

Equal Pay Review

2016



Bournemouth University Equal Pay Review 2016

Contents

1. Introduction.....	p. 3
2. Executive Summary.....	p. 4
3. Methodology.....	p. 5
4. Data Collection, Analysis & Reporting.....	p. 6
5. Workforce Composition.....	p. 7
6. Analysis of Base Pay by Gender.....	p. 9
7. Analysis of Base Pay by Race and Ethnicity.....	p. 11
8. Analysis of Base Pay by Disability.....	p. 12
9. Analysis of Base Pay by Age.....	p. 13
10. Analysis of Base Pay by Religion or Belief.....	p. 13
11. Analysis of Base Pay by Sexual Orientation.....	p. 14
12. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Full and Part-time Staff).....	p. 15
13. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Permanent & Fixed-Term Staff).....	p. 16
14. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Term Time Only).....	p. 17
15. Comparator Equal Pay Data.....	p. 17
16. Progress to Date.....	p. 18
17. Next Steps.....	p. 18
Appendix One: Mandatory Gender Pay Gap Reporting.....	p. 21
Appendix Two: Equal Pay Review 2016 Graphs.....	p. 22
Appendix Three: Equal Pay Review Action Plan 2014.....	p. 27

Bournemouth University Equal Pay Review 2016

1. Introduction

The Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) comprises the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) and the five nationally recognised Higher Education trades unions (EIS-ULA, GMB, UCU, Unison and Unite).

JNCHES recommends that all Higher Education institutions conduct periodic equal pay reviews, in partnership with their locally recognised trades unions, and take action to deal with any unjustified inequalities identified.

An equal pay review is a systematic analysis of pay within an organisation, designed to investigate whether there are pay inequities arising because of gender, race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, age and/or differing contractual arrangements. An equal pay review also involves diagnosing the causes of pay inequities and determining the action required to rectify any unjustified inequities.

The Gender Equality Duty which came into force on 6th April 2007 required all public sector organisations to develop and publish a policy on developing and maintaining equal pay between male and female employees.

The Equality Act 2010 extended this legislation by prohibiting direct discrimination in respect of 'protected characteristics' (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, religion or belief and sex and sexual orientation).

The new Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties and Public Authorities) Regulations 2017 requires employers to report on six gender pay gap and gender balance metrics annually, using data from every 31st March from 2017 onwards. Employers have until 31st March 2018 to produce the first report. The regulations apply to all public sector employers (including all HEIs) in England and all cross border authorities operating across England, Wales and Scotland with 250 or more employees as at the snapshot date of 31st March. All other private, voluntary and public sector employers have very similar reporting requirements enshrined in The Equality Act 2010 (Gender Pay Gap Information) Regulations 2017. (Please see Appendix One to review the six gender pay gap metrics).

An equal pay review provides an effective demonstration of action to promote equal pay under the terms of the gender equality duty and is an effective method of assessing whether employees are rewarded equitably.

The Bournemouth University Equal Pay Review Working Group (EPRWG) was formed in October 2013 and was responsible for the production and publication of the 2014 Equal Pay Review in June 2015. The group was stood down post publication and reformed in 2016 as Bournemouth University is committed to conducting a full equal pay review biennially in addition to the mandatory annual requirements described above. Undertaking an equal pay review links directly to the BU2018 people strategy: P3 "Be an excellent place to work" and P3D "Realise the benefits

of an engaged and diverse workforce". It also links directly to the new draft BU2025 strategy as part of the value of inclusivity.

The EPRWG will report their findings to the University Executive Team (UET). The report will be made available on the staff intranet and will also be shared with the Dignity, Diversity & Equality Steering Group (DDESG) and the Athena Swan institutional self-assessment team. Findings and recommendations will inform the Annual Equality Report and the Equality Action Plan. The implementation of recommendations will become the responsibility of the DDESG.

2. Executive Summary

A summary of the main findings from this report is as follows:

- **The overall percentage base pay gap at Bournemouth University is 16% (increasing very slightly from 15% in 2014).** This discrepancy is due to the uneven distribution of men and women across the pay and grading structure. When analysed by grade there were no significant differences found in the average base pay earned by male and female staff in the same grade.
- **Staff at Bournemouth University from black, minority or ethnic (BME) backgrounds earn 103% of that earned by white colleagues (decreasing from 105% in 2014).** However, with the exception of the staff above the fifty-one point pay spine, staff from BME backgrounds earn very slightly less than their white counterparts in each pay grade. Although the pay gap is small, this is classified as a 'marked pattern of difference in favour of one particular group', because it is apparent across all grades from 1 to 12. Further analysis indicates that this is because staff from BME backgrounds have significantly shorter lengths of service than staff from white backgrounds.
- **Bournemouth University employees who have declared a disability earn on average 98% of that earned by those who have not declared a disability (increasing from 95% in 2014).** When analysed by grade, staff with a declared disability were actually earning more than those who had not declared a disability at grades six and seven.
- **Analysis of the difference in the average full-time equivalent salary earned by male and female employees indicates that the difference continues to increase with age.** Male and female salaries were only broadly comparable until age 25 (age 35 in the 2014 analysis). Thereafter average male salaries continue to rise steadily, whereas average female salaries increase more slowly. This is potentially linked to the first point above.
- **Staff at Bournemouth University who practise a religion or belief other than Christianity earn 107% of that earned by Christian colleagues (increasing from 103% on 2014).** However, it is not possible to discern any 'marked patterns of difference in favour of one particular group'.
- **Staff who have declared that they are LGB (lesbian, gay or bisexual) earn 107% of that earned by heterosexual staff (increasing from 102% in 2014).** Again it is not possible to identify any 'marked patterns of difference in favour of one particular group'.

