

Report to Joint Consultative and Safety Committee

Subject: Equal Pay and Equality Audit 2014

Date: 25 November 2014

Author: Service Manager; Organisational Development

1. Purpose of the report/ background

It is good practice for any organisation to ensure that its pay policies are fair. More than this, in order to be able to successfully defend equal pay claims made through Employment Tribunals it is necessary to have an equal pay audit that was carried out within three years prior to such a claim.

The equal pay audit shown at Appendix 1 has been endorsed by Senior Leadership Team and the proposed actions identified are supported in principle subject to consultation through this committee.

2. Summary of findings

Although there are recommendations for actions arising from the audit, there are no major issues of concern in respect to pay equality.

3. Recommendation

The Committee is asked to offer comment and recommendations for consideration by the Corporate Director responsible for equalities who will determine a final work programme to be delivered.

1. Background

Gedling Borough Council supports the principle of equal pay for work of equal value.

This is demonstrated by the work that took place over many years resulting, in 2001, in the introduction of a single-status workforce and a fair and objective pay structure achieved through implementation of a job evaluation scheme. Gedling was the first local authority in the County and one of the first in the region to take this step.

The pay line that has been devised, agreed with trade unions and applied, comprises pay bands that are made up of short incremental pay scales; this is recommended good practice when considering equal pay issues. In practice this means that it takes most employees between 18 months to two years to reach the top of a pay scale. Jobs for which an approved career grade applies will comprise multiple pay bands associated with experience and qualification. The implementation of the revised pay bands that came with the introduction of the payment of a "Living Wage" at 1 April 2014 has further strengthened this good practice by grading all posts within Band 2 as a minimum and creating a three-point scale for all bands in which employees are paid. New basic pay bands are shown at Appendix A.

Bonus payments to ex-manual employees were withdrawn as part of the job evaluation and pay line implementation, effective from 1st April 2001. As such, differing pay for work of the same value was removed.

More recently, from 1st April 2007, a Principal Officer Incentive Scheme based on performance was introduced. Equality issues surrounding the implementation of this scheme will be explored in this paper.

There is an established procedure for dealing with grading appeals and for objectively valuing jobs new to the Council. This process involves both management and trade union representation.

Due to the measures that have been implemented, the issue of difference in pay for work of the same value due to gender or other areas of equality are largely removed. However, there still remain issues of balance in respect to the make-up of employees within job bands or pay groupings (team members/ Senior Officers/ Principal Officers/ Executive Team).

An Equal Pay Audit was last carried out in 2010 and prior to that in 2007. Certain actions were proposed as a result of this audit. These are shown through the tables included in the body of this report, together with a statement of actions that have taken place.

The analysis contained in this year's report is based on data as at the end of March 2014.

Since the last Equal Pay Audit, the Equality Act 2010 has now been fully enacted and the content of this has a material effect on the sort of data that employers are expected to gather, combined with the Government's changing expectation on certain types of monitoring. In essence it is now more appropriate to produce a succinct and targeted report.

2. Summary Statement

The following paper is based on the premise that a sound, objective system of job evaluation and pay grading is in place. Pay bands comprise short incremental scales. Work of same value is paid within fixed bands. There is no discretion for difference of treatment in respect to basic pay. Consequently, in respect to "equal value" pay claims the Council has a robust defence.

However, there are clear differences in the make-up and balance of representation in particular pay bands and pay groupings. Also, there are issues surrounding the application of the Principal Officer Incentive Scheme. All of these issues are explored in the paper and, where appropriate, recommendations made.

3. Gender Equality

An analysis of pay against gender is shown at Appendix B.

For employees up to Band 7 there are proportionately more females than males in these bands, although since the last audit in 2007 the proportion of men in these posts has increased by almost 13%. There are now proportionately more men than women in pay Bands 1, 4, 6 and 7. With the introduction of the Living Wage arrangements from 1 April 2014, no one will be paid within Band 1 and it is anticipated that this measure will produce an almost equal pay split for pay Bands 2-4. If the whole of the range of Bands 1-7, the mean pay (as assessed by analysis of numbers of employees of each gender in each pay band) is almost identical between men and women with men being slightly better-paid by about 0.58%.

