

Royal Holloway University of London

Equal Pay Review

September 2012

Contents

List of Tables

<i>Executive Summary</i>	i
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Why undertake an equal pay review?.....	1
3. The Pay Review Process	2
3.1 Background	2
3.2 Method	3
4. Staff profile	5
4.1 Gender	5
4.2 Ethnicity	6
4.3 Disability	7
5. Pay gaps – current staff.....	8
5.1 Gender pay gaps	8
5.1.1 Gender pay gaps by staff group.....	8
5.1.2 Gender pay gaps by grade.....	12
5.2 Ethnicity pay gaps	14
5.2.1 Ethnicity pay gaps by staff group	14
5.2.2 Ethnicity pay gaps by grade.....	17
5.3 Disability pay gaps.....	19
5.3.1 Disability pay gaps by staff group	19
6. Pay gaps – starting salaries	20
6.1 Gender pay gaps - starters.....	20
6.2 Ethnicity pay gaps - starters	22
6.3 Disability pay gaps - starters.....	23
7. Market supplements	23
8. Summary	24
9. Recommendations.....	25
10. Bibliography.....	27

List of Tables

Table 1: Staff group by gender.....	5
Table 2: Grade by gender	5
Table 3: Staff group by ethnicity.....	6
Table 4: Grade by ethnicity	6
Table 5: Staff group by disability status.....	7
Table 6: Grade by disability status	7
Table 7: Staff group by salary by gender.....	8
Table 8: Staff group by gender cross-tabulation.....	9
Table 9: Gender by professorial band	10
Table 10: Staff group by total pay package by gender	11
Table 11 Grade by salary by gender	12
Table 12 Grade by total pay package by gender.....	13
Table 13 Staff group by salary by ethnicity.....	14
Table 14: Ethnic group by staff group cross-tabulation	15
Table 15: Ethnic group by grade cross-tabulation	15
Table 16: Staff group by total pay package by ethnicity	16
Table 17: Salary by ethnic group and grade.....	17
Table 18: Total pay package by ethnic group by grade.....	18
Table 19: Staff group by salary by disability	19
Table 20: Staff group by total pay package by disability.....	19
Table 21: Starter salaries by grade by gender	20
Table 22: Starter salaries by staff group by gender.....	21
Table 23: Starter salaries by gender by age group	21
Table 24: Starter salaries by grade by ethnicity	22
Table 25: Starter salaries by staff group by ethnicity.....	22
Table 26: Starter salaries by disabled or non disabled.....	23

EQUAL PAY REVIEW 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a summary of the results of the Royal Holloway equal pay review based on staff data as at 1st May 2012. It covers all employees, including employees on part-time and fixed term contracts. More details are in the full report.

Gender

In the academic grades (where men comprise 66.4% of posts) there is reasonable gender parity at lecturer, senior lecturer and reader level. The gender pay gap for the base salary of professors has reduced from 11% in 2009 to 8%.

The gender pay gap for professors increases to 11.6% when taking market supplements and pay protection into account. This figure is in part due to the application of market supplements for all professors in the department of Economics, a traditionally male discipline.

With other staff groups, there is good gender parity for technical and administrative staff in grades 1 to 5 and a gender pay gap of 5.8% for research staff. The most noteworthy differences in average salary are within the manual (12%) and senior grade 10 (16.9%) staff groups.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity pay gaps exist in favour of white employees for professors (7.2%), employees in grades 6-10 (10.6%) and for researchers (9.6%). There is a fair degree of consistency in the distribution of minority ethnic staff across most grades, with more significant imbalance at professorial and grades 6-10 levels.

Disability

Pay disparities between those who have declared a disability and those for whom there is no known disability is less than 2% overall. If broken down into staff groups there is a pay gap of 7% for all academic grades collectively. It is difficult to draw statistical inference from these figures due to the very small percentage of employees with a disability (2.6%).

Conclusions

The 2012 equal pay review has highlighted several positive points including confirmation that there are no significant pay disparities between men and women in the academic grades below the professoriate or in technical and administrative roles in grades 1-5. However, there are persistent gender pay gaps relating to professorial staff, which is largely explained by the higher percentage of men being in the top bands, admin grades 6-10, manual staff and researchers. Minority ethnic staff groups exhibit similar base pay gaps to the gender gaps across a number of staff groups.

Equal Pay Review September 2012

1. Introduction

An equal pay review is a statistical analysis of an organisation's pay and human resources data to identify and explain any pay differences – a pay gap - related to characteristics that are protected under both domestic and European law. This report presents the results of the Royal Holloway equal pay review based on staff data as at 1st May 2012. It covers all employees, including employees on part-time and fixed term contracts.

Equal pay reviews focus on comparisons between work that is equal. This includes like work (work which is the same or broadly similar), work rated as equivalent (under an analytical job evaluation scheme), or work of equal value (work which is different but equal in demands). As the College has placed jobs into a grade structure using an analytical job evaluation (HERA), all of these types of comparison are possible.

The main source of guidance for this review was the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) 2007, *Equal Pay Reviews: Guidance for Higher Education Institutions*, but it also was informed by guidance from the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), *Equal Pay Resources and Audit Toolkit* (online), and the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) 2010, *Promoting Equality in Pay* (see the reference list at the end of the report).

These guidance documents stress that an equal pay review or audit compares the pay of protected groups who are doing equal work.

2. Why undertake an equal pay review?

All higher education institutions are required to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty. In addition, the EHRC recommends that all employers undertake equal pay reviews. This is supported by:

- the Equal Opportunities Commission (2003) Code of Practice on Equal Pay which recommends equal pay reviews as the most appropriate method of ensuring that a pay system delivers equal pay for equal work and is free from gender bias
- the JNCHES Pay Agreement 2006–09 (see also Cambridge University Reporter, 2010), footnote 1-1-5) which includes a strong recommendation that Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) undertake an equal pay review within 12 months of the introduction of their new, post-framework, pay structures and periodically thereafter
- the Equality Act 2010, which places renewed emphasis on the need for pay equality and the Equal pay statutory code of practice (EHRC, 2010) recommends that all employers conduct equal pay reviews.

To this end, the JNCHEs and the ECU have both produced guidance on conducting these reviews. It is these guidance documents that we have drawn upon to carry out the equal pay review in the College.

According to the JNCHEs guidance (ref. p2) the primary purposes of an equal pay review are to:

- establish whether there are pay inequities for gender (and on a range of other equality grounds)
- analyse in more detail the nature of any inequities
- analyse the factors creating inequities and diagnose the cause or causes
- determine what action is required to deal with any unjustified inequities revealed by the analysis and diagnosis.

Furthermore, it asserts (p3) that the benefits arising from the conduct of a review are that it will:

- highlight areas for concern relating to equal pay
- enable causes of inequality to be diagnosed
- guide higher education institutions on the actions required to fulfil both their ethical and their legal obligations to pay those carrying out work of equal value equally
- contribute to the development and maintenance of a fair and equitable reward system, and thereby enhance the image of the institution as an employer, improve the climate of employee relations and further the ability of the institution to attract and retain the staff it requires
- help institutions to meet their statutory obligation to promote equal pay (under the gender equality duty)
- enable institutions to demonstrate progress in relation to providing equal pay and equal opportunity across the workforce.

This review includes analyses by disability and ethnicity as well as gender.

3. The Pay Review Process

3.1 Background

This annual review, following the process recommended by JNCHEs guidance, compares the pay of male and female employees carrying out work of equal value as determined by the job evaluation scheme adopted by the College (HERA). The actions specified at the conclusion follow EHRC advice that where:

- a pay differential related to gender is less than 3%, no action is necessary
- the difference is greater than 3% but less than 5%, the position should be regularly monitored
- gender pay gaps of more than 5% are identified, action is needed to address the issue and close the gap.

It should be noted that this review represents a statistical exercise and is therefore limited in its ability to uncover all the relevant reasons for pay differentials and anomalies. It can only describe where these exist and suggest areas for further study. For this to be a comprehensive investigation of pay differentials, a thorough research report would be required, combining qualitative investigations with the quantitative analysis.

A number of the tables in this report include standard deviation calculations which are used to identify the dispersion of the values from the average salary value. A low standard deviation indicates that the pay totals are clustered around the average value, whereas a high standard deviation indicates that the pay totals are spread over a wide range. This provides another helpful indicator on the conclusions that can be drawn from the comparisons but where the sample group size is less than 10, the standard deviation may be misleading. We have pointed out where this may be the case.

Care should be taken when interpreting differences in percentage pay terms as sample sizes vary considerably and a small change in the numbers in an occupational category or grade can seem to make a significant difference. Another factor that impacts on average salaries is the assimilation process from the former grading structure into the single salary spine. Furthermore, whereas gender statistics are complete and relatively unambiguous, ethnicity and disability data are based on self-reporting by employees and are incomplete. Even so, the analyses and key findings in this report provide a sound basis for identifying equal pay issues that require monitoring or action.

