

The government is committed to tackling pay inequality between men and women. Following a consultation period with interested parties, it proposed in 2016 that any company with over 250 employees would be obliged annually to report upon the pay that the respective genders receive within its organisation, to explain why any potential gap existed and to announce which measures it was taking to narrow the gap. Legislation was duly passed in 2017 and the reporting regime has come into effect.

Although under employment law agency workers are not classed as employees, for the purposes of a gender pay gap reporting exercise they are indeed in scope and so, as an employment business supplying temporary workers - primarily to the construction industry - Corepeople Recruitment is required to comply with this new reporting regime. Indeed, as an employer fully committed to the principle of workplace equality, we are happy to do so, and as well as publishing results for our workforce as a whole, over which we can exercise little control as our clients generally dictate pay rates, we have also undertaken the same task for our directly employed colleagues.

The results make for interesting reading, not least because, taken at face value, they buck the national trend, with women on our payroll earning on average 15% more than men. That said, although we would happily take the credit for being a particularly enlightened employer, it is incumbent upon us to point out that the sample size and composition throws up a number of anomalies which render the results virtually meaningless to the casual observer. The results are as follows:

Snapshot Date 5 April 2017			
1	Average gender pay gap as a mean average	Women's hourly rate is 15.1% higher	
2	Average gender pay gap as a median average	Women's hourly rate is 10.8% higher	
3	Average bonus gender pay gap as a mean average	Women's bonus is 7.8% lower	
4	Average bonus gender pay gap as a median average	Women's bonus is 26.0% higher	
5	Proportion of Men and Women who received bonus pay.	Male	Female
		4.4%	23.3%
6	Proportion of men and women in the four banded pay groups	Male	Female
	Upper quartile	55.8%	44.2%
	Upper middle quartile	63.5%	36.5%
	Lower middle quartile	57.7%	42.3%
	Lower quartile	84.6%	15.4%

For our internal staff the picture is equally nuanced, as again on account of the sample size there are factors which have impacted disproportionately upon one group or another and which would generally have been discarded in a bona fide statistical analysis.

Unlike our temporary workforce where men accounted for 72% of the sample, nearly three quarters (74%) of our internal workforce are women. We are pleased to be able to report that the median pay for this subsection of the overall analysis demonstrated a median pay nearly 7% higher than that of their male counterparts.

Whilst we are pleased, therefore, that the exercise has demonstrated that for our own internal staff our commitment to pay according to merit, regardless of gender, has been vindicated, we believe that, unfortunately, the results of the report as we have been obliged to present them do little to advance the argument for pay equality in the wider workforce.

Should any interested party require any further information upon the methodology used, or to examine our findings more closely, please do not hesitate to me.

I can confirm that the data reported is accurate.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S Jackson', is written over a light grey rectangular background.

Susan Jackson

Finance Director