Gender Pay Gap Action Plan 2020

Department of
Conservation
Te Papa Atawhai

New Zealand Government

1. Introduction

The New Zealand Government has committed to eliminating the gender pay gap (GPG) within the Public Service, with substantial progress within this Parliamentary term.

The GPG Action Plan involves collaborative action within and across Public Service agencies to accelerate progress with a focus on the following actions and milestones:

1. Equal pay

2. Flexible work by default

3. No bias or discrimination in remuneration systems and Human Resources practices

5. Gender balanced leadership

All Public Service chief executives are committed to closing GPGs in their agencies. The GPG work sits under Te Papa Atawhai's (DOC) Diversity and Inclusion Strategy (DOC-5517176) and Plan (DOC-5517247).

A working group, formed in partnership with the PSA, reviewed the analysis undertaken of DOC's salary data to formulate the 2019 GPG Action Plan (DOC-5684299). The same process has been undertaken for the 2020 GPG Action Plan.

This plan reviews progress made in 2019, provides an update on DOC's gender data and describes the actions DOC will take in 2020. This plan is to be read alongside the 2019 plan.

2. Executive Summary

The data used to analyse DOC's overall gender pay gap was data effective at 15 November 2019. DOC's overall gender pay gap is low (1%[1]) compared to the national public sector gender pay gap (6.2%, Human Resource Capability data as at June 2019).

The gender pay gap is calculated as (median male salary minus median female salary) divided by median male salary. A positive gender pay gap indicates males being paid more on average than females and a negative gender pay gap indicates females being paid more on average than males.

While DOC has an extremely low overall gender pay gap, the gap is impacted by vertical segregation - females are under-represented in leadership roles across the organisation. DOC has committed to gender balance across its leadership roles by 2022, this is aligned with the Public Service-wide milestones in the Gender Pay Gap 2018-20 Action Plan. Agencies are expected to achieve gender balance across Tier 2 and Tier 3 roles by a nominated target date. While there is now gender balance across the eight Deputy Director General (DDG) roles, males are still over-represented in Tier 3 (71% vs 29%) and there are slightly more males at Tier 4 (54% versus 46%).

There are some instances of gender pay gaps in business/occupation groups. There is, however, no guarantee that gender is a contributing factor to these pay gaps. These gaps are larger in some parts of the organisation compared to others and are also typically driven by a lack of females in senior roles.

Across the other measures recommended by the State Services Commission (e.g., starting salaries, like for like roles, part time versus full time employees, tenure and age), in some groups, there are trends of gender pay gaps exceeding +/- 2%. We are undertaking additional work in 2020 to ensure gender is not a factor in salaries for the same or similar roles. We will continue to monitor all measures to analyse trends and identify areas of concern.

DOC has asked staff to revalidate their personal details, including ethnicity, to ensure the information held is correct. Preliminary analysis has been undertaken to calculate the ethnicity pay gap. Meaningful conclusions are difficult to make given the disproportionate weighting of employees to one ethnicity (European). A number of staff chose not to specify their ethnicity (11.9%).

The focus of DOC's 2020 Gender Pay Gap Action Plan is on better understanding the reasons why females are under-represented in senior leadership roles across the organisation. It is important to understand the aspirations, motivations and barriers for females moving into leadership (or more senior leadership) roles so that the

---

[1] Median pay.

organisation can move toward equal representation. There is also an opportunity to continue the focus on key aspects of the employee lifecycle (e.g. recruitment, annual salary review, return from parental leave, succession planning and promotion into leadership roles) to ensure that our processes are fair and are not inadvertently disadvantaging females (or other groups of employees).

Annual analysis of key GPG measurements will be completed to ensure that DOC continues to make progress on closing its gender pay gap.

3. Drivers of the Gender Pay Gaps at DOC

Based on the analysis of salary data, females are under-represented in senior leadership roles.

As at 15 November 2019, only 33% of DOC's 2 and 3 managers were female. DOC is aiming for gender balance across its leadership roles (i.e. females represented in 50% of leadership roles), as well as its overall workforce by the end of 2022.

4. Overall Gender Pay Gap

DOC's overall gender pay gap is impacted by vertical segregation. There is an even distribution of male and female employees (49.8% and 49.6%) however this even gender distribution is not reflected at Tier 3, with 71% of Director roles being represented by males. Less than 1% of DOC employees identify as gender diverse (0.3%) or choose not to specify their gender (0.3%). Due to the sample size being too small (and privacy issues), staff who identify as gender diverse or choose not to specify their gender are not included in the tables below.

