



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

# **Equal Pay Audit 2020**

**June 2021**

## 1. **Background**

- 1.1 The University supports the principle of equal pay for work of equal value and recognises that it should operate a pay system that is free from bias and is based on objective criteria. The University has conducted regular Equal Pay Audits since 2009, in accordance with the National Pay Agreement.

## 2. **Legislation**

- 2.1 The Equal Pay (Northern Ireland) Act 1970 provides for equal pay between men and women by giving a woman the right to equality in the terms of her contract of employment where she is doing equal work. Equal work includes work that is similar; work rated as equivalent through job evaluation; or work that is different but considered to be of equal value.
- 2.2 As a public authority designated for the purposes of Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998, it is a statutory reporting requirement for the University to carry out an Equal Pay Audit, and in doing so helps to ensure transparency in matters relating to pay and to protect against any potential equal pay claims.
- 2.3 Where gender is mentioned in the report, it is in the context of Equal Pay Audit, not Gender Pay Gap Reporting. A separate Gender Pay Gap Report will be conducted when regulations required under the Employment Act (Northern Ireland) 2016 are finalised.

## 3. **Scope of the Equal Pay Audit (2018-2020)**

- 3.1 The University's Equal Pay Audit (2020) assesses the remuneration of our 4180 contracted employees as at 1 August 2020, by the protected characteristics of gender, ethnicity, disability, and community background.
- 3.2 This pay audit is based on the salary period from 2 August 2019 to 1 August 2020 and excludes:
- The Vice-Chancellor;
  - The Registrar and Chief Operating Officer;
  - Clinical Academic staff;
  - Clinical Teaching Fellows
  - Staff on Consultant Pay Scales
  - Remuneration of visiting academics;
  - Knowledge Transfer Partnership Associates;
  - Contractors for Services;
  - Premature Retirement Compensation Scheme staff; and
  - Student Employment
  - Graduate Interns
  - Staff paid by Health Trusts.
- 3.3 These categories were excluded from the scope of previous institutional pay audits conducted in 2009, 2014 and 2017 and allow for an accurate "like for like" comparison.
- 3.4 It also makes reference to the work of the University's Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group. This group was established in December 2016 to address potential

gaps in Professoriate pay and to develop evidence-based recommendations to address the gender pay gaps identified within specific ranges of the Professoriate. This group had a range of specific objectives to meet in relation to the Professoriate Gender Pay Gap and concluded in March 2019.

- 3.5 This pay audit identifies mean equal pay gaps based on basic salary and total earnings not just in respect of gender but also on the grounds of disability, ethnicity, and community background. All data has been anonymised in accordance with relevant guidance to prevent the identification of any individual's salary.
- 3.6 The basic salary equal pay gap by gender is calculated using the average basic salaries of females expressed as a percentage of the average basic salaries of males doing work of equal value.
- 3.7 The total salary equal pay gap by gender is calculated using the average total earnings of females expressed as a percentage of the average total earning of males.
- 3.8 Basic salary includes both basic salary and market supplements.
- 3.9 Total salary includes basic salary plus any job-related additional salary payments for example, honoraria, overtime, shift allowances, discretionary awards and head of school payments.
- 3.10 Additional salary payments not included are those payments which are not directly job related, for example, additional payments for acting as a First Aider, Invigilating, Clinical Excellence Awards, Consultancy, Royalty Income etc.
- 3.11 In line with advice issued nationally and as per Equality Commission for Northern Ireland guidance, overall equal pay gaps of 5% have been considered significant and worthy of further investigation.

#### 4. Findings

- 4.1 Identification of an equal pay gap does not necessarily indicate inequalities in pay practices or discriminatory treatment.
- 4.2 The causes of equal pay gaps are complex and may result from a combination of factors for example, length of service, the percentage of men and women employed at senior grades, the number of interruptions to careers (e.g. maternity leave, career break, sabbaticals), the award of attraction/retention payments and market supplements.
- 4.3 Care should be taken when interpreting equal pay gaps in instances where there is a small number of staff in a particular grade and / or employment category. This is particularly the case in relation to disability and ethnicity.
- 4.4 The findings are presented on pages 3-22 and are analysed by:-
  - Gender (Table 1, pg 4)
  - Gender by Grade (Table 2, pg 5)
  - Gender by Grade Comparison with 2017 Audit (Table 3, pg 6)
  - Gender by Employment Category (Table 4, pg 8)
  - Gender by Employment Category Comparison with 2017 Audit (Table 5, pg 9)
  - Gender by Academic Grade (Table 6, pg 10)

- Gender by Academic Grade Comparison with 2017 Audit (Table 7, pg 10)
- Gender by Professorial Range (Table 8, pg 10)
- Gender by Professorial Range Comparison with 2017 Audit (Table 9, pg 11)
- Gender by Starting Salaries (Table 10, pg 14)
- Gender by Market Supplements (Table 11, pg 16)
- Gender by Part-Time Working (Table 12, pg 17)
- Gender by Part-Time Working and Grade (Table 13, pg 18)
- Ethnicity (Table 14, pg 19)
- Disability (Table 15, pg 21)
- Community background (Table 16, pg 24)

4.5 The findings refer to data extracted from previous Equal Pay Audits (2009, 2014 and 2017) to allow for a comparison and identification of emerging patterns and trends.

## 5. Gender

5.1 For calculating equal pay gaps based on gender, the percentage pay gap is the gap between average salaries of female members of staff and the average salaries of male members of staff.

5.2 The equal pay gap figure is shown as a negative percentage where the average female salary is greater than that of males.

**Table 1: Comparison of Equal Pay Gaps by Gender 2009-2020**

Year	All Staff			
	Female Number / %	Male Number / %	Basic Salary (Mean) % Pay Gap	Total Salary (Mean) % Pay Gap
<b>2009</b>	1817 (52.1)	1672 (47.9)	23.2	24.1
<b>2014</b>	1915 (53.5)	1662 (46.5)	21.1 ↓	22.0 ↓
<b>2017</b>	1977 (54.1)	1676 (45.9)	19.6 ↓	20.4 ↓
<b>2020</b>	2279 (54.5)	1901 (45.5)	17.6 ↓	18.1 ↓

5.3 54.5% (2279) of the University's employees are women and 45.5% (1901) are men. Since 2017, the % of women has increased by 0.4% and the % of men has decreased by 0.4%.

5.4 A comparison between the 2017 equal pay audit and the current audit shows a decrease in the mean basic equal pay gap by gender (down by 2.0%) and total salary equal pay gap by gender (down by 2.3%). Although the gaps remain significant (17.6% basic salary and 18.1% total salary) they have continued to reduce in each Equal Pay Audit to date.

5.5 In order to assess more fully the equal pay gaps by gender presented in Table 1, an analysis was carried out by grade see Table 2 below.