In 2010, for "Senior Officer" grades (Bands 8 and 9), there were about 1.3 times more females than males. This figure had remained almost unchanged since the 2007 audit and still remains the same in this audit with 28% more women than men. Within this pay group, the mean pay for women is higher than men by 1.61%.

Although at the time of the last audit, the proportion of males in "Principal Officer" grades (Bands 10+) was almost 30% higher than females, the levels of occupancy are now much more equal with 51% of such posts being held

by women. Both general turnover and the restructuring of the organisation has contributed to the provision of opportunity to help rectify this imbalance.

As there is only a small number of Chief Officers, the concept of proportionality is not particularly valid.

The average (median) pay band is the same for male and female employees; Band 4.

Appendix B shows that average (mean) pay between genders is largely equal but with women earning at slightly higher rates in Senior and Principal posts;

Employee group (NJC employees)	Males- mean average hourly pay (£)	Females- mean average hourly pay (£)
All employees	10.24	10.25
Employees (Band 1-7)	8.84	8.79
Senior Officers	14.17	14.40
Principal Officers	19.57	19.88

The median average for both males and females is £8.81 per hour.

From 1 April 2014 with the Introduction of the Living Wage pay arrangements, no employees will be paid within Band 1. This is likely to have an effect on average pay rates in the next equal pay audit.

Of the 57 career-graded posts occupied, 26 (46%) are occupied by women which is a slight increase on the occupancy rate of 42% shown in the last equal pay audit. However, of the 57, 17 jobs are the same job of Semi-skilled Grounds Worker. If this is excluded, women hold a much higher proportion of such posts than men at 65% (an increase from the 48% held at the time of the last audit).

Of the 41 current Principal Officers, 23 receive a payment under the Principal Officer Incentive Scheme. As none have been specifically excluded due to performance issues, this leads to the conclusion that 18 (44%) do not comply with the scheme criteria either to them not being at the top grade point or not meeting the scheme criteria in respect to wider management training and participation. In terms of Principal Officers not in receipt of the award, 8 officers are women (44%); this ratio is an improvement over the audit of 2010 which indicted that over half of all of the officers (53%) not receiving the award were female. Since then much has been done to further raise the profile of management training in the organisation (one criterion in the POI Scheme). The proportion of female employees on our level 5 Leadership programme (as an average over the last two programmes) is 47%. Nine people have a second award under the scheme, five of whom are women (56%) which further improves on the last audit in which 45% were women.

Potential Issues

There appear to be no major issues in relation to either the proportion of men and women in pay bandings or in the equality of pay.

Of the 18 pay protection arrangements applying at the time of data analysis (12 in the last pay audit), 10 are for women (7 in the last audit). This is a very similar proportion between this and the last audit with a slightly higher ratio (55%) of women receiving salary protection. Recent structural reviews do not appear to have affected women disproportionately in terms of down-grading of their posts.

There are no females occupying the lower-graded, ex-manual career-graded posts. As there are a relatively large number of these posts, the proportion of females against males occupying career-graded posts is skewed. Taking office-based career-graded posts separately, there is a much higher proportion of women occupying these posts than men whereas in the last audit the balance was almost equal.

Although pay bands are short in length, and it is likely that women newly recruited to Principal Officer grades will quickly be in a position to be eligible for a first payment under the Principal Officer Incentive Scheme, there is more potential for pay inequality when deciding who should be awarded a second incremental point. Although the 2007 audit showed that inequality existed in respect to how the second and third incremental points had been awarded (all to men), the 2010 audit showed the distribution to be much more evenly balanced with five women in receipt of the higher level awards, out of a total of 11. This year there are more women than men in receipt of the higher level of award. This pattern and the current proportion of awards indicate that this area is no longer one of specific concern.

In summary, there are appear to be no particular issues of pay inequality that relate to gender and there are no specific recommendations for action.

Proposals for Action

There are no proposed actions.

