

UNMET GOALS:
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN EMPLOYMENT
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

September 1981

--A report of the Nevada Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights prepared for the information and consideration of the Commission. This report will be considered by the Commission, and the Commission will make public its reaction. In the meantime, the findings and recommendations of this report should not be attributed to the Commission but only to the Nevada Advisory Committee.

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights, created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, is an independent, bipartisan agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. By the terms of the act, as amended, the Commission is charged with the following duties pertaining to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the laws based on race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap, or national origin, or in the administration of justice: investigation of individual discriminatory denials of the right to vote; study of legal developments with respect to discrimination or denials of the equal protection of the law; appraisal of the laws and policies of the United States with respect to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; maintenance of a national clearinghouse for information respecting discrimination or denials of equal protection of the law; and investigation of patterns or practices of fraud or discrimination in the conduct of Federal elections. The Commission is also required to submit reports to the President and the Congress at such times as the Commission, the Congress, or the President shall deem desirable.

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

An Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights has been established in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 as amended. The Advisory Committees are made up of responsible persons who serve without compensation. Their functions under their mandate from the Commission are to: advise the Commission of all relevant information concerning their respective States on matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission; advise the Commission on matters of mutual concern in the preparation of reports of the Commission to the President and the Congress; receive reports, suggestions, and recommendations from individuals, public and private organizations, and public officials upon matters pertinent to inquiries conducted by the State Advisory Committee; initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters in which the Commission shall request the assistance of the State Advisory Committee; and attend, as observers, any open hearing or conference which the Commission may hold within the State.

UNMET GOALS: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN EMPLOYMENT

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, LAS VEGAS

--A report prepared by the Nevada Advisory
Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

ATTRIBUTION:

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Nevada Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission. This report has been prepared by the State Advisory Committee for submission to the Commission, and will be considered by the Commission in formulating its recommendations to the President and the Congress.

RIGHT OF RESPONSE:

Prior to the publication of a report, the State Advisory Committee affords to all individuals or organizations that may be defamed, degraded, or incriminated by any material contained in the report an opportunity to respond in writing to such material. All responses have been incorporated, appended, or otherwise reflected in the publication.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Nevada Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
September 1981

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur S. Flemming, Chairman
Mary Berry, Vice Chairman
Blandina Cardenas
Stephen Horn
Jill Ruckleshaus
Murray Saltzman

The Nevada Advisory Committee submits this report of its study of affirmative action at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas as part of its responsibility to advise the Commission about civil rights issues within the State.

The purpose of the study was to document the utilization of minority and women professionals at the university and to determine what impact the school's affirmative action plan has had on their representation. In a State with only two university campuses and a growing minority population, community members are concerned about minority group visibility and participation in higher education.

In 1977, the Advisory Committee held a factfinding meeting to examine opportunities in employment for minorities and women. From 1977 through 1981, the Committee obtained statistics from the university's affirmative action office showing representation and utilization of minorities and women in professional job categories.

The Committee found that minorities and women were underrepresented at the university and that UNLV's affirmative action plan had not secured changes in the overall employment of these groups. Gains in total positions were miniscule from 1977 to 1981; percentages of minorities and women in faculty were lower in 1981 than they were in 1977. Non-minority males have constituted the majority of new hires since the plan has been in operation.

The study concludes that continued racial and sex imbalances in UNLV's professional staff indicate that the university's affirmative action program is insufficient to insure equal employment opportunity. An important finding by the Committee was the administration's refusal to take responsibility for and to correct internal conditions at the university which affect low numbers of minorities and women.

The Advisory Committee recommends that the administration undertake specific steps to increase numbers of minority and women professionals such as re-

evaluating and restructuring its affirmative action program. The regional office of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor is recommended to assist UNLV in its efforts to comply with Federal affirmative action requirements.

The Committee plans to disseminate its report widely in this State in order to inform and educate its citizenry about affirmative action in employment. The study demonstrates the importance of effective implementation of affirmative action in order to make equal employment opportunity a reality for all Americans.

Respectfully,

Woodrow Wilson
Chairperson
Nevada Advisory Committee

Membership
Nevada Advisory Committee to the
United States Commission on Civil Rights

Woodrow Wilson, Chairperson
Las Vegas

Marlene Coffey
Reno

Erma L. O'Neal
Las Vegas

Susan L. DeLuca
Las Vegas

Edita Perez
Las Vegas

William M. Deutsch
Las Vegas

Fernando Romero
Las Vegas

Jean E. Ford*
Las Vegas

Eddie B. Scott
Reno

Donny L. Johnson
Minden

Steven T. Walther
Reno

*Ms. Ford is no longer a
Committee member

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Advisory Committee wishes to thank its chair, Woodrow Wilson, Committee member Susan DeLuca, and staff of the Commission's Western Regional Office, Los Angeles, California for their help in preparation of this report.

This project was the primary staff assignment of Roberta Jones-Booker who is no longer with the Western Regional Office. Laurie Campbell researched this report with help from Thomas Pilla and Felicia Smith. The report was written by Laurie Campbell and edited by Thomas Pilla. Support was provided by Grace Diaz and Irene Garcia. All worked under the guidance of Philip Montez Regional Director.

CONTENTS

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Perceptions About Employment Opportunities.....	4
III.	Employment of Minorities and Women at UNLV.....	13
IV.	Conclusion and Recommendations.....	42

Appendices

A.	Letter from Chairman, University of Nevada System Board of Regents.....	45
B.	Reply to Chairman's Letter.....	47

Tables

I.	Nevada Population Increases, 1970 and 1981.....	21
II.	Nevada State Employment, 1980.....	22
III.	United States Employment as of May 1981.....	23
IV.	Percent of Degrees in all Fields Awarded to Minorities and Women, 1977 and 1979.....	24
Va.	Professional Rank Employees by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 and 1980.....	25
Vb.	Professional Rank Employees by Sex, 1977 and 1980.....	26
VIa.	Faculty Positions by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 and 1980.....	27
VIb.	Faculty Positions by Sex, 1977 and 1980.....	28
VIIa.	Administrative Positions by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 and 1980.....	29
VIIb.	Administrative Positions by Sex, 1977 and 1980.....	30
VIIIa.	Salary Distribution by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 and 1980.....	31
VIIIb.	Salary Distribution by Sex, 1977 and 1980.....	32
IXa.	Tenure Ratios by Minority Status, 1977 and 1980.....	33
IXb.	Tenure Ratios by Sex, 1977 and 1980.....	34

Xa.	New Hires by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 Through 1980.....	35
Xb.	New Hires by Sex, 1977 Through 1980.....	36
XI.	New Hires and Separations by Race/Ethnicity and Sex, 1977 Through 1980.....	37
XIIa.	Promotions by Race/Ethnicity, 1977 Through 1980.....	38
XIIb.	Promotions by Sex, 1977 Through 1980.....	39

I. INTRODUCTION

Federal law prohibits discrimination in employment.¹ Employers who contract with the Federal Government, including state universities and colleges, are obligated to not only refrain from employment discrimination, they must take affirmative steps to ensure that minority groups are afforded equal employment opportunity.² The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) of the U.S. Department of Labor is responsible for enforcing affirmative action obligations of Federal contractors.³

In July 1976, the Board of Regents for the University of Nevada established an affirmative action office for the university's Las Vegas campus (UNLV),⁴ and in May 1977, the regents approved an affirmative action plan.⁵

A year after the affirmative action office was established at UNLV, the Nevada Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights began monitoring employment there because of expressed concerns by community members. The community perceived that minorities and women were not receiving equal treatment in professional⁶ academic and administrative employment, including recruitment and hiring, salary and tenure, and promotion.

