

# Equality Impact Assessment

## Professorial banding scheme at RHUL

March 2013



## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background to this EqIA .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The professorial banding scheme .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Equality issues.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary of possible impacts, both positive and negative .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Recommendations .....</b>	<b>19</b>
	<b>Appendix 1 .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>The professoriate at RHUL .....</b>	<b>21</b>
	<b>Appendix 2 .....</b>	<b>24</b>
	<b>Information about EW Group .....</b>	<b>24</b>



## 1 Introduction

The purpose of this Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) is to gauge how well the professorial banding scheme works in relation to issues of gender equality. There are not enough people, and not enough data, to take ethnicity and disability equality into account, except in the most general terms. We have added comments where they might be useful in future.

There seems to be a consensus in the research that we have consulted<sup>1</sup> that under-representation and slow career progression of women and minority groups in the HE sector in general is about an accumulation of slight disadvantage at every step (rather than one obvious issue). Caring responsibilities certainly slow the career progression of some women but they do not, in themselves, fully explain the patterns of disadvantage.

We have therefore looked carefully at many aspects of the professorial banding scheme in Royal Holloway (RHUL), to see if there is evidence of seemingly small effects which could add up to disadvantage.

## 2 Background to this EqIA

The Higher Education sector in general has in the past been a climate more favourable to men than to women, in a variety of ways and for many reasons (as can be seen from annual reports by the Equality Challenge Unit). This legacy still has some impact on modern appointments, and the pool of people likely to be available to fill senior positions, more in some disciplines than in others.

Again throughout the sector there remains a gap in the pay received by women and men doing comparable work, and this has also been true at RHUL, where several Employment Tribunal cases have been brought by women in recent years. The professorial banding scheme was designed in part to address the issues highlighted by these equal pay cases. RHUL is one of only 38 HE institutions to have implemented a pay grading scheme for its professoriate.

This EqIA looks at the professorial banding scheme, as it was at the beginning of February 2013, incorporating the revisions which have been suggested to it in late 2012. It does not include any amendments made since early February.

---

<sup>1</sup> AAAS/L'Oreal (2010) Barriers for women scientists (<http://scim.ag/hPA8n>)

UCU (2012) *The position of women and BME staff in professorial roles in UK HEIs* (<http://www.ucu.org.uk/bmewomenreport>)

Doherty, E and Cooke, A (2011) *The report of the working group on academic advancement in NUI Galway*

Marschke, R, S et al. (2007) Demographic inertia revisited: An immodest proposal to achieve equitable gender representation among faculty in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education* 78(1): 1-26.

Toutkoushian, R K, and V. Martin Conley (2005) Progress for women in academe, yet inequities persist: Evidence from NSOPF:99. *Research in Higher Education* 46(1): 1-28.

---

## 3 The professorial banding scheme

The scheme consists of:

- 1 A description of the scheme, Professorial banding, dated November 2012, which also provides supporting documentation, such as CV templates and application forms (Forms 1 and 2), and a covering letter to the professoriate (Document 1);
- 2 Criteria under 4 headings (teaching, research, leadership and enhancement, external engagement) for allocating individuals to one of 5 bands; (Document 2);
- 3 Detailed criteria under 4 headings for the proposed 5 bands (a matrix document, Document 3);
- 4 A set of norms for each of the disciplines at RHUL.

## 4 Equality issues

From our reading of these documents, and our knowledge and experience of the sector, we produced a list of possible equality issues that could arise in the design and implementation of a professorial banding scheme, which was later refined by taking into account the specific data from RHUL.

These are divided into:

- 4.1 Possible equality issues in the scheme
- 4.2 Possible equality issues in the criteria
- 4.3 Possible equality issues in the implementation

### 4.1 Possible equality issues in the scheme

#### 4.1.1 The purpose of the scheme and the link to equal pay

The scheme was introduced in 2010 in part because there were concerns about gender inequalities at RHUL in relation to professorial pay.

The scheme has several stated purposes:

- To determine the appropriate level of pay for all members of the professoriate including new members of the College;
- To incentivise individual academics to achieve further, tangible progression within the most senior academic staff group;
- To provide clarity as to the level and nature of performance expected from professors;

- To recognise and reward exceptional achievement;
- To review activity and achievement since appointment or the last progression, in order to see what further progress has been achieved against clear criteria and reasonable benchmarks.

It has also the explicit purpose of improving equality within the processes and pay gap.

There is still a pay gap to address at RHUL (See Appendix 1).

