INTRODUCTION

The law on equal pay requires that men and women should receive the same level of pay and associated benefits as members of the opposite sex performing the same work, like work, or work assessed as being of equal value, save that differences may be objectively justified where they are not attributed to the sex of the individuals. Work of equal value is determined by means of analytical job evaluation, which assesses the relative size of a job by objectively analysing its skills and requirements. Over time, equality legislation has been extended to prohibit less favourable treatment on the basis of race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation, faith, and length and type of contract (i.e. fixed-term versus permanent, part-time versus full-time).

The purpose of this report is to provide Council, the Equal Opportunities Committee and School staff and stakeholders with information produced from the recent pay audit.

The School supports the principle of equal pay for work of equal value, and recognises that its pay systems should be based on objective criteria.

This is the first in-depth Equal Pay Audit undertaken by the School. It uses existing Personnel Office staffing data to provide an overview of pay patterns across the institution.

A Working Group was set up to oversee the process. This Group was made up of members of Personnel Office staff, the Chair of the Equal Opportunities Committee, the Secretary & Registrar, representatives from the School’s recognised trade unions and an academic statistician as Chair.

The data was analysed by the Chair of the Working Group and the Head of Personnel, Pay and Pensions, and the results were presented to the Working Group.

BACKGROUND

The Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) issued guidance on equal pay reviews as far back as 2002. Subsequently, HE institutions in partnership with trade unions concluded the Framework Agreement for the Modernisation of HE Pay Structures, a prime aim of which was to support the achievement of equal pay for work of equal value, with staff salaries being determined on a basis that is transparent, consistent and fair.
JNCHES recommended that institutions should undertake an equal pay review within 12 months of the introduction of the new Framework Agreement pay structures, and periodically thereafter.

As a matter of good practice, HE institutions were encouraged to cover in their equal pay audits the following equality strands: gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief and age, as well as addressing equal pay in respect of part-time employees and those on fixed-term contracts. The guidance did, however, recognise that there would be practical constraints on what is possible for some of these strands. In the case of the School, information in respect of sexual orientation and religion or belief is not recorded at present.

The primary purposes of an equal pay review are to:

- establish whether there are any pay inequalities arising because of gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief and age, and/or from differing contractual arrangements;
- analyse in more detail the nature of any inequalities;
- analyse the factors creating inequalities and diagnose the cause or causes, and
- determine what action is required to deal with any unjustified inequalities revealed.

The Equal Opportunities Commission (now the Equality and Human Rights Commission) recommended that, as a general guide, any pay gap differences of 5% or more between groups performing equal work (i.e. work rated as equivalent under an analytical job evaluation scheme) should warrant further investigation. Similarly, any pattern of differences in favour of one group which are reflected at all or most levels of the organisation may require investigation whether or not these are as high as 5%.

Equal pay reviews are covered by the Data Protection Act (1998) in terms of the processing of raw data, the disclosure of data to third parties involved in the review, and the publication of the results. The School has taken appropriate measures to ensure that the results of its Equal Pay Audit are published in a form which complies with this legislation.

Overall, the analysis highlights the issue of uneven distribution of certain equality groups (e.g. gender) across grades. This is an issue of equal opportunities rather than that of equal pay, and lies outside the scope of this report.

**Job Evaluation**

For staff in grades 1 to 8, pay range is largely determined by grade. The School's new salary and grading structure is in turn underpinned by the Higher Education Role Analysis scheme (HERA) – an analytical job evaluation scheme specifically designed for the HE sector. In 2006, staff were assimilated to the new structure following an extensive job evaluation exercise of benchmark roles.

All new jobs and re-grading requests from staff in post are individually analysed using the HERA scheme. Jobs are evaluated by trained role analysts either from Personnel
Services or a panel of accredited graders, and information about all grading procedures is available for staff on the Personnel Office website.

Detailed pay gap analyses within the above defined grades were conducted by equality group and contract type.

**METHODS**

**General**

The review was undertaken using data produced from the Cyborg Personnel & Payroll database.

