

EMPLOYMENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AND PROFESSIONALS BY KANSAS MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

March 1982

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

EMPLOYMENT OF ADMINISTRATORS AND PROFESSIONALS BY KANSAS MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS  
A monograph prepared by the Kansas Advisory  
Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

ATTRIBUTION

The findings and recommendations contained in this monograph are those of the Kansas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights and, as such, are not attributable to the Commission. This monograph 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 Congress.

RIGHT OF RESPONSE:

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

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Kansas Advisory Committee to the  
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights  
March 1982

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Arthur S. Flemming, Chairman  
Mary F. Berry, Vice Chairman  
Stephen Horn  
Blandina C. Ramirez  
Jill S. Ruckelshaus  
Murray Saltzman

John Hope III, Acting Staff Director

Dear Commissioners:

The Kansas Advisory Committee submits this monograph on its review of eight Kansas local governments' employment of minority, female, handicapped and older persons in administrative and professional positions as a part of its responsibility to advise the Commission about civil rights problems within the State. The Committee analyzed utilization patterns for administrators and professionals in the cities of Coffeyville, Dodge City, Junction City, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal, Kansas City, and Topeka. The Committee also reviewed their affirmative action plans and efforts to recruit for administrative and professional positions.

The Advisory Committee found that the municipalities utilized more white men and fewer white women in city government than would have been the case if the city work force matched the State labor force. Some municipalities used fewer minorities than would have been expected, but by and large most groups were well represented in comparison to the State labor force. The Committee recommends that municipal governments review their employment policies to determine whether any of these have a discriminatory effect on women, minorities, handicapped or older persons.

In the monograph the Advisory Committee notes that there is a disparity between the availability of handicapped workers as administrators or professionals by municipal governments. The Advisory Committee also noted that the disparity between the percent of white males and minorities and female administrators or professionals as a proportion of their own race/sex group is greater than 20 percent. The Committee believes that this suggests that minorities and women are not being hired or promoted into administrative or professional jobs to the extent one would expect. The Committee urges municipalities to examine their hiring and promotion policies to determine whether there are any practices that bar particular groups of people from administrative or professional jobs.

The Advisory Committee found that only three of the eight cities had made any effort to determine labor force availability, only one had made a determination of underutilization and set both long and short-term goals. It urges local governments obtain the necessary statistics to make determinations of underutilization and, if there are any, set remedial goals to be achieved immediately and over time.

The Advisory Committee is convinced that the wider the recruitment area, the better the quality of candidates available for selection and the greater the likelihood of minority and female applicants. It urges local governments to make extensive use of national and regional professional associations, specialized recruitment newsletters as well as regional newspapers for most administrative or professional jobs.

We urge you to concur in our recommendations and assist the Advisory Committee in follow-up activities.

Respectfully,

BENJAMIN H. DAY, Chairperson  
Kansas Advisory Committee

MEMBERS OF THE  
KANSAS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Benjamin H. Day, Chairperson  
Leavenworth

Norman E. Justice  
Kansas City

Jay D. Battenberg  
Leavenworth

Rayna F. Levine  
Overland Park

Russell W. Getter  
Lawrence

Gloria Jean Sandoval  
Garden City

Jaclyn Gossard  
Wichita

Ruth G. Shechter  
Fairway

Clyde D. Graeber  
Leavenworth

Leroy Tombs  
Bonner Springs

Will Florence Robbins-Hudgins  
Kansas City

Alfredo M. Valenzuela  
Garden City

Clarence E. Wesley  
Wichita

#### 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.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This monograph was produced with the assistance of the Commission's Central States Regional Office. The investigation and monograph were the principal staff assignment of Etta Lou Wilkinson. The report was written by Malcolm Barnett. Legal sufficiency review was conducted by Elaine M. Esparza and support services from Jo Ann Daniels and Gloria O'Leary. The project was undertaken under the overall supervision of Melvin L. Jenkins, Esq., Director, Central States Regional Office.

## Introduction

On Nov. 7, 1981, the Kansas Advisory Committee decided to conduct a study of the role of minority, female, handicapped and persons 40-70 who are administrative and professional employees of Kansas local governments. To do so it selected nine local governments for review--based on size and/or access to a center of minority population. The local governments selected were: Coffeyville, Dodge City, Junction City, Kansas City, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal, Topeka and Wichita. On Nov. 9, 1981, these cities were sent a letter requesting that they supply information for the study. The municipalities' responses are incorporated in this monograph. The Advisory Committee is grateful for the efforts of all the municipal officials who participated in the framing of those responses. (The City of Wichita declined to supply data, citing litigation and the time involved in preparation of the data requested.) All municipalities were asked to comment on the draft monograph which was sent to them so that they could correct any errors or omissions and verify the accuracy of the data.<sup>1</sup>

It should be emphasized that this is not a comprehensive review of either employment or affirmative action. The Advisory Committee did not interview all those involved in city government or representatives of minority people, women, the handicapped and persons 40-70. The Committee's study is further limited because it focuses on administrative and professional employment and contains only references to other categories of workers. What the Advisory Committee has done is to compare actual utilization, as reported by the municipalities, to the available labor force statistics; review the affirmative action plans submitted by the municipalities; and, summarize the information on efforts to recruit administrators and professionals that was supplied by each of the municipalities. The findings and recommendations are

based on these data and should not be construed as a comprehensive review of local government affirmative action efforts.

This monograph is one of a series of studies that the Kansas Advisory Committee has undertaken in reviewing public sector commitment to equal employment opportunity. The first such report was prepared jointly with the other Advisory Committees in Region VII (Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska) on State government affirmative action efforts. That report, published in 1978, soon will be updated.

These studies are undertaken as part of the Advisory Committee's contribution to fulfilling the statutory mandate of the Commission, "To study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting discrimination or a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution because of race, color, religion, sex, age, handicap or national origin or in the administration of justice."<sup>2</sup>



## 1. Analysis of Statistics

The Advisory Committee requested data on minority, female, aged and handicapped employees of the nine local governments. It obtained copies of the official reports those governments submit to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which subdivide local government workers by job category, salary level, race and sex. It also obtained data on administrators and professional employees and on administrators and professional employees whose positions are funded by the Federal, State or county governments, divided by race, sex, age and disability. A summary of the data that the local governments submitted to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is printed in appendix B of this monograph.

There are situations where statistical data of the kind obtained by the Advisory Committee can be used to show that there is, or is not, discrimination in employment. The data reported here do not permit such statements. What can be stated is that there are disparities from standard comparative measures that suggest the possibility of underutilization and discrimination. Even such statements are made with caution. Because Kansas' minority population is relatively small, the proportion of people from each of the principal minority groups in the available labor force is also small. Thus, where the proportion of a minority group available to be employed in a job category is less than 1 percent, parity would mean employment of a fraction of a person--clearly an artificial notion. Because the numbers of employees are small, even larger percentages, up to 5.56 percent, are needed to equate to one worker. The statistics on white women workers are not subject to the same problem because white women constitute a significant proportion of the available labor force in Kansas. Although the Advisory Committee uses several comparative measures and sometimes makes reference to

disparities where only a small number of persons are available, it has attempted to distinguish these from "significant disparities" where the statistical discrepancies are sufficiently large to suggest that a real possibility exists for employing persons from a given group. Even in these instances, however, the Advisory Committee is not asserting that a disparity is the same as discrimination. For many reasons, some identified in this report, and despite the best of intentions and good faith efforts, statistical disparities might exist which are not the consequence of discrimination. What a disparity does imply is that, assuming resources are available, a greater effort should be made to ensure that all that can be done, by way of recruitment, hiring procedure or promotion of an "underrepresented group", is being done where the actual work force of a local government is disparate from the available labor force.

