## GENDER PAY ANALYSIS



## CITY ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

The City of Berkeley Human Resources identified 1,928 on payroll across 348 Job Classifications. There are 116 Classifications of which males and females are represented.

1. The remaining classes were either classifications having representation of a single gender with multiple people,
2. Classifications with only one employee for a single gender, or
3. Unused classifications.

> This overview provides Gender Differentials by hourly rates of 2 Job Classifications.

Averages were calculated and compared to observe any differences in pay.

## Evaluation Process Overview

- Extracted data for all City of Berkeley staff on payroll April 2019.
- Grouped data by Job Classifications, then by Gender.
- Identified 116 Classifications of which males and females are represented.
- Calculated Averages by Classification, then by Gender.
- Compared Averages by Classification, then by Gender
- Evaluated the influence of Experience on Pay Steps.


## Note: Hire Dates indicate date employee entered Classification

## ASSISTANT MANAGEMENT ANALYST CSU (FEMALES EARN MORE)

|  | CLASSIFICATION <br> AVERAGE HOURLY <br> RATE <br> $\$ \mathbf{\$ 0 . 2 6}$ |  | AVERAGE HOURLY DIFFERENTIAL |  | FEMALE <br> GENDER DIFFERENTIAL |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FEMALES | \$ | 40.49 | \$ | 0.23 |  |  |
| MALES | \$ | 39.06 | \$ | (1.21) | \$ | 1.43 |

On average, females make $\$ 0.23$ more then the classification average. And females make $\$ 1.43$ more then males in the same classification.

| TITLE | HIRE DATE | GENDER | STEP | RATE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CSU | 11/25/2013 | FEMALE | 3 | \$ | 54.25 |
| CSU | 6/19/2006 | FEMALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 1/8/2007 | FEMALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 3/7/1988 | FEMALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 2/13/2008 | FEMALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 11/6/2017 | FEMALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 9/13/1999 | FEMALE | 4 | \$ | 40.54 |
| CSU | 8/26/2013 | FEMALE | 4 | \$ | 40.54 |
| CSU | 9/14/2008 | FEMALE | 3 | \$ | 38.94 |
| CSU | 1/17/2017 | FEMALE | 3 | \$ | 38.94 |
| CSU | 12/6/1999 | FEMALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 2/9/2015 | FEMALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 10/20/2015 | FEMALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 10/3/2016 | FEMALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 11/6/2017 | FEMALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 10/16/2017 | FEMALE | 1 | \$ | 35.87 |
| CSU | 2/14/2005 | MALE | 5 | \$ | 42.34 |
| CSU | 11/6/2017 | MALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |
| CSU | 11/24/2017 | MALE | 2 | \$ | 37.42 |

Within this classification the average pay amongst females can be calculated reliably because all Steps are represented. However, because there are a limited number of Steps amongst males the male average will not be comparable to the female average.

Note: Average calculated by adding Rates and divided by number of people.

## APPLICATION PROGRAM/ANALYST II (FEMALES EARN LESS)

$\left.\begin{array}{|r|r|rr|r|}\hline \begin{array}{c}\text { APPLICATION } \\ \text { PROG/ANALYST II }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { CLASSIFICATION } \\ \text { AVERAGE HOURIY } \\ \text { RATE } \\ \$ 54.82\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { AVERAGE } \\ \text { HOURLY } \\ \text { DIFFERENTIAL }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { FEMALE } \\ \text { GENDER }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { DIFFERENTIAL }\end{array}\right\}$

On average, women make $\$ 2.78$ less then the classification average. And females make $\$ 3.29$ less then males in the same classification.

| TITLE |  |  |  | HOURLY |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HIRE DATE | GENDER | STEP | RATE |  |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $11 / 9 / 2000$ | FEMALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $5 / 7 / 2018$ | FEMALE | 1 | $\$$ | 47.48 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $2 / 14 / 2006$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $1 / 31 / 2005$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $10 / 30 / 1995$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $10 / 21 / 2002$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $9 / 21 / 2009$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $9 / 8 / 2014$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $1 / 3 / 2017$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $2 / 25 / 2019$ | MALE | 5 | $\$$ | 56.60 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $7 / 5 / 2016$ | MALE | 4 | $\$$ | 54.15 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $12 / 19 / 2016$ | MALE | 4 | $\$$ | 54.15 |
| APPLICATION PROG/ANALYST II | $1 / 14 / 2019$ | MALE | 1 | $\$$ | 47.48 |

Note: Average calculated by adding Rates and divided by number of people.

There are a significant number of males who are employed at Step 5 within this classification. Because there are a limited number of Steps represented amongst males the average will be overstated when compared to the female average.

## Recruitment - Step Frequency

This overview demonstrates the Step Frequency by Gender offered during recruitment activity during the 2018 Calendar Year.

- This data includes step offers for internal and external applicants.
- The data indicates there is not a significant dispersion between Males and Females in each Step indicating pay is commiserate with experience, not gender.
- The data indicates there is not a significant dispersion in experience between Males and Females identified as higher steps.


| Gender/Step Freq | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M | $55 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| F | $53 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $14 \%$ |

## Compensation System Overview

## Formal Structure

1. Transparent
2. California Transparent State Controllers Office
3. Written in policy - MOUs
4. Pay Rate Steps - result of years of experience in a Classification
5. Negotiated with Labor Groups - approved by Council

## Human Resources Training

- Implicit bias
- Equity training
- Hiring ABC's
- GARE


## Conclusion

- Pay is capped at Step 5. It is most influenced by the years of experience in a classification resulting in a higher Step.
- Pay Rates Steps applied according to Step and Hire Date
- Disproportionate gender representation was observable and explainable.
- Importantly, employees across all classifications within the same Step are compensated equally regardless of gender.
- Human Resources implements Equal Employment Opportunity practices to address impacts.