- **Bournemouth University staff who work part-time earn on average only 86% of that earned by full-time staff (decreasing from 88% in 2014).** This discrepancy is due to the uneven distribution of full-time and part-time staff across the pay and grading structure. When analysed by grade there were no significant differences found in the average base pay earned by full and part-time staff in the same grade.
- **Staff employed by Bournemouth University on a fixed-term basis earn on average only 87% of that earned by those employed on a permanent basis (decreasing from 91% in 2014).** However there are marked grade differences: fixed-term staff earn broadly the same as permanent staff at grades six to eleven but significantly less at grades two to five. This is potentially due to the lower length of service.
- **At Bournemouth University staff employed on a term-time only basis earn on average only 61% of that earned by those employed all year round (increasing from 59% in 2014).** This pay gap is attributable to the distribution of term-time only staff across the pay and grading structure. When analysed within grade, term-time only staff actually earn more on average than all year round staff at five out of the seven grades in the pay and grading structure at which they are represented.

More detailed analysis of the findings commences in section six.

3. Methodology

This review has been conducted in accordance with the JNCHES Equal Pay Review Guidance for Higher Education Institutions 2013 using data correct as at 1 August 2016. This date was selected to ensure consistency and comparability with Athena Swan reporting. (Please note that salary changes that have resulted from the Autumn 2016 pay progression and promotion round and/or the Student Journey Project will not be reflected in the data set).

The JNCHES methodology is systematic, rigorous and comprehensive, and recommends a three stage approach as follows:

- **Stage One: analysis** of the relative rates of pay for men and women, those from different racial groups, those with and without declared disabilities, those with different sexual orientations, religions or beliefs and those of different ages carrying out 'like work', together with analysis of relative pay rates for full and part-time staff and for those on indefinite and fixed-term contracts. (Like work, also referred to as work rated as equivalent or work of equal value, can be defined as jobs which have been evaluated using an analytical method of job evaluation and found to be at the same grade). The aim is to establish the degree to which inequality exists in the form of a 'significant' pay gap. (A significant pay gap, warranting further investigation, is defined as being more than 5%. Pay gaps of between 3-5%, representing marked patterns of difference in favour of one particular group, may also warrant further investigation).

- **Stage Two: diagnosis** of the likely factors that have contributed to any significant pay gaps or marked patterns of difference identified. This stage seeks to explain why pay gaps exist and to question whether they can be objectively justified. If they cannot be objectively justified the diagnosis should indicate what remedial action is required to close the gap.
- **Stage Three: remedial actions** are specified, planned and implemented in accordance with the diagnosis above, to remove any unjustified pay gaps.

4. Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting

The systematic use of analytical job evaluation methodology (Hay) at Bournemouth University means that it is possible to measure work of equal value across the institution. Therefore all staff paid on the monthly payroll, from grade one to grade twelve, are included in this analysis.

Three staff groups, those who are 'protected', 'marking time' or 'other ISS' cannot be defined as doing 'like work' but are nevertheless included in the analyses as special categories. These groups, which are statistically very small in number, are defined as follows:

- **'Protected'**: staff of any grade who have a protected salary for a period of two years following organisational restructuring which has resulted in their new role being evaluated at a lower grade. Protected staff are still eligible to receive the annual nationally negotiated cost of living award and are eligible for consideration for pay progression.
- **'Marking Time'**: staff of any grade who have been protected as above for a period of two years and whose salary is still above the maximum for the correct grade for their role. Thereafter their salary is frozen, (and is not increased by the annual nationally negotiated cost of living award), until they are either promoted to a higher role or their salary is incorporated by the correct pay grade commensurate with their role.
- **'Other ISS'**: senior staff above BU grade twelve who are paid on the 'Independent Single Pay Spine', which continues above the nationally negotiated fifty-one point single pay spine and is determined at local institutional level.

Part-time hourly paid (PTHP) staff paid on the Fees payroll are excluded from the analyses in this report.

All data in this report is drawn from the CORE staff record system as at 1 August 2016. Whilst CORE is largely a comprehensive and accurate source of base data, there are certain caveats relating to the ethnicity, disability, religion and belief and sexual orientation data contained within.

Although data collection and completeness has improved since the production of the 2014 Equal Pay Review, gaps in the data remain. For example, of the 1,653 staff included in the 2016 review

(increasing from 1,560 in 2014), ethnicity data is unavailable for 42 employees, (previously unavailable for 90). Disability data is unavailable for 76 employees (previously unavailable for 73), religion and belief data is unavailable for 869 employees (previously 915) and sexual orientation data is unavailable for 860 employees (previously 917). Some staff simply do not wish to disclose such sensitive information, and in this report this category is referred to as 'prefer not to say'. Other staff simply decide not to respond to requests for equality information, and in this report this category is referred to as 'not known'. It should also be noted that the quantities of ethnicity and disability data held have improved markedly over time, whereas protected characteristics such as religion and belief and sexual orientation are far more recently incorporated into equality legislation.

