

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

(UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

CENTRAL STATES REGIONAL OFFICE

Old Federal Office Building
911 Walnut Street, Room 3103
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Telephone: (816) 374-5253

DATE: March 30, 1983

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: CSRO/MJBarnett

SUBJECT: Advance Copies of Missouri Advisory Committee Report

TO: Participating Reporters

Pursuant to your agreement with this office, enclosed is an advance copy of the Missouri Advisory Committee report on local government affirmative action efforts in Missouri. Also enclosed is a copy of the press release that will be sent to all media, a copy of the press advisory and a copy of the statement the chairperson of the Missouri Advisory Committee will read at the press conference.

You are reminded that it will be a breach of the embargo if this material is on the wires or in a newspaper that will appear on the streets prior to 2:00 p.m. C.S.T. on April 6, 1983.

All persons receiving an advance copy of this report are subject to the same embargo requirements.

If you have any questions about this report prior to publication time and date you may call this office but the answers will also be subject to the embargo rules.

For further information contact: Malcolm J. Barnett at (816) 374-2454 during the day or (816) 444-6123 during the evening.

CENTRAL STATES REGIONAL OFFICE
Old Federal Office Building
911 Walnut Street, Room 3103
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Telephone: (816) 374-5253

MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE
U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
RELEASES REPORT ON
LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS

On April 6, 1983 the Missouri Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights will release its report on local government affirmative action efforts in Missouri. The report reviews the activities of Boone, Jackson and St. Louis Counties; the cities of Columbia, Kansas City, St. Louis and University City; and, the metropolitan police departments of Kansas City and St. Louis. The Advisory Committee will hold a press conference in Room 327 of the Federal Building at 1520 Market Street, St. Louis, Missouri at 2:00 p.m. (C.S.T.) on April 6. Copies of the report will be available to the media at that time.

Media organizations wishing to receive, under embargo rules, an advance copy of the report and the prepared remarks of the chairperson of the Missouri Advisory Committee should contact Malcolm J. Barnett at (816) 374-2454.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

CENTRAL STATES REGIONAL OFFICE

Old Federal Office Building
911 Walnut Street, Room 3103
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
Telephone: (816) 374-5253

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT

Melvin L. Jenkins, Esq.
Regional Director
Central States Regional Office
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
911 Walnut, Room 3100
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
(816) 374-5253

FOR RELEASE AT 2:00 p.m. (C.S.T.), APRIL 6, 1983

ST. LOUIS....While local governments in Missouri generally had good records on their actual utilization of minorities and women, Joanne M. Collins, chairperson of the Missouri Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, noted that some of the data indicated patterns of past discrimination for which affirmative action would be an appropriate remedy. But local governments' affirmative action efforts were often deficient. The Advisory Committee reviewed the affirmative action efforts of Boone, Jackson and St. Louis Counties; the cities of Columbia, Kansas City, St. Louis and University City; and the St. Louis and Kansas City municipal police departments in a report released today.

Ms. Collins stated that the Advisory Committee made no findings and recommendations because they would be

substantially similar to those already made to Missouri State government in a 1982 report. At that time the Advisory Committee urged substantial revisions in affirmative action programs to make them efficient and effective. Ms. Collins concluded that "It is clear that affirmative action means more than simply reaching numeric goals that are easily reached. It is a matter of ensuring that the entire personnel process provides opportunity for minorities and women without discrimination. This goal remains unmet."

The report, Local Government Affirmative Action Efforts - Missouri, is available to the public without charge by contacting:

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
911 Walnut, Room 3100
Kansas City, Missouri 64106
(816) 374-5253

The Missouri Advisory Committee is one of 51 such Committees appointed by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to assist it in determining the current status of civil rights in the nation. The Chairperson of the Missouri Advisory Committee is Joanne M. Collins, of Kansas City. Other members of the Advisory Committee are: Anita Bond, John Buechner, Harold L. Dielmann, John B. Ervin, Henry Givens, William S. McEwen, Elsie A. Hall and Joseph H. Vatterott of St. Louis; Gail Achtenberg, Lu Arredondo Bowersox, Harrison Cornelius, Meyer L. Goldman, Stanley D. Rostov and Ashton Stovall of Kansas City; and, David R. Humes of Hayti Heights. Members of Advisory Committees to the Commission serve without compensation.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is an independent, bipartisan, factfinding agency of the Federal Government concerned with the rights of minorities, women, the handicapped and aged. Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr., is Chairman and Mary Louise Smith is Vice-Chairman. Other Commissioners are Mary F. Berry, Murray Saltzman, Jill S. Ruckelshaus and Blandina C. Ramirez. John Hope III is Acting Staff Director.

#

R.

STATEMENT
OF
JOANNE M. COLLINS, CHAIRPERSON
OF THE
MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE
U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

APRIL 6, 1983

MY NAME IS JOANNE M. COLLINS. WITH ME ARE SOME OF THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND MEMBERS OF OUR STAFF. I AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE SERVE WITHOUT COMPENSATION AS THE EYES AND EARS OF THE COMMISSION IN MISSOURI. WE ARE MANDATED BY THE 1957 CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, AS AMENDED, TO REPORT TO THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS DEVELOPMENTS IN THE STATE. THE COMMISSION CONSIDERS OUR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN ITS PROGRAM PLANNING ACTIVITIES AND IN FRAMING ITS OWN REPORTS ON CIVIL RIGHTS DEVELOPMENTS TO THE PRESIDENT AND THE CONGRESS.

WE ARE HERE TODAY TO ANNOUNCE THAT THE COMMITTEE HAS TRANSMITTED TO THE COMMISSIONERS ITS REPORT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS - MISSOURI. IN THIS REPORT WE REVIEW THE EFFORTS OF BOONE, JACKSON AND ST. LOUIS COUNTIES; THE CITIES OF COLUMBIA, KANSAS CITY, ST. LOUIS AND UNIVERSITY CITY; AND, THE METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENTS IN KANSAS CITY AND ST. LOUIS. WE CONDUCTED A

SIMILAR REVIEW OF STATE GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS THAT WAS RELEASED IN MARCH 1982.

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MAKES NO FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN OUR REPORT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BECAUSE THEY WOULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR TO THOSE ALREADY MADE TO MISSOURI STATE GOVERNMENT. IT IS CLEAR THAT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION MEANS MORE THAN SIMPLY REACHING NUMERIC GOALS THAT ARE EASILY REACHED. IT IS A MATTER OF ENSURING THAT THE ENTIRE PERSONNEL PROCESS PROVIDES OPPORTUNITY FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION. THIS GOAL REMAINS UNMET.

IN OUR STUDY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WE FOUND THAT, GENERALLY SPEAKING, UTILIZATION OF MINORITIES DID MATCH POPULATIONS. BUT PATTERNS OF UTILIZATION OF MINORITIES AND WOMEN COMPARED TO THE LABORFORCE WERE MORE VARIED. THERE WERE SOME EXAMPLES OF UNDERUTILIZATION IN MOST OF THE JURISDICTIONS. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS' NEW HIRES INDICATE THAT SOME EFFORT IS BEING MADE TO REMEDY UNDERUTILIZATION. BUT MEDIAN SALARIES FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN WERE FREQUENTLY LOWER THAN WHITE MEN'S IN COMPARABLE JOB CATEGORIES. SEVERAL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS NOTED THAT THIS WAS DUE TO SENIORITY. THAT SENIORITY HAS THIS EFFECT INDICATES A PATTERN OF PAST DISCRIMINATION FOR WHICH AFFIRMATIVE ACTION IS AN APPROPRIATE REMEDY.

BUT THESE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS ARE GENERALLY DEFICIENT. BOONE COUNTY'S PLAN IS NONEXISTENT. JACKSON COUNTY'S COUNTYWIDE PLANS WERE VAGUE AND NOT SUSCEPTIBLE OF EFFECTIVE REVIEW. WHILE THE COUNTY AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TASKFORCE DOES FRAME DEPARTMENT PLANS IT DOES NOT REVIEW

EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THEM. THE ABSENCE OF VALIDATION EXPERTISE HAS MADE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR THE COUNTY TO ASSURE THAT ITS SELECTION PROCEDURES ARE FREE OF DISCRIMINATION. THE GENERAL ST. LOUIS COUNTY PLAN IS SUFFICIENT AS A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES. BUT, AS THE U.S. OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT HAS POINTED OUT, IT IS FUNDAMENTALLY DEFICIENT BECAUSE IT LACKS CLEAR GOALS AND TIMETABLES AND PROHIBITIONS OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON AGE OR HANDICAP HAVE YET TO BE INSERTED. HOWEVER, THE COUNTY'S OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN IS SUFFICIENT. THE CITY OF COLUMBIA'S PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION ARE GENERALLY GOOD. KANSAS CITY'S PLAN LACKS A UTILIZATION ANALYSIS AND ITS GOALS ARE OFTEN VERY VAGUE. IT IS NOT CLEAR THAT THE QUALITATIVE EFFORTS NEEDED TO IMPROVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY HAVE BEEN MADE. THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS'S PLAN IS GENERALLY DEFICIENT AND APPARENTLY HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED. ALLOWING FOR ITS SIZE, UNIVERSITY CITY HAS A GENERALLY ACCEPTABLE SET OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS ARE ESPECIALLY IN NEED OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION BECAUSE OF THE SENSITIVE ROLE THEY HAVE IN THEIR COMMUNITIES. ONLY KANSAS CITY WAS ABLE TO ASSERT ITS COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR ACCREDITATION BY THE COMMISSION ON ACCREDITATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES. ST. LOUIS COUNTY'S POLICE DEPARTMENT PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION, IF NOT PERFECT, AT LEAST SHOWS PROMISE. UNIVERSITY CITY'S PLAN, ALLOWING FOR THE SIZE OF THE DEPARTMENT, APPEARS SUFFICIENT. BOONE AND JACKSON COUNTIES' EFFORTS ARE NONEXISTENT. ST. LOUIS'S PLAN IS NONEXISTENT. WHILE

ST. LOUIS'S POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS MADE SOME EFFORTS THAT COULD BE REGARDED AS AIDING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, THEY DO NOT APPEAR SUFFICIENT TO REMEDY THE PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED MANY YEARS AGO, NOR LIKELY TO PROVIDE REMEDY FOR PAST DISCRIMINATION IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE. KANSAS CITY'S PLAN IS COMPREHENSIVE BUT DIFFICULT TO EVALUATE BECAUSE MUCH EXTRANEOUS INFORMATION IS INCLUDED.

IN THESE TIMES OF FISCAL RESTRAINT, TAXPAYERS HAVE A RIGHT TO THE MOST EFFICIENT POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT. PERSONNEL SYSTEMS THAT DO NOT RESULT IN SELECTION OF THE BEST POSSIBLE PERSON ARE NOT EFFICIENT. AND ANY SYSTEM THAT EVEN POTENTIALLY DISCRIMINATES MEANS THAT THE BEST MAY NOT BE SELECTED AND THUS IS INEFFICIENT. GOOD NUMBERS ARE NOT ENOUGH. THIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE BELIEVES THAT GOOD ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE IS ALSO NECESSARY.

#

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EFFORTS - MISSOURI
- A report prepared by the Missouri Advisory
Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

ATTRIBUTION:

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

RIGHT OF RESPONSE:

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

THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

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

THE STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

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

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was produced with the assistance of the Commission's Central States Regional Office. The project director and writer was Malcolm Barnett. Legal sufficiency review was conducted by Melvin L. Jenkins, Esq. Support services was provided by Jo Ann Daniels. The project was undertaken under the overall supervision of Melvin L. Jenkins, Esq., Director, Central States Regional Office.

Membership

MISSOURI ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNITED STATES
COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Joanne M. Collins, Chairperson
Kansas City

Henry Givens, Jr.
St. Louis

Gail Achtenberg
Kansas City

Meyer L. Goldman
Kansas City

Anita Bond
St. Louis

Elsie (Mickey) Hall
St. Louis

Lu Arredondo Bowersox
Kansas City

David R. Humes
Hayti Heights

John Buechner
Kirkwood

William S. McEwen
St. Louis

Harrison C. Cornelius
Gladstone

Stanley D. Rostov
Kansas City

Harold L. Dielmann
Creve Coeur

Ashton Stovall
Kansas City

John B. Ervin
St. Louis

Joseph H. Vatterott
St. Louis

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Missouri Advisory Committee to the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
April 1983

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Clarence M. Pendleton, Jr., Chairman

Mary Louise Smith, Vice Chairman

Mary F. Berry

Blandina Cardenas Ramirez

Jill S. Ruckelshaus

Murray Saltzman

John Hope III, Acting Staff Director

Dear Commissioners:

The Missouri Advisory Committee submits this report on its study of the affirmative action efforts of local governments in Missouri. The Advisory Committee obtained data for this study from the cities of Columbia, Kansas City, St. Louis and University City and the counties of Boone, Jackson, and St. Louis. Separate requests for data about the Kansas City and St. Louis police were made to their police boards because those are State agencies. The governments and police departments were given an opportunity to comment on a draft of this report and their comments and corrections have been incorporated.

The affirmative action plans of most of the jurisdictions reviewed in this report were deficient. Perhaps the best were Columbia's and, allowing for size, University City's. Only the Kansas City police department was able to assert that its affirmative action efforts comply with the guidelines proposed by the Commission for the Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies. St. Louis County's plan showed promise of being able to comply and University City's plan, allowing for the small size of the department, also appeared adequate. Generally, the Advisory Committee found significant gaps in the efforts being made to assure that there was no discrimination in local government employment.

However,, the local governments' utilization statistics suggest far fewer deficiencies than do the plan evaluations. This paradox suggests that numeric based evaluations are no substitute for careful qualitative evaluations of each stage of the recruitment, selection and employment processes.

The Advisory Committee make no specific findings or recommendations but incorporated by reference recommendations already made by the Missouri Advisory Committee in its studies of State affirmative action effort and by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its assessments of affirmative action efforts.

We urge you to consider our report in your program planning activities and assist the Committee in its follow-up activities.

Respectfully,

JOANNE M. COLLINS, Chairperson
Missouri Advisory Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. Introduction..... 1

II. Appropriate Standards for Utilization Comparison..... 3

The Counties

III. Boone..... 7

IV. Jackson.....10

V. St. Louis.....17

The Cities

VI. Columbia.....22

VII. Kansas City.....27

VIII. St. Louis.....32

IX. University City.....36

X. Affirmative Action in Police Departments.40

XI. Conclusions.....48

Tables

III-1 - Workforce of Boone County - 1981.....7a

III-2 - New Hires-Boone County - 1981.....7b

III-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-Boone County - 1981.....7c

IV-1 - Workforce of Jackson County - 1981.....10a

IV-2 - New Hires-Jackson County - 1981.....10b

IV-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-Jackson County - 1981.....10c

V-1 - Workforce of St. Louis County - 1982.....17a

V-2 - Omitted

V-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-St. Louis County - 1982....17b

VI-1 - Workforce of Columbia - 1982.....22a

VI-2 - New Hires-Columbia - 1982.....22b

VI-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-Columbia - 1982.....22c

VII-1 - Workforce of Kansas City - 1981.....27a

VII-2 - New Hires-Kansas City - 1981.....27b

VII-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-Kansas City - 1981.....27c

VIII-1 - Workforce of the City of St. Louis - 1981.....32a

VIII-2 - New Hires-St. Louis City - 1981.....32b

VIII-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-St. Louis City-1981.....32c

IX-1 - Workforce of University City - 1981.....36a

IX-2 - New Hires-University City - 1981.....36b

IX-3 - Percent of Workforce & Laborforce Compared-University City-1981.....36c

I. INTRODUCTION

The Missouri Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has reviewed the State's affirmative action efforts in its 1982 study, State Government Affirmative Action in Mid-America: An Update. The Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska Advisory Committees which participated in the review of State government efforts also have reviewed the efforts of local governments in their jurisdiction.¹ The Missouri Advisory Committee decided it should conduct a similar review. To do so it focused on three metropolitan areas and requested data about the affirmative action efforts of Kansas City, St. Louis City, Columbia, University City, Boone County, Jackson County and St. Louis County. Separate requests were sent for information about the St. Louis City and Kansas City police departments to their respective boards of police commissioners since while they are funded by their municipal governments they are State agencies. The Advisory Committee acknowledges with gratitude the assistance of the local governments and police boards in providing data needed for this study. All have been provided an opportunity to comment on a preliminary draft of this report and their comments have been incorporated or otherwise noted.

In Chapter II of this report, the Committee outlines some methodological considerations in the examinations of numeric data relating to employment efforts and objectives. In Chapters III-IX the Committee reviews the affirmative action efforts of the local governments. In Chapter X the Committee reviews the efforts of each local government's police department. The Advisory Committee's conclusions are contained in Chapter XI.

Notes

1. Kansas Advisory Committee, Employment of Administrators and Professionals by Kansas Municipal Governments (March 1982); Iowa Advisory Committee, Employment of Professionals by Iowa Municipal Governments (June 1981); Nebraska Advisory Committee, Employment in the Pannhandle (February 1981).

II. APPROPRIATE STANDARDS FOR UTILIZATION COMPARISONS

The hardest part of any analysis of the efforts of local governments to employ minorities, women and other disadvantaged persons is to set a standard by which to compare the actual utilization of workers in the local government workforces with potential availability in the laborforce. Two separate issues must be resolved. First, what is the appropriate geographic area for comparison. Second, which of the many laborforce estimates available should be utilized and how.

The question of geographic scope is relatively free of controversy, although there are still some complexities. Generally speaking, it seems appropriate that all lower level employees (roughly from technician on down) should be found within the immediate labor market area. In this study that means the St. Louis, Kansas City and Columbia Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. It also seems appropriate to judge overall utilization based on the local area. However, there is some question about the appropriate geographical area for administrative and professional jobs. The reason for this is that while many local governments do obtain most of their administrators or professionals within their immediate labor market area, some are obtained by national recruitment (and indeed some could not be obtained locally). Therefore, by and large, analysts have chosen to use national laborforce estimates when assessing utilization of administrators or professionals. The Federal government has been inconsistent on this selection when evaluating its own workforce, but has generally taken a similar line. In order to use the most conservative estimate, however, the Advisory Committee has used the local labor market area.