#### **4.1.2 The need to apply for promotion**

UCU did a FOI request from 35 universities for equality data on their applicants, interviewees and appointees for professorial roles. Despite difficulties with access to and consistency of the data, clear patterns emerged. Over four times as many men as women applied for professorial posts; however, those women that did apply were actually more successful than their male counterparts. This fact, that women are less likely to put themselves forward, is documented in HE and elsewhere<sup>2</sup>.

The scheme takes this difference in levels of application into account by saying that it will review the CVs of everyone in the pool at 5 yearly intervals.

For BME people in the FOI survey, the issues were different: white applicants were three times more likely to be successful than BME applicants in securing professorial roles. Although there has been no equivalent study around disability, the issues here seem to be different again: very few disabled people get to university at all and even fewer reach a position where they might be selected for promotion.

#### **4.1.3 The need for an independent appeal process**

The revised appeals procedure allows for appeals on the grounds of procedural irregularity, prejudice or undue bias, or demonstrable error. This gives those who feel they have experienced discrimination or unfair treatment the possibility of raising that issue, and of having it considered by people who were not involved in the original decision.

#### **4.1.4 The potential link to appraisal**

We understand that it is envisaged that there will be a link to the performance appraisal process, and of course this makes sense in any integrated HR system. Performance appraisal is a management tool that has not sat comfortably in HE in general, or at RHUL, and this link will need to be handled with great care. In particular it is common that the system appears fair to all concerned, but its

---

<sup>2</sup> **Leeds University (2006)**, the internal equality service

outcomes betray bias, particularly from BME people and for the most senior women.<sup>3</sup>

The RHUL Equality Monitoring Report (2010-11) shows that 22% of academic staff were appraised in that year, which seems very low (though the target proportion is not specified). It also suggests that women and BME people (especially those from Asian backgrounds, though the numbers are very small) were less likely to have received appraisals – a pattern which is reflected in many other organisations.

#### **4.1.5 Work allocation in jobs leading up to the professoriate**

The system of professorial banding can work fairly only if the careers leading up to the point where people apply are equally available to all groups of staff. The work done at RHUL to make sure that people are not penalised because they choose a career that concentrates more on teaching is an example of taking this into account. But other posts need watching: for instance, HoDs are important in the professorial banding process, not only because that might be a significant step towards a professorship, but also because HoDs play a role in the judgment processes. At the moment they are disproportionately men in RHUL, though it is interesting to note that the three women HoDs (of a total of 19 HoDs) are benefitting from the opportunity to hold the role without having gained professorial status.

The issue of the 'leaking pipeline' is the subject of a recent report by PwC<sup>4</sup> which shows that the pipeline in many organisations becomes less diverse as the recruitment process continues. The PwC report suggests that women who do well have sometimes been supported in their need to be very visible by the assignments they have been able to undertake, and Opportunity Now<sup>5</sup> has figures suggesting that only 18% of leading employers measure the % of women on critical assignments. PwC highlights a lack of succession focussed planning and coaching/mentoring.

#### **4.1.6 The move from 4 bands to 5**

The current recommendation is that there are 5 bands, and that Bands 2, 3 and 4 have two contribution points.

If current bands are mapped onto the new system, no one should be worse off financially (though it is possible that those in the highest band could have their pay reduced). However, more men than women will be in higher bands, purely as a result of their location on the current system. It appears that the new system will remove the banding within the upper band, making this £89,387+ (rather than £89,387; £94,457; £99,527 as before). This will affect only men within the current

---

<sup>3</sup> Tackey et al (2001) *The problem of minority performance in organisations* Institute of Employment Studies

Mercer, M (2010) *Performance management and equality* Institute of Employment Studies

<sup>4</sup> Price Waterhouse Coopers (2008) *The leaking pipeline*

<sup>5</sup> Opportunity Now (nd) *Changing Gear: quickening the pace of women's progression*

banding and will re-open discretionary awards, albeit for a very small number of people.

### The headlines

	Current bands	No of men	% of men	No of women	% of women
<b>Stay the same</b>	1+, 2, 3-, 3+	63	46%	26	63%
<b>£3K better off</b>	1, 2-	14	10%	5	12%
<b>£6.5K better off</b>	2+, 3	45	33%	10	24%
<b>Discretionary (above £89,387)</b>	-4, 4, 4+	15	11%	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>		137	100%	41	99% (due to rounding)

This finding represents the current distribution of women and men professors in RHUL, and does not imply any shortcoming in the scheme itself.

