

1



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL

DONNA L. GILES
Director of Personnel

ADMINISTRATION
EMPLOYEE SERVICES DIVISION
PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT SERVICES
WORKERS' COMPENSATION DIVISION
April 10, 1986

Personnel and Public Employees Committee
of the City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Program
Status Report for 1985

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 and summary provide detailed information on the 1985 classified work force and employment practices.

BACKGROUND

Employment statistics indicate that the City of Sacramento was an equal opportunity employer in 1985. However, the data also suggests that there are areas which need to be addressed in the upcoming years. For example, minorities and females were well represented in the total applicant pool, but were underrepresented in several occupational categories. Another area of concern, is the impact employment tests have on Black candidates. In 1985, Black candidates failed City examinations at a rate significantly higher than candidates from other large ethnic groups.

In relation to affirmative action, the report shows an increase in the number of minorities and females in the total work force and in many occupational categories. The report also notes that the percentage of minorities in the work force has dropped to its lowest level in recent years, due to a substantial increase in the number of non-minority females.

While the number of minorities and females in the work force improved over the 1984 levels, it is apparent that the minority and female employment goals will not be reached in the near future. The status report contains an analysis of hiring trends, and projects when many of the goals will be met.

Also attached for the committee's perusal, is an "Executive Summary" which presents a summary of salient information from the status report.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Personnel and Public Employees Committee review the Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Program Status Report for 1985, and submit its findings to the full City Council for consideration.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gary L. Little

GARY L. LITTLE
Affirmative Action Officer

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED:

Dorinda L. Giles

DORINDA L. GILES
Director of Personnel

Walter J. Slipe, Jr.

For: WALTER J. SLIPE
City Manager

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY STATUS REPORT

Executive Summary

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Recruitment

Minorities were 37.26% of the total applicant pool in 1985. Chart A shows the breakdown of applicants by ethnicity. Over forty seven percent of the applicant pool were women. Chart B illustrates the division of applicants by sex.

Most applicants applied for clerical positions. The fewest number of applicants were for jobs in the Fire occupational category. Chart C shows the applicant pool by occupational category. Chart D is a distribution of the applicant pool by occupational category and Chart E is a further breakdown of minority recruitment by ethnicity and occupational category.

Examinations

In comparison with candidates of other races/ethnicities, there was a dramatic decrease in Black representation in the candidate pool after the conclusion of the testing process. Chart F illustrates this point.

Certifications & Appointments

Asians were the only minority race/ethnic group who were appointed at a lower percentage than their representation among those certified. Chart G is a comparison of the appointments & certifications by ethnicity. Chart H illustrates the percentage of females who were appointed in comparison to males in 1985. Chart I summarizes the 1985 employment process and its effect on various groups.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Total Work force

The affirmative action employment goal is 37.72% minority and 42.00% female. At years end, minority employment registered at 32.53% (a decrease from 32.74% in 1984) and female employment stood at 21.68% (an increase over the 20.58% level in 1984). Chart J represents the total career work force divided by ethnicity.

Blacks, Asians and Filipinos have not reached parity in the total work force. Chart K compares the 1985 minority work force with the affirmative action employment goals. Female employment is slightly under 50% of parity. Chart L illustrates this point.

In comparison with prior years, the number of minorities increased

significantly in 1985. Increases in the female work force continue to outdistance the increases in both the minority and total work force. Chart M shows the changes in the minority/female/total work force between 1980 and 1985.

Affirmative Action/Occupational Categories

The 37.72% and 42.00% goals also apply to employment in each occupational category. In 1985, the number of minorities increased in seven out of eight categories. Chart N represents changes which have occurred in the minority work force within each occupational category since 1980. Female employment increased in seven of the eight categories. Chart O illustrates this point.

Affirmative Action/Department

The last affirmative action goal is for minorities and females to be 37.72% and 42.00% (respectively) in each department. While minority representation is at parity in only 2 of the 17 departments, the numbers increased in 10 departments. Female employment is at parity in 9 departments.

Affirmative Action Timetables

Due to fluctuations in the work force, the timetables established in 1981 for reaching the employment goals are now unrealistic. If current hiring trends continue into the future, most of the employment goals will not be reached until the year 2000 and beyond.

Recommendations


- Recruitment: The Personnel Department should develop new methods for reaching minorities and females. The Department should also continue to monitor the use of "City Employees only" examinations.
- Examinations: The Personnel Department should also continue efforts to reduce the disproportionate impact its exams are having on Black candidates.
- Certifications: The "rule of three" should be repealed.
- Appointments/
Affirmative Action: The appointment rates for minorities will have to be increased for the affirmative action goals to be reached.

#####

CITY OF SACRAMENTO

TOTAL APPLICANT POOL - 1985


A
R
T
I
C
L
E



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

TOTAL APPLICANT POOL - 1985


CHART B



1985 APPLICANT POOL

BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES


C
H
A
R
T
C



DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICANT POOL


WHITE/FEMALE/MINORITY BY OCCUPATIONS

CHART D




MINORITY RECRUITMENT BY ETHNICITY/OCCUPATION

C H A R T B




EFFECT OF EXAMINATIONS ON ETHNIC GROUPS

CHART
F




1985 APPOINTMENTS COMPARISON WITH CERTIFICATIONS



1985 APPOINTMENTS BY SEX


C
H
A
R
T
H



IMPACT OF EMPLOYMENT ACTIVITIES


1985

CHART I



TOTAL CAREER WORKFORCE


1985



1985 MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

ACTUAL VS GOAL


CHART K



FEMALE WORKFORCE

ACTUAL VS GOAL

CHART 1




MINORITY/FEMALE WORKFORCE

1980 - 1985

CHARI M

NET INCREASE <DECREASE> FROM 1980



□ MINORITIES


+ FEMALES

◇ TOTAL WORKFORCE

CHANGES IN MINORITY EMPLOYMENT

1980 - 1985 BY OCCUPATIONS


ART 1 N



CHANGES IN FEMALE EMPLOYMENT

1980 - 1985 BY OCCUPATIONS

CHART 0



AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

STATUS REPORT

1985

A Review of City of Sacramento Employment Practices

Prepared by:

Gary L. Little
Affirmative Action Officer
City of Sacramento

INTRODUCTION

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. In 1983, the equal employment opportunity portion of the plan was amended to add discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation to the list of inappropriate practices.

In addition to the above, the affirmative action plan contains specific goals and timetables for the employment of minorities and women in occupations and departments where they are underrepresented.

This report is the fifth annual review of City civil service employment practices as they relate to equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. The first half of the report covers the equal employment opportunity program. Specifically, 1985 recruitment, examination & testing, certification and selection activities are reviewed for compliance with the policies set forth in the affirmative action plan. Also in this section, is a short review of the discrimination complaints which were filed against the City in 1985.

The second part of the report is an analysis of the City's effort to achieve the affirmative action goals within the timeframes established in 1981.

The final section summarizes the report and contains recommendations for increasing equal employment opportunities and affirmative action hiring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....		1
Section I	- Recruitment - Classified Employment.....	5
	Total Applicant Pool.....	5
	Examinations for City Employees Only.....	5
	Open Examinations.....	7
Section II	- Examinations - Classified Employment.....	11
Section III	- Certifications From Eligible Lists.....	13
Section IV	- Selections from Certifications.....	16
Section V	- Discrimination Complaints.....	20
Section VI	- Affirmative Action - Introduction.....	21
Section VII	- Affirmative Action/Total Work Force.....	22
Section VIII	- Affirmative Action/Occupational Categories.....	25
Section IX	- Affirmative Action/Departments.....	27
Section X	- Affirmative Action Timetables.....	29
Section XI	- Recapitulation & Recommendations.....	35
Attachment A	- 1985 Recruitment/Total Applicant Pool.....	37
Attachment B	- 1985 Recruitment/City Employees.....	39
Attachment C	- 1985 Recruitment/Open Positions.....	40
Attachment D	- Individuals Competing in Examinations.....	41
Attachment E	- Individuals on 1985 Eligible Lists.....	43
Attachment F	- 1985 Certifications.....	45
Attachment G	- 1985 Appointments from Certifications.....	48
Attachment H	- Synopsis of Discrimination Complaints filed in 1985..	51
Attachment I	- 1985 Employment/Occupational Categories.....	55
Attachment J	- Employment by Department.....	59

TABLE OF CHARTS

Figure	1.1	Total Applicant Pool - 1985.....	5
Figure	1.2	Recruitment - Examinations Limited to City Employees...	6
Figure	1.3	Minority Recruitment for Examinations Limited to City Employees.....	6
Figure	1.4	Female Recruitment for Examinations Limited to City Employees.....	7
Figure	1.5	Open Recruitment - Classified Positions.....	7
Figure	1.6	Minority Recruitment for Open Examinations.....	8
Figure	1.7	Female Recruitment for Open Examinations.....	8
Figure	2.1	Examinations - Effect of No Shows/Pre Screening.....	11
Figure	2.2	Examinations - Success Rate by Ethnicity.....	12
Figure	3.1	Certifications to Full-time Positions.....	13
Figure	3.2	Total Certifications by Occupational Category.....	13
Figure	3.3	Minority Certifications from Eligible Lists.....	14
Figure	3.4	Female Certifications from Eligible Lists.....	14
Figure	4.1	Appointments to Full-time Positions.....	16
Figure	4.2	Appointments - Selection Rates by Ethnicity.....	16
Figure	4.3	Total Appointments/Promotions by Occupational Category 1985.....	17
Figure	4.4	Minority Appointments/Promotions.....	17
Figure	4.5	Female Appointment/Promotions.....	18
Figure	4.6	Distribution of Minorities Re: Reasons for Non-Selection.....	18
Figure	4.7	Distribution of Females Re: Reasons for Non-Selection.....	19
Figure	5.1	Allegations of Discrimination.....	20
Figure	7.1	Total City Work force.....	22
Figure	7.2	Affirmative Action Goals - Total Work force.....	22
Figure	7.3	Ranking of Groups Who Are Under-utilized.....	23

Figure	7.4	Changes in the Full-Time Work Force.....	23
Figure	7.5	Terminations from Employment.....	24
Figure	7.6	Reasons for Termination.....	24
Figure	8.1	Minority Employment by Occupational Categories.....	25
Figure	8.2	Female Employment by Occupational Categories.....	26
Figure	9.1	Minority Employment by Departments.....	27
Figure	9.2	Female Employment by Departments.....	27
Figure	10.1	Timetable for Reaching Minority/Female Occupational Employment Goals 1981 Estimates.....	29
Figure	10.2	Timetable for Reaching Minority/Female Department Employment Goals 1981 Estimates.....	29
Figure	10.3	Projections on when Minority Employment Goals will be Reached (Based on five year experience).....	30
Figure	10.4	Projections on when Minority Employment Goals will be Reached (Based on 1985 experience).....	30
Figure	10.5	Projections on when Female Employment Goals will be Reached (Based on five year experience).....	31
Figure	10.6	Projections on when Female Employment Goals will be Reached (Based on 1985 experience).....	31
Figure	10.7	Projections on when Minority Department Goals will be Reached (Based on five year experience).....	32
Figure	10.8	Projections on when Minority Department Goals will be Reached (Based on 1985 experience).....	32
Figure	10.9	Projections on when Female Department Goals will be Reached (Based on five year experience).....	33
Figure	10.10	Projections on when Female Department Goals will be Reached (Based on 1985 experience).....	33

SECTION I

Recruitment - Classified Employment

Under Section 84 of the City Charter, all classified positions are filled from eligible lists established by the City of Sacramento's Civil Service Board. In 1985, there were 68 eligible lists established to fill vacant classified positions.

According to Personnel Department records, 5,706 individuals applied to take examinations which were held to establish the eligible lists. Two thousand one-hundred-twenty-six (37.26%) identified themselves as being ethnic or racial minorities, and 2,694 (47.21%) stated they were females. (Note: Accurate statistics on disabled applicants were not available at the time this report was written.)

Figure 1.1 shows a breakdown of 1985 applicants by ethnicity.

FIG. 1.1

TOTAL APPLICANT POOL - 1985

	#	%
White	3,456	60.57
Black	920	16.12
Hispanic	748	13.11
Asian	304	5.33
American Indian	61	1.07
Filipino	93	1.63
Did Not Indicate	124	2.17
TOTAL	5,706	100.00
Minority	2,126	37.26%
Females	2,694	47.21%

(Note: See Attachment A for more information on the total applicant pool.)

EXAMINATIONS FOR CITY EMPLOYEES ONLY

Twenty-five examinations were open only to City employees as part of a limited-recruitment strategy. There were 536 individuals who applied to take those examinations. Two hundred twenty-one (41.23%) were minorities and 139 (25.93%) were females. Figure 1.2 shows a breakdown of the individuals recruited for examinations open to City employees only.