Several cities suggested the appropriate goal for total municipal employment is the population percentage rather than the labor force. Dodge City noted that its long-term goal "would continue placing the City in a position of employing minority individuals in a percentage greater than they are found in the community at large."<sup>3</sup> The City of Lawrence also noted that its minority utilization of persons newly hired exceed the existing minority population of the city.<sup>4</sup> The City of Leavenworth, in its affirmative action policy resolution, stated "The Equal Employment Officer will identify and utilize referral employment sources in order to raise the number of minority and women employees within all departments and within each job classification to one consistent with the balance of residents in the local community."<sup>5</sup> The City of Topeka, in its affirmative action plan, implies a similar comparison when it notes "The percentage of City of Topeka's overall minority work force is slightly more than the local percentage of minorities available

[in the population], however it is recognized this is not distributed proportionately throughout all levels in each department...."<sup>6</sup> Table 1 compares the 1980 population by race in each city (data by race and sex will not be available until later in the year) with the work force. While there are some disparities, these are not of a large magnitude.

Appended to this monograph in appendix A are charts showing the employment of administrators and professionals in the fire and police departments and a variety of agencies lumped together under the heading of general administration. There are no statistically significant disparities regarding minority employment, nor are there concentrations of minorities in any of these departments. White women are either unrepresented or underrepresented in the fire and police departments of these jurisdictions, but except for Topeka and Kansas City, the underrepresentation is not significant. However, it has been suggested by many authorities, including the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, that for police departments the appropriate standard is not availability but population because a police department that is unrepresentative of the population may be seen as an "army of occupation."<sup>7</sup> By this standard, women and minorities (except in Kansas City) are underrepresented at the command level in all departments. The same is true in the command staff of fire departments except in Kansas City. But in general administration agencies of the city governments, where minorities or women are represented at all in the command staff (that is, in Coffeyville, Kansas City, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal and Topeka), they are reasonably represented relative to population.

The usual point of comparison to assess employment discrimination is the available labor force. One measure of this is EEOC's estimates of the regional civilian labor force for Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska: 58.5

percent are nonminority male workers and 35.1 percent are nonminority female workers. Another is EEOC's estimate of the Kansas civilian labor force (hereafter called the State labor force). In Kansas, 58.9 percent are estimated to be nonminority male and 35.0 percent are estimated to be nonminority female. Black men made up only 2.7 percent of the regional and 2.0 percent of the State labor forces. Hispanic men made up 0.6 percent of the regional and 1.1 percent of the State labor forces. Asian men made up 0.1 percent of the regional and a similar proportion of the State labor forces. American Indian and Alaskan Native men made up 0.1 percent of the regional and 0.1 percent of the State labor forces. Black women made up 2.5 percent of the regional and 1.7 percent of the State labor forces. Hispanic women made up 0.4 percent of the regional and 0.6 percent of the State labor forces. Asian women and American Indian women each made up 0.1 percent of the regional and similar proportions of the State labor forces.<sup>8</sup>

EEOC offers an estimate of professionals in the civilian labor force (PLF) as one standard to be used by Federal agencies in determining underutilization in the Federal service.<sup>9</sup> Since EEOC's alternative standard is the civilian labor force (CLF), the Advisory Committee chose the more conservative statistic, the PLF, for reviewing administrators and professionals. EEOC has not calculated the number of administrators from each ethnic group in the CLF, as such.<sup>10</sup> The Advisory Committee did compare the data used here on professionals and 1978 EEOC estimates of the private sector labor force (based on forms submitted by employers of more than 100 persons). There was no significant difference between the estimate of professionals used by EEOC and the Advisory Committee and the total for administrators and professionals in the 1978 EEOC estimate.<sup>11</sup> In this monograph the Advisory Committee uses the CLF and PLF statistics as surrogate measures of availability. For Kansas, the

data shows that nonminority males are 73.3 percent of the PLF, black males are 1.2 percent, Hispanic males are 1.2 percent, Asian males are 0.3 percent, American Indian males are 0.18 percent, white females are 22.3 percent, black females are 0.9 percent, Hispanic females are 0.4 percent, Asian females are 0.4 percent and American Indian females are less than 0.1 percent. Later in this monograph the Advisory Committee reviews local government descriptions on recruitment which suggest that for many administrative and professional level positions, the appropriate labor force data is at least the State. For some technical jobs it is clear a regional focus would be more relevant but this is not utilized, thereby choosing a more conservative statistic.

In analyzing the data in this report, the Advisory Committee regards a disparity as significant if the discrepancy between the civilian labor force or the professional labor force and actual employment is greater than could be corrected by the substitution of at least one person from a given race/sex group for another person in the local government work force.

Table 2 shows the percentage of workers available, based on the civilian labor force data, the number of workers actually employed by each municipality and the difference between availability and utilization. Each city utilized more white males and fewer white women than it would have if its work force matched the State labor force. Black men were utilized at or above the labor force rate in Coffeyville, Junction City, Kansas City, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal and Topeka. The same was true for Hispanic men in all jurisdictions. Black women were utilized at less than availability only in Dodge City and Liberal. Hispanic women were utilized at less than availability only in Coffeyville and Leavenworth. Asian and Indian men and women were utilized at or above availability in all cities except Topeka. These calculations are based on a conservative estimate. Where the availability calculation

described in the note to Table 2 produced a sum less than the number employed, the difference in totals was added to the white male availability, thus overestimating their availability. Moreover, because of the way the calculations are utilized, a disparity is reported only where a whole additional person would alter the disparity.

Table 3 shows the proportion of workers in each municipality who earn \$12,999 or less, divided by race and sex group. The proportions have to be treated with some caution since in many cases large proportions reflect the small number of workers from the ethnic group in city employment. But it is striking that the proportion of white female workers who earn \$12,999 or less is considerably larger than the proportion of white males who do so. Acknowledging the somewhat artificial nature of the proportion, the same is generally true for minority group workers, both male and female in most cities.

Table 4 shows the number of administrators and professionals potentially available to each city based on the State labor force data, and assuming no increase in the number of administrators and professionals employed by each city. It also shows the number actually employed and the difference between these two statistics. It shows that, except in Kansas City and Topeka, white men are overrepresented in these categories compared to availability. Minorities, male and female, are represented at or above availability. White women are underrepresented significantly.

Another way to look at disparity is to suggest that the proportion of employees from each ethnic group who are in each job category ought to be the same, or at least similar. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the Census Bureau have used an "index of disparity" to measure differences on this basis.<sup>12</sup> Table 5 provides the relevant comparison for administrative and professional workers. It also shows the range of 20 percent above or below

the white male rate that would be a reasonable expected deviation. In fact, where they are employed, the proportion who are administrators or professionals is lower than 80 percent of the white male rate for black men, Hispanic men, white women (except in Topeka), black women (except in Leavenworth), Hispanic women (except in Kansas City). Many cities employed no minorities or women at all as administrators or professionals and thus no percentage could be calculated. The Advisory Committee's staff has estimated that, based on the data supplied by EEOC, 10.69 percent of white males in the civilian labor force in Kansas are administrators or professionals, as are 5.11 percent of black males, 9.17 percent of Hispanic males, 42.17 percent of Asian males, 8.37 percent of American Indian males, 5.47 percent of white females, 4.66 percent of black females, 4.8 percent of Hispanic females, 13.04 percent of Asian females and 1.18 percent of American Indian females.<sup>13</sup>

Using a 20 percent range test, this means that in the civilian labor force we would expect substantial deviations between the utilization of white males and the utilization of many other groups--black males, Asian males, Indian males, white females, black females, Hispanic females, Asian females and Indian females. Only Hispanic males are utilized within range, but it should be noted that the disparity for Asian men and women is based on a utilization rate in excess of the white male rate. Because so few minorities are employed in most of the smaller cities, as well as because some have in fact done well in utilizing them, a comparison of availability to utilization by ethnic group does not show more than a trifling number of significant disparities.

