

**SPS Report on Gender Pay Gap,  
Occupational Segregation and Equal Pay  
Statement  
April 2017**

# Contents

<b>1.0 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 Equal Pay Statement .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3.0 Scope.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<i>Gender Pay Gap .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Occupational Segregation .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>4.0 Gender Pay Gap.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Occupational Segregation – Gender .....</b>	<b>2</b>
4.1 Gender – Horizontal Segregation .....	2
4.2 Gender – Vertical Segregation.....	4
<b>5.0 Occupational Segregation - Disability.....</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1 Disability – Horizontal Segregation .....	5
5.2 Disability – Vertical Segregation .....	6
<b>6.0 Occupational Segregation - Ethnicity .....</b>	<b>6</b>
6.1 Ethnicity – Horizontal Segregation.....	7
6.2 Ethnicity – Vertical Segregation .....	8

## 1.0 Introduction

This report sets out the information the Scottish Prison Service (SPS) are required to publish under the Public Sector Equality Duty. The Specific Duty requires:

- A listed authority to publish a statement on equal pay every four years. In 2017 this must specify the listed authority's policy on equal pay among its employees between women and men, and people who are disabled and people who are not, and people who fall into a minority racial group and people who do not.
- A listed authority to publish information on the percentage difference among its employees between men's average hourly pay (excluding overtime) and women's average hourly pay (excluding overtime).
- The publication of information on occupational segregation, being the concentration in particular grades and in particular occupations of women and men, persons who are disabled and people who are not, and persons who fall into a minority racial group and persons who do not.

Each of these will be presented and discussed in turn.

## 2.0 Equal Pay Statement

The SPS is committed to equal pay and recruitment and selection based on merit regardless of gender, ethnicity, disability, age or any other protected characteristic. Our pay structure is based on a grade system (labelled B – I, plus Directors and the Chief Executive).

Whilst there are many functions within the SPS – including Estates (who carry out everything from maintenance work to building design), HR, Procurement, Psychology, Finance and Project Management – the main distinction in our structure

is between those who work with prisoners (Operational employees) and those who do not work directly with prisoners (Non-Operational employees).

Historically, the SPS had a male-dominated Operational staff group, and for legal reasons related to same-sex searching there is a requirement for a higher proportion of male Operational staff in prisons which accommodate male prisoners, and vice-versa.

Given that there is a significantly higher number of men in custody than women (95.5% male, 4.5% female) it is reasonable to expect there to be a higher proportion of male Operational employees. However, the SPS acknowledges that the ratio of male to female Operational staff is higher than is necessary (under occupational requirements) to deliver our Operational functions, and this report will set out that this has changed in the recent past, and continues to change.

## 3.0 Scope

### *Gender Pay Gap*

The information relating to the gender pay gap in this report is based on pay and equality data extracted in line with the UK Government's gender pay gap reporting regulations which will come into force in 2017. We have used this scope and methodology to enable benchmarking across the public and private sector.

The data set is drawn from 'Relevant' employees under the UK regulations. These are active employees in receipt of a non-reduced salary. It assumes that all workers not on SPS payroll are employed via an Employment Agency and are therefore not reportable by the relevant Agency. It excludes employees who are not considered to be "full time relevant employees" i.e. employees being paid a reduced or nil rate due to being on leave (sick leave, annual leave, maternity, paternity, adoption, parental special leave).

The relevant date used is 31 December 2016 therefore the pay period is December 2016 (Tax Period 201609). Under these parameters, SPS had a total of **4482** relevant employees as of 31/12/2016.

In our calculations, pay is based on the total salary paid plus salary related allowances, but excluding expenses and overtime. The gross pay for employees paying child care vouchers has been calculated after voucher deduction.

All gender pay gap analysis is based on gross hourly rate in the pay period containing the relevant date. Gross hourly rate is calculated as follows:

**Total Period Amount X 12 = Annual Rate**

**Annual Rate / 52.2 = Weekly Rate**

**Weekly Rate / Hours Payable = Hourly Rate**

The report also presents the proportion of men and women by quartile, with each quartile containing the same number of employees.

### ***Occupational Segregation***

The data presented in relation to occupational segregation by sex, disability and race is extracted from the **total employee base** as of 31 December 2016, rather than the “Relevant Employees” used elsewhere in the report. This is to ensure that employees with disabilities who are on reduced salary due to sickness absence are captured in this data.

Using this approach, the total number of employees working in SPS on 31 December 2016 was **4577**.

The report acknowledges that there are challenges in the SPS in relation to equality monitoring: a new e-HR system has been introduced and the numbers of employees declaring their diversity information has been low. As such the data around occupational segregation for minority racial group (completion rate of 45%) must be caveated with the extremely small sample size.

The SPS is resolved to improve this situation and will take steps to encourage employees to complete their diversity information.

## 4.0 Gender Pay Gap

The SPS has an overall gender split of 71.2% male, 28.8% female.