RECRUITMENT - EXAMINATIONS LIMITED TO CITY EMPLOYEES

	#	%
White	309	57.65
Black	92	17.16
Hispanic	92	17.16
Asian	23	4.29
American Indian	6	1.12
Filipino	8	1.49
Did Not Indicate	6	1.12
TOTAL	536	100.00
Minorities	221	41.23
Females	139	25.93

The occupational categories with the highest number of applicants were Police (184), Service Maintenance (98) and Skilled Crafts (71). The categories with the highest minority applicant percentage were Service Maintenance with 65.31% of the applicants being minority, followed by Technicians (47.62%) and Skilled Crafts (46.48%). The highest percentage of females were in Clerical (77.42%) followed by Technicians (74.60%) and Supervisory (60.87%). Figure 1.3 displays by occupational category, the minority recruitment statistics for examinations limited to City employees. Figure 1.4 shows similar data for female recruitment by occupational category.

FIG. 1.3

MINORITY RECRUITMENT FOR EXAMINATIONS LIMITED TO CITY EMPLOYEES

	MINORITIES		TOTAL RECRUITS
	#	%	#
Supervisory	12	26.09%	46
Police	62	33.70%	184
Fire	0	0.00%	4
Professional	10	25.64%	39
Skilled Crafts	33	46.48%	71
Service Maintenance	64	65.31%	98
Technicians	30	47.62%	63
Clerical	10	32.26%	31

FEMALE RECRUITMENT FOR EXAMINATIONS LIMITED TO CITY EMPLOYEES

	FEMALES		TOTAL RECRUITS
	#	%	#
Supervisory	28	60.87%	46
Police	7	3.80%	184
Fire	0	0.00%	4
Professional	20	51.28%	39
Skilled Crafts	0	0.00%	71
Service Maintenance	13	15.48%	98
Technicians	47	74.60%	63
Clerical	24	77.42%	31

(Note: See Attachment B for additional information on Recruitment for examinations limited to City Employees.)

From the above data, it appears that the limited recruitment strategies did not adversely restrict employment opportunities for minorities and women. An argument can be made however, that minorities were not adequately represented in the Supervisory, Fire, and Professional categories, and there were a lack of female applicants in the Police, Fire, Skilled Crafts and Service Maintenance categories. It should be noted however, that some of the limited recruitment practices were required by the City Charter (Police and Fire sworn promotional exams) and others were instituted by a desire to increase upward mobility opportunities for city employees.

OPEN EXAMINATIONS

Forty-three (43) employment tests were held on an "Open" basis in 1985. There were 5,170 applicants for those examinations. Minorities totaled 1,905 (36.85%) of the applicant pool and female representation was 2,555 (49.42%). Figure 1.5 is an ethnic breakdown of the individuals who applied for "Open" examinations.

FIG. 1.5

OPEN RECRUITMENT - CLASSIFIED POSITIONS

	#	%
White	3,147	60.87
Black	828	16.02
Hispanic	656	12.69
Asian	281	5.44
American Indian	55	1.06
Philipino	85	1.64
Did Not Indicate	118	2.28

TOTAL	5,170	100.00
Minorities	1,905	36.85%
Females	2,555	49.42%

There were more recruits for Clerical (2,250), Police (918) and Professional (786) positions than for any other occupation. Numerically, more minorities applied for Clerical (917), Police (412) and Professional (213) positions than for jobs in other occupational categories. Comparatively, the percentage of minority recruits were highest in Supervisory (50.00%), Police (44.88%) and Service Maintenance (42.89%) occupations.

Numerically, more females applied for Clerical (1,774), Police (247) and Professional (235) examinations than for test in other occupations. The highest percentage of female recruits were in the Clerical (78.84%), Service Maintenance (40.44) and Professional (29.90%) categories.

Figure 1.6 displays data on minority recruitment for "open" examinations. Figure 1.7 presents information on female recruitment for open examinations.

FIG. 1.6

Minority Recruitment for "OPEN" Examinations

	Minorities		Total Recruits
	#	%	#
Supervisory	9	50.00	18
Police	412	44.88	918
Fire	0	0.00	0
Professional	213	27.10	786
Skilled Crafts	65	22.49	289
Service Maintenance	175	42.89	408
Technicians	114	22.75	501
Clerical	917	40.76	2,250

FIG. 1.7

Female Recruitment for "Open" Examinations

	Females		Total Recruits
	#	%	#
Supervisory	1	5.56	18
Police	147	26.91	918
Fire	0	0.00	0
Professional	235	29.90	786

Skilled Crafts	1	0.35	289
Service Maintenance	165	40.44	408
Technicians	132	26.35	501
Clerical	1,774	78.84	2,250

For additional statistics on recruitment by occupational categories, see Attachment C.

For the most part, recruitment practices for open positions were:

- 1) Job announcements were mailed to schools, community organizations and other interested parties.
- 2) Job announcements were also posted at the Personnel Department Office, 801 - 9th Street, Room 101, and in many City department offices.
- 3) Information regarding employment opportunities was placed on a 24-hour job line (443-9990).
- 4) Ads were regularly placed in the Sacramento Observer and El Hispano newspapers, and occasionally in the Sacramento Bee and other newspapers or special interest publications.

On occasion, additional activities were undertaken to recruit minority, female and/or disabled candidates. Among the special recruitment activities in 1985 were:

- 1) A combined Police and Personnel Department recruitment program was directed for Police Cadet/Police Officer. The recruitment effort included the assignment of minority and female police staff for appearances on college campuses, community based television programs, and for contacting community organizations.
- 2) Special media advertising and/or special interest mailings were used to recruit minorities, females and/or disabled applicants for Carpenter, Marina & Boating Facilities Attendant, Media Production Specialist, Police Officer (Lateral), Supervising Community Center Attendant and Typist Clerk I examinations.
- 3) Various departments conducted independent recruitment activities on college campuses. Prime examples are Public Work's efforts to recruit minorities and females for the Junior Engineer examinations and Planning and Development's effort to recruit minorities for a Junior Planner (L.T.) position.
- 4) City staff participated in Career Fairs including the Sacramento Youth and Young Adults Career Faire which was held at McKinley Park, the Veterans Information Fair at the VFW Hall and the Nontraditional Careers Fair at American River College.

In summary, it appears that additional efforts should be directed towards

recruiting minorities for open examinations. The Personnel Department should attempt to develop other means for disseminating information to potential minority candidates. One suggestion is to explore the possibility of running regular public service announcements or paid advertisements on selected radio and/or television stations.

In addition, the data in Attachment C indicates that entry level open positions receive more minority recruits than journey level positions. The Personnel Department should consider recruiting only at the entry level when an examination is being held to fill a position within a series (e.g. Administrative Trainee/Administrative Assistant I/Administrative Assistant II.). This would possibly increase the minority representation in the Professional and Technicians Series.

SECTION II

Examinations - Classified Employment

Of the 5,706 individuals who applied to take the examinations from which the 1985 eligible lists were developed, only 2,096 (36.73%) actually competed. The remaining candidates either failed to show for their exam or were prescreened out of the process.

Surprisingly, the high rate of "no shows" and/or persons "screened out" of the process, did not have a significant adverse impact on minorities or females. (Adverse impact is shown when the selection rate or success rate for an ethnic/sex group is not within 80% of the rate for the most successful group. The City of Sacramento uses the selection rate for White candidates as the benchmark figure.) The 35.51% participation rate for minorities is within 80% of the 37.85% figure for White candidates. Similarly, the 32.37% rate for females is 79.65% of the rate for males.

Figure 2.1 shows the participation rate by ethnicity.

FIG. 2.1

EXAMINATIONS - EFFECT OF NO SHOWS/PRE SCREENING

	Recruited	Examined	Participation Rate
White	3,456	1,308	37.85%
Black	920	283	30.76%
Hispanic	748	304	40.64%
Asian	304	118	38.82%
American Indian	61	22	36.07%
Filipino	93	28	30.11%
Did Not Indicate	124	33	26.61%
TOTAL	5,706	2,096	36.73%
Minorities	2,126	755	35.51%
Females	2,694	872	32.37%

80% Adverse Impact Figure (minorities) 30.28%

For detailed information on individuals who competed in examinations, see Attachment D.

Of the 2,096 candidates who took City examinations, 1,330 (63.45%) were successful and placed on eligible lists. The success rate for minorities was 52.98% and for females 57.22%. Figure 2.2 details the percentage of individuals who successfully passed various tests in 1985.

EXAMINATIONS - SUCCESS RATE BY ETHNICITY

	Examined	Passed	Percentage Successful
White	1,308	911	69.65%
Black	283	112	39.58%
Hispanic	304	182	59.87%
Asian	118	71	60.17%
American Indian	22	13	59.09%
Filipino	28	22	78.57%
Did Not Indicate	33	19	57.58%
TOTAL	2,096	1,330	63.45%
Minorities	755	400	52.98%
Females	872	499	57.22%

80% Adverse Impact Figure (Minorities) 55.72%

See Attachment E for additional information re: individuals on eligible lists.

As shown above, the testing process had an adverse impact on only one ethnic group, Blacks. The rate in which Black candidates were successful was only 56.82% of the rate for White candidates. On the other hand, candidates from other ethnic groups had roughly the same rate of success as the White candidates. No other minority group was below the 80% adverse impact figure.

Females were also within 80% of the rate for men. While 57.22% of females passed tests, 67.89% of males were successful. The success rate for females was 84.28% of the success rate for males.

In summary, the statistics infer that minorities and females did equally as well as Whites and males on examination. The only exception is the impact on Blacks, where the inference is that City employment examinations had a disproportionate impact on Black candidates.

The fact that City examinations had an apparent adverse impact on Blacks is not surprising. Historically, examinations across the country have tended to be more severe on Black candidates. Nevertheless, it is imperative that the Personnel Department continue in its efforts to seek ways in which to mitigate any future adverse impact.

SECTION III

CERTIFICATIONS FROM ELIGIBLE LISTS

Under Section 84 of the City Charter, all classified positions must be filled from the three candidates standing highest on an eligible list (with the exception of positions filled through Employee Development Programs or from employee reinstatement, recall, reemployment or transfer lists.).

In 1985, eligibles were certified to interview for positions on 1252 occasions. Of that total, 353 (28.19%) were minorities and 574 (45.85%) were females. Figure 3.1 is a breakdown of certifications by ethnicity/sex.

FIG. 3.1

Certifications to Full-time Positions
1985

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	468	37.38	406	32.43	874	69.81
Black	75	5.99	39	3.12	114	9.11
Hispanic	78	6.23	66	5.27	144	11.50
Asian	32	2.56	42	3.35	74	5.91
American Indian	7	0.56	3	0.24	10	0.80
Filipino	8	0.64	3	0.24	11	0.88
Other/Did Not Indicate	10	0.80	15	1.20	25	2.00
Total	678	54.15	574	45.85	1252	100.00
Minorities	200	15.97	153	12.22	353	28.19

The largest number of certifications were made to "Clerical" positions and the fewest were to "Supervisory" jobs. Figure 3.2 shows the number and percentage of certifications made within each occupational category.

FIG. 3.2

Total Certifications by Occupational Category
1985

	#	%
Supervisory	42	3.35
Police	120	9.58
Fire	53	4.23
Professional	209	16.69
Skilled Crafts	46	3.67
Service Maintenance	230	18.37

Technicians	110	8.79
Clerical	442	35.30
Total	1252	100.00

Consistent with the above, minorities and females were certified to clerical positions more than any other single occupation. Figures 3.3 and 3.4 show the number and percentage of minority and female certifications by occupational category. (For additional statistics on certifications, see Attachment E.)

FIG. 3.3

Minority Certifications From Eligible Lists

	Number of Minorities	Percent of Minorities	Total Certs.	Minority % of Total
Supervisory	9	2.55	42	21.43
Police	25	7.08	120	20.83
Fire	13	3.68	53	24.53
Professional	39	11.05	209	18.66
Skilled Crafts	8	2.27	46	17.39
Service Maintenance	103	29.18	230	44.78
Technicians	38	10.76	110	34.55
Clerical	118	33.43	442	26.70
Total	353	100.00	1252	28.19

FIG. 3.4

Female Certifications From Eligible Lists

	Number of Females	Percent of Females	Total Certs.	Female % of Total
Supervisory	9	1.57	42	21.43
Police	20	3.48	120	16.67
Fire	10	1.74	53	18.87
Professional	95	16.55	209	45.45
Skilled Crafts	0	0.00	46	0.00
Service Maintenance	35	6.10	230	15.22
Technicians	37	6.45	110	33.64
Clerical	368	64.11	442	83.26
Total	574	100.00	1252	45.85

The above data shows that minorities were well represented in the "Service Maintenance" and "Technicians" categories (44.78% and 34.55% respectively) in comparison with their representation in the "Skilled Crafts" and "Professional" categories. Female representation was heaviest

the certifications for jobs in the "Clerical" and "Professional" ranks and light in the "Service Maintenance", "Police" and "Fire" occupations. There were no females certified to positions in the "Skilled Crafts" Categories.

As has been stated in many of the past affirmative action/equal employment opportunity status reports, the rules governing the certification process hinder equal employment opportunity. The above data shows that 1985 was no exception. The fact that invitations to interview for a position are given only to the top three individuals on an eligible list, means that minorities have been and continue to be at a statistical disadvantage. Coupled with the fact that the testing process has a adverse impact on at least one ethnic group, it is clear that the "rule of three", "rule of one" and other arbitrarily restrictive certification procedures, are not conducive to equal employment opportunity.

