



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Equal Pay Audit 2017

December 2017

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 The University carries out Equal Pay Audits, to ensure transparency in matters relating to equality in pay.
- 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 are required under the Employment Act (Northern Ireland) 2016 are finalised.

3. **Scope of the Equal Pay Audit (2014-2017)**

- 3.1 This pay audit is based on the salary period from 1 August 2016 to 31 July 2017 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
- 3.2 These categories were excluded from the scope of previous institutional pay audits conducted in 2009 and 2014 and allow for an accurate “like for like” comparison.
- 3.3 It also makes reference to the work of the University’s Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group. This 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 has a range of specific objectives to meet in relation to the Professoriate Gender Pay Gap. It is recommended that representatives from the Diversity and Inclusion Unit liaise closely with this Project Group to share analysis, findings and lessons learnt from the Audit.

- 3.4 This pay audit identifies mean 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 order to prevent the identification of any individual's salary.
- 3.5 The basic salary gender pay gap 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.
- 3.6 The total salary gender pay gap is calculated using the average total earnings of females expressed as a percentage of the average total earning of males.
- 3.7 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.
- 3.8 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.
- 3.9 In line with advice issued nationally and as per Equality Commission for Northern Ireland guidance, overall pay gaps of 5% have been considered significant and worthy of further investigation.

4. Findings

- 4.1 Identification of a pay gap does not necessarily indicate inequalities in pay practices or discriminatory treatment.
- 4.2 The causes of 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 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 3)
 - Gender by Grade (Table 2, pg 4)
 - Gender by Grade Comparison with 2014 Audit (Table 3, pg 4)
 - Gender by Employment Category (Table 4, pg 5)
 - Gender by Employment Category Comparison with 2014 Audit (Table 5, pg 5)
 - Gender by Academic Grade (Table 6, pg 6)
 - Gender by Professorial Range (Table 7, pg 8)
 - Gender by Starting Salaries (Table 8, pg 10)
 - Gender by Market Supplements (Table 9, pg 12)
 - Gender by Part-Time Working (Table 10, pg 13)
 - Gender by Part-Time Working and Grade (Table 11, pg 14)
 - Ethnicity (Table 12, pg 15)

- Disability (Table 13, pg 17)
- Community Background (Table 14, pg 20)

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

5. Gender

5.1 For calculating 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 pay gap figure is shown as a negative percentage where the average female salary is greater than that of males.

Table 1: Comparison of Gender Pay Gaps 2009-2017

Year	All Staff			
	Female Number / %	Male Number / %	Basic Salary (Mean) % Pay Gap	Total Salary (Mean) % Pay Gap
2009	1817 (52.1)	1672 (47.9)	23.2	24.1
2014	1915 (53.5)	1662 (46.5)	21.1 ↓	22.0 ↓
2017	1977 (54.1)	1676 (45.9)	19.6 ↓	20.4 ↓

5.3 A comparison between the 2014 equal pay audit and the current audit shows a decrease in the mean basic gender pay gap (down by 1.5%) and total salary gender pay gap (down by 1.6%). Although the gaps remain significant (19.6% basic salary and 20.4% total Salary) they have reduced in each of the last two Equal Pay Audits.

5.4 This reflects national trends in the HE sector. According to HESA staff data referenced in the New JNCHES Higher Education gender pay gap data report [September 2016] the gender pay gap for the sector has narrowed over the last decade. The mean gender pay gap fell from 18.9% in 2003/04 to 14.1% in 2014/15.

5.5 In order to assess more fully the gender pay gaps 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 Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Grade 1	72	42	15,049.50	15,011.29	15,301.35	15,265.66	-0.3	-0.2
Grade 2	73	78	16,114.34	16,520.09	16,810.34	20,060.87	2.5	16.2
Grade 3	218	95	19,098.38	18,966.97	19,373.56	20,853.67	-0.7	7.1
Grade 4	267	88	22,158.44	22,738.95	22,350.01	24,383.15	2.6	8.3
Grade 5	159	69	25,969.77	25,832.13	26,168.99	26,344.11	-0.5	0.7
Grade 6	151	108	29,757.56	29,882.14	29,885.44	29,973.36	0.4	0.3
Grade 7	500	438	35,452.82	35,656.74	35,499.88	35,781.14	0.6	0.8
Grade 8	357	400	45,297.25	45,666.51	45,389.83	45,742.95	0.8	0.8
Grade 9	121	184	55,989.69	56,851.68	56,291.52	57,070.77	1.5	1.4
Grade 10	10	9	73,812.56	70,750.34	74,240.86	71,639.23	-4.3	-3.6
Above Gd 10	5	3	#####	#####	#####	#####	4.8	4.1
Professor	43	157	75,463.33	84,385.79	77,280.10	86,388.84	10.6	10.5
PVC	1	5	#####	#####	#####	#####	-0.1	0.9
Total	1977	1676	33,517.05	41,705.61	33,724.71	42,367.91	19.6	20.4