After a preliminary investigation, the Advisory Committee learned that minorities comprised only 9 percent of professional employees; women's total representation was about 22 percent. The majority of minorities and women occupied jobs which were lower in status and salary than non-minority males.⁷

In December 1977, the Advisory Committee conducted a public fact-finding meeting to assess employment policies and practices at UNLV. University administrators and faculty, as well as members of the University of Nevada System Board of Regents, were invited to speak about opportunities for minorities and women, including their understanding of the function of the university's

affirmative action plan.

From 1978 to 1981, the Nevada Advisory Committee continued to monitor the employment situation at UNLV. The Committee was interested in determining the impact of the affirmative action program on utilization of minority and women professionals.⁸

This report summarizes the Committee's findings. University representatives' perceptions about employment conditions and affirmative action are highlighted, and data showing representation of minorities and women in employment from 1977 through 1981 are analyzed.

NOTES TO SECTION I

1. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e - 2000e-17 (1976), prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.

2. Executive Order No. 11246, 3 C.F.R. 339 (1965), reprinted in 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, at 1232 (1976). This executive order was amended by Executive Order No. 11375 in 1967 to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex (3 C.F.R. 684 (1967)).

Employer affirmative action plans should include provisions designed to overcome obstacles to full utilization of minorities and women. While some measures may vary from contractor to contractor, such as improved recruiting, new training programs, and revised hiring and promotion procedures, all plans must contain goals and timetables for utilization of minorities and women which reflect their availability for employment. Goals and timetables are tools to remove barriers to equal employment opportunity; they are not there to require employers to hire individuals regardless of qualifications. See United States Commission on Civil Rights, Statement on Affirmative Action, Clearinghouse Publication 54, (October 1977).

3. Under Executive Order No. 12086 signed by the President in 1978, OFCCP enforces Executive Order No. 11246.

4. The Nevada Board of Regents, elected by district from throughout the State, governs the University of Nevada. The University of Nevada at Reno was established in 1886. In 1955, the board of regents officially founded a southern division of the university at Las Vegas. The Las Vegas campus was granted equal and autonomous status to that of the university at Reno in 1968.

5. University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Affirmative Action Plan, May 1977.

6. The word "professional" as used in this report means employment which is non-clerical and non-janitorial in nature, and which requires a terminal degree such as a bachelors, masters, or doctorate.

7. See Section III for an analysis of employment statistics at UNLV from 1977 through 1981.

8. Following the fact-finding meeting in December 1977, the university's affirmative action officer was contacted on an annual basis for additional information and updates of employment statistics.

II. PERCEPTIONS ABOUT EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Recruitment and Hiring

In 1977, persons who were concerned about the underrepresentation and underutilization of minorities and women at UNLV attributed their situation, in large part, to university attitudes about affirmative action in employment. James Kitchen, affirmative action officer at UNLV, stated:

One of the biggest obstacles /to effective implementation of the affirmative action program is/ ...convincing a lot of people that they need more minorities out in certain fields...Affirmative action has been around for several years, and there are still people who are very sensitive to the concept of affirmative action and others /who/ are not.¹

The Advisory Committee found that the meaning of affirmative action varied widely among university officials and employees. Former UNLV President Donald Baepler commented:

Equal employment opportunity has more to do with making certain that everything is open, well advertised, that minorities, women, have full access to the institution, both as students and as employees. Affirmative action connotes a little bit more effort, perhaps, on the part of the institution to see to it that the concepts of equal opportunity are actually carried out.

According to Dr. Bert Babero, zoology professor, "Affirmative action means that if you're looking for a particular type of group, then you make a special effort to go out and find this type of person."

Most officials at UNLV attributed low numbers of minorities and women in professional jobs to factors beyond the university's control. President Baepler said that few potential applicants were interested in moving to Las Vegas, and that social enticements for minorities were

minimal since their general population numbers in the area were small. On the other hand, Board of Regents member Lillian Fong believed it was the university's responsibility to encourage minorities to move to Las Vegas. She stated:

I think it behooves each of us as administrators, faculty members, and students, who are already on the campus, to act as ambassadors of goodwill and make it known that minority students and faculty members are welcome and wanted and that they are included in the social, political and recreational life of the campus.

UNLV officials stated that underrepresentation of minorities and women was due also to the small pool of qualified minority and women applicants.

Dr. Baepler said:

I think sometimes people look at the concept of affirmative action and they think there's a large pool of unemployed minority PHDs out there somewhere. . And that they're desperately trying to find jobs and people won't hire them. This is not the case. Much of Mr. Kitchen's efforts in hiring minorities are directed toward fully employed minority people that you hope you can steal away from some other school by offering them a couple of thousand dollars more or giving them a promotion.

This view was questioned by several people, including Affirmative Action Officer James Kitchen. He noted, "I think minorities and women are available. You just have to make every effort necessary to reach out and find them."

Finally, President Baepler said that low representation of minorities and women was due to "relatively little turnover, very modest additions, and the necessity to add specialists."

In 1981, university administrators complained that it was difficult for them to hire minorities and women. Robert Cashell, chairman of the Board

of Regents, University of Nevada System, explained:

The talented and qualified minorities and women are now in a position to command top salaries and, unfortunately, Nevada faculty salaries are ranked very low among the states. Rest assured the top priority of our Board of Regents is to raise this ranking. Some progress was made in the last session of our state legislature, however, in order to be more competitive for top candidates it will take more time and effort before we are able to do so.²

Mr. Kitchen commented:

There is no way the University of Nevada, Las Vegas can hire more minorities /when/...many of these do not have the background or working experience; their degree is in an entirely different field; they reject the position because of higher pay elsewhere or other reasons... Regardless of how many women or minorities are hired, a certain percentage will always be leaving, thus the gain is minimal.³

Despite alleged difficulties in locating and hiring minorities and women, UNLV representatives acknowledged that the university's recruitment budget was insufficient to conduct an effective outreach program. Regent Fong told the Advisory Committee in 1977:

I know that we...budget.../a/ full time salary for our one affirmative action officer and his secretary, and very little travel money. He says that he could do a better job if he could go out to colleges which may /give/ us more /minorities for/ positions.

President Baepler disagreed: "We spend thousands of dollars on advertising...Within our budget, I think we are doing about as much as we can do." He added, however:

Our out-of-state travel budget is the most critical part of our entire university budget. It is an embarrassment to me that we are not able to get our faculty to legitimate professional meetings and clearly we do not have the

money to extensively send faculty members out on recruitment trips.⁴

Salary, Tenure and Promotion

The Advisory Committee received numerous complaints during its 1977 investigation that once hired, minorities and women experienced inequities in advancement opportunities, particularly in faculty positions.

