

State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America: An Update

March 1982

—A report of the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees 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 Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees.

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.

STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN MID-AMERICA: AN UPDATE
--A report prepared by the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and
Nebraska Advisory Committees to the United States Commission
on Civil Rights

ATTRIBUTION:

The findings and recommendations contained in this report are those of the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees 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 Committees 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 Committees afford 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 this publication.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska
Advisory Committees 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 Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees submit this report on their review of State Government affirmative action efforts in their States. This report is an update of our 1978 report on the same subject.

The Committees found that there was a wide variation in the quality of State leadership in the development of State agency affirmative action plans. They urge the States of Iowa, Missouri and Nebraska to consider using materials prepared by the Kansas Department of Administration for agency technical assistance in the preparation of affirmative action plans.

The Committees found that there was a wide variation in the quality of reviews provided by State compliance agencies in the evaluation of State agency affirmative action plans. They urge the States to ensure that their units responsible for reviews of agency plans have resources to perform the kind and quality of evaluations prepared by the Kansas Department of Administration.

The Advisory Committees note that self-evaluation is generally the weakest element of the agency affirmative action plans reviewed for this study and that evaluation procedures vary widely, even within States. They urge that agencies in the States work together to develop a common evaluation strategy and that agencies with basically similar functions and personnel problems could devise common evaluation devices particularly suited to their common needs.

The Advisory Committees note that there was wide variation in the development and implementation of goals and timetables to remedy underutilization. They urge that all State agency plans include goals and timetables to correct identified underutilization and that these should be sufficiently detailed to allow evaluation at regular intervals. Data should be appended to these to show the statistical evidence on which they have been set and to show that they constitute reasonable efforts.

Because of deficiencies in the work force analysis of larger agencies, the Advisory Committees note their proposed remedial actions may be either overkill or insufficient. The Advisory Committees urge that all State agencies which include subunits of 20 or more persons analyze utilization and develop goals and timetables for each such subunit and that other portions of the agency be lumped together to form a subunit or subunits of 20 or more persons for analytical purposes.

The Advisory Committees commend all four governors for their success to date in appointing minorities and women to "top jobs" but urge that efforts to appoint minorities, women, the handicapped and older persons to such jobs should continue.

The Advisory Committees also have findings and recommendations regarding individual States. These commend the successes that are evident in State affirmative action planning efforts and especially the gubernatorial initiatives. There also are specific suggestions for improvements in the affirmative action process for the States of Iowa, Missouri and Nebraska.

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

Respectfully,

LEE B. FURGERSON, Chairperson
Iowa Advisory Committee

BENJAMIN H. DAY, Chairperson
Kansas Advisory Committee

JOANNE M. COLLINS, Chairperson
Missouri Advisory Committee

SHIRLEY M. MARSH, Chairperson
Nebraska Advisory Committee

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was produced with the assistance of the Commission's Central States Regional Office. Project director and writer was Malcolm J. Barnett. Assistance was provided by Etta Lou Wilkinson. Legal review was conducted by Elaine M. Esparza, Esq. Support services were provided by Jo Ann Daniels and Gloria M. O'Leary. The work of CSRO is guided by the Regional Director, Melvin L. Jenkins. Field operations are under the overall supervision of John Hope III. The staff of the Publications Support Center was responsible for final preparation of this document for publication.

Membership

IOWA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Lee B. Furgerson, Chairperson
Des Moines

Naomi S. Mercer
Des Moines

Margaret (Peg) Anderson
Bettendorf

Stephanie L. Michael*
Des Moines

Harold E. Butz
Des Moines

Marilyn O. Murphy
Sioux City

Allen J. Correll*
Des Moines

Ernest L. Ricehill
Sioux City

Louise E. Cribbs
Waterloo

Stephen D. Rocha
Des Moines

John M. Ely, Jr.
Cedar Rapids

Paula Schaedlich*
Ames

John M. Estes, Jr.
Des Moines

William A. Stauffer
Des Moines

Signi Falk
Cedar Rapids

Gregory H. Williams
Iowa City

George Garcia*
Des Moines

William Gluba*
Davenport

Louise H. Goldman
Davenport

Virginia Correa Jones
Ames

*No longer a member of the Advisory Committee.

Membership

KANSAS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Benjamin H. Day, Chairperson
Leavenworth

Jay D. Battenberg
Leavenworth

James L. Crawford, Sr.*
Wichita

Russell W. Getter
Lawrence

Jaclyn Gossard
Wichita

Clyde D. Graeber
Leavenworth

Will Florence Robbins-Hudgins
Kansas City

Norman E. Justice
Kansas City

Rayna L. Levine
Overland Park

John Mendoza*
Topeka

Constance L. Menninger*
Topeka

Gloria Jean Sandoval
Garden City

Ruth G. Shechter
Shawnee Mission

Forrest Swall*
Lawrence

Leroy C. Tombs
Bonner Springs

Alfredo M. Valenzuela
Garden City

Clarence E. Wesley
Wichita

*No longer a member of the Advisory Committee.

Membership

MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Joanne M. Collins, Chairperson
Kansas City

Gail Achtenberg
Kansas City

Betty A. Adams*
Jefferson City

Anita Bond
St. Louis

Lu Arredondo Bowersox
Kansas City

John Buechner
Kirkwood

Harrison C. Cornelius
Gladstone

James A. DeClue*
St. Louis

Harold L. Dielmann
Creve Coeur

John B. Ervin
St. Louis

Henry Givens, Jr.
St. Louis

Meyer L. Goldman
Kansas City

Elizabeth Gutierrez*
Kansas City

Elsie (Mickey) Hall
St. Louis

David R. Humes
Hayti Heights

J.B. Kibler*
Kansas City

William S. McEwen
St. Louis

Stanley D. Rostov
Kansas City

Ashton Stovall
Kansas City

Joseph H. Vatterott
St. Louis

*No longer a member of the Advisory Committee.

Membership

NEBRASKA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Shirley M. Marsh, Chairperson
Lincoln

Rita L. Melgares
Omaha

Michael B. Adams*
Omaha

William Moore
Omaha

Hazel M. Anthony
Lincoln

Dianne G. Myers
Lincoln

Donald A. Deppe*
Omaha

Joe L. Romero
Scottsbluff

Martha M. Gibbs
Omaha

Charles B. Washington
Omaha

Arlie F. Heald
Lincoln

Gary Hill
Lincoln

Stephen F. Janis
Scottsbluff

Vicki L. Krecek
Omaha

Garnet Larson
Lincoln

Dorothy Martin*
Lincoln

James M. McClymond
Omaha

*No longer a member of the Advisory Committee.

Executive Summary

In June 1978, the Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published their study, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America. At that time they concluded that the recruitment efforts of States needed to be strengthened. At that time they found little evidence that States or agencies attempted nationwide or regionwide searches for the best qualified candidates, although good personnel practice would dictate such searches both to maintain high standards in the public service and to produce adequate representation of minority and female candidates. The Advisory Committees also pointed out that few State agencies had taken the necessary steps to create entry level positions that would serve as the bottom rung of career ladders for the disadvantaged, although these were necessary if the many minorities and women who lack previous job experience or training were to be brought into the public service. The Advisory Committees concluded that many State agencies underutilized minorities and women in their work forces, that affirmative action programs were not uniformly effective and that most agency affirmative action plans did not match the standards set by the Advisory Committees, much less the standards established by private sector employers.¹

The Advisory Committees decided, in late 1980, to review what progress had been made in State efforts to promote equal employment opportunity in State government since their 1978 report. To do so they requested data on employment patterns and the employment practices of State agencies. They also sought to obtain information on gubernatorial appointments to "top jobs," as a measure of the efforts that are totally within the control of the States' governors. This report is based entirely on the data supplied by the governors and on their comments to a draft report circulated in October 1981.

The Advisory Committees have incorporated in this final draft of the report all comments, corrections and most suggestions made by representatives of the governors. The governors were asked, as a part of their review of the draft report, to verify the accuracy of the tables. All errors reported by their representatives have been corrected.

In Chapter one of this report the Advisory Committees explain the rationale for their data analysis and the techniques used to evaluate the affirmative action programs. (Readers may wish to review that chapter to understand the terminology used in this summary.)

In Chapter two, the Advisory Committees review the legal bases for affirmative action efforts in the public sector.

In Chapter three, the Advisory Committees review some of the data on the four States in a comparative setting. Table 3-2 compares utilization of minorities and women in State government with their availability as measured by the 1970 census and 1978 estimates of the private sector labor force. It shows that the State of Kansas has exceeded both labor force estimates in the utilization of black and Hispanic men. Only Nebraska shows any significant underutilization of white women. Table 3-3 compares the percent disparity between the utilization of workers in the total State work force and the utilization in each of the 15 functional work forces for which the States make reports to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Table 3-4 shows a remarkably high percentage of disparity for administrators and a generally lower, but far from nil percentage for professionals in all four States. This statistic reflects only the difference in utilization between the State government as a whole and the agencies whose work forces are included in each of the functions. It is a surrogate for comparisons to the potentially available labor force data that are unavailable from published

sources. The Advisory Committees wonder why the implementation of affirmative action plans has not reduced or eliminated these disparities.

The Advisory Committees compare some elements of the affirmative action plans of State agencies in Tables 3-8, 3-9 and 3-10. These show how few plans in any of the four States contain the essential elements for promoting equal opportunity. Less than half the State agencies' plans show that any determination of underutilization is either planned or has been done. Only about a third of the State agencies' plans contain either long or short-term goals to remedy any underutilization that has been identified. Although the elements of a recruitment effort are present to a greater degree, few plans contain commitments to develop a nondiscriminatory selection procedure. Generally agencies were committed to evaluate their own efforts, but a large proportion (though on most items less than a majority) did not plan to do so.

Affirmative action efforts in Iowa State government began in 1973 when Governor Robert Ray issued an executive order requiring the development and implementation of affirmative action plans and procedures. The Governor's own pattern of appointments shows a consistent increase year by year in the proportion of minorities and women. Thus, in 1980 32 percent of his appointments were women and 6.3 percent were minorities.

Utilization of black men in the State work force is identical to the availability reported in the 1970 census of population but less than that reported to EEOC for 1978 by private sector employers. Utilization of Hispanic men is below both estimates. Utilization of white women is above both estimates. Utilization of black and Hispanic women is equal to the 1978 estimate and above the 1970 census.

Although the pattern is not clearcut, there is indication in the different rates of disparity in utilization between function and State work forces that

a pattern of unequal employment exists. If change is important, new hires must be the measure. In many functions white women and/or minorities, whether male or female, did not get hired for administrative or professional positions. (See Tables 4-3 to 4-8)

The affirmative action plans of Iowa State agencies (See Tables 4-9 and 4-10) contained many good elements but also were deficient in many respects.

No State agency has a formal coordinating role. The Iowa Civil Rights Commission does have one staff person who reviews agency plans and prepares a summary report.

Affirmative action planning in Kansas was initiated by former Governor Robert Bennett in 1975. In 1980 Governor John Carlin issued a new order that improved the practices. At the statewide level, Kansas had the best affirmative action effort in the region. Its level of commitment reflected in its 1980 plan, its implementing procedures and the resources allocated to review and evaluation were incomparable. Many of the difficulties attributed to individual efforts by State agencies may have been the consequence of a lag between statewide initiatives and their implementation at the agency level.

A substantial number of gubernatorial appointments have gone to minorities and women. The proportion of such appointments is also significant.

The State has been remarkably successful in utilizing minorities and women at levels above the availability indicated in the two measures of labor force availability. Thus, to some extent, disparities noted for Kansas based on comparisons between State work force utilization and functional work force utilization reflect a higher standard than that applied in other States where there are more race/sex groups whose utilization in the State work force is significantly below that in the two available labor force measures.

Nonetheless, many functions were utilizing minorities and women at levels

significantly below that of the State as a whole. White men continue to dominate both administrative and professional job categories. Some functions were far more successful than others in obtaining minority and female qualified persons for such jobs.(See Tables 5-3 to 5-8) But perhaps as significant, in general the relative utilization of minorities and women in the work force was increasing due to new hires. However, the proportion of new hires in the better jobs was not increasing. One possible explanation for this is that minorities and women are promoted rather than newly hired and thus not reported in the EEOC statistics.

The affirmative action plans (most predated the new executive order and implementing documents noted above) had some good elements but also many significant deficiencies.(See Tables 5-9 and 5-10)

The State's equal employment opportunity office was the most sophisticated in the region. It reported detailed procedures for review and evaluation of agency efforts. It also reported on a large number of reviews of agency efforts. This is not surprising, since the agency had a large budget and sufficient staff.

An appendix to the Kansas chapter summarizes the efforts of the six Kansas State agencies reviewed by the Advisory Committee in 1978 to improve their affirmative action efforts.

Missouri's affirmative action efforts, like those in Kansas, were in transition while this report was being prepared from an order issued by former Governor Joseph Teasdale to one issued by the current Governor, Christopher S. Bond. The new order retained many elements of the old. But it eliminated specific requirements for determining the extent and consequence of past discriminatory actions and the requirement that agencies undertake a recruitment program to reach underutilized groups of potential workers. The

new order does not require that applicant flow data be maintained. The new order appears to strengthen the role of the State affirmative action officer by giving her authority to require any necessary revisions in agency plans, but it is too soon to know whether this will happen since new plans were not due until November 1981.

Missouri's affirmative action officers in both administrations reported a variety of informal activities such as the sponsorship of conferences and breakfast meetings, establishment of a resume clearinghouse, an interstate network, liaison with community groups, maintenance of a resource center, forms redesigning. Governor Teasdale's aide reported that there had been "some significant but not necessarily dramatic progress" in opportunities for minorities and women. Both former Governor Teasdale and Governor Bond reported a significant number of minority and female appointees. Minority males were 8.5 percent, minority females were 4.0 percent and white females were 18.2 percent of Governor Bond's appointees since January 1981.

There were some significant disparities between the two labor force measures and the State work force. (See Tables 6-1, 6-2 and 6-3). Only agencies involved in health care (other than hospitals) were likely to use minorities and women at greater than the State proportions, all others were likely to utilize them in proportions less than the State proportions. (See Table 6-3) While the disparity calculations for different job levels raise questions, these are not about discrimination of the kind that would be evident in disparate utilization within each ethnic group. For many ethnic groups, the new hire rates indicate their opportunities are increasing, although not at the administrator level. (See Tables 6-5, 6-6, 6-7 and 6-8)

The affirmative action plans of most State agencies were very thin and incomplete in 1978 and remained so in 1981. Few had many of the essential

elements. Many of the plans were very old, but this should be corrected under the provisions of the new Executive Order. (See Tables 6-9 and 6-10)

The State affirmative action officer is a part of the staff of the Department of Administration and reports to its Commissioner. In 1981 her office cost the State about \$46,710. Because she had held her post for only six months when this report was drafted, it is impossible to assess her accomplishments.

Of the four States, Nebraska has made the largest improvement in its affirmative action efforts since the 1978 review. The significant measures to promote equal employment opportunity introduced by Governor Charles Thone and the Nebraska legislature have resulted in the development of a meaningful affirmative action program in the State and in many of its agencies.

The administrator of the State's affirmative action office reported that the Governor had appointed a significant number of minorities and women to State boards and commissions and to "top jobs."

Comparison of the State work force to two labor force measures showed that many race/sex groups were utilized at levels significantly less than their indicated availability. Minorities and women were less disparately represented in service/maintenance jobs than in other jobs. White women were noticeably underrepresented in both administrative and professional jobs. Although in quite a few functions, minorities did not hold either administrative or professional jobs, the patterns were less apparent. (See Tables 7-3 to 7-8)

The pattern of new hires indicated an overall increase in the utilization of minorities and women. The pattern within better jobs for minorities was not clear.

Significant omissions from the affirmative action plans submitted for review are noted by the Advisory Committee. However, the State administrator of the affirmative action office noted that many of these plans have been subsequently improved following submission and that some elements reviewed by the Advisory Committee as missing had been done but not formally reported. (See Tables 7-9 and 7-10)

The administering agency was established only in 1980. Since then it has undertaken a variety of measures to implement the State's affirmative action program. It has a relatively small staff and budget.

Notes

1. Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America (June 1978), pp. ii-iii; 49-51.

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. THE LEGAL BASES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION.....	9
3. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE FOUR STATES-- A COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW.....	14
4. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN IOWA.....	37
5. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN KANSAS.....	72
6. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN MISSOURI.....	120
7. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN NEBRASKA.....	154
8. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	191

TABLES

3-1 Comparison of State Work Forces to Regional Labor Force.....	15
3-2 Disparity of more than 20 percent between the State Work Force and the 1970 Census of Population Labor Force Estimate or 1978 EEOC Private Sector Labor Force Estimate.....	17
3-3 Comparison of Percent Disparity Between State Utilization and Function Utilization by State-Total Employment.....	18
3-4 Comparison of Percent of Functions where Utilization of Minorities and Women was Significantly Disparate from Utilization of White Males in the State Work Force-Administrators.....	20
3-5 A Comparison of Relative Utilization of Minorities and Women in Selected Functional Categories-Administrators.....	22
3-6 Comparison of Percent of Functions where Utilization of Minorities and Women was Significantly Disparate from Utilization of White Males in the State Work Force-Professionals.....	23
3-7 A Comparison of Relative Utilization of Minorities and Women in Selected Functional Categories-Professionals.....	24

3-8	A Comparison of Plans to Develop Utilization Analyses, Goals and Timetables.....	26
3-9	A Comparison of Plans to Affirmatively Recruit and Select Minorities and Women.....	28
3-10	A Comparison of Plans to Evaluate Implementation of Affirmative Action Plans.....	31
4-1	Iowa Labor Force - 1970.....	40
4-2	1978 EEO-1 Report Summary.....	41
4-3	Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force Who Are From Each Ethnic Group.....	42
4-4	Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force.....	43
4-5	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	46
4-6	Comparison of Percent from each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	47
4-7	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	48
4-8	Percent Disparity Compared.....	49
4-9	Summary of Affirmative Action Plans.....	53
4-10	Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons.....	64
5-1	Kansas Labor Force - 1970.....	76
5-2	1978 EEO-1 Report Summary.....	77
5-3	Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force Who Are From Each Ethnic Group.....	78
5-4	Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force.....	79
5-5	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	81
5-6	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	82
5-7	Comparison of Percent From Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	83
5-8	Percent Disparity Compared.....	85
5-9	Summary of Affirmative Action Plans.....	88
5-10	Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons.....	99
6-1	Missouri Labor Force - 1970.....	125
6-2	1978 EEO-1 Report Summary.....	126
6-3	Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force Who Are From Each Ethnic Group.....	127
6-4	Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force.....	128
6-5	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	130
6-6	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	131
6-7	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	132

6-8	Percent Disparity Compared.....	134
6-9	Summary of Affirmative Action Plans.....	137
6-10	Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons.....	148
7-1	Nebraska Labor Force - 1970.....	157
7-2	1978 EEO-1 Report Summary.....	158
7-3	Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force Who are From Each Ethnic Group.....	159
7-4	Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force.....	160
7-5	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	162
7-6	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	163
7-7	Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function Work Forces.....	165
7-8	Percent Disparity Compared.....	166
7-9	Summary of Affirmative Action Plans.....	169
7-10	Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons.....	179



1. INTRODUCTION

The Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees reviewed their State governments' affirmative action efforts in a 1978 report, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America. But since much of the data for that report covered 1975 and 1976, by 1980 it seemed to them that a review of subsequent developments would be appropriate. To accomplish this, while imposing a minimal burden on State officials, the Advisory Committees requested copies of affirmative action plans of larger State agencies and information about the affirmative action efforts of smaller ones. The Committees asked the Governors of the four States to comment on changes in affirmative action efforts since the 1978 report and to provide information about gubernatorial affirmative action efforts, including policies and appointments. The States were asked to provide copies of forms they submit to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which detail hiring by category, salary range, race and sex for each functional activity of State government. Most of this information was supplied by the States by the end of December 1980.

Transformation of the data into uniform patterns across the four States took approximately six months. Most of this time was spent condensing the employment statistics from the S.M.S.A. level to statewide level and calculating percentages of employees in each category. A revised assessment instrument for reviewing affirmative action plans was developed and used to answer questions about the content of each of 57 State agency plans from larger agencies.

The report includes a chapter on the legal bases for affirmative action, a comparison of efforts by the four States, and analysis of each State's efforts. As many of the comments on State efforts provided by representatives

of the four Governors as possible are included in the chapters on each State. Since the volume of commentary varied widely from State to State, the amount included also varies. Because of the changes in methodology detailed below, it is possible to make only limited comparisons between what was said in 1978 and what is now. Wherever it seemed appropriate, comparisons are made.

This report is based entirely on data supplied by the governors and on their comments on a draft report circulated in October 1981. The Advisory Committees have incorporated in this final report all comments, corrections and most suggestions made by representatives of the governors. The governors were asked as part of their review of the draft report, to verify the accuracy of the tables. All errors reported by their representatives have been corrected.

Definitions

The following terms are used throughout the report.

1. Labor force - People who are actually available or potentially available for work. In this report two definitions of the labor force are used. One is based on the number of persons in each occupation job category reported in the 1970 census of population. (This is sometimes called the 1970 work force - but not in this report) The other is the number of persons in each job category reported by private sector employers to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in 1978. (This is sometimes called the 1978 private sector work force - but not in this report)
2. Work force - The number of persons actually employed by State government. State work force is the total number of State employees. Function work force is the number of State workers who perform a particular function.
3. Function - A function is a category used by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to describe the activity of State government.

There are 15 such functions ranging from Financial Administration to Fire Protection to a category that covers unnamed activities called "Other." Usually each State agency fits one function, but parts of larger agencies might be in different functions. Readers may wish to refer to the numbers of particular functions in looking at the tables in this report. These are:

1. Financial Administration and General Control
2. Streets and Highways
3. Public Welfare
4. Police Protection
5. Fire Protection
6. Natural Resources; Parks and Recreation
7. Hospitals and Sanatoriums
8. Health
9. Housing
10. Community Development
11. Corrections
12. Utilities and Transportation
13. Sanitation and Sewage
14. Employment Security
15. Other

4. Job Category - A job category is a U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission description of a range of occupations. There are eight such categories used to describe public employees. These are Officials/Administrators, Professionals, Technicians, Protective Service Workers, Paraprofessionals, Office/Clerical workers, Skilled Craftspeople and Foremen and Service/Maintenance workers.
5. Net score is calculated by determining the absolute number of functions where utilization is greater or lesser than that in the State work force by +/-20 percent (assigning a +1 for greater, 0 for the same, -1 for lesser) for each ethnic group. NR (none in category) is scored -1, except where the State work force proportion is less than 0.1 percent, when it is scored 0. Disparity is the difference between the net score for white males and that of each other ethnic group. Percent disparity is

calculated by dividing the actual disparity by the maximum possible disparity which is twice the number of functions in which the State employs workers.¹

6. State agencies report on their utilization of workers from 10 ethnic/sex groups. The following is a list of those groups and the abbreviations used in many of the tables of this report:

White male - WM
 Black male - BM
 Hispanic male - HM
 Asian or Pacific Islander male - AM
 American Indian or Alaskan Native male - AIM
 White female - WF
 Black female - BF
 Hispanic female - HF
 Asian or Pacific Islander female - AF
 American Indian or Alaskan Native female - AIF

7. Where no person from a given ethnic/sex group is in a particular cell of a table in this report, the notation NR is used.

Data Methodology

It is, of course, impossible to "prove" discrimination simply on the basis of statistical disparities. What such disparities show is that there are questions which need to be answered as to whether there is any discrimination and whether as much is being done as can be done to ensure the employment of qualified minorities and women.

In the following paragraphs the Advisory Committees review the methodology they used in the preparation of this report. These include some methods utilized in the 1978 report and some revised procedures based on comments made by State officials about the 1978 report. The Advisory Committee does compare total labor force estimates to total State work force (as it did in 1978). For analysis of the functional work forces, the Advisory Committees compare State work force to function work force (as they did in 1978). To analyze utilization within job categories, the Advisory Committees adopted a change in

methodology and utilized the proportions of persons in each ethnic group in each job category rather than the proportions of persons in the function work force in each job category.

An obvious starting point for any analysis of statistical disparity is to compare the State work force (the total of all persons actually employed in State government) with the State labor force (the total of all persons actually employed in comparable job categories by all employers in the State). In fact, this presents some difficulty. As the Advisory Committees in Region VII have repeatedly noted,² the published data on the State labor force does not contain categories identical to those used to analyze State government. Thus, any comparison other than that of total work force to total labor force are, at best, very rough approximations. The Advisory Committees have decided that the standard for analysis of any portion of the State work force will be the (total) State work force, although the proportion of minority or female workers in the State work force is not always roughly similar to the proportion of minority or female workers in the State labor force. This method was used in the 1978 study of the various State agencies and is used here in the analysis of the work forces in the 15 functional categories reported by the States to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission on form EEO-4. This form of analysis makes it possible to compare like with like rather than rely on labor force data whose categories are not identical to the State's.

In the four States in this region the proportions of minorities are so much smaller than the proportion of white males that it would be unreasonable to expect equal proportions of white males and other minority groups in each job category. There is no obvious statistic to make comparisons. In 1978 the Advisory Committees attempted to resolve this by using as a measure of

equality/inequality the number of persons of each race/sex group in each job category divided by the number of persons in the total agency work force.

This did not effectively resolve the problem. In the present study, the Advisory Committees have chosen instead to use the proportions of the total agency work force from each race/sex group who are in each job category.

Our new statistic is not entirely free of problems due, in part, to historical factors. In the real world, past discrimination has resulted in a skewing of the minority and female portions of the labor force toward lower paid and lower status jobs. It would be unreasonable to believe that this pattern does not affect State work forces.³ Thus our new statistic, like the old, reflects what should be rather than what is.⁴ Nevertheless, Advisory Committees have taken the position that public employers have an obligation, in the context of sound merit employment practices, to take all possible steps to ensure that, with the rise in availability of minorities and women with skills and desires to move into "better" jobs, they are not excluded, as they were in the past, simply because of prejudice. The Advisory Committees do not believe that all disparity in the distribution of workers will be eliminated in the immediate future. But they do believe that State governments have an obligation to be aware of the disparities and seek to reduce them. By focusing on the proportion of workers in each category from each race/sex group, the Advisory Committees have avoided the setting of an unreasonable standard involving absolute numerical equality. Rather, recognizing that the labor force contains only a small proportion of minorities, the Advisory Committees have set a standard of relative equality. For white women the position is somewhat different. There have always been large numbers of white women employed in the labor force and in the State work force. Very often women had major decisionmaking roles without the

commensurate salary or title. Thus, the question has not been numbers but rather title and salary. The Advisory Committees do not believe it unreasonable to suggest that, over time, the distribution of women in the work force should resemble the distribution of men. In using this methodology we are following the examples of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women (August 1978), and the Kentucky Commission on Human Rights report on Black Employment in Kentucky State Agencies(1980).

Chapter 1 Notes

1. Ta-Yu Yang, Affirmative Action Director, Iowa Civil Rights Commission commented that this score is unfair because "NR" is counted as a negative score. (Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981) The purpose of the scoring procedure is to compare disparity between the total State work force and the function work forces. The Advisory Committees recognize that the success of a few agencies in recruiting, hiring and promoting minorities and women will make some function work forces look less adequate by showing what some agencies can do.

2. Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska Advisory Committees to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America (June 1978), Iowa Advisory Committee, Employment of Professionals by Iowa Municipal Governments (June 1981).

3. Kay E. Meadows, State Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Office of the State of Kansas, has pointed out another significant problem with our data:

the use of vertical dispersion does not, and cannot, gauge the representation of protected group persons in the work force who are available for employment from the civilian labor force. Using the vertical dispersion statistic, it is possible to reflect full 'parity' even though the percent of minorities in each occupational level is not commensurate with the percent of minorities in the civilian labor force. (Kay E. Meadows, letter to staff, Nov. 17, 1981)

The Advisory Committees have deliberately chosen a conservative statistic.

4. Kay E. Meadows, State Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Office of the State of Kansas, has commented: "Because this new statistic is overwhelmingly influenced by traditional hiring patterns, it should be noted that the inverse of this statement is true. The new statistic reflects what is but does not incorporate a comparison with what should be." (Kay Meadows, letter to staff, Nov. 17, 1981)

2. THE LEGAL BASES OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Affirmative action in employment is a shorthand way of referring to practices which assure employment opportunities to minorities, women and other protected groups. Affirmative action may be necessary when there has been some showing of discrimination by the employer. This evidence of discrimination could be developed as a result of an employer voluntarily reviewing its work force and finding imbalances there which were most likely the result of discriminatory employment practices. The evidence could also be developed as a result of legal or administrative action. Affirmative action in employment is meant to put those in protected groups in the positions they would have achieved absent the discrimination. It in no way requires the hiring of unqualified persons.¹

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended,² is the primary Federal statute prohibiting employment discrimination. State and local governments became subject to the nondiscrimination provisions of Title VII in 1972 when it was amended to cover them. Title VII may require affirmative action when there is a finding of discrimination. However, voluntary affirmative action is encouraged.³

Affirmative action can be required in the public sector as a result of court action. Federal courts in NAACP v. Allen⁴ and Bridgeport Guardians Inc. v. Bridgeport Civil Service Commission⁵ upheld hiring quotas in law enforcement agencies. A primary consideration of the Court in Bridgeport was that a public employer, namely the police department, was involved. The Court indicated that more black representation in the department could benefit the entire community. In the 8th Circuit, which includes Iowa, Missouri and Nebraska, affirmative action was required in Firefighters Institute for Racial Equality v. City of St. Louis.⁶ Currently the police department of Omaha is under a consent decree requiring an overall work force of 9.5 percent black

officers within seven years of entry of the decree, subject to availability of qualified applicants.⁷

Voluntary affirmative action is permitted by Title VII as mentioned earlier.⁸ Regulations issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the agency responsible for enforcement of Title VII, include guidelines on voluntary affirmative action plans.⁹ The data developed in the plans form the basis for developing affirmative action type employment practices. To meet the EEOC guidelines, the affirmative action plans must contain a reasonable self-analysis by the employer of its work force to determine if its employment practices do or tend to discriminate in any way; a reasonable basis for concluding action is appropriate; and action which is reasonable to correct the problems that have been identified.¹⁰

Affirmative action by public employers based on plans meeting these criteria have been accepted by the Courts. In Price v. Civil Service Commission of Sacramento County,¹¹ the civil service commission had voluntarily reviewed its employment practices to determine if there were discriminatory reasons for the low number of minorities in city jobs. As a result of the review, the district attorney's office was required to implement an affirmative action program which required hiring one minority for every two nonminorities. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld this hiring program, noting that the underrepresentation of minorities in city jobs had been shown by the review to be caused by the county's past discriminatory employment practices. Another consideration was that the hiring ratio was flexible, open to review and amendment if there was a change of circumstance. The Court relied heavily on Weber, the case which upheld voluntary affirmative action plans in private industry, saying that case presented a two-pronged test for judging the validity of voluntary affirmative action plans. First, the

overall purposes of the plan must be compatible with the objectives of Title VII and second, the plan must not operate in an unduly harsh manner on nonminorities. The civil service commission's plan in this case passed the Weber test.

Another case with similar results was Baker v. City of Detroit¹² which involved an affirmative action plan for the Detroit police department. At issue specifically were the department's promotion procedures. The District Court said the affirmative action plan was not an unreasonable solution for past discrimination. It too depended on Weber, saying that in its opinion Weber should apply equally to the public sector.

A more recent case upholding affirmative action programs in public employment is Valentine v. Smith.¹³ In this case before the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals, the Arkansas State University adopted an affirmative action plan after the Office for Civil Rights of what was then the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare threatened enforcement action. Under the provisions of the plan, a white candidate was eliminated from consideration for a university post solely because of her race. The Court of Appeals held that the Arkansas State University plan was a constitutionally valid means of remedying past discrimination because 1) it was designed to make the racial balance of the University work force approximately that which it would have been absent past discrimination, 2) it was of reasonable duration, 3) it did not result in the hiring of unqualified applicants and 4) it did not act as an absolute bar to the hiring of nonminority applicants.

Affirmative action has been justified as a means of holding down personnel costs because it results in a wider labor pool.¹⁴ It also results in a more balanced work force which increases the public's confidence in the fairness and impartiality of their government. A valid affirmative action plan which

satisfies the EEOC guidelines can serve as a defense in some discrimination complaints.¹⁵

The EEOC guidelines require long and short-term goals, interim goals and timetables, a recruitment program, upgrading methods, validation of selection instruments and revamping if necessary, initiation of measures to ensure qualified minorities and women are included in the applicant pool, systematic efforts to provide career ladders, and establishment of a regular monitoring and evaluation system.¹⁶ Whether the plans developed by State government agencies in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska meet these criteria is discussed in the succeeding chapters of this report.

Chapter 2 Notes

1. See Griggs v. Duke Power Co., 401 U.S. 424 (1971).
2. 42 U.S.C. Sec. 2000e (1976), as amended.
3. 42 U.S.C. Sec. 2000e-5(g) (1976), 29 C.F.R. Sec. 1608.1 (1980).
4. 493 F.2d 614 (5th Cir. 1974).
5. 482 F.2d 1333 (2nd Cir. 1973).
6. 588 F.2d 235 (8th Cir. 1979).
7. Brotherhood of Midwest Guardians, Inc. v. Omaha, Civil Action 79-0-528 (D. Neb. Oct. 23, 1980).
8. See United Steelworkers v. Weber, 443 U.S. 193 (1979).
9. 29 C.F.R. Part 1608 (1980).
10. 29 C.F.R. Sec. 1608.4 (1979).
11. 604 F.2d 1365 (Cal. 1980).
12. 483 F. Supp. 930 (D. Mich. 1979).
13. 50 LW 2066 (Aug. 4, 1981).
14. Contractors Association of Eastern Pa. v. Shultz (3rd Cir. 1971).
15. 29 C.F.R. Sec. 1608.10 (1980).
16. 29 C.F.R. Sec. 1608.4 (1980).

3. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN THE FOUR STATES - A COMPARATIVE OVERVIEW

Comparing the differences in utilization of minorities and women in the four States and the quality of their affirmative action plans with the evidence available to the Advisory Committees must be done cautiously. The Committees concentrate on key indicators of effort and accomplishment. That there are disparities in the accomplishments or extent of efforts, actual or proposed, between the four States is inevitable. Whether they mean that one State is doing better than another, either overall or in a particular area, is not at all clear. In this chapter the Committees rely on comparisons to standard measures for assessing total work force utilization, to the relative accomplishments of each State in assessing functional work force utilization and to the mean of the four States' efforts in assessing affirmative action plans. The appropriateness of any of these measures is open to question, but they are the best measures available to the Committees because of limitations in the data that are being analyzed. Thus, the comparisons should be seen as indicative, not conclusive.¹

There is no readily available measure of the available labor force that can be used to assess the performance of all four States in utilizing minorities and women. However, the Federal Government is currently using regional and national estimates of the civilian labor force for some of its affirmative action planning efforts.² For some jobs use of a larger than statewide labor force estimate is clearly appropriate. The Iowa Advisory Committee has discussed one such case in its review of affirmative action efforts by some Iowa local governments to hire professional workers.³ At best, the regional estimate provides a crude means of assessing what might be accomplished. The comparison of the four States' work forces and the EEOC estimate of the four States' civilian labor force appears in Table 3-1. This

Table 3-1
 Comparison of State Work Forces to Regional Labor Force
 (Percent Row)

	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
<u>Iowa</u> Work Force	51.2	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.1	46.1	0.9	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Kansas</u> Work Force	44.4	3.0	1.1	0.1	0.3	45.5	4.1	1.0	0.2	0.2
<u>Missouri</u> Work Force	43.3	3.4	0.2	0.3	0.2	42.7	9.4	0.2	0.2	0.1
<u>Nebraska</u> Work Force	53.5	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.2	43.5	0.7	0.4	0.1	0.1
<u>EEOC</u> Estimate of Region VII Labor Force	58.5	2.7	0.6	0.1	0.0	35.1	2.5	0.4	0.1	0.0
Labor Force Range +20%	70.2	3.2	0.7	0.1	0.0	42.1	3.0	0.5	0.1	0.0
-20%	46.8	2.2	0.5	0.1	0.0	28.1	2.0	0.3	0.1	0.0

NOTES:

WM=white male

BM=black male

HM=Hispanic male

AM=Asian or Pacific Islander male

AIM=American Indian or Alaskan Native male

WF=white female

BF=black female

HF=Hispanic female

AF=Asian or Pacific Islander female

AIF=American Indian or Alaskan Native female

SOURCES: EEO-4 forms supplied by States; EEOC, Management Directive 707 (Jan. 23, 1981),
 Appendix B, Table B-2.

shows that black men's representation in Iowa and Nebraska State work forces is less than 80 percent of their proportion of the region's labor force. Missouri's is more than 120 percent. Only in Kansas are Hispanic men represented above their regional labor force proportion. Asian and Indian males are represented at not less than 80 percent of their proportions of the regional labor force estimate in all four States, as are white women, Asian and Indian women. Black women are represented at less than 80 percent of regional labor force in Iowa and Nebraska, but greater than 120 percent in Kansas and Missouri.⁴

Table 3-2 shows the comparisons between each of the four States' work forces and two labor force estimates for that State only--the 1970 census of population and the 1978 private sector labor force estimate of EEOC. Except for the comparison in Kansas to the 1970 census, utilization of white men in the States' work forces is less than or equal to that of the two labor force estimates. Except in Kansas, utilization of black men and Hispanic men is less than or equal to both labor force estimates. Except in Nebraska, utilization of white women is greater than both labor force estimates. Utilization of black women is greater than the 1970 census labor force estimate in Iowa, Kansas and Missouri but less than that in Nebraska. Utilization of Hispanic women is the same as or greater than the two labor force estimates in Iowa and Kansas. It is the same as the 1970 estimate in Missouri and Nebraska but less than the 1978 estimate in those States.

Table 3-3 compares the percent disparity between the State utilization and function utilization for the four States and for the total of all four States. Iowa's total disparity is 23.1 percent, Kansas' is 18.2 percent, Missouri's is 15.0 percent and Nebraska's is 11.5 percent. While Kansas appears to have the second highest disparity, it should be noted that this

Table 3-2

Disparity of more than 20 percent between the State Work Force and the 1970 Census of Population Labor Force Estimate or 1978 EEOC Private Sector Labor Force Estimate

	WM	BM	HM	WF	BF	HF
<u>Iowa</u>						
1970	-	0	0	+	+	+
1978	0	-	-	+	0	0
<u>Kansas</u>						
1970	+	+	0	+	+	+
1978	-	0	+	+	+	0
<u>Missouri</u>						
1970	-	-	-	+	+	0
1978	0	-	-	+	+	-
<u>Nebraska</u>						
1970	0	-	-	-	-	0
1978	0	-	-	0	-	-

NOTES:

WM=white male
 BM=black male
 HM=Hispanic male

WF=white female
 BF=black female
 HF=Hispanic female

A plus sign means that representation of the group in the State work force is greater than 120 percent of the labor force. A minus sign means that representation of the group in the State work force is less than 80 percent of the labor force. A zero means that the difference between work force and labor force is less than 20 percent.

SOURCE: Tables 4-5, 5-4, 6-4 and 7-4 of this report..

Table 3-3

Comparison of Percent Disparity Between State Utilization and Function Utilization
by State - Total Employment

	TOTAL	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
IOWA	23.1	19.2	15.4	23.1	23.1	11.5	11.5	23.1	34.6	34.6
KANSAS	18.2	18.2	4.6	4.6	31.8	13.6	27.3	9.1	13.6	31.8
MISSOURI	15.0	10.0	5.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	15.0
NEBRASKA	11.5	11.5	0	19.2	7.7	3.9	7.7	11.5	15.4	11.5

Note: The total column is calculated by taking the mean disparity and dividing by the maximum score.

BM = black male
 HM = Hispanic male
 AM = Asian or Pacific Islander male
 AIM = American Indian or Alaskan Native Male
 WF = white female
 BF = black female
 HF = Hispanic female
 AF = Asian or Pacific Islander female
 AIF = American Indian or Alaskan Native female

Source: Data in Tables 4-3, 5-3, 6-3, 7-3 of this report

reflects the relatively high standard set by the State work force as shown in Table 3-2--in no category except white male is the Kansas work force significantly less than that for the labor force estimates. By contrast, although Nebraska has the lowest disparity, the standard for computing its disparity is based on significantly lower utilization in the work force compared to the labor force. State work force does not significantly exceed either of the labor force estimates in any category of race/sex. Iowa's work force utilization of men is generally the same or lower than either estimate while its utilization of women is generally the same or higher. Utilization in Missouri is a mix--lower than the 1970 labor force estimate for white men but the same as the 1978 estimate for white men, lower than both for black and Hispanic men, higher for white and black women, lower for Hispanic women. Allowing for the effect of the difference in standard, Missouri and Nebraska have the least disparity in utilization of black men. Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska have about equally low disparities in utilization of Hispanic men. Missouri (where the disparity is actually based on a utilization rate in excess of the white male rate) and Nebraska have the lowest disparity in utilization of white women. Iowa and Nebraska have the lowest disparity in utilization of black women. Nebraska and Kansas have the lowest disparity in utilization of Hispanic women.

A review of the functional disparity percentages for the administrator (Table 3-4) and professional job categories (Table 3-6) shows a remarkably high percentage of disparity for administrators and a generally lower, but still far from nil percentage for professionals in all four States. In the administrator job category (See Table 3-4), the lowest disparities are: zero for Asian women in Iowa; zero for American Indian women in Iowa, Kansas and Missouri (there were no administrators in the State from these groups); zero

Table 3-4

Comparison of Percent of Functions Where Utilization of Minorities and Women was Significantly Disparate from Utilization of White Males in the State Work Force - Administrators

	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
IOWA	50.0	38.5	46.2	57.7	7.7	46.2	53.8	0	0
KANSAS	9.1	22.7	40.9	50.0	22.7	22.7	0	50.0	0
MISSOURI	15.0	40.0	15.0	40.0	15.0	20.0	0	40.0	0
NEBRASKA	30.8	34.6	50.0	42.3	19.2	46.2	42.3	57.7	57.7

Notes: BM = black male
 HM = Hispanic male
 AM = Asian or Pacific Islander male
 AIM = American Indian or Alaskan Native Male
 WF = white female
 BF = black female
 HF = Hispanic female
 AF = Asian or Pacific Islander female
 AIF = American Indian or Alaskan Native female

Source: Tables 4-8,5-8,6-8,7-8 of this report

for Hispanic females in Kansas and Missouri; 9.1 percent in Kansas for black male; and, 7.7 percent in Iowa for utilization of white women. The lowest Missouri disparity percentage--except for two zeroes, which reflect no employment of persons in those groups--is 15 percent for utilization of black men, Asian men and white women. The lowest Nebraska percent disparity is 19.2 percent for utilization of white women. Table 3-5 shows the utilization of each ethnic group as administrators in four functions: streets, public welfare, police and financial administration. The largest number of administrators are in financial administration. There the disparity between white male and female (both white and minority) utilization is most apparent. Minority male utilization significantly different from white male utilization is apparent only for black men in Iowa and Kansas, and Hispanic men in Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. White women are utilized disparately in all four States, as are most other groups of women. In the public welfare function disparate utilization is apparent for women but not for minority men. In the other functions disparate utilization is not apparent except for white women in the Kansas police function and white women in the Nebraska streets function (mainly because there are no minority administrators from many ethnic groups in those functions).

A review of the functional disparity percentages for professional jobs in Table 3-6 shows zero disparity for black males and Asian males in Missouri and 10 percent for Hispanic males in Missouri, less than 10 percent for American Indian men in Missouri. Table 3-7 shows the utilization in certain functions. In financial administration while there is a pattern of disparate utilization for women compared to men in all four States, only in Missouri do black men appear to be utilized significantly differently than white men. In the public welfare function there is a pattern of disparate utilization of

Table 3-5

A Comparison of Relative utilization of Minorities & Women in Selected Functional Categories - Administrators (Percent of ethnic group in function in each State)

	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
<u>STREETS</u>											
Nebraska	173	170(8.1)					3(1.1)				
Missouri	30	28(0.5)	1(0.5)				1(0.3)				
Kansas	46	44(1.4)					2(0.4)				
Iowa	66	59(1.9)			1(7.7)		6(1.6)				
<u>PUBLIC WELFARE</u>											
Nebraska	87	42(17.5)	3(50.0)	1(100.0)		1(100.0)	35(9.3)	5(62.5)			
Missouri	20	14(1.8)	2(2.3)				4(0.1)				
Kansas	148	67(7.8)	2(2.7)	1(4.8)	1(20.0)		65(2.3)	12(4.0)			
Iowa	162	94(14.6)	3(21.4)	1(20.0)			62(2.7)	1(2.2)	1(6.3)		
<u>POLICE</u>											
Nebraska	3	2(0.5)					1(1.6)				
Missouri	4	4(0.3)									
Kansas	47	42(6.2)	1(6.7)	1(10.0)			2(1.2)	1(16.7)			
Iowa	31	28(4.1)					3(2.0)				
<u>FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION</u>											
Nebraska	465	352(25.4)	5(25.0)	1(7.7)			103(7.7)	2(6.9)	1(6.3)		1(14.3)
Missouri	182	113(11.5)	5(8.5)				62(3.2)	2(1.6)			
Kansas	445	313(17.9)	5(6.8)	1(2.3)		2(20.0)	117(4.1)	6(4.7)		1(14.3)	
Iowa	234	204(9.4)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)	1(10)		27(1.4)				

NOTES:

Percent of ethnic group in function in each State is in parentheses

WM=white male

WF=white female

BM=black male

BF=black female

HM=Hispanic male

HF=Hispanic female

AM=Asian or Pacific Islander male

AF=Asian or Pacific Islander female

AIM= American Indian or Alaskan Native male

AIF=American Indian or Alaskan Native

female

SOURCE: Tables 4-5,5-5,6-5,7-5 of this report.

Table 3-6

Comparison of Percent of Functions where Utilization of Minorities and Women was Significantly Disparate from Utilization of White Males in the State Work Force - Professionals

	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
IOWA	19.2	11.5	15.4	30.8	11.5	19.2	30.8	38.5	50.0
KANSAS	13.6	18.2	22.7	22.7	18.2	18.2	18.2	27.3	45.5
MISSOURI	0	10.0	0	5.0	30.0	15.0	25.0	40.0	20.0
NEBRASKA	46.2	38.5	30.8	42.3	23.1	23.1	30.8	42.3	46.2

Notes - BM = black male
 HM = Hispanic male
 AM = Asian or Pacific Islander male
 AIM = American Indian or Alaskan Native Male
 WF = white female
 BF = black female
 HF = Hispanic female
 AF = Asian or Pacific Islander female
 AIF = American Indian or Alaskan Native female

Source: Tables 4-8,5-8,6-8,7-8 of this report

Table 3-7

A Comparison of Relative Utilization of Minorities and Women in Selected Functional Categories - Professionals (Percent of Ethnic Group in Function in Each State)

	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
Streets											
Nebraska	286	254(12.1)	2(8.7)	3(21.4)	4(80.0)		22(8.4)	1(20.0)			
Missouri	1100	1068(18.9)	5(2.3)	4(28.6)	2(33.3)	5(15.6)	15(4.7)	1(6.3)			
Kansas	396	362(11.4)	4(5.6)	3(4.2)	1(11.1)	6(60.0)	20(3.9)				
Iowa	374	333(10.8)		1(11.1)	9(69.2)	1(9.1)	29(7.5)				
Public Welfare											
Nebraska	306	148(61.7)	1(16.7)		1(100.0)		152(40.4)	3(37.5)	1(50.0)		
Missouri	406	728(92.0)	81(98.1)		4(100.0)	1(100.0)	2500(70.8)	539(67.1)	2(50.6)	10(908)	1(100)
Kansas	1612	523(60.7)	20(26.7)	11(52.4)	3(60.0)	6(75.0)	951(33.1)	75(25.2)	9(14.3)	5(31.3)	9(52.9)
Iowa	1176	404(62.7)	6(42.9)	3(60.0)	11(91.7)		736(31.6)	10(22.2)	5(31.3)	1(100)	
Police											
Nebraska	54	52(11.7)					2(3.3)				
Missouri	5	5(0.3)									
Kansas	54	42(6.2)	2(13.3)				10(5.9)				
Iowa	90	74(10.8)	1(11.1)		1(100.0)		13(8.8)	1(20.0)			
Financial Administration											
Nebraska	772	501(36.1)	9(45.0)	9(69.2)	4(57.1)	2(40.0)	240(18.0)	2(6.9)	3(18.8)	1(25.0)	1(143)
Missouri	634	429(43.6)	15(25.4)	2(100.0)	2(100.0)	1(100.0)	178(8.9)	12(9.6)	1(33.3)	2(50.0)	
Kansas	968	589(33.8)	26(35.6)	10(23.3)	1(25.0)	4(40.0)	309(10.8)	24(18.6)	4(6.9)	1(14.3)	
Iowa	1122	838(38.6)	12(30.8)	6(46.2)	5(50.9)		249(13.2)	9(15.8)	1(6.3)	2(25.0)	

NOTES:

Percent of ethnic group in function in each State is in parentheses

WM=white male

WF=white female

BM=black male

BF=black female

HM=Hispanic male

HF=Hispanic female

AM=Asian or Pacific Islander male

AF=Asian or Pacific Islander female

AIM= American Indian or Alaskan Native male

AIF=American Indian or Alaskan Native female

SOURCE: Tables 4-6,5-6,6-6,7-6 of this report.

women but there is also a disparate utilization of black men (except in Missouri). In the streets function there is disparate utilization of black men and of white women in every State but Iowa. The numbers in the police function are so small that disparate utilization cannot be compared.

All this data raises questions rather than answers them. There are too many inconsistencies to show stable patterns across the region that could be the basis for praise or accusations. But it is clear that there are enough disparities in overall utilization and in utilization within functional groups to wonder why the implementation of affirmative action plans has not reduced or eliminated these patterns.

How much really has been done to promote affirmative action in the four States? To answer that question we first review the fundamental steps in affirmative action planning, identification of underutilization, if any, and the framing of goals and timetables or other remedies to correct it. (The data is in Table 3-8)⁵ Only about half of the plans of the 57 agencies in the four States specify that labor force data needed for comparison either has been or will be collected. Missouri agencies are most remiss on this (only about one-third specify they have or will do so). Four-fifths of the State agencies' plans in the four States show that agencies have or will determine the ethnic/sex composition of their work forces in job and salary categories. Less than half of the four State agencies' plan or have compared these two sets of data to determine underutilization. Missouri is most remiss, only about a quarter of its agencies have done so. Only a little over one-third of the plans in the four States specify long term goals either have been or will be set. Iowa plans are most deficient in this regard, only about a tenth contain such goals.⁶ Missouri plans are nearly as deficient, only a fifth contain such goals. Only one-third of the agencies' plans in the four States

Table 3-8

A Comparison of Plans to Develop Utilization Analyses,
Goals and Timetables

	Total	Iowa	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska
A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, age, handicap. 4. Determined by all categories. 3. Determined by job category, race, sex. 2. Plan to determine by all categories. 1. Less data.	28 (49.1)	10 (55.6)	5 (41.7)	4 (30.8)	9 (64.3)
B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary. 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.	47 (82.5)	14 (77.8)	11 (91.7)	10 (76.9)	12 (85.7)
C. Work force analysis includes age or handicap. 4. Age and handicap. 3. Age or handicap. 2. Plan discusses age and handicap but analysis not yet implemented. 1. Less.	24 (42.1)	9 (50.0)	3 (25.0)	4 (30.8)	8 (57.1)
D. Determine underutilization by race and sex, age and handicap. 4. Underutilization determined for all four categories by job category and salary. 3. Underutilization determined for race, sex and job category. 2. Underutilization determination for all four categories by job category and salary level planned but not yet implemented. 1. Less.	28 (49.1)	9 (50.0)	9 (75.0)	3 (23.1)	7 (50.0)
E. Set long term goals. 4. Set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set long term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap but not yet implemented. 1. No long term goals planned.	21 (36.8)	2 (11.1)	8 (66.7)	3 (23.1)	8 (57.1)
F. Set short term goals. 4. Set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set short term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. No short term goals.	19 (33.3)	6 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	2 (15.4)	5 (35.7)

NOTE: The number and (percent) of agencies which had implemented or planned to implement these items are shown.

SOURCES: Affirmative action plans from the four States. Summaries of these are in each of the subsequent chapters.

either contain short term goals or state such goals will be developed. Missouri plans are most deficient in this regard, only about 15 percent include short term goals or plans to develop them.

The key element to change is recruitment and selection. Table 3-9 compares the plans of agencies in the four States. Over half the agencies' plans state they have or will identify and maintain regular contact with minority/women's organizations which could assist in recruitment. Over two-fifths of the agencies' plans state they have or plan to contact all such organizations about vacancies. Missouri plans are most deficient in this regard, only about 15 percent include this commitment. Nearly 30 percent of all agencies' plans in the four States state that the agency does or plans to maintain records of recruitment efforts, including sources used during the preceding year and what those sources produced. None of the Missouri agencies' plans include this commitment. Nearly half the agencies either do or plan to advertise jobs using media with the largest minority and female audience in the normal recruitment area for the position. Only a little more than one-fifth of Missouri agency plans include this commitment.

Only about 15 percent of all agencies' plans include statements that all written tests do not have discriminatory effects or include plans to ensure that this will be true. Iowa and Missouri agencies' plans are most deficient in this regard.⁷ Nearly one-fifth of all agencies' plans include commitments that the interviews used either are or will be structured and that performance will reasonably predict job performance. The proportion of Kansas and Missouri agencies which include this point is significantly less than that in the other States. Nearly two-fifths of all agencies' plans include a commitment to train persons responsible for hiring to handle the selection process in a nondiscriminatory way. Only about a quarter of Missouri plans

Table 3-9

A Comparison of Plans to Affirmatively Recruit and Select Minorities and Women

	Total	Texas	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska
RECRUITMENT					
A. Identify and maintain contact with minority/women's organizations, which could assist in recruitment.					
4. State they have a contact list and show that they maintain regular contact.					
3. State they have a contact list but do not show or assert regular contact.					
2. Plan to maintain regular contact and state they will develop complete contact list.					
1. Less, including assertions of contact but no list.					
	31 (54.4)	7 (38.9)	7 (58.3)	6 (46.2)	11 (78.6)
B. Make sure contacts above are notified of all vacancies.					
4. Do.					
3. Notify some but not all.					
2. Plan to make sure all are notified but not yet implemented.					
1. Do not.					
	24 (42.1)	8 (44.4)	6 (50.0)	2 (15.4)	8 (57.1)
C. Maintain records of recruitment efforts including sources used during the preceding year and what they produced.					
4. Detailed records of sources used and their productivity.					
3. Record of sources used but little or no productivity information.					
2. Plan to maintain detailed records of sources used and their productivity but not yet implemented.					
1. Less.					
	17 (29.8)	6 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	0 (0)	5 (35.7)
D. Advertise jobs using media with the largest minority and female audience in the normal recruitment area for the position.					
4. Assert they use major media and principal minority/female oriented media.					
3. Assert they use major media only.					
2. Plan to use major media and principal minority/female oriented media but not yet implemented.					
1. Do not advertise or do not specify media used.					
	27 (47.4)	10 (55.6)	8 (66.7)	3 (23.1)	6 (42.9)
SELECTION					
A. Ensure all written or skills testing do not have discriminatory effects or have been validated.					
4. All testing validated or assertion of nondiscriminatory effects.					
3. Some validation done and intent to do more validation or effects testing.					
2. Plan to validate all tests or determine nondiscriminatory effects within five years.					
1. No validation or effects testing, or not scheduled for completion within five year time span.					
	9 (15.8)	1 (5.6)	3 (25.0)	1 (7.7)	4 (28.6)

Table 3-9 (Cont'd)

	Total	Idaho	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska
B. Ensure interview is structured and performance on interview reasonably predicts job performance. 4. Completely structured interview guidelines relate to knowledge, skills, abilities. 3. Structured interview not necessarily related to knowledge, skills, and abilities. 2. Plan to structure all interviews using knowledge, skills and abilities criteria within five years. 1. Less.	11 (19.3)	4 (22.2)	1 (8.3)	1 (7.7)	5 (35.7)
C. Train persons responsible for hiring to handle selection process in nondiscriminatory way. 4. Training completed. 3. Training scheduled. 2. Training mentioned but not scheduled. 1. Less.	22 (38.6)	8 (44.4)	5 (41.7)	3 (23.1)	6 (42.9)
D. Review application questionnaire to ensure no illegal questions asked. 4. Questionnaire reported to be nondiscriminatory. 3. Questionnaire under review for appropriateness. 2. Plan to review questionnaire but not yet done. 1. Questionnaire not discussed.	18 (31.6)	3 (16.7)	6 (50.0)	4 (30.8)	5 (35.7)
E. Review entry level job descriptions to ensure they do not contain unreasonable job specifications. 4. Job descriptions have been validated. 3. Job descriptions are currently under review and some have been validated. 2. Plan to validate all job descriptions within 5 years but not yet begun. 1. No review of entry level job descriptions has been done or is planned or no timeframe for completing validation.	12 (21.1)	1 (5.6)	6 (50.0)	1 (7.7)	4 (28.6)
F. Where agency entry level jobs require considerable knowledge, skills and ability, develop trainee classes or justify inability to do so. 4. Trainee positions established. 3. General review of possible training positions 2. Trainee positions planned. 1. Less.	12 (21.1)	3 (16.7)	5 (41.7)	2 (15.4)	2 (14.3)

NOTE: The number and (percent) of agencies which had implemented or planned to implement those items are shown.

SOURCE: Affirmative Action Plans from the four States. Summaries of these are in each of the subsequent chapters.

include this commitment. Nearly a third of all agencies' plans include a commitment to review the application questionnaire to insure that no illegal questions are asked. Less than a fifth of Iowa agencies' plans include this commitment. Over one-fifth of all agencies' plans state that the agency has or will review entry level job descriptions to ensure they do not contain unreasonable job specifications. A very small proportion of Iowa and Missouri agency plans include this commitment. Over one-fifth of all agency plans include a commitment to develop trainee classes or justify their inability to develop such classes if the agency's entry level jobs require considerable knowledge, skills and ability. Kansas agencies' plans are significantly more likely to do so than those of any of the other States.

Another measure of activity is the extent to which agencies' plans provide the means to evaluate efforts and assess accomplishments. Agencies' plans are summarized in Table 3-10. Over half the agencies either do or plan to update their work force utilization analysis on an annual basis. A third of the State agencies either do or plan to annually review success in meeting their affirmative action goals and timetables. Only about 15 percent of Missouri agencies' plans include this commitment. Over half the agencies either maintain or plan to maintain applicant flow data and analyze that to determine obstacles to affirmative action. A third of the agencies' plans include a commitment to review interview practices and procedures. A smaller proportion of Missouri and Nebraska agencies' plans include this commitment. Only 14 percent of all agencies' plans state that records of equal opportunity complaints will be maintained. Over three-quarters of all agencies' plans include a commitment to appraise supervisors affirmative action efforts (although as the data in the chapters on each State show, a significantly smaller proportion actually include such appraisal in the formal evaluation process).

Table 3-10

A Comparison of Plans to Evaluate Implementation
of Affirmative Action Plans

	Total	Iowa	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska
A. Annually update work force utilization analysis. 4. Annual update implemented and analysis of change over the preceding 12 months. 3. Annual update implemented but no analysis of change. 2. Plan annual update and analysis--not yet implemented. 1. Less.	29 (50.9)	8 (44.4)	8 (66.7)	7 (53.9)	6 (42.9)
B. Annually review success in meeting goals and timetables. 4. Annual review indicates or promises to review degree of success and corrective measures if needed, including revised one year goals. 3. Notes changes but does not indicate action. 2. Plan annual review of degree of success and corrective measures including one year goals but not yet implemented. 1. No action.	19 (33.3)	8 (44.4)	6 (50.0)	2 (15.4)	3 (21.4)
C. Applicant flow data analyzed to determine obstacles to affirmative action. 4. Applicant flow data shows reasons for non-hire. 3. No reasons for non-hire maintained. 2. Plans applicant flow with reasons for non-hire. 1. No applicant flow data.	30 (52.6)	9 (50.0)	7 (58.3)	8 (61.5)	6 (42.9)
D. Review interview practices and procedures. 4. Plan shows implementation of <u>systematic</u> review of practices and procedures. 3. Shows reviews of practices and procedures but not systematic. 2. Plans implementation of systematic review but not yet done. 1. Less.	18 (31.6)	8 (44.4)	6 (50.0)	2 (15.4)	2 (14.3)
E. Maintain records of promotions, upgrading and transfers by race, sex, age, handicap. 4. Maintain complete records including salaries and analyze for all categories. 3. Maintain complete records except salary and/or age. 2. Plan to maintain full records on promotions, upgrade and transfer by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. Less.	23 (40.4)	6 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	5 (38.5)	6 (42.9)

Table 3-10 (Cont'd)

	Total	Iowa	Kansas	Missouri	Nebraska
F. Records of equal opportunity complaints.					
4. Maintain records of all complaints by race, sex, age, handicap and analyze for discriminatory practices.	8	2	1	2	3
3. Maintain records but do not include age and/or analysis.	(14.0)	(11.1)	(8.3)	(15.4)	(21.4)
2. Plan but have not yet implemented recordkeeping on EO complaints by race, sex, age, handicap.					
1. No records.					
G. Appraise supervisors' affirmative action efforts.					
4. Performance evaluation includes affirmative action.	43	11	10	11	11
3. Affirmative action expected but not a formal part of evaluation.	(75.4)	(61.1)	(83.3)	(84.6)	(78.6)
2. Plan performance evaluation to include affirmative action.					
1. Less.					
H. Overall assessment of affirmative action efforts.					
4. Narrative reports in which action items were implemented with what success or problems.	20	10	3	3	4
3. Some successes and failure in implementation are reported but not all action items are discussed.	(35.1)	(55.6)	(25.0)	(23.1)	(28.6)
2. Plan calls for complete narrative report on progress in subsequent years.					
1. Less.					

NOTE: The number and (percent) of agencies which had implemented or planned to implement these items are shown.

SOURCE: Affirmative Action plans from the four States. Summaries of these are in each of the subsequent chapters.

An unanswered question, given these levels of activity, is how much of the utilization of minorities and women can be explained by special efforts and how much would happen without them. We may not yet know what a significant public sector affirmative action effort can do to ensure equal representation of all groups of citizens in the public service.