to avoid disclosing salary of an individual

Table 3: Gender by Grade of all Staff – Comparison with 2014 Audit

Grade	2014		2017		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay	% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay
Grade 1	-0.3	1.3	-0.3	-0.2	
Grade 2	2.9	17.0	2.5	16.2	↓ (1.2%)
Grade 3	-1.2	6.5	-0.7	7.1	↑ (0.6%)
Grade 4	3.2	9.9	2.6	8.3	↓ (1.6%)
Grade 5	0.2	1.6	-0.5	0.7	
Grade 6	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.3	
Grade 7	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.8	
Grade 8	-0.7	-0.5	0.8	0.8	
Grade 9	0.2	0.3	1.5	1.4	
Grade 10	-3.9	-3.9	-4.3	-3.6	
Above Gd 10	-6.9	-6.9	4.8	4.1	
Professor	11.4	11.4	10.6	10.5	↓ (0.9%)
PVC	NA	NA	-0.1	0.9	
Total	21.1	22.0	19.6	20.4	↓ (1.6%)

- 5.6 The data in Table 2 illustrates there is no significant gender pay gap in 9 of the 13 Grades; the only gender total pay gaps of significance occur in Grades 2, 3, 4 and within the Professoriate. This presents a skewed figure of 20.4%
- 5.7 One explanation for the overall gender pay gap 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 (47.5% and 28.6% respectively).
- 5.8 The data also illustrates that there is no significant basic salary pay gap identified except at the Professorial grade. Furthermore, at Grade 10 and PVC the average basic salary of the females is above that of the males.
- 5.9 The data illustrates that while there is a significant total salary pay gap at Grades 2, 3, 4 and (within some ranges at the) Professoriate, when comparing with the 2014 Equal Pay Audit (see Table 3) the pay gap within each of these grades has decreased since 2014, with the exception of Grade 3.
- 5.10 The total pay gap at Grade 2 could be explained by the staff profile in the Operational category. Within Grade 2, 39% of females received additional payments such as overtime and shift payments compared to 93% of males. We will further examine the reasons female members of staff maybe unable to avail of additional hours, which may include, childcare and other work/life balance commitments. However, further analysis of this issue may be required.
- 5.11 The total pay gap at Grade 3 could also be explained by the staff profile in the Operational category. Within Grade 3, 21% of females received additional payments such as overtime and shift payments compared to 71% of males.
- 5.12 A similar pattern emerges in Grade 4 where out of a very small number of female staff (4), only one received additional payment(s) (25%) compared to 30 out of 33 males (91%).
- 5.13 The Professoriate pay gap although still significant at 10.6% basic salary and 10.5% total salary has reduced from 11.4% in 2014. 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 pay gap.
- 5.14 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 pay gaps. The Project Group have also developed an action plan setting out medium to long term recommendations to address the challenges within this cohort of academics.
- 5.15 Data is broken down by employment category to investigate the gaps 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 Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Academic	389	624	49,738.68	57,658.30	50,041.43	58,248.20	13.7	14.1
Academic Related	440	306	41,818.94	44,226.32	41,958.61	44,386.44	5.4	5.5
Research	281	297	34,309.37	34,883.62	34,314.24	34,968.20	1.6	1.9
Technical	80	152	25,774.18	27,263.22	26,027.84	27,730.42	5.5	6.1
Clerical	646	110	22,423.32	20,633.73	22,626.01	21,022.15	-8.7	-7.6
Operational	141	187	16,497.87	19,317.75	17,056.15	22,280.56	14.6	23.4
Total	1977	1676	33,517.05	41,705.61	33,724.71	42,367.91	19.6	20.4

