



# Pay Gap Report 2023

# UWS Equal Pay Statement

University of the West of Scotland is committed to the principles of equal pay for work of equal value for all our employees, irrespective of gender or any other protected characteristics. The University is committed to compliance with legislative requirements as set out in the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012, Public Sector Equality Duty.

Our pay and grading framework for achieving equal pay across the University is underpinned by an analytical job evaluation scheme (HAY) and is supported by complementary reward. We believe that ensuring equal pay for work of equal value demonstrates the University's commitment to its employees through equitable, fair and transparent pay and reward mechanisms. We aim to reflect equal pay with respect to remuneration, development and career progression for all staff in ensuring that the level of reward is appropriate to the relative size and content of each job.

The University's policies and procedures associated with pay and remuneration have been developed and implemented with a view to eliminating all bias. In addition, we regularly review our processes, in partnership with the recognised trade unions, to ensure their integrity in relation to equal pay considerations.

Our equal pay objectives are to:

- Carry out regular monitoring of the impact of our pay practices and review the application of its policies and procedures
- Undertake regular equal pay reviews in line with guidance issued by the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), as required under PSED
- Monitor starting salaries for new staff, ensuring they adhere to our Starting Salary Guidance
- Assess and review findings of equal pay reviews, in conjunction with our recognised local Trade Unions, and take action where necessary
- The findings of these reviews will be considered by the University's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Committee.



# Data

In line with GDPR and to prevent any identifiable data being published several measures have been taken throughout this report when presenting data.

Wherever possible a percentage and number will be given throughout this report. However, where the number of staff or students is less than five this has been indicated as "<5" and the corresponding percentage has been removed.

If a table only has one number that is less than five within it the table will not display both the numbers and percentages. Instead, only one of the two (numbers or percentages) will be reported. Where the number is less than five in these tables this will be indicated as "<5" to prevent the percentage or number being worked out from the other data available in the table.

In a few tables there is only one number that is less than five and only the corresponding percentage has been removed. This is because these tables show groupings of staff and thus the data is less identifiable.

Where data is benchmarked throughout this report to the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) Scotland equivalent the dataset from HESA will be the 2020 -2021 data. Where data is benchmarked throughout this report to the Scottish Census data this is from the year 2011. This is the most up to date data available at the time of writing this report.

It should also be noted that UWS has one campus based in London and we take cognisance that our staff and students at this campus will reflect the local population which is more racially and ethnically diverse than our campuses based within Scotland. Therefore, the numbers displayed are not an accurate comparison to the Scottish Census or Scottish HESA data. In future reports we will consider how to compare and present our ethnicity data in a more representative way.



# Gender Pay Gap Report

The gender pay gap is a measure of the difference between men's and women's average earnings across the University. The gender pay gap is not an indication of how much more male employees are earning than females doing the same work. This concept is called equal pay, and the University undertakes regular equal pay audits to ensure that men and women doing the same work are paid equitably.

The review of the University salary data includes all posts within the University structure. A snapshot of data from 31st July 2022 has been analysed to provide a detailed salary breakdown and comparison.

The gender pay gap reporting regulations define a "relevant employee" as all those employed by the University on the snapshot date and therefore includes full time and part time core workers. Knowledge Transfer Partnerships (KTP) appointments are excluded as their pay is determined by the host organisation rather than UWS.

It is worth noting that 58.5% of our headcount staff are female, and 41.5% are male.

## Methodology & Calculation

While there is no single measure that fully deals with the complex issue of the differences between men's and women's pay, in this report we use mean and median hourly earnings (excluding overtime). Including overtime can skew the results because men work relatively more overtime than women and using hourly earnings better accounts for the fact that men work on average more hours per week than women.

The gender pay gap at UWS is calculated as the difference between average hourly earnings (excluding overtime) of men and women as a proportion of average hourly earnings (excluding overtime) of men's earnings.



There are two measures of the gender pay gap – mean and median.

The mean average is calculated by adding all individual employees' hourly rate of pay and dividing by the total number of employees. The mean is a useful measure as it includes the highest and lowest rates of pay, and because those on the highest rates of pay tend to be men, and those on the lowest rates of pay tend to be women, it captures a more complete picture of the gap.

The median average is calculated by listing all employees' hourly rate of pay and finding the midpoint. The median is not skewed by very low hourly rates of pay or very high hourly rates of pay and gives a more accurate representation of the typical difference. However, the median can also distort the true picture if there are large numbers of a particular gender at one end of the pay spectrum. There is no consensus on which is the best measure, and instead it can be helpful to publish both, giving preference to the mean, which will give a deeper understanding of any pay gaps.



### Mean Pay Gap Calculation:

(Mean hourly rate of pay of male employees – Mean hourly rate of pay of female employees) / Mean hourly rate of male employees x 100.

#### UWS Mean Pay Gap

Mean Salary for Females across UWS	£20.51
Mean Salary for Males across UWS	£23.43
<b>MEAN PAY GAP</b>	<b>12.5%</b>

### Median Pay Gap Calculation:

(Median hourly rate of pay of male employees – median hourly rate of pay of female employees) / Median hourly rate of pay of male employees x 100.

