35,121$ and a mean male salary of $£ 44,140$ currently stands at $20 \%$ (and $21 \%$ based on median calculation). This is the lowest mean Gender Pay Gap since the reporting has started in 2007 (Tables 1 and 2 below). The median Gender Pay Gap is $21 \%$ (reduction from 23\% in 2016).

Table 1

| Pay Gap by Gender and Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  |  | MEAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  | MEDIAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  |
|  | Female | Male | Total | \% of total population | Female | Male | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gap } \\ & (\%) \end{aligned}$ | Female | Male | Gap (\%) |
| 1 | 212 | 83 | 295 | 10 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 |
| 2 | 70 | 53 | 123 | 4 | 18,701 | 18,674 | 0 | 19,133 | 19,133 | 0 |
| 3 | 216 | 109 | 325 | 11 | 21,600 | 21,893 | 1 | 22,417 | 22.417 | 0 |
| 4 | 194 | 89 | 283 | 9 | 25,664 | 26,416 | 3 | 26,328 | 26,715 | 1 |
| 5 | 264 | 140 | 404 | 13 | 30,975 | 30,851 | 0 | 31,865 | 31,865 | 0 |
| 6 | 328 | 231 | 559 | 18 | 38,176 | 38,291 | 0 | 39,152 | 40,323 | 3 |
| 7 | 274 | 219 | 493 | 16 | 46,962 | 47,690 | 1 | 41,114 | 49,552 | 3 |
| 8 | 137 | 211 | 348 | 11 | 58,402 | 58,645 | 0 | 59,135 | 59,135 | 0 |
| 9 | 21 | 33 | 54 | 2 | 65,027 | 65,778 | 1 | 64,605 | 66,539 | 3 |
| 9 Off | 53 | 137 | 190 | 6 | 85,945 | 89,631 | 4 | 81,990 | 85,512 | 4 |
| TOTAL | 1769 | 1305 | 3074 | 100 | 35,121 | 44,140 | 20 | 31,865 | 40,323 | 21 |

Table 2

| Mean Pay Gap by Gender and Grade (Annual Comparisons) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean Pay Gap \% |  |  |  |  |
| Grade | 2007 | 2010 | 2013 | 2016 | 2019 |
| 1 | 2\% | -1\% | -2\% | 0\% | 0 |
| 2 | -6\% | -8\% | -1\% | -1\% | 0 |
| 3 | 2\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1 |
| 4 | 5\% | 6\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3 |
| 5 | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0 |
| 6 | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0 |
| 7 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1 |
| 8 | 2\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0 |
| 9 | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 5\% | 1 |
| 9 Off | 1\% | 2\% | 5\% | 7\% | 4 |
| Total | 29\% | 36\% | 25\% | 23\% | 20\% |

3.3 The percentage of female employees in Grades 1-7 is higher (63\%) than in Grades 8-9 (37\%) (Including Grade 9 Off-Scale). Within grades 8-9, the percentage of males is higher (64\%) than females (36\%) (Figure 1)

Figure 1
Gender Representation (Grades 1-7 \& 8-9)

3.4 The imbalance of gender amongst the high and mid to lower grades can suggest that females are facing a 'glass ceiling' which prevents them from entering / receiving promotion into the higher posts that are mainly occupied by males. Nonetheless, despite this imbalance of gender in the high and mid/low grades, the horizontal Gender Pay Gap at grade level shows acceptable gaps within the recommended 5\% threshold throughout all grades (including Grade 9 Off-scale) - this is also an improvement from 2016, when the Grades 9 and 9 Off-scale had a mean Gender Pay Gap of $5 \%$ and $8 \%$ respectively.
3.5 Furthermore, more females continue to work part time compared to males. The percentage of females and employees is part -time posts is $73 \%$ and male $27 \%$. The percentage of female employees in full-time posts currently stands at $49 \%$ and male at $51 \%$ - this represents only a minimal change from 2016, which was $48 \%$ and $52 \%$ respectively
3.6 A total of 137 females (increased from 119 in 2016) are in receipt of the 'top' contribution points from an eligible population of 1695 , hence an $8 \%$ representation. The total number of males in receipt of the 'top' contribution point cannot be included within this report due to low numbers $(<5)$ within some grades (Table 3).

