

University of Reading

Diversity and Inclusion Information Report: Staff 2014-2015

January 2016

Contents

Page 2	Abbreviations
Page 2 to 3	Executive Summary
Page 4 to 9	Summary of Recommendations (progress on previous and new going forward)
Page 10 to 11	Objective 1
Page 12 to 13	Objective 2
Page 14 to 19	Objective 3
Page 20 to 27	Objective 4
Page 27 - 28	Objective 5
Page 28 to 29	Objective 6
Page 30 to 31	Objective 7
Page 31	Objective 8

Abbreviations used in the report

AHSS	Arts, Humanities and Social Science
BAME	Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
DAS	Disability Advisory Service
HARC	Health, Advocacy, Care and Respect advisors
HBS	Henley Business School
LS	Life Science
NSS	National Student Survey
OIA	Office of the Independent Adjudicator
PGR	Postgraduate Research
PGT	Postgraduate Taught
RUSU	Reading University Student Union
SC	Science
UG	Undergraduate
UEB	University Executive Board

Executive Summary

The University is proud to have a strong history of demonstrating tolerance and promoting equality of opportunity. The University has a diverse range of students and staff and seeks to ensure that all students and employees are able to fulfil their potential and talent regardless of their background.

Staff

The University's Equality Policy and Objectives set out priorities for action, against which progress is measured in this document. This year we have substantially raised the profile of and increased resource available for diversity and inclusion, specifically:

We established and appointed to a Dean for Diversity and Inclusion post which is filled on a job share basis (50/50 between a man and a woman). This post has taken the lead on ensuring that diversity and inclusion matters are central to decision making, , and that activities across the university are brought together and aligned to the broader Diversity and Inclusion agenda. In particular, we have for the first time, had University Executive Board agree a set of targets for Diversity and Inclusion, specifically on gender, race, ethnicity and sexual orientation, as well as packages to improve recruitment processes.

We also created and appointed to a Diversity and Inclusion Officer Role for a fixed term period of 2 years.

- The data shown in this report show that this year we have: Reduced the gender pay gap, including to some extent at senior levels
- Continued to close the gender gap in terms of distribution and amount of reward and recognition
- Supported the participation of 76 women from across the University in national career development programmes (12 attending Aurora, and 64 Springboard)
- The continued commitment to the promotion of women in science through the Athena Swan Charter Mark

- Increased declaration rates for sexual orientation, religion and disability via promotional activity
- Launched the online Diversity and Inclusion training module which UEB made compulsory for all staff to complete
- Opened new gender neutral toilets in the Humanities and Social Science building
- Increased support for those seeking promotion through the personal titles process, and provided additional means to declare and consider personal circumstances in applications.
- Held Ask the Board – Diversity & Inclusion Sessions (Q&A with the university executive board for all staff)
- Application to Stonewall
- Delivered teaching and learning diversity training to 47 teaching-focused staff, called, “What does increased student diversity mean for your teaching?”

Key challenges and future focus

Although there are areas of continued progress, there is still much work to do. The challenges and areas of focus remain the same as last year, both in relation to the priority areas for action and the detail of the work that needs to be done within them.

This is largely due to a significant amount of change and upheaval of roles at a senior level during the last 12 months, making progress difficult to achieve. This has now been addressed and a number of key roles are in place to take this forward.

1. **Gender:** to ensure parity in the progression, involvement in decision making and leadership, and pay arrangements for women. Key challenges include lower levels of representation by women in the more senior grades (from Grade 8), small but increasing numbers of women on decision-making bodies, the need to continue to reduce the gender pay gap amongst the senior staff in both academic and professional services roles.
2. **Ethnicity:** to broaden the representation of BAME staff across all job families, improve progression rates, increase involvement in decision making and leadership roles. Key challenges include low levels of representation from BAME staff beyond the lowest grades, differences in the distribution of reward and recognition tools, and variations in success rates on application for roles at the University. The picture is complex and there is a need to understand the variations between different ethnic groups and also in relation to nationality. There is also a need to understand how we can best encourage staff engagement with race and ethnicity issues.
3. **Sexual orientation:** to ensure that all members of staff feel comfortable in being themselves at work and are confident to be open about their sexuality if they wish to do so. Key challenges include seeking a continued increase in the disclosure rates on sexual orientation, and ensuring that the culture at the University supports open dialogue about sexual diversity.

Alison Hackett, Assistant Director of HR (People & Talent)

Table 1 Summary of progress against last year's recommendations:

Number	Objective	Recommendation	Progress	Status
1	1	Review the collection of data and effectiveness of recording cases relating to discriminatory behaviour for both staff and students	The HR team have created a casework tracking tool during 2014/15 so that we can better record and monitor employment relations casework and analyse this to determine whether there are any emerging patterns or concerns with regard to discriminatory behaviour.	Complete
2	1	Review the role of the Harassment and HARC Advisors and the level of contact made with them.	This action is ongoing and we are constantly looking at how best to promote their services	Ongoing
3	1	Review the use and marketing of the Employee Assistance Programme (EAP).	This is run by health Assured. We will be re tendering this year.	On going
4	2	University wide initiative to increase the disclosure rates, utilising the new release of 'Employee Self Service' working with HR Partners to explore the reasons for low disclosure rates on protected characteristics in their areas.	A range of activity took place during 14/15 in relation to disclosure. There was a staff portal article and promotion of Employee Self Service (ESS) when it launched in February 2015.	Complete
5	3	Reforms to the senior pay arrangements for both Professorial and Grade 9 staff to be taken forward.	Professorial - No changes were made during 14/15. Grade 9 was divided into 4 zones with descriptors for each. Each zone has incremental points. This was effective from 1 st April 15	Review of process and criteria completed during 15/16 Grade 9 and the Grade 8 vs grade 9 boundary will be further reviewed during 15/16, possibly by an external organisation to account for job