SECTION IV

SELECTIONS FROM CERTIFICATIONS
1985

There were 384 selections made from the 1252 eligibles who were certified for employment in 1985. Minorities were appointed/promoted to 108 positions and females were selected 154 times. Figure 4.1 is a breakdown of the individuals who were appointed/promoted in 1985.

FIG. 4.1

Appointments to Full-time Positions
1985

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	159	41.41	113	29.43	272	70.83
Black	23	5.99	13	3.39	36	9.38
Hispanic	29	7.55	18	4.69	47	12.24
Asian	10	2.60	5	1.30	15	3.91
American Indian	2	0.52	3	0.78	5	1.30
Filipino	4	1.04	1	0.26	5	1.30
Other/Did Not Indicate	3	0.78	1	0.26	4	1.04
Total	230	59.90	154	40.10	384	100.00
Minorities	68	17.71	40	10.42	108	28.13

The selection rate for minorities was 30.59 (108 out of 353 eligibles) and for White eligibles the rate was 31.12 (272 out of 874). The selection rate for females was 26.83 (154 out of 574) and the rate for males was 33.92 (230 out of 678).

Because the selection rate for minorities was close to the rate for Whites, there was no adverse impact against minorities. However, there was a slight adverse impact against females. Figure 4.2 illustrates this point.

FIG. 4.2

Appointments - Selection Rates by Ethnicity
1985

	Certified	Appointed	Selection Rate
White	874	272	31.12
Black	114	36	31.58
Hispanic	144	47	32.64
Asian	74	15	20.27

African Indian	10	5	50.00
Hispanic	11	5	45.45
Did Not Indicate	25	4	16.00
Total	1252	384	30.67
Minorities	353	108	30.59
Females	574	154	26.83
Males	678	230	33.92

80% Adverse Impact Rate (minorities) 24.90%
80% Adverse Impact Rate (females) 27.14

Most of the positions filled were Clerical and Service Maintenance. The fewest appointments were to Skilled Crafts and Supervisory positions. Figure 4.3 shows the number and percentage of appointments made to jobs within each occupational category.

FIG. 4.3

Total Appointments/Promotions by Occupational Category
1985

	#	%
Supervisory	18	4.69
Police	68	17.71
Fire	25	6.51
Professional	40	10.42
Skilled Crafts	14	3.65
Service Maintenance	95	24.74
Technicians	28	7.29
Clerical	96	25.00
Total	384	100.00

Minority appointment statistics are consistent with the above data. Most of the minority appointments (over 60 percent) were to jobs in the Service Maintenance and Clerical occupations. For females, 51.95% of those selected went to clerical positions and 15.58% were appointed/promoted to professional jobs. Figures 4.4 and 4.5 show the number and percentage of minority and female appointments by occupational categories. (For a further breakdown of the selection statistics, see Attachment G.)

FIG. 4.4

Minority Appointments/Promotions

	Number of Minorities	Percent of Minorities	Total Appnts.	Minority % of Total
Supervisory	2	1.85	18	11.11
Police	9	8.33	68	13.24
Fire	6	5.56	25	24.00

Professional	8	7.41	40	20.00
Skilled Crafts	2	1.85	14	14.29
Service Maintenance	44	40.74	95	46.32
Technicians	11	10.19	28	39.29
Clerical	26	24.07	96	27.08
Total	108	100.00	384	28.13

FIG. 4.5

Female Appointments/Promotions

	Number of Females	Percent of Females	Total Appnts.	Female % of Total
Supervisory	4	2.60	18	22.22
Police	15	9.74	68	22.06
Fire	5	3.25	25	20.00
Professional	24	15.58	40	60.00
Skilled Crafts	0	0.00	14	0.00
Service Maintenance	16	10.39	95	16.84
Technicians	10	6.49	28	35.71
Clerical	80	51.95	96	83.33
Total	154	100.00	384	40.10

Of those minority eligibles who did not receive appointments or promotions, 43.50% were interviewed by an appointing authority but not selected. In comparison, only 31.20% of the females (who were not appointed/promoted) were rejected. The majority of females not appointed, took themselves out of the process by refusing job offers or declining interviews. Figures 4.6 and 4.7 show the distribution of minorities and females relative to the reasons they were not appointed/promoted.

FIG 4.6

Distribution of Minorities re: Reasons for Non-selection

1985

- A. Minority candidate was interviewed but not selected. (Appointing authority rejected the eligible or another minority or non-minority was appointed or promoted.) 43.50%
- B. Minority eligible refused employment or a promotion. (Eligible rejected the job offer or did not desire to be interviewed for the position.) 33.74%
- Minority candidate did not respond to the certification notice. (Eligible did not contact the appointing authority) 12.20%

to set up an interview.)

D.	A selection was not made from among the eligibles who were certified. (The appointing authority did not select any of the eligibles, the certification was made in error or the certification was cancelled	10.57%
----	---	--------

FIG 4.7

Distribution of Females re: Reasons for Non-selection

1985

A.	Female candidate was interviewed but not selected. (Appointing authority rejected the eligible or another female or male was appointed or promoted.)	31.67%
----	--	--------

B.	Female eligible refused employment or a promotion. (Eligible rejected the job offer or did not desire to be interviewed for the position.	45.14%
----	---	--------

	Female candidate did not respond to the certification notice. (Eligible did not contact the appointing authority to set up an interview.)	13.22%
--	---	--------

D.	A selection was not made from among the eligibles who were certified. (The appointing authority did not select any of the eligibles, the certification was made in error or the certification was cancelled	9.98%
----	---	-------

In summary, minorities and females were well represented among those selected, in the Service Maintenance (minorities), Professional and Clerical (females) occupations. Overall, the selection rates were generally consistent with the rates for Whites and males (with the exception of the minority selection rate to positions in the Police and Supervisory categories, and the appointment rate for females in the Police occupations). It is reasonable to conclude, that appointing authorities generally made selections in accordance with the principles of equal employment opportunity.

SECTION V

DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS

There were seventeen (15) cases involving charges of discrimination filed against the City of Sacramento in 1985. Eight cases (53.33%) were filed with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, and the remaining seven (46.66%) were investigated by the Affirmative Action Officer.

Figure 5.1 shows the number and type of allegations of discrimination which were made in 1985.

FIG. 5.1

Allegations of Discrimination

<u>Basis of Complaint</u>	Number	Percentage
Age Discrimination	2	10.00
Ancestry Discrimination	1	5.00
Color Discrimination	1	5.00
National Origin Discrimination	4	20.00
Physical Handicap Discrimination	3	15.00
Race Discrimination	5	25.00
Sex Discrimination	3	15.00
Sexual Orientation	1	5.00
Total	20	100.00

For a synopsis of the cases, see Attachment H.

SECTION VI

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION - INTRODUCTION

Affirmative actions in employment are remedial acts taken by employers to improve work opportunities for women, ethnic and racial minorities, and in some cases other groups of individuals who have been deprived of those job opportunities. The obligation to implement affirmative actions comes only when there is evidence that women or minorities (and in some cases the disabled) have not been afforded the same opportunities as non-minorities and males.

The City of Sacramento's current affirmative action program was established in 1981 to: 1) determine where minorities and women are or have been under-utilized; and 2) correct any under-utilization of those groups. In 1979/80, the Personnel Department conducted an analysis of the work force to determine the number of minorities and women in the overall work force, each department and in each occupational category.

The work force data was compared to: 1) statistics on the availability of minorities and women in Sacramento County and the Sacramento SMSA (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area), who have the requisite education, skills and training that is required 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 minority population of the City of Sacramento.

Based on the information collected and analyzed, the City Council in 1981, established goals for the employment of minorities and women in the total work force, in each occupational category and in each department. In 1983, the City Council amended the minority employment goals to reflect the 1980 census.

The following sections pertain to the City's 1985 efforts to reach the minority and female employment goals.

SECTION VII

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION/TOTAL WORK FORCE

The overall goal of the affirmative action program is to have a work force which is 37.72% minority and 42% female. These goals are based on the 1980 Census of the Sacramento population and 1980 labor force data.

Figures 7.1 and 7.2 shows the 1985 City work force by ethnicity/sex and the affirmative action goals for each group.

FIG 7.1

TOTAL CITY WORK FORCE
1985

	Male		Female		Total	
White	1,430	52.65	407	14.78	1,857	67.43
Black	246	8.93	69	2.51	315	11.44
Hispanic	328	11.91	74	2.69	402	14.60
Asian	90	3.27	35	1.27	125	4.54
American Indian	27	0.98	3	0.11	30	1.09
Filipino	15	0.54	9	0.33	24	0.87
Other	1	0.04	0	0.00	1	0.04
TOTAL	2,157	78.32	597	21.68	2,754	100.00
TOTAL MINORITY	706	25.64	190		896	32.53

FIG 7.2

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION GOALS - TOTAL WORK FORCE

Based on 37.72% Minority Population/42% Female Labor Force)

	Male	Female	Total
White	36.12	26.16	62.28
Black	7.60	5.51	13.11
Hispanic	8.24	5.96	14.20
Asian	4.39	3.18	7.57
American Indian	0.37	0.27	0.64
Filipino	0.66	0.48	1.14
Other	0.61	0.44	1.05
TOTAL	58.00	42.00	100.00

Numerically, White females are the most under-utilized group. However, is the Asian female who by percentage, is furthest from their goal. Figure 7.3 ranks the individual sex/ethnic groups in order of severity of under-utilization and also lists the 1984 figures.

FIG. 7.3

RANKING OF GROUPS WHO ARE UNDER-UTILIZED

	Ethnic/Sex	1985	1984
1)	Asian Female	40.52	39.29
2)	Hispanic Female	45.38	45.86
3)	Black Female	45.83	47.58
4)	White Female	56.91	47.82
5)	Filipino Female	68.89	61.22
6)	Asian Male	74.95	75.86
7)	Filipino Male	83.15	76.47

In comparison with the 1984 statistics, the above under-utilized groups moved an average of 10.42% toward the affirmative action goals. When the 15.98% change in the White female ranks is deleted, the statistics still show an average 9.63% progression for the remaining minority groups.

Overall, the number of minorities in the work force is at an all time high. However, due to a significant increase in the White female work force, coupled with a net loss of Black males, the percentage of minorities in the work force is at the lowest level in five years. Figure 7.4 shows the changes in the minority and female work force since 1980.

FIG. 7.4

CHANGES IN THE FULL-TIME WORKFORCE

	Minority		Female		Total Workforce
	#	%	#	%	#
1980	875	32.71	439	16.41	2,675
1981	281	32.76	467	17.36	2,689
1982	866	32.90	471	17.89	2,632
1983	864	32.95	498	18.99	2,622
1984	864	32.74	543	20.58	2,639
1985	896	32.53	597	21.68	2,754

Part of the reason for the net reduction in the number of Black males is the fact that 12 left the work force in 1985. In comparison, only 4 Hispanic males terminated employment during the year. Figure 7.5 shows the number of terminations by ethnicity and sex during 1985. Figure 7.6 gives the general reasons for the terminations.

TERMINATIONS FROM EMPLOYMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	44	34.92	40	31.75	84	66.67
Black	12	9.52	6	4.76	18	14.29
Hispanic	4	3.17	8	6.35	12	9.52
Asian	2	1.59	4	3.17	6	4.76
American Indian	3	2.38	2	1.59	5	3.97
Filipino	1	0.79	0	0.00	1	0.79
TOTAL	66	52.38	60	47.62	126	100.00

Most of the minorities and females who terminated resigned from the City. Figure 7.6 shows the reasons minorities and female terminated employment in 1985.

FIG. 7.6

REASONS FOR TERMINATION

	Minorities	Females
Resignations	30	59
Retirements	7	0
Discharged	4	0
Deceased	1	1
Total	42	60

SECTION VIII

Affirmative Action/Occupational Categories

A second goal of the affirmative action program is to have a work force in which 37.72% of those employed in each occupational category are minorities and 42% are females. At years end, minorities were at or above the 37.72% level in only the Service Maintenance occupational category while females were at parity in Professional and Clerical occupations.

In comparison with 1984 figures, the number of minorities increased in seven out of eight occupational categories. Figure 8.1 shows the 1980 thru 1985 minority work force by occupational category.

FIG 8.1

Minority Employment by Occupational Categories

	Supervisory		Police		Fire		Professional	
1985	41	28.67	128	24.81	83	21.01	23	16.08
1984	40	28.78	127	25.81	80	20.20	16	14.54
1983	38	27.74	124	25.41	73	18.86	19	18.09
1982	n/a	---	123	24.90	71	17.53	22	16.54
1981	n/a	---	122	24.49	83	19.12	26	19.69
1980	n/a	---	122	24.50	79	18.50	38	24.20
	Sk. Crafts		Serv. Maint.		Techs.		Clerical	
1985	24	23.76	384	53.48	47	25.41	136	35.70
1984	23	22.55	374	53.81	37	22.56	136	35.88
1983	23	21.49	401	54.78	33	20.63	124	35.53
1982	21	20.19	410	55.56	35	22.01	136	35.39
1981	21	20.00	411	54.50	36	21.42	126	35.00
1980	21	19.44	415	55.48	31	21.09	120	32.43

Female employment increased in all eight of the occupational categories. Most noteworthy is the fact that in 1985, a female was hired into a career Skilled Crafts position for the first time in Sacramento history. Also of interest is a significant increase in the number of females in the police and fire ranks.

