



Equal pay audit report – gender, ethnicity and disability 2025



Inclusivedinburgh
respect and equality in the workplace

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Equal pay audit - gender.....	6
Equal pay audit - ethnicity.....	8
Equal pay audit - disability	11
Equal pay audit outcomes	13
Equal pay actions	14
Appendix 1: 2025 Equal pay audit, gender – LGE workforce	15
Appendix 2: Equal pay audit, gender – L&T workforce.....	16
Appendix 3: 2025 Equal pay audit, ethnicity - LGE workforce	17
Appendix 4: 2025 Equal pay audit, ethnicity – L&T workforce.....	18
Appendix 5: 2025 Equal pay audit, disability – LGE workforce.....	19
Appendix 6: 2025 Equal pay audit, disability – L&T workforce	20

Introduction

Background

The City of Edinburgh Council is committed to fulfilling the three key elements of the public sector equality duty (PSED), as defined in the Equality Act 2010. A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act.
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Under the equal pay provisions of the Equality Act 2010, men and women in the same employment who are performing equal work should receive equal pay.

We outline our commitment and approach to equal pay at the Council in our [Equal Pay Policy Statement](#).

As part of our ongoing commitment to equal pay, we carry out annual equal pay audits for the Local Government Employee (LGE) and Learning and Teaching (L&T) workforce groups.

Equal work

Jobs that may be entirely different in content might be considered work of equal value when the demands made on the employees doing them are assessed. Robust and fair job evaluation is the most reliable way of assessing whether jobs are of equal value.

Job evaluation schemes:

- Provide a basis for a grading and pay structure.
- Provide a means to check and demonstrate there is equal pay for equal work.

- Evaluate the job, not the postholder(s).
- Provide a way of assessing the demands of a job that is as objective as possible.

At the Council:

- LGE roles are graded using the Capital Job Evaluation scheme.
- L&T roles are graded based on SNCT job-sizing methodology.
- Chief Officer roles are evaluated using the Hay/Korn Ferry job evaluation scheme.

The job evaluation systems in place are intended to provide a robust and defensible understanding of internal relativities when applied in the manner they are intended to be used.

Approach

An equal pay audit examines at the rates of pay for different groups carrying out equal work and pay is analysed on an equal work band (or grade-by-grade) basis. It is an effective way to determine whether an organisation is rewarding colleagues fairly and promoting equal pay for equal work.

Unless there is a genuine justification for a difference in pay that has nothing to do with the gender (sex) of postholders, women and men doing equal work are entitled to equal pay.

An equal pay audit involves:

- comparing the pay of different workforce groups doing equal work
- identifying any differences in pay
- investigating the causes of any differences in pay
- an action plan to address and eliminate gaps where there is no genuine justification for a difference in pay
- ongoing monitoring.

Scope

Traditionally, equal pay audits have compared the pay of women and men doing equal work. Our equal pay audit also analyses the picture of equal pay for our minority ethnic and disabled populations.

Our analysis includes:

- protected characteristics of gender (sex), ethnicity and disability
- permanent and fixed-term contracts
- base pay and additional payments
- grades where there is scope for a difference in pay
- mean and median pay gaps by grade.

Our analysis excludes:

- other protected characteristics at present
- the flexible workforce carrying out roles on a casual, supply, locum or agency basis.

Readers should note the scope of our equal pay audit is different to that of our pay gap reporting, which also includes the flexible workforce (except for agency workers).

In our analysis:

- all LGE grades are examined for equal pay gaps in relation to 'base' and 'package' pay
- we have excluded analysis for some L&T grades as they consist of a single pay point
- we report only base pay differences for the L&T workforce as they do not earn additional payments under the SNCT framework
- we have excluded analysis for the Chief Officer workforce as their pay and grading structure consists single pay points
- we have excluded analysis for grades with single incumbents or where the dataset does not provide a representative sample for analysis.

The analysis is based on disclosure levels of:

- 100% for gender (sex)
- 84% for ethnicity
- 81% for disability.

When considering statistical significance, proportions must be reviewed in relation to the sample size in each grouping. Whilst the workforce datasets for gender/sex, ethnicity and disability represent a rate of disclosure of 80% and above, our analysis and outcomes will become more robust as we achieve improved disclosure rates for protected characteristics and as representation improves.

The workforce profile reflected in this analysis is:

- 70% female
- 7% minority ethnic
- 3% declared disabled.