5. Gender Pay Gap by Business Group

Gender Pay Gap by Business Group has been identified as a key measure of interest. There are larger gender pay gaps (>10%) across three of the Business Groups: Corporate Services, Partnerships, and Policy and Visitors. Governance and Treaty, and Kāhui Kaupapa Atawhai have not been assessed due to the sample size being too small.

These pay gaps can be attributed to the under-representation of females in leadership positions in these Business Groups. Females are under-represented at Director level (Tier 3) in Corporate Services and Partnerships. While there is an even distribution of males and females represented at Director level in the Policy and Visitors group, females are under-represented at Manager level.

The breakdown of female and male representation at each organisational level is shown in the second table.

When looking at the gender pay gap using Position in Range (PIR), which is less influenced by the vertical segregation of the genders, the gaps across all Business Groups are much lower and in one instance becomes negative.

Group	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries	GPG using average Position in Range (PIR)	GPG using median PIR
Biodiversity [220]	53%	47%	6%	7%	2%	3%
Corporate Services [349]	62%	38%	28%	36%	4%	4%
Operations [1721]	44%	56%	4%	1%	2%	3%
Partnerships [98]	62%	38%	13%	24%	-3%	-2%
People and Engagement [123]	72%	28%	-3%	-2%	0%	0%
Policy and Visitors [117]	56%	44%	13%	11%	0%	-1%

This table shows the proportion of females: males in each column.

Group	Total Group (females:males)	Tier 2 (females: males)	Tier 3 (females: males)	Tier 4 (females:males)	Tier 5 (females:males)
Biodiversity [220]	53% : 47%	0% : 100%	75% : 25%	71% : 29%	51% : 49%
Corporate Services [349]	62% : 38%	100% : 0%	0% : 100%	46% : 54%	65% : 35%
Operations [1721]	44% : 56%	0% : 100%	25% : 75%	38% : 62%	45% : 55%
Partnerships [98]	62% : 38%	100% : 0%	14% : 86%	52% : 48%	70% : 30%
People and Engagement [123]	72% : 28%	100% : 0%	75% : 25%	70% : 30%	73% : 27%
Policy and Visitors [117]	56% : 44%	0% : 100%	50% : 50%	39% : 61%	61% : 39%

6. Gender Pay Gap by Occupation Type

Gender Pay Gap analysis by Occupation Type is another measure of interest. High level analysis by Occupation Type shows gender pay gaps in average/median salaries in excess of the organisation's overall GPG. More detailed analysis using Position in Range (which is less sensitive to the representation of males and females at different levels within the occupation type) shows much smaller and marginal gender pay gaps.

The analysis also shows some occupations are dominated by females (e.g. Administration and Planning and Permissions) and others more dominated by males (e.g. Ranger). Additional commentary is included in the Appendix.

Occupation Type	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries	GPG using average PIR	GPG using median PIR
Ranger [1172]	38%	62%	4%	2%	3%	5%
Management [248]	42%	58%	2%	0%	-1%	0%
Community [213]	68%	32%	4%	9%	1%	1%
Administration [175]	87%	13%	4%	8%	1%	2%
Technical Support [139]	50%	50%	12%	8%	1%	2%
Planning/Permissions [106]	70%	30%	5%	6%	2%	3%
Other [102]	49%	51%	11%	11%	4%	2%
Scientist [60]	45%	55%	1%	6%	0%	2%
Operational Planning [50]	48%	52%	7%	3%	3%	4%

7. Agency Actions to Close the Gender Pay Gap

All Public Service chief executives have committed to a series of Public Service-wide milestones in the Gender Pay Gap 2018-20 Action Plan. The actions DOC is committing to have been organised against the four areas below.

1. Equal Pay (eliminating gender pay gaps within the same roles and progressing any pay equity claims)[2]

A Pay Equity claim was raised by the Public Services Association (PSA) for its members who undertake administration/clerical roles. SSC is working with the PSA around developing a shared understanding of the scope of the claim and working with agencies to clarify which roles may fit within the definition of work. This Pay Equity Claim is in the early stage of the process.

DOC is undertaking a 'like for like' pay gap review to ensure gender is not a factor in salaries for the same or similar roles. This work will be separate from DOC's Annual Salary Review (ASR) process which is part of the requirements of employment agreements. The 'like for like' analysis will occur in October/November 2020 with outcomes communicated and implemented by end of December 2020.

2. Flexible Work by Default (all roles to be treated as flexible unless there is a good business reason for a role not to be)

DOC is currently well on track to meet the milestones that have been set for flexible-by-default to be delivered by 2020. DOC's Senior Leadership Team has adopted the vision 'DOC will offer a flexible workplace, to be a great place to work for conservation'.