Chapter 3 Notes

1. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

My general comments on the Commission's comparisons on the following pages are that I would have preferred

1) That each State agency to be evaluated had been given a standard by which you were going to measure their activities, etc., so they could respond directly to each part of the standard. Some materials not necessarily in their plans are vital in any such evaluation;

2) That each State be evaluated on its own efforts and programs. Comparative charts listing all four States together are misleading. Assumptions drawn from them are not necessarily true. We all have different programs and varying circumstances and problems. Having seven personnel systems in State government in Nebraska is an example;

3) That the Commission understood fully our entire program;

4) That the Commission acknowledge the wide variety of effective affirmative action plans, guidelines and evaluating techniques that exist. One is not necessarily better than another.

(Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981)

2. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Management Directive 707, Jan. 23, 1981.

3. Iowa Advisory Committee, Employment of Professionals by Iowa Local Governments (June 1981).

4. Ta-Yu Yang, Affirmative Action Director of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission commented that: "The use of the regional labor force as the standard of comparison is unfair since Iowa has the least concentration of minorities among the four States." (Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981)

The comparison to the regional labor force is utilized only in Table 3-1 and the commentary to it. The comparison is not used in any other calculation. For calculating disparity, the State work force is the point of comparison.

5. Carol Walker, Administrator of the Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

Perhaps we should first note that an affirmative action plan and an affirmative action total program are two different things. Much has been written about what should or should not actually be put in a plan--and it varies greatly. Our office looks upon affirmative action plans as flexible management tools to allow growth.

Before an evaluation of an agency's affirmative action plan or program (total effort) can be made, a standard or list of criteria to be used in the evaluation should be provided to the agency so that it can respond to some criteria it has addressed which may not appear on its plan.

Attached [not reproduced here] are the criteria your Committee used in 1978 and 1980 to evaluate affirmative action plans. We compiled this after the fact, and this information would have been useful to agencies as they developed their affirmative action programs and responded to your recent request for information on their affirmative action efforts.

For example:

1) Under our law the chief executive of each Code agency (chief executive or director, of all Code agencies is appointed by Governor) is directly responsible for affirmative action. All but three of the agencies evaluated were Code agencies when your information was gathered, and one of those (Health) is now a Code agency. Code agencies were required to appoint affirmative action officers and duties were given to all by our office.

2) Under your 1980 Standards II - Work Force Analysis, all Nebraska agencies again should have received perfect or near perfect scores. All agencies were furnished most of this information by our State Affirmative Action Office.

These are just a few samples showing the work that was done by an agency but is not necessarily spelled out in their plans. (Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981)

6. Ta-Yu Yang, Affirmative Action Director, Iowa Civil Rights Commission,

commented:

Iowa State agencies are required to annually report to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission. Consequently, agencies are accustomed to annually adjust their goals and timetables. This helps to explain the cited deficiency in long term affirmative action goals. However, in the past year, agencies have been encouraged to develop long term goals (3-5 years). I believe this deficiency will be markedly improved in the near future. (Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981)

7. Ta-Yu Yang, Affirmative Action Director, Iowa Civil Rights Commission,

commented:

Many of the agencies' affirmative action plans were cited for deficiencies in failing to address such areas as illegal questions on applications, entry level job descriptions and test validations. I believe these deficiencies can be largely explained by the fact that there is one single State agency - Merit Employment Department - which administers and handles all applications, job classifications and tests for almost all State agencies. Generally, those issues are addressed by the Merit Department and the Iowa Civil Rights Commission for the State government as a whole. It was therefore reasonable for a State agency not to address the issues on its affirmative action plan on the individual basis. Similarly, State employees are offered the same basic health and medical coverages, in addition to flexible working hours. These policies are given across the board and therefore not addressed individually by each State agency. (Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981)

4. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN IOWA

a. Introduction

The legal basis for Iowa State affirmative action efforts in effect in 1980 was Executive Order No. 15, issued by Governor Robert Ray on April 2, 1973. Citing as his authority, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended¹ and Constitution of the United States and the Iowa civil rights laws, Governor Ray required that:

State officials who are responsible to the Governor shall appoint, assign and advance employees solely on the basis of merit and fitness. Each State agency responsible to the Governor shall promulgate a clear and unambiguous written affirmative action program containing goals and time specifications in personnel administration. Each such agency shall regularly review its personnel practices and procedures with a view to correcting any such personnel practices and procedures which may contribute to discrimination in appointment, assignment or advancement. Each such agency shall conduct programs of job orientation and provide training and organizational structure for upward mobility and shall place emphasis upon fair practices in employment. Each such agency shall also bar from employment application forms any inquiry as to race, creed, color, sex, age or physical or mental disability, except for statistical purposes unless it relates to a bona fide occupational qualification.²

Under Article IX of the Executive Order, all State agencies are to cooperate fully with the Iowa Civil Rights Commission's efforts to monitor compliance with the Executive Order and the State commission is authorized to take whatever action it deems necessary to assure compliance with the provisions of the order. Each State agency is required to report annually on its programmatic efforts to ensure compliance and the State commission is required to report on these to the Governor by the end of January in each year.³

In 1979, the Iowa Civil Rights Commission required each agency to submit an updated policy statement, state who was assigned responsibility for implementation, a quantitative audit, qualitative audit and defined action items with goals and timetables.⁴

b. Iowa Governor's Activity

The Governor has undertaken a number of measures to promote affirmative action efforts required by his Executive Order. Perhaps most significant is his own pattern of appointments. In each year since 1974 there have been larger proportions of women appointed by the Governor; 14 percent of his appointments in 1974 were women, 32 percent of his appointments in 1980 were women. The proportion of minority appointments has also increased, from three percent in 1978 to 6.3 percent in 1980.⁵ In 1979 the Governor met with the heads of all State agencies to discuss and reaffirm his commitment to Executive Order No. 15. He sent follow-up letters to the heads of those agencies who were unable to attend. In 1980 the Governor met with key State agency affirmative action officers to discuss issues and concerns about affirmative action. One of the Governor's principal aides has been assigned as his liaison with the Iowa Civil Rights Commission and the director of the State commission's affirmative action unit (which reviews State efforts) has been given direct access to that aide.⁶

The Iowa Civil Rights Commission has prepared a manual on the preparation of affirmative action programs⁷ While this covers the elements of affirmative action programming in broad categories and has worthwhile appendices on the handicapped and older worker, it seems unlikely to be helpful to those required to develop an affirmative action plan. The audit element, which provides categories for analysis of numbers, is adequate. But the suggestions on how to develop action items to remedy problems and the kinds of action that might be undertaken are very thin and often incomplete.

In 1978-1980 the Iowa commission conducted a number of training sessions on affirmative action, some in conjunction with the Iowa Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.⁸

The Iowa commission reported that in 1979 it noted significant improvement in the affirmative action plans of State agencies. It stated that:

Each agency evaluated its individual work force and planned goals in recruitment, hiring, training, promotions, etc. If all agencies implement their affirmative action goals, significant gains would be made for the minority /sic/ and women in Iowa.⁹

c. Data

Table 4-1 shows the utilization of workers as reported in the 1970 Census of Population. Table 4-2 shows the utilization of workers in the private sector as reported by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), based on 1978 employer reports. Table 4-3 shows the utilization of workers by Iowa State Government as reported by the State on its 1980 EEO-4 form submission to EEOC. Table 4-4 shows the comparison between the 1970 State labor force, the 1978 private labor force and the 1980 State work force.

A comparison of the State work force to the two labor force measures¹⁰ shows some disparities greater than 20 percent. Utilization of white men although lower than in either of the labor force measures is within 20 percent of those measures. Utilization of black men is identical to the 1970 State labor force but lower than the private sector labor force. Utilization of Hispanic men is more than 20 percent below either the 1970 labor force or the private sector labor force. Utilization of white women is well above a 20 percent disparity with the 1970 State labor force or private sector labor force. Utilization of black women is above a 20 percent disparity with the 1970 State labor force but equal to the private sector labor force. Utilization of Hispanic women is above a 20 percent disparity with the 1970 State labor force but identical to the private sector labor force. While there are some significant disparities between State labor force and State

Table 4-1
Iowa Labor Force - 1970

	TOTAL	WHITE % Row	BLACK % Row	HISPANIC % Row
Total	1,088,340	1,075,216 (98.8)	10,845 (1.0)	5,874 (0.5)
Female	392,706	387,065 (98.6)	4,771 (1.2)	2,017 (0.5)
Male	695,634	688,151 (98.9)	6,074 (0.9)	3,857 (0.6)
<u>Professionals, Technicians & Kindred</u>		% Column	% Column	% Column
Total	138,226	136,354	1,078	866
Female	64,210	63,372 (16.4)	586 (12.3)	328 (16.3)
Male	74,016	72,982 (10.6)	492 (8.1)	538 (13.9)
<u>Managers & Administrators</u>				
Total	94,884	94,516	256	358
Female	15,355	15,248 (3.9)	82 (1.7)	68 (3.4)
Male	79,529	79,268 (11.5)	174 (2.9)	290 (7.5)
<u>Clerical & Kindred</u>				
Total	161,481	159,686	1,562	701
Female	123,595	122,301 (31.6)	1,128 (23.6)	524 (26.0)
Male	37,886	37,385 (5.4)	434 (7.1)	177 (4.6)
<u>Crafts</u>				
Total	127,916	126,778	1,010	656
Female	7,011	6,911 (1.8)	91 (1.9)	11 (0.5)
Male	120,905	119,867 (17.4)	919 (15.1)	645 (16.7)
<u>Service</u>				
Total	133,312	130,115	2,848	856
Female	88,638	86,753 (22.4)	1,705 (35.7)	560 (27.8)
Male	44,674	43,362 (6.3)	1,143 (18.8)	296 (7.7)

Source: Bureau of Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Iowa (PC(1)-C17 Iowa), Table 54.
Calculations by CSRO.

TABLE 4-2
1978 KEO-1 Report Summary
(percent by row)

	TOTAL EMPLOYMENT	WHITE COLLAR	OFFICIALS & MANAGERS	PROFESSIONALS	TECHNICIANS	SALES WORKERS	OFFICE & CLERK WORKERS	TOTAL	CRAFT WORKERS	BLUE COLLAR- OPERATIVES	LABORERS	SERVICE WORKERS
ALL T	380,451	168,603	37,668	24,442	18,077	34,463	53,953	179,329	47,723	94,161	37,445	32,519
ALL M	239,601	86,442	32,112	14,473	10,942	19,090	7,825	141,457	44,438	71,662	25,357	15,702
ALL F	140,850	84,161	5,356	9,969	7,135	15,373	46,128	37,872	3,285	22,499	12,088	16,817
WHITE T	365,871	164,181	37,030	23,843	17,547	33,735	52,026	171,125	46,441	89,707	34,975	30,567
WHITE M	230,491	82,519(35.8)	31,593(13.7)	14,069(6.1)	10,633(4.6)	18,722(8.1)	7,482(3.2)	135,280(58.7)	43,288(18.8)	68,380(29.7)	23,612(10.2)	12,692(5.5)
WHITE F	135,380	81,662(60.3)	5,437(4.0)	9,774(7.2)	6,894(5.1)	15,013(11.1)	44,544(32.9)	35,843(26.5)	3,153(2.3)	21,327(15.8)	11,363(8.4)	17,875(13.2)
MIM T	14,560	4,422	638	399	530	728	1,927	8,206	1,282	4,454	2,470	1,952
MIM M	9,110	1,523	519	404	289	368	6,177	6,177	1,150	3,282	1,745	1,010
MIM F	5,470	2,499	119	195	241	360	1,584	2,029	132	1,172	725	942
BLACK T	8,573	2,629	370	257	324	402	1,276	4,655	703	2,587	1,365	1,291
BLACK M	5,156	976(18.9)	286(5.5)	145(2.8)	153(2.8)	187(3.6)	207(4.0)	3,534(68.5)	630(12.2)	1,955(37.9)	949(18.4)	644(12.5)
BLACK F	3,419	1,653(48.3)	84(2.5)	112(3.3)	173(5.1)	215(6.3)	1,069(31.3)	1,121(32.8)	73(2.1)	632(18.5)	416(12.2)	645(18.9)
HISP T	3,621	853	133	84	96	161	379	2,383	385	1,230	768	375
HISP M	2,473	395(16.0)	119(4.8)	62(2.5)	67(2.7)	80(3.2)	67(2.7)	1,857(75.1)	351(14.2)	891(36.0)	615(24.9)	291(6.8)
HISP F	1,148	458(40.2)	14(1.2)	22(1.9)	29(2.5)	81(7.1)	312(27.4)	526(46.2)	34(3.0)	339(29.8)	153(13.4)	134(13.5)
AS/PI T	1,438	608	56	229	81	61	181	615	72	348	195	215
AS/PI M	903	343(42.7)	49(6.1)	180(22.4)	51(6.4)	24(3.0)	39(4.9)	356(44.3)	50(6.2)	199(24.8)	107(13.3)	104(13.0)
AS/PI F	635	265(41.7)	7(1.1)	49(7.7)	30(4.7)	37(5.8)	142(22.4)	259(40.8)	22(3.5)	149(23.5)	88(13.9)	111(17.5)
AI/AK T	956	332	79	29	29	104	553	553	122	289	142	71
AI/AK M	678	209(30.8)	65(9.6)	17(2.5)	20(2.9)	77(11.4)	30(4.4)	430(63.4)	119(17.4)	237(35.0)	74(10.9)	39(5.8)
AI/AK F	278	123(44.2)	14(5.0)	12(4.3)	9(3.2)	27(9.7)	61(21.9)	123(44.2)	3(1.1)	52(18.7)	68(24.5)	32(11.5)
ALL T PR	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ALL M PR	63.0	50.1	85.3	59.2	60.5	55.4	14.5	78.9	93.1	76.1	67.7	42.1
ALL F PR	37.0	49.9	14.7	40.8	39.5	44.6	85.5	21.1	6.9	23.9	32.3	37.9
WHITE T PR	96.2	97.4	98.3	97.5	97.1	97.9	96.4	93.4	97.3	95.3	93.4	94.0
WHITE M PR	60.6	48.9	83.9	57.6	58.9	54.3	13.9	75.4	90.7	72.6	63.1	39.0
WHITE F PR	35.6	48.4	14.4	40.0	38.1	43.6	82.6	20.0	6.6	22.6	30.3	55.0
MIM T PR	3.8	2.6	1.7	2.5	2.9	2.1	3.6	4.6	2.7	4.7	6.6	6.0
MIM M PR	2.4	1.1	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.1	0.6	3.4	2.4	3.5	4.7	3.1
MIM F PR	1.4	1.5	0.3	0.8	1.3	1.0	2.9	1.1	0.3	1.2	1.9	2.9
BLACK T PR	2.3	1.6	1.0	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.4	2.6	1.5	2.7	3.6	4.0
BLACK M PR	1.4	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.4	2.0	1.3	2.1	3.5	2.0
BLACK F PR	0.9	1.0	0.2	0.5	1.0	0.6	2.0	0.6	0.2	0.7	1.1	2.0
HISP T PR	0.9	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.7	1.3	0.8	1.3	2.1	1.2
HISP M PR	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.0	0.7	0.9	1.6	0.7
HISP F PR	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.5
AS/PI T PR	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.9	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.3
AS/PI M PR	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.3
AS/PI F PR	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3
AI/AK T PR	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2
AI/AK M PR	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1
AI/AK F PR	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1

NOTES: PR=Percent of Total Employment in a given Occupational Category
MIM=Total Minority AS/PI=Asian or Pacific Islander
HISP=Hispanic AI/AK=American Indian or Alaskan Native
M=Male F=female
0=less than 0.5 percent

Percent by row, that is percent of ethnic group in each job category, is shown in parentheses. Calculated by CSBO.

SOURCE: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1978 KEO-1 Summary by State.

Table 4-3
Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force That Are
From Each Ethnic Group

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	4,201	2,172 (51.7)	39 (0.9)	13 (0.3)	10 (0.2)	2 (0)	1,880 (44.8)	57 (1.4)	16 (0.4)	8 (0.2)	4 (0.1)
2.	3,536	3,095 (87.5)	12 (0.3)	9 (0.3)	13 (0.4)	11 (0.3)	387 (10.9)	6 (0.2)	NR	3 (0.1)	NR
3.	3,071	644 (21.0)	14 (0.5)	5 (0.2)	12 (0.4)	NR	2,330 (75.9)	45 (1.5)	16 (0.5)	1 (0)	4 (0.1)
4.	851	685 (80.5)	9 (1.1)	3 (0.4)	1 (0.1)	NR	148 (17.4)	5 (0.6)	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	1,099	784 (71.3)	4 (0.4)	2 (0.2)	7 (0.6)	1 (0.1)	289 (26.3)	6 (0.5)	3 (0.3)	3 (0.3)	NR
7.	4,438	1,269 (28.6)	16 (0.4)	3 (0.1)	21 (0.5)	4 (0.1)	3,072 (69.2)	25 (0.6)	2 (0)	20 (0.5)	6 (0.1)
8.	320	109 (34.1)	4 (1.3)	1 (0.3)	1 (0.3)	NR	198 (61.9)	6 (1.9)	1 (0.3)	NR	NR
9.	9	3 (33.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR	6 (66.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.	27	17 (63.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	10 (37.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	1,484	1,092 (73.6)	27 (1.8)	8 (0.5)	6 (0.4)	5 (0.3)	336 (22.6)	7 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	NR	2 (0.1)
12.	57	38 (66.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	18 (31.6)	1 (1.8)	NR	NR	NR
13.	NONE										
14.	1,082	466 (43.1)	4 (0.4)	4 (0.4)	NR	3 (0.3)	570 (52.7)	19 (1.8)	10 (0.9)	2 (0.2)	4 (0.4)
15.	856	384 (44.9)	5 (0.6)	5 (0.6)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	443 (51.8)	13 (1.5)	4 (0.5)	NR	NR
TOTAL	21,031	10,758 (51.2)	134 (0.6)	53 (0.3)	72 (0.3)	27 (0.1)	9,687 (46.1)	190 (0.9)	53 (0.3)	37 (0.2)	20 (0.1)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%		61.4	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.1	55.3	1.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
-20%		41.0	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.1	36.9	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		0	+	0	0	-	0	+	0	0	0
2.		+	-	0	0	+	-	-	NR	-	NR
3.		-	0	0	0	NR	+	+	+	-	0
4.		+	+	0	-	NR	-	-	NR	NR	NR
6.		+	-	0	+	0	-	-	0	+	NR
7.		-	-	-	+	0	+	-	-	+	0
8.		-	+	0	0	NR	+	+	0	NR	NR
9.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	0	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		+	+	+	0	+	-	-	-	NR	0
12.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	+	NR	NR	NR
14.		0	-	0	NR	+	0	+	+	0	+
15.		0	0	+	-	0	0	+	+	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+2	-3	-2	-4	-4	-1	-1	-4	-7	-7
DISPARITY			-5	-4	-6	-6	-3	-3	-6	-9	-9
% DISPARITY			19.2	15.4	23.1	23.1	11.5	11.5	23.1	34.6	34.6

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers from each ethnic group in the function/State work forces.

Table 4-4
Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force

	%WM	%BM	%HM	%WF	%BF	%HF
1970 State Labor Force	63.2	0.6	0.4	35.6	0.4	0.2
1978 Private Sector Labor Force	60.6	1.4	0.7	35.6	0.9	0.3
1980 State Work Force	51.2	0.6	0.3	46.1	0.9	0.3

Notes:

WM=white male
 BM=black male
 HM=Hispanic male
 WF=white female
 BF=black female
 HF=Hispanic female

Source: Tables 4-1, 4-2 & 4-3 of this report.

work force, the Advisory Committee believes it is appropriate to use the State work force as a reasonable standard for achievement by State agencies.

Table 4-3 not only contains basic data on utilization by agency function but also contains a score indicating the extent to which functional work force utilization of each ethnic group is significantly less than or greater than would be expected if it matched the State work force. The score awards each function a plus one if its utilization exceeds the State's by 20 percent, a minus one if it is 20 percent less than the State's and a zero if there is no disparity in utilization. Analyzing the net score by function shows that agencies involved in financial administration, public welfare and employment security were likely to use minorities and women more than the State work force proportions; that agencies involved in health or miscellaneous functions were likely to utilize minorities and women to about the same extent as the State as a whole; that agencies involved in other functions were likely to use minorities and women to a considerably lesser degree than the State as a whole. Agencies whose work involves streets and highways, police protection, housing, community development, and utilities and transportation had work forces in which utilization scores indicate considerable underutilization and in only one of these functions, housing, is there also underutilization of white males.

White men, Hispanic men and white women were represented at 80 percent of the State work force proportion or better in a majority of the 13 function groupings (Iowa has no workers in two functions). A review of the appended data on total employment by the State shows no major differences in the median incomes of each race/sex group within each job category, except protective service jobs. These statistics do not prove discrimination. What they do show is a disparity that needs to be explored.

To explore the disparity in total employment might reasonably require an analysis of disparity in each of the job categories. Here the analysis is compressed. Table 4-5 shows the pattern for administrators; 4-6 for professionals and 4-7 for service workers (two of three top job and one of three bottom job categories). (Note that, for reasons explained in the introduction, we have shifted the basis of analysis from percent of job category to percent of ethnic group.)

The disparity calculations from the three tables are summarized on Table 4-8. The proportion of disparity is greatest for administrators (except for Asian or Pacific Islander and American Indian or Alaskan Native women; there were no persons in this State work force job category who were from these groups); less for professionals and less for service workers than professionals (the white women's rate reflects greater utilization in the service/maintenance category than white males, while the other disparities for white women reflect lesser rates). The proportion of disparity is about the same for each group of administrators in which disparity is reported, except white women, whose rate is much lower. The proportion of disparity shows a different pattern at the professional level. American Indian or Alaskan Native women, Asian or Pacific Islander women, Hispanic women and American Indian or Alaskan Native men appear to suffer most. At the service worker level the rates are quite similar to each other, except for the very low rates for Asian and American Indian men whose rate is zero. These are patterns one would expect if one suspected a pattern of unequal employment, albeit not a uniform pattern.

The reader seeking to pinpoint the source of unequal opportunity could review tables 4-5 to 4-7, comparing the proportion of white men in each job category with the proportion of other minorities or women in each category for

Table 4-5

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	234 (5.6)	204 (9.4)	1 (2.6)	.1 (7.7)	1 (10.0)	NR	27 (1.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
2.	66 (1.9)	59 (1.9)	NR	NR	1 (7.7)	NR	6 (1.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	162 (5.3)	94 (19.6)	3 (21.4)	1 (20.0)	NR	NR	62 (2.7)	1 (2.2)	1 (6.3)	NR	NR
4.	31 (3.6)	28 (4.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (2.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	28 (2.5)	26 (3.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	45 (1.0)	38 (3.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	7 (0.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR
8.	22 (6.9)	17 (15.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR	5 (2.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.	2 (22.2)	2 (66.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.	9 (33.3)	8 (47.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (10.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	37 (2.5)	33 (3.0)	1 (3.7)	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.6)	1 (14.3)	NR	NR	NR
12.	10 (17.5)	9 (23.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (5.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	NONE										
14.	41 (3.8)	35 (7.5)	NR	1 (25.0)	NR	NR	5 (0.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.	59 (6.9)	48 (12.5)	NR	NR	NR	1 (100.0)	10 (2.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	746 (3.5)	601 (5.6)	5 (3.7)	3 (5.7)	2 (2.8)	1 (3.7)	131 (1.4)	2 (1.1)	1 (1.9)	0 0	0 0
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%		6.7	4.4	6.8	3.4	4.4	1.7	1.3	2.3	0	0
-20%		4.5	3.0	4.6	2.2	3.0	1.1	0.9	1.5	0	0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	-	+	+	NR	0	NR	NR	NR	NR
2.		-	NR	NR	+	NR	0	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		+	+	+	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	NR
4.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
8.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	0	NR	NR	NR	-	+	NR	NR	NR
12.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	NR	+	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.		+	NR	NR	NR	+	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+3	-10	-7	-9	-12	+1	-9	-11	0	0
DISPARITY			-13	-10	-12	-16	-2	-12	-14	0	0
% DISPARITY			50.0	38.5	46.2	57.7	7.7	46.2	53.8	0	0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 4-6

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	1,122 (26.7)	838 (38.6)	12 (30.8)	6 (46.2)	5 (50.0)	NR	249 (13.2)	9 (15.8)	1 (6.3)	2 (25.6)	NR
2.	374 (10.6)	333 (10.8)	NR	1 (11.1)	9 (69.2)	1 (9.1)	29 (7.5)	NR	NR	1 (33.3)	NR
3.	1,176 (38.3)	404 (62.7)	6 (42.9)	3 (60.0)	11 (91.7)	NR	736 (31.6)	10 (22.2)	5 (31.3)	1 (100.0)	NR
4.	90 (3.6)	74 (10.8)	1 (11.1)	NR	1 (100.0)	NR	13 (8.8)	1 (20.0)	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	302 (27.5)	264 (33.7)	1 (25.0)	1 (50.0)	7 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	27 (9.3)	NR	NR	1 (33.3)	NR
7.	684 (15.4)	235 (18.5)	3 (18.8)	1 (33.3)	19 (90.5)	1 (25.0)	415 (13.5)	2 (8.0)	1 (50.0)	7 (35.0)	NR
8.	154 (48.1)	60 (55.0)	4 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	NR	87 (44.4)	1 (16.7)	NR	NR	NR
9.	4 (44.4)	1 (33.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (50.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.	17 (63.3)	9 (52.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR	8 (80.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	318 (21.4)	228 (20.9)	8 (29.6)	2 (25.0)	6 (100.0)	1 (25.0)	69 (20.5)	4 (57.1)	NR	NR	NR
12.	9 (15.8)	9 (23.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	NONE										
14.	551 (50.9)	348 (74.7)	1 (25.0)	3 (75.0)	NR	3 (100.0)	183 (32.1)	6 (31.6)	5 (50.0)	NR	2 (50.0)
15.	446 (32.1)	297 (77.3)	4 (80.0)	3 (60.0)	NR	NR	136 (30.7)	3 (23.1)	3 (75.0)	NR	NR
TOTAL	5,247 (24.9)	3,100 (28.8)	40 (29.9)	21 (39.6)	59 (81.9)	7 (25.9)	1,955 (20.2)	36 (18.9)	15 (28.3)	12 (32.4)	2 (10.0)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	29.9	34.6	35.9	47.5	98.3	31.1	24.2	22.7	34.0	38.9	12.0
-20%	19.9	23.0	23.9	31.7	65.5	20.7	16.2	15.1	22.6	25.9	8.0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	0	0	-	NR	-	0	-	-	NR
2.		-	NR	-	0	-	-	NR	NR	0	NR
3.		+	+	+	0	NR	+	0	0	+	NR
4.		-	-	NR	+	NR	-	0	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	0	+	+	+	-	NR	NR	0	NR
7.		-	-	0	0	+	-	-	+	0	NR
8.		+	+	+	+	NR	+	0	NR	NR	NR
9.		0	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	0	-	+	0	0	+	NR	NR	NR
12.		0	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	0	+	NR	+	+	+	+	NR	+
15.		+	+	+	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+2	-3	-1	-2	-6	0	-3	-6	-8	-11
DISPARITY			-5	-3	-4	-8	-2	-5	-8	-10	-13
% DISPARITY			19.2	11.5	15.4	30.8	11.5	19.2	30.8	38.5	50.0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 4-7

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs
in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in
Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	541 (12.9)	332 (15.3)	13 (33.3)	3 (23.1)	1 (10.0)	2 (100.0)	178 (9.5)	11 (19.3)	1 (6.3)	NR	NR
2.	1,125 (31.8)	1,072 (34.6)	7 (58.3)	3 (33.3)	NR	4 (36.4)	39 (10.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	28 (0.9)	22 (3.4)	2 (14.3)	NR	NR	NR	4 (0.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.	14 (1.6)	10 (1.5)	1 (11.1)	NR	NR	NR	3 (2.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	117 (10.6)	101 (12.9)	2 (50.0)	NR	NR	NR	13 (4.5)	1 (16.7)	NR	NR	NR
7.	651 (14.7)	212 (16.7)	2 (12.5)	NR	1 (4.8)	NR	424 (13.8)	2 (8.0)	NR	9 (45.0)	1 (16.7)
8.	3 (0.9)	3 (2.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.	1 (11.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (16.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.	NONE										
11.	33 (2.2)	27 (2.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR	6 (1.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	6 (0.6)	4 (0.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.	30 (3.5)	11 (2.9)	1 (20.0)	2 (40.0)	NR	NR	15 (3.4)	1 (7.7)	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	2,549 (12.1)	1,794 (16.7)	28 (20.9)	8 (15.1)	2 (2.8)	6 (22.2)	685 (7.1)	15 (7.9)	1 (1.9)	9 (24.3)	1 (50.0)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	14.5	20.0	25.1	18.1	3.4	26.6	8.5	9.5	2.3	29.2	60.0
-20%	9.7	13.4	16.7	12.1	2.2	17.8	5.7	6.3	1.5	19.4	40.0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	NR	NR
2.		+	+	+	NR	+	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		-	+	NR	NR	NR	-	+	NR	+	NR
7.		0	-	NR	+	NR	+	0	NR	NR	-
8.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.		NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.		-	0	+	NR	NR	-	0	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		-7	-4	-5	-7	-7	-3	-5	-9	-9	-11
DISPARITY			+3	+2	0	0	+4	+2	-2	-2	-4
% DISPARITY			13.6	9.1	0	0	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1	18.2

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 4-8
Percent Disparity Compared

	MALE					FEMALE			
	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind. or Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind. or Al.Nat.
Administrative	50.0	38.5	46.2	57.7	7.7	46.2	53.8	0	0
Professional	19.2	11.5	15.4	30.8	11.5	19.2	30.8	38.5	50.0
Service	13.6	9.1	0	0	18.2	9.1	9.1	9.1	18.2

Source: Calculations by CSRO shown on Tables 4-5, 4-6 and 4-7.

each of the functions. In the administrative category only 14 of 746 administrators are from minority groups. Thus, there are very few to compare with the white men who predominate in this category. In those functions which include minority administrators they are usually as great or greater a proportion of their ethnic group as white males. However, it should be noted that only six of 13 functions include minority administrators. In most functions there are none at all. White women are administrators in all but one of the functions. But without exception, white women administrators in each function are a smaller proportion of all white women employed in the function than are white male administrators as a proportion of all white males employed in the function. The disparities are usually quite dramatic.

White men are less dominant a proportion (about 60 percent) of the professional level jobs and more functions include at least some minority professionals than is the case for administrators. Indeed, the percentage of minority professionals from each ethnic group in some functional work forces is greater than the proportion of white male professionals from the white male group in the same functional work force. However, the significance of this can be overrated because in so many functions minorities are such a small proportion of the functional work force that even one person in the job category constitutes a large proportion of that group's functional representation. Again, in most functions white female professionals constitute a much smaller portion of the white female component of the functional work force than white male professionals of the white male component of the functional work force. The exceptions are in functions where there are very few women employed and therefore a small number of white women professionals constitute a large proportion of the white women employed in the function.

In the service/maintenance worker category a review of the data in Table 4-7 shows that there are many functions in which most of the nonwhite ethnic groups are not represented. But black males are represented in seven of 11 functions and in those functions where there are a large number of black males it would appear that the proportion of black male workers in the function who are service/maintenance workers is considerably larger than the proportion of white male workers in the function who are service/maintenance workers. White female service/maintenance workers in four of the five functions where there are 10 or more are a smaller proportion of all white female workers in the function than are white male service/maintenance workers a proportion of all white male workers in the function.

A glance through the appendix tables shows that although few administrators earned less than \$15,999; the proportion of minority or white females in the administrator category who did so was larger than the proportion of white male administrators at that salary level. Indeed, it is striking that there are any administrators at below \$15,999.¹¹

But perhaps the most interesting measure of State affirmative action efforts is the change that occurs because of new hires. About 14 percent of the 1980 State work force are persons hired during the year. There is thus much room for change in the composition of the State work force. The proportion of new hires who are minorities or women is greater than their proportions in the existing work force for the State. But a look at the details indicates an interesting pattern. During 1980 no minorities were hired as administrators. Although 0.7 percent of the white women hired were administrators, 2.0 percent of white males hired were administrators so the disparity between these two groups increased. The proportion of black men who were professionals, protective service, office clerical and

service/maintenance workers who were hired was larger than the comparable proportion for white men. No black women administrators were hired during the year, and the proportion of black women hired as professionals was nearly half that of white men. No black women technicians or protective service workers were hired and the proportion of black paraprofessionals was less than the comparable proportion of white. Only in the office/clerical category did the proportion of black women hired exceed the comparable proportion for white men or women. A review of the hiring in individual functions shows broadly the same pattern. Overall, there is a slight shift in total work force because minorities and women are a greater proportion of new hires than of the work force. But a review of the actual hiring patterns shows that in only six of 13 functions were any white or women hired as officials or administrators and in none were minorities (either male or female) hired as administrators. In four functions no minority professionals were hired; in five functions no minorities were hired as service/maintenance workers.

d. Analyses of Affirmative Action Plans

Table 4-9 shows the extent to which 18 plans for affirmative action submitted to the Advisory Committee by the State of Iowa meet the test of a good plan. (Comments by the Iowa Civil Rights Commission on this review are noted in Chapter 3.) The 18 plans cover all State agencies which employ more than 100 persons. In 1978 the Advisory Committee reviewed six agencies: Education, Social Services, the Job Service, the Crime Commission, the Secretary of State's Office and the Banking Commission. The last three are not included in the current analysis. The three agencies surveyed here and in 1978 either had compared work force to labor force or planned to do so in 1978. Only the Department of Public Instruction had analyzed its utilization. Both the departments of social services and job service proposed

Table 4-9

SUMMARY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
I. IMPLEMENTATION																		
A. Chief Executive of agency responsible																		
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. An affirmative action officer is appointed and duties specified.																		
4. Yes.																		
3. Appointed but duties not specified.																		
2. Post planned.																		
1. No affirmative action officer appointed.																		
C. Dissemination of affirmative action plan.																		
4. Wide internal and external.																		
3. Some internal and external.																		
2. Wide internal and external planned.																		
1. Less.																		
II. WORK FORCE ANALYSIS																		
A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, salary.																		
4. Determined by all categories.																		
3. Determined by job category, race, sex.																		
2. Plan to determine by all categories.																		
1. Less data.																		
B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary.																		
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.																		

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
<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	4	3	1	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	4	1	3	1
<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	4	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	3	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	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	1
<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	1	1	1	3	1	4	1	1	4	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	3
III. RECRUITMENT																		
<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	1	3	1	2	4	1	4	1	3	4	3	4	1	1	3

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
<p>B. Make sure contacts above are notified of all vacancies.</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	3	1	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	3	4	1	2	2	1	3
<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>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	4	2	2	3	1	1	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.</p>	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	3	2	3	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	4
<p>IV. SELECTION</p> <p>A. Ensure 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	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
<p>B. Ensure 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	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	1	1
<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	1	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	2
<p>D. Review application questionnaire to ensure 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	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1
<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	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	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	2	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
<p>V. PROMOTION</p> <p>A. Review and analyze job descriptions to ensure that there are no unreasonable job specifications.</p> <p>4. Knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements are stated to be minimum.</p> <p>3. Validation in process.</p> <p>2. Validation planned.</p> <p>1. No validation of KSAs planned.</p>	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1
<p>B. Career ladder established.</p> <p>4. Many ladders exist or planned.</p> <p>3. Agency considering planning career ladders but none in actual operation.</p> <p>2. Agency mentions planning career ladders.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	1	1	2	1	4	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<p>C. Ensure employees are aware of career ladder opportunities, the requirements for other jobs are known and procedures for using career ladders are publicized.</p> <p>4. Fully done.</p> <p>3. Partially done.</p> <p>2. Planned for implementation within five years.</p> <p>1. Less, or no timeframe for completion within five years.</p>	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<p>D. Identify resources and procedures for upward mobility and disseminate this information.</p> <p>4. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling.</p> <p>3. Posting or other formal announcement only.</p> <p>2. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling planned but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Vague commitments to upward mobility.</p>	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	2	1	1	3
<p>E. Develop and maintain a listing of the skills of all employees to be used for encouraging application for promotion.</p> <p>4. Done.</p> <p>3. Mentioned.</p> <p>2. Planned.</p> <p>1. Not mentioned.</p>	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
F. Providing training opportunities both on the job and classroom. 4. Training for advancement and reasonable accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 3. Improved skills training, no special accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 2. Plan to provide training and accommodation. 1. Less.	2	4	3	2	2	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	2
VI. CONDITIONS OF WORK																		
A. Childbirth covered by medical leave policies and provision of limited leave of absence without pay. 4. All provided. 3. No extra leave. 2. Plan to provide full maternity benefits. 1. Less.	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	4
B. Flexible hours provided. 4. Established for all positions. 3. Considered/planned. 2. Mentioned. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
C. Part-time work available. 4. Stated available. 3. Availability limited. 2. Planned but not yet implemented. 1. Not mentioned.	1	1	1	1	4	2	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	4
D. Facilities accessible by public transportation. 4. Stated accessible. 3. Mentioned. 2. Plan for future facilities. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation	
E. Facilities accessible to handicapped. 4. Completely accessible. 3. Planning underway to make completely accessible, some areas accessible. 2. Plan complete accessibility but plans not yet developed. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	
VII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.																		
A. Formalized procedures for personnel grievances with both in-house remedies and appeal outside. 4. Formal procedure includes external appeal. 3. Formal procedure but not structured external appeal. 2. Formal procedure planned to include appeal but not yet implemented. 1. No formal structure.	1	4	4	1	4	2	3	4	2	4	1	1	2	4	1	4	1	1
B. Formal discrimination complaint processing established in addition to personnel grievance procedures. 4. Full equal opportunity complaint processing leads to State human rights agency. 3. Equal opportunity complaint processing ends at agency level. 2. Plan internal mechanism. 1. No internal mechanism.	1	4	4	1	4	1	4	4	2	4	1	1	2	4	3	4	4	4
C. Affirmative action officer available to counsel employees on complaints about discrimination. 4. Full-time counselor. 3. Part-time counselor. 2. Plan full-time counselor but not yet implemented. 1. None.	1	3	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation	
VIII. LAYOFFS, DISCHARGE, DEMOTIONS																			
A. Exit interviews to determine discrimination is not forcing employees out.																			
4. Yes.	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	1	4	1	4	1	4	
2. Planned but not yet implemented.																			
1. No.																			
IX. EVALUATION																			
A. Annual update work force utilization analysis.																			
4. Annual update implemented and analysis of change over the preceding 12 months.	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	4	1	1	3	2	4	3	1	1	3	
3. Annual update implemented but no analysis of change.																			
2. Plan annual update and analysis--not yet implemented.																			
1. Less.																			
B. Annually review success in meeting goals and timetables.																			
4. Annual review indicates or promises to review degree of success and corrective measures if needed, including revised one year goals.	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	
3. Notes changes but does not indicate action.																			
2. Plan annual review of degree of success and corrective measures including one year goals but not yet implemented.																			
1. No action.																			
C. Applicant flow data analyzed to determine obstacles to affirmative action.																			
4. Applicant flow data shows reasons for non-hire.	4	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	3	2	1	3	1	1	1	4	
3. No reasons for non-hire maintained.																			
2. Plans applicant flow with reasons for non-hire.																			
1. No applicant flow data.																			
D. Review interview practices and procedures.																			
4. Plan shows implementation of <u>systematic</u> review of practices and procedures.	1	3	4	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	
3. Shows reviews of practices and procedures but not systematic.																			
2. Plans implementation of systematic review but not yet done.																			
1. Less																			

Table 4-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Beer & Liquor	Blind	Commerce	Comptroller	Conservation	Environmental Quality	General Services	Health	Job Service	Justice	OPP	Public Safety	DPI	Revenue	Social Services	Soil Conservation	Transportation
E. Maintain records of promotions, upgrading and transfers by race, sex, age, handicap. 4. Maintain complete records including salaries and analyze for all categories. 3. Maintain complete records except salary and/or age. 2. Plan to maintain full records on promotions, upgrade and transfer by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	4	2	1	4	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
F. Records of equal opportunity complaints. 4. Maintain records of all complaints by race, sex, age, handicap and analyze for discriminatory practices. 3. Maintain records but do not include age/or analysis. 2. Plan but have not yet implemented record-keeping on EO complaints by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. No records.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
G. Appraise supervisors' affirmative action efforts. 4. Performance evaluation includes affirmative action. 3. Affirmative action expected but not a formal part of evaluation. 2. Plan performance evaluation to include affirmative action. 1. Less.	1	3	1	1	4	1	1	4	4	3	1	4	4	3	3	4	1	3
H. Overall assessment of affirmative action efforts. 4. Narrative reports which action items were implemented with what success or problems. 3. Some successes and failures in implementation are reported but not all action items are discussed. 2. Plan calls for complete narrative report on progress in subsequent years. 1. Less.	1	3	4	1	1	3	3	1	3	2	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	4

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

to review entry job classifications. Public Instruction indicated a formal commitment to training opportunities to improve mobility. Both public instruction and job service had formal recruitment plans. The three agencies had plans for evaluation including data collection and assigned responsibility for implementation.¹² The Advisory Committee reported that the few recruitment efforts in those plans were incomplete and unlikely to produce increases in the numbers of minorities and women who applied for posts.¹³ It also reported that evaluation methods were primitive and responsibility too widely dispersed.¹⁴

Of the 18 plans reviewed in Table 4-9, 10 indicate that information about the available labor force has been obtained and 14 indicate that they have determined the racial and sex composition of the agency. Many, however, did not bother to make this determination for each principal subunit. (The exceptions are noted in the narrative in Table 4-10.) However only nine had actually compared work force to labor force. Only one agency had set long term goals and only five had set short term goals, although one other agency planned to do both.

Less than half of the agencies had satisfactory recruitment programs. Very few had satisfactory plans or had undertaken satisfactory measures to ensure that selection was nondiscriminatory.

Few agencies planned or had implemented affirmative action efforts to promote or upgrade minorities or women. Only two agencies maintained lists of employees' skills which could be used in encouraging upward mobility.

Only three agencies had explicit provisions for full maternity leave benefits. None had flexible work schedule provisions or stated that their facilities were readily accessible by public transportation.

Most agencies had formal grievance and formal discrimination complaint procedures but only four provided a full or part time counselor to assist employees in resolving discrimination complaints. Only seven agencies had exit interview procedures.

Less than half the agencies had planned or implemented annual updates of their work force utilization or reviewed success in meeting goals and timetables. Seven agencies maintained applicant flow data and two more planned to do so. Few maintained or planned to maintain records on promotions, upgrading and transfers. Six agencies included accomplishment of affirmative action in supervisors' evaluations and five others expected affirmative action efforts from their supervisors but did not include this item in their evaluations.

The chief officers of eight agencies assumed formal responsibility for implementation of affirmative action programs. All but one agency had an affirmative action officer. Only six agencies disseminated their plans both internally and to outsiders.

All of the 18 plans had been approved except for that of the Department of Social Services which was under revision at the end of 1980.¹⁵

In Table 4-10 the Advisory Committee presents some narrative comments on the key elements of the affirmative action plans. Although there are some significant exceptions, many of these comments suggest that the planning in 1980, as it was at the time of the last review, does not provide for effective measures of affirmative action. Particularly noteworthy is the frequent omission of an effective internal evaluation procedure that would allow determination of what worked and what did not and provide a basis for subsequent modifications in the plan.

Table 4--10
 Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans
 of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons

IOWA

Department of Agriculture - The plan is dated April 1980. There is no analysis of utilization to determine underutilization. There is no detailed analysis of work force or comparison to labor force. Except for recordkeeping on applicants and review of training opportunities no concrete measures are proposed which might improve opportunities. There is no circumstantial detail on improvements in selection procedure or promotion procedure. Most elements necessary for a comprehensive plan are missing. There is no provision for internal monitoring or review by the agency.

Beer and Liquor Control Department - The plan is dated April 8, 1980. A very rudimentary utilization analyses and equally rudimentary goal and timetable for remedying the implied underutilization are provided. The agency asserts that the Merit Employment Department is entirely responsible for selection and that any changes must be done by it. It blames any inequality in transfers on a union contract. It hints at assisting in recruitment, but makes no commitment. There are no monitoring or review mechanisms. The document lacks many of the essential elements of an affirmative action plan.

Commission for the Blind - The plan is dated May 20, 1980. The plan contains detailed utilization analyses, detailed comparison to the labor force and sets goals but not timetables. The action elements are based on the utilization analyses and a detailed assessment of other problems. Taken as a whole, this is a comprehensive and sophisticated plan although some elements are missing.

State Commerce Commission - The plan is dated October 3, 1980. This contains a statement of principles appended to which are some vague action items. There are no utilization analyses or comparison between work force and labor force. The absence of a full-time personnel officer in the agency may explain the visible paper deficiency. Some of the action elements such as widespread advertising and monitoring of training fund allocations may help. But the gaps revealed in the agency's comprehension of the scope of the problem are large. Most elements necessary for a comprehensive plan are missing.

State Comptroller - The plan is dated July 1, 1979 and reported republished April 21, 1980. This plan contains careful utilization analyses and carefully developed numeric goals and timetables to remedy the identified underutilization. Although some of the action elements are less specific than might have been possible and not every possible action has been planned, the document contains most of the key elements--including good monitoring procedures for some elements of the plan. Significant weaknesses are the absence of a comprehensive evaluation procedure and failure to plan reviews of job specifications and applicant flow.

Conservation Commission - The plan is dated May 1981. It contains 1979 data on utilization of minorities, women and handicapped persons by the agency but does not provide data on utilization by units within the agency. Although 1977 work force analyses, appended to an April 1980 plan recommend an "eight factor" analysis and development of numeric goals and timetables, these are not evident in the 1981 plan. The 1981 plan acknowledges minority and female underutilization but specifies only a concentration of white females in the office/clerical job category. New hires, promotions and terminations are

reported, but their impact is not. The plan gives no indication that a comprehensive evaluation procedure will be developed. It places responsibility for selection on merit systems although it does suggest the department has some classifications which could be used to promote affirmative action.

Department of Environmental Quality - The plan is dated March 4, 1980. The plan contains an agencywide work force utilization analysis and numeric goals and timetables but there is no comparison to the available labor force. While the goals and procedures to attain them do seem likely to increase representation of minority and female workers, there is no explicit rationale for the basic goals. More important, the goals do not separate the various affected groups so that it would appear, however unjustified, that there is scope for filling slots with one group to the exclusion of others. The plan details at length recruitment problems and proposes some measures for resolving these. But these proposals are somewhat vague, albeit there are other agencies who have proposed less. The evaluation mechanism is specified in vague terms.

Department of General Services - The plan is dated December 31, 1979. The plan contains a utilization analysis and comparison to the available work force. Underutilization is identified on the agency level but the analysis also includes divisional statistics. Several evaluative mechanisms are implemented to review the major action elements of the plan. But no numeric goals and timetables are specified. While some of the action elements are well defined, others are not--many of these do not detail how an action is to be implemented. While many items are reported as completed, there is no information provided in the plan on how, or how effectively.

State Department of Health - The plan is dated March 1979 with a December 31, 1979 update. The plan includes a detailed comparison of work force to available labor force for the agency as a whole and each subunit. Numerical goals and timetables are not specified but efforts to reach parity are indicated. The action items stated in the update are less precise than they might be. The analysis of barriers to employment suggests further study of these is necessary. The proposed in-agency evaluation should be effective. Although many items in the 1979 plan had target completion dates prior to December 1979, there is no indication from the supplement that they were completed.

Department of Job Services - The plan is dated June 6, 1980. This is a reasonably complete affirmative action plan containing a work force utilization analysis and comparison to the available labor force, specific short term goals and most of the relevant action elements. What is missing is detail on how some elements are to be implemented and some indication of the success or failure of efforts currently underway. It would appear that the in-agency evaluation procedures could provide for effective review but because detail is lacking, it is hard to be unequivocal.

Department of Justice - The plan is dated October 15, 1979 and includes an update including the period to January 20, 1981. The update reports success in recruiting both entry level and senior level women as attorneys and in recruiting minorities. The labor force data is for Polk County only and is not compared to the work force. Some recruitment and utilization problems are identified. The plan includes no numeric goals and timetables and no action elements.

Office for Planning and Programming - The plan, dated November 26, 1980, contains a detailed assignment of responsibility, analyses of work force and determination of underutilization for the agency and each subunit. Although underutilization is identified, no numeric goals and timetables are set. Evaluation procedures are established. Almost every significant element for affirmative action is mentioned but the details of what will actually be done are sometimes thin. A strong point of the plan is the clear delineation of responsibility.

Department of Public Instruction - The plan is dated March 10, 1980 with an update dated April 1980. The plan contains a work force utilization analysis. Although note is taken of the size of the labor force, there are no detailed comparisons. There are numeric goals and timetables. These are not as detailed as they might be. Many of the action items would promote affirmative action but details on what will be done are often omitted. For a plan which is the latest of seven year's effort, there is remarkably little detail about results achieved and, although some data is apparently available, little evidence of evaluation and review.

Department of Public Safety - The plan is dated May 1, 1980. Although the introductory material is complete, there are few other details to support the plan. There is an assertion that the long-term goal is parity with the available labor force. But availability is based on those employed in 1970 and omits many other factors. There are no work force analyses or comparison to the available labor force computations, although one plan item is to prepare one. There is a "situation audit" that implies such analysis has been done in the past, but no evidence of this is presented. The "situation audit" suggests general satisfaction with current efforts but provides no detailed information to justify that conclusion. The action items are described in very vague terms and even where specific action steps are specified, there is little detail.

Department of Revenue - The plan is dated January 13, 1981. It contains a departmentwide utilization analysis, applicant flow statistics and a comparison to the available labor force. The basis for the labor force data is provided. There is detailed information on recruitment efforts and detailed one and five year goals. The calculation of underrepresentation is provided. The action elements for recruitment are specific. Other action elements are less well specified. Although substantially more data was assembled in 1980 than earlier, there is still little evaluation of what the data means--especially that on applicant flow and internal staffing changes.

Department of Social Services - The plan is dated July 1978. The plan states that there are numeric goals and timetables for remedying underutilization but these are not included in the document provided. Nor is there a comparison of labor force to work force. The action elements do not have specific timeframes for implementation. Some are more specific and detailed than others. Plans for evaluation are incorporated into the process. There is no indication of the success or failure of past efforts. The absence of specificity of goals might make assessment of efforts difficult. Although the plan covers 1978-1980, there is no assessment of first year accomplishments.

Department of Soil Conservation - There is no affirmative action plan. All that is available is a series of letters between ICRC and the department. One of the letters does indicate some issues and the letters contain data on the agency work force but there is no analysis. Because there is no affirmative action plan, data on the department's efforts are not included in Table 4-9.

Department of Transportation - The plan is dated January 1981. It contains goals and timetables for each unit of the agency for specific job categories, labor force and work force statistics. An earlier plan, dated March 27, 1980 contained buried within supporting documents a lot of thorough evaluations of accomplishments and deficiencies. This is lacking in the newer plan. Also absent is data presented in 1980 which analyze turnover. The plan contains specific commitments regarding recruitment, promotion, training, career planning and conditions of employment. The affirmative efforts of supervisors are to be part of their evaluations. Lacking are substantive steps to ensure that the selection process is nondiscriminatory and detailed procedures to evaluate accomplishments and determine what should be done in subsequent years.

The Iowa Civil Rights Commission has conducted annual reviews of the status of affirmative action efforts beginning in 1978.¹⁶ The Iowa commission reported that the proportion of State agencies which met the requirement to submit affirmative action plans under the provisions of Governor Ray's Executive Order No. 15 increased dramatically between 1978 and 1979. It also stated that the quality of the plans submitted improved significantly.¹⁷

Analyzing the overall utilization of minorities and women, the Iowa commission stated that "Each State agency must make an affirmative action effort of increasing black employees, as well as other protected class members in 1980 to meet affirmative action goals."¹⁸ It concluded that greater recruitment efforts would be needed, in coordination with the State Merit Department.¹⁹ It suggested that alternate selection procedures should be explored.²⁰ It urged that management and line supervisors be evaluated on their affirmative action performance.²¹ The Iowa commission noted that it lacked the staff to provide consistent monitoring and technical affirmative action assistance to State agencies and would seek the help of other groups, including the Iowa Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to improve its monitoring.²²

e. Administering Agency: The Iowa Civil Rights Commission

The following description of the powers and duties of the agency responsible for administering the Iowa affirmative action program was provided by the Iowa Civil Rights Commission:

Iowa does not have an affirmative action office per se. There is neither such an office attached to the Governor nor such an independent office. Rather, each State agency has an official responsible for affirmative action. The time spent by these officials may range from "as needed" to full time basis. Presently, approximately five of the largest State agencies have full time AA/EEO officers.

All of the agencies' AA/EEO officers do report annually to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission, more specifically to the Affirmative Action Director of the Commission. The Affirmative Action Director of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission would be the closest thing to the "affirmative action office." The powers and duties of this office are those which are delineated by Executive Order Number Fifteen. Operationally, the powers and duties have been those of monitoring and coordination. There is no supervisory relationship between this office and the agencies' AA/EEO officers.

The staffing pattern for the office has been one full time employee who is the Affirmative Action Director. Except for a period about two years ago when a second employee was temporarily assigned to the office, the same pattern has existed since the promulgation of the Executive Order. The budget for the office for FY 1980-81 was \$24,848. The budget for FY 1981-82 is \$24,951.

The office relies heavily on outside assistance. For example, questions relating to application flow, testing, and test validation are addressed cooperatively with the Iowa Merit Employment Department. Similarly, census and labor market data are secured from Iowa Job Services and Office for Programming and Planning. Computer programming and services are mainly secured through the State Comptrollers Office.

The office reports directly to the Executive Director of the Civil Rights Commission. Additionally, the office has a direct access to the Governor's office.²³

Chapter 4 Notes

1. 42 USC 2000e(1972).
2. State of Iowa, Office of the Governor, Executive Order No. 15, April 2, 1973, Article II.
3. Ibid., Article IX.
4. Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Status of Affirmative Action in Iowa, A Report to the Governor(n.d.), p.10.
5. Artis Van Roekel Reis, Executive Director of the Iowa Civil Rights Commission, letter to staff, Dec. 10, 1980. As of September 25, 1981, 33 percent of all gubernatorial appointees were women.(Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981.)
6. Artis Reis, letter to staff, Dec. 10, 1980.
7. Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Guidelines for Developing an Affirmative Action Program(n.d.).
8. Artis Van Roekel Reis, Letter to Staff, Dec. 10, 1980 and Central States Regional Office, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Civil Rights Developments in the Central States Region" (November 1978), p. 27.
9. Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Status of Affirmative Action in Iowa(n.d.), p.11.
10. See Table 4-4.
11. Ta-Yu Yang, Affirmative Action Director, Iowa Civil Rights Commission, commented:

It was indeed striking why any administrator should be making an annual salary below \$15,999. This matter came to my attention about a year ago. It was discovered that some positions were obviously misclassified - some classified too high and some too low. These misclassifications have since been corrected after Iowa has submitted the data to the Commission. (Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981)

12. Iowa Advisory Committee, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America(June 1978), pp. 98-107.
13. Ibid., p.15.
14. Ibid.
15. Iowa Civil Rights Commission, Status of Affirmative Action in Iowa(n.d.), pp. 22, 24, 25, 39, 40, 44, 45, 50, 57, 59, 61, 68, 82,86, 87, 89, 90, 90, 91, 97, 98.
16. Ibid., p.10.
17. Ibid., pp.10-11.
18. Ibid., p.13.
19. Ibid., p.108.
20. Ibid., p.109.
21. Ibid., pp. 109-110.
22. Ibid., p.110.
23. Ta-Yu Yang, letter to chairperson, Iowa Advisory Committee, Nov. 5, 1981.

5. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN KANSAS

a. Introduction

This report on Kansas State affirmative action efforts was prepared while the legal basis of such efforts was in transition from a July 1975 Executive Order with an accompanying State affirmative action plan by former Governor Robert Bennett to a similar order by the current Governor, John Carlin, and a new State affirmative action plan. The new Executive Order and plan were issued after most of the plans reviewed here were submitted to the Advisory Committee and State review under the standards set in the new plans had not begun at the time the Kansas State Equal Employment Opportunity Office reported on its activities.

Executive Order No. 80-47 of October 21, 1980 specifies that:

The Secretary of Administration shall have the responsibility for the preparation, promulgation, administration and annual update of the State Affirmative Action Plan for equal employment opportunity within the State civil service system. The State Affirmative Action Plan shall apply to hiring, recruitment, selection, benefits, promotion, transfer, layoff, return from layoff, compensation, equality of wages, employee development programs and training programs; ...

Each State agency designated in the State Affirmative Action Plan shall establish and annually update an Agency Affirmative Action Plan within the parameters of the State Plan;

Each State agency designated in the State Affirmative Action Plan shall include in their Agency Affirmative Action Plan the development of reasonable goals and timetables to address underutilization of minority, female and handicapped persons;

The Department of Administration...shall, at regular intervals, evaluate Agency Affirmative Action Plans designated in the State Plan....¹

Under the new plan, all agencies with 15 or more permanent positions are required to submit an affirmative action plan. These agencies are listed in the State plan.² In a statement attached to the plan, Governor Carlin notes:

...it has become apparent that the State was ill equipped to satisfactorily realize its commitment [to affirmative action made in the

Executive Order 75-9 and the accompanying plan]. Efforts at affirmative action were oriented toward a problem-reaction concept. That is, as problems arose, attempts at reconciliation were made after the fact.

To minimize future occurrences of this nature, we are strengthening our goal-oriented approach to affirmative action. Toward this objective, three major programs are being reinforced.³

Governor Carlin's plan requires annual revision of the State and agency plans, special emphasis on "initiatives which exist as affirmative action to overcome residual effects of inadvertent discrimination," and emphasis on the special needs of disabled individuals.⁴ He concludes "My message is clear. Through application of the necessary tools, affirmative action within State agencies will result in a true realization of equal employment opportunity for all."⁵ The State plan not only specifies what actions will be undertaken by the Department of Administration to further affirmative action governmentwide, but also specifies how agencies are to prepare their affirmative action plans.⁶ The work force utilization analysis and document maintenance requirements specified in the plan are unique in the region. If an agency rigorously followed the State plan requirements it would produce an extremely comprehensive affirmative action plan comparable to the best plans prepared by private employers subject to Federal contract compliance regulations.

Actions to be taken by the Department of Administration include education of both State officials and the public about affirmative action, increased validation efforts to ensure unbiased testing, classification reviews, development of career ladders, increased recruitment, development and maintenance of unbiased working environment and record keeping procedures. The new plan is candid in admitting past defects and precise in stating what needs to be done and will be done to remedy deficiencies in the existing governmentwide efforts.⁷

State agencies are provided detailed instructions for developing a work force utilization analysis and determining appropriate goals and timetables to remedy any underutilization that analysis might disclose.⁸ While the whole plan is worthy of praise and imitation, the provision to State agencies of county by county civilian labor force statistics on the availability of handicapped persons to serve as a target for State efforts for the handicapped is particularly noteworthy because it is unique. In addition to utilization analysis and setting of numeric goals and timetables, the State plans calls for problems to be identified and addressed in such areas as recruitment, trainee programs, classifications, examinations, preemployment procedures, exit interview procedures, EEO mediation procedures, grievance procedures, work environments, EEO administration, data collection, training opportunities and reasonable accommodation.⁹ The plan requires that accomplishments or failures to achieve previous year objectives be reported and explained.¹⁰ The plan details what responsibilities for implementation must be assigned, as a minimum, to appointing authorities, EEO personnel, personnel officers, supervisors and other State employees.¹¹ But the plan does not explicitly provide for supervisory appraisals to include implementation of these elements in evaluations of performance. This is the only significant omission from the plan.

b. Kansas Governor's Activity

The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office reported that of 505 administrative appointments in the classified service, 86 went to white females, 20 to black males, eight to black females, 20 to Hispanic males, two to American Indian/Alaskan Native males, four to Asian/Pacific Islander males, one to Asian/Pacific Islander females. Overall, 11 percent of the Governor's administrative appointments went to minority persons, 19 percent went to women

from all ethnic groups. The Governor made 91 appointments of professionals to the unclassified service. Of these, one was a black male, one was a black female, one was an Asian/Pacific Islander male and one was an Asian/Pacific Islander female. Overall, four percent of his professional appointments went to minority group persons and 29 percent of his professional appointments went to women from all ethnic groups. The Governor appointed 21 persons to secretarial/clerical jobs in the unclassified service. Twelve of these went to white women, two to black women, one to an Hispanic woman. Overall, 14 percent of the Governor's appointments in this category went to minority women and 71 percent went to women from all ethnic groups. The Governor made a total of 630 appointments to the unclassified service. Ten percent of these were from minority groups, 24 percent were women from all ethnic groups. Five percent of his appointees were black, three percent were Hispanic.¹²

c. Data

Table 5-1 shows the utilization of workers as reported in the 1970 Census of Population. Table 5-2 shows the utilization of workers in the private sector as reported by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), based on 1978 employer reports. Table 5-3 shows the utilization of workers by Kansas State government as reported by the State in its 1980 EEO-4 form submission to EEOC. Table 5-4 shows the comparison between the 1970 State labor force, the 1978 private labor force and the 1980 State work force.

A comparison of the State work force to the two labor force measures shows some disparities greater than 20 percent. The State utilization of white men is below both the labor force levels (the disparity between work force and private sector labor force is less than 20 percent), that of white women is above both; that of black women is above both labor force levels and that of Hispanic women is above the 1970 labor force but level with the 1978 private

Table 5-1
KANSAS LABOR FORCE - 1970

		TOTAL	WHITE	% Row	BLACK	% Row	HISPANIC	% Row
Total		852,313	816,590		31,300		14,647	
Female		314,221	298,218 (94.9)		14,113 (4.5)		5,246 (1.7)	
Male		538,092	518,372 (96.3)		17,187 (3.4)		9,401 (1.8)	
Prof., Tech., and Kindred		Total	121,765	% Column	2,905	% Column	1,648	% Column
		F	53,079	51,053 (6.3)	1,749 (5.6)		594 (4.1)	
		M	68,686	67,057 (8.2)	1,156 (3.7)		1,054 (7.2)	
Managers & Admin.		Total	80,181	79,289	729		643	
		F	13,976	13,733 (1.7)	203 (0.6)		88 (0.6)	
		M	66,205	65,556 (8.0)	526 (1.7)		555 (3.8)	
Clerical & Kindred		Total	141,783	136,898	4,306		1,847	
		F	106,387	103,079 (12.6)	2,889 (9.2)		1,284 (8.8)	
		M	35,396	33,819 (4.1)	1,417 (4.5)		563 (3.8)	
Crafts		Total	113,084	109,540	2,944		2,014	
		F	6,290	5,910 (0.7)	291 (0.9)		83 (0.6)	
		M	106,794	103,630 (12.7)	2,653 (8.5)		1,931 (13.2)	
Service		Total	101,940	92,051	8,893		2,915	
		F	65,434	59,807 (7.3)	5,039 (16.1)		1,857 (12.7)	
		M	36,506	32,244 (3.9)	3,854 (12.3)		1,058 (7.2)	

Notes: F = Female
M = Male

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Kansas (PC(1) - C18(Ks.), Table 54.
Calculations by CSRO.