The review covered all staff in post as at 31 October 2008 (962 in total). It included staff covered by the Pay Framework Agreement as well as those staff groups which did not fall under that remit, ie clinical staff and senior staff above PSP/Academic Grade 8. Hourly paid lecturers were excluded from the current review because they are all paid on the same spine point regardless of experience, length of service etc.

Staff on Grades 1 to 8 and all clinical staff are paid on national incremental pay scales. Staff on PSP Grade 9, and non-clinical Professors and Readers are paid on a performance-related basis, which includes payment of the annual cost-of-living award.

In parallel to the introduction of the new structure in August 2006, benefits for all staff, academic and professional support, in grades 1-10 were harmonised. As all staff on these grades have equal access to School benefits (e.g. annual leave, access to superannuation schemes), an analysis of these benefits has been excluded from the audit.

**First-level analysis**

Detailed pay gap analyses were conducted by equality group and contract type. The pay gap for a given grade was determined by first calculating the average salary for each equality group at that grade (for part-time staff, transforming to the equivalent full-time rate), then the pay gap was calculated as the difference between those averages expressed as a percentage of one group’s average. In the case of gender, for example, the pay gap is obtained by expressing the male minus female difference in average salaries for a grade as a percentage of the male average salary for the grade, ie

$$\text{Pay Gap} = \frac{\text{Average M Salary} - \text{Average F Salary}}{\text{Average M Salary}}$$

In accordance with the good practice recommendations outlined above, in addition to gender, pay gaps were reviewed for the following areas (hereafter collectively referred to as “equal pay areas”, with each divided, for feasibility, into two equality groups:-

**Ethnicity:**
the two groups are White, and Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME)

Ethnicity is recorded by the School under the 13 categories required by the Higher Education Statistics Agency. However, the numbers within most of
these categories are too small for meaningful analysis, and so for the purpose
of this report have been grouped into two: White, and Black and Minority
Ethnic.

Disability:
the two groups are disabled and non-disabled

FTE Status:
the two groups are staff working full-time, and those working at any level less
than full-time

Contractual Status:
the two groups are staff on fixed-term contracts and those on permanent
contracts

Age:
Age analysis was compiled on the basis of a comparison between staff under
40 years of age compared with staff aged 40 and over. The average age of
School staff at the date of analysis was 41.6 years.

In addition, pay gaps between staff on grades 5 to 8 of the Professional Support
Pathway (PSP) and non-clinical staff on grades 5 to 8 of the Academic Pathway
(AP) were compared.

No review was carried out by sexual orientation or by religion or belief, since the
School does not hold data on these groupings.

The relevant pay gap (eg Male/Female, Disabled/Non-disabled) was calculated for
each of the following grades:
PSP1, PSP2, PSP3, PSP4, PSP5, PSP6, PSP7, PSP8 and PSP9;
AP5 (Research Assistant), AP6 (Research Fellow), AP7 (Lecturer), AP8 (Senior
Lecturer), Reader and Professor;
Clinical Research Fellow, Clinical Lecturer, Clinical Senior Lecturer, Clinical Reader,
Clinical Professor, and

for the combined PSP and AP pathways at each of grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 (ie
AP5+PSP5 etc.)

The clinical staff groupings were split into those with an Honorary Consultant
Contract (HCC) and those without, since the pay scales are different for those staff
holding an HCC.

A further analysis of clinical staff was also conducted across each of the equal pay
areas, combining non-HCC Clinical Research Fellows and Clinical Lecturers, since both
these grades of staff are paid on the same payscale.
The results of this first-level analysis are set out in lines 101 to 404 of each pay area,
and can be found in Appendix A.
Where a paygap of 5% or more than was identified, further second-level analysis was undertaken, as discussed below. Note was also taken of consistent patterns where the pay gap, though not reaching 5%, was in the same direction.

**Second-level analysis**

Having identified pay gaps greater than or equal to 5%, these were investigated to try to identify what factors were causing them. Since the single most likely such factor is a possible difference in length of service among the two equality groups within a grade, in most cases the grade in question was stratified by length of service (LOS) as follows: the mean LOS for the grade was obtained, and then two separate pay gaps were calculated for the stratum of staff below and above this mean LOS. If different LOS profiles in the two equality groups were generating the pay gap, then it would be expected that the pay gap would reduce within strata where equality groups with more similar LOS were compared.