4. Other Equality Issues

In respect to equality and pay issues relating to disability, age and race, some further analysis can be undertaken. From comparisons with local borough data provided through the National Census, it is clear that the Council is under-represented in its workforce in respect to people who declare a disability and people from a BME background. Although analysis can go some way to highlighting areas where the Council may wish to focus appropriate actions, due to the small numbers of people involved, there is little statistical significance in the data other than the headline information that there is under-representation. At the moment, there is no information available to the Council as an employer, or at a borough level that would

allow any meaningful analysis of pay and equality issues relating to religious belief or sexual orientation.

4.1 Ethnicity/ Race

Of the economically active (age 16-64) people living within the borough, 11.0% (up from 3.6% in the 2001 census) of people are from a visible BME background. Locally we have set a target of 4% for BME employees within the workforce and over the last four years we have steadily improved against this ambition with the proportion rising from 2.9 to 3.8%; almost now at target. With the change in the proportion of people from a BME background since the last census, measures to further improve the BME presence in the workforce seems necessary together with a review of the corporate target at the next opportunity.

In addition to the use of more mainstream media, we continue to target recruitment adverts to particular community and religious groups in order to maximise our advertising impact at a relatively low cost.

Appendix C shows a breakdown of employees from a BME background against pay grade.

What is obvious from Appendix C is that there is no employee in the Principal Officer group that has declared a racial background other than "UK White". This is an issue of concern. Although there may be practical measures at times of recruitment to try to target advertisements more effectively to a wider range of people, or to perhaps consider whether there is more that we can do to encourage and support our current BME employees to enable them to effectively compete for future senior vacancies (succession planning), the fact is that at the moment and for the foreseeable future turnover in staff will be very low at the higher levels.

Proposals for Action

Action Proposed from 2010 Audit	Action undertaken	Action proposed for 2014 Audit
Adopt a targeted approach to advertising external vacancies; in addition to advertising in local media also send job vacancy details to identified appropriate community groups for more targeted circulation.	Targeted recruitment is now established in addition to use of "mainstream" media.	Continue action, particularly in relation to Band 10+ posts. The continued use of targeted recruitment is proposed although, due to low turnover, and the need to redeploy internal staff, little positive effect is anticipated this year.
-	-	Review of local target to be used in future council and service planning for the proportion of people from a BME background in our workforce.

4.2 Disability

Of the economically active people living within the borough, 5.7% declare a severe disability that limits their lives (the definition has changed since the last census when 14.2% declare disability of some kind). The Council's declared figure for this local performance indicator has also risen over the last four years and has climbed from 2.4% to its current level of 2.99% against a target of 3.5%. Improvement over the years has been slow, again due in part to low rates of turnover. There are, however, many examples of how new and existing employees with a variety of disabilities have had their particular needs in the workplace accommodated.

The council uses the "Two Tick" symbol in its recruitment advertisements (giving a guaranteed interview to suitably qualified job applicants) and targets recruitment to certain relevant community groups.

Appendix D shows a breakdown of employees with a declared disability against pay grade.

Proposal for action are shown on the following page.

Proposals for Action

Action Proposed from 2010 Audit	Action undertaken	Action proposed for 2014 Audit
Adopt a targeted approach to advertising external vacancies; in addition to advertising in local media, also send job vacancy details to identified appropriate community groups for more targeted circulation.	Targeted recruitment is now established in addition to use of "mainstream" media.	Continue action. There has been a slight improvement to the proportion of employees with a disability. The continued use of targeted recruitment is proposed although, due to low turnover, little positive effect is anticipated this year.
To continue to promote at points of recruitment, the Council's commitment to the national "two tick" symbol. This symbolises the Council's support for a range of positive action including guaranteed interview for people declaring disability and who meet all of a job's stated essential criteria.	This is a well-respected measure used by reputable employers to show support for the employment of people with a disability.	Continue action. The continued use of this symbol on all recruitment advertising is proposed although, due to low turnover, little positive effect is anticipated this year.
The current medical questionnaire used to assess a new starter's medical suitability for work now fall foul of the Equality Act, both in terms of content and process.	New action. In light of the new Equality Act, the medical questionnaire used for new recruits will be redesigned, together with a review of process that will reduce cost and also further remove potential for discrimination.	New process is now embedded as standard practice. No further action proposed.