				size, relativity and market data
6	3	Consideration of the distribution of rewards (contribution points, increments, lump sums) to be taken forward.	This is an ongoing piece of work that is regularly reviewed and reports sent to Staffing Committee and shared with the staff representatives	Ongoing
7	3	Proposals to provide decision making groups for reward with diversity information for their area to provide some context for their consideration.	Reward committees are provided with individual history data and a personal circumstances form, however, no wider information is provided as there is not the resource to support each committee at faculty level. However, data may be available at faculty or school level from Athena Swan applications so this data should be made visible to panels	Ongoing
8	3	Consideration to be given to the lower success rate for older staff in reward committees.	See above	Complete
9	4	Continued use of leadership development programmes to increase the proportion of women in more senior roles.	We are currently supporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2 Springboard cohorts (64 spaces) - 1 Aurora cohort (13 spaces) - 1 StellarHE place - 1 place on the pilot Leadership Foundation – Diversifying leadership in HE We will review the benefits of these programmes over the 15/16 year	Ongoing
10	4	Continued support for the attainment and retention of Athena Swan Awards to increase gender representation in science, and participation in the	This is ongoing. We are resubmitting to retain our Institutional Bronze Award and a number of Schools are submitting for bronze or silver awards.	Ongoing

		Gender Equality Charter Mark.	The approach is building in resilience and an ability to apply for the Gender Equality Charter Mark in future years	
11	4	Continue to deliver unconscious bias training and embed it in core programmes that reach all decision makers.	This training is offered throughout the year and is a key part of our open programme (training available to all staff) and is compulsory for interview chairs	Ongoing
12	4	Consider the actions needed to increase the proportion of BAME staff in higher grades and across job families, particularly Professional and Managerial and Academic and Research, with a particular focus on increasing representation from Black and Black British and Asian and Asian British staff.	Proposals around Diversity and Inclusion were put to UEB in June 2015. One recommendation was <i>'Trial anonymization of applications for Grade 3-5 non-academic posts goes ahead, with a view to extending the approach if it is successful in raising the BAME representation. UEB approved but suggested that this should be Grades 1-5 and that more explanation as to why this isn't being done with academic posts is needed.'</i> The first application to go through this process was in August 2015.	Ongoing – work to embed this will take place in 15-16
13	4	Continue the efforts to support a broader range of applicants to the Personal Titles process for academic promotion.	A review took place over the summer of 14/15 for implementation in 16/17. This review was "Driven by motivation to ensure greater transparency, more overt assurance about consistency at each stage of the process and to reflect good practice elsewhere in the sector".	Progress to implementation in 16/17
14	6	Further exploration to assessing whether senior members of staff who are not office holders can sit on University level Committees	In June 2015 UEB considered proposals around targets in relation to diversity and inclusion. This included diversity of committees. UEB agreed:	Progress made in relation to targets Ongoing in terms of

		to increase the diversity of committee membership.	<p><i>'The Academic Restructuring Implementation group should be tasked such that each of the strategic and decision making Committees/Boards of the university and all those considering cases for promotion and reward should normally:</i></p> <p><i>a. Have a minimum of 30% of either gender by 2020 and 35% by 2026.</i></p> <p><i>b. match academic staff BAME representation by 2020 and keep pace thereafter</i></p> <p><i>Where necessary, the membership of these committees should be considered via skills required rather than role held in order to achieve these targets.'</i></p> <p>The committee structure is being reviewed and work being done to consider top level UEB and Council</p>	meeting the targets
15	6	The University's emerging approach to talent identification and management should be used to ensure that there is a diverse range of talented individuals, from a range of ages, ready to take up leadership positions in the future.	<p>As yet we do not have an official approach to talent management.</p> <p>We are in the process of establishing a leadership development programme for the newly created Leadership Group (UEB and their direct reports).</p> <p>This is in its early days but the aim is to extend this wider and to establish a talent management approach</p>	In progress
16	6	Consideration of the arrangements for appointing to Council and Senate to consider how to increase membership from under-represented groups	<p>There are now targets embedded in our D&I strategy around improved diversity of committee membership</p> <p>See action 16 above</p>	<p>Progress made in relation to targets</p> <p>Ongoing in terms of</p>

				meeting the targets
17	7	Continued embedding of diversity training, and a review of the Diversity in the Workplace tool to ensure that it is fit for purpose and linked to individual training records.	<p>After initial technical issues this tool is now updated and live on the system for all staff to access.</p> <p>UEB stated that completion should be mandatory for all staff and we are working towards this.</p> <p>We are working with departments to ensure the tool is fit for purpose for their needs and where appropriate designing alternative methods of achieving this.</p> <p>The tool will need to be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure it meets needs.</p>	In progress
18	7	Exploring further opportunities to enable staff and students to build up networks and attend learning events which promote equality and diversity.	This is ongoing and will be considered by the Deans for Diversity and Inclusion	Ongoing
19	7	Support RUSU to expand diversity training.	Not progressed	Ongoing

Table 2 New recommendations for 15/16

Number	Objective	Recommendation
1	3	Detailed review of grade 9 zones and grade 8 to grade 9 progression in professional and managerial services in 2016-17; development and implementation of action plan to improve representation of women at senior levels.
2	1 to 7	Apply for and win University Bronze Award for 3 years from 2016. Support all Science Schools to apply for and win at least Bronze, and support AHSSBL Schools to consider preparing applications from 2017 onwards.
3	3 and 4	Review data on promotion for BAME staff and assess whether current support mechanisms are sufficient.

4	3 and 4	Detailed review of promotions procedures at school level by Deans in particular to ensure changes in the University process and criteria are applied at the School level.
5	1 to 7	Review practice elsewhere both within and external to the HE sector in terms of diversifying boards. Develop staged action plans for reaching the targets set out in the new Diversity and Inclusion Strategy in relation to diversity of decision making bodies
6	7	Embed diversity training into all activity; specifically raising the profile in new staff inductions, discussion of the BME attainment gap at School and programme level, liaison with the curriculum framework project. Work with RUSU to develop enhanced diversity and inclusion training and cultural appreciation across student bodies and in particular student societies.
7	7	Develop new website for Diversity and Inclusion to provide links to diversity resources, and to showcase our activities.
8	1?	Large scale review, consolidation and update of University Policies relating to Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. New over-arching policy to be complete and approved by end of 15-16 session. More detailed and specific policies to be examined during 16-17 session. This activity will be shared by the Deans and the Governance team.
9	1,3,4,6,7	Continue with all carried over and ongoing actions from the previous year (2,3,6,7,9,10,11,12,15,16,17,18,19)

**The University of Reading's Equality Objectives
2014-2015**

Objective 1

Oppose any form of discrimination unless it can be objectively justified as genuine, substantial, reasonable and within the law. The University will communicate and raise awareness of the role of staff and students in minimising and challenging inappropriate behaviour and practices and evidence of discriminatory behaviour (including harassment) will be treated as a potential disciplinary matter which may, in turn, result in sanction up to and including staff dismissal or student expulsion in line with our staff grievance and disciplinary procedures and student complaints and disciplinary procedures.