The choice of laborforce estimates and how to use them is both complex and controversial. The traditional choices have been census data, Bureau of Labor Statistics data or U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) reports of private sector utilization.

Using 1970 census data was practical for the first few years of the last decade. But the data became increasingly out-of-date. It also was inconvenient to use because published versions failed to provide information in job categories that paralleled that needed to analyze particular employers. As the decade progressed, private sector employers who needed good data for affirmative action planning relied on statistical services that started with census statistical data tapes and then used a variety of computations to update the data and provide it in appropriate job categories. Such services were relatively inexpensive, but still beyond the means of the Missouri Advisory Committee. Nor were they utilized by public sector employers in the State. The 1980 census data tapes are available and are current. But the data has yet to be published in print or microfiche. Thus, use of census data was effectively debarred as an option.

Bureau of Labor Statistics published data are the most current. They are available for calendar year 1981.¹ This data can be used to measure availability by State. The data are presented for useful occupational groups in race by category format. That is, it is possible to determine the proportion of persons in ethnic group who are in particular job categories. It is not possible to determine the proportion of persons in each job category who are in particular ethnic groups. Moreover, because the data are sample-based, data on particular ethnic groups are limited. The data available for Missouri is limited to proportions of whites, blacks, all men and all women in particular job categories. There are no available data on Hispanics or other groups nor is there data for SMSAs. In short, while for limited purposes the Bureau of Labor Statistics data are helpful, they are incomplete.

The Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations produces a series, Manpower Information for Affirmative Action Programs. This is based on 1970 census proportions for utilization of minorities and women and

the most recent available Bureau of Labor Statistics report on total employment. The data thus have the deficiencies of both the other data sets. The department hopes to produce a better data set in 1983.²

Finally, the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has published data on the employment of persons by industry, job category and race/sex group by private sector employers of more than 100 persons. Although published in 1982, the data covers employment patterns in 1980. Clearly this is not a full profile of the available labor force, or even of all workers in the private sector. But it does provide an interesting point of comparison by which to judge the success of larger employers (and all the governments reviewed in this study fall into that category). The advantage of using this data is that it provides the necessary points of comparison of job category by race/sex and race/sex by category. It uses some categories comparable to those used in county and city government. This data is available for the nation, for each State and for each SMSA. Thus, we have national data, Missouri data and data for the three SMSAs that are the locus of this study, Kansas City, St. Louis and Columbia.

The problem of now to use the available data is controversial. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its studies of employment patterns, has usually made comparisons on a race by category basis and showed disparities in the relative utilization of the various ethnic/sex groups.³ Some writers have complained that this approach ignores disparities in education and background between ethnic/sex groups that affect the availability of persons from particular ethnic/sex groups for highly technical jobs. While to some extent that is a factor, by using as a point of comparison the proportions achieved by private sector employers, there is every reason to suppose that any employer could achieve similar results. In the past, public sector employers have protested that they were unable to match the private sector because of sharply lower payscales. In the present economic setting, this explanation for differences between public and private sector patterns can be discounted.

Analysis of total employment and analysis of utilization in distinct job categories is, by nature, not susceptible to use of race by job category data. For this analysis it is necessary to use job category by race formats. Nobody has ever suggested that these should be judged by the test of strict equality (that is, for example, there should be equal numbers of persons from each race/sex group in a category) when, except for total male/total female comparisons, the proportions available are clearly unequal. But what can be expected is that patterns in a larger workforce should reflect patterns in the available laborforce. We have no ready measure of "availability," all persons qualified and willing to take a particular job. What we do have are the actual utilization patterns achieved in the private sector by larger employers. It seems reasonable that public sector achievements should be comparable.

Analysis of public sector employers raises some issues that can be ignored in comparable private sector studies. In this country the notion of "representation" at least suggests the need for a representative bureaucracy as well as a representative legislature. Some local governments have, in fact, used comparison to their populations in analyzing their workforces.⁴ Thus, without placing undue emphasis on it, the Advisory Committees note comparisons between population and workforce.

The question as to the point at which a disparity becomes significant is largely arbitrary, although there are statistical rules which could be applied. To simplify matters, while the Advisory Committee notes disparities at all levels, it classifies as "significant" disparities of 20 percent above or below the laborforce estimate.

To calculate a recognizable measure, the Advisory Committee estimated the number of workers who would have to be added to the government workforce (assuming the total remained constant and only white males left) to produce

parity with the private sector. To do this it divided the difference in the percentages in the government and SMSA private sector data by the percentage equal to one workers or 0.1, whichever is larger. Thus, the usual concerns about fractions of workers needed for parity were avoided.

To help understand utilization, we have used EEO-4 data to calculate median salary. EEOC data is grouped into salary ranges. We report their range rather than attempt greater precision.

The reader will have noted there has been no discussion of comparisons to data on the handicapped or older persons. While eventually census data will be available on older workers, there is little data on the handicapped. Thus, the Advisory Committee reports without comment the utilization by local government of handicapped or older workers. Similarly, local governments have not collected data on "Euroethnics" nor have any of the sources of laborforce estimates. Thus, consideration of these was impossible.

Notes

1. Bureau of Labor Statistics Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment, 1981 (December 1982).

2. Tom Hammond, Supervisor, Labor Market Information Unit, Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, undated letter to staff, received Jan. 19, 1983.

3. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women (August 1978) and Unemployment and Underemployment Among Blacks, Hispanics and Women (November 1982).

4. See Kansas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Employment of Administrators and Professionals by Kansas Municipal Governments (March 1982), p. 4.

III. BOONE COUNTY

Boone County is located in the mid-Missouri area of central Missouri. It surrounds the town of Columbia. The county comprises the Columbia SMSA. In 1980 the county had a population of 100,376 of whom 91.4 percent were white; 6.4 percent, black; 0.2 percent, Indian; 1.1 percent, Asian; and 1.0 percent, Hispanic.¹

Boone County stated that to supply the information requested by Advisory Committee staff "would require hours of staff time which we cannot, at present, afford." It went on to state that:

We strive to be a dedicated equal opportunity employer, but since second class counties in Missouri are not authorized to have a personnel official, our efforts are a great deal less structured than the information sought seems to recognize.

Although we subscribe to your goals, we are not now in a position to do justice to the subject request for information.²

What was supplied were copies of the county's personnel manual, its affirmative action statement, and its EEO-4 report. The following analysis is therefore limited to those documents and does not provide the detail available in other chapters of this study.

The county employed 165 persons. Summaries of its employment patterns are in Tables III-1 and III-2. Table III-3 compares the workforce to the area laborforce. Overall, 50.9 percent of the county workforce was white male, a somewhat higher figure than the private sector. Black male workers were 6.1 percent of the workforce, significantly higher than the area laborforce. White women were 41.2 percent of the workforce, somewhat lower than the area laborforce. Black women were 1.2 percent of the workforce, significantly lower than the area laborforce. However, the county's workforce did approximate the proportions of minorities in the population, except for Asians and Hispanics where the difference was slight. To match the area laborforce, the county would have to employ four additional black women and three additional white women, and one Asian (either male or female).³

The data on new hires indicates that the county is moving in the right direction. Its proportions of white and black women new hires exceed that in the existing workforce, as does the proportion of black male new hires.⁴

The data show that the county utilized fewer black men or black women as administrators than were in the area laborforce. But they utilized more black men and more white women as professionals than were in the area laborforce while utilizing fewer white men or black women. They utilized more black men and fewer black women and white men as office clericals than the area laborforce. They utilized more white and black men as service maintenance workers than in the area laborforce. Again, the pattern of new hires shows significant improvements in the categories where there was relative underutilization.⁵

On March 3, 1978 the county adopted an affirmative action resolution and plan. In the resolution the county stated it "desires to be known as an equal opportunity employer and a participant in affirmative action."⁶ The plan prohibits discrimination based on race, color, creed, age, sex, national origin and handicap. However, the prohibition of discrimination against the handicapped is limited to "qualified handicapped persons."⁷ In the plan, the county states it will:

Table III-1

Workforce of Boone County - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
"N" Row	5	4					1				
% Column	3.0	4.8					1.5				
% Row		80.0					20.0				
<u>Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	8	4	1			3					
% Column	4.9	4.8	10.0			4.4					
% Row		50.0	12.5			37.5					
<u>Technicians</u>											
"N" Row	1					1					
% Column	0.6					1.5					
% Row						100.0					
<u>Protective Service</u>											
"N" Row	52	39	4			9					
% Column	31.5	46.4	40.0			13.2					
% Row		75.0	7.7			17.3					
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	3	3									
% Column	1.8	3.6									
% Row		100.0									
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
"N" Row	60	2	1			54	2			1	
% Column	36.4	2.4	10.0			79.4	100.0			100.0	
% Row		3.3	1.7			90.0	3.3			1.7	
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
"N" Row											
% Column											
% Row											
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
"N" Row	36	32	4								
% Column	21.8	38.1	40.0								
% Row		88.9	11.1								
TOTAL	165	84	10			68	2			1	
%		50.9	6.1			41.2	1.2			0.6	

Source: Data supplied by Boone County on file at CSRO.

Table III-2
New Hires-Boone County-1981

	<u>MALE</u>					<u>FEMALE</u>					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number	3	2					1				
% Row		66.7					33.3				
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	4	1	1				2				
% Row		25.0	25.0				50.0				
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	30	21	5				3	1			
% Row		70.0	16.7				10.0	3.3			
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number	8						8				
% Row							10.0				
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	18						18				
% Row							100.0				
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	8	6	2								
% Row		75.0	25.0								
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	71	30	8				32	1			
% Row		42.3	11.3				45.1	1.4			

Source: EEO-4 supplied by Boone County, 1981.

Table III - 3

Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- Boone County - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	50.9	6.1				41.2	1.2			0.6
% Laborforce/ % Row	48.6	3.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	43.0	3.7	0.2	0.4	0.1
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	80.0					20.0				
% Laborforce/ % Row	76.6	1.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	19.7	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.2
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	50.0	12.5				37.5				
% Laborforce/ % Row	64.4	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	33.1	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row						100.0				
% Laborforce/ % Row	63.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.5	3.9	0.0	0.3	0.0
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	3.3	1.7				90.0	3.3			1.7
% Laborforce/ % Row	9.3	0.6	0.2	*	0.1	83.9	5.2	0.6	0.2	0.0
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	88.9	11.1								
% Laborforce/ % Row	39.1	8.5	0.4	0.9	0.1	41.2	8.7	0.4	0.4	0.3

Sources: EEO-4 for Boone County, 1981.

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 399.

* Less than 0.05 percent

- advise the State employment services, employment agencies specializing in minority services, secondary schools and colleges that it does not discriminate;
- other sources will be informed as they are developed;
- it will maintain liaison with all the above;
- ensure that ads included the equal opportunity employer logo;
- not discriminate in considering persons for employment;
- ensure its employment form complies with the law;
- ensure its screening procedures are "in conformance with applicable laws and acceptable personnel practice;"
- not discriminate in promotions, transfers, training, or benefits and compensation.⁸

There are no goals and timetables. There is no indication that any of these commitments have been implemented, for example validation of testing and screening procedures. The application for employment form provided to the Advisory Committee shows questions on handicap that may not be permissible.⁹ Lacking a personnel officer, it is hard to know how the commitments, much less the requirements of the law regarding nondiscrimination, could be implemented. It should be noted that employers with similarly small numbers of workers (the county had 165) do have personnel officers and have developed complete affirmative action plans to meet OFCCP requirements. It is hard to understand why the county has not been able to do the same. No information was provided on the personnel practices of the county police.

Notes

1. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 1. Hispanics are also counted in a racial group and the proportion of persons categorized as "other" has been omitted.
2. William M. Frech, Presiding Judge, Boone County Court, letter to staff, Aug. 11, 1982.
3. See Table III-3.
4. See Table III-2.
5. See Table III-3.
6. Resolution on an affirmative action plan for the County of Boone, Missouri, Mar. 3, 1978.
7. Affirmative Action Plan for the County of Boone, Missouri, Mar. 3, 1978.
8. Ibid.
9. See CCH, Employment Practices Reporter, para. 422.

IV. JACKSON COUNTY

Jackson County is one of six first class counties in the State. It includes the cities of Independence and Kansas City.¹ It is located on the western edge of the State, somewhat north of center. The county had a population of 629,180 in 1980 of whom 77.6 percent were white; 20.0 percent black; 0.4 percent, Indian; 0.7 percent, Asian; 1.3 percent, other; 2.6 percent, Hispanic.²

Utilization of black workers in the 1,564 person county workforce is in excess of the county population (although it would not take too many reductions in utilization to alter that pattern).³ Utilization of Hispanics is significantly lower and that of other groups nonexistent. Summary profiles of the county's workforce appear in Table IV-1 and IV-2.⁴

The utilization rates in the workforce and area laborforce are shown in Table IV-3. By and large the utilization of minority workers exceeded utilization in the area laborforce overall and in administrative, professional and technical jobs, while white men were utilized somewhat less. White women's shares of administrative but not professional or technician jobs were larger than in the laborforce. In clerical jobs white women were utilized somewhat less than the laborforce, as were white men. Black men were utilized somewhat more than in the laborforce.⁵ Jackson County also provided data compressing all officials, administrators and professionals into one category but excluding court personnel who are included in their EEO-4 report. This showed that for these two categories, utilization of black workers in the workforce was significantly higher than in the laborforce and utilization of white women workers was significantly lower.⁶

Black and white women workers in the administrative, professional, technical, protective service, paraprofessional jobs were a smaller proportion of all workers from their group than were white men. But black men were a larger proportion in administrative, professional, technical, protective service, paraprofessional and clerical jobs. It should be noted, however, that generally even black and white women workers in particular categories were a larger proportion of the county workforce from their group than they were in the area laborforce.⁷

Overall, proportionately more black and white men were hired than were in the existing workforce. The proportion of white women hired was comparable to that in the workforce. But the proportion of new hires to total employment was lower for other groups. Only one administrator was hired. But the proportion of newly hired white male professionals far exceeded their share of the existing group of professional workers while new hires for other groups were far less than their share of the existing workforce. The same was true for technicians. It was not true for protective service or service workers.⁸

Data on median salary by job category was provided. These show that black male administrators had median salaries considerably below white males and even white and black female administrators had salaries well below that of white males. Black male and female professionals had median salaries below that of white male or female professionals. Both white and black female technicians had median salaries below that of white and black male technicians. Black male, white female and black female protective service workers had median salaries below that of white male workers in this category. There was no disparity in median salary for clerical, skilled crafts or service workers.⁹ Data assembled by the county personnel office show the disparities in salaries even more dramatically.¹⁰ There were 54 white males with salaries above \$24,901 but only four minority male and one minority female with such salaries and only nine white females.¹¹ The apparent explanation for these statistics is the disparity in seniority. Most minorities have less than five years of tenure. None has more than 10.

Table IV-1
Workforce of Jackson County - 1981

	Total	MALE				FEMALE					
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
Officials/Administrators											
"N" Row	87	54	3				25	5			
% Column	5.6	8.5	1.9				4.7	2.3			
% Row		62.1	3.5				28.7	5.8			
Professionals											
"N" Row	232	105	38	1			62	26			
% Column	14.8	16.6	24.1	16.7			11.7	11.7			
% Row		43.3	16.4	0.4			26.7	11.2			
Technicians											
"N" Row	149	67	17		1		48	16			
% Column	9.5	10.6	10.8		33.3		9.0	7.2			
% Row		45.0	11.4		0.7		32.2	10.7			
Protective Service											
"N" Row	222	130	39	1		2	30	19	1		
% Column	14.2	20.5	24.7	16.7		66.7	5.7	8.6	16.7		
% Row		58.6	17.6	0.5		0.9	13.5	8.6	0.5		
Para-Professionals											
"N" Row	39	15	4				10	10			
% Column	2.5	2.4	2.5				1.9	4.5			
% Row		38.5	10.3				25.6	25.6			
Offico/Clerical											
"N" Row	600	89	28		1	1	34	129	5		1
% Column	38.4	14.0	17.7		33.3	33.3	65.2	58.1	83.3		100.0
% Row		14.8	4.7		0.2	0.2	57.7	21.5	0.8		0.2
Skilled Craft											
"N" Row	78	71	7								
% Column	5.0	11.2	4.4								
% Row		91.0	9.0								
Service/Maintenance											
"N" Row	157	104	22	4	1		10	17			
% Column	10.0	16.3	13.9	66.7	33.3		1.9	7.7			
% Row		65.6	14.0	2.6	0.6		6.4	10.8			
TOTAL	1564	634	158	6	3	3	531	222	6		1
%		40.5	10.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	34.0	14.2	0.4		0.1

Source: Data supplied by Jackson County, on file at CSRO.

Table IV - 2
New Hires Jackson County - 1981

	<u>MALE</u>					<u>FEMALE</u>					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number	1	1									
% Row		100.0									
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	16	10	1			3	2				
% Row		62.5	6.3			18.8	12.5				
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number	15	11	1			3					
% Row		73.3	6.7			20.0					
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	179	84	51			26	18				
% Row		46.9	28.5			14.5	10.1				
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	229	31	8			150	38	2			
% Row		13.5	3.5			65.5	16.6	8.7			
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	178	138	9		1	28	2				
% Row		77.5	5.1		0.6	15.7	1.1				
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	618	275	70		1	210	60	2			
% Row		44.5	11.3		0.2	34.0	9.7	0.3			

Source: EEO-4 supplied by Jackson County, 1981.