The disclosure to third parties of data from equal pay reviews is covered by the Data Protection Act (1998). The results of an equal pay review can be disclosed as regards individuals or small groups as long as they are in sufficiently anonymised form.

3.2 Method

The analytical process used in this equal pay review is consistent with previous pay reviews and, along with JNCHES 2007 equal pay review guidance, it focuses on base pay, allowances, and total earnings (including contribution-related pay and bonuses) so that the extent to which there are inequities in the operation of any contribution-related pay arrangements can be established.

The guidance recommended that the analysis of pay data should consider employee numbers in each grade, staff group, and across all employees as follows:

- average pay for each grade,
- average pay for each job category (where differentiated within or across grades),
- average pay for all employees,
- average pay for full-time, part-time, term-time, and fixed-term contract employees by grade and job category,
- pay gap percentages for each staff group and all employees.

Average salaries and gender pay gaps can be calculated by either using the mean or median values. The median can be a more relevant method of reporting gender pay gaps than the mean where there are outlying values within the data being analysed. However, the median values for both genders may mask any pay gap that may exist, particularly when a significant proportion of staff are at the more senior level grades. Consequently, while we have reported median and mean salaries, in a majority of cases we have focused on discussion of mean (average) differences.

In general terms, a pay gap is “the percentage difference between the rates of pay of men and women (often referred to as the gender gap), employees from different racial groups, those with and without disabilities, employees of different sexual orientations, employees of different religions or beliefs, and employees in different

age bands, and also in respect of pay differences between employees with differing contractual arrangements” (JNCHES, 2007, p.4). The gender pay gap, which serves as a model for other groups, is calculated as follows:

$$\text{Gender pay gap} = \frac{\text{Average (mean) male salary} - \text{Average female salary}}{\text{Average male salary}}$$

A positive gap in this calculation means that there is a gap in favour of men; for ethnicity this means a pay gap in favour of white people; for disability a positive pay gap means a pay gap in favour of those who are not disabled.

Use of statistical tests

In this report parametric statistical tests are used to explore whether two or more pieces of data are statistically associated with each other, and also to explore whether there is any statistically robust evidence for group differences, for example differences in average salary between men and women. Use of statistical significance testing is common in the social sciences and in wider scientific research. Its purpose is to establish a degree of confidence that any observed findings are unlikely to be due to chance. Statistical tests produce ‘significance levels’, also known as ‘p values’ which are the primary means for deducing whether any observed effects are deemed to be robust. In the social sciences (e.g. Psychology), a ‘significance level’ or ‘p value’ of .05 or less is generally regarded as acceptable evidence that a finding is robust. A p value of .05 indicates a roughly 5% chance that an error has been made and the observed findings are in fact due to chance, and conversely therefore, that there is an estimated 95% degree of certainty that the findings are not due to chance and are robust. Values lower than $p=.05$, such as $p<.01$, indicate even lower probabilities that the observed findings are due to chance (a p value of $<.01$ indicates an estimate that there is less than a 1% chance that the findings occurred due to chance and a p value of $<.001$ indicates a less than 0.1% chance).

There are many different statistical tests available, and the choice of appropriate test depends on a range of factors. In this report different tests are used due to differences in type of data and the question that is being asked of the data. However, we primarily use t-tests to explore mean (average) differences between two groups and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) to explore differences between means when we are comparing more than one group. It is important to note that statistical testing in the context of this report should not be misinterpreted – where a significant statistical test backs up the observation of a pay gap, this lends additional weight to the confidence one can have that the observed difference is worthy of note, however in cases where a statistical test is not significant but a pay gap of over 5% is noticeable, this should not mean that the pay gap is not treated seriously – in many cases this has occurred because the numbers involved are sometimes small, and this reduces the power of statistical tests to detect differences. In summary then, statistical tests are presented here as an additional piece of information for pay gaps of 5% or higher, but they are not treated as the sole criterion which should be used to judge whether a gap is important to note.

4. Staff profile

4.1 Gender

Men and women are roughly equal in numbers in RHUL, but this overall statistic hides considerable variation across the College, and is only maintained in one staff group, Research. Indeed, several staff groups – academic Professors, Admin 1-5, and Technical staff - show great imbalances in gender ratios.

Table 1: Staff group by gender

Staff group	Men	Women
Academic - professor	75.2%	24.8%
Academic - reader	65.6%	34.4%
Academic - senior lecturer	66.9%	33.1%
Academic - lecturer	55.3%	44.7%
Academic - other	41.7%	58.3%
Admin 1 - 5	12.0%	88.0%
Admin 6 - 10	40.7%	59.3%
M & A	61.2%	38.8%
Other	44.0%	56.0%
Research	51.7%	48.3%
Technical	70.8%	29.2%
Total	49.0%	51.0%

The RHUL grade bands point up these imbalances even more dramatically where only four of the fifteen bands demonstrate any sort of gender balance.

Table 2: Grade by gender

Grade	Men	Women
PROF BAND 1	50.0%	50.0%
PROF BAND 2	74.6%	25.4%
PROF BAND 3	85.5%	14.5%
PROF BAND 4	100.0%	0.0%
PROF BAND 4 +	100.0%	0.0%
RHUL 10	52.0%	48.0%
RHUL 9	65.9%	34.1%
RHUL 8	51.6%	48.4%
RHUL 7	47.3%	52.7%
RHUL 6	38.4%	61.6%
RHUL 5	34.9%	65.1%
RHUL 4	20.1%	79.9%
RHUL 3	33.8%	66.2%
RHUL 2	71.4%	28.6%
RHUL 1	29.4%	70.6%
Total	49.0%	51.0%

4.2 Ethnicity

At 1st May 2012, minority ethnic staff represent between 9% (UK nationals) and 13% (all) of the College workforce. This proportion varies across the different staff groups.

Table 3: Staff group by ethnicity

Staff group	Minority ethnic	White
Academic - professor	5.5%	94.5%
Academic - reader	12.7%	87.3%
Academic - senior lecturer	13.7%	86.3%
Academic - lecturer	18.9%	81.1%
Academic - other	36.4%	63.6%
Admin 1 - 5	12.5%	87.5%
Admin 6 - 10	9.9%	90.1%
M & A	16.1%	83.9%
Other	22.2%	77.8%
Research	18.6%	81.4%
Technical	9.9%	90.1%
Total	13.2%	86.8%

There is a fair degree of consistency in the distribution of minority ethnic staff across the RHUL grade bands apart from the imbalances at the opposite poles of the grade bands, i.e. they are over-represented in the lowest grade and under-represented, or missing, from the senior grades.

Table 4: Grade by ethnicity

Grade	Minority ethnic	White
PROF BAND 1	6.5%	93.5%
PROF BAND 2	4.9%	95.1%
PROF BAND 3	3.3%	96.7%
PROF BAND 4	0.0%	100.0%
PROF BAND 4 +	0.0%	100.0%
RHUL 10	0.0%	100.0%
RHUL 9	13.5%	86.5%
RHUL 8	16.6%	83.4%
RHUL 7	15.9%	84.1%
RHUL 6	11.7%	88.3%
RHUL 5	11.7%	88.3%
RHUL 4	13.9%	86.1%
RHUL 3	12.7%	87.3%
RHUL 2	14.3%	85.7%
RHUL 1	41.2%	58.8%
Total	13.2%	86.8%

4.3 Disability

Disabled staff comprise a small proportion of the staff and thus their representation varies greatly over the various staff groups. This can be seen in even greater contrast when one considers the RHUL grade bands.

Table 5: Staff group by disability status

Staff group	Disabled	Non-disabled
Academic - professor	2.4%	97.6%
Academic - reader	0.0%	100.0%
Academic - senior lecturer	3.9%	96.1%
Academic - lecturer	5.3%	94.7%
Academic - other	0.0%	100.0%
Admin 1 - 5	2.6%	97.4%
Admin 6 - 10	1.9%	98.1%
M & A	2.5%	97.5%
Other	2.0%	98.0%
Research	4.3%	95.7%
Technical	1.4%	98.6%
Total	2.6%	97.4%

Table 6: Grade by disability status

Grade	Disabled	Non-disabled
PROF BAND 1	6.3%	93.8%
PROF BAND 2	1.6%	98.4%
PROF BAND 3	1.6%	98.4%
PROF BAND 4	0.0%	100.0%
PROF BAND 4 +	0.0%	100.0%
RHUL 10	8.0%	92.0%
RHUL 9	2.4%	97.6%
RHUL 8	2.2%	97.8%
RHUL 7	1.8%	98.2%
RHUL 6	5.1%	94.9%
RHUL 5	0.0%	100.0%
RHUL 4	3.6%	96.4%
RHUL 3	4.6%	95.4%
RHUL 2	14.3%	85.7%
RHUL 1	0.0%	100.0%
Total	2.6%	97.4%

Although there are relatively small numbers across the College, we can still make some conclusions relating to disabled staff.