**Table 2: Gender by Grade of all Staff**

Grade	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean) £		Total Salary (Mean) £		% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Grade 1	69	40	16,827.22	16,824.00	17,245.35	17,363.15	0.0	0.7
Grade 2	51	74	17,621.69	18,075.84	<b>18,845.50</b>	<b>21,944.67</b>	2.5	<b>14.1</b>
Grade 3	218	104	20,278.05	20,151.37	20,676.64	21,515.14	-0.6	3.9
Grade 4	276	118	23,459.77	23,959.64	<b>23,720.40</b>	<b>25,821.90</b>	2.1	<b>8.1</b>
Grade 5	196	85	27,452.93	27,435.12	27,686.94	27,891.23	-0.1	0.7
Grade 6	221	137	31,275.81	31,545.19	31,395.72	31,681.65	0.9	0.9
Grade 7	564	482	37,776.97	37,505.19	37,863.51	37,592.07	-0.7	-0.7
Grade 8	377	345	47,137.17	47,763.36	47,259.79	47,846.69	1.3	1.2
Grade 9	212	290	57,094.87	58,340.09	57,465.97	58,593.77	2.1	1.9
Grade 10	8	11	<b>71,776.06</b>	<b>76,688.21</b>	<b>72,528.61</b>	<b>77,161.49</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>
Above Gd 10	5	4	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>-6.2</b>	-4.0
Professor	80	208	<b>83,387.75</b>	<b>90,630.31</b>	<b>84,894.10</b>	<b>91,875.02</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>
PVC	2	3	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>1901</b>	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>17.6</b>	<b>18.1</b>

##### Redacted to avoid potentially disclosing salary of any individual

**Table 3: Gender by Grade of all Staff – Comparison with 2017 Audit**

Grade	2017		2020		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
Grade 1	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	0.7	
Grade 2	2.5	<b>16.2</b>	2.5	<b>14.1</b>	↓ <b>2.1</b>
Grade 3	-0.7	<b>7.1</b>	-0.6	3.9	
Grade 4	2.6	<b>8.3</b>	2.1	<b>8.1</b>	↓ <b>0.2</b>
Grade 5	-0.5	0.7	-0.1	0.7	
Grade 6	0.4	0.3	0.9	0.9	
Grade 7	0.6	0.8	-0.7	-0.7	
Grade 8	0.8	0.8	1.3	1.2	
Grade 9	1.5	1.4	2.1	1.9	
Grade 10	-4.3	-3.6	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.0</b>	↑ <b>9.6</b>
Above Gd 10	4.8	4.1	<b>-6.2</b>	-4.0	
Professor	<b>10.6</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	↓ <b>2.9</b>
PVC	-0.1	0.9	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>	↑ <b>5.1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>18.1</b>	↓ <b>2.3</b>

- 5.6 The 2020 Equal Pay Audit (Table 2) illustrates there are no significant equal pay gaps by gender in 8 of the 13 Grades at the University; the total salary equal pay gaps of significance occur in Grades 2, 4, and 10, and within the Professoriate and PVC Grades.
- 5.7 However, it should be noted that of the 5 grades in which total salary equal pay gaps by gender of significance occur, 3 have decreased since the last audit in 2017.
- 5.8 One explanation for the overall equal pay gap by gender could be attributed to the distribution of the females and males across grades. A greater percentage of females than males are employed in Grades 1 to 6 (45.2% and 29.4% respectively).
- 5.9 The data illustrates that there is a positive basic salary equal pay gap by gender at Grade 3, Grade 5, Grade 7, and Above Grade 10. This shows an improvement at Grade 7 and Above Grade 10 in which negative equal pay gaps were identified in 2017.
- 5.10 The equal pay gap by gender in Grade 3 was deemed significant in the last audit but has decreased from 7.1% in 2017 to 3.9% in 2020.
- 5.11 Significant equal pay gaps by gender occur at Total Salary in Grades 2 and 4. This is due to the differences in additional payments paid to staff in these grades. For both Grades 2 and 4 additional payments were made to staff across the Clerical, Operational and Technical Categories.
- 5.12 Within Grade 2, 68.6% of females received additional payments such as overtime and shift payments compared to 87.8% of males. This is an improvement on the 2017 audit where only 30.1% of females at Grade 2 received additional payments compared to 83.3% of males.

However, when we look at the average amount of additional payments for this category and grade, for females this is £1783.26 (down from £2309.45 in 2017) and males £4404.52 (up from £4248.93 in 2017).

- 5.13 Within Grade 4, 27.9% of females received additional payments compared to 52.5% of males (in 2017 18.0% of females received payments compared to 55.7% of males). The average payment was £934.19 (down from £1065.62 in 2017) to females and £3544.31 to males (up from £2952.84 in 2017). Hence the large total salary equal pay gap in favour of males for both Grade 2 and 4.
- 5.14 Whilst the above shows an increase in the % of female staff in these grades being awarded additional payments, female members of staff may still be unable to avail of as many additional hours as their male colleagues, due to reasons such as, childcare and other work/life balance commitments. Further analysis of this issue may be required.
- 5.15 However, it should be noted that the equal pay gaps at these Grades have decreased since the last audit in 2017 by 2.1% (Grade 2) and 0.2% (Grade 4). This may be because of the University's continued commitment to develop and enhance its suite of family friendly / work life balance policies.
- 5.16 The most significant change in equal pay gap by gender is at Above Grade 10. The total salary equal pay gap has decreased from 4.1% in 2017 to -4.0% in 2020. The data shows that at this Grade, the average salary of the females is higher than that of the males for both basic and total salary. This is positive news for women in senior leadership positions within the University.
- 5.17 The total salary equal pay gap by gender at Grade 10 has increased by 9.6%, with a significant equal pay gap at both basic (6.4%) and total salary (6%) at this Grade. The reason for this is due to movement and the salaries of those within the Grade. Due to the small number of posts at Grade 10, any such movement can create a substantial difference in the % equal pay gap.
- 5.18 The data also illustrates that there are no significant basic salary equal pay gaps identified except at Grade 10 and at the Professoriate grade.
- 5.19 The data illustrates that while there is a significant total salary equal pay gap at Grades 2, 4, 10 and within the Professoriate and the PVC Grades, when comparing with the 2017 Equal Pay Audit (see Table 3), the equal pay gap within each of these grades has decreased since 2017, with the exception of Grade 10 and PVC.
- 5.20 In 2014, the Professoriate equal pay gap was 11.4% for both Basic and Total salary. The Professoriate equal pay gap, although still significant at 8.0% basic salary and 7.6% total salary, has reduced from 10.6% (Basic Salary) and 10.5% (Total Salary) in 2017. This may be in part due to the work carried out by the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group established in December 2016 to bring forward recommendations to close the Professoriate equal pay gap.
- 5.21 The PVC total salary equal pay gap by gender has increased from 0.9% in 2017 to 6.0% in 2020 and this is considered significant. However, there are only a very small number of staff at this Grade and as one of the PVCs is excluded from the audit, further analysis may not be meaningful.
- 5.22 Following a detailed analysis of various options and lengthy consultation with the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland and Trade Unions, the Professorial Gender

Pay Gap Project Group recommended amendments to points within the Professorial Salary Ranges 1 and 2. This would appear to have had a positive effect on the equal pay gaps.

5.23 Data is broken down by employment category to investigate the equal pay gaps by gender further (see tables 4 and 5 below).

