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## GENDER PAY GAP REPORT APRIL 2021

## 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 31st December 2020 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: Heads of School, Vice Principal - Academic Development \& Student Experience, and Vice Principal \& Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research).

The Professional \& Support category includes all Professional \& Support Grades and all Senior Manager roles with the exception of 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 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 917 Female employees |  |
| Mean Hourly Rate $£ 20.06$ |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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 $9.84 \%$. This is a decrease of $3.39 \%$ when compared against our analysis from April 2019. This follows on from a $2.78 \%$ decrease in the previous reporting period so the university continues to make progress with closing the gap. According to the ONS, the UK gender pay gap (2020) is $15.5 \%$ so the university remains ahead of that benchmark. Another benchmark to note is that the gender pay gap across the higher education sector in 2019 was $15.1 \%$ while RGU's was $13.23 \%$.

The pay gap when using the median average hourly rate of pay is $16.17 \%$ which is a decrease of $9.6 \%$ when compared against our analysis from 2019. This can be explained by a reduction of approximately 50 staff in grades 1-3 which contracts the data range. Grades 1 and 3 have a high number and percentage of female staff whereas there has been a small shift towards males in grade 2 since 2019.

Analysis will follow which further explains the reasons for the gender pay gap and at which grade level the gender pay gap is most prominent.

Distribution of Male and Female Employees by Grade

|  | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 127 | 35 | 115 | 64 | 81 | 70 | 100 | 246 | 35 | 17 | 12 | 15 |
| Male | 44 | 42 | 31 | 19 | 67 | 54 | 69 | 200 | 34 | 15 | 13 | 18 |
| Total | 171 | 77 | 146 | 83 | 148 | 124 | 169 | 446 | 69 | 32 | 25 | 33 |
| Female \% | $74.27 \%$ | $45.45 \%$ | $78.77 \%$ | $77.11 \%$ | $54.73 \%$ | $56.45 \%$ | $59.17 \%$ | $55.16 \%$ | $50.72 \%$ | $53.13 \%$ | $48.00 \%$ | $45.45 \%$ |
| Male \% | $25.73 \%$ | $54.55 \%$ | $21.23 \%$ | $22.89 \%$ | $45.27 \%$ | $43.55 \%$ | $40.83 \%$ | $44.84 \%$ | $49.28 \%$ | $46.87 \%$ | $52.00 \%$ | $54.55 \%$ |

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


## 4. Distribution of Male and Female Staff

The university employs 1523 staff, full and part-time. 60.2\% of staff are female and 39.8\% of staff are male. In 2019 the university employed 1601 staff and $61 \%$ were female.

As Figure 1 illustrates, female staff are in the majority for all grades apart from SMG, Professorial and Grade 2. For SMG and Grade 2 the split is insignificant, and for Professorial it would change if one male was to leave and be replaced by a female. In 2019 there was one more male on grade 10 than there were females however it is female staff that are now in the majority in that grade and therefore in those promoted positions.

The gender split for SMG has reduced from almost 63\% male in 2019 to 55.5\% in 2021. If two males were to leave and be replaced by females SMG would be 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 at Grade 1, 3 and 4 are predominantly female. At Grade 3 for example, $78.77 \%$ of staff are female. 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 expected to be held by males. The challenge for the university in addressing, what is referred to as occupational segregation, is to continue to contest these stereotypes, educate where we can and encourage greater diversity. One example of a step the university has taken is the introduction of a centralised Assessment Centre for the appointment of administration staff which takes any unconscious bias out of the recruitment decisions.

With considerably fewer male staff at the lower end of the scale, with the \% gradually increasing from Grade 1 to SMG, it is indisputable as to why the university gender pay gap exists. Steps can be taken to address issues identified within grades - having flexible working policies which indirectly contribute to more female staff applying for promoted positions for example - however it remains the case that the overall gender pay gap at the university will not be closed until the gender balance at the lower levels change.