It is sometimes alleged that minority and female workers are employed on "soft money," that is using grant funds provided by Federal, State or other sources outside the municipalities' controls and therefore, especially at present, likely to be terminated. The Advisory Committee requested

information on this, but was told either that jurisdictions had no soft money positions or that the data was not available, except in Kansas City. Only white women were more likely than white men to be in "soft money" jobs and the difference is not statistically significant.

Kansas is unique in having readily available data on the handicapped worker proportion of the civilian labor force. That data is available by county. Coffeyville's labor force included 7.1 percent handicapped persons, Dodge City's included 6.5 percent, Junction City's had 13.4 percent, Kansas City's had 7.7 percent, Lawrence's had 5.4, Leavenworth's had 8.7 percent, Liberal's had 6.0 percent and Topeka's had 8.1 percent.<sup>14</sup> Based on these percentages there might have been two handicapped administrators or professionals in Coffeyville (it had none), one in Dodge City (it had three), three in Junction City (it had one), 24 in Kansas City (it had 7), two in Leavenworth (it had one), one in Liberal (it had none), 28 in Topeka (there were 11). Lawrence had no data on its handicapped workers but stated it will be preparing a report in the near future; it would need two to match the estimate of availability.

There is no available data on older workers in the labor force. A review of the data on utilization of older workers does not show any glaring disparities in the utilization of older male vs. older female workers as administrators or professionals. Given the demographics, there are probably somewhat fewer older female workers than would have been the case had women always had equal access to municipal jobs that were, or led to, administrative or professional posts.



## 2. Analysis of Affirmative Action Plans and Recruitment Efforts

The Advisory Committee reviewed the affirmative action plans submitted by the eight jurisdictions. To do so the Advisory Committee used a standard utilized in its forthcoming study of State government affirmative action.<sup>15</sup> The contents of the plans are ranked in Table 6.<sup>16</sup> Most of the cities did not have affirmative action plans per se.

Coffeyville provided a policy resolution entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity Policy of the City of Coffeyville."<sup>17</sup> It also provided a statement of the "Goals, Objectives and Timetables for All Departments of the City of Coffeyville, Kansas." This stated that "This affirmative action plan (Oct. 22, 1975) did not however, include goals, objectives and timetables for each department of the City. This enumeration of the goals, objectives and timetables...is to be attached to and become a part of the affirmative action plan of the City of Coffeyville."<sup>18</sup>

Dodge City provided an "affirmative action policy statement" and an attachment showing goals and timetables.<sup>19</sup>

Junction City stated it did not have an affirmative action plan. It also stated that segments of its personnel manual constituted an affirmative action policy.<sup>20</sup>

Lawrence provided an extract from its city code that details the city's affirmative action program.<sup>21</sup> It also supplied supplementary information on the administration of its program.<sup>22</sup> The city reported that it is currently revising its affirmative action program and that it had run a seminar on employing the handicapped.<sup>23</sup>

Leavenworth submitted a copy of its Resolution No. B321 of June 8, 1976 entitled, "A Resolution Establishing an Affirmative Action Policy..." a copy of the city civil service commission rules and regulations,<sup>24</sup> and a copy of the sections of the city code requiring equal opportunity.<sup>25</sup>

Liberal provided a copy of a resolution of the city council "to make equal employment opportunity a reality for all and approving a complete affirmative action plan," dated Aug. 17, 1976.<sup>26</sup> It also attached an undated Affirmative Action Program,<sup>27</sup> an affirmative action plan policy statement<sup>28</sup> and a document entitled an Affirmative Action Plan.<sup>29</sup>

Kansas City supplied a copy of its Affirmative Action Program and Equal Opportunity Program implementing a March 1976 resolution of the board of commissioners.<sup>30</sup>

The City of Topeka provided a copy of its Affirmative Action Program plan as adopted on Mar. 25, 1980.<sup>31</sup> Also provided were data on applicant flow, contact lists and media utilization.<sup>32</sup>

Only in Liberal and Lawrence had the chief executive assumed formal responsibility for affirmative action. In Junction City the City Manager implicitly assumed this. In Topeka, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal, Coffeyville and Kansas City an affirmative action officer had been appointed.<sup>33</sup>

Only Lawrence, Topeka and Kansas City had made an effort to determine labor force availability. Coffeyville, Dodge City, Kansas City, Lawrence, Leavenworth and Topeka took their work force analysis into account in planning. Only Topeka actually made a determination of underutilization. Only Topeka had set long and short term goals by race, sex, and handicap. Dodge City and Liberal had set short term goals by race and sex. Kansas City set vague long term goals and planned to set short term goals.

Topeka's recruitment activities satisfied all and Lawrence nearly all the criteria. Dodge City, Leavenworth and Liberal said they advertised jobs in major print media. Kansas City provided a list of media and community groups that were contacted. Coffeyville planned to maintain information on the

productivity of recruitment sources. Liberal did monitor the effectiveness of its sources.

Only Lawrence and Topeka had even the rudiments of a plan to assure that the selection process did not discriminate against minorities and women. Topeka's only deficiency was in the area of validation of entry level job requirements and consideration of trainee posts. Kansas City planned to validate its selection and classification process but did not specify when. Liberal had reviewed its employee questionnaire. Other jurisdictions had no plans.

Only Lawrence and Topeka had most of the elements of a program to ensure that promotions were nondiscriminatory. Dodge City did provide some training opportunities for employees and Coffeyville did maintain a skills list.

Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal, Topeka and Junction City provided maternity leave on the same basis as sick leave. Only Lawrence and Topeka provided flexible hours. Lawrence, Liberal and Topeka encouraged part-time work, and Lawrence and Topeka asserted that their facilities were accessible to the handicapped.

Lawrence, Liberal and Topeka had developed meaningful equal employment opportunity complaint and grievance processes.

Only Topeka and Lawrence either had or planned to establish an effective evaluation mechanism to ensure affirmative action and equal opportunity programs functioned as intended. Coffeyville, Lawrence and Liberal did maintain applicant flow data including reasons for nonhire. Kansas City planned a general evaluation only.

Larger cities in the study obviously benefited from the greater availability of qualified minority, female, older or handicapped applicants. Leavenworth reported that of its last three top jobs, it did get minority

applicants for one and hired a minority person. It also reported hiring an older worker as city manager. But, it noted, most such jobs were filled by promotions.<sup>34</sup> Lawrence noted that minority new hires in 1981 constituted 23 percent of all such hires and female new hires were 29 percent of all such new hires. It particularly noted the hiring of women as parks supervisor and director of employee relations noting that "These represent 'breakthroughs' in traditionally male dominated classifications."<sup>35</sup> It also noted it had a white female as a water collections supervisor.<sup>36</sup>

The Advisory Committee asked the local governments to describe some aspects of their programs for recruiting administrators and professionals.