Table IV-3

Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- Jackson County - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	40.5	10.1	0.4	0.2	0.2	34.0	14.2	0.4		0.1
% Laborforce/ % Row	50.2	6.2	1.4	0.4	0.3	33.8	6.2	0.9	0.4	0.2
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	62.1	3.5				28.7	5.8			
% Laborforce/ % Row	75.3	2.7	0.8	0.3	0.5	18.7	1.4	0.3	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	43.3	16.4	0.4			26.7	11.2			
% Laborforce/ % Row	54.4	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.2	38.4	2.7	0.4	0.8	0.1
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	45.0	11.4		0.7		32.2	10.7			
% Laborforce/ % Row	50.4	3.7	0.8	0.6	0.2	34.7	8.2	0.7	0.5	0.2
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	14.8	4.7		0.2	0.2	57.7	21.5	0.8		0.2
% Laborforce/ % Row	13.7	2.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	71.7	9.5	1.9	0.4	0.3
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	91.0	9.0								
% Laborforce/ % Row	81.1	6.2	2.2	0.2	0.6	7.3	1.8	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	65.6	14.0	2.6	0.6		6.4	10.8			
% Laborforce/ % Row	31.8	12.6	1.8	0.9	0.3	34.7	15.3	1.7	0.7	0.2

Sources: EEO-4 for Jackson County - 1981

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 143.

100

Overall, nearly a quarter of county employees earning \$19,901 and more have 10 years or more of tenure and half or more have more than five years of tenure. Between one-third and 40 percent of minorities have between 5-9 years of tenure.¹² Commenting on the disparities in salary, Jackson County's personnel director stated:

Our salary policies are designed to assure that no race or sex discrimination is possible.

Our point-factor comparison system (similar to the well known Hay system) has 22 grades. All merit positions fall within those 22 grades regardless of the work performed and regardless of whether those jobs are traditionally occupied by members of a particular race or sex.

National statistics show there is considerably more turnover in the clerical, service worker category than the professional, administrative. The situation also exists in Jackson County. This substantiates our position regarding the effect of tenure on salaries.¹³

Prior to November 1982, the county operated under an affirmative action plan adopted in August 1975. In November 1982, the then county executive issued a new executive order establishing a new affirmative action plan that will hereafter be in effect.¹⁴ The 1975 plan covered black, Asian, Indian, Hispanic, all women, handicapped, veterans, welfare recipients, the employable mentally retarded, ex-offenders and older persons.¹⁵ It provided for an affirmative action taskforce that would establish goals based on Jackson County statistics, report compliance deficiencies and goal accomplishment to the affirmative action officer and monitor implementation of the plan. The taskforce was to include a range of employees, supervisors and representatives of both the county legislature and executive.¹⁶

The 1975 plan called for specific actions in recruitment, selection and training. It required that:

- recruitment be directed toward the disadvantaged using private employment agencies, the State employment service, minority groups and schools;
- existing employees be encouraged to refer minority group applicants;
- liaison be established with such groups by the recruiting staff;
- jobs be structured to provide a balance between promotional and open competitive positions at all levels;
- tests be subjected to reliability and validation analysis;
- interviews be structured based on clearly defined job tasks;
- career ladders be established;
- training be provided to the maximum extent possible to ensure employee development;
- data on employment be maintained and reported semiannually.¹⁷

As a practical matter, the plan contains so few specifics that it would be difficult to evaluate any progress that might have been made pursuant to it.¹⁸

On November 30, 1982 the new affirmative action plan took effect with the issuance of Executive Order No. 93. The scope of the order is identical with that of 1975, as is the goal of matching the Jackson County laborforce. Again, an affirmative action taskforce with diverse membership is given coordinative responsibility.¹⁹ The taskforce is to arrange with the individual agencies that have appointing authority in county government to develop their own affirmative action plans and monitor implementation of those plans. An affirmative action officer is to monitor efforts and help with

remedial action. An affirmative action program director is to focus on personnel administration problems to eliminate sources of bias and provide appropriate data. Managers or others with appointing authority are to help the taskforce develop plans for their agencies, set an example of good employment practices, and maintain the records that would be necessary to monitor compliance with plans and achievement of goals.²⁰ This plan has even fewer specifics than its predecessor. Jackson County commented:

Our current affirmative action plan was not as detailed as the 1975 version because certain Ordinances passed in 1977 provided the guideline for personnel practices and administration to provide that work. Further, Executive Order #93 was a statement of moral commitment; no enabling legislation is mandating our position.²¹

Executive Order No. 86 of Dec. 28, 1977 includes a rule on applications and examinations of applicants. This required the personnel director to periodically review examinations to determine whether:

1. The examinations measure the skills and abilities directly related to the positions for which they are given.
2. The tests are reliable and valid as determined by validation techniques accepted within the profession of personnel administration.
3. There are available alternative pre-selection techniques.
4. The testing procedures follow guidelines established by the [U.S.] Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.²²

The evidence provided by Jackson County, summarized below, indicates this rule was not effectuated. Absent these efforts, Rule 9 of Executive Order No. 86, which requires that selection be based "on criteria which predict performance in a position or measure ability, knowledge or skills necessary for the position or class for which the applicant is being considered"²³ cannot have been enforced. Ordinance No. 552 of Dec. 12, 1977 required that appointing authorities furnish information to the Director of Personnel so that the director could determine whether there was an underutilization problem and suggest corrective action.²⁴ The ordinance states that "corrective action will be taken immediately...."²⁵

The Director of Personnel told staff that several methods are used to implement the countywide plan as embodied in the various ordinances. Each department has an affirmative action plan that was framed prior to 1982 by the county affirmative action taskforce and is now framed by the taskforce and the department head together. This includes numeric objectives, an analysis of recruitment sources and methods to be utilized and special efforts (such as summer internships) to be used to increase the utilization of minorities and women in the department. After the plan takes effect, the county taskforce requests data on accomplishments three months and six months later. In these requests, using a standardized form, the taskforce asks the numbers of hires, promotions, separations, vacancies. It asks what sources were used for recruitment and with what success. It also asks about changes in the job prerequisites and selection procedures, efforts to disseminate the plan and efforts to orient supervisors to affirmative action. There is no analyses of this data²⁶

Jackson County has a residence requirement for employees (although waivers can be obtained on an annual basis). Consequently, although it recruits from throughout the metropolitan area, most efforts are concentrated in Jackson County.²⁷ It posts notices of jobs on about 75 county bulletin boards and mails notices to a similar number of community agencies within the county--including minority employment agencies, rehabilitation and handicapped organizations, women's groups, special interest groups, community centers and any other group that expresses an interest in receiving them and which can

potentially provide qualified applicants.²⁸ In addition, the county reported advertising in the Kansas City Star/Times, Kansas City Call, Dos Mundos and sometimes in various suburban papers, professional journals, Chicago area papers and the Wall Street Journal.²⁹

Recruitment is the responsibility of a personnel analyst. Most efforts have been directed at local colleges. Particular effort has been focused on UMKC law school because the county has been unsuccessful in recruiting minority lawyers, although it has made offers to several. This, the county attributed to its low pay scale.³⁰

Efforts to validate the selection process have been limited. The county was ultimately unsuccessful in obtaining a Federal grant to employ a psychometrician to conduct validation studies. Although a psychologist with validation training was briefly employed, he left county service before conducting any validation studies and has not been replaced because a person with the requisite skills cannot be found. However, job-specific job descriptions for all merit positions have been established and the county is currently developing formal career ladders.³¹ The county reported no other efforts, such as standardization of interview questions or training for supervisory personnel on interview techniques. This might be important since all but two of 20 directors and managers are white (the two are the personnel director and CETA manager) and 13 are white male.³²

The county provided specific data on 183 administrators and professionals within each county department under the control of the county executive. These showed that 66.7 percent of such persons were white males, 5.5 percent were black males, 21.3 percent were white females and 6.0 percent were black females. It also noted that 37.2 percent were workers 40-70 and 1.1 percent were handicapped.³³ The proportion of black males, white females and black females was considerably lower than for all administrators and professionals reported in the county's EEO-4 that includes other agencies, primarily court officers. Utilization of black males is concentrated in five of the 14 agencies listed. Only in two of these, planning and zoning and corrections, are the proportions substantially greater than the countywide average. White women are represented in all but four agencies. In one the proportion is less than the countywide proportion.³⁴ The county insists that inclusion of technical workers is necessary to get a true picture of utilization.³⁵ But there are no apparent differences of any great magnitude. The proportion of black males and females are somewhat larger, the proportion of white females and older workers are somewhat smaller. The proportion of older workers is also somewhat smaller. Nor does the pattern for particular agencies vary. The new numbers add only seven black males, 17 white females, eight black females and a few other minorities. Only six county administrative or professional positions were "soft money" slots funded by Federal or State government. But four of these were held by black workers and one was held by a white female.³⁶ This seems disproportionate.

In general, promotion is encouraged to higher positions rather than direct entry. Employees are notified by postings and encouraged to apply for higher positions.³⁷ But there is no indication that any of the potential barriers that might adversely affect minorities and women have been addressed by the county. The county provided data on 21 promotions to professional or administrative positions that had occurred since August 1, 1981. None of these were minority, seven were white women, none was handicapped, one was a person aged 40-70.³⁸ It also provided data on 11 appointments to technical positions that had occurred since August 1981. Five were white female, one was a black female.³⁹ In short, there is no indication of substantial movement of minorities to higher positions and little indication that white women are moving up. The county reported it has rarely utilized noncompetitive appointments for promotions.⁴⁰ It further noted "The data

reflect an emphasis we have placed during the past year on increasing the number of females in higher paying positions."⁴¹

In short, whatever successes the county has had in obtaining minority and white female workers at better jobs are clearly not the result of a rigorous examination of the selection process to eliminate potential sources of discrimination or eliminate to the effect of actual promotion practices. Although there may be departmental plans and reports, the county has yet to evaluate these. For this reason their effectiveness is open to question. This would need expert assistance that is currently unavailable to the county personnel department. The Director of Personnel of Jackson County commented that:

we seek to institute hiring practices that reflect fairness to all. Therefore, our efforts will continue to be directed toward improvement in all areas of employment practices. We are still seeking funding for psychometric expertise (this position was cut from the Personnel Department's 1983 budget). We intend to get copies...[of affirmative action plans prepared by employers with a repute of being particularly successful in promoting affirmative action]. Hopefully, information contained therein will assist us in our continued effort to assure that Jackson County government is bias free in every aspect of employment practice.⁴²

Notes

1. EEO-4 data includes all Jackson County employees but evaluation of county's affirmative action is only for the Executive Branch.
2. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 1. Hispanics are also counted in a racial group.
3. Data supplied by Jackson County on file in CSRO.
4. The Director of Personnel of Jackson County commented that recent statistics collected by her department show that as of Feb. 18, 1983, 2.3 percent of executive branch employees are Hispanic. She noted that this was essentially similar to the proportion in the population. (Sandra L. White, Director of Personnel, Jackson County, letter to staff, Mar. 16, 1983 (hereafter cited as Jackson County Comment Letter).) This represents a substantial increase from 1981 when the proportion was 0.8 percent.
5. See Table IV-3. Jackson County commented:

not only is Jackson County generally comparable to private industry, but in some categories, surpasses the private sector in its hiring practices. We feel these kinds of comparisons should also be made if the private sector data is going to be used. (Jackson County Comment Letter)

Such an analysis would show that black males were represented at levels significantly above the laborforce in the workforce as a whole and in all job categories except service/maintenance workers. White women were represented at levels significantly above the laborforce levels in administrative jobs. Black women were represented at levels significantly above the laborforce levels the workforce as a whole and in administrative, professional, technical and office/clerical worker job categories.

6. Data in Jackson County Comment Letter.
7. See Table IV-3 and EEOC, 1980 Report, Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. 11-143.
8. See Table IV-2.
9. EEO-4 for Jackson County-1981, on file at CSRO.
10. Sandra L. White, Personnel Director, Jackson County, letter to staff, Dec. 3, 1982 (hereafter cited as Jackson County Letter).
11. Ibid., Exhibit 6.
12. Ibid., Exhibit 7.
13. Jackson County Comment Letter. The Advisory Committee agrees that seniority appears to be responsible for most of the salary disparity. That is precisely the problem. The county has not considered the question of what the salaries of their minority or white female employees would have been or what positions they might have held, absent the discriminatory practices of the past.
14. Ibid., Exhibit 3.
15. Ibid., Exhibit 2.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid., Exhibit 2.
18. The Jackson County director of personnel commented:

Your comments regarding our recent affirmative action plan are, in my opinion, misleading. Your posture is that there is the possibility of ineffectiveness. However, the Executive Order #22 was passed in 1975; less than 10 years later our work force population has changed dramatically.

We supplied data showing that no minorities have tenure past 10 years, yet out minority population is just less than 30 percent. This is far higher than the census data which you provided in your report. It seems fairly obvious that a great deal of progress has been made in the past eight years.(Jackson County Comment Letter).

19. Ibid., Exhibit 3.
20. Ibid.
21. Jackson County Comment Letter.
22. Jackson County, Executive Order No. 86, pp. 12-13.
23. Ibid., p. 13.
24. Jackson County, Ordinance No. 552, Dec. 12, 1977.
25. Ibid.
26. Sandra White, Director of Personnel, Jackson County, telephone interview, Mar. 17, 1983.
27. Jackson County Letter.
28. Ibid.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., Exhibit 7.
33. Ibid., Exhibit 5.
34. Ibid., Exhibits 5 and 9.
35. Jackson County Letter.
36. Ibid. and Exhibits 4, 5, 10 and 11.
37. Jackson County Letter.
38. Ibid., Exhibit 10.
39. Ibid., Exhibit 11.
40. Jackson County Letter.
41. Ibid.
42. Jackson County Comment Letter.

V. ST. LOUIS COUNTY

St. Louis County completely surrounds the City of St. Louis on the west bank of the Mississippi River. It is one of six first class counties in the State. It is a part of the nine county St. Louis SMSA that includes portions of both Missouri and Illinois. The extent of residential segregation in the county was documented by the Missouri Advisory Committee in a 1982 report.¹ In 1980 the county had a population of 974,815 of whom 87.5 percent were white; 11.3 percent, black; 0.1 percent, Indian; 0.8 percent, Asian; 0.9 percent, Hispanic.²

In 1981, 81.7 percent of the county workforce of 4,035 persons was white; 17.0 percent, black; 0.5 percent, Hispanic; 0.8 percent, Asian; 0.2 percent, Indian.³ In short, the county's utilization of workers from minority groups generally exceeded its population.

Table V-1 compresses the data on the county's workforce. (Table V-2 has been omitted because EEO-4 data was not provided on new hires. The county provided comparable data for three years that is referenced below.) Table V-3 compares the utilization rates of the workforce and area laborforce.⁴ For the most part minorities and women were utilized at rates less than their white male counterparts except in traditional occupations for women such as office/clericals and paraprofessionals. Minorities were represented at rates larger than those of white males in protective services and service worker jobs. The county utilized overall a smaller proportion of black men, Hispanic men, Indian men, white women, and Hispanic women than were utilized in the private sector.⁵ To replicate the private sector there would need to be 36 more white women than there are in the county's workforce, five more black males, three more Hispanic males, two more Hispanic females. St. Louis County commented that "...the Committee failed to note that 47 percent of the personnel in the professional category are women compared to the national and Missouri rate of 37 percent. Nor did the Committee point out that the replication model corrections constitute less than one percent of the workforce (46 people)."⁶ In administrative jobs the proportions of black workers (male and female) matched the area laborforce. But the proportion of white females was considerably less than the area laborforce. In professional jobs the proportions of black workers (male and female) and white female workers were greater in the county workforce than in the area laborforce. In technical jobs the proportions of black males, Hispanic females and Asian females were comparable to those in the area laborforce but the proportions of white and black females were less than in the area laborforce.⁷ The national laborforce rates for black administrators and professionals were lower than the area rates. The rates for Hispanic administrators or professionals were higher.

The county provided data on current utilization of minorities and women as administrators or professionals in each county agency. It was not able to provide data on older workers or handicapped workers without extensive research. The data available show discrepancies in the utilization rates of the principal agencies. The overall utilization rate for black males is 4.4 percent.⁸ The utilization rates for black males by all departments except human resources, justice services, juvenile court, Lakeside Center, parks and recreation and public works were significantly less. The overall utilization rate for white women was 42.0 percent. The utilization rates of the departments of administration, county counselor, highways and traffic, Lakeside Center, parks and recreation, planning, prosecuting attorney, public works, and revenue were significantly lower. The overall utilization rate for black women was 6.7 percent. The rate was significantly lower in all agencies except community health, human resources, justice services, juvenile court, planning, other.⁹ The county also provided data on administrative and

Table V-1
Workforce of St. Louis County - 1982

	MALE					FEMALE					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
Officials/Administrators											
"N" Row	62	53	2				5	1		1	
% Column	1.5	2.5	0.7				0.4	0.3		5.0	
% Row		85.5	3.2				8.1	1.6		1.6	
Professionals											
"N" Row	938	448	40	2	5		373	62		8	
% Column	23.3	21.1	14.2	14.3	45.5		31.9	15.4		40.0	
% Row		47.8	4.3	0.2	0.5		39.8	6.6		0.9	
Technicians											
"N" Row	602	417	27	1	1	1	98	53	1	3	
% Column	14.9	19.6	9.6	7.1	9.1	50.0	8.4	13.2	20.0	15.0	
% Row		69.3	4.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	16.3	8.8	0.2	0.5	
Protective Service											
"N" Row	735	571	85	7	1	1	51	18	1		
% Column	18.2	26.8	30.3	50.0	9.1	50.0	4.4	4.5	20.0		
% Row		77.7	11.6	1.0	0.1	0.1	6.9	2.5	0.1		
Para-Professionals											
"N" Row	127	22	17	1			33	51		3	
% Column	3.2	1.0	6.1	7.1			2.8	12.7		15.0	
% Row		17.3	13.4	0.8			26.0	40.2		2.4	
Office/Clerical											
"N" Row	828	93	13		1		581	132	3	4	1
% Column	20.5	4.4	4.6		9.1		49.6	32.8	60.0	20.0	100.0
% Row		11.2	1.6		0.1		70.2	15.9	0.4	0.5	0.1
Skilled Craft											
"N" Row	145	133	9	2	1						
% Column	3.6	6.3	3.2	14.3	9.1						
% Row		91.7	6.2	1.4	0.7						
Service/Maintenance											
"N" Row	598	391	88	1	2		30	85		1	
% Column	14.8	18.4	31.3	7.1	18.2		2.6	21.1		5.0	
% Row		65.4	14.7	0.2	0.3		5.0	14.2		0.2	
TOTAL	4035	2128	281	14	11	2	1171	402	5	20	1
%		52.7	7.0	0.4	0.3	0.1	29.0	10.0	0.1	0.5	0.0

Source: Data supplied by St. Louis County, on file at CSRO.