Such information gaps will of course continue to distort the ethnicity, disability, religion and belief and sexual orientation analyses, particularly as the numbers of employees reported to be from black/minority/ethnic (BME) backgrounds, declaring a disability, practising a religion or belief other than Christianity or who are lesbian/gay/bisexual (LGB) are already very small. Such small numbers make detailed analyses statistically unreliable, as well as potentially compromising the confidentiality of individuals. Therefore this report will only include broad, high level ethnicity, disability, religion and belief and sexual orientation analyses. (No analysis will be reported for a minority group with less than ten individuals within a grade). For the same reasons of confidentiality and data reliability, the graphs provided in Appendix Two represent the total BU workforce and have not been split into academic and professional and support staff.

This report focuses upon base pay, as the numbers of staff in receipt of allowances are small, as are the sizes of the few allowances that are paid. All salaries are quoted as full-time equivalents and all averages quoted are arithmetic means. All pay gaps are expressed in percentage terms, with the average salaries of the minority groups being compared to the average salaries of the majority group. If the pay 'gap' is 100%, then the average salaries of both the minority and majority groups are equal and there is in fact no pay gap. If the pay gap is greater than 100%, then the average salary of the minority group is higher than that of the majority group. If the pay gap is less than 100%, then the average salary of the minority group is lower than that of the majority group.

5. Workforce Composition

Many of the potential equal pay gaps identified later in this report relate to the distribution of different staff groups across the pay and grading structure, hence the need to describe the current workforce composition at the University.

The total number of University staff as at 1 August 2016 was 1,653, increasing from 1,560 in October 2014 at the time of the last Review. In both 2014 and 2016 men comprised 44% (684 and 731 respectively) of the workforce and women 56% (876 and 922 respectively). The distribution of men and women across the pay and grading structure varies considerably. In 2016 women represent 68% (51) of the workforce at grade two, 70% (72) of the workforce at grade three and 68% (138) of the workforce at grade four. Contrastingly men represent 67% (42) of the workforce at grade eleven and 68% (17) of the workforce at grade twelve. The pattern was very similar in 2014. (See Graph 1 and Table 1 below).

Table 1: Workforce Composition by Gender and Grade

Grade	Female	Male	Total	Females as % of Total	Males as % of Total
1	7	9	16	44%	56%
2	51	24	75	68%	32%
3	72	31	103	70%	30%
4	138	64	202	68%	32%
5	133	85	218	61%	39%
6	94	67	161	58%	42%
7	154	104	258	60%	40%
8	145	171	316	46%	54%
9	33	45	78	42%	58%
10	47	50	97	48%	52%
11	21	42	63	33%	67%
12	8	17	25	32%	68%

BU is addressing this issue and six female academics have been promoted to grades 10+ in the 2016 promotion round. Externally, seven women have been recruited at grades 10+ over the past year.

The majority of the workforce at the University remains white, although numbers of staff from different racial backgrounds has increased slightly since 2014. In 2016 8.5% (140) employees are recorded as black/minority/ethnic (BME), increasing from 7.2% (113) in 2014. (See Graph 2).

The numbers of employees with a declared disability has also increased slightly, rising from 4.6% (72) of the total workforce in 2014 to 5.0% (82) of the total workforce in 2016. (See Graph 3).

Employees who have declared a religion or belief other than Christianity represent 3.9% (65) of the workforce in 2016, increasing very slightly from 3.5% (55) of the workforce in 2014. However, it must be noted that some staff (135) actively chose not to declare their religion or belief, whilst others fail to respond to requests for data (734), which results in the low percentage quoted.

Those who have declared themselves to be lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB) represent 2.2% (36) of the workforce in 2016, again increasing marginally from 1.9% (30) in 2014. However, it must be noted that some staff (108) chose not to declare their sexuality, whilst others fail to respond to requests for data (752), hence the low percentage quoted.

The University workforce remains evenly distributed across the 31-60 age bracket. Just 10% (164) of the workforce are younger than age 31 in 2016, (decreasing from 12% (180) in 2014) and only 8.5% (141) are older than age 60 in 2016 (increasing from 6.9% (107) in 2014). (See Graph 4).

20% (338) of the BU workforce are employed part-time in 2016 (decreasing from 21% (326) in 2014), and of those that work part-time 80% (270) are female (increasing from 79% (258) in 2014). In 2016 the distribution of part-time staff continues to vary considerably across the pay and grading structure, and remains broadly inversely proportional to grade. For example, part-time staff represent 44% (40) of the workforce at grades one and two, decreasing steadily to just 6% (11) at grades nine and ten, before increasing to 20% (18) of the workforce at grades eleven and twelve. (See Graph 5).

In 2016 13% (223) of University employees are on fixed-term contracts compared to 15% (241) in 2014. Of those that work on a fixed term basis 60% (133) are female, (compared to 56% (136) in 2014) and 40% (90) are male, (compared to 44% (105) in 2014). Proportionally, the numbers of fixed-term employees are highest at the lower end of the pay and grading structure. Fixed-term workers comprise 23% (86) of the workforce at grades two, three and four and 14% (25) of the workforce at grades ten, eleven and twelve. Female fixed-term workers predominate at grades two, three and four, representing 65% (56) of those working on a fixed-term basis, whilst male fixed-term workers predominate at grades ten, eleven and twelve, representing 52% (13) of those working on a fixed-term basis. (See Graph 6).

2.6% (39) of BU employees are employed on a term-time only basis in 2016 (compared to 2.9% (45) in 2014), concentrated in grades one to six. Of these term-time only employees, 82% (32) are female, compared to 78% (35) in 2014. (N.B. There is no graph for term-time only employees, due to the very small numbers of staff involved).