5. Pay gaps – current staff

5.1 Gender pay gaps

5.1.1 Gender pay gaps by staff group

Table 7: Staff group by salary by gender

GENDER SALARY BY STAFF GROUP								Mean	Median	
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Female as % of male	Female as % of male
	Female	Male			Female	Male				
All Staff	33,890.50	44,914.03	11,023.53	24.5%	30,122.00	44,166.00	14,044.00	31.8%	75.5%	68.2%
Academic - professor	66,266.90	72,212.57	5,945.66	8.2%	65,410.00	68,924.00	3,514.00	5.1%	91.8%	94.9%
Academic - reader	53,519.59	51,767.00	-1,752.59	-3.4%	54,283.00	52,706.00	-1,577.00	-3.0%	103.4%	103.0%
Academic - senior lecturer	49,086.36	50,752.14	1,665.78	3.3%	48,246.00	52,706.00	4,460.00	8.5%	96.7%	91.5%
Academic - lecturer	41,541.20	42,504.37	963.17	2.3%	41,639.00	41,639.00	0.00	0.0%	97.7%	100.0%
Academic - other	38,636.71	40,322.60	1,685.89	4.2%	38,140.00	39,257.00	1,117.00	2.8%	95.8%	97.2%
Admin 1 - 5	19,769.07	19,843.54	74.47	0.4%	19,692.00	19,832.00	140.00	0.7%	99.6%	99.3%
Admin 6 - 10	38,859.85	46,728.26	7,868.41 ¹	16.8%	35,938.00	39,257.00	3,319.00	8.5%	83.2%	91.5%
M & A	18,282.00	20,793.41	2,511.41	12.1%	17,087.00	19,692.00	2,605.00	13.2%	87.9%	86.8%
Other	34,518.39	34,273.09	-245.30	-0.7%	31,021.00	35,448.00	4,427.00	12.5%	100.7%	87.5%
Research	32,231.87	34,205.65	1,973.78	5.8%	31,948.00	31,484.00	-464.00	-1.5%	94.2%	101.5%
Technical	29,738.95	30,940.63	1,201.68	3.9%	29,249.00	30,122.00	873.00	2.9%	96.1%	97.1%

An estimate of the national gender pay gap in the public sector is 19.3% and in the private sector 27.4% (ONS, 2012). Across all RHUL staff, apart from Readers amongst Academic staff and 'Other' staff, there is a consistent differential in pay in favour of men. This is considerable in the Admin 6-10 and M & A staff groups, as well as the Professor grades amongst academic staff. Overall, there is a large gender pay gap of 24.5% - roughly midway between the national pay gaps in the private and public sectors - equivalent to a mean annual salary difference of £11,023. The data suggest that overall, women in the College earn on average 75.5% of what men earn. The difference in the average salary earned by men and women in the College is significantly different according to statistical tests (a t test shows a p value of $<.001$). These data partly reflect differences in the proportion of men and women employed in different roles and different grades as shown in the table below. From this it can be noted, for example, that men comprise 66.4% of academic staff, and 70.4% of technical staff, but are outnumbered considerably by women in the administrative positions, most notably in the Admin 1–5 posts.

¹ Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £6,405.76, a 14.2% pay gap.

Table 8: Staff group by gender cross-tabulation

			Gender		Total
			F	M	
StaffGroup	ACAD	Count	163	322	485
		% within StaffGroup	33.6%	66.4%	100.0%
		% within Gender	22.1%	45.5%	33.5%
		% of Total	11.3%	22.3%	33.5%
		<hr/>			
	AD1-5	Count	206	28	234
		% within StaffGroup	88.0%	12.0%	100.0%
		% within Gender	27.9%	4.0%	16.2%
		% of Total	14.2%	1.9%	16.2%
		<hr/>			
	AD6-10	Count	188	129	317
		% within StaffGroup	59.3%	40.7%	100.0%
		% within Gender	25.5%	18.2%	21.9%
		% of Total	13.0%	8.9%	21.9%
		<hr/>			
	M&A	Count	47	75	122
		% within StaffGroup	38.5%	61.5%	100.0%
		% within Gender	6.4%	10.6%	8.4%
		% of Total	3.3%	5.2%	8.4%
		<hr/>			
OTHER	Count	56	44	100	
	% within StaffGroup	56.0%	44.0%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	7.6%	6.2%	6.9%	
	% of Total	3.9%	3.0%	6.9%	
	<hr/>				
RES	Count	57	60	117	
	% within StaffGroup	48.7%	51.3%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	7.7%	8.5%	8.1%	
	% of Total	3.9%	4.1%	8.1%	
	<hr/>				
TECH	Count	21	50	71	
	% within StaffGroup	29.6%	70.4%	100.0%	
	% within Gender	2.8%	7.1%	4.9%	
	% of Total	1.5%	3.5%	4.9%	
	<hr/>				
Total	Count	738	708	1446	
	% of Total	51.0%	49.0%	100.0%	

Looking at the academic grades, there is reasonable gender parity for all grades (based on the +/-5% criterion) apart from Professor, where an 8.2% difference in average salary is noted in favour of men (statistically significant at $p < .001$). This difference is not explained by age, since there is no statistically significant difference in average age for male and female Professors (53 years for both). A breakdown of professorial bands by gender sheds some light on the underlying reason for this finding, as shown in the table below. In brief, there is a higher relative proportion of male Professors at bands 3-4+ (49.1% of male Professors versus 22% of female Professors). In contrast, 50.8% of male Professors are at Professorial bands 1-2 compared to 78% of the female Professors being in bands 1 or 2. We do not have the data relating to staff's total years of service in their academic career, which may have an impact on the differentials.

Table 9: Gender by professorial band

			Professorial Grade					Total
			BAND1	BAND2	BAND3	BAND4	BAND4+	
Gender	F	Count	16	16	9	0	0	41
		% within Gender	39.0%	39.0%	22.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		% within Grade	50.0%	25.4%	14.5%	.0%	.0%	24.8%
		% of Total	9.7%	9.7%	5.5%	.0%	.0%	24.8%
	M	Count	16	47	53	7	1	124
		% within Gender	12.9%	37.9%	42.7%	5.6%	.8%	100.0%
		% within Grade	50.0%	74.6%	85.5%	100.0%	100.0%	75.2%
		% of Total	9.7%	28.5%	32.1%	4.2%	.6%	75.2%
Total	Count	32	63	62	7	1	165	
	% of Total	19.4%	38.2%	37.6%	4.2%	.6%	100.0%	

There are sizeable differences of 5% or over in average salary for four groups, with men in each case earning more than women. The differences are particularly high for the Admin grade 6-10 and the M & A staff groups (and both gaps are statistically significant). For the Admin grade 6-10 staff group, the average salary difference of £7,868 in favour of men (£6,405.76 when the Principal is excluded from the data) cannot be explained by age differences, since the average age for women in this group is 43.5 versus 44 years for men. Similarly, the average age of men and women in the M & A staff group is not significantly different so can not explain the average gender gap in salary of £2,511.

Table 10: Staff group by total pay package by gender

GENDER TOTAL PAY PACKAGE										Mean	Median
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Female as % of male	Female as % of male	
	Female	Male			Female	Male					
	All Staff	36,300.46	48,224.81	11,924.35	24.7%	32,256.00	46,300.00	14,044.00	30.3%	75.3%	69.7%
Academic - professor	70,059.83	79,248.46	9,188.63	11.6%	67,544.00	77,584.00	10,040.00	12.9%	88.4%	87.1%	
Academic - reader	56,971.77	54,401.00	-2,570.77	-4.7%	56,417.00	54,840.00	-1,577.00	-2.9%	104.7%	102.9%	
Academic - senior lecturer	51,990.29	53,592.33	1,602.04	3.0%	51,823.00	54,840.00	3,017.00	5.5%	97.0%	94.5%	
Academic - lecturer	44,920.96	45,441.37	520.41	1.1%	43,773.00	45,146.00	1,373.00	3.0%	99.0%	97.0%	
Academic - other	40,770.71	42,456.60	1,685.89	4.0%	40,274.00	41,391.00	1,117.00	2.7%	96.0%	97.3%	
Admin 1 - 5	21,926.34	21,977.54	51.20	0.2%	21,826.00	21,966.00	140.00	0.6%	99.8%	99.4%	
Admin 6 - 10	41,039.52	49,317.56	8,278.04 ²	16.8%	38,072.00	43,773.00	5,701.00 ³	13.0%	83.2%	87.0%	
M & A	20,416.00	23,287.85	2,871.85	12.3%	19,221.00	21,826.00	2,605.00	11.9%	87.7%	88.1%	
Other	36,652.39	36,407.09	-245.30	-0.7%	33,155.00	37,582.00	4,427.00	11.8%	100.7%	88.2%	
Research	34,289.66	36,268.52	1,978.86	5.5%	33,618.00	33,618.00	0.00	0.0%	94.5%	100.0%	
Technical	31,872.95	33,032.78	1,159.83	3.5%	31,383.00	32,256.00	873.00	2.7%	96.5%	97.3%	

