# RODERT GORDON UNIVERSITY ABERDEEN 

## GENDER PAY GAP REPORT

April 2023

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of a gender pay gap analysis, as outlined by the Equality and Human Rights Commission, is to compare the pay of male and female employees. As well as identifying differences in pay, a gender pay analysis should also examine the factors influencing any gender pay gap and identify actions for addressing it.

In accordance with our mandatory requirement under the Public Sector Equality Duty to publish our gender pay gap figure, and to ensure that the design and operation of our pay system is unbiased, RGU undertakes to publish this gender pay gap analysis.

As per legislative requirements, all Academic and Professional \& Support Staff, as well as Senior Managers and Professors are included within this analysis.

## 2. Methodology

The pay gap has been calculated using the average hourly rate across each characteristic. As recommended by the Equality Challenge Unit, this audit has used both the mean and median average hourly rates.

This audit uses pay data effective $31^{\text {st }}$ December 2022 as its basis.
The two highest paid positions, which includes the Principal \& Vice Chancellor post, were mapped to the Academic \& Research category and the Professional \& Support category respectively.

The Academic \& Research category includes all staff on Academic and Research grades, Professors, and those staff in the following Senior Manager roles: Deans of School, Vice Principal - Academic Development \& Student Experience, and Vice Principal Research \& Community Engagement.

The Professional \& Support category includes all Professional \& Support grades and all Senior Manager roles except for those referred to above.

## 3. University Gender Pay Gap

The gender pay gap results, when all staff are considered, are detailed below:

| Mean Hourly Rate | Median Hourly Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| 1055 Female employees <br> (+138 from 2021) | 1055 Female employees |
| Mean Hourly Rate $£ \mathbf{2 0 . 8 1}$ | Median Hourly Rate $£ 19.36$ |
|  | (1) |
| $\begin{aligned} & 690 \text { Male employees (39.5\%) } \\ & \text { (+84 from 2021) } \end{aligned}$ | 690 Male employees |
| Mean Hourly Rate $£ 23.77$ | Median Hourly Rate $\mathbf{£ 2 3 . 1 0}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gender Pay Gap is } \mathbf{1 2 . 4 5 \%} \\ & (+2.61 \% \text { from } 2021) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gender Pay Gap is } \mathbf{1 6 . 1 9 \%} \\ & (+0.02 \% \text { from 2021) } \end{aligned}$ |

The calculations for these figures were made using the following formula, substituting the mean average hourly rates with the median average hourly rates as required:

```
(Average Male Hourly Rate - Average Female Hourly Rate) X 100
    Average Male Hourly Rate
```

The current gender pay gap when using the mean average hourly rate of pay is $12.45 \%$. This is an increase of $2.61 \%$ when compared against our analysis from 2021. According to the ONS, the UK gender pay gap (2022) is $14.9 \%$ so the University remains ahead of that benchmark. The pay gap when using the median average hourly rate of pay is $16.19 \%$ which is a slight increase of $0.02 \%$ when compared against our analysis from 2021.

The University gender pay gap largely exists because of the gender split at the lower end of the pay scale. The increase in the mean pay gap, which, as explained in section 4 below, largely results from the growth in female staff numbers in grades 1-7.

Tackling the pay gap remains a priority and will be reflected in the numerous actions arising from this report. Analysis will follow which further explains the reasons for the gender pay gap and why there are gaps when considering individual grades.

## Distribution of Male and Female Employees by Grade

|  | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 135 | 50 | 134 | 69 | 89 | 86 | 153 | 252 | 38 | 21 | 13 |
| Male | 43 | 63 | 31 | 21 | 75 | 65 | 88 | 210 | 41 | 14 |  |
| Total | 178 | 113 | 165 | 90 | 164 | 151 | 241 | 462 | 79 | 18 |  |
| Female \% | $\mathbf{7 5 . 8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 4 . 2 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 . 2 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 6 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 9 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 . 4 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 . 5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 8 . 1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 . 7 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 9 4 \%}$ |
| Male \% | $\mathbf{2 4 . 1 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 . 7 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 7 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 0 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 5 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 . 4 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 1 . 9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 3 . 2 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 8 . 0 6 \%}$ |

Figure 1: Distribution of Female and Male Employee's by Grade


## 4. Distribution of Male and Female Staff

The University employs 1745 staff, full and part-time. 60.5\% of staff are female and $39.5 \%$ of staff are male. In 2021 the University employed 1523 staff and $60.2 \%$ were female. This is an increase of 138 females and 84 males.