TABLE 5-2
1978 HEO-1 Report Summary
(percent by row)

EMPLOYMENT	1978 HEO-1 Report Summary (percent by row)											
	TOTAL	OFFICIALS & MANAGERS	PROFESSIONALS	TECHNICIANS	SALES WORKERS	OFFICE & CLERK WORKERS	TOTAL	CHART WORKERS	BLUE COLLAR	OPERATIVES	LABORERS	SERVICE WORKERS
ALL T	296,028	132,922	19,488	15,145	26,475	43,987	136,216	45,716	62,169	20,331	27,660	
ALL H PR	180,865	86,333	11,173	9,285	13,526	8,311	104,486	41,046	44,859	10,571	9,760	
ALL F	117,163	4,533	8,315	5,860	12,949	35,676	31,730	4,670	17,300	9,760	18,100	
WHITE T	264,219	27,639	48,516	13,892	24,719	40,417	116,632	41,563	53,066	21,973	22,414	
WHITE M PR	160,231	23,360	30,604	8,710	12,738	7,509	89,934	37,440	38,330	14,136	7,384	
WHITE F PR	103,988	4,279	7,912	5,182	11,981	31,908	26,688	4,123	14,728	7,837	15,028	
MIN T	8,749	1,198	972	1,233	1,756	3,570	19,594	4,133	9,083	6,356	5,466	
MIN M PR	20,644	964	569	575	788	802	14,552	4,435	6,511	2,334	2,466	
MIN F PR	13,165	234	403	678	968	2,768	5,042	3,606	2,572	1,923	3,072	
BLACK T	20,415	4,973	419	758	1,027	2,184	11,395	2,133	5,660	3,597	4,097	
BLACK M PR	11,953	1,798	186	277	272	385	8,376	1,808	4,447	2,447	2,819	
BLACK F PR	8,462	3,175	233	481	755	1,799	3,019	343	1,213	1,150	1,278	
HISP T	6,971	237	231	294	515	87	2,767	1,367	2,341	2,059	1,033	
HISP M PR	5,942	133	128	166	215	191	2,492	1,261	1,771	1,550	818	
HISP F PR	3,029	1,229	98	128	300	636	1,185	106	570	509	215	
AS/PT T	1,988	62	214	88	84	156	1,121	130	471	320	240	
AS/PT M PR	1,087	32	117	50	29	29	592	88	234	237	96	
AS/PT F PR	901	49	97	38	55	127	527	42	237	233	144	
AI/AK T	2,435	978	86	113	130	403	1,311	503	611	197	146	
AI/AK M PR	1,662	626	63	82	76	187	975	449	385	141	81	
AI/AK F PR	773	352	23	31	54	216	336	56	226	56	65	

NOTES: PR-Percent of Total Employment in a given Occupational Category
 M-Minority
 H-Hispanic
 F-Female
 AI/AK-Asian or Pacific Islander
 AS/PT-Asian or Pacific Islander
 AI/AK-Asian or Pacific Islander
 AS/PT-Asian or Pacific Islander
 F-Female
 Percent by row, that is percent of ethnic group in each job category, is shown in parentheses. Calculated by CSBO.
 SOURCE: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1978 HEO-1 Summary by State.

Table 5-3
 Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force That Are From
 Each Ethnic Group

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	4,928	1,744 (35.4)	73 (1.5)	43 (0.9)	4 (0.1)	10 (0.2)	2,857 (58.9)	129 (2.6)	58 (1.2)	7 (0.1)	3 (0.1)
2.	3,869	3,163 (81.8)	72 (1.9)	71 (1.8)	9 (0.2)	10 (0.3)	517 (13.4)	9 (0.2)	17 (0.4)	NR	1 (0)
3.	4,241	862 (20.3)	75 (1.8)	21 (0.5)	5 (0.1)	8 (0.2)	2,876 (67.9)	298 (7.0)	63 (1.5)	16 (0.4)	17 (0.4)
4.	885	681 (76.9)	15 (1.7)	10 (1.1)	NR	1 (0.1)	169 (19.1)	6 (0.7)	3 (0.3)	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	1,390	967 (69.6)	27 (1.9)	10 (0.7)	3 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	366 (26.3)	8 (0.6)	7 (0.5)	NR	NR
7.	5,098	1,554 (30.5)	277 (5.4)	57 (1.0)	6 (0.1)	43 (0.8)	2,641 (51.8)	425 (8.3)	59 (1.2)	7 (0.1)	29 (0.6)
8.	620	269 (43.4)	4 (0.6)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	NR	330 (53.2)	3 (0.5)	8 (1.3)	3 (0.5)	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	55	25 (45.5)	2 (3.6)	1 (1.8)	NR	NR	23 (41.8)	1 (1.8)	2 (3.6)	1 (1.8)	NR
11.	1,214	702 (57.8)	117 (9.6)	24 (2.0)	2 (0.2)	8 (0.7)	229 (18.9)	55 (4.5)	3 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	1,344	533 (39.7)	38 (2.8)	28 (2.1)	3 (0.2)	1 (0.1)	664 (47.9)	48 (3.6)	26 (1.9)	3 (0.2)	NR
15.	97	39 (40.2)	5 (5.2)	NR	NR	NR	51 (52.6)	2 (2.1)	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	23,741	10,539 (44.4)	705 (3.0)	267 (1.1)	33 (0.1)	83 (0.3)	10,793 (45.5)	984 (4.1)	246 (1.0)	39 (0.2)	52 (0.2)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%		53.3	3.6	1.3	0.1	0.4	54.6	5.0	1.2	0.2	0.2
-20%		35.5	2.4	0.9	0.1	0.3	36.4	3.3	0.8	0.2	0.2
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		-	-	0	0	-	+	-	0	0	-
2.		+	-	+	+	0	-	-	-	NR	-
3.		-	-	-	0	-	+	+	+	+	+
4.		+	-	0	NR	-	-	-	-	NR	NR
6.		+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	NR	NR
7.		-	+	0	0	+	0	+	0	-	+
8.		0	-	-	+	NR	0	-	+	+	NR
10.		0	0	+	NR	NR	0	-	+	+	NR
11.		+	+	+	+	+	-	0	-	0	0
14.		0	0	+	+	-	0	0	+	0	NR
15.		0	+	NR	NR	NR	0	-	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+1	-3	0	+2	-6	-2	-5	-1	-2	-6
DISPARITY			-4	-1	+1	-7	-3	-6	-2	-3	-7
% DISPARITY			18.2	4.6	4.6	31.8	13.6	27.3	9.1	13.6	31.8

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers from each ethnic group in the function/State work forces.

Table 5-4

Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force

	ZWM	ZBM	ZHM	ZWF	ZBF	ZHF
1970 Labor Force	60.8	2.0	1.1	35.0	1.7	0.6
1970 Private Sector Labor Force	53.8	4.0	2.0	34.9	2.8	1.0
State Workforce (1960)	44.4	3.0	1.1	45.5	4.1	1.0

NOTES:

WM=white male

BM=black male

HM=Hispanic male

WF=white female

BF=black female

HF=Hispanic female

SOURCE: Tables 5-1, 5-2 and 5-3 of this report.

sector labor force. Utilization of black men is greater than the 1970 labor force, less than the 1978 private sector labor force. Utilization of Hispanic men is identical to the 1970 labor force, less than the 1978 private sector labor force. Despite these disparities, the Advisory Committee believed that it would be appropriate to use the State work force as a reasonable standard for achievement by State agencies.

Table 5-3 not only contains basic data on utilization by agency function but also contains scores indicating the extent to which functional work force utilization of each ethnic group is significantly less or greater than would be expected if it matched the State work force. The score awards each function a plus one if its utilization exceeds the State's by 20 percent, a minus one if it is 20 percent less than the State's and a zero if there is no disparity in utilization. Analysis of the net score by function shows that agencies involved in public welfare and corrections were likely to use minorities and women more than the State proportions, that agencies involved in miscellaneous functions were likely to use minorities and women to about the same level and that agencies involved in other functions were likely to use minorities and women to a significantly lesser degree than the State as a whole.

White males, Hispanic males, Asian males; white women, Hispanic women, Asian women were utilized in six or more functions at 80 percent or greater of the State average. These statistics do not prove discrimination. What they do show is some disparities that need to be explored.

To explore the disparity in total employment might reasonably require an analysis of disparity in each of the job categories. Here the analysis is compressed. Table 5-5 shows the pattern for administrators; 5-6 for professionals and 5-7 for service workers (two of three top job and one of

Table 5-5

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Forces with Percent Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	445 (9.0)	313 (17.9)	5 (6.8)	1 (2.3)	NR	2 (20.0)	117 (4.1)	6 (4.7)	NR	1 (14.3)	NR
2.	46 (1.2)	44 (1.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	148 (3.5)	67 (7.8)	2 (2.7)	1 (4.8)	1 (20.0)	NR	65 (2.3)	12 (4.0)	NR	NR	NR
4.	47 (5.3)	42 (6.2)	1 (6.7)	1 (10.0)	NR	NR	2 (1.2)	1 (16.7)	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE 86 (6.2)	79 (8.2)	NR	1 (10.0)	NR	NR	6 (1.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	73 (1.4)	33 (2.1)	1 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR	38 (1.4)	1 (0.2)	NR	NR	NR
8.	78 (12.6)	45 (16.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	33 (10.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	6 (10.9)	5 (20.0)	1 (50.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	27 (2.2)	17 (2.4)	5 (4.3)	1 (4.2)	NR	NR	3 (1.0)	1 (1.8)	NR	NR	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	125 (9.3)	94 (17.6)	3 (7.9)	6 (21.4)	1 (33.3)	NR	20 (3.0)	1 (2.1)	NR	NR	NR
15.	12 (12.4)	9 (23.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (5.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	1,093 (4.6)	748 (7.1)	18 (2.6)	11 (4.1)	2 (6.1)	2 (2.4)	289 (2.7)	22 (2.2)	0	1 (2.6)	0
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	5.5	8.5	3.1	4.9	7.3	2.9	3.2	2.6	0	3.1	0
-20%	3.7	5.7	2.1	3.3	4.9	1.9	2.2	1.8	0	2.1	0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	-	NR	+	+	+	NR	+	NR
2.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		0	0	0	+	NR	0	+	NR	NR	NR
4.		0	+	+	NR	NR	-	+	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	NR	+	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	-	NR	NR	NR
8.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
10.		+	+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	+	0	NR	NR	-	0	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	+	+	+	NR	0	0	NR	NR	NR
15.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+2	0	-3	-7	-9	-3	-3	0	-9	0
DISPARITY			-2	-5	-9	-11	-5	-5	0	+11	0
% DISPARITY			9.1	22.7	40.9	50.0	22.7	22.7	0	50.0	0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 5-6
Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State
Work Force with Percent Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces.

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	968 (19.6)	589 (33.8)	26 (55.6)	10 (23.3)	1 (25.0)	4 (40.0)	309 (10.8)	24 (18.6)	4 (6.9)	1 (14.3)	NR
2.	396 (10.2)	362 (11.4)	4 (5.6)	3 (4.2)	1 (11.1)	6 (60.0)	20 (3.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	1,612 (38.0)	523 (60.7)	20 (26.7)	11 (52.4)	3 (60.0)	6 (75.0)	95 (33.1)	75 (25.2)	9 (14.3)	5 (31.3)	9 (52.9)
4.	54 (6.1)	42 (6.2)	2 (13.3)	NR	NR	NR	10 (5.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	212 (15.3)	183 (18.9)	1 (3.7)	1 (10.0)	1 (33.3)	2 (100.0)	24 (6.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	645 (12.7)	189 (12.2)	12 (4.3)	7 (12.3)	2 (33.3)	32 (74.4)	363 (13.7)	19 (4.5)	4 (6.8)	NR	17 (58.6)
8.	204 (32.9)	121 (45.0)	3 (75.0)	NR	NR	NR	74 (22.4)	1 (33.3)	4 (50.0)	1 (33.3)	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	22 (40.0)	14 (56.0)	NR	1 (100.0)	NR	NR	7 (30.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	107 (8.8)	52 (7.4)	9 (7.7)	2 (8.3)	NR	4 (50.0)	35 (11.7)	3 (5.5)	1 (33.3)	1 (50.0)	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	616 (45.8)	330 (61.9)	22 (57.9)	15 (53.6)	NR	1 (100.0)	220 (33.1)	18 (37.5)	7 (26.9)	3 (100.0)	NR
15.	19 (19.6)	9 (23.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	10 (19.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	4,855 (20.4)	2,414 (22.9)	99 (14.0)	50 (18.7)	8 (24.2)	55 (66.3)	2,023 (18.7)	140 (14.2)	29 (11.8)	11 (28.2)	26 (50.0)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	24.5	27.5	16.8	22.4	29.0	79.6	22.4	17.0	14.2	33.8	60.0
-20%	16.3	18.3	11.2	15.0	19.4	53.0	15.0	11.4	9.4	22.6	40.0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	+	0	-	-	+	-	-	NR
2.		-	-	-	-	0	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0
4.		-	0	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	-	-	+	+	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.		-	-	-	+	0	-	-	-	NR	0
8.		+	+	NR	NR	NR	0	+	+	0	NR
10.		+	NR	+	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	-	-	NR	-	-	-	+	+	NR
14.		+	+	+	NR	+	+	+	+	+	NR
15.		0	NR	NR	NR	NR	0	NR	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+1	-2	-3	-4	-4	-3	-3	-3	-5	-9
DISPARITY			-3	-4	-5	-5	-4	-4	-4	-6	-10
% DISPARITY			13.6	18.2	22.7	22.7	18.2	18.2	18.2	27.3	45.5

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 5-7

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	174 (3.5)	60 (3.4)	24 (32.9)	7 (16.3)	NR	3 (30.0)	58 (2.0)	13 (10.1)	7 (12.1)	NR	2 (66.7)
2.	1,248 (32.3)	1,052 (33.3)	30 (41.7)	30 (42.3)	1 (11.1)	NR	132 (25.0)	1 (11.1)	2 (11.8)	NR	NR
3.	185 (4.4)	76 (8.8)	10 (13.3)	1 (4.8)	1 (20.0)	1 (12.5)	85 (3.0)	5 (1.7)	5 (7.9)	1 (6.3)	NR
4.	12 (1.4)	4 (0.6)	1 (6.7)	NR	NR	NR	7 (4.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	368 (26.5)	290 (30.0)	16 (59.3)	8 (80.0)	NR	NR	52 (14.2)	2 (25.0)	NR	NR	NR
7.	657 (12.9)	153 (9.8)	64 (23.1)	11 (19.3)	NR	3 (7.0)	337 (12.8)	73 (17.2)	14 (23.7)	1 (14.3)	1 (3.4)
8.	12 (1.9)	12 (4.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	3 (5.5)	1 (4.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (8.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	80 (6.6)	27 (3.8)	8 (6.8)	2 (8.3)	NR	NR	33 (11.0)	8 (14.5)	NR	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	32 (2.4)	22 (4.1)	5 (13.2)	1 (3.6)	NR	NR	2 (0.3)	1 (2.1)	1 (3.8)	NR	NR
15.	9 (9.3)	5 (12.8)	4 (80.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	2,780 (11.7)	1,702 (16.1)	162 (23.0)	60 (22.5)	2 (6.1)	7 (8.4)	708 (6.6)	103 (10.5)	29 (11.8)	3 (7.7)	4 (7.7)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	14.0	19.3	27.6	27.0	7.3	10.1	7.9	12.6	14.2	9.2	9.2
-20%	9.4	12.9	18.4	18.0	4.9	6.7	5.3	8.4	9.4	6.2	6.2
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.	-	+	-	NR	+	-	0	0	NR	+	
2.	+	+	+	NR	NR	+	0	0	NR	NR	
3.	-	-	-	NR	NR	-	-	-	0	NR	
4.	-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	
6.	+	+	+	NR	NR	+	+	NR	NR	NR	
7.	-	0	0	NR	NR	+	+	+	+	-	
8.	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
10.	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
11.	-	-	-	NR	NR	+	+	NR	+	+	
14.	-	-	-	NR	NR	-	-	-	NR	NR	
15.	-	+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
NET SCORE		-7	-2	-6	-7	-6	-1	-3	-7	-6	-7
DISPARITY			+5	+1	0	+1	+6	+4	0	+1	0
% DISPARITY			22.7	4.5	0	4.5	27.3	18.2	0	4.5	0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

three bottom job categories). (Note that, for reasons explained in the Introduction, we have shifted the basis of analysis from percent of job category to percent of ethnic group.)

The disparity calculations from the three tables are summarized on Table 5-8. The proportion of disparity is greatest for administrators, less for professionals and the same or less for service workers as professionals in some race/sex groups. The exceptions to this pattern are for black men and white, black, Hispanic and Indian women. (Note that there were no Hispanic or Indian female administrators so that divergence from the pattern is a statistical artifact.) The proportion of disparity for administrators is fairly high for each group actually represented except black males, ranging from about 20 percent for Hispanic males, white women and black women to 50 percent for Indian men and Asian women. The proportion of disparity is about the same, nearly 20 percent, for all groups of professionals except for Indian women for whom it is higher and black men for whom it is lower. There is no disparity in the utilization of Asian men, Indian men, Hispanic women or Indian women as service workers. The rate of disparity is low for Hispanic men, Indian men, and Asian women service workers. It is about 20 percent for black women and over 25 percent for white women. With the exception of the pattern for white and black women, these are the patterns one would expect if one suspected a pattern of unequal employment. (Although the disparity percentage for black male service workers is high, this reflects black male utilization above 120 percent of work force whereas the disparity percentages in the other job categories reflect utilization at 80 percent or less. The divergence of Hispanic and Indian women is explained above.)

The reader seeking to pinpoint the source of unequal opportunity could review Tables 5-5 to 5-7, comparing the proportion of white men in each job

Table 5-8
Percent Disparity Compared

	MALE					FEMALE			
	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind. or Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind. or Al.Nat.
Administrative	9.1	22.7	40.9	50.0	22.7	22.7	0	50.0	0
Professional	13.6	18.2	22.7	22.7	18.2	18.2	18.2	27.3	45.5
Service	22.7	4.5	0	4.5	27.3	18.2	0	4.5	0

Source: Tables 5-5, 5-6 and 5-7 of this report

category with the proportion of other minorities or women in each category for each of the functions. In the administrative category only 56 of 1093 administrators are from minority groups. Thus, there are very few to compare with the white men who predominate in this category. In those functions which include minority administrators they are usually as great or greater a proportion of their ethnic group as white men. In the 11 functions which had administrators, three had no minority administrators. There are white women administrators in all functions except community development. In all of the 10 functions which had white women administrators they were a lesser proportion of their ethnic group than were their white male counterparts, usually significantly less.

While the dominance of white men in professional jobs is somewhat less (they are only half the professionals), it remains significant. Black men, black and Hispanic women professionals were a significantly smaller proportion of their ethnic group than were white men. In four of 11 functions which had professionals (nine had black male professionals) black male professionals were a larger proportion of their ethnic group than were white men. The same was true for Hispanic men in two functions; for Asian men in two functions; for Indian men in six functions; for black women in no function; for Hispanic women in one function; for Asian women in one function; for Indian women in two functions; and, for white women in two functions. (Where there was only one minority person in the function, the function is not mentioned.) Except for white women, the significance of these figures can be overrated because in so many functions minorities are such a small proportion of the functional work force that even one person in the job category constitutes a large proportion of that group's functional representation.

In three of 11 functions which had service/maintenance workers minorities were either unrepresented or there was only one minority service worker. Black and Hispanic men were a significantly larger proportion of this category than white men. All other groups were significantly underrepresented. But in many of the functional work forces where there were minority service workers there was a tendency to overrepresentation by comparison to the proportion of white male service workers.

A glance through the appendix tables shows that while few administrators earned less than \$15,999, white and black women were more likely to do so than white men, though not significantly so.

But perhaps the most interesting measure of State affirmative action efforts is the change that occurs because of new hires. Analysis of the appendix tables shows that about 23 percent of the 1980 State work force are persons hired during the year. Thus there is much room for change in the composition. White male new hires are a significantly smaller proportion of all new hires than they are of the existing work force, indicating that the proportion of minorities or women is rising. This is particularly the case for black men and black women. Similarly, the proportions of white males hired as administrators and professionals is also less than the proportion in the work force. But the proportions of new hires in professional or administrative jobs who are minorities or white women are also lower than their proportions in the work force. New hires tend to be concentrated at the bottom. This may be compensated by unreported upgrading of minorities and women from lower level positions. In only one function are there no minority new hires.

d. Analyses of Affirmative Action Plans

Table 5-9 compares the affirmative action plans for 12 Kansas State agencies with more than 100 employees to a model plan standards developed by

Table 5-9

SUMMARY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
I. IMPLEMENTATION												
A. Chief Executive of agency responsible												
4. Chief assumes formal responsibility, affirmative action officer reports to chief executive.	4	1	4	2	1	4	1	4	1	4	3	3
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. An affirmative action officer is appointed and duties specified.												
4. Yes.	4	4	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	4	4	4
3. Appointed but duties not specified.												
2. Post planned.												
1. No affirmative action officer appointed.												
C. Dissemination of affirmative action plan.												
4. Wide internal and external.	3	1	4	2	4	2	1	4	4	3	2	4
3. Some internal and external.												
2. Wide internal and external planned.												
1. Less.												
II. WORK FORCE ANALYSIS												
A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, salary.												
4. Determined by all categories.	1	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	1	3	1	1
3. Determined by job category, race, sex.												
2. Plan to determine by all categories.												
1. Less data.												
B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary.												
4. Implemented including job classifications, race, sex, salary.	3	3	3	4	3	3	1	3	3	4	3	4
3. Does not include salary.												
2. Plan discusses all items but analysis is not yet implemented.												
1. Less.												

Table 5-9 (Cont;d)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
<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	1	1	3	2	2
<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	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	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	3	3	3	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
<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	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	3	1	1	3
<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	2	4	3	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	4

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	S&P	Transportation
<p>B. Make sure contacts above are notified of all vacancies.</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	2	4	1	1	1	4	1	2	3	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>	1	3	4	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	3
<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.</p>	1	3	4	3	1	2	4	1	2	1	2	4
IV. SELECTION												
<p>A. Ensure 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	3	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	1

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
E. Maintain records of promotions, upgrading and transfers by race, sex, age, handicap. 4. Maintain complete records including salaries and analyze for all categories. 3. Maintain complete records except salary and/or age. 2. Plan to maintain full records on promotions, upgrade and transfer by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. Less.	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
F. Records of equal opportunity complaints. 4. Maintain records of all complaints by race, sex, age, handicap and analyze for discriminatory practices. 3. Maintain records but do not include age/or analysis. 2. Plan but have not yet implemented record-keeping on EO complaints by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. No records.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
G. Appraise supervisors' affirmative action efforts. 4. Performance evaluation includes affirmative action. 3. Affirmative action expected but not a formal part of evaluation. 2. Plan performance evaluation to include affirmative action. 1. Less.	3	4	3	3	3	3	1	2	1	3	3	2
H. Overall assessment of affirmative action efforts. 4. Narrative reports which action items were implemented with what success or problems. 3. Some successes and failures in implementation are reported but not all action items are discussed. 2. Plan calls for complete narrative report on progress in subsequent years. 1. Less.	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	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

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
B. Ensure interview is structured and performance on interview reasonably predicts job performance. 4. Completely structured interview guidelines relate to knowledge, skills, abilities. 3. Structured interview not necessarily related to knowledge, skills, and abilities. 2. Plan to structure all interviews using knowledge, skills and abilities criteria within 5 years. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
C. Train persons responsible for hiring to handle selection process in nondiscriminatory way. 4. Trained-completed. 3. Training scheduled. 2. Training mentioned but not scheduled. 1. Less.	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
D. Review application questionnaire to Ensure no illegal questions asked. 4. Questionnaire reported to be nondiscriminatory. 3. Questionnaire under review for appropriateness. 2. Plan to review questionnaire but not yet done. 1. Questionnaire not discussed.	2	4	4	1	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	2
E. Review entry level job descriptions to ensure they do not contain unreasonable job specifications. 4. Job descriptions have been validated. 3. Job descriptions are currently under review and some have been validated. 2. Plan to validate all job descriptions within 5 years but not yet begun. 1. No review of entry level job descriptions has been done or is planned or no timeframe for completing validation.	1	4	3	4	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1
F. Where agency entry level jobs require considerable knowledge, skills and ability, develop trainee classes or justify inability to do so. 4. Trainee positions established. 3. General review of possible trainee positions. 2. Trainee positions planned. 1. Less.	1	3	4	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
<p>V. PROMOTION</p> <p>A. Review and analyze job descriptions to ensure that there are no unreasonable job specifications.</p> <p>4. Knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements are stated to be minimum.</p> <p>3. Validation in process.</p> <p>2. Validation planned.</p> <p>1. No validation of KSAs planned.</p>	1	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	2
<p>B. Career ladder established.</p> <p>4. Many ladders exist or planned.</p> <p>3. Agency considering planning career ladders but none in actual operation.</p> <p>2. Agency mentions planning career ladders.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
<p>C. Ensure employees are aware of career ladder opportunities, the requirements for other jobs are known and procedures for using career ladders are publicized.</p> <p>4. Fully done.</p> <p>3. Partially done.</p> <p>2. Planned for implementation within five years.</p> <p>1. Less, or no timeframe for completion within five years.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
<p>D. Identify resources and procedures for upward mobility and disseminate this information.</p> <p>4. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling.</p> <p>3. Posting or other formal announcement only.</p> <p>2. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling planned but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Vague commitments to upward mobility.</p>	3	1	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	3
<p>E. Develop and maintain a listing of the skills of all employees to be used for encouraging application for promotion.</p> <p>4. Done.</p> <p>3. Mentioned.</p> <p>2. Planned.</p> <p>1. Not mentioned.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
F. Providing training opportunities both on the job and classroom. 4. Training for advancement and reasonable accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 3. Improved skills training, no special accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 2. Plan to provide training and accommodation. 1. Less.	3	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	4
VI. CONDITIONS OF WORK												
A. Childbirth covered by medical leave policies and provision of limited leave of absence without pay. 4. All provided. 3. No extra leave. 2. Plan to provide full maternity benefits. 1. Less.	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
B. Flexible hours provided. 4. Established for all positions. 3. Considered/planned. 2. Mentioned. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
C. Part-time work available. 4. Stated available. 3. Availability limited. 2. Planned but not yet implemented. 1. Not mentioned.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	4
D. Facilities accessible by public transportation. 4. Stated accessible. 3. Mentioned. 2. Plan for future facilities. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
E. Facilities accessible to handicapped. 4. Completely accessible. 3. Planning underway to make completely accessible, some areas accessible. 2. Plan complete accessibility but plans not yet developed. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1
VII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.												
A. Formalized procedures for personnel grievances with both in-house remedies and appeal outside. 4. Formal procedure includes external appeal. 3. Formal procedure but not structured external appeal. 2. Formal procedure planned to include appeal but not yet implemented. 1. No formal structure.	1	3	3	3	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	1
B. Formal discrimination complaint processing established in addition to personnel grievance procedures. 4. Full equal opportunity complaint processing leads to State human rights agency. 3. Equal opportunity complaint processing ends at agency level. 2. Plan internal mechanism. 1. No internal mechanism.	4	4	3	3	4	3	1	1	3	3	3	4
C. Affirmative action officer available to counsel employees on complaints about discrimination. 4. Full-time counselor. 3. Part-time counselor. 2. Plan full-time counselor but not yet implemented. 1. None.	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	3	1	3	4	3

Table 5-9 (Cont'd)

	Agriculture	Corporation Commission	Corrections	Education	Forestry, Fish and Game	Health and Environment	Highway Patrol	Human Resources	Parks	Revenue	SRS	Transportation
VIII. LAYOFFS, DISCHARGE, DEMOTIONS												
A. Exit interviews to determine discrimination is not forcing employees out.												
4. Yes.	2	4	1	2	1	2	4	1	4	2	4	4
2. Planned but not yet implemented.												
1. No.												
IX. EVALUATION												
A. Annual update work force utilization analysis.												
4. Annual update implemented and analysis of change over the preceding 12 months.	2	4	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2
3. Annual update implemented but no analysis of change.												
2. Plan annual update and analysis—not yet implemented.												
1. Less.												
B. Annually review success in meeting goals and timetables.												
4. Annual review indicates or promises to review degree of success and corrective measures if needed, including revised one year goals.	1	4	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	4
3. Notes changes but does not indicate action.												
2. Plan annual review of degree of success and corrective measures including one year goals but not yet implemented.												
1. No action.												
C. Applicant flow data analyzed to determine obstacles to affirmative action.												
4. Applicant flow data shows reasons for non-hire.	2	1	4	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	4	4
3. No reasons for non-hire maintained.												
2. Plans applicant flow with reasons for non-hire.												
1. No applicant flow data.												
D. Review interview practices and procedures.												
4. Plan shows implementation of <u>systematic</u> review of practices and procedures.	1	3	4	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	2
3. Shows reviews of practices and procedures but not systematic.												
2. Plans implementation of systematic review but not yet done.												
1. Less												

the Advisory Committee. In 1978 the Advisory Committee reviewed six agencies: the departments of education, social and rehabilitative service, job services (now a part of the department of Human Resources), the department of administration, water resources board and the department of credit unions. The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office prepared a summary showing what the Advisory Committee said about these agencies in 1978 and what actions they have undertaken since then. This appears as Appendix A to this chapter. The response in Appendix A also summarizes activities by the State. In addition to the plans reviewed in Table 5-9, the State sent copies of affirmative action plans of smaller agencies and their comments on those efforts. These are noted later in this report.

Of the 12 plans reviewed in Table 5-9, five indicate that labor force availability information has been obtained, 11 indicate that they have determined the racial and sex composition of their work forces. Many, however, did not bother to make this determination for each principal subunit (the exceptions are noted in the narrative in Table 5-10). Nine had determined whether or not there was any underutilization. Eight set long term goals and six set short term goals. In short, about half of the agencies had done most of what was necessary to develop effective goals and timetables (subject to the caveats contained in Table 5-10).

At the level of concrete activities planned or mentioned in the plan as having been implemented, the agencies' performances were comparable. About half of the agencies had developed or had clear plans to develop effective recruitment strategies. Somewhat fewer had developed or planned to develop effective undiscriminatory selection procedures. Almost none had plans for improving career ladder opportunities except to ensure dissemination of information about what was currently available. None maintained lists of

employee skills to encourage career development. While most had formal grievance procedures, very few proposed any other measures to ensure that minority, handicapped or women employees, once hired, would not face discriminatory on-the-job practices. For example, none had implemented full maternity leave policies.

Only one agency stated that it updated its utilization analyses, although seven others planned to do so. Only two reviewed success in meeting goals and timetables, although four others planned to do so. Five agencies maintained data on applicant flow and 10 included or planned to include achievement of affirmative action goals in supervisors performance evaluations.

Eight plans included agency head assumption of formal responsibility for implementation of affirmative action and 11 stated that an affirmative action officer had been or would be appointed. Ten agencies either had or planned to disseminate information about their plans both internally and to outsiders.

In Table 5-10 the Advisory Committee presents some narrative comments on the key elements of the affirmative action plans. The principal deficiencies reported are the failure to develop effective evaluation mechanisms and vague statements of objectives. With several exceptions, these plans are seen as at least a reasonable first step. There are hints in the plans that more is being done than is indicated in the plan documents. Some of the relevant additional activities are reported in the appendix to this chapter.

The following report by the State Equal Employment Opportunity Office summarizes what it has done to monitor compliance with the guidelines and indicates some of the deficiencies it has found in the affirmative action efforts.

Table 5--10
Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans
of State Agencies that Employ 100 or More Persons

KANSAS

Department of Administration (Statewide Plan) - A department plan is being developed. The State plan developed in 1975 serves as the current department plan. Its targets have not been revised since 1975. The plan is comprehensive in its proposals to assure that there will be effective affirmative action. But there is no evaluation after five years to determine what has been done, what remains undone and how successful the program has been in promoting equal opportunity. Many of the activities proposed are outlined in such broad terms that implementation and evaluation or may have proved difficult. The plan contains data on the State's work force but no labor force data, no identification of underutilization or proposed goals and timetables to remedy underutilization for the State government. There is no data or analysis for the Department of Administration. The department apparently did not implement its own proposal for development of departmental initiatives.

Board of Agriculture - The department's current plan was published September 30, 1976. A new plan is currently under review by the State's affirmative action coordinator. The target date established by the board for developing a complete affirmative action plan was October 15, 1976. It would appear the board is over 4 years late. The 1976 plan includes total labor force statistics and detailed agency work force statistics but no analyses of utilization, goals or timetables to remedy any underutilization. It does not appear that the department has proposed specific plans to address most items in the State plan. The only specific implementation is to assign responsibility to the personnel officer and arrange to publicize the plan. Most items in the Advisory Committee summary are not addressed.

Corporation Commission - The current plan is dated June 1977. The State equal opportunity coordinator has scheduled an on-site review and plan update for the first quarter of 1981. The plan contains numeric goals and informal utilization analysis and labor force analysis. Many procedural changes are mentioned as goals but these are described in vague terms. Although evaluation is mentioned, there is no detailed evaluation strategy nor is there evidence that the commission has assessed its accomplishments.

Department of Corrections - The current plan is dated October 26, 1978 and covers the period January 1978 - June 1979. The plan is extremely detailed, including for each unit a utilization analysis, comparison of work force and labor force, specific goals and timetables to remedy identified underutilization. Efforts to achieve some of the other action goals are reported. The narrative goals vary in specificity but, overall, constitute effective planning projections.

Department of Education - The current plan was published May 1, 1977. A recent review by the State equal opportunity coordinator is expected to result in a revised plan. The plan contains an analysis of utilization, labor force analysis and numeric goals and timetables for FY 1978. The narrative elements of the plan are extremely sketchy except in the area of entry level classification. There is no evidence of significant evaluation, but this may

be attributed to the department's perception that it has little underutilization.

Forestry, Fish and Game Commission - The current plan is dated April 1976 with a supplement dated November 2, 1977. The State equal opportunity coordinator scheduled the agency for an on-site review and plan update during November 1980 (after the coordinator had submitted data to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights). The plan contains limited numeric goals and states why more cannot be done. There is a utilization analysis and informal labor force analysis. The action items are described vaguely although many relevant activities are mentioned.

Department of Health and Environment - The current plan is dated November 1976. Following review by the State's equal opportunity coordinator, a revised plan was developed and is currently under review. The 1976 plan called for a detailed affirmative action plan by January 1977. The plan contains numeric goals to be reached in each year 1977-78 to 1981-82. There is a utilization analysis and comparison of total labor force in each labor market area to total work force in each office but no explanation of the connection between this and the categorical goals. There is no evidence of any evaluation of proposed activities to determine their impact. Nor are most proposed activities sufficiently specified to allow assessment of their probable success, much less develop measures of actual success.

Highway Patrol - The current plan is dated August 25, 1975 and contains a supplement dated May 16, 1977. The State equal opportunity coordinator reviewed the agency's activities in June 1980, noted deficiencies and called for plan modifications which had not been submitted as of November 1980. The documents in the submission include very general statements on affirmative action, documents showing a major recruitment effort in 1975, a document describing validation procedures, and work force utilization analysis and goals for the capitol area security patrol. None of the key planning components of an affirmative action plan are included.

Department of Human Resources - The basic plan is dated October 1977 with a supplement dated October 1, 1979. The update contains a detailed utilization analysis and goals and timetables for new hires or promotions as well as detailed action goals for monitoring the plan, report on their implementation and new goals for fiscal 1980. Similar goals and analysis of utilization are in the 1977 plan. The rationale for these appear to be comparison to the agency work force as there is no detailed labor force analysis. The analysis of reasons for goals not fulfilled is remarkably candid and there is a strong verbal commitment. The plan and update note many successes in revising tests and job descriptions and a massive evaluation effort. The plan states that the capacity of the equal opportunity office to veto all personnel actions has served to prevent discrimination.

Park and Resources Authority - The current plan is dated January 1980. The plan contains a rough labor force analysis, work force utilization analysis and goals. However, even the goals are hedged with many undocumented allegations about the labor force availability. There are no reviews of individual facilities. The EEO complaint procedures are detailed but other elements are not. There are no programmatic goals or specific assignments of responsibility. There is no effective evaluative component although extensive recordkeeping is mandated.

Department of Revenue - The plan is contained in two documents dated February 12, 1976 and April 1, 1980. The plan contains a utilization analysis and goals. These are based on total labor force proportions rather than the

proportions in each occupation. The logic of some of the aggregations is not completely clear. The narrative goals are quite vague regarding implementation of key elements of affirmative action programming and some elements are not mentioned at all. The utilization analyses and goals have not been revised or reviewed since 1976.

Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services - The current plan is dated July 1, 1978 and contains a supplement dated September 25, 1980. The plan includes aggregate data on the department's work force and relevant labor force. The supplement states that numeric goals have been developed by each unit of the department and are contained in unit plans (not reviewed in this study). The plan does not provide specific information about what is to be done but does contain self-evaluations which may be read to suggest that many key elements of an affirmative action program have been put in place. The difficulty in reviewing this plan is that lack of specific detail make it hard to determine what has been done while references and hints suggest that more has been planned and accomplished than is specified.

Department of Transportation - The current plan is dated January 1980. The plan is comprehensive in its scope. There are, however, some omissions and several areas in which detail is lacking. The narrative on goals for new hires fails to specify opportunities for improvement and concentrate on what cannot be done. There is little detail on recruitment efforts, upward mobility and the precise responsibility of line staff. Much of the responsibility for selection activity is placed on outside agency units. Though many activities are maintained, it is unclear how much implementation and internal evaluation has occurred.

Current Status [as of December 31, 1980] of the State's
Affirmative Action Program

The State civil service affirmative action program, mandated by executive order, was initiated in order to establish a program capable of reaffirming this State's commitment to equal employment opportunity. Equal employment opportunity is the condition whereby all employment processes and circumstances operate to afford an equitable opportunity to all individuals, irrespective of nonmerit principles such as race, color, sex, religion, national origin, age, disability status (except when any of these factors is an existing bona fide occupational qualification) or political affiliation (except for certain specified employees in the unclassified service). The State has committed its energies to a deliberate and sustained effort to identify and eliminate artificial barriers to employment and advancement which may discriminate against various groups.

The primary focus of State affirmative action programs, as endorsed by the executive branch, has been upon minority persons and women. Handicapped person programs are currently being developed which will place special emphasis upon this protected group.

The initial State Affirmative Action Plan has been a positive instrument for inaugurating the State's affirmative action effort. This document made a declaration of State equal employment opportunity policy and provided a framework for the development of affirmative action programs. The more visible developments which have occurred within this framework are:

- the creation of the State EEO Office, within the Department of Administration, designated as the single coordinating body responsible for assuring that State agencies do provide equal employment opportunity
- the dissemination of a State plan for affirmative action
- the training of agency personnel concerning the required components of an effective agency level affirmative action plan
- the preparation and submission of affirmative action plans by all appropriate State agencies
- the ongoing review of affirmative action plans submitted by State agencies
- the development of standard reporting procedures allowing the analysis of agency work forces on a quarterly basis
- the development of certain computerized employee data providing for increased analysis of the State work force in relation to affirmative action mandates

- the implementation of a field review process utilized to assess agencies effectiveness in fulfilling affirmative action responsibilities
- the preparation and dissemination of a compliance manual applicable to the field review process
- the institution of a Governor's Trainee Program designed to improve the employment and promotion opportunities available to protected group persons
- the publication and annual update of a recruitment guide
- the publicity of the State's affirmative action commitment among civil service employees and the general public
- the establishment of an EEO library utilized to monitor the content and ramifications of current laws and regulations
- the initiation of procedures to incorporate a handicapped person emphasis into all affirmative action planning

The developments listed above have established the basic foundation for the implementation of State EEO policy. Though a foundation for implementation has been established and EEO programs are in force, the actual implementation of EEO policy is essentially determined by the evaluation of individual agency affirmative action programs. This evaluation process entails the use of field reviews, conducted by the EEO staff. A field review is an on-site assessment of a State agency's efforts and progress toward the implementation of State equal employment opportunity policy.

Based upon the completion of a field review, an agency is assigned one of three ratings. These ratings are:

- Satisfactory Compliance
- Marginal Compliance
- Significant Noncompliance

The individual circumstance of an agency is taken into consideration in the assignment of a compliance rating. Under current procedures, the primary factors assessed in determining an agency's compliance status are as follows:

- overall content of the agency affirmative action plan
- procedures for disseminating the agency plan
- adequacy of the policy statement committing the agency to affirmative action/equal employment opportunity
- the procedures for disseminating the agency's affirmative action policy statement

- assignment of EEO responsibilities within the agency
- the exercise of responsibilities by persons assigned EEO functions
- the development of reasonable goals and timetables for the employment of protected group persons
- progress in meeting goals and timetables for the employment of protected group persons
- agency's list of recruitment sources of protected group persons and documentation of contact with such sources
- the accuracy and timely submission of affirmative action quarterly reports
- the representation of protected group persons in each occupational category
- the relationship between the percentage of protected group persons interviewed and the percentage of protected group persons hired
- use of nondiscriminatory preemployment interview and selection techniques
- effect of turnover rates upon the employment and representation of protected group persons
- the exit rate of protected group persons as compared to the agency's overall exit rate
- use of appropriate exit interview procedures
- comments made by exiting employees concerning their reasons for separation
- the promotion rate of protected group persons as compared to the agency's general promotion rate
- agency provisions for nondiscriminatory upward mobility opportunities
- utilization of the Governor's Trainee Program
- the content and employee understanding of EEO grievance procedures
- the occurrence and resolution of EEO complaints
- employees' perspective of the agency's work environment in relation to equal employment opportunity
- documentation demonstrating management support of affirmative action
- good faith efforts to improve internal affirmative action programs

Based upon a review of the above assessment factors, the Department of Administration formulates a composite compliance status which is assigned to an agency. Consideration is given to the agency's progress, the nature and seriousness of existing discrepancies and special circumstances affecting the agency's EEO program. The assignment of a Satisfactory Compliance, Marginal Compliance or Significant Noncompliance rating is based upon an agency's maximum effort to implement State equal employment opportunity policy as specified in the State Affirmative Action Plan.

Since the institution of the field review process, 64 compliance reviews have been completed. Of these, 36 were initial reviews, 23 were second reviews and five were third reviews. As provided for in the initial State Affirmative Action Plan, all agencies with 15 or more employees have been reviewed. The total number of employees within these agencies which have been reviewed comprise 98 percent of the State classified work force.

Of the 36 agencies which have been reviewed, 21 are currently assigned a Satisfactory Compliance rating, seven are assigned a Marginal Compliance rating and two assigned a Significant Noncompliance rating. Compliance ratings for agencies are being formulated. As previously stated, the compliance status assigned to an agency is a composite rating. Thus, the assignment of a Satisfactory rating should not be interpreted to mean that all aspects of the agency's affirmative action program meet the mandates of equal employment opportunity. Likewise, an agency assigned a Significant Noncompliance rating may have certain program components which do meet equal employment opportunity guidelines. An agency assigned a satisfactory rating has, to a considerable degree, instituted the primary elements of an acceptable affirmative action program. A Marginal rating indicates the existence of program deficiencies hampering an agency's internal implementation of State EEO policy. A Significant Noncompliance rating occurs when an agency's affirmative action program requires basic restructuring.

The major problem areas isolated during the review of the above agencies are as follows:

- affirmative action plans which do not fully conform to guidelines specified in the State Affirmative Action Plan
- a recurrent underrepresentation of protected group persons in specific occupational categories and job classifications
- a failure to establish realistic goals and timetables for the employment of protected group persons and for the accomplishment of affirmative action program objectives
- recruitment efforts which do not adequately exploit available recruitment sources
- a limited development of upward mobility programs
- underutilization of the Governor's Trainee Program

- improper documentation of activities affecting affirmative action
- limited management understanding of and commitment to the intent of State equal employment opportunity policy

An analysis of the State affirmative action program which gives some consideration to the current status of individual agency program reveals that state equal employment opportunity policy has yet to be fully implemented. In order to better assure full implementation of State equal employment opportunity policy, new programs and activities should be incorporated into the State's approach to affirmative action. This addition of the State affirmative action plan outlines such an effort. The following items highlight the major revisions contained in the new State Plan.

- annual update of the State Affirmative Action Plan and all agency plans
- comprehensive use of reasonable goals and timetables for the employment of protected group persons
- refined quarterly report procedures
- research of proposals designed to strengthen affirmative action efforts
- analysis of means to increase the use of the Governor's Trainee Program
- institution of a program analysis approach to affirmative action problem solving
- handicapped person programs emphasizing affirmative action toward disabled individuals
- refined data collection and data analysis based upon an increased utilization of computer facilities.¹³

The State's Equal Employment Opportunity Office reviewed the affirmative action efforts of many agencies whose activities are not reported in Tables 5-9 and 5-10 of this report. It found several in satisfactory compliance (according to the standards reported above): the Adjutant General's Department, Department of Economic Development, Department of Aging, the Kansas Commission on Civil Rights, the Kansas Public Employee's Retirement System (after first finding it in marginal compliance), the Kansas State Grain Inspection Department (after a first finding of marginal compliance), the

Kansas State Historical Society (after a first finding of noncompliance), the Kansas State Library, the Kansas Water Resources Board, the State Banking Department. Other agencies were found to be in marginal compliance: Governor's Committee on Criminal Administration and the State Fire Marshall. Among those found in noncompliance was the Kansas Animal Health Department. The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office also reviewed several educational institutions but these are not reported here since they are not a part of this study.¹⁴ In short, the State has a sophisticated system for tracking not only what the State agencies plan to do but what they are actually doing to further affirmative action goals.

e. Administering Agency: Department of Administration, Equal Employment Opportunity Office

The following description of the administering agency's powers, duties and budget was provided by its director:

The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office was created through the issuance of Executive Order 75-9 in July of 1975. During the Carlin administration, Executive Order 75-9 was rescinded by Executive Order 80-47 which strengthened the direction and scope of affirmative action within the State of Kansas....

In January of 1979, immediately prior to Governor Carlin's administration assuming office, a proposal was before the legislature to include the State Equal Employment Opportunity Office within the Division of Personnel Services. One of Governor Carlin's first actions in office was to rescind this proposed reorganization. In doing so, the independence and autonomy of the office was preserved. This action was particularly important since the State EEO Office functions as an "oversight" agency in personnel matters....[The office continued to report directly to the Secretary of Administration.]

Because the State EEO Office is an integral part of the Secretary's staff, its approved recommendations and directives carry the weight of the Secretary's authority....

The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office is responsible for the preparation, promulgation and administration of the State Affirmative Action Plan. The State Equal Employment Opportunity Office is also responsible for assuring that each department, agency and institution has

established and maintains an affirmative action plan that conforms with guidelines of the State plan. The purpose of such plans is to insure equal employment opportunity for all State employees and for all applicants seeking employment within the jurisdiction of the State civil service system. Personnel transactions addressed in such affirmative action plans include: hiring, recruitment, selection, benefits, promotions, transfers, layoff, return from layoff, compensation, equality of wages and employee development programs....

Pursuant to the responsibility for assuring that State agencies, departments and institutions provide equal employment opportunity to applicants and employees, the Equal Employment Opportunity Office has established the following as major program objectives for FY 1982.

1. EEO compliance field reviews will be conducted on all major departments, agencies and institutions throughout the State.
2. All State agency affirmative action plans will be reviewed for compliance with the State Affirmative Action Plan.
3. The work force composition of all agencies will be reviewed on a quarterly basis in order to isolate potential barriers to equal employment opportunity.
4. The review of agency work force data will be based upon an increased utilization of existing computerized data in order to decrease the EEO paperwork burden experienced at the agency level.
5. Computerized data will be examined for the development of a format that will more specifically identify EEO problem areas.
6. Special emphasis programs designed to increase equal employment opportunities for handicapped persons will be fully incorporated into the State's affirmative action efforts.
7. Agency heads and agency EEO Officers will be assisted in developing affirmative action goals and timetables, in collecting and analyzing employment data, in establishing recruitment sources and in identifying and solving EEO problem areas.
8. Special studies will be prepared which identify effective programs and which recommend program improvements.
9. The State Affirmative Action Plan, the EEO Compliance Manual and the Field Review Manual will be updated.
10. Training seminars concerning affirmative action programs will be scheduled for agency heads, supervisors and members of the general State employee population.
11. Informal mediation services will be provided, when requested, to assist in the timely resolution of discrimination complaints.
12. Informational materials designed to inform State employees and community members about the State's EEO program will be prepared and published in a timely manner.
13. Continued liaison between the State EEO Office and groups representing minority persons, women and handicapped persons will be assured.¹⁵

The staff of the office includes a director, five professional staff persons and two clericals. In FY 1979 when Governor Carlin took office, the budget for this unit was \$144,963. In FY 1982 the allocation was \$244,137, an increase of 54.6 percent.¹⁶

Appendix A

The following shows activity by the State and by those State agencies reviewed in the Advisory Committee's 1978 report. This document was prepared by the Kansas Equal Employment Opportunity Office and submitted with Governor Carlin's letter of Nov. 3, 1980. It is reproduced unchanged except that additional documents referenced in the State's comments have been summarized or deleted. Summaries are surrounded by brackets.

State and Agency Affirmative Action Plans
Compared to a Model Plan

I. COMPARE MANPOWER POOL WITH EMPLOYED WORK FORCE

Department of Education

The U.S. Commission specified no deficiencies in the report published June 1978.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

The U.S. Commission specified no deficiencies in the report published June 1978.

Job Services (Human Resources)

The U.S. Commission specified no deficiencies in the report published June 1978.

Department of Administration

The Department of Administration has prepared a work force analysis and has compiled State and county civilian work force data for all protected groups. The department is in the process of formulating a plan which will conform to specifications projected for the new Carlin Affirmative Action Plan. The requirements which are projected for the Carlin plan are: work force analyses; availability analyses; underutilization analyses; goals and timetables; and program analyses to identify problems and corrective actions.

Kansas Water Resources Board

The U.S. Commission specified no deficiencies in the report published June 1978.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan. However, the agency does submit statistical reports quarterly.

State

The U.S. Commission specified no deficiencies in the report published June 1978.

II. ANALYZE ENTRY LEVEL ROLES

Department of Education

The department is currently cooperating with the State Division of Personnel Services in a validation study of the examination instrument used to rate applications for the Education Program Specialist class. The study will ensure that the instrument used is a valid predictor of how well applicants can be expected to perform on the job, and that the rating instrument does measure what it intends to measure.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

- A. Validation studies have been conducted by the Division of Personnel Services with input from SRS for the following classifications:
- Attorney I
 - Program Technician
 - Location and Support Specialist I
 - Power Plant Operator I
- B. [A full list is appended of job classifications for which entry level job classes have been reviewed.] A partial list is shown below:
- Data Entry Series
 - Development and Training Specialist Aide
 - Development and Training Specialist I
 - Program Technician
 - Attorney I
 - Location and Support Specialist I
 - Power Plant Operator I
 - Registered Nurse I
- C. SRS has participated in validation studies. Groups of classes or positions have been under study for revision, modification or establishment of new classes.

Job Services (Human Resources)

All entry level role requirements have been previously analyzed. They were found consistent with the purpose and organization of the Department of Human Resources. There would be no purpose to pitch any jobs to lower levels. A number of direct entry paraprofessional positions would not be effective as this would be inconsistent with the agency's funding level and assignment. The most serious problem lies in the computer field and at the administrative level. However, the professional ranks are already staffed so that affected classes may be promoted. In the future, this will eventually solve the underutilization problem in administrative positions. The underutilization in the computer section is not amendable by analysis of entry level requirements. The agency is cooperating with the Division of Personnel Services in order to resolve underutilization in this area. Validation studies have been conducted by the Division of Personnel Services with input from the Department of Human Resources.

Department of Administration

The Division of Personnel Services within the Department of Administration has increased activities in the job analysis area. Such analyses are designed to assure that job requirements are appropriate.

Kansas Water Resources Board

Due to the highly specialized and technical aspect of work programs assigned to the Kansas Water Resources Board and the limited number of staff positions authorized, very few entry level positions are utilized. The current entry level positions in the Engineering Technician classification have experienced very little turnover since 1978.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan.

State

The State has increased activities in the job analysis area to assure that knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform a particular job are supported by appropriate minimum qualifications. The State is expanding the use of provisions for the substitution of education and experience in order to broaden the pool of qualified applicants. The State EEO Office encourages agencies to contact the Division of Personnel Services and the State EEO Office in order to create trainee classifications. Trainee classifications are designed to facilitate the recruitment of protected group persons into types of positions where such persons are underutilized.

III. CAREER LADDER OPPORTUNITIESDepartment of Education

The department posts position openings on its bulletin boards for five working days. Employees who are interested in applying for the openings contact the department's Director of Personnel Services for an interview appointment. This provides promotional opportunities for department employees. The Governor's Trainee Program has been used for employing two Spanish surnamed Americans and one handicapped individual in the Education Program Specialist, Trainee job class and one female in the class of Data Entry Operator I, Trainee. The Trainee Program has enabled the department to employ protected group applicants who did not meet the qualifications requirements for the regular Education Program Specialist and Data Entry Operator I classes.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

SRS has made training available to any employee interested in attending job related in-service training. The costs of in-service training is borne by the department [using State funds or Federal training funds].

The Governor's Trainee Program has been utilized to the maximum extent possible for women and minorities in underutilizing job categories.

Job Services (Human Resources)

The agency is using Washburn University and ESSI to resolve underutilization in the Data Processing area. The new agency training officer is organizing a Career Enrichment program for this agency. The program is designed to avoid the pitfall of creating false promises while striving to develop promotional opportunities for protected class members. Such a program also gives employees a better understanding of themselves in relationship to their environment.

All employees are given administrative leave or training leave to pursue promotional opportunities. Further, a tuition/book reimbursement program has been implemented for 90 agency employees. All such programs have 100 percent distribution through the agency. These programs are further coupled with in-house training and training at Breech Academy which is conducted by the Region VII Office of the U.S. Department of Labor. This agency does not utilize the Governor's Trainee Program but does use summer interns extensively.

Department of Administration

Promotional opportunities are published and circulated within the department. The division directors submit quarterly reports on promotions and transfers to the State EEO Office. The State EEO Office within the Department of

Administration submits semi-annual reports of promotions by name, ethnic code and sex to the EEOC.

Kansas Water Resources Board

Within budgetary limitations, the Kansas Water Resources Board provides training opportunities for all employees. New criteria for reimbursement of training expenses and time off to pursue training were developed in 1979-80. Approval of training leave and payment for tuition and other educational expenses is based on the assumption that such training or education is of value to the agency, in that persons in attendance will widen their skills and knowledge base. This will result in more effective and efficient operations. Promotional opportunity announcements are posted on the agency Personnel Bulletin Board.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan.

State

The State EEO Office conducts on-site field reviews. Field reviews evaluate the use of career ladders by State agencies.

IV. RECRUITMENT

Department of Education

The department's recruitment process includes written notification to about twenty (20) female, minority and handicapped organizations. These organizations are notified of current position openings. Also, the department regularly advertises positions in minority publications in Topeka, Kansas City and Wichita.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

SRS institutions and offices maintain contacts with community groups, including protected group organizations, to inform the members of current and anticipated vacancies. SRS employees have participated in Division of Personnel Services' Career Fairs throughout the State, including Topeka, Kansas City, Wichita and Salina. Nurses from two institutions attended a meeting in Kansas City and staffed a booth to inform nurses of career opportunities in Kansas. Staff from Salina and Beloit attended a Career Fair in Concordia on September 12, 1980. SRS institutions have used radio and television "spots" to advertise existing and anticipated vacancies. Classified advertisements are placed in minority newspapers in addition to ads being placed in the major daily newspapers within Kansas and adjoining States.

SRS EEO Representatives, SRS EEO Section Staff, SRS Personnel Management Section Staff, SRS Personnel Officers and SRS program staff maintain constant contact with community groups. This is a significant resource in recruiting protected class members. The "Recruitment Referral Sources" directory (published by State EEO Office), the Governor's Advisory Committee on Mexican-American Affairs and the minority newspapers such as: Call of Kansas City, Kansas City Globe, Kansas City Voice, El Centro of Topeka, Indian Center of Topeka, El Perico of Wichita and Kansas Wheatly of Wichita are also significant resources in recruiting protected class members.

Job Services (Human Resources)

Primary success in this effort must be given to this agency's internal monitoring system in which the EEO Officer exercises veto over all hiring and promotion decisions. Success of this agency's staffing pattern must also be credited to the EEO Office's continual dialogue with groups and organizations. Further credit must be given to the involvement of Job Service and Unemployment Insurance Managers across the State with community organizations.

Department of Administration

The Division of Personnel Services/Recruitment Branch within the department issues public notification of competitive examination dates. The Division of Personnel Services disseminates job vacancy announcements to departmental personnel. In addition, the Recruitment Branch disseminates vacancy announcements to community organizations whose members represent protected groups. Further, the division advertises positions in professional and trade publications to attract qualified protected group members.

All divisions within the Department of Administration submit applicant flow data to the EEO Office. The State EEO Office within the department publishes a directory titled "Recruitment Referral Sources." The directories are distributed statewide.

Kansas Water Resources Board

When a staff vacancy occurs or is anticipated, efforts are made to fill positions with full attention to minority, female and handicapped persons. Job openings are listed with agencies, organizations and media that are normally prepared to refer qualified and qualifiable protected group applicants. Prominent individuals within the protected groups of the community are utilized as recruiting sources. Efforts are made to contact minority, female and handicapped persons through workstudy programs. Recruiting efforts at schools and colleges are incorporated in order to reach qualified protected group persons.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan.

State

The Division of Personnel/Recruitment Branch within the Department of Administration maintains a mailing list in order to disseminate job vacancies on a statewide basis. In addition, the Recruitment Branch provides a 24-hour telephone service that is used to assist the public to obtain information concerning vacant positions in State government. The State EEO Office within the Department of Administration publishes a directory titled "Recruitment Referral Sources."

The State EEO Office conducts on-site field reviews. These field reviews evaluate State agencies' actions with regard to recruitment.

V. RETENTION

Department of Education

A formalized grievance procedure has been established for the department. Thorough exit interviews are conducted with staff members prior to their departure. The exit interview includes inquiries relative to any discrimination which the employee perceived. Training has been provided to the department's managers and supervisors on interviewing techniques and nondiscriminatory interviewing practices. Workshops were presented by Dr. Percy Sillin, Assistant Commissioner, and Mr. Lanny Gaston, Director, Personnel Services, on March 27, 1980 and April 3, 1980. The workshops featured: completion of a "Do's and Don'ts" interviewing quiz by the participants; two mock interviews which illustrated discriminatory questioning; and an opportunity for staff to practice interviewing an applicant for a position.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

The Personnel Management Section and the SRS EEO Section provide training upon the request of any SRS employee or supervisor. [A list of 22 workshops in different parts of the State and the dates held was provided.]

Each office and institution uses an individualized exit interview format. A standard exit interview format is used by all SRS staff in the Topeka area. [The Secretary has drafted a letter to all unit heads regarding the utilization of handicapped and accessibility of facilities.]

Job Services (Human Resources)

Every effort is made to retain and promote the satisfactory employee and seek relief for the troubled employee. A formalized grievance procedure has been used for nearly four years. Efforts to increase employee protection and satisfaction through this process has annually been reviewed by a standing committee on which the EEO Office is always represented. Further, any personnel actions or supervision which may feasibly be discriminatory are acted on as a formal complaint under Employment Security Regulations by the EEO Office. Not only is there continuous training in affirmative action and equal employment opportunity for supervisors, this training is provided to all employees at their respective work sites. This office provides the equal employment opportunity training for the State Employment Security Agency, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Administration, and Region VII Community Services Administration personnel.

Personnel counseling and exit interviews have been an ongoing program in this agency for a number of years. Jobs and facilities have been reviewed for accessibility to handicapped persons. Further, an ongoing process of internal monitoring reviews each personnel transaction with a view toward reasonable accommodation.

Department of Administration

The department has implemented Grievance Procedures and an Exit Interview Program. Both are designed to obtain information needed to reduce employee turnover and to improve working conditions.

The Grievance Procedures were designed to identify and resolve practices and attitudes which adversely impact on the retention of protected group persons. Employee counseling has been implemented in the areas of work performance, guidance and discipline.

The State EEO Office distributes booklets and pamphlets and attends agency staff meetings in order to stress the importance of the retention of protected group persons.

Within the department, facilities continue to be located in areas which are accessible to protected group persons who are in the work force.

Kansas Water Resources Board

The Kansas Water Resources Board has a formalized grievance procedure which is reviewed periodically and updated to provide an avenue for problem solving within the agency. Each staff member is provided a copy of the procedure, and it is posted on the agency Personnel Bulletin Board. An exit interview procedure was officially instituted in 1980. The agency is vitally concerned with the reasons for which employees terminate employment. The purpose of the exit interview procedure is to collect information to be used in identifying these reasons, with the ultimate goal of reducing avoidable turnover in the agency. The Kansas Water Resources Board currently employs five handicapped persons and strives to provide reasonable accommodations for the employment of handicapped persons.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan.

State

The State has incorporated an analysis of work environments in order to isolate practices which adversely impact on the retention of protected group persons. The State has a formalized grievance procedure and has developed an exit interview system to be used statewide. Training has been provided to agency managers and supervisors on interviewing techniques and nondiscriminatory interviewing practices.

The State EEO Office conducts on-site field reviews. These reviews evaluate State agencies' actions with regard to retention.

VI. EVALUATION

Department of Education

The department maintains the Applicant Register, the Training Log, the Promotion and Transfer Log and the Termination Data Log. In addition, quarterly statistical reports are submitted to the State EEO Office.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

The department maintains the Applicant Register, the Training Log, the Promotion and Transfer Log and the Termination Data Log. In addition, quarterly statistical reports are submitted to the State EEO Office.

Job Services (Human Services)

The agency maintains the Applicant Register, the Training Log, the Promotion and Transfer Log and the Termination Data Log. In addition, quarterly statistical reports are submitted to the State EEO Office.

Department of Administration

The department maintains the Applicant Register, the Training Log, the Promotion and Transfer Log and the Termination Data Log. The State EEO Office is delegated the responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the collection of data and the content of agency quarterly reports.