Figure 8.2 shows the 1980 through 1985 female work force by occupational category.

Female Employment by Occupational Categories

	Supervisory		Police		Fire		Professional	
1985	27	18.88	33	6.40	12	3.04	66	46.15
1984	26	18.71	20	4.07	9	2.27	48	43.64
1983	27	19.70	16	3.28	7	1.86	49	46.66
1982	n/a	---	13	2.63	2	0.49	57	42.85
1981	n/a	---	14	2.81	8	1.84	47	35.60
1980	n/a	---	13	2.61	2	.47	50	31.85

	Sk. Crafts		Serv. Maint.		Techs.		Clerical	
1985	1	0.99	50	6.96	44	23.78	332	87.14
1984	0	0.00	40	5.76	36	23.78	336	88.65
1983	0	0.00	37	5.05	35	21.88	304	87.11
1982	0	0.00	29	3.92	35	22.01	312	87.64
1981	0	0.00	32	4.24	40	23.80	309	85.83
1980	0	0.00	23	3.07	32	21.77	307	82.70

For additional information on employment by occupational categories, see Attachment I

In summary, the number of minorities increased in most of the occupational categories however, the percentage of minorities increased in only three of the seven occupational groups. This is one indication that minority hiring is being offset by non-minority female hiring.

The fact that females are being employed is in accordance with the affirmative action program. Nevertheless, it is recommended that appointing authorities seek to hire minority males and females at an increased rate in the future.

SECTION IX

Affirmative Action/Departments

The final goal of the affirmative action program is to reach a point where minorities and females are 37.72% and 42% respectively, of the work force in each department. At years end, minority representation was at or above parity in only 2 of the 17 departments (two other departments were very close to parity) and female representation was at parity in 9 of the 17 departments.

In 1985, the number of minorities increased in 10 out of 17 departments. Figure 9.1 shows the 1980 thru 1985 minority work force by department.

FIG. 9.1

Minority Employment by Departments

	1985		1984		1983		1982		1981		1980	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CITY ATTORNEY	3	27.27	2	18.18	1	11.11	1	11.11	1	10.00	1	10.00
CITY CLERK	3	37.50	3	42.86	2	40.00	2	50.00	2	40.00	2	40.00
CITY MANAGER	1	16.67	1	16.67	1	20.00	1	12.50	1	12.50	2	18.18
CITY TREASURER	2	22.22	4	44.44	3	37.50	3	37.50	2	33.33	1	20.00
COMMUNITY CENTER	15	37.50	14	37.83	14	37.83	14	38.88	15	44.11	11	35.48
DATA PROCESSING	9	33.33	8	28.57	6	22.22	6	22.22	7	23.33	7	21.87
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS	1	25.00	1	25.00	1	33.33	1	25.00	1	25.00	1	25.00
FINANCE	22	32.84	22	35.48	23	39.65	25	42.37	24	38.09	30	36.14
FIRE	90	21.03	85	19.90	82	19.20	78	17.88	90	18.98	85	18.43
GENERAL SERVICES	40	27.97	37	29.36	38	29.66	36	27.90	46	31.72	-	---
LIBRARY	23	25.84	22	24.17	24	25.26	25	26.04	21	22.34	23	23.00
MAYOR/COUNCIL	0	0.00	1	20.00	1	33.33	2	40.22	2	50.00	2	40.00
PARKS/COMMUNITY SERVICES	155	44.93	146	44.10	154	45.29	151	45.48	154	45.29	156	44.69
PERSONNEL	12	32.43	11	32.35	9	33.33	11	39.29	12	42.85	14	48.27
PLANNING	17	16.83	15	20.00	14	17.94	-	---	-	---	-	---
POLICE	212	27.50	212	28.57	191	27.20	191	27.28	186	26.83	182	26.56
PUBLIC WORKS	292	43.78	280	43.47	300	44.77	313	43.35	309	42.85	350	41.81

The number of females increased in 9 out of 17 departments. Figure 9.2 shows the 1980 thru 1985 female work force by department.

FIG. 9.2

Female Employment by Departments

	1985		1984		1983		1982		1981		1980	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
CITY ATTORNEY	5	45.45	5	45.45	3	33.33	4	44.44	4	40.00	5	50.00
CITY CLERK	7	87.50	6	85.71	5	100.00	4	100.00	4	80.00	4	80.00
CITY MANAGER	3	50.00	3	50.00	2	40.00	3	37.50	2	25.00	2	18.18

CITY TREASURER	5	55.56	5	55.55	4	50.00	2	25.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
COMMUNITY CENTER	9	22.50	9	24.32	8	21.62	8	22.22	7	20.58	7	22.58
DATA PROCESSING	5	18.52	7	25.00	8	29.62	10	37.04	10	33.33	12	37.50
EMPLOYEE RELATIONS	2	50.00	2	50.00	2	66.66	2	50.00	2	50.00	2	50.00
FINANCE	46	68.66	45	72.58	42	72.41	42	71.19	40	63.49	51	61.44
FIRE	21	4.91	15	3.51	17	3.98	11	2.50	19	4.00	10	2.16
GENERAL SERVICES	16	11.19	13	10.31	14	10.93	14	10.85	19	13.10	—	—
LIBRARY	73	82.02	74	81.31	77	81.05	79	82.29	81	86.17	84	84.00
MAYOR/COUNCIL	1	100.00	5	100.00	2	66.66	3	60.00	2	50.00	3	80.00
PARKS/COMMUNITY SERVICES	65	18.84	50	15.11	50	14.70	43	12.95	36	10.58	33	9.45
PERSONNEL	27	72.97	24	70.58	20	74.07	21	75.00	22	78.57	21	72.41
PLANNING	29	28.71	21	28.00	24	30.76	-	—	-	—	-	—
POLICE	208	26.98	196	26.41	165	23.50	153	21.86	143	20.63	133	19.41
PUBLIC WORKS	75	11.24	63	9.78	55	8.20	60	8.31	63	8.73	59	7.04

The above minority/female employment charts, are additional evidence that appointing authorities have recently had more success hiring females than minorities. As stated in the past section, females are a target group yet a balance needs to be found between hiring females and minorities. The Police department is one case in point, in 1985 they experienced a net numerical and percentage increase in their female work force yet had a percentage decrease in their minority work force.

One of the best examples of a balanced approach to affirmative action is the Fire Department. Although it may be inappropriate to use this department as an example (they are under a selective certification order), the increases in their minority and female work force are representative of the level of achievement the affirmative action program is based on. Hopefully, more departments will show similar results in the next status report.

SECTION X

Affirmative Action Timetables

The Affirmative Action Plan fixed timetables for reaching the occupational and department minority & female employment goals. The timetables were based on anticipated turnover and minority/female hiring percentages during the life of the affirmative action plan. Figures 10.1 & 10.2 list the timetables by occupational category and department.

FIG. 10.1

Timetable for Reaching Minority/Female Occupational Employment Goals
1981 Estimates

Category	Projected year goal to be reached.
Supervisory	n/a
Police	2028
Fire	2006
Professional	1984
Skilled Crafts	2021
Service Maintenance	2001
Technicians	1986
Clerical	1985

FIG. 10.2

Timetable for Reaching Minority/Female Department Employment Goals
1981 Estimates

Department	Projected year goal to be reached.
City Attorney	1984
City Clerk	n/a
City Manager	1993
City Treasurer	n/a
Community Center	1989
Data Processing	1984
Employee Relations	n/a
Finance	1985
Fire	2006
General Services	n/a
Library	1985
Mayor/Council	n/a
Parks & Community Services	1992
Personnel	1985
Planning & Development	1986
Police	2028
Public Works	1994

Since 1981, the City work force has fluctuated to the extent that the 1981 timetables are generally unrealistic. Instead of revising the timetables, projections have been made to show the anticipated date in which the employment goals would be reached if past employment trends were to continue. For example, minorities would reach parity in the fire occupational category by the year 2019 if the employment trends of the past five years were to continue into the future. However, if the 1985 employment picture is used to project a parity date, minorities will be at parity in the sworn fire ranks by the year 2006. Figure 10.3 shows minority occupational category projections based on five and one year employment history models.

FIG 10.3

Projections on when Minority Employment Goals Will be Reached
(based on the past five years experience)
by Occupational Category

Category	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
Supervisory	29.19	Feb-2015
Police	208.23	Not projected
Fire	33.29	Mar-2019
Professional	-.--	Cannot project
Skilled Crafts	16.15	Feb-2002
Service Maintenance	-.--	parity
Technicians	14.25	Mar-2000
Clerical	3.09	Jan-1989

FIG 10.4

Projections on when Minority Employment Goals Will be Reached
(based on 1985 experience)
by Occupational Category

Category	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
Supervisory	-.--	Cannot project
Police	-.--	Cannot project
Fire	20.63	Jul-2006
Professional	14.05	Dec-1999
Skilled Crafts	11.53	Jun-1997
Service Maintenance	-.--	parity
Technicians	4.32	Apr-1990
Clerical	-.--	Cannot Project

As indicated above, there are occasions where projections have not been made. In the "Police" category (five year), a projection was not made because the percentage of minorities in the sworn ranks has only progressed 0.31 over the past five years (the percentage of minorities in

Police category actually declined in 1985). At that rate, it would take approximately 208 years for minorities to reach parity in the sworn ranks. In the other categories where projections have not been made, the percentage of minorities has either decreased or minorities are currently at parity.

For the most part, female employment has increased in all occupational categories in which they are under parity. Figures 10.5 and 10.6 show the projections for female employment by occupational category using the five years and one year models.

FIG 10.5

Projections on when Female Employment Goals Will be Reached
(based on the past five years experience)
by Occupational Category

Category	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
Supervisory	-.--	Cannot Project
Police	41.32	Mar-2027
Fire	67.47	May-2053
Professional	-.--	parity
Skilled Crafts	185.51	Not projected
Service Maintenance	39.54	Jun-2025
Technicians	34.68	Aug-2020
Clerical	-.--	parity

FIG 10.6

Projections on when Female Employment Goals Will be Reached
(based on 1985 experience)
by Occupational Category

Category	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
Supervisory	110.82	Sep-2096
Police	13.44	May-1999
Fire	45.04	Dec-2030
Professional	-.--	parity
Skilled Crafts	37.10	Jan-2023
Service Maintenance	25.63	Jul-2011
Technicians	-.--	Cannot Project
Clerical	-.--	parity

As indicated by the data in Section IX, 1985 was not a particularly good year for minority employment by department. However, there were several departments who based on 1985 activities, are projected to reach parity sooner than what is projected under the five year projection format. Figures 10.7 and 10.8 show the projections for minority employment by department.

10.7

Projections on when Minority Department Goals Will be Reached
(based on the past five years experience)

Department	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
City Attorney	3.03	Dec-1988
City Clerk	-.--	Cannot project
City Manager	-.--	Cannot project
City Treasurer	34.91	Nov-2020
Community Center	0.54	Jul-1986
Data Processing	1.92	Nov-1987
Employee Relations	-.--	Cannot project
Finance	-.--	Cannot project
Fire	32.10	Jan-2018
General Services	-.--	Cannot Project
Library	20.92	Nov-2006
Mayor/Council	-.--	Cannot Project
Parks	-.--	Parity
Personnel	-.--	Cannot Project
Planning & Development	-.--	Cannot Project
Police	54.36	Apr-2040
Public Works	-.--	Parity

10.8

Projections on when Minority Department Goals Will be Reached
(based on 1985 experience)

Department	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
City Attorney	1.15	Feb-1987
City Clerk	-.--	Cannot project
City Manager	-.--	Cannot project
City Treasurer	-.--	Cannot project
Community Center	-.--	Cannot project
Data Processing	1.92	Nov-1986
Employee Relations	-.--	Cannot project
Finance	-.--	Cannot project
Fire	14.77	Sep-2000
General Services	-.--	Cannot Project
Library	7.11	Jan-1993
Mayor/Council	-.--	Cannot Project
Parks	-.--	Parity
Personnel	66.13	Jan-2052
Planning & Development	-.--	Cannot Project
Police	-.--	Cannot Project
Public Works	-.--	Parity

There was only one department in which the projected date for female parity (based on 1985 employment data) is worst than the date projected under the five year analysis. Figures 10.9 and 10.10 show the dates in which the female work force is expected to reach parity in departments where such projects could be made.