**Table 4: Gender by Employment Category**

Employment Category	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean)		Total Salary (Mean)		% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
<b>Academic</b>	506	703	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>13.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>
<b>Academic Related</b>	558	372	<b>42,729.23</b>	<b>45,706.79</b>	<b>42,971.17</b>	<b>45,945.77</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>
<b>Research</b>	314	324	36,415.00	36,302.80	36,437.82	36,317.52	-0.3	-0.3
<b>Technical</b>	93	165	27,644.50	29,021.90	<b>27,900.10</b>	<b>29,453.57</b>	4.7	<b>5.3</b>
<b>Clerical</b>	657	145	<b>24,142.73</b>	<b>22,339.57</b>	<b>24,367.68</b>	<b>22,582.69</b>	<b>-8.1</b>	<b>-7.9</b>
<b>Operational</b>	151	192	<b>18,783.20</b>	<b>20,975.93</b>	<b>19,771.58</b>	<b>24,246.05</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>18.5</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>1901</b>	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>17.6</b>	<b>18.1</b>

##### Redacted to avoid potentially disclosing salary of any individual

**Table 5: Gender by Employment Category – Comparison with 2017 Audit**

Employment Category	2017		2020		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	
<b>Academic</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>	↓ 0.8
<b>Academic Related</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	<b>6.5</b>	↑ 1.0
<b>Research</b>	1.6	1.9	-0.3	-0.3	↓ 2.2
<b>Technical</b>	<b>5.5</b>	<b>6.1</b>	4.7	<b>5.3</b>	↓ 0.8
<b>Clerical</b>	<b>-8.7</b>	<b>-7.6</b>	<b>-8.1</b>	<b>-7.9</b>	↑ 0.3
<b>Operational</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>23.4</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>18.5</b>	↓ 4.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>19.6</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>17.6</b>	<b>18.1</b>	↓ 2.3

5.24 Overall the equal pay gap by gender (% total salary) has reduced from 20.4% in 2017 to 18.1% in 2020. This reflects a continued decrease from the last reporting periods. The following paragraphs look at each employment category in turn, in order to determine if any particular trends or patterns have or are emerging.



## Academic Grades

- 5.25 The total salary equal pay gap by gender for Academic staff has decreased from 14.1% in 2017 to 13.3% in 2020.
- 5.26 While this equal pay gap by gender of 13.3% is considered significant, there is positive news in this category. There are no significant equal pay gaps by gender at Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Reader level, which combined covers 75.8% (916 out of 1209) of staff in the Academic category (Table 6 refers).

**Table 6: Gender by Academic Grade**

Academic Grade	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean)		Total Salary (Mean)		% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Lecturer	252	242	45,022.89	45,634.09	45,061.57	45,693.29	1.3	1.4
Senior Lecturer	141	191	55,434.53	56,378.90	55,636.77	56,570.63	1.7	1.7
Reader	31	59	61,183.81	63,162.64	61,740.32	63,491.73	3.1	2.8
Professor	80	208	83,387.75	90,630.31	84,894.10	91,875.02	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>
PVC	2	3	#####	#####	#####	#####	<b>3.3</b>	<b>6.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>703</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>

##### Redacted to avoid potentially disclosing salary of any individual

**Table 7: Gender by Academic Grade – Comparison with 2017 Audit**

Academic Grade	2017		2020		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
Lecturer	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.4	↑ 0.3
Senior Lecturer	1.2	1.1	1.7	1.7	↑ 0.6
Reader	2.9	2.9	3.1	2.8	↓ 0.1
Professor	<b>10.6</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>7.6</b>	↓ 2.9
PVC	-0.1	0.9	3.3	<b>6.0</b>	↑ 5.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>14.1</b>	<b>13.2</b>	<b>13.3</b>	↓ 0.8

**Table 8: Gender by Professorial Range**

Range	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean)		Total Salary (Mean)		% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Prof Range 1	35	68	66,813.57	70,020.23	67,215.22	70,619.60	4.6	4.8
Prof Range 2	33	94	90,928.02	93,240.13	93,034.29	94,944.53	2.5	2.0
Prof Range 3	10	33	108,304.54	110,677.31	111,777.85	112,223.13	2.1	0.4
Prof Range 4	2	13	#####	128,677.35	#####	129,209.40	3.3	2.8
PVC	2	3	#####	#####	#####	#####	3.3	<b>6.0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>#####</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.0</b>

##### Redacted to avoid potentially disclosing salary of any individual

**Table 9: Gender by Professorial Range – Comparison with 2017 Audit**

Range	2017		2020		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Basic Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary	% Pay Gap Total Salary
Prof Range 1	-1.0	-1.2	4.6	4.8	↑ 6.0
Prof Range 2	<b>8.4</b>	<b>8.3</b>	2.5	2.0	↓ 6.3
Prof Range 3	2.3	0.1	2.1	0.4	↑ 0.3
Prof Range 4	n/a	n/a	3.3	2.8	n/a
PVC	-0.1	0.9	3.3	<b>6.0</b>	↑ 5.1
<b>Total</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>10.5</b>	<b>7.3</b>	<b>7.0</b>	↓ <b>3.5</b>

5.27 Further analysis within the Academic Grades (Table 7 refers) shows that while there is a significant equal pay gap by gender within the Professoriate (8.0% basic salary and 7.6% total salary equal pay gap), the Professoriate Equal Pay Gap has decreased from the last Equal Pay Audit in 2017.

5.28 Though still considered to be significant at 8.0% basic salary and 7.6% total salary, this has reduced from 10.6% (basic salary) and 10.5% (total salary) in 2017 to 7.6% in 2020 (Table 7 refers). This may be in part due to the work carried out by the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group established in December 2016 to bring forward recommendations to close the Professoriate equal pay gap by gender.

The Group focused on three main themes; reward, recruitment and development and took a number of actions. These include: the reduction of the Professorial Range 2 scale points from 6 to 4, the creation of a new Reader range (AC5) to help support a pipeline of talent to increase the number of females at Professorial level, and the streamlining of the Professorial Salary Review process into a single process for Academic Progression to enable applications to continue to be evaluated holistically with overall contributions taken into account.

These specific actions are in addition to QGI initiatives to support the female professoriate including welcome statements, mentoring, coaching, leadership development and tiered development support.

- 5.29 Further analysis within the professoriate has revealed that there is only one significant equal pay gap by gender at PVC level (Table 8 refers).
- 5.30 It should be noted that in 2017 there were no female professors at Range 4 but there are now female professors at each level of the Professoriate and representation of females at each level has increased since the last audit.
- 5.31 At Range 2, the 2017 data identified a significant equal pay gap by gender of 8.4% (Basic Salary) and 8.3% (Total Salary). This equal pay gap has decreased significantly by 6.3% to 2.0% in 2020. This is particularly of note as there are almost three times as many male professors at Range 2 (94) than females (33) and reveals that male and female professors are paid broadly equally (both in terms of basic (2.5%) and total salary (2.0%).

As noted, this may be attributed to the work of the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group and their actions to reduce the Professorial Range 2 scale points from 6 to 4. This action reduced the equal pay gap (gender) as people moved up points in the scale by almost 3%. This was achieved along with a repositioning of the points in Range 1.

- 5.32 The number of females at Range 2 has almost doubled since 2017 (from 19 in 2017 to 33 in 2020) (Table 8).
- 5.33 The data has identified a 4.6% basic salary and a 4.8% total salary equal pay gap at Professoriate Range 1.

As the gap has increased since the 2017 audit (-1.0% basic salary equal pay gap and -1.2% total salary equal pay gap), this figure is of concern but, may be explained in part by the small number of female Professors at Range 1 (women: 34.0% (35), men: 66.0% (68)), in addition to the large numbers of male professors in Range 1 who have been in post longer (3.5 years compared to 1.6 years) which inevitably results in higher salaries being acquired through incremental pay progression over time.

- 5.34 The PVC equal pay gap has increased from 0.9% in 2017 to 6.0% in 2020.