Table 3

| Contribution Points By Gender \& Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  | Number on Normal Grade Point |  | Number on Contribution Point |  | \% On Contribution Point |  |
|  | Female | Male | Total | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male |
| 1 | 212 | 83 | 295 | 212 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 70 | 53 | 123 | 64 | 50 | 6 | $<5$ | 8.6 | ** |
| 3 | 216 | 109 | 325 | 203 | 90 | 13 | 19 | 6 | 17 |
| 4 | 194 | 89 | 283 | 175 | 67 | 19 | 22 | 9.8 | 24.7 |
| 5 | 264 | 140 | 404 | 240 | 127 | 24 | 13 | 9 | 9 |
| 6 | 328 | 231 | 559 | 317 | 220 | 11 | 11 | 3.4 | 4.8 |
| 7 | 274 | 219 | 493 | 240 | 203 | 34 | 16 | 12.4 | 7.3 |
| 8 | 137 | 211 | 348 | 107 | 167 | 30 | 44 | 21.9 | 20.9 |

$* * /<5$ - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)

## 4. Ethnicity and Race

4.1 The proportion of black and minority ethnic groups (BME) currently stands at 10\% alongside $86 \%$ white and $4 \%$ unknown groups. The BME representation remained the same in comparison with 2016. The data demonstrates that the white group is more highly represented than BME group across all grades. This is contributed to the disproportion of the BME group in the overall University population
4.2 The overall Ethnicity Pay Gap for 2019 is $3.7 \%$ (Table 4) - an increase from $-3 \%$ in 2016. This is based on a mean white group salary of $£ 39,041$ and a mean BME group salary of $£ 37,581$.
4.3 The horizontal Ethnicity Pay Gap at grade level shows that the mean gap in Grades 1-8 is below the recommended $5 \%$ threshold - which is similar to the figures reported in 2016. However Grade 9 off - scale saw an increase in the gap to $6 \%$ respectively from $-38 \%$ in 2016 . The gap for Grade 9 could not be included due to low numbers of employee within this grade.

Table 4

| Pay Gap by Ethnicity and Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEAN Salary } \\ & (£ ' s) \end{aligned}$ |  | MEAN Gap (\%) | MEDIAN Salary (£'s) |  | MEDIAN Gap (\%) |
|  | BME <br> (BME) | White (W) | Unknown (U) | Total | BME | White | BME/White | BME | White | BME/White |
| 1 | 43 | 240 | 12 | 295 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 |
| 2 | 8 | 111 | <5 | ** | 18,519 | 18,706 | 1 | 18,525 | 19,133 | 3 |
| 3 | 24 | 293 | 8 | 325 | 21,146 | 21,733 | 2.7 | 20,403 | 22,417 | 9 |
| 4 | 13 | 265 | 5 | 283 | 25,128 | 25,929 | 3 | 25,217 | 26,715 | 5.6 |
| 5 | 31 | 355 | 18 | 404 | 30,372 | 30,994 | 2 | 30,942 | 31,865 | 3 |
| 6 | 75 | 457 | 27 | 559 | 37,479 | 38,358 | 2 | 36,914 | 39,152 | 5.7 |
| 7 | 53 | 421 | 19 | 493 | 46,953 | 47,349 | 0.8 | 48,114 | 48,114 | 0 |
| 8 | 43 | 288 | 17 | 348 | 57,905 | 58,695 | 1 | 59,135 | 59,135 | 0 |
| 9 | $<5$ | 50 | $<5$ | ** | ** | 65,627 | ** | ** | 65,572 | ** |
| 9 Off | 9 | 173 | 8 | 190 | 83,609 | 89,217 | 6 | 81,818 | 84,005 | 2.6 |
| Total | ** | 2653 | ** | 3074 | 37,581 | 39,041 | 3.7 | 36,379 | 34,803 | -4.5 |