Several cities reported that they recruited nationwide for these positions. Topeka stated:

Administrative and professional level positions are recruited nationwide, depending on the position and the availability of applicants (determined by past experience). They are minimally advertised throughout the State of Kansas.<sup>37</sup>

Liberal stated:

For recruitment of administrative and professional level positions, we recruit in nationwide media. We do not limit our recruitment to a geographical area.<sup>38</sup>

Coffeyville reported that most of its positions were filled locally, except for such positions as city manager.<sup>39</sup> Leavenworth reported that its choice of recruitment area depended on the job. Where there was a national source, such as for public works engineers, city manager, finance officer, nationwide recruitment was undertaken. Otherwise, recruitment was statewide and in the Missouri portion of the Kansas City SMSA (of which Leavenworth is a part).<sup>40</sup> Junction City stated that its usual recruitment area was the Junction City labor market but that if the number of potentially qualified applicants in the area was anticipated to be insufficient, it would utilize other sources within the State.<sup>41</sup>

Lawrence used both national and regional sources, depending on the position. It utilized the regional media but also utilized a nationwide recruitment program operated by the International City Management Association.<sup>42</sup> Kansas City reported only area sources for recruitment.<sup>43</sup>

One test of the scope of actual recruitment is the media list used by local governments to advertise positions. Topeka provided an extensive list of media used that included all of the principal papers and minority media in Oklahoma, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri and Kansas. It also included the Wall Street Journal and specialist newsletters directed to computer technology, community development, human rights workers and public works officers.<sup>44</sup> Dodge City said it advertised in "local newspapers, surrounding large city newspapers and in numerous professional publications."<sup>45</sup> The City of Liberal reported that "the media used is that which is appropriate for the particular position involved. We advertise in publications distributed to persons in the field we are recruiting for."<sup>46</sup>

Leavenworth stated that:

If the position is one for which membership in a national organization is possible such as the International City Management Association for City Managers, the Municipal Finance Officers Association for Finance Directors, the American Public Works Association for Engineers or Directors of Public Works; we would advertise the position in the publications of those national organizations as well as all the media listed below. Also depending on the position we may advertise the position in the State of Kansas Municipal League Magazine. For most positions we would advertise in the major Kansas City Metropolitan newspapers, the Kansas City Star or Times and the minority press Kansas City Call or Kansas City Globe. We would also advertise the position locally in the Leavenworth Times and post a notice of vacancy for current employees under the internal promotion program. We have also used college placement departments to help recruit civil engineers, however it has been used in combination with the above.<sup>47</sup>

Coffeyville stated that it advertised for most jobs only in the local media. A few professional positions were advertised in professional journals or recruited via consultant agencies.<sup>48</sup> Junction City stated that where a wide recruitment effort was needed:

notices would also be published in other newspapers within the State having a wider area of circulations than the local newspaper, municipal league publications and appropriate professional publications. Additionally, if the vacant position is of a professional nature employment notices are also sent to appropriate departments and placement centers at State universities and colleges. Also, all position vacancy notices, except direct promotional within a department, are posted at various locations within each departments area.<sup>49</sup>

It noted that fire and police professional and administrative positions are filled only by promotion.<sup>50</sup> The City of Lawrence reported that it utilized a wide variety of media: the Lawrence Journal-World, Kansas City Star, Topeka Capitol and a minority newspaper in Kansas City, the Kansas City Globe. It also reported using many professional publications including The City-County Recruitment and the State Recruiter, Fire Prevention, Fire Engineering, and the American Water Works Journal as well as other professional sources.<sup>51</sup>

The city also reported using a wide variety of community placement sources including the Kansas Human Relations Association and the placement offices of the University of Kansas, Haskell Indian Junior College, and Baker University.<sup>52</sup> Kansas City reported using area newspapers, local community groups and job centers.<sup>53</sup>

Some travel by city officials to conduct recruitment was reported. The City of Topeka reported it limited such travel to within-State except for recreation positions.<sup>54</sup> Dodge City reported that it recruited police officers in Wichita.<sup>55</sup> Liberal reported it filled only one professional position during the preceding 12 months and made no recruitment trips in connection with it, although it did bring the top three contenders of 25 applicants to Liberal.<sup>56</sup> None of the other cities reported any travel.

## Notes

1. Comments were received from Coffeyville (William Clairborne, equal opportunity officer, telephone interview, Feb. 23, 1982); Lawrence (Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, letter to staff, Feb. 19, 1982 and telephone interview, Feb. 25, 1982); Leavenworth (Harold Anderson, assistant city manager, telephone interview, Feb. 24, 1982); Liberal (Raylene E. Noreen, director of personnel, telephone interview, Feb. 24, 1982) and Topeka (Pat Mills-Hawkins, personnel officer, letter to chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Feb. 16, 1982). All their comments and corrections have been incorporated in this monograph.
2. 42 USC sec. 1975 c(a)(2)(1980).
3. John Deardoff, administrative assistant to the city manager, letter to staff, Nov. 20, 1981.
4. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, letter to staff, Jan. 15, 1982.
5. City of Leavenworth, Resolution No. B321, Sec. 3.
6. City of Topeka, Affirmative Action Program (Mar. 25, 1980), p. 4.
7. See: Gerald E. Caiden, Police Revitalization (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977), p. 129; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979), p. 330.
8. Doris Werwie, EEOC, letter to staff, Dec. 4, 1981. Regional data calculated by CSRO.
9. EEOC, Management Directive 702, appendix B.
10. Doris Werwie, telephone interview, Dec. 10, 1981.
11. EEOC, 1978 EEO-1 Summary by State, nd.
12. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women (August 1978), pp. 39-45.

13. Doris Werwie, EEOC, letter to staff, Dec. 4, 1981.
14. Kansas, State Affirmative Action Plan (1980), pp. 115-126.
15. State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America: An Update (forthcoming).
16. In addition to the sources listed below, the following cities provided comments that have been incorporated in the final draft: Coffeyville, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Liberal and Topeka.
17. City of Coffeyville, Policy Resolution No. PR-77-04 (May 11, 1977).
18. City of Coffeyville, "Goals, Objectives and Timetables of All Departments of the City of Coffeyville, Kansas," nd.
19. John Deardoff, administrative assistant to the city manager, letter to staff, Nov. 20, 1981.
20. Richard A. McClanathan, administrative assistant to the city manager, letter to the Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 28, 1981.
21. City of Lawrence, Code of the City of Lawrence, Kansas, Sec. 10.9, nd.
22. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, City of Lawrence, letter to staff, Jan. 15, 1982.
23. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, telephone interview, Jan. 20, 1982.
24. City of Leavenworth, Civil Service Commission, Rules and Regulations (1981).
25. City of Leavenworth, Code of Ordinances, Article VI, sec. 2-147 to 2-166.
26. City of Liberal, Resolution No. 683, Aug. 17, 1976.
27. City of Liberal, Affirmative Action Program, nd.
28. City of Liberal, Affirmative Action Plan Policy Statement, nd.
29. City of Liberal, Affirmative Action Plan, nd.
30. City of Kansas City, Affirmative Action Program and Equal Employment Opportunity Program, nd.



31. City of Topeka, Affirmative Action Program (Mar. 25, 1980).
32. Pat Mills-Hawkins, personnel officer, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 2, 1981.
33. In this and the following analysis, efforts or accomplishments at levels lower than specified in Table 6 are acknowledged.
34. Harold Anderson, assistant city manager, letter to staff, Dec. 17, 1981.
35. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, letter to staff, Jan. 15, 1982.  
The city also hired two white female firefighters. (Kim Austin-Smith, letter to staff, Feb. 19, 1982).
36. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, telephone interview, Jan. 20, 1982.
37. Pat Mills-Hawkins, personnel officer, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 2, 1981.
38. Raylene E. Noreen, director of personnel, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 4, 1981.
39. William Clairborne, equal opportunity officer, telephone interview, Dec. 18, 1981.
40. Harold Anderson, assistant city manager, letter to staff, Dec. 17, 1981.
41. Richard A. McClanathan, administrative assistant to the city manager, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 28, 1981.
42. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, letter to staff, Jan. 15, 1982.
43. John E. Reardon, Mayor of Kansas City, letter to staff, Jan. 14, 1982.
44. Pat Mills-Hawkins, personnel officer, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 2, 1981.
45. John Deardoff, administrative assistant, letter to staff, Nov. 20, 1981.
46. Raylene E. Noreen, director of personnel, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 4, 1981.
47. Harold Anderson, assistant city manager, letter to staff, Dec. 17, 1981.