**Overall, the mean difference between male and female pay in the SPS is 7.8%.**

We have also calculated the mean pay gap by quartile. Table 1 below shows that women are almost evenly represented in the lowest quartile (quartile 1) and represent less than their overall proportion of the workforce in quartiles 2, 3 and 4. However, when mean pay within these quartiles is examined (Table 2), the results show that there is no pay gap in Quartile 3 – despite having the lowest proportion of women – and 5.5% *in favour* of female employees in the highest quartile (Q4).

	Female	Male
<b>Quartile 1</b>	44.6%	55.4%
<b>Quartile 2</b>	27.3%	72.7%
<b>Quartile 3</b>	18.6%	81.4%
<b>Quartile 4</b>	22.9%	77.1%

	Female	Male	%
<b>Quartile 1</b>	£10.43	£10.72	2.8%
<b>Quartile 2</b>	£13.29	£13.88	4.4%
<b>Quartile 3</b>	£15.11	£15.11	0.0%
<b>Quartile 4</b>	£20.60	£19.47	-5.5%

It will be demonstrated through the data on occupational segregation that there are significant differences in the types of roles generally performed by male and female employees in the SPS, and the impact of this on pay will be explored further.

## Occupational Segregation – Gender

### 4.1 Gender – Horizontal Segregation

Horizontal segregation is the term used to describe the clustering of men and women into different types of work. As above, there are a number of different functions within the SPS, and we intend in the near future to move to a “Job Families” approach which would differentiate roles into a number of homogeneous groups. We anticipate having this structure in place for the next Pay Gap report, but in the interim the differentiation will simply be by Operational and Non-Operational function (Table 3).

**Table 3.**

	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% Female</b>
<b>Non-Operational</b>	526	530	1056	50%
<b>Operational</b>	745	2681	3426	22%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1271</b>	<b>3211</b>	<b>4482</b>	<b>28%</b>

The split of male and female staff by occupational group reflects earlier comments about the occupational requirement for more males than females in Operational roles, and indicates that women are significantly more likely to be employed in Non-Operational roles than men. It also reflects the historical context within SPS whereby until the early 1990’s women did not work in Operational roles in male establishments (which are the overwhelming majority of our prisons). This effect has been slow to dissipate due to SPS’ low employee attrition rate.

This segregation may also provide some basis for pay differentials outlined above. Some specialist Operational Band D roles (such as Dog Handler) receive additional allowances in line with their differentiated roles. Managerial Operational roles (F, G) provide additional allowances such as on-call allowance (£2,000 pa) which are not available to most non-Operational staff of the same grade. Finally, senior Operational managers (H, I) receive Recruitment and Retention allowances of up to

£9,000 pa which are not available to most Non-Operational senior managers of the same grade.

The SPS has taken steps to address the gender balance in our Operational group, including Resourcing strategies aimed at making the vacancy proposition more reflective of skills that appeal to women. Table 4 shows the gender split for the most recent intakes of Operational staff.

**Table 4.**

<b>Intake date</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>
Oct-15	19	70%	8	30%	27
May-16	9	64%	5	36%	14
Oct-16	4	29%	10	71%	14
Mar-17	38	51%	36	49%	74
<b>Total(s)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>129</b>

Additionally, when the age range of our employee group is considered (Table 5) – using the assumption that younger employees are more likely to be new recruits – a generational shift in gender balance can be seen beginning to permeate the SPS, with a much greater gender balance in the lower age ranges, and a significant shift to a male dominated group in the higher age ranges.

**Table 5.**

<b>Age Range</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>16-24</b>	54.15%	45.85%	100.00%
<b>25-34</b>	43.98%	56.02%	100.00%
<b>35-44</b>	40.62%	59.38%	100.00%
<b>45-54</b>	18.31%	81.69%	100.00%
<b>55-64</b>	14.82%	85.18%	100.00%
<b>65+</b>	8.33%	91.67%	100.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>28.80%</b>	<b>71.20%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>



## 4.2 Gender – Vertical Segregation

As noted above, the SPS has a grading structure which effectively places employees in one of 9 grades. Table 6, below, demonstrates that the lowest levels of female participation in the workplace is within pay Bands D and E, with D also the most populous pay point, with almost 47% of SPS employees. Table 7 also demonstrates that bands D and E are the points which have the highest proportion of Operational employees, showing a link between the horizontal and vertical gender segregation within the SPS.

Table 6.

Gender	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	SCS	Total
Female	142	488	435	90	64	31	14	5	2	1271
Male	109	809	1656	374	161	72	17	11	2	3211
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>1297</b>	<b>2091</b>	<b>464</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4482</b>
<b>% Female</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>28%</b>

Table 7.

Band	Non-Operational	Operational	Grand Total	% Operational
<b>B</b>	251		251	0.0%
<b>C</b>	326	971	1297	74.9%
<b>D</b>	160	1931	2091	92.3%
<b>E</b>	87	377	464	81.3%
<b>F</b>	137	88	225	39.1%
<b>G</b>	75	28	103	27.2%
<b>H</b>	11	20	31	64.5%
<b>I</b>	5	11	16	68.8%
<b>SCS</b>	4		4	0.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>3426</b>	<b>4482</b>	<b>74.9%</b>

## 5.0 Occupational Segregation - Disability

### 5.1 Disability – Horizontal Segregation

In 2014 the SPS introduced diversity monitoring through a new e-HR system. At present the structure of the system lends itself to declarations by those employees who have a disability, but may not be clear to non-disabled employees that they are required to also make an entry indicating that they are not disabled. As a result, it is overwhelmingly employees who have a disability who have provided this information on e-HR. We will take steps to encourage all employees to complete this field to enable better analysis.

