

# The policy workforce and pathways to improved capability

Public Service agency practices related to policy people capability and potential options for collective policy workforce initiatives

# Contents

Background and intent.....	2
Policy workforce: profile and trends .....	3
Attraction and retention issues .....	4
Attraction and retention issues (continued) .....	5
Skills gaps .....	6
Skills development and progression issues .....	7
Capacity and deployment issues .....	8
Training provision .....	9
Policy Skills Framework – current and potential uptake .....	10
Collective policy workforce initiatives –top picks.....	11
Options for Action.....	12
Annex 1: Policy Project survey methodology .....	13
Annex 2: Training options – a mix of light to heavy intervention .	14

# Purpose of this document

This report is part of the Policy Project people capability workstream, agreed by the Head of Policy Profession Board in 2016. The Board commissioned the Policy Project to support agencies to use the policy improvement frameworks, and to examine and analyse priority policy workforce issues and where they might be best addressed collectively.

# Publication details

*The policy workforce and pathways to improved capability* was first released in July 2017 by the Policy Project. This visually refreshed edition was released in April 2023.

Policy Project  
c/o The Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet  
Parliament Buildings  
Wellington 6160  
New Zealand

Email: [policy.project@dpmc.govt.nz](mailto:policy.project@dpmc.govt.nz)

Website: [dpmc.govt.nz/policy-project](https://dpmc.govt.nz/policy-project)

© Crown copyright



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence. In essence, you are free to copy, distribute and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to the Crown and abide by the other licence terms.

To view a copy of this licence, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Please note that no departmental or governmental emblem, logo or Coat of Arms may be used in any way which infringes any provision of the Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection Act 1981. Attribution to the Crown should be in written form and not by reproduction of any such emblem, logo or Coat of Arms.



## Background and intent

This report is part of the Policy Project people capability workstream, agreed by the Head of Policy Profession (HoPP) Board in 2016. The Board commissioned the Policy Project to:

- support agencies to use the policy improvement frameworks, including the Policy Skills Framework (PSF)
- examine and analyse priority policy workforce issues (attract, retain, develop, deploy) and where they might be best addressed collectively.


This report:

- profiles the policy workforce and describes key trends and perceptions related to recruitment, retention, development and deployment
- reports current and potential use of the PSF
- outlines the reported appetite for collective policy workforce initiatives
- sets out potential options for action (for the Policy Project and collective initiatives).

This report draws together information about the policy workforce based on:

- a 2017 Policy Project survey of agency policy capability leads and their HR/OD colleagues on agency policy people capability practices, including their use of the PSF (see Annex 1 for the survey methodology)
- 2005–2017 data from the Human Resource Capability Survey (HRC) and Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI)
- policy related system level workforce analysis of 2017 Four-year plans
- insights from numerous cross-agency workshops and discussions on ‘pain points’ related to the recruitment, retention, development and deployment of policy staff.

This report supports policy leaders’ consideration of potential collective initiatives to build policy people capability, including as part of any possible future Public Service wide policy workforce strategy. Such a strategy, if supported, would be consistent with agencies maintaining responsibilities for their own workforce planning but recognise the opportunities for and benefits of collective action. It should also align with any talent management system in support of the proposed policy career board.





# Policy workforce: profile and trends

## Changing age profile

Since 2007, the 20–34 and 65+ age brackets’ proportions of the policy workforce have increased, while 40–59 brackets have decreased (Chart 1).

## Becoming more ‘top heavy’

Since 2007 the proportion of the non-managerial policy workforce classified as ‘Principals’ has doubled, while the proportion of analysts has reduced. The cap on Public Service numbers may incentivise a preference for more senior staff (Chart 2).

## Opportunities for more diversity


There is a mixed diversity story, with low representation of Pacific, Māori and Asians compared with the general population, but good gender balance (except for in the Principal analyst cohort). Gender pay gaps exist, but are less than the Public Service average (Table 1).