A similar pattern is prevalent for total pay package as was observed for salary. Across all staff, there is a large gender pay gap of 24.7% equivalent to a mean annual pay package difference of £11,924. The data suggest that overall, women in the College earn on average 75.3% of what men earn as a total pay package. The difference in the average pay package for men and women in the College is significantly different according to statistical tests (a t test shows a p value of $<.001$). Once again, sizeable differences in favour of men are evident for the following staff groups: Professors, Admin 6-10, M&A and Research. Additionally, some other staff groups are approaching the 5% criterion deemed to be of concern by the EHRC toolkit (Part 2, Step 3). As discussed above, these gender pay gaps are not explained by differences in the average age of men and women in these staff groups. The 11.6% pay gap for Professors in favour of men is statistically significant ($p<.001$), as is the 16.8% gap in favour of men in the Admin grade 6-10 staff group ($p<.001$) (which is 14.2% when the Principal is excluded) and the gap for the M&A staff group ($p=.01$).

It is worth noting that the above analyses are based on mean salaries. The median pay gap in the sector is lower (18.7%), but is higher in the whole economy at 22% (ECU Equality in Higher Education Statistical Report 2010, based on 2008/9 HESA data; Office of National Statistics website). Analysing the median takes out the potential for distortion from the inclusion of a small number of high or low salaries. The median pay gap is over 30%, with significant differentials evident in the professorial, Admin 6-10, M & A and 'Other' staff groups.

² Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £6,818.95, a 14.2% pay gap.

³ The difference in medians is also less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £4,510.00. a 10.6% pay gap.

5.1.2 Gender pay gaps by grade

Table 11 Grade by salary by gender

GENDER BY SALARY BY GRADE ⁴									Mean	Median
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Female as % of male	Female as % of male
	Female	Male			Female	Male				
PROF BAND 1	58,821.25	58,444.75	-376.50	-0.6%	59,386.00	59,386.00	0.00	0.0%	100.6%	100.0%
PROF BAND 2	66,382.63	66,905.32	522.69	0.8%	65,410.00	68,924.00	3,514.00	5.1%	99.2%	94.9%
PROF BAND 3	80,804.67	78,026.30	-2,778.36	-3.6%	79,466.00	75,450.00	-4,016.00	-5.3%	103.6%	105.3%
PROF BAND 4	n/a	93,522.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	93,522.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 4 +	n/a	105,573.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	105,573.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
A-PROF ⁵	n/a	65,236.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	63,267.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RHUL 1	13,322.00	13,055.40	-266.60	-2.0%	13,353.00	12,981.00	-372.00	-2.9%	102.0%	102.9%
RHUL 2	14,602.50	14,259.20	-343.30	-2.4%	14,602.50	14,376.00	-226.50	-1.6%	102.4%	101.6%
RHUL 3	16,628.74	16,765.41	136.66	0.8%	17,087.00	17,087.00	0.00	0.0%	99.2%	100.0%
RHUL 4	18,906.25	19,110.75	204.50	1.1%	19,692.00	19,692.00	0.00	0.0%	98.9%	100.0%
RHUL 5	22,218.58	22,191.07	-27.52	-0.1%	22,475.00	23,121.00	646.00	2.8%	100.1%	97.2%
RHUL 6	27,435.47	26,982.40	-453.07	-1.7%	27,578.00	26,779.00	-799.00	-3.0%	101.7%	103.0%
RHUL 7	32,933.58	33,318.84	385.25	1.2%	31,948.00	33,884.00	1,936.00	5.7%	98.8%	94.3%
RHUL 8	41,582.98	42,527.46	944.48	2.2%	41,639.00	44,166.00	2,527.00	5.7%	97.8%	94.3%
RHUL 9	50,476.79	51,268.19	791.40	1.5%	52,706.00	52,706.00	0.00	0.0%	98.5%	100.0%
RHUL 10	87,110.42	114,702.46	27,592.04 ⁶	24.1%	87,318.50	115,150.00	27,831.50	24.2%	75.9%	75.8%

In general, the average gender gaps across the grades in the table are below the 5% level and so relatively small. The one band that stands out is RHUL 10 where there is a 24.1% gap in favour of men, and although this reduces to 16.9% when the data for the Principal is excluded it still stands out as relatively high. In this group of 25 staff, 12 are female and 13 male, with the average age of men in the group being 57 years and women 48 years (an age difference which is statistically significant at $p=.003$). The difference in salary between men and women in this group is very close to being statistically significant ($p=.06^7$).

⁴ Excluded from this table are the small number of posts which are not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies or they are employed from TUPE transfer.

⁵ Not yet banded.

⁶ Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £17,655, a 16.9% pay gap.

⁷ This gap becomes less close to being statistically significant ($p=.084$) if the Principal's salary is excluded.

Table 12 Grade by total pay package by gender⁸

	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Female as % of male	Female as % of male
	Female	Male			Female	Male				
PROF BAND 1	61,775.31	63,797.44	2,022.13	3.2%	61,520.00	61,520.00	0.00	0.0%	96.8%	100.0%
PROF BAND 2	71,426.25	74,274.02	2,847.77	3.8%	71,058.00	71,058.00	0.00	0.0%	96.2%	100.0%
PROF BAND 3	82,938.67	86,073.94	3,135.27	3.6%	81,600.00	81,734.00	134.00	0.2%	96.4%	99.8%
PROF BAND 4	n/a	97,311.43	n/a	n/a	n/a	95,656.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 4 +	n/a	107,707.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	107,707.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
A-PROF ⁹	n/a	67,370.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	65,401.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RHUL 1	15,456.00	15,189.40	-266.60	-1.8%	15,487.00	15,115.00	-372.00	-2.5%	101.8%	102.5%
RHUL 2	16,736.50	16,393.20	-343.30	-2.1%	16,736.50	16,510.00	-226.50	-1.4%	102.1%	101.4%
RHUL 3	18,762.74	18,906.82	144.07	0.8%	19,221.00	19,221.00	0.00	0.0%	99.2%	100.0%
RHUL 4	21,065.48	21,405.54	340.06	1.6%	21,826.00	21,826.00	0.00	0.0%	98.4%	100.0%
RHUL 5	24,401.73	24,814.13	412.41	1.7%	24,609.00	25,255.00	646.00	2.6%	98.3%	97.4%
RHUL 6	29,569.47	29,176.13	-393.34	-1.3%	29,712.00	28,913.00	-799.00	-2.8%	101.3%	102.8%
RHUL 7	35,082.17	35,432.71	350.54	1.0%	34,082.00	36,018.00	1,936.00	5.4%	99.0%	94.6%
RHUL 8	44,161.28	45,131.56	970.28	2.1%	43,773.00	46,300.00	2,527.00	5.5%	97.9%	94.5%
RHUL 9	53,601.58	53,985.11	383.52	0.7%	54,840.00	54,840.00	0.00	0.0%	99.3%	100.0%
RHUL 10	89,661.08	119,144.15	29,483.07 ¹⁰	24.7%	89,778.50	117,284.00	27,505.50	23.5%	75.3%	76.5%

In relation to the grades in the table above there is just one instance where a gender pay gap of over 5% can be observed in average total pay package, although three of the Professor bands show a difference of over 3% in favour of men. At the RHUL 10 grade there is a gender pay gap of 24.7% in favour of men, which is statistically significant ($p < .05$), a gap which reduces when the Principal is excluded, but still remains a relatively high 18%, although not statistically significant ($p = 0.69$).

⁸ Excluded from this table are the small number of posts which are not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies or they are employed from TUPE transfer.

⁹ Not yet banded.

¹⁰ Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £19,738.34, an 18% pay gap.