As Fig 1 illustrates, female staff are in the majority for all grades apart from SMG, Professorial, grade 9 and grade 2 . For grade 9 the split is insignificant and there would be more female staff if two male staff were to leave and be replaced by females. In 2021 there was a higher \% of female Professors however the change can appear more significant when the numbers in the data set are small.

The gender split for SMG has reduced from almost 63\% male in 2019 to 57.8\% in 2023 however it has increased slightly since 2021 because of there being an increase of one more male. As with Professors, we are dealing with a small data set and if three males were to leave and be replaced by females, or the current SMG vacancies were filled by female leaders, then SMG would be more evenly split or over $50 \%$ female.

At the opposite end of the spectrum, leaving aside grade 2 , which will be covered in the next section, the lowest paid role holders in the University at grades 1, 3 and 4 are predominantly female. At grade 3 for example, $81.21 \%$ of staff are female which is an increase of almost $2.5 \%$ from 2021. Grade 3 roles include Administration staff which is a role predominantly held by females and is a consequence of societal and educational expectations in the same way jobs such as Janitors (at grade 2) are typically held by males.

In all grades up to grade 8, apart from grade 4, there has been an increase in the proportion of female staff since 2021. By increasing the University headcount and in doing so continuing to recruit more females than males at the lower end of the pay scale we are automatically increasing our pay gap. With significantly fewer male staff at the lower end of the scale, it remains the major contributing factor to the continuation of the pay gap.

As our analysis shows, the University can react relatively quickly to pay gaps identified within grades however the headline gender pay gap will not be closed until the gender balance at the lower end of the pay scales changes. In the past 2 years, Covid and Brexit have impacted on the job market and there have been less candidates to select from which reduces the opportunity for positive action in this regard. Job markets change however the ongoing challenge for the University in addressing, what is referred to as occupational segregation, will be to continue to contest role stereotypes, educate where we can and encourage greater diversity.

Further analysis on the impact of the SMG gender split on the University pay gap follows in the next section.

## Gender Pay Gap by Grade

| Mean Hourly Rate | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $£ 10.92$ | $£ 13.30$ | $£ 13.41$ | $£ 15.35$ | $£ 16.85$ | $£ 18.80$ | £21.46 | $£ 29.08$ | $£ 32.08$ | $£ 36.30$ | $£ 41.98$ | $£ 48.70$ |
| Male | $£ 11.06$ | $£ 12.44$ | $£ 13.15$ | $£ 15.68$ | $£ 16.96$ | £20.34 | £22.22 | $£ 29.05$ | $£ 33.20$ | $£ 35.87$ | $£ 39.73$ | $£ 57.72$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | 1.27\% | -6.9\% | -1.98\% | 2.10\% | 0.65\% | 7.57\% | 3.42\% | -0.10\% | 3.37\% | -1.20\% | -5.66\% | 15.63\% |

Figure 2: Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Mean Hourly Rate


| Median Hourly Rate | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $£ 10.90$ | $£ 11.61$ | $£ 13.31$ | $£ 15.76$ | $£ 16.96$ | $£ 18.25$ | $£ 20.88$ | $£ 28.39$ | $£ 31.94$ | $£ 35.93$ | $£ 39.23$ | $£ 44.31$ |
| Male | $£ 10.90$ | $£ 11.61$ | $£ 13.68$ | $£ 15.55$ | $£ 17.10$ | $£ 19.36$ | $£ 21.15$ | $£ 28.39$ | $£ 33.88$ | $£ 35.93$ | $£ 39.42$ | $£ 50.74$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | 0\% | 0\% | 2.70\% | -1.35\% | 0.82\% | 5.73\% | 1.28\% | 0\% | 5.73\% | 0\% | 0.48\% | 12.67\% |

Figure 3: Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Median Hourly Rate


As illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, the results differ depending on whether the mean or median average is applied

## 5. Gender Pay Gap by Grade

As part of this analysis, consideration is given to any pay gaps on a grade-bygrade basis to ensure the design and operation of our pay system continues to be unbiased.