Table 5: Gender by Employment Category – Comparison with 2014 Audit

Employment Category	2014		2017		Movement
	% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay	% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay	
Academic	13.7	14.2	13.7	14.1	↓ (-0.1%)
Academic Related	5.1	5.4	5.4	5.5	↑ (+0.1%)
Research	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.9	
Technical	8.6	9.6	5.5	6.1	↓ (-3.5%)
Clerical	-10.2	-9.4	-8.7	-7.6	↓ (-1.8%)
Operational	16.0	25.4	14.6	23.4	↓ (-2.0%)
Total	21.1	22.0	19.6	20.4	↓ (-1.6%)

5.16 Overall the Gender Pay Gap (% total pay) has reduced from 2014 (22.0%) to 20.4% in 2017. 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

5.17 Despite a total pay gap of 14.1% it is clear that this figure is highly skewed by one grade as detailed below.

5.18 On a positive note, there are no significant gender pay gaps at Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader or PVC level, which combined covers 80% (813 out of 1013) of staff in the Academic category. Further analysis within the Academic Grades (Table 6 refers) shows that the only significant pay gap within Academic Grades is within the Professoriate which has a 10.6% basic salary and 10.5% total salary pay gap. The basic and total salary gap at Professor level was 11.4% in 2014.

5.19 According to HESA figures referenced in the Times Higher Education Survey 2017 the mean pay gap in 2015/16 for Academic staff overall is 10.5% and 5.83% for Professors. Therefore we are performing well across Academic Grades but have some further analysis and work to do in the Professoriate Grades.

Table 6: Gender by Academic Grade

Academic Grade	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean)		Total Salary (Mean)		% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Lecturer	261	316	43,272.31	43,793.20	43,325.11	43,825.10	1.2	1.1
Senior Lecturer	69	117	55,364.01	56,048.87	55,718.77	56,338.73	1.2	1.1
Reader	15	29	57,861.02	59,577.28	57,953.48	59,698.05	2.9	2.9
Professor	43	157	75,463.33	84,385.79	77,280.10	86,388.84	10.6	10.5
PVC	1	5	#####	#####	#####	#####	-0.1	0.9
Total	389	624	49,738.68	57,658.30	50,041.43	58,248.20	13.7	14.1

to avoid disclosing salary of an individual

Table 7: Gender by Professorial Range

Range	Number of Staff		Basic Salary (Mean)		Total Salary (Mean)		% Pay Gap Basic Pay	% Pay Gap Total Pay
	F	M	F	M	F	M		
Prof Range 1	21	56	67,281.02	66,582.90	67,940.83	67,129.75	-1.0	-1.2
Prof Range 2	19	72	80,187.99	87,586.60	82,855.10	90,373.57	8.4	8.3
Prof Range 3	3	20	102,816.67	105,244.63	107,346.68	107,486.80	2.3	0.1
Prof Range 4	0	9	NA	123,199.86	NA	127,460.97	NA	NA
PVC	1	5	#####	#####	#####	#####	-0.1	0.9
Total	44	162	76,505.53	85,522.64	78,281.01	87,501.70	10.5	10.5

* To provide this information would be to identify the salary details of an individual professor

5.20 Further analysis within the professoriate shows has revealed there is no significant gender pay gap at either Range 1 or Range 3 (Table 7 refers). There are no female professors at range 4.

5.21 Indeed, at Range 1, the data reveals that male and female professors are paid broadly equally (both in terms of basic (-1.0%) and total salary (-1.2%). Likewise at Range 3, where the gender pay gap is very narrow both in terms of Basic salary (2.3%) and total salary (0.1%).

- 5.22 The professoriate pay gap (range 2) has been the subject of extensive analysis with the dedicated project group and could be influenced by the distribution of female and male professors across the ranges, with a greater percentage of the females than of the males in range 1 (47.7% (21) and 34.6% (56) respectively).
- 5.23 The data has identified an 8.4% basic salary and an 8.3% total salary pay gap at professoriate range 2. While the gaps have decreased since the 2014 audit (10.6% basic salary pay gap and 9.5% total salary pay gap), this figure is still of concern and the subject of much scrutiny by the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group.
- 5.24 The gap may be explained in part by the small number of female Professors at Range 2 (women: 20.9%, men: 79.1%), in addition to the large numbers of male professors in Range 2 who have been in post longer (7.2 years compared to 4.6 years) which inevitably results in higher salaries being acquired through incremental pay progression over time.

Academic Related Grades

- 5.25 A 5.5% gender pay gap remains across the Academic Related category. This may be explained partially by the Above Grade 10 cohort which has a basic salary pay gap of 4.8% and total salary pay gap of 4.1%.