**/<5 - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)
4.4 A total of 14 employees from the BME group are in receipt of the 'top' contribution point (total eligible population cannot be reported due to low numbers of employees). The total number from the white group in receipt of the 'top' contribution point is 246 from an eligible population of 2430, representing $10 \%$ (slight decrease from $11 \%$ in 2016) (Table 5)

Table 5

| Contribution Points by Ethnicity and Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  |  | Number on Normal Grade Point |  | Number on Contribution Point |  | $\qquad$ |  |
|  | BME (BME) | White (W) | Unknown (U) | Total | BME | White | BME | White | BME | White |
| 1 | 43 | 240 | 12 | 295 | 43 | 240 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| 2 | 8 | 111 | <5 | <5 | 8 | 102 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 24 | 293 | 8 | 325 | 22 | 264 | 0 | 29 | 8 | 9.9 |
| 4 | 13 | 265 | 5 | 283 | 12 | 225 | 0 | 40 | 7.7 | 15 |
| 5 | 31 | 355 | 18 | 404 | 30 | 322 | <5 | 33 | ** | 9 |
| 6 | 75 | 457 | 27 | 559 | 73 | 437 | $<5$ | 20 | ** | 4 |
| 7 | 53 | 421 | 19 | 493 | 51 | 373 | $<5$ | 48 | ** | 11 |
| 8 | 43 | 288 | 17 | 348 | 37 | 221 | 6 | 67 | 14 | 23 |
| Total | 290 | 2430 | ** | ** | 276 | 2184 | 14 | 246 | 4.8 | 10 |

$* *<5$ - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)

## 5. Disability

5.1 The number of employees with a declared disability is currently 149 , representing $4.8 \%$ of the total population. For comparison, the number of employees declaring a disability in 2016 report was 103, representing less than $4 \%$ of the total population. In 2013, this figure was 35, representing $1 \%$ of the total population.
5.2 The overall Disability Pay Gap is $18.9 \%$ (Table 6). In comparison, the Disability Pay Gap for 2016 was $15 \%$ with a mean disabled group salary of $£ 33,140$ compared to non- disabled group salary $£ 39,161$. In 2013 , the Disability Pay Gap was $11 \%$ and a mean disabled group salary of $£ 31,972$ compared to non-disabled group salary $£ 35,980$.

Table 6

| Pay Gap by Disability and Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  | MEAN Salary (£'s) |  | MEAN Gap (\%) | MEDIAN Salary (£'s) |  | MEDIAN Gap (\%) <br> Disabled / Nondisabled |
|  | Disabled | NonDisabled | Unknown | Disabled | NonDisabled | Disabled / Non-disabled | Disabled | NonDisabled |  |
| 1 | 23 | 257 | 13 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 |
| 2 | 11 | 101 | 9 | 18,656 | 18,688 | 0.2 | 19,133 | 19,133 | 0 |
| 3 | 26 | 284 | 5 | 21,358 | 21,722 | 1.7 | 21,236 | 22,417 | 5 |
| 4 | 18 | 256 | 5 | 25,384 | 25,945 | 2 | 25,217 | 26,715 | 5 |
| 5 | 19 | 365 | 12 | 29,761 | 31,025 | 4 | 29,176 | 31,865 | 8 |
| 6 | 19 | 525 | 6 | 38,042 | 38,218 | 0.5 | 39,152 | 39,152 | 0 |
| 7 | 22 | 457 | $<5$ | 48,100 | 47,255 | -1.8 | 49,552 | 48,114 | -3 |
| 8 | 6 | 327 | 0 | 58,007 | 58,618 | 1 | 59,135 | 59,135 | 0 |
| 9 | <5 | 51 | 0 | ** | 65,535 | ** | ** | 64,605 | ** |
| 9 Off | < 5 | 180 | 0 | ** | 88,794 | ** | ** | 83,996 | ** |
| Total | ** | 2803 | ** | ** | 39,474 | 18.9 | 26,715 | 35,844 | ** |

$* *<5$ - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)
5.3 A total of 9 disabled employees from an eligible population of 144 are in receipt of the 'top' contribution point, representing $6 \%$. There are 248 non-disabled employees in receipt of the 'top' contribution point salary from an eligible population of 2572 , representing $10.7 \%$ (Table 7). In 2016, a total of 10 disabled employees from an eligible population of 98 were in receipt of the 'top' contribution point, representing $10 \%$. There were 241 non-disabled employees in receipt of the 'top' contribution point from an eligible population of 2310 , representing $10 \%$.