Analysis of the data for 2023 shows that when the mean average calculation is applied there are four grades with a pay gap over the targeted 'within' 5\% grades 2, 6, Professoriate and the Senior Management Grade (SMG). When the median average calculation is applied it is grades 6, 9 and SMG that have a pay gap greater than $5 \%$. With rigorous job evaluation processes in place there continues to be no evidence to suggest any bias in our recruitment practices or pay systems. As the following will show, we know why grade pay gaps exist and what needs to change for them to close. None of the gaps contribute significantly to the headline University pay gap.

### 5.1. Grade 2 (mean)

The data in grade 2 continues to be skewed by the inclusion of exercise and climbing instructors which are roles that are mostly held by female staff. These roles are job evaluated at grade 2 however market forces dictate that we require to pay a higher hourly rate. If we remove the instructors from the analysis, the mean gender pay gap in grade 2 drops from $6.9 \%$ (in favour of female staff) to 0.75\%.

Unless we report on staff on personal contracts separately or there is a change in approach to how we engage and pay Instructors, we will continue to have a gender pay gap in favour of female staff in this grade.

### 5.2. Grade 6 (mean \& median)

There wasn't a gender pay gap for grade 6 in 2021 so this analysis is not in response to any trend.

The gap has increased by 2.92\% (mean) and 2.82\% (median) with analysis revealing two reasons for this. Several role holders, all female, had their jobs regraded to grade 7. All the role holders were high on the grade 6 scale and when the salaries are removed from the data set it has had an impact on the average female pay within the grade.

Of the increase in grade 6 staff numbers, more have been female, and turnover of female staff during the last two years was also higher. With it being University policy to appoint, where we can, at the bottom of the pay scale, this also contributes to an increasing grade 6 pay gap. The gap will close organically if the
female staff remain in post and progress up the scale as they are expected to do.

### 5.3. Grade 9 (median)

The gap for grade 9 was present in 2021 and is a consequence of a higher proportion of male staff in the grade having longer service than their female colleagues. We want to encourage female applicants for merit based academic career progression, with the \% of female staff at grade 9 broadly reflecting the \% at grade 8. Female turnover in this grade was $11.43 \%$ in 2022 with male turnover at $2.56 \%$.

This is a pay gap we are willing to accept in the short term as any new female appointees will start on the first point of the grade and incrementally progress up the 6-8 point scale, closing the gap as they do so. Given the difference, we will be exploring the reasons for significantly higher female turnover in this grade.

### 5.4. Professoriate (mean)

Note that the mean pay gap for the Professoriate is only just over the desired range and only increased slightly since 2021. The number of male professors has increased by 5 whereas we have one additional female Professor. This results in the increase to the mean pay gap which is now $5.66 \%$, in favour of female staff, and will close should the most recently appointed male professors meet their performance objectives and progress up the salary band.

### 5.5. Senior Management Grade (mean \& median)

When the mean average is applied the pay gap at SMG is $15.63 \%$ in favour of male staff. In 2021 the mean pay gap was $9.98 \% \%$ so it has increased further since then. The two highest paid jobs in the University are held by male staff and while there is a 50-50 male-female split on the Executive, two of the most senior female staff left the University during this period, which impacts on a relatively small data set but corrects itself as new staff progress up the salary band.

If the two highest paid jobs are removed, then the grade mean pay gap drops to 2.6\%. If the University had appointed a female Principal \& Vice Chancellor in the autumn of 2020 the pay gap for SMG would be $1.42 \%$. If this (or any) gap can be influenced or changed by one or two appointments, we can be satisfied there are no biases or unfair practices when appointing staff to roles within the senior management grade.