## 4.2 Possible equality issues in the criteria

The key challenge here, as RHUL recognises, is the 'variety of individual achievement and the possibility that the individual components of achievement may be spread across different bands'.

The criteria themselves (as shown in the matrix, with its practical examples Document 3) have responded to or pre-empted many of the potential general equalities issues, for example:

- They attempt to quantify and clarify the expectations around teaching in some detail, which is good given the points about the portfolios of many women professors focusing more on this than research – at band 5, professors can achieve their '5' rating in the core business of either research **or** teaching.
- There is also a good focus on knowledge transfer/ consultancy/ application into practice, which in some HE institutions is an issue for BME people.
- Under leadership, they also include 'well-developed management skills and evidence of significant and ongoing contributions..... through major administrative roles' – for band 2, they also look for evidence of *success* in leadership roles and the capacity to motivate colleagues, so this category is not just about being chosen to chair lots of committees.
- They also say that you can include activities which are not easily accommodated under the four areas or straddle more than one.

### 4.2.1 The privileging of research

A recurring finding in the literature<sup>6</sup> is that women in HE in general are more likely to focus on teaching, pastoral care, internal administrative roles; and men are more

<sup>6</sup> Doherty and Cooke, op cit

likely to understand the importance of, prioritise and achieve more outputs around research. There is research evidence that men generally are subsequently more likely to finish their PhDs, report prolific publications, supervise doctoral students, win research grants and self-assess their research careers more confidently (not surprising, given that the system values these kinds of outputs) than women. Research is either explicitly given stronger focus than other areas (and there has been feedback at universities where other areas are supposed to be on an equal footing that this does not happen in practice), so men are more likely to be promoted/ advanced.

It is possible that the RHUL scheme prioritises research, in that:

- It allows a 'buy out' from teaching, which implies that research is more important;
- The external engagement criteria may be easier to meet if you are doing high profile research;
- The leadership criteria may be easier to meet if you are doing high profile research.

This privileging of research would matter only if men are more likely to have the opportunity to do research than their women colleagues. If the research career is equally available to them at RHUL then this is not an issue of equality. If women are less likely than men to engage in research, then the recognition of the contribution that teaching makes is crucial.

One piece of evidence here is that women seem as likely as men to be able to 'buy out' of teaching in order to be able to spend more time to research. 21 professors (14 men and 7 women – so women well represented here) 'bought out' of the teaching aspect in the 2010 banding. These men were more likely to come out with 3's or 4's than the women (M: 6 x 4's; 8 x 3's; W: 1 x 4; 3 x 3's; 2 x 2's). However, these women did noticeably better than the men in terms of pay before and after, increasing an average of £5528 each where the men *lost* an average of £1340.

The scheme works hard not to give undue status to research. For example, the teaching category is simplified by excluding from it:

- Contributions to the advancement of teaching, learning, curriculum development, or assessment;
- Post graduate research supervision and training at doctoral and MPhil levels.

In addition:

- The research cap been removed (this supports those who are more committed to teaching and teaching-related activities).
- A professor can get to Band 5 in the core business of teaching **or** research (again, support for those more committed to teaching).



This allows recognition for these teaching-related activities (which may be done more by women than by men) to be taken into account under the research heading – the most prestigious category. If there is any bias in this decision, it should work in favour of those most committed to teaching and teaching-related activities.

#### 4.2.2 Different kinds of research

We know that in parts of HE there can be ingrained views about what sort of research 'counts' and it can be much more difficult to attract research grants in the social sciences and humanities where more women are concentrated. In RHUL the disciplinary norms are intended to address this situation, by recognising that disciplines differ significantly, and by dealing with each discipline in its own terms. These norms seem a sensible way to deal with these long standing differences between disciplines.

We reviewed 8 disciplinary norms from a selection of disciplines; 3 from each of the Arts and Humanities and Sciences faculties and 2 from Management & Economics.

There are many significant differences between the disciplines and these may have equalities implications: biological sciences often work in large teams and it can be difficult to get author recognition (there are rules here but there may well be the issue of more senior men taking credit for the hard work of female researchers). Some disciplines are very diverse and share boundaries with many other disciplines (eg. computer sciences); disciplines vary in how well-established they are and therefore how clear or even existent the hierarchies and structures are for judging esteemed performance.