Table V - 3
 Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- St. Louis County - 1982

	MALE					FEMALE			Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. Al. Nat.
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic		
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	52.7	7.0	0.4	0.3	0.1	29.0	10.0	0.1	0.5	0.0
% Laborforce/ % Row	52.0	7.5	0.7	0.3	0.2	32.6	6.3	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	85.5	3.2				8.1	1.6		1.6	
% Laborforce/ % Row	77.2	3.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	16.5	1.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	47.8	4.3	0.2	0.5		39.8	6.6		0.9	
% Laborforce/ % Row	60.6	2.3	0.7	1.2	0.3	31.4	2.8	0.2	0.5	0.1
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	69.3	4.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	16.3	8.8	0.2	0.5	
% Laborforce/ % Row	51.7	4.5	0.4	0.4	0.1	32.8	9.4	0.2	0.3	0.1
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	11.2	1.6		0.1		70.2	15.9	0.4	0.5	0.1
% Laborforce/ % Row	15.2	2.0	0.3	0.1	*	70.3	11.1	0.7	0.2	0.2
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	91.7	6.2	1.4	0.7						
% Laborforce/ % Row	83.6	7.0	1.2	0.1	0.3	6.5	1.1	0.1	0.1	*
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	65.4	14.7	0.2	0.3		5.0	14.2		0.2	
% Laborforce/ % Row	29.0	13.7	0.4	0.3	0.1	38.5	17.6	0.2	0.3	0.1

Sources: EEO-4 for St. Louis County, 1982

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 279.

* Less than 0.05 percent

professional employees whose jobs were funded by Federal or State funds. Such jobs are usually referred to as "soft money" jobs because there is a risk that they can be terminated by ending of the grant program under which they are funded (a risk considerably increased by recent Federal and State policies). The proportions of black men and women whose positions were funded by the State or Federal government were significantly larger than their proportions in the county workforce. Most of these jobs were in the department of human resources.¹⁰

County EEO-4 data allow determination of median wages for each ethnic group within each job category. An examination of that data shows that compared to white males in the job category, white female administrators had lower median salaries as did black male, white female and black female professionals; white female and black female technicians; black male and black female protective service workers; black male, white female and black female clerical workers; black male, white female and black female service maintenance workers.¹¹ But it should be noted that the differences were not very large. St. Louis County commented:

In analyzing the median wages the Committee correctly notes that differences in pay are "not very large." The Committee might also note that the County pay structure progresses by merit and longevity. White males may earn higher wages simply because of seniority. Also, the earnings potential for men and women doing the same job is the same.¹²

The county government provides centralized personnel services for all its agencies except the police department and the juvenile court. Thus, the analysis that follows should not be construed to cover those two agencies. In fact, the county's only connection to the court is its legal responsibility to pay the salaries of court personnel.

The county noted that its commitment to equal opportunity "began in 1950 with the passage of the county's first charter. Article IX, Section 94, provided for employment and compensation free of discrimination based upon 'sex, race, national origin, or religious affiliation.'" ¹³ Nondiscrimination was assured by the rules of the county civil service commission, adopted in 1954 which forbade references to race, color, creed and attachment of a photograph.¹⁴ Discrimination by reason of age or handicap is prohibited under the civil service rules as "other non-merit factors."¹⁵ These rules also prohibited discrimination in the examining process except as a business necessity.¹⁶

The county has two affirmative action plans. One, promulgated in 1973 with subsequent attachments, covers all county agencies. The other was adopted by and applies to only the county department of human resources, Office of Employment and Training and its support staff. As a general statement of principles, the countywide plan is complete. It contains clear commitments to efforts in the areas of recruitment, selection, classification, training, establishing of goals that, if implemented, would have produced a fully effective affirmative action program. But, in the course of an U.S. Office of Personnel Management review conducted in March 1981, reviewers found that the affirmative action plan's goals and timetables had never been developed and that prohibitions of discrimination based on age and handicap had not been inserted.¹⁷ The Office of Employment and Training plan is essentially the same as the county's except that it includes a utilization analysis showing that minorities and women are well utilized in comparison to data provided by the Missouri Department of Employment Security. It also has specific timeframes for its action elements.¹⁸

The county stated that its primary affirmative action effort is its EEO workshop. This provides extensive training on equal employment opportunity

laws and good affirmative action practices to supervisory personnel. The program has included training in all phases and has included problems of discrimination affecting the handicapped and older workers. To date 860 county workers, mainly supervisory and managerial personnel, have received this training, approximately one sixth of all county employees.¹⁹

Implementation of other elements of the county's plan are discussed below in the context of affirmative action efforts the county has made.

The primary recruitment area for the county is the St. Louis SMSA. Beginning in August 1979 a hiring freeze was imposed that drastically limited the number of positions filled. Although county civil service rules permit preference for county residents in unskilled positions, in the past this had been applied only to CETA jobs where residence was a requirement of the Federal program and beginning in September 1979 such positions were phased out. Recruitment of administrators and professionals is conducted by the division of personnel and involve work by the affirmative action coordinator, manager of recruitment and selection, the personnel analyst supervisors, four personnel analysts- seniors and two part-time personnel analysts.²⁰

In the period prior to 1979, the county regularly advertised "when there were not enough current applications on file from which to choose." Thereafter, ads were more carefully placed due to budgetary constraints.²¹ The primary local media utilized were the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and Globe Democrat. But ads were also regularly placed in the St. Louis Argus, a paper serving the black community, and various suburban newspapers. Specific positions requiring out-of-area recruitment were advertised in such publications as Feedstaff, the Kansas City Star, Chicago Tribune, ASMT News, AANA Bulletin, and the Wall Street Journal. Copies of ads were sent to a variety of local organizations such as the St. Louis County Special School District, Jewish Employment Vocational Services (JEVS), Vocational Rehabilitation and IMAGE (an agency involved in public sector employment of Hispanics). The county also participated in a variety of job fairs targeted to minority and handicapped youth and its personnel staff visited a large number of area colleges and schools.²² The county sends job notices to 13 agencies involved in the employment of women, 14 dealing with blacks and other minorities, three dealing with Hispanics and 26 dealing with the handicapped, and makes its job vacancy newsletter available to the County Older Residents Program staff and JEVS which are the primary job placement sources for older persons.²³

The county reported that during the mid-1970's it employed an industrial psychologist to determine the validity of selection devices used by it. Priority was given to more populous job classes such as Secretary, Park Supervisor, Corrections Officer and Sanitarian Aide. Test validation for these jobs was completed. Although, subsequent validation efforts were hampered by budget constraints, in 1982 the county began a systematic applicant flow analysis to lay the groundwork for future test validation studies. In addition, the interviewer worksheet for most administrative and professional jobs was revised to reduce the potential for inequalities and supervisory training in writing performance standards and evaluating performance was developed.²⁴ Before recruitment is started a job analysis is conducted by supervisory staff to determine the necessary knowledge, skill and abilities.²⁵

The county established at least 26 career ladders that would provide avenues of advancement from entry-level jobs and created the technical aide job classification to provide advancement opportunities for persons in dead-end jobs. This provides an opportunity for supervisors to develop a program suited to a particular individual so that individual can move from one job to another. Such a program usually includes college level work, in-house training, independent study, and special projects. Nine employees have

entered the program, six successfully completed it, one remains in the program.²⁶

Under county civil service rules all merit system vacancies are filled by promotion, if practical, provided the position is not filled from the layoff list (recall) demotion or transfer of another employee. If promotion is not practical, the position is filled by open competition in which employees and nonemployees are tested for the position. Promotional examinations are usually opened only to individuals having the necessary qualifications, knowledge and experience and employed by the specific department. Notice of promotional opportunities are posted within the specific department with the vacancy to insure that all interested and qualified employees are made aware of such opportunities.²⁷

The county provided data on the promotion of minorities and women by each department. They show that for the period 1979-1981 the proportion of persons promoted to administrative and professional jobs who were white males was slightly smaller than the 1981 total workforce proportion, the proportion of black males was also slightly smaller but the proportions of white and black females was somewhat larger. The proportion of white males promoted to administrative or professional jobs from above entry-level jobs during this period was larger than the workforce proportion existing in 1981. But the proportion of black males, white females and black females was somewhat smaller.²⁸ The proportion of noncompetitive appointments from entry level to administrative or professional was higher for white men than for black men or white women. Similarly, the proportion of noncompetitive appointments from above entry level jobs to administrative or professional was higher for white men than for white or black women. But the proportion of noncompetitive appointments from entry level to technical level jobs was lower for white men than for black men, white women or black men.²⁹ Most departments with more than a minimal number of promotions did promote minorities and women. The exceptions for minorities' promotions to administrative or professional jobs were administration, highways and traffic, prosecuting attorney. But it should be noted that in several departments with a number of promotions, the promotions of white women or black men were proportionately fewer than the average for all agencies.³⁰

The county noted that it has been successful in employing minorities and women in a variety of administrative and professional categories and has been successful in maintaining parity or greater with the SMSA laborforce percentages for minorities and women.³¹ The employment practices of the county police department are discussed in another chapter of this report.

Notes

1. Missouri Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Fair Housing Enforcement in St. Louis (February 1982).
2. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 1. The category "other" race has been omitted. Hispanics are also counted in one of the racial groups and therefore total exceeds 100 percent.
3. Karen C. Moleculeski, Assistant County Counselor, letter to staff, including attachments, Nov. 14, 1982 (hereafter cited as St. Louis County Letter), Exhibit 5.
4. *Ibid.*, Exhibit 5.
5. See Table V-1, Percent Column Rows.
6. Thomas W. Wehrle, County Counselor, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983. If the Committee cited national data for other groups, the disparities for Hispanics, Asians and Indians would have been much higher. Moreover, in specific occupations, such as crafts and professionals, the proportions that were white women were larger in the national than in the local laborforces. (EEOC, 1980 Report..., pp. I-1, II-279.) While it is true that the changes compared to the total workforce are small, they would result in an increase in the number of white women of three percent, black men of two percent, Hispanic men of 21 percent, Hispanic women of 40 percent.
7. See Table V-3.
8. St. Louis County Letter, Chart A.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*, Chart B.
11. *Ibid.*, Exhibit 5.
12. Thomas W. Wehrle, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983.
13. St. Louis County Letter.
14. *Ibid.*
15. Thomas W. Wehrle, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983.
16. St. Louis County Letter.
17. *Ibid.*, Exhibit 7. St. Louis County commented:

In view of the Committee's replication model which requires a "correction" of less than one percent of the workforce, it is apparent that goals and timetables are not necessarily a panacea. The Committee also ignores the fact that the Civil Service Rules prohibit the use of non-merit factors such as age or handicap. (Thomas W. Wehrle, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983.)

18. St. Louis County Letter, Exhibit 7.
19. St. Louis County Letter.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Thomas W. Wehrle, County Counselor, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983.
22. St. Louis County Letter and Exhibits 3, 4.
23. St. Louis County Letter.
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. Thomas W. Wehrle, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983.
28. St. Louis County Letter, Chart C.
29. *Ibid.*, Chart C.
30. St. Louis County Letter, Chart C.
31. St. Louis County Letter.

VI. CITY OF COLUMBIA

The City of Columbia is the county seat for Boone County and the site of the University of Missouri-Columbia. It is located in the mid-Missouri area. In 1980, out of a population of 62,061, 88.3 percent were white, 8.8 percent were black, 0.2 percent were Indian, 1.5 percent were Asian, 1.3 percent were other races and 1.1 percent were Hispanic.¹

The City of Columbia employs 756 persons. Data on its employment patterns appear in Tables VI-1 and VI-2. It employs proportionately more black workers in its workforce than are in the population. The same is true for Indian workers. But in other categories it employs somewhat fewer, although the differences are not substantial.² Table VI-3 shows the data on workforce utilization rates and comparable data on the area laborforce.

Compared to the area laborforce, it employed significantly more black men than in the laborforce. But the proportions of white women and black women employed were significantly below the laborforce level. There were fewer white female administrators, professionals, clericals, technicians and service workers than in the laborforce. There also were fewer black female technicians, clericals and service workers than in the laborforce. Although there were differences in the relative utilization of white males and other groups in the various occupations, these differences were comparable to those in the laborforce. The median salaries of white female professionals, white female technicians, black male and white female skilled workers were lower than their white male counterparts.³ The city believes this is because minorities and women have less seniority.⁴

The rate of new hires for 1982 shows that a significantly smaller proportion of new hires were black men than were in the existing workforce. But the proportion of new hires that was white female was significantly larger than in the workforce. The City commented:

approximately twenty percent of the employees who left the City of Columbia were black males and black females. Replacing those employees at that rate is difficult as several of these individuals left professional and technical positions.⁵

Although 10 new hires were in administrative or professional jobs, none were minorities and only three were white women. The city noted that while it had difficulty in finding new minority and female professionals and administrators it had been successful in promoting them.⁶

The city also provided data on the utilization of minorities and white women as administrators or professionals in each city department. Only five of 15 departments had minority workers: finance, parks and recreation, police, fire and health. Four departments had no white female workers and one had significantly fewer than the total. Overall, 44.8 percent of the administrators and professionals were aged 40-70 and 6.3 percent were handicapped. The city employed 27 persons on "soft-money" provided by Federal, State or County governments. Of these, two-thirds were white male, 3.7 percent were black male, 25.9 percent were white female and 3.7 percent were Indian female. While only 16.5 percent of the white male administrators or professionals were so funded, half of the black males, 22.5 percent of the white women and the one Indian woman were so funded.⁷ The city commented:

We consider the interest, qualification and eventual hiring of minorities and females in grant-funded positions a very positive factor. In fact, the Indian female who held a "soft money" funded Community Health Nurse position during 1982 was promoted to Senior Public Health Nurse in August. Our ordinances speak to the desirability and commitment to hiring

Table VI-1
Workforce of Columbia - 1982

	MALE						FEMALE				
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
Officials/Administrators											
"N" Row	38	34	1				3				
% Column	5.0	6.5	1.4				2.2				
% Row		89.5	2.6				7.9				
Professionals											
"N" Row	97	75					20	1			1
% Column	12.8	14.2					14.5	12.5			33.3
% Row		77.3					20.6	1.0			1.0
Technicians											
"N" Row	64	46	2				12	1	1		1
% Column	8.5	8.7	2.7				8.9	12.5	100.0	50.0	33.3
% Row		71.9	3.1				18.8	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
Protective Service											
"N" Row	130	109	8		1	2	8	2			
% Column	17.2	20.7	10.8		50.0	66.7	5.9	25.0			
% Row		83.8	6.2		0.8	1.5	6.2	1.5			
Para-Professionals											
"N" Row	11	3	1				6	1			
% Column	1.5	0.6	1.4				4.4	12.5			
% Row		27.3	9.1				54.5	9.1			
Office/Clerical											
"N" Row	89	9	2				73	3		1	1
% Column	11.8	1.7	2.7				54.1	37.5		50.0	33.3
% Row		10.1	2.2				82.0	3.4		1.1	1.1
Skilled Craft											
"N" Row	236	204	21		1	1	9				
% Column	31.2	38.7	28.4		50.0	33.3	6.7				
% Row		86.4	8.9		0.4	0.4	3.8				
Service/Maintenance											
"N" Row	91	47	39	1			4				
% Column	12.0	8.9	52.7	100.0			3.0				
% Row		51.6	42.9	1.1			4.4				
TOTAL	756	527	74	1	2	3	135	8	1	2	3
%		69.7	9.8	0.1	0.3	0.4	17.9	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.4

Source: Data supplied by City of Columbia, on file at CSRO.

New Hires - Columbia - 1982

	<u>MALE</u>					<u>FEMALE</u>					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number	2	2									
% Row		100.0									
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	8	5				3					
% Row		62.5				37.5					
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number	4	3				1					
% Row		75.0				25.0					
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	11	8			1		2				
% Row		72.7			9.1		18.2				
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	20	4				16					
% Row		20.0				80.0					
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number	12	11				1					
% Row		91.7				8.3					
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	5	2	2			1					
% Row		40.0	40.0			20.0					
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	62	35	2		1	22	2				
% Row		56.5	3.2		1.6	35.5	3.2				

Source: EEO-4 supplied by City of Columbia, 1982.

Table VI - 3
 Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- City of Columbia - 1982

	MALE					FEMALE				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	69.7	9.8	0.1	0.3	0.4	17.9	1.1	0.1	0.3	0.4
% Laborforce/ % Row	48.6	3.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	43.0	3.7	0.2	0.4	0.1
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	89.5	2.6				7.9				
% Laborforce/ % Row	76.6	1.3	0.5	0.3	0.3	19.7	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	77.3					20.6	1.0			1.0
% Laborforce/ % Row	64.4	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.1	33.1	1.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	71.9	3.1				18.8	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6
% Laborforce/ % Row	63.1	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.5	3.9	0.0	0.3	0.0
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	10.1	2.2				82.0	3.4		1.1	1.1
% Laborforce/ % Row	9.3	0.6	0.2	*	0.1	83.9	5.2	0.6	0.2	0.0
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	86.4	8.9		0.4	0.4	3.8				
% Laborforce/ % Row	82.4	3.6	0.0	0.3	1.0	11.2	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	51.6	42.9	1.1			4.4				
% Laborforce/ % Row	39.1	8.5	0.4	0.9	0.1	41.2	8.7	0.4	0.4	0.3

Sources: EEO-4 for City of Columbia - 1982

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 399.

* Less than 0.05 percent

22c

of the disadvantaged, minorities and females for temporary and summer appointments. As with the PSE/CETA program, they are thus afforded the opportunity to get a "foot in the door," train and prove themselves for competition in subsequent permanent processes.

