

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL

DONNA L. GILES DIRECTOR

### CITY OF SACRAMENTO

921 TENTH STREET ROOM 301 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-2713

916-449-5270

DIVISION: ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL SERVICES OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH SAFETY & RETIREMENT

June 6, 1990

Personnel and Public Employees Committee Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY REPORT FOR 1989

#### **SUMMARY**

The City's Affirmative Action Plan requires a review and update of the Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Program on an annual basis. The attached status report provides information on the 1989 City work force and employment practices.

It is recommended that this report be referred to the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee for review and then forwarded to the City Council for approval.

#### BACKGROUND

On January 20, 1981, the City Council adopted the first written Affirmative Action Plan for the City of Sacramento. Among other things, the Plan requires a review and update of the Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Program on an annual basis. The attached report is the ninth annual review of City employment practices.

The 1989 status report has been disseminated to all City departments/divisions, members of the Civil Service Board, members of the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, employee organizations, community organizations and other interested parties.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Status Report for 1989 be reviewed by the Personnel and Public Employee Committee, referred to the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee and forward to the City Council for approval.

Respectfully submitted,

DONNA L. GILES

Director of Personnel

Recommendation Approved:

JACK R. CRIST Deputy City Manager

June 12, 1990

Whra. 2



AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM STATUS REPORT FOR 1989

# A REVIEW OF THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Prepared By:
Affirmative Action Office
Department of Personnel
City of Sacramento
May 1990

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1989 AFFIRMATI	VE ACTION REPORT HIGHLIGHTS	1
REPORT OVERVIE	w	3
SECTION I	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM	4
	Percentage of Full-Time Career Work Force by Ethnicity	5
	Total Career Minority Work force	6
	The Status of Individual Ethnic groups in the Total Career Work Force	7
	Review of the Status of Females in the Total Career Work Force	10
	Minority & Female Employment by Occupational Categories	11
	Affirmative Action Goals for Department Employment	18
	Analysis of the Exempt Work Force	30
	Analysis of New Hires and Terminations	31
SECTION II	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	34
	Recruitment/Examination Analysis	36
	Examination Analysis by Occupational Category	38
	Review of Incidents of Discipline	41
	Analysis of Discrimination Complaints Filed in 1989	43
RECAPITULATION	••••••	47
AFFIRMATIVE AC	TION POLICY STATEMENT (REAFFIRMATION)	48
	CRAMENTO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT	49

#### - 1989 AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT HIGHLIGHTS -

The City of Sacramento first adopted a formal affirmative action program in 1981. The primary goals of the affirmative action program are to determine whether minorities and/or women are being underutilized in the City workforce and to correct any underutilization which is found to exist. This includes the total City workforce, individual occupational categories and each City department. The City Council has established a 37.72% minority employment goal and a 42% goal for female employment.

#### TOTAL WORKFORCE

- . Minorities The percentage of minorities employed in the total workplace was 32.70% when the Affirmative Action Program began in 1981. It reached a high of 33.04% in 1987 and has declined to 32.06% in 1989.
- . <u>Females</u> In 1980, female employment was 16.41%. It has steadily increased to 26.20% in 1989.

The percentage of minorities employed in the total workforce dropped slightly in 1989 (.51%). There was a decrease in the percentage of Blacks employed; a reduction in the percentage of Hispanic and American Indian females; and no significant growth in the employment of Hispanic and Filipino males.

Two major factors affecting the reduction in the percentage of minorities include: 1) a 1989 minority hiring rate of 30% which is below the 37.72% affirmative action employment goal; and 2) a 36.17% minority termination rate which offset minority new hires.

Progress was made in the employment of White, Black and Filipino females. In addition, the percentage of non-minority males dropped which indicates overall affirmative action program gains.

#### EMPLOYMNET BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

- Minorities Employment goals have been reached in 1 of 9 occupational categories (Service Maintenance). The percentage of minorities employed increased in 1989 in 5 of 9 categories (Supervisory, Fire, Professional, Skilled Crafts and Exempt).
- Females Employment goals have been met in 2 of 9 categories (Professional and Clerical). In 1989, the percentage of females employed increased in 8 of 9 categories.

In contrast to the improvements made by females overall, minority females lost ground slightly in 4 of 9 occupational categories (Technicians, Police, Service Maintenance and Clerical).

Overall, minority employment increased in 5 of 9 occupational categories in 1989.

#### EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

- Minorities Are employed at or above their goal in 4 of 17 departments (including charter offices). Of those departments with a minority workforce which was not at the goal in 1989, 11 of 13 departments did not register an increase in the percentage of minorities employed.
- Females The overall female employment goals have been reached in 8 of 17 departments. In 1989, the percentage of females employed increased in 9 departments.

In 1989, the percentage of minorities improved in the Mayor/Council and City Manager Offices, and the Finance, Police, Fire, Library and Parks and Community Services Departments. Female employment increased in the City Manager's and Treasurer's Offices, and the Finance, Personnel, General Services, Fire, Public Works, Planning and Development and Parks and Community Services Departments.

The City Clerk's and City Treasurer's Offices, and the Data Management, Personnel, General Services, Public Works and Planning and Development Departments had reduction in the percentage of minorities employed in their workforces. The percentage of females working in the City Clerk's Office, Police, and Planning and Development Departments also dropped.

#### REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- Aggressively seek to increase the employment of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians.
- The Career Development Trainee classification should continue to be utilized for training females for Skilled Crafts and Service Maintenance positions.
- . The City Council should place before the voters a ballot measure to either repeal or modify Section 84 of the City Charter (the rule of three persons certification requirement).
- The discipline program should be reviewed, focusing on its impact on Blacks and other minorities. Managers, supervisors and employees should participate in cultural diversity training.
- Additional efforts should be directed toward increasing the percentage of minorities in the Exempt, Supervisory, Police, Professional and Skilled Crafts applicant pools and increasing the percentage of female Supervisory, Police, Fire, Skilled Crafts, and Technician applicants.

## ANALYSIS OF 1989 YEAR END EMPLOYMENT STATISTICS IN COMPARISON TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GOALS & EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY GUIDELINES

#### REPORT OVERVIEW

On January 20, 1981, the Sacramento City Council adopted a written Affirmative Action Plan to provide equal employment opportunities to all individuals regardless of race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, disability or marital status. Later, discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and medical condition (cancer) were added to the list of inappropriate practices. (The City Manager and Council Policy Statements appear as Attachments A & B, in this report.)

In addition to the above, the Affirmative Action Plan contains specific goals and general timetables for the employment of minorities and women in occupations and departments where they are under-represented.

This is the City of Sacramento's Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Status Report for 1989. Within it are analyses of City employment practices as they relate to state and federal laws and City policies on equal employment opportunity. This report also discusses the state of the City work force relative to the minority and female affirmative action employment goals.

Section I is an analysis of the City's efforts to achieve the affirmative action goals within the time-frames established in 1981. Included in this section are reviews of the "Exempt" work force.

Section II covers the equal employment opportunity program. Specifically, 1989 recruitment and examination activities are examined to determine overall compliance with the policies set forth in the City's Affirmative Action Plan. This Section also contains a review of discipline imposed on employees in 1989 and a discussion on the discrimination complaints filed against the City during the review period.

#### SECTION 1 - AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

Affirmative Action in employment can be described as a formal effort to provide increased employment opportunities for minorities, women, and in some cases members of other groups, in order to overcome the effects of past discrimination. Affirmative Action programs may be instituted by employers voluntarily, or employers may be ordered by courts, compliance agencies or other governmental entities to implement affirmative action programs. Irrespective of the commitment employers may have, courts have ruled that specific race or sex conscious hiring practices can only be used when there is evidence that women and minorities have not been afforded the same opportunities as non-minorities and males.

The City of Sacramento's current Affirmative Action Program is a voluntary goal oriented program designed to draw attention to the necessity to increase employment opportunities for minorities and females in areas where they are severely under-utilized. Established in 1981 by Council Resolution and updated annually, the Affirmative Action Program strives to determine whether minorities and/or women are being under-utilized by the City. If any under-utilization is found, the Affirmative Action Program seeks to correct the under-utilization through voluntary acts on the part of those involved in the employment process.

In 1979-80, the Personnel Department conducted an analysis of the City work force to determine the number of minorities and women employed in the organization, in each department and in each occupational category. The data was compared to statistics in other juridictions/employers. Among them: 1) statistics on the availability of minorities and women in Sacramento County and the Sacramento SMSA (Sacramento Metropolitan Statistical Area - now referred to as the MSA), who have the education, skills and/or training necessary for employment in each occupational category; 2) the percentage of minorities and women in the Sacramento County and Sacramento SMSA labor force; and, 3) the percentage of minorities living in the City of Sacramento.

After reviewing the information, the City Council in 1981, established a set of goals for the employment of minorities and women in the total work force, in each occupational category and in each department. Minority employment goals were set at 31% and the female goals at 42%. In 1983, the City Council amended the goals for minority employment by increasing them to 37.72%, to reflect the 1980 census data on the City population.