4.2 Age

National statistics (Local Government Digest) showed that in December 2009, 34% of local government employees were in the 50+ age band. LGA data (Earnings Survey for English councils) suggested that there had been a slight increase in this figure to 38.5% in 2013/14. Locally, at Gedling BC, this figure is much lower for Principal Officers (including service managers) at around 29% (28% in the previous audit) and Senior Officers at 31% (20% in the last audit). Figures for the whole UK economy (AgeUK) show that just over a third of people are age 50-plus. Only for Bands 1-7 employees is the proportion of people aged 50+ higher than the economy average at just over 42% (up from 35% three years' ago). Appendix E shows this detail.

This data perhaps runs against an expected pattern in that for more senior jobs, it is not the case that there are a disproportionate amount of employees that might be imminently due to retire, at least not when assessed against the general picture in local government. Instead, it is the lower-graded bands of employees where attention needs to be paid to future robustness. A similar statement was made at the time of the last audit but the analysis now suggests that employees are either choosing or needing to stay on in their employment into later life. Almost 15% of Bands 1-7 employees are age 60+ but this reduces to about 10% of senior officer and less than 3% of principal officers. Although there is no firm evidence to support the statement, the figures suggest perhaps that people find it harder to afford to leave work earlier. In addition, some of the changes to the Local Government Pension Scheme mean that receipt of pension for reasons of redundancy or efficiency are not payable until age 55 rather than age 50 and the new rule applying to ill-health retirement make such retirement a less attractive, and potentially a financially impossible option for many employees. These changes at a time of austerity perhaps all contribute to the picture of a necessarily aging workforce with little opportunity for younger employees to move into the sector as turnover and job availability are both reduced.

In order to try to give young people an opportunity to effectively compete for jobs when they do become available, perhaps the most practical step to undertake is to provide some structured approach to both equip existing younger or less experienced staff with relevant training and to provide young people who don't work for the council with meaningful work experience and apprenticeship opportunities. To this end, programmes to provide such opportunities have been set up and these are shown in the proposals for action below.

Proposals for Action

Actions from previous audits	Action undertaken following 2010 audit	Action proposed for 2014 Audit
<p>Actions from 2007 audit completed and no additional actions identified for 2010 audit.</p> <p>Previous actions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review of work experience practice being undertaken. - “Gedling Employee and Manager” Standards established to help inform construction of person specifications and removing, wherever possible, unnecessary reference in person specifications to longer lengths of work experience as an essential criterion 	N/a	<p>Delivery of training programmes to enable progress of employees within the business (succession planning). Specifically, level 2/3 Management Development Programme (for current or aspiring supervisors) to be delivered early 2015.</p>
		<p>Building a requirement within our performance management framework to encourage the take-up of both pre-employment work experience candidates and apprentices. Targets for each are both set at 8 for 2014/15.</p>

5. Equal Pay Policy Statement

As part of the last Equal Pay Audit, and in order to establish the principles of what equal pay means to this Council and to formally define how these principles are to be delivered, an Equal Pay Policy Statement was produced and approved by committee. This is shown at Appendix F. It is not proposed that this policy is amended. It will be formally included in the Employee Handbook.

In addition, as required by the Localism Act, the council also produces an annual Pay Policy Statement. This document both outlines the policies of the council relating to pay and also shows how rates of pay are applied within the council. The purpose of this document is to ensure transparency in relation to pay. This statement is published on the council’s web site.

6. Recommendations

Senior Leadership Team is **recommended**:

6.1 To support the proposals of the report and to refer these to the Joint Consultative and Safety Committee for the purpose of consultation following which the Corporate Director responsible for equalities will determine a final work programme to be delivered.