Research Grades

- 5.26 The analysis shows there is no significant gender pay gap across the Research category (1.9% total salary pay gap, compared to 2% in 2014).
- 5.27 Further analysis by grade shows Grade 9 presents a -5.0% pay gap but the very small number of staff in this grade renders this figure not statistically significant.

Technical Grades

- 5.28 Basic salary and total salary pay gaps of 5.5% and 6.1% respectively have been identified across the Technical category. This represents a continuing decrease (8.6% basic and 9.6 % total pay gap in 2014) and (10% basic and 12% total pay gap identified in the 2009 pay audit). (Tables 4 and 5 refer).
- 5.29 Further analysis by grade shows the only significance is at Grade 3 where there is a gap of more than 5% between basic pay (1.2%) and total pay (7.6%). Further analysis shows that the total salary pay gaps may be influenced by more men receiving additional payments for overtime and shift allowances in this grade and category.

Clerical Grades

- 5.30 The average basic salary and total salary of female staff in the Clerical category is greater than that of males (gaps at -8.7% and -7.6% respectively). This is a reduction from the 2014 audit which showed a basic pay gap of -10.2% and a total pay gap of -9.4%.
- 5.31 This may be explained by the distribution of females and males across grades, with 55.5% (61) of males in grades 2 and 3 compared to 34% (220) of females.
- 5.32 Further analysis by grade shows the only significant pay gap is at Grade 5 (-6.1% basic and -5.3% total). This may be explained by the greater number of women at this Grade (89.4% (126)) compared to men (10.6% (15)). More than half of the women are on the upper scale points including contribution points, and more than

half of men are on the lower scale points, consistent with their length of time-in-post profile.

- 5.33 Within clerical grades there has been traditionally more flexibility and part time working.

Operational Grades

- 5.34 The data reveals a 14.6% (basic pay) and a 23.4% (total salary) gender pay gap across the Operational category. While still significant, this is an improvement from the University's previous pay audits (2009 and 2014). The total 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 which have included, childcare/dependency and other work/life balance commitments.
- 5.35 Another contributory factor may be the distribution of the females and males across grades, with 83.7% (118) of all females in the Operational category in grades 1 and 2 compared to 58.3% (109) of males.
- 5.36 The data revealed a basic salary pay gap of 12.8% at grade 5 but there are only a very small number of staff at Grade 5 so the basic pay gap is not statistically significant.
- 5.37 The data revealed total salary pay gaps at grades 2, 3, 4 and 5. Again, these may be as a result of a greater percentage of males receiving additional payments such as overtime and shift allowances (89% of total males in these grades compared to 36% of total females).
- 5.38 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 8: Starting Salaries of Appointees by Gender 1 August 2016 – 31 July 2017

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 (#)	
Academic	36	61.1% (22)	59	69.5% (41)	+7.9%

Academic related	55	47.3% (26)	23	65.2% (15)	+17.9%
Research	94	22.3% (21)	111	27.9% (31)	+5.6%
Technical	6	0	12	58.3% (7)	+58.3%
Clerical	71	18.3% (13)	16	43.8% (7)	+25.5%
Operational	9	0	14	14.3% (2)	+ 14.3%
Total	271	30.3% (82)	235	43.8% (103)	+13.5%
	(232*)	32.8% (76)*	(227*)	(45.4% (103)*)	

*Figures from 2014 for comparison

- 5.39 The data above reflects the 271 (53.6%) females and 235 (46.4%) males who were appointed during the period covered by the pay audit (i.e. 1st August 2016 to 31st July 2017) (Table 8 refers).
- 5.40 A review of the starting salaries of the appointees showed that a greater percentage of the male appointees (43.8%) were appointed above the bottom point of the relevant grade / range than the percentage of the female appointees (30.3%) – a difference of +13.5% in favour of men.
- 5.41 An analysis of the data shows that similar percentages of women and men appointees to Academic and Research roles were granted starting salaries above the bottom point of their grade. However, women appointed to Academic-Related, Technical, Clerical, and Operational roles were less likely than men to be offered starting salaries above the bottom point of their grade.
- 5.42 A similar analysis was carried out in the 2014 Equal Pay Audit. The current figures illustrate that in all categories except Operational, the % difference between males and females commencing employment on a salary above the bottom point of their scale, has increased in favour of men. This may merit further detailed analysis. However, it is also important to bear in mind the small numbers appointed in some categories for example in Technical and Operational Categories.
- 5.43 In the Academic Related category there was a 5.8% difference in 2014. This has risen to 17.9% in 2017. Similar numbers of males were appointed during both audits 24 in 2014 and 23 in 2017. However 30 females were appointed in 2014 and 55 females in 2017 so this may explain the large % difference in part.
- 5.44 In a competitive marketplace where there is a demand for recruiting talent and the best candidates, the University will often offer a starting salary which matches or in some cases exceeds the previous salaries of applicants. This practice may well be attributing to the % difference of males and females starting above the bottom point of University pay scales and be contributing to/widening existing gender pay gaps overall. This is an assumption and further analysis is required to determine if this is actually a contributory factor.
- 5.45 No significant bias by ethnicity, disability, or NI Community Background was found.