Kansas Water Resources Board

The board maintains the Applicant Register, the Training Log, the Promotion and Transfer Log and the Termination Data Log. In addition, quarterly statistical reports are submitted to the State EEO Office.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is therefore not required to prepare an affirmative action plan. However, the agency does submit quarterly statistical reports to the State EEO Office.

State

The State EEO Office conducts on-site field reviews. The field review evaluates the actions of State agencies in this area.

VII. RESPONSIBILITYDepartment of Education

All supervisory personnel are responsible for implementation of EEO policy. The EEO Officer, who is also the director of personnel services, has been given specific authority for planning and monitoring the program.

Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

All administrative and supervisory personnel are responsible for the success of EEO. The EEO Officer is delegated the responsibility for planning and monitoring the program.

Job Services (Human Resources)

All supervisory personnel are responsible for implementation of EEO policy. The EEO Officer is delegated the responsibility for planning and monitoring the program.

Department of Administration

The State EEO Office and the Secretary of Administration share responsibility toward affirmative action within the department. The daily responsibility for administration for affirmative action within the department is carried out by the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Administration and the staff of the State EEO Office. The division chiefs within the department are responsible for meeting affirmative action obligations outlined in the State plan.

Kansas Water Resources Board

Responsibility for planning and monitoring the program is shared by the agency head and the EEO Officer.

Department of Credit Unions

The agency employs fewer than 15 staff members and is shared by the agency head and the EEO Officer.

State

The State EEO Office conducts on-site field reviews annually. The EEO Office has the delegated responsibility for evaluating State agencies' actions in this area.

Chapter 5 Notes

1. State of Kansas, Office of the Governor, Executive Order 80-47, Oct. 21, 1980.
2. State of Kansas, Department of Administration, State Affirmative Action Plan, April 27, 1981, p.1.
3. Ibid., p.i.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., p.ii.
6. Ibid., pp. 69-85.
7. Ibid., pp. 31-61.
8. Ibid., pp. 69-85.
9. Ibid., p.93.
10. Ibid., pp. 95-96.
11. Ibid., pp. 153-154.
12. Kay Meadows, State Director for the Equal Employment Opportunity Office, letter to staff, Nov. 17, 1981.
13. State of Kansas, Department of Administration, State Affirmative Action Plan, April 27, 1981, pp. 25-30.
14. John Carlin, letter to staff, Nov. 3, 1980, attachment.
15. Kay Meadows, letter to staff, Nov. 17, 1981.
16. Ibid.

6. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN MISSOURI

a. Introduction

Like Kansas, the legal basis for affirmative action in Missouri was in transition during the period in which this report was prepared. The plans and most implementing efforts reported in this chapter were initiated by the administration of former Governor Joseph Teasdale. However, following the election of Governor Christopher S. Bond in 1980, a new executive order was issued and new affirmative action plans were promised.

The authorities cited by Governor Teasdale in his March 23, 1978 executive order were the various Federal laws requiring equal employment opportunity, the Federal Executive Order 11246, as amended, requiring affirmative action by Federal contractors, and the State law prohibiting discrimination in employment.¹ The rationale for the order was that failure to act might expose the State to Federal or court sanctions that should be avoided.

The Teasdale Executive Order required implementation of an equal employment opportunity policy,² appointment of a State affirmative action officer,³ development by each agency of an affirmative action plan,⁴ creation of a State affirmative action council to coordinate and review agency efforts,⁵ conduct of utilization analyses and development of goals and timetables to reduce underutilization,⁶ development and implementation of a recruitment program to reach minorities and women, the handicapped and veterans,⁷ regular reporting by each agency of its efforts and problems.⁸

The key provisions related to affirmative action planning were:

The responsibility for development of Affirmative Action Plans rests with each department director, who shall appoint an EEO or Human Relations Officer to develop its Affirmative Action Plan. Minimum standards shall be included for the development of specific programs relating to recruiting, hiring, training, career development, promotions, terminations, disciplinary actions and other terms, conditions and privileges of employment.⁹

Each such Affirmative Action Plan shall contain an analysis of the department work force by race, sex, age, veteran and handicap status. This analysis shall be used to determine underutilization of individuals from these groups. In addition an analysis shall be made relative to appointments, assignments, advancements.... The Affirmative Action Plan shall provide for the correction of all discriminatory practices and procedures and shall contain goals and timetables for instituting steps to eliminate past inequities in employment....¹⁰

On August 28, 1981, Governor Christopher S. Bond issued a new executive order with effect from September 1, 1981. This made significant changes in the affirmative action process in the State. The position of State affirmative action officer, reporting to the Commissioner of Administration, was retained together with the coordinating function. Each department director continued to be responsible for developing a plan, but the directors were no longer required to appoint a human relations/EEO officer.¹¹ Whereas the Teasdale order required work force utilization analysis and determination of underutilization, concrete proposals to correct all discriminatory practices and specific goals and timetables to achieve these objectives,¹² the new order requires that:

Each such plan shall be designed to address any past or present discriminatory employment or personnel practices and to prevent such practices in the future. In addition, each such plan shall facilitate the promotion and enhancement of equal employment opportunities for all personnel within the department.¹³

While the Teasdale order mandated creation of a recruitment program to reach underutilized groups of potential workers,¹⁴ the new order does not.¹⁵

Both the new and old orders require that testing and promotion procedures be nondiscriminatory but while the new executive order states this as a principle, the old order included specific requirements for collection and maintenance of applicant flow data that would allow a determination of where the blockages, if any, for minorities, women, the handicapped and veterans existed.¹⁶ The office of the State Affirmative Action Officer is

substantially strengthened in the new executive order. Unlike its role under the old order, "If any plan submitted is determined not to be in compliance, the State Affirmative Action Officer may require such revisions as are necessary to accomplish the purposes of this order."¹⁷ The impact of this change could not be measured, since plans were not to be submitted until November 1981. State departments' reporting requirements under the new order are annual, whereas under the old order they were required to report quarterly.¹⁸ The language of the new executive order is significantly less specific than the old order on the substance of these reports.¹⁹

b. Missouri Governor's Activity

Responsibility for coordinating the State's affirmative action efforts is assigned to the State Affirmative Action Officer who reports to the Commissioner of the Department of Administration. The State Affirmative Action Officer under the Teasdale administration reported that the principal efforts of his office were the sponsorship of three conferences on affirmative action; sponsorship of breakfast meetings at which the Governor's chief-of-staff emphasized the importance of affirmative action to department directors, mid-level manager, personnel officers and supervisors from State departments; a meeting to promote affirmative action by the State judiciary; implementation of equal employment and affirmative action training of State personnel; and, establishment of a resume clearinghouse.²⁰

The State Affirmative Action Officer told the Advisory Committee: "I can assure you that there has been some significant but not necessarily dramatic progress" in promoting opportunities for minorities and women. He cited as evidence for this an increase of 2.9 percent in non-minority male employment in the period June 30, 1978 - June 30, 1979, an increase of 7 percent in black male employment, a decline of 1.6 percent in Hispanic male employment, an

increase of 5 percent in Asian male employment, an increase of 14.3 percent in American Indian male employment, an increase of 4.7 percent in non-minority female employment, an increase of 5 percent in black female employment, an increase of 43 percent in Hispanic female employment, an increase of 14.7 percent in Asian female employment and an increase of 27.3 percent in American Indian female employment.²¹

Governor Bond reported the following efforts by the new State Affirmative Action Officer in the six months since she was appointed:

- A. There has been a network established between the States of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Illinois, California and Georgia to share information and benefits.
- B. In addition to maintaining a Resume' Clearinghouse, all persons who submit resumes to the Affirmative Action Office receive a copy of the merit application for completion, and after testing are placed on the merit register. [The office]...is communicating with people in private enterprise to retain a reservoir of resumes.
- C. Interacting, by speaking and meeting with various groups that represent minority interest.
- D. Rapport has been established with the Department Directors and they have been assured that the Affirmative Action Office is available to provide technical assistance to insure compliance.
- E. Informational Repository. An inter-departmental exchange of video-tapes, books, etc., relative to affirmative action has been established.
- F. A display booth was designed and created to disseminate information regarding career choices, internships and summer employment with State Government. The most recent display was at Lincoln University's Career Day Program.
- G. Graphs and charts were designed to make a more comprehensive comparative analysis, by race, sex and salary.
- H. The Affirmative Action Officer is working in concert with the Minority Contractor and Minority Business Coordinator.
- I. [The Affirmative Action Officer]...is also working with the Electronic Data Processing Director to computerize and generate data needed for equal employment opportunity reports.

J. A training program has been approved to aid upward mobility which becomes quite key as the effect of the budget cuts have taken a toll in layoff and terminations.²²

The Advisory Committee was particularly interested to know what efforts the Governor had made to promote affirmative action by employment of minorities and women in jobs which were appointive. Former Governor Teasdale stated that 40 black males, 24 black females, 18 Hispanic and other males, one "Hispanic or other females," 114 white females had been appointed by him during his administration. He did not report how many white males he appointed.²³ Governor Bond reported that of 318 appointments since January 1981, 58 (18.2 percent) were white females, 10 (3.1 percent) were black females, 3 (0.9 percent) were Hispanic females, 220 (69.2 percent) were white males, 15 (4.7 percent) were black males and 12 (3.8 percent) were Hispanic males.²⁴

c. Data

Table 6-1 shows the utilization of workers as reported in the 1970 census of population. Table 6-2 shows the utilization of workers in the private sector as reported to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), based on 1978 employer reports. Table 6-3 shows the utilization of workers by Missouri State Government as reported by the State on its 1980 EEO-4 form submission to EEOC. Table 6-4 shows the comparison between the 1970 State labor force, the 1978 private labor force and the 1980 State work force.

A comparison of the State work force to the two labor force measures shows some disparities greater than 20 percent. Utilization of white men, black men and Hispanic men is lower than that in either of the two labor force estimates by more than 20 percent. Utilization of white women in the work force is significantly above the 1970 State labor force estimate and is above, but not significantly, the 1978 private labor force estimate. The proportion of black

Table 6-1

MISSOURI LABOR FORCE - 1970

	TOTAL	WHITE	% Row	BLACK	% Row	HISPANIC	% Row
Total	1,767,310	1,603,908	(90.8)	157,767	(8.9)	13,963	(0.8)
Female	678,476	599,991	(88.4)	76,171	(11.2)	5,419	(0.8)
Male	1,088,834	1,003,917	(92.2)	81,596	(7.5)	8,544	(0.8)
<u>Professionals, Technicians & Kindred</u>		% Column		% Column		% Column	
Total	239,887	223,363		14,551		2,598	
Female	103,111	92,712	(15.5)	9,734	(12.8)	963	(17.8)
Male	136,776	130,651	(13.0)	4,817		1,635	(19.1)
<u>Managers & Administrators</u>							
Total	143,659	140,132		3,328		751	
Female	23,879	22,784	(3.8)	1,036	(1.4)	129	(2.4)
Male	119,780	117,348	(11.7)	2,292	(2.8)	622	(7.3)
<u>Clerical & Kindred</u>							
Total	321,545	296,018		24,872		2,716	
Female	238,036	220,785	(36.8)	16,743	(22.0)	1,862	(34.4)
Male	83,509	75,233	(7.5)	8,129	(10.0)	854	(10.0)
<u>Crafts</u>							
Total	238,358	226,976		10,934		1,567	
Female	13,666	12,539	(2.1)	1,101	(1.4)	134	(2.5)
Male	224,692	214,437	(21.4)	9,833	(12.1)	1,433	(16.8)
<u>Service</u>							
Total	203,708	163,112		39,668		1,620	
Female	119,300	95,530	(15.9)	23,303	(30.6)	888	(16.4)
Male	84,408	67,582	(6.7)	16,365	(20.1)	732	(8.6)

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Missouri (PC(1)-C17 Mo.), Table 54.
 Calculations by CSRO.

TABLE 6-2
1978 EEO-1 Report Summary
(Percent by Row)

	TOTAL	TOTAL	OFFICIALS	PROFESSIONALS	TECHNICIANS	SALES	OFFICE &	TOTAL	CRAFT	OPERATIVES	LABORERS	SERVICE
	EMPLOYMENT	WHITE COLLAR	& MANAGERS			WORKERS	CLERK WORKERS		WORKERS	BLUE COLLAR		WORKERS
ALL T	820,377	364,799	86,930	67,115	35,643	77,595	127,516	345,384	102,105	183,097	60,182	80,194
ALL M	485,103	197,208	71,901	44,360	21,138	36,740	23,069	252,383	91,400	121,540	37,443	35,512
ALL F	335,274	197,591	15,029	22,755	14,505	40,855	104,447	93,001	10,705	61,557	22,739	44,682
WHITE T	712,855	358,759	82,503	62,580	31,200	71,073	111,403	296,631	93,530	154,334	48,767	57,465
WHITE M	427,863	184,285(43.1)	68,663(16.1)	41,797(9.8)	19,439(4.5)	34,029(8.0)	20,317(4.7)	218,165(51.0)	84,384(19.7)	102,582(24.0)	31,199(7.3)	25,413(5.9)
WHITE F	284,992	174,474(61.2)	13,820(4.8)	20,783(7.3)	11,761(4.1)	37,044(13.0)	91,086(32.0)	78,466(27.5)	9,146(3.2)	51,752(18.2)	17,568(6.2)	32,052(11.2)
MIN T	107,522	36,040	4,427	4,535	4,443	6,522	16,113	48,753	8,573	28,763	11,415	22,729
MIN M	57,240	12,923	3,218	2,563	1,679	2,752	7,016	34,218	7,016	18,958	8,244	10,099
MIN F	50,282	25,117	1,209	1,972	2,764	3,811	14,533	14,533	1,559	9,805	3,171	12,630
BLACK T	92,872	28,809	3,219	2,658	3,786	5,435	13,711	43,097	7,018	25,921	10,158	20,966
BLACK M	48,178	8,957(18.6)	2,192(4.5)	1,200(2.5)	1,257(2.6)	2,132(4.5)	2,156(4.5)	30,104(62.5)	5,685(11.8)	17,090(35.5)	7,329(15.2)	9,117(18.9)
BLACK F	44,694	19,852(44.4)	1,027(2.3)	1,458(3.3)	2,529(5.7)	3,283(7.3)	11,555(25.9)	12,993(29.1)	1,333(3.0)	8,831(19.8)	2,829(6.3)	11,849(26.3)
HISP T	7,912	3,614	554	545	726	399	1,337	3,382	930	1,399	853	916
HISP M	4,914	1,711(34.8)	471(9.6)	416(8.5)	150(3.1)	350(7.1)	324(6.6)	2,678(54.5)	820(16.7)	1,172(23.9)	686(14.0)	525(10.7)
HISP F	2,998	1,903(63.5)	83(2.8)	129(4.3)	102(3.4)	376(12.5)	1,213(40.5)	704(23.5)	110(3.7)	427(14.2)	167(5.6)	391(13.0)
AS/PI T	3,672	2,093	235	1,009	251	199	399	944	190	369	185	635
AS/PI M	1,995	1,237(62.0)	205(10.3)	665(33.3)	148(7.4)	99(5.0)	120(6.0)	437(21.9)	103(5.2)	244(12.2)	90(4.3)	321(16.1)
AS/PI F	1,677	856(51.0)	30(1.8)	344(20.5)	103(6.1)	100(6.0)	279(16.6)	507(30.2)	87(5.2)	325(19.4)	95(5.7)	314(18.7)
AI/AK T	3,066	1,524	419	323	154	162	466	1,330	437	674	219	212
AI/AK M	2,153	1,018(47.3)	350(16.3)	282(13.1)	124(5.8)	110(5.1)	152(7.1)	999(46.4)	408(19.0)	452(21.0)	139(6.5)	136(6.3)
AI/AK F	913	506(55.4)	69(7.6)	41(4.5)	30(3.3)	32(3.7)	314(34.4)	331(36.3)	29(3.2)	222(24.3)	80(8.8)	76(8.3)
ALL T PR	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
ALL M PR	59.1	50.0	82.7	66.1	59.3	47.3	18.1	73.1	89.5	66.4	65.5	44.3
ALL F PR	40.9	50.0	17.3	33.9	40.7	52.7	81.9	26.9	10.5	33.6	34.5	55.7
WHITE T PR	86.9	90.9	94.9	93.2	87.5	91.6	87.4	85.9	91.6	84.3	81.0	71.7
WHITE M PR	52.2	46.7	79.0	62.3	54.6	43.9	15.9	63.2	82.6	56.0	51.8	31.7
WHITE F PR	34.7	44.2	15.9	31.0	32.9	47.7	71.4	22.7	9.0	28.3	29.2	40.0
MIN T PR	13.1	9.1	5.1	6.8	12.3	8.4	12.6	14.1	8.4	15.7	19.0	29.3
MIN M PR	7.0	3.3	3.7	3.8	4.7	3.5	2.2	9.9	6.9	10.4	13.7	12.6
MIN F PR	6.1	5.9	1.4	2.9	7.8	4.9	10.5	4.2	1.5	5.4	5.3	15.7
BLACK T PR	11.3	7.3	3.7	4.0	10.6	7.0	10.8	12.5	6.9	14.2	16.9	26.1
BLACK M PR	5.9	2.3	2.5	1.8	3.5	2.8	1.7	8.7	5.6	9.3	12.2	11.4
BLACK F PR	5.4	5.0	1.2	2.2	7.1	4.2	9.1	3.8	1.3	4.8	4.7	14.8
HISP T PR	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.9	1.2	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.1
HISP M PR	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.1	0.7
HISP F PR	0.4	0.5	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5
AS/PI T PR	0.4	0.5	0.3	1.5	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.8
AS/PI M PR	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4
AS/PI F PR	0.2	0.2	*	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4
AI/AK T PR	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3
AI/AK M PR	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2
AI/AK F PR	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	*	0.1	0.1	0.1

* Less than 0.05 percent

NOTES: PR-Percent of Total Employment in a given Occupational Category
 MIN-Minority
 HISP-Hispanic
 M-male
 F-female
 *less than 0.5 percent

Percent by row, that is percent of ethnic group in each job category, is shown in parentheses. Calculated by CERO.

SOURCE: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1978 EEO-1 Summary by State.

Table 6-3

Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force That Are From Each Group

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	3,095	983 (31.8)	59 (1.9)	2 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	1 (0)	1,916 (61.9)	125 (4.0)	3 (0.1)	4 (0.1)	NR
2.	6,416	5,817 (90.7)	215 (3.4)	14 (0.2)	6 (0.1)	32 (0.5)	316 (4.9)	16 (0.3)	NR	NR	NR
3.	5,521	791 (14.3)	87 (1.6)	NR	4 (0.1)	1 (0)	3,670 (66.5)	952 (17.2)	4 (0.1)	11 (0.2)	1 (0)
4.	1,846	1,509 (81.7)	65 (3.5)	8 (0.4)	NR	2 (0.1)	244 (13.2)	16 (0.9)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	2,290	1,734 (75.7)	33 (1.4)	8 (0.3)	7 (0.3)	5 (0.2)	479 (20.9)	18 (0.8)	NR	2 (0.1)	4 (0.2)
7.	1,134	324 (28.6)	2 (0.2)	2 (0.2)	10 (0.9)	NR	785 (69.2)	9 (0.8)	NR	2 (0.2)	NR
8.	13,049	3,262 (25.0)	690 (5.3)	37 (0.3)	71 (0.5)	19 (0.1)	6,552 (50.2)	2,288 (17.5)	40 (0.3)	54 (0.4)	36 (0.3)
9.	NONE										
10.	NONE										
11.	2,320	1,467 (63.2)	128 (5.5)	1 (0)	3 (0.1)	27 (1.2)	571 (24.6)	119 (5.1)	2 (0.1)	1 (0)	1 (0)
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	2,349	891 (37.9)	50 (2.1)	2 (0.1)	4 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	1,235 (52.6)	156 (6.6)	3 (0.1)	3 (0.1)	3 (0.1)
15.	3,368	1,143 (33.9)	98 (2.9)	2 (0.1)	4 (0.1)	4 (0.1)	1,899 (56.4)	195 (5.8)	12 (0.4)	6 (0.2)	5 (0.1)
TOTAL	41,388	17,921 (43.3)	1,427 (3.4)	76 (0.2)	111 (0.3)	93 (0.2)	17,667 (42.7)	3,894 (9.4)	65 (0.2)	84 (0.2)	50 (0.1)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%		52.0	4.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	51.2	11.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
-20%		34.6	2.7	0.2	0.2	0.2	34.2	7.5	0.2	0.2	0.1
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	NR
2.		+	0	0	-	+	-	-	NR	NR	NR
3.		-	-	NR	-	-	+	+	-	0	-
4.		+	0	+	NR	-	-	-	-	-	NR
6.		+	-	+	0	0	-	-	NR	-	+
7.		-	-	0	+	NR	+	-	NR	0	NR
8.		-	+	+	+	-	0	+	+	+	+
11.		+	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
14.		0	-	-	0	-	+	-	-	-	0
15.		-	0	-	-	-	+	-	+	0	0
NET SCORE		-1	-3	-2	-4	-5	+1	-6	-6	-5	-4
DISPARITY			-2	-1	-3	-4	+2	-5	-5	-4	-3
% DISPARITY			10.0	5.0	15.0	20.0	10.0	25.0	25.0	20.0	15.0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers from each ethnic group in the functions/State work forces.

Table 5-4

Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force

	%WM	%BM	%HM	%WF	%BF	%HF
1970 State Labor Force	56.8	4.6	0.5	33.9	4.3	0.3
1978 Private Sector Labor Force	52.2	5.9	0.6	34.7	5.4	0.4
1980 State Work Force	43.3	3.4	0.2	42.7	9.4	0.2

Notes:

WM=white male

BM=black male

HM=Hispanic male

WF=white female

BF=black female

HF=Hispanic female

Source: Tables 6-1,6-2,6-3 of this report

women workers is significantly above both labor force estimates. The proportion of Hispanic women workers is significantly below both labor force estimates. While there are some significant discrepancies between labor force and work force, the Advisory Committee believed that it would be appropriate to use the State work force as a reasonable standard for achievement by State agencies.

Table 6-3 not only contains basic data on utilization by agency function but also contains scores indicating the extent to which functional work force utilization of each ethnic group is significantly less or greater than would be expected if it matched the State work force. The score awards each function a plus one if its utilization exceeds the State's by 20 percent, a minus one if it is 20 percent less than the State's and a zero if there is no disparity in utilization. Analysis of the net score by function shows that only agencies involved in health care (other than hospitals) were likely to use minorities and women more than the State proportions; all others were likely to use minorities and women less than the State proportions. Those functions with the largest disparity were financial administration; streets and highways; public welfare; police protection; corrections; and, employment security.

While all minority groups tended to be underrepresented in each function, Asian males; American Indian males; black, Hispanic, Asian and American Indian females were represented at less than 80 percent the State average in six or more functions. These statistics show disparities that need to be explored.

To explore the disparity in total employment might reasonably require an analysis of disparity in each of the job categories. Here the analysis is compressed. Table 6-5 shows the pattern for administrators; 6-6 for professionals and 6-7 for service workers (two of the three top job and one of

Table 6-5

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces.

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	182 (5.9)	113 (11.5)	5 (8.5)	NR	NR	NR	62 (3.2)	2 (1.6)	NR	NR	NR
2.	30 (0.5)	28 (0.5)	1 (0.5)	NR	NR	NR	1 (0.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	20 (0.4)	14 (1.8)	2 (2.3)	NR	NR	NR	4 (0.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.	4 (0.2)	4 (0.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	150 (6.6)	145 (8.4)	NR	NR	1 (14.3)	NR	4 (0.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	4 (0.4)	4 (1.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
8.	446 (3.4)	219 (6.7)	12 (1.7)	4 (10.8)	9 (12.7)	3 (15.8)	162 (2.5)	33 (1.4)	NR	4 (7.4)	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	NONE										
11.	10 (0.4)	9 (0.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (0.8)	NR	NR	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	259 (11.0)	214 (24.0)	9 (18.0)	NR	1 (25.0)	NR	26 (2.1)	9 (5.8)	NR	NR	NR
15.	217 (6.4)	179 (15.7)	8 (8.2)	NR	1 (25.0)	NR	25 (1.3)	4 (2.1)	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	1,322 (3.2)	929 (5.2)	37 (2.6)	4 (5.3)	12 (10.8)	3 (3.2)	284 (1.6)	49 (1.3)	0 (0)	4 (4.8)	0 (0)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20	3.8	6.2	3.1	6.4	13.0	3.8	1.9	1.6	0	5.8	0
-20	3.0	4.2	2.1	4.2	8.6	2.6	1.3	1.0	0	3.8	0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	NR	NR	NR	+	0	NR	NR	NR
2.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		-	0	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		+	NR	NR	+	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
8.		+	-	+	0	+	+	0	NR	+	NR
11.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	+	NR	+	NR	0	+	NR	NR	NR
15.		+	+	NR	+	NR	0	+	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		0	-3	-8	-3	-8	-3	-4	0	-8	0
DISPARITY			-3	-8	-3	-8	-3	-4	0	-8	0
% DISPARITY			15.0	40.0	15.0	40.0	15.0	20.0	0	40.0	0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 6-6

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work

Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces											
FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	634 (20.5)	429 (43.6)	15 (25.4)	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	170 (8.9)	12 (9.6)	1 (33.3)	2 (50.0)	NR
2.	1,100 (17.1)	1,068 (18.4)	5 (2.3)	4 (28.6)	2 (33.3)	5 (15.6)	15 (4.7)	1 (6.3)	NR	NR	NR
3.	4,066 (73.6)	728 (92.0)	81 (93.1)	NR	4 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	2,600 (70.8)	639 (67.1)	2 (50.0)	10 [*] (90.9)	1 (100.0)
4.	5 (0.3)	5 (0.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	674 (29.4)	573 (33.0)	8 (24.2)	1 (12.5)	5 (71.4)	2 (40.0)	80 (16.7)	4 (22.2)	NR	NR	1 (25.0)
7.	274 (24.2)	92 (28.4)	NR	1 (50.0)	10 (100.0)	NR	168 (21.4)	2 (22.2)	NR	1 (50.0)	NR
8.	2,504 (19.1)	813 (24.9)	48 (7.0)	20 (54.1)	45 (76.1)	1 (5.3)	1,322 (20.3)	196 (8.6)	11 (27.5)	37 (63.5)	2 (5.6)
9.	NONE										
10.	NONE										
11.	792 (34.1)	512 (34.9)	46 (35.9)	1 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	NR	181 (31.9)	49 (41.2)	NR	NR	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	1,230 (52.4)	563 (63.2)	29 (58.0)	2 (100.0)	3 (75.0)	1 (50.0)	553 (44.8)	77 (49.4)	1 (33.3)	NR	1 (33.3)
15.	1,434 (42.6)	723 (63.3)	42 (42.9)	1 (50.0)	3 (75.0)	3 (75.0)	593 (31.2)	60 (30.8)	2 (16.7)	4 (66.7)	3 (60.0)
TOTAL	12,713 (30.7)	5,506 (30.7)	274 (19.2)	32 (42.1)	86 (77.5)	14 (15.1)	5,682 (32.2)	1,040 (26.7)	17 (26.2)	54 (64.3)	8 (16.0)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	36.8	36.8	23.0	50.5	93.0	18.1	38.6	32.0	31.4	77.2	19.2
-20%	24.6	24.6	15.4	33.7	62.0	12.1	25.8	21.4	21.0	51.4	12.8
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	-	NR
2.		-	-	-	-	0	-	-	NR	NR	NR
3.		+	+	NR	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	+	-	0	+	-	0	NR	NR	+
7.		0	NR	0	+	NR	-	0	NR	-	NR
8.		0	-	+	0	-	-	-	0	0	-
11.		0	+	+	+	NR	0	+	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	NR	+
15.		+	+	0	0	+	0	0	-	0	+
NET SCORE		+2	+2	0	+2	+1	-4	-1	-3	-6	-2
DISPARITY			0	-2	0	-1	-6	-3	-5	-8	-4
% DISPARITY			0	10.0	0	5.0	30.0	15.0	25.0	40.0	20.0

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 6-7
Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force With Percent in Service/Maintenance
Jobs in Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	95 (3.1)	55 (5.6)	16 (27.1)	NR	NR	NR	20 (1.0)	4 (3.2)	NR	NR	
2.	66 (1.0)	39 (0.6)	19 (8.8)	NR	2 (33.3)	1 (3.1)	4 (1.3)	1 (6.3)	NR	NR	
3.	NONE										
4.	42 (2.3)	30 (2.0)	4 (6.2)	NR	NR	NR	5 (2.0)	3 (18.8)	NR	NR	
5.	NONE										
6.	338 (14.8)	315 (18.7)	8 (24.2)	1 (12.5)	1 (14.3)	2 (40.0)	10 (2.1)	NR	NR	NR	
7.	279 (24.6)	111 (34.3)	2 (100.0)	1 (50.0)	NR	NR	163 (20.8)	1 (11.1)	NR	1 (50.0)	
8.	2,136 (16.4)	676 (20.7)	231 (33.5)	3 (8.1)	NR	4 (21.1)	825 (12.6)	380 (16.6)	6 (15.0)	5 (9.3)	
9.	NONE										
10.	NONE										
11.	96 (4.1)	79 (5.4)	4 (3.1)	NR	NR	NR	9 (1.6)	4 (3.4)	NR	NR	
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	5 (0.2)	4 (0.4)	1 (0.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
15.	220 (6.5)	79 (6.9)	27 (27.6)	1 (50.0)	NR	1 (25.0)	80 (4.2)	32 (16.4)	NR	NR	
TOTAL	3,277 (7.9)	1,388 (7.7)	312 (21.9)	6 (7.9)	3 (2.7)	8 (8.6)	1,116 (6.3)	425 (10.9)	6 (9.2)	6 (7.1)	
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	9.5	9.2	26.3	9.5	3.2	10.3	7.5	13.1	11.0	8.5	
-20%	6.3	6.2	17.5	6.3	2.2	6.9	5.0	8.7	7.4	5.7	
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		-	+	NR	NR	NR	-	-	NR	NR	
2.		-	-	NR	+	-	-	-	NR	NR	
3.											
4.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	+	NR	NR	
6.		+	0	+	+	+	-	NR	NR	NR	
7.		+	+	+	NR	NR	+	0	NR	+	
8.		+	+	0	NR	+	+	+	+	+	
11.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	-	-	NR	NR	
14.		-	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	
15.		0	+	+	NR	+	-	+	NR	NR	
NET SCORE		-2	0	-2	-5	-3	-5	-2	-7	-5	
DISPARITY			+2	0	-3	-1	-3	0	-5	-3	
% DISPARITY			22.2	0	33.3	11.1	33.3	0	55.6	33.3	

three bottom job categories). (Note that, for reasons explained in the Introduction, we have shifted the basis of analysis from percent of job category to percent of ethnic group.)

The disparity calculations from the three tables are summarized in Table 6-8. This shows a mixed pattern. If there were discrimination one would expect that the disparity would be greatest for administrators, less for professionals and still less for service workers. This pattern is evident for Hispanic men, black women, and Asian women. It is not true for other groups. While the levels of disparity are sufficiently high to raise questions, these are not about discrimination of the kind that would be evident in disparate utilization within each ethnic group. Disparity at the administrator level is greatest for Hispanic and American Indian men and Asian women. At the service worker level the disparity is greatest for Asian men, Hispanic and American Indian women. Noteworthy are the absence or very low levels of disparity for black male, Hispanic male, Asian male, and black female professionals and for Hispanic male, American Indian male, and black female service workers.

To explore this matter further, the reader could review Tables 6-5 to 6-7, comparing the proportion of white men in each job category with the proportion of other minorities and women in each category for each function. In the administrative category, 108 of 1,322 administrators are from minority groups (about eight percent) and 284 (about 21 percent) are white women. In two functions no minority administrators are employed. In those which do employ white female administrators, there is some difference in utilization between white women and white men. There is generally little difference between minority and white male utilization in those functions where minority administrators were used.

Table 6-8

Percent Disparity Compared

	MALE					FEMALE			
	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. or Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. or Al. Nat.
Administrative	15.0	40.0	15.0	40.0	15.0	20.0	0	40.0	0
Professional	0	10.0	0	5.0	30.0	15.0	25.0	40.0	20.0
Service	22.2	0	33.3	11.1	33.3	0	55.6	33.3	44.4

Source: Calculations by CSRO shown on Tables 6-5, 6-6 & 6-7.

White men are a smaller proportion of the professional level jobs (less than half of the professionals are white male) and more functions include at least some minority professionals than is the case for administrators. With a scattering of exceptions, most notably in health care, there is little disparity in utilization of white men and minorities. However, the proportions of female professionals appears to be less than the proportion of men in several functions: financial administration, streets and highways, public welfare, health and other.

In the service/maintenance worker category, a review of the data in Table 6-7 shows that there are many functions in which most of the nonwhite ethnic groups are not represented. Where there is representation, there is little disparity regarding either minorities or white women.

A glance through the appendix tables shows that while few administrators earned less than \$15,999, the proportion of minority or white women in the administrator category who did so was larger than the proportion of white male administrators at that salary level. Indeed, it is striking that there are any administrators at below \$15,999.

But perhaps the most interesting measure of State affirmative action efforts is the change that occurs because of new hires. About 11 percent of the 1980 State work force are persons hired during the year. There is thus much room for change in composition. Although the proportion of newly hired white women is larger than the proportion in the work force, as were the proportions of black men, Hispanic men and Hispanic women, the proportions of Hispanic men and Asian women decreased. Looking at the job categories, the proportion of newly hired black male administrators was less than the existing proportion, as was the proportion of newly hired female administrators (no minorities from other groups were hired as administrators). The proportions

of newly hired black male, American Indian male, white female, black female, Hispanic female and American Indian female professionals were greater than the existing proportions. But the proportions of Hispanic men, Asian men and Asian women newly hired as professionals were less than the existing proportions.

Only 13 minority technicians were hired. The proportions of black men and women hired as technicians would have reduced, somewhat, the proportions of black men and women who were employed as technicians. The proportion of white women hired as technicians was considerably lower than the existing proportion.

The proportions of white men hired for protective service jobs, paraprofessional, clerical and service jobs were greater than the existing proportions. The proportions of black male new hires in protective service, clerical and skilled craft were greater than the proportions in the existing work force. The proportions of Hispanic new hires were larger in all categories below technical. White female new hires proportions were larger than the existing proportions in protective service, clerical and skilled craft jobs. The proportions of black women newly hired were larger than the existing proportions in clerical and skilled craft jobs. New hires were lower proportions than existing more often for women (white or minority) than for men.

d. Analyses of Affirmative Action Plans

Table 6-9 compares the thirteen plans for affirmative action submitted to the Advisory Committee by the State of Missouri to criteria for a model plan developed by the Advisory Committee. In 1978 the Advisory Committee reported that the six agencies it reviewed had, for the most part, only stated intentions to do the key elements of affirmative action planning.²⁵ Despite three training conferences sponsored by the Governor's office with technical

Table 6-9

SUMMARY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
I. IMPLEMENTATION													
A. Chief Executive of agency responsible													
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.													
	1	3	1	4	2	1	1	4	4	3	1	1	4
B. An affirmative action officer is appointed and duties specified.													
4. Yes.													
3. Appointed but duties not specified.													
2. Post planned.													
1. No affirmative action officer appointed.													
	3	4	4	4	4	4	1	3	4	4	2	4	4
C. Dissemination of affirmative action plan.													
4. Wide internal and external.													
3. Some internal and external.													
2. Wide internal and external planned.													
1. Less.													
	1	3	4	1	3	3	1	4	1	1	1	1	3
II. WORK FORCE ANALYSIS													
A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, salary.													
4. Determined by all categories.													
3. Determined by job category, race, sex.													
2. Plan to determine by all categories.													
1. Less data.													
	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1
B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary.													
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.													
	3	3	2	1	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	2	2

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
C. Work force analysis includes age or handicap. 4. Age and handicap. 3. Age or handicap. 2. Plan discusses age and handicap but analysis not yet implemented. 1. Less.	2	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1
D. Determine underutilization by race and sex, age and handicap. 4. Underutilization determined for all four categories by job category and salary level. 3. Underutilization determined for race, sex and job category. 2. Underutilization determination by all four categories by job category. 1. Less.	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1
E. Set long term goals. 4. Set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set long term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap but not yet implemented. 1. No long term goals planned.	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1
F. Set short term goals. 4. Set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set short term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. No short term goals.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1
III. RECRUITMENT													
A. Identify and maintain contact with minority/women's organizations, which could assist in recruitment. 4. State they have a contact list and show that they maintain regular contact. 3. State they have a contact list but do not show or assert regular contact. 2. Plan to maintain regular contact and state they will develop complete contact list. 1. Less, including assertions of contact but no list.	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
<p>B. Make sure contacts above are notified of all vacancies.</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>	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<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>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
<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.</p>	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
<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	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
<p>B. Ensure 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	1	1	1	1	1	1	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>	3	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
<p>D. Review application questionnaire to ensure 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	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1
<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	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	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	1	4	1	1	4	1	1	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
<p>V. PROMOTION</p> <p>A. Review and analyze job descriptions to ensure that there are no unreasonable job specifications.</p> <p>4. Knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements are stated to be minimum.</p> <p>3. Validation in process.</p> <p>2. Validation planned.</p> <p>1. No validation of KSAs planned.</p>	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1
<p>B. Career ladder established.</p> <p>4. Many ladders exist or planned.</p> <p>3. Agency considering planning career ladders but none in actual operation.</p> <p>2. Agency mentions planning career ladders.</p> <p>1. Less.</p>	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	2	1
<p>C. Ensure employees are aware of career ladder opportunities, the requirements for other jobs are known and procedures for using career ladders are publicized.</p> <p>4. Fully done.</p> <p>3. Partially done.</p> <p>2. Planned for implementation within five years.</p> <p>1. Less, or no timeframe for completion within five years.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	4
<p>D. Identify resources and procedures for upward mobility and disseminate this information.</p> <p>4. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling.</p> <p>3. Posting or other formal announcement only.</p> <p>2. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling planned but not yet implemented.</p> <p>1. Vague commitments to upward mobility.</p>	1	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	4
<p>E. Develop and maintain a listing of the skills of all employees to be used for encouraging application for promotion.</p> <p>4. Done.</p> <p>3. Mentioned.</p> <p>2. Planned.</p> <p>1. Not mentioned.</p>	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
F. Providing training opportunities both on the job and classroom. 4. Training for advancement and reasonable accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 3. Improved skills training, no special accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 2. Plan to provide training and accommodation. 1. Less.	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	2	2	1	2
VI. CONDITIONS OF WORK													
A. Childbirth covered by medical leave policies and provision of limited leave of absence without pay. 4. All provided. 3. No extra leave. 2. Plan to provide full maternity benefits. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	2	1
B. Flexible hours provided. 4. Established for all positions. 3. Considered/planned. 2. Mentioned. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
C. Part-time work available. 4. Stated available. 3. Availability limited. 2. Planned but not yet implemented. 1. Not mentioned.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
D. Facilities accessible by public transportation. 4. Stated accessible. 3. Mentioned. 2. Plan for future facilities. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
E. Facilities accessible to handicapped. 4. Completely accessible. 3. Planning underway to make completely accessible, some areas accessible. 2. Plan complete accessibility but plans not yet developed. 1. Less.	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
VII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.													
A. Formalized procedures for personnel grievances with both in-house remedies and appeal outside. 4. Formal procedure includes external appeal. 3. Formal procedure but not structured external appeal. 2. Formal procedure planned to include appeal but not yet implemented. 1. No formal structure.	2	1	1	3	1	2	1	3	2	1	1	3	1
B. Formal discrimination complaint processing established in addition to personnel grievance procedures. 4. Full equal opportunity complaint processing leads to State human rights agency. 3. Equal opportunity complaint processing ends at agency level. 2. Plan internal mechanism. 1. No internal mechanism.	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	3	1
C. Affirmative action officer available to counsel employees on complaints about discrimination. 4. Full-time counselor. 3. Part-time counselor. 2. Plan full-time counselor but not yet implemented. 1. None.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
VIII. LAYOFFS, DISCHARGE, DEMOTIONS													
A. Exit interviews to determine discrimination is not forcing employees out.													
4. Yes.													
2. Planned but not yet implemented.													
1. No.													
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	2	1	1	4
IX. EVALUATION													
A. Annual update work force utilization analysis.													
4. Annual update implemented and analysis of change over the preceding 12 months.													
3. Annual update implemented but no analysis of change.													
2. Plan annual update and analysis--not yet implemented.													
1. Less.													
2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	4	2	1	1	1
B. Annually review success in meeting goals and timetables.													
4. Annual review indicates or promises to review degree of success and corrective measures if needed, including revised one year goals.													
3. Notes changes but does not indicate action.													
2. Plan annual review of degree of success and corrective measures including one year goals but not yet implemented.													
1. No action.													
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
C. Applicant flow data analyzed to determine obstacles to affirmative action.													
4. Applicant flow data shows reasons for non-hire.													
3. No reasons for non-hire maintained.													
2. Plans applicant flow with reasons for non-hire.													
1. No applicant flow data.													
2	1	1	4	1	1	1	3	2	3	3	3	3	2
D. Review interview practices and procedures.													
4. Plan shows implementation of <u>systematic</u> review of practices and procedures.													
3. Shows reviews of practices and procedures but not systematic.													
2. Plans implementation of systematic review but not yet done.													
1. Less													
1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

Table 6-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Conservation	CARL	Elementary & Secondary Ed.	Employment Security	Higher Education	Highways	Mental Health	Natural Resources	Public Safety	Revenue	Social Services
<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	2	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	4
<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 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>	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
<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>	3	3	3	4	3	3	1	3	3	1	2	3	4
<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	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	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

assistance from the Missouri Advisory Committee, little apparently had been done in the succeeding two years.

The Advisory Committee assessed 13 agency plans. Only two had determined the available labor force (two others planned to do so) and only five had conducted a work force analysis (although five others planned to do so). Only three agencies had assessed the extent of underutilization, only three had set long term goals and only two set short term goals for remedying underutilization. Few agencies had implemented recruitment strategies to reach out to groups not well represented in the State work force. Similarly, only one or two agencies had plans or had revised their selection procedures to ensure that those were nondiscriminatory. While more agencies had some plans or had taken some steps to ensure opportunities for upward mobility, none had actually developed a list of employee skills which could be used to encourage employee mobility (and only two planned to do so).

Only one agency provided full maternity benefits, none provided either flexible work schedules or the possibility of part-time work. None planned or assured that their facilities were accessible by public transportation and only two agencies either had taken steps or planned to take steps to assure that their facilities were accessible to the handicapped.

Three agencies had formalized grievance procedures and three others planned to establish them. But few of the agencies had formalized procedures specifically for dealing with allegations of discrimination. Only one agency had an official available to provide assistance to employees who alleged discrimination. Only two agencies had formal exit interview procedures which would help monitor for discrimination (although one other agency planned to implement an exit interview procedure).

Seven agencies either had implemented or planned to implement annual updates of their work force utilization analysis. But no agency had actually reviewed success in meeting affirmative action goals (although two planned to do so in the future). Eight agencies monitored or planned to monitor applicant flow and five monitored or planned to maintain data on promotions upgrading and transfers.

Two agencies included accomplishment of affirmative action goals in supervisors performance evaluations and eight others expected supervisors to practice affirmative action but did not include this in their evaluations.

Seven of the 13 agency heads assumed formal responsibility for their agency affirmative action efforts. Eleven agencies had affirmative action officer positions and another planned to establish one. Only six agencies had disseminated their plans both internally and to interested outsiders.

Table 6-10 contains a summary comment by the Advisory Committee on each plan. Many of the annual plans are more than a year old; most are very sketchy in detailing what will be done; and, few have any detail reporting what has been done to implement previous plans or to reach ongoing objectives. Governor Bond pointed out that new affirmative action plans were to be submitted by November 1, 1981 and that "This should resolve your concern regarding outdated plans."²⁶ Although there was a State affirmative action officer, there was no indication that there was a State review of the compliance with the 1978 Executive Order. The 1981 Executive Order requires that such reviews be done. But it is too soon for this portion of the process to be evaluated since plans were not to be submitted pursuant to the new order until November 1981.

Table 6--10
Summary Comments on the Affirmative Action Plans
State Agencies That Employ 100 or More Persons

MISSOURI

Department of Administration - The plan is dated April 27, 1978 and has not been updated. It contains no analysis of utilization nor does it suggest that one will be conducted. The goals and means of implementation of actions to improve equal opportunity by recruitment, selection, upward mobility, terms of work and program evaluation are described sketchily. There is no indication that any have been implemented or with what effect. The proposed program is much less extensive than that of some other State agencies.

Merit Systems - The merit system plan is dated December 12, 1979 and proposes activities for the period October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980. The proposed activities cover a wide range of equal opportunity functions. However, the Personnel division assumes that most of its plans will be implemented by other agencies. There is no evidence that those agencies are required to carry out the personnel division's plan. In many cases several persons would share responsibility for initiation but without incentive to act, as for example, in revision of entry level requirements and establishment of career ladders. Most activities have no target dates even though interim fixed targets could easily be established for such items as development of effective recordkeeping systems.

Department of Agriculture - The undated plan contains no utilization or labor force analysis. A cover letter dated August 22, 1980 says it is the latest plan. It does specify a departmentwide analysis will be conducted. It does not specify any goals or timetables will be developed. None of the action items contain finite completion dates. There is no evidence that an effective strategy to deal with equal opportunity problems or evaluate the program exists. The plan contains a couple of a sentences which are inflammatory and destructive of affirmative action efforts. They indicate that minorities have a more difficult time than others keeping jobs. The statements, "For many reasons some minority group persons may have difficulty adjusting to their jobs" and "The Department will not retain an employee only because he/she is a minority member," subtly reinforce negative stereotypes and should be removed.

Department of Conservation - The plan is dated May 1, 1978. It has not been updated. No detailed utilization analysis has been conducted. The plan merely notes the increase in total utilization. There is informal reference to availability but no labor force analysis. There is no plan to develop evaluation procedures to determine program effectiveness. The plan calls for an identification of problems to be completed by September 1978 but such a report is not included in the document. A unique element of this plan is the creation of scholarships to train minority and female college students for conservation careers.

Department of Consumer Affairs, Regulation and Licensing - The plan appears to have been developed in 1977 since it contains activities for 1978. There are no subsequent updates. The plan specifies underutilization and suggests corrective action but there are no numeric goals or timetables. The basis on which underutilization was determined is not specified, nor is there evaluation of the success of non-numeric goals. Other efforts are specified only in the most sketchy terms.

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - The plan is dated April 13, 1978. There are no updates. There is no labor force or work force analysis nor are there any goals established. Although the plan proposes some activities there is no timeframe established for their completion. There is no delegation of coordinating responsibility for affirmative action. Although a utilization analysis is proposed, there is no evidence, as of August 18, 1980 that it was conducted. By and large, the problems and proposed solutions are stated in vague terms.

Division of Employment Security - The plan was submitted for the 1978 fiscal year and had not been updated as of fall 1980. There is no utilization analysis nor have goals and timetables been developed. An unexplained increase in the number of applicants is suggested. Although the plan states that an internal audit system has been developed, there is no indication of its use in developing the FY 1978 plan. Many of the most significant program elements are described very vaguely. The detailed items in the plan are generally fairly trivial.

Department of Higher Education - The draft plan contains a statement of principles. It states that employment terms will not be discriminatory, but does not specify how. It mentions conducting a utilization analysis but there is no indication that one has ever been conducted. It mentions affirmative recruitment barrier elimination but specifies no methods or timeframes. It specifies selection procedures and data maintenance but does not provide any guidelines for implementation. As of 1980 the board had not approved the plan. The plan states "The department will not retain an employee only because he/she is a minority group member." The statement is inflammatory and reinforces negative stereotypes by suggesting that some minorities are hired only to satisfy a quota. It should be removed from the plan.

Highway and Transportation Commission - The plan was sent to the State affirmative action officer on August 14, 1980. It mentions many areas of activity but contains no utilization analysis, goals or timetables. Although some outreach and job restructuring is mentioned, there is no evidence that this is very extensive. The plan places primary responsibility on the District Engineers but requires no plan from them, nor does it appear to provide a vehicle through which they could develop plans tailored to their work sites. On key elements such as recruitment and selection procedures there is little discussion of reviews to ensure equal opportunity or selection training for District Engineers who appear to do much of the hiring.

Department of Mental Health - The plan is comprehensive. However, it was developed in 1977 and apparently has not been revised since. Goals and analyses are all based on 1977 data. There is no indication of any evaluation of accomplishments and revisions in the plan based on those accomplishments. Although planning and implementation must utilize individual facility data and resources there are no facility addenda showing what will be done to meet the unique problems at each location. The success of the department, and the problems in employing minorities and women are noted in the plan. The portion dealing with the handicapped are proscriptive but not detailed affirmative remedies.

Department of Natural Resources - The plan, dated July 1, 1979, provides a detailed set of goals and timetables for remedying the underutilization that has been identified. In addition the plan specifies concrete steps to ensure effective affirmative action. The only missing elements are indication of what has been done in the past, analysis of the effectiveness of past efforts

and identification of procedures to remedy past deficiencies. Reclassification and similar efforts are mentioned but not specified. Specific provision is made for remedying discrimination affecting the handicapped.

Department of Public Safety - The plan covers the period July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980. The plan narrative repeats verbatim material provided by the Personnel Division of the Department of Administration. The plan contains a number of specific tasks to be accomplished by June 1979 and others by September 1979. There is no indication that any of the goals have been accomplished. Although the plan ostensibly covers the period July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980, no numerical goals are specified for the period. No data on either labor force or work force are specified.

Department of Revenue - The "plan" is no more than a recitation of promises. There is no indication that anyone has bothered to determine how to fulfill the promises nor is there any indication that any efforts have been made to implement them. Although the plan is undated, its goals and timetables begin in 1974. There is no indication which, if any, have been accomplished nor any measures of activity. No analysis of underutilization or corrective goals are reported.

Department of Social Services - The plan was sent to the State affirmative action office on August 22, 1980. The plan provides that labor force and utilization analysis will be conducted and appropriate goals developed but does not indicate when or how. Line supervisors are held accountable for implementation but it is unclear whether or not supervisors are given support to perform the tasks specified. Proposals for affirmative recruitment, selection, training and career ladders are stated. Recruitment, selection and promotion procedures could be specified in greater detail. Although the plan proposes several records systems it is not evident that these and the proposed committee review system will provide effective monitoring of program implementation. None of the action items has a fixed timeframe except the records systems. The starting points for reporting are unspecified.

e. Administering Agency: The State Affirmative Action Officer

The State Affirmative Action Officer is charged, under Executive Order 81-17, with "primary responsibility for implementation" of the order.²⁷ She reports to the Commissioner of Administration.²⁸ Governor Bond has stated that she has "unrestricted access to the Commissioner of Administration, and the Executive Assistant, if I am not available."²⁹ As noted earlier, the State Affirmative Action Officer is to review agency plans to ensure compliance with the Governor's order and may require "such revisions as are necessary to accomplish the purposes" of the order.³⁰ The officer also is to review progress reports from departments and meet annually with each department director "to evaluate departmental results and determine the course of future affirmative action implementing and planning."³¹ The officer also "shall coordinate and provide technical assistance to departments in the development and implementation of their respective affirmative action plans of implementation."³²

The Governor estimated that about \$46,710 was allocated by the Department of Administration to the operation of the State Affirmative Action Office, including the officer's salary, a part-time secretary and support services.³³

In addition, there is an Affirmative Action Council, whose membership includes representatives of the State departments, chaired by the State Affirmative Action Officer, that meets quarterly to "make such recommendations as it believes necessary to the State affirmative action officer to assist in the implementation" of the Executive Order.³⁴

Chapter 6 Notes

1. Mo. Rev. Stat. Chapters 269 and 558.
2. Executive Order on Affirmative Action, Mar. 23, 1978, clause 1.
3. Ibid., clause 2.
4. Ibid., clause 3.
5. Ibid., clause 4.
6. Ibid., clause 5.
7. Ibid., clause 6.
8. Ibid., clause 8.
9. Ibid., clause 3.
10. Ibid., clause 5.
11. Executive Order 81-17, Aug. 28, 1981, Articles II, IV, V.
12. Executive Order on Affirmative Action, Mar. 23, 1978, clause 5.
13. Executive Order 81-17, Article V.
14. Executive Order on Affirmative Action, Mar. 23, 1978, clause 6.
15. Executive Order 81-17, Article V.
16. Ibid., Article V; and, Executive Order on Affirmative Action, Mar. 23, 1978, clause 6.
17. Executive Order 81-17, Article II.
18. Ibid., Article V, and Executive Order on Affirmative Action, Mar. 23, 1978, clause 8.
19. Ibid.
20. Vernell Fuller, letter to the chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Oct. 6, 1980 and Nov. 21, 1979.
21. Vernell Fuller, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Nov. 21, 1979.

22. Governor Christopher S. Bond, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1981.
23. Vernell Fuller, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Oct. 6, 1980, Joseph Teasdale, Governor, letter dated Oct. 3, 1980, appended thereto.
24. Christopher S. Bond, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1981.
25. Missouri Advisory Committee, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America (June 1978), pp. 98-107.
26. Governor Christopher S. Bond, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1981.
27. Executive Order 81-17, Article II.
28. Ibid.
29. Governor Christopher S. Bond, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1981.
30. Executive Order 81-17, Article II.
31. Executive Order 81-17, Article II.
32. Ibid., Article V.
33. Governor Christopher S. Bond, letter to chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Dec. 16, 1981.
34. Executive Order 81-17, Article III.

7. STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IN NEBRASKA

a. Introduction

Whatever its failings, Nebraska's affirmative action efforts have made remarkable strides since the Advisory Committee published its 1978 report.¹ There was no State affirmative action program at that time. The only agencies which had affirmative action programs were those subject to the provisions of the Federal Intergovernmental Personnel Act.² However, in 1979 a new Governor, Charles Thone, and the State legislature approved LB 500³ which declared that it is:

the public policy of Nebraska that each division of State government shall take positive action in all areas of its operation to insure that all citizens are given fair and equal opportunities for employment and advancement regardless of race, color, religion, national origin, age, sex marital status, or physical or mental disability.

Affirmative actions shall be taken to insure the implementation of this policy in State government employment. This policy and obligation to provide equal employment opportunity include, but are not limited to:

1. Hiring, placement, upgrading, transfer, or demotion;
2. Recruitment, advertising, or solicitation for employment;
3. Treatment during employment;
4. Rates of pay or other forms of compensation;
5. Selection for training;
6. Layoff, termination, or reinstatement; and
7. Any other condition of employment.⁴

The act establishes a State affirmative action office which would:

1. Be responsible for coordinating, directing and implementing program.
2. Promulgate rules and regulations for development of affirmative action plans.
3. Provide counseling and assistance to agencies in developing their plans.
4. Review agency plans and direct modifications where necessary.
5. Monitor progress of agencies by establishing report forms.
6. Review quarterly agency reports.
7. Report quarterly to the Governor.
8. Make recommendations for legislative changes when necessary.
9. Serve as liaison between State and Federal compliance agencies.
10. Plan and carry out training in equal employment opportunity, racial awareness, women's concerns, the disabled and aging for all State employees.

11. Coordinate activities of agency affirmative action person.
12. Submit an annual report to the Governor and Legislature.⁵

Section 14 of the Act requires that each agency plan be approved by the affirmative action office. If that agency cannot obtain an acceptable plan by agreement, it is to report that to an affirmative action committee and the Governor and the information is to be made public.⁶

Section 13 of the Act specifies that the "efforts and results of all directors, managers and supervisors will be used in evaluation of work performance."⁷

Agencies covered by the law are those which are under the direct control of the Governor. There are 24 of these ("Code" agencies). Others may participate voluntarily. There are 32 of these, agencies run by boards or commissioners, including the departments of health and education and the Nebraska Merit System agency.⁸

The State Affirmative Action Office opened on Jan 2., 1980. It reports the following sequence of events:

January - office worked with "Code" agency directors in outlining LB500 mandates and asked them to appoint affirmative action officers. We assisted agencies in describing duties and responsibilities of their directors and of their affirmative action officers. I personally called on directors. Other agencies were invited to participate voluntarily.

February 13, 1980 - held first formal meeting of all of these newly appointed officers. Note that packets of materials to be used by agencies in writing their affirmative action plans were given to officers of Code agencies.

February 25, 1980 - same materials, etc., given voluntary agencies. (Agenda for voluntary agencies meeting was the same one used for Code meeting Feb. 13, 1980.)

From the time an agency's affirmative action officer was appointed until July 1, 1980, we worked with them on a one-to-one basis, as well as having our bi-monthly affirmative action officers group meetings, to assist them in any way needed to write their plans and to develop their overall programs.

At various times, then, we have given packets of information. The Guidelines (with my referenced letter of July 1, 1980) is merely putting into a single, workable notebook all the materials that had been distributed; some sections and materials will be constantly updated.⁹ Affirmative action plans were to be submitted by July 1, 1980.¹⁰

The State affirmative action officer stated that:

Since Governor Thone took office in January of 1979, he has taken steps to fulfill his commitment to affirmative action. Of the 24 "Code" agency directors he appointed, one is female and one is a black male. In addition he appointed a black male as director of Governor's Special Grants and over a third of his appointments to advisory boards and commissions have been women and minorities. Women have also been placed in top management positions. 1980 statistics show that of the 7670 employees in administrative, professional and para-professional positions (not including University and State College systems) 42 percent are women.¹¹

b. Data

Table 7-1 shows the utilization of workers as reported in the 1970 Census of Population. Table 7-2 shows the utilization of workers in the private sector as reported by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), based on 1978 employer reports. Table 7-3 shows the utilization of workers by Nebraska State government as reported by the State in its 1980 EEO-4 form submission to EEOC. Table 7-4 shows the comparison between the 1970 State labor force, the 1978 private sector labor force and the 1980 State work force.

A comparison of the State work force to the two labor force measures shows many disparities greater than 20 percent. The State utilization of white men is smaller than the 1970 labor force and slightly larger than the 1978 private sector labor force, but neither difference is significant. The State's utilization of black men, Hispanic men and black women is significantly less than either the 1970 labor force or 1978 private sector labor force. The State's utilization of white women is significantly larger than the 1970 labor force and larger, but not significantly, than the 1978 private sector labor force. The State's utilization of Hispanic women is identical to the 1970

Table 7-1

Nebraska Labor Force - 1970

	TOTAL	WHITE % ROW	BLACK % ROW	HISPANIC % ROW
Total	576,065	560,697	12,554	6,397
Female	212,601	205,329 (96.6)	6,123 (2.9)	2,343 (1.1)
Male	363,464	355,368 (97.7)	6,431 (1.8)	4,054 (1.1)
Professionals, Technicians & Kindred		% Column	% Column	% Column
Total	74,116	72,381	1,186	637
Female	34,368	33,407 (16.3)	711 (11.6)	256 (10.9)
Male	39,748	38,974 (11.0)	475 (7.4)	381 (9.4)
Managers & Administrators				
Total	52,196	51,803	309	359
Female	8,712	8,632 (4.2)	51 (0.8)	44 (1.9)
Male	43,484	43,171 (12.1)	258 (4.0)	315 (7.8)
Clerical & Kindred				
Total	90,024	87,847	1,851	649
Female	67,450	65,789 (32.0)	1,452 (23.7)	452 (19.3)
Male	22,574	22,058 (6.2)	399 (6.2)	197 (4.9)
Crafts				
Total	65,806	64,745	847	736
Female	4,151	4,019 (2.0)	110 (1.8)	32 (1.4)
Male	61,655	60,726 (17.1)	737 (11.5)	704 (17.4)
Service				
Total	74,039	70,203	3,274	1,114
Female	48,200	46,101 (22.5)	1,736 (28.4)	665 (28.4)
Male	25,839	24,102 (6.8)	1,538 (23.9)	449 (11.1)

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics: Nebraska (PC(1)-C29 (Ne.)), Table 54.
Calculations by CSRO.

Table 7-2
1978 EEO-1 Report Summary
(percent by row)

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT	TOTAL		OFFICIALS & MANAGERS		PROFESSIONALS		TECHNICIANS		SALES WORKERS		OFFICE & CLERK WORKERS		TOTAL		CRAFT WORKERS		OPERATIVES		LABORERS		SERVICE WORKERS	
	WHITE COLLAR	BLUE COLLAR																				
ALL T	139,322	90,061	19,310	15,103	8,193	2,430	19,437	34,841	23,974	40,094	19,310	16,773	62,486	23,974	34,841	19,310	16,773	62,486	23,974	34,841	19,310	16,773
ALL M	112,637	41,062	15,510	8,193	2,430	1,931	3,462	4,591	19,437	21,248	34,841	21,248	61,707	21,248	34,841	21,248	34,841	61,707	21,248	34,841	21,248	34,841
ALL F	86,085	51,999	3,720	6,770	4,939	4,939	10,015	28,447	9,442	6,394	28,447	6,394	20,781	1,329	1,329	6,820	6,820	20,781	1,329	1,329	6,820	6,820
WHITE T	185,912	91,404	18,745	14,621	8,664	18,637	18,637	18,637	18,637	18,637	32,517	27,046	75,880	27,046	32,517	17,375	17,375	75,880	27,046	32,517	17,375	17,375
WHITE M	105,311	39,260	15,156	7,850	4,391	9,087	9,087	9,087	9,087	9,087	6,015	20,816	57,031	20,816	6,015	11,031	11,031	57,031	20,816	6,015	11,031	11,031
WHITE F	90,551	50,796	3,567	6,771	4,273	9,554	9,554	9,554	9,554	9,554	26,300	1,238	18,849	1,238	11,584	6,139	6,139	18,849	1,238	11,584	6,139	6,139
WIR T	13,410	4,377	483	482	546	546	546	546	546	546	2,264	1,030	6,608	1,030	3,432	2,126	2,126	6,608	1,030	3,432	2,126	2,126
WIR M	7,276	1,544	332	275	399	399	399	399	399	399	1,867	93	4,676	93	1,178	1,465	1,465	4,676	93	1,178	1,465	1,465
WIR F	6,134	3,033	133	207	367	367	367	367	367	367	1,067	93	1,932	93	1,178	661	661	1,932	93	1,178	661	661
BLACK T	7,081	3,026	377	277	382	382	382	382	382	382	1,066	463	3,204	463	1,066	956	956	3,204	463	1,066	956	956
BLACK M	3,976	969	165	141	180	180	180	180	180	180	202	413	1,223	413	1,223	565	565	1,223	413	1,223	565	565
BLACK F	3,005	2,117	212	136	202	202	202	202	202	202	346	300	1,981	300	346	394	394	1,981	300	346	394	394
HISP T	3,235	990	118	91	111	111	111	111	111	111	416	463	2,431	463	1,135	823	823	2,431	463	1,135	823	823
HISP M	2,365	250	95	53	64	64	64	64	64	64	78	106	1,066	106	282	136	136	1,066	106	282	136	136
HISP F	1,370	591	23	38	47	47	47	47	47	47	132	44	1,365	44	302	38	38	1,365	44	302	38	38
AS/PT T	966	349	38	30	36	36	36	36	36	36	108	90	462	90	108	136	136	462	90	108	136	136
AS/PT M	446	126	21	16	21	21	21	21	21	21	32	21	235	21	32	136	136	235	21	32	136	136
AS/PT F	318	355	17	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	76	69	221	69	76	70	70	221	69	76	70	70
AI/AS T	878	232	22	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	78	80	311	80	150	201	201	311	80	150	201	201
AI/AS M	487	102	16	14	16	16	16	16	16	16	22	19	102	19	102	85	85	102	19	102	85	85
AI/AS F	341	130	6	10	8	8	8	8	8	8	62	61	109	61	48	99	99	109	61	48	99	99

NOTES: Percent of Total Employment in a given Occupational Category
 HSP-Total Minority AS/PT-Asian or Pacific Islander
 HSP-Hispanic AI/AS-American Indian or Alaskan Native
 Female F-male M
 *Less than 0.3 percent
 Percent by row, that is, percent of ethnic group in each job category, is shown
 % Parentheses. Calculated by CSBO.