Outcomes

An equal pay audit might reveal significant differences between the pay, of women and men doing equal work (and in respect of ethnicity and disability). When this happens, we need to identify which aspects of the pay system are causing the differences and why.

The Equalities and Human Right Commission (EHRC) recommend that the following equal pay audit outcomes require further investigation:

- Differences of 5% or more.
- Any recurring differences of 3% or more.

This is not definitive and does not mean that other differences are not significant or that we are protected from equal pay challenges being raised against us. The narrative contained in this report should be considered in the context of disclosure rates and data available for analysis. It should be recognised that this report does not constitute or replace any legal advice, nor is it a comprehensive listing of potential claims or issues.

Equal pay audit - gender

Local Government Employees

Equal pay audit outcomes for gender (sex) for the LGE workforce are detailed in **Appendix 1**.

Base pay

In general, colleagues are appointed at the bottom of a pay grade and progress through the scale on an annual basis in line with pay progression rules (contribution-based pay). In some grades, women have a higher rate of pay than men and this is denoted as a negative percentage gap.

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: none.
- Difference of 5% or more: none.

All mean differences observed are within EHRC guidelines.

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR5, GR10, GR12
- Difference of 5% or more: GR6, GR8.

Recurring differences: GR5, GR6, GR10 and GR12.

When we examine the underlying causes of these differences we see:

- many women in these grades have not yet progressed to the top of scale as they were appointed in role more recently
- men who have longer service in role have progressed to the top of scale
- there appears to be genuine justification for the differences observed.

Figure 1: Placement of women and men within grades

Grade	Top of scale		Lower in scale		Bottom of scale	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
GR5	36%	48%	51%	37%	13%	15%
GR6	41%	62%	47%	29%	12%	9%
GR8	43%	51%	49%	43%	8%	6%
GR10	32%	47%	59%	41%	9%	13%
GR12	35%	64%	50%	23%	15%	14%

Positively, we saw women being newly appointed to senior roles in GR10 and GR12, supporting representation of women in these equal work bands. Over time we anticipate the differences in base pay for GR5, GR6, GR8, GR10 and GR12 should narrow as women progress within the grade.

Package pay

The equal pay audit outcomes for package pay present a different picture compared with the analysis of base pay.

Mean difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR3, GR5
- Difference of 5% or more: none.

Median difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR5, GR8, GR12
- Difference of 5% or more: GR3, GR6, GR10

Recurring differences: GR3, GR5 and GR10.

Recurring differences for GR3 and GR5 are driven by differences in women's and men's average earnings for Working Time Payments (WTPs).

In addition, 217 full-time men who earn contractual overtime are concentrated in GR3 and GR5. By comparison, only 37 women are in

receipt of contractual overtime, and these are predominantly based in GR3 and GR4 roles in Care Homes in the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.

We know that women may be limited in their potential to earn additional payments linked to their working pattern as:

- occupational segregation means women are over-represented in part-time roles which attract little or no WTPs
- WTPs for disruption are pro-rated for part-time working patterns.

This is in the context of a workforce profile of 42% part-time, where 85% of part-time colleagues are women.

When we analyse earnings across the total populations of women and men, the average pay for women is diluted by the significant number of women in roles with no or limited WTPs. For example, we have approximately 1.2K part-time women in pupil support roles whose working patterns do not attract any WTPs.

Across the total workforce, the average WTPs per month are:

- £41 for women and £23 for part-time women
- £85 for men and £98 for full-time men.

The average contractual overtime earnings per month are:

- £3 for women
- £19 for men

The differences observed in:

- GR3 and GR5 relate to WTPs and other contractual payments
- GR8, GR10 and GR12 relate to recent appointments where women have not yet progressed to top of scale.

There appears to be genuine justification for the differences observed.

However, we recognise that persistent occupational segregation and the concentration of women in part-time roles with limited scope for additional payments must be addressed. We aim to explore the design of our

additional payments as part of the review of our reward and recognition framework over 2025-2026.

Learning and Teaching workforce

Equal pay audit outcomes for gender (sex) for the L&T workforce are detailed in **Appendix 2**.

Base pay

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: Principal Teacher.
- Difference of 5% or more: Head and Depute Head Teacher.

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: none.
- Difference of 5% or more: Head and Depute Head Teacher.

Recurring differences: none.