6. Analysis of Base Pay by Gender

The overall percentage base pay gap at Bournemouth University is 16%, (increasing from 15% in 2014), meaning that on average female staff at BU earn 84% of that earned by their male colleagues. In 2016 the average female full-time equivalent salary is £34,666,(£33,296 in 2014), compared to an average of £41,316 for men (£39,305 in 2014). However this discrepancy is due to the uneven distribution of men and women across the pay and grading structure as outlined in section five. When analysed by grade there were no significant differences found in the average base pay earned by male and female staff in the same grade. There were no pay gaps within grade of greater than 4% and no marked patterns of difference in favour of one gender. At grades one, four, five, seven, eight and ten female employees earned 100% of male average earnings. (See Graph 7 and Table 2 below).

Table 2: Percentage Base Pay Gap by Gender by Grade

Grade	Female Average Full-Time Salary	Male Average Full-Time Salary	Female Average Full-Time Salary as % of Male Average Full-Time Salary
1	£17,066	£17,142	100%
2	£17,909	£18,063	99%
3	£20,035	£20,177	99%
4	£22,707	£22,768	100%
5	£27,376	£27,495	100%
6	£31,279	£32,000	98%

Grade	Female Average Full-Time Salary	Male Average Full-Time Salary	Female Average Full-Time Salary as % of Male Average Full-Time Salary
7	£36,621	£36,646	100%
8	£45,463	£45,676	100%
9	£51,048	£51,738	99%
10	£59,281	£59,444	100%
11	£64,901	£67,488	96%
12	£75,959	£77,550	98%

When the workforce is divided into academic staff and professional and support staff, the overall percentage base pay gap reduces to 10% for both staff groups. (The gap in 2014 was 11% for academic staff and 9% for professional and support staff. In 2016 the average female academic full-time equivalent salary is £46,056, (£44,658 in 2014), compared to an average of £51,095 for men. (£49,984 in 2014). For professional and support staff the average female full-time equivalent salary in 2016 is £28,436, (£27,673 in 2014), compared to £31,724 for men. (£30,453 in 2014). The pay gap varies considerably across the pay and grading structure, and is greatest at grade eleven for academic staff (5%) and grades seven and ten (5%) for professional and support staff. However, amongst academic staff, average female salaries were equal to or very slightly higher than males at grades six, seven, eight, ten and twelve. Amongst professional and support staff, average female salaries were equal to or very slightly higher than males at grades one, four, five and eleven. This is illustrated in Tables 3 and 4 below:

Table 3: Percentage Base Pay Gap by Gender by Grade: Academic Staff

Grade	Academic Female Average Full-Time Salary	Academic Male Average Full-Time Salary	Academic Female Average Full-Time Salary as % of Academic Male Average Full-Time Salary
6	£32,247	£31,601	102%
7	£36,951	£35,981	103%
8	£45,798	£45,633	100%
9	£50,717	£51,478	99%
10	£60,336	£59,235	102%
11	£64,822	£67,931	95%
12	£77,227	£77,550	100%

Table 4: Percentage Base Pay Gap by Gender by Grade: Professional & Support Staff

Grade	Prof & Support Female Average Full-Time Salary	Prof & Support Male Average Full-Time Salary	Prof & Support Female Average Full-Time Salary as % of Prof & Support Male Average Full-Time Salary
1	£17,066	£17,142	100%
2	£17,909	£18,063	99%
3	£20,035	£20,177	99%
4	£22,707	£22,768	100%
5	£27,376	£27,495	100%
6	£30,965	£32,170	96%
7	£35,955	£37,667	95%

Grade	Prof & Support Female Average Full-Time Salary	Prof & Support Male Average Full-Time Salary	Prof & Support Female Average Full-Time Salary as % of Prof & Support Male Average Full-Time Salary
8	£44,063	£45,852	96%
9	£51,932	£52,451	99%
10	£57,236	£60,181	95%
11	£65,644	£63,288	104%
12	£73,847	N/A	N/A

7. Analysis of Base Pay by Race and Ethnicity

Overall, staff at Bournemouth University from black, minority or ethnic (BME) backgrounds earn 103% of that earned by white colleagues, (decreasing from 105% in 2014). In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary of BME staff is £38,726, (£37,717 in 2014), compared to an average of £37,673 for white staff (£35,964 in 2014). However when the data is analysed more closely a different picture appears. With the exception of the 'other ISS' category of staff, (where like work is not truly being compared as explained in section four), staff from BME backgrounds earn slightly less than their white counterparts in each pay grade. Whilst none of the pay gaps are more than 5%, and thus cannot be classified as 'significant', the fact that staff from BME backgrounds earn between 1-4% less than their white counterparts at every pay grade can be classified as a 'marked pattern of difference in favour of one particular group'. (See Graph 8).

In 2016 academic staff from BME backgrounds earn 92% of that earned by white colleagues. (£45,385 compared to £49,365). This figure has decreased from 96%, (£45,954 compared to £47,985), in 2014. As above, staff from BME backgrounds earn between 1-4% less than their white counterparts at each pay grade (aside from those who are 'other ISS'). The ethnicity pay gap is wider amongst professional and support staff, with staff from BME backgrounds earning on average 88% of that earned by white staff. (£26,359 compared to £29,975). However the gap has decreased significantly among professional and support staff. In 2014 staff from BME backgrounds earned on average 82% of that earned by white staff (£23,792 compared to £29,105). The difference between the pay gap for academic and professional and support staff can be explained by the distribution of staff from BME backgrounds across the pay and grading structure. Academic BME staff can be found at all grades from six to twelve, although the majority of BME employees are clustered at grades seven and eight. Amongst professional and support staff there are no employees from BME backgrounds above grade nine, with the majority clustered between grades three to six.