However, the variability of LOS within the two strata was often still high, and since further stratification was impractical, where a pay gap greater than or equal to 5% still remained for an individual stratum, the mean LOS in the two equality groups within that stratum was then compared: if quite similar, LOS would be unlikely to provide the mechanism for disparity; while a difference in mean LOS would suggest LOS as a plausible mechanism.

Other factors which might plausibly be generating pay gaps were explored according to context, and are outlined in the Results section.

**Additional Notes on Methods**

- All salaries shown are full-time equivalent (FTE) salaries.

- Most staff (>90%) are paid on School salary scales. These are the equivalent of national salary scales, with an additional amount (£3,456 at 31.07.2009) attributable to the former London Weighting allowance. Staff based overseas are paid on national scales, ie without that additional element. Where this differential was thought to have affected the pay gap, further analysis was carried out to take this into account, as described below in the Results section.

- Whilst the Cyborg Personnel & Payroll database is a comprehensive and accurate source of pay data, there are certain caveats relating to data on ethnicity and disability, since these are self-declared by staff. 9.25 per cent of the workforce had not declared whether they have a disability, and 6 per cent had not declared their ethnic origin. Non-declarations have been classified as “Unknown” and are clearly indicated in the analysis.

- First-level analysis has not been carried out on any grade containing 5 or fewer members in order to protect individual anonymity. However, where strata with fewer than or equal to 5 have been investigated in the second-level analysis, the pay gap has been calculated without reporting the salaries, to protect individual anonymity.
Increments on the non-clinical pay scales (AP and PSP grades 1 to 8) are separated by intervals of approximately 3%, whereas intervals on the clinical scales range from 4.5% to 10.73%, which may be relevant to the analysis, since on the clinical scales larger pay gaps can be generated from LOS disparities.

RESULTS

1. GENDER

The analysis of gender pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet I.

This identifies the following pay gaps greater than 5%:

(i) PSP2
(ii) Non-Clinical Professors, and
(iii) Clinical Lecturers (non-HCC).

(i) PSP2 (Rows 102, 102a, 102b)

The analysis of gender pay gap for grade PSP2 identified a pay gap of 8.18% in favour of female staff (F). Stratifying above and below the mean length of service (LOS) of 4.89 years reduced the pay gap to 5.04% in those with LOS below the mean (102a), but left a pay gap of 8.93% in those above the mean (102b).

In the below-mean stratum (102a), although there is a higher mean LOS in F (0.71) compared to males (M) (0.36), because of the very short LOS this is unlikely to generate the gap.

Four of the 7 M staff in the below-mean stratum are IT student placements. These staff are on one-year placements at the School during or at the end of an IT college course. They are routinely placed on the bottom point of the scale. Because they are only one-year placements, there is no incremental progression. If these four staff are removed from the below-mean analysis, the resulting pay gap diminishes to 0.02% in favour of M.

In the above-mean stratum (102b) there was only one male and eight females. However, the latter include 4 staff whose posts were red-circled as a result of the Pay Framework implementation exercise, and whose salaries are therefore at a protected level outside the normal range for grade PSP2, and it is this which generates this pay gap.

Points to Note:

The continuing existence of some red-circled posts may distort pay gaps on certain grades.
(ii) Non-Clinical Professors (Rows 206, 206e, 206f, 206f(i))

The analysis of gender pay gap for Non-Clinical Professors identified a pay gap of 8.13% in favour of M. In this case, stratification by mean length of conferment achieved greater congruence with salary than LOS, and stratification was carried out above and below the mean length of conferment (7.48 years). While this reduced the pay gap in those below the mean to 4.13% (206e), the pay gap increased in the above-mean stratum to 10.68% (206f).

However, in this stratum there were a number of M, but no F, with length of conferment >15 years, and it is these M which generate the pay gap; when the M with >15 years length of conferment are excluded, the pay gap is reduced to 1.16% in favour of M (206f(I)).

Points to Note:

In general for professorial staff, length of conferment is a more reliable predictor of pay than LOS, because many staff had significant service with the School prior to their promotion to Professor.