When we examine the underlying causes of these differences we see:

- many women in these grades have not yet progressed to the top of scale as they have less tenure in role
- men who have longer service in role have progressed further up the payscale.

At present there appears to be genuine justification for the differences observed.

Over time we anticipate the differences in base pay should narrow as women progress within the grade.

Figure 2: Placement of women and men within grades

Grade	Top of scale		Lower in scale		Bottom of scale	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Principal Teacher	4%	12%	64%	73%	32%	15%
HT and DHT	0%	2%	96%	96%	4%	2%

Most of the L&T workforce is concentrated in the Main Grade Teacher equal work band. In some grades, women have a higher rate of pay than men and this is denoted as a negative percentage gap. The existence of both positive and negative gaps indicates a lack of systematic bias towards one sex over another.



Equal pay audit - ethnicity

Local Government Employees

Equal pay audit outcomes for ethnicity for the LGE workforce are detailed in **Appendix 3**.

Base pay

In reviewing equal pay outcomes, we need to consider the analysis in the context of dataset size and the fact that datasets being examined (ME and white) are not of comparable size, particularly in the senior grades.

We recognise there is:

- an under-representation of ME colleagues in the senior grades
- and an over-representation of ME colleagues in the lower grades

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR7, GR8, GR10.
- Difference of 5% or more: none.

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR4, GR5, GR11.
- Difference of 5% or more: GR6, GR7, GR8, GR10

Recurring differences: GR4, GR7, GR11.

When we examine the underlying causes of these differences we see:

- many ME colleagues in these grades have not yet progressed to the top of scale as they were appointed in role more recently
- white colleagues who have longer service in role have progressed to the top of scale

There appears to be genuine justification for the differences observed.

Figure 3: Placement of ME and white colleagues within grades

Grade	Top of scale		Lower in scale		Bottom of scale	
	ME	White	ME	White	ME	White
GR4	38%	58%	39%	30%	24%	12%
GR5	25%	42%	50%	44%	26%	13%
GR6	29%	50%	49%	39%	22%	10%
GR7	22%	49%	58%	41%	19%	9%
GR8	26%	49%	56%	45%	18%	6%
GR10	0%	40%	100%	49%	0%	11%
GR11	0%	38%	100%	52%	0%	10%

Annually, our ME workforce is consistently increasing by 1% but a deep dive of recruitment data shows most appointments were made in the lower grades.

Positively, we saw ME colleagues being newly appointed to GR7 (Social Worker roles) and professional/technical GR8 roles but there was little change in ME representation in the senior grades.

Our understanding is that the differences observed in the equal pay audit are connected to the attraction of a more diverse workforce at the Council but where ME colleagues have not yet progressed to top of grade due to less time in role than white colleagues. We anticipate these differences would balance out over time with annual pay progression.

Package pay

The equal pay audit outcomes for package pay present a slightly different picture compared with the analysis of base pay.

Mean difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR5, GR7, GR10.
- Difference of 5% or more: None.

Median difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: GR11.
- Difference of 5% or more: GR5, GR6, GR7, GR8. GR10.

Recurring differences: GR5, GR7, GR10, GR11.

Across the total workforce, the average WTPs per month are:

- £63 for ME colleagues
- £38 for white colleagues

The higher average WTPs for ME colleagues are reflected in equal work bands for GR3 and GR4, where a positive (mean) difference exists for the ME group.

This outcome is influenced by occupational segregation, and an over-representation of ME colleagues in lower graded occupations that attract WTPs, coupled with a greater proportion of part-time white colleagues in the equivalent equal pay work bands (with less potential to earn WTPs).

The average contractual overtime earnings per month are:

- £0.47 for ME colleagues
- £4.44 for white colleagues

This should be considered in the context that two ME colleagues earn contractual overtime compared with 154 white colleagues, highlighting a lack of representation of ME colleagues in roles that attract this payment.

The recurring differences observed in:

- GR6 to GR11 relate to newer appointments where ME colleagues have not yet progressed to top of scale
- GR5 relate to an under-representation of ME colleagues in roles that attract contractual overtime, and tenure in role.

There appears to be genuine justification for the differences observed.

However, we recognise that persistent occupational segregation and the concentration of ME colleagues in lower grade roles, like care and catering and cleaning, and lack of representation in other services, must be addressed through strategic EDI initiatives.

Learning and Teaching workforce

Equal pay audit outcomes for ethnicity for the L&T workforce are detailed in **Appendix 4**.