Table 7

| Contribution Points by Disability and Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Number of Employees |  |  | Number on Normal Grade Point |  | Number on Contribution Point |  | \% on Contribution Point |  |
|  | Disabled | Non-Disabled | Unknown | Disabled | Non-Disabled | Disabled | Non-Disabled | Disabled | Non-Disabled |
| 1 | 23 | 257 | 13 | 23 | 257 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 11 | 101 | 9 | 11 | 92 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9.8 |
| 3 | 26 | 284 | 5 | 25 | 255 | <5 | 29 | ** | 11 |
| 4 | 18 | 256 | 5 | 15 | 219 | <5 | 37 | ** | 16.9 |
| 5 | 19 | 365 | 12 | 18 | 332 | <5 | 33 | ** | 9.9 |
| 6 | 19 | 525 | 6 | 19 | 504 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 4 |
| 7 | 22 | 457 | <5 | 18 | 411 | <5 | 46 | ** | 11 |
| 8 | 6 | 327 | 0 | 6 | 254 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 28.7 |
| Total | 144 | 2572 | ** | 135 | 2324 | 9 | 248 | 6 | 10.7 |

**/<5 - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)

## 6. Horizontal Segregation (based on HESA Standard Occupational Classification)

6.1 Research has shown that occupational segregation is one of the main causes of the pay gaps in the United Kingdom (Equality Challenge Unit, 2014). The University is committed to monitoring occupational segregation, ensuring equal access to training/development, supporting mobility for all employees as well as flexible working opportunities. The horizontal segregation grouping adopted by HESA (SOC2010) is presented below in Table 8 together with definitions and employees examples.

Table 8

| SOC2010 Groups with definitions and staff examples |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Occupational Group | Occupational Group Code Narrative | Types of staff within Group |
| Group 1 | Managers, Directors and Senior Officials | Technical Resources Manager, Research Finance Manager, Director of Finance, Oceanlab Director, Project Manager |
| Group 2 | Professional occupations | Lecturer, Senior lecturer, Research and Teaching Fellows, Personal Chair, Capital accountant, |
| Group 3 | Associate professional and technical occupations | Research Technician, Cartographer, Graphic designer, Careers advisor |
| Group 4 | Administrative and secreterial occupations | Personal assistant, Secretary, Recruitment assistant, Clerical assistant, income assistant, payroll officer |
| Group 5 | Skilled trades occupations | Electrician, Joiner, Grounds Person, Uniprint |
| Group 6 | Caring, leisure and other service occupations | Custodian, Technician, Domestic supervisor |
| Group 7 | Sales and customer service occupations | Sales assistant, Shop supervisor, Telephone |
| Group 8 | Process, plant and machine operatives | Uniprint assistant, Maintenance assistant, Porter/Driver, Control systems Engineer |
| Group 9 | Elementary occupations | Porter, Security officer, Cleaner, Catering assistant, Domestic assistant |

## 7. Gender

7.1 The spread of the University employees' population across the 9 Standard Occupational Classifications (SOC2010) groups can be identified in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2

7.2 Horizontal segregation analysis according to HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups shows that none of the nine groups have comparable distribution of males and females. Group 1 consists of slightly higher number of females, Groups $3,4,6,7 \& 9$ are characterised by a significantly higher distribution of females, whilst Groups $2,5 \& 9$ are characterised by a significantly higher number of males. (Figure 2)
7.3 Examples of imbalanced groups' composition using the University 'Post Long Description' (F/M):