## PERCENTAGE OF FULL-TIME CAREER WORK FORCE BY ETHNICITY 1980 - 1989

	White Total	Black Total	Hispanic <u>Total</u>	Asian <u>Total</u>	Am/Ind Total	Filipino Total	Minority Total
<u>Year</u>							
1980	67.30%	13.12%	13.49%	4.37%	1.05%	.67%	32.70%
1981	67.24%	12.57%	13.95%	4.50%	1.04%	.71%	32.76%
1982	67.21%	12.61%	14.10%	4.26%	1.06%	.76%	32.79%
1983	67.05%	12.51%	14.15%	4.46%	1.07%	.76%	32.95%
1984	67.26%	12.09%	14.21%	4.59%	1.06%	.80%	32.74%
1985	67.23%	11.52%	14.70%	4.57%	1.10%	.88%	32.53%
1986	66.96%	11.58%	14.76%	4.54%	1.16%	. 99%	33.04%
1987	67.23%	11.30%	14.63%	4.59%	1.22%	1.03%	32.77%
1988	67.94%	11.20%	14.16%	4.48%	1.18%	1.03%	32.06%
1989	68.44	11.04%	13.86	4.40%	1.18%	1.06%	31.56%

## TOTAL CAREER WORK FORCE 1989

ETHNICIT	<u>Y</u>	Ma	ıle	F	emale	T	otal
City Cat	egory Totals	NBR	PERCENT	NBR	PERCENT	NBR	PERCENT
WHITE BLACK HISPANIC ASIAN NATIVE AI FILIPINO OTHER	MERICAN	1642 271 365 105 32 24	49.68% 8.19% 11.04% 3.17% .96% .72%	620 94 93 41 7 11	18.75% 2.84% 2.81% 1.24% .21% .33%	2262 365 458 146 39 35	68.44% 11.04% 13.86% 4.42% 1.18% 1.06%
	TOTAL	2439	73.76%	866	26.20%	3305	100.0%
	MINORITIES	797	24.11%	246	7.45%	1045	31.56%

Total 1989 Year-End Workforce by Sex & Ethnicity

What follows is a review, analysis and comments on the City of Sacramento's work force in comparison with the goals of the Affirmative Action Program.

#### TOTAL CAREER MINORITY WORK FORCE

One goal of the affirmative action program is to assist in the attainment of a career work force which is 37.72% minority. The percentage goal was established by the City Council based on the percentage of minorities in the City of Sacramento population as determined by the 1980 federal census.

Since 1980, the percentage of minorities in the work force has fluctuated. The highest level of minorities in the work force at year-end was recorded in 1986 when 33.05% of the career work force was minority. Until recently, the lowest level was 32.53% which occurred in 1985.

The 1989 year-end statistics show that the total career work force grew during the year. There were 3,213 full-time career employees in 1988 and 3,305 employees in 1989 at year end. This amounts to a net increase of 92 employees in 1989.

The growth in the minority work force did not keep pace with changes in the total work force. Although the number of career minority employees increased from 1,030 to 1,043, the percentage of minorities fell from 32.06% in 1988 to 31.56% in 1989. The percentage of minorities in the work force in 1989 is the lowest since the adoption of the Affirmative Action Plan in 1981.

#### THE STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL GROUPS IN THE TOTAL CAREER WORK FORCE

#### WHITE

1989 Results (+79)

	Goal	1989
		Actual
Male	36.12%	49.68%
Female	26.16%	18.75%
Total	62.28%	68.44%

The number of White employees increased by 79 (from 2,183 to 2,262) during 1989. The increase within the ranks of White females, was from 582 to 620. Although White employees are not an affirmative action target group as an ethnicity, White females are targeted under the female goals.

In comparison, the number of white males (not an affirmative action target group) increased by 41, from 1,601 to 1,642.

#### **BLACK**

1989 Results (+5)

	Goal	1989
		Actual
Male	7.60%	8.19%
Female	5.51%	2.84%
Total	13.11%	11.03%

Blacks continue to be under parity. The number of Blacks in the work force increased from 360 to 365. However, the percentage of Blacks decreased from 11.20% in 1988 to 11.03% in 1989.

The number of Black males remained the same as in 1988 at 271. However, there was a decrease in the percentage. The number of Black females increased from 360 to 365.

#### **HISPANIC**

1989 Results (+3)

	Goal	1989
		Actual
Male	8.25%	11.04%
Female	5.96%	2.81%
Total	14.21%	13.85%

There were 455 Hispanics employed in 1988 and 458 in 1989, a net gain of three. The percentage of Hispanics in the work force dropped from 14.15% to 13.86% in 1989.

The number of Hispanic males increased by three from 362 to 365 during the reporting period.

Hispanic females employment number remained the same but the percentage at 93 dropped to (2.80%) during 1989.

#### ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER

1989 Results (+2)
Goal 1989
Actual
Male 4.39% 3.17%
Female 3.18% 1.24%
Total 7.57% 4.41%

Asian employment remained under parity in 1989. At the end of the reporting period, there were 146 Asian career employees, 4.41 of the work force. In 1988, there were 144 Asian employees, 4.48% of the career employees.

There was an increase in the number of Asian males in 1989, from 104 to 105. However, the percentage of Asian males fell from 3.34% to 3.17%

Although the number increased from 40 to 41, the percentage of Asian female work force remained the same at 1.24%.

#### AMERICAN INDIAN/ALASKAN NATIVE

1989 results (+1)

Goal 1989 Actual Male 0.37% 0.96% Female 0.27% 0.21% Total 0.64% 1.17%

There was one additional American Indian employed in career positions at the end of 1989.

Thirty-eight American Indians were employed in 1988 and thirty-nine in 1989. The percentages decreased, however, as a result of the growth in the overall work force.

#### **FILIPINO**

1989 Results (+2)

Goal 1989 Actual Male 0.66% 0.72% Female 0.48% 0.33% Total 1.14% 1.05%

There was a net gain of two Filipino career employees in 1989. This increase was not enough to move the level of Filipino employment to parity.

The number of Filipino males increased to 24. Their percentage of the total work force remained the same as a result of the increase in the size of the career work force. However, the percentage of Filipino males is at parity.

There was an increase in the number of Filipino females, which went from 10 in 1988 to 11 in 1989. The percentage of Filipino females moved from .31% to .33%.

PERCENTAGE OF MALES IN THE FULL-TIME CAREER WORK FORCE BY ETHNICITY

1980 - 1989

Year	White <u>Male</u>	Black <u>Male</u>	Hispanic <u>Male</u>	Asian <u>Male</u>	Am/Ind <u>Male</u>	Filipino <u>Male</u>	T/Min <u>Male</u>	Total <u>Male</u>
1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986	56.20% 55.63% 55.40% 54.39% 53.62% 52.34% 51.14%	10.91% 10.34% 10.26% 10.11% 9.47% 9.00% 9.09%	11.66% 11.68% 11.74% 11.71% 11.48% 12.00% 11.96%	3.44% 3.53% 3.23% 3.32% 3.33% 3.29%	.93% 1.00% 1.03% 1.03% 1.02% .99%	.45% .45% .46% .50% .49%	27.39% 27.00% 26.71% 26.66% 25.81% 25.82%	83.59% 82.63% 82.10% 81.05% 79.42% 78.16%
1986 1987 1988 1989	50.06% 49.83% 49.68%	8.76% 8.43% 8.19%	11.55% 11.27% 11.04%	3.28% 3.40% 3.24% 3.17%	.96% 1.03% .93% .96%	.61% .74% .72% .72	25.90% 25.48% 24.59% 24.11%	77.04% 75.55% 74.42% 73.76%

The percentage of males has decreased annually

#### SUMMARY

Areas where affirmative action progress was made relative to minorities in the total full-time career work force:

- + An increase in the percentage of black and filipino females.
- + A reduction in the percentage of white males (a non-target group).

Areas where affirmative action progress did not occur:

- The overall drop in the percentage of minorities from 32.06% to 31.55%.
- A fall in the percentage of hispanic females from 2.89% to 2.81%.
- No (or insignificant) growth in the number of hispanic and filipino males.
- No change in the number of black males which resulted in a drop in the percentage of blacks from 11.2% to 11.04%.

#### REVIEW OF THE STATUS OF FEMALES IN THE TOTAL CAREER WORK FORCE

The affirmative action goal for the employment of females in the work force is 42%. In achieving this goal, the percentage of females in the work force would approximate their percentage in the 1980 Sacramento County labor force.

There were improvements in the percentage of females. White females increased from  $582 \ (18.11\%)$  in 1988 to  $620 \ (18.75\%)$ . The minority female work force had a net gain of 6. Their numbers changed from  $240 \ (7.47\%)$ , to  $246 \ (7.5\%)$  at years end.

According to the <u>Personnel Activity Report - Annual Summary for 1989</u>, there were 117 female new hires during the year. They represent 45% of all new hires which occurred during 1989. (Note: the new hire rate is higher than the 42% female employment goal.) Also, females terminated from City service at an equal rate of the affirmative action goal for female employment. Seventy-nine (79) females left City employment, 42.03% of all terminations in 1989.

#### PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES IN THE FULL-TIME CAREER WORK FORCE 1980 - 1989

		Black Female	Hispanic Female	Asian Female	Am/Ind Female	Filipino Female	T/Min Female	Total Female
1981 11 1982 11 1983 12 1984 13 1985 14 1986 15 1987 17	.60% .82% .66% .64% .89% .82% .17%	2.36% 2.40% 2.61% 2.52% 2.49% 2.54%	1.83% 2.27% 2.36% 2.44% 2.73% 2.71% 2.80% 3.08% 2.89% 2.81%	.93% .97% 1.03% 1.14% 1.25% 1.28% 1.26% 1.19% 1.24%	.11% .04% .04% .04% .04% .11% .20% .19% .25%	. 22% . 26% . 30% . 27% . 30% . 33% . 38% . 29% . 31%	5.31% 5.76% 6.08% 6.29% 6.93% 6.95% 7.14% 7.28% 7.45%	16.41% 17.37% 17.90% 18.95% 20.58% 21.84% 22.96% 24.45% 25.58%

White women have made significant employment gains.

#### SUMMARY

Positive affirmative action results relative to the employment of females occurred in the following areas:

- + Female employment increased from 25.58% to 26.20%
- + Two of the five minority female subgroups registered employment gains during the year (Black, Asian, American Indian and Filipino females).

Areas where affirmative action progress did not occur:

- Hispanic and American-Indian female employment dipped.