#### UWS Median Pay Gap

Median Salary for Females across UWS	£20.53
Median Salary for Males across UWS	£22.43
<b>MEDIAN PAY GAP</b>	<b>8.5%</b>

There has been a decrease in the mean gender pay gap of 2.5% compared to 2021 and a significant decrease of 11.5% to the median. These figures are the lowest they have been since formal reporting commenced 10 years ago with an overall reduction in the mean gender pay gap for that period of just under 10%. More details can be found in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 - UWS Pay Gap Comparative Data since 2021**

Publication	Snapshot date for data	Mean Gender Pay Gap	Median Gender Pay Gap
Equal Pay Mainstreaming Report 2012/2013	31st August 2012	22.00% (core staff only)	Not Published
Equal Pay Mainstreaming Report 2014/2015	31st August 2014	19.90% (core staff only)	Not Published
PSED Report 2017	31st December 2016	17.00%	27.5% (Not Published)
PSED Report 2019	28th February 2019	14.39%	23.25%
PSED Report 2021	31st July 2020	15.07%	23.25%
Snapshot Annual Report 2022	31st July 2021	15%	20%
PSED Report 2023	31st July 2022	12.5%	8.5%

The latest figures also compare favorably with the national picture as can be seen in Table 2.

**Table 2 - ONS Gender Pay Gap Comparator data over the past 5 years**

Year	Gender pay gap (all employees)
2022	14.9% (median) 13.9% (mean)
2021	15.4% (median) 14.9% (mean)
2020	14.9% (median) 13.9% (mean)
2019	17.4% (median) 16.3% (mean)
2018	17.8% (median) 17.2% (mean)

Source: Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings: [Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings time series of selected estimates - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](https://ons.gov.uk/economy/earningsandwages/datasets/annualsurveyofhoursandearnings)

There continues to be issues to be addressed however, particularly around occupational segregation and also salary point placement despite our normal practice of appointment being on the first point of the salary scale, where this is sometimes bypassed in order to secure a desired candidate. This is especially challenging in the current labour market conditions.

## Pay Gap by Grade

Table 3 indicates the percentage value of any pay gaps by grade. This is shown as + % if females are paid less than males. Pay gaps of more than 5% in favour of males are highlighted in red, pay gaps under 5% are highlighted in yellow. Those figures where the pay differential is neutral or in favour of females are highlighted in green.

**Table 3 - percentage value of pay gap by grade**

Job Family	Headcount	Female Average Hourly Rate	Male Average Hourly Rate	Average Hourly Rate	% difference Female to Male
Academic & Research Ac 1	23	£17.59	£17.26	£17.43	-2%
Academic & Research Ac 2	326	£21.28	£21.25	£21.26	0%
Academic & Research Ac 3	349	£26.66	£26.91	£26.78	1%
Academic & Research Ac 4	128	£31.39	£32.04	£31.72	2%
Academic & Research FE64	8	£26.09	£24.46	£25.48	-7%
Academic & Research Professor	30	£43.00	£41.29	£41.75	-4%
Professional Services Grade 1	105	£9.98	£9.98	£9.98	0%
Professional Services Grade 2	125	£10.56	£10.72	£10.63	2%
Professional Services Grade 3	118	£12.25	£11.97	£12.18	-2%
Professional Services Grade 4	182	£14.91	£15.06	£14.96	-1%
Professional Services Grade 5	146	£18.99	£18.85	£18.94	1%
Professional Services Grade 6	91	£23.47	£23.69	£23.55	1%
Professional Services Grade 7	31	£26.21	£26.73	£26.45	2%
Professional Services Grade 8	20	£30.14	£30.89	£30.52	2%
Senior Management Grade 1	34	£36.79	£38.61	£37.59	5%
Senior Management Grade 2	6	£42.03	£46.85	£43.64	10%
Senior Management Grade 3	12	£51.00	£48.52	£49.56	-5%
Senior Management Grade 4/5/6	10	£67.61	£69.70	£69.07	3%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,744</b>	<b>20.51</b>	<b>23.43</b>	<b>£21.73</b>	<b>12%</b>

Eight grades have positive pay gaps in favour of women. Eight grades have pay gaps in favour of men, but lower than the 5% threshold for further investigation. Pay gaps of 5% or more are generally regarded as significant, potentially requiring further analysis and the development of specific action plans/ interventions. Two senior management grades have significant pay gaps in favour of men.

This is a shift from last year's analysis where the two senior management grades had a -4% pay gap in favour of women.

Further investigation has identified that there are nineteen females and sixteen males within Senior Management Grade 1. More female colleagues on this grade have had a service of four years or less. This has therefore skewed the salary figures in this way to present a picture of men earning more than women in this grade, as a result of length of service.

Within the SS2 grade, there is a majority (<5) of female staff. The majority of the SS2 roles are interim posts and are all held by females being paid at the lowest point on the grade. The interim posts have a disproportionate impact on the salary averages.

It is worth noting that, again this year, we have a positive gender pay gap within our Professoriate, although women are still under-represented in terms of headcount, with eight females and twenty-one males, two fewer females compared to last year.