Group 2: Trial Manager (12/1)
Group 3: Counsellor (8/0), HR Partner (5/1), IT Support Technician (2/8) Research Technician (21/5)

Group 4: Administrative Assistant (11/1), Income Assistant (3/0), Information Assistant (13/3), Payroll officer (4/0), Personal Assistant (14/0), School Admin Officer (7/1), School Support Assistant (31/3), School Support Coordinator (11/1), Secretary (53/0), Senior Information Assistant (9/1), Senior Secretary (7/0)

Group 5: Ground Person (1/10), Assistant Engineer/Electrician (0/4), Electrician (0/9), Engineer (0/6)

Group 8: Porter/Driver (0/13)
Group 9: Cleaner (39/6), Domestic Assistant (27/0), Porter (1/12)
7.4 The imbalanced groups within the HESA Occupational Groups represent a wider socio economic issue, whereby females and males are clustered into particular types of occupation,
e.g. more females working in Admin or Cleaning posts than males or more males working in Porter/Driver posts than females.
7.5 The mean salary for females and males, across all grades is respectively $£ 35,166$ (up from $£ 34,223$ in 2016 ) and $£ 44,539$ (down from $£ 44,861$ in 2016) with the mean Gender Pay Gap at $21 \%$ (down from 23.7 in 2016) (Table 9). The median salary for females and males is $£ 31,865$ (down from $£ 32,004$ ) and $£ 40,323$ (down from $£ 41,709$ in 2016 ) with median Gender Pay Gap at $21 \%$ (down from $23.3 \%$ in 2016).
7.6 The horizontal segregation Gender Pay Gap exceeds the recommended 5\% threshold for the overall mean and median Gender Pay Gaps which are $21 \%$ and $21 \%$ respectively in favour of males (decrease from $23.7 \%$ and $23.3 \%$ in 2016 respectively). Where reporting is possible (>5 member of employees) at a Group level, the mean and median Gender Pay Gaps remain in favour of males within the following three HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups since 2016:

- Group 2 (Professional Occupations) Mean 15\% (decrease from 17.7\% in 2016), Median 13.6\% (increase from 12.4\% in 2016)
- Group 5 (Skilled Trades Occupations) Mean 10.7\% (increase from 5.4\% in 2016), Median 28\% (increase from 23.1\% in 2016)
- Group 9 (Elementary Occupations) Mean 15.3\% (decrease from 18.4\% in 2016), Median 18\% (increase from 16.4\% in 2016)
7.7 Group 1 (Managers, directors and senior officials) saw an improvement in both mean and median Gender Pay Gaps since 2016. The mean Gender Pay Gap has decreased from 7.7\% to $-4.3 \%$ in favour of females. The median Gender Pay Gap has increased from $-7.7 \%$ to $15.9 \%$ in favour of females. The remaining five Occupational Groups have their mean and median Gender Pay Gaps in favour of females.

Table 9

| Pay Gap by Gender and Occupational Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Employees |  |  |  | MEAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  | MEDIAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  |
| HESA Group | Female | Male | Total | \% of total population | Female | Male | Gap | Female | Male | Gap |
| 1 | 30 | 21 | 51 | 1.7 | 62,114 | 59,529 | -4.3 | 57,418 | 49,552 | -15.9 |
| 2 | 727 | 819 | 1546 | 50.1 | 46,152 | 54,396 | 15 | 42,793 | 49,552 | 13.6 |
| 3 | 265 | 162 | 427 | 13.9 | 33,244 | 32,480 | -2.4 | 31,865 | 31,865 | 0 |
| 4 | 558 | 113 | 671 | 21.8 | 25,789 | 23,942 | -7.7 | 23,067 | 19,612 | -17.6 |
| 5 | 10 | 60 | 70 | 2.3 | 25,928 | 29,041 | 10.7 | 21,014 | 29,176 | 28 |
| 6 | 35 | 18 | 53 | 1.7 | 21,489 | 21,022 | -2.2 | 22,417 | 19,904 | -12.6 |
| 7 | 6 | $<5$ | <5 | ** | 19,065 | ** | ** | 17,389 | ** | ** |
| 8 | < 5 | 19 | 8 | ** | ** | 20,527 | -3.2 | ** | 19,133 | ** |
| 9 | 136 | 96 | 232 | 7.5 | 17,929 | 21,169 | 15.3 | 17,389 | 21,236 | 18 |
| TOTAL | ** | ** | ** | 100 | 35,166 | 44,539 | 21 | 31,865 | 40,323 | 21 |