Table 1: Policy Workforce demographics – 2016

Policy Group	Head-count	% Women	Average age	% Māori	% Pacific	% Asian	Gender pay gap
Tier 2 and 3 Managers	133	51.1%	47.8	10.5%	0.8%	1.6%	6.0%
Other Managers	332	48.5%	46.0	10.4%	1.3%	3.0%	7.5%
Principal Advisors	318	40.9%	49.7	6.0%	0.7%	4.7%	8.0%
Senior Analysts	1,021	57.5%	43.9	11.7%	1.8%	5.2%	5.6%
Analysts	879	59.5%	32.0	10.7%	1.7%	8.2%	4.7%
<b>Policy Total</b>	<b>2,683</b>	<b>51.5%</b>	<b>43.9</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>4.5%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>
<b>Public Service</b>	<b>47,570</b>	<b>60.7%</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>8.1%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>


Source: State Service Commission/HRC Survey

Chart 1: Age-brackets’ proportion of the policy workforce overtime



Source: State Services Commission/HRC Survey

Chart 2: Non-managerial job levels’ proportion of the policy workforce overtime



Source: State Service Commission/HRC Survey



# Attraction and retention issues

## Grad intake dropped post-GFC

Graduate recruitment for all segments of the Public Service workforce dropped post-GFC, but policy dropped the most.

Policy graduate recruitment tends to be higher than for other workforces (e.g. corporate, ICT), as policy capability needs to be developed 'in system' rather than imported 'fully formed' (Chart 3).

## Grad retention is also falling

40–45% of policy grads who entered the Public Service between 2006–08 were employed in the Public Service five years later.

For the 2010 entry cohort only 20% remain after five years, and the 2012 cohort is tracking for a similarly low retention rate (Chart 4).

## Good seniors are scarce

Senior analysts are perceived to be the hardest policy staff to both recruit and retain.

Principal analysts also hard to recruit, but not to retain (Chart 5).

Chart 5: Policy job levels that are the hardest to recruit and retain




Chart 3: Changes in total graduate intake overtime





Chart 4: Graduate retention (years in Public Service since initial employment)



Source: State Services Commission/HRC Survey and Stats NZ IDI



# Attraction and retention issues (continued)

## Unplanned turnover is increasing

Unplanned turnover (the rate permanent staff resign, retire or are dismissed) has trended up since 2010, and is now much higher than the Public Service average. It tends to be higher for Analysts (younger cohorts tend to have higher mobility anyway) but the trend is lifting for Seniors and Principals too (Chart 6).

## Why do people move?

According to respondents to the Policy Project survey, the main reason staff leave is to gain broader experience.

Salary variation and progression difficulties also featured as (lesser) drivers (Chart 7).

## Salaries are significantly varied, but average increases are modest

Salary ranges vary significantly between agencies.

Overall average Senior and Principal salaries have increased at around the rate of inflation, but slightly less than inflation for Analysts (Chart 8).

Chart 7: Reasons given for why policy staff are leaving




Chart 6: Average unplanned turnover per policy job level over time





Chart 8: Range of salaries per job level over time



Source: State Services Commission/HRC Survey



# Skills gaps

## Perceived skills shortages

The three skills agencies perceived to be the hardest to recruit (based on those listed in the PSF) are:

- strategic thinking
- evidence, insights and evaluation
- advise and influence (Chart 9).

Domain knowledge also featured (although being technical and often sector-specific are arguably best addressed at an agency or sector level).

Qualitative comments reveal survey respondents' perceptions of why these skills are scarce (Chart 10).

Chart 9: Skills found the hardest to recruit





Chart 10: Reasons for skills shortages






# Skills development and progression issues

## Planning for future skills is mixed

Some respondents felt planning for future skills was integral to wider agency planning.

More described their skills planning as ad hoc or dependent on the relative attention given to it by particular managers (Chart 11).

Chart 11: How agency planning for future policy skills is described




Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey

## Learning from seniors is not systematic

While senior policy staff are nominally responsible for coaching less experienced staff, many felt that this was up to individuals to organise and was therefore not systematised.

Shadowing of senior managers provides other opportunities for on-the-job learning (Chart 12).

Chart 12: How policy people learn from more senior staff



Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey

## Progression pathways are perceived to be transparent

Job levels, progression pathways and opportunities are perceived by agencies to be largely transparent, with staff promoted 'when ready', but usually only when a vacancy exists (Chart 13).

Chart 13: Perceptions of progression management



Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey





# Capacity and deployment issues

## Use of contractors is mostly to augment capacity and 'about right'

60% of respondents considered their agency primarily contracts for capacity needs (rather than to fill gaps in capability).

The majority perceived their agency's use of contractors was about right (Chart 14).

## Deployment based on work demands

Most respondents considered their agency to be reasonably agile in terms of moving staff to meet work demands (Chart 15).

## Secondments are more passive than active

Regular offers to rotate internally are fairly common.

External secondments are largely supported, but often are up to individuals to organise (Chart 16).