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 <br> Rate | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 9.56$ | $£ 13.23$ | $£ 12.21$ | $£ 13.97$ | $£ 15.29$ | $£ 17.22$ | $£ 20.37$ | $£ 28.98$ | $£ 30.87$ | $£ 34.51$ | $£ 41.08$ | $£ 44.36$ |
| Male | $£ 9.68$ | $£ 10.56$ | $£ 12.01$ | $£ 13.91$ | $£ 15.28$ | $£ 18.06$ | $£ 20.51$ | $£ 27.74$ | $£ 31.40$ | $£ 36.67$ | $£ 39.08$ | $£ 49.28$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $1.24 \%$ | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $25.28 \%$ | $-1.67 \%$ | $-0.43 \%$ | $-0.07 \%$ | $4.65 \%$ | $0.68 \%$ | $-4.47 \%$ | $1.69 \%$ | $5.89 \%$ | $-5.12 \%$ | $9.98 \%$ |  |  |

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


| Median <br> Hourly <br> Rate | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | Prof | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 9.50$ | $£ 11.01$ | $£ 12.31$ | $£ 14.26$ | $£ 15.57$ | $£ 17.01$ | $£ 19.97$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 30.65$ | $£ 34.37$ | $£ 37.77$ | $£ 39.85$ |
| Male | $£ 9.50$ | $£ 10.17$ | $£ 11.62$ | $£ 13.85$ | $£ 15.57$ | $£ 17.52$ | $£ 20.23$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 32.40$ | $£ 34.37$ | $£ 38.50$ | $£ 42.35$ |
| Gender <br> Pay Gap | $0 \%$ | $-8.26 \%$ | $-5.94 \%$ | $-2.96 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2.91 \%$ | $1.29 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $5.40 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1.90 \%$ | $5.90 \%$ |

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


As illustrated in Figures 2 and 3, the results differ depending on whether or not the mean or median average is applied.

## 5. Differences by Grade

Analysis of this data shows that when the mean average calculation is applied there are four grades with a pay gap over the targeted 'within' 5\% - Grade 2, Grade 10, Professoriate and the Senior Management Grade (SMG). When the median average calculation is applied it is Grade 2 , Grade 3, Grade 9 and SMG that have a pay gap greater than $5 \%$. Pleasingly, there is no evidence to suggest there is any bias in our recruitment processes or pay systems. As the following will show, we know why the gaps that are there exist and what needs to change for them to close.

The most notable pay gap is $9.98 \%$ (mean) for SMG which in keeping with much of our analysis this year shows an improvement on the 2019 position.

### 5.1. Grade 2 (mean \& median)

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 average female pay (mean) drops from $£ 13.23 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h}$ to $£ 10.47 \mathrm{p} / \mathrm{h}$ and the mean gender pay gap in Grade 2 drops from $25.28 \%$ (in favour of female staff) to $1.16 \%$.

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 significant (but explainable) gender pay gap in favour of female staff in this grade.

### 5.2. Grade 3 (median)

There are five pay points within Grade 3, which employees progress through depending on their length of service until they reach the highest pay point within the grade.

Analysis of the staff data reveals that 115 female staff, and 31 male staff are employed on Grade 3. It is noted that $48.7 \%(n=56)$ of female staff are currently paid at spinal point 19 which is the top point in the Grade 3 scale. In comparison only $38.7 \%$ ( $n=12$ ) of Grade 3 male employees are paid at this point on the scale. Therefore, within this grade, it can be determined that length of service influences the pay gap (median) in favour of female employees and that the median gap (which is just over 5\%) will close organically if the
majority of male staff remain in post and progress up the scale as they are expected to do.

### 5.3. Grade 9 (median)

There are six pay points within Grade 9, which employees progress through incrementally until they reach the highest pay point within the grade. Most grade 9 staff are in senior academic positions and if we were to make merit based male appointments to Reader or Teaching Excellence Fellow in the 2021 Academic Progression cycle, for example, it would shift the median pay gap from $5.4 \%$ in favour of male staff to it being comfortably within the $5 \%$ target range.

### 5.4. Professoriate (mean)

Note that the mean pay gap for the Professoriate is only just over $5 \%$ but in the interests of transparency we do not round down. Since 2019 the number of male professors has remained at 13 however the average hourly rate has dropped as a result of new professors replacing old and - in line with policy - being appointed further down the pay band. The $5.12 \%$ mean pay gap, in favour of female staff, arises as a result of this 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 $9.98 \%$ in favour of male staff. In 2019 the mean pay gap was $11.75 \%$ so it has closed further since then. The two highest paid jobs in the university are held by male staff however the number of females on the Executive (the higher banded SMG roles) has increased from two (40\%) to four which now represents $57 \%$ of the leadership team. If the two highest paid jobs are removed then the mean pay gap drops to $2.95 \%$ in favour of female staff. If the university had appointed a female Principal \& Vice Chancellor in the autumn of 2020 the pay gap would be $1.19 \%$ in favour of female staff.

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 overall gender pay gap cannot be taken for granted. If we remove SMG from our analysis the mean gender pay gap drops to $8.17 \%$. With little room for further improvement within a grade by grade approach it brings us back to the headline issue which is there are significantly more
females in the lower grade jobs and it will be a challenge to address what is a consequence of societal occupational segregation in the short term.