Grade	SCP	R/Link SCP	NEW SALARY £		HRLY RATE £	Monthly Pay		JE Points Range
Spinal Column NJCLOCAL								
Band 1	5	50	12435		6.4454	1036.25		200-270
	6	60	12614		6.5382	1051.17		
	7	70	12915		6.6942	1076.25		
	8	80	13321		6.9046	1110.08		
Band 2	9	90	13725		7.1140	1143.75		271-310
	10	100	14013		7.2633	1167.75		
local scp	10a	101	14760		7.6505	1230.00		
Spinal column NJC salary								
Band 3	11	11	14880		7.7127	1240.00		311-350
	12	12	15189		7.8729	1265.75		
	13	13	15598		8.0849	1299.83		
Band 4	15	15	16215		8.4047	1351.25		351-395
	16	16	16604		8.6063	1383.67		
	17	17	16998		8.8105	1416.50		
Band 5	19	19	17980		9.3195	1498.33		396-440
	20	20	18638		9.6606	1553.17		
	21	21	19317		10.0125	1609.75		
Band 6	23	23	20400		10.5739	1700.00		441-475
	24	24	21067		10.9196	1755.58		
	25	25	21734		11.2653	1811.17		
Band 7	26	26	22443		11.6328	1870.25		476-515
	27	27	23188		12.0190	1932.33		
	28	28	23945		12.4113	1995.42		
Band 8	29	29	24892		12.9022	2074.33		516-540
	30	30	25727		13.3350	2143.92		
	31	31	26539		13.7559	2211.58		
Band 9	32	32	27323		14.1622	2276.92		541-580
	33	33	28127		14.5790	2343.92		
	34	34	28922		14.9910	2410.17		
Band 10	35	35	29528		15.3051	2460.67		581-620
	36	36	30311		15.7110	2525.92		
	37	37	31160		16.1511	2596.67		
Band 11	38	38	32072		16.6238	2672.67		621-650
	39	39	33128		17.1711	2760.67		
	40	40	33998		17.6221	2833.17		
Band 12	41	41	34894		18.0865	2907.83		651-695
	42	42	35784		18.5478	2982.00		
	43	43	36676		19.0101	3056.33		
Band 13	44	44	37578		19.4777	3131.50		696-735
	45	45	38422		19.9151	3201.83		
	46	46	39351		20.3967	3279.25		
Band 14	47	47	40254		20.8647	3354.50		736-800
	48	48	41148		21.3281	3429.00		
	49	49	42032		21.7863	3502.67		
	10a		14760		7.6505	1230.00		

Gender vs. Pay

As at 31 March 2014

Grade	Hrly Pay at grade max	Contract Count	Males	% Male Within Grade	% Male of Total Employees	Females	% Female within Grade	% Female of Total Employees	All Workforce % of Total Employees	Males as a proportion of Females
Band 1	6.5382	67	36	53.73%	7.19%	31	46.27%	6.19%	13.37%	1.16
Band 2	7.2633	56	17	30.36%	3.39%	39	69.64%	7.78%	11.18%	0.44
Band 3	8.0849	61	29	47.54%	5.79%	32	52.46%	6.39%	12.18%	0.91
Band 4	8.8105	92	53	57.61%	10.58%	39	42.39%	7.78%	18.36%	1.36
Band 5	10.0125	58	19	32.76%	3.79%	39	67.24%	7.78%	11.58%	0.49
Band 6	11.2653	43	22	51.16%	4.39%	21	48.84%	4.19%	8.58%	1.05
Band 7	12.4113	30	16	53.33%	3.19%	14	46.67%	2.79%	5.99%	1.14
1. Employees		407	192	47.17%	38.32%	215	52.83%	42.91%	81.24%	0.89
Band 8	13.7559	27	14	51.85%	2.79%	13	48.15%	2.59%	5.39%	1.08
Band 9	14.991	21	7	33.33%	1.40%	14	66.67%	2.79%	4.19%	0.50
2. Senior Officers		48	21	43.75%	4.19%	27	56.25%	5.39%	9.58%	0.78
BAND10+5%	16.9586	1	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00
BAND11	17.6221	5	4	80.00%	0.80%	1	20.00%	0.20%	1.00%	4.00
BAND11+5%	18.5032	1	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00
BAND12+5%	19.9607	2	1	50.00%	0.20%	1	50.00%	0.20%	0.40%	1.00
BAND13	20.3967	7	2	28.57%	0.40%	5	71.43%	1.00%	1.40%	0.40
BAND13+5%	21.4165	1	1	100.00%	0.20%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	100.00
BAND14+5%	22.8756	3	3	100.00%	0.60%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.60%	100.00
BAND15+10%	25.4342	1	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00
BAND15+20%	27.7464	1	0	0.00%	0.00%	1	100.00%	0.20%	0.20%	0.00
BAND15+5%	24.2781	4	2	50.00%	0.40%	2	50.00%	0.40%	0.80%	1.00
Band 10	16.1511	8	4	50.00%	0.80%	4	50.00%	0.80%	1.60%	1.00
Band 12	19.0101	7	3	42.86%	0.60%	4	57.14%	0.80%	1.40%	0.75
3. Principal Officers		41	20	48.78%	3.99%	21	51.22%	4.19%	8.18%	0.95
CHIEFEXEC		1	1	100.00%	0.20%	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.20%	100.00
DIRECTOR		4	3	75.00%	0.60%	1	25.00%	0.20%	0.80%	3.00
5. Exec		5	4	80.00%	0.80%	1	20.00%	0.20%	1.00%	4.00
Grand Total		501	237	47.31%	47.31%	264	52.69%	52.69%		0.90