Our analysis suggests however that further improvement in the University gender pay gap cannot be taken for granted. If we remove SMG from our overall data set the mean gender pay gap only drops to $11.27 \%$. With little room for further improvement when considering the gaps on a grade-by-grade basis, it brings us
back to the headline issue which is there are significantly more females in the lower grade jobs. We use a sector approved job evaluation scheme to ensure there is equal pay for equal value work and we regularly review market data to satisfy ourselves that there is no case for market supplements.

It is a challenge to address what is a consequence of long-term societal occupational segregation in the short to medium term however if we can make improvements in a number of areas, as reflected in the action of this report, we are confident that we can make reduce the gap.

## Academic \& Research Roles

Distribution of Female and Male Employees

|  | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | 19 | 108 | 216 | 30 | 16 | 13 | 7 |
| Male | 21 | 50 | 183 | 39 | 14 | 18 | 8 |
| Total | 40 | 158 | 399 | 69 | 30 | 31 | 15 |
| Female \% | 47.50\% | 68.35\% | 54.14\% | 43.48\% | 53.33\% | 41.94\% | 46.67\% |
| Male \% | 52.50\% | 31.65\% | 45.86\% | 56.52\% | 46.67\% | 58.06\% | 53.33\% |



Gender Pay Gap - Academic \& Research Staff (Mean)

| Mean Hourly <br> Rate | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 18.15$ | $£ 21.21$ | $£ 29.39$ | $£ 31.81$ | $£ 36.31$ | $£ 41.98$ |  |
| Male | $£ 18.01$ | $£ 21.17$ | $£ 29.19$ | $£ 33.08$ | $£ 35.94$ | $£ 39.73$ | $£ 60.55$ |
| Gender Pay <br> Gap | $\mathbf{- 0 . 7 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 6 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 8 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 0 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 . 6 6 \%}$ |  |

Figure 5: Gender Pay Gap - Academic \& Research Staff (Mean)


## Gender Pay Gap - Academic \& Research Staff (Median)

| Median Hourly Rate | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | $£ 17.72$ | $£ 20.53$ | $£ 28.39$ | $£ 31.94$ | $£ 35.93$ | $£ 39.23$ | $£ 45.91$ |
| Male | $£ 17.72$ | $£ 20.53$ | $£ 28.39$ | $£ 33.88$ | $£ 35.93$ | $£ 39.42$ | $£ 51.56$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 5.73\% | 0\% | 0.48\% | 10.96\% |

Figure 6: Gender Pay Gap - Academic \& Research Staff (Median)


## 6. Academic \& Research Staff

The University staffing profile is split into Academic \& Research and Professional \& Support staff. This allows us to delve a little deeper into the grade-by-grade analysis.

As illustrated in Figures 5 and 6, the results for Academic \& Research staff differ depending on whether the mean or median average is applied. The figures continue to be encouraging with further explanation required for SMG.

The gender split is approx. 50/50 for most grades, apart from grade 7 and Professor. Lecturers without any previous experience in academia are appointed to grade 7 but can apply to progress to grade 8 having gained two years service. With there being an increase of 42 grade 7 academic females since 2021 there will be a positive impact on the gender pay gap in 2025 as the majority will then be in grade 8.

The \% of female academic and research staff in promoted positions i.e. those with line management responsibility in grades 9 and 10, is $16 \%$. This has dropped by $1 \%$ since 2021. $24 \%$ of males are in promoted positions, which has dropped by over 2\%.

The University has career progression routes where staff progress based on their own performance. This creates equality of opportunity as staff do not need to wait for a senior person to leave to progress. Since 2021, more male staff than female have applied for merit-based progression which does not reflect the academic staff population at grade 8 , which is required staging point for promotion to grade 9 and performance related pay. This is likely to have been a consequence of Covid as more females than males assumed childcare responsibilities, and PWC'S 'women in work' analysis shows the extent this can have a knock-on effect on career progress. This is an area for review and will be captured in the actions below.

### 6.1. Senior Management Grade

As explained section 5.5, and with such a small data range, the SMG average pay and therefore pay gap is impacted by the Principal \& Vice Chancellor's salary.
Although it could be argued the Principal role is not an academic position we are required to include it in our analysis. Removing it from the data set reduces the SMG pay gap to $2.61 \%$ (mean) and $10.72 \%$ (median).

