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Gender Pay Gap
Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Pay Gap
Statement from the President and Principal

Queen Mary University of London is a Russell Group University with a difference. Our vision is to be recognised across the world as the most inclusive research-intensive University. To me, and to all the communities at Queen Mary, inclusivity and equality are key to who we are and to achieving our ambitions; it makes us better at everything we do, and it improves our daily lives and the delivery and impact of our work.

Reporting on our pay gaps by gender and ethnicity is one important element in helping us achieve our vision. We welcomed the introduction of the statutory gender pay gap reporting and published our first report in March 2018. In this report we have combined the statutory gender report with a discretionary Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) pay gap report. We have done this as a mark of our commitment to transparency in this matter and to help us identify and address the challenges to progression not only for women but also for colleagues in BAME groups.

We are determined to reduce pay gaps where they exist and this report describes the immediate steps we are taking to achieve this. We are also embedding measures in our forthcoming University Strategy 2019/30 to ensure this is a responsibility shared by the University as a whole, with a transparent set of actions that we monitor to ensure we are making a positive difference.

Colin Bailey
President and Principal
1. Introduction
This is Queen Mary University of London’s gender pay gap report based on data as at 31 March 2018.

The gender pay gap is defined as the difference between the mean and median hourly rate of pay of male and female employees using a prescribed method of calculation (see section 3 for full details).

2. Purpose of this report
This report complies with the mandatory Equality Act 2010 (Gender Pay Gap Information) Regulations 2017, which stipulate that public sector bodies with more than 250 relevant employees must report on their gender pay gap in the form of six statutory calculations, explained in detail below.

3. Method for calculations
The data presented in this report represents all Full Pay Relevant Employees (defined as employees paid their full usual pay during the pay period in which the snapshot date falls). The gender pay gap information for Queen Mary as at 31 March 2018 is represented in six different metrics:
1. Mean1 pay gap
2. Median2 pay gap
3. Mean bonus gap
4. Median bonus gap
5. Proportion of males and females receiving a bonus
6. Proportion of males and females in pay quartiles3

The method for the calculations in these reports is compliant with the Equality Act 2010 (Gender Pay Gap Information) Regulations 2017. This means all percentage pay gaps are expressed as the difference between female and male pay as a percentage of male pay using the following calculation:

\[ \frac{\text{male hourly rate} - \text{female hourly rate}}{\text{male hourly rate}} \]

A positive percentage indicates male staff are paid more than female staff. Zero per cent means there is no pay gap and a negative percentage indicates female staff are paid more than male staff.

4. Queen Mary staffing context / staff in scope
- As at 31 March 2018, Queen Mary employed 5,367 people as “relevant employees” as defined in the legislation4.
- The overall gender split within Queen Mary’s workforce was 48 per cent male and 52 per cent female.

---

1 Mean - the mean represents the average value within the data (ie add all the numbers together and divide by the number of items in the set).
2 Median figure is the exact middle figure when the data is ordered in a list from the highest to the lowest value.
3 Quartile figures show the proportion of males and females where each group is divided into four parts in each pay band, this has been produced in line with the government's Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service guidance on calculating pay quartiles.
4 "Relevant Employee" is defined as any employee who is not being paid at either a reduced rate or nil as a result of being on leave as at the snapshot date.
5. Statutory gender pay gap data
In preparing for the 2018 gender pay gap data, we have put in place a more robust process for improved data quality for reporting. Interrogation of the gender pay gap data from 2017 highlighted some anomalies which resulted in overinflated figures being reported last year.

The outcome of this is a significant drop in the size of the pay gap for 2018 compared with 2017. We are confident that the figures extracted this year are an accurate reflection of our gender pay gap as at 31 March 2018.

5.1. Mean pay gap: 13.69 per cent
Our mean pay gap is significantly lower than the figure reported for 2017 (21.7 per cent) for the reasons described above. The distribution for 2018 is similar to 2017. The gender pay gap is mainly due to the representation and types of roles in the dataset, such as higher representation of males in senior academic roles, and a larger number of females in hourly paid roles in the lower grades (shown in the lower two quartiles in section 5.6).