The research v teaching issue plays out very differently across even this small sample of disciplines. English is very keen to distinguish 'serious research projects' from studies, guides and primers which 'embody pedagogical concerns' and are weighted much less. At the other extreme, in Marketing, where grant funding is very rare, the 'added value' of marketing professionals lies precisely in the creation and teaching of courses with high fees (especially those which attract non EU post graduates). Teaching is key here; expectations around research are low. Others set out criteria for both: criminology and sociology includes norms around PhD supervision and masters/ undergraduate teaching (as well as mentoring and development of 'younger/junior' colleagues and researchers). Economics is keen that overall services to the teaching programme should be recognised, and that there should not be a hierarchy around the level of degree.

There seem to be significant differences in how the norms have been approached. In some departments, there has clearly been a collective voice with all professors feeding in; in others the document seems to have been written by the HoD (sometimes saying they have had input from others). The economics department collectively raise 'great concern over the document' and the attempt to develop standard measures, insisting that only experts, not tick boxes can assess the nuances and the holistic nature of a career – this is echoed by Computer Science. Others have approached the exercise in a much more clear-cut way (perhaps because their disciplines allow it).

### 4.2.3 Career development

The research data <sup>7</sup>suggests that women and/or BME people may be disadvantaged in areas which are important in the criteria, such as success in obtaining research grants, regular invitations to deliver keynote addresses, supervise large numbers of doctoral and post doctoral researchers, etc. Usually these are listed in the criteria as 'ancillary activities and responsibilities', so in theory it would be possible to put together a submission that had a different emphasis.

The mentoring scheme that is envisaged as part of professorial banding could be seen as a part of a much larger career development/talent management initiative, as the pipeline leading to professorial jobs is so important. Mentoring has a measured impact on confidence – Opportunity Now <sup>8</sup> recently reported that 90% of mentees said it increased their confidence. This is reinforced by similar findings in a report for the Medical Schools Council.<sup>9</sup>

There are grounds for suspecting that women and men do not have equal access to career development opportunities at senior levels, in HE and in other sectors. For example:

- Women are less likely to put themselves forward (and for some this may be an issue of confidence or lack of role models);
- They are less likely to be employed on highly visible projects or assignments;
- They are possibly stereotyped by others as less committed, or less mobile, or less available for some kinds of work.

There is no reason to believe that RHUL is markedly different from other institutions in this area.

### 4.2.4 Discretionary activities and responsibilities outside work

Many of the criteria for progression focus on willingness, ability and opportunity to take on discretionary activities. Particularly between ages 35 and 44, women academics tend in general to rate their 'performance' lower than men's – this may be about caring responsibilities, combined with points above about teaching, administration and pastoral support for students and colleagues<sup>10</sup>.

Many discretionary activities are ruled out for some people by their responsibilities outside work, either for children or for other dependants, and in our country the

---

<sup>7</sup> Doherty and Cooke, op cit

<sup>8</sup> Opportunity Now, op cit

<sup>9</sup> Medical Schools Council (2007) *Women in Clinical Academia*

<sup>10</sup> Clayton, J (2011) Fix the System, Not the Women: Removing Barriers to Success, *Science Careers*, January 21<sup>st</sup> 2011

majority of these people are women. Of course this does not mean that they are any less committed to their work, but they might need support in organising it differently – using technology and flexibility. Commitment in itself is not a criterion for promotion or advancement, but it may be a 'shorthand' in the minds of some decision makers.

The scheme takes account of this by including a method for explaining the effect of 'special circumstances'.

Conventionally the effect of caring responsibilities would be reflected in the number of people working flexibly, for example part time or remotely. In RHUL men and women seem equally likely to work part time.

- 22 out of 178 (12%) professors are working part time (ranging from 0.2 – 0.8, though many are at the lower end of this range);
- Just 8 of the 22 are women (5 of them are over 60, several of them working just 1 day a week, possibly on some sort of phased retirement);
- There are 5 men who are well below State Pension Age (SPA) who are holding posts of 0.25FTE or under - all but one are at bands 3 or 4.

No evidence has been presented to suggest that these arrangements are more difficult to organise for women than for men, or that they depend on the discretion of individual line managers.

#### **4.2.5 Different kinds of track record**

We applaud RHUL's attempts to make non-traditional progress in an academic career as viable as any other route to the professoriate, and we note that this possibility has not so far been used. The fact that it appears in the scheme signals a flexibility of attitude.

### **4.3 Possible equality issues in the implementation**

#### **4.3.1 Who is involved and how they are selected**

The memberships of the various panels are detailed in the scheme and it is clear how panel members are selected, and what their roles are.

The role of the ASTC is explicit, as is that of the Remuneration Committee, although their memberships are not spelled out here.

There is an external review for Band 5. External reviewers are chosen by the HoD.