#### MINORITY AND FEMALE EMPLOYMENT BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

The second goal of the affirmative action program is to assist in the creation of a work force in which 37.72% of those employed in each occupational category are minorities and 42% are females. (An occupational category is a grouping of similar jobs, e.g. Police = all sworn police positions, Professionals = all jobs which require specialized knowledge which usually is acquired through college. An exception is the Exempt category which contains all of the full time career positions, irregardless of job duties, which are not covered by the civil service rules and regulations.)

At year end, minorities were at parity in one occupational category, Service Maintenance. Since the Council increased the affirmative action goals in 1983, Service Maintenance continues to be the only occupational category in which minority employment has been at parity.

The percentage of minorities employed increased in five of the nine occupational categories: Supervisory, Fire, Professional, Skilled Craft and Exempt, in 1989.

#### FEMALE EMPLOYMENT

Female employment is at parity in two of the nine categories, Professional and Clerical. In 1989, the percentage of female employment increased in eight of the nine occupational categories (Supervisory, Fire, Professional, Skilled Crafts, Service Maintenance, Technicians and Exempt categories). There was only one occupational group, Police, in which female affirmative action gains did not occur in 1989.

The percentage of minority females was up in three of nine occupational categories (Supervising, Skilled Craft, and Exempt), down in four occupational categories (Technician, Police, Service Maintenance, and Clerical) and stayed the same in two occupational categories (Fire and Professional).

#### SUMMARY

- + Overall, minorities showed increases in <u>five</u> of <u>nine</u> occupational categories in 1989 as opposed to improvement in only one category in 1988.
- + Minority females maintained their overall percentage of the total workforce.
- Minority females had percentage losses in four of nine occupational categories.

## OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES DEFINITIONS

#### Category 1 Supervisory

Occupations in which employees are primarily responsible for supervising employees. Includes: office supervisors, field supervisors and similar positions.

#### Category 2 Police

Positions in this occupational category represent sworn police officers, excluding management. They require some college education and an ability to perform up to physical standards.

#### Category 3 Fire

Positions in this occupational category represent sworn firefighting personnel up to and including Fire Captains. The job requirements range from no college/no experience to highly technical experience and/or higher education.

#### Category 4 Professionals

Positions in this occupational category require specialized and theoretical knowledge which is usually acquired through college training (or other specialized training which provides comparable knowledge) coupled with work experience. Includes: accountants, engineers, librarians and similar professions.

#### Category 5 Skilled Crafts

The positions listed in this category require special manual skill and a thorough comprehensive knowledge of the processes involved in the work which is acquired through on-the-job training and experience or through apprenticeship or other formal training programs. Includes mechanics and repairers, electricians, heavy equipment operators, stationary engineers, skilled machining occupations, carpenters and similar positions.

#### Category 6 Service Maintenance

The positions in this category represent occupations which contribute to the upkeep and care of building, facilities, grounds or articles or public property. Includes: maintenance workers, truck drivers, grounds keepers, refuse collectors and similar positions.

#### Category 7 Technicians

Positions within this occupational category generally require a combination of para-scientific knowledge and manual skill. They frequently require post-secondary education. Includes: inspectors, computer operators, and similar professions.

#### Category 8 Clerical

The positions in this category are responsible for internal and external communication, recording and retrieval of data and/or information and other paperwork required in an office or similar setting. Includes: clerks, dispatchers, library assistants and similar positions.

#### Category 9 Exempt

Includes occupations in which employees set broad policies, exercise overall responsibility for execution of these policies, or direct individual departments or special phases of the City's operations, or provide specialized consultation on a regional, district or area basis. Also includes all professional, technical and clerical positions appointed on an "Exempt" basis with the exception of seasonal and limited-term employees.

## TOTAL WORK FORCE BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY 1989

#### SUPERVISORY (Approximately 5% of the City workforce or 173 employees)

	MALE		FEM	<u>FEMALE</u>		
	# _	<u> </u>	#	<u> </u>	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian Native American Filipino Other	85 14 17 7 1 2 0	49.1 8.0 9.8 4.0 .5 1.1	34 6 3 2 0 2	19.6 3.4 1.7 1.1 .0 1.1	119 20 20 9 1 4	68.7 11.5 11.5 5.2 .5 2.3
Total	126	72.5	47	27.1	173	100.0
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	41 42	23.7 24.0	13 9	7.5 5.2	54 51	31.3 29.0

#### POLICE (Approximately 17% of the City workforce or 573 employees)

		MALE	FEM	<u>FEMALE</u>		
	#	<b>~~~</b> %	#	%	#	%
White	382	66.6	37	6.4	419	73.1
Black	32	5.5	5	.8	37	6.4
Hispanic	62	10.8	5	.8	67	11.6
Asian	33	5.7	1	. 1	34	5.9
Native American	6	1.0	0	.0	6	1.0
Filipino	9	1.5	0	.0	10	1.7
Other	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Total	524	91.4	49	8.5	573	100.0
Minorities 1989	142	24.8	12	2.1	154	26.9
Minorities 1988	136	24.5	14	2.5	150	27.0

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### FIRE (Approximately 13% of the City workforce or 431 employees)

	MALE		FEN	MLE	TOTAL		
•	#	<u>~</u> %	#	<b>%</b>	#	<u>~~~</u> %	
White	298	69.1	24	5.5	322	74.7	
Black	36	8.3	0	.0	36	8.3	
Hispanic	50	11.6	1	.2	51	11.8	
Asian	13	3.0	0	.0	13	3.0	
Native American	8	1.8	-1	. 2	9	2.0	
Filipino	Ö	.0	Ō	.0	. 0	.0	
Other	ő	.0	Ö	.0	Ō	.0	
Total	405	93.9	26	6.0	431	100.0	
Minorities 1989	107	24.8	2	.5	109	25.3	
Minorities 1988	105	24.8	2	.5	107	25.2	
			-14-				

PROFESSIONAL (Approximately 1% of the City workforce or 219 employees)

	MA	LE	FEMALE		FEMALE TOTAL		OTAL
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
White Black Hispanic Asian Native American Filipino Other	103 2 6 10 0 0	47.0 .9 2.7 4.5 .0 .0	78 6 4 9 0 0	35.6 2.7 1.8 4.1 .0 .0	181 8 10 19 0 0	82.6 3.6 4.5 8.6 .0 .0	
Total	121	55.2	98	44.7	219	100.0	
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	18 16	8.2 8.1	20 18	9.1 9.1	38 34	17.4 17.2	

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

#### SKILLED CRAFTS (Approximately 4% of the City workforce or 143 employees)

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian Native American Filipino Other	102 6 17 8 3 0	71.3 4.1 11.8 5.5 2.0 .0	5 1 1 0 0 0	3.4 .6 .6 .0 .0	107 7 18 8 3 0	74.8 4.8 12.5 5.5 2.0 .0
Total	136	95.1	7	4.8	143	100.0
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	34 30	23.8 22.6	2 1	1.4	36 31	25.2 23.3

#### SERVICE MAINTENANCE (Approximately 25% of the City workforce or 806 employees)

	M	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
White	359	44.5	46	5.7	405	50.2	
Black	157	19.4	6	.7	163	20.2	
Hispanic	184	22.8	15	1.8	199	24.6	
Asian	18	2.2	1	.1	19	2.3	
Native American	11	1.3	0	.0	11	1.3	
Filipino	9	1.1	0	.0	9	1.1	
Other	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0	
Total .	738	91.5	68	8.4	806	100.0	
Minorities 1989	359	47.0	22	2.7	401	49.8	
Minorities 1988	381	47.9	23	2.9	404	50.9	

#### TECHNICIANS (Approximately 8% of the City workforce or 268 employees)

	M	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	2	#	%	#	%	
White Black Hispanic Asian Native American Filipino Other	147 9 12 7 2 3 0	54.8 3.3 4.4 2.6 .7 1.1	69 8 8 3 0 0	25.7 2.9 2.9 1.1 .0 .0	216 17 20 10 2 3	80.5 6.3 7.4 3.7 .7 1.1	
Total	180	67.1	88	32.8	268	100.0	
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	33 36	12.3 13.4	19 20	7.1 7.5	52 56	19.5 20.1	

CLERICAL (Approximately 14% of the City workforce or 455 employees)

	M	<b>NLE</b>	FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian Native American Filipino Other	30 8 5 1 1 1 0	6.5 1.7 1.0 .2 .2 .2	268 55 52 22 5 7 0	58.9 12.0 11.4 4.8 1.0 1.5	298 63 57 23 6 8 0	65.4 13.8 12.5 5.0 1.3 1.7
Tota1	46	10.1	409	89.8	455	100.0
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	16 18	3.6 4.1	141 139	30.9 31.7	157 157	34.5 35.8

#### EXEMPT (Approximately 1% of the City workforce or 237 employees)

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	*	#	%
White Black	136 7	57.3 2.9	59 7	24.8 2.9	195 14	82.2 5.9
Hispanic Asian	12 8	5.0 3.3	4 3	1.6 1.2	16 11	6.7 4.6
Native American Filipino	0	.0 .0	1 0	.4	1 0	.4
Other	U	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Total	163	68.7	74	31.2	237	100.0
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	27 26	11.4 11.3	15 14	6.4 6.1	42 40	17.8 17.4

TOTAL	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	1642	49.68	620	18.75	2262	68.44
Black Hispanic	271 365	8.19 11.04	94 93	2.84 2.81	365 458	11.04 13.86
Asian Native American	105 32	3.14 .96	41 7	1.24 .21	146 39	4.42 1.18
Filipino Other	24 0	.72 .0	11 0	.33	35 0	1.06 .0
	2439	73.76	866	26.20	3305	100.0
Total						
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	797 790	24.11 24.59	246 240	7.45 7.40	1,043 1,030	31.56 32.06

While there have been some gains, there is significant minority underrepresentation underrepresention in the Professional, Technical, Skilled Crafts, and Exempt occupational categories.