SOURCE: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1978 EEO-1 Summary by State.

Table 7-3
Comparison of Percent of State Work Force and Function Work Force Who
Are From Each Ethnic Group

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	2,824	1,386 (49.1)	20 (0.7)	13 (0.5)	7 (0.2)	5 (0.2)	1,337 (47.3)	29 (1.0)	16 (0.6)	4 (0.1)	7 (0.2)
2.	2,412	2,096 (86.9)	23 (1.0)	14 (0.6)	5 (0.2)	3 (0.1)	262 (10.9)	5 (0.2)	3 (0.1)	NR	1 (0)
3.	637	240 (37.7)	6 (0.9)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)	376 (59.0)	8 (1.3)	2 (0.3)	1 (0.2)	1 (0.2)
4.	518	443 (85.5)	2 (0.4)	7 (1.4)	NR	3 (0.6)	61 (11.8)	2 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR
5.	47	36 (76.6)	NR	1 (2.1)	NR	NR	10 (21.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.	1,514	961 (63.5)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	2 (0.1)	NR	543 (35.9)	3 (0.2)	2 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	NR
7.	3,386	1,071 (31.6)	12 (0.4)	8 (0.2)	8 (0.2)	4 (0.1)	2,245 (66.3)	15 (0.4)	16 (0.5)	4 (0.1)	3 (0.1)
8.	433	214 (49.4)	2 (0.5)	NR	2 (0.5)	NR	202 (46.7)	4 (0.9)	7 (1.6)	2 (0.5)	NR
9.	None										
10.	102	36 (35.3)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	9 (8.8)	48 (47.1)	NR	2 (2.0)	NR	4 (3.9)
11.	1,070	700 (65.4)	29 (2.7)	12 (1.1)	1 (0.1)	5 (0.5)	312 (29.2)	9 (0.8)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)	NR
12.	95	68 (71.6)	NR	NR	NR	1 (1.1)	26 (27.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	None										
14.	841	311 (37.0)	15 (1.8)	9 (1.1)	NR	1 (0.1)	472 (56.1)	16 (1.9)	13 (1.5)	NR	4 (0.5)
15.	1,102	448 (40.7)	12 (1.1)	4 (0.4)	NR	2 (0.2)	619 (56.2)	10 (0.9)	5 (0.5)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.1)
TOTAL	14,981	8,010 (53.5)	123 (0.8)	71 (0.5)	27 (0.2)	34 (0.2)	6,513 (43.5)	101 (0.7)	67 (0.4)	14 (0.1)	21 (0.1)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
≥20%		64.2	1.0	0.6	0.2	0.2	52.2	0.8	0.5	0.1	0.1
-20%		42.8	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.2	34.8	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.1
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+	0	+
2.		+	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	NR	-
3.		-	0	-	0	0	+	+	0	+	+
4.		+	-	+	NR	+	-	-	NR	NR	NR
5.		+	NR	+	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	-	-	-	NR	0	-	-	0	NR
7.		-	-	-	0	-	+	-	0	0	0
8.		0	-	NR	+	NR	0	+	+	+	NR
10.		-	0	+	+	+	0	NR	+	NR	+
11.		+	+	+	-	+	-	0	-	0	NR
12.		+	NR	NR	NR	+	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		-	+	+	NR	-	+	+	+	NR	+
15.		-	+	0	NR	0	+	+	0	0	0
NET SCORE		0	-3	0	-5	-2	-1	-2	-3	-4	-3
DISPARITY			-3	0	-5	-2	-1	-2	-3	-4	-3
% DISPARITY			11.5	0	19.2	7.7	3.9	7.7	11.5	15.4	11.5

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers from each ethnic group in the function/State work forces.

Table 7-4

Comparison of Work Force and Labor Force

	%WM	%BM	%HM	%WF	%BF	%HF
1970 State Labor Force	61.7	1.1	0.7	33.6	1.1	0.4
1978 Private Sector Labor Force	52.9	2.0	1.2	40.4	2.0	0.7
1980 State Work Force	53.5	0.8	0.5	43.5	0.7	0.4

Notes:

WM=white male
 BM=black male
 HM=Hispanic male
 WF=white female
 BF=black female
 HF=Hispanic female

Source: Tables 7-1, 7-2 and 7-3 of this report

labor force but smaller than that of the private sector labor force. Despite these very significant discrepancies, the Advisory Committee believed that it would be appropriate to use the State work force as a reasonable standard for achievement by State agencies although it should not be the basis for their ultimate efforts.

Table 7-3 not only contains basic data on utilization by agency function but also contains scores indicating the extent to which functional work force utilization of each ethnic group is significantly less or greater than would be expected if it matched the State work force. The score awards each function a plus one if its utilization exceeds the State's by 20 percent, a minus one if it is 20 percent less than the State's and a zero if there is no disparity in utilization. A review of the net scores by function shows that agencies involved in public welfare, health, community development, employment security functions were likely to use minorities and women more than the State proportions for their respective ethnic groups. Agencies using minorities or women in most groups at less than 80 percent of the State work force average were in such functions as streets and highways, police, fire protection, natural resources and utilities and transportation.

The proportion of white males utilized is at least 80 percent of the State average in eight functional groups. The numbers of functions for other groups where this is so are: black male - 7, Hispanic male - 8, Asian male - 6, Indian male - 7, white female - 8, black female - 6, Hispanic female - 7, Asian female - 7, Indian female - 6. These statistics show disparities that need to be explored.

To explore the disparity in total employment might reasonably require an analysis of disparity in each of the job categories. Here the analysis is compressed. Table 7-5 shows the pattern for administrators; 7-6 for

Table 7-5
Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Administrative Jobs in the State
Work Force with Percent in Administrative Jobs in Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	465 (16.5)	352 (25.4)	5 (25.0)	1 (7.7)	NR	NR	103 (7.7)	2 (6.9)	1 (6.3)	NR	1 (14.3)
2.	173 (7.2)	170 (8.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	3 (1.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.	87 (13.7)	42 (17.5)	3 (50.0)	1 (100.0)	NR	1 (100.0)	35 (9.3)	5 (62.5)	NR	NR	NR
4.	3 (0.6)	2 (0.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (1.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	20 (42.6)	19 (52.8)	NR	1 (100.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.	170 (11.2)	160 (16.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR	10 (1.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	147 (4.3)	90 (8.4)	NR	NR	1 (12.5)	NR	54 (2.4)	1 (6.7)	NR	1 (25.0)	NR
8.	143 (33.0)	112 (52.3)	2 (100.0)	NR	NR	NR	27 (13.4)	2 (50.0)	NR	NR	NR
9.	None										
10.	33 (32.4)	14 (38.9)	NR	NR	1 (100.0)	9 (100.0)	5 (10.4)	NR	NR	NR	4 (100.0)
11.	143 (13.4)	125 (17.9)	4 (13.8)	1 (8.3)	NR	1 (20.0)	12 (3.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR
12.	19 (20.0)	19 (27.9)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	None										
14.	126 (15.0)	83 (26.7)	6 (40.0)	NR	NR	1 (100.0)	33 (7.0)	2 (12.5)	1 (7.7)	NR	NR
15.	207 (18.8)	142 (31.7)	2 (16.7)	2 (50.0)	NR	NR	60 (9.7)	NR	1 (20.0)	NR	NR
TOTAL	1,736 (11.6)	1,330 (16.6)	22 (17.9)	6 (8.5)	2 (7.4)	12 (35.5)	343 (5.3)	12 (11.9)	3 (4.5)	1 (7.1)	5 (23.8)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	13.9	19.9	21.5	10.2	8.9	42.4	6.4	14.3	5.4	8.5	28.6
-20%	9.3	13.3	14.3	6.8	5.9	28.2	4.2	9.5	3.6	5.7	19.0
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	0	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	-
2.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
3.		0	+	+	NR	+	+	+	NR	NR	NR
4.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.		+	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.		-	NR	NR	+	NR	-	-	NR	+	NR
8.		+	+	NR	NR	NR	+	+	NR	NR	NR
10.		+	NR	NR	+	+	+	NR	NR	NR	+
11.		0	-	0	NR	-	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
12.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	+	NR	NR	+	+	0	+	NR	NR
15.		+	0	+	NR	NR	+	NR	+	NR	NR
NET SCORE		+4	-4	-5	-9	-7	-1	-8	-7	-11	-11
DISPARITY			-8	-9	-13	-11	-5	-12	-11	-15	-15
% DISPARITY			30.8	34.6	50.0	42.3	19.2	46.2	42.3	57.7	57.7

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 7-6
Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Professional Jobs in the State Work
Force with Percent in Professional Jobs in Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	772 (27.3)	501 (36.1)	9 (45.0)	9 (69.2)	4 (57.1)	2 (40.0)	240 (18.0)	2 (6.9)	3 (18.8)	1 (25.0)	1 (14.3)
2.	287 (11.9)	254 (12.1)	2 (8.7)	3 (21.4)	4 (80.0)	NR	22 (8.4)	1 (20.0)	NR	NR	NR
3.	306 (48.0)	148 (61.7)	1 (16.7)	NR	1 (100.0)	NR	152 (40.4)	3 (37.5)	1 (50.0)	NR--	NR
4.	54 (10.4)	52 (11.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 ₃ (3.2)	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	11 (23.4)	11 (30.6)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.	260 (17.2)	216 (22.5)	NR	NR	2 (100.0)	NR	41 (7.6)	NR	1 (50.0)	NR	NR
7.	515 (15.2)	187 (17.5)	2 (16.7)	1 (12.5)	3 (37.5)	1 (25.0)	314 (14.0)	4 (26.7)	1 (6.3)	2 (50.0)	NR
8.	155 (35.8)	92 (43.0)	NR	NR	2 (100.0)	NR	59 (29.2)	1 (25.0)	NR	1 (50.0)	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	25 (24.5)	13 (36.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	12 (25.0)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	203 (19.0)	119 (17.0)	7 (24.1)	3 (25.0)	NR	1 (20.0)	70 (22.4)	3 (33.3)	NR	NR	NR
12.	44 (46.3)	42 (61.8)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (7.7)	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	NONE										
14.	215 (23.6)	111 (35.7)	NR	4 (44.4)	NR	NR	94 (19.9)	NR	5 (38.5)	NR	1 (25.0)
15.	482 (43.7)	192 (42.9)	7 (58.3)	2 (50.0)	NR	NR	273 (44.1)	3 (30.0)	3 (60.0)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)
TOTAL	3,328 (22.2)	1,938 (24.2)	28 (22.8)	22 (31.0)	16 (59.3)	4 (11.8)	1,281 (19.7)	17 (16.9)	14 (20.9)	5 (35.7)	3 (14.3)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	26.6	29.0	27.4	37.2	71.2	14.2	23.6	20.3	25.1	42.8	17.2
-20%	17.8	19.4	18.2	24.8	47.4	9.4	15.8	13.5	16.7	28.6	11.4
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.		+	+	+	0	+	0	-	0	-	0
2.		-	-	-	+	NR	-	0	NR	NR	NR
3.		+	-	NR	+	NR	+	+	+	NR	NR
4.		-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.		0	NR	NR	+	NR	-	NR	+	NR	NR
7.		-	-	-	-	+	-	+	-	+	NR
8.		+	NR	NR	+	NR	+	+	NR	+	NR
10.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.		-	0	0	NR	+	0	+	NR	NR	NR
12.		+	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
14.		+	NR	+	NR	NR	0	NR	+	NR	+
15.		+	+	+	NR	NR	+	+	+	+	+
NET SCORE		+4	-8	-6	-4	-7	-2	-2	-4	-7	-8
DISPARITY			-12	-10	-8	-11	-6	-6	-8	-11	-12
% DISPARITY			46.2	38.5	30.8	42.3	23.1	23.1	30.8	42.3	46.2

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

professionals and 7-7 for service workers (two of three top job and one of three bottom job categories). (Note that, for reasons explained in the Introduction, we have shifted the basis of analysis from percent of job category to percent of ethnic group.)

The disparity calculations from the three tables are summarized in Table 7-8. The percent of disparity is generally greater for administrators (except for black, Hispanic and American Indian men and white women) than for professionals and consistently less than either for service/maintenance workers. The proportions of disparity for both administrators and professionals are fairly high--ranging from nearly 20 percent for white female administrators to nearly 60 percent for American Indian female administrators. The proportions for professionals range from 23.1 percent for white and black female professionals to 46.2 percent for black male and American Indian female professionals. But the proportions of disparity for Service/Maintenance workers range from a high of 18.2 percent for American Indian women through 9.1 percent for most other groups down to 4.5 for Asian men and Hispanic women and no disparity for white women. Allowing for the discrepancies between the administrator and professional levels, these patterns indicate the possibility but do not prove a pattern of unequal employment.

The reader seeking to pinpoint the source of unequal opportunity could review Tables 7-5 to 7-7, comparing the proportion of white men in each job category with the proportion of other minorities or women in each category for each of the functions. Only 63 (about 4 percent) of 1,736 administrators are minorities. Thus, there are very few to compare with the white men who predominate in this category. In those functions which include black male, Asian male, Indian male, black female administrators, they are usually as

Table 7-7

Comparison of Percent from Each Ethnic Group in Service/Maintenance Jobs in the State Work Force with Percent in Service/Maintenance Jobs in Function Work Forces

FUNC.	TOTAL	WM	BM	HM	AM	AIM	WF	BF	HF	AF	AIF
1.	127 (4.5)	78 (5.6)	3 (15.0)	1 (7.7)	3 (42.9)	1 (20.0)	37 (2.8)	3 (10.3)	NR	1 (25.0)	NR
2.	180 (7.5)	162 (7.7)	4 (17.4)	2 (14.3)	NR	2 (66.7)	9 (3.4)	NR	NR	NR	1 (100.0)
3.	3 (0.5)	1 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.	5 (1.0)	5 (1.1)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
5.	NONE										
6.	544 (35.9)	323 (33.6)	1 (100.0)	1 (100.0)	NR	NR	218 (40.1)	NR	1 (50.0)	NR	NR
7.	674 (19.9)	244 (22.9)	4 (33.3)	1 (12.5)	2 (25.0)	1 (25.0)	412 (18.4)	2 (13.1)	8 (50.0)	NR	NR
8.	2 (0.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	1 (0.5)	NR	1 (14.3)	NR	NR
9.	NONE										
10.	24 (23.5)	7 (19.4)	1 (100.0)	NR	NR	NR	16 (33.3)	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	66 (6.2)	35 (5.0)	2 (6.9)	NR	1 (100.0)	NR	27 (8.7)	NR	NR	1 (100.0)	NR
12.	NONE										
13.	NONE										
14.	3 (0.4)	NR	1 (6.7)	NR	NR	NR	2 (0.4)	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.	67 (6.1)	36 (8.0)	2 (16.7)	NR	NR	1 (50.0)	28 (4.5)	NR	NR	NR	NR
TOTAL	1,695 (11.3)	891 (11.1)	18 (14.6)	5 (7.0)	6 (22.2)	5 (14.7)	752 (11.5)	5 (5.0)	10 (14.9)	2 (14.3)	1 (4.8)
WORK FORCE RANGE											
+20%	13.6	13.3	17.5	8.4	26.6	17.6	13.8	6.0	17.9	17.2	5.8
-20%	9.0	8.9	11.7	5.6	17.8	11.8	9.2	4.0	11.9	11.4	3.8
COMPARISON OF FUNCTION TO STATE											
1.	-	0	0	+	+	-	+	NR	+	NR	NR
2.	-	0	+	NR	+	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	+
3.	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
6.	+	+	+	NR	NR	+	NR	+	NR	NR	NR
7.	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	NR	NR
8.	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	0	NR	NR
10.	+	+	NR	NR	NR	NR	+	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	-	-	NR	+	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	+	NR
14.	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
15.	-	0	NR	NR	NR	+	-	NR	NR	NR	NR
NET SCORE		-5	-2	-4	-6	-3	-5	-7	-6	-7	-9
DISPARITY			+3	+1	-1	+2	0	-2	-1	-2	-4
% DISPARITY			13.6	4.5	4.5	9.1	0	9.1	4.5	9.1	18.2

SOURCE: Calculations by CSRO based on EEO-4 data supplied by the State. The numbers in parentheses are the proportions of workers in the ethnic group in the particular job category.

Table 7-8

Percent Disparity Compared

	MALE					FEMALE				
	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. or Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hisp.	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. or Al. Nat.	
Administrative	30.8	34.6	50.0	42.3	19.2	46.2	42.3	57.7	57.7	
Professional	46.2	38.5	30.8	42.3	23.1	23.1	30.8	42.3	46.2	
Service	13.6	4.5	4.5	9.1	0	9.1	4.5	9.1	18.2	

Source: Tables 7-5, 7-6 and 7-7 in this report

great or greater a proportion of their ethnic group as white men (allowing a 20 percent variation). In 13 functions which had administrators, four had no minority administrators. In two of the 13 functions there were no white female administrators. In general, white female administrators were a lesser proportion of their ethnic group than were their white male counterparts, usually significantly less.

In four of the 13 functions which had professionals, there were no minority professionals, in one there were no women. When minorities were represented, black males, Hispanic males, Asian males and Indian males were as great or greater a proportion of their ethnic group than were white men. This was not true for white women who in only two of the 12 functions in which they were represented were a greater proportion (then only by a few percentage points, always less than 20 percent different) of their ethnic/sex group than were white men of theirs. Nor was it true for the groups of minority women.

Minorities and white women in service/maintenance jobs were consistently a larger proportion of their ethnic/sex group than were white men in each functional category (with a few minor exceptions) in which they were represented (although allowance must be made for the effect of low numbers). Minorities were unrepresented in two of 11 functions in which there were service/maintenance workers, white women were unrepresented in one function.

A remarkably large number and proportion of administrators in Nebraska earn less than \$15,999 including some who are reported to earn less than \$3,900 per year. The proportion of administrators who earn less than \$15,999 who are white male is larger than the proportions of administrators who are from minority groups or white women and earn less than \$15,999.

Approximately 14 percent of the State work force were newly hired in 1980. The proportions of new hires who were black male, Asian or Pacific

Islander male, white female, black female, Hispanic female and Indian female were larger than their proportions in the work force, indicating there had been some increase during the year. Only seven of 85 new hires in the administrators category were minority persons, a further 17 were white women. The proportions of newly hired administrators as a fraction of their ethnic group were smaller than the comparable proportions for the work force for American Indian or Alaskan Native men, white women. But it should be noted the proportion of white men in this category also was smaller. Of 360 professionals hired, only 21 were minorities, and a further 174 were white women. Again, while the proportions of minority new hires who were professionals was for most groups smaller than for the work force, the proportion of new hires who were white males was also smaller than for the work force. Only four minority technicians were hired, out of 100. A further 59 of the newly hired technicians were white women. Of 108 protective service new hires only four were minorities; 14 were white women. Of 519 para-professional new hires, 14 were minorities, 298 were white women. In these categories minorities were a smaller proportion of new hires than of the work force. In skilled craft and service maintenance jobs minorities and women were a greater share of new hires than of the work force.¹²

Table 7-9 compares the affirmative action plans for 14 Nebraska State agencies with more than 100 employees to standards developed by the Advisory Committee. These were 1980 plans; amended plans were filed July 1, 1981 but not submitted to the Advisory Committee. In 1978 the Advisory Committee reviewed six agencies: The departments of education, welfare and health; the job service section of the department of labor; the commission on law enforcement and criminal justice; and, the insurance commission. The Committee then found only one agency had even begun to compare its work force

Table 7-9

SUMMARY OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
I. IMPLEMENTATION														
A. Chief Executive of agency responsible														
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.														
1	4	4	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	3	3	1	
B. An affirmative action officer is appointed and duties specified.														
4. Yes.														
3. Appointed but duties not specified.														
2. Post planned.														
1. No affirmative action officer appointed.														
4	4	4	4	4	4	1	4	4	3	4	4	4	3	
C. Dissemination of affirmative action plan.														
4. Wide internal and external.														
3. Some internal and external.														
2. Wide internal and external planned.														
1. Less.														
1	1	4	4	1	4	1	1	1	4	4	3	4	4	
II. WORK FORCE ANALYSIS														
A. Determine available labor force by job category, race, sex, salary.														
4. Determined by all categories.														
3. Determined by job category, race, sex.														
2. Plan to determine by all categories.														
1. Less data.														
1	4	3	4	3	1	3	1	3	1	1	3	3	3	
B. Work force analysis includes race, sex, salary.														
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.														
3	4	3	4	3	1	3	3	3	1	4	3	4	4	

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
C. Work force analysis includes age or handicap. 4. Age and handicap. 3. Age or handicap. 2. Plan discusses age and handicap but analysis not yet implemented. 1. Less.	4	4	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	1	1	4	1	4
D. Determine underutilization by race and sex, age and handicap. 4. Underutilization determined for all four categories by job category and salary level. 3. Underutilization determined for race, sex and job category. 2. Underutilization determination by all four categories by job category. 1. Less.	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	3	3
E. Set long term goals. 4. Set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set long term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set long term goals by race, sex, age, handicap but not yet implemented. 1. No long term goals planned.	2	1	3	3	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	3	3	1
F. Set short term goals. 4. Set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 3. Set short term goals by race, sex only. 2. Plan to set short term goals by race, sex, age, handicap. 1. No short term goals.	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	3	1
III. RECRUITMENT														
A. Identify and maintain contact with minority/women's organizations, which could assist in recruitment. 4. State they have a contact list and show that they maintain regular contact. 3. State they have a contact list but do not show or assert regular contact. 2. Plan to maintain regular contact and state they will develop complete contact list. 1. Less, including assertions of contact but no list.	1	1	4	4	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	4

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
<p>B. Make sure contacts above are notified of all vacancies.</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	4	4	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	4	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>	1	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
<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.</p>	1	1	4	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	4	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	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	4

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
<p>B. Ensure 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	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	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>	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	2
<p>D. Review application questionnaire to ensure 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	4	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	2	1
<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	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	4	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	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
V. PROMOTION														
A. Review and analyze job descriptions to ensure that there are no unreasonable job specifications. 4. Knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements are stated to be minimum. 3. Validation in process. 2. Validation planned. 1. No validation of KSAs planned.	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	4	2	1
B. Career ladder established. 4. Many ladders exist or planned. 3. Agency considering planning career ladders but non in actual operation. 2. Agency mentions planning career ladders. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
C. Ensure employees are aware of career ladder opportunities, the requirements for other jobs are known and procedures for using career ladders are publicized. 4. Fully done. 3. Partially done. 2. Planned for implementation within five years. 1. Less, or no timeframe for completion within five years.	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1
D. Identify resources and procedures for upward mobility and disseminate this information. 4. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling. 3. Posting or other formal announcement only. 2. Full dissemination and publication and personnel counseling planned but not yet implemented. 1. Vague commitments to upward mobility.	1	1	1	3	3	4	1	2	1	2	4	1	2	1
E. Develop and maintain a listing of the skills of all employees to be used for encouraging application for promotion. 4. Done. 3. Mentioned. 2. Planned. 1. Not mentioned.	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
F. Providing training opportunities both on the job and classroom. 4. Training for advancement and reasonable accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 3. Improved skills training, no special accommodation of work schedule to training needs. 2. Plan to provide training and accommodation. 1. Less.	2	1	3	4	1	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	2	1
VI. CONDITIONS OF WORK														
A. Childbirth covered by medical leave policies and provision of limited leave of absence without pay. 4. All provided. 3. No extra leave. 2. Plan to provide full maternity benefits. 1. Less.	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
B. Flexible hours provided. 4. Established for all positions. 3. Considered/planned. 2. Mentioned. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
C. Part-time work available. 4. Stated available. 3. Availability limited. 2. Planned but not yet implemented. 1. Not mentioned.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1
D. Facilities accessible by public transportation. 4. Stated accessible. 3. Mentioned. 2. Plan for future facilities. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
E. Facilities accessible to handicapped. 4. Completely accessible. 3. Planning underway to make completely accessible, some areas accessible. 2. Plan complete accessibility but plans not yet developed. 1. Less.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
VII. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES.														
A. Formalized procedures for personnel grievances with both in-house remedies and appeal outside. 4. Formal procedure includes external appeal. 3. Formal procedure but not structured external appeal. 2. Formal procedure planned to include appeal but not yet implemented. 1. No formal structure.	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1
B. Formal discrimination complaint processing established in addition to personnel grievance procedures. 4. Full equal opportunity complaint processing leads to State human rights agency. 3. Equal opportunity complaint processing ends at agency level. 2. Plan internal mechanism. 1. No internal mechanism.	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	1	1
C. Affirmative action officer available to counsel employees on complaints about discrimination. 4. Full-time counselor. 3. Part-time counselor. 2. Plan full-time counselor but not yet implemented. 1. None.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
VIII. LAYOFFS, DISCHARGE, DEMOTIONS														
A. Exit interviews to determine discrimination is not forcing employees out.														
4. Yes.	4	1	4	4	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	4	4	1
2. Planned but not yet implemented.														
1. No.														
IX. EVALUATION														
A. Annual update work force utilization analysis.														
4. Annual update implemented and analysis of change over the preceding 12 months.	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	4	1	1	2	1	1
3. Annual update implemented but no analysis of change.														
2. Plan annual update and analysis--not yet implemented.														
1. Less.														
B. Annually review success in meeting goals and timetables.														
4. Annual review indicates or promises to review degree of success and corrective measures if needed, including revised one year goals.	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
3. Notes changes but does not indicate action.														
2. Plan annual review of degree of success and corrective measures including one year goals but not yet implemented.														
1. No action.														
C. Applicant flow data analyzed to determine obstacles to affirmative action.														
4. Applicant flow data shows reasons for non-hire.	1	1	4	4	1	2	1	1	1	3	4	3	1	1
3. No reasons for non-hire maintained.														
2. Plans applicant flow with reasons for non-hire.														
1. No applicant flow data.														
D. Review interview practices and procedures.														
4. Plan shows implementation of <u>systematic</u> review of practices and procedures.														
3. Shows reviews of practices and procedures but not systematic.	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
2. Plans implementation of systematic review but not yet done.														
1. Less														

Table 7-9 (Cont'd)

	Administration	Agriculture	Corrections	Education	Games & Parks	Health	Labor	Military	Motor Vehicles	Public Institutions	Public Welfare	Revenue	Roads	State Patrol
<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	3	1	1	3	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3
<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 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>	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
<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>	4	3	4	2	1	4	1	3	1	2	3	3	3	3
<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>	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3

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

to the available labor force, set goals and timetables. Only two agencies had made even rudimentary efforts to improve career ladder opportunities.

Although four agencies had some sort of recruitment effort, these were for the most part fragmentary. Only the department of education had anything approaching an effective evaluation system, although the job service and crime commission had begun to develop a system that would allow evaluation. Responsibility for implementation had been assigned usually to personnel officers.¹³ There was no statewide affirmative action effort.¹⁴

Of the 14 plans reviewed in Table 7-9, nine indicate that labor force availability has been obtained, 12 indicate that they have determined the racial and sex composition of their work forces. Several, however, did not bother to make this determination for each principal subunit (the exceptions are noted in Table 7-10). Seven plans stated that a determination of the extent of underutilization either had been or would be made, but only six set long term goals although two others planned to do so. Three agency plans stated they had set short term goals, two others planned to do so.¹⁵

Few agencies had concrete plans or had implemented plans to improve equal opportunity in State government. Recruitment efforts were implemented by less than half of the State agencies (although many had plans for recruitment). Affirmative efforts to ensure promotion were outlined by few agencies. Only one agency had established career ladders and none had lists of employee skills to be utilized in encouraging career mobility (although three planned to do so).

Few of the agencies had developed or even planned to develop nondiscriminatory selection procedures.

While five agencies had established exit interview procedures, few had other plans to ensure that work place practices were not discriminatory.

Table 7--10
Summary Comments in the Affirmative Action Plans
of State Agencies That Employ 100 or More Persons

NEBRASKA

Department of Administrative Services - The plan is dated July 1, 1980. The plan contains a departmentwide utilization analysis and comparison to the Lincoln area labor force (but not the State labor force which would be the appropriate one). Although it would appear that there is underutilization, no analysis is done and there is no determination of the extent of the problem. There are no numeric goals and timetables. The action elements are vague and unlikely to alter Department personnel practices or composition. There is only minimal evaluation. The quarterly progress report is not a report of progress and problems but simply a list of accomplishments. The plan has been approved by the State affirmative action office.

Department of Agriculture - The plan is dated November 19, 1980. The plan contains a departmentwide utilization analysis, comparison of utilization to the State labor force and indicates underutilized groups by job category. Although severe underutilization is identified, no numeric goals and timetables are set. The action elements, while covering the range of possible activities, are entirely lacking in specific commitment. There are no evaluative mechanisms and it is unlikely that full implementation of the plan would have any effect on the department's personnel practices or composition. The plan was approved by the State affirmative action office.

Department of Correctional Services - The plan is dated June 19, 1980. The plan contains a unit by unit utilization analysis, comparison to the available labor force and numeric goals and timetables. Unlike most State agencies it states that compliance with these will be part of supervisors' evaluations. The plan is reasonably complete except on providing upward mobility and working conditions. The provisions for evaluation could be strengthened. Unlike most plans, there is provision for ascertaining the reasons for underutilization--although this had not been implemented when the plan was written.

Department of Education - The plan is dated January 1978 and updated February 10, 1978. The plan contains unit by unit utilization statistics and compares total agency utilization to the available labor force. Although some goals and a timetable are suggested--these are vague. There are few action items other than those implemented prior to the publication of the plan. By and large the action elements do not seem likely to promote greater affirmative action or ensure an effective monitoring strategy--although they contain elements of both and thus are rated as satisfying the plan criteria.

Department of Game and Parks Commission - The plan is dated July 1, 1980. There is no detailed utilization analysis nor are goals and timetables developed. Male and female minorities were not separately analyzed. The implementation elements are, with some exceptions, too general to have an impact on the system and many significant elements are omitted.

Department of Health - The plan is dated November 8, 1978. Although the plan is two years old, no evaluation of its success is reported. There is no utilization analysis, no comparison of utilization to the available labor force and no numeric goals and timetables. The principal elements for

affirmative action are included but many are phrased so broadly that evaluation would be difficult. This is one of the few State departments that does plan to hold its supervisors accountable for implementation--although given the above this might be difficult.

Department of Labor - The plan is dated July 10, 1980. The plan contains a departmentwide utilization analysis and comparison to the available labor force that shows no significant underutilization. No unit analysis is reported. Although the action elements cover many significant aspects of affirmative action, the proposed activities are often either insufficient to give prospect of effect or are vague. The data gathered should be sufficient for effective evaluation. Many key elements depend on actions by other State agencies. The plan also contains an ill-chosen phrase which reflects negatively on the agency's affirmative action efforts. The agency justifies the concentration of women in its clerical positions by saying "...we believe the nature of our work requires a higher percentage of clerical types." The statement indicates women are "clerical types" which is a stereotypical assessment of women's abilities and aptitudes. The sentence should be eliminated from the text.

Department of Law Enforcement and Public Safety - The plan, dated July 1, 1980, includes labor force data but no goals and timetables are specified, except for white females in a letter addendum. Underutilization is noted but the extent is unspecified. Efforts to reduce underutilization are mentioned but not in sufficient detail. The recruitment process is described in detail but though applicant flow analysis appears to show few minority or female applicants and disproportionate rejection or withdrawal during the selection process, no remedies are proposed.

Military Department - The plan, dated July 1, 1980, contains a departmentwide utilization analysis, comparison to the area labor force and identification of areas of underutilization by race and sex. However no numeric goals and timetables are established. The action elements of the plan cover many of the appropriate topics but are phrased so broadly that evaluation, if it were included in the plan, would be impossible.

Department of Motor Vehicles - The plan is dated October 1, 1980. There is a detailed utilization analysis, division by division, and long term goals are set. However there is little indication that the activities planned are likely to make possible implementation of the goals. Some action elements are alluded to, but there are few specific proposals. In other cases there are specific activities that do not focus on discrimination. There is no indication of a monitoring strategy which would allow performance evaluation.

Department of Public Institutions - The plan is dated June 16, 1980. The plan refers to numeric goals and timetables, unit utilization analyses and comparison to the available labor force but this information is not included in the plan. Recruitment, upward mobility and evaluation action elements are reasonably well specified but the items are not. The plan states there is underutilization of both minorities and women. This is one of the few department plans that will make supervisors accountable for their affirmative action accomplishments. Sexual harassment is defined and prohibited in an August 28, 1980 attachment.

Department of Revenue - The plan is dated July 1, 1980. The plan includes short-term goals and long term goals and a utilization analysis. Short-term goals include hiring of additional minority and female candidates by specific units in upper levels, although, departmentwide, the report shows no

underutilization. The plan provides for collection of data and evaluation, albeit the details on how this data will be collected and evaluated are not specified. The main action elements for successful affirmative action are mentioned but details on their implementation are unspecified.

Department of Roads - The plan is dated March 1, 1980. The plan contains a set of numeric goals and a five year timetable based on the available labor force and departmentwide utilization. The bases for the goals are not fully specified. The planned recruitment efforts are reasonably well specified but other action elements are not. An evaluation component is provided but this does not include applicant flow data. The plan is approved by the State affirmative action office.

Department of Welfare - The plan is dated June 27, 1980. The plan contains data on utilization of minorities and women departmentwide and compares the aggregate of minority and female workers to the State labor force. There is no detailed comparison. The action elements are stated in broad generalities too vague to allow effective evaluation. The data to be used in evaluation seem unlikely to allow effective assessment of what has happened.

While five agencies kept detailed applicant flow information, only one updated its work force utilization annually and reviewed success in reaching goals and timetables. Three agencies included affirmative action efforts in supervisory evaluations (two others planned to do so) and six others expected such efforts but did not include them in evaluations, although Neb. Rev. Stat. sec. 81-1367 (1979) required that evaluations of affirmative action efforts be a part of all supervisors' appraisals.

In eight plans overall responsibility was accepted by the agency chief executive and in 13 an affirmative action officer was appointed. Only eight agencies had disseminated their plan both within the agency and outside.

In Table 7-10 the Advisory Committee presents some narrative comments on the key elements of the affirmative action plans. For the most part, this indicates the Advisory Committee's view that the action elements are stated so broadly that evaluation, even if plans had been implemented, would be difficult. It seemed unlikely that most agencies could know whether they had successfully implemented their plans because there was little detailed action proposed.¹⁶

In July 1980 the State affirmative action office issued a compilation of materials on affirmative action which specify how State agencies are to develop an affirmative action plan and how they are to implement the programs required by LB 500. This includes an outline of the format and contents expected in each affirmative action plan, specific suggestions on recruitment/hiring efforts, how to utilize the State personnel recruitment procedures, training and training opportunities, lists of protected group organizations, minority businesses in Nebraska and resource materials on affirmative action.¹⁷ Each element of the plan outline contains a draft section or instructions for preparing one and an explanation of what needs to be included.

The plan outline calls for a comparison of the agency work force to the area labor force, by job category. While for smaller agencies this might be effective, for agencies with more than 100 workers this is unlikely to be effective in identifying problems that might be the result of misclassifications, salary structure problems, or particular to one major subunit of the agency. At the very minimum, there should be a review by salary. The advice on comparative analysis includes no information about how to determine underutilization, when to use which labor force estimates, or how to assess the problems that the raw data suggest.¹⁸

The plan outline on goals and timetables provides a clear indication of how to identify and state action elements of an affirmative action plan.

The section of the guidelines on evaluation does not provide for a comprehensive evaluation strategy. While it does prescribe recordkeeping formats it does not explain what is to be done with these records or prescribe a system for measuring what has happened in each category of activity for which the records are maintained. The listing provided in the plan is unlikely to meet this need. These belong in the section on issues that should be reviewed as possible action elements in the planning process.

The section on recruitment describes the existing process. It does not amplify the very brief discussion of appropriate alterations in the recruitment process contained in the evaluation section. The significant substantive material is a list of inappropriate and appropriate interview questions.¹⁹

The requirements for affirmative action planning had been in effect for only one year when the State submitted its information to the Advisory Committee. There was no State analysis of agency efforts. While a quarterly report was provided that had been prepared by the State affirmative action

office, this did not provide detailed comparative data which would enable the State affirmative action officer to determine what progress had been made toward implementing those numeric goals that existed and provided no analysis of implementation of action elements of agency plans.

The State affirmative action office reported the following activities to promote affirmative action during the year since it was established:

The Affirmative Action Office then worked, on an individual basis, with each agency to provide any additional assistance and explanation necessary in writing their plan. One part of writing the plan that perhaps differs from the general concept of A/A plan writing was a request that the agency review how they handle every personnel action listed in LB 500. The reason was to have agencies adopt more uniform approaches to personnel decisions if they did not have them, and/or to make all personnel actions discrimination-free.

As required by LB 500, the State Affirmative Action Office has designed a quarterly reporting system. This is explained in the "Guidelines," Section IV, Subsection "I." October 1, 1980, was the first due date and all Code agencies and seven voluntary agencies submitted written First Quarter reports. The quarterly statistical evaluation is done in the State Affirmative Action Office by a Summary Staffing Report which gives the necessary protected group breakdown.

Aside from continuing to monitor agencies' plans, the State A/A Office has initiated an extensive training program for directors, affirmative action officers, managers and supervisors. This training includes a basic overview of the applicable laws, a formula to help one decide if their personnel action is legal, and 16 modules training the participant to identify discriminatory situations, what law applies, what group(s) are affected, and how to resolve the matter. We feel training at all levels is vital in making affirmative action succeed. Great emphasis will be given to training in 1981. The year will start with an "Affirmative Action Conference for State Agency A/A Officers" in January. A consultant/attorney specializing in equal employment and affirmative action from New York will conduct this 2-day seminar. We will also begin training within the agencies in January. Our training package is very flexible and each agency will have a tailored program to meet their needs and incorporate in-house affirmative action policies and plans. With cooperation from the University of Nebraska - Lincoln Affirmative Action Office we were able to purchase this basic training program and will be sharing the materials with them.

In addition, the State Affirmative Action Office has started a Resource Center within the office to assist agencies and State employees in affirmative action matters. The section in the "Guidelines" on the resource materials available and to be available will give you an idea of

the materials to be included. We are also compiling lists, in the Resource Center, of materials available in other State agencies (and the private sector) which may be borrowed, thus cutting down on needless duplication of materials and allowing for different types of materials to be purchased by our office.

In October, the State Affirmative Action Office sponsored an "Affirmative Action Week for State Employees" to focus attention on the affirmative action program in Nebraska. Governor Charles Thone signed a proclamation encouraging employees to reinforce their commitment toward equality. A flyer sent to all State employees ...[will] give you an idea of the activities held during this most successful week. Even though affirmative action is not just a one-week-out-of-the-year proposition, we plan to have an annual A/A Week to continue to emphasize affirmative action in State government.

Our office has also started a program of contacting, visiting, and communicating with relevant community groups and participating in various activities. In 1981 we plan to expand our recruitment and community efforts. We have met with tremendous cooperation, both within State government and in the community, and feel our new program is off to a solid, positive start. ...

In addition to the ongoing programs of the State Affirmative Action Office and various advocacy agencies in State government, there have been several special programs from the Governor's Office. In March 1979 there was a "Governor's Conference on Affirmative Action" and in 1980, in cooperation with the Governor's Special Grants office, a seminar on Minority Businesses was held. A division of the Governor's Special Grants office also compiled and printed a directory of minority-owned businesses in Nebraska.²⁰

A State affirmative action Advisory Committee was established and held three meetings during 1981.²¹

c. Administering Agency: Affirmative Action Office

The following description of the powers and duties of the State Affirmative Action Office was provided by its director:

The State Affirmative Action Office became operative January 2, 1980. The enabling legislation guarantees that the office "shall be provided with sufficient staff and budget support to carry out the duties of the office." We decided that the staff, at that time, would consist of an administrator, assistant administrator and an affirmative action specialist, with support staff in the State Personnel Department....

In April 1980 [we decided that]...we didn't need an assistant administrator and this position was eliminated....[But we did add] a secretary II because of the professionalism, knowledge and duties required of that person. [We now have separate office space.]

The first year budget was higher than the second year to allow for the establishment of a new office, e.g., furniture, equipment and initial supplies. The budget was adequate. We also applied for and received a \$5,000 grant to begin an ongoing training program.

This year the budget for everyone has been reduced 3 percent. We feel we still have adequate funds.

To augment our budget we make use of other agencies' materials (e.g., books, films) and resources (personnel - affirmative action officers, trainers). We utilize the talents of our Affirmative Action Advisory Committee. We work with outside sources, such as the Nebraska Library Commission, organizations and private citizens (attorneys, for example) for volunteer assistance and additional materials.

By law we are a division of the State Department of Personnel. The administrator of the Affirmative Action Office is selected by and is under the administrative control of the Personnel director. [The duties of this office are listed in the statute and were summarized earlier in this report.]

The office statutorily reports quarterly to the State Affirmative Action Advisory Committee and to the Governor. Annual reports are made to the Governor and to the Legislature.

We have direct access to the Governor and to his staff and frequently are in contact with them.²²

Chapter 7 Notes

1. Nebraska Advisory Committee, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America (June 1978).

2. See 5 C.F.R. 900.607-1.

3. Neb. Rev. Stat. secs. 81-1355 to 1368(1979).

4. Neb. Rev. Stat. sec. 81-1355(1979).

5. Ibid., sec. 1360.

6. Ibid., sec. 1368.

7. Ibid., sec. 1367.

8. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, letter to staff, Dec. 31, 1980.

9. Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981.

10. Carol Walker, letter to staff, Dec. 31, 1980.

11. Ibid.

12. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

The paragraph is an example of some significant gains that have been minimized by either using the word only or just stating a figure without making it relevant by comparing it to State labor force, work force, and/or availability.

Examples:

Administrators - 7 minorities is 8.2% of administrative new hires.

Professionals - 21 minorities is 5.8% of total professionals hired.

- 174 women is 48.3%.

Technicians - 59 women is 59%.

Protective Service - 4 minorities is 3.7%.

- 14 white women is 13%.

(Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981.)

The Advisory Committee notes the commendable effort of the State to hire additional minorities and women. But the extent of the success is not as great as suggested in the comment. Looking simply at the new hires data, the

proportion of black male new hires was only a little above the proportion of white male new hires and the proportion of white female new hires was actually lower than the proportion of white male new hires in this category.

Similarly, in the technicians category, the proportion of white female new hires was only 1.2 percentage points above that of white males. In the protective service category, the proportion of minority new hires (except for American Indian/Alaskan Natives) is actually considerably lower than the proportion of white male new hires. In short, despite the efforts of the State, and considering the existing distribution of workers, the State's new hire efforts have not altered the imbalance in the distribution of people from the various ethnic groups by new hires. Indeed, in the protective service category, only the employment of new Hispanic workers and American Indian/Alaskan Native workers increases utilization of minority/female workers in that category over existing levels. (See Appendix charts for the raw data.)

13. Nebraska Advisory Committee, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America (June 1978), pp.98-107.

14. Ibid.

15. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented that some of the criteria had been satisfied by the agencies, although they had not indicated that in their written submission to the Advisory Committee. She stated that had the Advisory Committee indicated their criteria in advance, the agencies could have given evidence of their compliance. (Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981) See Ms. Walker's comments in Chapter 3.

16. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

It may be helpful in this analysis to keep in mind that only six (6) months had transpired (January 1, 1980 to July 1, 1980) when these first plans, now being analyzed, were required to be filed.

Also, the State Affirmative Action Office has adopted a policy of allowing agencies to amend their plans at the quarterly reporting times and to annually update (or re-write) their entire plans on July 1 of each year. To date all plans being reviewed herein have been through five (5) quarterly reporting periods (where changes were made in some) plus the July 1, 1981 annual update (where some submitted entirely new plans). We find this approach allows agencies' plans to "grow" as those involved become more knowledgeable in the field and/or new areas of concern are identified and previous goals are met. (Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981.)

17. State of Nebraska, Office of Affirmative Action, Guidelines for Affirmative Action (July 1980).

18. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

Each year, the State conducts a salary survey of Lincoln, Omaha and the bordering State governments to keep abreast of pay rates for workers doing jobs comparable to those in our own State government. This information is summarized and sent to the Governor and the Legislature's Appropriations Committee for consideration. Historically, the role of the Department of Personnel has been to assure consistency in overall market relationship policy (high-low-average) after the Governor and the Legislature have set the policy.

Generally, this survey confirms that the Nebraska labor market is reflective of national pay relationships. While generally, all wages are somewhat lower than national averages, the male-dominated job categories were also paid more than female-dominated job categories.

On July 1, 1981, the Department of Personnel implemented a new pay plan for its 1,000 classifications of jobs. Each class was separately evaluated, primarily on its relationship with other classes, and secondarily on labor market rate relationships. Through this process, female dominated jobs in the clerical category received rather large increases. In part this was due to the re-evaluation of the worth of these jobs compared to other jobs, an evaluation which our labor market has also been moving toward. However, we shouldn't overstate the "comparable worth" argument. Other classes generally had received some salary grade adjustments in past years, and clerical classes hadn't, so it was time for them to catch up. The reason they had not received any salary grade adjustments prior to the new pay plan was the cost factor and labor supply factor. While we were experiencing a shortage in some clerical areas, it was not severe. And to raise the salary grades of clerical classes would have been very costly, due to the large numbers of job incumbents in those classes. The July 1 pay plan allowed us to

correct some of the internal relationships which may have been upset earlier.

Nebraska State government, like nearly everyone else, faces a comparable worth dilemma. If we recognize some jobs as being undervalued, they then should be paid more. But if we pay them more to correct this situation, we exaggerate the rates the labor market says we have to pay to attract applicants, and both our labor market competitors and the taxpayers become upset. This would seem to be a circular argument with no just solution.

Our evaluation guidelines section is not meant to be an evaluation system. It merely is there to call to the affirmative action officers' attention areas of concern. This is to generate ideas, programs and/or systems to expand their affirmative action programs. "Evaluation" is used in the broad sense of the terms. The Checklist at the front of that Section is an outline of what should be in their plans. These Guidelines, again, are general in nature and specifics were established, and continue to be worked on, agency by agency. (Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981)

19. Carol Walker, Administrator, Affirmative Action Office, State of Nebraska, commented:

This section is currently being revised. Our office also now has a separate training session on recruitment and interviewing.

Keep in mind that many State agencies in Nebraska have their own personnel departments. Not all openings are processed through State Personnel or the Merit System. Furthermore, a number of State employees are not under either of these personnel systems. We felt it was necessary to have a starting point of discussion with an agency; hence, the section in the Guidelines describing the existing procedures used in State Personnel and Merit System.

The recruitment items referred to in the Evaluation section were to be used to generate ideas for use of the lists our office provides for recruitment sources, etc. ... (Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981)

20. Carol Walker, letter to staff, Dec. 31, 1980.
 21. Carol Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 13, 1981.
 22. Carol J. Walker, letter to staff, Nov. 23, 1981.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following findings and recommendations are submitted under the provisions of Section 703.1(e) of the Commission's regulations, empowering the Advisory Committees to "Initiate and forward advice and recommendations to the Commission upon matters which the State Committees have studied."

The Advisory Committees present the findings and recommendations for consideration by the Commission in its national program planning and for its consideration in advising the President and Congress on matters within its jurisdiction.

STATEWIDE ISSUES AFFECTING ALL FOUR STATES

Finding 1: The Advisory Committees found that there was a wide variation in the quality of State leadership in the development of State agency affirmative action plans.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committees urges the States of Iowa, Missouri and Nebraska consider using materials prepared by the Kansas Department of Administration for agency technical assistance in the preparation of affirmative action plans.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committees found that there was a wide variation in the quality of reviews provided by State compliance agencies in the evaluation of State agency affirmative action plans.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committees urge the States to ensure that their units responsible for reviews of agency plans have the resources to fully evaluate their State agencies' plans.

Finding 3: The Advisory Committees commend all four governors for their success to date in appointing minorities and women to "top jobs."

Recommendation 3: The governors should continue their efforts to appoint minorities, women, older persons, the handicapped to "top jobs."

AGENCY LEVEL ISSUES AFFECTING ALL FOUR STATES

Finding 1: The four Advisory Committees note that self-evaluation is generally the weakest element of the agency affirmative action plans reviewed for this study and that evaluation procedures vary widely, even within States.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committees urge agencies in the four States work together to develop a common evaluation strategy which could be utilized in all four States. In addition, agencies with basically similar functions and personnel problems might work together to provide common evaluation devices particularly suited to their common needs.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committees noted that there was wide variation in the development and implementation of goals and timetables to remedy underutilization.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committees urge that all State agency affirmative action plans include goals and timetables to correct identified underutilization and that these should be sufficiently detailed to allow evaluation at regular intervals. Such goals and timetables should have appended data indicating that they constitute reasonable efforts and statistical evidence to show the basis on which they have been set.

Finding 3: Work force analyses in many agency plans produced by larger agencies do not examine utilization by major divisions or units. In consequence, the four Advisory Committees believe that divergence in subunit achievement of affirmative action goals cannot be properly identified and remedial action at the agency level may be either overkill or insufficient.

Recommendation 3: The Advisory Committees urge that all State agencies which include subunits of 20 or more persons analyze utilization and develop goals and timetables for each such subunit and that other portions of the agency be lumped together to form a subunit or subunits of 20 or more persons for analytical purposes.

INDIVIDUAL STATE ISSUESIowa

Finding 1: The Iowa Advisory Committee notes that although new administrators were hired during 1980 none were minority persons and that in consequence of this and the disparity in new hires of white male and white female administrators the disparity in utilization of minority and female administrators continues.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committee urges State agencies to make a greater effort to hire or promote minorities and women to administrative jobs and urges the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to take a close look at efforts to recruit and select for such positions by State agencies.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committee notes that fewer agencies than would be expected had adequate recruitment and selection strategies to ensure equal opportunity.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committee urges the Iowa Civil Rights Commission to review the recruitment and selection process used by State government to ensure that it does promote affirmative action efforts.

Finding 3: The Advisory Committee notes that only seven of 18 agency plans indicate maintenance of applicant flow data. The Advisory Committee does not believe that recruitment and selection procedures can be properly monitored without this data.

Recommendation 3: The Advisory Committee urges all State agencies with more than 50 new hires each year maintain adequate applicant flow data and develop procedures to evaluate that data.

Finding 4: The Advisory Committee notes that the Iowa Civil Rights Commission has stated it is unable to adequately monitor State affirmative action efforts because it lacks sufficient resources for this function.

Recommendation 4: The Advisory Committee urges the resources available to the Iowa Civil Rights Commission be increased so that it can properly perform its job in evaluating State government efforts.

Kansas

Finding 1: The Kansas Advisory Committee commends the Governor and the Department of Administration for the comprehensive affirmative action planning guidelines they have developed.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committee recommends that the Governor and Department of Administration publicize their successful affirmative action efforts as an example to all employers in the State.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committee notes that despite current State efforts, the number and proportion of minority and female administrators is relatively low.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committee urges the Department of Administration to consider whether additional affirmative action guidelines are needed to correct this disparity or whether current efforts will remedy the problem without further action.

Missouri

Finding 1: The Missouri Advisory Committee found that there was virtually no State review of agency affirmative action efforts, although there is a State affirmative action officer.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committee urges the State affirmative action officer to develop an effective strategy to monitor agency affirmative action efforts and publicize successes and criticize failures.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committee notes the relatively high utilization of minority and female administrators, despite the absence of adequate affirmative action strategies.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committee urges the State affirmative action officer to review whether, given the apparent statistical success with no effort, further efforts would produce a larger pool of applicants, highly qualified, minority or female, for administrator jobs in State government.

Finding 3: The Advisory Committee finds that the affirmative action plans of most of the agencies it reviewed were inadequate and often out-of-date.

Recommendation 3: The Advisory Committee urges the plans of all State agencies be reviewed and reworked where necessary to conform with existing executive orders.

Nebraska

Finding 1: The Nebraska Advisory Committee commends Governor Charles Thone and the legislature for taking prompt action to remedy the deficiencies in affirmative action efforts reported in the Committee's 1978 report. While a year is too short a time to review implementation of LB 500, the Advisory Committee believes some improvements on that record is possible.

Recommendation 1: The Advisory Committee urges the utilization of a comprehensive review strategy in monitoring State agency efforts to comply with the provisions of LB 500, whether those efforts are voluntary or required by law.

Finding 2: The Advisory Committee notes that many State agencies are excluded from the mandatory provisions of LB 500.

Recommendation 2: The Advisory Committee urges that, as the affirmative action monitoring of the State Department of Personnel becomes effective, consideration will be given to inclusion of other agencies in the mandatory provisions of LB 500.

Finding 3: The Advisory Committee notes that there are very high disparities in the utilization of minority and white female administrators and professionals.

Recommendation 3: The Advisory Committee urges the individual agencies and State reviewers to consider what further affirmative action planning efforts may be necessary to begin reduction in the levels of disparity while utilizing the most qualified persons.

Finding 4: Of the 14 plans reviewed by the Advisory Committee only five indicated that applicant flow data would be maintained and utilized. The Advisory Committee believes without such data efforts to ensure recruitment and selection processes are nondiscriminatory cannot succeed.

Recommendation 4: The Advisory Committee urges that all State agencies maintain applicant flow data and utilize an appropriate monitoring technique to ensure that indications of discriminatory practices are investigated and, if necessary, remedied.

APPENDIX

The following tables summarize the four States' submissions to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, on EEO-4 forms, of data on the State work force. The consolidations eliminate labor market area analysis that was provided by the States. This appendix also includes (total) State work force data that is not provided to EEOC and was provided to the Advisory Committees by only one State, Iowa.