Chart 14: Perceptions of levels of contracting (by count)




Chart 15: Perceptions of agency agility





Chart 16: Management of rotations and secondments






# Training provision

## Internal agency training is kept 'in-house' but could be open to others

Most internally-delivered training is limited to agency staff, but respondents considered that it could be opened up to staff from other agencies.

A number of agencies deliver similar training suggesting scope for some shared provision, opportunities for consistency and potential economies of scale.

Chart 17: How open is or could internal training be



Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey

When asked what policy training provided **internally** is most useful respondents cited...

- Writing [MoT, MBIE, MoJ]
- Machinery of Government [TPK, MPI]
- Critical thinking [TPK, MoT]
- Good Regulatory Practice [MBIE, Treasury]
- Regulatory Impact Analysis [MoJ, MPI, Treasury]
- Policy analysis fundamentals [MfE]
- Frameworks for policy papers [MCH]
- Assessing risk [MCH]
- Formulating Policy Advice [TPK]
- Intro to Microeconomics for Policy Analysis [GEN/MBIE]
- Presentation of policy papers [MCH]
- Peer review [MfE]
- Coaching and mentoring training [MoJ]
- Commissioning [MfE]
- Basics of International Law [MFAT]
- OIA training [MoT]

When asked what policy training provided **externally** is most useful respondents cited...

- Writing skills [**seven** agencies listed various private providers useful]
- Machinery of Government, especially for graduates /advisors [**five** agencies listed various private providers useful]
- Applied Policy Adviser Development (APAD) [**three** agencies cited Vic School of Government provision as useful]
- Good Regulatory Practice [two agencies cited MBIE, Treasury provision as useful]
- Introduction to/basics for policy making [two agencies listed different private providers useful]
- Story lining for policy analysts [one agency cited a private provider]
- Foreign Policy [one agency cited Otago University provision as useful]
- Private Secretary Course [one agency cited a private provider]
- Agile [one agency cited a private provider]
- Critical thinking [one agency cited a private provider]
- Achieving results through others [one agency cited a private provider]

Source: responses to Policy Project survey



## Policy Skills Framework – current and potential uptake

### Agencies are already using the PSF

- ✓ To describe required policy skills [MoH, MSD, MPP, LINZ]
- ✓ For aligning with own competency framework [MBIE, MoE]
- ✓ To create JD's [MBIE, MPP, Customs]
- ✓ For recruitment assessment [MPI, LINZ, TSY, MPP]
- ✓ For performance and development processes [LINZ, Corrections]
- ✓ To map skill gaps and overlaps of teams [MoJ, MoE, Corrections, LINZ]
- ✓ For setting up new policy teams [MoH]
- ✓ Looking to embed throughout agency [MCH]

Source: Policy Capability Leads workshop

### Many are interested in using it...

Chart 18: Likelihood of using the Policy Skills Framework



Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey

### ...for multiple purposes


Chart 19: Use and function of Policy Skills Framework



Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey

### Many use bespoke or agency wide frameworks

Chart 20: How agencies describe required policy skills



Source: agency responses to PP survey

### ...and there are barriers to uptake

When asked what was stopping agencies from using the PSF some agencies say they simply don't know where to start and need implementation support and advice.

Other agencies cite the need for alignment with existing HR systems and competencies (policy specific and general).

Support from HR partners would be needed to enable uptake, including mechanisms for incorporating the PSF into job descriptions, recruitment processes, and performance, development and progression discussions.



# Collective policy workforce initiatives – top picks

Survey respondents supported more consistency across agencies in the following areas:


1. role descriptions
2. secondments
3. common training
4. system-based approach to talent management (Chart 21)

The survey asked “what collective action would help build a more unified policy workforce?” Respondents ranked a shortlist of options (developed with the policy and HR communities).

**How well might these most favoured collective initiatives start addressing the above attraction, retention, development and deployment challenges?**

57%  
129

Chart 21: Most favoured collective workforce actions



\*This option had a low number of agencies selecting it, but those that did gave it a high ranking