## Recommendations

The University continues to address the pay gap with the following initiatives:

1. Continue working towards programmes which will deliver an intersectional approach to improvement e.g. Athena Swan and the Race Equality Charter. Increase and widen participation in internal programmes and activities that are designed to address occupational segregation, e.g. Women's Leadership Programme, Management Development Programme, HighHER, etc.
2. Implement the University's revised Academic promotion criteria and procedures.
3. Review starting salary guidance as females may be less likely to ask for enhanced grading.
4. We will use inclusive and dynamic recruitment practices and deliver exceptional service and support to our hiring managers.





# UWS Ethnicity Pay Gap Report

To support our wider commitment to improve the representation of Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) people across our workforce, we have chosen to publish our ethnicity pay gap – the difference in average pay between White and BME staff, which we did for the first time last year.

Our ethnicity pay gap in 2022 is 0% median and -4.5% mean, in **favour** of staff who disclose as **BME**.

Our ethnicity pay gap in 2021 (reported in 2022) was -9% median and -12% mean, in **favour** of staff who disclose as **BME**.

This is based on a disclosure rate of 95% of staff who have shared their ethnicity with the University. “Not Known” are not included in the detailed grade by grade analysis.

**Table 4 - UWS workforce breakdown by Ethnicity**

Ethnicity	Headcount	% of total
BME	243	13.9%
White	1417	81.3%
Unknown	84	4.8%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1744</b>	<b>-</b>

Similar to our gender pay gap report, ethnicity pay gap is a measure of the difference between BME and White average earnings across the University. The review of the University salary data includes all posts within the University structure. A snapshot of

data from 31st July 2022 has been analysed to provide a detailed salary breakdown and comparison.

## Methodology & Calculation

In this report we use mean and median hourly earnings (excluding overtime). The ethnicity pay gap at UWS is calculated as the difference between average hourly earnings (excluding overtime) of BME and White employees as a proportion of average hourly earnings (excluding overtime) of White employee earnings.

## Mean Pay Gap Calculation:

(Mean hourly rate of pay of White employees – Mean hourly rate of pay of BME employees) / Mean hourly rate of White employees x 100.

## UWS Mean Pay Gap

Mean Salary for BME across UWS	£20.51
Mean Salary for White across UWS	£22.65
<b>MEAN PAY GAP</b>	<b>£21.76</b>

## Median Pay Gap Calculation:

(Median hourly rate of pay of White employees – Median hourly rate of pay of BME employees) / Median hourly rate of pay of White employees x 100.

## UWS Median Pay Gap

Median Salary for BME across UWS	£20.53
Median Salary for White across UWS	£21.14
<b>MEDIAN PAY GAP</b>	<b>£20.53</b>

The mean Ethnicity Pay Gap has changed from -12% in 2022 to -4.1% in 2023. The Median Ethnicity Pay Gap has changed from -9% in 2022 to -3% in 2023.

Table 5 shows UWS Ethnicity Pay Gap comparative data since 2021.

**Table 5 - UWS Ethnicity Pay Gap Comparative Data**

<b>Publication</b>	<b>Snapshot date for data</b>	<b>Mean Ethnicity Pay Gap</b>	<b>Median Ethnicity Pay Gap</b>
Snapshot Annual Report 2022	31st July 2021	-12%	-9%
PSED Report 2023	31st July 2022	-4.1%	-3%



## Pay Gap by Grade

Table 6 indicates the percentage value of any pay gaps by grade. This is shown as + % if BME are paid less than White. Pay gaps of more than 5% in favour of white pay are highlighted in red, pay gaps in favour of white under 5% are highlighted in yellow. Those figures where the pay differential is neutral or in favour of BME are highlighted in green.

**Table 6 - Ethnicity Pay Gap by Grade**

Job Family	Headcount	Black and Ethnic Minority Average Hourly Rate	White Average Hourly Rate	"Not Known" Average Hourly Rate	Average Hourly Rate	% Difference Ethnic Minority to White
Academic & Research Ac 1	23	17.77	17.29	17.73	17.43	-3%
Academic & Research Ac 2	326	21.01	18.45	20.80	21.26	-14%
Academic & Research Ac 3	349	26.23	26.87	27.56	26.78	2%
Academic & Research Ac 4	128	31.70	31.73	31.44	31.72	0%
Academic & Research FE64	8	-	25.48	-	25.48	-
Academic & Research Professor	30	41.95	41.67	-	41.75	-1%
Professional Services Grade 1	105	9.98	9.98	9.98	9.98	0%
Professional Services Grade 2	125	10.30	10.69	10.42	10.63	4%
Professional Services Grade 3	118	11.39	12.22	12.15	12.18	7%
Professional Services Grade 4	182	14.23	15.00	14.90	14.96	5%
Professional Services Grade 5	146	18.76	18.95	19.37	18.94	1%
Professional Services Grade 6	91	23.92	23.50	24.50	23.55	-2%
Professional Services Grade 7	31	24.50	26.62	27.56	26.45	8%
Professional Services Grade 8	20	-	30.39	32.89	30.52	-
Senior Management Grade 1	34	40.43	37.41	40.43	37.59	-8%
Senior Management Grade 2	6	-	43.64	-	43.64	-
Senior Management Grade 3	12	46.85	49.96	48.25	49.56	6%
Senior Management Grade 4/5/6	10	-	69.07	-	69.07	-
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1,744</b>	<b>22.65</b>	<b>21.76</b>	<b>18.61</b>	<b>21.73</b>	<b>4%</b>

Six grades have positive pay gaps in favour of BME. Three grades have pay gaps in favour of white, but lower than the 5% threshold for further investigation. Pay gaps of 5% or more are generally regarded as significant, potentially requiring further analysis and the development of specific action plans/interventions. 4 grades fall into this category.