Queen Mary’s mean pay gap is just below the national mean of 13.8 per cent and the higher education mean of 14.0 per cent as reported by the Office of National Statistics provisional figure April 2018. We remain committed to reducing the pay gap and ensuring equal pay for all.

5.2. Median pay gap: 10.07 per cent
The median pay gap shows a lower figure than last year (15.0 per cent) and is 1.6 percentage points above the national figure of 9.1 per cent. The figure is lower than the higher education median of 11.2 per cent as reported by the Office of National Statistics (provisional figure April 2017).

5.3. Bonus context
At Queen Mary, bonuses are awarded through four main processes: the Staff Bonus Scheme, the Professorial Review, Grade 8 Professional Services Review, and the national Clinical Excellence Awards.

The Staff Bonus Scheme is open to all staff in Queen Mary’s grading structure 1-7 and rewards staff for exceptional contribution over and above what might reasonably be expected.

The Professorial Review rewards professors for achievement across specific areas of assessed contribution and is aimed at those professors who have made a significant contribution and impact in their role. These payments are made either as a bonus or increment. Queen Mary has a larger proportion of male professors than females (72 per cent male and 28 per cent female) which means higher salaries and awards are made to males rather than females which may have an impact on the pay gap for this population.

The Grade 8 Professional Services Review rewards senior professional services post holders for exceptional performance through incremental progression or through the award of bonuses.

The national Clinical Excellence Awards reward staff who are undertaking clinical roles and who deliver over and above the standards expected. These are awarded by the Advisory Committee on Clinical Excellence Awards. Due to lower number of applications from female staff in Queen Mary there are a larger number of awards made to male applicants each year which impacts on the bonus gap.

Due to the amounts awarded, Clinical Excellence Awards have a major impact on the bonus figures shown in sections 5.4-5.6.

Whether Clinical Excellence Awards should be recorded as bonuses, in view of the level of payment and impact on the gender pay gap figures, continues to be debated across the higher education sector. The Universities and Colleges Employer Association view, based on legal advice, is that the awards should be considered as bonuses. However, it remains up to individual institutions to decide their own approach.

Figures for Queen Mary’s bonus pay gap have therefore been provided both with and without the Clinical Excellence Awards in the calculation of bonus gap.
5.4. Mean bonus gap
• 76.01 per cent including Clinical Excellence Awards
• 20.74 per cent excluding Clinical Excellence Awards

5.5. Median bonus gap
• 47.23 per cent including Clinical Excellence Awards
• 25.00 per cent excluding Clinical Excellence Awards

5.6. Proportion of males/females receiving a bonus
• 4.95 per cent male, 4.78 per cent female, including Clinical Excellence Awards
• 2.90 per cent male, 4.14 per cent female, excluding the Clinical Excellence Awards

5.7. Proportion of males and females in pay quartiles

Quartile 4 (highest paid) - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the upper quartile.

Quartile 3 - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the median but at or below the upper quartile.

Quartile 2 - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the lower quartile but at or below the median.

Quartile 1 (lowest paid) - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them at or below the lower quartile.

As with the quartile figures for 2017, there is a higher female representation within the two lowest paid quartiles (1 and 2) and a higher male representation in the highest paid quartile 4. The gender pay gap in the lowest paid quartiles can be attributed to the fact that, unlike some other universities, we do not outsource our cleaning and catering services. A large proportion of our cleaning and catering staff are female and, [comma] owing to the nature of the work, these roles are generally at the lower grade. The highest paid quartile consist of grade 8 roles which have a higher proportion of males as illustrated in the graph below. This is an area of concern for Queen Mary and we have various initiatives in place to increase the number of women in high grade positions, as described in section 6.
6. Initiatives to address our gender pay gap
Since our previous report in March 2018 we have taken the following actions to address our gender pay gap:

• Our continued commitment to Athena SWAN has ensured that gender equality and inclusivity is an ongoing priority for the University.

• We are committed to encouraging more women to apply for local and national Clinical Excellence Awards. For the 2018 Clinical Excellence Awards application window we ran structured sessions to encourage applications from women. The session was well received: 22 of a possible 45 women attended. We will monitor the application rates from attendees and will run further sessions during the 2019 application window.