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GOALS BY DEPARTMENT

The third affirmative action goal is for each individual City Department and Charter Office to have a work force which is 37.72% minority and 42% female. Although the Council did not establish an affirmative action goal for individual divisons, the Affirmative Action Officer has recommended that each department work to establish a work force in which minorities and females are not "concentrated" in a few divisions.

At the end of 1989, minority employment was at or above parity in three departments while female employment was at parity in eight departments. Of those departments with a minority work force under parity, five had percentage increases in minority representation and nine either had no change in minority representation or lost ground. The percentage of females employed increased in nine departments and the remaining four did not experience an increase in the level of female representation.

#### **ANALYSIS BY DEPARTMENTS**

#### CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

Most of the positions in this Office are exempt from civil service. The minority work force at years end was 30% of the total which is equal to the 1988 percentage. Since 1980, the minority work force percentage has increased from 10% to the current 30%. Females were 55% in 1988.

#### CITY CLERK

There was a decrease in the percentage of minorities and females in the work force in comparison to 1988 figures. Minorities fell below parity in this office in 1989. Minority employment at year end was 40.00%, female employment stood at 80.00%.

#### CITY MANAGER

The City Manager's office has Exempt positions only. There was an increase to 20.00% minorities in 1989 from 17.64% in 1988. The Office is at parity in the overall female work force with 60% and below parity in minorities.

#### CITY TREASURER

In 1989, there were no changes in the number of minorities and the net gain of two females. Minorities are 15.38 of the work force and females are 40%.

#### COMMUNITY CENTER

Minorities remained as they were in 1988 at 31.70% of the individuals employed in this department and females are 26.83%. Female employment is under parity in the Supervisory, Skilled Crafts, Service Maintenance and Exempt ranks. Minorities are under represented in the Skilled Crafts, Technicians, Clerical and Exempt occupations.

#### DATA MANAGEMENT

This department is below parity in both the minority and female work forces. Minority employment decreased to 18.75% from 20.75%; females are at 31.25%, up from 26.47% in 1988.

#### **EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

The smallest of the City Departments, it is rare for it to have any turnover. 1989 was no exception. There were no employment changes in this department. The percentage of minorities remained at 25% and females 50% throughout the year.

#### FINANCE

This department experienced an increase in the minority workforce from 34.18 in 1988 to 37.66 in 1989. Females showed a slight increase from 68.35% to 68.23% in 1989.

#### FIRE

Minorities are 24.31% of the department work force and females are 7.61%. In 1980, minority employment stood at 18.44% and females were 2.17% of the work force.

#### GENERAL SERVICES

The department had a decrease in the percentage of minorities from 23.78% to 22.39% and an increase in females to 14.58%.

#### LIBRARY

In 1980, there were 100 full-time career City employees in the City/County Library. At 1989 year end, there were 77 employees. The percentage of minorities has increased from 27.50% in 1989 to 28.57% in 1989. Females decreased from 63 to 60 and decreased in percentage from 78.75% to 77.92%.

#### MAYOR/COUNCIL OFFICE

The percentage of minorities employed in this office increased from 33.33% to 40.00%. All of the employees in this office are female and classified as Exempt.

#### PARKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

The Parks and Community Services Department underwent a major reorganization in 1989. The major changes resulted in Parks & Recreation services being divided into three major divisions. These major divisions were Parks and Recreation Services North, Parks and Recreation Services South and City-wide Services each under its own division manager. The data base for employment statistics has not been changed to reflect this reorganization, therefore, for the purpose of this report, the information will be reported in the organizational format prior to the reorganization.

Overall, Parks and Community Services had a percentage increase in both minorities and the female workforce. The minority workforce in Parks & Community Services increased from 40.66% in 1988 to 41.66% in 1989. The female workforce increased from 28.36% in 1988 to 30.78% in 1989.

The **Administration Division** showed no change in the percentage of minority workforce in 1989 and remains at 28.57%. The Division did show an increase female workforce from 47.61% in 1988 to 52.38% in 1989.

The **Recreation Division** had an increase in the percentage of minorities from 34.18% in 1988 to 38.75 in 1989 which brings this Division to parity. This Division also had an increase in the percentage of females from 50.42% in 1988 to 52.71% in 1989.

The **Parks Division** showed slight increases in the percentage of minorities and females in the workforce for 1989. Minority employment increased from 51.79% in 1988 to 51.83% in 1989 and female employment increased from 7.17% in 1988 to 7.85% in 1989. It should be noted that this Division is one of three divisions in the Department that are at parity in minority employment.

The **Golf Division** which is also at parity with 41.66% minorities remained constant from the same period in 1989. It also remained constant in the female workforce with 8.33%.

The **Zoo Division** had a decrease in the percentage of minority employees from 21.73% in 1988 to 20.83% in 1989. There was also a decrease in this Division in the female workforce from 56.2% in 1988 to 54.16% in 1989.

The Crocker Art Museum remained constant in the number of minority employees but showed an increase from 25% in 1988 to 27.7% for 1989 due to a configuration of the workforce. In the female workforce there was a decrease of one employee and a decrease in percentage from 58.33 in 1988 to 54.54% in 1989.

The **Metropolitan Arts Division** is made up of a total of seven positions which includes one professional minority which represents 14.28% of the Division. The entire workforce in this Division is female and both the minority and female workforce have remained constant from 1988.

The **Museum and History Division** remain constant in the number of minorities with one, but decreased in percentages to 7.69% in 1989 from 8.33% in 1988 due to an increase in the overall staffing. This staffing increase was in the female make-up of the division which increased from 58.33 in 1988 to 76.92 in 1989.

#### PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

The Personnel Department experienced a decrease in the number of minorities by one which dropped the percentage of minorities in 1989 to 28.20% from 30.76% in 1988. The percentage of female remains significantly over parity at 82.05%. There is an anticipation of increasing the number of staff positions in the Department which will provide an opportunity to make affirmative action appointments during the 1990 reporting year.

#### PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

The Planning and Development Department experienced a decrease in their minority staff which resulted in an overall decrease in the percentage of their minority workforce in 1989 to 19.72% from 22.72% in 1988. There was an increase of 9 females in their workforce which resulted in an increase from 33.33% in 1988 to 37.41% in 1989.

The Administration Division remains at parity with a 66.6% female workforce but has experienced a decrease in the percentage of their minority workforce to 25.00% in 1989 from 36.36% in 1988. The number of minorities in the Planning Division remain constant at 8. However, the number of females decreased from 20 to 16 resulting in a decrease in the percentage of the female workforce to 45.71 in 1989.

The number of minorities in the **Building Inspections Division** increased from 8 to 11 which resulted in an increase from 13.11% in 1988 to 15.27% in 1989. The female staff in this Division also increased resulting in an increase from 18.03% in 1988 to 22.22% in 1989.

The **Nuisance Abatement Division** had a significant decrease in the percentage of minorities from 47.61% in 1988 to 28.57% in 1989. The percentage of female staff in this division increased from 33.33% in 1988 to 38.09% in 1989.

#### **POLICE**

The Police Department had a decrease in the percentage of females in 1989. The percentage of females in the Police occupational category is 8.55%. In 1980, females were 2.61% of the sworn officers. Females are also at parity in the supervisory, professional and technicians category, three affirmative action target areas. There was a slight increase in the percentage of minorities employed in this Department although their number increased from 244 in 1988 to 251 in 1989. Blacks continue to be the most under-represented ethnic group in the sworn ranks.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS**

One of the largest of the City Departments, Public Works has the largest minority workforce. In 1989, there was an increase of 36 positions in the Department but a decrease of three minorities. This resulted in a decrease in the minority workforce from 39.97 in 1988 to 37.93 in 1989. Overall, the Department remains in parity primarily due to the large number of minorities in the Service Maintenance occupational category in which 49.07% of the workforce is minority. The occupational categories where minorities are significantly underrepresented are in the Exempt category which is at .09%, the Professional category which is at 12.72% and the Technical area which is at 20.89%. Due to a departmental reorganization, the divisional breakdowns for 1989 due not reflect the 1988 divisional breakdowns.

The **Administration Division** had a decrease in their minority employment from 23.80% in 1988 to 14.28% in 1989. Female employment in the Division increased from 61.90% to 71.42% in 1989.

Traffic Engineering which had no corresponding division in 1988 currently stands at 24.07% minorities and 12.96% females in the workforce. Of the 54 employees in this Division, there are no minority Exempt employees, one minority supervisory employee, one minority professional employee, and two minority technical employees.

The **Engineering Division** in its current configuration has 20.77% minorities and 25.97% female in its workforce. However, this Division also remains significantly under parity in the Professional, Technical and Exempt occupational categories.

The **Developmental Services Division** with only 21 employees in 1989 had a 38.09% minority workforce and a 23.80% female workforce.

The **Solid Waste Division** has by far the largest number of minorities with 118 which accounts for 76.62% of the Division's workforce. However, 109 of the minorities are in the Service Maintenance occupational category. The female workforce accounts for 7.14% of the total workforce in the Division.

The Water Division had a decrease in their minority workforce from 25% in 1988 to 21.19% in 1989. The female workforce in this Division increased from 8.78% in 1988 to 11.25% in 1989. This Division has no minorities in the Exempt occupational category and continues to be underrepresented in the Professional, Technical and Skill Craft occupational categories.

The **Flood Control and Sewer Division** had an increase of three minorities and remained constant at just over 24%. The female workforce increased by three and increased to 10.38% of the workforce. This Division also remains significantly underrepresented in the Professional, Technical and Exempt categories and of the 17 Skilled Craft workers in the Division there are no minorities.

The Animal Control Division continues over parity with 60.00% minorities and has decreased in the female workforce from 31.25% in 1988 to 26.66% in 1989.