Those hearing appeals will be different from those involved in the original decision. They will be chosen by virtue of the role/s they perform.

---

#### **4.3.2 Training for those involved**

It is good to hear that training will be arranged for all those involved at each stage, because that should help panels and chairs to operate fairly.

#### **4.3.3 The role of mentoring**

We note that there is to be a mentoring scheme, and we applaud this example of legal positive action, which has been shown elsewhere to be useful to people from under-represented groups. The scheme is proposed to help professors develop their case for re-banding.

#### **4.3.4 Bias in judgement processes**

There is now a great deal of research that suggests that we are all biased in our judgement processes, and that such bias is often unconscious. Until we can recognise the likelihood of that effect, it is difficult for us to challenge ourselves about the decisions we make about the careers of others.

In the recent past the Professorial Banding Monitoring Group found a gender pay gap (see Appendix 1), and it is possible that unconscious bias contributes to this gap.

#### **4.3.5 Feedback**

Feedback is to be provided to those seeking promotion or advancement, based on the criteria. This is important because BME people often complain that they are disproportionately denied honest and constructive feedback.

#### **4.3.6 The need for good data**

The data we have now on the professoriate is good, although we have 8 who prefer not to reveal their gender or their ethnicity. We have very unsound data for disability. At the moment the College has a declared rate of disabled employees of 2%, compared with a working age disabled population of 15%. There are plans to increase the rate of reporting in this area: a Staff Disability Forum has been established and the Single Equality Plan contains plans to increase monitoring up take. There are also plans to monitor for sexual orientation and religion/belief, as it is impossible at the moment to check for progress in these areas.

#### **4.3.7 Changes to bands after the process**

36 of the records say that changes were made after the initial banding, some following external moderator recommendations or 'expert feedback', some following initial appeals or further information about special circumstances, some with no explanation. 28 of these were to increase the score (20 men; 8 women – this seems

---

proportionate); 5 to reduce it and in 3 cases, it is not clear what the outcome was. The figures we have (and those on which the above analysis is based) are those with these changes updated – so it may be that the original picture was significantly different but there do not seem to be any obvious patterns around gender here.

There were approximately 30 cases in which changes were made following external moderator recommendations, informal appeals or expert feedback.

## 5 Summary of possible impacts, both positive and negative

The positive impacts of the revised scheme are accompanied by suggestions that will build on existing good practice; the negative impacts are accompanied by suggestions to mitigate the potentially adverse impacts.

Paragraph	Possible positive impact	Building on good practice
4.1.1	The purpose of the scheme is at least in part to address inequalities.	An annual review is referred to in Document 1, and this will help to demonstrate that the scheme is delivering its intended outcomes.
4.1.2	The scheme recognises that some people do not put themselves forward.	All CVs are to be reviewed every 5 years. We would recommend doing this more often, say every 3 years.
4.1.3	The appeals procedure allows for appeals on the grounds of prejudice or undue bias. It also provides an independent review of previous decisions.	We recommend that the procedure is slightly amended to require appellants to be explicit about the grounds of their complaint, specifically addressing prejudice or undue bias if that is at issue; and to require panels to take equalities explicitly into account, and to record the ways in which they have done that. This should be the responsibility of the Chair. Attempts should be made to increase the diversity of panel members, and these should be recorded.
4.1.5	The scheme recognises the value of teaching and teaching-related activities, which may be done more by women than men.	The possibility of a Teaching Professorship is mooted, and it would help to raise this status of this area of work if this possibility were to be followed up.
4.1.6	The proposed move to 5 bands will initially mean that more men than women are in higher bands, because of the way women and	It is received wisdom among diversity professionals that setting a target means help in the achievement of that target.

	men are currently distributed in the professoriate.	
4.2.1	The removal of the research cap will benefit those most committed to teaching.	This should be monitored to make sure it has the desired effect.
4.2.1	Buy out from teaching seems to be equally available to women and men.	This should be monitored carefully.
4.2.2	Disciplinary norms are to be revised.	There was and will continue to be variation in the way these norms are written. We recommend that a process is established whereby the norms are produced by departments in a similar way – preferably using a range of input from diverse sources; that there is a specific requirement to take equalities into account and to record that.
4.2.3	Career development – some areas which may be difficult for under-represented groups to access are treated as ‘ancillary’ in the criteria.	Career development needs to be addressed for the academic staff as a whole, so that the pipeline for professors is as diverse as possible in many different ways. For example, developing the career of your direct reports could be part of the job description of line managers; there might be a College wide process of talent management.
4.2.4	The scheme takes into account responsibilities outside work, and ‘special circumstances’.	The requests for flexible arrangements such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Part time working;</li> <li>● Remote working;</li> <li>● Reasonable adjustments;</li> <li>● Sabbaticals;</li> </ul> should be reviewed regularly for equalities.
4.2.5	Different track records are acknowledged as a possibility in the scheme.	Might it be possible to work up some examples of what this means?
4.3.1	The scheme allows for an external	Reviewers will be chosen by HoDs: criteria should be published, and the