• We have made changes in governance of the Equality Diversity and Inclusion Steering Group to ensure appropriate representation and decision-making channels are in place. We have also re-instated the Gender Equality Self-Assessment Team to provide leadership for gender equality across the University.

• When using external recruitment experts and agencies, we have ensured that they provide evidence of their success in appointing female candidates where they are under-represented in an organisation.

• We have revised the Academic Promotions process and conducted a review of the guidelines. The main purpose of the review was to deliver a revised process and associated guidance, which would be clear and transparent and would encourage applications from women for senior positions.

• Alongside our work on the gender pay gap, we have started to look at our Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) pay gap, and have included our 2018 data in this report.

• We have continued to support professional and academic women in their career progression through the Aurora women’s leadership programme and the Springboard women’s development programme aimed at giving women more confidence to work at senior levels in the University. Last year, we supported 37 women on the Aurora programme and 31 on the Springboard programme.

7. Next steps
As articulated in our People and Organisation Development Strategy and Equality and Diversity Annual Report 2018, we are undertaking the following steps to continue to address pay gaps:

• Review our processes such as recruitment, induction, promotion, exit interviews and flexible working to address gender bias and barriers to gender equality.

• Ensure that, for Professorial Reviews, gender pay gap data is provided to the panel in advance so they take this into account when recommending awards.

• Complete an Equal Pay Audit that will look in more detail at matters such as gender pay gaps by grade or school/institute/department.

• Continue to invest in addressing unconscious bias including through a network of faculty-based trainers to help ensure staff are able to make more informed and bias-free decisions.

• Review and update our equality policies with particular reference to the provision and support for transgender staff by September 2019.

• A targeted action plan to close the pay gap between BAME and non-BAME female staff.

• Align the methodologies of our gender and BAME pay gap reports to improve consistency and comparability.
1. Introduction
This report presents an initial analysis of the BAME\(^5\) pay gap at Queen Mary based on data as at 4 September 2018. We have voluntarily produced this BAME pay gap report in addition to the statutory gender pay report. The results are not directly comparable for analysis due to different census dates. For the 2019 reports, we will align dates to improve consistency and comparability.

The BAME pay gap is a measure of the difference in pay between the average hourly earnings of BAME and non-BAME staff and is subject to a prescribed method of calculation (see section 3).

2. Purpose of the report
This report will help to identify the BAME staff pay gaps and underpin the development of action plans that will enable the delivery of our objective to “increase the proportion of BAME staff at senior levels in both academic and professional services” as set out in the Equality and Diversity Annual Report 2018. This initial data analysis will also help to inform our application for the Race Equality Charter Award.

3. Method for calculations
The following analysis of the data has been undertaken:
- Mean\(^6\) pay gap
- Median\(^7\) pay gap
- Mean bonus gap
- Median bonus gap
- Proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff receiving a bonus

The method for the calculations in these reports is based on that used to calculate the gender pay gap. All percentage pay gaps are expressed as the difference between BAME and non-BAME pay as a percentage of non-BAME pay using the following calculation:

\[
\frac{\text{(non-BAME hourly rate - BAME hourly rate)}}{\text{(non-BAME hourly rate)}} \times 100\%
\]

A positive percentage indicates non-BAME staff are paid more than BAME staff. Zero per cent means there is no pay gap. A negative percentage indicates BAME staff are paid more than non-BAME staff.

---

\(^5\) Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) is the terminology normally used in the UK to describe people of non-white descent. For our data and research to be relevant and useful, we adopt ‘BAME’ as a commonly used term to ensure consistency with other public bodies and to benchmark against their data. Existing diversity monitoring categories were used for BAME staff. White European ethnic minorities were excluded and counted as ‘other white’ and thus in non-BAME, as this category is not monitored separately at Queen Mary.

\(^6\) Mean - the mean represents the average value within the data (ie add all the numbers together and divide by the number of items in the set).

\(^7\) The median figure is the exact middle figure when the data is ordered in a list from the highest to the lowest value.
4. Queen Mary staffing context / staff in scope

• As at 4 September 2018, Queen Mary employed 5,950 people as “relevant employees” as defined in the legislation.