Base pay

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: Education Support Officer.
- Difference of 5% or more: Music Instructor, Educational Psychologist.

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: none.
- Difference of 5% or more: Music Instructor, Educational Psychologist, Education Support Officer.

Recurring differences: Music Instructor, Educational Psychologist.

Comparability of dataset size is important to reflect upon for L&T outcomes. The differences observed should be considered in the context that:

- there is less representation of ME colleagues across the L&T workforce when compared to LGE; the L&T ME workforce is 2.6% and the LGE ME workforce is 8.3%.
- for all differences observed, we are comparing the pay of single ME postholders with the pay of a much larger group of white colleagues in the same equal work bands.

In terms of data validity, we cannot draw robust conclusions from the analysis due to the datasets under examination being of incomparable

size. The analysis highlights the lack of representation of ME colleagues within L&T specialist and senior roles.



Equal pay audit - disability

Local Government Employees

Equal pay audit outcomes for disability for the LGE workforce are detailed in **Appendix 5**.

Base pay

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: None.
- Difference of 5% or more: None.

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: None.
- Difference of 5% or more: None.

All differences observed are within EHRC guidelines.

We see positive pay gaps for the disabled groups across many of the equal work bands.

The existence of both positive and negative gaps indicates a lack of systematic bias towards one group over another, but again, we need to consider the outcomes in relation to the size of datasets under examination and workforce diversity.

We recognise there is:

- potential under-disclosure of disabilities based on lack of understanding of the 'definition of disability'
- no **declared** representation of disabled colleagues in GR11 and GR12

- an over-representation of disabled colleagues in the business support occupational group

The positive differences observed reflect:

- longer tenure of the disabled workforce in many equal work bands, where most disabled colleagues have progressed to the top of their grade
- colleagues without a disability are still progressing in the scale and were recruited to role more recently.

However, as many disabled colleagues have progressed to the top of grade, this highlights a lack of new appointments of disabled candidates in recent years, which we need to look at.

Package pay

Mean difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: None.
- Difference of 5% or more: None.

Median difference – package pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: None.
- Difference of 5% or more: None.

All differences observed are within EHRC guidelines.

The equal pay audit outcomes for package pay present a slightly different picture compared with the analysis of base pay.

Whilst we still see some positive differences in pay across several equal work bands for package pay, the differences are smaller when we take

account of additional payments. In GR4 a positive difference in base pay of -0.6% becomes a difference of 2.7% for package pay when we include WTPs and contractual overtime in the analysis.

All variances observed for package pay are within EHRC guidelines.

Across the total workforce, the average WTPs per month are:

- £31 for disabled colleagues
- £41 for colleagues without a disability

The average contractual overtime earnings per month are:

- £2.74 for disabled colleagues
- £4.22 for colleagues without a disability.

This should be considered in the context that three disabled colleagues earn contractual overtime compared with 148 colleagues without a disability. It highlights a lack of representation of disabled colleagues in roles that attract this payment.

We recognise that persistent occupational segregation and the concentration of disabled colleagues in lower grade roles, like business support assistants, and lack of representation at the senior level, must be addressed through strategic EDI initiatives.



Learning and Teaching workforce

Equal pay audit outcomes for disability for the L&T workforce are detailed in **Appendix 6**.

Base pay

Mean difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: Education Support Officer, Educational Psychologist
- Difference of 5% or more: Music Instructor, Head & Depute Head Teacher

Median difference – base pay

Analysis of difference in pay by equal work bands:

- Difference of 3% or more: none
- Difference of 5% or more: Music Instructor, Education Support Officer, Educational Psychologist, Head & Depute Head Teacher

Recurring differences: none.

Comparability of dataset size is important to reflect upon for L&T outcomes. The differences observed should be considered in the context that:

- for all differences observed, we are comparing the pay of single disabled postholders with the pay of a much larger group of colleagues without a disability in the same equal work bands.

In terms of data validity, we cannot draw robust conclusions from the analysis due to the datasets under examination being of incomparable size. The analysis highlights the lack of representation of disabled colleagues within L&T specialist and senior roles.

Equal pay audit outcomes

“It is rare to emerge from a properly conducted pay audit without some gender pay differences or aspects of pay policy requiring change...that doesn’t mean that pay discrimination has occurred, or if it has that it has been deliberate. Pay differences between men and women may have been caused by the impact of historical factors...some differences may be justified.”