## Academic \& Research Roles

Distribution of Female and Male Employees

|  | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 9 | 66 | 211 | 26 | 16 | 12 | 7 |
| Male | 7 | 36 | 173 | 33 | 12 | 13 | 7 |
| Total | 16 | 102 | 384 | 59 | 28 | 25 | 14 |
| Female \% | $56.25 \%$ | $64.71 \%$ | $54.95 \%$ | $44.07 \%$ | $57.14 \%$ | $48 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Male \% | $43.75 \%$ | $35.29 \%$ | $45.05 \%$ | $55.93 \%$ | $42.86 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $50 \%$ |



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

| Mean Hourly <br> Rate | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 16.58$ | $£ 20.35$ | $£ 29.73$ | $£ 31.04$ | $£ 34.64$ | $£ 41.08$ | $£ 42.45$ |
| Male | $£ 16.53$ | $£ 20.25$ | $£ 28.27$ | $£ 31.38$ | $£ 34.58$ | $£ 39.08$ | $£ 51.87$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $-0.32 \%$ | $-0.49 \%$ | $-5.16 \%$ | $1.08 \%$ | $-0.17 \%$ | $-5.12 \%$ | $18.22 \%$ |

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


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

| Median Hourly <br> Rate | Grade 6 | Grade 7 | Grade 8 | Grade 9 | Grade 10 | Professor | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 16.52$ | $£ 19.64$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 31.10$ | $£ 34.37$ | $£ 37.69$ | $£ 39.46$ |
| Male | $£ 16.52$ | $£ 19.64$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 32.40$ | $£ 34.37$ | $£ 38.50$ | $£ 46.13$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $4.01 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $2.10 \%$ | $14.46 \%$ |

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


## 6. Academic \& Research Staff

As illustrated in Figures 5 and 6, the results for Academic \& Research staff differ depending on whether or not the mean or median average is applied. The figures continue to be encouraging with further explanation required for SMG.

The gender split is close to being 50/50 for most grades, apart from Grade 7 and SMG. A lower percentage of female academic and research staff (17\%) are in what we refer to as promoted positions i.e. those with line management responsibility. $26.4 \%$ of males are in promoted positions.

The introduction of new Academic progression routes in 2017 has been a positive development as grade 8 staff can be recognised and promoted based on their own performance, rather than having to wait for a senior position at grade 9 to become vacant. If we take the Teaching Excellence Fellow role we have made 7 appointments since its conception and 6 of those are female. We also have a $50 / 50$ split of Senior Lecturer A (grade 8 + exceptional performance recognition) and that opens the door to a higher-grade appointment as one of our former SLAs, the acting Head of School for Computing, will testify.

### 6.1. Senior Management Grade

As explained in an earlier section, 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. We also have 2 new female Head of School appointments and a further female Head acting into the post whereas all but two of the male academic SMG staff have been in post for many years and have therefore had more opportunity to progress up the salary band.

It is envisaged that many of the Heads of School of the future will come from the Grade 10 cohort of staff. The university has put structural arrangements in place to facilitate that opportunity. In 2019 the Grade 10 cohort was balanced with a 50/50 split between male and female staff however it is notable in the two years since that there are now more female Grade 10s than male staff, which is more reflective of the gender split at grade 8.

Setting aside the Principal position, we expect the pay gap at this level to recalibrate over time and we will continue to ensure the recruitment of Academic SMG posts is fair, consistent and free from gender bias.

### 6.2. Professoriate

See section 5.4 for analysis.

## 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 10 | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | 127 | 35 | 115 | 64 | 81 | 61 | 34 | 35 | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| Male | 44 | 42 | 31 | 19 | 67 | 47 | 33 | 27 | 1 | 3 | 11 |
| Total | 171 | 77 | 146 | 83 | 148 | 108 | 67 | 62 | 10 | 4 | 19 |
| Female <br> $\%$ | $74.27 \%$ | $45.45 \%$ | $78.77 \%$ | $77.11 \%$ | $54.73 \%$ | $56.48 \%$ | $50.75 \%$ | $56.45 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $42.11 \%$ |
| Male \% | $25.73 \%$ | $54.55 \%$ | $21.23 \%$ | $22.89 \%$ | $45.27 \%$ | $43.52 \%$ | $49.25 \%$ | $43.55 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $57.89 \%$ |