FIG. 10.9

Projections on when Female Department Goals Will be Reached
(based on the past five years experience)

Department	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
City Attorney	-.--	Parity
City Clerk	-.--	Parity
City Manager	-.--	Parity
City Treasurer	-.--	Parity
Community Center	-.--	Cannot project
Data Processing	-.--	Cannot project
Employee Relations	-.--	Parity
Finance	-.--	Parity
Fire	67.44	May-2053
General Services	-.--	Cannot Project
Library	-.--	Parity
Mayor/Council	-.--	Parity
Parks	12.33	Apr-1998
Personnel	-.--	Parity
Planning & Development	-.--	Cannot Project
Police	9.92	Nov-1995
Public Works	36.62	Jul-2022

FIG 10.10

Projections on when Female Department Goals Will be Reached
(based on 1985 experience)

Department	Proj. # of Years to reach goal	Proj. Date goal to be reached
City Attorney	-.--	Parity
City Clerk	-.--	Parity
City Manager	-.--	Parity
City Treasurer	-.--	Parity
Community Center	-.--	Cannot project
Data Processing	-.--	Cannot project
Employee Relations	-.--	Parity
Finance	-.--	Parity
Fire	26.49	Jun-2012
General Services	35.01	Dec-2020
Library	-.--	Parity
Mayor/Council	-.--	Parity
Parks	6.21	Feb-1992

Personnel	---	Parity
Training & Development	18.72	Aug-2004
Police	26.35	Apr-2012
Public Works	21.07	Jan-2007

SECTION XI

RECAPITULATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding pages provided information on the various aspects of the City's equal employment opportunity and affirmative action programs. Based on the information analyzed, the status of the program in 1985 can be summarized as follows:

The City of Sacramento was an equal opportunity employer in 1985.

Recruitment

The practice of having some examinations open only to city employees did not significantly limit minority or female participation. There were some occupational categories however, where minority and female representation was particularly low. It is recommended that the Personnel Department continue to closely monitor the use of "City employees only" examinations, especially in non-traditional fields.

Both minority and female recruitment were below desired levels in some occupations which were recruited on an open basis. It is recommended that the Personnel Department develop new methods for disseminating employment information, especially to minorities.

Examinations

Black candidates were the only group significantly impacted by City examinations in 1985. It is recommended that the Personnel Department continue efforts to try to reduce the negative impact exams are having on Black candidates.

Certifications

The "rule of three" certification requirement is continuing to cause problems. It is recommended that this rule be amended or repealed to provide increased employment opportunities for minorities and females.

Appointments

Appointment rates were fairly consistent among the various sex and ethnic groups, meaning appointing authorities were hiring/promoting minorities and females in reasonable numbers. As indicated below, the appointment rates for minorities will need to increase if affirmative action goals are to be met.

Affirmative Action

The number of minorities and women in the work force increased in 1985. However, the percentage of minorities decreased primarily because of a strong increase in the number of non-minority females. Even with the numerical increases, it will take several years for the City to reach parity in most of the occupational groups and many departments. It

is recommended that appointing authorities seek to hire more minorities, so that a balanced increase in the work force can be achieved by the next status report.

#

ATTACHMENT A - 1985 RECRUITMENT/TOTAL APPLICANT POOL

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
ACCOUNT CLERK I	517	344	103	78	41	8	16	17	607
ACCOUNT CLERK II	326	218	55	43	29	8	19	13	385
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	4	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	9
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ADMIN. ASST. I	56	190	54	14	20	2	1	5	286
ADMIN. ASST. II	77	126	22	9	0	0	1	8	166
ART MUSEUM REGISTRAR	50	59	2	1	3	0	0	2	67
ARTS PROGRAM COORD.	16	21	5	1	1	0	0	2	30
ASSIST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	1	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	7
ASSIST. LANDSCAPE ARCH.	17	50	5	0	6	0	0	2	63
ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (MECH)	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	12
ASST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	1	4	0	1	2	0	0	0	7
BUILD. INSP. I (ELECT)	0	35	4	2	1	2	1	1	46
BUILD. INSP. I (PLUMB)	1	42	2	4	0	1	0	1	50
BUILDING INSP. II (MISC)	3	14	4	0	0	0	0	0	18
CARPENTER	0	129	10	11	1	0	0	1	152
CASHIER	76	131	38	34	13	1	7	2	226
CHIEF OF POLICE	23	13	10	4	3	0	0	0	30
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	30	80	16	16	3	1	2	1	119
DISPATCHER I	374	304	91	67	5	6	5	14	492
DISPATCHER III	7	5	1	1	1	0	0	0	8
DRAFTING TECHNICIAN	10	19	2	9	8	0	0	1	39
ELECTRICIAN SUPV.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
EQUIP. BODY MECHANIC	0	22	3	6	2	0	0	2	35
EQUIP. MECHANIC I	1	36	4	7	8	0	1	1	57
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	5	15	23	19	0	0	1	3	61
FIRE INVEST. II	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
GREENSKEEPER	5	26	13	14	3	1	0	1	58
JUNIOR ENGINEER (CIVIL)	5	37	2	2	6	0	2	1	50
JUNIOR ENGINEER (ELECT)	1	8	0	0	11	0	0	0	19
JUNIOR PLANNER	52	92	12	11	3	0	0	0	118
LANDFILL EQUIP. OPERATOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MACHINIST HELPER	0	20	1	5	2	1	0	0	29
MARINA & BOATING FAC. ATTD.	2	39	1	4	0	0	2	1	47
MECH. MAINT. SUPERVISOR	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
MEDIA PROD. SPEC.	14	39	4	4	1	2	0	1	51
MINORITY SERVICES LIBRARIAN	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
MOTOR SWEEPER OPERATOR	0	5	2	6	0	1	0	0	14
OFFICE SUPERVISOR	28	21	3	5	0	0	0	0	29
PARKING ENF. OFFICER	158	159	69	55	8	5	0	7	303
PLUMBS SUPERVISOR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PLANNING TECH	24	20	7	4	2	0	0	0	33
PLUMBER	0	33	4	4	1	2	1	0	45
POLICE CADET/OFFICER	241	457	149	161	62	10	16	1	856

ATTACHMENT A - 1985 RECRUITMENT/TOTAL APPLICANT POOL

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
POLICE CLERK I	179	90	72	30	13	2	3	5	215
POLICE OFFICER (LATERAL)	6	48	3	10	1	0	0	0	62
POLICE SERGEANT	7	122	24	21	11	2	4	0	184
PROGRAMMER ANALYST I	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
PROGRAMMER I	11	28	9	2	3	0	3	3	48
PROGRAMMER II	0	10	2	0	0	0	1	0	13
PROPERTY ASSISTANT	11	10	1	5	0	0	1	0	17
REAL PROPERTY AGENT II	7	37	2	4	1	0	1	3	48
RECREATION SUPERVISOR I	19	25	6	4	0	0	0	2	37
SR. LANDFILL EQUIP. OPER.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
SR. PARKING LOT ATTD.	8	7	2	9	1	0	0	0	19
ST. CONSTR. EQUIP. OPER.	0	4	2	2	0	0	1	0	9
ST. CONSTR. LABORER	0	11	9	7	1	1	0	0	29
ST. MAINT. GEN. SUPVR.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
STENOGRAPHER CLERK I	44	33	4	2	3	0	1	1	44
SUPERVISING POLICE CLERK	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
SUPV. COMM. CENTER ATTD.	1	8	5	4	0	0	0	1	18
SUPVR. PLANT OPERATOR	0	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	9
TYPIST CLERK I	258	148	53	43	20	4	0	13	281
WORKERS' COMP. CL. REP.	9	6	4	0	0	0	1	3	14
ZOO ATTENDANT II	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ZOO SUPERVISOR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	2694	3456	920	748	304	61	93	124	5706
PERCENT	47.21	60.57	16.12	13.11	5.33	1.07	1.63	2.17	100.0

TOTAL MINORITY (NUMBER) 2126
 TOTAL MINORITY (PERCENT) 37.26%

ATTACHMENT B - 1985 RECRUITMENT/CITY EMPLOYEES

EXAM NAME	MINORITY		FEMALE	
	#	%	#	%
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	0	0.00%	1	50.00%
CLAIMS COLLECTOR	17	56.67%	23	76.67%
DISPATCHER III	3	37.50%	7	87.50%
ELECTRICAN SUPV.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	43	70.49%	5	8.20%
FIRE INVEST. II	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
LANDFILL EQUIP. OPERATOR	1	100.00%	0	0.00%
MACHINIST HELPER	9	31.03%	0	0.00%
MECH. MAINT. SUPERVISOR	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
MOTOR SWEEPER OPERATOR	9	64.29%	0	0.00%
OFFICE SUPERVISOR	8	27.59%	28	96.55%
PARKS SUPERVISOR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PLANNING TECH	13	39.39%	24	72.73%
POLICE SERGEANT	62	33.70%	7	3.80%
PROPERTY ASSISTANT	7	41.18%	11	64.71%
RECREATION SUPERVISOR I	10	27.03%	19	51.35%
SR. LANDFILL EQUIP. OPER.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SR. PARKING LOT ATTD.	12	63.16%	8	42.11%
ST. CONSTR. EQUIP. OPER.	5	55.56%	0	0.00%
ST. CONSTR. LABORER	18	62.07%	0	0.00%
ST. MAINT. GEN. SUPVR.	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SUPERVISING POLICE CLERK	0	0.00%	6	100.00%
SUPVR. PLANT OPERATOR	4	44.44%	0	0.00%
ZOO ATTENDANT II	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ZOO SUPERVISOR	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	221	41.23%	139	25.93%

ATTACHMENT C - 1985 RECRUITMENT/OPEN POSITIONS

EXAM NAME	MINORITY		FEMALE	
	#	%	#	%
ACCOUNT CLERK I	246	40.53%	517	85.17%
ACCOUNT CLERK II	154	40.00%	326	84.68%
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	2	22.22%	4	44.44%
ADMIN. ASST. I	91	31.82%	56	19.58%
ADMIN. ASST. II	32	19.28%	77	46.39%
ART MUSEUM REGISTRAR	6	8.96%	50	74.63%
ARTS PROGRAM COORD.	7	23.33%	16	53.33%
ASSIST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	3	42.86%	1	14.29%
ASSIST. LANDSCAPE ARCH.	11	17.46%	17	26.98%
ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (MECH)	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	3	42.86%	1	14.29%
BUILD. INSP. I (ELECT)	10	21.74%	0	0.00%
BUILD. INSP. I (PLUMB)	7	14.00%	1	2.00%
BUILDING INSP. II (MISC)	4	22.22%	3	16.67%
CARPENTER	22	14.47%	0	0.00%
CASHIER	93	41.15%	76	33.63%
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	38	31.93%	30	25.21%
DISPATCHER I	174	35.37%	374	76.02%
DRAFTING TECHNICIAN	19	48.72%	10	25.64%
EQUIP. BODY MECHANIC	11	31.43%	0	0.00%
EQUIP. MECHANIC I	20	35.09%	1	1.75%
GREENSKEEPER	31	53.45%	5	8.62%
JUNIOR ENGINEER (CIVIL)	12	24.00%	5	10.00%
JUNIOR ENGINEER (ELECT)	11	57.89%	1	5.26%
JUNIOR PLANNER	26	22.03%	52	44.07%
LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MARINA & BOATING FAC. ATTD.	7	14.89%	2	4.26%
MEDIA PROD. SPEC.	11	21.57%	14	27.45%
MINORITY SERVICES LIBRARIAN	1	50.00%	2	100.00%
PARKING ENF. OFFICER	137	45.21%	158	52.15%
PLUMBER	12	26.67%	0	0.00%
POLICE CADET/OFFICER	398	46.50%	241	28.15%
POLICE CLERK I	120	55.81%	179	83.26%
POLICE OFFICER (LATERAL)	14	22.58%	6	9.68%
PROGRAMMER ANALYST I	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
PROGRAMMER I	17	35.42%	11	22.92%
PROGRAMMER II	3	23.08%	0	0.00%
REAL PROPERTY AGENT II	8	16.67%	7	14.58%
STENOGRAPHER CLERK I	10	22.73%	44	100.00%
SUPV. COMM. CENTER ATTD.	9	50.00%	1	5.56%
TYPIST CLERK I	120	42.70%	258	91.81%
WORKERS' COMP. CL. REP.	5	35.71%	9	64.29%
TOTAL	1905	36.85%	2555	49.42%