5.2 Ethnicity pay gaps

5.2.1 Ethnicity pay gaps by staff group

Table 13 Staff group by salary by ethnicity

ETHNICITY BY STAFF GROUP BY SALARY										
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Mean Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Median Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White				
All Staff	35,062.57	39,794.49	4,731.92	11.9%	35,938.00	37,012.00	1,074.00	2.9%	88.1%	97.1%
Academic - professor	65,935.67	71,020.21	5,084.55	7.2%	65,410.00	68,924.00	3,514.00	5.1%	92.8%	94.9%
Academic - reader	51,695.50	52,461.36	765.86	1.5%	52,706.00	52,706.00	0.00	0.0%	98.5%	100.0%
Academic - senior lecturer	51,284.06	50,081.23	-1,202.83	-2.4%	52,706.00	52,706.00	0.00	0.0%	102.4%	100.0%
Academic - lecturer	41,947.29	42,018.50	71.21	0.2%	41,639.00	41,639.00	0.00	0.0%	99.8%	100.0%
Academic - other	39,361.75	39,338.00	-23.75	-0.1%	38,134.50	38,140.00	5.50	0.0%	100.1%	100.0%
Admin 1 - 5	19,189.28	19,862.93	673.65	3.4%	19,692.00	19,692.00	0.00	0.0%	96.6%	100.0%
Admin 6 - 10	37,260.13	42,380.60	5,120.47 ¹¹	12.1%	35,938.00	37,012.00	1,074.00	2.9%	87.9%	97.1%
M & A	16,930.74	20,386.84	3,456.10	17.0%	15,932.00	19,692.00	3,760.00	19.1%	83.0%	80.9%
Other	35,468.50	33,981.47	-1,487.03	-4.4%	37,012.00	31,021.00	-5,991.00	-19.3%	104.4%	119.3%
Research	30,612.05	33,864.84	3,252.79	9.6%	30,122.00	31,948.00	1,826.00	5.7%	90.4%	94.3%
Technical	31,173.29	30,372.61	-800.68	-2.6%	35,938.00	29,249.00	-6,689.00	-22.9%	102.6%	122.9%

Across all staff, there is an average ethnicity pay gap of 11.9% (equivalent to a mean annual salary difference of £4,731) in favour of white employees. The data suggest that overall, minority ethnic employees in the College earn on average 88.1% of the salary of white employees. The difference in the average salary earned is significantly different according to statistical tests (a t test shows a p value of $<.001$). These data partly reflect differences in the proportion of minority ethnic versus white employees in different roles and different grades as shown in the table below. We can see, for example, that 22.9% of white staff are in the higher paid Admin 6-10 staff group, compared to only 16.5% of minority ethnic staff. The average age of minority ethnic employees is slightly lower (39 years) than that of white employees (44 years), and this is a difference that is statistically significant at $p<.001$. Given the close relationship between time spent gaining 'experience' and pay/promotion, this average age difference is likely to be one of several factors in the observed pay gap.

¹¹ Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from these figures, when the difference reduces to £4,438.74, a 10.6% pay gap.

Table 14: Ethnic group by staff group cross-tabulation

Ethnic Group		StaffGroup						Total	
		ACAD	AD1-5	AD6-10	M&A	OTHER	RES		TECH
White	Count	413	203	282	100	77	93	63	1231
	% within Ethnic Group	33.5%	16.5%	22.9%	8.1%	6.3%	7.6%	5.1%	100.0%
	% within Staff Group	87.5%	87.5%	90.1%	84.0%	77.8%	81.6%	90.0%	86.8%
	% of Total	29.1%	14.3%	19.9%	7.0%	5.4%	6.6%	4.4%	86.8%
Minority ethnic	Count	59	29	31	19	22	21	7	188
	% within Ethnic Group	31.4%	15.4%	16.5%	10.1%	11.7%	11.2%	3.7%	100.0%
	% within Staff Group	12.5%	12.5%	9.9%	16.0%	22.2%	18.4%	10.0%	13.2%
	% of Total	4.2%	2.0%	2.2%	1.3%	1.6%	1.5%	.5%	13.2%
Total	Count	472	232	313	119	99	114	70	1419
	% within Ethnic Group	33.3%	16.3%	22.1%	8.4%	7.0%	8.0%	4.9%	100.0%
	% within StaffGroup	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	% of Total	33.3%	16.3%	22.1%	8.4%	7.0%	8.0%	4.9%	100.0%

There are four staff groups where the observed pay gap is 5% or greater, in favour of white employees: Academic Professor, Admin 6-10, M&A, and Research. Two of these pay gaps are statistically significant (M&A: $p=.019$; and Research: $p=.037$). One staff group – the “Other” category - shows a 4.4% gap in favour of minority ethnic employees. For the Professor staff group, the pay gap in favour of white employees seems to be associated with a difference in the proportion of white versus minority ethnic Professors at different Professorial bands as illustrated in the table below:-

Table 15: Ethnic group by grade cross-tabulation

Ethnic Group		Professorial Band					Total
		1	2	3	4	4+	
White	Count	29	58	58	7	1	153
	% within Ethnic Group	19.0%	37.9%	37.9%	4.6%	.7%	100.0%
	% within Grade	93.5%	95.1%	96.7%	100.0%	100.0%	95.6%
	% of Total	18.1%	36.3%	36.3%	4.4%	.6%	95.6%
Minority ethnic	Count	2	3	2	0	0	7
	% within Ethnic Group	28.6%	42.9%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within Grade	6.5%	4.9%	3.3%	.0%	.0%	4.4%
	% of Total	1.3%	1.9%	1.3%	.0%	.0%	4.4%
Total	Count	31	61	60	7	1	160
	% of Total	19.4%	38.1%	37.5%	4.4%	.6%	100.0%

Of note is that 71.4% of minority ethnic Professors are at the lower paid bands 1-2, whereas this figure for white Professors is 56.9%. There are no minority ethnic Professors at bands 4 or 4+. Also of note is the much higher number of white Professors (153) compared to minority ethnic (7).

Table 16: Staff group by total pay package by ethnicity

ETHNICITY BY STAFF GROUP BY TOTAL PAY PACKAGE											
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Mean Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Median Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White					
All Staff	37,263.40	42,738.55	5,475.15	12.8%	38,072.00	39,146.00	1,074.00	2.7%	87.2%	97.3%	
Academic - professor	69,298.89	77,458.81	8,159.92	10.5%	67,544.00	77,584.00	10,040.00	12.9%	89.5%	87.1%	
Academic - reader	54,017.00	55,477.18	1,460.18	2.6%	54,840.00	54,840.00	0.00	0.0%	97.4%	100.0%	
Academic - senior lecturer	53,418.06	53,078.44	-339.62	-0.6%	54,840.00	54,840.00	0.00	0.0%	100.6%	100.0%	
Academic - lecturer	44,081.29	45,353.87	1,272.58	2.8%	43,773.00	43,773.00	0.00	0.0%	97.2%	100.0%	
Academic - other	41,495.75	41,472.00	-23.75	-0.1%	40,268.50	40,274.00	5.50	0.0%	100.1%	100.0%	
Admin 1 - 5	21,323.28	22,020.54	697.27	3.2%	21,826.00	21,826.00	0.00	0.0%	96.8%	100.0%	
Admin 6 - 10	39,394.13	44,734.54	5,340.41 ¹²	11.9%	38,072.00	39,146.00	1,074.00	2.7%	88.1%	97.3%	
M & A	19,064.74	22,771.74	3,707.00	16.3%	18,066.00	21,826.00	3,760.00	17.2%	83.7%	82.8%	
Other	37,602.50	36,115.47	-1,487.03	-4.1%	39,146.00	33,155.00	-5,991.00	-18.1%	104.1%	118.1%	
Research	32,746.05	35,906.05	3,160.01	8.8%	32,256.00	34,082.00	1,826.00	5.4%	91.2%	94.6%	
Technical	33,307.29	32,473.27	-834.02	-2.6%	38,072.00	31,383.00	-6,689.00	-21.3%	102.6%	121.3%	

Compared to just salary, there is a slightly larger pay gap between white and minority ethnic employees when looking at total pay package (12.8% or an average of £5,475 in favour of white employees). Again, this average difference in favour of white employees is statistically significant ($p < .001$). Once again, four staff groups show a pay gap of 5% or higher (all in favour of white employees): Professor (approaching statistical significance at $p = .057$), Admin 6-10, M&A (statistically significant at $p = .014$) and Research (statistically significant at $p = .037$). The “Other” category shows a 4.1% pay gap in favour of minority ethnic staff.

¹² Note that the difference is less if the Principal is excluded from the figures, when the difference reduces to £4,659.46, a 10.6% pay gap.