Key achievements to date include:

- The development and implementation of a Flexible Work Arrangements Policy and SOP.
- Resources for staff, managers and teams on flexible work.
- The successful delivery of flexible work pilots in 2019 in several non-operational teams, and one operational team and a high level of engagement with these pilots.
- A nationwide flexible work implementation model for operational Business Groups.

The nationwide COVID-19 pandemic response saw DOC's entire workforce transition to working from home during Alert Levels 3 and 4, which meant a rapid acceleration of new work practices, equipment and technology to enable people to work remotely and online.

The experience of COVID-19 has resulted in a heightened interest in working from home and a wider discussion around how we can leverage flexible work practices to support improved wellbeing, engagement, a lighter carbon footprint and to attract and retain a more diverse workforce. During the next 6 months in 2020, DOC plans to:

- Conduct a scoping exercise across the organization to gain insights into how many staff would like to continue to work flexibly (incl working from home) post COVID, and how we can best support them.
- Support leadership teams to balance the needs of the individual, team and the organization and create a win for all.
- Continue to develop guidelines and resources to support leaders to hold flexible work conversations, develop a positive flexible work team culture and lead a distributed team effectively.
- Align flexible work implementation with related initiatives, including; wellbeing, diversity and inclusion, ICT strategy, recruitment, induction and leadership development.
- Collaborate with different functions, such as Information Support Services, to ensure that staff are upskilled with the technical capability and technology they need to work remotely.
- Review the Flexible Work Arrangements SOP to reflect our new context and continued commitment to our flexible work principles and work towards our goal: Flexible by default, with the aim that all positions can be worked flexibly, unless there is a strong business reason why they can't be.

3. No Bias or Discrimination in Remuneration Systems or Human Resources Practices (systems and practices are designed to remove bias, including no gaps in starting salaries and managers being equipped to address bias)

---

[2] Equal Pay for the purposes of this Plan includes Pay Equity (equal pay for work of same value) and like for like gender pay gaps within same or similar roles.

There is currently no trend of gender bias across starting salaries at DOC. This data will be monitored annually to ensure gaps are not appearing over time.

All new hiring managers at Director and Manager level were given an opportunity to go through unconscious bias awareness training in 2018. Supervisors and team leads completed this training in 2019. Wash up sessions for managers, supervisors and teams leads will be rolled out in 2020.

There are no signs of bias in our current remuneration system. There are a number of reasons for this, some examples are stated below:

- We have not identified gpgs in our starting salaries.
- Annual increases for staff take place via a matrix based on performance and position in the salary range (the increases are not determined by managers other than as a result of a staff member's performance outcome).
- We have not identified significant gender differences in our annual performance outcomes.

The Talent Mapping process will be reviewed and will ensure that diversity is a consideration.

An audit undertaken to ensure that all staff on parental leave go through the ASR process is underway.

4. **Gender Balanced Leadership** (females hold 50% of roles across the Public Service's top 3 of leadership and each agency has a target date for achieving balance in their own leadership roles)

As at 15 November 2019, 29% of DOC's Tier 3 leaders, and 46% of Tier 4 leaders were female. DOC is aiming for gender balance across its leadership roles (i.e. females represented in 50% of leadership roles), and its overall workforce by 2022. To make this shift over two years will require research to understand why this trend is occurring, and to identify areas to target investment across the employee lifecycle to achieve the desired changes/shifts.

To better understand why females are under-represented in leadership roles across the organisation, it had been intended to undertake research in the first half of 2019. Due to workload pressure across the business, a decision was made to defer the research to 2020 and the research will now take place in the first half of 2020.

The research is designed to understand the aspirations, motivations, opportunities and barriers for female employees currently in senior leadership roles or interested in moving into leadership (or more senior leadership) roles. Analysis is also required to understand the drivers of turnover and retention of female staff across different Business Units and regions. This work is critical to ensure the mix of actions/programmes of work planned will help achieve the desired outcomes.

Depending on the outcome of the research, some of the following actions may be undertaken:

- Review recruitment and selection practices to ensure DOC is attracting a diverse range of candidates
- Introduce gender balanced shortlists
- Introduce coaching and mentoring programmes
- Support targeted and fast track development for high potential females
- Women's leadership development programme
- Investigate options for a women's network group
- Review of role design
- Promote flexible working options including job sharing and part-time work for leadership roles.[3]

---

[3] According to our data, there are no Tier 3 staff working part-time hours (13% of DOC staff work part-time hours). It will be good to understand whether females in Tier –5 roles are experiencing real or perceived barriers on leadership opportunities at Tier 3 level.