Summary:

- There have been 5 reported cases of staff grievances undertaken during 2014/15 that relate to equality, diversity and harassment. Of the cases, 2 were concluded with 1 not being upheld, and 1 being withdrawn. One case has not been concluded. Two cases resulted in dismissal for issues related to inappropriate behaviour. This is a small increase on last year's figures (4 where 1 was upheld and the employee dismissed).
- The University's 9 volunteer Harassment Advisors, who provide a service available to staff and students, were contacted regarding 11 separate issues during 2014/15. Three of these matters were reported to concern equality and diversity (both from members of staff). One related to pregnancy, one to disability and one to sexual harassment.
- The University's 10 Health, Advocacy, Respect and Care (HARC) Advisors, who provide a service to staff only, were contacted once during 14/15. This was not related to equality and diversity.
- During 14/15, our Employee Assistance Programme (EAP) received:
 - o 42 calls for Counselling (reduced from 70 in 13/14)
 - o 79 face to face counselling sessions (reduced from over 90 in 13/14)
 - o 19 calls for legal information (reduced from 22 in 13/14)
 - o 1 call for health and wellbeing advice

As a result of confidentiality it is not possible to analyse the nature of the calls in detail, however, the telephone counselling was used by more men (67%) than women (33%). This is a change from 13/14 when men and women used the service equally.

The use of the service has reduced from 13/14 by 40% in relation to Counselling. The contract is now approaching the end and the use and requirement for an EAP will be reviewed and re-tendered.

Analysis:

The available data shows limited instances of complaints regarding equality and diversity issues.

The University continues to communicate and raise awareness of the role of all staff in minimising and challenging inappropriate behaviour or practices via a range of channels.

As was the case last year, there was a drop in the number of contacts with HARC (zero this year) and in the use of EmployeeCare but a slight increase in the use of Harassment Advisors (from 2 to 3).

The University is confident that it has put in place a range of mechanisms to support staff and students should they need peer or expert support. This support is also provided by the part-time student officers that continue to operate within the Reading University Students' Union (RUSU) to campaign for, represent, support and celebrate their members. They are:

- Disabled Students' Officer;
- Women's Officer;
- Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Officer;
- Postgraduate Students' Officer;
- International Students' Officer;
- Environment and Ethics Officer;
- LGBT+ Officer; and
- Mature Students Officer
- Student Peer Support Network

Recommendations and conclusions:

The evidence suggests that there is no significant evidence of discriminatory behaviour or practices across the University by members of staff.

The University reviews the contact made with HARC Advisors and Employee Care on an ongoing basis and continually considers how best to promote their services.

The University will continue to monitor the situation carefully and continue to develop its strategy for all staff to ensure that this objective remains central to the University ethos.

Objective 2

Build on existing work to increase the disclosure of equality related information from both staff and students to allow for better planning, delivery, monitoring and assessment of the outcome of programmes designed to address areas of inequality.

Summary

The University collects data on a range of protected characteristics, as required by HESA.

The University's declaration rates are as follows in Table 3:

Table 3 Declaration Rates - Year on year comparison

Protected characteristic	Percentage Declaring (%) 2011-12	Percentage Declaring (%) 2012-13	Percentage Declaring (%) 2013-2014	Percentage Declaring (%) 2014 – 2015	Direction of Travel
Gender	99.95%	100.00%	100%	100%	Maintaining at 100%
Ethnicity	93.3%	94.67%	92.59%	92.38%	Negative – decreasing by a small amount
Disability	88.8%	90.00%	89.65%	90.79%	Fluctuating over the years but an increase this year
Sexual orientation	9.1%	27.45%	32.57%	40.70%	Positive - increasing
Age	100%	100.00%	100%	100%	Maintaining at 100%
Religion or belief	Not reported	29.88%	33.5%	39.84%	Positive - increasing

Analysis:

Data for staff on protected characteristics are collected on appointment or subsequently through the University's Employee Self Service system.

The data shows an overall positive direction of travel with improvement in the collection of data across all but one protected characteristic (ethnicity), with 2 remaining the same at 100%.

This follows requests to staff to update their protected characteristics when updating their information for HESA returns in the autumn of 2014. It also follows active discussion of the need for individuals to ensure that their personal circumstances information is up to date as part of the New Staff Induction programme.

The University is mindful that data on disability is not static, and that to a large extent it relies on students and employees correctly identifying that they have a disability in accordance with the definition set out in the Equality Act 2010. To this end there is likely to be both over and under-reporting of disabilities that fall within the statutory definition. As such, it will never be possible to have a totally accurate picture in relation to this characteristic, but information should be such as to enable the identification of trends.

The focus is therefore on ensuring where a declaration is made, we work closely with the individual to ensure they are supported through appropriate measures and reasonable adjustments.

Recommendations and conclusions:

Whilst there are improvements to the declaration rates on sexual orientation and religion and belief for staff, the University will continue to take steps to increase the level of declarations. HR Partners will work with their Deans and Heads of Schools to explore the reasons for lower rates of disclosure where they exist. The Deans for Diversity and Inclusion will consider campaigns to encourage disclosure. Increasing the disclosure rate for sexual orientation is a key target for the University.

Objective 3

Work continuously towards identifying and addressing any unjustifiable inequality in pay and/or reward amongst different groups of staff.