Source: individual responses to Policy Project survey



## Options for Action

1. Policy Project and early PSF adopters develop further tools to make PSF **'easy to use'** e.g. sample job description text and bank of interview questions, an online assessment tool (based on the mapping tool)?
2. Policy Project and early PSF adopters undertake a lessons learnt exercise to share with agencies who are willing (but not ready) to adopt? Consider a 'buddy system' or early adopters 'paying it forward', or external consulting model (PP and/or others to help with implementation)?
3. Agencies identify the best HR process for the starting point for using the PSF. For example:
  - Recruitment** – use the PSF for **all new recruitment**, e.g.
    - To identify the gap/s to be filled based on mapping of teams' PSF profile (using team mapping tool)?
    - To develop new JDs that incorporate the PSF?
    - To assess candidates using the PSF diagnostic tool?
  - Development and performance discussions** – use the PSF progressively for **certain job-levels or all policy staff**, e.g.
    - To assess staff current skills profile (whether they are developing, practicing or expert/leading on each component of the PSF)?
    - To identify knowledge, skills and behaviours to be developed (using PSF diagnostic tool)?
4. Develop expectations to make the PSF **'hard to avoid'**, by referencing the need to use the PSF (and its value) in accountability documents (e.g. Four-year plan workforce strategy guidance, PIF guidance)?
5. Facilitate easier secondments through more transparency of opportunities (perhaps as phase 1 of a talent management system)?
6. Use the PSF as the foundation for:
  - a system-wide policy training strategy (see **Annex 2**: training options – a mix of light to heavy intervention)?
  - a talent management system to help feed the pipeline for the policy (leadership-level) career board (including clarifying how agencies concurrently use the PSF and Leadership Success Profile)?
  - a system-wide policy workforce strategy (including clarifying roles and responsibilities for agencies and the 'centre', and sequencing)?



## Annex 1: Policy Project survey methodology

- **22/26** policy agencies responded to the March 2017 Policy Project survey on practices related to policy skills, capability and workforce. Respondents were primarily those nominated as responsible for their agency's policy capability, with many in senior management roles.
- **Nine** agencies provided multiple responses, such as two or three from policy and/or HR/OD people, lifting total responses to **32** (plus some responses to just a few questions). This level and diversity of responses provides a sound evidence base as these people tend to have a high stake in, and influence on, policy people capability.
- When multiple responses were received from a single agency, and either a single agency view was preferred or there should only be one objective or technical truth, different responses have been reconciled (e.g. through follow-up with respondents).
- Alternatively, when understanding the diversity of perspectives is desirable, or the responses are more subjective in nature, all the different responses have been accepted. Assumptions include that reconciled views are representative of the agency's views, and that the diversity of responses represents the views of the Public Service.
- **Note:** In most cases, insights provided below are based on individual responses to questions that can have more than one answer. Because of this, and the fact that some respondents skipped a few questions, total counts of responses to each question vary.



## Annex 2: Training options – a mix of light to heavy intervention

### Light intervention

### Heavy intervention

#### Internal provision

Do stocktake of internal training and ask agencies to open up their existing training to others, and advertise offerings centrally

Groups of agencies develop new and/or share existing training

Training offered across the state services e.g. Government Economics Network (GEN), Govt. Regulatory Network (G-Reg) and newer 'communities of practice' (e.g. strategy/futures thinking)

Specialised agencies act as Centres of Expertise (CoE) to develop and deliver the training for a subject (e.g. Superu, Social Investment Agency and Stats NZ on evidence and data analytics)

Head of Policy Profession (HoPP) provides training resources for mandated policy training (e.g. common policy induction)

Seek agency-to-agency reciprocity commitments to balance capacity barriers

Policy Project develop Policy Skills Framework (PSF)-based training modules and trains trainers; agencies deliver customised versions of course

New 'Policy Academy' entity provides PSF-

#### External provision

Do stocktake of external training and develop basic online directory (with transparency of alignment to PSF)

Agencies partner with providers for training development and/or delivery of in-house courses

based policy training – customised in-house and external 'public courses' available to all agencies

Centrally led training procurement to meet gaps (once identified against the PSF) and achieve best public value (quality, consistency and efficiency):

Develop a sophisticated online directory, linked to external provider websites (allowing online enrolments)

Agency led procurement of training e.g. MoT-led Applied Policy Adviser Develop. programme

Survey users of externally provided courses and provide online 'trip advisor'-style rankings that future potential users can access

- A. All of Government contract – agencies must purchase from approved suppliers run by a CoE with oversight from HoPP (fee remitted to MBIE)
- B. Syndicated contract – groups of agencies collectively procure policy training services
- C. Partner and co-develop training with a limited number of external suppliers e.g. IPANZ, Victoria University

Options are not necessarily mutually exclusive ways of increasing PSF-linked training to build policy capability – what 'direction of travel' should the Policy Project focus on, in the next 3 years?