48. William Clairborne, equal opportunity officer, telephone interview, Dec. 18, 1981.
49. Richard A. McClanathan, administrative assistant to the city manager, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 28, 1981.
50. Ibid.
51. Kim Austin-Smith, administrative aide, letter to staff, Jan. 5, 1982.
52. Ibid and letter to staff, Feb. 19, 1982.
53. John E. Reardon, Mayor of Kansas City, letter to staff, Jan. 4, 1982.
54. Pat Mills-Hawkins, personnel officer, letter to Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 2, 1981.
55. John Deardoff, administrative assistant, letter to staff, Nov. 20, 1981.
56. Raylene E. Noreen, director of personnel, letter to the Chairperson, Kansas Advisory Committee, Dec. 4, 1981.

## Findings and Recommendations

The two portions of this monograph, on utilization and affirmative action efforts, are a study of contrast. Merely analyzing the employment data both for all workers and for administrators and professionals would suggest that while there is significant underutilization of white women, there is little underutilization of minorities, male or female. There are hints in the data of underutilization problems, but nothing that would lead an observer to allege discrimination. The data on white women workers is clear and unambiguous. It shows dramatic underutilization. The failures of the affirmative action efforts to reach such women are unmistakable. There are some noteworthy affirmative action efforts. But the overall pattern is of planning exercises that appear to have little prospect for implementation or, even if implemented, to be effective.

The Advisory Committee is convinced that the evidence of underutilization of white women points to a failure of the affirmative action efforts by the eight municipalities it reviewed. The Advisory Committee believes that if an effective affirmative action program is designed and implemented underutilization can be eliminated. Moreover, an effective affirmative action program which includes efforts to recruit, hire and promote minorities, white women, the handicapped and older workers might result in substantial increases in municipal employment of persons from each of those groups.

The following findings and recommendations are submitted under the provisions of Section 703.2(e) of the Commission's regulations, empowering the Advisory Committee to "Initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters which the State Committee has studied."

Finding 1: Each of the eight municipalities studied utilized more white men and fewer white women in city government than would have been the case if the

city work force matched the State labor force. Some municipalities used fewer minorities than would have been expected, using this standard, but by and large most groups were, by this standard, well represented.

Recommendation 1: Municipal governments should review their employment policies to determine whether any of these have a discriminatory effect on women, minorities, handicapped or older persons.

Finding 2: While acknowledging that in the State labor force the proportion of minorities and women who are administrators and professionals is lower than the comparable proportion of white males, the Advisory Committee notes that the disparity between the utilization of white males and minorities and females as administrators or professionals is greater than 20 percent. This suggests minorities and women are not being hired or promoted into administrative or professional jobs to the extent one would expect.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committee urges the municipal governments to examine their hiring and promotion policies to determine whether there are any practices that bar minorities or women from administrative or professional jobs.

Finding 3: Kansas is unique in having local data on handicapped worker participation in the labor force, although this is not readily available for particular job categories. Only Dodge City appeared to utilize a larger proportion of handicapped workers than were in the area labor force.

Recommendation 3: Local governments should take note of the availability and utility of handicapped workers. Necessary adaptations in the work place and job specifications should be considered to ensure the handicapped have access to government jobs.

Finding 4: Only three of the eight cities reviewed made any effort to determine labor force availability. Only one had made a determination of underutilization and set both long and short-term goals.

Recommendation 4: Affirmative action planning should include a determination of underutilization, if any, and setting remedial goals to be achieved immediately and over time. The local governments should obtain the necessary statistics, make the appropriate calculations and determinations and set both long and short range goals if these are necessary.

Finding 5: Some cities used a wide-ranging variety of sources for administrators or professionals. The Advisory Committee is convinced that the wider the recruitment area, the better the quality of candidates available for selection.

Recommendation 5: Local governments should make extensive use of national and regional professional associations, specialized recruitment newsletters as well as regional newspapers for most administrative or professional jobs.

Table 1  
1980 Population by Race Compared to 1980 Work  
Force by Race

City	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./Al.Native
Coffeyville						
Population	15,185	13,018 (85.73)	1,734 (11.42)	228 (1.50)	38 (0.25)	259 (1.71)
Work Force	220	195 (88.64)	23 (10.45)	2 (0.91)		
Dodge City						
Population	18,001	16,600 (92.22)	345 (1.92)	1,463 (8.13)	75 (0.42)	67 (0.37)
Work Force	151	136 (90.07)	2 (1.32)	12 (7.95)	0	1 (0.66)
Junction City						
Population	19,305	13,496 (69.91)	4,163 (21.56)	1,018 (5.27)	808 (4.19)	91 (0.47)
Work Force	197	158 (80.20)	30 (15.23)	6 (3.05)	3 (1.52)	0
Kansas City						
Population	161,087	114,315 (70.96)	40,826 (25.34)	7,820 (4.85)	708 (0.44)	744 (0.46)
Work Force	1,822	1,328 (72.89)	421 (23.11)	62 (3.40)	3 (0.16)	8 (0.44)
Lawrence						
Population	52,738	45,895 (87.02)	2,919 (5.53)	1,433 (2.72)	1,006 (1.91)	1,588 (3.01)
Work Force	423	354 (83.69)	45 (10.64)	12 (2.83)	2 (0.47)	10 (2.36)
Leavenworth						
Population	33,656	27,605 (82.02)	4,796 (14.25)	1,067 (3.17)	413 (1.23)	183 (0.54)
Work Force	182	153 (84.07)	25 (13.74)	3 (1.65)	0	1 (0.55)
Liberal						
Population	14,911	12,729 (85.37)	790 (5.30)	1,491 (10.0)	106 (7.1)	90 (6.0)
Work Force	119	100 (84.03)	8 (6.72)	10 (8.40)	0	1 (0.84)
Topeka						
Population	115,266	99,325 (86.17)	10,965 (9.5)	5,345 (4.64)	614 (0.53)	1,214 (1.05)
Work Force	1,283	1,106 (86.20)	117 (9.12)	50 (3.90)	2 (0.16)	8 (0.62)

SOURCE: Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC 80-V-18) and EEO-4 data on file at CSRO.