At UNLV, like most universities, employment decisions concerning faculty are recommended by department personnel committees and approved by the university's administration. These committees, either elected or appointed by their peers, not only recommend who is to be hired for a vacancy within their respective departments, they also make recommendations about salary increases, tenures, and promotions.⁵

At the university, broad written criteria exist which may be used by personnel committees to evaluate the performance of an individual faculty member. They include: advising and counseling students, comparisons with other faculty members in similar positions within the university, creative activity or research productivity, service to the university on committees, teaching effectiveness, and voluntary community activity.⁶ Other specific written criteria may be established within each department.

Minorities and women employed at UNLV had two major concerns about committee procedures. According to Lynn Osborn, assistant professor in the Sociology Department, "Personnel committees are the prime movers for affirmative action."⁷ Yet, Dr. Patricia Geuder, associate professor of English, told the Advisory Committee:

Women and minorities do not play a large part in any committees, whether elected or appointed, departmental, college, university-wide or system-wide. The number of persons voting, the sex, and

the ethnicity of the persons voting, pretty well determine that the compositions of committees will be primarily Caucasian /males/.

The other concern was that unstated criteria may be used in decision-making. While employees are permitted to view their individual written performance evaluations, Dr. Geuder commented:

I think that one of the unstated criteria is a list of journals which certain members of the personnel committees find acceptable, certain fields of study which members of personnel committees may feel are more prestigious than others, but these are unstated. Therefore, it leaves the person who is seeking a promotion in a rather precarious situation because he or she does not know in advance what is going to be acceptable.

Dr. Geuder was echoed by other faculty members. Esther Langston, associate professor in the Department of Social Work, alleged:

/Salaries/ do not seem to have anything to do with the kind of experience you had, your education or whatever...It just seems that arbitrarily you get assigned a salary and you get promotions arbitrarily or you get merit increases arbitrarily, no matter what the person does or does not do, whether they publish, whether they provide community service or whatever. It seems to be an arbitrary or subjective decision that is not in writing and you have no way to discover who gets what for what.

The Advisory Committee heard similar complaints about tenure⁸ and promotion. Ms. Langston described her view of the effect of tenure procedures on minorities and women:

It appears for minorities at this university that most of the time, when they get to the point of getting tenure, for some reason or the other they are voted not to receive it...I was the first Black woman to have been tenured on this campus...Even though there's written criteria for every department, you really don't know how you're evaluated.

Although one of the criteria in awarding tenure is a faculty member's effectiveness as an instructor, Ms. Langston reported that members of personnel committees had never visited her classroom, adding:

Colleagues evaluate you for tenure and one of the supposedly greater weights, say 70 percent, is supposed to be your effectiveness as a teacher, and they don't know whether you 're an effective teacher or not.

Dr. Thomas Wilson of the School of Education explained a catch-22 situation for minorities and women in tenure evaluation:

In nine years, [through 1977] I've never been on a university committee. I have volunteered to be voted on for committee membership, but I have never been on a committee. So when I was rated on this, I was, of course, rated down.

Dr. Wilson also commented on evaluation criteria for promotions:

In order to be promoted from an assistant professor to an associate professor, you're supposed to possess the terminal degree, which is either a doctorate in education or PhD. I know people who are associate professors on this campus who do not have the terminal degree. And that is...in violation of the guidelines for promotion or appointment to academic rank as far as the university is concerned.

Alice Mason, associate professor of physical education, reiterated Dr. Wilson's complaint. She told the Advisory Committee that within her department, there were full professors without doctorate degrees, and persons with doctorates who were not granted full professorships.

University representatives denied that there were inequities in employment opportunities. President Baepler noted that lower salaries depended on the external factor of UNLV's ranking among other state universities. He explained:

Let me put it in this context. The University of Nevada, Reno and Las Vegas combined, is now ranked 27th out of the 50 state universities, so we're just kind of middle range. And when you're 27th out of 50, you are average in salary. The qualified minority or woman can probably do better than average in salary.

James Buchanan, former chairman of the University of Nevada System Board of Regents, stated that the university had not received complaints about salary, tenure, and promotion, adding, "If these problems exist, "I'm sure someone would have come to me because of my high visibility."⁹ Other regents had differing perceptions. Former regent Brenda D. Mason said that she had received several complaints about employment decisions, noting:

Women complain vigorously that most men from other universities get tenure without waiting the six years, whereas most women here have to wait the full six years regardless of how many years they have worked elsewhere.¹⁰

Another regent, Lillian Fong, expressed concern about the employment process, stating that she perceived a reluctance on the part of the regents to become involved in personnel decisions. She explained:

Right now, people who are up for tenure or promotions come before us and it's just a matter of going over what has already been decided...by the department chairman, the dean, and eventually the vice president for academic affairs, and the president...Now, if we were to change policies, we would, and I think most of the regents don't want this, they don't want to be the court of last appeal. They don't want to be the judges, making the decision of changing something that's already been decided by the administration because they feel that they're the policy makers, they're really not the policy enforcers. I disagree with that...I think they should really enforce any policy that they have instituted.

NOTES TO SECTION II

1. Unless otherwise cited, all statements in this section are contained in the transcript of the public meeting held by the Nevada Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on December 8, 1977. This transcript is located at the Commission's Western Regional Office.

2. Letter from Robert Cashell to Philip Montez, regional director, Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, August 13, 1981, p. 1. This letter comprised the Board of Regents' official response to the Advisory Committee's draft report (see Appendix A for copy of letter).

3. Letter from James Kitchen, affirmative action officer, UNLV to Philip Montez, regional director, Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Aug. 6, 1981, pp. 3-4. Hereafter cited as Kitchen Letter. This letter was Mr. Kitchen's official response to the Advisory Committee's draft report, and it included the official comments of Dr. Leonard E. Goodall, president, UNLV. Telephone interview with James Kitchen, Aug. 5, 1981. The administration's comments are on file in the Commission's Western Regional Office and are included in the report where appropriate. In addition, in 1981, faculty members were allowed to review and comment on statements in this section.

4. In the administration's Aug. 6 response to the Committee's draft report, it said that "no mention /was/ taken into consideration the efforts that have been put into our recruitment." Yet the SAC notes that no mention was made concerning the extent of these efforts. Additionally, one factor the administration cited that the Committee failed to take into consideration in its report was a "limited amount of recruitment money." Kitchen Letter, p. 5. The Committee questions the ability of the university to actively seek out and hire minorities and women based on the information provided by the administration.

5. This practice is traditional at most universities. The reasoning behind it is that those most knowledgeable in a specific academic field can best judge the qualifications and credentials of an applicant for employment or advancement.

6. University of Nevada, Las Vegas By Laws, Sections 7 and 10 (1974). Other criteria include evidence of continued professional growth, leadership activities in professional organizations, total length of service in academic life, total years in present rank, and special assignments.