8. Agency, Union and Employee Involvement

Reflecting commitments in the Gender Pay Principles and the Public Service Gender Pay Gap Action Plan, and the High Performance Engagement relationship, a joint DOC/PSA working group was set up to analyse gender pay gap data and to contribute towards the development of this action plan.

This action plan will also be shared with both the PSA and the wider organisation once it has been approved.

Appendix

DOC's Gender Pay Gap (GPG) Measurements

DOC has completed a wide range of analysis to identify if and where gender pay gaps exist within the organisation.

The results of the analysis indicate that overall, DOC's gender pay gap is low, and seems to be attributable to females being underrepresented in senior roles across, and in specific parts, of the organisation.

Measures which would indicate bias occurring within the remuneration system and HR practices, such as starting salaries, pay by tenure and age, across "like for like" work, and where females are typically over-represented – e.g. part time work, were also analysed.

The results of these measures show ad hoc instances of both positive and negative gender pay gaps. As there are no apparent trends, it is not believed that these pay gaps have been caused by unconscious bias across DOC's systems and processes.

It is useful to note that individual salaries at DOC are determined by a range of factors including an individual's skills, experience, competencies and performance during their tenure in the organisation. Without understanding in detail the individual circumstances in each dataset used for comparison (e.g. females and males, part-time and full-time employees), it is impossible to know what factors are contributing to any gaps shown by the analysis.

In all data sets, the numbers in brackets in the first column, indicates the number of employees. Roles which had a minimum of 20 males and 20 females were analysed to determine if a gender pay gap exists.

Agency wide GPG:

Across all DOC employees, the average male salary is 4% higher than the average female salary. The median male salary is 1% higher than the median female salary.

The gender pay gap when using either average or median Position in Range (PIR) is 1%. PIR is less likely to be influenced by the vertical segregation of males or females.

% Females	% Males	% Gender Diverse	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
49.6%	49.8%	0.3%	4%	1%

Another 0.3% chose not to respond to the gender question.

GPG using average PIR	GPG using median PIR
1%	1%

GPG and Gender Representation by Tier:

The average male salary is less than 1% higher than the average female salary within Tiers 4 and 5. The median female salary is higher than the median male salary for Tier 4 and 5 employees by 2% and 1% respectively.

The representation of males and females is balanced at Tier 2, however males continue to be overrepresented at Tier 3. There are slightly more males than females at Tier 4 also. Males and females are represented almost equally at Tier 5.

Tier	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
Tier 2 [8]	50%	50%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 3 [41]	29%	71%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 4 [223]	46%	54%	0%	-2%
Tier 5 [2,388]	51%	49%	1%	-1%

Data from the 2019 GPG Action Plan:

Tier	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
Tier 2 [7]	29%	71%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 3 [42]	26%	74%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 4 [211]	45%	55%	0.2%	-2.3%
Tier 5 [2,081]	48%	52%	0.7%	-0.3%

GPG and Gender Representation within Business Groups:

There are some large gender pay gaps across the Business Groups (using both average and median salaries). This has been identified as being as a result of vertical segregation (females under- represented at senior levels of the Business Group.)

(see previous pages for GPG details).

GPG and Gender Representation by Occupational Type:

Occupation Type	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries	GPG using average PIR	GPG using median PIR
Ranger [1172]	39%	61%	4%	2%	3%	5%
Management [248]	41%	59%	3%	1%	-1%	0%
Community [213]	68%	32%	4%	9%	1%	1%
Administration [175]	87%	13%	4%	8%	1%	2%
Technical Support [139]	50%	50%	12%	8%	1%	2%
Planning/Permissions [106]	70%	30%	5%	6%	2%	3%
Other [102]	48%	52%	7%	10%	4%	2%
Scientist [60]	45%	55%	1%	6%	0%	2%
Operational Planning [50]	48%	52%	7%	3%	3%	4%

Ranger

This occupation type includes all Rangers not covered in the community group above (i.e. general, biodiversity, recreation/historic).

Whilst females continue to be under-represented in this occupation type, females make up a slightly larger proportion of Ranger roles in this year's data compared to last year, however the gender pay gap is slightly higher compared to last year's data. Across B and C Band Rangers, the gender pay gap is 4% which is higher than the DOC overall gender pay gap for those bands (0% and -2% respectively). Further analysis will be undertaken to monitor this gap. There is a gender pay gap for D Band Rangers of 1%.