### **Academic Related Grades**

- 5.35 A 6.5% equal pay gap by gender remains across the Academic Related category, an increase of 1.0% from 2017 audit. This may be explained partially by the equal pay gap of the Grade 10 cohort which has a basic salary equal pay gap of 6.4% and total salary equal pay gap of 6.0%. Above Grade 10 has a positive equal pay gap in favour of women -6.2% basic salary equal pay gap and total salary equal pay gap of -4.0%.

### **Research Grades**

- 5.36 The analysis shows there is no significant equal pay gap by gender across the Research category (-0.3% total salary equal pay gap, compared to 1.9% in 2017. This is a greater decrease from the previous audits (2.0% in 2014 and 1.9% in 2017).
- 5.37 There is a positive equal pay gap in favour of women within the Research Grade: -0.3% basic salary equal pay gap and -0.3% total salary equal pay gap.

## Technical Grades

5.38 Basic salary and total salary equal pay gaps of 4.7% basic salary equal pay gap and 5.3% total salary equal pay gap have been identified across the Technical category. This represents a continuing decrease of both basic and total salary equal pay gaps in this category since the 2009 pay audit (from 10% basic salary and 12% total salary equal pay gap identified in the 2009 pay audit, to 8.6% and 9.6% basic salary and total salary equal pay gap respectively in 2014, and 5.5% and 6.1% in 2017).

This is particularly of note as the percentage of male staff in this category remains broadly similar; males represent 64% of the staff in this category in 2020 and represented 65.5% of the staff in this category in 2017.

5.39 Further analysis by grade shows the only significance equal pay gaps by gender are at Grade 3 (total salary) and Grade 7 where there are gaps of more than 5%; 6.2% total salary at Grade 3 and 7.7% basic salary and 7.4% total salary at Grade 7. The equal pay gap at Grade 3 has decreased from 2017 (from 7.6% to 6.2%).

5.40 The equal pay gap at Grade 7 may be explained by the length of service of these staff; the average length of service for males is more than twice that of females (12.6 for males versus 5.6 for females) at Grade 7 which inevitably results in higher salaries being acquired through incremental pay progression over time.

5.41 The Grade 3 total salary equal pay gap by gender is due to the differences in additional payments paid to males and females. 10.0% of female staff at Grade 3 in the Technical Category received additional payments compared to 42.9% of males and the average payment was lower for females.

## Clerical Grades

5.42 The average basic salary and total salary of female staff in the Clerical category is greater than of males, with positive equal pay gaps by gender of -8.1% and -7.9% respectively. This is a reduction in basic salary equal pay gap from the 2017 audit (-8.7%) but a marginal increase in total salary equal pay gap from the 2017 audit (-7.6%).

5.43 This may be explained by the distribution of females and males across grades. Within this Category, females represent 82% of all Clerical staff in the University. 48.3% of males are in the lower grades (Grades 1-3), compared to 25.9% of females at these grades.

5.44 Further analysis by grade shows the only significant and negative equal pay gap is at Grade 6 (5.0% basic and 5.3% total). This may be explained by the greater number of women at this Grade (89.1% (49)) compared to men (10.9% (6)).

5.45 This is unsurprising given that within clerical grades there has been traditionally more flexibility and part time working.

## Operational Grades

5.46 The data reveals a 10.5% (basic salary) and an 18.5% (total salary) equal pay gap by gender across the Operational category. While still significant, this is an improvement from the University's previous pay audit, as there has been a decrease of 4.9% in the total salary equal pay gap since 2017 as it was 23.4%.

The total salary equal pay gap at the Operational grades may be attributable to the fact that many operational roles accrue shift and overtime allowances for work outside of standard working or reduced hours. Research would indicate that shift allowances, overtime and additional hours are accessed less by women who, for various reasons including childcare/dependents and other work/life balance commitments.

- 5.47 Another contributory factor may be the distribution of the females and males across grades, with 72.2% (109) of all females in the Operational category in Grades 1 and 2 compared to 54.7% (105) of males.
- 5.48 The data revealed a total salary equal pay gap of 6.9% at grade 5 but there are only a very small number of staff at Grade 5, so the total salary equal pay gap is not statistically significant.
- 5.49 The data revealed significant total salary equal pay gaps by gender at Grades 2, 3, 4 and 5. Again, a contributory factor may be the distribution of the females and males across grades, at Grade 4 females represent only 17% (9) of the Grade 4 Operational staff. This is also due to the differences in additional payments paid to males and females. 85.3% of female staff in Grades 2 to 5 in the Operational Category received additional payments compared to 90.3% of males. The average payment to females was £1856.86 compared to £4655.14 for males.
- 5.50 These patterns/trends may warrant further analysis to identify whether there are any implicit or explicit gender bias in the policy and/or process in respect of overtime availability, award of shift allowances and non-consolidated discretionary awards etc.

## Starting Salaries

**Table 10: Starting Salaries of Appointees by Gender 2 August 2019 – 1 August 2020**

Employment Category	Female Appointees		Male Appointees		% Difference between M/F Appointed above bottom point
	Total Number Appointed	% Appointed above bottom point of Grade (#)	Total Number Appointed	% Appointed above bottom point of Grade (#)	
<b>Academic</b>	42	83.3% (35)	43	79.1% (34)	<b>-4.2%</b>
<b>Academic related</b>	49	44.9% (22)	34	47.1% (16)	<b>+ 2.2%</b>
<b>Research</b>	65	27.7% (18)	91	33.0% (30)	<b>+ 5.3%</b>
<b>Technical</b>	13	#####	12	#####	<b>+ 1.3%</b>
<b>Clerical</b>	48	18.8% (9)	14	35.7% (5)	<b>+ 16.9%</b>
<b>Operational</b>	20	30.0% (6)	19	47.4% (9)	<b>+ 17.4%</b>
<b>Total</b>	237 (271*)	38.8% (##) (30.3% (82)*)	213 (235*)	45.1% (##) (43.8% (103*))	<b>+ 6.3%</b> <b>(+13.5%*)</b>

\*Figures from 2017 for comparison

## Redacted in accordance with ICO guidance where 5 or less staff could potentially be identified

- 5.51 The data above reflects the 237 (52.7%) females and 213 (47.3%) males who were appointed during the period covered by the pay audit (i.e. 2nd August 2019 to 1<sup>st</sup> August 2020) (Table 10 refers).
- 5.52 A review of the starting salaries of the appointees showed that a greater percentage of the male appointees (45.1%) were appointed above the bottom point of the relevant grade / range compared to the percentage of the female appointees (38.8%) – a difference of +6.3% in favour of men. This is a significant difference but is still an improvement on a similar analysis in the 2017 audit which showed a difference of +13.5% in favour of men.
- 5.53 An analysis of the data broken down by Category shows that in Academic roles a greater percentage of women had a starting salary above the bottom point of their grade. For Academic related and Technical roles the percentage of men and women appointed at a salary above the bottom point was similar. However, women appointed to Research, Clerical, and Operational roles were less likely than men to be offered starting salaries above the bottom point of their grade.