	review at Band 5.	pool should be monitored for diversity.
4.3.1	Membership and roles are clear.	The criteria for choosing members of all the groups involved in the process should be published. Where there is a pool to be established (eg. of mentors, or of external moderators, or non-Faculty professors) the criteria for selection should be published, and the membership monitored for proportionate diversity. These pool members should be offered training.
4.3.1	Processes are transparent, and clear for decision making and note taking.	Unconscious bias can interfere with judgment processes, and panels need to be able to challenge each other constructively in this area.
4.3.2	Training is foreseen.	Training should explicitly deal with equality issues and unconscious bias in decision making; in discretion; in appraisals. It should be regularly reviewed, and monitored for attendance. It might also be necessary to take account of successful learning/performance at training sessions.
4.3.3	Mentoring is to be offered.	This is good practice, and should be extended to include non-professorial staff, and support them in developing their careers and accessing the opportunities that they need in order to become professors. Take up and success need to be monitored.
4.3.5	Feedback is to be given.	Perhaps training could be offered here as well. Records should be kept of feedback given.
4.3.6	Data is good.	The data is good but could still be better (see the recommendations from the Equality Monitoring Report). We understand there are plans to improve the rate of disclosure. It may be important to include in the training (see above) why this issue is so important.
4.3.7	Changes to banding after appeals seem proportionate in gender terms.	It should be an objective to reduce the number of appeals, and this will probably happen under the revised scheme. Changes should continue to be monitored.
4.2.1	Buy out from teaching seems to be equally available to women and men.	This should be monitored carefully.



Paragraph	Possible negative impact	Building on good practice
4.1.4	The potential link to appraisals is likely to benefit men, white people and non-disabled people.	We understand that the appraisal system is due for a review, and recommend that an EqIA is done on the proposed scheme. The system should be designed with equality of outcome in mind, and monitored for this. Equitable access to appraisals is also important, and should be explicitly the responsibility of the appraising manager.
4.1.5	Work allocation – prestige tasks have to be equally available to women and men.	This can be taken into account in the design, implementation and review of any career development or talent management system.
4.1.6	The 5 <sup>th</sup> band initially contains only men, and it re-introduces discretion.	We hope that this is a temporary effect. A target should be set for equality (see above) and the effects of this change should be monitored. Discretion should be subject to constructive challenge from colleagues.
4.2.1	The weighting of research is perceived to work against women.	The transparency of the proposed revised system should help here, as will the monitoring and publishing of results.
4.3.4	There is always bias in judgment processes.	This bias may also operate in recruitment and selection decisions in RHUL (and elsewhere in HE) and should be addressed in training and career development schemes.
Appendix 1	The pay gap persists.	We note that there is an Equal Pay Review, and assume that this is addressed in that review.
Appendix 1	There are marked differences by department.	The annual review should ensure this is looked at.
Appendix 1	Gender breakdown by Faculty shows differences.	The annual review should ensure this is looked at.

---

## 6 Conclusions

The professorial banding scheme in RHUL represents a step forward for transparency and equality in the sector, where a minority of institutions have such a system for addressing inequalities, including those of pay.

Other good practice features of this scheme include:

- It recognises the essential contribution that teaching and teaching-related activities make;
- It can take into account 'special circumstances' (which might affect protected groups more than others);
- It has the possibility of recognising non-traditional progress in an academic career;
- It uses disciplinary norms as a way of addressing long standing differences between disciplines.

The original scheme privileged research as a category; the revised scheme places less emphasis on research. It remains important to demonstrate that research success is equally accessible to women and men.

The scheme, especially the revised version, recognises the contribution that teaching makes, and this will help those who do it, and choose to do it, at the expense of research – and more of these might be women.

The outcomes of the 2010 banding exercise show that the average gain was greater for women than for men. The outcomes of the appeals process also show no obvious signs of gender bias.

The new Band 5 will contain only men, simply because of where they are in the system at the moment. This makes it even more important to address issues of career development, so that the pool of potential post holders is diversified as soon as possible.