The salaries of M staff with >15 years length of conferment had benefited incrementally from a more generous system of performance-related pay which had been in place until 1995, and this effect is seen to be working its way through the system.

(iii) Clinical Lecturers (Rows 303, 303a, 303b, 303b(i))

The analysis of gender pay gap for Clinical Lecturers identified a pay gap of 10.56% in favour of F. Stratifying above and below the mean LOS (3.4 years) increased the pay gap to 18.06% in those with LOS below the mean (303a), but this stratum has only one F, whose salary is on the top point, and generates the pay gap.

Above the mean LOS (303b), LOS for the 4 M and 4 F are similar, and the pay gap of 7.45% reduced only slightly to 6.21% (303b(i)) when overseas status was taken into account (see note in Methods). 2M and 2F staff are at the top of the scale; the mean length of service as lecturer for the remaining 2M and 2F is 1 year and 2.75 years respectively. Bearing in mind the large differentials on the Clinical Lecturer/Research Fellow payscale, this could account for the pay gap, although these numbers are too small to draw any significant conclusions.

Points to Note:

In addition to the large intervals between increments on the clinical payscales, it is worth noting that the Clinical Lecturer/Research Fellow scale is longer than any of the other payscales used by the School; the new grades AP/PSP 1 to 8 developed under the Pay Framework Agreement all contain six automatic incremental points, whereas the Clinical Lecturer/Research Fellow scale consists of eleven automatic incremental points. It can thus be seen that larger pay gaps in either direction can arise more readily on this particular payscale. This is borne out by the standard deviations for these scales, which are the largest seen on any of the incremental payscales.
A new Clinical Lecturer scale is in course of development at national level, which should address this point, although at the time of writing it is likely that this would be open only to new staff at that level.

2. ETHNIC GROUP

The analysis of gender pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 2.

This identifies the following pay gap greater than 5%:

(i) Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC) (Rows 301, 301a, 301b, 321a, 321b, 321c, 301c, 301d)

The analysis of ethnic group pay gap for Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC) identified a pay gap of 10.00% in favour of BAME. Stratifying above and below the mean LOS (1.94 years) changed the pay gap to 0.13% in favour of White in those with LOS below the mean (301a), but the pay gap for those with LOS above the mean increased to 24.38% (301b).

It is worth noting here that the number of staff considered under 301b is 6 in total; 3 White and 3 BAME. The 3 BAME are all paid on the top point of the scale, and their mean LOS is 5.81 years; that for the 3 White is 4.13 years.

It should also be noted that 2 of these 3 BAME staff are based overseas; this may account for the fact that they have remained on the Clinical Research Fellow grade, rather than applying for promotion to the Clinical Lecturer grade.

When this group of staff was combined with staff on the Clinical Lecturer (non-HCC) grade (who share the same payscale - see above) a similar effect was seen; the pay gap for with LOS below the mean was 1.64% in favour of White (321a), but the pay gap for those with LOS above the mean was 11.23% in favour of BAME (321b). Adjusting overseas salaries in line with School scales did not make a significant difference to this pay gap (321c). This group of BAME consists of the 3 staff mentioned in the previous two paragraphs, with the addition of a Clinical Lecturer also paid on the top point of the scale.

Stratification of Clinical Research Fellows by gender revealed a pay gap of 2% in favour of White for F staff (301c), and a pay gap of 35% in favour of BAME for M staff (301d).

The salaries of the 3 BAME staff in this group are all at a higher level than the highest-paid member of the 4 White staff.

Points to Note:

The points noted earlier regarding length of the clinical scale and its intervals also apply to this group. However, it should be noted that the pay gap in favour of BAME occurs at the lowest point of the scale, and this is consistent with a possibly slower promotion rate in BAME: four of the five staff paid on the top point of the Clinical Research Fellow
(non-HCC) are BAME, which suggests that further investigation of promotion rates between different ethnic groupings could be warranted. Although numbers are relatively small, in this respect it should be noted that 47% of BAME staff were at this lower level, compared to 17% white.