Management

The data in 2020 shows that males make up more of the overall management population than females. The gender pay gap appears insignificant, particularly when looking at PIR, which removes most of the impact of vertical segregation.

Community

This occupation type is comprised of Tier 5 Partnerships staff, and Community and Visitor Centre Rangers in the Operations Group. This occupation type continues to be dominated by females, however the overall average male salary is 4% higher than the average female salary, and the median male salary is 9% higher than the median female salary. This is partly explained by an over-representation of male Community Rangers being found in the higher bands compared to females. In Community Ranger roles, 48% of females are in the two lowest bands (B and C), compared to 34% of males.

Administration

This occupation type includes Tier 5 staff only, and females are over-represented in this group. Administration management roles are included in the "Management" occupation type. The average male salary is higher than the average female salary in this group.

Of the males who are in Administration roles, a greater percentage of them are in the higher bands (C, D and E) compared to females. In Administration roles, 46% of females are in Band B compared to only 36% of men. This is likely to contribute to the higher gender pay gap seen in the average and median salaries.

The comparison between Administration roles and other DOC roles has been undertaken again this year to explore whether perceived 'female dominated' occupations are underpaid compared to other occupational groups. Average Administration salaries are higher than DOC's overall average salaries for the same gender and band which appears to refute this possibility. (Due to the small number of males the analysis compared to "All DOC" males may not be considered robust.)

Band	Administration Female (compared to All DOC female)	Administration Male (compared to ALL DOC male)
B	5% higher	1% higher
C	7% higher	7% higher
D	5% higher	8% higher
E	Insufficient numbers	Insufficient numbers

Technical Support

Technical Support roles are split equally between females and males, however the average male salary is 12% higher than the average female salary. Again this can be explained by vertical segregation occupied by females and males in this group. In Technical Support roles, 94% of males are in Bands E and above, compared to 74% of females. In Technical Support roles, 26% of females are in the lower bands, compared to just 6% of males.

Planning and Permissions

Females are over-represented in Planning and Permissions roles, with 70% of the roles filled by females. The average male salary however is 5% higher than the average female salary in this Business Unit.

This cannot be completely explained by the levels of work undertaken by males and females in this group as there is a relatively even split across the bands vertically. There are slightly more females than males in the lowest two bands: 49% of Planning and Permissions females are in Bands C and D, compared to 41% of Planning and Permissions males.

Analysis by band is not meaningful due to small sample sizes.

Scientist

The split between females and males in this occupation type is roughly equal. There is a difference in the gender pay gap using average and median salaries due to an outlier influencing the average female salary.

Analysis by band is not meaningful due to small sample sizes in this occupation type. Males are slightly over-represented in the two highest bands (79% of males versus 74% of females)

Operational Planning

The split between females and males in this group is roughly equal. The majority of employees are in D Band (86%) where there is a 3% gender pay gap.

19% of males are employed in higher bands compared to 8% of females.

"Other"

"Other" roles include individual or small numbers of positions which are not included in the other occupation types. There is almost an even split between males and females in these roles.

Small numbers across a range of bands and titles make it difficult for any meaningful analysis to be completed.

GPG and Gender Representation within Pay Quartiles:

The overall representation of males and females at DOC has balanced out over the past 12 months, however males continue to be over-represented as the top earners (55% versus 45%).

Pay Quartile	2019 data		2018 data	
	% Females	% Males	% Females	% Males
Quartile 1 (lowest 25%)	50%	50%	45%	55%
Quartile 2	51%	49%	50%	50%
Quartile 3	53%	47%	49%	51%
Quartile 4 (highest 25%)	45%	55%	43%	57%
DOC gender distribution agency wide	50%	50%	47%	53%

GPG and Gender Representation by Age:

The table below compares salary data across each age group across the organisation. The data this year shows the same trend as was seen in the previous year's data with negative gender pay gaps seen in the younger age groups (on average females are earning more than males). Positive gender pay gaps emerge in the two oldest age groups/brackets. There is a relatively strong gender balance across all age groups but noticeably less females in the 60+ age group. The gaps become smaller when using PIR which reduces the impact of vertical segregation.

Age Group	% Females	% Males	GPG using average Salaries	GPG using median salaries	GPG using average PIR	GPG using median PIR
under 20 [12]	50%	50%	Sample size too small		Sample size too small	
20-24 [137]	55%	45%	-4%	-2%	2%	1%
25-29 [321]	56%	44%	-2%	-5%	0%	-1%
30-39 [639]	56%	44%	-5%	-12%	0%	-1%
40-49 [597]	51%	49%	-1%	-4%	0%	1%
50-59 [653]	47%	53%	6%	4%	2%	2%
60 plus [327]	31%	69%	9%	5%	-1%	0%

Like for Like (same role, same salary band):[4]

The table below compares salary data for staff in the same *generic* role and same salary band. Generic roles have been created to allow more like for like analysis to be undertaken by aggregating positions of a similar nature. This applies to roles with a minimum of 20 males and 20 females.