When the data is analysed by gender as well as ethnicity, female staff from BME backgrounds continue to earn more on average than white staff. In 2016 female BME employees earn on average 104% of that earned by white colleagues, (£36,054 compared to £34,716). This differential has increased since 2014 when it was 102%, (£34,096 compared to £33,308). In 2016 male BME employees earn 100% of that earned by white colleagues (£41,398 compared to £41,491). This differential has decreased since 2014 when it was 103%, (£40,591 compared to £39,554).

When the data is analysed by length of service as well as ethnicity, it becomes apparent that staff from BME backgrounds continue to have significantly shorter lengths of service than white staff. For example, in 2016 34% of BME employees (47) have less than two years' service, compared to just 20% of white employees (296). This figure has increased since 2014, when 29% of BME employees (32) had less than two years' service, compared to 18% of white employees (239). Contrastingly, in 2016 only 18% of BME employees (25) have more than ten years' service, compared to 34% (493) of white employees. This figure has also increased since 2014, when 16% of BME employees (18) had more than ten years' service, compared to 35% of white employees (474). As BU has incremental pay scales, it is likely that this disparity in length of service is the causal factor behind the 'marked patterns of difference in favour of one particular group' outlined above.

8. Analysis of Base Pay by Disability

Bournemouth University employees who have declared a disability earn on average 98% of that earned by those who have not declared a disability, (increasing from 95% in 2014). In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for staff with declared disabilities is £37,200, (£34,541 in 2014), compared to £37,930 for those who have not declared a disability (£36,308 in 2014). When analysed by grade, staff with declared disabilities were found to earn on average the same or slightly more than those without declared disabilities at ten out of the twelve grades in the pay and grading structure. The greatest difference was apparent at grades six and seven, where staff with declared disabilities earned 5% more than those without. Grades four and ten were the only grades where staff with declared disabilities earned slightly less than those without declared disabilities. (See Graph 9).

When the workforce is divided into academic and professional and support staff, a similar pattern emerges. In 2016 academic staff with declared disabilities earn on average 96% of that earned by those who have not declared a disability, compared to 93% in 2014. In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for academic staff with declared disabilities is £47,191, (£44,342 in 2014), compared to £49,115 for those who have not declared a disability (£47,817 in 2014). As above, staff with declared disabilities were found to earn on average slightly more than those without declared disabilities at six out of the seven academic grades in the pay and grading structure. Grade ten was the only grade where staff with declared disabilities earned slightly less than those without declared disabilities

In 2016 professional and support staff with declared disabilities earn on average 94% of that earned by those who have not declared a disability. This represents a significant improvement on the 2014 figure of 87%. In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for professional and support staff with declared disabilities is £28,139, (£25,270 in 2014), compared to £29,961 for those who have not declared a disability (£29,162 in 2014).

Academic staff with declared disabilities can be found at all grades of the pay and grading structure, with the majority clustered at grades seven and eight. Professional and support staff with declared disabilities are clustered at grades four and five and there are no professional and support staff with declared disabilities above grade nine.

When the data is analysed by gender as well as disability, male employees who have declared a disability earn on average 99% of that earned by those who have no declared disability. (£41,523 compared to £41,763). This has improved since 2014 when the figure was 95% (£37,951 compared to £39,915). For female employees, those with declared disabilities earn on average 95% of that earned by those who have no declared disability. (£33,280 compared to £34,884). This has also improved slightly since 2014 when the figure was 94% (£31,656 compared to £33,551).

9. Analysis of Base Pay by Age

Analysis of the difference in the average full-time equivalent salary earned by male and female employees continues to indicate that the difference increases with age. Male and female staff earn very similar levels of base pay aged 25 or under, with women earning 102% of that earned by men (£20,348 compared to £19,917) in 2016.

However, thereafter the pay gap increases steadily between the 26-30 and 46-50 age brackets, probably attributable to women having more breaks in service than men for family or caring responsibilities. At age 26-30 women earn on average 94% of that earned by men, (£24,590 compared to £26,110 in 2016), dropping to 90% at age 31-35, (£29,969 compared to £33,401 in 2016) and remaining at 90% until age 46-50, when women earn on average just 75% of that earned by men (£35,709 compared to £47,606 in 2016). Above age 50 the pay gap fluctuates, with women earning between 76-83% of that earned by men. (See Graph 10). A very similar situation was observed in the 2014 Equal Pay Review.

This is because male salaries appear to rise steadily as age increases until age 50. They decrease marginally between ages 51-60, before continuing to rise steadily again. For women salaries increase more modestly as age increase until age 45. Between the ages of 46-65 they fluctuate and only begin to increase again at age 66 and over.

Analysis of the distribution of male and female employees across the age bands suggests there is an uneven distribution within the University. For example, in 2016 59% of all staff aged 35 and under are female (217 individuals), a percentage that remains unchanged from 2014. Contrastingly in 2016 60% of all staff aged 61 and over are male (84 individuals), increasing from 59% in 2014.