5.2.2 Ethnicity pay gaps by grade

Table 17: Salary by ethnic group and grade

ETHNICITY SALARY BY GRADE ¹³									Mean Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Median Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff		
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White				
PROF BAND 1	59,386.00	58,555.10	-830.90	-1.4%	59,386.00	59,386.00	0.00	0.0%	101.4%	100.0%
PROF BAND 2	66,581.33	66,768.86	187.53	0.3%	65,410.00	68,924.00	3,514.00	5.1%	99.7%	94.9%
PROF BAND 3	79,466.00	78,358.14	-1,107.86	-1.4%	79,466.00	79,466.00	0.00	0.0%	101.4%	100.0%
PROF BAND 4	n/a	93,522.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	93,522.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 4 +	n/a	105,573.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	105,573.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
A-PROF ¹⁴	63,267.00	66,221.00	2,954.00	4.5%	63,267.00	66,221.00	2,954.00	4.5%	95.5%	95.5%
RHUL 1	13,246.71	13,241.40	-5.31	0.0%	13,353.00	13,353.00	0.00	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RHUL 2	13,702.00	14,466.50	764.50	5.3%	13,702.00	14,567.00	865.00	6.3%	94.7%	94.1%
RHUL 3	16,700.62	16,656.29	-44.33	-0.3%	17,087.00	17,087.00	0.00	0.0%	100.3%	100.0%
RHUL 4	18,712.79	18,972.61	259.82	1.4%	18,340.00	19,692.00	1,352.00	6.9%	98.6%	93.1%
RHUL 5	21,473.80	22,292.40	818.60	3.7%	21,171.00	22,475.00	1,304.00	5.8%	96.3%	94.2%
RHUL 6	26,301.00	27,349.74	1,048.74	4.0%	25,251.50	27,578.00	2,326.50	9.2%	96.2%	91.6%
RHUL 7	32,676.46	33,186.16	509.71	1.5%	31,948.00	33,884.00	1,936.00	5.7%	98.5%	94.3%
RHUL 8	41,673.76	42,120.55	446.79	1.1%	41,639.00	41,639.00	0.00	0.0%	98.9%	100.0%
RHUL 9	51,553.96	50,946.10	-607.86	-1.2%	52,706.00	52,706.00	0.00	0.0%	101.2%	100.0%
RHUL 10	n/a	100,887.79	n/a	n/a	n/a	99,723.50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Broken down by pay grade, the only pay gap that meets the 5% criterion is observed at the RHUL 2 pay grade, where there is a 5.3% pay gap in favour of white employees, representing an average salary difference of £764.50. However, this pay gap is not statistically significant because the number of staff involved is small (below 10).

¹³ Excluded from this table are the small number of posts which are not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies or they are employed from TUPE transfer.

¹⁴ Not yet banded.

Table 18: Total pay package by ethnic group by grade

ETHNICITY TPP BY GRADE ¹⁵										Mean Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Median Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff			
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White					
PROF BAND 1	61,520.00	62,917.38	1,397.38	2.2%	61,520.00	61,520.00	0.00	0.0%	97.8%	100.0%	
PROF BAND 2	69,069.67	73,688.76	4,619.09	6.3%	68,607.00	71,058.00	2,451.00	3.4%	93.7%	96.6%	
PROF BAND 3	81,600.00	85,895.98	4,295.98	5.0%	81,600.00	85,616.00	4,016.00	4.7%	95.0%	95.3%	
PROF BAND 4	n/a	97,311.43	n/a	n/a	n/a	95,656.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
PROF BAND 4 +	n/a	107,707.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	107,707.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
A- PROF ¹⁶	65,401.00	68,355.00	2,954.00	4.3%	65,401.00	68,355.00	2,954.00	4.3%	95.7%	95.7%	
RHUL 1	15,380.71	15,375.40	-5.31	0.0%	15,487.00	15,487.00	0.00	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
RHUL 2	15,836.00	16,600.50	764.50	4.6%	15,836.00	16,701.00	865.00	5.5%	95.4%	94.8%	
RHUL 3	18,834.62	18,793.25	-41.37	-0.2%	19,221.00	19,221.00	0.00	0.0%	100.2%	100.0%	
RHUL 4	20,846.79	21,168.49	321.70	1.5%	20,474.00	21,826.00	1,352.00	6.2%	98.5%	93.8%	
RHUL 5	23,607.80	24,641.46	1,033.66	4.2%	23,305.00	25,255.00	1,950.00	7.7%	95.8%	92.3%	
RHUL 6	28,435.00	29,466.10	1,031.10	3.6%	27,385.50	29,712.00	2,326.50	8.5%	96.5%	92.2%	
RHUL 7	34,810.46	35,317.93	507.47	1.4%	34,082.00	36,018.00	1,936.00	5.4%	98.6%	94.6%	
RHUL 8	43,807.76	44,792.41	984.65	2.2%	43,773.00	44,183.50	410.50	0.9%	97.8%	99.1%	
RHUL 9	54,098.68	53,867.04	-231.63	-0.4%	54,840.00	54,840.00	0.00	0.0%	100.4%	100.0%	
RHUL 10	n/a	104,480.13	n/a	n/a	n/a	104,031.50	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	

When looking at total pay package broken down by ethnicity and pay grade, two pay gaps are evident at the 5% or higher level: At Professor Band 2 there is a 6.3% pay gap in favour of white employees, and at Professor Band 3 there is a 5% gap in favour of white Professors. While these differences are not statistically significant, it should be noted that this is partly due to the small number of minority ethnic staff in these bands (<10 in each case).

¹⁵ Excluded from this table are the small number of posts which are not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies or they are employed from TUPE transfer.

¹⁶ Not yet banded.

5.3 Disability pay gaps

The disability data is presented by staff group only, not by grade which would potentially identify individuals.

5.3.1 Disability pay gaps by staff group

Table 19: Staff group by salary by disability

DISABILITY SALARY BY STAFF GROUP										
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Disabled as % of not disabled	Disabled as % of not disabled
	Disabled	Not disabled			Disabled	Not Disabled				
All staff	38,575.50	39,307.13	731.63	1.9%	34,911.00	37,012.00	2,101.00	5.7%	98.1%	94.3%
Academic	51,641.13	55,605.98	3,964.85	7.1%	52,706.00	52,706.00	0.00	0.0%	92.9%	100.0%
Non-academic	30,054.43	31,140.35	1,085.91	3.5%	25,251.00	29,249.00	3,998.00	13.7%	96.5%	86.3%

In the table above it can be seen that overall there is a small pay gap of 1.9% in mean salary in favour of non-disabled staff, which increases to 5.7% when considering the median salary. When broken down by general staff group, there is a pay gap in the Academic staff group of 7.1% in favour of employees who are not disabled, equating to a mean pay difference of £3,964 per annum. This is not a statistically significant mean difference; however, since there are only 15 academics in the disabled category, statistical testing is not particularly appropriate in this case. The pay gap identified here is most likely a result of there being proportionately more non-disabled academics at Professor and Reader level compared to disabled academics overall. The non-academic staff group is interesting as the mean difference is relatively small (3.5%) whereas the median difference is a large 13.7% in favour of staff who are not disabled. Examining the detailed data for non-academic staff, there are specific staff groups where a pay gap in favour of disabled staff exists, along with instances where the pay gap is in the opposite direction. As such, there are no clear, consistent pay gap patterns in the non-academic category.

Table 20: Staff group by total pay package by disability

DISABILITY TPP BY STAFF GROUP										
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Disabled as % of not disabled	Disabled as % of not disabled
	Disabled	Not disabled			Disabled	Not Disabled				
All staff	41,772.89	42,148.82	375.93	0.9%	37,045.00	39,146.00	2,101.00	5.4%	99.1%	94.6%
Academic	56,469.07	59,672.51	3,203.44	5.4%	54,840.00	54,840.00	0.00	0.0%	94.6%	100.0%
Non-academic	32,188.43	33,368.29	1,179.86	3.5%	27,385.00	31,383.00	3,998.00	12.7%	96.5%	87.3%

The table above shows total pay package, and the pattern is similar to that observed in the table for salary, with the only pay gap above 5% being for academics, who have a higher mean total pay package if they are not disabled (this difference is not statistically significant, but see note above). The same observation can be made here about median pay gap for non-academic staff as was made above in relation to the table looking at salary.