One senior management grade has a significant pay gap in favour of white staff. This is a shift from last year's analysis where 2 senior management grades had a -4% pay gap in favour of BME staff.

Further investigation has identified that there is a total of 19 BME employees in Professional Services Grade 3, 4 and 7, the majority of whom have a length of service of less than 1 year, meaning they are on the minimum salary point for the grade. This has a disproportionate impact on the salary averages presenting a picture of white staff are earning more than BME staff in this grade, as a result of length of service.

An analysis of Senior Management Grade 3 presents the same conclusion. Looking at the data behind the four figures in red, the difference is attributable to the BME incumbents having a smaller length of service and therefore being lower down the salary scale. It is worth noting that low numbers of BME headcount are likely to influence the comparison of the averages. Low numbers aren't representative enough to be compared as averages. For example, if there is only one member of BME staff within a pay grade their salary is not representative as an average figure for all BME staff but merely shows their hourly rate.

### **The National Picture**

National figures for 2022 are not yet available at the time of writing this report. In 2021, Advance HE ([AdvHE Equality in higher education Staff stats 2021 1635342217.pdf](#)) reported that : Overall, the median and mean pay gap between UK white and UK Black,

Asian and minority ethnic staff stood at 0.0 and 1.4 percentage points respectively. The median and mean ethnicity pay gaps were wider among non-UK staff, at 8.4 and 12.8 percentage points respectively. The ethnicity pay gaps were particularly pronounced between Black, Asian and minority ethnic and white non-UK professional and support staff (15.2 percentage point median pay gap and 12.7 percentage point mean pay gap) compared with UK professional and support staff (0.0 percentage point median pay gap and 2.2 percentage point mean pay gap). Notably, median and mean ethnicity pay gaps among UK staff were largest in England (1.9% and 2.9% respectively), and especially in London (13.4% and 15.3% respectively). In the other countries, all ethnicity pay gaps were negative, meaning that UK Black, and Minority Ethnic staff were on average paid more than UK white staff. This was not the case among non-UK staff, where median and mean ethnicity pay gaps varied less across the different countries and none were negative.

### **Recommendations**

Improving the representation of BME people across our staff population remains a priority for us. As we grow our BME staff it is likely that we will see a larger BME pay gap at first as new starts will start on the entry point salary for the grade. We remain engaged to increase BME representation at UWS with the following activity:

1. We will work in partnership with local and national BME organisations to promote employment opportunities across UWS, providing advice and support through the process.
2. Develop an action plan to nurture and grow the UWS pipeline for PhD students and employment pathways at UWS.
3. Engage with and explore the development of bespoke asset-based programmes (such as mentoring) to enhance and extend the leadership opportunities of existing UWS BME staff.
4. Continue to work with marketing to profile and celebrate colleagues from a range of backgrounds in roles across UWS.

# UWS Occupational Segregation Report

## Introduction

Occupational segregation is a term that is used to describe employment patterns where workers with certain characteristics tend to be grouped in certain jobs. For example, women tend to be concentrated in the lower paid jobs (e.g. caring, catering, cleaning, clerical, cashiering) and the lower grades within an organisation. Previous research has shown that occupational segregation is one of the main causes of the pay gaps in the United Kingdom.

Understanding the scope and causes of occupational segregation is key to tackling gender, disability and ethnicity pay gaps within our institution.

There are two main dimensions to occupational segregation:

### Horizontal segregation

Workers with certain characteristics are clustered in certain types of jobs across an organisation

### Vertical segregation

Workers with certain characteristics are clustered at certain levels of jobs within an organisation's hierarchy

Some of the underlying causes of occupational segregation include:

- stereotyping (e.g. occupational and societal stereotyping based on disability, gender, race)
- lack of flexible working opportunities
- unequal access to training/development
- undervaluing some kinds of jobs

These contributory factors impact on individuals and employing organisations. Tackling occupational segregation is an essential step in creating more equal employment and development opportunities within Scottish HEIs. Reduced opportunities for staff constrains the pool of talent available to an employer as well as limiting the possibilities for individual employees to progress. Eliminating occupational segregation is about ensuring greater economic prosperity, linked to more effective skills utilisation, and social equality.

The University recognises that tackling the problem of occupational segregation is a national priority and that addressing the differences in distribution of men and women across different job types and job categories will help to progress gender equality.

Data is based on the characteristics of occupants in positions (including KTPs and hourly paid employees) as at 31 July 2022. It is based on posts rather than individual people, so if an individual holds more than one post at UWS they will be counted twice.