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> 10 | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 9.56$ | $£ 13.23$ | $£ 12.21$ | $£ 13.97$ | $£ 15.29$ | $£ 17.32$ | $£ 20.40$ | $£ 24.48$ | $£ 30.39$ | $£ 32.51$ | $£ 43.92$ |
| Male | $£ 9.68$ | $£ 10.56$ | $£ 12.01$ | $£ 13.91$ | $£ 15.28$ | $£ 18.29$ | $£ 20.79$ | $£ 24.37$ | $£ 31.84$ | $£ 45.00$ | $£ 47.64$ |
| Gender <br> Pay Gap | $1.24 \%$ | $-25.28 \%$ | $-1.67 \%$ | $-0.43 \%$ | $-0.07 \%$ | $5.30 \%$ | $1.88 \%$ | $-0.45 \%$ | $4.55 \%$ | $27.76 \%$ | $7.81 \%$ |

Figure 8: Gender Pay Gap by Grade - Professional \& Support Roles (Mean)


## 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> 10 | SMG |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 9.50$ | $£ 11.01$ | $£ 12.31$ | $£ 14.26$ | $£ 15.57$ | $£ 17.52$ | $£ 20.90$ | $£ 24.94$ | $£ 29.76$ | $£ 32.51$ | $£ 42.27$ |
| Male | $£ 9.50$ | $£ 10.17$ | $£ 11.62$ | $£ 13.85$ | $£ 15.57$ | $£ 17.52$ | $£ 20.90$ | $£ 23.51$ | $£ 31.84$ | $£ 32.51$ | $£ 41.16$ |
| Gender <br> Pay Gap | $0 \%$ | $-8.26 \%$ | $-5.94 \%$ | $-2.96 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-6.08 \%$ | $6.53 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-2.70 \%$ |

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


## 7. 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. At 9 there is significantly more female staff than males which does not then translate into their being more females at SMG level, where the opposite is true. It is noted however that if two male Professional \& Support SMG managers were to leave the university and be replaced with females then the gender split would be 10-9 if favour of female staff.

As illustrated in Figures 8 and 9, the results for Professional \& Support staff differ depending on whether or not the mean or median average is applied.

Analysis shows that when the mean average calculation is used there are four grades with a pay gap over 5\% - Grade 2, Grade 6, Grade 10 and SMG. There were mean pay gaps for Grade 8 and Grade 9 in 2019 but both have closed, not through specific interventions, but as a result of turnover. 2 years on we now have a mean pay gap in Grade 10 as a result of the creation of a new Senior Professional post where a male appointment was made. With very few staff at Grade 10, small changes can have an exaggerated impact. We have to accept there will be 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 Grade 2, Grade 3, Grade 8, Grade 9 that have a pay gap greater than $5 \%$.

The reasons for the pay gap at Grade 2 has been explained in section 5 above.

### 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 the payments biennially - which could result in them being removed or reduced - however the last review conducted in 2018 confirmed that based on local market forces these supplements are still required in order for the university to remain competitive. The review scheduled for 2020 was suspended due to the pandemic.

### 7.2. Grade 8 and Grade 9

The median pay gaps, which is at $6.08 \%$ and $6.53 \%$ respectively, and just over the target
range, is a consequence of turnover and length of service.

### 7.3. Grade 10

When there is turnover or change within this very small cohort of staff it will inevitably impact on the pay gap. Given the data range we will consider whether there is merit in grouping Professional \& Support SMG and Grade 10 roles together when we report on this in 2023.

### 7.4. Senior Management Grade

When the mean average is applied the pay gap is $7.81 \%$ in favour of male staff. The highest paid job is held by a male which if removed reduces the mean salary for males to $£ 40.94$. The gender pay gap then becomes $7.28 \%$ in favour of female staff.

Figure 10 further demonstrates that the university gender pay gap largely exists due to the number of female staff on lower grade professional \& support roles. Within Academic \& Research roles the pay gap is low at $0.31 \%$ when the mean calculation is applied and $0.00 \%$ when the median calculation is applied. Within Professional \& Support roles the pay gap is significantly higher regardless of the method of calculation.

|  | Academic \& Research <br> Mean Hourly Rate | Professional \& Support <br> Mean Hourly Rate | Academic \& Research <br> Median Hourly Rate | Professional \& Support <br> Median Hourly Rate |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 28.58$ | $£ 14.87$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 13.85$ |
| Male | $£ 28.67$ | $£ 16.69$ | $£ 27.15$ | $£ 15.12$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $0.31 \%$ | $10.90 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $8.40 \%$ |