It is envisaged that many of the Deans of the future will come from the grade 10 (Associate Dean) cohort of staff. The University is currently reviewing the structural arrangements across all Schools to facilitate that opportunity. Unlike at grade 9 , the grade 10 split closely reflects the grade 8 population so that element of the career progression pipeline to Dean is where it needs to be. Setting aside the Principal \& VC position, the pay gap will recalibrate over time.

### 6.2. Professoriate

The analysis for the professoriate is covered at 5.4 above.

### 6.3. Grade 9 (median)

The gap results from variations in length of service between male and female staff. There is no trend that gives rise to any concern and the gap will recalibrate over time however female turnover has been marginally higher than males and will be reviewed. The focus, as mentioned to above, is to increase the number of female applicants for merit-based career progression and aim for a grade 9 gender split that more closely resembles the demographic at grade 8.

## Professional \& Support Roles

Distribution of Female and Male Employees

|  | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ | SMG <br> Male 43 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Figure 7: Distribution of Male \& Female Employees within Professional \& Support roles


## Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Professional \& Support Roles (Mean)

| Mean <br> Hourly <br> Rate | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 10.92$ | $£ 13.30$ | $£ 13.41$ | $£ 15.35$ | $£ 16.85$ | $£ 18.99$ | $£ 22.08$ | $£ 27.22$ | $£ 31.53$ | $£ 36.24$ | $£ 46.74$ |
| Male | $£ 11.06$ | $£ 12.44$ | $£ 13.15$ | $£ 15.68$ | $£ 16.96$ | $£ 21.45$ | $£ 23.60$ | $£ 28.14$ | $£ 33.27$ | $£ 35.41$ | $£ 55.66$ |
| Gender <br> Pay Gap | $\mathbf{1 . 2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 6 . 9 1 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 9 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 1 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{3 . 2 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 2 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 3 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0 3 \%}$ |



## Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Professional \& Support Roles (Median)

| Median <br> Hourly <br> Rate | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade <br> $\mathbf{1 0}$ | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 10.90$ | $£ 11.61$ | $£ 13.31$ | $£ 15.76$ | $£ 16.96$ | $£ 18.25$ | $£ 22.43$ | $£ 27.56$ | $£ 30.11$ | $£ 34.89$ | $£ 42.34$ |
| Male | $£ 10.90$ | $£ 11.61$ | $£ 12.68$ | $£ 15.55$ | $£ 17.10$ | $£ 19.36$ | $£ 23.10$ | $£ 26.76$ | $£ 33.27$ | $£ 35.41$ | $£ 48.78$ |
| Gender <br> Pay Gap | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 . 9 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 3 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 7 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 9 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 . 9 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{9 . 5 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 4 7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 2 0 \%}$ |

Figure 9: Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Professional \& Support Staff (Median)


## 7. Professional \& Support Staff

As with academic staff, we delve a little deeper in the grade by grade analysis for Professional \& Support staff.

The gender split for grades 1, 3 and 4 (which only apply to Professional \& Support roles) has been referred to in section 4 of this report. There is also a notable gender split at SMG level however it should be noted that if two male Professional \& Support SMG managers were to leave the University and be replaced with females then the gender split would be 50/50. There is also currently a senior leader vacancy to fill. A small data set and healthy levels of turnover will ensure it remains a fluid gender split at SMG level which also impacts on the pay gap.

As illustrated in Figures 8 and 9, the results for Professional \& Support staff differ depending on whether the mean or median average is applied. Analysis shows that when the mean average calculation is used there are five grades with a pay gap over $5 \%$ - grades $2,6,7,9$ and SMG.

It is worth noting that there was a mean pay gap for grade 10 in 2021 but it has closed, not through specific interventions, but because of turnover and the male population increasing from 1 to 2 . We accept there will always be significant fluctuations with gender pay gaps within grades when we are dealing with small numbers of staff and are operating merit-based recruitment, selection, and promotion processes in line with the Equality Act.

When the median average calculation is applied it is grades 6, 9, and SMG that have a pay gap greater than $5 \%$.

The reasons for the mean pay gap at grade 2 has been explained in section 5 .