The **Parking Division** is at parity in minority employment with 38.54% and slightly below parity in female employment with 38.54%.

The **Streets Division** remains at parity with 45.94% minorities in the workforce and significantly under parity in the female workforce with 9.90%. This Division is at parity in two occupational categories, that of Skilled Craft with 46.66% and Service Maintenance with 53.22%.

#### SUMMARY

The following statements refer to areas where affirmative action gains occurred in 1989, regarding the employment of minorities and/or females in individual City departments.

- + The percentage of minorities improved in the Mayor/Council Office, City Manager's Office, Finance, Police, Fire, Library and Parks and Community Services.
- + There were improvements in the percentage of females employed in the City Manager's Office, City Treasurer, Finance, Personnel, General Services, Fire, Public Works, Planning and Development and Parks and Community Services.

The next statements refer to areas where Affirmative Action gains did not occur in 1989 and should be targeted for 1990.

- There was a decrease in the percentage of minorities in the City Clerk's Office, City Treasurer, Data Management, Personnel, General Services, Public Works and Planning and Development.
- There were also decreases in the percentage of females in the City Clerk's Office, Police, and Planning and Development.

## EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT 1989

#### CITY ATTORNEY

4	Male		Fe	Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
White	7	35.00	7	35.00	14	70.00	
Black	2	20.00	2	10.00	4	20.00	
Hispanic	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
Asian	0	.00	1	5.00	1	5.00	
American Indian	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
Filipino	0	.00	1	5.00	0	.00	
Other	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	
Total	9	45.00	11	55.00	20	100.00	
Minorities 1989	2	10.00	4	20.00	6	30.00	
Minorities 1988	2	10.00	4	20.00	6	30.00	

#### CITY CLERK

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	2	20.00	4	40.00	6	54.55
Black Hispanic	0	.00 .00	1	10.00 .00	1	10.00 .00
Asian	Ö	.00	1	10.00	1.	10.00
American Indian	0	.00	2	20.00	2	20.00
Filipino Other	0 0	.00 .00	0	.00 .00	0	.00
other	J	.00	J	.00	Ū	.00
Total	2	20.00	8	80.00	10	100.00
Minorities 1989	0	.00	4	40.00	4	40.00
Minorities 1988	0	.00	5	45.45	5	45.45

#### CITY MANAGER

	#	Male %	#	Female %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	5 1 1 0 0 0	26.66 6.66 6.00 .00 .00	8 1 0 0 0 0	53.33 6.66 .00 .00 .00 .00	12 2 1 0 0 0	80.00 13.32 5.88 .00 .00
Total	6	40.00	9	60.00	17	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	2 2	13.33 11.76	1	6.66 5.88	3	20.00 17.65
CITY TREASURER						
	#	Male %	#	Female %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	6 0 0 1 0 0	46.15 .00 .00 7.69 .00 .00	5 1 0 0 0 0	38.46 7.69 .00 .00 .00	11 1 0 0 0 0 0	84.61 7.69 .00 .00 .00
Total	7	53.84	6	46.15	13	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	1	7.69 10.00	1	7.69 10.00	2 2	15.38 20.00
COMMUNITY CENTER		·				
	#	Male %	#	Female %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	19 3 5 0 2 1 0	46.34 7.31 12.19 .00 4.87 2.43 .00	9 2 0 0 0 0	21.95 4.87 .00 .00 .00 .00	28 5 5 0 2 1 0	68.29 12.19 12.19 .00 4.87 2.43 .00
Total	30	73.17	11	26.83	41	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	11 12	26.82 29.27	2 1	4.87 2.44	13 13	31.70 31.70

#### DATA MANAGEMENT

DATA MANAGEMENT						
	Ma #	ale %	Fen #	nale %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	17 1 2 2 0 0 0	53.12 3.12 6.25 6.25 .00 .00	9 0 0 1 0 0	28.12 .00 .00 3.12 .00 .00	28 1 2 3 0 0	81.25 3.12 6.25 9.37 .00 .00
Total	22	68.75	10	31.25	32	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	5 6	15.62 17.65	1	3.12 2.94	6 7	18.75 18.75
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS						
	Ma #	ale %	F	emale %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	2 0 0 0 0 0	50.00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00	1 0 1 0 0 0	25.00 .00 25.00 .00 .00	3 0 1 0 0 0	75.00 .00 25.00 .00 .00
Total	2	50.00	2	50.00	4	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	0 0	.00	1	25.00 25.00	1 1	25.00 25.00
FINANCE DEPARTMENT						
	# #	ale %	Fe #	emale %	#	Total %
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	16 3 3 1 0 1	20.77 3.89 3.89 1.29 .00 1.29	32 7 5 7 1 1 0	41.55 9.09 6.49 9.09 1.29 1.29	48 10 8 8 1 2	62.33 12.98 10.38 10.38 1.29 2.59
Total	24	31.16	53	68.83	77	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	8 8	10.38 10.13	21 19	27.27 24.05	29 27	37.66 34.18

#### FIRE DEPARTMENT

Male

	Ma	le		remale		lotal
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	327	69.31	31	6.55	358	76.68
Black	37	7.82	2	.42	39	8.24
Hispanic	52	10.99	1	.21	53	11.20
Asian	13	2.74	i	.21	14	2.95
American Indian	8	1.69	ī	.21	9	1.90
Filipino	Ö	.00	ō	.00	Ŏ	.00
Other	Ö	.00	Ö	.00	Ö	.00
Total	431	92.38	36	7.61	473	100.00
Minorities 1989	110	23.25	5	1.05	115	24.31
Minorities 1988	108	23.25	4	.86	112	24.31
GENERAL SERVICES						
	M #	ale %	#.	Female %	#	Total %
White	129	67.18	20	10.41	149	77.60
Black	9	4.68	20	1.04	11	5.72
Hispanic	11	5.72	5	2.60	16	8.33
Asian	13	6.77	1	.52	14	7.29
American Indian	2	1.04	Ō	.00	2	1.04
Filipino	ō	.00	Ŏ	.00	ō	.00
Other	Ŏ	.00	Ŏ	.00	Ö	.00
Total	164	85.41	28	14.58	192	100.00
Minorities 1989	35	18.22	8	4.16	43.	22.39
Minorities 1988	37	20.00	7	3.78	44	23.78
LIBRARY DEPARTMEN	т					
	м	ale		Female		Total
	#	%	#	%	#	2
White	13	16.88	42	54.54	55	71.42
Black		1.29	4	5.19	5	6.49
Hispanic	2	2.59	9	11.68	11	14.28
Asian	1 2 0	.00	5	6.49	5	6.49
American Indian	0	.00	Õ	.00	ŏ	.00
Filipino	1	1.29	Ö	.00	1	1.29
Other	ō	.00	. 0	.00	ō	.00
Total	17	22.07	60	77.92	77	100.00
Minorities 1989	4	5.19	18	23.37	22	28.57
Minorities 1988	3	2.75	19	23.37	22	28.57
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-					

Total

Female

#### MAYOR/CITY COUNCIL

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	0	.00	6	60.00	. 6	60.00
Black	0	.00	2	20.00	2	20.00
Hispanic	0	.00	2	20.00	2	20.00
Asian	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
American Indian	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Filipino	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Other	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Total	0	.00	10	100.00	10	100.00
Minorities 1989	0	.00	4	40.00	4	40.00
Minorities 1988	0	.00	3	33.33	3	33.33

#### PARKS & COMMUNITY SERVICES

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	Z	#	%
White	153	35.41	99	22.91	252	58.33
Black	43	9.95	16	3.70	59	13.65
Hispanic	85	19.67	10	2.31	95	21.99
Asian	9	2.08	5	1.15	14	3.24
American Indian	3	.69	1	.23	4	.92
Filipino	6	1.38	2	. 46	. 8	1.85
Other	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Total	299	69.21	133	30.78	432	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	146 145	33.79 34.28	34 27	7.87 6.38	180 172	41.66 40.66

#### PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	5 1 0 0 0	12.82 2.56 2.56 .00 .00 .00	23 6 1 1 0 1	58.97 15.38 2.56 2.56 .00 2.56 .00	28 7 2 1 0 1	71.79 17.94 5.13 2.56 .00 2.56
Total	7	17.94	32	82.05	39	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	2	5.13 7.69	9 9	23.07 23.08	11 12	28.20 30.77

#### PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

	Male		Total		Tota1	
	#	%	#	%	#	2
White	78	53.06	40	27.21	118	80.27
Black	3	2.04	6	4.08	9	6.12
Hispanic	4	2.72	5	3.40	9	6.12
Asian	6	4.08	2	1.36	8	5.44
American Indian	1	. 68	0	.00	1	.68
Filipino	0	.00	2	1.36	2	1.36
Other	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Total	92	62.58	55	37.41	147	100.00
Minorities 1989	14	9.52	15	10.20	29	19.72
Minorities 1988	15	11.36	15	11.36	30	22.73

#### POLICE DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Other	440 41 75 36 7 11	50.63 4.71 8.63 4.14 .80 1.26 .00	178 32 34 10 1 4	20.48 3.68 3.91 1.15 .11 .46	618 73 109 46 8 15	71.11 8.40 12.54 5.29 .92 1.72
Total	610	70.19	259	29.80	869	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	170 160	19.56 118.93	81 84	9.32 9.32	251 244	28.88 28.88

#### PUBLIC WORKS

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	х	#	%	#	%
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian	424 126 124 24 9	49.64 14.75 14.51 2.81 1.05	106 10 20 6 1	12.41 1.17 2.34 .70 .11	530 136 144 30 10	62.06 15.92 16.86 3.51
Filipino Other	4	. 46 . 00	0	.00 .00	04 00	.46 .00
Total	711	83.25	143	16.74	854	100.00
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	287 288	33.60 35.21	37 39	4.33 4.77	324 327	37.93 39.98

#### ANALYSIS OF THE EXEMPT WORK FORCE

The City Charter provides that the City Manager, City Clerk, City Attorney, City Treasurer, Department Heads, Assistant Department Heads, Confidential Secretaries and other management staff are exempt from Civil Service provisions. The four Council Officers (City Manager, City Attorney, City Clerk and City Treasurer) are hired by the City Council directly. In turn, the Council Officers hire the other key "exempt" staff who are directly responsible to them. The concept behind this process is that the power to hire and fire key staff will help insure responsiveness and competence.