- 5.54 A similar analysis was carried out in the 2014 and 2017 Equal Pay Audits. In 2017 7.9% more men than women in the Academic Category were appointed to a salary above the bottom point and in 2014 this was 6.9%. The 2020 audit shows that during the reporting period this has reversed and 4.2% more women started above the bottom point on the scale compared to men.
- 5.55 The % difference in the Operational category has risen from 14.3% in 2017 to 17.4% in 2020. This may warrant further analysis but it must be noted that numbers are small.
- 5.56 In the Clerical category the % difference is 16.9% between males and females appointed above the bottom point of the grade. This has reduced from a similar analysis in the 2017 audit which showed a 25.5% difference in favour of males. Again this may warrant further analysis but numbers of staff are small.
- 5.57 In the Research category the % difference is 5.3% in favour of males, similar to 5.6% in the 2017 audit.
- 5.58 For all other categories the % difference of males commencing employment on a salary above the bottom point of their scale compared to females has reduced, compare to 2017.
- 5.59 When we look at the starting salaries for the same period by disability 39.7% of those with no disability started above the bottom point compared to 20.8% of staff with a disability, a difference of 18.8%. There were only a very small number of new staff with a disability who commenced employment, compared to those without a disability. There were none in the Clerical, Operational, Research and Technical Categories. There were a small number of staff in the Academic and Academic Related categories and for both these categories there were no significant % differences for those with or without a disability.
- 5.60 When we look at the starting salaries for the same period by ethnicity 41.5% of those who are White started above the bottom point compared to 35.3% of BAME staff, a difference of 6.2%. Again, the numbers of BAME staff commencing employment was small compared to White staff. There were none in Academic related, Clerical, Operational and Technical categories. There were a small number of staff in Academic and Research and in these categories there were no significant % differences.
- 5.61 When we look at the starting salaries for the same period by community background and exclude those who are non-determined 44.4% of Protestants started above the bottom point compared to 34.1% of Roman Catholics, a difference of 10.4%. The Clerical category in particular shows that 26.4% more Protestants started above the bottom point compared to Roman Catholics. For the Research category however 8.6% more Roman Catholics started above the bottom point for the Grade compared to Protestants. Numbers are small across the categories so this may not be significant.

### **Further Analysis**

- 5.62 Additional analysis was carried out, similar to the 2017 Audit to look at Market Supplements and Part-Time working by gender.

## Analysis of Market Supplements

**Table 11: Analysis of Market Supplements by Gender 2 August 2019 -1 August 2020**

Employment Category	Women		Men		% Difference between M/F awarded Market Supplement
	Total Number Women	% women to get Mkt Supp (#)	Total Number Men	% men to get Mkt Supp (#)	
Academic	506	8.7 %(44)	703	13.5% (95)	+4.8%
Academic related	558	2.5 % (14)	372	3.5% (13)	+1.0%
Research	314	1% (##)	324	0.3% (##)	-0.7%
Technical	93	1.1% (##)	165	0.6% (##)	-0.5%
Clerical	657	0.2% (##)	145	0.7% (##)	+0.5%
Operational	151	0% (0)	192	4.2% (8)	+4.2%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>2.8% (##)</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>6.3% (##)</b>	<b>+3.5%</b>

## Redacted in accordance with ICO guidance where 5 or less staff could potentially be identified

5.63 Table 9 illustrates that market supplements were paid to 182 staff during the period covered by the Equal Pay Audit. 63 (34.6%) of these were awarded to females and 119 (65.4%) were awarded to males. The two categories with the highest % difference are the Academic and Operational categories. The payment of market supplements is particularly necessary in the Academic category to attract the best academic talent to Northern Ireland. The payments made in the Operational Category were all Garden Market Supplements for Gardening staff which is paid to match Belfast City Council pay scale. There were no female gardening staff employed during the reporting period.

5.64 No significant bias by ethnicity, disability, or NI community background was found.



## Analysis of Part-Time Working

**Table 12: Analysis of Part-Time Working by Gender 2 August 2019 -1 August 2020**

Employment Category	Women		Men	
	Total Number Women Part and Full Time	% Women Part Time (#)	Total Number Men Part and Full Time	% Men Part Time (#)
<b>Academic</b>	506	12.8% (65)	703	10.0% (70)
<b>Academic related</b>	558	19.9% (111)	372	2.4% (9)
<b>Research</b>	314	11.5% (36)	324	8.6% (28)
<b>Technical</b>	93	20.4% (19)	165	4.2% (7)
<b>Clerical</b>	657	33.3% (219)	145	6.2% (9)
<b>Operational</b>	151	60.3% (91)	192	27.1% (52)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>23.7% (541)</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>9.2% (175)</b>

- 5.65 The data indicates that unsurprisingly, greater numbers of women work part-time than men in the University, across all categories except Academic where 70 men and 65 women currently work part-time, although women represent a larger proportion: 12.8% to 10.0% (see Table 10 above).
- 5.66 Research indicates that women are attracted to part-time roles for reasons associated with family, childcare and other work/life balance commitments including caring responsibilities.
- 5.67 Data would suggest that there is also greater opportunity to work flexibly/part-time in lower grades (see Table 11 below) which means those staff working part time, mainly women, are limited in progressing up the pay scales and this contributes to the equal pay gap in these categories, and overall.

**Table 13: Analysis of Part-Time Working by Gender and Grade 2 August 2019 -1 August 2020**

Grade	Women		Men	
	Total Number Women Part and Full Time	% Women Part Time (#)	Total Number Men Part and Full Time	% Men Part Time (#)
<b>Grade 1</b>	69	100% (69)	40	97.5% (39)
<b>Grade 2</b>	51	27.5% (14)	74	9.5% (7)
<b>Grade 3</b>	218	43.1% (94)	104	11.5% (12)
<b>Grade 4</b>	276	30.8% (85)	118	5.1% (6)
<b>Grade 5</b>	196	25.5% (50)	85	3.5% (##)
<b>Grade 6</b>	221	21.7% (48)	137	8.0% (11)
<b>Grade 7</b>	564	15.8% (89)	482	4.8% (23)
<b>Grade 8</b>	377	14.1% (53)	345	5.2% (18)
<b>Grade 9</b>	212	12.3% (26)	290	4.8% (14)
<b>Grade 10</b>	58	8.6% (##)	111	9.9% (11)
<b>Above Grade 10</b>	37	21.6% (8)	115	27.0% (31)
<b>Total</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>23.7% (##)</b>	<b>1901</b>	<b>9.2% (##)</b>

## Redacted in accordance with ICO guidance where 5 or less staff could potentially be identified

## 6. Ethnicity

- 6.1 For calculating equal pay gaps based on ethnicity, the average salaries of members of staff from an ethnic minority background are expressed as a percentage of the average salaries of white members of staff.
- 6.2 The equal pay gap figure is shown as a negative percentage where the average salary of members of staff from an ethnic minority background is greater than that of white staff.
- 6.3 The analysis does not include the 5.3% of staff for whom there was no information provided in respect of ethnicity.