7. Interview, Aug. 29, 1977.

8. According to the University of Nevada System Code, Chpt. 3, Sec. 3.1 (1972):

Tenure is a means to certain ends, specifically
(1) freedom of teaching and research and of
extramural activities; and, (2) a sufficient

degree of economic security to make faculty appointment at the University of Nevada attractive to persons of ability. A major purpose is to provide a faculty committed to excellence, but the objective of tenure is not merely to afford job security to persons who have performed satisfactorily or without incidence but rather to provide a substantial degree of security to those persons who have exhibited outstanding abilities, sufficient to convince the University that their expected services and performance in the future justify the degree of permanence afforded by tenure.

9. Interview, Oct. 11, 1977.

10. Interview, May 4, 1977.

III. EMPLOYMENT OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN AT UNLV

Nevada Population and Labor Force

Nevada's population nearly doubled in ten years from 488,738 in 1970 to 825,460 in 1981. Within the same period, the minority and female populations increased at a greater rate than non-minority males. Of all groups, Hispanics¹ and Asians increased at the fastest rate, with Hispanics (55,550) constituting the largest minority group in the State by 1981 and Blacks (52,460) the second largest minority group. Women were little under one-half of the total population in 1981. Table I shows State population numbers and rates of growth from 1970 to 1981 by race and sex.

According to the latest data from the Nevada Employment Security Department, minorities and women are represented in larger proportions in the State than the national labor force. Minorities comprised almost 20 percent of Nevada's workforce in 1980; women's representation was 40 percent. In 1981, minorities' representation in the national workforce was about 12 percent and women's percentage was 39.

Like national figures, State data shows that all minority groups had a higher unemployment rate than Whites. Unlike national statistics, women were unemployed in larger numbers than the general population. Table II lists 1980 State labor force figures and unemployment rates by race and sex. Table III provides 1981 national labor force and unemployment figures by race and sex.

Representation of Minorities and Women in Professional Positions at UNLV

Underrepresentation exists whenever the employment of minorities and women in a job group is less than their availability in the workforce. Availability of minorities and women in higher education is determined according to several factors which vary from university to university or college to college. One factor is recruitment; the type of availability sources used by a college or university depend on whether recruitment is carried out on a local, regional, or national level. Another factor is whether a college or university is oriented toward teaching or research. Availability also depends on applicant flow in particular fields of study.²

Most of the professional employment recruitment at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas is conducted nationwide. In some instances, the university will recruit locally and regionally, for example, if an unexpected resignation occurs or a vacant position is temporary or part-time.³ According to the administration, the school relies primarily on national statistics compiled by the University of Colorado at Boulder and masters and doctorate degree recipient data supplied by the Scientific Manpower Commission to determine availability of minorities and women.⁴

Unfortunately, availability data from the University of Colorado results from a study which was conducted in 1975.⁵ Information supplied by the Scientific Manpower Commission is also not up-to-date. There is no complete data on degrees awarded to all groups past 1979, and data on minority representation among masters degree recipients does not extend beyond 1977.⁶ However, information provided by the Scientific Manpower Commission is helpful as an indication of availability.

The percentage of minorities and women earning degrees which would prepare them for professional employment in higher education has steadily increased since 1977. By the end of 1979, women were awarded almost one-half of the masters degrees and nearly 30 percent of doctorate degrees. Minorities were earning at least 11 percent of all doctorates in 1979, a jump of 3 percent from 1977. Although there is no information indicating masters degrees awarded to minorities in 1979, in 1977 they were earning 11 percent of these degrees. The rate of increase in doctorates for minorities probably indicates a similar increase in their masters degree representation by 1979. Table IV lists percentages of degrees awarded in 1977 and 1979 by race and sex.⁷

In comparison to these national figures, women occupied only 19 percent of UNLV faculty positions in 1981; in 1981, minorities represented only 8 percent of all faculty jobs. Percentages of minorities and women in teaching positions actually decreased from 1977 to 1981. In 1977, women occupied 20 percent of faculty jobs and minorities representation was 9 percent.

In administrative jobs, representation of minorities and women increased from 1977 to 1981. Women comprised 34 percent of administrators in 1981, an increase of about 5 percent from 1977; minorities occupied 12 percent of administrative jobs in 1981, up from nearly 10 percent in 1977. These figures, however, still show underrepresentation when compared to 1977 and 1979 data of degree recipients.

Hispanics and American Indians were the most severely underrepresented minority groups in total professional positions.⁸ By 1981, Hispanics comprised only 1 percent and American Indians .3 percent of these jobs. Table Va provides figures on representation of professional rank employees by race in

in school years 1977-78 and 1980-81, while Table Vb shows representation of women in professional jobs for the same school years.

Since availability sources depend on many factors which were undeterminable in a study of this depth and no further data sources were provided by UNLV, statistics on availability of minorities and women in higher education were obtained from the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP). In 1981, OFCCP had conducted affirmative action compliance review of a California university and had determined the workforce availability of minorities and women for professional administration and faculty positions. Like UNLV, the California university recruits nationally, is part of a state-wide system, is primarily a teaching institution, and is situated in the same regional area of the country.⁹

A comparison with this data also indicates that minorities and women are underrepresented and underutilized in employment at UNLV.¹⁰ In most faculty categories¹¹ at the California university, availability of women in all fields of study averaged to about 34 percent of the total workforce compared to women's actual representation at UNLV of 19 percent; for minorities, their availability in all fields averaged to 22 percent in contrast to 8 percent actual representation among teachers at UNLV.

According to the California data, women's availability in most administrative jobs¹² in higher education averaged over 55 percent of the total labor force in 1981, compared to their representation of 34 percent at UNLV. Minorities' availability percentages were about 24 percent for most administrative levels, but their representation at UNLV was only 12 percent of total administrative jobs.

Utilization in Faculty and Administrative Jobs

Employment statistics for UNLV show that non-minority males are concentrated in higher level job categories, while most minorities and women are found in lower ranked positions.¹³

In faculty positions, women's representation in some categories increased since 1977. The highest increase was in the instructor category, the lowest faculty level. Increases in higher level positions, associate professors and professors, were slight; around 3 percent and 1 percent respectively.

By 1981, women occupied the lowest faculty rank, instructor, more than any other academic category. They represented 22 percent of associate professors and 8 percent of professors.

As with women, minorities are concentrated in lower level faculty positions. Their representation in most academic categories either decreased or remained the same by 1981. In associate professor jobs, Blacks and American Indians lost representation; Hispanics increased by only .2 percent and Asians by almost 3 percent.

Minorities represented only 3 percent of UNLV professors in 1981. Their largest percentage in faculty positions was in the associate professor level, but their representation here was 11 percent. Table VIa provides data on faculty positions by race and ethnicity and Table VIb lists teaching jobs by sex, for the school years 1977-78 and 1980-81.

Women's representation in administrative categories has not significantly increased since 1977. Their percentage in the professional noninstructional level increased 11 percent, but their numbers in high level executive and manager categories decreased 1 percent. By 1981, women represented only 6 percent of executives and managers.