Further Analysis

5.46 Additional analysis was carried out during this Audit to look at Market Supplements and Part-Time working by Gender.

Analysis of Market Supplements

Table 9: Analysis of Market Supplements by Gender 1 August 2016 -31 July 2017

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	389	5.9% (23)	624	11.5% (72)	+5.6%
Academic related	440	2.3% (10)	306	2.6% (8)	+0.3%
Research	281	1.1% (3)	297	0.7% (2)	-0.4%
Technical	80	1.3% (1)	152	0	-
Clerical	646	0.3% (2)	110	0	-
Operational	141	0	187	0	-
Total	1977	2.0% (39)	1676	4.9% (82)	+2.9%

5.47 Table 9 illustrates that 39 (32.2%) females and 82 (67.8%) males, included in this audit, were awarded market supplements during the period covered. The only category where there is a significant % difference is in the Academic category. The payment of market supplements is particularly necessary in this category to attract the best academic talent to Northern Ireland.

5.48 The recently established Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group have analysed the provision of market supplement payments specifically in relation to the Professoriate. This revealed that a larger number of male Professors (25%) received market supplements compared to females (15.5%). Their analysis also stated that 63% of market supplements paid are/were recruitment related. As a result, the Project Group has proposed that a detailed analysis of recruitment/retention procedures be conducted and to make recommendations for addressing the findings.

5.49 No significant bias by ethnicity, disability, or NI Community Background was found.

Analysis of Part-Time Working

Table 10: Analysis of Part-Time Working by Gender 1 August 2016 -31 July 2017

Employment Category	Women		Men	
	Total Number Women Part and Full Time	% Women Part Time (#)	Total Number Men Part and Full Time	% Men Part Time (#)
Academic	389	11.6% (45)	624	7.5% (47)
Academic related	440	21.1% (93)	306	3.3% (10)
Research	281	10.3% (29)	297	4.4% (13)
Technical	80	28.8% (23)	152	3.3% (5)
Clerical	646	33.6% (217)	110	9.1% (10)
Operational	141	71.6% (101)	187	29.4% (55)
Total	1977	26% (508)	1676	8.3% (140)

- 5.50 The data indicates that unsurprisingly, greater numbers of women work part-time than men in the University, across all categories except Academic where 47 men and 45 women currently work part-time, although women represent a larger proportion: 11.6% to 7.5% (see Table 10 above).
- 5.51 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.
- 5.52 Data would suggest that there is also greater opportunity to work flexibly/part-time in lower grades (see Table 11 below) in all Job Categories excluding Academic which means those staff working part time, mainly women, are limited in progressing up the pay scales and this contributes to the pay gap in these categories, and overall.

Table 11: Analysis of Part-Time Working by Gender and Grade (Excluding Academic Staff) 1 August 2016 -31 July 2017

Grade	Women		Men	
	Total Number Women Part and Full Time	% Women Part Time (#)	Total Number Men Part and Full Time	% Men Part Time (#)
Grade 1	72	100% (72)	42	97.6% (41)
Grade 2	73	38.4% (28)	78	16.7% (13)

Grade 3	218	43.1% (94)	95	9.5% (9)
Grade 4	267	32.2% (86)	88	6.8% (6)
Grade 5	159	28.3% (45)	69	1.4% (1)
Grade 6	148	19.6% (29)	108	2.8% (3)
Grade 7	450	17.1% (77)	371	2.2% (8)
Grade 8	149	16.8% (25)	147	6.8% (10)
Grade 9	37	16.2% (6)	42	2.4% (1)
Grade 10	10	10.0% (1)	9	11.1% (1)
Above Grade 10	5	0%	3	0%
Total	1125	29.2% (463)	1676	8.3% (140)

6. Ethnicity

- 6.1 For calculating 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 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 3.4% of staff for whom there was no information provided in respect of ethnicity.