### Occupational Segregation at UWS

The following provides a gender breakdown by job family, highlighting that there is generally a good gender split within the Academic & Research and the Senior Management job families. As is the case sector wide, there is a dominance of the female gender in Professional Services.

## **Breakdown by Job Family** - Horizontal segregation

### **Sex**

51.27% of all academic staff at UWS are female. This is an increase of 1.75% since 2021. This compares broadly to the national average for all UK Higher Education institutions of 49% (Source: HESA, 2020-21).

66.26% of all professional services roles are held by female staff. This is a small increase of just under 1% compared to the year earlier. There is no comparable HESA data.

50% of all senior management roles are held by female staff. This is an increase of just over 5% compared to the year earlier. There is no comparable HESA data.

Tables 7 to 9 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by job family and gender from 2020 to 2022.

### **Disability**

14.1 million people or 19% of the working-age population in Britain are disabled as defined as by the Equality Act 2010 (Source: Family Resources Survey 2019-20 [Disability facts and figures | Disability charity Scope UK](#)). 4.4 million disabled people were in employment in 2020 (Source [A08: Labour market status of disabled people - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](#))

In 2021 2.9% of our staffing complement were declared disabled (down 0.2% compared with 2020). In 2022, this is now 7.40%. It is worth noting that 28% of our staffing complement are unknown in relation to their disability status, a significant reduction on 2021's figure of 49%.

Tables 10 to 12 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by job family and disability from 2020 to 2022.

### **Ethnicity**

As noted previously UWS has one campus based in London and we take cognisance that our staff and students at this campus will reflect the local population which is more diverse than our campuses based within Scotland. Therefore, the numbers displayed below are not an entirely accurate comparison to the Scottish census data. In future reports we will consider how to compare and present our ethnicity data in a more representative way.

The size of the minority ethnic population in 2011 was just over 200,000 or 4% of the total population of Scotland, based on the 2011 ethnicity classification. (Scotland's 2011 census). Within London, the most ethnically diverse region in England, 40.2% of residents identified with either the Asian, Black, or Other ethnic group. The University has 13.9% within the Black and Ethnic Minority category (9.8% in 2021). The minority ethnic population is well represented in the Academic & Research job family (and an increase of 5.5% on 2021 data) but not as well represented in the Professional Services and Senior Management job families. Tables 13 to 15 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by job family and ethnicity from 2020 to 2022.

## **Breakdown by Occupational Category** - Horizontal segregation

Job Family information can be further broken down to a greater level of detail showing occupational groupings:

### **Sex**

Gender bias in occupational categories reflects broader society in relation to more females being in administrative and clerical roles and campus support roles. There is more equality within Academic and Research role and Senior Management roles. There are more males than females in technical roles which is again, reflective of society.

Tables 16 to 18 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by occupational category and sex from 2020 to 2022.

### Disability

The highest proportion of disabled staff are employed within our Academic & Research, Professional and Technical/IT occupational categories.

Tables 19 to 21 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by occupational category and disability from 2020 to 2022.

### Ethnicity

UWS saw just over a 5% increase within Academic & Research and Professional posts and just under a 6% increase in Professional posts compared to the previous year, but there remains a very low representation in Campus Support and Administrative & clerical roles. There is a 6% increase in BME representation in Senior management roles compared to the previous year.

Tables 22 to 24 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by occupational category and ethnicity from 2020 to 2022.

### Breakdown by Grade - Vertical segregation

#### Sex

Table 25 highlights those grades where there is male/female gender dominance of over 60% in yellow or a male/female gender dominance of over 70% in red. Tables 26 and 27 in Appendix 1 show the comparative breakdown of grades by sex in 2021 and 2022.

Professional Services Grade 1 and Grade 3 have roles which are predominantly filled by females across society – cleaners, food services assistants and invigilators (Grade 1) and administrative and clerical roles (Grade 3). 80% of our Grade 1 incumbents are female, an increase of just under 3% compared the previous year. It is worth noting that within Professional Services grades 1-4,

69% are female (1% increase on previous year). Within the higher graded Professional Services grades 5-8 (generally deemed to be of graduate level), 61% are female (a reduction of 1% compared with the previous year). 73% of our Professorial staff are male highlighting that UWS must do more work to attract female professorial staff and develop existing staff into professorial roles. Work is ongoing on a revised academic career pathways and academic promotions process which will address this.

**Table 25 - Breakdown by grade and sex 2022**

Grade	% to Grade Female	% to Grade Male
Academic & Research Ac 1	52.2%	47.8%
Academic & Research Ac 2	53.1%	46.9%
Academic & Research Ac 3	53.3%	46.7%
Academic & Research Ac 4	46.1%	53.9%
Academic & Research FE64	62.5%	-
Academic & Research Professor	26.7%	73.3%
Professional Services Grade 1	82.9%	17.1%
Professional Services Grade 2	52.8%	47.2%
Professional Services Grade 3	73.7%	26.3%
Professional Services Grade 4	69.8%	30.2%
Professional Services Grade 5	62.3%	37.7%
Professional Services Grade 6	62.6%	37.4%
Professional Services Grade 7	54.8%	45.2%
Professional Services Grade 8	50.0%	50.0%
Senior Management Grade 1	55.9%	44.1%
Senior Management Grade 2	66.7%	-
Senior Management Grade 3	41.7%	58.3%
Senior Management Grade 4, 5 & 6	-	70.0%

## Disability

Table 28 below shows the breakdown of staff by grade and disability in 2022. As the number of staff who have disclosed a disability within UWS is low within each grade it is difficult to do any accurate analysis of this data. Tables 29 to 30 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by grade and disability from 2021 to 2022. It is worth noting that above senior management grade 1 there have been no staff who have disclosed a disability over the past three years.