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 <br> Female | 4 | 7 | 58 | 40 | 45 | 45 | 65 | 132 | 31 | 17 | 11 | 15 |
| FT male | 0 | 32 | 22 | 17 | 45 | 46 | 55 | 146 | 34 | 15 | 12 | 18 |
| Total | 4 | 39 | 80 | 57 | 90 | 91 | 120 | 278 | 65 | 32 | 23 | 33 |
| Female <br> $\%$ | $100 \%$ | $17.95 \%$ | $72.5 \%$ | $70.18 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49.45 \%$ | $54.17 \%$ | $47.48 \%$ | $47.69 \%$ | $53.13 \%$ | $47.83 \%$ | $45.45 \%$ |
| Male \% | $0 \%$ | $82.05 \%$ | $27.5 \%$ | $29.82 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $50.55 \%$ | $45.83 \%$ | $52.12 \%$ | $52.31 \%$ | $46.87 \%$ | $52.17 \%$ | $54.55 \%$ |


| PT <br> Female | 123 | 28 | 57 | 24 | 36 | 25 | 35 | 114 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PT Male | 44 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 22 | 8 | 14 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 167 | 38 | 66 | 26 | 58 | 33 | 49 | 168 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Female <br> $\%$ | $73.65 \%$ | $73.68 \%$ | $86.36 \%$ | $92.31 \%$ | $62.07 \%$ | $75.76 \%$ | $71.43 \%$ | $67.86 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Male \% | $26.35 \%$ | $26.32 \%$ | $13.64 \%$ | $7.69 \%$ | $37.93 \%$ | $24.24 \%$ | $28.57 \%$ | $32.14 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $0 \%$ |

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


## Full-time versus Part-time breakdown

|  | Mean Hourly Rate - Full- <br> time | Mean Hourly Rate - Part- <br> time | Median Hourly Rate - <br> Full-time | Median Hourly Rate - <br> Part-time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Female | $£ 21.83$ | $£ 18.19$ | $£ 20.29$ | $£ 14.68$ |
| Male | $£ 23.40$ | $£ 19.13$ | $£ 22.75$ | $£ 15.57$ |
| Gender Pay Gap | $6.71 \%$ | $4.91 \%$ | $10.81 \%$ | $5.72 \%$ |



## 8. Full \& Part Time Staff

As illustrated in Figure 12, when comparing the pay between male and female employees employed on both full and part-time hours the gender pay gap is below $5 \%$ (mean) and 5.72\% (median) for part time staff, confirming that it's not a significant contributing factor to the overall university pay gap.

48\% of female staff are part time so it's encouraging that contractual hours are not impacting on management decisions relating to pay. Of the 917 female staff, 208 (22.7\%) are part time in Grades 1-3. Given the numbers of staff in Grades 1-3 roles there is higher turnover which as alluded to throughout impacts on average pay through recruitment at the first point of the scale.

Only $27 \%$ of male staff are part time (across all Grades) so when you exclude part time staff from the calculation it reduces the university gender pay gap - mean and median as a result of there then being significantly less female staff on the lower grades included in the data. This highlights again, the impact of gender balance at the lower Grades has on the overall gender pay gap.

## 9. Conclusion

The university remains committed to improving the gender pay gap and to furthering equality between female and male employees. A number of actions which the university identified in order to close the gender pay gap were outlined in the 2017 Equality Outcomes, covering the period 2017-21. As alluded to at points within the report, there has been significant improvement in the gender pay gap since 2017 and our targeted attention will undoubtedly have had an impact. These actions included:
i. Making information on the university's approach to equality and diversity and any specific services available to staff and job applicants (completed);
ii. Providing unconscious bias training to staff involved in the recruitment and selection process (completed);
iii. Undertaking biennial reviews on the justification for, and level of, individual attraction and retention premiums (ongoing);
iv. Continuing to review the use of gender-neutral language during the recruitment process (since expanded to all HR Policies);
v. Continuing to identify and address anomalies within historic pay arrangements (ongoing)

Further to the above the university identified additional actions in 2019 which are being
acted on, and are as relevant now as they were then, given the headline reason for the university gender pay gap remains:
i. Reviewing recruitment \& selection practices for roles in grades 1 to 5 in order to achieve greater gender balance;
ii. Monitoring the implementation of the Academic Roles review to ensure its guiding principles of fairness, consistency and transparency are being realised;
iii. Training and development of Academic Strategic Leads and other senior academic staff so that when Head of School opportunities arise they are in the position to apply;
iv. Continuing to develop and update our family friendly provision to ensure all staff, regardless of their personal circumstances, have the opportunity to progress.