---

## 7 Recommendations

Most of these recommendations are included in the table above, but they are presented differently here.

### 7.1 Annual review

Carry out the annual review that is mentioned in the documentation, and ensure that it includes:

- Differences for protected groups by department;
- Differences for protected groups by Faculty;
- The impact of removing the research cap;
- All the monitoring data that relates to the operation of this scheme.

### 7.2 Career development

It is really important that the career development of all the staff is addressed, so that the pool of potential post holders for the senior positions across RHUL, including non-academic staff, is as diverse and as representative as possible.

A college-wide career development/talent management programme would include the mentoring that is mentioned in the revised scheme, but would be much broader than that. Such a scheme should be assessed at the design stage for Equality Impact.

The work to introduce a Teaching Professorship would enhance any career development scheme.

### 7.3 Transparency: criteria, data and monitoring

The criteria that are used for the scheme are published and can be reviewed. The criteria for other parts of the process are less clear – for examples, how people are selected for various roles; how do they take equality and diversity into account in their disciplinary norms, in the decision making, in their composition. So it seems sensible to continue down the path already started, and publish as much as possible about criteria, and then monitor all aspects of the system to make sure it is transparent.

Issues outside the scheme are also relevant here: the way requests for flexible working and/or reasonable adjustments are met or not; the way high profile or advantageous work allocations are made; the outcomes of mentoring and career development processes; the outcomes of appraisals.

---

The recommendations about improving the comprehensiveness of equality monitoring data are important, because an absence of data makes a big difference when numbers are small.

## 7.4 Training

It is good to see that training is foreseen in the implementation plans for the revised scheme. We recommend that everyone involved in this process is trained – including those in pools for the different panels – and that the training covers unconscious bias, the role of discretion, decision making processes, etc.

It might also be good to use this opportunity to review the existing training on recruitment and selection.

## 7.5 Appraisal

We understand that the appraisal system is due for review, and recommend that it is reviewed with equality and professorial banding in mind, and that it is assessed at the design stage for equality impact. Equitable access to appraisals is also important, and should be explicitly the responsibility of the appraising manager.

## 7.6 Appeals

We recommend that the procedure is slightly amended to require appellants to be explicit about the grounds of their complaint, specifically addressing prejudice or undue bias if that is at issue; and to require panels to take equalities explicitly into account, and to record the ways in which they have done that. This should be the responsibility of the Chair. Attempts should be made to increase the diversity of panel members, and these should be recorded.

---

## Appendix 1

### The professoriate at RHUL

This section is based on the Equality Monitoring Report which collected data on staff in post at 31.08.2011.

#### Gender

- Two thirds of academic staff overall are men; just over three quarters of professors are men; though there have been slight but steady increases in the proportion of female professors over the past three years, from 22.9% (2008/9) to 24.4% (2010/11). The report cites a national average from the Equality Challenge Unit (2011) of 80.9% of professors being men.
- There are significant differences across the three faculties: women make up 36.8% of professors in Arts & Social Sciences; 20% in Management & Economics and 14% in Science.
- The Senior Lecturer to Reader promotions were equally divided between men and women but 2/3rds of the promotions from Reader to Professor were men.
- 89% of academic staff are full-time (77% of those on part-time contracts were women); just 7.7% of professors work part time.

#### Ethnicity, nationality, disability, age

- There are 60 BME academics – 80% of them are either Asian, Chinese or Mixed Asian; 12.7% of academic staff are BME (this has been steadily increasing since 2003, when the figure was 7.9%); 10.5% of UK academic staff are from BME backgrounds. The proportions drop by seniority: 18.9% of lecturers are BME, but just 5.5% of professors. By far the highest proportion of BME academics is in Management and Economics (27%), compared to around 9% in the other faculties.
- 20% of professors are 61 years old and over: around 1/3 are under 50.
- 2.1% of academic staff have declared a disability; 3.1% of lecturers/ senior lecturers; 1.2% of professors.
- There are very high numbers of international academics working at RHUL: overall a third of academic staff are from non-UK backgrounds; 46.4% of new academic starters are from non-UK backgrounds – at lecturer level, it is half and half UK and non-UK; at professorial level, about a third are from non-UK backgrounds.

## 1 The pay gap

	Royal Holloway	UK average
<b>Average pay of professors: female</b>	£67, 111	£71, 910
<b>Average pay of professors: male</b>	£72, 330	£76, 738
<b>Pay gap (in favour of males)</b>	7.2%	6.3%

There is insufficient data/ numbers of BME professors to calculate this at Royal Holloway, but nationally, BME professors earn an average of 9.4% (£7,147 p.a.) less than their non-BME colleagues.