As the job market continues to tighten up and a higher percentage of the City's job openings are of a funded nature, larger numbers of qualified individuals looking for permanent employment are happy to start out or return to the job market in such positions.⁸

Columbia first adopted an affirmative action policy in 1974. Affirmative action became a part of county law in 1975. A workforce analysis was conducted in 1976, goals and timetables were established. Beginning in 1974, the city also revised its job and pay classifications and its minimum qualifications statements. In 1976 the city manager assigned an assistant to the city manager as the EEO Officer and the Personnel Advisory Board was given monitoring responsibilities.⁹

Under Article XI of the city code, the city declares its policy to support affirmative action. It states that department heads and supervisors are responsible for implementing this policy. The general policy clause includes the sentence: "While EEO Affirmative Action shall be considered a top priority, neither shall it unreasonably infringe upon the goal of efficient, productive, continuing public service."¹⁰ The personnel director is required to develop annually both annual and long-term goals and timetables. The code states "Identifiable lack of good faith in attempting to achieve established goals shall be just cause of disciplinary action, and shall involve any and all employees."¹¹

In the area of recruitment, the code requires that after first consideration has been given to current employees, contact should be made with appropriate agencies or programs that might provide qualified minorities or women and jobs should be advertised in publications with a broad circulation. Systematic contact is to be maintained with the State employment service and local community action agencies. Present employees are encouraged to refer minority or woman applicants and the city proposes a special effort to seek minority and woman applicants in classifications in which it has found underutilization.¹²

The city personnel director is instructed to determine whether there are job categories closed to minorities or women; whether hiring practices indicate all applicants are considered solely based on their qualifications; whether initial job assignments were nondiscriminatory; whether minimal entry qualifications are necessary, valid and justifiable; applicant flow system be established; and, the validity of testing ensured. The skills of current employees are to be reassessed periodically to ensure they are offered promotion opportunities for which they are qualified. To the maximum extent possible, the city proposes to utilize minorities and women as trainees and summer part-time workers.¹³

Where the city personnel director finds underutilization relative to the labor market, more vigorous recruitment is to be undertaken, policies are to be discussed with appropriate management, supervisory and other personnel, and an effort made to see whether minorities or women in lower grades could be transferred. Quarterly statistics are to be assembled to evaluate the program.¹⁴

The city, has in fact, calculated goals and timetables quarterly. Achievement is based on representational goals established in 1976. The data show that the goals have been exceeded for minorities in the administrative and general laborer categories but not in others. They also show that the goals have been achieved for women (regardless of race) in the

paraprofessional/technical, clerical, and labor supervisor categories but not in other categories.¹⁵ The city's data over the period 1973-1979 showed a steady increase in utilization of both groups, for minorities from 10.5 percent in 1973 to 13.4 percent in 1979 and for women from 11.1 percent in 1973 to 19.2 percent in 1979.¹⁶

Full scale workforce analyses apparently have been done for several years.¹⁷ The city provided a copy of its 1981 utilization analysis using the eight factor system utilized by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs of the U.S. Department of Labor. This suggested that the achievable long-term goals should, in fact, be lower than the actual city workforce proportions in that year. The same was found for most job categories for utilization of women. These numbers appear, on their face, peculiar. But such results are easily obtained in an OFCCP-type analysis, without any actual error. What is required is that the analysis be re-examined and weights or factors were arbitrary or at best impressionistic estimates have been made be reassessed. For some categories this may require consideration of potential sources beyond the SMSA, since, as indicated below, recruitment occurs beyond there. The city noted it would look again at its analyses but that historically it had gotten few interested qualified applicants from outside the SMSA.¹⁸

The city also maintains quarterly applicant flow data that enable it to determine whether there has been any discrimination in filling particular broad job categories. The city also tracks the filling of each city position. The data assembled are sufficient for a reasonable assessment to be made by the city as to whether there has been any discrimination. While the city does not assemble its data by department, it is not so voluminous that this is unclear, and presumably the city does check on department or hiring authority performance.¹⁹

Recruitment efforts are the responsibility of the assistant city manager for human services and the director of personnel services. Approximately 82 individuals and agencies and a variety of placement centers are sent notification of vacancies. In addition, ads are placed in 16 general circulation newspapers throughout the State, including the Post-Dispatch, Globe-Democrat and Kansas City Star/Times for difficult to fill positions or positions where there are few minority/female employees. The city has also utilized headhunter firms to fill key positions.²⁰ The personnel director participates in the University of Missouri Minority Task Force that seeks to recruit and retain qualified minorities and her staff have participated in job fairs for minorities and the handicapped.²¹ Copies of its ads make clear that it has sought to obtain minorities and women for nontraditional jobs.²²

The city noted that it continually reviews qualifications requirements as jobs become vacant. It is particularly proud of its success in hiring a black male police chief, female public health nurse, nursing supervisor, senior rate analyst, parks and recreation supervisor, public health nurse and staff accountant. It also has hired handicapped persons as city attorney and city manager. The city is particularly proud of its summer employment program. It noted:

The City appropriated \$165,000 last year (\$176,000 for 1983) to provide summer employment for hard-to-place, low income or otherwise disadvantaged youth with Columbia employers. A concerted effort was made to place the youths in one of the eighteen vocational opportunities best suited to their career plans. For each participant, the work experience was preceded by four weeks of mandatory vocational training funded by a \$35,000 grant from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Key Parks and Recreation CARE Program Staff received the highest level of cooperation from local social service agencies as 150 youths were selected to participate (a total of 109 completed the program).

The City of Columbia has already begun the process of selecting Summer 1983 CARE Job Developers and Job Coaches to hire local youths who will obtain the job skills training, education and experience so critical to their total career effectiveness.²³

The city authorizes noncompetitive promotions when the person under consideration meets the minimum standards, has been certified as eligible, and wants the promotion. But this applies only to within-department promotions. Candidates from other departments must compete with outsiders unless both departments heads agree and the promotion is in conformity with the affirmative action program.²⁴ Although the qualifications lists are apparently regularly revised, it is not clear from the city's response that tests are validated.²⁵

The city provided data on promotions into administrative and professional positions from 1979-1982. These show that of 20 administrators or professionals promoted to such jobs from entry-level, one was black, nine were white women. One-third of the white males and nearly half the white females so promoted obtained noncompetitive appointments. Of 12 persons appointed to administrative or professional positions from above entry-level jobs, one was a black male, five were white females. Over half the white males so appointed and all the white women received noncompetitive appointments.²⁶ The city comments:

One can readily discern from our enclosed promotional professional and administrative charts that females, handicapped, older workers and minorities are well aware that upward mobility is available to all and "go for it." This pattern is evidenced all the way down through our entry level positions. City employees desirous of changing their career paths notify personnel and a file indicating their interests/qualifications is established for regular referral and action. We have a comprehensive employee development and tuition reimbursement program, better preparing employees for advancement.²⁷

Despite the optimism of the city, and its relatively good statistics, there is reason for concern about its affirmative action efforts. Its success in reaching statistical goals is to some extent the result of using local statistics. If national or State statistics were used for administrative and professional jobs then the goals would be much higher and success less evident. Although the city maintains good data on its efforts, the extent of analysis given that data was not made clear to the Advisory Committee and is not apparent from the planning documents. Allowing for all that has been done, there is still room for improvements.

Notes

1. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 2. Note that total percentage exceeds 100 because Hispanics are also counted in a racial group.
2. Data supplied by the City of Columbia, on file at CSRO.
3. See Table VI-3.
4. Gloria Seabaugh, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 3, 1983 (hereafter cited as Columbia Comment Letter).
5. Columbia Comment Letter.
6. Columbia Comment Letter, see below, p. 24.
7. Gloria Seabaugh, Director, Personnel Services, City of Columbia, letter to staff, Nov. 16, 1982 (hereafter cited as Columbia Letter), attachment 5.
8. Columbia Comment Letter.
9. Columbia Letter, attachment 2.
10. City of Columbia, Revised Ordinances (1964), Chapter 22, Sec. 22.910.
11. Ibid., Sec. 22.920.
12. Ibid., Sec. 22.940.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid., Sec. 22.960.
15. City of Columbia, Utilization Analyses, Oct. 1, 1981.
16. Ibid.
17. Columbia Letter, Ibid.
18. Columbia Comment Letter.
19. Columbia Letter, "Vacancies Filled," "Applicant Flow."
20. Columbia Letter and attachment 3b.
21. Columbia Letter.
22. Ibid., attachment 3b.
23. Columbia Comment Letter.
24. Columbia Letter; City of Columbia, Revised Ordinances, Chapter 22, Sec. 22.830.
25. Columbia Letter.
26. Ibid., "Applicant Flow."
27. Columbia Letter.

VII. KANSAS CITY

The City of Kansas City is located on the western edge of the State. In 1980, the city had a population of 448,159 persons, 69.8 percent of whom were white, 27.4 percent were black 0.4 percent were Indian. 0.8 percent were Asian, 1.7 percent were other races and 3.3 percent were Hispanic.¹ The city includes portions of three counties--Jackson, Clay and Platte--in the seven county Kansas City metropolitan area.

The city employed 4,849 persons in 1981, 43.6 percent of whom were white men; 30.5 percent, black men; 1.3 percent, Hispanic men; 0.3 percent, Asian men; 12.0 percent, white women; 11.7 percent, black women; 0.4 percent, Hispanic women, 0.1 percent, Asian women.² In short, overall the city's workforce reflected its ethnic composition. A compressed summary of the city's workforce is in Tables VII-1 and VII-2. The utilization rates of the workforce and area laborforce are shown in Table VII-3.

The laborforce of the SMSA was about 50.2 percent white male, 33.8 percent white female, 6.2 percent black male and female, 1.4 percent Hispanic male, 0.9 percent Hispanic female and less than 0.5 percent each from other ethnic/sex groups. White women were clearly considerably underrepresented in the workforce. An examination of individual job categories also shows underrepresentation. In the administrator category, white women were 7.5 percent of the city work force but 18.7 percent of the laborforce. In the professional and technical categories the patterns were similar. There were no patterns of underrepresentation in the office/clerical, crafts or service workers categories.³

Women and minority administrative workers were a lesser proportion of their ethnic/sex groups in the workforce than were white males. This was also true in comparison to the laborforce. At the professional level, black men professionals were a lesser proportion of their group in the workforce than were white men, but their share was greater than that of black men in the laborforce. Other race/sex groups' representation was greater than that of white men. In technical jobs, black technicians, Hispanic technicians, white female technicians, black female technicians and Hispanic female technicians were a smaller proportion of their race/sex group than were white male technicians. But, except for black female technicians, these proportions were greater than in the laborforce.⁴

An examination of median salaries, shows black women administrators' were very much lower than other groups and white female administrators' were somewhat lower. White male professionals had higher median salaries than did any other group. Black male, white female and Hispanic female professionals' median salaries were very much lower. Black male and female technicians' median salaries were lower than that of other groups. White male protective service workers had higher median salaries than any other group and very much higher than white or black female protective service workers. White male clerical workers had higher median salaries than did black male, white female or black female clericals. There were no major differences in the remaining job categories.⁵

The overall new hires during 1981 apparently increased the proportions of black men, white and black women in the workforce. They increased the proportions of white and black female administrators; white and black female professionals; black male, white and black female technicians; minority and white female protective service workers; black female clerical workers; decreased the proportions of white female and black skilled workers and decreased the proportion of black male service workers. Considering that overall turnover was more than half of the city's workforce, one would have expected more significant changes in the city's affirmative action posture than were reported.⁶

Table VII-1
Workforce of Kansas City - 1981

	Total	White	MALE Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	FEMALE Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
Officials/Administrators											
"N" Row	251	197	25	3			19	7			
% Column	5.2	9.3	1.7	4.7			3.3	1.2			
% Row		78.5	10.0	1.2			7.5	2.8			
Professionals											
"N" Row	401	207	36	6	5	1	78	62	4	1	1
% Column	8.3	9.8	2.4	9.4	35.7	50.0	13.4	11.0	19.1	16.7	100
% Row		51.6	9.0	1.5	1.2	0.2	19.5	15.5	1.0	0.2	0.2
Technicians											
"N" Row	381	216	73	5	6		41	37	1	2	
% Column	7.9	10.2	4.9	7.8	42.9		7.0	6.6	4.8	33.3	
% Row		56.7	19.2	1.3	1.6		10.8	9.7	0.3	0.5	
Protective Service											
"N" Row	1087	780	230	20	1	1	40	14	1		
% Column	22.4	36.9	15.6	31.3	7.1	50.0	6.9	2.5	4.8		
% Row		71.8	21.2	1.8	0.1	0.1	3.7	1.3	1.1		
Para-Professionals											
"N" Row	22		4				3	15			
% Column	0.5		0.3				0.5	2.7			
% Row			18.2				13.6	68.2			
Office/Clerical											
"N" Row	930	126	48	2			373	363	15	3	
% Column	19.2	6.0	3.3	3.1			64.0	64.3	71.4	50.0	
% Row		13.5	5.2	0.2			40.1	39.0	1.5	0.3	
Skilled Craft											
"N" Row	650	318	273	11	1		10	37			
% Column	13.4	15.0	18.5	17.2	7.1		1.7	6.6			
% Row		48.9	42.0	1.7	0.2		1.5	5.7			
Service/Maintenance											
"N" Row	1127	270	790	17	1		19	30			
% Column	23.2	12.8	53.4	26.6	7.1		3.3	5.3			
% Row		24.0	70.1	1.5	0.1		1.7	2.7			
TOTAL	4849	2114	1479	64	14	2	583	565	21	6	1
%		43.6	30.5	1.3	0.3	0.0	12.0	11.7	0.4	0.1	0.0

Source: Data supplied by Kansas City, on file at CSRO.

Table VII - 2
New Hires-Kansas City-1981

	<u>MALE</u>						<u>FEMALE</u>				
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number	88	59	14	1			10	4			
% Row		67.1	15.9	1.1			11.4	4.6			
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	280	131	25	4	4	1	61	50	3	0	1
% Row		46.8	8.9	1.4	1.4	0.4	21.8	17.9	1.1		0.4
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number	249	127	57	2	5		29	27		2	
% Row		51.0	22.9	0.8	2.0		11.7	10.8		0.8	
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	544	319	155	13	1		42	13	1		
% Row		58.6	28.5	2.4	0.2		7.7	2.4	0.2		
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number	16		2				2	12			
% Row			12.5				12.5	75.0			
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	651	77	40	2			250	267	13	2	
% Row		11.8	6.1	0.3			38.4	41.0	2.0	0.3	
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number	236	155	71	4	1		2	3			
% Row		65.7	30.1	1.7	0.4		0.9	1.3			
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	865	200	583	10			22	50			
% Row		23.1	67.4	1.2			2.5	5.8			
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	2929	1068	947	36	11	1	418	426	17	4	1
% Row		36.5	32.3	1.2	0.4	0.0	14.3	14.5	0.6	0.1	0.0

Source: EEO-4 Supplied by Kansas City, 1981

Table VII - 3

Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- Kansas City - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE			Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. Al. Nat.
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic		
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	43.6	30.5	1.3	0.3	0.0	12.0	11.7	0.4	0.1	0.0
% Laborforce/ % Row	50.2	6.2	1.4	0.4	0.3	33.8	6.2	0.9	0.4	0.2
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	78.5	10.0	1.2			7.5	2.8			
% Laborforce/ % Row	75.3	2.7	0.8	0.3	0.5	18.7	1.4	0.3	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	51.6	9.0	1.5	1.2	0.2	19.5	15.5	1.0	0.2	0.2
% Laborforce/ % Row	54.4	1.5	0.5	1.0	0.2	38.4	2.7	0.4	0.8	0.1
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	56.7	19.2	1.3	1.6		10.8	9.7	0.3	0.5	
% Laborforce/ % Row	50.4	3.7	0.8	0.6	0.2	34.7	8.2	0.7	0.5	0.2
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	13.5	5.2	0.2			40.1	39.0	1.5	0.3	
% Laborforce/ % Row	13.7	2.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	71.7	9.5	1.9	0.4	0.3
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	48.9	42.0	1.7	0.2		1.5	5.7			
% Laborforce/ % Row	81.1	6.2	2.2	0.2	0.6	7.3	1.8	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	24.0	70.1	1.5	0.1		1.7	2.7			
% Laborforce/ % Row	31.8	12.6	1.8	0.9	0.3	34.7	15.3	1.7	0.7	0.2

Sources: EEO-4 supplied by Kansas City, Mo. - 1981

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 143.