[^0]
## 8. Ethnicity

8.1 Horizontal pay gap analysis by occupational grouping is difficult to assess for some of the HESA SOC2010 groups. This is due to low numbers of BME employees in some of the groups (e.g. Groups 1, 5, 6, 7 and 8) See Table 10 below.
8.2 The horizontal segregation Ethnicity Pay Gap is under the recommended $5 \%$ threshold for the overall mean and median pay gaps which are $4.1 \%$ and $-4.3 \%$ (median in favour of BME) respectively (increase from $-3.2 \%$ and -9.2 in favour of BME in 2016). Where reporting is possible (>5 members of employees) at a Group level, the mean and median Ethnicity Pay Gaps remained above the acceptable $5 \%$ level since 2016 within two Groups (2 \& 4), and an additional Group (3) increased significantly from acceptable level of $4.1 \%$ to $18.4 \%$. The mean and median Ethnicity Pay Gaps for these HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups are as below:

- Group 2 (Professional Occupations) Mean 10.4\% (decrease from 13.4\% in 2016), Median 11\% (unchanged)
- Group 3 (Associate professional and technical Occupations) Mean 18.4\% (increase from 4.1\% in 2016), Median 21\% (increase from 11\% in 2016)
- Group 4 (Administrative and secretarial occupations) Mean $22.5 \%$ (increase from $16.7 \%$ in 2016), Median $24.6 \%$ (increase from $17.2 \%$ in 2016)
8.3 Two Occupational Groups (1 \& 8) did not have any BME representation within them; therefore no Ethnicity Pay Gap has been calculated. Three Occupational Groups (5, 6, 7) cannot have their Ethnicity Pay Gap included in this report due to low numbers of employees (<5) within them. Group 9 has the Ethnicity Pay Gap within the recommended threshold $3.6 \%$ (an increase from $0.5 \%$ in 2016).

Table 10

| Pay Gap by Ethnicity and Occupational Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Employees |  |  |  | MEAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  | MEDIAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  |
| HESA Group | BME | White | Unknown | \% of total population | BME | White | Gap | BME | White | Gap |
| 1 | 0 | 50 | $<5$ | ** | N/A | 61.088 | N/A | N/A | 55,775 | N/A |
| 2 | 196 | 1274 | 76 | 50.1 | 45,868 | 51,220 | 10.4 | 42,793 | 48,114 | 11 |
| 3 | 31 | 381 | 15 | 13.9 | 27,259 | 33,413 | 18.4 | 25,217 | 31,865 | 21 |
| 4 | 50 | 598 | 23 | 21.8 | 20,088 | 25,936 | 22.5 | 17,389 | 23,067 | 24.6 |
| 5 | $<5$ | 65 | <5 | ** | ** | 28,649 | ** | ** | 28,332 | ** |
| 6 | $<5$ | 50 | 0 | ** | ** | 21,501 | ** | ** | 21,814 | ** |
| 7 | <5 | 6 | <5 | ** | ** | 19,065 | ** | ** | 17,389 | ** |
| 8 | 0 | 22 | 0 | 0.7 | N/A | 20,616 | N/A | N/A | 19,133 | N/A |
| 9 | 17 | 211 | $<5$ | ** | 18,649 | 19,355 | 3.6 | 17,389 | 17,389 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 300 | 2657 | 123 | 100 | 37,581 | 39,194 | 4.1 | 36,379 | 34,803 | -4.3 |

$* *<5$ - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)