**Table 28 - Breakdown by grade and disability 2022**

Grade	Declared Disabled	Declared Not Disabled	Not Known
Academic & Research Ac 1	<5	15	7
Academic & Research Ac 2	31	236	59
Academic & Research Ac 3	28	230	91
Academic & Research Ac 4	7	61	60
Academic & Research FE64	0	0	8
Academic & Research Professor	<5	13	15
Professional Services Grade 1	<5	60	44
Professional Services Grade 2	8	69	48
Professional Services Grade 3	10	70	38
Professional Services Grade 4	17	122	43
Professional Services Grade 5	12	97	37
Professional Services Grade 6	5	57	29
Professional Services Grade 7	<5	26	<5
Professional Services Grade 8	<5	15	<5
Senior Management Grade 1	<5	26	5
Senior Management Grade 2	0	<5	<5
Senior Management Grade 3	0	10	<5
Senior Management Grade 4 & 5	0	9	<5
Senior Management Grade 6	0	<5	<5



## Ethnicity

With 4% of the total population of Scotland in the Black and Ethnic Minority category (Scotland's 2011 census), 13 out of 19 of our grades are represented in line with the Scottish Average.

Nationally, of academic staff with known ethnicity, 17% were Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) in 2020/21 (Source: [Higher Education Staff Statistics: UK, 2020/21 | HESA](#)). This equates broadly to the picture at UWS (16% on grades Ac1 -Ac4).

Nationally, of the 21,135 professors with known ethnicity, 11% or 2,425 were BME (Source: [Higher Education Staff Statistics: UK, 2020/21 | HESA](#)). At UWS, professors of BME ethnicity account for 26.7%, a positive picture by comparison.

**Table 31 - Breakdown by grade and ethnicity 2022**

Grade	Ethnic minority	White	Not Known
Academic & Research Ac 1	5	16	<5
Academic & Research Ac 2	99	190	37
Academic & Research Ac 3	58	286	5
Academic & Research Ac 4	17	109	<5
Academic & Research FE64	0	8	0
Academic & Research Professor	8	22	0
Professional Services Grade 1	8	90	7
Professional Services Grade 2	7	102	16
Professional Services Grade 3	6	108	<5
Professional Services Grade 4	10	168	<5
Professional Services Grade 5	12	132	<5
Professional Services Grade 6	8	82	<5
Professional Services Grade 7	<5	27	<5
Professional Services Grade 8	0	19	<5
Senior Management Grade 1	<5	32	<5
Senior Management Grade 2	0	6	0
Senior Management Grade 3	<5	10	<5
Senior Management Grade 4, 5 & 6	0	10	0

Tables 32 to 33 in Appendix 1 show a detailed breakdown by grade and sex from 2021 to 2022.

### **Recommendations**

1. Monitor the recommendations in the Ethnicity and Gender Pay Gap Report to determine any further gaps on occupational segregation and create action plans to address gaps where they arise.
2. Implement Reasonable Adjustments Guidance for disabled staff and explore further initiatives to understand the barriers to staff declaring their disability.
3. Continue to celebrate profiles of diverse staff in all areas and at all levels of UWS.
4. Review of UWS hybrid working guidance to ensure that this is suitable for all UWS staff being cognisant of those with intersecting identities.



# Appendix 1: Occupational Segregation Pay Gap Reporting

**Table 7 - Breakdown by job family and sex 2022**

Job Family	Headcount Female	% of Total	Headcount Male	% of Total
Academic & Research	443	51.27%	421	48.73%
Professional Services	542	66.26%	276	33.74%
Senior Management	31	50.00%	31	50.00%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>58.26%</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>41.74%</b>

**Table 8 - Breakdown by job family and sex 2021**

Job Family	Headcount Female	% of Total	Headcount Male	% of Total
Academic & Research	362	49.52%	369	50.48%
Professional Services	577	65.57%	303	34.43%
Senior Management	29	44.62%	36	55.38%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>968</b>	<b>57.76%</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>42.24%</b>

**Table 9 - Breakdown by job family and sex 2020**

Job Family	Headcount Female	% of Total	Headcount Male	% of Total
Academic & Research	349	52.09%	321	47.91%
Professional Services	692	67.51%	333	32.49%
Senior Management	31	50.82%	30	49.18%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1072</b>	<b>61.05%</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>38.95%</b>

**Table 10 - Breakdown by job family and disability 2022**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	69	555	240
Professional Services	57	516	245
Senior Management	<5	49	10

**Table 11 - Breakdown by job family and disability 2021**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	28	363	340
Professional Services	17	412	451
Senior Management	<5	32	33