IOWA - Function 1: Financial Administration			MALE							* FEMALE			
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	Black C	* FEMALE									
				Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
	(B-K) A	White B											
Officials/ Administrators	1.	5(0.1)	4(0.2)					1(0.1)					
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.	3(0.1)	2(0.1)					1(0.1)					
	7.	69(1.6)	52(2.4)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)			15(0.8)					
	8.	157(3.7)	146(6.7)				1(10)	10(0.5)					
TOTAL	234(5.6)	204(9.4)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)	1(10)		27(1.4)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.	1(0)						1(0.1)					
	13.	7(0.2)	2(0.1)					5(0.3)					
	14.	188(4.5)	116(5.3)	4(10.3)	1(7.7)			63(3.4)	2(3.5)	1(6.3)	1(12.5)		
	15.	806(19.2)	611(28.1)	8(20.5)	4(46.2)	4(40)		171(9.1)	7(12.3)		1(12.5)		
	16.	120(2.9)	109(5.0)		1(7.7)	1(10)		9(0.5)					
TOTAL	1122(26.7)	838(38.6)	12(30.8)	6(46.2)	5(50)		249(13.2)	9(15.8)	1(6.3)	2(25.0)			
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.	63(1.5)	17(0.8)			1(10)		44(2.3)	1(1.8)				
	22.	157(3.7)	79(3.6)	3(7.7)		1(10)		72(3.8)	2(3.5)				
	23.	224(5.3)	190(8.7)	1(2.6)		1(10)		31(1.6)			1(12.5)		
	24.	1(0)	1(0)										
TOTAL	445(10.6)	287(13.2)	4(10.3)		3(30)		147(7.8)	3(5.3)		1(12.5)			
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.	4(0.1)	2(0.1)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)								
	29.	31(0.7)	28(1.3)	2(5.1)				1(0.1)					
	30.	21(0.5)	21(1.0)										
	31.	4(0.1)	4(0.2)										
	32.	2(0)	2(0.1)										
TOTAL	62(1.5)	57(2.6)	3(7.7)	1(7.7)			1(0.1)						
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.	14(0.3)	5(0.2)					7(0.4)	1(1.8)	1(6.3)			
	37.	77(1.8)	27(1.2)					48(2.6)	2(3.5)				
	38.	129(3.1)	78(3.6)					48(2.6)		2(12.5)		1(25.0)	
	39.	36(0.9)	27(1.2)					9(0.5)					
	40.												
TOTAL	256(6.1)	137(6.3)					112(6.0)	3(5.3)	3(18.8)		1(25.0)		
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	27(0.6)		2(5.1)				21(1.1)	2(3.5)	2(12.5)			
	44.	479(11.4)	25(1.2)					432(230)	16(28.1)	1(6.3)	4(50.0)	1(25.0)	
	45.	669(15.9)	83(3.8)	3(7.7)	1(7.7)			561(29.8)	10(17.5)	8(50.0)	1(12.5)	2(50.0)	
	46.	213(5.1)	102(4.7)					111(5.9)					
	47.	47(1.1)	21(1.0)					26(1.4)					
	48.												
TOTAL	1435(34.2)	231(10.6)	5(5.1)	1(7.7)			1151(61.2)	28(49.1)	11(68.8)	5(62.5)	3(75)		

IOWA - 1																
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE					* FEMALE								
			White A	Black B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP		
Skilled Craft	49.															
	50.															
	51.															
	52.															
	53.	38(0.9)	24(1.1)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)			10(0.5)	2(3.5)							
	54.	44(1.0)	39(1.8)					4(0.2)	1(1.8)							
	55.	24(0.6)	23(1.1)					1(0.1)								
	56.															
	TOTAL	106(2.5)	86(4.0)	1(2.6)	1(7.7)			15(0.8)	3(5.3)							
Service Maintenance	57.															
	58.															
	59.	8(0.2)						8(0.4)								
	60.	191(4.5)	98(4.5)	6(15.4)	2(15.4)			81(4.3)	3(5.3)	1(6.3)						
	61.	315(7.5)	207(9.5)	7(17.9)	1(7.7)	1(10)	2(100)	89(4.7)	8(14.0)							
	62.	24(0.6)	24(1.1)													
	63.	3(0.1)	3(0.1)													
	64.															
	TOTAL	541(12.9)	332(15.3)	13(33.3)	3(23.1)	1(10)	2(100)	178(9.5)	11(19.3)	1(6.3)						
TOTAL FULL TIME		4201	2172	39	13	10	2	1880	57	16	8					4
Officials/Adm	73.	19(2.9)	17(5.9)					2(0.6)								
Professionals	74.	176(27.2)	105(36.2)	2(33.3)				65(19.8)	2(15.4)		2(50)					
Technicians	75.	52(8.0)	38(13.1)					14(4.3)								
Prot. Serv.	76.	7(1.1)	7(2.4)													
Para-Prof.	77.	44(6.8)	27(9.3)					17(5.2)								
Off/Clerical	78.	239(36.9)	26(9.0)	2(33.3)				196(59.6)	10(76.9)	3(100)	2(50)					
Skilled Craft	79.	15(2.3)	15(5.2)													
Serv./Maint.	80.	95(14.7)	55(19.0)	2(33.3)	1(100)		1(100)	35(10.6)	1(7.7)							
TOTAL NEW HIRES		647	290	6	1		1	329	13	3	4					

IOWA - Function 2: Streets & Highways														
		Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
Job Category		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Amer. Ind. * Pac. Isl. E Alaskan F			White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Amer. Ind. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.		7(0.2)	5(0.2)					2(0.5)					
	6.													
	7.		23(0.7)	18(0.6)				1(7.7)	4(1.0)					
	8.		36(1.0)	36(1.2)										
	TOTAL	66(1.9)	59(1.9)				1(7.7)	6(1.6)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.		22(0.6)	12(0.4)					10(2.6)					
	15.		202(5.7)	179(5.8)		1(11.1)	3(23.1)		19(4.9)					
	16.		150(4.2)	142(4.6)			6(46.2)	1(9.1)				1(33.3)		
	TOTAL	374(10.6)	333(10.8)		1(11.1)	9(69.2)	1(9.1)	29(7.5)			1(33.3)			
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.		102(2.9)	69(2.2)		1(11.1)			29(7.5)	1(16.7)		2(66.7)		
	22.		370(10.5)	319(10.3)	2(16.7)	2(22.2)		4(36.4)	41(10.6)	2(33.3)				
	23.		495(14.0)	484(15.6)	1(8.3)		3(23.1)	1(9.1)	6(1.6)					
	24.													
	TOTAL	967(27.3)	872(28.2)	3(25.0)	3(33.3)	3(23.1)	5(45.5)	76(19.6)	3((50)		2(66.7)			
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.		4(0.1)	3(0.1)					1(0.3)					
	29.		2(0.1)	2(0.1)										
	30.		1(0)	1(0)										
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	7(0.2)	6(0.2)					1(0.3)						
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.		1(0)						1(0.3)					
	36.		2(0.1)	1(0)					1(0.3)					
	37.		71(2.0)	45(1.5)		1(11.1)			25(6.5)					
	38.		2(0.1)	1(0)					1(0.3)					
	39.		41(1.2)	41(1.3)										
	40.													
	TOTAL	117(3.3)	88(2.8)		1(11.1)			28(7.2)						
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.		2(0.1)						2(0.5)					
	44.		83(2.3)	1(0)					79(20.4)	3(50)				
	45.		139(3.9)	30(1.0)					109(28.2)					
	46.		30(0.8)	19(0.6)					11(2.8)					
	47.		2(0.1)	2(0.1)										
	48.													
	TOTAL	256(7.2)	52(1.7)					201(51.9)	3(50)					

IOWA - 2													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE					* FEMALE				
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.	64(1.8)	59(1.9)		1(11.1)								
	54.	539(15.2)	533(17.2)	2(16.7)				1(9.1)					
	55.	21(0.6)	21(0.7)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	624(17.6)	613(19.8)	2(16.7)	1(11.1)			1(9.1)					
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.												
	60.	22(0.6)	15(0.5)										
	61.	916(25.9)	873(28.2)	6(50.0)	3(33.3)			1(9.1)					
	62.	43(1.2)	41(1.3)	1(8.3)				2(18.2)					
	63.	144(4.1)	143(4.6)										
	64.							1(9.1)					
	TOTAL	1125(31.8)	1072(34.6)	7(58.3)	3(33.3)			4(36.4)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		3536	3095	12	9			13					3
								11					
								387					
									6				
Officials/Adm	73.	3(1.1)	1(0.5)										
Professionals	74.	9(3.2)	8(4.1)										
Technicians	75.	23(8.3)	20(10.3)										
Prot. Serv.	76.	2(0.7)	1(0.5)										
Para-Prof.	77.	19(6.8)	13(6.7)										
Off/Clerical	78.	48(17.3)	5(2.6)										
Skilled Craft	79.	18(6.5)	15(7.7)		1(25.0)								
Serv./Maint.	80.	156(56.1)	131(67.5)	2(100)	3(75.0)			1(100)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		278	194	2	4			1					2

IGWA - Function 3: Public Welfare												
Annual Salary		Total (Columns)	MALE						* FEMALE			
Job Category	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.											
	2.											
	3.											
	4.											
	5.	5(0.2)	1(0.2)	1(7.1)			3(0.1)					
	6.	2(0.1)					2(0.1)					
	7.	103(3.4)	54(8.4)	1(7.1)	1(20)		46(2.0)		1(6.3)			
	8.	52(1.7)	39(6.1)	1(7.1)			11(0.5)	1(2.2)				
	TOTAL	162(5.3)	94(18.6)	3(21.4)	1(20)		62(2.7)	1(2.2)	1(6.3)			
Professionals	9.											
	10.											
	11.											
	12.											
	13.	3(0.1)	1(0.2)				2(0.1)					
	14.	548(17.8)	149(23.1)	2(14.3)	3(60)	8(66.7)	379(16.3)	3(6.7)	3(18.8)	1(100)		
	15.	616(20.1)	246(38.2)	4(28.6)		3(25.0)	354(15.2)	7(15.6)	2(12.5)			
	16.	9(0.3)	8(1.2)				1(0)					
	TOTAL	1176(38.3)	404(62.7)	6(42.9)	3(60)	11(91.7)	736(31.6)	10(22.2)	5(31.3)	1(100)		
Technicians	17.											
	18.											
	19.											
	20.											
	21.	21(0.7)	6(0.9)				15(0.6)					
	22.	56(1.8)	15(2.3)				40(1.7)					1(25)
	23.	80(2.6)	18(2.8)				60(2.6)	2(4.4)				
	24.											
	TOTAL	157(5.1)	39(6.1)				115(4.9)	2(4.4)			1(25)	
Protective Service	25.											
	26.											
	27.											
	28.											
	29.											
	30.	1(0)	1(0.2)									
	31.											
	32.											
	TOTAL	1(0)	1(0.2)									
Para Professionals	33.											
	34.											
	35.											
	36.	83(2.7)	12(1.9)	1(7.1)			67(2.9)	3(6.7)				
	37.	476(15.5)	35(5.4)	1(7.1)	1(20)	1(8.3)	425(18.2)	11(24.4)	1(6.3)		1(25)	
	38.	250(8.1)	23(3.6)	1(7.1)			217(9.3)	6(13.3)	2(12.5)		1(25)	
	39.	2(0.1)	1(0.2)				1(0)					
	40.											
	TOTAL	811(26.4)	71(11.1)	3(28.6)	1(20)	1(8.3)	710(30.5)	20(44.4)	3(18.8)		2(50)	
Office Clerical	41.											
	42.											
	43.	1(0)					1(0)					
	44.	366(11.9)	2(0.3)				355(15.2)	5(11.1)	4(25.0)			
	45.	320(10.4)	3(0.5)				307(13.2)	7(15.6)	3(18.8)			
	46.	32(1.0)					31(1.3)				1(25)	
	47.	4(0.1)	2(0.3)				2(0.1)					
	48.											
	TOTAL	723(23.5)	7(1.1)				696(29.9)	12(26.7)	7(43.8)		1(25)	

IOWA - 3														
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						* FEMALE					
			(B-R) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HRDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.		7(0.2)											
	54.		5(0.2)	5(0.8)										
	55.		1(0)	1(0.2)										
	56.													
	TOTAL		13(0.4)	6(0.9)										
Service	57.													
Maintenance	58.													
	59.													
	60.		8(0.3)	5(0.8)	1(7.1)									
	61.		11(0.4)	8(1.2)	1(7.1)									
	62.		7(0.2)	7(1.1)										
	63.		2(0.1)	2(0.3)										
	64.													
	TOTAL		28(0.9)	22(3.4)	2(14.3)									
TOTAL FULL TIME			3071	644	14	5	12	2330	45	16	1	4		
							NEW HIRES							
Officials/Adm	73.		5(1.1)	3(3.2)										
Professionals	74.		182(38.6)	57(60.6)	1(33.3)	1(50)	4(100)	116(32.2)	1(25)	1(33.3)	1(100)			
Technicians	75.		12(2.5)	8(8.5)				4(1.1)						
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.		114(24.2)	21(22.3)	1(33.3)	1(50)		90(25.0)					1(100)	
Off/Clerical	78.		154(32.6)	2(2.1)				147(40.8)	3(75)	2(66.7)				
Skilled Craft	79.		1(0.2)	1(1.1)										
Serv./Maint.	80.		4(0.8)	2(2.1)	1(33.3)			1(0.3)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES			472	94	3	2	4	360	4	3	1	1		

IOWA - Function 4: Police Protection		Annual Salary	Protection Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE			
Job Category		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.		8(0.9)	5(0.7)				3(2.0)						
	8.		23(2.7)	23(3.4)										
	TOTAL	31(3.6)	28(4.1)				3(2.0)							
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.		8(0.9)	4(0.6)				4(2.7)						
	15.		46(5.4)	34(5.0)	1(11.1)		1(100)	9(6.1)	1(20)					
	16.		36(4.2)	36(5.3)										
	TOTAL	90(10.6)	74(10.8)	1(11.1)		1(100)	13(8.8)	1(20)						
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.		11(1.3)	4(0.6)				6(4.1)	1(20)					
	22.		52(6.1)	37(5.4)				14(9.5)	1(20)					
	23.		92(10.8)	89(13.0)	1(11.1)			2(1.4)						
	24.													
	TOTAL	155(18.2)	130(19.0)	1(11.1)			22(14.9)	2(40)						
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.		31(3.6)	25(3.6)	2(22.2)			4(2.7)						
	30.		54(6.3)	47(6.9)	1(11.1)	1(33.3)		5(3.4)						
	31.		377(44.3)	364(53.1)	3(33.3)	2(66.7)		8(5.4)						
	32.													
	TOTAL	462(54.3)	436(63.6)	6(66.7)	3(100)		17(11.5)							
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.		2(0.2)					2(1.4)						
	38.		4(0.5)					4(2.7)						
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	6(0.7)					6(4.1)							
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.		2(0.2)					2(1.4)						
	44.		34(4.0)					33(22.3)	1(20)					
	45.		45(5.3)	3(0.4)				42(28.4)						
	46.		8(0.9)					7(4.7)	1(20)					
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	89(10.5)	3(0.4)				84(56.8)	2(40)						

IOWA - 4													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE					* FEMALE				
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	54.												
	55.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	4(0.5)	4(0.6)										
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.												
	60.												
	61.	12(1.4)	8(1.2)	1(11.1)				3(2.0)					
	62.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	63.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	64.												
	TOTAL	14(1.6)	10(1.5)	1(11.1)	3	1		3(2.0)	5				
TOTAL FULL TIME		851	685	9				148					
Officials/Adm	73.	1(2.2)	1(3.7)										
Professionals	74.	12(26.1)	9(33.3)					3(17.6)					
Technicians	75.	6(13.0)	3(11.1)					3(17.6)					
Prot. Serv.	76.	12(26.1)	11(40.7)					1(5.9)					
Para-Prof.	77.												
Off/Clerical	78.	10(21.7)						9(52.9)	1(100)				
Skilled Craft	79.	1(2.2)	1(3.7)										
Serv./Maint.	80.	4(8.7)	2(7.4)	1(100)				1(5.9)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		46	27	1				17	1				

IOWA - Function 6: Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation

Job Category	Annual Salary (Column)	MALE											*	FEMALE					
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP						
Officials/ Administrators	1.																		
	2.																		
	3.																		
	4.																		
	5.																		
	6.																		
	7.		7(0.6)	6(0.8)															
	8.		21(1.9)	20(2.6)															
	TOTAL	28(2.5)	26(3.3)																
Professionals	9.																		
	10.																		
	11.																		
	12.																		
	13.																		
	14.		21(1.9)	13(1.7)															
	15.		241(21.9)	213(27.2)	1(25)														
	16.		40(3.6)	38(4.8)															
	TOTAL	302(27.5)	264(33.7)	1(25)	1(50)	1(14.3)	1(100)	7(2.4)											
Technicians	17.																		
	18.																		
	19.																		
	20.																		
	21.		57(5.2)	38(4.8)															
	22.		200(18.2)	187(23.9)															
	23.		18(1.6)	17(2.2)															
	24.																		
	TOTAL	275(25.0)	242(30.9)		1(50)	7(100)	1(100)	27(9.3)											
Protective Service	25.																		
	26.																		
	27.																		
	28.																		
	29.		5(0.5)	5(0.6)															
	30.		26(2.4)	26(3.3)															
	31.		93(8.5)	93(11.9)															
	32.																		
	TOTAL	124(11.3)	124(15.8)		1(50)			30(10.4)	1(16.7)	1(33.3)									
Para Professionals	33.																		
	34.																		
	35.																		
	36.																		
	37.		32(2.9)	20(2.6)															
	38.		3(0.3)																
	39.		1(0.1)																
	40.																		
	TOTAL	36(3.3)	20(2.6)					16(5.5)											
Office Clerical	41.																		
	42.																		
	43.																		
	44.		59(5.4)																
	45.		143(13.0)	2(0.3)															
	46.		9(0.8)																
	47.																		
	48.																		
	TOTAL	211(19.2)	2(0.3)					201(69.6)	4(66.7)	2(66.7)	2(66.7)								

IOWA - 6		*																			
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE											
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP							
Skilled Craft	49.																				
	50.																				
	51.																				
	52.																				
	53.	1(0.1)			1(25)																
	54.	4(0.4)	4(0.5)																		
	55.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)																		
	56.																				
	TOTAL	6(0.5)	5(0.6)	1(25)																	
Service Maintenance	57.																				
	58.																				
	59.																				
	60.	10(0.9)	6(0.8)	1(25)					2(0.7)	1(16.7)											
	61.	96(8.7)	85(10.8)	1(25)					10(3.5)												
	62.	11(1.0)	10(1.3)						1(0.3)												
	63.																				
	64.																				
	TOTAL	117(10.6)	101(12.9)	2(50)					13(4.5)	1(16.7)											
TOTAL FULL TIME		1099	784	4	2				289	6			3								3
Officials/Adm	73.																				
Professionals	74.	24(23.5)	18(31.0)						3(8.1)												
Technicians	75.	19(18.6)	15(25.9)						4(10.8)												
Prot. Serv.	76.	3(2.9)	3(5.2)																		
Para-Prof.	77.	20(19.6)	12(20.7)						8(21.6)												
Off/Clerical	78.	22(21.6)							19(51.4)	1(100)		1(100)	1(100)								
Skilled Craft	79.	1(1.0)	1(1.7)																		
Serv./Maint.	80.	13(12.7)	9(15.5)	1(100)					3(8.1)												
TOTAL NEW HIRES		102	58	1				3	37	1		1									1

IOWA - Function 7: Hospitals & Sanitoriums
 Annual Total
 Salary (Columns)

Job Category	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE					FEMALE					
				Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HMDCP		
Officials/ Administrators														
1.														
2.														
3.														
4.														
5.														
6.														
7.	15(0.3)	11(0.9)												
8.	30(0.7)	27(2.1)					4(0.1)							
TOTAL	45(1.0)	38(3.0)					3(0.1)							
Professionals														
9.							7(0.2)							
10.														
11.														
12.														
13.														
14.	184(4.1)	46(3.6)	1(6.3)				134(4.4)	1(4.0)						
15.	425(9.6)	141(11.1)	2(12.5)	1(33.3)	1(4.8)	1(25)	276(9.0)	1(4.0)	1(50)	2(10)				
16.	75(1.7)	48(3.8)					5(0.2)							
TOTAL	684(15.4)	235(18.5)	3(18.8)	1(33.3)	19(90.5)	1(25)	415(13.5)	2(8.0)	1(50)	7(35)				
Technicians														
17.														
18.														
19.														
20.	39(0.9)	1(0.1)												
21.	106(2.4)	8(0.6)					37(1.2)				1(5)			
22.	131(3.0)	30(2.4)	2(12.5)				97(3.2)				1(5)			
23.	20(0.5)	10(0.8)					99(3.2)							
24.							9(0.3)							
TOTAL	296(6.7)	49(3.9)	2(12.5)				242(7.9)						1(16.7)	
Protective Service														
25.														
26.														
27.														
28.	7(0.2)	7(0.6)												
29.	10(0.2)	9(0.7)												
30.	1(0)	1(0.1)												
31.														
32.														
TOTAL	18(0.4)	17(1.3)					1(33.3)							
Para Professionals														
33.														
34.														
35.	268(6.0)	105(8.3)	3(18.8)				156(5.1)	2(8.0)	1(50)					
36.	991(22.3)	249(19.6)	4(25.0)				721(23.5)	10(40.0)		2(10)	2(33.3)			
37.	723(16.3)	116(9.1)					598(19.5)	8(32.0)						
38.	108(2.4)	12(0.9)					96(3.1)							
39.														
40.														
TOTAL	2090(47.1)	482(38.0)	7(43.8)	1(33.3)	1(4.8)	3(75)	1571(51.1)	20(80.0)	1(50)	2(10)	2(33.3)			
Office Clerical														
41.														
42.														
43.	4(0.1)						4(0.1)							
44.	119(2.7)	1(0.1)					118(3.8)							
45.	196(4.4)	6(0.5)					189(6.2)						1(16.7)	
46.	17(0.4)	2(0.2)					15(0.5)							
47.	3(0.1)	2(0.2)					1(0)							
48.														
TOTAL	339(7.6)	11(0.9)					327(10.6)						1(16.7)	

ICWA - 7		MALE											* FEMALE		
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		White C	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Amer. Ind.			White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Amer. Ind.		
		(B-K) A	White B				Pac. Isl. E	Alaskan F	Pac. Isl. J				Amer. Ind. K	HNDCP	
Skilled Craft	49.														
	50.														
	51.														
	52.	26(0.6)	5(0.4)						21(0.7)						
	53.	123(2.8)	68(5.4)	2(12.5)					52(1.7)					1(16.7)	
	54.	130(2.9)	120(9.5)						9(0.3)	1(4.0)					
	55.	36(0.8)	32(2.5)						4(0.1)						
	56.														
	TOTAL	315(7.1)	225(17.7)	2(12.5)					86(2.8)	1(4.0)				1(16.7)	
Service Maintenance	57.														
	58.														
	59.														
	60.	314(7.1)	66(5.2)	1(6.3)			1(4.8)		237(7.7)	1(4.0)			7(35)	1(16.7)	
	61.	291(6.6)	110(8.7)						178(5.8)	1(4.0)			2(10)		
	62.	29(0.7)	21(1.7)						8(0.3)						
	63.	17(0.4)	15(1.2)	1(6.3)					1(0)						
	64.														
	TOTAL	651(14.7)	212(16.7)	2(12.5)		3	1(4.8)	4	424(13.8)	2(8.0)	2	9(45)	1(16.7)	6	
TOTAL FULL TIME		4438	1269	16			21		3072	25		20			
							NEW HIRE								
Officials/Adm	73.	1(0.1)	1(0.4)												
Professionals	74.	111(12.5)	38(14.4)	1(25)				5(83.3)	64(10.7)				3(50.0)		
Technicians	75.	41(4.6)	7(2.7)						33(5.5)				1(16.7)		
Prot. Serv.	76.	2(0.2)	2(0.8)												
Para-Prof.	77.	589(66.2)	178(67.4)	3(75)			1(16.7)	3(100)	397(66.2)	5(83.3)	1(100)		1(16.7)		
Off/Clerical	78.	35(3.9)	1(0.4)						34(5.7)						
Skilled Craft	79.	24(2.7)	14(5.3)						10(1.7)						
Serv./Maint.	80.	87(9.8)	23(8.7)						62(10.3)	1(16.7)			1(16.7)		
TOTAL NEW HIRE		890	264	4			6	3	600	6	1	6			

IOWA - Function 8: Health			MALE							* FEMALE				
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	HNDCP	
		(B-K)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.	5(1.6)		3(2.8)					2(1.0)					
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.	5(1.6)		3(2.8)					2(1.0)					
	8.	12(3.8)		11(10.1)					1(0.5)					
	TOTAL	22(6.9)		17(15.6)					5(2.6)					
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	1(0.3)							1(0.5)					
	14.	15(4.7)		9(8.3)					6(3.1)					
	15.	123(38.4)		37(34.0)	4(100.0)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)	79(40.3)	1(16.7)					
	16.	15(4.7)		14(12.9)				1(0.5)						
	TOTAL	154(48.1)		60(55.0)	4(100.0)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)	87(44.4)	1(16.7)					
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.	3(0.9)							3(1.5)					
	22.	22(6.9)		13(12.0)					9(4.6)					
	23.	17(5.3)		14(12.8)					3(1.5)					
	24.													
	TOTAL	42(13.1)		27(24.8)				15(7.7)						
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.	1(0.3)							1(0.5)					
	38.	1(0.3)		1(0.9)										
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	2(0.6)		1(0.9)				1(0.5)						
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	1(0.3)							1(0.5)					
	44.	43(13.4)							41(20.9)	2(33.3)				
	45.	45(14.1)							42(21.4)	2(33.3)	1(100.0)			
	46.	7(2.2)							6(3.1)	1(16.7)				
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	96(30.0)						90(45.5)	5(83.3)	1(100.0)				

ICWA - 8		MALE											*	FEMALE			
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	White A	Black B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP			
Skilled Craft	49.																
	50.																
	51.																
	52.																
	53.	1(0.3)	1(0.9)														
	54.																
	55.																
	56.																
	TOTAL	1(0.3)	1(0.9)														
Service	57.																
Maintenance	58.																
	59.																
	60.	1(0.3)	1(0.9)														
	61.	2(0.6)	2(1.8)														
	62.																
	63.																
	64.																
	TOTAL	3(0.9)	3(2.8)	4	1	1			198	6	1						
TOTAL FULL TIME		320	109														
Officials/Adm	73.	2(3.2)	1(4.2)						1(2.9)								
Professionals	74.	25(40.3)	13(54.2)	1(100.0)					11(32.4)								
Technicians	75.	10(16.1)	7(29.2)						3(8.8)								
Prot. Serv.	76.																
Para-Prof.	77.																
Off/Clerical	78.	22(35.5)							19(55.9)	3(100.0)							
Skilled Craft	79.	1(1.6)	1(4.2)														
Serv./Maint.	80.	2(3.2)	2(8.3)														
TOTAL NEW HIRES		62	24	1					34	3							

IGWA - Function 9: Housing														
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.													
	8.		2(22.2)	2(66.7)										
	TOTAL	2(22.2)	2(66.7)											
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.		2(22.2)											
	14.							2(33.3)						
	15.		1(11.1)					1(16.7)						
	16.		1(11.1)	1(33.3)										
	TOTAL	4(44.4)	1(33.3)				3(50.0)							
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.													
	22.													
	23.													
	24.													
	TOTAL													
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.		1(11.1)					1(16.7)						
	38.													
	39.													
	40.		1(11.1)					1(16.7)						
	TOTAL						1(16.7)							
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.													
	44.													
	45.													
	46.		1(11.1)					1(16.7)						
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	1(11.1)					1(16.7)							

ICWA - 9	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.												
	54.												
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL												
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.												
	60.	1(11.1)											
	61.												
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	1(11.1)											
TOTAL FULL TIME		9	3										
Officials/Acm	73.												
Professionals	74.												
Technicians	75.												
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.												
Off/Clerical	78.												
Skilled Craft	79.												
Serv./Maint.	80.	1(100.0)											
TOTAL NEW HIRES		1											

NEW HIRES

1(16.7)
6

1(100.0)

1

IOWA - Function 10: Community Development																		
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE											*	FEMALE			
	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP						
Officials/ Administrators	1.																	
	2.																	
	3.																	
	4.																	
	5.																	
	6.																	
	7.	7(25.9)	6(35.3)															
	8.	2(7.4)	2(11.8)															
	TOTAL	9(33.3)	8(47.1)															
Professionals	9.																	
	10.																	
	11.																	
	12.																	
	13.																	
	14.	7(25.9)	1(5.9)															
	15.	10(37.0)	8(47.1)															
	16.	TOTAL	17(63.0)	9(52.9)														
Technicians	17.																	
	18.																	
	19.																	
	20.																	
	21.																	
	22.																	
	23.																	
	24.																	
		TOTAL																
	Protective Service	25.																
		26.																
27.																		
28.																		
29.																		
30.																		
31.																		
32.																		
		TOTAL																
Para Professionals		33.																
	34.																	
	35.																	
	36.																	
	37.																	
	38.																	
	39.																	
	40.																	
		TOTAL																
	Office Clerical	41.																
42.																		
43.																		
44.																		
45.		1(3.7)																
46.																		
47.																		
48.		1(3.7)																
	TOTAL																	

IOWA - 10																
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							* FEMALE						
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP		
Skilled Craft	49.															
	50.															
	51.															
	52.															
	53.															
	54.															
	55.															
	56.															
	TOTAL															
Service	57.															
Maintenance	58.															
	59.															
	60.															
	61.															
	62.															
	63.															
	64.															
	TOTAL															
TOTAL FULL TIME		27		17												10
Officials/Adm	73.															
Professionals	74.	6(100.0)		2(100.0)												4(100.0)
Technicians	75.															
Prot. Serv.	76.															
Para-Prof.	77.															
Off/Clerical	78.															
Skilled Craft	79.															
Serv./Maint.	80.															
TOTAL NEW HIRES		6		2												4

IOWA - Function 11: Corrections													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							* FEMALE			
	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	INDCP	
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	5(0.3)	2(0.2)	1(3.7)			1(0.3)	1(14.3)					
	6.												
	7.	10(0.7)	9(0.8)				1(0.3)						
	8.	22(1.5)	22(2.0)										
	TOTAL	37(2.5)	33(3.0)	1(3.7)			2(0.6)	1(14.3)					
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)										
	14.	111(7.5)	74(6.8)	3(11.1)		2(33.3)	29(8.6)	3(42.9)					
	15.	200(13.5)	150(13.7)	4(14.8)	1(12.5)	3(50.0)	1(25.0)	40(11.9)	1(14.3)				
	16.	5(0.3)	2(0.2)	1(3.7)	1(12.5)	1(16.7)							
	TOTAL	318(21.4)	228(20.9)	8(29.6)	2(25.0)	6(100.0)	1(25.0)	69(20.5)	4(57.1)				
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.	15(1.0)	6(0.5)				9(2.7)						
	22.	19(1.3)	5(0.5)	1(3.7)			12(3.6)				1(50.0)		
	23.	10(0.7)	7(0.6)				3(0.9)						
	24.												
	TOTAL	44(3.0)	18(1.6)	1(3.7)			24(7.1)				1(50.0)		
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.	4(0.3)	4(0.4)										
	29.	294(19.8)	250(22.9)	9(33.3)	2(25.0)		1(25.0)	31(9.2)	1(14.3)				
	30.	222(15.0)	194(17.8)	6(22.2)	1(12.5)		1(25.0)	19(5.7)		1(100.0)			
	31.	160(10.8)	152(13.9)	1(3.7)	2(25.0)		1(25.0)	4(1.2)					
	32.												
	TOTAL	680(45.8)	600(54.9)	16(59.3)	5(62.5)		3(60.0)	54(16.1)	1(14.3)	1(100.0)			
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.	24(1.6)	17(1.6)	1(3.7)				6(1.8)					
	37.	66(4.4)	35(3.2)					31(9.2)					
	38.	9(0.6)	6(0.5)					3(0.9)					
	39.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	40.												
	TOTAL	100(6.7)	59(5.4)	1(3.7)			40(11.9)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	1(0.1)						1(0.3)					
	44.	62(4.2)	2(0.2)					59(17.6)	1(14.3)				
	45.	60(4.0)	3(0.3)					56(16.7)			1(50.0)		
	46.	9(0.6)	1(0.1)					8(2.4)					
	47.	3(0.2)	2(0.2)					1(0.3)					
	48.												
	TOTAL	135(9.1)	8(0.7)				125(37.2)	1(14.3)			1(50.0)		

ICWA - 11

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns) (B-K)	MALE					* FEMALE					
			White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.													
52.		8(0.5)	2(0.2)						6(1.8)				
53.		19(1.3)	11(1.0)						8(2.4)				
54.		66(4.4)	63(5.8)			1(12.5)			2(0.6)				
55.		44(3.0)	43(3.9)					1(25.0)					
56.													
TOTAL		137(9.2)	119(10.9)			1(12.5)		1(25.0)	16(4.8)				
Service Maintenance 57.													
58.													
59.													
60.		4(0.3)	1(0.1)						3(0.9)				
61.		13(0.9)	11(1.0)						2(0.6)				
62.		11(0.7)	10(0.9)						1(0.3)				
63.		5(0.3)	5(0.5)										
64.													
TOTAL		33(2.2)	27(2.5)						6(1.8)				
TOTAL FULL TIME		1484	1092	27	8	6	5	336	7	1		2	
						NEW HIRES							
Officials/Adm 73.													
Professionals 74.		26(8.9)	11(4.8)	1(11.1)					12(23.5)			2(100)	
Technicians 75.		9(3.1)	5(2.2)						4(7.8)				
Prot. Serv. 76.		196(67.4)	181(79.4)	7(77.8)	1(100)				7(13.7)				
Para-Prof. 77.		17(5.8)	12(5.3)	1(11.1)					4(7.8)				
Off/Clerical 78.		24(8.2)	2(0.9)						22(43.1)				
Skilled Craft 79.		17(5.8)	15(6.6)						2(3.9)				
Serv./Maint. 80.		2(0.7)	2(0.9)										
TOTAL NEW HIRES		291	228	9	1			51	2				

IOWA - Function 12: Utilities & Transportation

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.												
	8.		10(17.5)	9(23.7)				1(5.6)					
	TOTAL	10(17.5)	9(23.7)				1(5.6)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.												
	15.		5(8.8)	5(13.2)									
	16.		4(7.0)	4(10.5)									
	TOTAL	9(15.8)	9(23.7)										
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.		1(1.8)	1(2.6)									
	22.		3(5.3)	1(2.6)				2(11.1)					
	23.		15(26.3)	14(36.8)				1(5.6)					
	24.												
	TOTAL	19(33.3)	16(42.1)				3(16.7)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.		2(3.5)	1(2.6)				1(5.6)					
	38.		2(3.5)	1(2.6)				1(5.6)					
	39.		1(1.8)	1(2.6)									
	40.												
	TOTAL	5(8.8)	3(7.9)				2(11.1)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.												
	44.		3(5.3)					2(11.1)	1(100.0)				
	45.		9(15.8)					9(50.0)					
	46.		1(1.8)					1(5.6)					
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	13(22.8)					12(66.7)	1(100.0)					

IOWA - 12

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.													
	54.													
	55.	1(1.8)	1(2.6)											
	56.													
	TOTAL	1(1.8)	1(2.6)											
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.													
	60.													
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL													
TOTAL FULL TIME		57	38						18		1			
Officials/Adm	73.	2(18.2)	1(14.3)						1(25.0)					
Professionals	74.													
Technicians	75.	6(54.5)	5(71.4)						1(25.0)					
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.	1(8.1)	1(14.3)											
Off/Clerical	78.	2(18.2)							2(50.0)					
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.													
TOTAL NEW HIRES		11	7						4					

IOWA - Function 14: Employment Security													
Annual Salary		Total (Columns)											
Job Category		MALE						* FEMALE					
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.	17(1.6)	14(3.0)		1(25.0)			2(0.4)					
	8.	24(2.2)	21(4.5)					3(0.5)					
	TOTAL	41(3.8)	35(7.5)		1(25.0)		5(0.9)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.	182(16.8)	83(17.8)		2(50.0)			90(15.8)	1(5.3)	5(50.0)		1(25.0)	
	15.	357(33.0)	254(54.5)	1(25.0)	1(25.0)		3(100.0)	92(16.1)	5(26.3)			1(25.0)	
	16.	12(1.1)	11(2.4)					1(0.2)					
	TOTAL	551(50.9)	348(74.7)	1(25.0)	3(75.0)	3(100.0)	183(32.1)	6(31.6)	5(50.0)		2(50.0)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.	75(6.9)	36(7.7)	2(50.0)				36(6.3)				1(25.0)	
	22.	43(4.0)	20(4.3)					22(3.9)				1(25.0)	
	23.	14(1.3)	8(1.7)					6(1.1)					
	24.												
	TOTAL	132(12.2)	64(13.7)	2(50.0)			64(11.2)				2(50.0)		
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.	78(7.2)	11(2.4)	1(25.0)				60(10.5)	5(26.3)	1(10.0)			
	37.	52(4.8)	1(0.2)					49(8.6)		2(20.0)			
	38.	4(0.4)						4(0.7)					
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	134(12.4)	12(2.6)	1(25.0)			113(19.8)	5(26.3)	3(30.0)				
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	5(0.5)	1(0.2)					4(0.7)					
	44.	108(10.0)	1(0.2)					98(17.2)	6(31.6)	1(10.0)	2(100.0)		
	45.	87(8.0)						84(14.7)	2(10.5)	1(10.0)			
	46.	12(1.1)						12(2.1)					
	47.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	48.												
	TOTAL	213(19.7)	3(0.6)				198(34.7)	8(42.1)	2(20.0)	2(100.0)			

IOWA -14

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian of Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.	4(0.4)												
	54.	1(0.1)												
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	5(0.5)												
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.													
	60.	5(0.5)	3(0.6)											
	61.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)											
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	6(0.6)	4(0.9)	4	4		3	2(0.4)	19	10	2	4		
TOTAL FULL TIME		1082	466					570						
							NEW HIRES							
Officials/Adm	73.	1(0.8)						1(1.2)						
Professionals	74.	11(8.5)	8(23.5)					3(3.5)						
Technicians	75.	44(33.8)	23(67.6)					21(24.4)						
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.	28(21.5)		1(100.0)				26(30.2)	1(15.7)					
Off/Clerical	78.	41(31.5)	1(2.9)					32(37.2)	5(83.3)	1(100.0)	2(100.0)			
Skilled Craft	79.	1(0.8)						1(1.2)						
Serv./Maint.	80.	4(3.1)	2(5.9)					2(2.3)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		130	34	1				86	6	1	2			

IOWA - Function 15: Other													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE			
	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP	
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	1(0.1)					1(0.2)						
	6.	1(0.1)					1(0.2)						
	7.	6(0.7)	1(0.3)				5(1.1)						
	8.	51(6.0)	47(12.2)				3(0.7)						
	TOTAL	59(6.9)	48(12.5)			1(100.0)	10(2.3)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.	1(0.1)					1(0.2)						
	12.												
	13.	20(2.3)	4(1.0)	1(20.0)			15(3.4)						
	14.	60(7.0)	23(6.0)	1(20.0)			33(7.4)	1(7.7)	2(50.0)				
	15.	217(25.4)	151(39.3)	1(20.0)	1(20.0)		62(14.0)	1(7.7)	1(25.0)				
	16.	148(17.3)	119(31.0)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)		25(5.6)	1(7.7)					
	TOTAL	446(32.1)	297(77.3)	4(80.0)	3(60.0)	136(30.7)	3(23.1)	3(75.0)					
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.	5(0.6)					4(0.9)	1(7.7)					
	22.	10(1.2)	5(1.3)				4(0.9)	1(7.7)					
	23.	5(0.6)	4(1.0)				1(.02)						
	24.	2(0.2)	2(0.5)										
	TOTAL	22(2.6)	11(2.9)			9(2.0)	2(15.4)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.	5(0.6)	3(0.8)				1(0.2)	1(7.7)					
	37.	7(0.8)					6(1.4)	1(7.7)					
	38.	9(1.1)	2(0.5)				7(1.6)						
	39.	6(0.7)	1(0.3)				5(1.1)						
	40.												
	TOTAL	27(3.2)	6(1.5)			19(4.3)	2(15.4)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	15(1.8)	1(0.3)				14(3.2)						
	44.	90(10.5)	2(0.5)			1(100.0)	86(19.4)		1(25.0)				
	45.	152(17.8)	5(1.3)				142(32.1)	5(38.5)					
	46.	10(1.2)					10(2.3)						
	47.												
	48.	1(0.1)	1(0.3)										
	TOTAL	268(31.3)	9(2.3)			1(100.0)	252(56.9)	5(38.5)	1(25.0)				

IOWA - 15		MALE											*	FEMALE	
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	HNDCP		
		(B-K) A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K			
Skilled Craft	49.														
	50.														
	51.														
	52.														
	53.	2(0.2)						2(0.5)							
	54.		2(0.5)												
	55.	2(0.2)													
	56.														
	TOTAL	4(0.5)	2(0.5)												
Service Maintenance	57.														
	58.														
	59.	2(0.2)						2(0.5)	1(7.7)						
	60.	6(0.7)	5(1.3)					2(40.0)							
	61.	8(0.9)	4(1.0)					11(2.5)							
	62.	14(1.6)	2(0.5)	1(20.0)											
	63.														
	64.														
	TOTAL	30(3.5)	11(2.9)	1(20.0)	2(40.0)	1	15(3.4)	1(7.7)	13	4					
TOTAL FULL TIME		856	384	5	5	NEW HIRES	1	443							
Officials/Adm	73.	2(2.1)						2(3.0)							
Professionals	74.	36(38.3)	15(65.2)	1(100.0)				20(29.9)							
Technicians	75.	2(2.1)	1(4.3)					1(1.5)							
Prot. Serv.	76.														
Para-Prof.	77.	1(1.1)	1(4.3)												
Off/Clerical	78.	47(50.0)	2(8.7)												
Skilled Craft	79.														
Serv./Maint.	80.	6(6.4)	4(17.4)					2(3.0)							
TOTAL NEW HIRES		94	23	1		1		67	1	1					

IGWA - Total Employment														
Annual Salary														
Total (Columns)														
Job Category	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE						FEMALE				
				Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HSNDP		
Officials/ Administrators	1.	10(0)	7(0.1)					3(0)						
	2.													
	3.													
	4.	18(0.1)	8(0.1)	2(1.5)				7(0.1)	1(0.5)					
	5.	6(0)	2(0)					4(0)						
	6.	270(1.3)	179(1.7)	2(1.5)	3(5.7)	1(1.4)		84(0.9)		1(1.9)				
	7.	442(2.1)	405(3.8)	1(0.7)		1(1.4)	1(3.7)	33(0.3)	1(0.5)					
TOTAL	746(3.5)	601(5.6)	5(3.7)	3(5.7)	2(2.8)	1(3.7)	131(1.4)	2(1.1)	1(1.9)					
Professionals	8.													
	9.	1(0)						1(0)						
	10.	1(0)						1(0)						
	11.	35(0.2)	9(0.1)	1(0.7)				25(0.3)						
	12.	1346(6.4)	530(4.9)	11(8.2)	6(11.3)	11(15.3)		761(7.9)	11(5.8)	11(20.8)	4(10.8)	1(5.0)		
	13.	3249(15.4)	2029(18.9)	26(19.4)	10(18.9)	22(30.6)	6(22.2)	1124(11.6)	24(12.6)	4(7.5)	3(8.1)	1(5.0)		
	14.	615(2.9)	532(4.9)	2(1.5)	5(9.4)	26(36.1)	1(3.7)	43(0.4)	1(0.5)		5(13.5)			
TOTAL	5247(24.9)	3100(28.8)	40(29.9)	21(39.6)	59(81.9)	7(25.9)	1955(20.2)	36(18.9)	15(28.3)	12(32.4)	2(10.0)			
Technicians	15.													
	16.													
	17.	39(0.2)	1(0)					37(0.4)			1(2.7)			
	18.	459(2.2)	185(1.7)	2(1.5)	2(3.8)	1(1.4)		260(2.7)	4(2.1)	1(1.9)	3(8.1)	1(5.0)		
	19.	1063(5.1)	711(6.6)	8(6.0)	2(3.8)	1(1.4)	4(14.8)	327(3.4)	7(3.7)			3(15.0)		
	20.	990(4.7)	855(7.9)	3(2.2)		4(5.6)	1(3.7)	123(1.3)	2(1.1)		1(2.7)	1(5.0)		
	21.	3(0)	3(0)					4(0.9)	1(7.7)					
TOTAL	2554(12.1)	1755(16.3)	13(9.7)	4(7.5)	6(8.3)	5(18.5)	747(7.7)	13(6.8)	1(1.9)	5(13.5)	5(25.0)			
Protective Service	22.													
	23.													
	24.	19(0.1)	16(0.1)	1(0.7)	1(1.9)			1(0)						
	25.	373(1.8)	319(3.0)	13(9.7)	3(5.7)		1(3.7)	36(0.4)	1(0.5)					
	26.	326(1.6)	291(2.7)	7(5.2)	2(3.8)		1(3.7)	24(0.2)		1(1.9)				
	27.	634(3.0)	613(5.7)	4(3.0)	4(7.5)		1(3.7)	12(0.1)						
	28.	2(0)	2(0)											
TOTAL	1354(6.4)	1241(11.5)	25(18.7)	10(18.9)		3(11.1)	73(0.8)	1(0.5)	1(1.9)					
Para Professionals	29.													
	30.	269(1.3)	105(1.0)	3(2.2)				157(1.6)	2(1.1)	1(1.9)				
	31.	1197(5.7)	298(2.8)	7(5.2)			1(1.4)	863(8.9)	20(10.5)	2(3.8)	2(5.4)	2(10.0)		
	32.	1510(7.2)	280(2.6)	1(0.7)	3(5.7)	1(1.4)		1199(12.4)	22(11.6)	3(5.7)		1(5.0)		
	33.	521(2.5)	124(1.2)	1(0.7)				384(4.0)	6(3.2)	4(7.5)		2(10.0)		
	34.	88(0.4)	72(0.7)					16(0.2)						
	35.													
TOTAL	3585(17.0)	879(8.2)	12(9.0)	3(5.7)	2(2.8)	3(11.1)	2619(27.0)	50(26.3)	10(18.9)	2(5.4)	5(25.0)			
Office Clerical	36.													
	37.	58(0.3)	2(0)	2(1.5)				50(0.5)	2(1.1)	2(3.8)				
	38.	1446(6.9)	34(0.3)				1(1.4)	1357(14.0)	38(20.0)	8(15.1)	7(18.9)	1(5.0)		
	39.	1866(8.9)	135(1.3)	3(2.2)	1(1.9)			1680(17.3)	27(14.2)	14(26.4)	2(5.4)	4(20.0)		
	40.	349(1.7)	124(1.2)					222(2.3)	2(1.1)			1(5.0)		
	41.	60(0.3)	30(0.3)					30(0.3)						
	42.	1(0)	1(0)											
TOTAL	3780(18.0)	326(3.0)	5(3.7)	1(1.9)	1(1.4)		3339(34.5)	69(36.3)	24(45.3)	9(24.3)	6(30.0)			

IOWA - Total Employment													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)											
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE				FEMALE				
					Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	43.												
	44.												
	45.	34(0.2)	7(0.1)					27(0.3)					
	46.	261(1.2)	165(1.5)	4(3.0)	2(3.8)			87(0.9)	2(1.1)				1(5.0)
	47.	789(3.8)	764(7.1)	2(1.5)	1(1.9)		1(3.7)	19(0.2)	2(1.1)				
	48.	132(0.6)	126(1.2)				1(3.7)	5(0.1)					
	49.												
	TOTAL	1216(5.8)	1062(9.9)	6(4.5)	3(5.7)		2(7.4)	138(1.4)	4(2.1)				1(5.0)
Service Maintenance	50.												
	51.	10(0)						10(0.1)					
	52.	562(2.7)	200(1.9)	9(6.7)	2(3.8)	1(1.4)	1(3.7)	334(3.4)	6(3.2)	1(1.9)	7(18.9)		1(5.0)
	53.	1665(7.9)	1309(12.2)	16(11.9)	6(11.3)	1(1.4)	4(14.8)	318(3.3)	9(4.7)		2(5.4)		
	54.	140(0.7)	116(1.1)	2(1.5)				22(0.2)					
	55.	172(0.8)	169(1.6)	1(0.7)			1(3.7)	1(0)					
	56.												
	TOTAL	2549(12.1)	1794(16.7)	28(20.9)	8(15.1)	2(2.8)	6(22.2)	685(7.1)	15(7.9)	1(1.9)	9(24.3)		1(5.0)
TOTAL FULL TIME		21031	10758(51.2)	134(0.6)	53(0.3)	72(0.3)	27(0.1)	9687(46.1)	190(0.9)	53(0.3)	37(0.2)		20(0.1)
								NEW HIRES					
Officials/Adm	65.	36(1.2)	25(2.0)					11(0.7)					
Professionals	66.	618(20.4)	284(22.8)	7(24.1)	1(12.5)		12(85.7)	302(18.1)	5(12.8)	1(10.0)	6(42.9)		
Technicians	67.	224(7.4)	132(10.6)					91(5.5)			1(7.1)		
Prot. Serv.	68.	222(7.3)	205(16.5)	7(24.1)	1(12.5)			9(0.5)					
Para-Prof.	69.	833(27.5)	265(21.3)	6(20.7)	1(12.5)	1(7.1)	3(60.0)	548(32.9)	6(15.4)	1(10.0)	1(7.1)		1(100.0)
Off/Clerical	70.	644(21.3)	39(3.1)	2(6.9)				563(33.8)	26(66.7)	8(80.0)	5(35.7)		
Skilled Craft	71.	79(2.6)	63(5.1)		1(12.5)		1(20.0)	14(0.8)					
Serv./Maint.	72.	374(12.3)	232(18.6)	7(24.7)	4(50.0)		1(20.0)	127(7.6)	2(5.1)		1(7.1)		
TOTAL NEW HIRES		3030	1245(41.1)	29(1.0)	8(0.3)	14(0.5)	5(0.2)	1665(55.0)	39(1.3)	10(0.3)	14(0.5)		1(0)

KANSAS - Function 1: Financial Administration

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE							FEMALE		
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	2(0)	1(0.1)				1(0)						
	2.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	3.												
	4.	1(0)					1(0)						
	5.	39(0.8)					36(1.3)		2(1.6)		1(14.3)		
	6.	26(0.5)	5(0.3)				21(0.7)						
	7.	168(3.4)	117(6.7)	3(4.1)			45(1.6)		2(1.6)				
	8.	208(4.2)	189(10.8)	2(2.7)	1(2.3)		1(10.0)	1(10.0)	13(0.1)	2(1.6)			
	TOTAL	445(9.0)	313(17.9)	5(6.8)	1(2.3)		2(20.0)	117(4.1)	6(4.7)		1(14.3)		
Professionals	9.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	10.												
	11.	3(0.1)					3(0.1)						
	12.	1(0)					1(0)						
	13.	181(3.7)	73(4.2)	8(10.9)	6(14.0)		88(3.1)		5(3.9)	1(1.7)			
	14.	191(3.9)	95(5.4)	7(9.6)	2(4.7)	1(25.0)	74(2.6)		10(7.8)	1(1.7)	1(14.3)		
	15.	454(9.2)	300(17.2)	10(13.7)			130(4.6)	3(30.0)	9(7.0)	2(3.4)			
	16.	137(2.8)	120(6.9)	1(1.4)	2(4.7)		13(0.5)	1(10.0)					
	TOTAL	968(19.6)	589(33.8)	26(35.6)	10(23.3)	1(25.0)	4(40.0)	309(10.8)	24(18.6)	4(6.9)	1(14.3)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	1(0)					1(0)						
	20.												
	21.	389(7.9)	180(10.3)	1(1.4)	3(7.0)	1(25.0)	194(6.8)		7(5.4)	2(3.4)		1(33.3)	
	22.	201(4.1)	128(7.3)	1(1.4)	2(4.7)		67(2.3)		2(1.6)	1(1.7)			
	23.	125(2.5)	89(5.1)	2(2.7)	5(11.6)	1(25.0)	25(0.9)	1(10.0)	1(0.8)	1(1.7)			
	24.	6(0.1)	5(0.3)				1(0)						
	TOTAL	722(14.7)	402(23.1)	4(5.5)	10(23.3)	2(50.0)	1(10.0)	288(10.1)	10(7.8)	4(6.9)		1(33.3)	
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	58(1.2)	53(3.0)	1(1.4)			4(0.1)						
	28.												
	29.												
	30.	12(0.2)	11(0.6)				1(0)						
	31.	24(0.5)	22(1.3)				2(0.1)						
	32.	5(0.1)	4(0.2)				1(0)						
	TOTAL	99(2.0)	90(5.2)	1(1.4)			8(0.3)						
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	1(0)					1(0)						
	36.												
	37.	5(0.1)	5(0.3)										
	38.	4(0.1)	2(0.1)	1(1.4)						1(1.7)			
	39.	5(0.1)	1(0.1)		1(2.3)		3(0.1)						
	40.	2(0)	2(0.1)										
	TOTAL	17(0.3)	10(0.6)	1(1.4)	1(2.3)		4(0.1)			1(1.7)			
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	334(6.8)	27(1.5)	6(8.2)	5(11.6)		273(9.6)		17(13.2)	5(8.6)	1(14.3)		
	44.	1042(21.1)	37(2.1)	2(2.7)	3(7.0)		938(32.8)		37(28.7)	25(43.1)			
	45.	623(12.6)	39(2.2)		2(4.7)		553(19.4)		16(12.4)	9(15.5)	4(57.1)		
	46.	164(3.3)	10(0.6)				150(5.3)		2(1.6)	2(3.4)			
	47.	179(3.6)	33(1.9)	1(1.4)	2(4.7)		138(4.8)		4(3.1)	1(1.7)			
	48.	3(0.1)	3(0.1)										
	TOTAL	2345(47.6)	149(8.5)	9(12.3)	12(27.9)		2052(71.8)		76(58.9)	42(72.4)	5(71.4)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.			3(0.1)	1(0.1)										
53.			4(0.1)	3(0.1)										
54.			33(0.7)	20(1.1)	1(1.4)	1(2.3)								
55.			50(1.0)	42(2.4)	1(1.4)	1(2.3)								
56.			68(1.4)	65(3.7)	1(1.4)		1(25.0)							
TOTAL			158(3.2)	131(7.5)	3(4.1)	2(4.7)	1(25.0)							
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.			59(1.2)	13(0.7)	8(11.0)	2(4.7)		2(20.0)	27(0.9)	4(3.1)	2(3.4)			1(33.3)
60.			101(2.0)	42(2.4)	12(16.4)	5(11.6)		1(10.0)	29(1.0)	7(5.4)	4(6.9)			1(33.3)
61.			11(0.2)	3(0.1)	3(4.1)				2(0.1)	2(1.6)	1(1.7)			
62.			2(0)	2(0.1)										
63.			1(0)		1(1.4)									
64.														
TOTAL			174(3.5)	60(3.4)	24(32.9)	7(16.3)		3(30.0)	58(2.0)	13(10.1)	7(12.1)			2(66.7)
TOTAL FULL TIME			4928	1744	73	43	4	10	2857	129	58	7		3
Officials/Adm 73.			36(3.7)	25(9.4)	1(5.3)				10(1.6)					
Professionals 74.			201(20.7)	109(40.4)	4(21.1)	1(9.1)			77(12.6)	8(19.0)	1(6.6)	1(50.0)		
Technicians 75.			72(7.4)	44(16.5)		1(9.1)			25(4.1)	2(4.8)				
Prot. Serv. 76.			2(0.2)	2(0.7)										
Para-Prof. 77.			12(1.2)	6(2.2)	1(5.3)	1(9.1)			4(0.7)					
Off/Clerical 78.			532(54.9)	36(13.5)	6(31.6)	4(36.4)			448(73.4)	26(61.9)	11(73.3)	1(50.0)		
Skilled Craft 79.			18(1.8)	11(4.1)		1(9.1)			6(0.1)					
Serv./Maint. 80.			96(9.9)	34(12.7)	7(36.8)	3(27.3)		2(100.0)	40(6.6)	6(14.3)	3(20.0)			1(100.0)
TOTAL NEW HIRES			969	267	19	11		2	610	42	15	2		1

KANSAS - Function 2: Streets & Highways

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.		1(0)	1(0)										
	7.		16(0.4)	14(0.4)					2(0.4)					
	8.		29(0.7)	29(0.9)										
	TOTAL	46(1.2)	44(1.4)					2(0.4)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.		21(0.5)	10(0.3)	1(1.4)			1(10.0)	9(1.7)					
	15.		178(4.6)	159(5.0)	2(2.8)	3(4.2)		4(40.0)	10(1.9)					
	16.		197(5.1)	193(6.1)	1(1.4)			1(10.0)	1(0.2)					
	TOTAL	396(10.2)	362(11.4)	4(5.6)	3(4.2)	1(11.1)	6(60.0)	20(3.9)						
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.		290(7.5)	208(6.6)	10(13.9)	9(12.7)	2(22.2)	2(20.0)	56(10.8)					
	22.		147(3.8)	117(3.7)	6(8.3)	5(7.0)	1(11.1)	1(10.0)	12(2.3)	1(11.1)		3(17.6)	4(23.5)	
	23.		546(14.1)	537(17.2)	2(2.8)	3(4.2)			4(0.8)					
	24.		42(1.1)	42(1.3)										
	TOTAL	1025(26.5)	904(28.6)	18(25.0)	17(23.9)	3(33.3)	3(30.0)	72(13.9)	1(11.1)		7(41.2)			
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.													
	38.		4(0.1)		1(1.4)				1(0.2)	1(11.1)			1(100.0)	
	39.		1(0)						1(0.2)					
	40.													
	TOTAL	5(0.1)		1(1.4)				2(0.4)	1(11.1)			1(100.0)		
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.		9(0.2)	1(0)					8(1.5)					
	44.		132(3.4)	9(0.1)		1(1.4)		116(22.4)	4(44.4)	2(11.8)				
	45.		143(3.7)	17(0.5)	1(1.4)	1(1.4)		121(23.4)	1(11.1)	2(11.8)				
	46.		53(1.4)	20(0.6)				30(5.8)	1(11.1)	2(11.8)				
	47.		11(0.3)	3(0.1)				6(1.2)		2(11.8)				
	48.													
	TOTAL	348(9.0)	50(1.6)	1(1.4)	2(2.8)			281(54.4)	6(66.7)	8(47.1)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.		33(0.9)	25(0.8)	3(4.2)	1(1.4)			4(0.8)						
53.		294(7.6)	263(8.3)	11(15.3)	12(16.9)	3(33.3)	1(10.0)	4(0.8)						
54.		444(11.5)	433(13.7)	4(5.6)	6(8.5)	1(11.1)								
55.		30(0.8)	30(0.9)											
56.														
TOTAL		801(20.7)	751(23.7)	18(25.0)	19(26.8)	4(44.4)	1(10.0)	8(1.5)						
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.		3	1(0)					1(0.2)		1(5.9)				
60.		396(10.2)	269(8.5)	10(13.9)	6(8.5)			109(21.1)	1(11.1)	1(5.9)				
61.		626(16.2)	565(17.9)	19(26.4)	19(26.8)	1(11.1)		22(4.3)						
62.		50(1.3)	47(1.5)		3(4.2)									
63.		173(4.5)	170(5.4)	1(1.4)	2(2.8)									
64.														
TOTAL		1248(32.3)	1052(33.3)	30(41.7)	30(42.3)	1(11.1)		132(25.5)	1(11.1)	2(11.8)				
TOTAL FULL TIME		3869	3163	72	71	9	10	517	9	17			1	
Officials/Acm 73.		1(0.1)	1(0.2)											
Professionals 74.		39(4.5)	31(5.2)	1(3.7)	1(4.5)			5(2.4)						
Technicians 75.		130(15.1)	96(16.2)	7(25.9)	4(18.2)			1(50.0)		1(50.0)				
Prot. Serv. 76.								21(10.0)						
Para-Prof. 77.		3(0.3)		1(3.7)				1(0.5)	1(20.0)					
Off/Clerical 78.		75(8.7)	6(1.0)		1(4.5)			65(31.0)	3(60.0)					
Skilled Craft 79.		34(4.0)	29(4.9)	1(3.7)	2(9.1)			2(1.0)						
Serv./Maint. 80.		577(67.2)	428(72.4)	17(63.0)	14(64.0)			116(55.2)	1(20.0)	1(50.0)				
TOTAL NEW HIRES		859	591	27	22		2	210	5	2				

KANSAS - Function 3: Public Welfare
Annual Total
Salary (Columns)

Job Category	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE				FEMALE						
				Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	* White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP		
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	2(0)	1(0.1)				1(0)							
	7.	95(2.2)	39(4.5)	1(1.3)	1(4.8)	1(20.)	44(1.5)	9(3.0)						
	8.	51(1.2)	27(3.1)	1(1.3)			20(0.7)	3(1.0)						
	TOTAL	148(3.5)	67(7.8)	2(2.7)	1(4.8)	1(20.)	65(2.3)	12(4.0)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.	3(0.1)			1(4.8)		2(0.1)							
	12.													
	13.	10(0.2)	2(0.2)				2(0.1)	2(0.7)						
	14.	747(17.6)	197(22.9)	8(10.7)	7(33.3)	2(40.0)	472(16.4)	39(13.1)	8(12.7)	4(25.0)	8(47.1)			
	15.	824(19.4)	298(34.6)	12(16.0)	3(14.3)	1(20.0)	473(16.4)	34(11.4)	1(1.6)	1(6.3)	1(5.9)			
	16.	28(0.7)	26(3.0)				2(0.1)							
	TOTAL	1612(38.0)	523(60.7)	20(26.7)	11(52.4)	3(60.0)	951(33.1)	75(25.2)	9(14.3)	5(31.3)	9(52.9)			
Technicians	17.	3(0.1)					1(0)							
	18.													
	19.	3(0.1)					2(0.1)	1(0.3)						
	20.	705(16.6)	4(0.5)	5(6.7)	1(4.8)		606(21.1)	72(24.2)	12(19.0)	2(12.5)	3(17.6)			
	21.	114(2.7)	5(0.6)				95(3.3)	11(3.7)	3(4.8)					
	22.	17(0.4)	9(1.0)				7(0.2)		1(1.6)					
	23.	13(0.3)	10(1.2)				2(0.1)							1(5.9)
	24.													
	TOTAL	855(20.2)	28(3.2)	5(6.7)	1(4.8)		713(24.8)	84(28.2)	17(27.0)	2(12.5)	5(29.4)			
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.	1(.0)	1(0.1)											
	28.	2(.0)		2(2.7)										
	29.	1(.0)	1(0.1)											
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	4(0.1)	2(0.2)	2(2.7)	4(19.0)		81(2.8)	10(3.4)			1(6.3)	1(5.9)		
Para Professionals	33.	171(4.0)	53(6.1)	21(28.0)										
	34.													
	35.	56(1.3)	5(0.6)	3(4.0)			36(1.3)	8(2.7)	4(6.3)					
	36.	72(1.7)	3(0.3)	1(1.3)			58(2.0)	4(1.3)	6(9.5)					
	37.	102(2.4)	35(4.1)	6(8.0)		1(12.5)	44(1.5)	15(5.0)	1(1.6)					
	38.	14(0.3)	4(0.5)	2(2.7)			7(0.2)	1(0.3)						
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	415(9.8)	100(11.6)	33(44.0)	4(19.0)	1(12.5)	226(7.9)	38(12.8)	11(17.5)	1(6.3)	1(5.9)			
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	29(0.7)	2(0.2)				23(0.8)	4(1.3)						
	44.	521(12.3)	14(1.6)	1(1.3)	2(9.5)		432(15.0)	54(18.1)	10(15.9)	6(37.5)	2(11.8)			
	45.	351(8.3)	13(1.5)	2(2.7)	1(4.8)		300(10.4)	23(7.7)	11(17.5)	1(6.3)				
	46.	80(1.9)	5(0.6)				72(2.5)	3(1.0)						
	47.	9(0.2)					9(0.3)							
	48.													
	TOTAL	990(23.3)	34(3.9)	3(4.0)	3(14.3)		836(29.1)	84(28.2)	21(33.3)	7(43.8)	2(11.8)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columna)	MALE					* FEMALE						
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.	14(0.3)	14(1.6)											
	54.	12(0.3)	12(1.4)											
	55.	6(0.1)	6(0.7)											
	56.													
	TOTAL	32(0.8)	32(3.7)											
Service	57.	3(0.1)						3(0.1)						
Maintenance	58.	4(0.1)						4(0.1)						
	59.	28(0.7)	9(1.0)	1(1.3)				17(0.6)	1(0.3)					
	60.	125(2.9)	62(7.2)	8(10.7)			1(20.0)	1(12.5)	44(1.5)	4(1.3)	5(7.9)			
	61.	23(0.5)	5(0.6)	1(1.3)	1(4.8)			15(0.5)				1(6.3)		
	62.	2(0)						2(0.1)						
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	185(4.4)	76(8.8)	10(13.3)	1(4.8)	1(20.0)	1(12.5)	85(3.0)	5(1.7)	5(7.9)	1(6.3)			
TOTAL FULL TIME		4241	862	75	21	5	8	2876	298	63	16			17
Officials/Adm	73.	10(1.0)	5(3.2)					4(0.6)	1(1.0)					
Professionals	74.	283(27.6)	77(48.7)	3(17.6)	3(50.0)		4(80.0)	166(23.5)	23(23.0)	3(12.5)	1(25.0)		3(50.0)	
Technicians	75.	253(24.7)	5(3.2)		1(16.7)			105(29.1)	30(30.0)	11(45.8)			1(16.7)	
Prot. Serv.	76.	2(0.2)	1(0.6)	1(5.9)										
Para-Prof.	77.	127(12.4)	23(14.6)	8(47.1)			1(20.0)	80(11.3)	10(10.0)	4(16.7)	1(25.0)			
Off/Clerical	78.	277(27.0)	11(7.0)		2(33.3)			220(31.2)	34(34.0)	6(25.0)	2(50.0)		2(33.3)	
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.	73(7.1)	36(22.8)	5(29.4)				30(4.3)	2(2.0)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		1025	158	17	6		5	705	100	24	4		6	

KANSAS - Function 4: Police Protection

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE					* FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.		1(0.1)							1(16.7)			
	4.												
	5.												
	6.		5(0.6)	5(0.7)									
	7.		23(2.6)	20(2.9)	1(6.7)	1(10.0)		1(0.6)					
	8.		18(2.0)	17(2.5)				1(0.6)					
	TOTAL	47(5.3)	42(6.2)	1(6.7)	1(10.0)		2(1.2)		1(16.7)				
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.		12(1.4)	4(0.6)	1(6.7)			7(4.1)					
	15.		39(4.4)	35(5.1)	1(6.7)			3(1.8)					
	16.		3(0.3)	3(0.4)									
	TOTAL	54(6.1)	42(6.2)	2(13.3)			10(5.9)						
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.		18(2.0)	3(0.4)				15(8.9)					
	22.		11(1.2)	7(1.0)				4(2.4)					
	23.		46(5.2)	37(5.4)		2(20.0)		7(4.1)					
	24.		22(2.5)	22(3.2)									
	TOTAL	97(11.0)	69(10.1)		2(20.0)		26(15.4)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.		1(0.1)					1(0.6)					
	28.		29(3.3)	25(3.7)				4(2.4)					
	29.		28(3.2)	19(2.8)	1(6.7)			7(4.1)		1(33.3)			
	30.		137(15.5)	117(17.2)	7(46.7)	4(40.0)		8(4.7)	1(16.7)				
	31.		354(40.0)	347(51.0)	3(20.0)	3(30.0)		1(0.6)					
	32.		4(0.5)	4(0.6)									
	TOTAL	553(62.5)	512(75.2)	11(73.3)	7(70.0)		21(12.4)	1(16.7)	1(33.3)				
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.		7(0.8)					7(4.1)					
	38.		1(0.1)					1(0.6)					
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	8(0.9)					8(4.7)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.		15(1.7)					14(8.3)		1(33.3)			
	44.		48(5.4)					46(27.2)	2(33.3)				
	45.		34(3.8)	2(0.3)			1(100.0)	29(17.2)	2(33.3)				
	46.		5(0.6)	2(0.3)				2(1.2)		1(33.3)			
	47.		4(0.5)					4(2.4)					
	48.												
	TOTAL	106(12.0)	4(0.6)				1(100.0)	95(56.2)	4(66.7)	2(66.7)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE			
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asián or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asián or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.	5(0.6)	5(0.7)										
	54.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	55.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	8(0.9)	8(1.2)										
Service	57.												
Maintenance	58.												
	59.	2(0.2)						2(1.2)					
	60.	4(0.5)	1(0.1)	1(6.7)				2(1.2)					
	61.	6(0.7)	3(0.4)					3(1.8)					
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	12(1.4)	4(0.6)	1(6.7)				7(4.1)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		885	681	15	10		1	169	6	3			
Officials/Adm	73.	4(3.3)	3(4.3)										
Professionals	74.	10(8.3)	8(11.4)					2(4.7)		1(50.0)			
Technicians	75.	9(7.5)	2(2.9)					7(16.3)					
Prot. Serv.	76.	65(54.2)	54(77.1)	2(100.0)	2(100.0)			7(16.3)					
Para-Prof.	77.	1(0.8)						1(2.3)					
Off/Clerical	78.	26(21.7)						24(55.8)	1(50.0)	1(100.0)			
Skilled Craft	79.	2(1.7)	2(2.9)										
Serv./Maint.	80.	3(2.5)	1(1.4)					2(4.7)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		120	70	2	2			43	2	1			