Table 2

## Total Employment Distribution and Availability of Local Government

## Employees by Race and Sex

	Total	%=to 1 worker	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AFH
CLF-Kansas (% by Row)			58.95	2.04	1.12	0.18	0.18	35.01	1.75	0.65	0.08	0.12
Coffeyville	220	0.45										
E			133	4	2	0	0	77	3	1	0	0
A			167	20	2	0	0	28	3	0	0	0
			(75.91)	(9.09)	(0.91)			(12.73)	(1.36)			
D			+34	+16	-	-	-	-49	-	-1	-	-
Dodge City	151	0.66										
E			92	3	1	0	0	53	2	0	0	0
A			113	2	11	0	1	23	0	1	0	0
			(74.83)	(1.32)	(7.28)		(0.66)	(15.23)		(0.66)		
D			+21	-1	+10	0	+1	-30	-2	+1	0	0
Junction City	197	0.51										
E			119	4	2	0	0	68	3	1	0	0
A			126	26	4	0	0	32	4	2	3	0
			(63.96)	(13.20)	(2.03)			(16.24)	(2.03)	(1.02)	(1.52)	
D			+7	+22	+2	-	-	-36	+1	+1	+3	-
Kansas City	1,822	0.05										
E*			1,077	37	20	3	3	637	31	11	1	2
A			1,092	311	47	2	5	236	110	15	1	3
			(59.93)	(17.07)	(2.58)	(0.11)	(0.27)	(12.95)	(6.04)	(0.82)	(0.05)	(0.16)
D			+15	+274	+27	+1	+2	-401	+79	+4	-	+1
Lawrence	423	0.24										
E			257	8	4	0	0	145	7	2	0	0
A			299	35	10	1	5	55	10	2	1	5
			(70.69)	(8.27)	(2.36)	(0.24)	(1.18)	(13.00)	(2.36)	(0.47)	(0.24)	(1.18)
D			+42	+27	+6	+1	+5	-90	+3	0	+1	+5
Leavenworth	182	0.55										
E			110	3	2	0	0	63	3	1	0	0
A			133	21	3	0	0	20	4	0	0	1
			(73.08)	(11.54)	(1.65)			(10.99)	(2.20)			(0.55)
D			+23	+18	+1	-	-	-43	+1	-1	-	+1
Liberal	119	0.84										
E			73	2	1	0	0	41	2	0	0	0
A			74	8	7	0	1	26	0	3	0	0
			(62.18)	(6.72)	(5.88)		(0.84)	(21.85)		(2.52)		
D			+1	+6	+6	-	+1	-15	-2	+3		
Topeka	1,283	0.08										
E*			758	26	14	2	2	449	22	8	1	1
A			831	68	41	1	4	275	49	9	1	4
			(64.77)	(5.30)	(3.20)	(0.08)	(0.31)	(21.43)	(3.82)	(0.70)	(0.08)	(0.31)
D			+73	+42	+27	-1	+2	-174	+27	+1	-	+3

Table 2 (Cont'd)

E = Available - obtained by dividing the percent in the civilian labor force in each job category (shown in the first row) by a percent equal to one employee in each work force. \*For Kansas City and Topeka the calculation of availability is based on the actual percentage in the civilian labor force because the alternate calculation excessively inflated (for Kansas City) or deflated (for Topeka) availability. The difference between total obtained and actual employment is corrected by adding to the "availability" of white men.

A = Actual - and percent by row.

D = Difference.

SOURCE: Data on the civilian labor force supplied by EEOC and EEO-4 Data supplied by the cities and on file at CSRO.

Key:

WM = White Male

BM = Black Male

HM = Hispanic Male

AM = Alaskan Native Male

AIM = American Indian Male

WF = White Female

BF = Black Female

HF = Hispanic Female

AF = Alaskan Native Female

AIF = American Indian Female



Table 3

Percent of Local Government Employees Earning \$12,999 or Less  
(By Race and Sex)

	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Coffeyville	15.0	30.0				50.0	100.0			
Dodge City	19.5	0.0	36.4			73.9		0.0		
Junction City	55.6	84.6	75.0			90.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Kansas City	20.4	49.0	43.6	100.0	40.0	66.5	82.1	89.5	100.0	100.0
Lawrence	21.1	40.0	20.0		60.0	72.7	80.0	100.0	100.0	80.0
Leavenworth	10.5	28.6	33.3			25.0	75.0			0.0
Liberal	31.1	87.5	57.1		100.0	61.5		100.0		
Topeka	26.8	36.8	39.0	0.0	75.0	43.3	69.4	55.6	100.0	50.0

SOURCE: EEO-4 Data supplied by the cities and on file at CSRO.

Key:

WM = White Male

BM = Black Male

HM = Hispanic Male

AM = Alaskan Native Male

AIM = American Indian Male

WF = White Female

BF = Black Female

HF = Hispanic Female

AF = Alaskan Native Female

AIF = American Indian Female

Table 4

Professionals and Administrators Employed or Available  
to Local Governments by Race and Sex

	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF	Total	% for one Administrative or Professional Worker
PLF*	73.32	1.22	1.20	0.30	0.18	22.28	0.95	0.36	0.12	0.02		
Coffeyville												3.03
E	26	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0		
A	28	2				3					33	
	(84.85)	(6.06)				(9.09)						
D	+2	+2				-4						
Dodge City												4.35
E	18	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0		
A	22				1	0					23	
	(95.65)				(4.35)							
D	+4				+1	-5						
Junction City												4.00
E	20	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0		
A	23	1				1					25	
	(96.67)	(4.00)				(4.00)						
D	+3	+1				-4						
Lawrence												1.89
E	42	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0		
A	45	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	53	
	(84.91)	(5.66)		(1.89)		(7.55)						
D	+3	+3		+1		-7						
Kansas City												0.31
E	239	3	3	0	0	71	3	1	0	0		
A	223	46	5	0	1	31	11	3	0	0	320	
	(69.69)	(14.38)	(1.56)		(0.31)	(9.69)	(3.44)	(0.94)	(0.0)	(0.0)		
D	-16	+43	+2		+1	-40	+8	+2				
Leavenworth												3.03
E	26	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0		
A	30	1				1	1			0	33	
	(90.91)	(3.03)				(3.03)	(3.03)			(0.0)		
D	+4	+1				-6	+1					
Liberal												5.56
E	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0		
A	17					1					18	
	(94.44)					(5.56)						
D	+3					-3						
Topeka												0.28
E	267	4	4	1	0	80	3	1	0	0		
A	259	13	7	1	1	70	8	1			360	
	(71.94)	(3.11)	(1.94)	(00.29)	(00.29)	(19.44)	(2.22)	(0.28)				
D	-8	+9	+3	-	+1	-10	+5	-				

Table 4 (Cont'd)

\*Professionals in labor force.

E = Available - obtained by dividing the percent in the PLF in each ethnic category by percent equal to one professional and administrator in each work force.

A = Actual - and percent by row.

D = Difference.

SOURCE: Data on professional labor force supplied by EEOC and EEO-4 Data supplied by the cities and on file at CSRO.

Key:

WM = White Male

BM = Black Male

HM = Hispanic Male

AM = Alaskan Native Male

AIM = American Indian Male

WF = White Female

BF = Black Female

HF = Hispanic Female

AF = Alaskan Native Female

AIF = American Indian Female

Table 5  
Administrators and Professionals from Each Group as a Proportion  
of All Workers from Their Own Ethnic Group

	WM	Range		BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
		+20%	-20%									
Coffeyville	28 (16.77)	20.12	13.42	2 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	-	-	3 (10.71)	0 (0.0)	-	-	-
Dodge City	22 (19.47)	23.36	15.58	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	-	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	-	0 (0.0)	-	-
Junction City	23 (18.25)	21.90	14.60	1 (3.85)	0 (0.0)	-	-	1 (3.13)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	-
Kansas City	223 (20.42)	24.50	16.34	46 (14.79)	5 (10.64)	0	1 (20.0)	31 (13.14)	11 (10.0)	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Lawrence	45 (15.05)	18.06	12.04	3 (8.57)	0 (0.0)	1 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (7.27)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Leavenworth	30 (22.56)	27.07	18.05	1 (4.76)	0 (0.0)	-	-	1 (5.0)	1 (25.0)	-	-	0 (0.0)
Liberal	17 (22.97)	27.56	18.38	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	-	0 (0.0)	1 (3.85)	-	0 (0.0)	-	-
Topeka	259 (31.17)	37.40	24.94	13 (19.12)	7 (17.07)	1 (100.0)	1 (25.0)	70 (25.45)	8 (16.33)	1 (11.11)	-	-

- = None of this ethnic group employed by the city.  
0 = Some are employed, but none in these job categories.

SOURCE: EEO-4 Data supplied by the cities.