Summary:

Gender Pay Gap

Table 4 below gives a year on year comparison:

Table 4 Gender Pay Gap – Overall

2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Direction of Travel
20.86%	20.92%	19.98%	Positive – decreasing gap

The overall gender pay gap for the University is 19.98%. As this figure is for the whole institution, it includes salary data for cleaners and catering assistants through to senior management and professorial staff. It does not therefore necessarily reflect unequal pay for work of equal value. It is more a reflection of occupational segregation, as there are more male staff in senior positions. For some job families, there is an incremental pay scale based on length of service, which also makes metrics of equal pay complex.

Staff at the University can be grouped by grade, and by job family. Grades go from 1-8 in most job families. The most senior grade in the academic and research job family is Professor, and this is further divided into 4 zones; (1) emergent, (2) established, (3) outstanding and (4) exceptional. All professorial staff are placed in one of these zones regardless of whether they are teaching intensive, research intensive or teaching & research and therefore it can be somewhat difficult to define equal work. The most senior grade in the Professional and Managerial job family is known as grade 9, and this was further divided into 4 zones in April 2015. With the top grade 9 being split into 4 zone in both the Professional and Managerial and academic and research job families

Pay Gap by Job Family

The overall pay gap for the Academic & Research Job Family is 12.78%. This covers teaching staff from Lecturers and Associate Professors, through to senior professorial staff in Zone 4. This analysis highlights that there are significant pay gaps in Zone 2 (11.05%) and Zone 4 (14.44%). A closely related job family is the Research Job Family which includes early career researchers (usually grade 6) and other research intensive staff including Professors. There is a pay gap (5.81%) amongst Grade 7 Research Staff, although this is smaller than the other gaps found.

In the Administrative Support family –there is a pay gap of -5.24 in Grade 3, indicating that the women are paid more than the men. However, there are 83 women and only 16 men in this job family and grade, so we would need to look into other factors such as length of service, before drawing any conclusions.

In the Ancillary & Manual Support Job Family there are significant pay gaps in Grades 4 and 5. This is due in part to the small number of women in these grades. The majority of staff in Grades 4 and 5 of this Job Family are Security Controllers, Maintenance staff (plumbers, electricians) and Team Leaders (Grounds, Maintenance, Cleaning). It is important to note that before the implementation of the Framework Agreement in 2006, Ancillary & Manual Support staff were on spot rates and Maintenance staff were covered by a separate union agreement that linked their salary increases to local government pay bargaining. When these staff were assimilated to the new single pay and grading structure, their jobs were evaluated and their salaries mapped to the contribution point

ranges of the evaluated grades. As they are on contribution points they have not received any further salary progression.

There is a significant pay gap in Grade 9 of the Professional & Managerial Job Family (20.46%). A new zonal structure was introduced in April 2015 which has helped to reduce the gap to 15.37%, but there is still a lot of work to do.

Pay Gap by grade

When analysed by Grade there are no significant pay gaps in Grades 1-8. Jobs in these grades have a clear pay and grading structure, with incremental progression and jobs are subject to job evaluation.

Professorial pay gap: Professor Zones 2 (10.74%) and 4 (13.60%) The pay gap in Zone 2 is particularly important since this is the career expectation and where most of the Professorial staff are situated- however a wide range of “work” is done by these individuals. We note that the overall gender pay gap for professors is 9.37% as at 1st January 2015, or 9.14% as at 1st December 2015. This difference may be due to the Professorial Pay Review process last year reducing the gap as the increases are effective 1st August.

There are 13 female professors and 70 male professors paid spot salaries above the usual maximum for their zone. Henley Business School has the highest number of professors who are paid spot salaries (28), followed by the Faculty of Science (23). Often this is said to be a reflection of “market value”. However there are more men than women in this category and the processes leading to these awards needs considering. Zone 4 is affected by 3 Professors (2 male, 1 female) in Zone 4 who hold senior managerial posts.

Senior staff pay gap: A zonal structure was introduced in April 2015 for Grade 9 Professional & Managerial staff. This has had the effect of reducing the pay gap from 20.46% to 15.37%. There is still a lot of work to be done to reduce the gap to 5% or below.

Gender Pay Gap Summary

The gap is continuing to decrease, all be it at a slow rate and with significant gaps remaining at senior levels. Work on professorial pay, and grade 9 has resulted in some small decreases in the pay gap during 2015, however there is still more to do. Whilst women represent 56.31 % of the total population, women account for a greater proportion staff working in academic and administrative, casual, sessional, and professional and managerial roles. Indeed women are in the majority at every grade (with the exception of Grade 2) until the more senior grades of Grade 8 and above. However, at Grade 9 Professional and Managerial zones 1 and 3 women are now forming the majority.

We plan to review the zones and descriptors for grade 9 for professional staff and also the shift from grade 8 to grade 9. There has been a decrease this year in the size of the overall gender pay gap at the University, which may be due to adding zones into grade 9.

For both men and women professors, the average professorial salary is below the midpoint of each salary zone, with the exception of zone 4 where it is higher than the midpoint. This means that overall the majority of both men and women are being paid towards the lower end of the zone. However, no professorial zone favours women in terms of the gender pay gap.

Two key drivers that continue to influence professorial staff pay are faculty and spot salary (salary above the range for the assigned zone), with the Henley Business School having the greatest impact from a faculty perspective as a result of the high proportion of senior men in the faculty and market forces. More men than women were on spot salaries. Whilst progress has been made again this year increasing the number of female professors in Zone 2, the large number of male professors on spot salaries above the maximum for zone 2 proves a challenge for the pay gap in this grade. .

Table 5 Ethnicity Pay Gap - Overall

2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015	Direction of Travel
23.92%	22.18%	22.20%	Fluctuating – initial closing of the gap but this year a small increase

It is difficult to determine if the small increase in the ethnicity pay gap is significant or part of trend until we have data from future years.

There was a small decrease in 14/15 in the number of BAME staff applying via the personal titles process which may have had an impact on the pay gap figures. There has been a slight increase in the ethnicity pay gap from 22.18% to 22.20%.

There are no Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Grade 9 staff and as a result, the gap relates solely to the Professoriate. The gap is driven by the distribution of BAME professors in the professorial pay zones as the 15 (compared to 205 white professors) are predominantly in the lower professorial zones.