Table 12: Comparison of Ethnicity Pay Gaps 2009-2017

Year	All Staff (who provided information)			
	Ethnic Minority 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 ↑

- 6.4 The data reveals that the numbers of staff from an Ethnic minority background has increased since the last two audits (217 staff compared to 171 in 2009).
- 6.5 A comparison between the 2014 audit and the current audit shows the average salary of members of staff from an ethnic minority background continues to be greater than that of staff from a white/non ethnic minority background. While there has been a small

increase in the mean basic salary and total salary pay gaps the overall pay gaps are not significant.

- 6.6 When analysed by grade, it is clear that the pay gap in favour of staff from Ethnic Minorities may be explained by the small number of staff from an Ethnic Minority (217) compared to staff from a white background (3313). 89% of staff from an Ethnic Minority background are at Grade 6 and above.
- 6.6 82% of the 217 staff from an Ethnic Minority background are employed within the academic and research categories.

Academic Grades

- 6.7 Within the academic category, there is a basic ethnicity pay gap of 10.9% rising to 11.6% on total pay. While still of concern, the data confirms that the ethnicity pay gap has decreased by 2.3% basic pay gap and by 2.6% total pay gap since the 2014 audit.
- 6.8 There are no significant ethnicity pay gaps at Lecturer, Reader and PVC Grades. Significant ethnicity gaps exist at both Senior Lecturer Grade and Professor Grade.
- 6.9 At Senior Lecturer grade the ethnicity pay gap is basic salary 5.4% and total salary 6.0% which may be explained by the fact that Ethnic Minority staff have spent a shorter average time at the grade (Ethnic Minority Av: 2.9 years, White Av: 6.5 years), and that there is a small number of staff from Ethnic Minority backgrounds at this grade (7.3%).
- 6.10 Within the Professoriate, there is a basic ethnicity pay gap of 8.0% (down from 10.8% in 2014) and 9.7% for total pay (down from 12.9% in 2014).
- 6.11 When analysed by Professorial Range there is no significant basic ethnicity pay gap at Ranges 1, 2 or 3.
- 6.12 There is a total salary ethnicity pay gap at Range 3 (5.1%) but only one Professor at this range is from an Ethnic Minority background so it is not statistically significant.
- 6.13 There are no Range 4 Professors or PVCs from an Ethnic Minority background.

Academic Related Grades

- 6.14 Within the academic related category, there is an ethnicity pay gap of 14%, an improvement of 3% since 2014.
- 6.15 There are no staff from Ethnic Minority backgrounds in Grades 9, 10 and above.
- 6.16 When analysed by grade significant ethnicity pay gaps exist at Grade 6 in favour of staff from Ethnic Minority backgrounds (basic: -6.3%, total -6.2%) and Grade 8 in favour of Non Ethnic staff (basic:5.3%, total 5.6%). At both these grades there are very small numbers of staff from an Ethnic Minority background so further analysis would be meaningless.

Research Grades

- 6.17 Within the research staff category there is one significant ethnicity pay gap at Grade 6 of 5.7%. However, further analysis shows that staff from a white background have on average been in post longer than staff from an Ethnic Minority background (2.6 years compared to 1.6 years).

Technical Grades

- 6.18 An overall pay ethnicity gap exists for technical staff of 9.3% (down from 13.7% in 2014) and 10.7% total pay (down from 11.4% in 2014).
- 6.19 7 members of staff from an Ethnic Minority background are employed as technicians and of these, 57% (4) are employed at lower grades 2, 3 and 4, compared to 28.6% (61) of the white technicians. There is one member of staff from an ethnic minority background employed at each of Grades 5, 6 and 7.

Clerical Grades

- 6.20 Within the clerical staff category there are ethnicity pay gaps at Grades 5 and 6 but there are only a small number of staff from ethnic minority backgrounds in these grades (1 in each) which prevents any meaningful analysis.

Operational Grades

- 6.21 The number of staff (7) from an ethnic minority background in the Operational category is also too small to allow for any meaningful analysis.

7. Disability

- 7.1 For calculating 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 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 17% of staff for whom there was no information provided in respect of a disability.

Table 13: Comparison of Disability Pay Gaps 2009-2017

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 ↓

7.4 The figures show that greater numbers of staff (8.2%) are now recorded on iTrent as either disabled or living with a long term condition (248 compared to 107 in 2009).