## 9. Disability

9.1 The horizontal segregation Disability Pay Gap (Table 11) exceeds the recommended 5\% threshold for the overall mean and median pay gaps which are $19.3 \%$ and $25.5 \%$ respectively (increase from $15.4 \%$ and $21 \%$ in 2016). Where reporting is possible (>5 members of employees), the mean and median Disability Pay Gaps are above the acceptable 5\% threshold within the three following HESA SOC2010 Occupational Groups:

- Group 2 (Professional Occupations) Mean 14.3\% (increase from 6.7\% in 2016), Median 13.7\% (increase from 7\% in 2016)
- Group 3 (Associate professional and technical Occupations) Mean 18.3\% (increase from 8\% in 2016), Median 25.5\% (increase from 5.7\% in 2016)
- Group 5 (Skilled trades Occupations) Mean 24.3\% (increase from 5.8\% in 2016), Median 28.4\% (increase from -4.6\% in 2016)
9.2 The gaps within Groups 1, 6, 7, and 8 cannot be reported due to low numbers of employee within them. Group 9 has the Disability Pay Gap under the recommended 5\% threshold, $-1.5 \%$ in favour of the disabled group.

Table 11

| Pay Gap by Disability and Occupational Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Employees |  |  |  | MEAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  | MEDIAN (FTE Salary £'s) |  |  |
| HESA Group | Disabled | NonDisabled | Unknown | \% of total population | Disabled | NonDisabled | Gap | Disabled | NonDisabled | Gap |
| 1 | $<5$ | 47 | 0 | ** | ** | 60,123 | ** | ** | 57,418 | ** |
| 2 | 51 | 1434 | 20 | 50.1 | 43,632 | 50,905 | 14.3 | 41,526 | 48,114 | 13.7 |
| 3 | 17 | 404 | <5 | ** | 27,148 | 33,220 | 18.3 | 23,754 | 31,865 | 25.5 |
| 4 | 47 | 585 | 24 | 21.8 | 25,468 | 25,652 | 0.7 | 22,417 | 23,067 | 2.8 |
| 5 | 6 | 58 | <5 | ** | 22,233 | 29,385 | 24.3 | 20,888 | 29,176 | 28.4 |
| 6 | <5 | 49 | <5 | ** | ** | 21,511 | ** | ** | 21,814 | ** |
| 7 | $<5$ | 7 | 0 | ** | ** | 18,826 | ** | ** | 17,389 | ** |
| 8 | $<5$ | 20 | 0 | ** | ** | 20,764 | ** | ** | 19,133 | ** |
| 9 | 19 | 205 | <5 | ** | 19,534 | 19,251 | -1.5 | 19,133 | 17,389 | -10 |
| TOTAL | 149 | 2809 | 54 | 100 | 32,016 | 39,695 | 19.3 | 26,715 | 35,844 | 25.5 |