In top administrative positions, minorities fared better than women, increasing their representation in the executive/manager category about 8 percent by 1981, but occupying only about 12 percent of these jobs. In the professional noninstructional level, most minority groups remained at their same percentage of representation or lost positions; Asian employees decreased by almost one-half; Blacks increased their representation 3 percent. Table VIIa lists administrative positions by race and ethnicity for the school years 1977-78 and 1980-81 and Table VIIb presents this data according to sex.

Salary

UNLV employment data show that from 1977 to 1981, there was a dramatic increase in the number of persons earning \$19,000 and over. Minorities and women shared in this increase. In the salary range of \$19,000 to \$24,999, minorities' representation increased almost 3 times from 1977 to 1981, while women earning this amount increased almost 4 times by 1981.

Despite these gains, representation of minorities and women in the highest salary categories remained low in 1981. Among total employees earning \$25,000 and over, minorities occupied 6 percent and women 12 percent. Almost one-half, or 45 percent, of non-minority employees were earning \$25,000 and over, compared to less than 30 percent for minorities and 23 percent for women in these salary levels. Table VIIIa provides data on salary distribution by race and ethnicity for the school years 1977-78 and 1980-81, and Table VIIIb shows this information by sex.

Tenure

Between 1977 and 1981, minorities and women were granted tenure at a faster rate than non-minority male professionals. Tenured minorities rose 16 percent compared to an 11 percent increase for Whites, and tenured women

went up 15 percent by 1981, while both minority and non-minority males experienced a raise of 11 percent.

Although gains in receiving tenure were realized by minorities and women, their representation among tenured professionals has not increased significantly since 1977. Only 6 percent of tenured professionals at UNLV were minorities in 1981 compared to 4 percent in 1977. Women represented 15 percent of tenured employees in 1977 and 19 percent in 1981.

In 1981, 63 percent of White employees had received tenure; in comparison, 41 percent of minorities and 48 percent of women were tenured. Table IXa provides tenure ratios by minority status and Table IXb by sex from 1977 to 1981.

Hires, Separations and Promotions

Hires of professionals for the four-year period of this study increased 50 percent, from 38 in 1977 to 57 in 1981. During this period, minorities comprised only 10 percent of new hires, and 32 percent were women.

While numbers of minority and women hires increased, these increases were minimal (percentages went up 1 or 2 points). Hispanics and American Indians were the most severely underrepresented among new hires. In four years, only 2 Hispanics were hired as professionals and no American Indians were hired. Table Xa¹ presents data on new hires by race and ethnicity and Table Xb by sex for the school years 1977-78 through 1980-81.

UNLV data show that there were net gains in employment for all groups, except Hispanics and American Indians, when comparing hires and separations.¹⁴ There were small gains for minorities as a whole. Out of 187 new hires from 1977 to 1981, there were 125 separations, resulting in a net gain of 62 employees. Of this net gain, 54 or 87 percent, were White; 8 or 13 percent,

were minority. Asians realized the greatest gains of all minority groups at 7 persons; Blacks gained only 1 person, and Hispanics and American Indians gained none after separations were considered. Women experienced a net gain of 27 employees, or 44 percent. Table XI lists new hires and separations by race, ethnicity and sex for the school years 1977-78 and 1980-81.

During the four-year monitoring period, 90 percent of all promotions granted were given to White employees; minorities represented only 10 percent of the total promotions. Compared to men, 22 percent of the total promotions were given to women. Table XIIa provides information on promotions by race and ethnicity for the school years 1977-78 through 1980-81, while Table XIIb presents the same information by sex.

TABLE I

Nevada Population Increases, 1970 and 1981

<u>Race/Ethnicity and Sex</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>Rate of Growth</u>
Total ¹	488,738	825,460	1.7
White	449,850	722,380	1.6
Black	27,579	52,460	1.9
Hispanic ²	27,142	55,550	2.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	4,912	14,570	3.0
American Indian	8,241	13,740	1.7
Other Races ³	Not Available	22,310	--
Women	240,940	411,490	1.7

1. Sum of individual items may not add to total because of rounding and duplication between White and Hispanic categories.

2. Defined by Nevada State data as Spanish-American.

3. According to Nevada State data, the Other Races category has been redefined in the 1980 Census. This category now includes those persons who identify themselves as Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican, Dominican, Cambodian, Indochinese, Pakistani, Indonesian, Fiji Islander and any other races not specifically included in the race question on the Census questionnaire. Those identified as Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican, or Dominican were, for the most part, included as White in the 1970 Census.

Source: Nevada Employment Security Department, Employment Security Research Section, June 1981.

TABLE II

Nevada State Employment, 1980

<u>Race/Ethnicity and Sex</u>	<u>Civilian Labor Force</u>	<u>Percent Labor Force</u>	<u>Unemployment Rate</u>
Total All Groups ¹	376,000	100	6.1%
White	335,000	89.1	5.7%
Black	20,610	5.5	7.7%
Hispanic ²	22,330	5.9	7.3%
Other Races ³	20,340	5.4	11.7%
Total Minority Groups ⁴	63,280	16.8	8.8%
Women	151,240	40.2	6.8%

1. Sum of individual items may not add to total because of rounding and duplication between White and Hispanic categories.

2. Defined by Nevada State data as Spanish-American.

3. According to Nevada State data, the Other Races category has been redefined in the 1980 Census. This category now includes those persons who identify themselves as Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican, Dominican, Cambodian, Indochinese, Pakistani, Indonesian, Fiji Islander and any other races not specifically included in the race question on the Census questionnaire. Those identified as Cuban, Puerto Rican, Mexican, or Dominican were, for the most part, included as White in the 1970 Census.

4. Sum of all races except White. No figures were provided for Asian category.

Source: Nevada Employment Security Department, Employment Security Research Section, June 1981.

TABLE III

United States Employment as of May 1981
(Numbers in Millions)

<u>Race/Ethnicity and Sex</u>	<u>Civilian Labor Force</u>	<u>Percent Labor Force</u>	<u>Unemployment Rate</u>
Total All Groups	106,347	100	8.0%
White	93,670	88	6.3%
Total Minority Groups ¹	12,678	12	13.1%
Women (20 and Over)	41,616	39	6.3%

1. Since figures for minorities are compiled under the category Black and Other and not by each racial/ethnic group, representation of minorities in the U.S. labor force is probably larger since minorities such as Hispanics may be included in the White category.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 1981.

TABLE IV

Percent of Degrees in All Fields Awarded to
Minorities and Women, 1977 and 1979

<u>Degree Level</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian</u>	<u>American Indian</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Year</u>
Bachelors	6.4	2.0	1.5	0.4	10.3	46.3	1977
	--	--	--	--	--	48.3	1979 ¹
Masters	6.7	1.9	1.6	0.3	10.5	47.3	1977
	--	--	--	--	--	49.1	1979
Doctorate	3.8	1.6	2.0	0.3	7.7	24.4	1977
	4.2	1.9	3.8	0.7	10.6 ²	28.6	1979

1. For 1979, there is no data on percent of bachelors and masters degrees awarded to minorities. There is no complete data beyond 1979 degrees awarded to all groups.