ATTACHMENT D - INDIVIDUALS COMPETING IN EXAMINATIONS

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASIAN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
CLAIMS COLLECTOR	23	13	10	4	3	0	0	0	30
DISPATCHER III	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ELECTRICAN SUPV.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	4	6	10	8	0	0	1	3	28
FIRE INVEST. II	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
LANDFILL EQUIP. OPERATOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
MACHINIST HELPER	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
MECH. MAINT. SUPERVISOR	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
MOTOR SWEEPER OPERATOR	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	9
OFFICE SUPERVISOR	22	19	3	1	0	0	0	0	23
PARKS SUPERVISOR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PLANNING TECH	22	16	6	3	2	0	0	0	27
POLICE SERGEANT	7	108	21	21	11	2	4	0	167
PROPERTY ASSISTANT	9	7	1	4	0	0	1	0	13
RECREATION SUPERVISOR I	19	25	6	4	0	0	0	0	35
SR. LANDFILL EQUIP. OPER.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
SR. PARKING LOT ATTD.	6	5	2	8	1	0	0	0	16
CONSTR. EQUIP. OPER.	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
CONSTR. LABORER	0	8	2	4	0	1	0	1	16
MAINT. GEN. SUPVR.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
SUPERVISING POLICE CLERK	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
SUPVR. PLANT OPERATOR	0	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	9
ZOO ATTENDANT II	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ZOO SUPERVISOR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ACCOUNT CLERK I	31	18	5	4	4	0	1	1	33
ACCOUNT CLERK II	49	36	6	4	4	2	1	1	54
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	3	5	0	1	0	0	1	0	7
ADMIN. ASST. I	29	45	6	3	2	0	0	1	57
ADMIN. ASST. II	22	34	5	2	2	0	0	1	44
ART MUSEUM REGISTRAR	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
ARTS PROGRAM COORD.	3	5	1	0	1	0	0	2	9
ASSIST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
ASSIST. LANDSCAPE ARCH.	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	1	10
ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (MECH)	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
ASST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
BUILD. INSP. I (ELECT)	0	11	2	0	1	0	0	1	15
BUILD. INSP. I (PLUMB)	0	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	14
BUILDING INSP. II (MISC)	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
CARPENTER	0	19	1	2	0	0	0	0	22
CASHIER	110	85	17	20	7	0	5	0	134
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	2	21	0	8	0	1	0	0	30
DISPATCHER I	105	77	22	21	1	3	2	1	127

ATTACHMENT D - INDIVIDUALS COMPETING IN EXAMINATIONS

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASIAN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
DRAFTING TECHNICIAN	4	6	2	4	2	0	0	0	14
EQUIP. BODY MECHANIC	0	21	6	2	0	0	0	2	31
EQUIP. MECHANIC I	9	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
GREENSKEEPER	2	13	4	4	2	1	0	1	25
JUNIOR ENGINEER (CIVIL)	2	25	2	2	3	0	0	0	32
JUNIOR ENGINEER (ELECT)	1	6	0	0	5	0	0	0	11
JUNIOR PLANNER	22	33	2	5	1	0	0	0	41
LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MARINA & BOATING FAC. ATTD.	0	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	12
MEDIA PROD. SPEC.	6	14	1	0	1	2	0	0	18
MINORITY SERVICES LIBRARIAN	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
PARKING ENF. OFFICER	5	22	3	7	2	0	0	1	35
PLUMBER	0	18	3	4	0	1	1	0	27
POLICE CADET/OFFICER	129	301	76	94	36	5	9	0	521
POLICE CLERK I	32	17	13	4	7	0	0	0	41
POLICE OFFICER (LATERAL)	4	37	2	9	1	0	0	2	51
PROGRAMMER ANALYST I	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
PROGRAMMER I	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
PROGRAMMER II	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
REAL PROPERTY AGENT II	2	13	2	2	0	0	0	0	17
STENOGRAPHER CLERK I	12	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	12
SUPV. COMM. CENTER ATTD.	1	8	5	4	0	0	0	1	18
TYPIST CLERK I	156	85	28	29	12	2	0	8	164
WORKERS' COMP. CL. REP.	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
TOTAL	872	1308	283	304	118	22	28	33	2096
PERCENT	41.60	62.40	13.50	14.50	5.63	1.05	1.34	1.57	100.0
TOTAL MINORITY (NUMBER)	755								
TOTAL MINORITY (PERCENT)	36.02								

ATTACHMENT E - INDIVIDUALS ON 1985 ELIGIBLE LISTS

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASIAN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
ACCOUNT CLERK I	24	13	3	4	3	0	1	1	25
ACCOUNT CLERK II	40	31	3	4	3	2	1	1	45
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
ACCOUNTANT-AUDITOR III	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
ADMIN. ASST. I	18	27	2	0	0	0	0	0	29
ADMIN. ASST. II	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
ART MUSEUM REGISTRAR	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
ARTS PROGRAM COORD.	3	4	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
ASSIST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
ASSIST. LANDSCAPE ARCH.	2	7	0	0	2	0	0	1	10
ASSOCIATE ENGINEER (MECH)	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
ASST. ENGINEER (ELECT)	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
BUILD. INSP. I (ELECT)	2	11	2	0	1	0	0	1	15
BUILD. INSP. I (PLUMB)	0	11	0	1	0	1	0	1	14
BUILDING INSP. II (MISC)	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
CARPENTER	0	18	1	2	0	0	0	0	21
CASHIER	83	69	11	11	6	0	5	0	102
CLAIMS COLLECTOR	11	7	1	3	2	0	0	0	13
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICER	2	21	0	8	0	1	0	0	30
DISPATCHER I	59	55	7	9	0	2	2	0	75
DISPATCHER III	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
DRAFTING TECHNICIAN	4	6	2	4	2	0	0	0	14
ELECTRICIAN SUPV.	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
EQUIP. BODY MECHANIC	0	12	0	1	2	0	0	1	16
EQUIP. MECHANIC I	0	11	0	3	1	0	0	1	16
EQUIPMENT OPERATOR I	4	6	10	8	0	0	1	3	28
FIRE INVEST. II	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
GREENSKEEPER	2	11	2	4	2	0	0	1	20
JUNIOR ENGINEER (CIVIL)	1	23	2	2	3	0	0	0	30
JUNIOR ENGINEER (ELECT)	1	6	0	0	5	0	0	0	11
JUNIOR PLANNER	17	22	2	4	1	0	0	0	29
LANDFILL EQUIP. OPERATOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
LIBRARY ASSISTANT I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
LIBRARY ASSISTANT II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
MACHINIST HELPER	0	14	1	0	0	0	0	0	15
MARINA & BOATING FAC. ATTD.	0	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	10
MECH. MAINT. SUPERVISOR	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
MEDIA PROD. SPEC.	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
MINORITY SERVICES LIBRARIAN	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2
MOTOR SWEEPER OPERATOR	0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	9
OFFICE SUPERVISOR	12	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	13
PARKING ENF. OFFICER	18	22	3	7	2	0	0	0	34
PARKS SUPERVISOR	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
PLANNING TECH	14	11	1	2	2	0	0	0	16
PLUMBER	0	18	2	4	0	1	0	0	25
POLICE CADET/OFFICER	45	157	19	40	14	2	7	0	239
POLICE CLERK I	21	14	7	0	5	0	0	0	26

ATTACHMENT E - INDIVIDUALS ON 1985 ELIGIBLE LISTS

EXAM NAME	F/M	WHITE	BLACK	HISP	ASIAN	A/IND	FIL	DNI	TOTAL
POLICE OFFICER (LATERAL)	4	37	2	9	1	0	0	2	51
POLICE SERGEANT	4	62	7	12	5	2	2	0	90
PROGRAMMER ANALYST I	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
PROGRAMMER I	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
PROGRAMMER II	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
PROPERTY ASSISTANT	8	6	1	4	0	0	1	0	12
REAL PROPERTY AGENT II	1	10	2	2	0	0	0	0	14
RECREATION SUPERVISOR I	15	19	4	2	0	0	0	2	27
SR. LANDFILL EQUIP. OPER.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SR. PARKING LOT ATTD.	6	5	2	8	1	0	0	0	16
ST. CONSTR. EQUIP. OPER.	0	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	7
ST. CONSTR. LABORER	0	8	2	4	0	1	0	1	16
ST. MAINT. GEN. SUPVR.	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
STENOGRAPHER CLERK I	8	5	0	1	1	0	0	1	8
SUPERVISING POLICE CLERK	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
SUPV. COMM. CENTER ATTD.	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	12
SUPVR. PLANT OPERATOR	0	5	1	0	2	1	0	0	9
TYPIST CLERK I	38	30	1	7	2	0	0	0	40
WORKERS' COMP. CL. REP.	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	3
ZOO ATTENDANT II	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
ZOO SUPERVISOR	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	499	911	112	182	71	13	22	19	1330
PERCENT	37.52	68.50	8.42	13.68	5.34	0.98	1.65	1.43	100.0
TOTAL MINORITY (NUMBER)	400								
TOTAL MINORITY (PERCENT)	30.08%								

ATTACHMENT F - 1985 CERTIFICATIONS

SUPERVISORY

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	26	61.90%	7	16.67%	33	78.57%
BLACK	2	4.76%	2	4.76%	4	9.52%
HISPANIC	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	1	2.38%
ASIAN	3	7.14%	0	0.00%	3	7.14%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	2.38%	0	0.00%	1	2.38%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	33	78.57%	9	21.43%	42	100.00%
MINORITIES	7	16.67%	2	4.76%	9	21.43%
FEMALES	9	21.43%				

POLICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	76	63.33%	17	14.17%	93	77.50%
BLACK	3	2.50%	0	0.00%	3	2.50%
HISPANIC	11	9.17%	2	1.67%	13	10.83%
ASIAN	3	2.50%	1	0.83%	4	3.33%
AMERICAN INDIAN	4	3.33%	0	0.00%	4	3.33%
FILIPINO	1	0.83%	0	0.00%	1	0.83%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	2	1.67%	0	0.00%	2	1.67%
TOTAL	100	83.33%	20	16.67%	120	100.00%
MINORITIES	22	18.33%	3	2.50%	25	20.83%
FEMALES	20	16.67%				

FIRE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	31	58.49%	9	16.98%	40	75.47%
BLACK	6	11.32%	0	0.00%	6	11.32%
HISPANIC	3	5.66%	1	1.89%	4	7.55%
ASIAN	3	5.66%	0	0.00%	3	5.66%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	43	81.13%	10	18.87%	53	100.00%

ATTACHMENT F - 1985 CERTIFICATIONS

MINORITIES	12	22.64%	1	1.89%	13	24.53%
FEMALES	10	18.87%				

PROFESSIONALS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	95	45.45%	73	34.93%	168	80.38%
BLACK	7	3.35%	8	3.83%	15	7.18%
HISPANIC	3	1.44%	5	2.39%	8	3.83%
ASIAN	9	4.31%	7	3.35%	16	7.66%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	2	0.96%	2	0.96%
TOTAL	114	54.55%	95	45.45%	209	100.00%
MINORITIES	19	9.09%	20	9.57%	39	18.66%
FEMALES	95	45.45%				

SKILLED CRAFTS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	37	80.43%	0	0.00%	37	80.43%
BLACK	2	4.35%	0	0.00%	2	4.35%
HISPANIC	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASIAN	4	8.70%	0	0.00%	4	8.70%
AMERICAN INDIAN	2	4.35%	0	0.00%	2	4.35%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	1	2.17%	0	0.00%	1	2.17%
TOTAL	46	100.00%	0	0.00%	46	100.00%
MINORITIES	8	17.39%	0	0.00%	8	17.39%
FEMALES	0	0.00%				

SERVICE MAINTENANCE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	93	40.43%	25	10.87%	118	51.30%
BLACK	44	19.13%	3	1.30%	47	20.43%
HISPANIC	43	18.70%	3	1.30%	46	20.00%
ASIAN	6	2.61%	2	0.87%	8	3.48%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	2	0.87%	0	0.00%	2	0.87%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	7	3.04%	2	0.87%	9	3.91%

ATTACHMENT F - 1985 CERTIFICATIONS

TOTAL	195	84.78%	35	15.22%	230	100.00%
MINORITIES	95	41.30%	8	3.48%	103	44.78%
FEMALES	35	15.22%				

TECHNICIANS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	49	44.55%	23	20.91%	72	65.45%
BLACK	9	8.18%	1	0.91%	10	9.09%
HISPANIC	13	11.82%	7	6.36%	20	18.18%
ASIAN	0	0.00%	6	5.45%	6	5.45%
AMERICAN INDIAN	1	0.91%	0	0.00%	1	0.91%
FILIPINO	1	0.91%	0	0.00%	1	0.91%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	73	66.36%	37	33.64%	110	100.00%
MINORITIES	24	21.82%	14	12.73%	38	34.55%
FEMALES	37	33.64%				

CLERICAL

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	61	13.80%	252	57.01%	313	70.81%
BLACK	2	0.45%	25	5.66%	27	6.11%
HISPANIC	4	0.90%	48	10.86%	52	11.76%
ASIAN	4	0.90%	26	5.88%	30	6.79%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	3	0.68%	3	0.68%
FILIPINO	3	0.68%	3	0.68%	6	1.36%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	11	2.49%	11	2.49%
TOTAL	74	16.74%	368	83.26%	442	100.00%
MINORITIES	13	2.94%	105	23.76%	118	26.70%
FEMALES	368	83.26%				

ATTACHMENT G - 1985 APPOINTMENTS FROM CERTIFICATIONS

SUPERVISORY

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	12	60.00%	4	20.00%	16	80.00%
BLACK	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HISPANIC	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ASIAN	1	5.00%	1	5.00%	2	10.00%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	5.00%	1	5.00%	2	10.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	14	70.00%	6	30.00%	20	100.00%
MINORITIES	2	10.00%	2	10.00%	4	20.00%
FEMALES	6	30.00%				

POLICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	45	66.18%	14	20.59%	59	86.76%
BLACK	1	1.47%	0	0.00%	1	1.47%
HISPANIC	3	4.41%	1	1.47%	4	5.88%
ASIAN	3	4.41%	0	0.00%	3	4.41%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	1	1.47%	0	0.00%	1	1.47%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	53	77.94%	15	22.06%	68	100.00%
MINORITIES	8	11.76%	1	1.47%	9	13.24%
FEMALES	15	22.06%				

FIRE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	14	56.00%	5	20.00%	19	76.00%
BLACK	2	8.00%	0	0.00%	2	8.00%
HISPANIC	2	8.00%	0	0.00%	2	8.00%
ASIAN	2	8.00%	0	0.00%	2	8.00%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	20	80.00%	5	20.00%	25	100.00%
MINORITIES	6	24.00%	0	0.00%	6	24.00%
FEMALES	5	20.00%				

ATTACHMENT G - 1985 APPOINTMENTS FROM CERTIFICATIONS

PROFESSIONALS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	15	37.50%	17	42.50%	32	80.00%
BLACK	0	0.00%	3	7.50%	3	7.50%
HISPANIC	0	0.00%	3	7.50%	3	7.50%
ASIAN	1	2.50%	1	2.50%	2	5.00%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	16	40.00%	24	60.00%	40	100.00%
MINORITIES	1	2.50%	7	17.50%	8	20.00%
FEMALES	24	60.00%				

SKILLED CRAFTS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	12	85.71%	0	0.00%	12	85.71%
BLACK	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
HISPANIC	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
ASIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
AMERICAN INDIAN	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	1	7.14%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	14	100.00%	0	0.00%	14	100.00%
MINORITIES	2	14.29%	0	0.00%	2	14.29%
FEMALES	0	0.00%				

SERVICE MAINTENANCE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	37	38.95%	11	11.58%	48	50.53%
BLACK	18	18.95%	1	1.05%	19	20.00%
HISPANIC	16	16.84%	3	3.16%	19	20.00%
ASIAN	3	3.16%	1	1.05%	4	4.21%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
FILIPINO	2	2.11%	0	0.00%	2	2.11%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	3	3.16%	0	0.00%	3	3.16%
TOTAL	79	83.16%	16	16.84%	95	100.00%

ATTACHMENT G - 1985 APPOINTMENTS FROM CERTIFICATIONS

MINORITIES	39	41.05%	5	5.26%	44	46.32%
FEMALES	16	16.84%				

TECHNICIANS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	11	39.29%	6	21.43%	17	60.71%
BLACK	1	3.57%	1	3.57%	2	7.14%
HISPANIC	5	17.86%	1	3.57%	6	21.43%
ASIAN	0	0.00%	2	7.14%	2	7.14%
AMERICAN INDIAN	1	3.57%	0	0.00%	1	3.57%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL	18	64.29%	10	35.71%	28	100.00%
MINORITIES	7	25.00%	4	14.29%	11	39.29%
FEMALES	10	35.71%				

CLERICAL

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
WHITE	13	13.54%	56	58.33%	69	71.88%
BLACK	1	1.04%	8	8.33%	9	9.38%
HISPANIC	2	2.08%	10	10.42%	12	12.50%
ASIAN	0	0.00%	1	1.04%	1	1.04%
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	0.00%	3	3.13%	3	3.13%
FILIPINO	0	0.00%	1	1.04%	1	1.04%
OTHER/UNKNOWN	0	0.00%	1	1.04%	1	1.04%
TOTAL	16	16.67%	80	83.33%	96	100.00%
MINORITIES	3	3.13%	23	23.96%	26	27.08%
FEMALES	80	83.33%				

ATTACHMENT H - SYNOPSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1985

1. Investigating Agency: Internal

Open: April - 85 Closed: May - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of race and sex. The complainant, a Black female, was interviewed but not selected for a promotional position in her division. The individual who was appointed, a White male, had not been previously employed in the complainant's department. The case was closed prior to an investigation being conducted, because the processing of the complaint could have caused a conflict of interest for the investigator. The complainant was advised to contact the Department of Fair Employment and Housing if she were interested in pursuing an investigation of her allegations.

2. Investigating Agency: Internal

Open: April - 85 Closed: May - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of race and sex. The complainant, a Black female, was interviewed but not selected for a promotional position in her division (the position was the same as in the above case). The individual who was appointed, a White male, had not been previously employed in the complainant's department. The case was closed prior to an investigation being conducted, because the processing of the complaint could have caused a conflict of interest for the investigator. The complainant was advised to contact the Department of Fair Employment and Housing if she were interested in pursuing an investigation of her allegations.

3. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing

Open: April - 85 Closed: Sept - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of age. The Complainant, an individual over age 40, was terminated from employment as a probationary firefighter. The complainant felt that he had been terminated because of his age. (Previously, the complainant filed an internal discrimination complaint which was investigated by the Affirmative Action Officer with a finding of insufficient evidence to prove discrimination) The case was closed by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing after the complainant indicated that he would pursue the case in the court system. At the time this report was written, no court case had been filed.

Investigating Agency: Internal

Open: May - 85 Closed: Oct. - 85

ATTACHMENT H - SYNOPSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1985

The complainant alleged that he was subjected to harassment and discrimination as a result of his ethnicity and sexual orientation. The complainant, a homosexual Asian male, was denied a promotion to a limited term position. The complainant alleged that the denial occurred because his department managers were aware of his sexual orientation. He also stated that the fact that he was Asian was partly responsible for his not being promoted. The case was closed on the basis that there was insufficient evidence to prove discrimination.

5. Investigating Agency: Internal

Open: May - 85 Closed: Oct. - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of physical handicap. The complainant, an injured career City employee, was not allowed to be reasonably accommodated into a lighter non-career position. Based on the information obtained in the investigation, it was decided that the complainant should have been reasonably accommodated into the non-career position. The case was closed after the complainant was awarded a "make-whole" remedy of back pay.

Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: July - 85 Closed: Nov. - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of physical handicap. The complainant, a quadriplegic male, had applied for a state-funded training position to receive clerical training. After testing the individual, it was decided that the complainant could not perform the job functions and there were no reasonable accommodations available. The case was closed by DFEH because of "no basis to proceed."

7. Investigating Agency: Internal Investigation

Open: July - 85 Closed: Oct. - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of race and physical handicap. The complainant, a black female with a suspected heart problem, had resigned her clerical position with the city after complaining of harassment. The complainant alleged that her immediate supervisor had harassed her on the job and had also tried to fire her. The case was closed after a determination that there was insufficient evidence to support the allegation of discrimination. In addition, a settlement offer was made and rejected by the complainant.

ATTACHMENT H - SYNOPSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1985

8. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Aug. - 85 Closed: *****

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of ancestry. The complainant, a Hispanic male, was terminated from employment in a service maintenance position. The case is still under investigation.

9. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Aug. - 85 Closed: *****

Complainant alleged discrimination in employment on the basis of race. The complainant, a Black male, was terminated from employment while on probation. The Complainant alleged that other probationary employees had made the same mistakes yet were not terminated. The case was transferred to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for technical reasons. A decision is pending.

10. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Aug. - 85 Closed: *****

Complainant alleged discrimination in employment on the basis of physical handicap. The complainant, a paraplegic female, was terminated from her probationary clerical position. The case is under investigation.

11. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Sept. - 85 Closed: Jan. - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of sex. The complainant, a male, had previously resigned from his clerical position with the City. After requesting to be reinstated to his former position, the complainant was told that the department was not interested in re-employing him. The complainant alleged that female employees were allowed to rescind their resignations yet he wasn't. The case was closed by the Department of Fair Employment and Housing on the basis of insufficient evidence.

12. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Oct. - 85 Closed: *****

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of national origin. The complainant, a Hispanic female, was not selected for career employment with the City. The complainant had been employed in a limited-term clerical position but was not appointed to a career position when

ATTACHMENT H - SYNOPSIS OF DISCRIMINATION COMPLAINTS FILED IN 1985

certified. As a result, the complainant was released from City employment. The case is under investigation.

13. Investigating Agency: Internal Investigation

Open: Nov. - 85 Closed: Feb. - 86

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of national origin and physical handicap. The complainant, a Filipino female without any known disabling conditions, was not appointed to a career clerical position in a department where she was employed on a permanent part-time basis. The rationale given by the department for the non-selection was the fact that another individual was more qualified and the complainant had physical problems. On the basis of the information obtained during the investigation, the complainant was awarded a make whole remedy of back pay. In addition, the complainant was offered an unconditional offer of employment. As a result of the complainant's acceptance of the job offer, the case was closed on the basis of full remedy.

14. Investigating Agency: Internal Investigation

Open: Dec. - 85 Closed: Jan. - 85

Complainant alleged discrimination in employment on the basis of national origin. The complainant, a Filipino male, alleged that he had been passed over for promotion and had his hours cut. The case was closed on the basis of insufficient evidence.

15. Investigating Agency: Department of Fair Employment and Housing.

Open: Dec. - 85 Closed: Pending

Complainant alleged discrimination on the basis of national origin. The complainant, a Filipino female, was not appointed to a career clerical position in a department where she was employed on a permanent part-time basis (same complainant and situation as described above). The rationale given by the department for the non-selection was the fact that another individual was more qualified and the complainant had physical problems. Because the complainant was awarded a make whole offer as a result of the internal investigation, a settlement agreement with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing is pending.

ATTACHMENT I - 1985 EMPLOYMENT/OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

SUPERVISORY

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	81	56.64%	21	14.69%	102	71.33%
Black	15	10.49%	2	1.40%	17	11.89%
Hispanic	10	6.99%	2	1.40%	12	8.39%
Asian	9	6.29%	2	1.40%	11	7.69%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	1	0.70%	0	0.00%	1	0.70%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	116	81.12%	27	18.88%	143	100.00%
Minorities	35	24.48%	6	4.20%	41	28.67%

POLICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	363	70.35%	25	4.84%	388	75.19%
Black	27	5.23%	4	0.78%	31	6.01%
Hispanic	53	10.27%	3	0.58%	56	10.85%
Asian	27	5.23%	0	0.00%	27	5.23%
American Indian	7	1.36%	0	0.00%	7	1.36%
Filipino	6	1.16%	1	0.19%	7	1.36%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	483	93.60%	33	6.40%	516	100.00%
Minorities	120	23.26%	8	1.55%	128	24.81%

FIRE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	300	75.95%	12	3.04%	312	78.99%
Black	20	5.06%	0	0.00%	20	5.06%
Hispanic	48	12.15%	0	0.00%	48	12.15%
Asian	6	1.52%	0	0.00%	6	1.52%
American Indian	9	2.28%	0	0.00%	9	2.28%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	383	96.96%	12	3.04%	395	100.00%
Minorities	83	21.01%	0	0.00%	83	21.01%

ATTACHMENT I - 1985 EMPLOYMENT/OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

SUPERVISORY

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	81	56.64%	21	14.69%	102	71.33%
Black	15	10.49%	2	1.40%	17	11.89%
Hispanic	10	6.99%	2	1.40%	12	8.39%
Asian	9	6.29%	2	1.40%	11	7.69%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	1	0.70%	0	0.00%	1	0.70%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	116	81.12%	27	18.88%	143	100.00%
Minorities	35	24.48%	6	4.20%	41	28.67%

POLICE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	363	70.35%	25	4.84%	388	75.19%
Black	27	5.23%	4	0.78%	31	6.01%
Hispanic	53	10.27%	3	0.58%	56	10.85%
Asian	27	5.23%	0	0.00%	27	5.23%
American Indian	7	1.36%	0	0.00%	7	1.36%
Filipino	6	1.16%	1	0.19%	7	1.36%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	483	93.60%	33	6.40%	516	100.00%
Minorities	120	23.26%	8	1.55%	128	24.81%

FIRE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	300	75.95%	12	3.04%	312	78.99%
Black	20	5.06%	0	0.00%	20	5.06%
Hispanic	48	12.15%	0	0.00%	48	12.15%
Asian	6	1.52%	0	0.00%	6	1.52%
American Indian	9	2.28%	0	0.00%	9	2.28%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	383	96.96%	12	3.04%	395	100.00%
Minorities	83	21.01%	0	0.00%	83	21.01%

ATTACHMENT I - 1985 EMPLOYMENT/OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

PROFESSIONAL

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	65	45.45%	55	38.46%	120	83.92%
Black	0	0.00%	2	1.40%	2	1.40%
Hispanic	4	2.80%	3	2.10%	7	4.90%
Asian	8	5.59%	6	4.20%	14	9.79%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	77	53.85%	66	46.15%	143	100.00%
Minorities	12	8.39%	11	7.69%	23	16.08%

SKILLED CRAFTS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	77	76.24%	0	0.00%	77	76.24%
Black	6	5.94%	1	0.99%	7	6.93%
Hispanic	6	5.94%	0	0.00%	6	5.94%
Asian	8	7.92%	0	0.00%	8	7.92%
American Indian	3	2.97%	0	0.00%	3	2.97%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	100	99.01%	1	0.99%	101	100.00%
Minorities	23	22.77%	1	0.99%	24	23.76%