The city provided data on the composition of most city agencies. There were 551 administrators or professionals as of April 30, 1981. Of these 13.4 percent were white female; 9.1 percent, black male; 7.1 percent, black female; and, less than 0.5 percent from each of the other race/sex categories. Of the 21 agencies for which the city provided information, seven utilized fewer white females; 10 utilized fewer black males; 10 utilized fewer black females; than the average for all agencies. In short, a few agencies, mostly providing human services, covered the poor performance of other agencies.⁷

The city also provided data on the numbers of administrators and professionals whose jobs were dependent on Federal, State or county funds (that is soft-money positions). The proportions of persons in soft-money positions who were black male, black female or Hispanic female were larger than their proportions in all administrative or professional jobs. The proportions in particular agencies also varied. The fire, public works and office of housing and community development proportions of black male soft-money workers were larger than the citywide average. The same was true for OCHRD and the department of urban affairs for white women, for the departments of health and urban affairs for black women and for the departments of public works, parks and recreation and city development for Hispanic women.⁸

The city provided a copy of a 1973 affirmative action policy ordinance, a document entitled "Affirmative Action Plan for City of Kansas City, Missouri; April 30, 1981-82" and another entitled "Progress Report on Departmental Implementation of Affirmative Action Goals, City of Kansas City; May 1, 1982-July 31, 1982."⁹

The city's basic affirmative action plan was passed as ordinance 42406 in March 1973. This established activities in selection, recruiting, classification, determination of underutilization, and evaluation.¹⁰

In the area of selection, the plan requires the directors of the departments of personnel and human relations and their staffs to review the classifications standards for positions in the classified service to assure that the requirements are job related and do not constitute an unreasonable barrier to entry for minorities or women, review the examinations "to assure that written examinations are not having a discriminatory effect;" and review new classifications and any new examinations, as developed, as well as informal selection methods for the same purpose.¹¹

In the area of recruitment, the plan requires a review of the recruitment process to increase recruiting "directed toward colleges with a predominant minority or female enrollment," increased communication with groups likely to yield minority or female applicants, and advertising in local minority publications.¹²

In the area of classification, the departments of human relations and personnel are to work with each department to analyze it and restructure its organization so as to provide maximum opportunity for applicants to qualify for employment and for employees to advance. They are to assure that the maximum opportunity is provided for minorities and women to enter training or education programs "which will enhance their employment or upward mobility potential."¹³

Managers are to be trained in the skills they would need to make affirmative action work.¹⁴

Each department's staff are to be analyzed to identify areas in which minorities and women are underrepresented and establish goals for remedying those deficiencies. Statistical information on the selection and promotion process are to be collected, retained, and evaluated.¹⁵

An affirmative action evaluation committee is to be established, consisting of the director of personnel, the director of human relations, four other department heads and the city manager; is to advise on implementation

procedures, focus areas and the like. The departments of human relations and personnel are to prepare an annual report on accomplishments and a semi-annual evaluation of program efforts.¹⁶

A community advisory group, broadly representative of community organizations, is also established to meet quarterly to hear reports of progress and give advise to improve the program.¹⁷

The affirmative action plan for April 30, 1981-82 contains a description of the various city agency workforces in broad occupational groupings, such as administrator, professional, clerical, etc. There is no utilization analysis in comparison to any standard such as the area laborforce or population. Following each chart is a "goal" statement. Typical of these is the statement for the Administration-Director's Office which reads "For the fiscal year 1981-82, the Administration Department has set minority and female goals, in the event of any vacancies, in the Public Information Office and the Budget and Systems Division."¹⁸ In its accomplishment report for that year, the city stated:

The goal was to place minorities and females, in the event of any vacancies, in the Public Information Office and Budget and Systems Division. This objective was accomplished for females (a white female was hired as Journalist I, Public Information Office), but not for minorities.¹⁹

While the accomplishment reports notes that some agencies met their goals, many others that had hiring or promotional opportunities that would have allowed goal fulfillment did not.²⁰ The accomplishment report, while more detailed than the goal statement, does not really allow assessment since there is no way to know whether the goals set were reasonable or whether the reasons for not meeting the goal constituted "good faith" efforts. The data provided covers only the period May 1, 1982-July 31, 1982 and includes information on the race and sex of persons hired, separated, promoted or demoted by job classification.

Recruiting efforts are handled by a minority employment specialist. She has made trips to minority colleges in Tennessee, Georgia, Louisiana and Texas. In addition, the city has placed ads in minority weekly newspapers across the country (including the Kansas City Call) and the jobs are listed with the Urban League Job Data Bank.²¹ All administrative and professional jobs are advertised in the local news media and in monthly professional journals.²² Although all its job efforts are directed to obtain minority, female, handicapped and older worker, the city reported that "handicapped and older workers have not appeared for interviews" and "consequently have not been hired."²³

The department of personnel's validation section reported that the uniformed fire service examinations had been completely redone within the past three years and that both entry and promotional tests are now content valid.²⁴ It reported completing validation studies on nine jobs and revising five examinations. It also reported developing job-specific ratings of education and experience for "some professional and recreation work positions."²⁵ It designed a scored structured interview for assessing the capacity of persons seeking "first-line" supervisory positions. The city did not provide information on the scope of its validation efforts, so it was impossible to determine what proportion of its entry or promotion examinations, formal or informal, are validated or have been tested for discriminatory affect.²⁶

But the city did provide data on promotions from 1979-1982. The city was unable to provide information on promotion of the handicapped. There were 140 persons promoted from above entry-level jobs to administrative or professional

positions. The proportions of black and Hispanic workers so promoted were larger than their shares of the workforce. But there were wide variations in the actual shares within specific departments and in some, such as public works, the proportions of black women and white women so promoted were lower than the citywide average. Women were far more likely to get noncompetitive appointments than were men. The city also provided data on 114 promotions from entry-level to professional or administrative jobs during the period 1979-1982. The proportions of black and Hispanic persons so promoted were larger (albeit only slightly) than the proportions in the administrative and professional workforce. But again, there were wide variations in the performances of individual agencies. Some, such as the aviation and finance departments had much lower proportions of black male promotions. The same was true of the aviation and water departments for white women and public works department for black women.²⁷

In short, despite an affirmative action plan that is lacking in detail or evaluability, the city has succeeded in recruiting, hiring and promoting minorities and women in its service. All of which suggests that careful planning might result in yet better performance.

Notes

1. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 2. Note that percentage exceeds 100 because Hispanics are also counted in a racial group.
2. Data supplied by City of Kansas City on file at CSRO.
3. See Table VII-3.
4. See Table VII-1 and EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II-143.
5. EEO-4 for Kansas City, on file at CSRO.
6. See Tables VII-1 and 2.
7. Alvin Brooks, Director of Human Relations, Kansas City, letter to staff, Oct. 6, 1982 (hereafter cited as Kansas City Letter); "Affirmative Action Plan for City of Kansas City, Missouri, Apr. 30, 1981-82 (hereafter cited as Kansas City Plan).
8. Alvin Brooks, letter to staff, Feb. 7, 1983 (hereafter cited as KC Letter II).
9. Kansas City Letter, attachments.
10. Ibid., attachment.
11. Ibid.
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Ibid.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. Kansas City Plan.
19. Kansas City Letter, "Progress Report on Departmental Implementation of Affirmative Action Goals, City of Kansas City, May 1, 1982-July 31, 1982.
20. Ibid.
21. KC Letter II.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.

VIII. CITY OF ST. LOUIS

The City of St. Louis is located on the west bank of the Mississippi River. It is part of the St. Louis SMSA. In 1980 it had a population of 453,085 of whom 53.5 percent were white, 45.6 percent were black, 0.1 percent were Indian, 0.4 percent were Asian, 0.4 percent were of "other" races and 1.2 percent were Hispanic.¹ The city is both a municipality and a county and thus provides services of two governmental levels.

In 1981 the city's workforce comprised 7,224 persons, 44.8 percent were white, 54.6 percent were black, 0.3 percent were Hispanic, 0.5 percent were Asian.² A summary of the city's workforce profile is in Table VIII-1. Black and Asian segments of the population were well represented; other groups were not.

Table VIII-3 shows the utilization rates in the workforce and the area laborforce. Black workers were a larger proportion of the workforce than of the laborforce. Hispanic workers were a smaller proportion. White women were significantly underrepresented. This pattern also applies in the higher job categories. The area laborforce statistics are higher than the national, so no comparison is made to them. Overall, the city would need to hire at least 204 additional white female workers to begin to match the laborforce.³

An examination of the salary structure by race and sex shows that black men had a lower median salary as administrators than did white men; black men, white women and black women had lower median salaries as technicians; black men, white women and black women had lower median salaries as protective service workers; white and black women had lower median salaries as service workers. There were no discrepancies in the other job categories.⁴

The city also provided data on new hires in its EEO-4. These are replicated in Table VIII-2. This shows that it was hiring more white women and black men than were in its workforce in 1981 and fewer black women. This was also true for new hires in administrative, professional and technical jobs (but the difference in percentage was very slight). The proportion of black male new hires was lower than in the existing workforce in professional and technical jobs. The proportion of black female new hires was higher in administrative and professional out not technical jobs.⁵

The proportion of women and minorities in particular job categories in their own group was lower than that of white males in administrative, professional (not white women), technical, protective service, and skilled craft job categories. Compared to the area laborforce, while the proportions of white women and minorities who were administrators was lower, the proportion of white women, black men and black females who were professionals or technicians was higher. Hispanic administrators, professionals and technicians were generally a smaller part of their portion of the workforce than they were of the laborforce.

The city provided a copy of its current affirmative action plan. It was adopted in 1979. Although the plan was supposed to be updated on an annual basis, this apparently was not done.⁶ The city proposes to update it in 1983.⁷ The plan states that it is designed:

through voluntary self-analysis, to identify areas in which there may be underutilization of available women and minorities in the workforce and to design a positive program to correct and overcome this underutilization...and to familiarize operating managers and supervisors...with the City's overall goal of affirmatively seeking to hire those who may have been denied opportunities in the past and...to improve the quality and representativeness of the City's work force as a whole.⁸

Table VIII-1
Workforce of the City of St. Louis - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
"N" Row	192	140	19		1		19	13			
% Column	2.7	5.9	1.0		5.3		2.2	0.6			
% Row		72.9	9.9		0.5		9.9	6.8			
<u>Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	1229	477	139	1	13		237	348	2	12	
% Column	17.0	20.2	7.3	8.3	68.4		27.0	17.1	33.3	100.0	
% Row		38.8	11.3	0.1	1.1		19.3	28.3	0.2	1.0	
<u>Technicians</u>											
"N" Row	779	311	151	1	2		69	245			
% Column	10.8	13.2	8.0	8.3	10.5		7.9	12.0			
% Row		39.9	19.4	0.1	0.3		8.9	31.5			
<u>Protective Service</u>											
"N" Row	1049	589	400	1			3	56			
% Column	14.5	25.0	21.1	8.3			0.3	2.7			
% Row		56.2	38.1	0.1			0.3	5.3			
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	778	16	90				33	639			
% Column	10.8	0.7	4.7				3.8	31.3			
% Row		2.1	11.6				4.2	82.1			
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
"N" Row	995	65	54		1		498	374	3		
% Column	13.8	2.8	2.8		5.3		56.7	18.3	50.0		
% Row		6.5	5.4		0.1		50.1	37.6	0.3		
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
"N" Row	580	457	112	3	1	1	5	1			
% Column	8.0	19.4	5.9	25.0	5.3	100.0	0.6	0.1			
% Row		78.8	19.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.2			
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
"N" Row	1622	302	932	6	1		15	365	1		
% Column	22.5	12.8	49.1	50.0	5.3		1.7	17.9	16.7		
% Row		18.6	57.5	0.4	0.1		0.9	22.5	0.1		
TOTAL	7224	2357	1897	12	19	1	879	2041	6	12	
%		32.6	26.3	0.2	0.3	0.0	12.2	28.3	0.1	0.2	

Source: Data supplied by City of St. Louis, on file at CSRO.

TABLE VIII - 2
New Hires-St. Louis City - 1981

MALE

FEMALE

	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind. Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number	10	6	1				2	1			
% Row		60.0	10.0				20.0	10.0			
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	213	78	13		1		44	72		5	
% Row		36.6	6.1		0.5		20.7	33.8		2.4	
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number	71	21	13	2			15	20			
% Row		29.6	18.3	2.8			21.1	28.2			
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	64	22	25				5	12			
% Row		34.4	39.1				7.8	18.8			
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number	53	5	17				7	24			
% Row		9.4	32.1				13.2	45.3			
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	129	7	9				56	56		1	
% Row		5.4	7.0				43.4	43.4		0.8	
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number	68	51	13				4				
% Row		75.0	19.1				5.9				
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	173	44	117	1	1		3	7			
% Row		25.4	67.6	0.6	0.6		1.7	4.1			
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	781	234	208	3	2		136	192		6	
% Row		30.0	26.6	0.4	0.3		17.4	24.6		0.8	

Source: EEO-4 supplied by St. Louis City, 1981.

TABLE VIII-3
Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- City of St. Louis - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	32.6	26.3	0.2	0.3	0.0	12.2	28.3	0.1	0.2	
% Laborforce / % Row	52.0	7.5	0.7	0.3	0.2	32.6	6.3	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	72.9	9.9		0.5		9.9	6.8			
% Laborforce % Row	77.2	3.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	16.5	1.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	38.8	11.3	0.1	1.1		19.3	28.3	0.2	1.0	
% Laborforce/ % Row	60.6	2.3	0.7	1.2	0.3	31.4	2.8	0.2	0.5	0.1
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	39.9	19.4	0.1	0.3		8.9	31.5			
% Laborforce/ % Row	51.7	4.5	0.4	0.4	0.1	32.8	9.4	0.2	0.3	0.1
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	6.5	5.4		0.1		50.1	37.6	0.3		
% Laborforce/ % Row	15.2	2.0	0.3	0.1	*	70.3	11.1	0.7	0.2	0.2
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	78.8	19.3	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.9	0.2			
% Laborforce / % Row	83.6	7.0	1.2	0.1	0.3	6.5	1.1	0.1	0.1	*
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	18.6	57.5	0.4	0.1		0.9	22.5	0.1		
% Laborforce/ % Row	29.0	13.7	0.4	0.3	0.1	38.5	17.6	0.2	0.3	0.1

Sources: EEO-4 supplied by the City of St. Louis - 1981

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 279.

* Less than 0.05 percent

There is no utilization analysis in the plan, nor have any numeric objectives been framed. The only relevant information is a copy of the 1979 Missouri State Employment Service report on manpower information for affirmative action planning. The categories used in this would not help very much in conducting a detailed utilization analysis. Nor is there any data on the existing workforce patterns in the city civil service. Such analysis was supposed to have been conducted on an annual basis.⁹

The plan states that there will be visits by the department of personnel to local and out-of-town colleges to recruit employees, "with special emphasis on minorities and females." Similar efforts were to be made at city high schools.¹⁰ The plan calls for establishment of a mailing list for civil service examination announcements that would include a significant number of minority and women's organizations but does not specify which. It also requires that ads for some jobs be placed in minority newspapers.¹¹

Had the utilization analysis been conducted, each department was to target positions for affirmative action efforts in the coming year. When requesting permission to fill a vacancy from such a position, it was to be marked affirmative action before being sent to the department of personnel. That department would review the existing certification list to determine whether there was a good representation of minorities and women. If not, it would conduct an intensive recruiting effort if it had not already done so.¹² Training was to be provided for the oral examining boards to ensure they used structured interviews consistently and correctly.¹³ There is no discussion in the plan of efforts to validate the necessary entry examinations, written or oral.

The plan also calls for the personnel department to assist agencies in establishing career ladders and using them to provide opportunities for advancement.¹⁴

Supervisors were to receive awareness training to sensitize them to their responsibilities.¹⁵

Each person with appointing authority was to designate someone to be that agency's affirmative action representative. The primary function of that representative would be to hear complaints. The affirmative action section of the personnel department would work with the other departments to develop the annual plan and updates and monitor implementation.¹⁶

In addition to lacking numeric goals, the plan fails to provide a specific timetable for implementation of the broad objectives it outlines. Moreover, those objectives are so broadly described that it would be very difficult to determine, in most instances, what ought to be done. A detailed monitoring procedure and the documentation needed for such an effort is not spelled out in the plan. Nor are responsibilities for implementation clearly delegated so that line personnel know what they need to do.

To see what had been accomplished, the Advisory Committee asked for a compendium of administrators and professionals in each department showing their race, sex, whether they were aged 40-70 or handicapped. The city did not provide this information. Instead, it asked that the EEO-4, which provides 14 broad categories of agencies be utilized.¹⁷ This shows that in five categories that together employed 35 administrators no minorities or women were employed as administrators. These functions were housing, police, sanitation, miscellaneous activities and utilities. Overall, in seven of 14 functions utilization of black men was less than in the city as a whole. In 10 functions utilization of white and black women was less than for the city as a whole. In two functions which included 10 professionals, there were no professional minorities or women. One of the 14 functions had no professionals. In seven functions black men were utilized as professionals at a rate lower than the citywide average. The same was true for white women in eight functions and black women in nine functions. In short, the city's

employment of minorities essentially in social services departments covered the failure of effort by departments and agencies in other functions.¹⁸

Recruitment of minorities is the responsibility of the city affirmative action officer. He reported that the city advertises in all three black newspapers as well as the Post-Dispatch and Globe-Democrat, sends notices to over 300 community groups, colleges, universities, libraries, clergymen and civic leaders of whom about one-third are minority-related. Recruitment is conducted in Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Oklahoma and Kansas.¹⁹ But, he reported that the city did no on-campus recruitment in 1982 because there were limited vacancies to fill.²⁰

The city reported that qualifications required for particular jobs are reviewed prior to examination to ensure job relatedness and minimize adverse impact. It further stated:

Other efforts to avoid or minimize adverse impact include allowing experience to substitute for formal training or education, developing work sample tests, structuring oral interviews and analyzing results for inter-rater reliability, requiring and providing interviewer training for all persons selected to sit on oral review boards, ensuring minority participation on such boards, and reviewing adverse impact analysis of past examinations before developing new tests.²¹

The city does report a validation project²² but there is no indication that it has been completed nor whether the adverse impact reviews have been effective.

Although the 1979 plan called for development of career ladders, this has only now begun.²³

The city provided data on promotions into administrative, professional and technical jobs. It was unable to provide data on the promotion of handicapped workers.²⁴ Of 34 promotions to administrative jobs, one was a black male, three white females and two black females. Of the 16 city agencies that promoted someone to an administrative job, only five promoted minorities or women. There were 360 promotions into professional jobs of which 52 were black men, 44 were white women 87 were black women, one was an Hispanic woman and one was an Asian woman. Of the 22 agencies that made promotions into professional jobs, only four promoted at least the citywide average of black men, only 11 promoted the citywide average of white women and only 10 promoted the citywide average of black women. There were 219 promotions into technical jobs of which 37 were black men; one, an Hispanic man, two, Asian men; 30, white women, 33, black women; and one, Asian woman. Of the 15 agencies that made such appointments, only five promoted at least the citywide average of black men, only five promoted at least the citywide average of white women and only six promoted at least the citywide average of black women.²⁵

The city reported that all its promotions are competitive "and require tests of fitness for every higher level (promotional) class of position." Candidates who are placed on an eligibility list are then grouped in sets of three for consideration by the hiring official.²⁶

The city clearly has been successful, overall, in utilizing minorities but less successful in its efforts to assure equality for white women. But closer analysis reveals significant disparities between employing units. The affirmative action plan does not seem to provide a basis for significant change. It is not clear that the selection procedure is free of potential bias and since promotions are by examination (whether written or oral) it is not clear that these are any less likely to be discriminatory than the entry-level examinations.