**Table 12 - Breakdown by job family and disability 2020**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	24	334	312
Professional Services	26	474	525
Senior Management	<5	31	29

**Table 13 - Breakdown by job family and ethnicity 2022**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Ethnic minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	187	631	46
Professional Services	54	728	36
Senior Management	<5	58	<5

**Table 14 - Breakdown by job family and ethnicity 2021**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Not Known</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Academic & Research	118	16.14%	581	79.48%	32	4.38%
Professional Services	43	4.89%	789	89.66%	48	5.45%
Senior Management	<5	-	59	90.77%	<5	-

**Table 15 - Breakdown by job family and ethnicity 2020**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Not Known</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Academic & Research	89	13.28%	548	81.79%	33	4.93%
Professional Services	35	3.41%	910	88.78%	80	7.80%
Senior Management	<5	-	56	91.80%	<5	-

**Table 16 - Breakdown by occupational category and sex 2022**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Headcount Female</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Headcount Male</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Academic & Research	452	51.5%	425	48.5%
Administrative & Clerical	291	74.2%	101	25.8%
Campus Support	101	68.2%	47	31.8%
Professional	124	64.9%	67	35.1%
Senior Management	19	45.2%	23	54.8%
Technical & IT	29	30.9%	65	69.1%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1016</b>	<b>58.3%</b>	<b>728</b>	<b>41.7%</b>

**Table 17 - Breakdown by occupational category and sex 2021**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Headcount Female</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Headcount Male</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Academic & Research	362	49.52%	369	50.48%
Administrative & Clerical	320	73.90%	113	26.10%
Campus Support	101	66.89%	50	33.11%
Professional	121	62.69%	72	37.31%
Senior Management	29	44.62%	36	55.38%
Technical & IT	35	33.98%	68	66.02%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>968</b>	<b>57.76%</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>42.24%</b>

**Table 18 - Breakdown by occupational category and sex 2020**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Headcount Female</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Headcount Male</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Academic & Research	349	52.09%	321	47.91%
Administrative & Clerical	375	74.40%	129	25.60%
Campus Support	136	62.67%	81	37.33%
Professional	146	73.00%	54	27.00%
Senior Management	31	52.54%	28	47.46%
Technical & IT	35	33.02%	71	66.98%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1072</b>	<b>61.05%</b>	<b>684</b>	<b>38.95%</b>

**Table 19 - Breakdown by occupational category and disability 2022**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	70	568	239
Administrative & Clerical	27	245	120
Campus Support	8	82	58
Professional	15	138	38
Senior Management	<5	31	9
Technical & IT	7	56	31

**Table 20 - Breakdown by occupational category and disability 2021**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	28	363	340
Administrative & Clerical	10	214	209
Campus Support	0	58	93
Professional	<5	90	99
Senior Management	0	32	33
Technical & IT	<5	50	50

**Table 21 - Breakdown by occupational category and disability 2020**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	24	334	312
Administrative & Clerical	17	249	238
Campus Support	0	86	131
Professional	5	90	105
Senior Management	<5	30	28
Technical & IT	<5	50	52

**Table 22 - Breakdown by occupational category and ethnicity 2022**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	188	643	46
Administrative & Clerical	20	348	24
Campus Support	6	136	6
Professional	21	166	<5
Senior Management	<5	40	<5
Technical & IT	8	84	<5

**Table 23 - Breakdown by occupational category and ethnicity 2021**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	118	32	581
Administrative & Clerical	15	35	383
Campus Support	<5	6	142
Professional	17	5	171
Senior Management	<5	<5	59
Technical & IT	8	<5	93

**Table 24 - Breakdown by occupational category and ethnicity 2020**

<b>Job Family</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research	89	548	33
Administrative & Clerical	22	444	38
Campus Support	<5	184	31
Professional	6	190	<5
Senior Management	<5	54	<5
Technical & IT	5	94	7



Table 26 highlights those grades where there is male/female gender dominance of over 60% in yellow or a male/female gender dominance of over 70% in red for 2021. Where the number of staff is below 5 a percentage is not provided.

**Table 26 – Breakdown by grade and sex 2021**

Grade	% of Grade Total Female	% of Grade Total Male
Academic & Research Ac 1	55.56%	44.44%
Academic & Research Ac 2	49.78%	50.22%
Academic & Research Ac 3	52.78%	47.22%
Academic & Research Ac 4	43.20%	56.80%
Academic & Research FE64	55.56%	<5
Academic & Research Professor	30.00%	70.00%
Knowledge Transfer Partnerships	40.91%	59.09%
Professional Services Grade 1	80.00%	20.00%
Professional Services Grade 2	55.29%	44.71%
Professional Services Grade 3	68.87%	31.13%
Professional Services Grade 4	69.36%	30.64%
Professional Services Grade 5	63.85%	36.15%
Professional Services Grade 6	66.67%	33.33%
Professional Services Grade 7	55.88%	44.12%
Professional Services Grade 8	37.50%	62.50%
Senior Management Grade 1	51.61%	48.39%
Senior Management Grade 2	<5	<5
Senior Management Grade 3	45.45%	54.55%
Senior Management Grades 4-6	<5	63.64%