## 2 What were the results of the 2010 banding?

A total of 150 professors were banded for the first time. 111 (74% of known gender) were men; 36 were women; gender not recorded for 2; 1 was banded in 2012 and was excluded from our analysis.

There were winners and losers from this process (a handful either lost or gained over £20K a year from their annual pay package), though on average professors each gained £4277 (per annum) from the banding. There were patterns of difference here and generally these seem to have rewarded those who are more likely to have been receiving a poorer deal around pay, e.g. women and younger professors. On average (mean), the men gained £3800 each from the process and the women gained £5750 each. Those under 50 years old gained £5378 on average; those aged 50-60 gained £3191 on average; those aged 61 and over gained £2775 on average.

## 3 Gender patterns

### 3.1 Headlines

- The 4 biggest losers (over £20K) were all men in Biological Sciences;
- Women were slightly more likely than men to be smaller losers (<£10K), e.g. those in the drama department;
- Men were noticeably (significant is probably too strong a word given size of numbers) over-represented in the group that had small gains (up to £5K);
- Women were well-represented amongst the biggest winners (e.g. two of the four £20K+ gains were women in health and social care; unfortunately the gender of another of the four is unknown).

### 3.2 Breakdown by Faculty

There are some interesting patterns when figures are broken down by Faculty and Gender. Although women gained more overall, the gains are concentrated in Management & Economics (this is particularly skewed by two women who got increases of more than £20K each in the Health and Social Care faculty, which is very small and seems to fit best with M&E). Women gained more than men in science (where there were some heavy male losers) and men did better than women in Arts and Social Sciences.

Faculty/ gender group	No. in group	Average gain
<b>Arts &amp; Social Sciences:</b>		
Total	59	£3118
Women	21	£1797
Men	38	£3848
<b>Management &amp; Economics (inc Health &amp; S.Care):</b>		
Total	30	£6962
Women	8	£13,104
Men	22	£4728
<b>Science:</b>		
Total (Gender known)	59	£3131
Women	7	£7547
Men	52	£1959
<b>All faculties:</b>		
Total (Gender known)	147	£4277
Women	36	£5748
Men	111	£3799

---

## Appendix 2

### Information about EW Group

EW Group (formerly Equality Works) is a woman-owned SME which was set up in October 1992 by Jane Farrell and Dr Annie Hedge. We are a specialist consultancy with twenty years' experience of all aspects of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. We work with a range of clients in the public, private and not-for-profit sectors in areas that include local and central government, transport, healthcare, engineering, probation, emergency services, construction, education, criminal justice, trade unions and housing.

Our training is enriched by the large amount of consultancy work that we now do in organisational development. In recent years more and more of our work has been about supporting managers in bringing about organisational change in an effective and equitable way. We have had considerable success in using our experience of Equality and Diversity – recognised as a challenging area requiring sensitivity and skill – to understand and support organisational change in a variety of settings.

Our company is distinguished by the fact that we look at how organisational structures or processes can impact on, or discriminate against, groups and individuals. Rather than blaming individuals, we analyse how these structures and processes function so that we can help our clients work towards practical solutions.

We are interested in mainstreaming Equality and Diversity by concentrating on day-to-day activities, rather than tackling them as a separate issue. We believe, because of our experience, that managing Equality and Diversity is a set of skills that people can learn and develop and that working within this framework creates an exciting opportunity to be at the forefront of organisational change.

We work hard to ensure that our work is engaging and inclusive. All of our materials can be produced in a variety of formats and we make sure our venues are fully accessible. We adopt a holistic approach and work across the equality groups: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, and sexual orientation. We also use social class as a cross-cutting theme in our equality analysis to help draw out the different types of disadvantage experienced by protected groups.

Our approach is supportive, practical and outcome-orientated. We work with your organisation to develop policies, strategies and action plans that will deliver the necessary change and improvement to meet your identified needs. Our work is designed to support and empower people as they meet the challenge of carrying out their daily work in a professional and equitable way.





**ewgroup**

**Unit 004 Coppergate House  
16 Brune Street  
London E1 7NJ  
T: 0207 953 1010  
F: 0207 953 1015  
[www.theewgroup.com](http://www.theewgroup.com)**

**Contact:  
Dr. Annie Hedge  
Co Founder  
[annie.hedge@theewgroup.com](mailto:annie.hedge@theewgroup.com).**