Reward – Additional Increment, Contribution Points, Merit Based Progression

The University encourages, recognises and rewards excellence in its staff and for their contributions to the University with arrangements including Celebrating Success Vouchers, Lump Sum Awards, accelerated incremental progression, contribution points, and merit based promotion (see information under Objective 4).

Table 6 below gives a year on year comparison for incremental progression, contribution points and merit based progression by gender

Table 6 Successful Reward Applications by Gender

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Additional Increment	18 (Male) (44%) 23 (Female) (56%)	18 (Male) (44%) 23 (Female) (56%)	11 (Male) (24%) 35 (Female) (76%)
Contribution Points	14 (Male) (29%) 34 (Female) (71%)	19 (Male) (34%) 37 (Female) (66%)	14 (Male) (29%) 35 (Female) (71%)
Merit Based Promotion	1 (Male) (20%) 4 (Female) (80%)	6 (Male) (46%) 7 (Female) (54%)	2 (Male) (33.3%) 4 (Female) (66.6%)

Females make up 56% of the staff population so the figures above show that females receive a proportionally higher % of rewards than males.

14/15 saw a large increase in successful applications for females for additional increments and a smaller but marked increase in successful applications for contribution points and merit based promotion.

93 cases were from those who had declared themselves as white, compared to 8 from BAME backgrounds. However, there were very few cases from BAME staff reflecting the low number of individuals from BAME backgrounds in those job families. The applications also tended to be strongly influenced by School or Function suggesting inconsistency in the way staff are being put forward for these rewards.

Reward – Lump Sum

Table 7 below gives a year on year comparison for lump sum award by gender.

Table 7 Successful Lump Sum Applications by gender

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Number Awarded	167 (Male) (35%) 315 (Female) (65%)	155 (Male) (34%) 302 (Female) (66%)	130 (Male) (30%) 310 (Female) (70%)
Average Value	£552.40 (Male) £463.54 (Female) Difference = £88.86	£571.45 (Male) £483.20 (Female) Difference = £88.25	£545.85 (Male) £504.95 (Female) Difference = £40.90

While females still account for the majority of lump sum awards, they still receive lower average amounts than men, although this gap is closing and in 14/15 reduced by more than 50% which is a positive direction of travel.

The minimum award for men and women was £150, this is an improvement on 13/14 when the minimum for men was three times higher than the minimum award for women. The maximum award for men was £2,000, whereas the maximum given to women was £1,500, this is the same as 13/14.

The table below gives a year on year comparisons for lump sum award by ethnicity.

Successful Lump Sum Applications - Ethnicity

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Number Awarded	427 (White) (86%) 29 (BAME) (6%) 26 (Not Known) (8%)	412 (White) (90%) 30 (BAME) (7%) 15 (not known) (3%)	398 (white) (91%) 26 (BAME) (6%) 15 (not known) (3%)
Average Value	£502.61 (White) £437.93 (BAME) Difference = £64.68	£513.83 (White) £482.67 (BAME) Difference = £32.16	£515.17 (white) £506.92 (BAME) Difference = £8.25

There are many more successful applications from or for white staff than BAME staff, and the proportion of BAME staff rewarded is lower than the % of BAME staff overall BAME staff are 12.99% of all staff and the figures above are not representative of this.

The average value received by white and BAME staff still differs but this has decreased steadily and dramatically over the past 3 years.

When analysed by job family, 144 awards were made to Professional & Managerial Staff (down from 166 in 13/14), 112 awards were made to Academic & Research Staff, 139 awards were made to Academic & Administrative Support Staff and only 19 awards were made to Ancillary & Operational Support Staff.

Understanding the distribution of lump sum awards amongst the job families helps to explain the distribution of awards, as the largest proportions went to staff in academic and administrative support, and professional and managerial job families, both areas dominated by female members of staff, with low levels of representation from BAME staff.

Reward – Celebrating Success

During 2014/15 639 awards were made.

The scheme continues to reinforce the understanding of the Professional Behaviours, which were introduced in 2012.

- The largest proportion (39.5%) went to those staff in the Chief Officers Operating Group (COOG)
 - 80 to Ancillary and Operational Support Staff
 - 29 to professional and managerial Support staff
 - 21 to Academic and Administrative Support staff
 - 6 to casual bar staff

Table 8 below gives a year on year comparison for celebrating success by gender.

Table 8 Successful Applications for celebrating success by gender

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Male	165 (33%)	197 (35%)	221 (34.5%)
Female	342 (66%)	374 (65%)	418 (65.5%)

The percentage of successful applications by females is considerably higher than that for males, and higher than the representation of females in all staff (56%)

Table 9 gives a year on year comparison for celebrating success by ethnicity.

Table 9 Successful applications for celebrating success by ethnicity

	2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
BAME	37 (8%)	59 (11%)	60 (10%)
White	454 (92%)	493 (89%)	556 (90%)

Overall, BAME staff make up 12.99% of all staff, this means that the figures above are slightly below where they need to be in order to be representative.

Recommendations and conclusions:

Whilst there has been a small reduction in the gender pay gap, it remains an issue in the senior grades across both academic and professional and managerial job families. The professorial review process and criteria are undergoing review in the session 15-16, and we plan a review for grade 9 and progression from grade 8 to 9 in professional and managerial in 16-17. The more prescriptive criteria introduced part way through 14-15 has reduced the grade 9 pay gap, and we need to learn from this. The ethnicity pay gap also comes mainly from the senior grades, but in this case only from the professorial zones as there are no non-white grade 9 staff. This is to be addressed in the wider University Diversity and Inclusion strategy led by the Deans.

Considering all reward more broadly, women are in fact gaining an ever higher percentage of successful awards compared to men, although men receive on average higher valued awards than women – this gap having been reduced somewhat in the past year. We need to address whether men are being nominated for awards appropriately, or to analyse by job family and grade to explore where the gender imbalance is originating.

Objective 4

Take action to ensure that individuals were selected, developed, appraised, rewarded, promoted and otherwise treated on the basis of their relevant merits and abilities and were provided with equality of opportunity within the University.