According to the December 20, 1989 Payroll Personnel Systems Employment Statistics Report, there were 237 individuals employed in full-time Exempt positions. Minorities were employed in 42 poisitions (17.80% of the total) and females were 71 (31.00%).

The total number of Exempt employees grew by 8 in 1989. The number of minorities increased by two and the female count increased by 3. Minorities increased from 17.50% of the Exempt work force to 17.80. Females increased from 31.00% to 31.2%.

#### SUMMARY

The following statements summarize the changes in the Exempt work force relative to the employment of minorities and females in comparison to the Affirmative Action goals.

- There were slight gains in both minorities and females in the exempt categories for 1989.
- The percentage of white males and females in the Exempt work force remains at over 82%.

#### **EXEMPT POSITIONS**

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	136	57.3	59	24.8	195	82.2
Black	7	2.9	7	2.9	14	5.9
Hispanic	12	5.0	4	1.6	16	6.7
Asian	8	3.3	3	1.2	11	4.6
Native American	0	.0	0	. 4	1	. 4
Filipino	0	.0	0	.0	0	.0
Other	0	.0	. 0	.0	0	.0
Total	163	68.7	74	31.2	237	100.0
Minorities 1989	27	11.4	15	6.4	42	17.8
Minorities 1988	26	11.3	14	6.2	40	17.5

#### ANALYSIS OF NEW HIRES AND TERMINATIONS

There were two major trends which occurred relative to affirmative action employment in 1989. First, female employment continued on track towards the 42% goal. Second, there were few gains in minority employment. An analysis of the new hire and termination statistics supports these conclusions.

#### **NEW HIRES**

Minorities were 30% of the career new hires in 1989. ("New hires" refers to individuals who were hired during the review period, and were not previously employed in a career position.) This percentage is below the 37.72% affirmative action goal for minority employment but a significant gain from the 23.05% in 1988.

Specifically, there were 78 minorities hired into career positions, out of 260 total career new hires. Females were 45% of the new hires (117 of 260). (Note: these statistics are from the Personnel Activity Report - Annual Summary for 1989. The annual summary covers a slightly different time period compared to the Employment Statistics Report which generates the majority of the statistics used in this report. As a result, information from the two reports is not 100% comparable.)

#### **TERMINATIONS**

188 individuals left full-time career City service in 1989. 68 (36.17%) were minorities, 79 (42.03%) were females. In comparison to the statistics on new hires, there was a net increase of ten minority employees and a gain of 38 females during the year.

#### SUMMARY

Based on the new hire/termination statistics, the following statements summarize the findings of the Affirmative Action Office, relative to the new hire and termination rates for minorities and females.

- + The number and percentage of female new hires were consistent with the goals of the affirmative action program.
- The rate of minority new hires in 1989 was below the affirmative action employment goal percentage.
- While 30% of the new hires were minorities, 36.17% of the terminations were minorities.

### FULL-TIME CAREER NEW HIRES 1989

TOTAL							
	Male	9	Fema	ıle	Total		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	
White	94	36.15	- 88	33.85	182	70.00	
Black	24	9.23	15	5.77	39	15.00	
Hispanic	17	6.54	7	2.69	24	9.23	
Asian	3	1.15	4	1.54	7	2.69	
American Indian	2	.77	0	.00	2	.77	
Filipino	3	1.15	3	1.15	6	2.31	
Others	0	.00	. 0	.00	0	.00	
Total	143	55.00	117	45.00	260	100.00	
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	49 31	18.84 11.40	29 31	11.15 11.40	78 62	30.00 22.79	

### FULL-TIME CAREER TERMINATIONS 1989

	Ma	le	Fem	ale	Total			
	#	%	#	%	#	%		
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Others	65 26 14 2 0 2	34.57 13.83 7.45 1.06 .00 1.06	55 10 8 3 1 2	29.26 5.32 4.28 1.60 .53 1.06	120 36 22 5 1 4	63.83 19.15 11.70 2.66 .53 2.13		
Totals	109	57.98	79	42.2	188	100.00		
Minorities 1989 Minorities 1988	44 41	23.40 21.24	24 22	12.76 11.40	68 63	36.17 32.54		

TERMINATION ANALYSIS
1989

		RELEAS	ED		RETIRE	D		RESIGNATION				
	#	% of of Total Released	% of Total Term	#	% of Total Retire	% of Total Term	#	% of Total Resign	% of Total Term			
White	6	60.0	3.1	37	62.7	19.68	73	18.2	38.8			
Black	3	30.0	1.6	10	16.9	5.3	18	16.8	9.6			
Hispanic	1	10.0	.5	7	11.8	3.7	12	11.2	6.4			
Asian	0	.0	.0	4	6.7	2.1	0	.0	.0			
American Indian	0	.0	.0	0	.0	.0	1	.93	.5			
Filipino	0	.0	.0	1	1.7	.5	3	2.8	1.6			
TOTAL	10		5.3	59		31.4	107	100.0				
MINORITIES	4	40.0	2.1	22		11.7	34	31.7	18.1			

## TERMINATION ANALYSIS 1989

	-	DECEASED	)	1	DISCHARG	ED	TOTAL BY ETHNIC CATEGORY			
	#	% of Total Deceased	% of Total Term	#	% of Total Disch.	% of Total Term	#	%		
White	2	40.0	1.0	2	33.3	1.0	120	63.8		
Black	3	60.0	1.6	2	33.3	1.0	36	19.1		
Hispanic	0	.0	.0	2	33.3	1.0	22	11.7		
Asian	0	.0	.0	0	.0	.0	. 5	2.7		
American Indian	0	.0	.0	0	.0	.0	1	. 5		
Filipino	0	.0	.0	0	.0	.0	4	2.1		
TOTAL	5	2.7		6		3.2	188			
MINORITIES	3	60.0	1.6	4	66.6	2.1	68	36.2		

#### SECTION II EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

The Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Fair Employment & Housing Act of the State of California, and other Laws, require most employers in this State to be non-discriminatory in their hiring practices. As stated in the introduction of this report, the City of Sacramento is committed to the principles of equal employment opportunity.

Each year, the Affirmative Action Officer conducts an analysis of City hiring practices to determine if they are in accordance with the laws, regulations, and guidelines on equal employment opportunity.

### ANALYSIS OF 1989 RECRUITMENT AND EXAMINATION RESULTS - FULL TIME CLASSIFIED POSITIONS

The City of Sacramento, like most government agencies, uses a civil service merit system for hiring employees. The Personnel Department will usually conduct recruitment campaigns, accept applications from all who qualify, screen applicants, test some or all of the applicants and ultimately rank those who passed in the order of their test scores. This ranking (referred to as an eligible list) is used to determine who the appointing authorities can interview for hire. Under the City Charter, only the top three individuals on an eligible list (regardless of score) are eligible to be interviewed by an appointing authority for filling a vacant position.

In 1989 there were 5,986 applicants for examinations used to establish eligible lists lists for full time classified positions. (Positions governed by the Civil Service Board are hereinafter referred to as "classified positions".) Of that total 2,405 (40.17%) identified themselves as ethnic or racial minorities, and 2,543 (42.48%) were females. The percentage of both groups were above the City's affirmative action parity goals. However, minorities were at parity or above in only three occupational categories. Those categories were Fire (38.5%), Service Maintenance (55.3%), and clerical (46.8%).

#### ANALYSIS OF 1989 EXAMINATION RESULTS

There were 69 employment examinations given in 1989. Employment tests were given to 4,683 examinees. Minorities were 44.75% of the total tested and females were 39.48% of the total tested.

Minorities had the highest level of success in the Supervisory, Fire, Service Maintenance and Technician occupational categories and the lowest in the Clerical, Skilled Craft and Professional categories. Minorities that passed were 9.31% of the total examinees and 31.12% of the total successful examinees. Women that passed were 10.50% of the total examinees and 35.11% of the total successful examinees.

Of particular interest, is that the minority percentage by ethnic category of the total examinees which passed, very closely parallels the percentage of minorities in the 1989 workforce by ethnic category.

Under Federal Guidelines, employers are advised to analyze the results of their examinations to determine if there is any indication of disparate impact on groups protected under the Civil Rights Act. One of the first stages of the analysis is a determination of whether there is evidence that tests had an

"adverse impact" on a protected group. Adverse impact is shown when a selection rate or success rate for an individual ethnic group is less than 80% of the rate for the most successful group. In tabulating for adverse impact, the City of Sacramento modifies the formula by using the passing rate of white candidates as a bench mark figure rather than the rate for the most successful group of any ethnicity as prescribed in the guidelines.

An analysis of the examinations given by the City of Sacramento in 1989, indicate that where there was a statistically significant number of examinees, there was adverse impact in 11 (15.94%) of the 69 examinations given. However, when all examinations were included there was adverse impact in 42 (60.86%) of the 69 examinations given in 1989. Females were adversely impacted in 20 (28.98%) of the total examinations given in 1989.

Of particular concern is that there was adverse impact in ten of the fifteen examinations given in the Technician occupational category and adverse impact of the 11 of the 13 examinations given in the clerical category.

#### SUMMARY

The following statement summarizes the findings of the Affirmative Action Officer relative to the results of the 1989 recruitment and pre-employment examination process.