Generic Role Titles	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
Advisor (D) [55]	67%	33%	1%	-1%
Advisor (E) [139]	63%	37%	2%	3%
Planner (D) [45]	51%	49%	3%	4%

---

[4] Roles which had a minimum of 20 males and 20 females were analysed to determine if a gender pay gap exists.

Position Title	% Females	% Males	GPG avg	GPG median
Ranger (B) [513]	39%	61%	3%	5%
Ranger (C) [459]	49%	51%	3%	5%
Manager (Range B) [114]	40%	60%	-2%	-2%

This analysis shows small positive gender pay gaps exist for all of these generic positions except for the D Band Advisor role. For the Manager role, the gender pay gap is negative by 2%.

This table looks at individual positions and compares average and median salaries.

Position Title	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
Ranger (C Band) – uncategorised [72]	67%	33%	5%	6%
Ranger (C Band) Biodiversity [134]	38%	62%	0%	3%
Ranger (C Band) Biodiversity Monitoring [85]	61%	39%	2%	4%
Ranger (C Band) Community [75]	72%	28%	3%	2%
Senior Ranger (D) [97]	48%	52%	2%	2%
Supervisor (D) [68]	43%	57%	2%	4%
Technical Advisor (E band) [47]	55%	45%	6%	4%

The highest gender pay gaps exist in the uncategorised C Band Ranger position, and in the E Band Technical Advisor position.

For the Technical Advisor role this is a significant change from last year when there was no gender pay gap apparent.

The next table shows positions where the sample size was insufficient for gender pay gap analysis to be completed, but where one gender is disproportionately represented (70% or greater of the total population).

Position Title	% Females	% Males
Personal Assistant (C Band) [13]	100%	0%
Admin Officer (B Band) [75]	91%	9%
Personal Assistant and Administrator (C Band) [10]	90%	10%
Admin Officer (C Band) [16]	88%	13%
Regional Administration Officer [16]	88%	13%
Ranger (B Band) Visitor Centre [31]	81%	19%
Ranger (D Band) [14]	79%	21%
Administration Manager [8]	75%	25%
Solicitor - RR6 [16]	75%	25%
Communications Advisor [10]	70%	30%
Operations Manager [45]	29%	71%
Director Operations [12]	25%	75%

Senior Ranger (Band D) Recreation/Historic [29]	21%	79%		
Senior Works Officer [10]	20%	80%		
Works Officer [13]	15%	85%		
Ranger Supervisor Recreation/Historic [21]	10%	90%		
Ranger (C Band) Recreation/Historic [62]	5%	95%		

Like for Like (same salary band):

The table below compares salary data for staff in the same salary band (regardless of their role).

The two highest gender pay gaps are seen in two of the Tier 5 "Recruitment and Retention" salary ranges – RR4 and RR5. (Positions that are subject to demonstrable recruitment and/or retention problems are administered under a recruitment and retention salary range.)

Salary Band	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
Tier 5-B [625]	46%	54%	1%	2%
Tier 5-C [565]	53%	47%	2%	3%
Tier 5-D [466]	53%	47%	1%	1%
Tier 5-E [267]	53%	47%	3%	3%
Tier 5-F [204]	55%	45%	0%	0%
Tier 5-G [36]	33%	67%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 5-RR4 [78]	50%	50%	7%	7%
Tier 5-RR5 [102]	48%	52%	4%	3%
Tier 5-RR6 [26]	54%	46%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 5-RR7 [4]	0%	100%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 4-Range C [60]	53%	47%	1%	-1%
Tier 4-Range B [124]	40%	60%	-2%	-3%
Tier 4-Range A [39]	51%	49%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 3-Range B [29]	28%	72%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 3-Range A [12]	33%	67%	Insufficient sample size	

Flexible Working (Part Time versus Full Time):

Guidelines compiled by the State Services Commission, Ministry of Women and Statistics New Zealand state "on average, people in part time work receive a lower hourly rate than those in full-time work."

The completed analysis shows that a much higher proportion of female employees at DOC are part-time compared to males, i.e. 79% of female employees are full time, compared to 95% of male employees. Females make up 81% of part time employees, while only 19% of part time employees are male.