2. Since 5.3 percent of Ph.Ds were awarded to persons of unknown race/ethnicity in 1979, this percentage for all minorities may actually be larger.

Source: Betty Vetter, Scientific Manpower Commission, Washington, D.C., telephone interview, June 8, 1981.

TABLE Va

Professional Rank Employees by
Race/Ethnicity, 1977 and 1980

	Total	White ¹	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alaskan	Minority	School Year Beginning
Faculty	313	286	12	4	10	1	27	1977
	100 ²	91.4	3.8	1.3	3.2	0.3	8.6	
	299	275	9	4	10	1	24	1980
	100	92.0	3.0	1.3	3.3	0.3	8.0	
Administration	105	95	5	1	4	0	10	1977
	100	90.5	4.8	0.9	3.8	0	9.5	
	108	95	8	1	4	0	13	1980
	100	88.0	7.4	.9	3.7	0	12.0	
Total Positions	418	381	17	5	14	1	37	1977
	100	91.1	4.1	1.2	3.4	0.2	8.9	
	407	370	17	5	14	1	37	1980
	100	90.9	4.2	1.2	3.4	0.3	9.1	

1. According to University of Nevada, Las Vegas statistics, the White category does not include persons of Hispanic descent.

2. Bottom figure under each number represents percentage of that number to total positions for that year.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981

TABLE Vb

Professional Rank Employees by
Sex, 1977 and 1980

	Total	Men	Women	School Year Beginning
Faculty	313	250	63	1977
	100 ¹	79.9	20.1	
	299	241	58	1980
	100	80.6	19.4	
Administration	105	75	30	1977
	100	71.4	28.6	
	108	71	37	1980
	100	65.7	34.3	
Total Positions	418	325	93	1977
	100	77.7	22.3	
	407	312	95 ²	1980
	100	76.7	23.3	

1. Bottom figure under each number represents percentage of that number to total positions for that year.

2. Out of 95 professional women employees in 1980-81, 12 were minority, including 7 Blacks, 1 Hispanic, and 4 Asians.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE VIa

Faculty Positions by Race/Ethnicity,
1977 and 1980

	School Year Beginning	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alaskan	Total Minority
Instructor- Rank I	1977	17 100 ¹	14 82.3	1 5.9	0 0	2 11.8	0 0	3 17.7
	1980	5 100	5 100	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
Assistant Professor- Rank II	1977	106 100	94 88.7	6 5.6	2 1.9	4 3.8	0 0	12 11.3
	1980	70 100	65 92.9	3 4.3	1 1.4	1 1.4	0 0	5 7.1
Associate Professor- Rank III	1977	108 100	98 90.7	4 3.7	2 1.9	3 2.8	1 0.9	10 9.3
	1980	144 100	128 88.9	4 2.8	3 2.1	8 5.5	1 0.7	16 11.1
Professor- Rank IV	1977	67 100	65 97.0	1 1.5	0 0	1 1.5	0 0	2 3.0
	1980	72 100	70 97.2	1 1.4	0 0	1 1.4	0 0	2 2.8
Lecturer ² - Rank V	1977	15 100	15 100	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
	1980	8 100	7 87.5	1 12.5	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 12.5

1. The right-hand figure in each column represents the percentage of the left-hand number to the total positions for that year.

2. Although classified as a Rank V level, lecturer is a nontenure position.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE VIb

Faculty Positions by Sex,
1977 and 1980

	School Year Beginning	Total	Men	Women
Instructor- Rank I	1977	17 100 ¹	9 52.9	8 47.1
	1980	5 100	2 40.0	3 60.0
Assistant Professor- Rank II	1977	106 100	81 76.4	25 23.6
	1980	70 100	54 77.1	16 22.9
Assistant Professor Rank III	1977	108 100	87 80.6	21 19.4
	1980	144 100	112 77.8	32 22.2
Professor- Rank IV	1977	67 100	62 92.5	5 7.5
	1980	72 100	66 91.7	6 8.3
Lecturer- Rank V	1977	15 100	11 73.3	4 26.7
	1980	8 100	7 87.5	1 12.5

1. The right-hand figure in each column represents the percentage of the left-hand number to the total positions for that year.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE VIIa

Administrative Positions by Race/Ethnicity,
1977 and 1980

	School Year Beginning	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alaskan	Total Minority
Undesignated Rank	1977	1 100 ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1980	No Positions Listed	-	-	-	-	-	-
Professional Non- instructional	1977	75 100	66 88.0	4 5.3	1 1.3	4 5.3	0 0	9 12.0
	1980	72 100	63 87.5	6 8.3	1 1.4	2 2.8	0 0	9 12.5
Executive and Management	1977	28 100	27 96.4	1 3.6	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 3.6
	1980	34 100	30 88.2	2 5.9	0 0	2 5.9	0 0	4 11.8
Technical	1977	1 100	1 100	0	0	0	0	0
	1980	1 100	0	0	0	0	0	0

1. The right-hand figure in each column represents the percentage of the left-hand number of the total positions for that year.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE VIIb

Administrative Positions by Sex,
1977 and 1980

	School Year Beginning	Total	Men	Women
Undesignated Rank	1977	1 100 ¹	0 0	1 100 ¹
	1980	No Positions Listed	- -	- -
Professional Non- Instructional	1977	75 100	48 64.0	27 36.0
	1980	72 100	38 52.8	34 47.2
Executive and Management	1977	28 100	26 92.9	2 7.1
	1980	34 100	32 94.1	2 5.9
Technical	1977	1 100	1 100	0 0
	1980	1 100	0 0	1 100

1. The right-hand figure in each column represents the percentage of the left-hand number to the total positions for that year.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE VIIIa

Salary Distribution by Race/Ethnicity,
1977 and 1980

<u>Yearly Salary</u> <u>Below</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>8</u>	<u>White</u> <u>7</u>	<u>Black</u> <u>0</u>	<u>Hispanic</u> <u>1</u>	<u>Asian/ Pac. Islander</u> <u>0</u>	<u>Am. Indian/ Alaskan</u> <u>0</u>	<u>Total Minority</u> <u>1</u>	<u>School Year Beginning</u> <u>1977</u>
\$7,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1980
\$7,500 to \$9,999	7	6	1	0	0	0	1	1977
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1980
\$10,000 to \$12,999	26	24	1	1	0	0	2	1977
	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1980
\$13,000 to \$15,999	90	83	2	1	4	0	7	1977
	14	12	1	0	1	0	2	1980
\$16,000 to \$18,999	120	108	7	1	4	0	12	1977
	39	34	4	0	1	0	5	1980
\$19,000 to \$24,999	127	120	5	2	0	0	7	1977
	173	154	7	3	9	0	19	1980
\$25,000 to \$29,999	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	1977
	114	106	4	2	1	1	8	1980
\$30,000	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	1977
And Above	65	62	1	0	2	0	3	1980

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 1977 and 1981.