- + Both minorities and females were generally well represented in the 1989 total applicant pool. The percentages of each target group exceeded their representation in the City's total career workforce.
- + Female representation in the applicant pool also exceeded workforce percentages.
- The low percentage of minorities in the Supervisory, Police, Professional and Skilled Craft applicant pool suggests that additional efforts are needed in this area. Likewise, the low percentage of females in the Supervisory, Police, Fire, Skilled Craft and Technician applicant pool also suggests that additional efforts are needed in these areas.
- The significant number of examinations with adverse impact indicates a need for review of those areas where the adverse impact occurs.

## RECRUITMENT/EXAMINATION ANALYSIS TOTAL

	Recr	uited	Tested			Passed.	<u></u>	Compared		
	#	% of Total	#	% of Ethnic Cat.	% of Total Tested	#	% of Total Passed	% of Total Tested	AA Goa 1	1989 AA Actual
White	3311	55.31	2587	78.13	55.24	885	63.16	18.89	62.28	68.44
Black	1006	16.80	784	77.93	16.74	155	11.06	3.30	13.11	11.04
Hispanic	839	14.01	676	76.93	14.43	184	13.13	3.92	14.21	13.86
Asian	340	5.67	258	75.88	5.50	61	4.35	1.30	7.57	4.42
American Indian	90	1.50	68	75.55	1.45	20	1.42	.42	.64	1.18
Filipino	130	2.17	107	82.30	2.28	16	1.14	. 34	1.14	1.06
DNI	270	4.51	203	75.18	4.33	80	5.71	1.70	•	
TOTAL	5986		4683			1401				
MINORITIES	2405	40.17	2096	78.35	44.75	436	31.12	9.31	37.72	31.56
FEMALE	2543	42.48	1849	72.70	39.48	492	35.11	10.50	42.00	26.20

### RECRUITMENT/EXAMINATION ANALYSIS PERCENTAGE PASS RATE BREAKDOWN

		RECRUITE	ED .	•	TESTED		TOTAL MINORITY			TOTAL RECRUITED			
	#	# Passed	% of Recruit. Categ.	#	# Passed	% of Tested Categ.	#	# Passed	% Passed	#	# Passed	% Passed	
White	3,311	885	26.72	2,587	885	34.20				5,986	885	14.78	
Black	1,006	155	15.40	784	155	19.77	2,405	155	6.44	5,986	155	2.58	
Hispanic	839	184	21.93	676	184	27.21	2,405	184	7.65	5,986	184	3.07	
Asian	340	61	17.94	258	61	23.64	2,405	61	23.64	2,405	61	1.01	
American Indian	90	20	22.22	68	20	29.41	2,405	20	.83	5,986	20	.33	
Filipino	130	16	12.30	107	16	14.95	2,405	16	.66	5,986	16	. 26	
Did Not Indicate	270	80	29.62	203	80	39.40				5,986	80	1.33	
TOTAL	5,986	1,401	23.40	4,683	1,401	29.91							
MINORITIES	2,405	436	18.12	2,096	436	20.80				5,986	436	7.28	
FEMALE	2,543	492	19.34	1,849	492	26.60				5,986	492	8.21	

# EXAMINATION ANALYSIS BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY

	Ē	Recruited		Tested		<u>Passed</u>			
	#	% of Total Recruited	#	% of Total Tested	#	% of Total Passed	% of Total Tested		
SUPERVISORY				•					
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	64 7 1 1 0 4	79.0 4.9 8.6 1.2 1.2 0 4.9	64 7 1 1 0 4	79.0 4.9 8.6 1.2 1.2 0 4.9	39 3 6 1 0 0 4	73.6 5.7 11.3 1.9 0 0 7.5	48.1 3.7 7.4 1.2 0 0 4.9		
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	81 13 11	100.0 16.0 13.6	81 13 11	100.0 16.0 13.6	53 10 5	100.0 18.9 9.4	65.4 12.3 6.2		
POLICE									
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	441 81 107 45 9 14 101	55.3 10.2 13.4 5.6 1.1 1.8 12.7	329 61 83 20 7 10 76	56.1 10.4 14.2 3.4 1.2 1.7 13.0	168 13 32 11 3 3	63.2 4.9 12.0 4.1 1.1 13.5	28.7 2.2 5.5 1.9 .5 6.1		
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	798 256 132	100.0 32.1 16.5	586 181 77	100.0 30.1 13.1	266 62 40	100.0 23.3 15.0	45.4 10.6 6.8		
FIRE			•						
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	32 4 14 1 0 0	62.0 7.7 26.9 1.9 0 0	28 4 10 1 1 0 0	64.0 9.0 22.7 2.3 2.3 0	23 3 8 0 1 0	66.0 8.6 22.9 0 2.9 0	52.3 6.8 18.2 0 2.3		
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	52 20 2	100.0 38.5 3.8	44 16 1	100.0 36.4 2.3	35 12 1	100.0 34.3 2.9	79.5 27.3 2.3		

	Reci	ruited	Tes	sted		Pass	<u>ed</u>
	# Re	% of Total ecruited	#	% of Total Tested	#	% of Total Passed	% of Total Tested
PROFESSIONAL							
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	569 78 53 70 6 20 37	68.3 9.4 6.4 8.4 .7 2.4 4.4	493 71 49 57 5 18 31	68.1 9.8 6.8 7.9 .7 2.3 4.3	139 10 13 17 1 2 13	71.2 5.1 6.7 8.7 .5 1.0 6.7	19.2 1.4 1.8 2.3 .1 .3 1.8
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	833 227 328	100.0 27.3 39.4	724 200 289	100.0 27.3 40.0	195 43 68	100.0 22.1 34.9	26.9 6.0 9.4
SKILLED CRAFT							
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	268 35 50 36 7 8 15	64.8 8.4 12.8 8.6 .2 .4 3.6	238 33 48 32 6 8 12	63.1 8.8 12.7 8.5 1.6 2.1 3.2	72 10 11 5 4 1	70.0 9.8 10.7 4.9 3.9 1.0	19.1 2.7 2.9 1.3 1.1 .2 0
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	419 136 14	100.0 32.4 3.3	377 127 11	100.0 33.5 2.9	103 31 5	100.0 30.1 4.9	27.3 8.2 1.3
SERVICE MAINTENANCE							
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	369 198 251 22 23 11 39	40.4 21.7 27.5 2.4 2.5 1.2 4.3	327 178 222 21 21 11 34	40.2 21.9 27.3 2.6 2.6 1.3 4.2	83 43 53 4 8 3	40.5 21.0 25.7 2.0 3.9 1.5 5.4	10.2 5.3 6.5 .5 1.0 .4 1.4
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	913 505 57	100.0 55.3 6.2	814 453 49	100.0 55.7 6.0	205 111 13	100.0 54.1 6.3	25.2 13.6 1.6

	Recr	<u>uited</u>	Tes	ted		<b>Passed</b>	
	# 	% of Total Recruited	#	% of Total Tested	#	% of Total Passed	% of Total Tested
TECHNICIANS							
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	542 133 108 37 14 11 24	62.4 15.3 12.4 4.3 1.6 1.3 2.8	426 111 78 31 10 10	62.3 16.2 11.4 4.5 1.5 2.6	171 36 34 11 1 2 7	65.3 13.7 13.0 4.2 .4 .8 2.7	25.0 5.3 5.0 1.6 .1 .3 1.0
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	869 303 57	100.0 34.9 6.6	684 240 49	100.0 35.1 7.2	262 84 13	100.0 32.1 5.0	38.3 12.3 1.9
CLERICAL							
White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian Filipino Did Not Indicate	1,026 473 249 128 29 66 50	50.8 23.4 12.3 6.3 1.4 3.3 2.5	682 322 179 95 17 50 28	49.7 23.5 13.0 6.9 1.2 3.6 2.0	190 37 27 12 12 2 5	66.7 13.0 9.5 4.2 4.2 .7 1.8	13.8 2.7 2.0 .9 .9 .1
TOTAL MINORITIES FEMALE	2,021 945 1,533	100.0 46.8 75.9	1,373 663 1,046	100.0 48.3 76.2	285 90 213	100.0 31.6 74.7	20.6 6.6 15.5

N N

#### REVIEW OF INCIDENTS OF DISCIPLINE

There are times in which employees do not measure up to the standards set by their employer. Steps are taken to correct the employee's performance or behavior and if the employee improves, the matter is settled. If the unacceptable performance or behavior continues, the employer usually imposes some form of discipline until the desired modifications occur or the offender is separated from the organization. In the City of Sacramento, formal discipline usually starts with a "letter of reprimand" placed in an employee's file. The most severe form of discipline is termination from the job.

In 1989 there were 191 disciplinary actions taken against career employees. (For the purpose of this report, "probationary release" is counted as a disciplinary action.) Of that number 84 (43.97%) were taken against Whites, 54 (28.27%) Blacks, 47 (24.60%) Hispanics, 1 (.52%) Asians, 3 (1.57%) American Indian 2 (1.04%) Filipino. Most of the individuals received "letters of reprimand" or suspensions. Terminations account for 7.85% of the total.

Approximately one-third (34.55%) of the discipline was imposed for violations of absenteeism and/or tardiness standards. Of significance is the fact that 45.45% of those disciplined for this reason were Black and 28.78% Hispanic. Absenteeism was by far the main reason used for disciplining Black and Hispanic employees.

In total, the percentage of minorities among those disciplined (56.02%) exceed the percentage of minorities employed in the total career workforce. The Black representation in this group is significantly higher than their rate in the workforce (28.27%) among those disciplined, 11.04% in the career workforce. Hispanics were 24.60% of the total discipline and 13.86% of the career employees.

#### SUMMARY

Previous status reports have recommended a review of the discipline program focusing on the impact on Blacks and other minorities. It is the opinion of the Affirmative Action Officer that the need still exists for such a review. In addition, it is recommended that managers, supervisors and employees participate in Cultural Diversity Training in an effort to develop a better understanding between employer and employee.