The majority of part time employees are in Tier 5 positions and a very small proportion of managers are part-time. At Tier 3, no employees in this data set are part time, only 6% of Tier 4 employees are part time, whereas 27% of Tier 5 staff are part time.

	% Full Time employees	% Part Time employees
ALL DOC [2702][5]	87%	13%
Female [1339]	79%	21%
Male [1347]	95%	5%

	% Females	% Males
ALL DOC [2686]	50%	50%
Full-time [2342]	45%	55%
Part-time [344]	81%	19%

The table below shows there is no significant trend of part-time employees earning less than full time employees at DOC. In many instances, part time employees earn, on average, a higher salary than full time employees.

Salary Band	% Full Time employees	% Part Time employees	Pay Gap between Full/Part Time using average salaries	Pay Gap between Full/Part Time using median salaries
Tier 5-B [627]	82%	18%	0%	1%
Tier 5-C [570]	88%	12%	-2%	0%
Tier 5-D [468]	90%	10%	0%	-1%
Tier 5-E [269]	84%	16%	-1%	0%
Tier 5-F [207]	84%	16%	-4%	4%
Tier 5-G [36]	92%	8%		
Tier 5-RR4 [78]	96%	4%		
Tier 5-RR5 [102]	89%	11%		
Tier 5-RR6 [26]	81%	19%		
Tier 5-RR7 [4]	100%	0%	Insufficient sample size	
Tier 4-Range C [61]	92%	8%		
Tier 4-Range B [124]	94%	6%		
Tier 4-Range A [39]	100%	0%		
Tier 3-Range B [29]	100%	0%		
Tier 3-Range A [12]	100%	0%		

---

[5] 16 DOC employees identify as gender diverse or chose not to specify their gender.

Length of Service:

There does not appear to be a trend regarding gender pay gaps based on employees' length of service.

The representation of males and females changes as tenure increases with more females than males at the lower end of the service continuum and more males than females at the highest end.

Across DOC, the average or median salary gender pay gap based on years of service is predominantly negative. When looking at Position in Range (PIR) which is less influenced by level of work, there is next to no gender pay gap based on length of service.

Length of Service	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries	GPG using average PIR	GPG using median PIR
under 1 year [702]	59%	41%	-2%	-4%	0%	0%
1-3 years [549]	57%	43%	-1%	-9%	0%	0%
3-5 years [248]	56%	44%	9%	-2%	0%	1%
5-10 years [434]	50%	50%	-1%	-4%	0%	0%
10-15 years [307]	41%	59%	-3%	-1%	0%	0%
15-20 years [156]	40%	60%	-1%	-8%	1%	0%
over 20 years [290]	23%	77%	6%	9%	0%	-1%

Starting Salaries:

Starting salary analysis includes all new hires from 2013 until September 2019. It includes casual, fixed term and permanent employees – including employees who leave and return to DOC employment.

In this period slightly more females than males have started at DOC, and the average and median starting salary for females has been higher than males.

New employees	% Females	% Males	Gender Pay Gap using average starting salary	Gender Pay Gap using median starting salary
All DOC	55%	45%	-5.2%	-4.9%

Less than 1% of new starters have identified as gender diverse.

The average and median Position in Range (PIR) of male and female Tier 5 employees when starting at DOC is effectively the same for this period.

New employees	% Females	% Males	Gender Pay Gap using average PIR	Gender Pay Gap using median PIR
Tier 5 employees	55%	45%	0.1%	0.0%

Historically, the starting salaries show a negative gender pay gap, however there is a positive gender pay gap in the most recent year of analysis.

Recruitment Years	% Females	% Males	Gender Pay Gap using average starting salary
5 years to 30 Sep 2019	55%	45%	-5.2%
2012-2013	44%	56%	-10.2%
2013-2014	48%	52%	-6.7%
2014-2015	48%	52%	-5.0%
2015-2016	43%	57%	0.5%
2016-2017	44%	56%	-4.1%
2017-2018	47%	53%	-7.8%
2018-2019	42%	58%	-4.3%
2019-2020	37%	63%	4.9%

The following table shows the gender distribution of starting employees and the gender pay gap by job level. Across all levels, except for Tiers 3 and 4, more females have been recruited compared to males. The gender pay gaps are predominantly small.