7.5 A comparison between the 2014 equal pay audit and the current audit shows an improvement in the Disability pay gap (a 3.2% decrease in the basic salary (mean) gap since 2014, and a 3.5% decrease in the total salary (mean) pay gap in 2014), an improving trend since the 2009 audit.

7.6 While there is an overall 5.5% basic salary (down from 8.7% in 2014) and 5.4% total salary pay gap (down from 8.9% in 2014) there are no significant basic or total salary pay gaps at any of the individual grades.

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 pay gap overall across the academic category.

7.9 Further analysis by Professorial range shows there is no disability pay gap at Range 1. A total disability pay gap of 5.5% was identified at Range 2 and a basic disability pay gap of 5.8% in Range 3. These gaps are consistent with the small numbers of staff with disabilities in these ranges. The average number of years in grade for staff with disabilities is lower than for those without disabilities. None of the Range 4 professors have a declared disability.

Academic Related Grades

7.10 There is an overall 5.0% basic salary disability pay gap (down from 8.7% in 2014) and 4.9% total salary disability pay gap (down from 8.9% in 2014) identified across the

academic related category. Further analysis shows that there are no significant disability pay gaps at any individual grade.

- 7.11 The overall disability pay gap in this category may be explained by the fact that 92.2% (47) of staff who have declared a disability are employed at Grades 6, 7 and 8 compared to 85.8% (518) who have not declared a disability. There are no members of staff at Grade 10 and above Grade 10 who have declared a disability.

Research Grades

- 7.12 Within the Research category positive disability pay gaps exist at Grade 6 (basic and total: -6.3%) and Grade 8 (basic: -7.7%, total -6.8%). This reflects that the people with disabilities are at the higher end of the Researcher Grade 6 and Grade 8 pay scale, compared to those without disabilities. There is no correlation with length of time in grade.

Technical Grades

- 7.13 A total disability pay gap of 5.1% was identified across the Technical category, with significant disability pay gaps at 10.7% basic and 15.6% total salary in Grade 3. When investigated further this is not significant as there is only one member of technical staff with a disability at this grade and they have been in post for a much shorter time than those staff without a disability.

Clerical Grades

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

Operational Grades

- 7.15 There is no significant basic disability pay gap across the operational category.
- 7.16 When analysed further Grade 3 shows a total disability pay gap of 6.4%. These gaps are consistent with the small number of staff with disabilities at this grade. Furthermore, the average number of years in grade for staff with disabilities is lower than for those without disabilities (9.9 years compared to 11.6).
- 7.17 Grade 4 has a significant positive disability gap (Basic: -6.7%, total: -9.1%) which reflects not only the small numbers of staff in this grade with disabilities, but also that they have longer average years of service (9.5 years) than those without disabilities (8.5 years).

8. Community Background

- 8.1 For calculating 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 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 22.7% of staff for whom no community background could be determined.

Table 14: Comparison of Community Background Pay Gaps 2009-2017

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 ↓

- 8.4 Like previous audits the current audit shows there is no significant overall basic salary or total salary pay gap by Community Background.

Academic Grades

- 8.5 Within the academic category overall there is no significant community background pay gap. The only significant community background pay gap is at Grade 6 (total and basic: 5.8%) but this reflects a very small number of people in post (3).

Academic Related Grades

- 8.6 There is no overall community background pay gap across the academic related category. A -8.7% Protestant basic pay gap exists at grade 10. This reflects that the average length of time in grade for those Protestant members of staff is 4.1 years, while for Roman Catholic staff it is 7.1 years.

Research Grades

- 8.7 The analysis shows there is no significant basic community background pay gap across the research category or at any individual grade.
- 8.8 There is a community background pay gap at Grade 8 (basic: -4.3%, total: -5.8%) in favour of Roman Catholic staff. This may be explained by the fact there are more Roman Catholic staff in these posts (23 RC to 14P), and more of them are on the

higher end of the pay scale compared to Protestant colleagues. The average number of years in post does not appear to be a factor.

Technical Grades

- 8.9 The overall community background pay gap for this category (basic: 6.7%, total: 7.4%) could be explained by the fact that Roman Catholic staff have, on average, been in post 2 years less than Protestant staff. As a result of the period of time in grade, there are greater numbers of Protestant staff on higher salaries than Roman Catholic staff.
- 8.10 The total community background pay gap at Grade 3 of 5.0% and Grade 4 5.5% may be explained by the smaller number of Roman Catholic staff in this grade compared to Protestant staff.