Analysis of the distribution of staff by age band across the pay and grading structure also continues to show an uneven distribution. Whilst older employees appear to be fairly evenly distributed across the pay grades, there were no employees aged under 31 in grade nine or above in 2014 and there are still none in 2016. Amongst the academic workforce at least, this may reflect the time required to develop an academic profile and resulting seniority.

10. Analysis of Base Pay by Religion or Belief

As noted in section four there are still a significant number of staff, (734 individuals or 44% of the workforce), for whom their religion or belief is recorded as 'not known'. This has however

improved as 'not known' was recorded for 52% of the workforce (809 individuals) in 2014. In 2016 a further 339 individuals (21%) have declared they have 'no religion' and 135 (8%) would 'prefer not to say'. There remain 380 (23%) members of staff who have declared they practise Christianity and 65 (3.9%) who have declared they practise another religion or belief.

This lack of data obviously makes it more difficult to make a robust analysis of base pay by religion and belief. The University will of course continue to explore ways of encouraging disclosure so that staff records are as complete as possible, and the University can meet its obligations in promoting and monitoring equality under the Equality Act 2010.

Caveats aside, **staff at Bournemouth University who practise a religion or belief other than Christianity earn 107% of that earned by Christian colleagues, (increasing from 103% in 2014).** In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary of staff practising other religions or beliefs is £37,385, (£34,266 in 2014), compared to an average of £34,891, (£33,280 in 2014), for Christian staff. Staff declaring 'no religion' also earn very slightly more than those practising Christianity. On average the full-time equivalent salary in 2016 of those declaring 'no religion' was £36,069, (£34,498 in 2014), which represents 103% of that earned by Christian staff.

The numbers of staff practising other religions or beliefs within grade are very small. More detailed analyses would be both statistically unreliable and could potentially compromise staff confidentiality. However it is possible to state that it is difficult to discern any 'marked patterns of difference in favour of one particular group', with Christian staff earning slightly more on average at some grades and staff with other religions or beliefs earning slightly more at others.

11. Analysis of Base Pay by Sexual Orientation

As in section ten above, there are large numbers of staff (752 individuals or 45% of the workforce), for whom their sexual orientation is recorded as 'not known'. This has however again improved, as 'not known' was record for 54% of the workforce (837 individuals) in 2014. A further 7% of the workforce, (108 individuals), have declared that they would 'prefer not to say'. 46% of staff at Bournemouth University, (752 individuals), have stated that they are heterosexual, (an increase from 39% (613 individuals) in 2014), and just 2.2% of staff, (36 individuals), have declared that they are lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB).

As above, this paucity of data makes it very difficult to conduct a thorough analysis of base pay by religion or belief, without compromising staff confidentiality or producing results that are statistically unsound. The University will however continue to encourage disclosure with the aim of producing more comprehensive analyses in the future when a more complete data set is available.

With the data currently available it is possible to state that **staff who have declared that they are LGB are evenly distributed across the pay and grading structure and that they are earning 107% of that earned by heterosexual staff, (increasing from 102% in 2014).** The average full-time equivalent salary of LGB staff in 2016 is £38,200, (£34,585 in 2014), compared to £35,827 for heterosexual staff, (£34,025 in 2014). Within grade it is not possible to identify any 'marked

patterns of difference in favour of one particular group', with LGB staff earning slightly more on average at some grades and heterosexual staff earning slightly more at others.

12. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Full and Part-Time Staff)

At Bournemouth University staff who work part-time earn on average only 86% of that earned by full-time staff, (decreasing from 88% in 2014). In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for part-time staff is £33,249, (£32,403 in 2014), compared to £38,727, (£36,863 in 2014), for full-time staff. However when analysed by grade, it becomes obvious that this pay gap is attributable to the distribution of full and part-time staff across the pay and grading structure. There were no significant differences found in the average base pay earned by full and part-time staff in the same grade and there were no pay gaps within grade of greater than 4%. On average part-time staff actually earned the same or more than those working full-time in ten out of the twelve pay grades. (See Graph 11).

Amongst academic staff the pay gap disappears completely, with part-time academics earning on average 102% of that earned by full-time staff. In 2016 the average full-time equivalent for part-time academic staff is £49,694, compared to £48,517 for full-time academic staff. This has increased since 2014, when part-time academics earned on average 100% of that earned by full-time staff (£47,222 compared to £47,451). Part-time staff earned more than their full-time colleagues in six out of the seven academic pay grades, although they earned 5% less at grade nine.

The situation is very different amongst professional and support staff, with part-time professional and support staff earning on average 81% of that earned by full-time staff. In 2016 the average full-time equivalent for part-time professional and support staff is £25,208, compared to £31,073 for full-time professional and support staff. This has decreased since 2014, when part-time professional and support staff earned on average 84% of that earned by full-time staff (£25,163 compared to £29,818). However as with academic staff, part-time professional and support staff earned more than their full-time colleagues in seven out of the nine pay grades where they were represented, and earned 5% more at grade nine.

As highlighted in section five, this reiterates the fact that part-time staff are unevenly distributed across the pay and grading structure, representing 44% (40) of staff at grades one and two. Overall 54% (182) of part-time staff are in grades one to five and just 8.6% (29) are in grade nine or above. There is much less of a dichotomy amongst academic staff, where 70% (78) of part-time employees are employed at grades six to eight and 24% (27) are employed at grades nine or above. Amongst professional and support staff, only 4.8% (11) of part-time staff are employed at grade eight or above.