3. **FULL-/PART-TIME (FT/PT)**

The analysis of FT/PT pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 3.

This identifies the following pay gaps greater than 5%:

(i) Non-Clinical Professors;
(ii) Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC), and
(iii) Clinical Research Fellows and Lecturers (non-HCC) combined.

(i) **Non-Clinical Professors (Rows 206 and 206g to 206r)**

The analysis of FT/PT pay gap for Non-Clinical Professors identified a pay gap of 15.65% in favour of PT staff.

Stratifying by LOS was not helpful in this context, for two reasons. Firstly, because many staff in this group had significant LOS before being appointed as professors (as noted earlier in the gender discussion), and secondly because the payroll database requires a new record, with a new date of joining, for staff who are re-engaged following retirement. This results in an artificially low LOS in some cases.

Stratifying above and below the mean length of conferment (LOC) of 7.48 years reduced the pay gap to 0.03% in those with LOC below the mean (206j), but a pay gap of 12.25% remained for those with LOC above the mean (206k).

Further stratification was carried out by gender (206l and 206m), and then above and below the mean LOC by gender (206n, 206o, 206p and 206q, but pay gaps remained significantly above 5%.

Seven of the PT Professors are staff who are working on a part-time basis post-retirement. These are senior professors, with a mean LOC of 14.76 years; this group includes three of the five highest-earning professors in the School. The Points to Note under 1(ii) apply in particular to most of these seven staff, suggesting again that this effect is a legacy of the pay practice prior to 1995.

If the data is recalculated *excluding* these seven PT staff, the result is a pay gap of 2.58% in favour of part-time staff (206r), which indicates that these staff had caused the original adverse pay gap.
Points to Note:

As Section 1 (ii) (Gender and non-clinical professors).

(ii) Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC) (Rows 301 and 301e to 301g), and
(iii) Clinical Research Fellows and Lecturers (non-HCC) combined (Rows 321 and 321c to 321f).

These two groupings are discussed together, because they represent the same pay scale, and demonstrate similar findings.

The analysis of FT/PT pay gap for Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC) identified a pay gap of 11.92% in favour of PT (301), whilst that for Clinical Research Fellows and Clinical Lecturers (non-HCC) combined was 13.48% in favour of PT (321).

Stratifying above and below the mean LOS (1.94) for 301 produced two larger pay gaps in opposite directions (301e and 301f). However, it is likely that stratification into two groups is just not sufficient here: the mean LOS for PT in the group below mean LOS was approximately double the mean LOS in the FT (1.28 vs 0.63), and this would explain the pay gap in favour of PT in this stratum; in contrast, in staff with LOS above the mean (301f), the mean LOS in PT was just over half the FT LOS (2.78 vs 5.29) and this would explain the pay gap, this time in favour of FT in this stratum.

For Clinical Research Fellows and Clinical Lecturers (non-HCC) combined, again division into two strata is not sufficient to remove the pay gap: but in each stratum the mean LOS is higher in the PT group (1.54 vs 0.73 in 321c; 5.77 vs 4.76 in 321d).

4. PERMANENT/FIXED-TERM

The analysis of Permanent/Fixed-Term (Perm/FxT) pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 4.

This identifies the following pay gaps greater than 5%:
(i) PSP2
(ii) PSP7
(iii) Lecturer
(iv) Senior Lecturer
(v) Clinical Research Fellows and Lecturers (non-HCC) combined.
(vi) AP7 + PSP7
(vii) AP8 + PSP8

(i) PSP2 (Rows 102, 102c, 102ci, 102d, 102e, 102f)

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for grade PSP2 identified a pay gap of 6.13% in favour of permanent staff. Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service (LOS) (the period after which staff on their second or subsequent fixed-term contract are entitled to claim permanent status), increased this pay gap to 6.70% for staff with less
than 4 yrs LOS (102c), but produced a pay gap of 11.24% in favour of FxT for those with LOS greater than 4 years.

4 of the 10 staff in the below-4yrs LOS stratum are IT student placements. As mentioned above under Gender, these staff are on one-year placements at the School during or at the end of an IT college course. They are routinely placed on the bottom point of the scale. Because they are only one-year placements, there is no incremental progression. If these four staff are removed from the below-mean analysis, the resulting pay gap diminishes to 4.23% in favour of Perm (102ci).