### 7.1. Grade 6

In the same way we have market forces impacting on Instructor positions at grade 2 we also have IT positions which attract a market supplement on top of the basic salary range for the grade. These roles are predominantly occupied by male staff and this therefore creates an imbalance. The University reviews market supplements biennially which could result in them being removed or reduced. This mechanism for remunerating staff will be reviewed in 2023-24 with consideration given to its impact on the grade 6 pay gap.

### 7.2. Grade 7 (mean)

As referred to in section 5, several grade 6 female staff were promoted to grade 7 . They start on the first point of the grade 7 pay scale which reduces the average female hourly rate. The pay gap will recalibrate organically as the female staff move up their new pay scale.

### 7.3. Grade 9

The small data set, referred to above, explains the reason for a gender pay gap which will continuously change.

### 7.4. Senior Management Grade

When the mean average is applied the pay gap is $16.03 \%$ in favour of male staff and $13.20 \%$ when applying the median. If the highest paid position, referred to in section 1, is removed from the data set, the pay gap is $3.77 \%$ and $12.41 \%$ respectively. As stated above, if the mean gap alters significantly as a result of one change we can be confident of the robustness and appropriateness of our pay policies.

## Academic \& Research versus Professional \& Support

Figure 10 further demonstrates that the University gender pay gap largely exists due to the high proportion of female staff on lower grade professional \& support roles. Within Academic \& Research roles the pay gap is within $5 \%$ when the mean and the median calculation is applied. Within Professional \& Support roles the pay gap is significantly higher regardless of the method of calculation which reflects the numbers the gender imbalance at grades 1, 3 and 4 in particular.

|  | Academic \& Research <br> Mean Hourly Rate |  <br> Support Mean Hourly <br> Rate | Academic \& Research <br> Median Hourly Rate |  <br> Support Median <br> Hourly Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 27.95$ | $£ 16.29$ | $£ 14.46$ |  |
| Male | $£ 29.36$ | $£ 18.54$ | $£ 16.23$ |  |
| Gender Pay Gap | $\mathbf{4 . 8 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 . 1 4 \%}$ | $£ 27.74$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 9 1 \%}$ |

Figure 10: Gender Pay Gap - Academic \& Research versus Professional \& Support


Distribution of Female and Male Full \& Part Time Employees

|  | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FT Female | 7 | 12 | 85 | 43 | 53 | 49 | 98 | 138 | 37 | 21 | 12 | 14 |
| FT male | 0 | 34 | 23 | 20 | 54 | 50 | 63 | 148 | 41 | 15 | 16 | 19 |
| Total | 7 | 46 | 108 | 63 | 107 | 99 | 161 | 286 | 78 | 36 | 28 | 33 |
| Female \% | 100\% | 26.09\% | 78.70\% | 68.25\% | 49.53\% | 49.49\% | 60.87\% | 48.25\% | 47.44\% | 58.33\% | 42.86\% | 42.42\% |
| Male \% | 0\% | 73.91\% | 21.30\% | 31.75\% | 50.47\% | 50.51\% | 39.13\% | 51.75\% | 52.56\% | 41.67\% | 57.14\% | 57.58\% |


| PT <br> Female | 128 | 38 | 49 | 26 | 36 | 37 | 55 | 114 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PT Male | 43 | 29 | 8 | 1 | 21 | 15 | 25 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Total | 171 | 67 | 57 | 27 | 57 | 52 | 80 | 176 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 0 |
| Female \% | 74.85\% | 56.72\% | 85.96\% | 96.30\% | 63.16\% | 71.15\% | 68.75\% | 64.77\% | 100\% | 100\% | 33.33\% | 0\% |
| Male \% | 25.15\% | 43.28\% | 14.04\% | 3.70\% | 36.84\% | 28.85\% | 31.25\% | 35.23\% | 0\% | 0\% | 66.67\% | 0\% |

\% of PT Female / Male staff by grade

| Female \% | 95\% | 76\% | 37\% | 38\% | 40\% | 43\% | 36\% | 45\% | 3\% | 48\% | 8\% | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| male \% | 68\% | 46\% | 26\% | 5\% | 28\% | 23\% | 28\% | 30\% | 0\% | 0\% | 11\% | 0\% |