**Table 27 – Breakdown by grade and sex 2020**

Grade	% of Grade Total Female	% of Grade Total Male
Academic & Research Ac 1	76.47%	<5
Academic & Research Ac 2	56.80%	43.20%
Academic & Research Ac 3	52.96%	47.04%
Academic & Research Ac 4	45.97%	54.03%
Academic & Research FE64	55.56%	<5
Academic & Research Professor	26.67%	73.33%
Professional Services Grade 1	75.76%	24.24%
Professional Services Grade 2	56.77%	43.23%
Professional Services Grade 3	71.56%	28.44%
Professional Services Grade 4	69.54%	30.46%
Professional Services Grade 5	66.67%	33.33%
Professional Services Grade 6	72.04%	27.96%
Professional Services Grade 7	46.67%	53.33%
Professional Services Grade 8	46.67%	53.33%
Senior Management Grade 1	56.67%	43.33%
Senior Management Grade 2	<5	55.56%
Senior Management Grade 3	55.56%	<5
Senior Management Grades 4 and 5	<5	60.00%

**Table 29 - Breakdown by grade and disability 2021**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research Ac 1	0	9	9
Academic & Research Ac 2	10	129	88
Academic & Research Ac 3	14	163	147
Academic & Research Ac 4	<5	49	73
Academic & Research FE64	0	0	9
Academic & Research Professor	<5	13	16
Knowledge Transfer Partnerships	0	15	7
Professional Services Grade 1	<5	78	63
Professional Services Grade 2	<5	84	83
Professional Services Grade 3	<5	42	62
Professional Services Grade 4	5	82	86
Professional Services Grade 5	<5	56	73
Professional Services Grade 6	<5	35	50
Professional Services Grade 7	0	12	22
Professional Services Grade 8	0	9	7
Senior Management Grade 1	0	15	16
Senior Management Grade 2	0	<5	<5
Senior Management Grade 3	0	7	<5
Senior Management Grades 4 to 6	0	5	6

**Table 30 – Breakdown by grade and disability 2020**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Declared Not Disabled</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research Ac 1	0	10	7
Academic & Research Ac 2	5	105	59
Academic & Research Ac 3	15	159	147
Academic & Research Ac 4	<5	48	73
Academic & Research FE64	0	0	9
Academic & Research Professor	<5	12	17
Professional Services Grade 1	8	116	140
Professional Services Grade 2	<5	116	109
Professional Services Grade 3	<5	43	64
Professional Services Grade 4	6	87	81
Professional Services Grade 5	<5	56	54
Professional Services Grade 6	<5	37	55
Professional Services Grade 7	<5	12	17
Professional Services Grade 8	0	8	7
Senior Management Grade 1	<5	14	15
Senior Management Grade 2	0	5	<5
Senior Management Grade 3	0	7	<5
Senior Management Grades 4 and 5	0	<5	6
Senior Management Grades 4 to 6	0	5	6

**Table 32- Breakdown by grade and ethnicity 2021**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research Ac 1	<5	<5	14
Academic & Research Ac 2	53	23	151
Academic & Research Ac 3	40	6	278
Academic & Research Ac 4	15	<5	108
Academic & Research FE64		0	9
Academic & Research Professor	8	0	22
Knowledge Transfer Partnership	10	0	12
Professional Services Grade 1	6	13	126
Professional Services Grade 2	6	21	143
Professional Services Grade 3	<5	<5	100
Professional Services Grade 4	8	<5	161
Professional Services Grade 5	<5	<5	122
Professional Services Grade 6	6	<5	80
Professional Services Grade 7	0	<5	33
Professional Services Grade 8	0	<5	15
Senior Management Grade 1	<5	<5	28
Senior Management Grade 2	0	0	7
Senior Management Grade 3	<5	<5	9
Senior Management Grades 4, 5 & 6	0	0	11

**Table 33 – Breakdown by grade and ethnicity 2020**

<b>Grade</b>	<b>Black &amp; Ethnic Minority</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Not Known</b>
Academic & Research Ac 1	<5	13	<5
Academic & Research Ac 2	33	116	20
Academic & Research Ac 3	33	280	8
Academic & Research Ac 4	14	107	<5
Academic & Research FE64	0	9	0
Academic & Research Professor	7	23	0
Professional Services Grade 1	9	212	43
Professional Services Grade 2	8	202	19
Professional Services Grade 3	<5	97	8
Professional Services Grade 4	6	163	5
Professional Services Grade 5	<5	110	<5
Professional Services Grade 6	6	86	<5
Professional Services Grade 7	0	29	<5
Professional Services Grade 8	0	14	<5
Senior Management Grade 1	<5	26	<5
Senior Management Grade 2	<5	8	0
Senior Management Grade 3	0	9	0
Senior Management Grades 4, 5 & 6	0	12	0

The background of the entire image is a vibrant, multi-colored spray of fine particles, transitioning from blue on the left to red in the center, and then to yellow, orange, and green on the right. The particles are most dense in the center and become sparser towards the edges. The text is centered horizontally and vertically.

UNIVERSITY OF THE  
WEST *of* SCOTLAND  
**UWS**

**DREAM.BELIEVE.ACHIEVE.**