It is worth noting that a disability declaration rate of 7.87% is higher than under the previous system which could point to more staff feeling confident about providing this information and finding it easier to do so.

Table 8 below shows that the split of employees who have self-declared a disability is fairly uniform across the Operational and Non-Operational sides of SPS' business. There is a very slight difference in the proportions in Non-Operational employees who have self-declared a disability, however this is less than 0.4% and the gap may perhaps have been expected to be larger, given the requirements of Operational roles.

**Table 8.**

	<b>Self-Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Non Self-Declared Disabled</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Operational</b>	7.96%	92.04%	100.00%
<b>Non-Operational</b>	7.57%	92.43%	100.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7.87%</b>	<b>92.13%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## 5.2 Disability – Vertical Segregation

Table 9 shows that the distribution across the main staff groups is relatively regular, with slightly higher concentrations within the middle bands (D, E, F) and a tailing off in the highest bands. Notably there are no individuals who have self-declared disabled at the highest bands of SPS leadership.

**Table 9.**

Band	Self-Declared Disabled	Non Self-Declared Disabled	Grand Total
<b>B</b>	4.58%	95.42%	100.00%
<b>C</b>	5.18%	94.82%	100.00%
<b>D</b>	9.07%	90.93%	100.00%
<b>E</b>	12.18%	87.82%	100.00%
<b>F</b>	9.73%	90.27%	100.00%
<b>G</b>	--	--	100.00%
<b>H</b>	--	--	100.00%
<b>I</b>	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>SCS</b>	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>7.87%</b>	<b>92.13%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## 6.0 Occupational Segregation - Ethnicity

As noted previously, completion rates across many diversity categories on our e-HR system are low. For ethnicity, only 46% of employees have provided information about their ethnicity, of whom one fifth selected “Prefer Not to Declare”. Therefore the data on which we can report is limited in order to protect individuals’ identities.

Additionally, as reported in our separate Equality Monitoring Report (also published on the SPS website), our workforce has a low ethnic diversity with 0.96% of employees declaring their ethnicity as Mixed or multiple ethnic group; Asian, Asian Scottish or Asian British; African; Caribbean or Black; or other ethnic group. In order to enable meaningful analysis, we have grouped these categories into a single

‘ethnic minority group’. We have also grouped as ‘White’ all employees who identified as belonging to a sub-category of White using Census categories.

In doing so we recognise the limitations this imposes on being able to understand the particular differences in experiences of people between people who fall into visible minority ethnic groups and non-visible minority ethnic groups (e.g. people who are Polish or Gypsy/Travellers) or among visible ethnic minority groups. However, were we to disaggregate the data in this way, our data set would be so small as to then require redaction which would be contrary to the purpose of this analysis.

## 6.1 Ethnicity – Horizontal Segregation

**Table 10.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Non-Operational</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Operational</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Ethnic Minority group</b>	10	50.00%	10	50.00%	20
<b>White</b>	374	23.73%	1202	76.27%	1576
<b>No data</b>	565	23.34%	1856	76.66%	2421
<b>Prefer Not to Declare</b>	107	23.01%	358	76.99%	465
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>23.56%</b>	<b>3426</b>	<b>76.44%</b>	<b>4482</b>

The data shows that employees who belong to an ethnic minority group are evenly distributed between our Operational and Non-Operational functions. However, given that the Operational function is more than twice the size of the non-Operational function, when presented as a proportion of the function the results are:

**Table 11.**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Non-Operational</b>	<b>Operational</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
<b>Ethnic Minority group</b>	0.95%	0.29%	0.45%
<b>White</b>	35.42%	35.08%	35.16%
<b>No data</b>	53.50%	54.17%	54.02%
<b>PNTD</b>	10.13%	10.45%	10.37%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

This shows that ethnic minority employees represent *less* as a proportion of the Operational function when compared with the Non-Operational group. Increasing the diversity of our workforce has been identified as an equality outcome for 2017-2020 and we will use the information above when recruiting, particularly to Operational vacancies.

## **6.2 Ethnicity – Vertical Segregation**

Because of the small numbers involved, we cannot present data on vertical segregation by ethnicity as, due to the spread of employees, we would require to redact the data. However, we can report that:

- the majority of employees who belong to an ethnic minority group are located in Band C, whereas band D is our most populous band;
- Compared to white employees, ethnic minority employees have higher representation rates at B, C, F and G, and lower representation rates at D and E.
- There is no one who identifies as belonging to an ethnic minority group at band H or higher.

In considering the implications of these results we need to use caution due to the small cohort of ethnic minority employees, and the fact that we do not hold data for 54% of employees. We will re-evaluate the data once we have taken action to increase completion rates.