6. Pay gaps – starting salaries

6.1 Gender pay gaps - starters

Table 21: Starter salaries by grade by gender

	GENDER STARTER SALARY BY GRADE ¹⁷							Mean	Median	
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Female	Female
	Female	Male			Female	Male			as % of male	as % of male
All staff	29,265.83	35,415.23	6,149.40	17.4%	29,972.00	30,122.00	150.00	0.5%	82.6%	99.5%
PROF BAND 1	n/a	57,880.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	57,880.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 2	68,924.00	63,904.00	-5,020.00	-7.9%	68,924.00	63,904.00	-5,020.00	-7.9%	107.9%	107.9%
PROF BAND 3	79,466.00	79,466.00	0.00	0.0%	79,466.00	79,466.00	0.00	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
RHUL 1	13,105.00	12,981.00	-124.00	-1.0%	12,981.00	12,981.00	0.00	0.0%	101.0%	100.0%
RHUL 2	13,702.00	13,926.67	224.67	1.6%	13,702.00	13,702.00	0.00	0.0%	98.4%	100.0%
RHUL 3	16,247.50	15,151.00	-1,096.50	-7.2%	16,376.00	15,151.00	-1,225.00	-8.1%	107.2%	108.1%
RHUL 4	18,001.94	18,275.60	273.66	1.5%	17,329.00	18,190.00	861.00	4.7%	98.5%	95.3%
RHUL 5	21,157.60	20,271.75	-885.85	-4.4%	20,559.00	19,972.00	-587.00	-2.9%	104.4%	102.9%
RHUL 6	26,447.56	25,565.95	-881.61	-3.4%	26,779.00	24,885.50	-1,893.50	-7.6%	103.4%	107.6%
RHUL 7	30,339.00	31,223.17	884.17	2.8%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00	0.0%	97.2%	100.0%
RHUL 8	39,800.79	40,440.47	639.68	1.6%	37,990.00	39,257.00	1,267.00	3.2%	98.4%	96.8%
RHUL 9	45,411.00	50,126.00	4,715.00	9.4%	45,411.00	50,476.00	5,065.00	10.0%	90.6%	90.0%
RHUL 10	70,150.00	115,150.00	45,000.00	39.1%	70,150.00	115,150.00	45,000.00	39.1%	60.9%	60.9%

Across all starters (99 female, 92 male), there is a gender pay gap of 17.4% in mean salary in favour of men (statistically significant at $p < .005$), equating to an average salary difference of £6,149. This may partly reflect the higher number of male starters in professorial bands 2 and 3, and at RHUL grades 9 and 10, however the numbers in some of the grades are too small to form firm conclusions about the cause of this overall gender pay gap for starters. Looking at the data broken down by grade it is apparent that there are some grades at which there is a gender pay gap in favour of men (RHUL 9 and RHUL 10) and some show a pay gap in favour of women (Prof Band 2, RHUL 3).

¹⁷ This excludes a small number of posts not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies.

Table 22: Starter salaries by staff group by gender

GENDER STARTER SALARY BY STAFF GROUP	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Mean Female as % of male	Median Female as % of male
	Female	Male			Female	Male				
	All staff	29,265.83	35,415.23	6,149.40	17.4%	29,972.00	30,122.00	150.00	0.5%	82.6%
ACAD	45,791.73	50,737.48	4,945.75	9.7%	37,990.00	45,486.00	7,496.00	16.5%	90.3%	83.5%
Admin 1-5	18,768.48	18,903.25	134.77	0.7%	18,340.00	19,156.00	816.00	4.3%	99.3%	95.7%
Admin 6-10	35,243.86	46,002.54	10,758.67	23.4%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00	0.0%	76.6%	100.0%
M&A	14,359.00	16,340.45	1,981.45	12.1%	13,353.00	15,151.00	1,798.00	11.9%	87.9%	88.1%
Other	32,079.40	28,305.29	-3,774.11	-13.3%	30,122.50	27,321.00	-2,801.50	-10.3%	113.3%	110.3%
Research	32,595.32	31,942.44	-652.87	-2.0%	30,122.00	30,571.00	449.00	1.5%	102.0%	98.5%
Technical	24,520.00	29,623.33	5,103.33	17.2%	24,520.00	26,629.00	2,109.00	7.9%	82.8%	92.1%

An examination of the table above indicates that there is an overall pattern across most grades for a pay gap in favour of men. This is particularly noticeable in the Academic, Admin 6-10, M&A and Technical staff groups (the relatively small numbers of starters when broken down by gender and staff group preclude the use of statistical tests to analyse these differences/pay gaps). There is one staff group in which a pay gap in favour of women is evident – in the “Other” staff group women on average start on £3,774 more than men (13.3% difference).

Table 23: Starter salaries by gender by age group

Age range by starter salary	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Mean Female as percentage of male	Median Female as percentage of male
	Female	Male			Female	Male				
	20 and under	n/a	15,151.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	15,151.00	n/a	n/a	n/a
21 - 30	28,425.29	27,187.73	-1,237.57	-4.6%	30,122.00	25,251.00	-4,871.00	-19.3%	104.6%	119.3%
31 - 40	29,290.71	33,881.71	4,591.00	13.6%	30,122.00	32,841.00	2,719.00	8.3%	86.4%	91.7%
41 - 50	34,769.20	39,870.30	5,101.10	12.8%	30,047.00	39,325.50	9,278.50	23.6%	87.2%	76.4%
51 - 60	18,354.86	60,794.64	42,439.78	69.8%	17,329.00	59,386.00	42,057.00	70.8%	30.2%	29.2%
61 - 70	n/a	42,144.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	29,249.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The table above illustrates that, in general, a gender pay gap for starters in favour of men is noticeable, and this increases with the age group of the starter, being highest in the 51-60 age group (statistically significant at $p < .005$) and lowest in the 21-30 age group where there is a small gap in favour of women. An analysis of the data for the 51-60 age group sheds light on the basis of this pay gap in favour of men: while there were four male Professors appointed, there were no female Professors starting, and in this age group there were 4 male starters in the Admin 7-10 grades compared to no female starters at those grades.

6.2 Ethnicity pay gaps - starters

Table 24: Starter salaries by grade by ethnicity

ETHNICITY STARTER SALARY BY GRADE ¹⁸									Mean Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Median Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary
	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff		
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White				
All staff	30,024.09	32,615.90	2,591.81	7.9%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00	0.0%	92.1%	100.0%
PROF BAND 1	n/a	57,880.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	57,880.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 2	n/a	65,577.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	65,410.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PROF BAND 3	n/a	79,466.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	79,466.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RHUL 1	13,167.00	12,981.00	-186.00	-1.4%	13,167.00	12,981.00	-186.00	-1.4%	101.4%	101.4%
RHUL 2	13,702.00	13,926.67	224.67	1.6%	13,702.00	13,702.00	0.00	0.0%	13.7%	13.7%
RHUL 3	n/a	16,028.20	n/a	n/a	n/a	16,376.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RHUL 4	18,725.75	17,921.58	-804.17	-4.5%	18,941.00	17,329.00	-1,612.00	-9.3%	104.5%	109.3%
RHUL 5	n/a	20,904.50	n/a	n/a	n/a	20,559.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
RHUL 6	26,152.29	25,740.05	-412.24	-1.6%	25,251.00	25,251.00	0.00	0.0%	101.6%	100.0%
RHUL 7	31,542.60	30,546.39	-996.21	-3.3%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00	0.0%	103.3%	100.0%
RHUL 8	39,192.60	40,355.19	1,162.59	2.9%	37,012.00	39,257.00	2,245.00	5.7%	97.1%	94.3%
RHUL 9	45,486.00	49,168.00	3,682.00	7.5%	45,486.00	48,246.00	2,760.00	5.7%	92.5%	94.3%
RHUL 10	n/a	100,150.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	115,150.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Overall, there is an ethnicity pay gap for starters of 7.9%, equating to an average difference in starting salary of £2,591 (153 white starters versus 35 minority ethnic; this difference in starting salary is not statistically significant). This overall difference is likely affected by the fact that no minority ethnic Professors were appointed, and no minority ethnic starters were appointed at RHUL grade 10. Broken down by grade, the pay gap is most evident in the RHUL 9 grade (7.5%) and least prominent in the RHUL 4 grade, where there is a 4.5% gap in favour of minority ethnic staff. The numbers involved are too small to warrant statistical significance testing.

Table 25: Starter salaries by staff group by ethnicity

	Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff	Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary	Minority ethnic as a % of white staff salary
	Minority ethnic	White			Minority ethnic	White				
	All staff	30,024.09	32,615.90	2,591.81	7.9%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00		
ACAD	40,137.60	51,354.07	11,216.47	21.8%	37,012.00	45,486.00	8,474.00	18.6%	78.2%	81.4%
Admin 1-5	18,941.00	18,774.36	-166.64	-0.9%	18,941.00	18,340.00	-601.00	-3.3%	100.9%	103.3%
Admin 6-10	36,288.20	39,731.90	3,443.70	8.7%	35,938.00	30,122.00	-5,816.00	-19.3%	91.3%	119.3%
M&A	15,411.40	15,862.09	450.69	2.8%	13,702.00	15,151.00	1,449.00	9.6%	97.2%	90.4%
Other	31,474.29	29,220.47	-2,253.82	-7.7%	30,122.00	30,122.00	0.00	0.0%	107.7%	100.0%
Research	29,751.70	33,297.62	3,545.92	10.6%	30,122.00	30,945.00	823.00	2.7%	89.4%	97.3%
Technical	35,938.00	28,354.67	-7,583.33	-26.7%	35,938.00	26,629.00	-9,309.00	-35.0%	126.7%	135.0%

¹⁸ This excludes a small number of posts not currently on RHUL pay spine as they are determined by external bodies.