• The overall BAME split within Queen Mary’s workforce is 32 per cent BAME, 62 per cent non-BAME and six per cent who did not declare their ethnicity. All calculations are based only on those who declared their ethnicity (5,572 people).

• The percentage of BAME staff who work part-time is 48 per cent, compared to 39 per cent non-BAME.

5. Pay gap data

5.1. Overall mean BAME pay gap: 21.9 per cent
We have also calculated the mean pay gap by full and part-time staff:

• The mean BAME pay gap for full-time staff was 13.4 per cent
• The mean BAME pay gap for part-time staff was 27.56 per cent

Initial investigation has identified the following areas as relevant to the difference between the full-time and part-time pay gap:

• The higher number of BAME staff who work part-time compared to non-BAME staff.
• Unlike some other universities, at Queen Mary services such as cleaning and catering are run in-house. These services have a number of roles on lower grades and are undertaken predominantly by BAME staff working part-time.

5.2. Overall median BAME pay gap: 19.3 per cent
We have also calculated the median pay gap by full and part-time staff:

• The median pay gap for full-time staff was 10.3 per cent
• The median pay gap for part-time staff was 30.43 per cent

The median pay gap for part-time staff is greater than the mean pay gap. This is likely to be due to the point made concerning the large number of part-time BAME staff among our domestic staff, who are among the lowest paid within Queen Mary owing to the nature of the work.

We are also looking at the proportions of BAME staff in the higher pay grades and senior management roles. We will be conducting a modelling exercise on the effects of the pay gap on higher and lower grades.

5.3. Mean pay gap by academic and non-academic staff
We also calculated the mean and median pay gap by academic and non-academic staff and across faculties, linked to our work carried out as part of the academic promotion review and new key performance indicators for enhancing staff diversity.

A high proportion of our BAME staff are in grades 1-4 which are exclusively professional services roles. BAME staff are also under represented at the higher professional services grades. This has resulted in a higher pay gap in professional services compared to academic staff.

"Relevant Employee" is defined as any employee who is not being paid at either a reduced rate or nil as a result of being on leave as at the snapshot date.
Mean pay gap by academic and non-academic staff
- The mean pay gap for academic staff was 7.8 per cent
- The mean pay gap for non-academic staff (professional services and support staff) was 19.6 per cent

Median pay gap by academic and non-academic staff
- The median pay gap for academic staff was 10.4 per cent
- The median pay gap for non-academic staff (professional services and support staff) was 18.9 per cent

We will consider the intersectionality with international BAME staff and UK BAME staff to ascertain the effect on median pay for academic staff.

Median and mean BAME pay gaps for faculties and professional services

5.4. Mean bonus pay gap: 17 per cent
At Queen Mary, bonuses are awarded through four main processes: the Staff Bonus Scheme, the Professorial Review, Grade 8 Professional Services Review, and the national Clinical Excellence Awards.

National Clinical Excellence Awards are awarded to our staff in clinical roles by the NHS. The effect of these awards on the pay gap has not been addressed here and will be considered as part of the further work on analysing the BAME pay gap.

The calculations for both mean and median bonus pay gaps were based on total average bonuses paid to all staff during the period from August 2017 to July 2018:
- For full-time staff the mean bonus gap was 16 per cent
- For part-time staff the mean bonus gap was 18 per cent

5.5. Median bonus pay gap: 25 per cent
- For full-time staff the median bonus gap was 40 per cent
- For part-time staff the median bonus gap was 25 per cent

5.6. Median and mean bonus gap variances
The variance indicates that there is a much wider range in the bonus amounts awarded to non-BAME staff, than to BAME staff. This contributes to the difference between the mean and median bonus gap together with the fact that we have a higher number of non-BAME staff receiving a bonus (see below).