**Table 14: Comparison of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Equal Pay Gaps 2009-2020**

Year	All Staff (who provided information)			
	BAME Number / %	White Number / %	Basic Salary Gap (Mean) %	Total Salary Gap (Mean) %
2009	171 (5.2)	3101 (94.8)	-1.8	-1.1
2014	204 (5.9)	3233 (94.1)	-3.4 ↑	-2.4 ↑
2017	217 (6.1)	3313 (93.9)	-4.0 ↑	-3.0 ↑
2020	278 (7.0)	3682 (93.0)	-3.0 ↓	-2.0 ↓

- 6.4 The data reveals that the numbers of staff from a BAME background has continued to increase. During this reporting period there are 278 BAME staff (7.0%) compared to 171 BAME staff (5.2%) in the first audit in 2009.
- 6.5 Similar to previous audits the average salary of members of staff from a BAME background continues to be greater than that of staff from a White background. The mean basic salary (-3.0%) and total salary equal pay gaps (-2.0%) are not significant and the gaps have both reduced by 1% since the last audit.
- 6.6 When analysed by grade, it is clear that the equal pay gap in favour of BAME staff may be explained by the small number of BAME staff overall (278) compared to staff from a White background (3682). 91% of staff from an Ethnic Minority background are at Grade 6 and above.
- 6.7 85% of the 278 staff from a BAME background are employed within the academic and research categories.

### Academic Grades

- 6.8 Within the academic category, there is a basic salary BAME equal pay gap of 11.3% (up from 10.9% in the last audit) rising to 11.9% on total salary (up from 11.6% in the last audit). While still of concern, the data confirms that the BAME equal pay gap has still decreased by 1.9% basic salary equal pay gap and by 2.1% total salary equal pay gap since the 2014 audit.
- 6.9 There are no significant BAME equal pay gaps at the Grade of either Lecturer or Senior Lecturer but a significant equal pay gap exists at Professor Grade.
- 6.10 At Reader grade there is a positive equal pay gap in favour of BAME staff (2.8% basic and 2.1% total salary).
- 6.11 Within the Professoriate, there is a basic salary BAME equal pay gap of 9.8% (up from 8.0% in 2017) and 10.8% for total salary (up from 9.7% in 2017). This may be as numbers of BAME staff are small at this grade, only 5.8% of the Professoriate are from a BAME background.

- 6.12 When analysed by Professorial Range there is a very minimal BAME equal pay gap at Range 1.
- 6.13 However there are significant BAME equal pay gaps at Range 2 (7.0% basic salary and 7.9% total salary) and Range 3 (5.8% basic salary and 7.8% total salary). At Range 2 the average number of years at grade is 3.2 years for BAME staff compared to 5.4 years for White staff. At Range 3 the average number of years at grade is 2.6 years for BAME staff compared to 4.0 years for White staff. There are also a small number of BAME staff at these grades, making up only 5.1% of staff in Range 2 and 3 combined.
- 6.14 There are no Range 4 Professors or PVCs from a BAME background.

### **Academic Related Grades**

- 6.15 Within the academic related category, there is a BAME equal pay gap of 12.4% basic salary and 12.5% total salary, down from 14.3% basic salary and 14.4% total salary in 2017.
- 6.16 Similar to the 2017 audit there are no staff from a BAME background in Grades 9, 10 and above Grade 10.
- 6.17 When analysed by grade a significant BAME equal pay gap exists at Grade 8 (basic salary: 6.1%, total salary 4.5%). At this grade there is a very small number of staff from a BAME background.

### **Research Grades**

- 6.18 Within the research staff category there are significant positive BAME equal pay gaps in favour of staff from a BAME background at Grade 6 (-5.2% both basic and total salary) and Grade 9 (-6.0% both basic and total salary), up from -4.5% in 2017.

### **Technical Grades**

- 6.19 An overall BAME equal pay gap exists for technical staff of 12.1% basic salary (up from 9.3% in 2017) and 13.3% total salary (up from 10.7% in 2017).
- 6.20 Only 6 members of staff from a BAME background are employed as technicians and of these, 83% are employed at lower Grades 2 and 3, compared to 10% (24) of the White technicians.

### **Clerical Grades**

- 6.21 Within the clerical staff category there are significant BAME equal pay gaps at Grade 4 for total salary and Grade 5 for basic salary but there are only a very small number of staff from a BAME background in these grades which prevents any meaningful analysis.

## Operational Grades

6.22 The number of staff (6) from a BAME background in the Operational category is also too small to allow for any meaningful analysis.

### 7. Disability

7.1 For calculating equal pay gaps based on disability the average salaries of members of staff with a disability are expressed as a percentage of the average salaries of members of staff without a disability.

7.2 The equal pay gap figure is shown as a negative percentage where the average salary of members of staff with a disability is greater than that of members of staff without a disability.

7.3 The analysis does not include the 23% of staff for whom there was no information provided in respect of a disability.

**Table 15: Comparison of Disability Equal Pay Gaps 2009-2020**

Year	All Staff (who provided information)			
	With a disability Number / %	Without a disability Number / %	Basic Salary Gap (Mean) %	Total Salary Gap (Mean) %
2009	107 (3.4)	3015 (96.6)	8.2	8.1
2014	215 (7.4)	2684 (92.6)	↑ 8.7	↑ 8.9
2017	248 (8.2)	2784 (91.8)	↓ 5.5	↓ 5.4
2020	321 (10.0)	2898 (90.0)	↑ 6.2	↑ 6.4

7.4 The figures show that the number of staff (10.0%) now recorded on iTrent as either disabled or living with a long term condition has tripled since our first audit in 2009 (107 3.4%). It is encouraging that staff now feel more comfortable disclosing their disability/long term condition to the University.

7.5 Unfortunately a comparison between the 2017 equal pay audit and the current audit shows a small increase in the disability equal pay gap (0.7% increase in the basic salary (mean) equal pay gap, and a 1.0% increase in the total salary (mean) equal pay gap). We are still in a better position than previous equal pay gaps in 2009 and 2014.

7.6 While there is an overall 6.2% basic salary and 6.4% total salary equal pay gap there is only one significant total salary equal pay gap at Grade 2 of 10.8%. Staff with a

disability at Grade 2 have an average number of years in service of 5.4 years compared to 10.6 years for those without a disability.

- 7.7 As each of the individual grades comprises of a number of employment categories a further analysis was carried out by employment category.

### **Academic Grades**

- 7.8 There is no significant disability equal pay gap overall across the academic category.
- 7.9 There are positive equal pay gaps of -4.8% basic salary and -4.9% total salary at the grade of Lecturer.
- 7.10 Further analysis by Professorial range shows there is no disability equal pay gap at Range 1 or Range 3. A total salary disability equal pay gap of 5.3% was identified at Range 2. This gap is consistent with the small number of staff with disabilities in this range. None of the Range 4 Professors or Pro-Vice Chancellors have declared a disability.

### **Academic Related Grades**

- 7.11 There is an overall 5.8% basic salary disability equal pay gap (up from 5.0% in 2017) and 5.9% total salary disability equal pay gap (up from 4.9% in 2017) identified across the academic related category. Further analysis shows that there are no significant disability equal pay gaps at any individual grade.
- 7.12 The overall disability equal pay gap in this category may be explained by the fact that 93.2% (68) of staff who have declared a disability are employed at the lower Grades in this category, Grades 6, 7 and 8, compared to 88.2% (612) who have not declared a disability. There are no members of staff at Above Grade 10 who have declared a disability.

### **Research Grades**

- 7.13 Within the Research category there are no significant equal pay gaps by disability overall. When broken down by grade equal pay gaps exist at Grade 6 and Grade 8 but the numbers of staff are so small, particularly at Grade 8 that further analysis may not be required.

### **Technical Grades**

- 7.14 A basic salary disability equal pay gap of 9.9% (up from 4.3% in 2017) and a total disability equal pay gap of 10.0% (up from 5.1% in 2017) were identified across the Technical category. This may be explained as the numbers of staff with a disability in this category are small and 45.2% of those without a disability are in the higher grades 6 and 7 compared to 23.1% of those with a disability. **There were no significant disability equal pay gaps when broken down by Grade.**

## **Clerical Grades**

- 7.15 There is no significant disability equal pay gap across the clerical category or by individual grade.