## PRIMARY CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE BY ETHNIC GROUP 1989

	White		Black		Hispanic		Asian		Am/Ind		Filipino		Total	
	#	*	#	%	#	x	#	%	#	%	#	2	#	%
Absent/Tardiness	14	21.21	30	45.45	19	28.78	0	0	1	1.50	2	3.03	66	34.35
Alcohol	2	50.00	2	50.00	0	.00	0	0	0	.00	0	.00	4	2.09
City Property/ Unauthorized Use	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00		0	0	.00	0	.00	4	2.09
Controlled Substance	1	.50	0	.00	1	50.00	0	0	0	.00	0	.00	2	1.04
Dept. Rule Violation	1	33.33	0	.00	1	33.33	0	0	0	.00	0	.00	3	1.57
Insubordination	6	66.66	3	33.33	0	.00	0	0	0	.00	0	.00	9	4.71

## PRIMARY DISCIPLINE LEVIED 1989

	White		Black		Hispanic Asian			Am/Ind		Filipino		Total		
	#	%	#	%	i	# %	#	¥ %	#	L	#	%	#	%
Written Reprimand	9	39.13	3	13.04	10	43.47	0	0	1	4.34	0	0	23	12.04
Rejection During Probation	10	71.42	3	21.42	1	7.14	0	0	0	.00	0	. 0	14	7.32
Suspension	12	21.81	28	50.90	12	21.81	1	1.81	0	.00	0	0	55	28.78
Termination	6	40.00	. 4	26.66	5	33.33	0	0	0	.00	0	0	15	7.85

#### ANALYSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1989

The City of Sacramento has a formal procedure of investigating discrimination complaints which are filed internally agains the City or its employees. The <u>Discrimination Complaint Resolution Procedure</u>, authorizes the Affirmative Action Officer to investigate discrimination complaints and to seek conciliation of those where there is sufficient evidence in support of the allegation that discriminatory employment practices have occurred. Matters which can not be settled are forwarded to the City Manager for final disposition.

The Affirmative Action Officer in conjunction with the City Attorney's office, is also respnsible for coordinating responses to discrimination complaints which are filed against the City by State, Federal and local compliance agencies.

In 1989, there were 17 charges of discrimination formally filed with compliance agencies or through the internal procedure, against the City of Sacramento. In comparison, 12 cases were filed in 1988. Five of the cases were filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, 11 with the Affirmative Action Officer, and one with the Courts.

Eight (47.05%) of the cases alleged discrimination on the basis of sex (including sexual harassment) as the major cause of discrimination.

Five of the cases were based on National Origin/Ancestry/Race and four were based on Handicapped Status.

#### SUMMARY

- There were more cases filed in 1989 than in the preceding year.
- There was a significant increase in the number of complaints alleging sex discrimination in general, and sexual harassment specifically. There has been an increase during the year in the number of training sessions on sexual harassment. Due to staff and funding limitations, not all employees have received sexual harassment awareness training. it is strongly recommended by the Affirmative Action Officer, that the City initiate exmployee orientation training for all new employees and that sexual harassment awareness and prevention be a component of the training.

#### SYNOPSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1989

1. Investigating Agency: Superior Court

Opened: May 24, 1989

89 Closed:

Basis:

Sexual Harassment

Resolution:

Pending

2. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment & Housing

Opened:

January 23, 1989

Closed: June 5, 1989

Basis

Physical Handicap

Resolution:

Terminated based on preliminary analysis

3. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment & Housing

Opened:

September 8, 1989

Closed:

Basis:

Sexual Harassment

Resolution:

Pending

4. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment & Housing

Opened:

April 28, 1989

Closed: Sept. 12, 1989

Basis:

Sexual Harassment

Resolution:

Complainant elected court action

5. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment & Housing

Opened:

June 26, 1989

Closed: Sept. 7, 1989

Basis:

Sexual Harassment

Resolution:

Complainant elected court action

6. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment & Housing

Opened:

January 3, 1989

Closed:

Basis:

Sexual Harassment

Resolution:

Complainant elected court action

7. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: November 2, 1989

November 2, 1989 Closed: Jan. 16, 1990

Basis: Sexual Harassment

Resolution: Complaint Withdrawn

8. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: April 6, 1989 Closed: July 6, 1989

Basis: Sexual Harassment

Resolution: No basis to proceed

9. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: December 20, 1989 Closed: April 30, 1990

Basis: Sex Discrimination

Resolution: Agreed Settlement

10. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: October 31, 1989 Closed: March 6, 1990

Basis: Ancestry

Resolution: Insufficient Evidence

11. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: December 12, 1989 Closed: April 20, 1990

Basis: Ancestry

Resolution: Insufficient Evidence

12. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: November 13, 1989 Closed: April 4, 1990

Basis: Ancestry

Resolution: Insufficient Evidence

13. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened: Februa

February 9, 1989

Closed: Oct. 3, 1989

Basis:

Sex/Physical Handicap

Resolution:

Resolved at City Manager Level

14. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened:

April 11, 1989

Closed: May 2, 1989

Basis:

Sex/Physical Handicap

Resolution:

Complainant withdrew complaint

15. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened:

January 20, 1989

Closed: April 11, 1989

Basis:

Physical Handicap

Resolution:

Insufficient evidence to prove violation of State

or Federal status or City policy.

16. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened:

January 24, 1989

Closed: April 20, 1990

Basis:

Race

Resolution:

Insufficient evidence

17. Investigating Agency: In-House

Opened:

January 18, 1989

Closed: April 4, 1989

Basis:

Race

Resolution:

Insufficient evidence

#### RECAPITULATION

The 1989 year ended in mixed results. Overall, the minority workforce lost ground in 1989. However, affirmative action progress was made in five of the nine occupational categories in 1989. There are a number of areas where underutilization of minorities and females continues and where additional efforts by all appointed authorities is imperative. Recommendations which could have significant impact on the overall Affirmative Action Program are:

- + Individuals involved in employment decisions should aggressively seek to increase the employment of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians, which are three groups which lost ground in 1989.
- + Departments with Skilled Craft and Service Maintenance positions should continue to utilize the Career Development Trainee classification for training females.
- + It is again recommended that the City Council place before the voters a ballot measure to either repeal or modify Section 84 of the City Charter.
- + It is again recommended that the City Manager consider for possible implementation various methods of increasing appointing authority accountability for affirmative action hiring.

This concludes the analysis of the year-end employment statistics for the calendar year 1989.

Respectfully submitted,

S. REY PENA

Affirmative Action Officer

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY STATEMENT

(REAFFIRMATION)

It is the fundamental policy of the City of Sacramento to afford equal employment opportunities to all persons, and to prohibit discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, age (over 40), national origin, disability, medical condition, marital status or As a government employer, we bear a special responsibility orientation. to ensure that the basic legislative and constitutional guarantees of equal employment opportunity are not diminished.

In order for us to meet the challenge of affording equal employment opportunity, we have adopted an Affirmative Action Plan as a statement of our ultimate goals as we presently perceive them. Through this Plan, all City employees will be informed of our affirmative action program, and will be expected to incorporate its policies in their official activities. We must all work together in support of this program.

As the City Manager, I accept responsibility for the administration and implementation of this Plan. My signature below, shall signify that the City of Sacramento is committed to equal employment opportunity. commitment shall be reaffirmed on an annual basis.

The Affirmative Action Officer will be my representative on matters relating to equal employment opportunity, and will administer affirmative action activities.

In time, this Affirmative Action Plan will achieve its purpose. such time, we will refine and strengthen the concept of equal employment opportunity, not only for those groups who are identified in this Plan, but also for the disabled, the aged and others who may be subjected to arbitrary discrimination.

Date: JUNE 5, 1990

City Manager

### THE CITY OF SACRAMENTO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT

It is the policy of the City of Sacramento to be fair and impartial in its relations with its employees and applicants for employment, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, ancestry, disability, marital status or sexual orientation.

The City of Sacramento is committed to the concept of equal employment as a necessary element of basic merit system principles. Furthermore, the City recognizes that equal employment opportunities can only be acieved through definitive, affirmative actions. If progress is to be made toward achieving equal employment opportunities, the affirmative action efforts cannot be merely passive; they must be positive-action steps to eliminate conditions that have resulted in racial discrimination and other inequities.

To achieve the goal of equal employment opportunities, the Sacramento City Council has adopted this Equal Employment Opportunity General Policy Statement as the cornerstone of the Affirmative Action Plan for Sacramento. The major emphasis of this Plan is the removal of barriers which might have existed in the past, adversely affecting women, minorities, the disabled and other specified groups; and to take positive action to see that persons who might have been the subject of discrimination are provided every opportunity to compete for jobs. The Sacramento City Council believes that an effective affirmative action plan benefits not only those who have been denied employment opportunity, but also benefits those City departments, boards and commissions that overlooked or did not fully utilize the skills, resources and talents of women, minorities, the disabled and other groups of individuals.

The Affirmative Action Plan commits all City of Sacramento employees to support, in an affirmative matter, the City Council's policy regarding equal employment opportunity. The City Manager is responsible for implementing this Affirmative Action Plan. The City Manager shall provide for effective communication of, and conformance with, requirements of the Plan and to see that each Department Head takes such affirmative action as is necessary to achieve its goals.

The Affirmative Action Plan shall be implemented consistent with State and Federal laws and other mandated requirements among them:

- 1. The Civil Rights Act of 1964;
- 2. The Fair Employment Practices Act of the State of California;
- 3. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and,
- 4. The Age of Discrimination Acts of 1967 and 1975.

The Personnel Department will establish, develop and promulgate personnel rules, procedures and policies to effect the provision and intent of this Policy and Plan.