**/<5 - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
0 (zero - no employees within the group)

## 10. Conclusion and recommendations

10.1 The overall Gender Pay Gap in 2019 is $20 \%$ (a slight improvement from 2016 when the gap was $23 \%$ ). The gap is indicative of the uneven distribution of males and females across the pay grades. The under-representation of females at higher grades is a factor in weighting the overall gender gap in favour of males. The imbalance of gender amongst the high and mid to lower grades can suggest that females are facing a 'glass ceiling' which prevents them from entering / receiving promotion into the higher posts that are mainly occupied by males
10.2 There are no significant pay gaps across individual grades and none which exceed the $5 \%$ recommended threshold. Females do appear to be disadvantaged when it comes to contribution point salaries. On average $11 \%$ of the male population are in receipt of the top contribution point salary compared to $8 \%$ of females.
10.3 The overall Ethnicity Pay Gap is within the recommended threshold at $3.7 \%$ and there are no significant gaps across the grades (apart from Grade 9 Off-Scale where the Ethnicity Pay Gap stands at $6 \%$ ). The BME groups do appear disadvantaged on contribution points with $10 \%$ of
the white group in receipt of the 'top' contribution point salary compared to only $4.8 \%$ of BME group.
10.4 The number of colleagues who have a declared disability is low; it equates to $4.8 \%$ of the total population of employees at the University and these low numbers of declared disability could contribute to the fluctuation of the gap for this characteristic. The overall Disability Pay Gap is $18.9 \%$, the disabled group appears disadvantaged on contribution points with $10.7 \%$ of nondisabled group in receipt of the 'top' contribution point salary compared to only $6 \%$ of disabled group.
10.5 The horizontal segregation Gender Pay Gap crosses the recommended 5\% threshold at three different HESA Occupational Groups. The gap is in favour of males at $15 \%$ for Group 2 (Professional occupations), 10.7\% for Group 5 (Skilled trade occupations) and 15.3\% for Group 9 (Elementary occupations). The gap (mean calculation) is -4.3, -2.4, -7.7, -2.2, -3.2, in favour of females in Groups 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8.
10.6 Due to the low numbers of BME employees in some of the HESA Occupational Groups it is difficult to assess the Ethnicity Pay Gap at each Group level. Where measurements are possible, the Ethnicity Pay Gap by Occupational Groups exceeds the 5\% threshold for three groups: Group 2 (mean gap 10.4\%, median gap 11\%), Group 3 (mean gap 18.4\%, median gap $21 \%$ ), and Group 4 (mean gap 22.5\%, median gap 24.6\%). The overall Ethnicity Pay Gap based on mean salaries is below the recommended threshold at 4.1\% (median -4.3\%).
10.7 Similarly, due to the low numbers of declared disabled employees in some of the HESA Occupational Groups it is difficult to assess the Disability Pay Gap at each group level. Where measurements are possible, the Disability Pay Gap by Occupational Groups exceeds the 5\% threshold for three groups: Group 2 (mean gap 14\%, median gap 13.7\%), Group 3 (mean gap 18.3\%, median gap 25.5\%). Group 5 (mean gap 24.3\%, median gap 28.4\%). The overall Disability Pay Gap based on mean salaries is $19.3 \%$ (median 25.5\%). For Group 9, the mean and median Disability Pay Gap is in favour of the disabled groups ( $-1.5 \%$ and $-10 \%$ respectively)

## Recommendations

- Undertake a robust Equal Pay audit which will follow all criteria required for the audit as per the JNCHES and the Equality and Human Rights Commission guidelines
- All gaps of $5 \%>$ or repeated gaps of $3 \%$ to be investigated on an annual basis
- Continue to monitor the rates of successful and unsuccessful promotions/regrading applicants within each of the protected characteristics included in this report
- Monitor the pay gap in relation to the protected characteristics included in this report in relation to promotions and salaries at appointment
- Undertake a review of internal and external recruitment outcomes and practices
- Participate in job fairs or apprenticeships programmes which can target job opportunities to individuals from the under-represented gender
- Work with local schools to promote positive role models in occupations which have historically been dominated by one particular gender
- For future reports, include analysis of the number of the employees who received a contribution award in within each protected characteristics included in this report
- Continued commitment to Athena SWAN across the University to ensure that action plans are implemented and monitored
- Continue to deliver the unconscious bias training to University employees
- Continue to monitor the representation across the equality strands within the University Committees and influential bodies
- Continue to offer flexible working and review procedures regularly to ensure they continue to meet the University and employees' needs
- Continue the development of the Unconscious Bias Observer scheme within the University to eradicate any discriminatory behaviour in promotions panels
- Continue with a Blind Review of anonymised promotions and regrading applications to reduce the potential for unconscious bias and ensure that all interviewers/panellists have undergone unconscious bias training
- Ensure that females have the opportunity and ability to progress their careers within the University through talent management and on-going personal development. Continue to offer mentoring and coaching programmes to our employees
- Continue the work of the Senior Women's Network. This network meets to identify and address the issues that are central to career development for female colleagues and particularly those in, or aspiring to, senior positions.


[^0]:    **/<5 - less than 5 employees within the group, data withheld due to confidentiality
    0 (zero - no employees within the group)