Equalities and Human Rights Commission

Through the equal pay audit, we have identified both positive and negative gaps across the protected characteristics of gender (sex), ethnicity and disability, indicating an absence of systematic bias in favour of one characteristic.

Most gaps identified are below the 5% threshold for investigation recommended by the EHRC, and justification or genuine material factors appear to drive the observed recurring gaps of 3% or more.

Where gaps exceed the threshold, an investigation of payments indicates that differentials predominantly relate to:

Dataset size

We need to take account of representation and dataset size when considering the analysis outcomes. It is challenging to draw robust conclusions from some elements of the data analysis based on current dataset numbers and a lack of representation of ME and disabled colleagues across certain equal work bands.

Occupational segregation

The Equal Pay Audit has not highlighted any significant pay gaps that appear to be directly linked to equal work but the analysis highlights that the gaps are influenced by occupational segregation and the level of payments attracted by part-time working.

In this respect it could perhaps be deemed that some of the outcomes we see are attributable to historical factors, and that there is a genuine justification for the observed differences in pay.

Despite this, we have a key long-term commitment to tackle occupational segregation at the Council. We recognise this will involve opening more part-time working opportunities in senior grades and achieving a better representation of protected groups at senior levels. Pilot activities are currently being undertaken with services for these initiatives - more information is available in our annual EDI action plan update.

Working time payments

We know that certain groups may be limited in their potential to earn additional payments linked to their role and working pattern as:

- occupational segregation means they are over-represented in predominantly part-time roles, or occupations, that attract little or no WTPs in relation to disruption or unsocial hours (for example educational support, business support)
- conversely, they are under-represented in predominantly full-time roles that attract more significant WTPs and contractual overtime (for example frontline public services)
- WTPs for disruption are pro-rated for part-time working patterns.

We aim to develop pilots in relevant services to drive additional flexible working opportunities and attract more women into roles historically carried out by men.

Contractual overtime

In the main, contractual overtime payments at the enhanced x1.5 rate are earned by full-time men, white colleagues and colleagues without a disability.

Due to the prevalence of part-time working arrangements, and occupational segregation of women, ME and disabled colleagues, there is limited scope for protected groups to earn contractual overtime.

Equal pay actions

Monitoring and evaluation

We will continue to:

- monitor, report, and review our equal pay position and pay gaps on an annual basis
- push for higher rates of disclosure to make sure future analysis reflects the widest population possible
- use equal pay audit and pay gap analysis to inform EDI strategies and initiatives, where the metrics are used as a baseline upon which to measure the success of such initiatives
- make sure an audit trail exists for all decisions in relation to pay and salary placement.

In addition, we want to explore:

- incorporating pay equality change impact analysis into Integrated Impact Assessments where there is a change to structures, roles, work patterns, or payments that might affect workforce pay gaps.

Pay arrangements

We will:

- continue to make sure the policies and processes associated with pay management are transparent and clearly articulated
- continue to do everything we can to make sure our locally determined pay framework, and the application of this, promotes fairness and pay equality
- review our current reward and recognition framework as part of our People Strategy 2025 to 2027

- use equal pay audit and pay gap analysis to inform the exploration and development of a revised reward and recognition framework. Based on equal pay audit findings, we plan to explore:
 - the design of our pay and grading structure, for parity in the lower grades
 - grade overlaps and pay differentials between grades
 - the design of our framework for WTPs and the scope for part-time earnings
 - Arrangements for contractual overtime



Appendix 1: 2025 Equal pay audit, gender – LGE workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)	Mean difference (package pay)	Median difference (package pay)
	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %				
Workforce	67%	33%	85%	15%				
GR1	89%	11%	91%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%
GR2	75%	25%	76%	24%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
GR3	78%	22%	91%	9%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	7.7%
GR4	59%	41%	82%	18%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
GR5	70%	30%	88%	12%	0.9%	3.2%	4.4%	4.4%
GR6	59%	41%	83%	17%	1.9%	5.3%	1.8%	5.0%
GR7	66%	34%	84%	16%	0.5%	0.0%	0.7%	2.7%
GR8	59%	41%	78%	22%	0.8%	5.7%	0.5%	3.3%
GR9	60%	40%	90%	10%	0.7%	1.5%	0.4%	1.5%
GR10	56%	44%	73%	27%	1.1%	4.4%	1.3%	5.2%
GR11	35%	65%	100%	0%	-0.1%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.0%
GR12	48%	52%	N/A	N/A	2.1%	3.6%	2.1%	3.6%

