

## Appendix 1

### EQUAL PAY REVIEW SUMMARY

#### Reason for the review

This review has been carried out following the completion of the implementation of the University's Pay and Reward Modernisation Project. The scope of the review was to include all staff on the nine harmonised grades created and implemented with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006, and to review the analysed data for these staff, who were in post on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2007.

The review has been informed by the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) Equal Pay Reviews, Guidance for Higher Education Institutions (March 2007)<sup>1</sup> and by the Equal Opportunities Commission's Equal Pay Review Kit Guidance Notes.

#### The Purpose of the Review

The purpose of the review was to:

- Establish whether there are any pay inequalities arising because of gender, race, disability and age; and/or from differing contractual arrangements
- Analyse in more detail the nature of inequalities
- Analyse the factors creating inequalities and diagnose the cause or causes
- Determine what action is required to deal with any unjustified inequalities (pay gaps of more than 5%) revealed by the analysis and diagnosis<sup>2</sup>.

We do not hold data about individuals' sexual orientation and religion or belief, so could not undertake any analyses of these attributes.

Part-time staff salaries were expressed in full-time equivalent values, so as to enable like for like comparison with full-time staff.

In this review, the analysis of each grade is provided, and the final chapter gives an analysis of the whole population set across the nine grades. This information provides a picture of the whole population set and so is valuable. However, the analysis is not relevant to the issue of equal pay within grades, which is the focus of this review.

#### Summary of Significant Findings

In Grades 1, 2, 8 and 9, male mean average salaries are higher than female mean average salaries, by greater than 1%. Only in Grade 4 is female mean average salary more than 1% higher than the male mean average salary. Analysis by age shows significant variations in salary that exceed 5%. However, length of service is significant in these instances, and is the prime reason for the salary differentials, given that we have longer incremental scales for the more senior grades.

Specifically:

- Grades 1 to 3: There are no areas for concern, arising from the analysis of the data. In Grade 3 the mean average female salary is 0.6% higher than male average salary.
- Grade 4: The female mean average salary is 2.2% higher than male average salary. There is a 6.4% salary spread when analysed by age, but the length of service is the reason for the pay difference.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ucea.ac.uk/ucea/filemanager/root/site\\_assets/jnches/1176796034234.pdf](http://www.ucea.ac.uk/ucea/filemanager/root/site_assets/jnches/1176796034234.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> If the analysis reveals equal pay gaps of 5% or more then the Equal Opportunities Commission Equal Pay Review Model states that further analyses are necessary.

- Grade 5: The female and male average salaries are within 0.06% of each other. There is a 8.2% salary spread when analysed by age, but the length of service is the reason for the pay difference.
- Grade 6: The female and male average salaries are within 0.3% of each other. There is a 5.8% salary spread when analysed by age, but the length of service is the reason for the pay difference.
- Grade 7: The female and male average salaries are within 0.4% of each other.
- Grade 8: There is a 15% salary spread when analysed by age, but the length of service is the reason for the pay difference.
- Grade 9: There is a 8.7% salary spread when analysed by age, but the length of service is the reason for the pay difference.

### **Conclusion**

The analysis shows that the grading of posts on to the new grading scheme has not resulted in any significant inequalities in pay for staff within grades. Any significant variations are not due to any discriminatory factors. We analysis that was undertaken that relates to ethnicity was compromised as we hold no data on the ethnicity of 23% of our staff. Action to collect data on ethnicity must be a high priority.

*Nicholas Bowry*  
*Assistant Director of HR*