Recruitment Years	% Females	% Males	GPG using average salaries	GPG using median salaries
A (2838)	50%	50%	0%	0%
B (1331)	52%	48%	1%	2%
C (1348)	60%	40%	-1%	-1%
D (506)	64%	36%	2%	1%
E (323)	70%	30%	1%	2%
F (211)	68%	32%	2%	-3%
G (42)	52%	48%	3%	2%
Tier 3 and 4 (128)	48%	52%	0%	1%
Tier 2 (7)	71%	29%	Insufficient sample size	

Tier 5 Performance Outcomes 2014 – 2019:

Performance results for Tier 5 employees for the years 2014 to 2019 show similar results for males and females, however, across all years, it does appear that a slightly greater percentage of females receive 'no rating' compared to men.

Year	Performance	Females	Males
2014	No rating	8%	3%
	Not performing to capability	1%	0%
	Developing	6%	4%
	Fully Competent & Performing	29%	33%
	High Performing & Fully Competent	40%	44%
	Advanced	16%	16%
2015	No rating	2%	1%
	Not performing to capability	0%	1%
	Developing	3%	2%
	Fully Competent and Performing	30%	30%
	High Performing and Fully Competent	46%	48%
	Advanced	19%	17%
2016	No rating	6%	3%
	Not performing to capability	0%	1%
	Developing	4%	5%
	Fully Competent and Performing	26%	26%
	High Performing and Fully Competent	44%	47%
	Advanced	20%	18%
2018	No rating	7%	5%
	Not performing to capability	0%	0%
	Developing	3%	4%
	Performing	37%	38%
	High Performing	52%	53%
2019	No rating	9%	7%
	Not performing to capability	0%	0%
	Developing	4%	4%
	Performing	32%	38%
	High Performing	55%	50%

Ethnicity:

DOC employees have recently been asked to update their ethnicity data to assist with analysis of this factor. Employees were able to select up to three different ethnicities.

Using Statistics NZ Ethnicity classification guidelines, these ethnicities have been aggregated into a "Group One" ethnicity code. The exception to this is "New Zealander", which has been retained as a "Group One" code whereas Statistics NZ guidance would code this to "Other Ethnicity".

Employees who have selected multiple ethnicities are represented in accordance with their "Group One" code(s), i.e. NZ European/Scottish/French will be represented as "European". "Taiwanese/NZ European/Bangladeshi" will be represented as "Asian/European."

Where no response has been entered by an employee or the employee has selected "Chose not to specify", the

employee has been classified as "Unknown".

Almost two thirds of DOC's permanent and fixed term employees identify as "European" when asked to describe their ethnicity. 7.3% of DOC employees identify as Māori, 2.4% as Asian and less than half a percent as "Pacific Peoples".

Ethnicity (Group One)	Percentage of population
European	65.3%
New Zealander[6]	14.3%
Māori	7.3%
Unknown	3.7%
Māori/European	3.3%
Asian	2.4%
All others (2 or less people)	0.6%
European/New Zealander	0.6%
MELAA[7]	0.6%
Pacific Peoples	0.4%
Māori/New Zealander	0.3%
Pacific Peoples/European	0.3%
Asian/European	0.3%
European/Māori/New Zealander	0.1%
European/MELAA	0.1%
MELAA/European	0.1%
Pacific Peoples/Māori/European	0.1%
Asian/Māori/European	0.1%

---

[6] Statistics NZ classify "New Zealander as "Other Ethnicity".

[7] Middle Eastern/Latin American/African

Analysis Information

- Data – effective 15 November 2019

- 728 fixed term and 1,974 permanent employees are included in the data set.

- 8 employees have identified as gender diverse, and 8 employees have chosen not to respond to the gender question.

- Unit of pay used – hourly rate.

- Analysis completed on base pay.

- Excludes Chief Executive role (employed by State Services Commission).

- Gender Pay Gap is calculated as (average male salary – average female salary)/average male salary).

- 27 employees have been excluded from the "like-for-like" analysis, as they are either in unique positions, or their information in payroll is continuing to be investigated. They have been included in any overall analysis. This includes 11 female employees, 1 gender diverse employee and 15 male employees).

- A minimum sample size of 20 in each category being compared has been used. (e.g., 20 males and 20 female or 20 part time and 20 full time employees).

- Median pay is the middle amount of pay earned – half the employees earn less and half earn more than the median amount.

- Mean (average) pay is the sum of all pay, divided by the number of people earning that total pay.

- Quartiles are formed by dividing all employees in an organisation into four equal groups, ranked from lowest to highest pay. Each quartile represents 25% of the organisation.

- Quartile pay gaps compare the pay of males and females at each quartile.

- Position in Range (PIR) refers to where an employee's salary sits in relation to their band. It is represented as percentage – the calculation being employee salary/band midpoint x 100.