	Mean hourly rate- Men	Mean hourly rate- Women
For All NJC (excluding Directors and Chief Exec) Average mean hourly rate (total payrate / total number employees)	£ 10.24	£ 10.25
For NJC "Employees" only (excluding Directors and Chief Exec) Average hourly rate (total payrate / total number employees)	£ 8.84	£ 8.79
For NJC "Senior Officers" only (excluding Directors and Chief Exec) Average hourly rate (total payrate / total number employees)	£ 14.17	£ 14.40
For NJC "Principal Officers" only (excluding Directors and Chief Exec) Average hourly rate (total payrate / total number employees)	£ 19.57	£ 19.88

Appendix C

Ethnicity vs Pay (As at 31 March 2014)

Grade	Any other ethnic group	Asian or Asian British-Indian	Asian or Asian British-Pakistani	Black or black British-Any other	Black or black British-Caribbean	Mixed-White and black Caribbean	Unknown	White- Any otherwhite background	White-British	White-Irish	% BME employees within pay grouping (of employees declaring origin)
Band 1						1	17	1	48		2.00%
Band 2				1	1	1	24		29		9.38%
Band 3					1		7	3	50		1.85%
Band 4	1			1			16		74	1	2.60%
Band 5		1		1			5	2	49		3.77%
Band 6			1		1		11		30		6.25%
Band 7		1		1			1	1	26		6.90%
1. Employees	1	2	1	4	3	2	81	7	306	1	3.98%
Band 8							10		17		0.00%
Band 9			1		1		3		16		11.11%
2. Senior Officers			1		1		13		33		5.71%
BAND10+5%							1				
BAND11									5		0.00%
BAND11+5%									1		0.00%
BAND12+5%									2		0.00%
BAND13									7		0.00%
BAND13+5%							1				0.00%
BAND14+5%							1		2		0.00%
BAND15+10%									1		0.00%
BAND15+20%									1		0.00%
BAND15+5%									4		0.00%
Band 10							4		4		0.00%
Band 12							1		6		0.00%
3. Principal Officers							8		33		0.00%
CHIEFEXEC							1				0.00%
DIRECTOR							2		2		0.00%
5. Exec							3		2		0.00%
	1	2	2	4	4	2	105	7	374	1	3.78%

Disability vs Pay (As at 31 March 2014)