## **Operational Grades**

- 7.16 There is no significant basic salary disability equal pay gap across the operational category.
- 7.17 When analysed further Grades 2 and 3 show total salary disability equal pay gaps of 10.6% at Grade 2 and 7.6% at Grade 3. These gaps are consistent with the small number of staff with disabilities at these grades. Furthermore, at Grades 2 and 3 in the Operational category the average number of years in grade for staff with disabilities is much lower than for those without disabilities (6.8 years compared to 11.0 at Grade 2) and (4.0 years compared to 10.8 at Grade 3).
- 7.18 Total salary takes into account additional payments such as overtime and shift pay. At Grade 2 in the Operational category 60% of those with a disability received additional payments compared to 93% of those without a disability. The average payment was £2272.85 for staff with a disability compared to £3852.50 for staff without a disability. At Grade 3 100% of those with a disability received additional payments compared to 94.3% of those without a disability. The average payment for Grade 3 staff was £1836.78 for staff with a disability compared to £3270.87 for those without a disability. This may warrant further analysis but numbers of staff with a disability is small across these grades.
- 7.19 Grade 4 has a significant positive disability equal pay gap (basic salary: -13.2%, total salary: -5.2%) which reflects not only the small numbers of staff in this grade with disabilities, but also that they have longer average years of service (11.7 years) than those without disabilities (8.1 years). At Grade 4 50% of staff with a disability received additional payments compared to 93.9% of staff without a disability. The average payment for Grade 4 staff was £5963.38 for staff with a disability compared to £5016.46 for those without a disability.

## **8. NI community background**

- 8.1 For calculating equal pay gaps based on community background (Protestant/Catholic) the average salaries of members of staff from a Catholic background are expressed as a percentage of the average salaries of members of staff from a Protestant background.
- 8.2 The equal pay gap figure is shown as a negative percentage where the average salary of members of staff from a Catholic background is greater than that of members of staff from a Protestant background.
- 8.3 The analysis does not include the 26.8% of staff for whom no community background could be determined.

**Table 16: Comparison of Community Background Equal Pay Gaps 2009-2020**

Year	All Staff (for whom Community Background was determined)			
	Roman Catholic Community Number / %	Protestant Community Number / %	Basic Salary Gap (Mean) %	Total Salary Gap (Mean) %
2009	1285 (45.5)	1540 (54.5)	1.8	2.0
2014	1460 (51.2)	1394 (48.8)	-0.6 ↓	-0.2 ↓
2017	1509 (52.1)	1381 (47.9)	-1.0 ↓	-0.7 ↓
2020	1633 (53.4)	1425 (46.6)	0.5 ↑	0.8 ↑

8.4 Like previous audits the current audit shows there is no significant overall basic salary or total salary equal pay gap by community background.

**Academic Grades**

8.5 Within the academic category overall there is no significant community background equal pay gap overall or by grade.

**Academic Related Grades**

8.6 There is no overall significant community background equal pay gap across the academic related category. At Grade 10 and above Grade 10 there are significant equal pay gaps on both basic and total salary. At Grade 10 the basic salary equal pay gap is 6.0% and total salary equal pay gap is 6.7%. The average length of time in grade at Grade 10 for those Protestant members of staff is 5.9 years, while for Roman Catholic staff it is 4.3 years. At above Grade 10 the basic salary equal pay gap is 8.5% and total salary equal pay gap is 8.3% but the numbers of staff are so small, especially as we have excluded those who do not identify as coming from either the Protestant or Roman Catholic communities so any further analysis would not be meaningful.

**Research Grades**

8.7 The analysis shows there is no significant basic or total salary community background equal pay gap across the research category or at any individual grade.



## **Technical Grades**

- 8.8 The analysis shows there is no significant basic or total salary community background equal pay gap across the technical category or at any individual grade.

## **Clerical Grades**

- 8.9 There is no overall community background equal pay gap across the clerical category and no significant community background equal pay gaps by individual grade.

## **Operational Grades**

- 8.10 There is no overall community background equal pay gap within the operational staff category.
- 8.11 At Grade 5 there is a positive equal pay gap for Roman Catholic staff of -6.2% basic salary and - 8.7% total salary. There are a very small number of staff from both communities in post at this grade so further analysis would not be meaningful.

## **9. Key findings**

- 9.1 The identification of an equal pay gap does not necessarily indicate inequalities in pay practices or discriminatory treatment.
- 9.2 A comparison between the 2017 equal pay audit and the current audit shows a decrease in the mean basic salary equal pay gap by gender (down by 2.0%) and mean total salary equal pay gap by gender (down by 2.3%). Although the gaps remain significant (17.6% basic salary and 18.1% total salary) both figures represent marginal improvements and with each Audit the equal pay gaps continues to reduce further.
- 9.3 This audit found no significant basic salary equal gaps by gender at the majority of individual grades.
- 9.4 There are positive basic salary equal pay gaps at Grade 3, Grade 5, Grade 7 and Above Grade 10. This shows an improvement at Grade 7 and Above Grade 10 in which negative equal pay gaps were identified in 2017.
- 9.5 Although there is a total salary equal pay gap across the grades (18.1%) there is no significant equal pay gap by gender in 8 of the 13 Grades.
- 9.6 The only total salary equal pay gaps by gender of significance appear in Grades 2, 4 and 10, and within the Professoriate and PVC Grades.
- 9.7 The overall basic salary equal pay gap by gender, and the small number of equal pay gaps across some of the employment categories, may be explained in part by the distribution of females and males across grades and is in the main, reasonably consistent with the length of service profile within respective grades.
- 9.8 The total salary equal pay gaps at Grades 2 and 4 may be explained by the difference in additional payments paid to staff in these grades across the Clerical, Operational and Technical Categories. A much lower % of females received additional payments - such as overtime and shift allowances - compared to males and when they did receive such payments the average amount was lower than for males.

One possible explanation for this disparity could be the difficulties of women being able to avail of additional hours, for reasons associated with family, childcare and other work/life balance commitments. This assumption may require further analysis.