Key:  
 WM = White Male                      WF = White Female  
 BM = Black Male                      BF = Black Female  
 HM = Hispanic Male                  HF = Hispanic Female  
 AM = Alaskan Native Male          AF = Alaskan Native Female  
 AIM = American Indian Male        AIF = American Indian Female

Table 6

## SUMMARY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

	Coffeyville	Dodge City	Junction City	Kansas City	Lawrence	Leavenworth	Liberal	Topeka				
<b>I. IMPLEMENTATION</b>												
<b>A. Chief Executive of agency responsible</b>												
4. Chief assumes formal responsibility, affirmative action officer reports to chief executive.												
3. Chief assumes formal responsibility, affirmative action officer reports to intermediate official.												
2. Chief assumes formal responsibility but there is no affirmative action officer.												
1. Chief does not assume formal responsibility.												
<b>B. An affirmative action officer is appointed and duties specified.</b>												
4. Yes.												
3. Appointed but duties not specified.												
2. Post planned.												
1. No affirmative action officer appointed.												
<b>C. Dissemination of affirmative action plan.</b>												
4. Wide internal and external.												
3. Some internal and external.												
2. Wide internal and external planned.												
1. Less.												
<b>II. WORK FORCE ANALYSIS</b>												
<b>A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, salary.</b>												
4. Determined by all categories.												
3. Determined by job category, race, sex.												
2. Plan to determine by all categories.												
1. Less data.												
<b>B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary.</b>												
4. Implemented including job classifications, race, sex, salary.												
3. Does not include salary.												
2. Plan discusses all items but analysis is not yet implemented.												
1. Less.												

	Coffeyville	Dodge City	Junction City	Kansas City	Lawrence	Leavenworth	Liberal	Topeka					
<p>C. Work force analysis includes age or handicap.</p> <p>4. Age and handicap.</p> <p>3. Age or handicap.</p> <p>2. Plan discusses age and handicap but analysis not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3					
<p>D. Determine underutilization by race and sex, age and handicap.</p> <p>4. Underutilization determined for all four categories by job category and salary level.</p> <p>3. Underutilization determined for race, sex and job category.</p> <p>2. Underutilization determination by all four categories by job category.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3					
<p>E. Set long term goals.</p> <p>4. Set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>3. Set long term goals by race, sex only.</p> <p>2. Plan to set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. No long term goals planned.</p>	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	4 (not age)					
<p>F. Set short term goals.</p> <p>4. Set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>3. Set short term goals by race, sex only.</p> <p>2. Plan to set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>1. No short term goals.</p>	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1					
<p>III. RECRUITMENT</p>													
<p>A. Identify and maintain contact with minority/women's organizations, which could assist in recruitment.</p> <p>4. State they have a contact list and show that they maintain regular contact.</p> <p>3. State they have a contact list but do not show or assert regular contact.</p> <p>2. Plan to maintain regular contact and state they will develop complete contact list.</p> <p>1. Less, including assertions of contact but no list.</p>	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	4					

	Coffeyville	Dodge City	Junction City	Kansas City	Lawrence	Leavenworth	Liberal	Topeka					
<p>B. Make sure contacts above are notified.</p> <p>4. Do.</p> <p>3. Notify some but not all.</p> <p>2. Plan to make sure all are notified but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Do not.</p>	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	4					
<p>C. Maintain records of recruitment efforts including sources used during the preceding year and what they produced.</p> <p>4. Detailed records of sources used and their productivity.</p> <p>3. Record of sources used but little or no productivity information.</p> <p>2. Plan to maintain detailed records of sources used and their productivity but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	2	1	1	1	3	1	4	4					
<p>D. Advertise jobs using media with the largest minority and female audience in the normal recruitment area for the position.</p> <p>4. Assert they use major media and principal minority/female oriented media.</p> <p>3. Assert they use major media only.</p> <p>2. Plan to use major media and principal minority/female oriented media but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Do not advertise or do not specify media used or less than the above.</p>	1	3	1	4	4	4	3	4					
<p>IV. SELECTION</p> <p>A. Insure all written or skills testing do not have discriminatory effects or have been validated.</p> <p>4. All testing validated or assertion of non-discriminatory effects.</p> <p>3. Some validation done and intent to do more validation or effects testing.</p> <p>2. Plan to validate all tests or determine non-discriminatory effects within five years.</p> <p>1. No validation or effects testing, or not scheduled for completion within five year time span.</p>	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4					

	Coffeyville	Dodge City	Junction City	Kansas City	Lawrence	Leavenworth	Liberal	Topeka					
<p>B. Insure interview is structured and performance on interview reasonably predicts job performance.</p> <p>4. Completely structured interview guidelines relate to knowledge, skills, abilities.</p> <p>3. Structured interview not necessarily related to knowledge, skills, and abilities.</p> <p>2. Plan to structure all interviews using knowledge, skills and abilities criteria within 5 years.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4					
<p>C. Train persons responsible for hiring to handle selection process in nondiscriminatory way.</p> <p>4. Trained-completed.</p> <p>3. Training scheduled.</p> <p>2. Training mentioned but not scheduled.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	2	4	1	2	4					
<p>D. Review application questionnaire to insure no illegal questions asked.</p> <p>4. Questionnaire reported to be nondiscriminatory.</p> <p>3. Questionnaire under review for appropriateness.</p> <p>2. Plan to review questionnaire but not yet done.</p> <p>1. Questionnaire not discussed.</p>	1	1	1	2	3	1	4	4					
<p>E. Review entry level job descriptions to ensure they do not contain unreasonable job specifications.</p> <p>4. Job descriptions have been validated.</p> <p>3. Job descriptions are currently under review and some have been validated.</p> <p>2. Plan to validate all job descriptions within 5 years but not yet begun.</p> <p>1. No review of entry level job descriptions has been done or is planned or no timeframe for completing validation.</p>	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1					
<p>F. Where agency entry level jobs require considerable knowledge, skills and ability, develop trainee classes or justify inability to do so.</p> <p>4. Trainee positions established.</p> <p>3. General review of possible trainee positions.</p> <p>2. Trainee positions planned.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1					











	Coffeyville	Dodge City	Junction City	Kansas City	Lawrence	Leavenworth	Liberal	Topeka				
<p>E. Maintain records of promotions, upgrading and transfers by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>4. Maintain complete records including salaries and analyze for all categories.</p> <p>3. Maintain complete records except salary and/or age.</p> <p>2. Plan to maintain full records on promotions, upgrade and transfer by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	1	2	1	4	2				
<p>F. Records of equal opportunity complaints.</p> <p>4. Maintain records of all complaints by race, sex, age, handicap and analyze for discriminatory practices.</p> <p>✓3. Maintain records but do not include age/or handicap analysis.</p> <p>2. Plan but have not yet implemented record-keeping on EO complaints by race, sex, age, handicap.</p> <p>1. No records.</p>	4	1	1	1	3	1	4	4				
<p>G. Appraise supervisors' affirmative action efforts.</p> <p>4. Performance evaluation includes affirmative action.</p> <p>3. Affirmative action expected but not a formal part of evaluation.</p> <p>2. Plan performance evaluation to include affirmative action.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1				
<p>H. Overall assessment of affirmative action efforts.</p> <p>4. Narrative reports which action items were implemented with what success or problems.</p> <p>3. Some successes and failures in implementation are reported but not all action items are discussed.</p> <p>2. Plan calls for complete narrative report on progress in subsequent years.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2				

Codes: 4-implementation--good  
 3-implementation--satisfactory  
 2-plan but not implementation reported  
 1-plan unsatisfactory

Source: Affirmative Action Plans supplied to the Central States Regional Office of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

Appendix A

Utilization of Minorities and Women, Older Workers, Handicapped  
in Selected Activities

a. Fire Department

Permanent Administrators & Professionals

Municipality	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Coffeyville	10	10 (100.0)									
Dodge City	7	6 (85.7)		1 (14.3)							
Junction City	7	7 (100.0)									
Kansas City	9	5 (55.6)	3 (33.3)	1 (11.1)							
Lawrence	15	15 (100.0)									
Leavenworth	11	10 (90.9)	1 (9.1)								
Liberal	2	2 (100.0)									
Topeka	142	132 (93.0)	9 (6.3)				1 (0.7)				

SOURCE: Chart A responses provided by local governments.