Figure 11: Distribution of Female and Male Employees on Full-time and Part-time Contracts


Full-time versus Part-time breakdown

|  | Mean Hourly Rate - <br> Full-time | Mean Hourly Rate - <br> Part-time | Median Hourly Rate - <br> Full-time | Median Hourly Rate - <br> Part-time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 22.62$ | $£ 18.70$ | $£ 15.76$ |  |
| Male | $£ 25.12$ | $£ 20.58$ | $£ 23.79$ | $£ 17.72$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $9.95 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 . 1 4 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 . 7 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 . 0 6 \%}$ |

Figure 12: Gender Pay Gap - Full-time versus Part-time


## 8. Full \& Part Time Staff

As illustrated in Figure 12, when comparing the pay between male and female employees engaged on both full and part-time hours the gender pay gap is less (both mean and median) for part time staff, confirming that it's not a significant contributing factor to the overall University pay gap.
$47 \%$ of female staff are part time so it's encouraging that contractual hours are not impacting on management decisions relating to pay. Of the 1055 female staff employed by the University, 208 (20.4\%) are part time in grades 1-3. Given the numbers of staff in grades 1-3 roles there is more turnover which, as alluded to throughout, impacts on average pay as most replacements are recruited to the first point of the scale.
$30 \%$ of male staff are part time (across all grades) so it continues to be the case more female staff would assume childcare responsibilities, which we also know can have an impact on career choices and progression. Childcare is the most common (but not the only) reason for requesting flexible working.

There is some evidence that flexible working opportunities are more limited at the higher end of the scale - at grade 9, for example which includes our entry level promoted post for academic staff. If it is perceived that there is no flexibility in a promoted post then this could be a factor in the low number of female staff applying and higher levels of turnover.

## 9. Conclusion

The University remains committed to improving the gender pay gap and to furthering equality between female and male employees. There has been a lot of change in the University since 2021 and significant progress has been made in the equality space since the last gender pay gap report, including:

- The appointment of a full time Equality, Diversity \& Inclusion Adviser with a focus on raising awareness and increasing employee engagement and participation.
- The appointment of staff equality champions for all 9 equality strands, with greater opportunities for staff to influence organizational change and support the University remove any inequality through participation in champion led action groups.
- Staff surveys that now ask for demographic information and allows senior management to consider variations in response against overall University staff population and identify areas for improvement.
- Roll out of EDI training and development modules to all staff, which covered eliminating bias in recruitment and raising awareness of the gender pay gap challenge.

These are the relatively recent developments, but our aim is to increase staff participation in the equality space and by doing so we open the door to more views and lived experiences on how gaps in equality arise and can be addressed.

We are conscious of the gender pay gap increasing since 2021 however it is largely a consequence of organizational change post Covid with the University investing significantly in staffing resource in a challenging job market. The headline reason for the pay gap has not changed since 2021 and we are upfront that it will not be addressed quickly.

There are areas we can improve on in the short term that will ultimately have an impact on the gap. Actions, many of which are already in train to address the pay gap, and which are part of this Gender Pay Gap report include:

- Working with managers to encourage greater diversity in roles where occupational segregation occurs.
- Reviewing practice in relation to succession planning with a view to encouraging female staff to work towards and apply for promoted positions, in particular for opportunities at grade 9 .
- Reassessing the University appraisal process, and in particular ensuring senior managers are engaged in meaningful career progression conversations.
- Progressing a new staff development strategy which places greater emphasis on career progression for female staff, complimenting not replacing existing aurora provision.
- Training and development of Associate Deans and other senior academic staff so that when Deans of School opportunities arise, they are in the position to apply.
- Continuing to develop and update our flexible working and family friendly provision to ensure all staff, regardless of their personal circumstances, can progress.
- Reviewing our attraction and recruitment processes to ensure our approach promotes and always reflects the purpose, mission, and culture of the University.
- Engaging with Equality Champions and staff action groups to generate new ideas on how the University can close the gender pay gap in the short and long term.
- Evaluating our approach to market supplements and whether our grading
for roles that attract such premia is still fit for purpose.