The pay gap in favour of FxT for those with LOS greater than 4 years derives from one member of staff paid above the top point for the range, whose post was red-circled during the implementation of the Pay Framework Agreement.

(ii) **PSP7 (Rows 107, 107a, 107b, 107c, 107d)**

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for grade PSP7 identified a pay gap of 7.13% in favour of permanent staff. Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service (LOS) reduces this pay gap to 4.27% for staff with less than 4 yrs LOS (107a) and 2.5% for those with more than 4 yrs LOS (107b), suggesting that the pay gap is generated by length of service.

(iii) **Lecturer (Rows 203, 203a, 203b)**

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for Lecturers identified a pay gap of 6.09% in favour of permanent staff. Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service (LOS) shows that all staff with less than 4 yrs LOS are FxT (203a), therefore no pay gap was generated for this group. For staff with more than 4 yrs LOS, the pay gap reduces slightly to 5.46% (203b). reduces this pay gap to 4.27% for staff with less than 4 yrs LOS (107a) and 2.5% for those with more than 4 yrs LOS (107b), suggesting that the pay gap is generated by length of service/seniority.

(iv) **Senior Lecturer (Rows 204, 204a, 204b, 204c, 204d)**

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for Senior Lecturers identified a pay gap of 5.15% in favour of permanent staff (204). Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service (LOS) shows that all staff with less than 4 yrs LOS are FxT (204a), therefore no pay gap was generated for this group. For staff with more than 4 years LOS, the pay gap increases to 6.79% in favour of Perm staff.

For staff with more than 4 years LOS (204b), FxT had a lower mean LOS (10.6) than permanent (11.9), and this is probably responsible for the pay gap.

(vi) **AP7+ PSP7 (Rows 403, 403a, 403b, 403bi)**

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for staff on AP7 and PSP7 combined identified a pay gap of 6.83% in favour of permanent staff (403). Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service reduces this gap for staff with less than 4 yrs LOS to 3.85% (403a). For staff with more than 4 years OS, the pay gap reduces only slightly, to 6.32% (403b).
It was noted that there were four permanent staff in the latter group whose salaries had been protected under implementation of the Pay Framework Agreement, and were therefore paid above the normal range for PSP7/AP7. If these four staff are removed from the analysis, the resulting pay gap becomes 4.73%, and salary protection therefore explains this pay gap.

(vii) **AP8 + PSP8 (Rows 404, 404a, 404b)**

The analysis of Perm/FxT pay gap for staff on AP8 and PSP8 combined identified a pay gap of 5.88% in favour of permanent staff (404). Stratifying above and below 4 years length of service reduces this gap for staff with less than 4 yrs LOS to 2.57% (404a), but the gap for staff with more than 4 yrs LOS increases to 7.43%.

**Points to Note:**

It should be noted that, in all the cases considered above, there emerges a clear correlation between length of service and seniority, which in turn impacts on pay gap. This in turn reflects a correlation in most cases between seniority and contractual status where, following stratification, a greater proportion of permanent staff are found to be in the longer-serving group.

5. **DISABILITY**

The analysis of disability pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 5.

The number of disabled staff was 5 or fewer within each grade of the review population. This meant that the value of any analysis by salary would be insufficiently robust to be meaningful.

It was only possible to conduct any kind of analysis in two cases, both of which fell under the combined academic and professional support pathway.

These cases revealed no adverse disability pay gap.

6. **AGE**

The analysis of age pay gap by grade can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 6.

This identifies the following pay gaps greater than 5%:

(i) PSP2 (Row 102)
(ii) PSP7 (Row 107)
(iii) Non-Clinical Senior Lecturer (Row 204)
(iv) Clinical Research Fellows (non-HCC) (Row 301)
(v) Clinica Lecturers (non-HCC) (Row 303)
(vi) Clinical Research Fellows and Lecturers (non-HCC) combined (Row 321)
(vii) AP5 + PSP5 combined (Row 401), and
(viii) AP8 + PSP8 combined (Row 404).
The analysis of age pay gap was carried out by comparing the salaries of staff under 40 with staff aged 40 and over.