10% (14) of staff from black, minority or other ethnic backgrounds work part-time at Bournemouth University, compared to 22% (318) of white staff. Proportionally 24% (20) of staff with declared disabilities work part-time, compared to 20% (305) of staff with no declared disabilities. Proportionally slightly more fixed-term employees are employed part-time (28% or 62 individuals) than permanent employees (19% or 276 individuals). The principle disparity is

one of gender: 29% (270) of female employees work part-time compared to just 9% (68) of men, and 80% (270) of all part-time staff are female.

13. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Permanent and Fixed-Term Staff)

Staff employed by Bournemouth University on a fixed-term basis earn on average only 87% of that earned by those employed on a permanent basis, (decreasing from 91% in 2014). In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for fixed-term staff is £33,351, (£33,207 in 2014), compared to £38,271, (£36,428 in 2014), for permanent staff. When analysed by grade, fixed-term employees earn less on average than permanent employees at grades two, three, four, five, six, seven and twelve. Fixed-term employees earn the same on average as their permanent counterparts at grades eight, nine, ten and eleven. A similar situation was observed in the 2014 Equal Pay Review. The pay gap can be termed as 'significant' at grades two to five, ranging from 6% at grade four to 11% at grade two. (See Graph 12).

Greater disparity is evident when academic and professional and support staff are analysed separately. Amongst academic staff the pay gap is smaller: on average fixed-term academic staff earn 94% of that earned by permanent academic staff. The average full-time equivalent salary for fixed-term academics in 2016 is £46,101, compared to £49,099 for permanent academics. Within grade the pay gap can be termed significant (greater than 5%) at grades six and twelve only. At all other grades academic fixed-term employees earn just very slightly more or very slightly less than permanent academics. This represents a change from 2014, when fixed-term academic staff actually earned more on average (£49,660) than permanent academics (£47,023).

Contrastingly professional and support staff who work on a fixed-term basis earn on average only 81% of that earned by their permanent colleagues. (The average full-time equivalent salary for professional and support fixed-term staff in 2016 is £24,727, compared to £30,488 for permanent staff). This can be partially explained by the uneven distribution of fixed-term professional and support staff across the pay and grading structure. Whereas 65% (59 individuals) of academic fixed-term staff are concentrated in grades six, seven and eight, 65% (86 individuals) of professional and support fixed-term staff are concentrated in grades two to four and 83% (111 individuals) are concentrated in grades two to six. Within grade fixed-term professional and support staff earn less on average than their permanent colleagues at every level of the pay and grading structure, with the exception of grades nine, eleven and twelve, where the sample of fixed-term staff is very small. At grades two to seven the pay gap is 'significant', ranging from 6% at grades four and six to 11% at grade two.

Slightly higher proportions of women (14% or 133 individuals) than men (12% or 90 individuals) are employed on fixed-term contracts, although the percentages of both genders employed on a fixed-term basis has declined slightly since 2014. Fixed-term female staff earn on average 90% of that earned by permanent female staff (£31,619 compared to £35,180). Fixed-term male staff earn on average just 85% of that earned by permanent male staff (£35,912 compared to £42,075). The male percentage is unchanged since 2014, although the female percentage has declined from 97%.

When the data is analysed by length of service as well as contract status, it becomes apparent that staff with fixed-term contracts have significantly shorter lengths of service than staff with permanent contracts. For example, 58% of fixed-term employees (129) have less than two years' service, compared to just 17% of permanent employees (241). Contrastingly, only 10% of fixed-term employees (23) have more than ten years' service, compared to 35% (504) of permanent employees. A very similar pattern was observed in the 2014 Equal Pay Review. As BU has incremental pay scales, it is likely that this disparity in length of service is the causal factor behind the pay gaps outlined above.

14. Analysis of Base Pay by Contract Status (Term Time Only)

At Bournemouth University staff employed on a term-time only basis earn on average only 61% of that earned by those employed all year round, (increasing from 59% in 2014). In 2016 the average full-time equivalent salary for term-time only employees is £23,339, (£21,417 in 2014), compared to £37,952, (£36,362 in 2014), for all year employees. However when analysed by grade, it becomes obvious that this pay gap is attributable to the distribution of term-time only staff across the pay and grading structure. The numbers of term-time only staff are very small (39 individuals) and all are professional and support staff. 97% of term-time only employees (38 individuals) are concentrated in grades one to six.

When analysed within grade, term-time only staff actually earn the same or more on average than all year round staff at five out of the seven grades in the pay and grading structure at which they are represented. Term-time only staff earn less on average than all year round staff at grades four and six, where the pay gap can be termed 'significant' at 10% and 6% respectively.

15. Comparator Equal Pay Data

In this section some background contextual information is provided regarding the sizes of equal pay gaps in the U.K as a whole and in the Higher Education sector in specific.

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) calculates the gender pay gap based upon average hourly earnings (excluding overtime) and uses median data .The provisional results of the Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2016 (ASHE) were released in October 2016. Based upon data as at April 2016, the survey recorded the lowest gender pay gap for full-time employees since the survey began in 1997 at 9.4% decreasing from 9.6% in 2015. When part-time employees are also included, the pay gap in 2016 increases to 18.1%. However this still represents a decrease from 19.3% in 2015 and is also the lowest figure since the survey began in 1997, when the pay gap for all employees was 27.5%.