This objective relates to:

- i. **Staff** in terms of appointment and promotion (reward data for staff is set out and analysed under Objective 3)

Summary:

Demographic Data

Data shows little change from 2012/13 in relation to gender, ethnicity or disability. The main difference is that increasing data is now available on religion and belief and sexual orientation following another significant increase in disclosure rates. Key findings are::

Gender

- Whilst women represent 56.31 % of the total population, women account for a greater proportion staff working in academic and administrative, casual, sessional, and professional and managerial roles. Indeed women are in the majority at every grade (with the exception of Grade 2) until the more senior grades of Grade 8 and above.
- Additionally, at Grade 9 zones 1 and 3 women are now forming the majority. This is the first time we have been able to report on this due to the recent introduction of zoning in grade 9.
- As was the case last year, the only area of the University where women are in the minority is the Faculty of Science. The University anticipates that the ongoing commitment to the Athena Swan Awards (with 5 schools now holding an award) will help to address this challenge.
- Whilst some progress has been made, women continue to be underrepresented at senior levels of the University; however we are progressing with a number of initiatives to try and address this, including the continuation of the Aurora and Springboard Programmes, and the relaunch of the Women@Reading network. We now have targets around increasing women in senior roles embedded into our D&I strategy and approved by UEB in autumn 2015. These are:
 - 45% of either gender by 2026 in professorial roles. Intermediate goal of 40% of either gender by 2020
 - Grade 9 non-academic staff to be at least 45% of either gender by 2026

Ethnicity

- Whilst 12.99% (an increase from 11.54% from 13/14) of the total University population is Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic there are significant variations across the University with the greatest proportion of BAME staff working in the lower grades and in Ancillary and Operational (where they are 30.05% of the staff) or Casual roles (20.77%);

- The greatest proportions of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Staff are found in the Chief Operating Officers Group, The School of Life Sciences and the Henley Business School. This represents a change from last year's data where the greatest proportions were found in the Chief Officers Operating Group and Henley Business School. Academic and Governance Services has the lowest proportion of BAME staff, significantly lower than the 12.99% for the whole University at just 7.88%. In terms of Grade this explains the peak representation of BAME staff in Grade 1 (46.67%) which steadily declines until a further peak in Grade 6 (11.83%) – probably due to international research staff, to a cliff edge at Grade 9 where there are no BAME staff and only 3% of Professors. Within the job families the variation of ethnicity suggests that Black and Black British and Asian and Asian British staff are represented less amongst the Academic and Research, Professional and Managerial staff and in the higher grades at the University, with just 15 Black or Black British members of academic and research staff.

We have already introduced targets with relation to ethnicity in the new Diversity and Inclusion Strategy. These targets are:

- Minimum of 15% in each of grades 1-5 non-academic staff and 12% in grades 6-9 non-academic staff to be BAME by 2020 (16% by 2026) 7. Current baseline across all non-academic staff is 8%.
- Minimum of 14% of academic staff in grades 7 and above to be BAME by 2020 (18% by 2026) Current baseline is 11%
- Key University Committees/Boards to match academic staff BAME representation by 2020, and to keep pace thereafter.
- Council and Committees of Council to set targets for BAME representation on their committees consistent with national census baseline for BAME
- University leadership roles to be minimum of 18% BAME staff by 2026
- University to attain Bronze Race Equality Charter Mark before 2018 and be working towards silver by 2021

Age

The Chief Operating Officer's Group has the youngest age profile with 22.5% of its staff under the age of 24, and 41% of the staff under the age of 34. This group is closely followed by Henley Business School with 10.28% of staff under the age of 24 and 32.16% of staff under the age of 34.

Academic and Governance Services has the next youngest age profile with 9.36% of staff under the age of 24 and 33.39% of staff under the age of 34. The Faculty of Arts Humanities and Social Sciences has the oldest age profile with 55.46% of the staff over the age of 45.

Disability, sexual orientation, religion and belief

On the remaining protected characteristics the numbers are currently too low to draw meaningful conclusions by job family or grade.

Staff Appointments

Recruitment Data – Internal and External Applicants

Table 10 Recruitment success by Gender

	12/13	13/14	14/15
	Success Rate	Success Rate	Success Rate
Female	15%	8.5%	4.8%
Male	11%	6.98%	3.7%
Success Rates Ratio (F/M)	1.4	1.2	1.3

Table 11 Recruitment success by Ethnicity

	12/13	13/14	14/15
	Success Rate	Success Rate	Success Rate
BAME	15%	4%	2.5%
White	7%	9%	5%
Success Rates Ratio (BAME/W)	2.1	0.44	0.50

Table 12 Recruitment success rates by Disability

	12/13	13/14	14/15
	Success Rate	Success Rate	Success Rate
Disabled	9%	7.47%	2%
Non-Disabled	12%	7.58%	4.4%
Success rates ratio (Disabled/non-disabled)	0.75	0.98	0.45

Analysis

The lower success rate across all characteristics is due to a reduction in new staff appointments by 45% from 13/14. Whilst the success rate ratio for women compared to men has been stable over the past 3 years with women being slightly more successful than men, the success rate ratio for other characteristics is further from 1 and has varied substantially from year to year. We will be trialling anonymous applications in grades 1-5 to explore whether this raises the success rate for BAME staff.

Unconscious bias training is now embedded into the Recruitment and Selection training, which is a mandatory course for those involved in this activity. We are continuing to deliver this training for which there is high demand and positive feedback from participants.

Promotion - Summary

Personal Titles

Over the last 3 sessions, changes have been made to the Personal Titles process to ensure that diversity of contribution is better reflected and to ensure that diversity and inclusion considerations are built into the process.

A number of changes are being made for the next session (15/16) and beyond in line with academic restructuring. This will be detailed in next year's report.

Table 13 Changes made to personal titles in the past 3 years.

2012/2013	2013/2014	2014/2015
Changes to enable those with less traditional academic portfolios were recognised for the quality of their contribution	Expansion of the personal circumstance section	Introduction of more formalised feedback at faculty and university level Additional guidance on how to complete personal circumstance section

1. Gender Analysis

The following tables show gender success rates at all levels of the 'Personal Titles' process. The first table is a summary of all levels.