- 9.9 The significant basic and total salary equal pay gaps by gender at Grade 10 are due to movement of staff in and out of this grade since the last audit. The number of staff within this grade is small so any movement can create a substantial % difference to the equal pay gap. The PVC equal pay gaps may also be due to the small number of staff at this grade.
- 9.10 The equal pay gap by gender for Academic staff overall has decreased. The audit revealed there are no significant equal pay gaps by gender at Lecturer, Senior Lecturer or Reader level, which combined covers 75.8% (916 out of 1209) of staff in the Academic category.
- 9.11 There is a 13.2% basic salary equal pay gap by gender and 13.3% total salary equal pay gap in the academic category which is broadly similar to the 2017 audit. However further analysis within the Academic Grades (Table 6 refers) shows that the professoriate and PVC grades have the only significant equal pay gaps at total salary, 7.6% and 6.0% respectively.
- 9.12 Though still considered to be significant at 7.6% total salary, the Professorial equal pay gap by gender has reduced from 10.5% (Total Salary) in 2017 to 7.6% in 2020.
- 9.13 It should be noted that in 2017 there were no female professors at Range 4 but there are now female professors at each level of the Professoriate
- 9.14 The audit identified a 4.6% basic salary and a 4.8% total salary equal pay gap by gender at Professoriate Range 1. While this may be explained in part by the small number of female Professors at Range 1 and the increased length of service of the male professors in Range 1, this figure is still of concern and the subject of much scrutiny
- 9.15 The positive equal pay gap of female staff in the Clerical category remains high, with equal pay gaps by gender of -8.1% and -7.9% respectively. However, this may be explained by the distribution of females and males across grades. Within this Category, females represent 82% of all Clerical staff in the University.
- 9.16 Equal pay gaps in the Operational and Technical categories have reduced since the previous audit.
- 9.17 Analysis of the starting salaries of appointees during the most recent year of the reporting period, showed that a greater percentage of males (45.1%) were appointed above the bottom point of the relevant grade / range than female (38.8%) – a difference of +6.3% in favour of men. This difference has more than halved from the last audit in 2017 (+13.5%).
- 9.18 Analysis shows that during the reporting period, 2.8% of female employees were awarded a market supplement compared to 6.3% of male employees.
- 9.19 The audit has illustrated that the average salary of members of staff from a BAME background continues to be greater than that of staff from a White background. The mean basic salary positive equal pay gap (-3.0%) and total salary positive equal pay gaps (-2.0%) are not significant and the gaps have both reduced by 1% since the last audit.

There are significant BAME equal pay gaps at Professorial Range 2 (7.0% basic salary and 7.9% total salary) and Range 3 (5.8% basic salary and 7.8% total salary). This may be explained by the difference in length of service between white and BAME staff at Range 2 and Range 3 combined with the small number of BAME staff at these grades, making up only 5.1% of staff in Range 2 and 3 combined.

- 9.20 There are no Range 4 Professors or PVCs from a BAME background.
- 9.21 There is an overall basic salary disability equal pay gap of 6.2% and a total salary disability equal pay gap of 6.4% (up from 5.4% in 2017). We are still in a better position than previous pay gaps in 2009 and 2014. It is encouraging that the number of staff who have declared a disability or long-term condition has risen from 3.4% in our first audit of 2009 to 10% of staff in this audit.
- 9.22 There are no significant basic or total salary disability equal pay gaps at any of the individual grades. The overall equal pay gaps are mainly because there are no staff with a disability at Above Grade 10 or PVC Grade.
- 9.23 As with previous audits this audit has illustrated no significant overall basic salary or total salary equal pay gap by community background.

## **10. Recommendations**

- 10.1 It is recommended that further analysis is undertaken to ensure that female staff (Academic and Professional Services) are attracted to the University and encouraged to apply for progression and leadership opportunities.
- 10.2 It is recommended that further analysis of market supplements is undertaken.
- 10.3 The Diversity and Inclusion Unit will share these findings and our action plan of recommendations to close the equal pay gap at Queen's with key stakeholders such as Queen's Gender Initiative and Trade Union representatives.

### Clerical Equal Pay Gap (Gender)

- 10.4 It is recommended that the Diversity and Inclusion Unit continue to work with the Internal Recruitment team to continue to encourage applications from males for Clerical positions.

### Operational Equal Pay Gap (Gender)

- 10.5 It is recommended that further analysis and/or equality screening into the allocation of overtime and additional payments within the Operational staff category is carried out by the Diversity and Inclusion Unit to determine whether our policy/processes unintentionally result in direct or indirect gender bias.
- 10.6 It is recommended that the Diversity and Inclusion Unit liaise directly with relevant directorates where male staff are disproportionately benefitting from additional payments and liaise directly with Directorate leads to identify and implement appropriate measures and interventions which could help narrow any equal pay gaps by gender.
- 10.7 It is recommended that any new/revised policies are equality screened to ensure that they do not create any direct or indirect gender bias (and that this work synchronises with any other work relating to pay, reward and review of market supplements etc).

## Professoriate Equal Pay Gap (Gender)

- 10.8 From the work of the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group which concluded in March 2019, we can see that significant improvements can occur when there is good governance and specific measures are taken. For example: the removal of spine points, and better promotion for women.
- 10.9 It is recommended that the University consider the value of enhanced stewardship of the Professoriate Equal Pay Gap on an ongoing basis.

## Disability

- 10.10 It is recommended that the Diversity and Inclusion Unit continue to deliver positive action measures in line with our commitments under our Institutional Disability Action Plan (2021-2026), to ensure that applicants and staff with a disability or long-term condition in those identified areas where there are Disability equal pay gaps.

Specific actions to encourage persons with a disability to apply for roles at the university through use of positive action measures such as welcoming statements. and the support available to individuals with a disability including the newly formed Disability Staff Network, Disability Support Fund, and other initiatives, are clearly communicated to encourage individuals to disclose a disability or long-term condition on employment or at time of acquiring, to support those employed to succeed at Queen's.

## Ethnicity

- 10.11 It is recommended that the Diversity and Inclusion Unit work with colleagues from the Athena Swan and Race Equality Charter teams to develop actions to address the significant BAME equal pay gaps identified at Range 2 and Range 3.

## The Impact of Covid-19

- 10.12 The Covid-19 pandemic has dramatically changed the way in which we work. Since March 2020 we have seen increased flexible working at Queen's as the majority of our staff have been required to work from home whilst simultaneously balancing other responsibilities such as increased caring responsibilities for children or other dependants.
- 10.13 Whilst caring may be a source of concern for employees of both sexes, traditionally the burden of caring responsibility affects women more than men (Equality Commission NI's advice note on Caring responsibilities and returning to work after lockdown). At Queen's, 2003 staff have said that they have caring responsibilities. 54% (1081) of carers are female and 46% (922) are male. When broken down by type of dependant, those who say they care for a child are 52.6% (862) female and 47.4% (777) male. However, when we look at those with wider caring responsibilities including care of a dependant older person or care of a person with a disability 63.7% of these carers are women (209) compared to 36.3% who are men (119).
- 10.14 As a result of Covid-19 we may see shifts in our equal pay gap as a result of the effect of the increased demand and increased caring responsibilities such as home schooling, home working and unpaid caring. If women continue to bear most of the domestic burden in this context, the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland advises that consequences may include women's productivity in employment;

potentially fewer economic opportunities for women (e.g. merit-based promotion); and ultimately a wider gender remuneration gap (Equality Commission, 2020).

- 10.15 It is recommended that the Diversity and Inclusion Unit review the results from the recent 'Covid-19 Pandemic Lockdown Survey: Understanding the Issues and Engendering Solutions for Queen's Staff' and the recent Staff Pulse Survey in February 2021 regarding flexible working as these could significantly inform our action plans in this area. From these results, we will be able to examine the data to identify if there are any trends of inflexibility or lack of uptake of flexible working etc in any particular categories, grades, or areas of the University.

This work will support the Flexible Working Group to ensure that we can put in place initiatives that support our staff to work flexibly; to ensure that appropriate work-life balance is supported, and to mitigate against the potential movement of female staff from the University as a result of any of these issues, therefore supporting our work towards Equal Pay.

- 10.16 Continued institutional support and funding for Athena SWAN and Race Equality Charter initiatives will be very important as we move forward to try to continue to decrease our equal pay gap. It is recommended that continued commitment in these areas in addition to continued support for staff wellbeing should be considered a major priority to implement effective interventions to address our equal pay gap.