This cut-off point was identified because mean age of staff is 41 years, with a median age of 39 and mode of 42 years.

Somewhat predictably, the data revealed an overall trend that average salary increases with age. Further stratification by length of service (Rows 102g,h, 107e,f, 204e,d, 301j,k 303c,d and 321g,h) supports this correlation.

7. **AP/PSP GRADES 5 to 8**

The analysis of pay gap between equivalent grades on the Academic (AP) and Professional Support (PSP) pathways can be found at Appendix A, Sheet 7.

Pay gaps in excess of 5% in favour of PSP staff were identified at all levels, with the exception of PSP-AP Grade 6.

Stratifying above and below the mean length of service (4.67, 3.64 and 9.83 years for grades 5, 7 and 8 respectively) (rows 505a,b, 507a,b and 508a) reduced the level of the pay gap in all cases, but this nonetheless remains greater than 5% in four of the six groupings.

It is suggested that the pay gap in favour of PSP across the board here reflect the different patterns of career movement between the two separate pathways. In general terms, staff on PSP grades are unlikely to advance by more than one grade whilst remaining in the same job. Movement is between and into defined roles carrying defined tasks.

On the academic pathway however, progress is less dependent on the availability of vacant posts at the appropriate post, and more reliant on the outputs of the individual.

This is evidenced by the fact that just under 60% of the School’s non-clinical professors started at the School on research grades RIB or RIA (equivalent to AP5 or 6), and have worked their way through the grades.

This is further borne out by Table 1 which, by considering the proportions of staff paid at or above the top scale point, provides some measure of the length of time that individuals remain on certain grades. For AP5, only 3.8% of staff are paid on the top point, compared to 37.5% on PSP5. Movement for academic staff is particularly rapid, and it is unusual for staff to spend more than three years on this grade. On AP7 and PSP7 the proportions are closer at 32.8% and 49.3% respectively, reflecting the fact that the move from Lecturer (AP7) to Senior Lecturer (AP8) is one of the most significant career moves on the Academic Pathway. The comparison at Grade 8 shows that almost all staff on PSP8 (81.8%) are paid on or above the top point, compared to only 32.1% of Senior Lecturers, or AP8.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 2006, the School, along with other HE institutions, undertook a large-scale exercise to assimilate the majority of its staff onto a unified grading structure, underpinned by analytical job evaluation and based on a single pay spine. One of the key objectives of this exercise was to achieve equal pay for work of equal value across the School’s diverse staff groups. This is the first equal pay audit undertaken since implementation of the new pay and grading structure.

The results of the audit, and in particular where pay gaps are measured across grades ranked as equivalent through the analytical job evaluation exercise (lines 401 to 404 on each sheet), demonstrate that the salary and grading structure is generally delivering equal pay irrespective of gender, ethnic origin, disability or FTE.

Across the data as a whole, there are few significant pay gaps (ie greater than 5%) and investigation of those identified revealed a non-discriminatory explanation.

The equal pay audit has been successfully conducted in partnership with representatives from the School’s three recognised trade unions, and has presented an opportunity to work together with staff representatives on a subject which could have been contentious.

The recommendations are that:

(i) an equal pay audit is carried out every three years, with the next audit taking place based on data as at October 2011;
(ii) this report is widely distributed within the School, and posted on its website;
(iii) an Equal Pay Policy and Statement is drawn up;
(iv) explicit reference to equal pay is included in the School’s Equality & Diversity Strategy and related documents;
(v) guidance on setting starting salaries is drawn up, providing for these to be documented and evidenced, in order to ensure consistency of practice;
(vi) arrangements are put in place to further improve capture of equal opportunities data, especially ethnicity and disability status, for all staff;
(vii) departments are reminded that annual opportunities exist to review pay patterns and to address any anomalies;
(viii) further analysis is carried out to investigate whether BME staff are applying for promotion at similar rates to White staff, particularly from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer, and
(ix) the School implements the revised Clinical Lecturer scale as soon as possible, in order to avoid arising from over-long pay scales.
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