Table 14 Applications – Total (Associate Professor and Professor by Gender)

	Successful applicants as a % of the number of applicants in that gender			% successful of total applicants (male and female)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
Male	72%	77%	68%	46%	80%	54%
Female	79%	64%	88%	54%	20%	46%

Table 15 Total Applications Associate Professor (successful and Unsuccessful) - Gender

	Percentage of applicants against gender baseline (total numbers of staff, split by gender who could have applied via the personal titles process for Associate Professor)			Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff, adding males and females together who could have applied for promotion via the personal titles process for Associate Professor)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
Male	15%	16%	15%	7%	5%	7%
Female	12%	12%	9.6%	6%	4%	5%

Table 16 Total Applications Professor (Successful and Unsuccessful) - Gender

	Percentage of applicants against gender baseline (total numbers of staff, split by gender who could have applied via the personal titles process for Professor))			Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff, adding males and females together who could have applied for promotion via the personal titles process for Professor)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
Male	7.7%	17%	7%	4%	10%	5%
Female	11%	8%	4%	5%	3%	2%

The difference in successful application rates for males and females has widened over the 14/15 academic year by 20% (in 13/14 it was a gap of 13%) with women being more successful than men overall. However the percentage of women who applied compared to the pool is still lower than that for men but varies from year to year.

When considered as % successful in relation to the total number of applications there has been an interesting reversal from 12/13 and a major shift from 13/14.

When broken down, at associate professor level success rates are marginally higher for both males and females from 13/14. At professor level, success rates for males are halved from 13/14 and marginally reduced for females, suggesting perhaps that the applications from women are better prepared.

2. During 14/15 we ran workshops on ‘preparing for promotion.’ In total 56 academics attended, 32 of which were women and 24 men. In future years we might analyse the effectiveness of this application, but bearing in mind that there might be a time lag. **Ethnicity Analysis**

Table 17 Applications – Total (Associate Professor and Professor - Ethnicity)

	Successful applicants as a % of the number of applicants in that category			% successful of total applicants (BAME and white)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
White	77%	75%	78%	65%	74%	68%
BAME	50%	70%	67%	11%	7%	6%

Table 18 Total Applications Associate Professor (successful and Unsuccessful) - Ethnicity

	Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff of each ethnicity)			Percentage of applicants against baseline (all ethnicities)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
White	15%	15%	14%	13%	11%	11%
BAME	8%	9.5%	10%	0.9%	1%	1%

Table 19 Total Applications Professor (Successful and Unsuccessful) - Ethnicity

	Percentage of applicants against baseline (total numbers of staff of each ethnicity)			Percentage of applicants against baseline (all ethnicities)		
	12/13	13/14	14/15	12/13	13/14	14/15
White	8%	13.5%	7%	7%	12%	6%
BAME	10%	8%	8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%

Applications for promotion for the Personal Titles process were predominantly from white staff, largely as a result of the small numbers of BAME staff working as academic and research staff.

In 2014-15 we received applications from 6 BAME staff, which is the same last year and an increase from 0 from the previous year. This accounts for 9.5% of all applications and 9% of all BAME staff in the population eligible to apply. The proportion of applicants from the total pool applying for promotion is similar in BAME staff and white staff, which is encouraging. However,

78% of white applications were successful compared with the 67% of those from ‘other ethnic groups’. This gap has increased since 13/14 but the low numbers of applications from the ethnic group make these figures subject to high variability.

Age

The majority of applications for professor were from those aged 40 to 49 and for associate professor from those aged 30 to 49, which is unsurprising given the need to demonstrate academic distinction over a period of time and the greater density of individuals being from that age group.

Information is not available on the other protected characteristics as the levels of declaration are too low.

Merit based promotions

This was the second year that merit based promotion was open to all staff at the University. Previously it had been restricted to staff in Grades 6-8. However, due to large scale restructuring, promotions were not encouraged in professional and administrative support roles.

Table 20 Applications by Gender and Ethnicity

	Successful Total	Unsuccessful Total	Gender	Ethnicity
12/13	5	1	4 female (66%) 2 male (44%)	White 6 (100%) BAME 0 (0%)
13/14	13	0	7 female (54%) 6 male (46%)	White 12 (92%) Unknown 1 (8%)
14/15	7	3	4 Female (66%) 2 Male (44%)	White 6 (100%) BAME 0 (0%)

Applications by Age

Year	Age Band									
	25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65+	
	Successful	Unsuccessful								
2012 /13	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2013 /14	5	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	0
2014 /15	1	1	4	0	1	1	1	1	0	0

Recommendations

Continued support of the Athena Swan Awards to increase representation of women in STEM, plus move towards the new gender charter mark to ensure an appropriate gender balance in all Schools and functions.

We need to consider how to encourage more staff from a BAME background to apply for promotion and to review how best to support and develop BAME staff ready for promotion. Consideration also needs to be given to if changes are needed to promotions procedures at school level.

Continue the roll-out a programme of unconscious bias training to all decision makers;

Objective 5

Ensure that the University environment is welcoming and accessible to all, in particular:

- i. Ensuring all stakeholder groups were aware of, and practice, our commitment on mutual respect for everyone;**
- ii. Maintaining an environment that is free from offensive material and suggestion;**
- iii. Make reasonable adjustments and modifications for people with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (where reasonably practicable); and iv. Providing alternative catering options for those with specific requirements.**

Summary and analysis:

The University takes full and appropriate steps to ensure that the University environment is welcoming and accessible to all. Under Objective 1, we have set out data relating to staff complaints which are low in number, and suggest that stakeholder groups are aware of and to a large extent comply with our published commitment of mutual respect.

The University has a raft of policies and procedures, including HR policies, Codes of Conduct, Values for Working Together and Professional Behaviours, the Student Charter and the Regulations for Conduct, which embed the University's approach to equality and make clear our commitment to mutual respect and ensuring an environment free from offensive material and suggestion. This is communicated to staff and students as they join the University and throughout their time with us.