KANSAS - Function 6: Natural Resources

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators														
1.														
2.														
3.														
4.														
5.		4(0.3)	4(0.4)											
6.		14(1.0)	11(1.1)											
7.		42(3.0)	38(3.9)		1(10.0)									
8.		26(1.9)	26(2.7)											
TOTAL		86(6.2)	79(8.2)		1(10.0)									
Professionals														
9.														
10.														
11.														
12.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
13.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
14.		47(3.4)	36(3.7)	1(3.7)										
15.		123(8.8)	107(11.1)		1(10.0)	1(33.3)	2(100.0)							
16.		40(2.9)	39(4.0)											
TOTAL		212(15.3)	183(18.9)	1(3.7)	1(10.0)	1(33.3)	2(100.0)							
Technicians														
17.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
18.														
19.		4(0.3)	1(0.1)											
20.		41(2.9)	10(1.0)	2(7.4)										
21.		35(2.5)	27(2.8)											
22.		145(10.4)	124(12.8)	4(14.8)		1(33.3)								
23.		142(10.2)	138(14.3)	1(3.7)		1(33.3)								
24.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
TOTAL		369(26.5)	302(31.2)	7(25.9)		2(66.7)								
Protective Service														
25.		1(0.1)												
26.														
27.														
28.														
29.		4(0.3)	4(0.4)											
30.		26(1.9)	26(2.7)											
31.		2(0.1)	2(0.2)											
32.														
TOTAL		33(2.4)	32(3.3)											
Para Professionals														
33.														
34.														
35.		24(1.7)	16(1.7)											
36.		3(0.2)	1(0.1)											
37.		7(0.5)	2(0.2)											
38.		2(0.1)												
39.														
40.														
TOTAL		36(2.6)	19(2.0)											
Office Clerical														
41.														
42.														
43.		18(1.3)	3(0.3)											
44.		111(8.0)	7(0.7)											
45.		83(6.0)	7(0.7)	2(7.4)										
46.		24(1.7)	2(0.2)											
47.		6(0.4)	1(0.1)											
48.														
TOTAL		242(17.4)	20(2.1)	2(7.4)										

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						* FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.	2(0.1)	1(0.1)					1(0.3)						
	53.	26(1.9)	25(2.6)	1(3.7)										
	54.	11(0.8)	11(1.1)											
	55.	5(0.4)	5(0.5)											
	56.													
	TOTAL	44(3.2)	42(4.3)	1(3.7)				1(0.3)						
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.	83(6.0)	58(6.0)	1(3.7)				24(6.6)						
	60.	54(3.9)	30(3.1)	2(7.4)	1(10.0)			20(5.5)	1(12.5)					
	61.	195(14.0)	166(17.2)	13(48.1)	7(70.0)			8(2.2)	1(12.5)					
	62.	31(2.2)	31(3.2)											
	63.	5(0.4)	5(0.5)											
	64.													
	TOTAL	368(26.5)	290(30.0)	16(59.3)	8(80.0)			52(14.2)	2(25.0)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		1390	967	27	10	3	2	366	8	7				
						NEW HIRES								
Officials/Adm	73.	4(1.0)	4(1.8)											
Professionals	74.	23(6.0)	19(8.5)	1(10.0)		1(100.0)		2(1.4)						
Technicians	75.	50(13.0)	20(9.0)	3(30.0)				24(16.7)	1(50.0)	2(50.0)				
Prot. Serv.	76.	5(1.3)	5(2.2)											
Para-Prof.	77.	24(6.2)	12(5.4)					12(8.3)						
Off/Clerical	78.	88(22.9)	11(4.9)					74(51.4)	1(50.0)	2(50.0)				
Skilled Craft	79.	7(1.8)	6(2.7)	1(10.0)										
Serv./Maint.	80.	184(47.8)	146(65.5)	5(50.0)	1(100.0)			32(22.2)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		385	223	10	1	1		144	2	4				

KANSAS - Function 7: Hospitals & Sanatoriums

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	3(0.1)	1(0.1)					2(0.1)						
	7.	43(0.8)	15(1.0)	1(0.4)				26(1.0)	1(0.2)					
	8.	27(0.5)	17(1.1)					10(0.4)						
TOTAL	73(1.4)	33(2.1)	1(0.4)				38(1.4)	1(0.2)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.	2(0)	1(0.1)					1(0)						
	13.	150(2.9)	43(2.8)	4(1.4)	1(1.8)	1(16.7)		93(3.5)	7(1.6)	1(1.7)				
	14.	377(7.4)	106(6.8)	7(2.5)				246(9.3)	9(2.1)	2(3.4)			4(13.8)	
	15.	116(2.3)	39(2.5)	1(0.4)	6(10.5)	1(16.7)	29(67.4)	23(0.9)	3(0.7)	1(1.7)			13(44.8)	
	16.	645(12.7)	189(12.2)	12(4.3)	7(12.3)	2(33.3)	32(74.4)	363(13.7)	19(4.5)	4(6.8)			17(58.6)	
TOTAL														
Technicians	17.													
	18.	239(4.7)	137(8.8)	15(5.4)	2(3.5)			74(2.8)	9(2.1)	2(3.4)				
	19.	419(8.2)	252(16.2)	43(15.5)	3(5.3)	1(16.7)		107(4.1)	10(2.4)	2(3.4)			1(3.4)	
	20.	10(6.2)						8(0.3)	2(0.5)					
	21.	80(1.6)	12(0.8)	1(0.4)	1(1.8)			55(2.1)	8(1.9)	3(5.1)				
	22.	10(0.2)	2(0.1)					7(0.3)		1(1.7)				
	23.	7(0.1)	3(0.2)	1(0.4)				3(0.1)						
	24.	1(0)		1(0.4)										
	25.	766(15.0)	406(26.1)	61(22.0)	6(10.5)	1(16.7)		254(9.6)	29(6.8)	8(13.6)			1(3.4)	
	TOTAL													
Protective Service	26.													
	27.	2(0)	2(0.1)											
	28.	2(0)	2(0.1)											
	29.	55(1.1)	47(3.0)	5(1.8)	1(1.8)			2(0.1)						
	30.	23(0.5)	19(1.2)	3(1.1)				1(0)						
	31.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	32.													
	TOTAL	83(1.6)	71(4.6)	8(2.9)	1(1.8)			3(0.1)	7(0.3)					
Para Professionals	33.	11(0.2)	4(0.3)											
	34.													
	35.	57(1.1)	10(0.6)	2(0.7)	1(1.8)	1(16.7)	1(2.3)	31(1.2)	9(2.1)	1(1.7)			1(3.4)	
	36.	921(18.1)	212(13.6)	82(29.6)	11(19.3)	2(33.3)	4(9.3)	501(19.0)	90(21.2)	11(18.6)	3(42.9)		5(17.2)	
	37.	677(13.3)	156(10.0)	16(5.8)	4(7.0)			421(15.9)	71(16.7)	8(13.6)			1(3.4)	
	38.	496(9.7)	76(4.8)	18(6.5)	8(14.0)			293(11.1)	92(21.6)	6(10.2)	2(28.6)		1(3.4)	
	39.	51(1.0)	13(0.8)	7(2.5)	1(1.8)			16(0.6)	14(3.3)					
	40.													
	TOTAL	2213(43.4)	471(30.3)	125(45.1)	25(43.9)	3(50.0)	5(11.6)	1269(48.0)	276(64.9)	26(44.1)	5(71.4)		8(27.6)	
	Office Clerical	41.												
42.														
43.		11(0.2)	1(0.1)					7(0.3)	1(0.2)	1(1.7)	1(14.3)			
44.		161(3.2)	10(0.6)		1(1.8)			137(5.2)	12(2.8)	1(1.7)				
45.		180(3.5)	15(1.0)		1(1.8)		1(2.3)	150(5.7)	8(1.9)	3(5.1)			2(6.9)	
46.		80(1.6)	13(0.8)					61(2.3)	5(1.2)	1(1.7)				
47.		10(0.2)		1(0.4)				7(0.3)	1(0.2)	1(1.7)				
48.														
TOTAL		442(8.7)	39(2.5)	1(0.4)	2(3.5)		1(2.3)	362(13.7)	27(6.4)	7(11.9)	1(14.3)		2(6.9)	

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE							* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.		3						3(0.1)						
53.		68(1.3)	54(3.5)	4(1.4)	2(3.5)			8(0.3)						
54.		101(2.0)	92(5.9)		3(5.3)		2(4.7)	4(0.2)						
55.		47(0.9)	46(3.0)	1(0.4)										
56.														
TOTAL		219(4.3)	192(12.4)	5(1.8)	5(8.8)		2(4.7)	15(0.6)						
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.		129(2.5)	32(2.1)	17(6.1)	3(5.3)		2(4.7)	66(2.5)	6(1.4)	3(5.1)				
60.		317(6.2)	70(4.5)	35(12.6)	4(7.0)		1(2.3)	168(6.4)	29(6.8)	8(13.6)	1(14.3)	1(3.4)		
61.		167(3.3)	36(2.3)	11(4.0)	3(5.3)			87(3.3)	27(6.4)	3(5.1)				
62.		33(0.6)	7(0.5)	1(0.4)	1(1.8)			14(0.5)	10(2.4)					
63.		11(0.2)	8(0.5)					2(0.1)	1(0.2)					
64.														
TOTAL		657(12.9)	153(9.8)	64(23.1)	11(19.3)		3(7.0)	337(12.8)	73(17.2)	14(23.7)	1(14.3)	1(3.4)		
TOTAL FULL TIME		5098	1554	277	57	6	43	2641	425	59	7	29		
						NEW HIRES								
Officials/Adm 73.		1(0.1)							1(1.1)					
Professionals 74.		138(10.1)	30(6.5)	1(0.9)	2(11.8)	1(20.0)	12(70.6)	76(12.1)	4(4.5)	2(11.8)		10(62.5)		
Technicians 75.		323(23.6)	169(36.3)	42(37.8)	2(11.8)	1(20.0)		91(14.4)	15(17.0)	2(11.8)		1(6.3)		
Prot. Serv. 76.		13(1.0)	11(2.4)	2(1.8)										
Para-Prof. 77.		655(47.9)	198(42.6)	49(44.1)	8(47.1)	3(60.0)	3(17.6)	325(51.6)	54(61.4)	8(47.1)	2(100.0)	5(31.3)		
Off/Clerical 78.		73(5.3)	3(0.6)					61(9.6)	7(8.0)	2(11.8)				
Skilled Craft 79.		13(1.0)	10(2.2)					3(0.5)						
Serv./Maint. 80.		152(11.1)	44(9.5)	17(15.3)	5(29.4)		2(11.8)	74(11.7)	7(8.0)	3(17.6)				
TOTAL NEW HIRES		1368	465	111	17	5	17	630	88	17	2	6		

KANSAS - Function 8: Health

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	1(0.2)	1(0.4)											
	7.	30(4.8)	11(4.1)					19(5.8)						
	8.	47(7.6)	33(12.3)					14(4.2)						
	TOTAL	78(12.6)	45(16.7)				33(10.0)							
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	1(0.2)								1(12.5)				
	14.	34(5.5)	16(5.9)	1(25.0)				16(4.8)		1(12.5)				
	15.	144(23.2)	83(30.9)	1(25.0)				57(17.3)	1(33.3)	2(25.0)				
	16.	25(4.0)	22(8.2)	1(25.0)				1(0.3)			1(33.3)			
	TOTAL	204(32.9)	121(45.0)	3(75.0)			74(22.4)	1(33.3)	4(50.0)	1(33.3)				
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.	8(1.3)	3(1.1)					5(1.5)						
	21.	41(6.6)	21(7.8)					20(6.1)						
	22.	31(5.0)	20(7.4)					11(3.3)						
	23.	44(7.1)	37(13.8)					6(1.8)						
	24.	2(0.3)	2(0.7)											
	TOTAL	126(20.3)	83(30.9)				1(100.0)	42(12.7)						
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.	1(0.2)								1(12.5)				
	36.													
	37.	1(0.2)						1(0.3)						
	38.													
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	2(0.3)					1(0.3)		1(12.5)					
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	9(1.5)		1(25.0)				8(2.4)						
	44.	98(15.8)	3(1.1)					92(27.9)	2(66.7)	1(12.5)				
	45.	69(11.1)	2(0.7)				1(50.0)	63(19.1)		1(12.5)	2(66.7)			
	46.	18(2.9)	1(0.4)				1(50.0)	15(4.5)		1(12.5)				
	47.	2(0.3)						2(0.6)						
	48.													
	TOTAL	196(31.6)	6(2.2)	1(25.0)	2(100.0)		180(54.5)	2(66.7)	3(37.5)	2(66.7)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.	2(0.3)	2(0.7)										
	54.												
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	2(0.3)	2(0.7)										
Service	57.												
Maintenance	58.												
	59.												
	60.	2(0.3)	2(0.7)										
	61.	10(1.6)	10(3.7)										
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	12(1.9)	12(4.5)										
TOTAL FULL TIME		620	269	4	2	1	330	3	8	3			
						NEW HIRES							
Officials/Acm	73.	7(6.3)	6(12.2)				1(1.6)						
Professionals	74.	28(25.2)	17(34.7)				11(17.7)						
Technicians	75.	27(24.3)	21(42.9)				6(9.7)						
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.												
Off/Clerical	78.	45(40.5)	1(2.0)				44(71.0)						
Skilled Craft	79.	1(0.9)	1(2.0)										
Serv./Maint.	80.	3(2.7)	3(6.1)										
TOTAL NEW HIRES		111	49				62						

KANSAS - Function 10: Community Development

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.		2(3.6)	2(8.0)									
	8.		4(7.3)	3(12.0)	1(50.0)								
	TOTAL	6(10.9)	5(20.0)	1(50.0)									
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.		1(1.8)	1(4.0)									
	14.		3(5.5)	3(12.0)									
	15.		17(30.9)	9(36.0)		1(100.0)			7(30.4)				
	16.		1(1.8)	1(4.0)									
	TOTAL	22(40.0)	14(56.0)		1(100.0)			7(30.4)					
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.												
	22.												
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL												
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.												
	38.												
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL												
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.		3(5.5)	1(4.0)				1(4.3)				1(100)	
	44.		14(25.5)	3(12.0)	1(50.0)			9(39.1)		1(50)			
	45.		4(7.3)					3(13.0)		1(50)			
	46.		2(3.6)					1(4.3)	1(100)				
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	23(41.8)	4(16.0)	1(50.0)			14(60.9)	1(100)	2(100)	1(100)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.	1(1.8)	1(4.0)										
	54.												
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	1(1.8)	1(4.0)										
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.												
	60.												
	61.	3(5.5)	1(4.0)										
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	3(5.5)	1(4.0)										
TOTAL FULL TIME		55	25	2	1			23	1	2	1		
Officials/Adm	73.	1(4.5)	1(10.0)										
Professionals	74.	6(27.3)	4(40.0)		1(100)			1(10.0)					
Technicians	75.												
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.												
Off/Clerical	78.	13(59.1)	4(40.0)	1(100)				8(80.0)					
Skilled Craft	79.												
Serv./Maint.	80.	2(9.1)	1(10.0)					1(10.0)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		22	10	1				10					

KANSAS - Function 11: Corrections
Annual Total
Salary (Columns)

Job Category	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE					FEMALE					
				Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP		
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)											
	7.	16(1.3)	11(1.6)	2(1.7)				2(0.7)	1(1.8)					
	8.	9(0.7)	4(0.6)	3(2.6)	1(4.2)			1(0.3)						
	TOTAL	27(2.2)	17(2.4)	5(4.3)	1(4.2)			3(1.0)	1(1.8)					
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	1(0.1)		1(0.9)										
	14.	23(1.9)	9(1.3)	2(1.7)	1(4.2)			8(2.7)	2(3.6)			1(50)		
	15.	69(5.7)	35(5.0)	6(5.1)				1(12.5)	25(8.4)	1(1.8)	1(33.3)			
	16.	14(1.2)	8(1.1)		1(4.2)			3(37.5)	2(0.7)					
	TOTAL	107(8.8)	52(7.4)	9(7.7)	2(8.3)			4(50.0)	35(11.7)	3(5.5)	1(33.3)	1(50)		
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.	2(0.2)						2(0.7)						
	20.	1(0.1)						1(0.3)						
	21.													
	22.													
	23.													
	24.													
	TOTAL	3(0.2)						3(1.0)						
Protective Service	25.	1(0.1)								1(1.8)				
	26.													
	27.	1(0.1)		1(0.9)										
	28.													
	29.	285(23.5)	189(26.9)	21(17.9)	5(20.8)			56(18.7)	13(23.6)	1(33.3)				
	30.	222(18.3)	179(25.5)	11(9.4)	5(20.8)	1(50)		18(6.0)	7(12.7)	1(33.3)				
	31.	82(6.8)	70(10.0)	5(4.3)	2(8.3)			4(1.3)						
	32.													
	TOTAL	591(48.7)	438(62.4)	38(32.5)	12(50.0)	1(50)	1(12.5)	78(26.1)	21(38.2)	2(66.7)				
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.	3(0.2)	3(0.4)											
	36.	1(0.1)						1(0.3)						
	37.	118(9.7)	34(4.8)	38(32.5)	6(25.0)	1(50)		32(10.7)	7(12.7)					
	38.	44(3.6)	8(1.1)	14(12.0)				12(4.0)	10(18.2)					
	39.	7(0.6)	2(0.3)	4(3.4)				1(0.3)						
	40.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
	TOTAL	174(14.3)	48(6.8)	56(47.9)	6(25.0)	1(50)		46(15.4)	17(30.9)					
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	7(0.6)	1(0.1)					5(1.7)				1(50)		
	44.	64(5.3)	7(1.0)					55(18.4)	2(3.6)					
	45.	46(3.8)	11(1.6)					34(11.4)	1(1.8)					
	46.	12(1.0)	4(0.6)					6(2.0)	2(3.6)					
	47.	3(0.2)	2(0.3)					1(0.3)						
	48.													
	TOTAL	132(10.9)	25(3.6)					101(33.8)	5(9.1)			1(50.0)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
53.		33(2.7)	30(4.3)	1(0.9)										
54.		48(4.0)	46(6.6)		1(4.2)			2(25.0)						
55.		18(1.5)	18(2.6)					1(12.5)						
56.														
TOTAL		100(8.2)	95(13.5)	1(0.9)	1(4.2)			3(37.5)						
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.		5(0.4)	1(0.1)					3(1.0)	1(1.8)					
60.		23(1.9)	4(0.6)	2(1.7)	1(4.2)			14(4.7)	2(3.6)					
61.		36(3.0)	13(1.9)	3(2.6)	1(4.2)			13(4.3)	4(7.3)		1(50)	1(50)		
62.		12(1.0)	7(1.0)	2(1.7)				3(1.0)						
63.		4(0.3)	2(0.3)	1(0.9)					1(1.8)					
64.														
TOTAL		80(6.6)	27(3.8)	8(6.8)	2(8.3)			33(11.0)	8(14.5)		1(50.0)	1(50.0)		
TOTAL FULL TIME		1214	702	117	24			299	55	3	2	2		
Officials/Adm 73.		6(2.3)	3(2.0)	2(9.1)					1(7.1)					
Professionals 74.		16(6.2)	6(4.1)	1(4.5)										
Technicians 75.		2(0.8)						9(12.7)						
Prot. Serv. 76.		138(53.5)	103(70.1)	9(40.9)	2(100)			2(2.8)						
Para-Prof. 77.		32(12.4)	8(5.4)	8(36.4)				19(26.8)	5(35.7)					
Off/Clerical 78.		31(12.0)	3(2.0)					11(15.5)	5(35.7)					
Skilled Craft 79.		16(6.2)	15(10.2)					26(36.6)	1(7.1)				1(100)	
Serv./Maint. 80.		17(6.6)	9(6.1)	2(9.1)										
TOTAL NEW HIRES		258	147	22	2			71	14				1	

NEW HIRES

KANSAS - Function 14: Employment Security

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						* FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	11(0.8)	5(0.9)						6(0.9)					
	7.	78(5.8)	57(10.7)	2(5.3)	4(14.3)				14(2.1)	1(2.1)				
	8.	36(2.7)	32(6.0)	1(2.6)	2(7.1)	1(33.3)								
TOTAL	125(9.3)	94(17.6)	3(7.9)	6(21.4)	1(33.3)			20(3.0)	1(2.1)					
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	179(13.3)	54(10.1)	4(10.5)	5(17.9)				97(14.6)	11(22.9)	5(19.2)	3(100)		
	14.	159(11.8)	68(12.8)	10(26.3)	5(17.9)				72(10.8)	4(8.3)				
	15.	235(17.5)	166(31.1)	8(21.1)	5(17.9)		1(100)		50(7.5)	3(6.3)	2(7.7)			
	16.	43(3.2)	42(7.9)						1(0.2)					
TOTAL	616(45.8)	330(61.9)	22(57.9)	15(53.6)		1(100)		220(33.1)	18(37.5)	7(26.9)	3(100)			
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.	11(0.8)	2(0.4)	1(2.6)					7(1.1)		1(3.8)			
	20.													
	21.	14(1.0)	2(0.4)						10(1.5)	2(4.2)				
	22.	23(1.7)	10(1.9)	3(7.9)	2(7.1)				8(1.2)					
	23.	39(2.9)	28(5.3)	1(2.6)			1(33.3)		9(1.4)					
	24.	4(0.3)	3(0.6)				1(33.3)							
TOTAL	91(6.8)	45(8.4)	5(13.2)	2(7.1)	2(66.7)			34(5.1)	2(4.2)	1(3.8)				
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.	1(0.1)			1(3.6)									
	28.													
	29.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)											
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
TOTAL	2(0.1)	1(0.2)		1(3.6)										
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.	30(2.2)	3(0.6)						21(3.2)	4(8.3)	2(7.7)			
	36.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)											
	37.	108(8.0)	25(4.7)	2(5.3)					76(11.4)	3(6.3)	2(7.7)			
	38.	2(0.1)							2(0.3)					
	39.													
	40.													
TOTAL	141(10.5)	29(5.4)	2(5.3)					99(14.9)	7(14.6)	4(15.4)				
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	30(2.2)	1(0.2)						26(3.9)	3(6.3)				
	44.	158(11.8)		1(2.6)					137(20.6)	11(22.9)	9(34.6)			
	45.	102(7.6)	1(0.2)		1(3.6)				92(13.9)	5(10.4)	3(11.5)			
	46.	36(2.7)	3(0.6)		1(3.6)				32(4.8)					
	47.	6(0.4)	3(0.6)						2(0.3)		1(3.8)			
	48.													
TOTAL	332(24.7)	8(1.5)	1(2.6)	2(7.1)				289(43.5)	19(39.6)	13(50.0)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE			
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.													
52.													
53.		4(0.3)	3(0.6)		1(3.6)								
54.													
55.		1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
56.													
TOTAL		5(0.4)	4(0.8)		1(3.6)								
Service Maintenance 57.													
58.													
59.		7(0.5)	6(1.1)							1(3.8)			
60.		24(1.8)	16(3.0)	4(10.5)	1(3.6)			2(0.3)	1(2.1)				
61.		1(0.1)		1(2.6)									
62.													
63.													
64.													
TOTAL		32(2.4)	22(4.1)	5(13.2)	1(3.6)			2(0.3)	1(2.1)	1(3.8)			
TOTAL FULL TIME		1344	533	38	28	3	1	664	48	26	3		
Officials/Adm 73.		12(3.3)	6(5.7)		1(11.1)			5(2.3)					
Professionals 74.		93(25.3)	46(43.8)	2(25.0)	4(44.4)			35(16.3)	5(25.0)	1(10.0)			
Technicians 75.		33(9.0)	14(13.3)	3(37.5)	1(11.1)	1(100)		13(6.0)		1(10.0)			
Prot. Serv. 76.		1(0.3)			1(11.1)								
Para-Prof. 77.		112(30.4)	28(26.7)	2(25.0)				73(34.0)	6(30.0)	3(30.0)			
Off/Clerical 78.		106(28.8)	3(2.9)		1(11.1)			89(41.4)	9(45.0)	4(40.0)			
Skilled Craft 79.		1(0.3)	1(1.0)										
Serv./Maint. 80.		10(2.7)	7(6.7)	1(12.5)	1(11.1)					1(10.0)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES		368	105	8	9	1		215	20	10			

KANSAS - Function 15: Other		MALE							* FEMALE				
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
	(B-K)	A											
Officials/ Administrators	1.	1(1.0)	1(2.6)										
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.	1(1.0)						1(2.0)					
	7.	7(7.2)	6(15.4)					1(2.0)					
	8.	3(3.1)	2(5.1)					1(2.0)					
	TOTAL	12(12.4)	9(23.1)				3(5.9)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.	3(3.1)	2(5.1)					1(2.0)					
	15.	16(16.5)	7(17.9)					9(17.6)					
	16.												
	TOTAL	19(19.6)	9(23.1)				10(19.6)						
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.												
	22.	2(2.1)	2(5.1)										
	23.	2(2.1)	1(2.6)					1(2.0)					
	24.												
	TOTAL	4(4.1)	3(7.7)				1(2.0)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	2(2.1)	2(5.1)										
	28.	1(1.0)	1(2.6)										
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL	3(3.1)	3(7.7)										
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.	3(3.1)						3(5.9)					
	38.												
	39.	1(1.0)						1(2.0)					
	40.												
	TOTAL	4(4.1)					4(7.8)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	5(5.2)	1(2.6)					4(7.8)					
	44.	12(12.4)	1(2.6)	1(20)				9(17.6)	1(50)				
	45.	16(16.5)	1(2.6)					15(29.4)					
	46.	7(7.2)	2(5.0)					4(7.8)	1(50)				
	47.	1(1.0)						1(2.0)					
	48.												
	TOTAL	41(42.3)	5(12.8)	1(20.0)			33(64.7)	2(100.0)					

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amet. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.	3(3.1)	3(7.7)											
	54.	1(1.0)	1(2.6)											
	55.	1(1.0)	1(2.6)											
	56.													
	TOTAL	5(5.2)	5(12.8)											
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.	2(2.1)	1(2.6)	1(20)										
	60.	4(4.1)	2(5.1)	2(40)										
	61.	3(3.1)	2(5.1)	1(20)										
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	9(9.3)	5(12.8)	4(80.0)										
TOTAL FULL TIME		97	39	5				51	2					
Officials/Adm	73.	1(9.1)	1(25)											
Professionals	74.													
Technicians	75.													
Prot. Serv.	76.	1(9.1)	1(25)											
Para-Prof.	77.													
Off/Clerical	78.	8(72.7)	2(50)					5(100)	1(100)					
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.	1(9.1)		1(100)										
TOTAL NEW HIRES		11	4	1				5	1					

NEW HIRES

KANSAS - Total Employment													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
	(B-K)	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	HNDCP	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.												
	8.												
	TOTAL	1093(4.6)	748(7.1)	18(2.6)	11(4.1)	2(6.1)	2(2.4)	289(2.7)	22(2.2)		1(2.6)		
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.												
	15.												
	16.												
	TOTAL	4855(20.4)	2414(22.9)	99(14.0)	50(18.7)	8(24.2)	55(66.3)	2023(18.7)	140(14.2)	29(11.8)	11(28.2)	26(50.0)	
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.												
	22.												
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	4058(17.1)	2242(21.3)	100(14.2)	38(14.2)	11(33.3)	4(4.8)	1487(13.8)	127(12.9)	40(16.3)	2(5.1)	7(13.5)	
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL	1368(5.8)	1149(10.9)	60(8.5)	21(7.9)	1(3.0)	1(1.2)	111(1.0)	22(2.2)	3(1.2)			
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.												
	38.												
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	3015(12.7)	677(6.4)	218(30.9)	36(13.5)	4(12.1)	6(7.2)	1676(15.5)	339(34.5)	43(17.5)	6(15.4)	10(19.2)	
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.												
	44.												
	45.												
	46.												
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	5197(21.9)	344(3.3)	20(2.8)	23(8.6)		2(2.4)	4454(41.3)	231(23.5)	102(41.5)	16(41.0)	5(9.6)	

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	* White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.														
53.														
54.														
55.														
56.														
TOTAL	1375(5.8)	1263(12.0)	28(4.0)	28(10.5)	5(15.2)	6(7.2)	45(0.4)							
Service														
Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.														
60.														
61.														
62.														
63.														
64.														
TOTAL	2780(11.7)	1702(16.1)	162(23.0)	60(22.5)	2(6.1)	7(8.4)	708(6.6)	103(10.5)	29(11.8)	3(7.7)	4(7.7)			
TOTAL FULL TIME	23741	10539(44.4)	705(3.0)	267(1.1)	33(0.1)	83(0.3)	10793(45.5)	984(4.1)	246(1.0)	39(0.2)	52(0.2)			
Officials/Adm 73.	83(1.5)	55(2.6)	3(1.4)	1(1.4)			20(0.7)	4(1.5)						
Professionals 74.	837(15.2)	347(16.6)	13(6.0)	12(16.9)	2(28.6)	17(63.0)	384(14.2)	40(14.6)	7(9.6)	2(25.0)	13(54.2)			
Technicians 75.	899(16.4)	371(17.8)	55(25.2)	9(12.7)	2(28.6)	1(3.7)	394(14.6)	48(17.5)	17(23.3)		2(8.3)			
Prot. Serv. 76.	227(4.1)	177(8.5)	14(6.4)	5(7.0)			26(1.0)	5(1.8)						
Para-Prof. 77.	966(17.6)	275(13.2)	69(31.7)	9(12.7)	3(42.9)	4(14.8)	507(18.7)	76(27.7)	15(20.5)	3(37.5)	5(20.8)			
Off/Clerical 78.	1274(23.2)	80(3.8)	7(3.2)	8(11.3)			1064(39.3)	83(30.3)	26(35.6)	3(37.5)	3(12.5)			
Skilled Craft 79.	92(1.7)	75(3.6)	2(0.9)	3(4.2)			1(3.7)	11(0.4)						
Serv./Maint. 80.	1118(20.3)	709(33.9)	55(25.2)	24(33.8)			4(14.8)	299(11.1)	18(6.6)	8(11.0)	1(4.2)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES	5496	2089(38.0)	218(4.0)	71(1.3)	7(0.1)	27(0.5)	2705(49.5)	274(5.0)	73(1.3)	8(0.1)	24(0.4)			

MISSOURI - Function 1: Financial Administration

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	21(0.7)	6(0.6)	1(1.7)				14(0.7)					
	6.	57(1.8)	26(2.6)	1(1.7)				29(1.5)	1(0.8)				
	7.	62(2.0)	42(4.3)	2(3.4)				17(0.9)	1(0.8)				
	8.	42(1.4)	39(4.0)	1(1.7)				2(0.1)					
	TOTAL	182(5.9)	113(11.5)	5(8.5)			62(3.2)	2(1.6)					
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.	1(0)						1(0.1)					
	13.	41(1.3)	24(2.4)	1(1.7)				13(0.7)	3(2.4)				
	14.	186(6.0)	100(10.2)	6(10.2)	1(50.0)			76(4.0)	2(1.6)		1(25.0)		
	15.	359(11.6)	259(26.3)	8(13.6)	1(50.0)	2(100)	1(100)	79(4.1)	7(5.6)	1(33.3)	1(25.0)		
	16.	47(1.5)	46(4.7)					1(0.1)					
	TOTAL	634(20.5)	429(43.6)	15(25.4)	2(100)	2(100)	1(100)	170(8.9)	12(9.6)	1(33.3)	2(50.0)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	22(0.7)						21(1.1)	1(0.8)				
	20.	88(2.8)	13(1.3)					67(3.5)	6(4.8)	1(33.3)	1(25.0)		
	21.	121(3.9)	46(4.7)					71(3.7)	4(3.2)				
	22.	55(1.8)	37(3.8)	1(1.7)				17(0.9)					
	23.	35(1.1)	29(3.0)					6(0.3)					
	24.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	TOTAL	322(10.4)	126(12.8)	1(1.7)			182(9.5)	11(8.8)	1(33.3)	1(25.0)			
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	13(0.4)	10(1.0)	1(1.7)				2(0.1)					
	28.	13(0.4)	9(0.9)	2(3.4)				2(0.1)					
	29.	4(0.1)	4(0.4)										
	30.	4(0.1)	4(0.4)										
	31.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	32.												
	TOTAL	35(1.1)	28(2.8)	3(5.1)			4(0.2)	2(0.1)					
Para Professionals	33.	3(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	34.												
	35.	5(0.2)	1(0.1)					4(0.2)					
	36.	74(2.4)	14(1.4)					58(3.0)	2(1.6)				
	37.	137(4.4)	59(6.0)	3(5.1)				69(3.6)	6(4.8)				
	38.	35(1.1)	21(2.1)					11(3.6)	3(2.4)				
	39.	3(0.1)	2(0.2)					1(0.1)					
	40.												
	TOTAL	257(8.3)	98(10.0)	3(5.1)			145(7.6)	11(8.8)					
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.	3(0.1)						3(0.2)					
	43.	547(17.7)	30(3.1)	3(5.1)				476(24.8)	37(29.6)		1(25.0)		
	44.	581(18.8)	25(2.5)	3(5.1)				521(27.2)	31(24.8)	1(33.3)			
	45.	301(9.7)	12(1.2)	1(1.7)				275(14.4)	13(10.4)				
	46.	56(1.8)	5(0.5)	1(1.7)				49(2.6)	1(0.8)				
	47.	9(0.3)	4(0.4)					5(0.3)					
	48.												
	TOTAL	1497(48.4)	76(7.7)	8(13.6)			1329(69.4)	82(65.6)	1(33.3)	1(25.0)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.		19(0.6)	9(0.9)	7(11.9)										
52.		13(0.4)	9(0.9)	1(1.7)				3(0.2)	3(2.4)					
53.		25(0.8)	25(2.5)											
54.		6(0.2)	5(0.5)					1(0.1)						
55.		10(0.3)	10(1.0)											
56.														
TOTAL		73(2.4)	58(5.9)	8(13.6)				4(0.2)	3(2.4)					
Service 57.														
Maintenance 58.		1(0)	1(0.1)											
59.		26(0.8)	6(0.6)	10(16.9)				6(0.3)	4(3.2)					
60.		17(0.5)	15(1.5)	1(1.7)				1(0.1)						
61.		29(0.9)	19(1.9)	2(3.4)				8(0.4)						
62.		15(0.5)	9(0.9)	2(3.4)				4(0.2)						
63.		7(0.2)	5(0.5)	1(1.7)				1(0.1)						
64.														
TOTAL		95(3.1)	55(5.6)	16(27.1)				20(1.0)	4(3.2)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		3095	983	59	2	2	1	1916	125	3	4			
Officials/Adm 75.		8(1.5)	7(3.8)					1(0.3)						
Professionals 76.		140(25.8)	90(48.6)	1(12.5)				46(13.6)	2(18.2)					
Technicians 77.		36(6.6)	17(9.2)					19(5.6)						
Prot. Serv. 78.		17(3.1)	16(8.6)					1(0.3)						
Para-Prof. 79.		41(7.6)	17(9.2)	1(12.5)				20(5.9)	3(27.3)					
Off/Clerical 80.		274(50.6)	20(10.8)	1(12.5)				247(73.7)	6(54.5)					
Skilled Craft 81.		4(0.7)	4(2.2)											
Serv./Maint. 82.		22(4.1)	14(7.6)	5(62.5)				3(0.9)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		542	185	8			1	337	11					

MISSOURI - Function 2: Streets & Highways

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.		1(0)											1(0.3)
	8.		29(0.5)	28(0.5)	1(0.5)									
	TOTAL	30(0.5)	28(0.5)	1(0.5)										1(0.3)
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.		23(0.4)	18(0.3)		1(7.1)							4(1.3)	
	15.		927(14.4)	901(15.5)	5(2.3)	3(21.4)	2(33.3)	4(12.5)	4(1.3)					1(6.3)
	16.		150(2.3)	149(2.6)				1(3.1)						
	TOTAL	1100(17.1)	1068(18.4)	5(2.3)	4(28.6)	2(33.3)	5(15.6)	15(4.7)					1(6.3)	
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.		14(0.2)	9(0.2)	1(0.5)								4(1.3)	
	21.		131(2.0)	120(2.1)	6(2.8)								5(1.6)	
	22.		356(5.5)	350(6.0)	3(1.4)	2(14.3)							1(0.3)	
	23.		226(3.5)	223(3.8)	1(0.5)	1(7.1)							1(0.3)	
	24.													
	TOTAL	727(11.3)	702(12.1)	11(5.1)	3(21.4)								11(3.5)	
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.													
	38.													
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL													
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.		18(0.3)										15(4.7)	3(18.8)
	44.		65(1.0)	5(0.1)	1(0.5)	2(14.3)							55(17.4)	2(12.5)
	45.		229(3.6)	67(1.2)	4(1.9)								153(48.4)	5(31.3)
	46.		101(1.6)	68(1.2)	1(0.5)								31(9.8)	1(6.3)
	47.		88(1.4)	84(1.4)	1(0.5)								1(3.1)	2(0.6)
	48.													
	TOTAL	501(7.8)	224(3.9)	7(3.3)	2(14.3)		1(3.1)	256(81.0)					11(68.8)	

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE					* FEMALE				
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.	4(0.1)	2(0)	2(0.9)									
	52.	1082(16.9)	951(16.3)	87(40.5)	4(28.6)		9(28.1)	28(8.9)				3(18.8)	
	53.	2145(33.4)	2060(35.4)	74(34.4)		2(33.3)	8(25.0)	1(0.3)					
	54.	599(9.3)	581(10.0)	9(4.2)	1(7.1)		8(25.0)						
	55.	162(2.5)	162(2.8)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	3992(62.2)	3756(64.6)	172(80.0)	5(35.7)	2(33.3)	25(78.1)	29(9.2)				3(18.8)	
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.	6(0.1)	2(0)	2(0.9)		1(16.7)		1(0.3)					
	60.	49(0.8)	30(0.5)	13(6.0)		1(16.7)	1(3.1)	3(0.9)				1(6.3)	
	61.	11(0.2)	7(0.1)	4(1.9)									
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	66(1.0)	39(0.6)	19(8.8)		2(33.3)	1(3.1)	4(1.3)				1(6.3)	
TOTAL FULL TIME		6416	5817	215	14	6	32	316				16	
Officials/Adm	75.	1(0.3)		1(2.0)									
Professionals	76.	14(3.7)	7(2.6)					6(15.4)				1(12.5)	
Technicians	77.	20(5.3)	17(6.3)	2(3.9)				1(2.6)					
Prot. Serv.	78.												
Para-Prof.	79.												
Off/Clerical	80.	26(6.9)	3(1.1)		1(25.0)			17(43.6)				5(62.5)	
Skilled Craft	81.	299(79.1)	236(87.1)	42(82.4)	2(50.0)		4(100)	13(33.3)				2(25)	
Serv./Maint.	82.	18(4.8)	8(3.0)	6(11.8)	1(25.0)	1(100)		2(5.1)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		378	271	51	4	1	4	39				8	

MISSOURI - Function 3: Public Welfare														
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)												
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE					FEMALE				
					Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.		1(0)						1(0)					
	7.		5(0.1)	2(0.3)					3(0.1)					
	8.		14(0.3)	12(1.5)	2(2.3)									
	TOTAL	20(0.4)	14(1.8)	2(2.3)				4(0.1)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.		1(0)						1(0)					
	12.		38(0.7)	9(1.1)				16(0.4)	13(1.4)					
	13.		2770(50.2)	421(53.2)	60(69.0)	3(75.0)		1817(49.5)	461(48.4)	2(50.0)	5(45.5)	1(100.0)		
	14.		959(17.4)	196(24.8)	17(19.5)	1(25)		608(16.6)	132(13.9)		5(45.5)			
	15.		287(5.2)	93(11.8)	4(4.6)		1(100.0)	156(4.3)	33(3.5)					
	16.		11(0.2)	9(1.1)				2(0.1)						
	TOTAL	4066(73.6)	728(92.0)	81(93.1)		4(100)	1(100.0)	2600(70.8)	639(67.1)	2(50.0)	10(90.9)	1(100.0)		
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.		6(0.1)					5(0.1)	1(0.1)					
	21.		11(0.2)	4(0.5)				6(0.2)	1(0.1)					
	22.		14(0.3)	13(1.6)				1(0)						
	23.		10(0.2)	9(1.1)				1(0)						
	24.													
	TOTAL	41(0.7)	26(3.3)				13(0.4)	2(0.2)						
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.		17(0.3)		1(1.1)			2(0.1)	14(1.5)					
	36.		37(0.7)	1(0.1)			3(0.1)	33(3.5)						
	37.		6(0.1)	2(0.3)			4(0.1)							
	38.		2(0)	1(0.1)			1(0)							
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	62(1.1)	4(0.5)	1(1.1)			10(0.3)	47(4.9)						
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.		1(0)					1(0)						
	43.		637(11.5)	14(1.8)	3(3.4)			470(12.8)	149(15.7)	1(25.0)				
	44.		510(9.2)	3(0.4)			411(11.2)	94(9.9)	1(25.0)	1(9.1)				
	45.		179(3.2)	1(0.1)			158(4.3)	20(2.1)						
	46.		4(0.1)				3(0.1)	1(0.1)						
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	1331(24.1)	18(2.3)	3(3.4)			1043(28.4)	264(27.7)	2(50.0)	1(9.1)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.													
52.													
53.		1(0.0)	1(0.1)										
54.													
55.													
56.													
TOTAL		1(0)	1(0.1)										
Service Maintenance 57.													
58.													
59.													
60.													
61.													
62.													
63.													
64.													
TOTAL FULL TIME		5521	791	87		4	1	3670	952	4	11	1	
Officials/Adm 75.		9(0.7)	7(4.4)					2(0.2)					
Professionals 76.		738(56.9)	132(83.5)	24(92.3)		1(100)		470(52.4)	95(47.7)	14(93.3)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)	
Technicians 77.		20(1.5)	8(5.1)					12(1.3)					
Prot. Serv. 78.													
Para-Prof. 79.		4(0.3)	2(1.3)					1(0.1)		1(6.7)			
Off/Clerical 80.		527(40.6)	9(5.7)	2(7.7)				412(45.9)	104(52.3)				
Skilled Craft 81.													
Serv./Maint. 82.													
TOTAL NEW HIRES		1298	158	26		1		897	199	15	1	1	

MISSOURI - Function 4: Police Protection

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.	3(0.2)	3(0.2)											
	8.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
	TOTAL	4(0.2)	4(0.3)											
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.													
	15.	5(0.3)	5(0.3)											
	16.	TOTAL	5(0.3)	5(0.3)										
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.	17(0.9)	8(0.5)					9(3.7)						
	20.	158(8.6)	112(7.4)	7(10.8)	1(12.5)			36(14.8)	2(12.5)					
	21.	318(17.2)	292(19.4)	8(12.3)				13(5.3)	5(31.3)					
	22.	135(7.3)	133(8.8)					1(0.4)					1(100.0)	
	23.	46(2.5)	46(3.0)											
	24.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
	TOTAL	675(36.6)	592(39.2)	15(23.1)	1(12.5)		59(24.2)	7(43.8)				1(100.0)		
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.	7(0.4)	4(0.3)	2(3.1)				1(0.4)						
	29.	41(2.2)	38(2.5)					3(1.2)						
	30.	263(14.2)	232(15.4)	23(35.4)	5(62.5)		1(50.0)	1(0.4)	1(6.3)					
	31.	586(31.7)	563(37.3)	20(30.8)	2(25.0)		1(50.0)							
	32.	33(1.8)	33(2.2)											
	TOTAL	930(50.4)	870(57.7)	45(69.2)	7(87.5)		2(100.0)	5(2.0)	1(6.3)					
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.													
	38.													
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL													
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.	20(1.1)						20(8.2)						
	43.	59(3.2)		1(1.5)				56(23.0)	1(6.3)	1(100.0)				
	44.	80(4.3)	1(0.1)					77(31.6)	2(12.5)					
	45.	21(1.1)	2(0.1)					17(7.0)	2(12.5)					
	46.	6(0.3)	1(0.1)					5(2.0)						
	47.	2(0.1)	2(0.1)											
	48.	TOTAL	188(10.2)	6(0.4)	1(1.5)			175(71.7)	5(31.3)	1(100.0)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Amer. Ind. Pac. Isl. E	Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.													
52.													
53.			1(0.1)	1(0.1)									
54.			1(0.1)	1(0.1)									
55.													
56.													
TOTAL			2(0.1)	2(0.1)									
Service Maintenance 57.													
58.			1(0.1)				1(0.4)						
59.			18(1.0)	13(0.9)			4(1.6)	1(6.3)					
60.			19(1.0)	15(1.0)	3(4.6)			1(6.3)					
61.			4(0.2)	2(0.1)	1(1.5)			1(6.3)					
62.													
63.													
64.													
TOTAL			42(2.3)	30(2.0)	4(6.2)			5(2.0)	3(18.8)				
TOTAL FULL TIME			1846	1509	65	8	2	244	16	1	1		
Officials/Adm 75.													
Professionals 76.													
Technicians 77.			14(8.8)	10(9.0)				3(20.0)	1(10.0)				
Prot. Serv. 78.			125(78.6)	97(87.4)	20(100.0)		3(100.0)	4(26.7)	1(10.0)				
Para-Prof. 79.													
Off/Clerical 80.			18(11.3)	2(1.8)				8(53.3)	8(80.0)				
Skilled Craft 81.			1(0.6)	1(0.9)									
Serv./Maint. 82.			1(0.6)	1(0.9)									
TOTAL NEW HIRES			159	111	20		3	15	10				

MISSOURI - Function 6: Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.	2(0.1)	1(0.1)						1(0.2)					
	6.	8(0.3)	8(0.5)											
	7.	85(3.7)	82(4.7)											
	8.	55(2.4)	54(3.1)					1(14.3)						
	TOTAL	150(6.6)	145(8.4)					1(14.3)						
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.	2(0.1)	1(0.1)											
	12.	28(1.2)	21(1.2)											
	13.	134(5.9)	98(5.7)	3(9.1)	1(12.5)	1(14.3)				1(5.6)			1(25.0)	
	14.	220(9.6)	186(10.7)	4(12.1)		1(14.3)	1(20)			3(16.7)				
	15.	281(12.3)	259(14.9)	1(3.0)		2(28.6)	1(20)			28(5.8)				
	16.	9(0.4)	8(0.5)			1(14.3)				28(5.8)				
	TOTAL	674(29.4)	573(33.0)	8(24.2)	1(12.5)	5(71.4)	2(40)		80(16.7)	4(22.2)			1(25.0)	
Technicians	17.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	18.													
	19.	13(0.6)	1(0.1)											
	20.	49(2.1)	35(2.0)						10(2.1)					
	21.	174(7.6)	149(8.6)	7(21.2)	3(37.5)				13(2.7)	1(5.6)		1(50.0)	1(25.0)	
	22.	67(2.9)	64(3.7)	1(3.0)	1(12.5)				15(3.1)					
	23.	54(2.4)	53(3.1)		1(12.5)				1(0.2)					
	24.													
	TOTAL	358(15.6)	303(17.5)	8(24.2)	5(62.5)				39(8.1)	1(5.6)		1(50.0)	1(25.0)	
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.	3(0.1)	3(0.2)											
	29.	54(2.4)	52(3.0)	2(6.1)										
	30.	84(3.7)	83(4.8)											
	31.	21(0.9)	21(1.2)											
	32.													
	TOTAL	162(7.1)	159(9.2)	2(6.1)					1(0.2)					
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.	5(0.2)	2(0.1)											
	36.	22(1.0)	18(1.0)											
	37.	52(2.3)	43(2.5)											
	38.	10(0.4)	6(0.3)											
	39.	5(0.2)	3(0.2)											
	40.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	TOTAL	95(4.1)	73(4.2)											
Office Clerical	41.	1(0)			1(12.5)									
	42.	1(0)												
	43.	104(4.5)	2(0.1)											
	44.	148(6.5)	9(0.5)	2(6.1)										
	45.	93(4.1)	8(0.5)											
	46.	11(0.5)	1(0.1)											
	47.	1(0)												
	48.													
	TOTAL	359(15.7)	20(1.2)	2(6.1)					323(67.4)	13(72.2)		1(50)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE					FEMALE				
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.		5(0.2)	5(0.3)										
52.		18(0.8)	14(0.8)	1(3.0)				3(0.6)					
53.		86(3.8)	82(4.7)	4(12.1)									
54.		40(1.7)	40(2.3)										
55.		5(0.2)	5(0.3)										
56.													
TOTAL		154(6.7)	146(8.4)	5(15.2)				3(0.6)					
Service Maintenance 57.													
58.		1(0)	1(0.1)										
59.		95(4.1)	81(4.7)	6(18.2)		1(14.3)		6(1.3)				1(25.0)	
60.		189(8.3)	182(10.5)	2(6.1)	1(12.5)			4(0.8)					
61.		52(2.3)	50(2.9)				2(40.0)						
62.		1(0)	1(0.1)										
63.													
64.													
TOTAL		338(14.8)	315(18.7)	8(24.2)	1(12.5)	1(14.3)	2(40)	10(2.1)	18		2		1(25.0)
TOTAL FULL TIME		2290	1734	33	8	7	5	479					4
Officials/Adm 75.		4(1.0)	4(1.7)										
Professionals 76.		137(35.5)	97(40.8)	2(20.0)		2(100)	1(100)	35(27.1)					
Technicians 77.		59(15.3)	43(18.1)					15(11.6)	1(16.7)				
Prot. Serv. 78.		6(1.6)	5(2.1)					1(0.8)					
Para-Prof. 79.		11(2.8)	7(2.9)					4(3.1)					
Off/Clerical 80.		76(19.7)	3(1.3)	1(10.0)				68(52.7)	4(66.7)				
Skilled Craft 81.		49(12.7)	46(19.3)	1(10.0)				1(0.8)	1(16.7)				
Serv./Maint. 82.		44(11.4)	33(13.9)	6(60.0)				5(3.9)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		386	238	10		2	1	129	6				

MISSOURI - Function 7: Hospitals and Sanatoriums

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic N	Asian or Pac. Isl. R	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	NDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.		2(0.2)	2(0.6)										
	8.		2(0.2)	2(0.2)										
	TOTAL	4(0.4)	4(1.2)											
Professionals	9.		23(2.0)	18(5.6)				1(10.0)						
	10.													
	11.		4(0.4)	3(0.9)										
	12.		5(0.4)	2(0.6)										
	13.		25(2.2)	8(2.5)			1(10.0)				1(11.1)			
	14.		111(9.8)	15(4.6)			1(10.0)				95(12.1)			
	15.		72(6.3)	24(7.4)			1(10.0)				46(5.9)			
	16.		34(3.0)	22(6.8)		1(50.0)	6(60.0)				4(0.5)		1(50.0)	
	TOTAL	274(24.2)	92(28.4)		1(50.0)	10(100)				168(21.4)			2(22.2)	1(50.0)
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.		2(0.2)											
	20.		80(7.1)	13(4.0)							1(0.1)		1(11.1)	
	21.		87(7.7)	10(3.1)							66(8.4)		1(11.1)	
	22.		8(0.7)	5(1.5)							77(9.8)			
	23.		4(0.4)	3(0.9)							3(0.4)			
	24.										1(0.1)			
	TOTAL	181(16.0)	31(9.6)							148(18.9)			2(22.2)	
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)										
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	1(0.1)	1(0.3)											
Para Professionals	33.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)										
	34.		1(0.1)											
	35.		92(8.1)	13(4.0)							1(0.1)			
	36.		73(6.4)	14(4.3)							77(9.8)		2(22.2)	
	37.		23(2.0)	3(0.9)							57(7.3)		2(22.2)	
	38.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)							20(2.5)			
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	190(16.8)	31(9.6)							155(19.7)			4(44.4)	
Office Clerical	41.		4(0.4)	2(0.6)										
	42.													
	43.		51(4.5)	4(1.2)										
	44.		61(5.4)	2(0.6)										
	45.		13(1.1)	1(0.3)										
	46.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)										
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	130(11.5)	10(3.1)							120(15.3)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE					* FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft 49.													
50.													
51.		14(1.2)		1(0.3)									
52.		13(1.1)		5(1.5)				13(1.7)					
53.		24(2.1)		15(4.6)				8(1.0)					
54.		24(2.1)		23(7.1)				9(1.1)					
55.								1(0.1)					
56.													
	TOTAL	75(6.6)		44(13.6)				31(3.9)					
Service 57.		1(0.1)		1(0.3)									
Maintenance 58.		1(0.1)											
59.		190(16.8)		53(16.4)	2(100.0)			1(0.1)					
60.		49(4.3)		24(7.4)				133(16.9)	1(11.1)			1(50.0)	
61.		26(2.3)		21(6.5)				25(3.2)					
62.		10(0.9)		10(3.1)		1(50.0)		4(0.5)					
63.		2(0.2)		2(0.6)									
64.													
	TOTAL	279(24.6)		111(34.3)	2(100)		1(50)	163(20.8)	1(11.1)			1(50.0)	
TOTAL FULL TIME		1134		324	2		2	785	9			2	
Officials/Adm 75.													
Professionals 76.		1(4.0)											
Technicians 77.								1(6.7)					
Prot. Serv. 78.													
Para-Prof. 79.		2(8.0)		1(10.0)									
Off/Clerical 80.								1(6.7)					
Skilled Craft 81.													
Serv./Maint. 82.		22(88.0)		9(9.0)				13(86.7)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		25		10				15					

10
NEW HIRES

MISSOURI - Function 8: Health			MALE							FEMALE			
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)											
	(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	8(0.1)	3(0.1)				5(0.1)						
	6.	46(0.4)	25(0.8)	3(0.4)			16(0.2)	2(0.1)					
	7.	301(2.3)	130(4.0)	6(0.9)	1(2.7)		129(2.0)	31(1.4)		2(3.7)			
	8.	91(0.7)	61(1.9)	3(0.4)	3(8.1)	9(12.7)	1(5.3)	12(0.2)		2(3.7)			
	TOTAL	446(3.4)	219(6.7)	12(1.7)	4(10.8)	9(12.7)	3(15.8)	162(2.5)	33(1.4)	4(7.4)			
Professionals	9.												
	10.						2(0)						
	11.	11(0.1)	8(0.2)	1(0.1)			5(0.1)	1(0)					
	12.	12(0.1)	5(0.2)	1(0.1)			267(4.1)	20(0.9)	1(2.5)	3(5.6)			
	13.	416(3.2)	112(3.4)	10(1.4)	1(2.7)	2(2.8)	628(9.6)	77(3.4)	7(17.5)	8(14.8)	1(2.8)		
	14.	1048(8.0)	305(9.4)	14(2.0)	1(2.7)	6(8.5)	1(5.3)	408(6.2)	97(4.2)	2(5.0)	9(16.7)	1(2.8)	
	15.	861(6.6)	311(9.5)	21(3.0)	4(10.8)	8(11.3)		12(0.2)	1(2.5)	17(31.5)			
	16.	156(1.2)	72(2.2)	1(0.1)	14(37.8)	38(53.5)	1(5.3)	1(0)	1(2.5)	17(31.5)			
	TOTAL	2504(19.1)	813(24.9)	48(7.0)	20(54.1)	54(76.1)	1(5.3)	1322(20.3)	196(8.6)	11(27.5)	37(68.5)	2(5.6)	
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	10(0.1)		1(0.1)			4(0.1)	5(0.2)					
	20.	356(2.7)	40(1.2)	5(0.7)			265(4.0)	46(2.0)					
	21.	338(2.6)	39(1.2)	4(0.6)			238(3.6)	51(2.2)	1(2.5)	3(5.6)	2(5.6)		
	22.	87(0.7)	42(1.3)	3(0.4)			37(0.6)	4(0.2)			1(2.8)		
	23.	41(0.3)	21(0.6)	2(0.3)			18(0.3)						
	24.												
	TOTAL	832(6.4)	142(4.4)	15(2.2)			562(8.6)	106(4.6)	1(2.5)	3(5.6)	3(8.3)		
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	17(0.1)	8(0.2)	7(1.0)				2(0.1)					
	28.	80(0.6)	55(1.7)	21(3.0)	1(2.7)		3(0)						
	29.	18(0.1)	12(0.4)	5(0.7)							1(2.8)		
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL	115(0.9)	75(2.3)	33(4.9)	1(2.7)		3(0)	2(0.1)			1(2.8)		
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	2581(19.8)	433(13.3)	246(35.7)	6(16.2)	4(5.6)	4(21.1)	1175(17.9)	695(30.4)	10(25.0)	2(3.7)	6(16.7)	
	36.	1612(12.4)	214(6.6)	60(8.7)		2(2.8)	3(15.8)	825(12.6)	496(21.7)		1(1.9)	11(30.6)	
	37.	645(4.9)	187(5.7)	22(3.2)				245(3.7)	188(8.2)	1(2.5)		2(5.6)	
	38.	48(0.4)	31(1.0)	1(0.1)			1(5.3)	14(0.2)	1(0)				
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	4886(37.4)	865(26.5)	329(47.7)	6(16.2)	6(8.5)	8(42.1)	2259(34.6)	1380(60.3)	11(27.5)	3(5.6)	19(52.8)	
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	495(3.8)	43(1.3)	7(1.0)	1(2.7)			399(6.1)	41(1.8)	2(5.0)	1(1.9)	1(2.8)	
	44.	903(6.9)	55(1.7)	4(0.6)				714(10.9)	119(5.2)	7(17.5)	1(1.9)	2(5.6)	
	45.	331(2.5)	27(0.8)	1(0.1)	1(2.7)		1(5.3)	280(4.3)	18(0.8)	2(5.0)	2(5.6)		
	46.	15(0.1)	9(0.3)					6(0.1)					
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	1744(13.4)	134(4.1)	12(1.7)	2(5.4)		1(5.3)	1399(21.5)	178(7.8)	11(27.5)	2(3.7)	5(13.9)	

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.		2(0)						1(0)	1(0)					
52.		9(0.1)	3(0.1)					3(0)	3(0.1)					
53.		147(1.1)	116(3.6)	5(0.7)	1(2.7)			15(0.2)	9(0.4)					
54.		207(1.6)	198(6.1)	5(0.7)		2(2.8)		1(5.3)						
55.		21(0.2)	21(0.6)					1(0)						
56.														
TOTAL		386(3.0)	338(10.4)	10(1.4)	1(2.7)	2(2.9)	2(10.5)	20(0.3)	13(0.6)					
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.		1268(9.7)	285(8.7)	141(20.4)			4(21.1)	583(8.9)	242(10.6)	5(12.5)	5(9.3)	3(8.3)		
60.		533(4.1)	183(5.6)	64(9.3)	1(2.7)			172(2.6)	110(4.8)	1(2.5)		2(5.6)		
61.		273(2.1)	156(4.8)	23(3.3)	2(5.4)			67(1.0)	24(1.0)			1(2.8)		
62.		55(0.4)	45(1.4)	3(0.4)				3(0)	4(0.2)					
63.		7(0.1)	7(0.2)											
64.														
TOTAL		2136(16.4)	676(20.7)	231(33.5)	3(8.1)		4(21.1)	825(12.6)	380(16.6)	6(15.0)	5(9.3)	6(16.7)		
TOTAL FULL TIME		13049	3262	690	37	71	19	6552	2288	40	54	36		
Officials/Adm 75.		4(0.6)	2(1.1)					2(0.6)						
Professionals 76.		110(16.4)	25(13.4)	3(6.3)	1(33.3)	3(42.9)		70(22.3)	7(6.4)		1(50)			
Technicians 77.		16(2.4)	1(0.5)					11(3.5)	4(3.7)					
Prot. Serv. 78.		9(1.3)	2(1.1)	4(8.3)	1(33.3)			2(0.6)						
Para-Prof. 79.		306(45.6)	69(37.1)	24(50.0)	1(33.3)	3(42.9)		130(41.4)	77(70.6)	1(100.0)		1(100.0)		
Off/Clerical 80.		88(13.1)	12(6.5)	1(2.1)				63(20.1)	12(11.0)					
Skilled Craft 81.		6(0.9)	5(2.7)			1(14.3)								
Serv./Maint. 82.		132(19.7)	70(37.6)	16(33.3)				36(11.5)	9(8.3)		1(50.0)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES		671	186	48	3	7		314	109	1	2	1		

MISSOURI - Function 11: Corrections

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columnis)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	7.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	8.	8(0.3)	7(0.5)							1(0.8)				
	TOTAL	10(0.4)	9(0.6)						1(0.8)					
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	191(8.2)	68(4.6)	18(14.1)				83(14.5)	22(18.5)					
	14.	371(16.0)	263(17.9)	18(14.1)		3(100)		69(12.1)	18(15.1)					
	15.	213(9.2)	164(11.2)	10(7.8)	1(100.0)			29(5.1)	9(7.6)					
	16.	17(0.7)	17(1.2)											
	TOTAL	792(34.1)	512(34.9)	46(35.9)	1(100.0)	3(100)	181(31.7)	49(41.2)						
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.	11(0.5)	2(0.1)					8(1.4)	1(0.8)					
	22.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	23.	10(0.4)	6(0.4)					4(0.7)						
	24.													
	TOTAL	22(0.9)	9(0.6)				12(2.1)	1(0.8)						
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.	27(1.2)	8(0.5)	8(6.3)				4(0.7)	7(5.9)					
	29.	46(2.0)	33(2.2)	6(4.7)				5(0.9)	2(1.7)					
	30.	672(29.0)	545(37.2)	40(31.3)			2(7.4)	74(13.0)	10(8.4)		1(100.0)			
	31.	53(2.3)	51(3.5)	1(0.8)				1(0.2)						
	32.													
	TOTAL	798(34.4)	637(43.4)	55(43.0)			2(7.4)	84(14.7)	19(16.0)		1(100.0)			
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.	99(4.3)	61(4.2)	17(13.3)				10(1.8)	11(9.2)					
	38.	27(1.2)	23(1.6)	1(0.8)				3(0.5)						
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	126(5.4)	84(5.7)	18(14.1)			13(2.3)	11(9.2)						
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.	122(5.3)	3(0.2)					9(16.5)	14(11.8)	1(50.0)		1(100.0)		
	44.	144(6.2)	4(0.3)					12(44.4)	10(8.4)					
	45.	85(3.7)	22(1.5)	1(0.8)				4(14.8)	3(2.5)	1(50.0)				
	46.	8(0.3)	5(0.3)					54(9.5)	2(0.4)					
	47.	2(0.1)	1(0.1)					2(0.2)	1(0.8)					
	48.							1(0.2)						
	TOTAL	361(15.6)	35(2.4)	1(0.8)			25(92.6)	269(47.1)	28(23.5)	2(100.0)		1(100.0)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE						FEMALE					
			White A	Black B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.														
53.		34(1.5)	23(1.6)					2(0.4)	6(5.0)					
54.		60(2.6)	59(4.0)					1(0.2)						
55.		21(0.9)	20(1.4)											
56.														
TOTAL		115(5.0)	102(7.0)	4(3.1)				3(0.5)	6(5.0)					
Service Maintenance 57.		1(0)	1(0.1)											
58.														
59.														
60.		3(0.1)	3(0.2)											
61.		56(2.4)	44(3.0)					7(1.2)	3(2.5)					
62.		31(1.3)	26(1.8)					2(0.4)	1(0.8)					
63.		5(0.2)	5(0.3)											
64.														
TOTAL		96(4.1)	79(5.4)	4(3.1)				9(1.6)	4(3.4)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		2320	1467	128	1	3	27	571	119	2	1	1		
Officials/Adm 75.														
Professionals 76.		81(18.8)	32(14.6)	8(53.3)				30(17.9)	11(44.0)					
Technicians 77.														
Prot. Serv. 78.		201(46.5)	165(75.3)	5(33.3)				1(100)	30(17.9)					
Para-Prof. 79.		5(1.2)	2(0.9)					3(1.8)						
Off/Clerical 80.		119(27.5)	3(1.4)	1(6.7)				97(57.7)	14(56.0)	2(100.0)	2(100.0)			
Skilled Craft 81.		5(1.2)	2(0.9)					3(1.8)						
Serv./Maint. 82.		21(4.9)	15(6.8)	1(6.7)				5(3.0)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		432	219	15			1	168	25	2	2			