There are some large pay gaps evident in the table above, however, while four of them are in favour of white starters, two of them are in favour of minority ethnic starters. The largest gap in favour of white starters is in the academic staff group, where a 21.8% gap is evident, with white academics (who numbered 27) on average starting on £11,216 more than minority ethnic academics (of whom there were 5). This average difference in starting salary is statistically significant at $p < .005$ (and no other staff group differences are statistically significant), but these comparisons should be treated with caution since in some cases the numbers are too small to make statistical analyses meaningful. In fact, the pay gap in the academic staff group is most likely a result of the fact that none of the nine appointee Professors were of minority ethnic background. In contrast, there is a large pay gap in favour of minority ethnic starters in the technical staff group, equating to 26.7% or an average difference in starting salary of £7,583.

6.3 Disability pay gaps - starters

Table 26: Starter salaries by disabled or non disabled

DISABLED by starter salary								Mean Disabled as % of non-disabled	Median Disabled as % of non-disabled
Mean salary		Difference	% Diff	Median salary		Difference	% Diff		
Disabled	Non disabled			Disabled	Non disabled				
39,858.10	31,806.28	-8,051.82	-25.3%	34,016.00	30,122.00	-3,894.00	-12.9%	125.3%	112.9%

In the table above it is evident that there is an overall pay gap for starters in favour of employees who are disabled of 25.3% equating to £8,051 (there were 10 disabled starters compared with 181 not disabled). This pay gap is not statistically significant due to the small number of disabled starters. Drilling down into the data, this pay gap appears to be linked to the fact that a majority of disabled starters were appointed at the higher administrative pay grades.

7. Market supplements

68 employees received a market supplement; 18 (26%) are women and 50 (74%) are men. These supplements range from £805 through to £30,000. the average supplement received by the 18 female staff is £8,435 and the average by the men was slightly lower, at £7,956 although the much higher number of men who receive supplements should be born in mind. In addition, the two highest amounts are allocated to 10 men and to 1 woman. Market supplements are allocated to staff in Administrative Resources (32%), Faculty of Management and Economics (50%) and the Faculty of Science (18%). None are in Arts and Social Sciences.

8. Summary

Pay gaps exist in occupations and sectors across the national economy – from, for example, a 19.3% national gender pay gap in the public sector to a 27.4% gap in the private sector (ONS, 2012, p.11).

8.1 Staff

Gender

Overall, there is a large gender pay gap of 24.5%, whereby women in the College earn on average 75.5% of what men earn – a statistically significant difference, partly reflecting differences in the proportion of men and women employed in different roles and different grades.

In the academic grades (where men comprise 66.4% of posts), there is reasonable gender parity for all grades apart from Professor, where there is an 8.2% difference in average salary in favour of men which is not explained by age – but may be explained by a higher relative proportion of male Professors at the higher Professorial grades.

With the other staff groups, there are significant differences in average salary in favour of men for four groups, in particular Admin grade 6-10 and M & A, which cannot be explained by age differences.

A similar pattern is prevalent for total pay package as was observed for salary: a large gender pay gap of 24.7%, equivalent to a mean annual pay package difference of £11,924. The difference is particularly evident for Professors, Admin 6-10, M&A and Research, but other staff groups are also approaching the 5% criterion. Women receive only 26% of the 68 market supplements which have been allocated. These gender pay gaps are also not explained by differences in the average age of men and women in the institution.

In addition, there is a difference in salary that is very close to being statistically significant at the RHUL 10 grade, where there is a 24.1% gap in favour of men, although the average age difference in this case is statistically significant.

Ethnicity

Across all staff, there is an average ethnicity pay gap of 11.9% (equivalent to a mean annual salary difference of £4,731) in favour of white employees (and slightly larger when looking at total pay package). The difference in the average salary earned is significantly different according to statistical tests, partly reflecting differences in the proportion of minority ethnic versus white employees in different roles and different grades. The average age of minority ethnic employees is slightly lower (39 years) than that of white employees (44 years), and likely to be one of the factors in explaining this pay gap, although length of service data would need to be looked at in detail in order to consider this a factor.

There are four staff groups where the observed pay gap is 5% or greater, in favour of white employees: Admin 6-10, Professor, M&A, and Research – the last two being statistically significant. For the Professor staff group, the pay gap in favour of white

employees seems to be associated with a difference in the proportion of white versus minority ethnic Professors (who are in ratio 153:7) at different Professorial bands (and the absence of the latter at band 4 or 4+). Of note is that 71.4% of minority ethnic Professors are at the lower paid bands 1-2, whereas this figure for white Professors is 56.9%. However, one staff group – the “Other” category - shows a 4.4% gap in favour of minority ethnic employees.

Disability

There is a small pay gap of 1.9% in mean salary in favour of non-disabled staff, which increases to 5.7% when considering the median salary (with a similar situation when total pay is considered). When broken down by general staff group, there is a pay gap in the Academic staff group of 7.1% in favour of employees who are not disabled, equating to a mean pay difference of £3,964 per annum. In the non-academic staff group the mean difference is relatively small (3.5%) whereas the median difference is a large 13.7% in favour of staff who are not disabled and overall there are no clear, consistent pay gap patterns in the non-academic category.

8.2 Starters

Across all starters and most grades, there is a statistically significant gender pay gap of 17.4% in mean salary in favour of men, equating to an average salary difference of £6,149 - and this increases with the age group of the starter. This is particularly noticeable in the Academic, Admin 6-10, M&A and Technical staff groups. The ‘Other’ staff group has a pay gap in favour of women who on average start on £3,774 more than men (13.3% difference). Overall, there is an ethnicity pay gap for starters of 7.9%, equating to an average difference in starting salary of £2,591. The pay gap is most evident in the RHUL 9 grade (7.5%) and least prominent in the RHUL 4 grade, but the numbers involved are too small to warrant statistical analysis. The largest gap (21.8%) in favour of white starters is in the academic staff group, who start on £11,216 more than minority ethnic starters, and this is likely due to the lack of minority ethnic Professors amongst the starters. On the other hand, there is a large pay gap in favour of minority ethnic starters in the technical staff group, equating to 26.7% or an average difference in starting salary of £7,583.

It is evident that there is an overall pay gap (25.3%) for starters in favour of employees who are disabled, equating to £8,051. This pay gap is not statistically significant due to the small number of disabled starters.

9. Recommendations

- 9.1 The pay gaps of more than 5% that have been identified should be addressed with action focused on either explaining or on closing the gap. These include:
- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Gender: | Staff groups – Admin 6 – 10; M&A; Academic (Professor);
Research |
| Grade: | RHUL 10 |
| Starter salaries: | Grades RHUL 9, 10, 3 and Prof Band 2 |
| Ethnicity: | Staff groups - Admin 6 – 10; M&A; Academic (Professor);
Research |
| Grades: | Prof Band 2; Prof Band 3; RHUL 2 |
| Starter salaries: | Grade RHUL 9 |
| Disability: | Academic staff group |

- 9.2 Data relating to market supplement payments could be further explored in order to ensure that the College is applying its market supplement policy consistently in line with JNCHES guidance and that the differences in numbers of supplements allocated to men and women are justified.
- 9.3 It is recommended that some further analysis could be undertaken to look at length of service and general experience of staff to assess how this impacts on recognised pay gaps.
- 9.4 The low numbers of disabled staff continues to persist and the findings of this report in relation to disabled staff should be considered alongside the findings of the equality monitoring report and attention paid in particular to disabled staff and progression, including in relation to academic staff and the REF.
- 9.5 The differences in pay that are greater than 3% but less than 5% should be given consideration and also continue to be regularly monitored.

10. Bibliography

Cambridge University Reporter (2010) No. 6208, Vol XCLI, no. 12 'Equal Pay Review, 2010: Notice' <http://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2010-11/weekly/6208/section1.shtml> [accessed July 2012]

Educational Competencies Consortium (2002) 'HERA FOR ROLE HOLDERS: To enable role holders to record examples of the requirements of their role and prepare for the meeting with the Role Analyst' (*Role Holders Guide* v. 4 April 2005)

Equality Act, 2010 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/section/149> [28 August 2012]

Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) 2010, *Promoting Equality in Pay A practical resource for conducting equal pay reviews in higher education*

Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), Equal Pay Audit Toolkit, <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/tools-equal-pay/equal-pay-audit-toolkit/> [last accessed July 2012]

Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) (2011) *Equal pay statutory code of practice*

The Guardian (2011) 'The ethnic population of England and Wales broken down by local authority' [<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2011/may/18/ethnic-population-england-wales>]

Home Office, Public Sector Equality Duty <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/equalities/equality-act/equality-duty/> [28 August 2012]

Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (2009) 'PAY AGREEMENT 2006-09', <http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/l/k/2006payagreement06-09.pdf> [accessed 28 August 2012]

Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) (2007) *Equal Pay Reviews, Guidance for Higher Education Institutions*

Office for National Statistics (2012), *Statistical Bulletin*, 2011 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (based on SCO 2010), March

Royal Holloway University of London (2012), Equality Monitoring Data Employment Report 2010/11