Key:

WM = White Male	WF = White Female
BM = Black Male	BF = Black Female
HM = Hispanic Male	HF = Hispanic Female
AM = Alaskan Native Male	AF = Alaskan Native Female
AIM = American Indian Male	AIF = American Indian Female

## EEO-4 Data Summaries

<u>LIBERAL</u>	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Officials/Administrators	14	14									
Professionals	4	3					1				
Technicians	9	7					2				
Protective Service	20	17				1	2				
Para-Professionals	3	3									
Office/Clerical	23		1				19		3		
Skilled Craft	7	6		1							
Service/Maintenance	39	24	7	6			2				
TOTAL	119	74	8	7		1	26		3		
		(62.18)	(6.72)	(5.88)		(0.84)	(21.85)		(2.52)		
<hr/>											
<u>TOPEKA</u>											
Officials/Administrators	23	20	1				2				
Professionals	337	239	12	7	1	1	68	8	1		
Technicians	107	93	4	2			7	1			
Protective Service	268	244	6	10		1	6	1			
Para-Professionals	61	12	5			1	27	14	1		1
Office/Clerical	224	36	5	2			155	17	5	1	3
Skilled Craft	120	96	12	9			1	2			
Service/Maintenance	143	91	23	11		1	9	6	2		
TOTAL	1,283	831	68	41	1	4	275	49	9	1	4
		(64.77)	(5.30)	(3.20)	(0.08)	(0.31)	(21.43)	(3.82)	(0.70)	(0.08)	(0.31)

Appendix A

Utilization of Minorities and Women, Older Workers, Handicapped  
in Selected Activities

b. Police Department

All Permanent Administrators & Professionals

Municipality	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BE	HF	AF	AIF
Coffeyville	9	8 (88.9)	1 (11.1)								
Dodge City	2	2 (100.0)									
Junction City	9	9 (100.0)									
Kansas City	16	5 (31.3)	10 (62.5)					1 (6.3)			
Lawrence	7	7 (100.0)									
Leavenworth	8	8 (100.0)									
Liberal	3	3 (100.0)									
Topeka	38	33 (86.8)	2 (5.3)	2 (5.3)			1 (2.6)				

SOURCE: Chart A responses provided by local governments.



Appendix A

Utilization of Minorities and Women, Older Workers, Handicapped  
in Selected Activities

c. General Administration

All Permanent Administrators & Professionals

Municipality	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Coffeyville	13	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)				7 (53.8)	1 (7.7)			
Dodge City	6	6 (100.0)									
Junction City	6	6 (100.0)									
Kansas City	85	24 (28.2)	14 (16.5)	4 (4.7)			23 (27.1)	14 (16.5)	5 (5.9)		1 (1.2)
Lawrence	17	8 (47.1)	3 (17.6)				5 (29.4)	1 (5.9)			
Leavenworth	13	6 (46.2)	1 (7.7)					1 (38.5)			
Liberal	7	3 (42.9)					4 (57.1)				
Topeka	103	34 (33.0)	4 (3.9)	3 (2.9)	1 (1.0)		57 (55.3)	4 (3.9)			

The following units of city government were included in this table:

Coffeyville - Finance, Community Development

Dodge City - General Administration, Economic Development, Discretionary Community Development

Junction City - Administration, Economic Development

Kansas City - Board of Health, Manpower, Disabled and Handicapped, Physical Planning, City Treasurer, Information Officer, Commissioner of Finance, Health, City Auditor, City Clerk, License, Area Aging, Human Relations, Personnel, Economic Development, Neighborhood Services, Domestic Relations

Lawrence - City Manager's Office, Employee Relations Department, Human Relations/Human Resources, Planning, City Clerk  
Finance, Community Development

Leavenworth - City Manager's Office, City Clerk's Office, Finance, Housing, Community Development and Planning

Liberal - Finance, Administration

Topeka - Community Development, Labor Services, City Treasurer, City Auditor, City Clerk and Computer Services, Human Relations, Mayor's Office, Personnel, Planning, Housing Authority

SOURCE: Chart A responses provided by local governments and an addendum provided by the City of Lawrence.

## EEO-4 Data Summaries

<u>KANSAS CITY</u>	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Officials/Administrators	114	78	17	2			11	5	1		
Professionals	206	145	29	3		1	20	6	2		
Technicians	123	83	17	2		1	12	5	1		2
Protective Service	496	382	70	16			16	12			
Para-Professionals	99	55	8	1			22	13			
Office/Clerical	224	18	5				139	51	10		1
Skilled Craft	59	50	7	2							
Service/Maintenance	501	281	158	21	2	3	16	18	1	1	
TOTAL	1,822	1,092	311	47	2	5	236	110	15	1	3
		(59.93)	(17.07)	(2.58)	(0.11)	(0.27)	(12.95)	(6.04)	(0.82)	(0.05)	(0.16)
<u>LAWRENCE</u>											
Officials/Administrators	28	22	3				3				
Professionals	25	23			1		1				
Technicians	63	42	6	2		1	9	2			1
Protective Service	110	93	4	1		1	6	4	1		
Para-Professionals	8	4	1			1	2				
Office/Clerical	38	1					28	3	1	1	4
Skilled Craft	92	77	9	4		1	1				
Service/Maintenance	59	37	12	3		1	5	1			
TOTAL	423	299	35	10	1	5	55	10	2	1	5
		(70.69)	(8.27)	(2.36)	(0.24)	(1.18)	(13.00)	(2.36)	(0.47)	(0.24)	(1.18)
<u>LEAVENWORTH</u>											
Officials/Administrators	12	11					1				
Professionals	21	19	1					1			
Technicians	11	9	2								
Protective Service	61	49	5	2			4				1
Para-Professionals	1						1				
Office/Clerical	20	2	1				14	3			
Skilled Craft	21	20	1								
Service/Maintenance	35	23	11	1							
TOTAL	182	133	21	3			20	4			1
		(73.08)	(11.54)	(1.65)			(10.99)	(2.20)			(0.55)

## EEO-4 Data Summaries

COFFEYVILLE	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Officials/Administrators	17	12	2				3				
Professionals	16	16									
Technicians	12	10	1				1				
Protective Service	36	34	2								
Para-Professionals	1	1									
Office/Clerical	27			1			23	3			
Skilled Craft	67	59	6	1			1				
Service/Maintenance	44	35	9								
TOTAL	220	167	20	2			28	3			
		(75.91)	(9.09)	(0.91)			(12.73)	(1.36)			

DODGE CITY	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Officials/Administrators	18	17				1					
Professionals	5	5									
Technicians	4	4									
Protective Service	37	32	1	3			1				
Para-Professionals	7	6		1							
Office/Clerical	20						19		1		
Skilled Craft	4	4									
Service/Maintenance	56	45	1	7			3				
TOTAL	151	113	2	11		1	23		1		
		(74.83)	(1.32)	(7.28)		(0.66)	(15.23)		(0.66)		

JUNCTION CITY	Total	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Officials/Administrators	13	11	1				1				
Professionals	12	12									
Technicians	20	12	2				2	3	1		
Protective Service	54	48	3	3							
Para-Professionals	9	3					5		1		
Office/Clerical	22	1					17	1		3	
Skilled Craft	26	22	3				1				
Service/Maintenance	41	17	17	1			6				
TOTAL	197	126	26	4			32	4	2	3	
		(63.96)	(13.20)	(2.03)			(16.24)	(2.03)	(1.02)	(1.52)	