MISSOURI - Function 14: Employment Security													
Job Category	Annual	Total											
	Salary	(B-K)	White	Black	MALE					FEMALE			
	(Column)	A	B	C	Hispanic	Asian or	Amer. Ind.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or	Amer. Ind.	HNDCP
					D	Pac. Isl.	Alaskan	G	H	I	J	K	
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.	4(0.2)	2(0.2)	1(2.0)				1(0.1)					
	7.	239(10.2)	196(22.0)	8(16.0)			1(25.0)	25(2.0)	9(5.8)				
	8.	16(0.7)	16(1.8)										
	TOTAL	259(11.0)	214(24.0)	9(18.0)		1(25.0)	26(2.1)	9(5.8)					
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.	197(8.4)	72(8.1)	6(12.0)			1(25.0)	110(8.9)	8(5.1)				
	14.	852(36.3)	356(40.0)	19(38.0)	2(100.0)	2(50.0)	1(50.0)	403(32.6)	67(42.9)	1(33.3)			1(33.3)
	15.	181(7.7)	135(15.2)	4(8.0)				40(3.2)	2(1.3)				
	16.	TOTAL	1230(52.4)	563(63.2)	29(58.0)	2(100.0)	3(75.0)	1(50.0)	553(44.8)	77(49.4)	1(33.3)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	3(0.1)	1(0.1)					2(0.2)					
	20.	12(0.5)	2(0.2)					10(0.8)					
	21.	48(2.0)	29(3.3)	4(8.0)				1(50.0)	13(1.1)	1(0.6)			
	22.	21(0.9)	16(1.8)					5(0.4)					
	23.	3(0.1)	3(0.3)										
	24.	TOTAL	87(3.7)	51(5.7)	4(8.0)			1(50.0)	30(2.4)	1(0.6)			
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)										
	30.												
	31.												
	32.	TOTAL	2(0.1)	2(0.2)									
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.	40(1.7)	11(1.2)					26(2.1)	2(1.3)			1(33.3)	
	37.	204(8.7)	22(2.5)	4(8.0)				136(11.0)	39(25)			1(33.3)	2(66.7)
	38.												
	39.												
	40.	TOTAL	244(10.4)	33(3.7)	4(8.0)			162(13.1)	41(26.3)			2(66.6)	2(66.7)
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	92(3.9)	7(0.8)	1(2.0)				81(6.6)	3(1.9)				
	44.	289(12.3)	4(0.4)					260(21.1)	23(14.7)	2(66.7)			
	45.	125(5.3)	4(0.4)					118(9.6)	2(1.3)			1(33.3)	
	46.	5(0.2)						5(0.4)					
	47.												
	48.	TOTAL	511(21.8)	15(1.7)	1(2.0)			464(37.6)	28(17.9)	2(66.7)	1(33.3)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.	3(0.1)	1(0.1)	2(2.0)										
	54.	6(0.3)	6(0.7)											
	55.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)											
	56.													
	TOTAL	11(0.5)	9(1.0)	2(4.0)										
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.													
	60.	4(0.2)	3(0.3)	1(1.0)										
	61.	1(0)	1(0.1)											
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	5(0.2)	4(0.4)	1(2.0)										
TOTAL FULL TIME		2349	891	50	2	4	2	1235	156	3	3	3		
						NEW HIRES								
Officials/Adm	75.	1(0.3)	1(0.9)											
Professionals	76.	76(22.4)	49(43.4)	4(36.4)		1(100)		20(9.9)	2(18.2)					
Technicians	77.	29(8.6)	22(19.5)	4(36.4)				2(1.0)	1(9.1)					
Prot. Serv.	78.													
Para-Prof.	79.	74(21.8)	35(31.0)	1(9.1)				37(18.3)	1(9.1)					
Off/Clerical	80.	159(46.9)	6(5.3)	2(18.2)				143(70.8)	7(63.6)	1(100.0)				
Skilled Craft	81.													
Serv./Maint.	82.													
TOTAL NEW HIRES		339	113	11		1		202	11	1				

MISSOURI - Function 15: Other

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE					FEMALE						
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.		1(0)						1(0.1)					
	6.		9(0.3)	6(0.5)	1(1.0)				2(0.1)					
	7.		109(3.2)	84(7.3)	4(4.1)				20(1.1)	1(0.5)				
	8.		98(2.9)	89(7.8)	3(3.1)				2(0.1)	3(1.5)				
	TOTAL	217(6.4)	179(15.7)	8(8.2)			1(25.0)	25(1.3)	4(2.1)					
Professionals	9.		1(0.1)											
	10.		1(0.1)											
	11.		1(0.1)											
	12.		149(4.4)	4(0.3)	2(2.0)				133(7.0)	10(5.1)				
	13.		325(9.6)	78(6.8)	8(8.2)	1(50.0)			218(11.5)	16(8.2)	1(8.3)	1(16.7)	2(40.0)	
	14.		289(8.6)	137(12.0)	16(16.3)			1(25.0)	116(6.1)	19(9.7)				
	15.		611(18.1)	454(39.7)	16(16.3)			3(75.0)	2(50.0)	117(6.2)	14(7.2)	1(8.3)	3(50.0)	1(20.0)
	16.		57(1.7)	47(4.1)					9(0.5)	1(0.5)				
	TOTAL	1434(42.6)	723(63.3)	42(42.9)	1(50.0)	3(75.0)	3(75.0)	593(31.2)	60(30.8)	2(16.7)	4(66.7)	3(60.0)		
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.		5(0.1)	2(0.2)					3(0.2)					
	20.		5(0.1)	2(0.2)					3(0.2)					
	21.		30(0.9)	18(1.6)	2(2.0)				8(0.4)	2(1.0)				
	22.		38(1.1)	32(2.8)					4(0.2)	1(0.5)	1(8.3)			
	23.		33(1.0)	26(2.3)					6(0.3)	1(0.5)				
	24.													
	TOTAL	111(3.3)	80(7.0)	2(2.0)				24(1.3)	4(2.1)	1(8.3)				
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.		9(0.3)	7(0.6)	1(1.0)				1(0.1)					
	28.		1(0)		1(1.0)									
	29.		1(0)						1(0.1)					
	30.		1(0)	1(0.1)										
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	12(0.4)	8(0.7)	2(2.0)				2(0.1)						
Para Professionals	33.		210(6.2)	4(0.3)	1(1.0)				158(8.3)	41(21.0)	3(25.0)	1(16.7)	2(40.0)	
	34.		87(2.6)	6(0.5)	2(2.0)				75(3.9)	4(2.1)				
	35.		55(1.6)	4(0.3)	2(2.0)				40(2.1)	9(4.6)				
	36.		27(0.8)	4(0.3)	1(1.0)				19(1.0)	3(1.5)				
	37.		20(0.6)	1(0.1)					17(0.9)	2(1.0)				
	38.		9(0.3)	2(0.2)					7(0.4)					
	39.		1(0)	1(0.1)										
	40.													
	TOTAL	409(21.1)	22(1.9)	6(6.1)				316(16.6)	59(30.3)	3(25.0)	1(16.7)	2(40.0)		
Office Clerical	41.		3(0.1)						2(0.1)	1(0.5)				
	42.		9(0.3)						9(0.5)					
	43.		143(4.2)	9(0.8)	4(4.1)				121(6.4)	5(2.6)	4(33.3)			
	44.		480(14.3)	7(0.6)	3(3.1)				441(23.2)	26(13.3)	2(16.7)	1(16.7)		
	45.		243(7.2)	7(0.6)	4(4.1)				228(12.0)	4(2.1)				
	46.		34(1.0)	2(0.2)					32(1.7)					
	47.		27(0.8)	7(0.6)					20(1.1)					
	48.													
	TOTAL	939(27.9)	32(2.8)	11(11.2)				853(44.9)	36(18.5)	6(50)	1(16.7)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE			
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft 49.		1(0)							1(0.1)				
50.													
51.													
52.		5(0.1)	3(0.3)						2(0.1)				
53.		12(0.4)	9(0.8)						3(0.2)				
54.		6(0.2)	6(0.5)										
55.		2(0.1)	2(0.2)										
56.													
TOTAL		26(0.8)	20(1.7)						6(0.3)				
Service Maintenance 57.		44(1.3)	13(1.1)	3(3.1)					23(1.2)	4(2.1)			
58.		38(1.1)	5(0.4)				1(25)		24(1.3)	9(4.6)			
59.		90(2.7)	32(2.8)	15(15.3)	1(50.0)				27(1.4)	15(7.7)			
60.		37(1.1)	23(2.0)	9(9.2)					2(0.1)	3(1.5)			
61.		9(0.3)	5(0.4)						3(0.2)	1(0.5)			
62.		2(0.1)	1(0.6)						1(0.1)				
63.													
64.													
TOTAL FULL TIME		220(6.5)	79(6.9)	27(27.6)	1(50.0)		1(25)		80(4.2)	32(16.4)			
		3368	1143	98	2		4		1899	195	12		6
Officials/Adm 75.		7(1.4)	4(2.8)	1(10.0)									
Professionals 76.		237(47.5)	97(68.8)	5(50.0)					2(0.7)				
Technicians 77.		13(2.6)	12(8.5)				3(100)		118(38.7)	14(40.0)			
Prot. Serv. 78.		1(0.2)	1(0.7)						1(0.3)				
Para-Prof. 79.		71(14.3)	9(6.4)	2(20.0)					49(16.1)	10(28.6)			1(100.0)
Off/Clerical 80.		141(28.5)	9(6.4)						122(40.0)	10(28.6)			
Skilled Craft 81.		1(0.2)							1(0.3)				
Serv./Maint. 82.		24(4.8)	9(6.4)	2(20.0)					12(3.9)	1(2.9)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES		495	141	10			3		305	35			1

MISSOURI - Total Employment

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amet. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.													
	6.													
	7.													
	8.													
	TOTAL	1322(3.2)	929(5.2)	37(2.6)	4(5.3)	12(10.8)	3(3.2)	284(1.6)	49(1.3)		4(4.8)			
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.													
	14.													
	15.													
	16.													
	TOTAL	12713(30.7)	5506(30.7)	274(19.2)	32(42.1)	86(77.5)	14(15.1)	5682(32.2)	1040(26.7)	17(26.2)	54(64.3)	8(16.0)		
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.													
	20.													
	21.													
	22.													
	23.													
	24.													
	TOTAL	3356(8.1)	2062(11.5)	56(3.9)	9(11.8)		1(1.1)	1080(6.1)	135(3.5)	3(4.6)	6(7.1)	4(8.0)		
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.													
	30.													
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	2055(5.0)	1780(9.9)	140(9.8)	8(10.5)		4(4.3)	99(0.6)	22(0.6)		1(1.2)	1(2.0)		
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.													
	37.													
	38.													
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	6269(15.1)	1210(6.8)	361(25.3)	7(9.2)	6(5.4)	9(9.7)	3079(17.4)	1553(39.9)	14(21.5)	6(7.1)	24(48.0)		
Office Clerical	41.													
	42.													
	43.													
	44.													
	45.													
	46.													
	47.													
	48.													
	TOTAL	7561(18.3)	570(3.2)	46(3.2)	4(5.3)		27(29.0)	6231(35.3)	645(16.6)	25(38.5)	7(38.5)	6(12.0)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HND/CP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.													
	54.													
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	4835(11.7)	4476(25.0)	201(14.1)	6(7.9)	4(3.6)	27(29.0)	96(0.5)	25(0.6)					
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.													
	60.													
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
TOTAL FULL TIME	TOTAL	3277(7.9)	1388(7.7)	312(21.9)	6(7.9)	3(2.7)	8(8.6)	1116(6.3)	425(10.9)	6(9.2)	6(7.1)	7(14.0)		
		41388	17921(43.3)	1427(3.4)	76(0.2)	111(0.3)	93(0.2)	1766(42.7)	3894(9.4)	65(0.2)	84(0.2)	50(0.1)		
Officials/Adm	75.	34(0.7)	25(1.5)	2(1.0)				7(0.3)						
Professionals	76.	1534(32.5)	529(32.4)	47(23.6)	1(14.3)	10(66.7)	2(20.0)	796(32.9)	132(31.9)	14(70.0)	2(40.0)	1(50.0)		
Technicians	77.	207(4.4)	130(8.0)	6(3.0)				64(2.6)	7(1.7)					
Prot. Serv.	78.	359(7.6)	286(17.5)	29(14.6)	1(14.3)		4(40.0)	38(1.6)	1(0.2)					
Para-Prof.	79.	514(10.9)	142(8.7)	28(14.1)	1(14.3)	3(20.0)		245(10.1)	91(22.0)	3(15.0)		1(50.0)		
Off/Clerical	80.	1428(30.2)	67(4.1)	8(4.0)	1(14.3)			177(48.6)	170(41.1)	3(15.0)	2(40.0)			
Skilled Craft	81.	365(7.7)	294(18.0)	43(21.6)	2(28.6)	1(6.7)	4(40.0)	18(0.7)	3(0.7)					
Serv./Maint.	82.	284(6.0)	159(9.7)	36(18.1)	1(14.3)	1(6.7)		76(3.1)	10(2.4)		1(20.0)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES		4725	1632(34.5)	199(4.2)	7(0.1)	15(0.3)	10(0.2)	2421(51.2)	414(8.8)	20(0.4)	5(0.1)	2(0)		

NEBRASKA - Function 1: Financial Administration

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HMDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	45(1.6)	29(2.1)					14(1.0)	1(3.4)			1(14.3)	
	2.	48(1.7)	44(3.2)	1(5.0)				3(0.2)					
	3.												
	4.	3(0.1)	1(0.1)					2(0.1)					
	5.	54(1.9)	24(1.7)	2(10.0)				28(2.1)					
	6.	65(2.3)	39(2.8)					25(1.9)	1(3.4)				
	7.	137(4.9)	110(7.9)		1(7.7)			25(1.9)		1(6.3)			
	8.	113(4.0)	105(7.6)	2(10.0)				6(0.4)					
	TOTAL	465(16.5)	352(25.4)	5(25.0)	1(7.7)		103(7.7)	2(6.9)	1(6.3)			1(14.3)	
Professionals	9.	15(0.5)	11(0.8)					4(0.3)					
	10.	8(0.3)	4(0.3)					3(0.2)					
	11.	28						28(2.1)					
	12.	29(1.0)	4(0.3)					24(1.8)				1(14.3)	
	13.	120(4.2)	51(3.7)		1(7.7)			67(5.0)		1(6.3)			
	14.	235(8.3)	145(10.5)	7(35.0)	5(38.5)	3(42.9)	1(20.0)	69(5.2)	2(6.9)	2(12.5)	1(25.0)		
	15.	238(8.4)	187(13.5)	2(10.0)	3(23.1)	1(14.3)		45(3.4)					
	16.	99(3.5)	99(7.1)										
	TOTAL	772(27.3)	501(36.1)	9(45.0)	9(69.2)	4(57.1)	2(40.0)	240(18.0)	2(6.9)	3(18.8)	1(25.0)	1(14.3)	
Technicians	17.	70(2.5)	66(4.8)					3(0.2)					
	18.												
	19.	5(0.2)	1(0.1)					4(0.3)					
	20.	20(0.7)	3(0.2)					16(1.2)				1(14.3)	
	21.	109(3.9)	89(6.4)		1(7.7)			16(1.2)	3(10.3)				
	22.	42(1.5)	35(2.5)					7(0.5)					
	23.	52(1.8)	28(2.0)		1(7.7)			23(1.7)					
	24.												
	TOTAL	298(10.6)	222(16.0)		2(15.4)		1(20.0)	69(5.2)	3(10.3)			1(14.3)	
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	2(0.1)	2(0.1)										
	28.												
	29.	47(1.7)	26(1.9)				1(20.0)	18(1.3)	2(6.9)				
	30.	44(1.6)	39(2.8)	1(5.0)				3(0.2)	1(3.4)				
	31.	27(1.0)	27(1.9)										
	32.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	TOTAL	121(4.3)	95(6.9)	1(5.0)			1(20.0)	21(1.6)	3(10.3)				
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	18(0.6)	6(0.4)					12(0.9)					
	36.	36(1.3)	10(0.7)					24(1.8)	2(6.9)				
	37.	60(2.1)	26(1.9)					34(2.5)					
	38.	12(0.4)	9(0.6)					3(0.2)					
	39.	2(0.1)	2(0.1)										
	40.												
	TOTAL	128(4.5)	53(3.8)				73(5.5)	2(6.9)					
Office Clerical	41.	2(0.1)						2(0.1)					
	42.	1(0)						1(0.1)					
	43.	380(13.5)	26(1.9)	1(5.0)				337(25.2)	6(20.7)	5(31.3)	2(50.0)	3(42.9)	
	44.	305(10.8)	5(0.4)					288(21.5)	5(17.2)	6(37.5)		1(14.3)	
	45.	158(5.6)	14(1.0)	1(5.0)				139(10.4)	3(10.3)	1(6.3)			
	46.	18(0.6)	1(0.1)					17(1.3)					
	47.	2(0.1)						2(0.1)					
	48.	1(0)	1(0.1)										
	TOTAL	867(30.7)	47(3.4)	2(10.0)			786(58.8)	14(48.3)	12(75.0)	2(50.0)	4(57.1)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.	2(0.1)	1					1(0.1)					
	52.	11(0.4)	9					2(0.1)					
	53.	23(0.8)	18					5(0.4)					
	54.	10(0.8)	10										
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	46(1.6)	38(2.7)					8(0.6)					
Service	57.	1(0)	1										
Maintenance	58.												
	59.	66(2.3)	30	1(5.0)		3(42.9)	1(20.0)	28(2.1)	2(6.9)		1(25.0)		
	60.	44(1.6)	33	2(10.0)	1(7.7)			7(0.5)	1(3.4)				
	61.	14(0.5)	13					1(0.1)					
	62.	2(0.1)	1					1(0.1)					
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	127(4.5)	78(5.6)	3(15.0)	1(7.7)	3(42.9)	1(20.0)	37(2.8)	3(10.3)	16	1(25.0)		
TOTAL FULL TIME		2824	1386	20	13	7	5	1337	29		4		
						NEW HIRES							
Officials/Adm	73.	30(7.7)	23(14.6)	1(25.0)				5(2.4)	1(14.3)				
Professionals	74.	77(19.8)	52(33.1)	2(50.0)	1(100.0)		1(33.3)	17(8.3)		4(57.1)			
Technicians	75.	25(6.4)	12(7.6)					12(5.9)				1(50.0)	
Prot. Serv.	76.	17(4.4)	12(7.6)				1(33.3)	4(1.9)					
Para-Prof.	77.	32(8.2)	17(10.8)					15(7.2)					
Off/Clerical	78.	155(39.8)	8(5.1)					137(65.6)	5(71.4)	3(42.9)	1(100.0)	1(50.0)	
Skilled Craft	79.	6(1.5)	5(3.2)					1(0.5)					
Serv./Maint.	80.	47(12.1)	28(17.8)	1(25.0)		2(100)	1(33.3)	14(6.7)	1(14.3)				
TOTAL NEW HIRES		389	157	4	1	2	3	205	7	7	1	2	

NEBRASKA - Function 2: Streets & Highways

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(8-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amt. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amt. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.													
	2.													
	3.													
	4.													
	5.	1(0)												
	6.	32(1.3)	30(1.4)											1(0.4)
	7.	123(5.1)	123(5.9)											2(0.8)
	8.	17(0.7)	17(0.8)											
	TOTAL	173(7.2)	170(8.1)											3(1.1)
Professionals	9.													
	10.													
	11.													
	12.													
	13.	19(0.8)	8(0.4)											
	14.	69(2.9)	58(2.8)	2(8.7)										11(4.2)
	15.	182(7.5)	172(8.2)				3(21.4)	1(20.0)						7(2.7)
	16.	16(0.7)	16(0.8)					3(60.0)						4(1.5)
	TOTAL	286(11.9)	254(12.1)	2(8.7)	3(21.4)	4(80.0)								22(8.4)
Technicians	17.													
	18.													
	19.	2(0.1)	1(0)											
	20.	36(1.5)	18(0.9)	1(4.3)										1(0.4)
	21.	106(4.4)	93(4.4)	1(4.3)	1(7.1)									16(6.1)
	22.	144(6.0)	141(6.7)	1(4.3)										12(4.6)
	23.	26(1.1)	26(1.2)											2(0.8)
	24.													
	TOTAL	314(13.0)	279(13.3)	3(13.0)	1(7.1)									31(11.8)
Protective Service	25.													
	26.													
	27.													
	28.													
	29.	1(0)	1(0)											
	30.	1(0)	1(0)											
	31.													
	32.													
	TOTAL	2(0.1)	2(0.1)											
Para Professionals	33.													
	34.													
	35.													
	36.	181(7.5)	146(7.0)	3(13.0)	2(14.3)	1(20.0)								29(11.1)
	37.	95(3.9)	85(4.1)	2(8.7)	1(7.1)									7(2.7)
	38.	3(0.1)	3(0.1)											
	39.													
	40.													
	TOTAL	279(11.6)	234(11.2)	5(21.7)	3(21.4)	1(20.0)								36(13.7)
Office Clerical	41.	1(0)												1(0.4)
	42.													
	43.	66(2.7)	1(0)											
	44.	71(2.9)	15(0.7)											61(23.3)
	45.	79(3.3)	53(2.5)											53(20.2)
	46.	16(0.7)	16(0.8)											2(40.0)
	47.													2(40.0)
	48.													1(33.3)
	TOTAL	233(9.7)	85(4.1)											26(9.9)
														141(53.8)
														4(8.0)
														3(100.0)

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns) (B-K) A	MALE							FEMALE			
			White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amet. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCCP
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.	536(22.2)	505(24.1)	6(26.1)	5(35.7)			20(7.6)					
	53.	395(16.4)	391(18.7)	3(13.0)			1(33.3)						
	54.	8(0.3)	8(0.4)										
	55.	6(0.2)	6(0.3)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	945(39.2)	910(43.4)	9(39.1)	5(35.7)		1(33.3)	20(7.6)					
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.	24(1.0)	17(0.8)	1(4.3)				5(1.9)				1(100.0)	
	60.	35(1.5)	28(1.3)	3(13.0)			1(33.3)	3(1.7)					
	61.	88(3.6)	85(4.1)		1(7.1)		1(33.3)	1(0.4)					
	62.	33(1.4)	32(1.5)		1(7.1)								
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	180(7.5)	162(7.7)	4(17.4)	2(14.3)		2(66.7)	9(3.4)					1(100.0)
TOTAL FULL TIME		2412	2096	23	14		5	262	5	3			1
							NEW HIRES						
Officials/Acm	73.	2(0.7)	2(0.9)										
Professionals	74.	13(4.8)	9(4.2)				2(100)	2(4.3)					
Technicians	75.	11(4.1)	8(3.8)	1(33.3)	1(25.0)			1(2.1)					
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.	47(17.4)	40(18.9)					7(15.2)					
Off/Clerical	78.	29(10.7)	3(1.4)					24(52.1)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)			
Skilled Craft	79.	148(54.8)	136(64.2)	2(66.7)	3(75.0)			7(15.2)					
Serv./Maint.	80.	20(7.4)	14(6.6)					5(10.9)					1(100.0)
TOTAL NEW HIRES		270	212	3	4	2		46	1	1			1

NEBRASKA - Function 3: Public Welfare

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	1(0.2)	1(0.4)										
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	12(1.9)	5(2.1)	1(16.7)				6(1.6)					
	6.	21(3.3)	6(2.5)	1(16.7)				13(3.5)	1(12.5)				
	7.	45(7.1)	22(9.2)	1(16.7)	1(100.0)		1(100)	16(4.3)	4(50)				
	8.	8(1.3)	8(3.3)										
	TOTAL	87(13.7)	42(17.5)	3(50.0)	1(100.0)		1(100)	35(9.3)	5(62.5)				
Professionals	9.	96(15.1)	69(28.8)			1(100)		26(6.9)					
	10.												
	11.	2(0.3)						2(0.5)					
	12.	3(0.5)	1(0.4)					2(0.5)					
	13.	66(10.4)	14(5.8)					49(13.0)	2(25.0)	1(50.0)			
	14.	86(13.5)	25(10.4)	1(16.7)				59(15.7)	1(12.5)				
	15.	52(8.2)	38(15.8)					14(3.7)					
	16.	1(0.2)	1(0.4)										
	TOTAL	306(48.0)	148(61.7)	1(16.7)		1(100)	152(40.4)	3(37.5)	1(50.0)				
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	2(0.3)						2(0.5)					
	20.	1(0.2)						1(0.3)					
	21.	8(1.3)						8(2.1)					
	22.	3(0.5)	1(0.4)					2(0.5)					
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	14(2.2)	1(0.4)				13(3.5)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.	2(0.3)	1(0.4)										
	35.	8(1.3)	4(1.7)					1(0.3)					
	36.	23(3.6)	10(4.2)	2(33.3)				4(1.1)					
	37.	46(7.2)	13(5.4)					10(2.7)					
	38.	8(1.3)	3(1.3)					31(8.2)		1(50)	1(100)	1(100)	
	39.	2(0.3)	2(0.8)					5(1.3)					
	40.												
	TOTAL	89(14.0)	33(13.8)	2(33.3)			51(13.6)		1(50)	1(100)	1(100)		
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	42(6.6)	6(2.5)										
	44.	69(10.8)	1(0.4)					36(9.6)					
	45.	18(2.8)						68(18.1)					
	46.							18(4.8)					
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	129(20.3)	7(2.9)				122(32.4)						

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.	3(0.5)	3(1.3)											
	52.	2(0.3)	1(0.4)					1(0.3)						
	53.	4(0.6)	4(1.7)											
	54.													
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	9(1.4)	8(3.3)					1(0.3)						
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.	2(0.3)	1(0.4)					1(0.3)						
	60.	1(0.2)						1(0.3)						
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
TOTAL FULL TIME	TOTAL	3(0.5)	1(0.4)	6	1	1	1	2(0.5)	8	2	1	1		
	637		240					376						
Officials/Adm	73.	5(6.8)	3(12.5)					1(2.1)	1					
Professionals	74.	20(27.4)	7(29.2)					13(27.7)						
Technicians	75.	1(1.4)						1(2.1)						
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.	18(24.7)	6(25.0)					11(23.4)				1		
Off/Clerical	78.	24(32.9)	4(16.7)					20(42.6)						
Skilled Craft	79.	3(4.1)	3(12.5)											
Serv./Maint.	80.	2(2.7)	1(4.2)					1(2.1)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		73	24					47	1			1		

NEBRASKA - Function 4: Police Protection

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	1(0.2)						1(1.5)					
	6.												
	7.	1(0.2)	1(0.2)										
	8.	1(0.2)	1(0.2)										
	TOTAL	3(0.6)	2(0.5)										
Professionals	9.							1(1.6)					
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.	2(0.4)	1(0.2)										
	15.	52(10.0)	51(11.5)					1(1.6)					
	16.							1(1.6)					
	TOTAL	54(10.4)	52(11.7)										
Technicians	17.							2(3.3)					
	18.												
	19.												
	20.	1(0.2)						1(1.6)					
	21.	2(0.4)	1(0.2)					1(1.6)					
	22.	3(0.6)	3(0.7)										
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	6(1.2)	4(0.9)										
Protective Service	25.							2(3.3)					
	26.												
	27.	13(2.5)	12(2.7)					1(1.6)					
	28.												
	29.												
	30.	214(41.3)	201(45.4)	2(100.0)	6(85.7)		3(100.0)	2(3.3)					
	31.	124(23.9)	123(27.8)		1(14.3)								
	32.												
	TOTAL	351(67.8)	336(75.8)	2(100.0)	7(100.0)		3(100.0)	3(4.9)					
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.	1(0.2)						1(1.6)					
	35.	1(0.2)	1(0.2)										
	36.	11(2.1)	3(0.7)										
	37.	38(7.3)	28(6.3)					8(13.1)					
	38.	10(1.9)	10(2.3)					10(16.4)					
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	61(11.8)	42(9.5)										
Office Clerical	41.	2(0.4)						19(31.1)					
	42.							2(3.3)					
	43.	10(1.9)											
	44.	20(3.9)						10(16.4)					
	45.	4(0.8)						18(29.5)	2(100.0)				
	46.							4(6.6)					
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	36(6.9)						34(55.7)	2(100.0)				

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.	2(0.4)	2(0.5)											
	53.													
	54.													
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	2(0.4)	2(0.5)											
Service Maintenance	57.													
	58.													
	59.													
	60.	4(0.8)	4(0.9)											
	61.	1(0.2)	1(0.2)											
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	5(1.0)	5(1.1)	2	7		3	61	2					
TOTAL FULL TIME		518	443											
Officials/Adm	73.													
Professionals	74.	2(5.6)	1(4.6)					1(7.1)						
Technicians	75.							2(14.3)						
Prot. Serv.	76.	19(52.8)	17(77.3)					4(28.6)						
Para-Prof.	77.	7(19.4)	3(13.6)					7(50.0)						
Off/Clerical	78.	7(19.4)												
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.	1(2.8)	1(4.6)											
TOTAL NEW HIRES		36	22					14						

NEBRASKA - Function 5: Fire Protection

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE				
		(B-K)	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Amer. Ind.			Black	Hispanic	Asian or Amer. Ind.	HNDCCP		
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
Officials/ Administrators	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.													
	TOTAL	20(42.6)	19(52.8)		1(100.0)									
Professionals	9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16.													
	TOTAL	11(23.4)	11(30.6)											
Technicians	17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24.													
	TOTAL													
Protective Service	25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32.													
	TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40.													
	TOTAL	6(12.8)	6(16.7)											
Office Clerical	41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48.													
	TOTAL	10(21.3)							4(40.0) 2(20.0) 4(40.0)					
									10(100.0)					

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.													
	54.													
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL													
Service	57.													
Maintenance	58.													
	59.													
	60.													
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL													
TOTAL FULL TIME		47	36		1									10
Officials/Adm	73.	2(50.0)	2(66.7)											
Professionals	74.													
Technicians	75.													
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.	1(25.0)	1(33.3)											
Off/Clerical	78.	1(25.0)												1(100)
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.													
TOTAL NEW HIRES		4	3											1

NEBRASKA - Function 6: Natural Resources, Parks & Recreation

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE						FEMALE		
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	7(4.6)	6(0.6)										
	2.												
	3.							1(0.2)					
	4.												
	5.	23(1.5)	20(2.1)										
	6.	45(3.0)	41(4.3)					3(0.6)					
	7.	77(5.1)	75(7.8)					4(0.7)					
	8.	18(1.2)	18(1.9)					2(0.4)					
	TOTAL	170(11.2)	160(16.6)										
Professionals	9.	15(1.0)	15(1.6)					10(1.8)					
	10.												
	11.	2(0.1)											
	12.							2(0.4)					
	13.	31(2.0)	17(1.8)										
	14.	95(6.3)	76(7.9)					13(2.4)					
	15.	110(7.3)	101(10.5)					18(3.3)		1(50.0)			
	16.	7(0.5)	7(0.7)					8(1.5)					
	TOTAL	260(17.2)	216(22.5)										
Technicians	17.												
	18.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)										
	19.												
	20.	9(0.6)	3(0.3)										
	21.	20(1.3)	11(1.1)					6(1.1)					
	22.	18(1.20)	18(1.9)					8(1.5)					
	23.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)							1(33.3)			
	24.												
	TOTAL	51(3.4)	36(3.7)										
Protective Service	25.												
	26.							14(2.6)					
	27.												
	28.												
	29.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	30.	35(2.3)	35(3.6)										
	31.	19(1.3)	19(2.0)										
	32.												
	TOTAL	55(3.6)	55(5.7)										
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	4(0.3)	3(0.3)										
	36.	50(3.3)	37(3.9)					1(0.2)					
	37.	68(4.5)	52(5.4)					13(2.4)					
	38.	21(1.4)	20(2.1)					16(2.9)					
	39.							1(0.2)					
	40.												
	TOTAL	143(9.4)	112(11.7)										
Office Clerical	41.	1(0.1)						31(5.7)					
	42.							1(0.2)					
	43.	155(10.2)	11(1.1)										
	44.	62(4.1)						142(2.6.2)		1(33.3)		1(100.0)	
	45.	20(1.3)						61(11.2)		1(33.3)			
	46.							20(3.7)					
	47.	1(0.1)											
	48.							1(0.2)					
	TOTAL	239(15.8)	11(1.1)					225(41.4)	2(66.7)		1(100)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							* FEMALE			
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amet. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	50.												
	51.												
	52.	17(1.1)	15(1.6)						2(0.4)				
	53.	29(1.9)	28(2.9)						1(0.2)				
	54.	5(0.30)	4(0.4)						1(0.2)				
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	52(3.4)	48(5.0)						4(0.7)				
Service	57.	2(0.1)	1(0.1)						1(0.2)				
Maintenance	58.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	59.	409(27.0)	207(21.5)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)			200(36.8)		1(50.0)			
	60.	113(7.5)	96(10.0)					16(2.9)					
	61.	16(1.1)	15(1.6)					1(0.2)					
	62.	2(0.1)	2(0.2)										
	63.	1(0.1)	1(0.1)										
	64.												
	TOTAL	544(35.9)	323(33.6)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)			218(40.1)	3	1(50.0)		1	
TOTAL FULL TIME		1514	961	1	1			543		2			
Officials/Adm	73.	7(7.8)	6(15.4)										
Professionals	74.	9(10.0)	4(10.3)										
Technicians	75.	6(6.7)	2(5.1)										
Prot. Serv.	76.	1(1.1)	1(2.6)										
Para-Prof.	77.	13(14.4)	7(17.9)										
Off/Clerical	78.	28(31.1)						6(12.2)					
Skilled Craft	79.	5(5.6)	5(12.8)					28(57.1)					
Serv./Maint.	80.	21(23.3)	14(35.9)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)			5(10.2)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		90	39	1	1			49					

2
NEW HIRES

NEBRASKA - Function 7: Hospitals & Sanatoriums

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE							FEMALE		
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HRDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	14(0.4)	12(1.1)										
	2.												
	3.							2(0.1)					
	4.												
	5.	10(0.3)	7(0.7)										
	6.	38(1.1)	17(1.6)					3(0.1)					
	7.	62(1.8)	33(3.1)					21(0.9)					
	8.	23(0.7)	21(2.0)					27(1.2)					
TOTAL	147(4.3)	90(8.4)					1(12.5)						
Professionals	9.	13(0.4)	1(0.1)					54(2.4)					
	10.	7(0.2)	5(0.5)					12(0.5)					
	11.	20(0.6)	1(0.1)					2(0.1)					
	12.	19(0.6)	3(0.3)					18(0.8)					
	13.	179(5.3)	41(3.8)					16(0.7)					
	14.	140(4.1)	48(4.5)	1(8.3)	1(12.5)			135(6.0)					
	15.	110(3.2)	74(6.9)	1(8.3)			1(25.0)	88(3.9)					
	16.	27(0.8)	14(1.3)					34(1.5)					
TOTAL	515(15.2)	187(17.5)	2(16.7)	1(12.5)	3(37.5)	1(25.0)	9(0.4)	314(14.0)					
Technicians	17.												
	18.	82(2.4)	38(3.5)										
	19.							44(2.0)					
	20.	64(1.9)	2(1.9)										
	21.	63(1.8)	11(1.0)					61(2.7)					
	22.	5(0.1)	2(0.2)					52(2.3)					
	23.							3(0.1)					
	24.												
TOTAL	214(6.3)	53(4.9)						160(7.1)					
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
TOTAL													
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.	99(2.9)	57(5.3)										
	35.	485(14.3)	121(11.3)	4(33.3)	1(12.5)		1(25.0)	41(1.8)					
	36.	473(14.0)	100(9.3)	1(8.3)				351(15.6)	3(20.0)	2(12.5)			1(100.0)
	37.	387(11.4)	102(9.5)	1(8.3)	4(50.0)	2(25.0)	1(25.0)	367(16.3)	1(6.7)	3(18.8)			
	38.	10(0.3)	8(0.7)		1(12.5)			273(12.2)	3(20.0)	1(6.3)	1(25.0)		
	39.							1(0)					
	40.												
TOTAL	1454(42.9)	388(36.2)	6(50.0)	6(75.0)	2(25.0)	2(50.0)	1033(46.0)	7(46.7)	6(37.5)	1(25.0)		3(100.0)	
Office Clerical	41.	1(0)						1(0)					
	42.												
	43.	90(2.7)	3(0.3)					87(3.9)					
	44.	134(4.0)	9(0.8)					125(5.6)					
	45.	61(1.8)	12(1.1)					48(2.1)					
	46.												
	47.	1(0)						1(0)					
	48.												
TOTAL	287(8.5)	24(2.2)					262(11.7)			1(6.3)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.		3(0.1)	3(0.3)					7(0.3)						
53.		26(0.8)	19(1.8)											
54.		52(1.5)	49(4.6)					3(0.1)						
55.		14(0.4)	14(1.3)											
56.														
TOTAL		95(2.8)	85(7.9)					10(0.4)						
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.		20(0.6)	15(1.4)	1(8.3)				4(0.2)						
59.		377(11.1)	107(10.0)	2(16.7)	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	1(25.0)	257(11.4)		7(43.8)				
60.		203(6.0)	73(6.8)					128(5.7)	1(6.7)	1(6.3)				
61.		71(2.1)	48(4.5)	1(8.3)				21(0.9)	1(6.7)					
62.		3(0.1)	1(0.1)					2(0.1)						
63.														
64.														
TOTAL FULL TIME		674(19.9)	244(22.8)	4(33.3)	1(12.5)	2(25.0)	1(25.0)	412(18.4)	2(13.3)	8(50.0)	4	3		
		3386	1071	12	8	8	4	2245	15	16				
Officials/Acm 73.		4(0.6)	3(1.7)					1(0.2)						
Professionals 74.		113(16.5)	29(16.0)					81(16.9)	2(40.0)		1(50.0)			
Technicians 75.		35(5.1)	3(1.7)					32(6.7)						
Prot. Serv. 76.														
Para-Prof. 77.		340(49.6)	91(50.3)	3(60.0)	1(100.0)			237(49.4)	3(60.0)	2(28.6)		3(100.0)		
Off/Clerical 78.		38(5.6)						38(7.9)						
Skilled Craft 79.		8(1.1)	6(3.3)					2(0.4)						
Serv./Maint. 80.		147(21.5)	49(27.1)	2(40.0)		1(100)		89(18.5)		5(71.4)	1(50.0)			
TOTAL NEW HIRES		685	181	5	1	1		480	5	7	2	3		

NEBRASKA - Function 8: Health

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE					FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Officials/ Administrators	1.	104(24.0)	85(39.7)	2(100.0)			15(7.4)	2(50.0)					
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	2(0.5)						2(1.0)					
	6.	4(0.9)		1(0.5)				3(1.5)					
	7.	22(5.1)		15(7.0)				7(3.5)					
	8.	11(2.5)		11(5.1)									
	TOTAL	143(33.0)	112(52.3)	2(100.0)			27(13.4)	2(50.0)					
Professionals	9.	18(4.2)	13(6.1)			1(50.0)	4(2.0)						
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.	19(4.4)	8(3.7)				10(5.0)	1(25.0)					
	14.	78(18.0)	39(18.2)				38(18.8)				1(50.0)		
	15.	38(8.8)	30(14.0)				7(3.5)						
	16.	2(0.5)	2(0.9)										
	TOTAL	155(35.8)	92(43.0)			2(100.0)	59(29.2)	1(25.0)			1(50.0)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.	5(1.2)					5(2.5)						
	21.	3(0.7)					3(1.5)						
	22.												
	23.	2(0.5)	1(0.5)				1(0.5)						
	24.												
	TOTAL	10(2.3)	1(0.5)				9(4.5)						
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	5(1.2)					3(1.5)			2(28.6)			
	36.	3(0.7)	1(0.5)				2(1.0)						
	37.	7(1.6)	1(0.5)				4(2.0)			2(28.6)			
	38.	3(0.7)	1(0.5)				1(0.5)			1(14.3)			
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	18(4.2)	3(1.4)				10(5.0)			5(71.4)			
Office Clerical	41.	1(0.2)					1(0.5)						
	42.												
	43.	41(9.5)	1(0.5)				38(18.8)			1(14.3)	1(50.0)		
	44.	46(10.6)					45(22.3)	1(25.0)					
	45.	11(2.5)					11(5.4)						
	46.	1(0.2)					1(0.5)						
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	100(23.1)	1(0.5)				96(47.5)	1(25.0)		1(14.3)	1(50.0)		

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE							FEMALE			
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.												
	54.	1(0.2)	1(0.5)										
	55.	4(0.9)	4(1.9)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	5(1.2)	5(2.3)										
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.	2						1(0.5)		1(14.3)			
	60.												
	61.												
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	2(0.5)						1(0.5)	4	1(14.3)		2	
TOTAL FULL TIME		433	214	2				202		7			
Officials/Adm	73.	1(2.5)											
Professionals	74.	17(42.5)	10(83.3)					1(3.7)					
Technicians	75.	2(5.0)						7(25.9)					
Prot. Serv.	76.							2(7.1)					
Para-Prof.	77.	1(2.5)						1(3.7)					
Off/Clerical	78.	18(45.0)	1(8.3)					16(59.3)		1(100)			
Skilled Craft	79.	1(2.5)	1(8.3)										
Serv./Maint.	80.												
TOTAL NEW HIRES		40	12					27		1			

2
NEW HIRES

NEBRASKA - Function 10: Community Development

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						* FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Officials/ Administrators	1.	12(11.8)						7(77.8)	1(2.1)				4(100.0)
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.	2(2.0)	1(2.8)										
	7.	17(16.7)	11(30.6)				1(100.0)	2(22.2)	3(6.3)				
	8.	2(2.0)	2(5.6)										
	TOTAL	33(32.4)	14(38.9)				1(100.0)	9(100.0)	5(10.4)				4(100.0)
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.	1(1.0)	1(2.8)										
	12.												
	13.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	14.	12(11.8)	5(13.9)						7(14.6)				
	15.	11(10.8)	7(19.4)						4(8.3)				
	16.												
	TOTAL	25(24.5)	13(36.1)					12(25.0)					
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	22.												
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	1(1.0)						1(2.1)					
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL												
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	36.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	37.	5(4.9)					1(100)		4(8.3)				
	38.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	8(7.8)				1(100.0)		7(14.6)					
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	1(1.0)							1(2.1)				
	44.	7(6.9)	1(2.8)						4(8.3)		2(100.0)		
	45.	2(2.0)							2(4.2)				
	46.												
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	10(9.8)	1(2.8)					7(14.6)		2(100.0)			

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.													
	54.	1(1.0)	1(2.8)											
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	1(1.0)	1(2.8)											
Service	57.													
Maintenance	58.													
	59.	19(18.6)	5(13.9)					14(29.2)						
	60.	5(4.9)	2(5.6)	1(100.0)				2(4.2)						
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
	TOTAL	24(23.5)	7(19.4)	1(100.0)	1	1	9	16(33.3)		2		4		
TOTAL FULL TIME		102	36	1				48						
Officials/Adm	73.	3(21.4)	1(12.5)					1(20)						
Professionals	74.	7(50.0)	5(62.5)					2(40)						
Technicians	75.													
Prot. Serv.	76.													
Para-Prof.	77.	1(7.1)						1(20)						
Off/Clerical	78.													
Skilled Craft	79.													
Serv./Maint.	80.	3(21.4)	2(25.0)					1(20)						
TOTAL NEW HIRES		14	8				1	5						

NEBRASKA - Function 11: Corrections

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE					FEMALE					
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.	47(4.4)	39(5.6)	1(3.4)	1(8.3)			6(1.9)					
	6.	44(4.1)	40(5.7)	1(3.4)				3(1.0)					
	7.	41(3.8)	36(5.1)	2(6.9)				2(0.6)					
	8.	11(1.0)	10(1.4)				1(20.0)	2(0.6)					
	TOTAL	143(13.4)	125(17.9)	4(13.8)	1(8.3)		12(3.8)						
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.	8(0.7)	4(0.6)					4(1.3)					
	13.	92(8.6)	50(7.1)	3(10.3)	3(25.0)		1(20.0)	32(10.3)	3(33.3)				
	14.	62(5.8)	36(5.1)	3(10.3)				23(7.4)					
	15.	31(2.9)	25(3.6)	1(3.4)				5(1.6)					
	16.	10(0.9)	4(0.6)					6(1.9)					
	TOTAL	203(19.0)	119(17.0)	7(24.1)	3(25.0)		70(22.4)	3(33.3)					
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	20.	9(0.8)	3(0.4)					5(1.6)	1(11.1)				
	21.	4(0.4)						3(1.0)	1(11.1)				
	22.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	17(1.6)	7(1.0)				8(2.6)	2(22.2)					
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.	43(4.0)	38(5.4)	1(3.4)	1(8.3)			2(0.6)		1(100.0)			
	29.	284(26.5)	219(31.3)	8(27.6)	4(33.3)		2(40)	47(15.1)	4(44.4)				
	30.	65(6.1)	59(8.4)	3(10.3)			1(20)	2(0.6)					
	31.	3(0.3)	3(0.4)										
	32.												
	TOTAL	395(36.9)	319(45.6)	12(41.4)	5(41.7)		51(16.3)	4(44.4)	1(100.0)				
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.	11(1.0)	9(1.3)	1(3.4)				1(0.3)					
	36.	42(3.9)	21(3.0)		1(8.3)			20(6.4)					
	37.	52(4.9)	29(4.1)	3(10.3)	1(8.3)			19(6.1)					
	38.	4(0.4)	3(0.4)					1(0.3)					
	39.	2(0.2)	2(0.3)										
	40.												
	TOTAL	111(10.4)	64(9.1)	4(13.8)	2(16.7)		41(13.1)						
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	41(3.8)						41(13.1)					
	44.	50(4.7)						50(16.0)					
	45.	11(1.0)						11(3.5)					
	46.												
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	102(9.5)					102(32.7)						

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE							FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Amer. Ind.			White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Amer. Ind.	
							Pac. Isl. E	Alaskan F	Alaskan K				HNDCP	
Skilled Craft 49.														
50.														
51.														
52.		10(0.9)	9(1.3)						1(0.3)					
53.		22(2.1)	21(3.0)		1(8.3)									
54.		1(0.1)	1(0.1)											
55.														
56.														
TOTAL		33(3.1)	31(4.4)		1(8.3)				1(0.3)					
Service Maintenance 57.														
58.														
59.		6(0.6)	2(0.3)						4(1.3)					
60.		30(2.8)	11(1.6)	1(3.4)		1(100)			16(5.1)				1(100.0)	
61.		28(2.6)	20(2.9)	1(3.4)					7(2.2)					
62.		2(0.2)	2(0.3)											
63.														
64.														
TOTAL		66(6.2)	35(5.0)	2(6.9)	12	1(100.0)	5		27(8.7)	9	1		1(100.0)	1
TOTAL FULL TIME		1070	700	29	12	1	5		312	9	1		1	1
Officials/Adm 73.		14(7.1)	13(9.5)		1(25.0)									
Professionals 74.		18(9.1)	8(5.8)	1(25.0)	2(50.0)		1(100.0)		6(12.0)					
Technicians 75.		6(3.0)	4(2.9)						2(4.0)					
Prot. Serv. 76.		69(34.9)	58(42.3)	1(25.0)	1(25.0)				8(16.0)		1(100.0)			
Para-Prof. 77.		27(13.6)	23(16.8)	2(50.0)					2(4.0)					
Off/Clerical 78.		23(11.2)							23(46.0)					
Skilled Craft 79.		15(7.6)	15(11.0)											
Serv./Maint. 80.		26(13.1)	16(11.7)					1(100.0)	9(18.0)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		198	137	4	4	1	1		50		1			

NEBRASKA - Function 12: Utilities & Transportation

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)			MALE					* FEMALE			
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	3(3.2)	3(4.4)										
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.	13(13.7)	13(19.1)										
	8.	3(3.2)	3(4.4)										
	TOTAL	19(20.0)	19(27.9)										
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.	14(14.7)	13(19.1)					1(3.8)					
	14.	14(14.7)	14(20.6)										
	15.	15(15.8)	14(20.6)					1(3.8)					
	16.	1(1.1)	1(1.5)										
	TOTAL	44(46.3)	42(61.8)				2(7.7)						
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.												
	22.												
	23.	3(3.2)	3(4.4)										
	24.												
	TOTAL	3(3.2)	3(4.4)										
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.	1(1.1)						1(1.0)					
	31.	1(1.1)	1(1.5)										
	32.												
	TOTAL	2(2.1)	1(1.5)				1(100.0)						
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.												
	38.												
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL												
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.	4(4.2)						4(15.4)					
	44.	16(16.8)	1(1.5)					15(57.7)					
	45.	5(5.3)						5(19.2)					
	46.												
	47.	1(1.1)	1(1.5)										
	48.												
	TOTAL	26(27.4)	2(2.9)				24(92.3)						

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.												
	53.												
	54.	1(1.1)	1(1.5)										
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	1(1.1)	1(1.5)										
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.												
	60.												
	61.												
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL												
TOTAL FULL TIME		95	68										
Officials/Adm	73.												
Professionals	74.	5(50.0)	5(83.3)										
Technicians	75.												
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.	1(10.0)	1(15.7)										
Off/Clerical	78.	4(40.0)											
Skilled Craft	79.												
Serv./Maint.	80.												
TOTAL NEW HIRES		10	6										

NEW HIRES 1 26

4(100)

NEBRASKA - Function 14. Employment Security

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)		MALE							FEMALE		
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	RNDGP
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.		5(0.6)						4(0.8)		1(7.7)		
	6.		28(3.3)	12(3.9)	2(13.3)				13(2.8)		1(6.3)		
	7.		87(10.3)	65(20.9)	4(26.7)				1(100.0)		16(3.4)		
	8.		6(0.7)	6(1.9)							1(6.3)		
	TOTAL	126(15.0)	83(26.7)	6(40.0)				1(100.0)	33(7.0)	2(12.5)	1(7.7)		
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.		5						5(1.1)				
	12.		103(12.2)	34(10.9)					64(13.6)		5(38.5)		
	13.		51(6.1)	36(11.6)					15(3.2)				
	14.		55(6.5)	40(12.9)				4(44.4)	10(2.1)				1(25.0)
	15.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)									
	16.	TOTAL	215(25.6)	111(35.7)		4(44.4)			94(19.9)		5(38.5)		1(25.0)
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.		2(0.2)						2(0.4)				
	21.		17(2.0)	7(2.3)					10(2.1)				
	22.		4(0.5)	2(0.6)					2(0.4)				
	23.												
	24.	TOTAL	23(2.7)	9(2.9)					14(3.0)				
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.		1(0.1)	1(0.3)									
	30.		3(0.4)	2(0.6)	1(6.7)								
	31.												
	32.	TOTAL	4(0.5)	3(1.0)	1(6.7)								
Para Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.		6(0.7)	1(0.3)					5(1.1)				
	37.		159(18.9)	52(16.7)	2(13.3)	4(44.4)			96(20.3)	3(18.8)	2(15.4)		
	38.		96(11.4)	41(13.2)	5(33.3)	1(11.1)			39(8.3)	10(63.0)			
	39.		13(1.5)	8(2.6)					5(1.1)				
	40.	TOTAL	274(32.6)	102(32.8)	7(46.7)	5(55.6)			145(30.7)	13(81.3)	2(15.4)		
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.		103(12.2)						99(21.0)		2(15.4)		2(50.0)
	44.		69(8.2)						65(13.8)	1(6.3)	2(15.4)		1(25.0)
	45.		22(2.6)	2(0.6)					19(4.0)		1(7.7)		
	46.												
	47.												
	48.	TOTAL	194(23.1)	2(0.6)					183(38.8)	1(6.3)	5(38.5)		3(75.0)

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.												
	52.	2(0.2)	1(0.3)					1(0.2)					
	53.												
	54.												
	55.												
	56.												
	TOTAL	2(0.2)	1(0.3)					1(0.2)					
Service Maintenance	57.												
	58.												
	59.	2(0.2)						2(0.4)					
	60.	1(0.1)		1(6.7)									
	61.												
	62.												
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	3(0.4)		1(6.7)				2(0.4)					
TOTAL FULL TIME		841	311	15	9		1	472	16	13		4	
Officials/Adm	73.	5(4.4)		2(66.7)				3(3.9)					
Professionals	74.	27(23.7)	15(50.0)					11(14.5)		1(50.0)			
Technicians	75.	6(5.3)	2(6.7)					4(5.3)					
Prot. Serv.	76.												
Para-Prof.	77.	22(19.4)	13(43.3)	1(33.3)				8(10.5)					
Off/Clerical	78.	54(47.4)						50(65.8)		1(50.0)		3(100.0)	
Skilled Craft	79.												
Serv./Maint.	80.												
TOTAL NEW HIRES		114	30	3				76		2		3	

NEBRASKA - Function 15: Other													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)											
		(B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE					FEMALE			
					Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP
Officials/ Administrators	1.	2(0.2)	2(0.4)										
	2.												
	3.												
	4.	5(0.5)	1(0.2)					3(0.5)		1(20.0)			
	5.	15(1.4)	3(0.7)					12(1.9)					
	6.	20(1.8)	11(2.5)					9(1.5)					
	7.	144(13.1)	105(23.4)	2(16.7)	2(50.0)			35(5.7)					
	8.	21(1.9)	20(4.5)					1(0.2)					
	TOTAL	207(18.8)	142(31.7)	2(16.7)	2(50.0)		60(9.7)			1(20.0)			
Professionals	9.	183(16.6)	36(8.0)		1(25.0)			142(22.9)		2(40.0)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)	
	10.												
	11.	9(0.8)	3(0.7)					6(1.0)					
	12.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	13.	59(5.4)	18(4.0)	1(8.3)	1(25.0)			38(6.1)	1(10.0)				
	14.	100(9.1)	46(10.3)	3(25.0)				50(8.1)	1(10.0)				
	15.	129(11.7)	87(19.4)	3(25.0)				37(6.0)	1(10.0)	1(20.0)			
	16.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	TOTAL	482(43.7)	192(42.9)	7(58.3)	2(50.0)		273(44.1)	3(30.0)	3(60.0)	1(100.0)	1(100.0)		
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.	13(1.2)	6(1.3)										
	21.	16(1.5)	13(2.9)	1(8.3)			1(50)	6(1.0)					
	22.	24(2.2)	20(4.5)					2(0.3)					
	23.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)					4(0.6)					
	24.												
	TOTAL	54(4.9)	40(8.9)	1(8.3)			1(50.0)	12(1.9)					
Protective Service	25.												
	26.												
	27.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	TOTAL	2(0.2)	2(0.4)										
Para Professionals	33.	1(0.1)						1(0.2)					
	34.	2(0.2)						2(0.3)					
	35.	20(1.8)	5(1.1)					15(2.4)					
	36.	11(1.0)	4(0.9)					6(1.0)	1(10.0)				
	37.	16(1.5)	2(0.4)					12(1.9)	1(10.0)	1(20.0)			
	38.	2(0.2)						2(0.3)					
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	52(4.7)	11(2.5)				38(6.1)	2(20.0)	1(20.0)				
Office Clerical	41.												
	42.	2(0.2)						2(0.3)					
	43.	82(7.4)	3(0.7)					79(12.8)					
	44.	88(8.0)						86(13.9)	2(20.0)				
	45.	32(2.9)	1(0.2)					30(4.8)	1(10.0)				
	46.	2(0.2)						2(0.3)					
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	206(18.7)	4(0.9)				199(32.1)	3(30.0)					

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column)	MALE						FEMALE				
			(B-K) A	White B	Black C	Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amet. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K
Skilled Craft	49.												
	50.												
	51.	5(0.5)						4(0.6)	1(10.0)				
	52.	16(1.5)	10(2.2)					5(0.8)	1(10.0)				
	53.	6(0.5)	6(1.3)										
	54.	4(0.4)	4(0.9)										
	55.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	56.												
	TOTAL	32(2.9)	21(4.7)					9(1.5)	2(20.0)				
Service	57.	16(1.5)	4(0.9)					12(1.9)					
Maintenance	58.	1(0.1)	1(0.2)										
	59.	28(2.5)	14(3.1)	1(8.3)			1(50)	12(1.9)					
	60.	15(1.4)	10(2.2)	1(8.3)				4(0.6)					
	61.	5(0.5)	5(1.1)										
	62.	2(0.2)	2(0.4)										
	63.												
	64.												
	TOTAL	67(6.1)	36(8.0)	2(16.7)	4		1(50.0)	28(4.5)	10	5	1	1	
TOTAL FULL TIME		1102	448	12			2	619					
							NEW HIRES						
Officials/Adm	73.	12(8.1)	8(15.7)					4(4.3)					
Professionals	74.	52(34.9)	20(39.2)	2(50.0)				29(31.5)	1(50)				
Technicians	75.	8(5.4)	6(11.8)	1(25.0)				1(1.1)					
Prot. Serv.	76.	2(1.3)	2(3.9)										
Para-Prof.	77.	9(6.0)	3(5.9)					6(6.5)					
Off/Clerical	78.	49(32.9)	2(3.9)					46(50.0)	1(50)				
Skilled Craft	79.	6(4.0)	4(7.8)					2(2.2)					
Serv./Maint.	80.	11(7.4)	6(11.8)	1(25.0)				4(4.3)					
TOTAL NEW HIRES		149	51	4				92	2				

NEBRASKA TOTAL EMPLOYMENT													
Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Columns)	MALE						*	FEMALE			
	(B-K)	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian or Pac. Isl.	Amer. Ind. Alaskan	HND/CP	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K		
Officials/ Administrators	1.												
	2.												
	3.												
	4.												
	5.												
	6.												
	7.												
	8.												
	TOTAL	1736(11.6)	1330(16.6)	22(17.9)	6(8.5)	2(7.4)	12(35.3)	343(5.3)	12(11.9)	3(4.5)	1(7.1)	5(23.8)	
Professionals	9.												
	10.												
	11.												
	12.												
	13.												
	14.												
	15.												
	16.												
	TOTAL	3328(22.2)	1938(24.2)	28(22.8)	22(31.0)	16(59.3)	4(11.8)	1281(19.7)	17(16.9)	14(20.9)	5(35.7)	3(14.3)	
Technicians	17.												
	18.												
	19.												
	20.												
	21.												
	22.												
	23.												
	24.												
	TOTAL	1005(6.7)	655(8.2)	4(3.3)	3(4.2)		2(5.9)	333(5.1)	7(6.9)			1(4.8)	
Protective Services	25.												
	26.												
	27.												
	28.												
	29.												
	30.												
	31.												
	32.												
	TOTAL	932(6.2)	813(10.1)	16(13.0)	12(16.9)		8(23.5)	75(1.2)	7(6.9)	1(1.5)			
Professionals	33.												
	34.												
	35.												
	36.												
	37.												
	38.												
	39.												
	40.												
	TOTAL	2623(17.5)	1048(13.1)	24(19.5)	17(23.9)	3(11.1)	2(5.9)	1484(22.8)	24(23.8)	15(22.4)	2(14.3)	4(19.0)	
Office/Clerical	41.												
	42.												
	43.												
	44.												
	45.												
	46.												
	47.												
	48.												
	TOTAL	2439(16.3)	184(2.3)	2(1.6)				2191(33.6)	27(26.7)	24(35.8)	4(28.6)	7(33.3)	

Job Category	Annual Salary	Total (Column) (B-K) A	White B	Black C	MALE					FEMALE				
					Hispanic D	Asian or Pac. Isl. E	Amer. Ind. Alaskan F	White G	Black H	Hispanic I	Asian or Pac. Isl. J	Amer. Ind. Alaskan K	HNDCP	
Skilled Craft	49.													
	50.													
	51.													
	52.													
	53.													
	54.													
	55.													
	56.													
	TOTAL	1223(8.2)	1151(14.4)	9(7.3)	6(8.5)		1(2.9)	54(0.8)	2(2.0)					
Service	57.													
Maintenance	58.													
	59.													
	60.													
	61.													
	62.													
	63.													
	64.													
TOTAL FULL TIME	TOTAL	1695(11.3)	891(11.1)	18(14.6)	5(7.0)	6(22.2)	5(14.7)	752(11.5)	5(5.0)	10(14.9)	2(14.3)	1(4.8)		
		14981	8010(53.5)	123(0.8)	71(0.5)	27(0.2)	34(0.2)	6513(43.5)	101(0.7)	67(0.5)	14(0.1)	21(0.1)		
Officials/Adm	75.	85(4.1)	61(6.9)	3(12.5)	1(9.1)		1(20.0)	17(1.6)	2(12.5)					
Professionals	76.	360(17.4)	165(18.7)	5(20.8)	3(27.3)	2(33.3)	2(40.0)	174(15.9)	3(18.8)	5(26.3)	1(33.3)			
Technicians	77.	100(4.8)	37(4.2)	2(8.3)	1(9.1)			59(5.4)				1(10.0)		
Prot. Serv.	78.	108(5.2)	90(10.2)	1(4.2)	1(9.1)		1(20.0)	14(1.3)		1(5.3)				
Para-Prof.	79.	519(25.0)	205(23.2)	6(25.0)	1(9.1)			298(27.2)	3(18.8)	2(10.5)		4(40.0)		
Off/Clerical	80.	430(20.8)	18(2.0)					394(36.0)	7(43.8)	6(31.6)	1(33.3)	4(40.0)		
Skilled Craft	81.	192(9.3)	175(19.8)	2(8.3)	3(27.3)			12(11.0)						
Serv./Maint.	82.	278(13.4)	131(14.9)	5(20.5)	1(9.1)	4(66.7)	1(20.0)	128(11.7)	1(6.3)	5(26.3)	1(33.3)	1(10.0)		
TOTAL NEW HIRES		2072	882(42.6)	24(1.2)	11(0.5)	6(0.3)	5(0.2)	1096(52.9)	16(7.7)	19(0.9)	3(0.1)	10(0.5)		

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
WASHINGTON, D C 20425

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
PERMIT NO. G73