TABLE VIIIb

Salary Distribution by Sex,
1977 and 1980

<u>Yearly Salary</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>School Year Beginning</u>
Below	8	1	7	1977
\$ 7,500	-	-	-	1980
\$ 7,500 to	7	4	3	1977
\$ 9,999	-	-	-	1980
\$10,000 to	26	12	14	1977
\$12,999	2	0	2	1980
\$13,000 to	90	58	32	1977
\$15,999	14	6	8	1980
\$16,000 to	120	93	27	1977
\$18,999	39	19	20	1980
\$19,000 to	127	116	11	1977
\$24,999	173	130	43	1980
\$25,000 to	27	25	2	1977
\$29,999	114	98	16	1980
\$30,000 to	15	15	0	1977
And Above	65	59	6	1980

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 1977 and 1981.

TABLE IXa

Tenure Ratios By Minority Status,
1977 and 1980

	<u>1977-78</u>		<u>1980-81</u>	
	<u>White</u>	<u>Minority</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Minority</u>
Total Professionals	381	37 ¹	370	37
Tenured	199	9	234	15
Percent of Group Tenured	52.2	24.3	63.2	40.5
Percent of Professionals Tenured	95.7	4.3	94.0	6.0

1. Minority figures include Blacks, Hispanics, Asians and American Indians.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981

TABLE IXb
Tenure Ratios by Sex,
1977 and 1980

	<u>1977-78</u>		<u>1980-81</u>	
	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Total Professionals	325	93	312	95
Tenured	177	31	203	46
Percent of Group Tenured	54.5	33.3	65.1	48.4
Percent of Professionals Tenured	85.1	14.9	81.5	18.5

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE Xa

New Hires By Race/Ethnicity,
1977 Through 1980

<u>School</u> <u>Year Beginning</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian/ Pac. Islander</u>	<u>Am. Indian/ Alaskan</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
1980	57	49	3	1	4	0	8
Percent	100	86	5	2	7	0	14
1979	38	35	1	0	2	0	3
Percent	100	92	3	0	5	0	8
1978	54	49	3	1	1	0	5
Percent	100	91	5	2	2	0	9
1977	38	35	1	0	2	0	3
Percent	100	92	3	0	5	0	8
Total	187	168	8	2	9	0	19
Percent	100	90	4	1	5	0	10

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE Xb
New Hires by Sex,
1977 Through 1980

School Year Beginning	Total	Men	Women
1980	57	37	20
Percent	100	65	35
1979	38	24	14
Percent	100	63	37
1978	54	40	14
Percent	100	74	26
1977	38	25	13
Percent	100	66	34
Total	187	126	61
Percent	100	68	32

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE XI

New Hires and Separations by Race/Ethnicity and Sex,
1977 Through 1980

<u>School</u> <u>Year Beginning</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian/ Pac. Islander</u>	<u>Am. Indian/ Alaskan</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>	<u>Women</u>
1980	57 ¹ 19 to date	49 17	3 2	1 0	4 0	0 0	8 2	20 8
	+38	+32	+1	+1	+4	0	+6	+12
1979	38 38	35 36	1 1	0 1	2 0	0 0	3 2	14 5
	0	-1	0	-1	+2	0	+1	+9
1978	54 36	49 32	3 2	1 1	1 1	0 0	5 4	14 13
	+18	+17	+1	0	0	0	+1	+1
1977	38 32	35 29	1 2	0 0	2 1	0 0	3 3	13 8
	+6	+6	-1	0	+1	0	0	+5
Total	187 125	168 14	8 7	2 2	9 2	0 0	19 11	61 34
	+62	+54	+1	0	+7	0	+8	+27

1. Within each square, the top line of figures represents the number of new hires for that year. The bottom line represents the number of separations for that year. The positive or negative figure in the center is the net gain or loss of that group for that year.

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE XIIa

Promotions by Race/Ethnicity,
1977 Through 1980

<u>School Year Beginning</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>	<u>Asian/ Pac. Islander</u>	<u>Am. Indian/ Alaskan</u>	<u>Total Minority</u>
1980	24	19	0	1	4	0	5
Percent	100	79	0	4	17	0	21
1979	27	25	0	0	2	0	2
Percent	100	93	0	0	7	0	7
1978	26	25	1	0	0	0	1
Percent	100	96	4	0	0	0	4
1977	20	18	0	1	1	0	2
Percent	100	90	0	5	5	0	10
Total	97	87	1	2	7	0	10
Percent	100	90	1	2	7	0	10

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

TABLE XIIb

Promotions by Sex,
1977 Through 1980

School Year Beginning	Total	Men	Women
1980	24	18	6
Percent	100	75	25
1979	27	22	5
Percent	100	81	19
1978	26	20	6
Percent	100	77	23
1977	20	16	4
Percent	100	80	20
Total	97	76	21
Percent	100	78	22

Source: James Kitchen, Affirmative Action Office, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, May 1981.

NOTES TO SECTION III

1. Under Federal Government requirements for Federal agencies, "Hispanic" is the standard classification used to describe "a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race." Memorandum from Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, to heads of executive departments, "Revision of Circular N. A-46, Exhibit F, 'Race and Ethnic Standards for Federal Statistics and Administrative Reporting,'" May 12, 1977. The Nevada Advisory Committee uses "Hispanic" in place of Nevada State's use of "Spanish American."
2. Interview with Adelina Figueroa, equal opportunity specialist, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, U.S. Department of Labor, in Van Nuys, Calif., June 10, 1981. Hereafter referred to as Figueroa Interview.
3. Letter from James Kitchen, affirmative action officer, UNLV to Philip Montez, regional director, Western Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Aug. 6, 1981, p. 2. Hereafter referred to as Kitchen Letter. It is also a common practice for universities and colleges to recruit locally and regionally for administrative positions. Figueroa Interview.
4. Telephone interview, May 21, 1981.
5. Figueroa Interview. In his Aug. 6, 1981 letter, Mr. Kitchen noted that his office has not used statistics from the University of Colorado since 1977 (p. 2).
6. Telephone interview with Betty Vetter, Scientific Manpower Commission, in Washington, D.C., June 8, 1981. The Committee was unable to determine what statistical sources are available to universities which recruit nationally. According to James Kitchen, the Federal Government does not provide up-to-date statistics. Kitchen Letter, p. 1.
7. The administration criticizes use of Table IV because these statistics are not broken down into individual fields. They further contend that the figures do not indicate recruiting availability since they do not take work experience of degree recipients into account. Kitchen Letter, p. 4. The Advisory Committee has included this information because it is used by the university as a resource and it shows an increasing availability of minorities and women.
8. University representatives state that it is "almost impossible" to increase the representation of Hispanics and American Indians because very few apply for positions at the school and some reject employment offers. Though only 1 application has been received by an American Indian since 1977, as many as 34 Hispanics applied for professional employment during the period of this study. Out of these applicants, 2 Hispanics were hired (see Table Xa). In 1980, a Hispanic was offered a position as "Athletic Information Officer," but the applicant rejected the offer. Kitchen Letter, pp. 3-4.

9. Figueroa Interview. Due to the confidentiality of this material, Ms. Figueroa did not provide Commission staff with the name of the California university.

10. The administration objects to the comparison of UNLV to a California university because California has a larger population from which to hire employees and its "many universities...attract qualified people to the area as faculty and graduate students." Kitchen Letter, p. 3.