The University regularly works with staff to ensure that members of staff with learning difficulties and/or disabilities are supported and that adjustments are made where appropriate. This includes working with our Occupational Health providers and medical practitioners and through EmployeeCare, our Employee Assistance Programme, and Counselling Services, as well as with other stakeholders.

The University's Estates and Facilities Department provides catering, conference, recreational, facilities, space, project, grounds, building and estate management services to the University. They are responsible for the physical environment of the University and the fabric of its buildings. Examples of recent projects include modifications to create new disabled toilets, alterations to create additional gender neutral toilets and lowering lab benches in the Knight Building Laboratory to create a disabled workspace.

Recommendations and conclusions:

From the information above it can be seen that the University has worked hard to ensure that the University environment is welcoming and accessible. The measures set out above and elsewhere in this report are some examples of how this is being achieved, and the University continues to put in place practices and initiatives that enhance the experience of staff, students and visitors.

Objective 6

Identify and put in place programmes to enhance diversity of representation on decision making bodies at the University.

Summary:

For the third year full analysis has been undertaken on the diversity of University decision making bodies on the basis of gender and race. There is still insufficient data available to undertake an analysis on sexual orientation or religion and belief.

The following tables show the diversity of the decision making bodies by gender and by race.

Gender

	2012/13		2013/14		2014/15	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Council	9 (30%)	21 (70%)	7 (24%)	22 (76%)	7 (24%)	22 (76%)
Senate	31 (35%)	57 (65%)	32 (37%)	55 (43%)	37 (42%)	51 (58%)
University Executive Board	1 (8%)	11 (92%)	1 (12%)	7 (88%)	0 (0%)	7 (100%)
Strategy and Finance Committee	2 (17%)	10 (83%)	2 (17%)	10 (83%)	1 (8%)	11 (92%)
University Board of Teaching and Learning	7 (35%)	13 (65%)	7 (35%)	13 (65%)	9 (43%)	12 (57%)
University Board of Research	4 (29%)	10 (71%)	4 (31%)	9 (69%)	3 (25%)	9 (75%)
University of Reading Malaysia	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2 (40%)	3 (60%)

Ethnicity

	Baseline	White British and Irish	Other white background	Asian or Asian British	Chinese	Other Ethnic Background	Not Known
Senate	86**	67 (78%)	13 (15%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2.5%)	2 (2.5%)
Council	12 *	9 (75%)	3 (25%)	0	0	0	0
University Executive Board	7	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	0	0	0	0
Strategy & Finance Committee	7	5 (71%)	2 (29%)	0	0	0	0
Totals	112	86 (75%)	20 (18%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)

Analysis:

There has been little change in the data for gender from 2013/14, largely because the majority of individuals involved in decision-making bodies are there because of their leadership positions at the University (Pro Vice-Chancellors, Heads of Services, Deans, Heads of School, Directors of Research, and Directors of Teaching and Learning) and have remained in office during this time. Compounding this, is the constituency from which the most senior decision makers are drawn. Whilst women constitute 41.7% of the academic staff population, they account for only 30.7% of the professoriate. The committee structure and membership is being reviewed and revised during 15-16 including potentially opening up committees to a wider group of contributors.

At the Governance level, during 14/15 3 women were appointed to replace men on the University Council and they will take up their posts during the 15/16 academic year.

This ethnic profile of decision making bodies reflects the fact that the majority of staff at the University in academic and professional and managerial roles are white (81.63% and 87.86% respectively).

Recommendations and conclusions

15/16 and beyond should start to see an increasing diversity on decision making bodies as we begin working towards achieving the targets set over the summer of 2015 in relation to this.

- Develop action plans for reaching the targets set out in the new Diversity and Inclusion Strategy in relation to diversity of decision making bodies

Objective 7

Build upon existing work to embed the understanding and promotion of equality and diversity across the University through an ongoing review of learning events and arrangements for both staff and students.

Summary and analysis of data:

During the 2014-15 academic session the University has continued to build on its diversity activities in learning and development:

- The women's development programme, Springboard, continued to run, with a commitment to two cohorts, seeing 64 women completing the programme. The feedback on the programme continued to be excellent and networks along with communities of practice continue to grow.
- In 2014-15 the University decided to support 13 women to attend the Aurora programme with full mentoring and role model support.
- We have also continued to develop the Unconscious Bias Training in 2014-15, offering sessions on the open programme
- Online Diversity and Inclusion training was developed and launched, however, technical difficulties meant that we had to remove the module from the system. This will now be rolled out in 15/16 with UEB making it a mandatory course for all staff
- New staff induction, which has discussions around the University's Values and Behaviours, a specific session on equality and diversity including a discussion on unconscious bias and being responsible for our behaviour towards others
- Recruitment and Selection Training has significant diversity and inclusion elements as does personal effectiveness and people management skills
- Delivery of diversity training for teaching staff in November 14, January 15 and June 15 – "What does increased diversity of students mean for your teaching?" This was attended by 47 staff

Recommendations and conclusions:

As with previous years, the University has continued to support a range of diversity training and awareness events, drawing on academic expertise, and achieving considerable impact through the delivery of the Springboard and Aurora programmes which has helped to raise the profile of women's career development needs.

During 2015/16 the University will continue to ensure that diversity training is embedded into all development activity, in line with our newly agreed Diversity and Inclusion Strategy and targets within this, and aligned to our work across a range of charter marks we will review our offer for appropriateness and impact.

We will also update our webpages where possible to provide useful information and links to TED talks, articles and recent research.

The University will also continue to seek further opportunities to enable staff and students to build up networks and attend learning events which promote equality and diversity.

Objective 8

Take steps to attract and retain quality students and staff from all backgrounds.

Staff data is largely considered elsewhere in the report. There are a number of other policies that the University has in place for encouraging staff retention beyond what has been considered elsewhere. This includes:

- A flexible approach to working, in accordance with its Health and Wellbeing policy. This means that applications for flexible working are considered locally by managers, and currently no central record is kept which could be analysed by protected characteristic;
- Broad range of parental leave options, which continue to be used by staff appropriately and according with personal circumstances.

Please refer to the student report for student data and information relating to this objective.