Clerical Grades

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

Operational Grades

- 8.12 There is no overall community background pay gap within the operational staff category.
- 8.13 At Grade 4 there is a total Protestant pay gap of -6.9% which may be explained by the allocation of additional payments.
- 8.14 At Grade 7 the apparent Protestant pay gap (basic: -14.1%, total: -5.2%) reflects that there are a very small number of people in post (3), of whom the Roman Catholic is higher up the scale points than the Protestants.

9. Key findings

- 9.1 The identification of a pay gap does not necessarily indicate inequalities in pay practices or discriminatory treatment.
- 9.2 A comparison between the 2014 equal pay audit and the current audit shows a decrease in the mean basic gender pay gap (down by 1.5%) and total salary gender pay gap (down by 1.6%). Although the gaps remain significant (19.6% basic salary and 20.4% total Salary) both figures represent marginal improvements.
- 9.3 This audit found no significant gender basic pay gaps at the majority of individual grades.
- 9.4 Although there is a total salary pay gap across the grades (20.4%) there is no significant gender pay gap in 9 of the 13 Grades.
- 9.5 The audit revealed there are no significant gender pay gaps at Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader or PVC level, which covers 80% (813 out of 1013) of staff in the Academic category.
- 9.6 The only gender total salary pay gaps of significance appear in Grades 2, 3, 4 and within Range 2 of the Professoriate.
- 9.7 The overall gender basic salary pay gap, and the small number of 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 pay gaps at Grades 2, 3 and 4 may be explained in part by the staff profile in the Operational category where 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 unable 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 There is a 13.7% basic gender pay gap and 14.1% total pay gap in the academic category which is very similar to the 2014 audit. However further analysis within the Academic Grades (Table 6 refers) shows that the professoriate grade has the only significant pay gap at 10.5% total salary.
- 9.10 The Professorial pay gap is the subject of intensive scrutiny by the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group. One explanation for the pay gap may be found in the distribution of female and male professors across the ranges.
- 9.11 The audit identified an 8.4% basic salary and an 8.3% total salary pay gap at Professoriate Range 2. While the gender pay gaps within the Professoriate have decreased since the 2014 audit, this figure is still of concern and the subject of much scrutiny by the Professorial Gender Pay Gap Project Group.
- 9.12 Analysis of the starting salaries of appointees during the reporting period, showed that a greater percentage of males (43.8%) were appointed above the bottom point of the relevant grade / range than female (30.3%) – a difference of +13.5% in favour of men.
- 9.13 Analysis shows that during the reporting period, 2% of female employees were awarded a market supplement compared to 4.9% of male employees.
- 9.14 There are no significant basic or total salary disability pay gaps at any of the individual grades. The gaps are mainly due small numbers of staff with disabilities and lower average length of service.
- 9.15 There is an overall total Disability pay gap (5.4%). There has been an improvement in the Disability pay gap since the last audit (a 3.2% decrease in the basic salary (mean) gap since 2014 and a 3.5% decrease in the total salary (mean) pay gap in 2014), an improving trend since the 2009 audit.
- 9.16 The audit has illustrated that the average salary of members of staff from an Ethnic Minority background continues to be greater than that of staff from a white/non ethnic minority background. While there has been a small increase in the mean basic salary and total salary pay gaps the overall pay gaps are not significant.
- 9.17 As with previous audits this audit has illustrated no significant overall basic salary or total salary pay gap by Community Background.

10. Recommendations

Operational Pay Gap

- 10.1 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.
- 10.2 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 gender pay gaps.
- 10.3 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 Gender Pay Gap

- 10.4 Prior to this Audit, a detailed analysis of background to the Professoriate Pay Gap was separately undertaken by the Human Resources Directorate and Professor Tom Millar following publication of the Times Higher Education Pay Gap table in 2016. The Project Group have undertaken very detailed analysis and have developed evidence-based recommendations to deal with the Professoriate Pay Gap. In doing so they considered best practice from other Universities, legal advice in relation to the proposals, and they took forward consultation with Trade Unions, the Professoriate and the Equality Commission for Northern Ireland.
- 10.5 As a result, a comprehensive action plan, with short, medium and long term actions has been developed. This sets out time bound targets, some of which have already been implemented. The Project Group will be reviewing professoriate pay data regularly to gauge what impact the interventions are making to the Professoriate Pay Gap. To ensure an effective and sustainable solution going forward, immediate actions are being supported by a comprehensive medium to longer term action plan.