5.7. Proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff receiving a bonus
- 38 BAME staff received bonus pay (23 per cent)
- 128 non-BAME staff received bonus pay (77 per cent)
5.8. Intersectionality: Mean pay gap - BAME female staff
The mean pay gap was calculated for BAME female staff with non-BAME female staff, non-BAME male staff and BAME male staff:

• The mean pay gap between BAME and non-BAME female staff was 20.4 per cent
• The mean pay gap between BAME female staff and non-BAME male staff was 31 per cent
• The mean pay gap between BAME female and BAME male staff was 11 per cent

5.9 Intersectionality: Median pay gap - BAME female staff
The median pay gap was calculated for BAME female staff with non-BAME female staff, non-BAME male staff and BAME male staff:

• The median pay gap between BAME and non-BAME female staff was 23 per cent
• The median pay gap between BAME female staff and non-BAME male staff was 31 per cent
• The median pay gap between BAME female and BAME male staff was 10 per cent

In relation to BAME and non-BAME females, the median pay gap is greater than the mean pay gap. This highlights that BAME female staff in comparison to non-BAME female staff are concentrated in the lower grades and are on lower salaries.

This was not highlighted in the gender pay gap as intersectionality was not considered.

Therefore within the gender pay gap action plan, targeted action is needed for BAME female staff only to close the gap.

5.10. Proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff in pay quartiles
The proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff at Queen Mary in the four pay quartiles is provided below.

![Pie chart showing the proportion of BAME and non-BAME staff in pay quartiles.](chart.png)

- **Quartile 4 (highest paid)** - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the upper quartile.
- **Quartile 3** - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the median but at or below the upper quartile.
- **Quartile 2** - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them above the lower quartile but at or below the median.
- **Quartile 1 (lowest paid)** - Includes all employees whose standard hourly rate places them at or below the lower quartile.
As evident from the graph, there is a higher representation of BAME staff in the two lowest quartiles where we have a large proportion of cleaning, catering and residential service roles, including some administration assistant roles in lower grades, and which tend to have a higher population of BAME staff.

The top quartile has a higher proportion of academic staff where the salaries are higher and the percentage of BAME staff lower. From analysing the data the findings also show that only 19 per cent of senior lecturers and 14 per cent of readers and professors were from a BAME background.

6. Next steps

Further data analysis is needed to deepen our understanding of the BAME pay gap and to determine what initiatives are most likely to be effective in the short, medium and longer term.

Below are examples of actions to be taken to help address the BAME pay gap:

A. Process improvements

• Review and analyse BAME recruitment and selection data through all stages of the recruitment cycle.

• Undertake a review of bonus award processes and outcomes and consider the implications of the national Clinical Excellence Awards on the pay gap.

• Work with executive and recruitment agencies to ensure longlists include at least 10 per cent BAME candidates.

• Review workload models to add capacity to ensure formal recognition of equality, diversity and inclusion work in BAME staff workloads.

• Introduce a system to monitor BAME uptake of training and development programmes.

• The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team to act as “mystery shoppers” and review at least five recruitment campaigns from each faculty to track number of BAME applicants and their recruitment journey.

• Implement the Dignity Disclosure Officers network and develop a reporting and recording mechanism to capture harassment and bullying incidents.

B. Senior leadership support

• Equality, diversity and inclusion leads and senior management team will work with heads of schools/institutes/departments to raise awareness of the BAME pay gap at team meetings and staff development days.

• Senior Academic Lead for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion will work with heads of schools/institutes/departments to ensure an objective for equality is included in appraisal reports “to identify and discuss career development and promotions with BAME staff who are or will shortly be eligible for promotion” and detailing the action taken.

• All heads of schools/institutes/departments to have taken unconscious bias training.

C. Diversity in decision making

• Revise guidance on constitution of recruitment and promotion panels to ensure there is at least one BAME member on the panel where possible.

• Initiate a review of University decision-making committees to increase BAME representation.

• Undertake an ‘Equal Merit Provision’ pilot project in one department and one academic faculty.

• Implement the ‘Train the Trainer’ faculty and school/institute/department-based trainers network to deliver local unconscious bias training programme for all staff.

D. Supporting diverse leaders

• Promote the B-MEntor scheme which is a mentoring programme for BAME academic and professional services staff and monitor its effectiveness.

• Develop an internal sponsorship scheme to run alongside B-MEntor for senior lecturers and above and equivalent professional services roles.

• Sponsor BAME staff (both academic and professional services) to attend the StellaHE leadership programme.

• Pilot a work shadowing programme for BAME staff.