Notes

1. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27). Hispanics are also counted in a racial group, therefore the total exceeds 100 percent.
2. See Table VIII-1.
3. See Table VIII-3.
4. Data in EEO-4 supplied by the City of St. Louis, on file at CSRO.
5. See Table VIII-2.
6. Ronald L. Marshall, Affirmative Action Officer, City of St. Louis, letter to staff, Jan. 26, 1983 (hereafter cited as St. Louis City Letter).
7. Ronald L. Marshall, Affirmative Action Officer, City of St. Louis, telephone interview, Feb. 2, 1983.
8. City of St. Louis. Affirmative Action Plan (nd), p. 1.
9. Ibid., p. 10.
10. Ibid., p. 11.
11. Ibid., p. 12.
12. Ibid., p. 10.
13. Ibid., p. 13.
14. Ibid., p. 15.
15. Ibid., p. 16.
16. Ibid., p. 6.
17. Ronald Marshall, telephone interview, Feb. 2, 1983.
18. EEO-4 supplied by the City of St. Louis, on file at CSRO.
19. St. Louis City Letter.
20. Ibid.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid.
25. St. Louis City Letter, Charts C, D, E.
26. St. Louis City Letter.

IX. UNIVERSITY CITY

University City is an incorporated area immediately to the west of the City of St. Louis. It is a part of St. Louis County and the St. Louis SMSA. In 1980 it had a population of 42,738 of whom 55 percent were white, 43 percent were black, 0.1 percent were Indian, 1.4 percent were Asian and 0.8 percent were Hispanic.¹

The city was unable to provide a full response to the Advisory Committee's questions because it lacked staff to do so.²

The city employed 301 persons, 56.2 percent were white men, 23.3 percent, black men; 0.3 percent, Asian men; 14.3 percent, white women; 5.7 percent, black women; and 0.3 percent, Hispanic women. Summaries of the city employment pattern are in Table IX-1 and IX-2. The percentage of black workers was somewhat less than in the population.

Table IX-3 shows the utilization rates in the workforce and area laborforce. The proportions of white and black male workers were somewhat higher but the proportions of white female workers were somewhat lower than in the area laborforce. This was also true within occupational groups for administrators, professionals, technicians. There were fewer white male and white female clerical persons than in the area laborforce. There were fewer white male service workers than in the area laborforce. There were no disparities in median salary. The city would need to employ 61 more white women to match the area laborforce.

There were substantial differences in the relative utilization of the ethnic groups. The proportions of black male, white female and black female administrators and professionals were significantly lower than the comparable proportions of white male administrators and professionals. This was also true in the technical, protective service, and paraprofessional worker categories. Only in the clerical worker category did the proportion of white women in the category exceed the proportion of white men. And only in the service worker category was the proportion of black men larger than the proportion of white men. However, when percentage of workers from a particular group in a particular job category in the workforce is compared to the comparable data in the area laborforce, it should be noted that for administrators there is still a lesser proportion but not for professionals.

University City has an elaborate affirmative action plan and review process. In addition to a comprehensive citywide affirmative action plan, each department also prepares an affirmative action plan that includes specific goals and timetables and action elements. The following analysis covers all elements except the police department, which is discussed in a subsequent chapter.

The citywide plan refers to a commitment to recruit hire and promote in all classifications and "to act affirmatively in those areas where general societal discrimination has denied equality of opportunity particularly where underrepresentation exists."³ The city emphasizes its intention to seek qualified blacks, females and handicapped individuals for technical and professional positions.

The citywide goals are to increase the hiring of minority and female professionals, to advance them in professional positions and to increase its utilization of the handicapped. The citywide plan requires each department to estimate expected new hires and specify how they will achieve their part of the plan. The action elements call for a variety of measures to improve outreach to minority and women's groups, monitor applicant flow, validate testing, monitor the entire affirmative action process and especially turnover, exist interviews. Two separate sections prohibit sexual harassment and indicate the willingness of the city to make reasonable accommodation to the needs of the handicapped.⁴

Table IX-1
Workforce of University City - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac.Isl.	Am.Ind./ Al.Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
"N" Row	11	9	1				1				
% Column	3.7	5.3	1.4				2.3				
% Row		81.8	9.1				9.1				
<u>Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	55	42	7				6				
% Column	18.3	24.9	10.0				14.0				
% Row		76.4	12.7				10.9				
<u>Technicians</u>											
"N" Row	25	17	5				2	1			
% Column	8.3	10.1	7.1				4.7	5.9			
% Row		68.0	20.0				8.0	4.0			
<u>Protective Service</u>											
"N" Row	92	72	12				7	1			
% Column	30.6	42.6	17.1				16.3	5.9			
% Row		78.3	13.0				7.6	1.1			
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
"N" Row	5	1					2	2			
% Column	1.7	0.6					4.7	11.8			
% Row		20.0					40.0	40.0			
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
"N" Row	42	1	1		1		25	13	1		
% Column	14.0	0.6	1.4		100.0		58.1	76.5	100.0		
% Row		2.4	2.4		2.4		59.5	31.0	2.4		
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
"N" Row	23	14	9								
% Column	7.6	8.3	12.9								
% Row		60.9	39.1								
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
"N" Row	48	13	35								
% Column	16.0	7.7	50.0								
% Row		27.1	72.9								
TOTAL	301	169	70		1		43	17	1		
%		56.2	23.3		0.3		14.3	5.7	0.3		

Source: Data supplied by University City, on file at CSRO.

Table IX - 2
New Hires-University City - 1981

	<u>MALE</u>					<u>FEMALE</u>					
	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Officials/Administrators</u>											
Number											
% Row											
<u>Professionals</u>											
Number	4	2	1			1					
% Row		50.0	25.0			25.0					
<u>Technicians</u>											
Number	3	1	1			1					
% Row		33.3	33.3			33.3					
<u>Protective Service</u>											
Number	10	8	1			1					
% Row		80.0	10.0			10.0					
<u>Para-Professionals</u>											
Number	1						1				
% Row							100.0				
<u>Office/Clerical</u>											
Number	5		1			3	1				
% Row			20.0			60.0	10.0				
<u>Skilled Craft</u>											
Number	1	1									
% Row		100.0									
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>											
Number	5	2	3								
% Row		40.0	60.0								
<u>TOTAL</u>											
Number	29	14	7			6	2				
% Row		48.3	24.1			20.7	6.9				

Source: EEO-4 supplied by University City, 1981.

Table IX - 3
 Percent Workforce/Percent Laborforce Compared -- University City - 1981

	MALE					FEMALE				
	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian/ Pac. Isl.	Am. Ind./ Al. Nat.
<u>Total</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	56.2	23.3		0.3		14.3	5.7	0.3		
% Laborforce/ % Row	52.0	7.5	0.7	0.3	0.2	32.6	6.3	0.3	0.2	0.1
<u>Administrators</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	81.8	9.1				9.1				
% Laborforce/ % Row	77.2	3.1	0.7	0.3	0.3	16.5	1.5	0.1	0.1	0.1
<u>Professionals</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	76.4	12.7				10.9				
% Laborforce/ % Row	60.6	2.3	0.7	1.2	0.3	31.4	2.8	0.2	0.5	0.1
<u>Technicians</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	68.0	20.0				8.0	4.0			
% Laborforce/ % Row	51.7	4.5	0.4	0.4	0.1	32.8	9.4	0.2	0.3	0.1
<u>Office/Clerical</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	2.4	2.4		2.4		59.5	31.0	2.4		
% Laborforce/ % Row	15.2	2.0	0.3	0.1	*	70.3	11.1	0.7	0.2	0.2
<u>Skilled Crafts</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	60.9	39.1								
% Laborforce/ % Row	83.6	7.0	1.2	0.1	0.3	6.5	1.1	0.1	0.1	*
<u>Service/Maintenance</u>										
% Workforce/ % Row	27.1	72.9								
% Laborforce/ % Row	29.0	13.7	0.4	0.3	0.1	38.5	17.6	0.2	0.3	0.1

Sources: EEO-4 for University City, 1981

EEOC, 1980 Report: Job Patterns for Minorities and Women in Private Industry, 1980, p. II - 279.

* Less than 0.05 percent

The department of planning notes the absence of minorities at the professional level and cites a 1980 affirmative action audit noting the underutilization of women at the technical level. It proposes to remedy these by:

- advertising in minority-oriented media and recruitment at educational facilities with a substantial proportion of minority students;
- maintaining systematic contacts with minority organizations;
- encouraging present employees to refer minority applicants;
- ensuring that its examinations are valid;
- providing training for interviewers to ensure unbiased techniques;
- establishing a skills bank to use for promotions;
- improving the human relations skills of supervisory personnel.⁵

The public works department plan seeks to increase the utilization of minorities in the engineering division and in supervisory positions generally. But it notes the difficulty of finding qualified senior staff and lack of turnover as problems. It proposes to seek new sources of technicians and review its selection process to ensure validity and to make additional training available so that existing minority employees can upgrade themselves. The main effort will be to communicate to employees the opportunities available to them and ways by which the city can assist them to advance.⁶

The parks and recreation department notes that it got its first minority supervisor during the year but that his promotion eliminated minority representation in the skilled trades category. Despite the addition of 1.5 positions, the percentage of both minority and female employees declined slightly. Its primary goals are to seek more minority employees in specialized and supervisory positions and encourage women to join the department at all levels, especially as laborers and as division heads or managers. To accomplish this it proposes to train minority workers, try to remove barriers that keep women from seeking lower level positions and train supervisors to "overcome any personal prejudices which may interfere with their objectivity in utilization of employees." However, it notes a concern that "far too many new employees are being brought in from the outside due to apparently apathy of current employees to advancement."⁷

The finance department notes that it lacked any minorities or women in its central garage operation. It proposes to remedy this by both internal and external recruitment.⁸

The central administration unit (comprising a number of small departments) proposes to seek one additional woman and one additional minority for administrative positions. Because it has a high turnover rate it believes this will be possible. But it notes the absence of career ladders within units and proposes to seek qualified people in other city departments and recruit outside the city by using the International City Manager's Association referral service and consult the Michigan City Manager's Association referral service.⁹

The fire department notes the difficulty in getting qualified minority paramedics and, despite a pattern of past promotions, a relative absence of mid-level minority officers or entry-level minority fireman available for promotion. It proposes to establish a cadet grade to train and employ minority paramedics who would be qualified by a combination of on-the-job and classroom training. It also proposes to seek, over a 10-year period, to increase the employment of minority firefighters at all ranks.¹⁰

All the planning documents lack comparison either to laborforce or population statistics. The problem with most of the agency plans is that they lack circumstantial detail for implementation. A casual reader of the plans

might well wonder whether the detail provided is sufficient to provide a guideline for future activities likely to be implemented and likely to have impact. However, because many apply to relatively small numbers of people, such detail may have been less appropriate than it would be for a larger organization.

An interesting feature of the University City plan is the special power given to its affirmative action officers. They are authorized to delay filling any position if goal attainment is lagging and the officers believe additional recruitment would produce minority or female candidates with appropriate skills. The officers are authorized to seek applicants beyond the SMSA for professional positions if local ads do not produce sufficient response.¹¹

The police department's affirmative action plan is discussed in another chapter of this report.

Notes

1. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Census of Population and Housing (PHC80-V-27), Table 2. The proportion of "other" has been omitted. Since Hispanics are also counted in a racial group, the percentage exceeds 100.
2. Robert E. Klein, Director of Personnel, University City, letter to staff, Sept. 20, 1982.
3. University City, Affirmative Action Program, January 1982.
4. Ibid.
5. Department of Planning, University City, Affirmative Action Plans (nd).
6. Department of Public Works, University City, Affirmative Action (nd).
7. Chuck Konlenberger, Director of Parks, University City, memo to Affirmative Action Officers, July 28, 1982.
8. Finance Department, University City, Affirmative Action Policy, nd.
9. Central Administration, University City, Affirmative Action Plan, nd.
10. Fire Department, University City, Affirmative Action Plan (July 1981).
11. University City, Affirmative Action Program, January 1982, pp. 4-5.

X. POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Complete responses were received to requests for data from the St. Louis City Police Department, Kansas City Police Department and St. Louis County on behalf of its police department. Answers with less detail were received from University City, Columbia and Jackson County. Boone County provided no information on its police employment practices. The Advisory Committee wanted to know whether police department employment practices conformed to those suggested by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies, a joint effort of the National Sheriff's Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

1. Columbia

The city of Columbia's police department had 105 persons on its payroll in 1982 including 77 white men, two black men, one Asian man, two Indian men, 21 white women, one black woman and one Indian woman. Its administrative and professional ranks included eight white men, one black man and one Indian woman. The newly appointed chief of police was black.

In 1976 the city established goals for the department. These provided that eventually 12.9 percent of the force would be women and 10.6 percent would be minority. As of 1981, 10.11 percent of the force was female and 7.87 was minority.¹ The goals were somewhat below the representation of minorities reported in the 1980 population.

The city reported that its chief of police had conducted recruitment visits at Northeastern Missouri State University, Central Missouri State University and Lincoln University. The city hired five white male officers during 1981, from a total of 171 applicants, 13 of whom were minority, 12 of whom were women. Of those who applied, three minorities and seven women reached the interview stage and one minority and one woman were declared eligible.² One white female became a police officer by promotion. One white male and one white female were promoted to sergeant.³

The city did not have copies of the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies draft guidelines. It therefore was unable to state whether or not its standards and procedures matched those that would be required for accreditation.⁴

2. Kansas City

The city's affirmative action plan does not state when the first black officer was appointed. But the first women to begin training at the academy were not appointed until 1967.⁵ As of July 1982, the department had 1,141 sworn personnel, 186 of whom were minorities or women. As of February 1982, 83.6 percent of the total were white male, 8.3 percent were black male, 1.7 percent were Hispanic male, 0.2 percent were other male; 3.4 percent were white female, 2.5 percent were black female, 0.4 percent were Hispanic female.⁶ The department also had 556 nonsworn personnel (civilians) of whom 8.6 percent were black male, 1.3 percent were Hispanic male, 36.5 percent were white female, 16.4 percent were black female and 1.4 percent were Hispanic female.⁷ The police department reported that between January 1975 and January 1982, of 340 persons appointed to the force, 52.3 percent were white men, 15.6 percent were black men, 4.7 percent were Hispanic men, 13.5 percent were white women, 12.4 percent were black women and 1.5 percent were Hispanic women.⁸ In the ranks above captain were 87 persons in 1982, 10.3 percent were black men, 1.2 percent were black women.⁹ In 1981, five white males were promoted from sergeant to captain, two white males and one black male from captain to major, one white male from major to lieutenant colonel.¹⁰ In addition, six white males were promoted from officer to sergeant, out of a

total of 422 who began the testing process. In the period 1979-1982, the police reported 47 promotions to sergeant. Of these, six percent were black men and two percent were white women. Twenty percent of 15 persons promoted from sergeant to captain were black men and seven percent were black women. During this period 11 persons were promoted to major from captain. This is a noncompetitive appointment. Of these, 18 percent were black men.¹¹

The police department has an elaborate and detailed volume of information on its affirmative action efforts and their implementation.¹² However, many of the details are general police department practices and do not reflect any special connection to affirmative action. The inclusion of so much extraneous data makes it extremely difficult to assess what is to be done and must make it difficult for administrators to assess what has been done. The President of the Kansas City Police Board commented on this:

In fact, the document which you call the "K.C.P.D. Plan" is a compilation of data gathered daily, week, and monthly.

Throughout the year, the Chief of Police, through the Personnel Division, keeps the Board apprised of the Department's Affirmative Action efforts. This is done through reports provided at the regular monthly meetings of the Police Board as well as through timely updates of transfers, promotions, etc., as they occur. Consequently, we monitor our program during the entire year and not just at year's end.¹³

The plan includes a comparison between the department's workforce and the SMSA labor market. This shows that the department has generally done better than the area labor market.¹⁴ Although the Advisory Committee has used somewhat different statistics, in general the comparison is similar. Some police departments make comparison not to the labor market but to the population, on the grounds that police forces should be representative of the communities they serve.¹⁵ The Kansas City Police Department does not use this approach.¹⁶ The department's own analysis notes disparity in the assignment of minorities and women to 12 units of the department.¹⁷ It also notes disparity in the process for selection of officers. The data show that while the ratio of persons beginning the testing process to hires are similar for the various ethnic/sex groups, the rejection rates at some phases are not. Thus, black men, white and black women were much more likely than white men to be rejected at the paper and pencil test stage. White men were somewhat more likely than others to be rejected at the polygraph phase. Background checks had a disproportionately negative effect on all minority and women applicants.¹⁸

The department's plan reports testing has been validated, in part. Its police career index is locally validated. It does not report validation of its TABE (tests of adult basic education) or the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The department began an effort in 1980 to obtain data needed for full validation. There is no indication that this has been completed.¹⁹

The personnel division notes that a full-scale recruitment program would not be productive because the department already has more applicants than could reasonably expect to succeed in the process and be appointed to entry-level positions.²⁰ Instead, it focuses on particular groups such as minorities and women. Its instructions include extensive contact with a wide range of listed sources. Its plan notes that these groups are contacted and minority media are utilized. The success of these efforts is not reported.²¹

Since above entry-level positions are filled by promotion, the promotion testing process is the sole vehicle of opportunity. The plan includes data on the testing process for sergeants in 1981. It shows that 30.6 percent of the

white males who signed up for testing reached the candidate review committee (that is, passed the written test) while 16.7 percent of black men, 28.6 percent of Hispanic men, 50.0 percent of white women and 20.0 percent of black women did so. Further, while 9.4 percent of the white men who signed up were found eligible for promotion, 5.6 percent of black men, 14.3 percent of Hispanic men, 12.5 percent of white women and 20.0 percent of black women were found eligible. Ultimately, as of January 1982, six white men had been promoted.²² This raises questions about whether the testing has a disparate effect on black male candidates. Data on the captain's testing does not show the same disparity. Proportionately more black men and white women passed the written test than did white men. Similarly, proportionately more black men and white women were declared eligible. While 11.1 percent of the black men who signed up were promoted as of June 1980, only 5.0 percent of the white men were promoted. The one white woman who was declared eligible had not been promoted.²³ The police department does not believe there is any disparate effect.²⁴ Its analysis, based on later tests and using a somewhat different formula, is reasonable and probably reflects the current state of testing.