The Committee questions the implication that Nevada has less to offer academicians than California. A recent Time Magazine article, "Pricing the Profs out of Eden" (Sept. 7, 1981), points out that the superinflationary housing market in California has seriously affected recruitment and retainment of faculty by higher education institutions in that State.

11. Availability percentages used here pertain only to tenure track positions.

12. Availability percentages apply to professional nonfaculty employees, excluding executive/managerial categories. In these categories, both women's and minorities' availability was 20 percent. Tables VIIa and b in this section show representation of minorities and women in specific administrative jobs at UNLV. In 1977, women occupied only 7 percent of executive/manager positions and minorities' representation was 4 percent. By 1981 minorities represented 12 percent of these jobs at UNLV, while women's representation decreased to 6 percent.

13. The administration comments:

From 1956 to 1970, one hundred (100) of our academic faculty were still with us, as of 1980-81. Of the one hundred (100), eighty-four (84) were male, twelve (12) were female and three (3) were minorities, which gives us a percentage of 20.64 males of our work force that have been with the University twelve (12) to twenty-five (25) years. This accounts for many males having higher ranked positions. Kitchen Letter, p. 3.

14. Separations mean terminations from employment for all reasons.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In 1977, an investigation by the Nevada Advisory Committee of complaints that minorities and women were receiving unequal treatment in professional rank employment at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas showed that these groups were poorly represented in faculty and administration. By 1981, an affirmative action plan at the university, in operation since the study began, had failed to secure changes in the overall employment of minority and women professionals.

Minorities experienced a .2 percent gain in total positions and women increased their representation 1 percent during the Committee's four-year monitoring. In faculty, percentages of minorities and women decreased from 1977 to 1981. While some improvements were seen in the areas of tenure and salary, no gains were realized in diversity of professional hires. Ninety (90) percent of the persons hired for academic and administrative work since the plan was implemented in 1977 were White and the majority of these were males.

Continued racial and sex imbalances in UNLV's professional staff indicate that the university's affirmative action program is insufficient to insure equal employment opportunity. The Committee found:

1. An unwillingness by the administration to take responsibility for and to correct internal conditions at the university which affect low numbers of minorities and women in professional jobs.
2. An inadequate recruitment budget to solicit applications from minorities and women.
3. The use of an insufficient data base by the university from which to assess the availability

of minorities and women in higher education.

4. Contradictory perceptions about the definition and purpose of affirmative action among UNLV representatives.
5. A reluctance by administration leaders to become involved in employment decisions.
6. A belief by minority and women professionals that evaluation of their work was inequitable and that they were prevented from full participation in personnel committee activities.
7. The use of non-uniform criteria by personnel committees in making recommendations concerning employment.

On the basis of the foregoing, the Nevada Advisory Committee recommends that:

1. The administration at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas
 - a. reevaluate and restructure its affirmative action plan so that it will remedy underemployment and underutilization of minorities and women in professional positions; and
 - b. increase the university's travel budget to support adequate recruitment.
2. The affirmative action office at UNLV
 - a. develop a comprehensive system to determine the annual availability of minorities and women in faculty and administration; and
 - b. increase its efforts to educate university staff about the history and purpose of affirmative action in relationship to equal employment opportunity.
3. The Board of Regents for the University of Nevada System
 - a. establish by-laws which require department personnel committees to use uniform standards in the employment selection and appraisal

process, and to include as members in each committee a representative of the Board of Regents and the President's Office; and

- b. develop a plan which will insure the racial/sex diversity of these committees.
4. The regional office of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor with jurisdiction over the University of Nevada conduct an investigation of UNLV's compliance with Federal affirmative action requirements, and provide technical assistance to help the university develop an effective affirmative action program.



University of Nevada System Board of Regents

405 MARSH AVENUE RENO, NEVADA 89509
(702) 784-4958

Robert A. Cashell
Chairman
P. O. Box 216
Verdi, Nevada 89439
(702) 345-6000

August 13, 1981

Mr. Philip Montez
Regional Director
Western Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
3660 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Dear Mr. Montez:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the report of your investigation of alleged hiring practices at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas and for extending the date for our reply.

In discussing this report with the University of Nevada, Las Vegas administrators and the changes which have occurred since 1977, we can assure you that they are most conscientious in their efforts to obtain women and minorities in professional positions on their campus. We learned there have been occasions in which a minority or woman was offered a vacant position but did not accept.

As an educational institution it is still our responsibility to obtain the best qualified person to impart knowledge and skills to our students. The talented and qualified minorities and women are now in a position to command top salaries and, unfortunately, Nevada faculty salaries are ranked very low among the states. Rest assured the top priority of our Board of Regents is to raise this ranking. Some progress was made in the last session of our state legislature, however, in order to be more competitive for top candidates it will take more time and effort before we are able to do so.

We are concerned with the comparison of Las Vegas and the university with an unnamed California institution and surrounding community from which to draw an applicant pool. Would you please relay that information so we may comment?

There is no indication of recommendations to the institution nor is their mention of the disposition of your report. That information is also desired.

Mr. Philip Montez
August 13, 1981
Page 2

We urge you to consider the information provided to you by Mr. Jim Kitchen, Affirmative Action Officer at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We feel you will find progress has been made and that attitudes on the campus are changing. The Board of Regents is very much aware of affirmative action policies. We shall continue to assist our administrators in making every effort to increase upward mobility of minorities and women and in providing every opportunity for success within our institution.

Sincerely,



Robert Cashell

RC/kd

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

WESTERN REGIONAL OFFICE
3660 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 810
Los Angeles, California 90010
Telephone: (213) 688-3437

August 25, 1981

Mr. Robert A. Cashell
Chairman
University of Nevada System
Board of Regents
405 Marsh Avenue
Reno, Nevada 89509

Dear Mr. Cashell:

Thank you for your comments regarding the draft report on affirmative action at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. We will consider your statements, as well as Mr. Kitchen's comments, for inclusion in the final report.

We did not send you the section dealing with recommendations to the university. This section is a prerogative of the Nevada Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights who will be issuing the report. The Commission has established advisory committees in each state to advise it on matters pertaining to discrimination or denials of equal protection of the laws. Under Section 703.2(e) of the Commission's rules and regulations, a function of state advisory committees is to "initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission." You will obtain a final copy of the report which will include the Nevada Advisory Committee's recommendations.

In answer to your question regarding disposition of the report, it will be submitted to our Commissioners in Washington, D.C. who will consider using the report in making their recommendations to the President and Congress. The report will also be distributed to those who participated in the study, as well as the press and interested individuals, agencies, and organizations.

We are unsure what type of information you are requesting concerning the comparison of UNLV to a California university. If you wish the name of the university, we refer you to note 7, Section III, p. 20 which states, "Due to the confidentiality of this material, Ms. Figueroa /OFCCP/ did not provide Commission staff with the name of the California university." If you are requesting information that the university uses to recruit personnel, we again refer you to our report, page 15, which states that

it recruits professional employees from a national applicant pool.

Sincerely,

PHILIP MONTEZ
Regional Office Director
Western Regional Office