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	Female	Male
Business support group	77%	23%
Care group	75%	25%
Catering, cleaning, FM group	70%	30%
Educational support group	93%	7%
Frontline public services group	23%	77%
Leadership group	49%	51%
Manager group	63%	37%
Professional / Technical group	58%	42%
Teacher group*	43%	57%

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	Female	Male
Salary range £20K - £29,999	73%	27%
Salary range £30k - £39,999	63%	37%
Salary range £40k - £49,999	63%	37%
Salary range £50k - £59,999	58%	42%
Salary range £60k - £69,999	60%	40%
Salary range £70k - £79,999	50%	50%
Salary range more than £80k	43%	57%

*LGE instructors

Appendix 2: Equal pay audit, gender – L&T workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)
	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %		
Workforce	76%	24%	86%	14%		
Main Grade Teacher	78%	22%	88%	12%	-1.0%	0.0%
Chartered Teacher	71%	29%	85%	15%	Single pay point per job size/grade	
Principal Teacher	71%	29%	81%	19%		
DHTs and HTs	75%	25%	94%	6%		
Music Instructor	56%	44%	58%	42%	-4.6%	0.0%
Educational Psychologist	88%	12%	92%	8%	-0.6%	0.0%
Education Support Officers	58%	42%	100%	0%	0.0%	0.0%
QIO	67%	33%	100%	0%	1.6%	0%

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	Female	Male
Leadership group	74%	26%
Manager group	64%	36%
Teacher group	77%	23%

Leadership group includes depute head teachers and head teachers.

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	Female	Male
Salary range £30k - £39,999	70%	30%
Salary range £40k - £49,999	73%	27%
Salary range £50k - £59,999	79%	21%
Salary range £60k - £69,999	72%	28%
Salary range £70k - £79,999	69%	31%
Salary range more than £80k	67%	33%

Appendix 3: 2025 Equal pay audit, ethnicity - LGE workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)	Mean difference (package pay)	Median difference (package pay)
	ME %	White %	ME %	White %				
Workforce	7%	76%	9%	74%				
GR1	13%	65%	13%	67%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%
GR2	13%	72%	14%	72%	0.2%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
GR3	12%	70%	10%	73%	0.1%	0.0%	-1.7%	0.0%
GR4	9%	75%	9%	76%	1.7%	4.5%	-0.2%	-0.6%
GR5	5%	78%	6%	80%	1.9%	3.6%	3.1%	5.5%
GR6	5%	81%	4%	81%	2.9%	10.2%	2.6%	5.5%
GR7	7%	81%	5%	82%	3.7%	7.8%	4.1%	9.0%
GR8	4%	84%	1%	88%	3.3%	7.9%	3.5%	9.5%
GR9	3%	89%	0%	95%	1.1%	1.5%	1.3%	1.5%
GR10	2%	88%	0%	73%	3.3%	7.1%	3.6%	7.1%
GR11	3%	85%	0%	100%	0.4%	3.0%	0.4%	3.0%
GR12	0%	98%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	ME	White
Business support group	7.9%	81.4%
Care group	14.9%	64.4%
Catering, cleaning, FM group	11.5%	71.9%
Educational support group	10.0%	73.0%
Frontline public services group	3.0%	78.8%
Leadership group	1.5%	88.7%
Manager group	4.3%	85.2%
Professional / Technical group	7.0%	80.7%
Teacher group*	0.0%	78.3%

*LGE instructors

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	ME	White
Salary range £20K - £29,999	10.9%	72.8%
Salary range £30k - £39,999	6.3%	78.1%
Salary range £40k - £49,999	5.0%	81.8%
Salary range £50k - £59,999	2.9%	88.5%
Salary range £60k - £69,999	3.0%	88.1%
Salary range £70k - £79,999	1.2%	90.7%
Salary range more than £80k	1.4%	91.3%

Appendix 4: 2025 Equal pay audit, ethnicity – L&T workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)
	ME %	White %	ME %	White %		
Workforce	3%	77%	1%	28%		
Main Grade Teacher	3%	75%	2%	81%	1.1%	0.0%
Chartered Teacher	3%	85%	2%	83%	Single pay point per job size/grade.	
Principal Teacher	1%	84%	1%	82%		
DHTs and HTs	1%	85%	0%	92%	2.8%	0.1%
Music Instructor	1%	85%	2%	86%	17.2%	20.3%
Educational Psychologist	12%	65%	8%	62%	4.8%	9.6%
Education Support Officers	8%	75%	0%	100%	4.7%	7.4%
QIO	0%	93%	0%	100%	All white.	