The police department reports that its promotion procedures are generally in accordance with the guidelines established by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies.²⁵ The differences cited by the department between its procedures and those urged are either imposed by State statute or minor.

In short, the primary problem for a reviewer is to determine what is being done. There is a considerable array of data available to the department and at some point in time guidelines have been issued covering all elements necessary for affirmative action. What is not clear is the extent to which these are regularly reviewed. The President of the Police Board stated:

...the Affirmative Action Evaluation Committee is required to meet not less than annually. In an effort to ensure that all personnel actions pertaining to employee standards, compensation, transfers, promotions and other related matters are in accordance with our Affirmative Action Plan, the Personnel Division Commander is designated as E.E.O. Compliance Officer.

In this capacity, the E.E.O. Officer has immediate access to all personnel actions and is able to advise the Affirmative Action Evaluation Committee on matters that require review or action. Also in this position, the Personnel Division Commander receives input from committee members regarding areas they have identified in need of study or remedial action. This system of reviewing Department policy and guidelines has been effective in keeping our Affirmative Action Plan current and providing management the feedback necessary to ensure full compliance with our commitment to equal employment opportunities.²⁶

3. St. Louis City

The recent controversy surrounding selection of a new police chief for the city of St. Louis has brought its entire selection process into controversy.²⁷ One of the department's own commissioners has stated that the department is not complying with its own affirmative action plan, that the plan is outdated and in need of revision.²⁸ The police department provided data to the Advisory Committee on its current policies.²⁹ It did not provide the same wealth of data on promotions available from other major departments.

The St. Louis Police Department had 2,488 employees in 1981, 69.4 percent of whom were white men, 15.8 percent were black men, 8.9 percent were white women and 5.9 percent were black women. In that year 40.6 percent of its new

hires (including non-sworn personnel) were white men, 15.9 percent were black men, 30.4 percent were white women and 13.0 percent were black women.³⁰ In the protective service category that includes patrolmen, there were 1,562 persons, 79.5 percent of whom were white male, 16.5 percent were black male, 2.2 percent were white female and 1.9 percent were black female. Only two persons, one white male and one black female were hired in this category during the year.³¹ No women were promoted during the period 1979-1981. During this period about two-thirds of all promotions to sergeant (47 persons), lieutenant (16 persons) and captain (6 persons) were white men. The remainder were black men. Three-quarters of all promotions to major (4 persons) were white men, the remainder was a black man.³² In February 1983, the department had 1,787 sworn personnel of whom 17.5 percent were black male and 1.6 percent were black female. The balance were white or other. The department had 549 nonsworn personnel, of whom 11.1 percent were black male and 19.3 percent were black female. The balance were white or other.³³

In 1979 the police board received a report on employment practices from a committee consisting of four eminent citizens. They noted that the force was not fully representative of the community and one reason for this was the limited resources available for recruitment. Only one officer was available. He had no budget. They noted that the psychological test might be biased against black applicants. They noted that only one of 13 persons on the regional police academy staff was black and thought this might result in the absence of effective role models for black recruits, indeed they noted a disproportionate number of black candidates were dismissed from the academy and the city did not conduct exit interviews to determine why. They noted that excessive weight appeared to be placed on influential friends or benefactors in promotion decisions. They urged a variety of measures to reduce that influence. They noted that appointments of black officers to what are regarded as particularly desirable units did not reflect the proportion of blacks likely to be involved in the particular crimes and similarly officers were disproportionately assigned to two districts. They noted the absence of black commanding line officers.³⁴ A press release from the department when it received the report indicated an intent to correct the assignments problems but reserved judgment on the other issues.³⁵

The most recent departmental affirmative action plan consists entirely of a general statement. It contains no timetables and no action elements. It does propose that half the officers appointed each year be black and 30 percent be women. It also makes a general commitment to continue promotions of black and female officers and assignment of officers so that representation of groups in particular units is proportional to the composition of the department.³⁶ The ultimate goal is a force whose ethnic and sex composition reflects the city's.³⁷

The department states that it has a black sergeant serving as recruitment coordinator who visits job fairs and maintains liaison with various minority groups. It notes that as a consequence, 52 percent of its 1982 recruit class was black and 32 percent was female.³⁸

The department did not provide any indication that its promotion practices (or its hiring practices) satisfy the guidelines proposed by the Commission on Accreditation of Law Enforcement Agencies. The evidence it supplied indicated that it would continue to use a combination of paper and pencil testing and supervisory appraisal as basic tools. The documents provided on promotion procedures did suggest a screening panel would review candidates and provide one of four recommendations on suitability. Candidates would also participate in an assessment center in which they would be evaluated by persons outside the department. The guidelines indicate the intent of the board of police commissioners to make promotions such that they reflect the proportions of minorities and women in the department.³⁹ Since these procedures have not yet been implemented, their effect is unknown.

In short, the Advisory Committee is unable to determine whether the St. Louis department has a fully effective affirmative action plan. Given the relatively slow rate of new hires and promotions in recent years, it might be quite a long time before any substantial increase in the proportion of minority and female officers or command staff occurs, if the process is to depend on available openings and the proportions proposed in the latest plan. But more important, there is no evidence of the kind of comprehensive evaluation of selection and promotion policies necessary to ensure they are nondiscriminatory not only in outcome but in practice. Nor are there the action elements that would set the stage for such review.

4. University City

The University City police force includes 78 commissioned officers, 21.7 percent are minorities or women. It also has 17 "citizen employees," 70.5 percent of whom are minorities or women. It states that its goal is that at least half its new hires be minorities and women.⁴⁰

Data on actual activity by the department were provided as a part of its affirmative action plan. The plan requires contacting a wide range of organizations likely to provide minorities or women, including community groups and schools. The department began to develop recruitment literature targeted at minorities and women. It has reviewed all job specifications to eliminate unnecessary requirements. It is currently reviewing, with the aid of expert consultants, its selection criteria and proposes to eliminate unscored procedures. It is also reviewing its use of seniority as a promotion basis to ensure this does not discriminate. It is providing affirmative action training for supervisors and developing a skills bank. It has made affirmative action a rating factor for supervisory appraisals.⁴¹

Given the size of the department, the plan is reasonable. It remains to be seen whether, given that the plan is less than a year old, whether it will be fully implemented and what effect it will have.

5. Boone County

No data was presented to the Advisory Committee that would allow an assessment of the employment practices of the Boone County sheriff's department.

6. Jackson County

The sheriff's department had 19 administrators, professionals or technical employees. All were white male. The county stated that all these jobs are filled by internal promotion using paper and pencil tests and an oral interview. The tests were validated over five years ago.⁴² The county is also served by 118 municipal police departments including Kansas City's whose efforts were discussed earlier. These have original jurisdiction in their service areas.

7. St. Louis County

Until December 1982, St. Louis County's police department was subject to the provisions of a consent decree entered into between the county and the United States on Dec. 19, 1978 requiring specific affirmative action efforts to increase the utilization of minority police officers.⁴³ The county is also served by 60 municipal police forces. These have original jurisdiction, for the most part, in their areas.

In 1974 in a department of 558 commissioned employees, two percent were minority and 3.9 percent were women. By 1978 that had changed to 6.3 percent minority and 5.8 percent women. By 1982 in a department of 534 sworn employees, 7.3 percent were minority and 5.4 percent were women. In addition, there were 188 unsworn personnel, 10.6 percent were minority and 59.0 percent

were women.⁴⁴ In 1974 there were two black sergeants, and eight black police officers. In 1981 there were still two black sergeants, 26 black police officers. In 1974 there were one white female sergeant, 20 white female officers, two black female officers and two Indian female officers. In 1981 there was one white female sergeant, 24 white female officers, three black female officers and one Hispanic female officer.⁴⁵

Although the department met its goals during the period of the consent decree for new hires, resignations thwarted success in reaching a long-term goal of 12 percent minority. The county committed itself to continuation of an annual hiring rate of 22 percent for entry-level positions until the long term goal is reached.⁴⁶

The 1982 affirmative action plan of the department includes a commitment to a comprehensive recruitment effort including a wide range of listed organizations likely to reach minority or women candidates for police officer. In addition, the plan calls for specific recruitment efforts at colleges and junior colleges. The list of recruitment visits during 1981 includes 32 schools, colleges or other places likely to reach minorities.⁴⁷

The plan does not state whether the selection procedure has been validated. The county did provide copies of its procedures on promotion testing.⁴⁸ While no validity studies are mentioned, there is every reason to believe that such a study could be conducted and would result in validation, if the necessary data were available. The problem may be the absence of the necessary data; this could be remedied internally.

Responsibility for implementing the plan is primarily vested in the assistant director for personnel. The scope of the assignment appears to be comprehensive.⁴⁹

Supervisors are trained in affirmative action and evaluated based on their performance in that component of their responsibility. About 91 of them have, in fact, received such training since 1974.⁵⁰

In short, the primary problem with the county police affirmative action effort is in the area of testing. It is ultimately necessary to conduct validation studies to determine whether there is discrimination. The county did not provide data that would indicate whether either the selection or promotion testing procedures is, or is not, having an adverse effect on minorities or women.

Notes

1. Columbia Letter, attachment 2, "Goals and Timetables Achievement."
2. Columbia Letter and attachment "Vacancies Filled."
3. Ibid.
4. Columbia Letter.
5. KCPD, Dissemination of the Equal Employment Program (July 26, 1982)(hereafter cited as KCPD Plan), Vol. 1, Department History, p. 7-13.
6. Ibid., "Employee Distribution Analyses Memorandum," July 8, 1982. Some cities use the term "commissioned officers" instead of "sworn" personnel. They cover the same groups. Here we have used the term used by the local government.
7. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, July 8, 1982 Memorandum, "Employee Distribution Analyses."
8. Maj. John Coleman, memorandum to Chief Norman A. Caron, July 8, 1982, "Recruitment."
9. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, Memorandum, July 8, 1982, "Employee Distribution Analyses."
10. KCPD Plan, Vol. 2, "Employee Career Development," July 8, 1982.
11. Edward S. Biggar, President, Board of Police Commissioners, Kansas City, letter to staff, Sept. 24, 1982 (hereafter cited as KCPD Letter).
12. KCPD Plan.
13. Edward S. Biggar, President, Board of Police Commissioners, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 4, 1983.
14. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, July 8, 1982, Memorandum "Analyses of SMSA Labor Ratio Comparison."
15. See: Gerald E. Caiden, Police Revitalization (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1977), p. 129; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979), p. 330.
16. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, July 1982, Memorandum "Analyses of SMSA Labor Ratio Comparison."
17. KCPD Plan, July 8, 1982, Memorandum "Employee Distribution Analyses."
18. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, July 8, 1982, Memorandum, "Police Officer Selection Analysis."
19. KCPD Plan, Vol. I, Memorandum, Nov. 26, 1980, "Validation of the Police Officer Selection System."
20. KCPD Plan, July 8, 1982, Memorandum, "Recruitment Program."
21. Ibid. and Memorandum, Feb. 15, 1979, "Recruitment 1979."
22. KCPD Plan, July 8, 1982, Memorandum, "Employee Career Development."
23. Ibid.
24. KCPD Letter.
25. KCPD Letter.
26. Edward S. Biggar, letter to Chairperson, Missouri Advisory Committee, Mar. 4, 1983.
27. See: The Riverfront Times, June 16-22, 1982.
28. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Dec. 2, 1982.
29. Homer Sayad, President, Board of Police Commissioners, City of St. Louis, letter to staff, Oct. 11, 1982.
30. St. Louis Metropolitan Police, EEO-4, Sept. 8, 1981.
31. Ibid.
32. Homer Sayad, letter to staff, Oct. 11, 1982.
33. Ronald Hopkins, Assistant Personnel Director, St. Louis Police Department, telephone interview, Mar. 4, 1983.
34. Report of the Special Committee appointed by the Board of Police Commissioners of the City of St. Louis (Nov. 2, 1979).
35. St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, Press Release, Nov. 2, 1979.

36. St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, Affirmative Action Program (Sept. 3, 1980).
37. Ibid.
38. Homer Sayad, letter to staff, Oct. 11, 1982.
39. St. Louis Metropolitan Police Department, Promotion Procedures for Police Officers and Sergeants and Promotion Procedures for Lieutenants, Captains and Majors (nd).
40. University City Police Department, Preliminary Affirmative Action Plan, May 22, 1981.
41. Ibid.
42. Jackson County Letter and Exhibits 4, 5, 10, 11 and Sandra White, telephone interview, Mar. 17, 1983.
43. St. Louis County Police Department, Affirmative Action Program (Aug. 24, 1982), p. 1.
44. Ibid., Exhibit 1.
45. Ibid., Exhibits 2-9.
46. Ibid., p. 5.
47. Ibid., pp. 6-7, Exhibits 13, 14.
48. St. Louis County Police Department, Departmental General Order 77-44 (Nov. 18, 1977).
49. St. Louis County Police Department, Affirmative Action Program (Aug. 24, 1982).
50. Ibid., Exhibit 15.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

The merits of numerical objectives for achieving equal opportunity have often been questioned. This report demonstrates their utility. If the local governments reviewed here were judged entirely by their affirmative action plans and the efforts they have made to ensure equal opportunity most would be found seriously wanting. What redeems them is the many successes they have had in actually employing minorities and women, despite the absence of efforts. This paradox illustrates the difficulty of actually ensuring a system is nondiscriminatory as opposed to merely assuring reasonable representation. Opponents of affirmative action have criticized the use of numerical objectives. But in doing so they ignore the substantial costs of real compliance. Of course numeric objectives are not an end alone. But they provide a handy means for making preliminary assessments of what absolutely must be done to ensure equality. Abolition of such tests would require far more complex actions by employers and far more detailed reviews by government agencies to determine what needs to be done. The patterns evident in this report suggest that many employers are unable to comply with the law.

Generally speaking, the local governments' utilization of minorities did match their populations. Their utilization compared to the laborforce patterns were more varied. Black male workers were underrepresented in St. Louis County and University City. White women were generally underrepresented except in Jackson County. Black women were underrepresented in Columbia, St. Louis County and Boone County. Black males were well represented in administrative jobs except in Boone County. White females were generally underrepresented in such jobs. Black females were also generally underrepresented in such jobs except in St. Louis and Jackson counties. Black men were well represented in professional jobs. White women were also well represented in professional jobs in the counties (not Jackson) but in none of the cities. Black women were generally also well represented except in Boone County. The new hire patterns generally showed patterns of increasing utilization of minorities and women. But median salaries for minorities and women were frequently lower than white men's in comparable job categories. In several jurisdictions--Jackson County, Columbia, Kansas City, St. Louis City and St. Louis County--utilization of minorities and women as professionals or administrators was concentrated in social services activities. Where data was available, it appeared that minorities were more likely than expected to be on "soft money." Promotion patterns appeared satisfactory only in St. Louis County and Kansas City. Allowing for the variations, these patterns show that while the local governments could do better, their patterns of employment are at least marginally satisfactory.

But the affirmative action plans of most jurisdictions are generally deficient. Boone County's plan is nonexistent. Jackson County has two plans--one in operation at the time of our study and one that was effective as of November 1982. While the countywide plans were vague and not susceptible of effective review, the county affirmative action taskforce (now in conjunction with department heads) does frame department plans and does receive reports on efforts to implement them. But these are not reviewed and are therefore of questionable value. The absence of validation expertise has made it impossible for the county to assure that its selection procedures are free of discrimination. The general St. Louis County plan is sufficient as a statement of principles. But, as the U.S. Office of Personnel Management has pointed out, it is fundamentally deficient because it lacks clear goals and timetables and prohibitions of discrimination based on age or handicap have yet to be inserted. However, the county's Office of Employment and Training plan is sufficient. Allowing for the use of local statistics, the City of Columbia's plan and implementation are generally good. While conducting more evaluation than most, the effectiveness of the city's review of its efforts is

open to question. Kansas City's plan lacks a utilization analysis and its goals are often very vague. There is no way to know whether the numeric goals set are reasonable. It is not clear that the qualitative efforts to improve equal opportunity have been made. The City of St. Louis's plan is generally deficient and apparently has not been implemented. There are no goals or timetables, no utilization analysis, no evaluation to determine whether the vague commitments made in the plan have been implemented. Allowing for its size, University City has a generally acceptable set of affirmative action plans. In short, municipal and county government efforts were far more deficient than they ought to be given that most receive Federal funds whose acceptance is conditional on acceptable affirmative action efforts. These plans do not meet the model criteria suggested by the Advisory Committee in its reviews of State affirmative action efforts.

Police departments are especially in need of affirmative action because of the sensitive role they have in their communities. Only Kansas City was able to assert its compliance with the proposed guidelines for accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. Other agencies were unaware of these provisions or unable to assert compliance. St. Louis County's police department plan and implementation, if not perfect, at least shows promise. University City's plan, allowing for the size of the department, appears sufficient. Boone and Jackson counties' efforts are nonexistent. Kansas City's plan is comprehensive but difficult to evaluate because too much extraneous information is included. It would appear as difficult for self-evaluation as for external review. St. Louis's plan is nonexistent. While some efforts have been made that could be regarded as aiding affirmative action, they do not appear sufficient to remedy the problems identified many years ago, nor likely to provide remedy for past discrimination in the immediate future.

The Advisory Committee notes the successes of many government agencies reviewed in this study in utilizing minorities and women. That these have been accomplished without assurance of equal opportunity (and in some cases in the face of lingering structural discrimination) suggests that adequate and effective affirmative action plans and implementation could result in substantial increases in the utilization of minorities, women, the handicapped and older workers. This is the same pattern the Advisory Committee found in its review of State government efforts and accomplishments. Clearly much remains to be done before Missouri local governments (at least those reviewed here) can claim to be truly equal opportunity employers.

The Advisory Committee makes no findings and recommendations because they would be substantially similar to those already made to Missouri State government. It is clear that affirmative action means more than simply reaching numeric goals that are easily reached. It is a matter of ensuring that the entire personnel process provides opportunity for minorities and women without discrimination. This goal remains unmet. Consequently, employment practices that do not result in maximum utilization of all available persons remain and the taxpayer continues to fund inefficiency, perhaps even waste. Because in the end, effective affirmative action means effective government.