Grade	People in grade	No of people with disability	% Disabled of Grade	% Disabled of Total Emps
Band 1	67	0	0.00%	0.00%
Band 2	56	0	0.00%	0.00%
Band 3	61	2	3.28%	0.40%
Band 4	93	2	2.15%	0.40%
Band 5	58	0	0.00%	0.00%
Band 6	43	2	4.65%	0.40%
Band 7	30	4	13.33%	0.80%
1. Employees	408	10	2.45%	1.99%
Band 8	27	4	14.81%	0.80%
Band 9	21	0	0.00%	0.00%
2. Senior Officers	48	4	8.33%	0.80%
BAND10+5%	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND11	5	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND11+5%	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND12+5%	2	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND13	7	1	14.29%	0.20%
BAND13+5%	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND14+5%	3	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND15+10%	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND15+20%	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
BAND15+5%	4	0	0.00%	0.00%
Band 10	8	0	0.00%	0.00%
Band 12	7	0	0.00%	0.00%
3. Principal Officers	41	1	2.44%	0.20%
CHIEFEXEC	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
DIRECTOR	4	0	0.00%	0.00%
5. Exec	5	0	0.00%	0.00%
Grand Total	502	15	2.99%	

Age vs Pay (As at 31 March 2014)

Grade	Contract Count	<20	% < 20	20-29	% 20-29	30-39	% 30-39	40-49	% 40-49	50-59	% 50-59	60+	% 60+
Band 1	67	0	0.00%	5	7.46%	12	17.91%	17	25.37%	15	22.39%	18	26.87%
Band 2	56	0	0.00%	14	25.00%	8	14.29%	11	19.64%	17	30.36%	6	10.71%
Band 3	154	0	0.00%	22	14.29%	26	16.88%	36	23.38%	44	28.57%	26	16.88%
Band 5	58	0	0.00%	5	8.62%	13	22.41%	20	34.48%	12	20.69%	8	13.79%
Band 6	43	0	0.00%	2	4.65%	12	27.91%	12	27.91%	16	37.21%	1	2.33%
Band 7	30	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	23.33%	13	43.33%	8	26.67%	2	6.67%
1. Employees	408	0	0.00%	48	11.76%	78	19.12%	109	26.72%	112	27.45%	61	14.95%
Band 8	27	0	0.00%	1	3.70%	8	29.63%	11	40.74%	2	7.41%	5	18.52%
Band 9	21	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	28.57%	7	33.33%	8	38.10%	0	0.00%
2. Senior Officers	48	0	0.00%	1	2.08%	14	29.17%	18	37.50%	10	20.83%	5	10.42%
BAND10+5%	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND11	5	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%	4	80.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND11+5%	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND12+5%	2	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	0	0.00%
BAND13	7	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	57.14%	2	28.57%	1	14.29%
BAND13+5%	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND14+5%	3	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	100.00%	0	0.00%
BAND15+10%	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND15+20%	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
BAND15+5%	4	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	50.00%	2	50.00%	0	0.00%
Band 10	8	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	37.50%	5	62.50%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Band 12	7	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	42.86%	2	28.57%	2	28.57%	0	0.00%
3. Principal Officers	41	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	10	24.39%	19	46.34%	11	26.83%	1	2.44%
CHIEFEXEC	1	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
DIRECTOR	4	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	3	75.00%	0	0.00%
5. Exec	5	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	40.00%	3	60.00%	0	0.00%
	502	0	0.00%	49	9.76%	102	20.32%	148	29.48%	136	27.09%	67	13.35%

EMPLOYEE HANDBOOK; APPENDIX 36 – EQUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Gedling Borough Council:

- Supports the principle of equal opportunities in employment and believes as part of that principle, that employees should receive equal pay for doing work of equal value.
- Believes that in addition to meeting the requirements of legislation in respect to equal pay, it is in its own interest and the interest of the community that it serves, that pay is awarded fairly and equitably to its employees.
- Recognises that in order to achieve the principle of equal pay for employees doing work of equal value, it should operate a pay system that is transparent, based on objective criteria and free from gender bias.
- Recognises that in order to meet its general and specific obligations under equalities legislation, it is also necessary to analyse pay against other aspects of employment equality where possible and work towards eradicating bias or potential discrimination.

In order to put Gedling Borough Council's commitment to providing equal pay into practice, it will:

- Keep under review, existing and future pay practices including continuing to utilise job evaluation methodology for all employees.
- Carry out monitoring of the impact of the Company's pay practices on at least a three-yearly cycle.
- Continue to work in partnership with recognised Trade Unions on the actions and implementation of this Policy.