SERVICE MAINTENANCE

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	303	42.26%	30	4.18%	333	46.44%
Black	162	22.59%	4	0.56%	166	23.15%
Hispanic	171	23.85%	15	2.09%	186	25.94%
Asian	21	2.93%	1	0.14%	22	3.07%
American Indian	4	0.56%	0	0.00%	4	0.56%
Filipino	6	0.84%	0	0.00%	6	0.84%
Other	1	0.14%	0	0.00%	1	0.14%
Total	667	93.03%	50	6.97%	717	100.00%

ATTACHMENT I 1985 EMPLOYMENT/OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES

Minorities 364 50.77% 20 2.79% 384 53.56%

TECHNICIANS

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	106	57.30%	32	17.30%	138	74.59%
Black	5	2.70%	5	2.70%	10	5.41%
Hispanic	20	10.81%	3	1.62%	23	12.43%
Asian	6	3.24%	3	1.62%	9	4.86%
American Indian	3	1.62%	0	0.00%	3	1.62%
Filipino	1	0.54%	1	0.54%	2	1.08%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	141	76.22%	44	23.78%	185	100.00%
Minorities	35	18.92%	12	6.49%	47	25.41%

CLERICAL

	MALE		FEMALE		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	36	9.45%	209	54.86%	245	64.30%
Black	3	0.79%	48	12.60%	51	13.39%
Hispanic	8	2.10%	46	12.07%	54	14.17%
Asian	1	0.26%	21	5.51%	22	5.77%
American Indian	0	0.00%	2	0.52%	2	0.52%
Filipino	1	0.26%	6	1.57%	7	1.84%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	49	12.86%	332	87.14%	381	100.00%
Minorities	13	3.41%	123	32.28%	136	35.70%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

CITY ATTORNEY

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	5	45.45%	3	27.27%	8	72.73%
Black	1	9.09%	1	9.09%	2	18.18%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	1	9.09%	1	9.09%
Asian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	6	54.55%	5	45.45%	11	100.00%
Minorities	1	9.09%	2	18.18%	3	27.27%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	2	18.18%	1	11.11%	1	11.11%
Females	4	36.36%	3	33.33%	4	44.44%
Department Total	11	100.00%	9	100.00%	9	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	10.00%	1	10.00%
Females	4	40.00%	5	50.00%
Department Total	10	100.00%	10	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

CITY CLERK

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	1	12.50%	4	50.00%	5	62.50%
Black	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%
American Indian	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%
Filipino	0	0.00%	1	12.50%	1	12.50%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	1	12.50%	7	87.50%	8	100.00%
Minorities	0	0.00%	3	37.50%	3	37.50%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	3	42.86%	2	40.00%	2	50.00%
Females	6	85.71%	5	100.00%	4	100.00%
Department Total	7	100.00%	5	100.00%	4	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	2	40.00%	2	40.00%
Females	4	80.00%	4	80.00%
Department Total	5	100.00%	5	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

CITY MANAGER

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	2	33.33%	3	50.00%	5	83.33%
Black	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	3	50.00%	3	50.00%	6	100.00%
Minorities	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	1	16.67%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	16.67%	1	20.00%	1	12.50%
Females	3	50.00%	2	40.00%	3	37.50%
Department Total	6	100.00%	5	100.00%	8	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	12.50%	2	18.18%
Females	2	25.00%	2	18.18%
Department Total	8	100.00%	11	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

CITY TREASURER

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	3	33.33%	4	44.44%	7	77.78%
Black	0	0.00%	1	11.11%	1	11.11%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian	1	11.11%	0	0.00%	1	11.11%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	4	44.44%	5	55.56%	9	100.00%
Minorities	1	11.11%	1	11.11%	2	22.22%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	4	44.44%	3	37.50%	3	37.50%
Females	5	55.56%	4	50.00%	2	25.00%
Department Total	9	100.00%	8	100.00%	8	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	2	33.33%	1	20.00%
Females	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Department Total	6	100.00%	5	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

COMMUNITY CENTER

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	17	42.50%	8	20.00%	25	62.50%
Black	4	10.00%	1	2.50%	5	12.50%
Hispanic	7	17.50%	0	0.00%	7	17.50%
Asian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian	1	2.50%	0	0.00%	1	2.50%
Filipino	2	5.00%	0	0.00%	2	5.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	31	77.50%	9	22.50%	40	100.00%
Minorities	14	35.00%	1	2.50%	15	37.50%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	14	37.84%	14	37.84%	14	38.89%
Females	9	24.32%	8	21.62%	8	22.22%
Department Total	37	100.00%	37	100.00%	36	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	15	44.12%	11	34.38%
Females	7	20.59%	7	21.88%
Department Total	34	100.00%	32	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

DATA PROCESSING

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	14	51.85%	4	14.81%	18	66.67%
Black	1	3.70%	1	3.70%	2	7.41%
Hispanic	5	18.52%	0	0.00%	5	18.52%
Asian	2	7.41%	0	0.00%	2	7.41%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	22	81.48%	5	18.52%	27	100.00%
Minorities	8	29.63%	1	3.70%	9	33.33%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	8	28.57%	6	22.22%	6	22.22%
Females	7	25.00%	8	29.63%	10	37.04%
Department Total	28	100.00%	27	100.00%	27	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	7	23.33%	7	22.58%
Females	10	33.33%	12	38.71%
Department Total	30	100.00%	31	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

EMPLOYEE RELATIONS

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	3	75.00%
Black	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%
Asian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	2	50.00%	2	50.00%	4	100.00%
Minorities	0	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	25.00%	1	33.33%	1	25.00%
Females	2	50.00%	2	66.67%	2	50.00%
Department Total	4	100.00%	3	100.00%	4	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	25.00%	1	25.00%
Females	2	50.00%	2	50.00%
Department Total	4	100.00%	4	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	16	23.88%	29	43.28%	45	67.16%
Black	1	1.49%	8	11.94%	9	13.43%
Hispanic	2	2.99%	5	7.46%	7	10.45%
Asian	1	1.49%	3	4.48%	4	5.97%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	1	1.49%	1	1.49%	2	2.99%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	21	31.34%	46	68.66%	67	100.00%
Minorities	5	7.46%	17	25.37%	22	32.84%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	22	35.48%	23	39.66%	25	42.37%
Females	45	72.58%	42	72.41%	42	71.19%
Department Total	62	100.00%	58	100.00%	59	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	24	38.10%	30	36.14%
Females	40	63.49%	51	61.45%
Department Total	63	100.00%	83	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

FIRE DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	321	75.00%	17	3.97%	338	78.97%
Black	21	4.91%	1	0.23%	22	5.14%
Hispanic	49	11.45%	2	0.47%	51	11.92%
Asian	6	1.40%	0	0.00%	6	1.40%
American Indian	10	2.34%	0	0.00%	10	2.34%
Filipino	0	0.00%	1	0.23%	1	0.23%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	407	95.09%	21	4.91%	428	100.00%
Minorities	86	20.09%	4	0.93%	90	21.03%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	85	19.91%	82	19.20%	78	17.77%
Females	15	3.51%	17	3.98%	11	2.51%
Department Total	427	100.00%	427	100.00%	439	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	90	18.99%	85	18.44%
Females	19	4.01%	10	2.17%
Department Total	474	100.00%	461	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

GENERAL SERVICES

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	94	65.73%	9	6.29%	103	72.03%
Black	6	4.20%	2	1.40%	8	5.59%
Hispanic	10	6.99%	4	2.80%	14	9.79%
Asian	15	10.49%	1	0.70%	16	11.19%
American Indian	2	1.40%	0	0.00%	2	1.40%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	127	88.81%	16	11.19%	143	100.00%
Minorities	33	23.08%	7	4.90%	40	27.97%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	37	29.37%	38	29.69%	36	27.91%
Females	13	10.32%	14	10.94%	14	10.85%
Department Total	126	100.00%	128	100.00%	129	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	46	31.72%	NA	NA
Females	19	13.10%	NA	NA
Department Total	145	100.00%	NA	NA

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

LIBRARY DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	12	13.48%	54	60.67%	66	74.16%
Black	1	1.12%	4	4.49%	5	5.62%
Hispanic	3	3.37%	9	10.11%	12	13.48%
Asian	0	0.00%	6	6.74%	6	6.74%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	16	17.98%	73	82.02%	89	100.00%
Minorities	4	4.49%	19	21.35%	23	25.84%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	22	24.18%	24	25.26%	25	26.04%
Females	74	81.32%	77	81.05%	79	82.29%
Department Total	91	100.00%	95	100.00%	96	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	21	22.34%	23	23.00%
Females	81	86.17%	84	84.00%
Department Total	94	100.00%	100	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

MAYOR/CITY COUNCIL

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Black	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Asian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	1	100.00%
Minorities	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	1	20.00%	1	33.33%	2	40.00%
Females	5	100.00%	2	66.67%	3	60.00%
Department Total	5	100.00%	3	100.00%	5	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	2	50.00%	2	40.00%
Females	2	50.00%	4	80.00%
Department Total	4	100.00%	5	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

PARKS AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	147	42.61%	43	12.46%	190	55.07%
Black	42	12.17%	9	2.61%	51	14.78%
Hispanic	81	23.48%	5	1.45%	86	24.93%
Asian	6	1.74%	6	1.74%	12	3.48%
American Indian	1	0.29%	1	0.29%	2	0.58%
Filipino	3	0.87%	1	0.29%	4	1.16%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	280	81.16%	65	18.84%	345	100.00%
Minorities	133	38.55%	22	6.38%	155	44.93%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	146	44.11%	154	45.29%	151	45.48%
Females	50	15.11%	50	14.71%	43	12.95%
Department Total	331	100.00%	340	100.00%	332	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	154	45.29%	156	45.48%
Females	36	10.59%	33	9.62%
Department Total	340	100.00%	343	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	8	21.62%	17	45.95%	25	67.57%
Black	2	5.41%	5	13.51%	7	18.92%
Hispanic	0	0.00%	4	10.81%	4	10.81%
Asian	0	0.00%	1	2.70%	1	2.70%
American Indian	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	10	27.03%	27	72.97%	37	100.00%
Minorities	2	5.41%	10	27.03%	12	32.43%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	11	32.35%	9	33.33%	11	39.29%
Females	24	70.59%	20	74.07%	21	75.00%
Department Total	34	100.00%	27	100.00%	28	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	12	42.86%	14	48.28%
Females	22	78.57%	211	727.59%
Department Total	28	100.00%	29	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	60	59.41%	24	23.76%	84	83.17%
Black	1	0.99%	3	2.97%	4	3.96%
Hispanic	3	2.97%	2	1.98%	5	4.95%
Asian	6	5.94%	0	0.00%	6	5.94%
American Indian	2	1.98%	0	0.00%	2	1.98%
Filipino	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	72	71.29%	29	28.71%	101	100.00%
Minorities	12	11.88%	5	4.95%	17	16.83%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	15	20.00%	14	17.95%	NA	NA
Females	21	28.00%	24	30.77%	NA	NA
Department Total	75	100.00%	78	100.00%	NA	NA

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	NA	NA	NA	NA
Females	NA	NA	NA	NA
Department Total	NA	NA	NA	NA

ATTACHMENT EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

POLICE DEPARTMENT

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	423	54.86%	136	17.64%	559	72.50%
Black	33	4.28%	27	3.50%	60	7.78%
Hispanic	63	8.17%	28	3.63%	91	11.80%
Asian	30	3.89%	13	1.69%	43	5.58%
American Indian	7	0.91%	1	0.13%	8	1.04%
Filipino	7	0.91%	3	0.39%	10	1.30%
Other	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	563	73.02%	208	26.98%	771	100.00%
Minorities	140	18.16%	72	9.34%	212	27.50%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	212	28.57%	191	27.21%	191	27.29%
Females	196	26.42%	165	23.50%	153	21.86%
Department Total	742	100.00%	702	100.00%	700	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	186	26.84%	182	26.57%
Females	143	20.63%	133	19.42%
Department Total	693	100.00%	685	100.00%

ATTACHMENT J - EMPLOYMENT BY DEPARTMENT

PUBLIC WORKS

	Male		Female		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
White	325	48.73%	50	7.50%	375	56.22%
Black	132	19.79%	6	0.90%	138	20.69%
Hispanic	105	15.74%	13	1.95%	118	17.69%
Asian	23	3.45%	4	0.60%	27	4.05%
American Indian	4	0.60%	0	0.00%	4	0.60%
Filipino	2	0.30%	2	0.30%	4	0.60%
Other	1	0.15%	0	0.00%	1	0.15%
Total	592	88.76%	75	11.24%	667	100.00%
Minorities	266	39.88%	25	3.75%	291	43.63%

	Dec-84		Dec-83		Dec-82	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Minorities	280	43.48%	300	44.78%	313	43.35%
Females	63	9.78%	55	8.21%	60	8.31%
Department Total	644	100.00%	670	100.00%	722	100.00%

	Dec-81		Dec-80	
	#	%	#	%
Minorities	309	42.86%	350	41.82%
Females	63	8.74%	59	7.05%
Department Total	721	100.00%	837	100.00%