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	ME	White
Leadership group	0.9%	86.1%
Manager group	1.3%	81.0%
Teacher group	2.8%	76.1%

Leadership group includes deputy head teachers and head teachers.

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	ME	White
Salary range £30k - £39,999	0.6%	21.9%
Salary range £40k - £49,999	3.6%	65.7%
Salary range £50k - £59,999	2.6%	81.7%
Salary range £60k - £69,999	1.6%	84.7%
Salary range £70k - £79,999	2.3%	81.4%
Salary range more than £80k	1.1%	85.1%

Appendix 5: 2025 Equal pay audit, disability – LGE workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)	Mean difference (package pay)	Median difference (package pay)
	Disabled %	Not disabled %	Disabled %	Not disabled %				
Workforce	4%	79%	4%	78%				
GR1	3%	72%	3%	74%	0.2%	0.0%	-0.4%	0.0%
GR2	2%	81%	2%	81%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%
GR3	3%	76%	3%	77%	-0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%
GR4	5%	77%	6%	77%	-0.6%	0.0%	2.7%	0.0%
GR5	3%	78%	4%	79%	0.4%	1.2%	0.9%	1.2%
GR6	4%	79%	7%	75%	-1.2%	-2.8%	-0.8%	-2.8%
GR7	5%	81%	5%	79%	-2.5%	-2.8%	-2.4%	-2.8%
GR8	4%	83%	3%	80%	-2.7%	-3.0%	-2.2%	-3.0%
GR9	4%	85%	5%	85%	-0.4%	0.0%	-0.1%	0.0%
GR10	5%	82%	0%	73%	-2.7%	-6.2%	-3.4%	-6.2%
GR11	0%	76%	0%	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GR12	0%	90%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	Disabled	Not disabled
Business support group	7.3%	77.8%
Care group	2.9%	73.6%
Catering, cleaning, FM group	2.2%	79.3%
Educational support group	2.6%	77.9%
Frontline public services group	3.2%	77.0%
Leadership group	3.1%	82.1%
Manager group	3.6%	82.7%
Professional / Technical group	5.2%	80.7%
Teacher group*	0.0%	65.2%

*LGE instructors

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	Disabled	Not disabled
Salary range £20K - £29,999	3.7%	77.5%
Salary range £30k - £39,999	3.1%	79.1%
Salary range £40k - £49,999	4.5%	79.5%
Salary range £50k - £59,999	5.0%	84.0%
Salary range £60k - £69,999	4.2%	85.2%
Salary range £70k - £79,999	5.8%	79.1%
Salary range more than £80k	0.0%	85.5%

Appendix 6: 2025 Equal pay audit, disability – L&T workforce

Grade	Workforce profile		Part time working		Mean difference (base pay)	Median difference (base pay)
	Disabled %	Not disabled %	Disabled %	Not disabled %		
Workforce	2%	74%	2%	77%		
Main Grade Teacher	2%	71%	2%	77%	0.1%	0.0%
Chartered Teacher	1%	87%	0%	83%	Single pay point per job size/grade	
Principal Teacher	2%	81%	2%	77%		
DHTs and HTs	1%	81%	0%	85%	11.2%	8.9%
Music Instructor	1%	74%	2%	76%	21.9%	24.8%
Educational Psychologist	4%	69%	8%	54%	4.2%	5.4%
Education Support Officers	8%	75%	0%	100%	4.7%	7.4%
QIO	0%	87%	0%	100%	All not disabled	

Occupational segregation

Occupational group	Disabled	Not disabled
Leadership group	0.9%	81.7%
Manager group	0.7%	79.1%
Teacher group	2.0%	72.9%

Leadership group includes depute head teachers and head teachers.

Vertical segregation

Salary bracket	Disabled	Not disabled
Salary range £30k - £39,999:	0.6%	17.2%
Salary range £40k - £49,999:	1.6%	58.6%
Salary range £50k - £59,999:	2.1%	79.6%
Salary range £60k - £69,999:	1.8%	80.2%
Salary range £70k - £79,999:	1.8%	80.5%
Salary range more than £80k:	0.0%	83.0%