Two other sources of comparative data within the Higher Education sector are the Universities and Colleges Employers Association (UCEA) Senior Staff Remuneration Survey and the UCEA/XpertHR Salary Survey of Higher Education Staff. The 2016 UCEA Senior Staff Remuneration Survey, published in March 2017, quotes an overall median gender base pay gap of 7.2%, decreasing from 7.3% in 2015 and 7.7% in 2014, and an overall mean gender base pay gap of 8.2%, decreasing from 8.7% in 2015 and 9.3% in 2014. The survey recorded the largest

median gender base gap at the most senior level included in the survey, (institution head at 17.2%), and the smallest median gender base pay gap at the least senior level in the survey, (function head at 3.2%).

The 2016 UCEA/XpertHR Salary Survey of Higher Education Staff, published in November 2016, quotes an overall gender pay gap of 10.1%, decreasing from 10.7% in 2015 and 11.4% in 2014. (N.B. This only includes staff on the 51 point national pay spine, and does not include those classified at Bournemouth University as 'other ISS').

16. Progress to Date

Following the last equal pay review in 2014, an equal pay action plan was created based on the findings and recommendations of the review. An updated action plan is appended which details the progress made since the review in 2014, clearly indicating which recommendations are complete (in grey), which are in progress (in yellow) and which are ongoing (in beige/pink).

Once the 2016 equal pay review has been discussed, completed and agreed with the Equal Pay Review Working Group (EPRWG) and the Dignity, Diversity and Equality Steering Group (DDESG), an updated equal pay action plan will be created, representative of the findings of 2016 and the actions suggested necessary to address them. This will also incorporate any remaining or incomplete actions from the 2014 review.

17. Next Steps

The next step is to seek explanations of why the pay gaps summarised in section two exist and to establish the extent to which the pay gaps can be objectively justified. If the pay gaps cannot be objectively justified, diagnosis should be undertaken to decide what remedial action is required to remove them. From the summary of report findings, the following are the key areas of concern that warrant further investigation:

- To investigate and remove any possible barriers that might be preventing female staff from ascending the BU pay and grading structure and to explore new initiatives to encourage this movement. (Section 6: analysis of base pay by gender).
- To investigate and remove any possible barriers that might be preventing female staff from progressing at the same rate as male staff and to explore new initiatives to encourage female progression. (Section 9: analysis of base pay by age).
- To investigate and remove any possible barriers that might be preventing part-time staff from ascending the BU pay and grading structure and to explore new initiatives to encourage this movement. (Section 12: analysis of base pay by contract status: full and part-time staff).
- To investigate the reasons why staff from BME backgrounds have significantly shorter lengths of service than white staff and to seek to address any factors that may be negatively impacting their length of service. (Section 7: analysis of base pay by race and ethnicity).

Three of the four areas of concern listed above (points one, three and four) were also listed as areas of concern in the 2016 equal pay review. It is disappointing that despite the many positive actions that have been undertaken in the last two years, the pay gaps listed above have not improved and have in some instances worsened.

However, it must be acknowledged that to tackle significant and persistent pay gaps requires structural, cultural and attitudinal change and that is not achieved swiftly or easily. It is the collective view of the EPRWG that ensuring that flexible working is acceptable, embedded and indeed embraced at all grades and across all business areas within BU could help significantly reduce the current pay gaps that exist by gender, age and contract type. Flexible working could also improve staff retention, widen the external pool of talent that the University recruits from and improve work/life balance for staff. It is the recommendation of the EPRWG that BU takes more overt, direct action to support flexible working in the widest sense of the term. ('Flexible working' could for example include working less than five days per week, working five days per week but for a shortened period of time, varying start and finish times, working longer hours in term-time to accrue time off in lieu (TOIL) to use during holiday periods, home-working, job – sharing, taking flexible retirement or indeed a combination of these options).

To launch and embed flexible working at BU, (in considering cases, need to ensure that organisational requirements and business needs are being met) both for existing staff and those yet to be recruited, the EPRWG recommends:

- Ensuring that as a default position all roles are advertised internally and externally as being available on a flexible working basis.
- Piloting the above approach in two business areas, one academic and one professional service, to assess interest, gain feedback and measure impact.
- Providing relevant development and support for those involved in the recruitment process, so they are both aware of the current equal pay gaps and promote the flexible working opportunities available.
- Creating a flexible working page on the BU website, with case studies of those who work flexibly to promote acceptability and remove negative perceptions.
- Finding 'champions' at senior levels who work flexibly and act as role models for others wishing to do the same.
- Encouraging all staff to disclose equality data to improve the robustness of the data set and demonstrate that fuller disclosure can result in stronger evidence based recommendations and positive actions.
- Conducting a flexible working survey to measure awareness, assess interest and gain feedback, and to promote the ability to disclose equality data via the CORE self-service portal.
- To invite the University of Reading (who have already successfully launched flexible working) to present their thoughts and findings to the Equal Pay Review Working Group so we can learn from their experience. N.B. We are not aware of their gender pay gap details and as this is newly implemented it is not yet known whether the measure has impacted positively upon equal/gender pay audit results at the University of Reading.

In addition the EPRWG recommends continuing to investigate why staff from BME backgrounds earn very slightly less than white colleagues at each pay grade.

Thanks are expressed to the EPRWG for their help and expertise in formulating this report. Members of the EPRWG that have contributed to this report are as follows:

Sara Ashencaen Crabtree
Rebecca Davies
Sally Driver
Ali Ebrahimi-Sabet
Maïke Helmers
Marian Mayer

James Palfreman-Kay
Stephen Pearce
Nigel Phillips
Elaine Sheridan
Richard Scullion
Adam Wright

November 29th 2017