



City of Long Beach

Working Together to Serve

Memorandum

Date: December 19, 2014

To: (Patrick H. West, City Manager) *T.H. West*

From: Deborah R. Mills, Director of Human Resources *Dr. Mills*

For: Mayor and City Council Members

Subject: Equal Employment Opportunity Plan Status (2014 YTD)

In response to recent requests from Councilmembers, the following information regarding the current composition of the City's full-time permanent workforce is provided.

As a result of Proposition 209, which was passed by the voters in 1996, the City can no longer establish numeric goals and/or quotas as part of our efforts to address under-representation of gender and ethnicity in the workforce. However, the City developed and implemented an Equal Employment Opportunity Program Plan (EEOP) in 2002, and has continued to monitor gender/ethnicity representation in the workforce to date.

The EEOP is designed to analyze the City's workforce, in comparison to its Relevant Labor Market (RLM), to determine if females and/or minorities are under-represented in the workforce. As such, it is important to note that male and female Blacks, Asians, and American-Indians are at, or near, parity with the RLM. We are also at or above parity with the RLM for White and Hispanic males.

To determine our Labor Market Availability (LMA), the City uses the combined labor forces of Los Angeles and Orange Counties as the City is a regional employer and, per state law, cannot require employees to live within city limits. LMA data includes persons over the age of 16 who are already employed, as well as those recorded as unemployed.

For purposes of this status update, data from the 2010 Census was used to analyze the City's RLM availability statistics. Biddle Consulting Group was hired to perform our RLM analysis, which was devised by using the employee census data, pursuant to the Federal Department of Justice 7-Step Guide for developing an EEOP.

WORKFORCE ANALYSIS

The *Workforce Analysis* chart (attached) is a detailed look at those areas where the City is at, or near, parity with the RLM, as well as those areas where the City is under-represented, in comparison to the applicable segments of the RLM. The analysis is based on the 2014 Year-to-Date (YTD) statistical information.

Before looking at the specific job categories, it is important to examine the overall composition of the City's workforce. This is shown in the following chart:

Overall (All Job Categories)

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	4,130	1,287	318	772	349	17	2,743	492	215	391	281	8	1,387
	100%	31.2%	7.7%	18.7%	8.5%	0.4%	66.4%	11.9%	5.2%	9.5%	6.8%	0.2%	33.6%
2010 RLM		22.1%	2.8%	19.3%	7.7%	0.1%	52.0%	18.8%	4.0%	14.3%	8.6%	0.1%	45.8%
Difference		9.1%	4.9%	-0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	14.4%	-6.9%	1.2%	-4.8%	-1.8%	0.1%	-12.2%

When looking at all job categories combined, all ethnic and gender groups meet or exceed parity with the RLM, except females, as a whole, though incremental progress has been made in these areas over the last three years. There are wider variances in representation in the specific job categories.

When the disparity is not significant, it is considered "near parity," which can result from normal turnover and is a contributing factor of under- or over-representation. For example, in the American-Indian group, the disparity in the RLM is not that significant, as the hiring of one individual could deem that group as over-represented. For the purposes of this summary, any ethnic/gender group with a percentage difference (between 2014 and the 2010 RLM) of +1.0 percent and -1.0 percent, is considered to be "near parity." The +/- 1.0% equates to the hiring of 5 (or less) employees in the job category based on ethnicity.

The following is a summary of workforce representation by job category:

Officials/Administrators

This job category includes City officials and those in management positions.

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	275	120	10	19	25	1	175	48	15	17	20	0	100
	100%	43.6%	3.6%	6.9%	9.1%	0.4%	63.6%	17.5%	5.5%	6.2%	7.3%	0.0%	36.4%
2010 RLM		38.5%	2.7%	11.6%	9.7%	0.1%	62.6%	19.3%	2.8%	7.3%	6.0%	0.1%	35.5%
Difference		5.1%	0.9%	-4.7%	-0.6%	0.3%	1.0%	-1.8%	2.7%	-1.1%	1.3%	-0.1%	0.9%

In this category, Hispanic and Asian males are under-represented. White and Hispanic females are also under-represented.

Professionals

This job category includes those in professional positions such as Attorney, Engineer, Physician and the Analyst series. These positions require a bachelor's degree or higher and/or equivalent years of experience.

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	686	145	22	66	79	1	313	147	53	60	111	2	373
	100%	21.1%	3.2%	9.6%	11.5%	0.1%	45.6%	21.4%	7.7%	8.7%	16.2%	0.3%	54.4%
2010 RLM		27.9%	2.6%	10.4%	10.8%	0.1%	51.8%	21.3%	3.7%	9.2%	11.8%	0.1%	46.1%
Difference		-6.8%	0.6%	-0.8%	0.7%	0.0%	-6.2%	0.1%	4.0%	-0.5%	4.4%	0.2%	8.3%

In this category, White and Hispanic males are under-represented. Females in all ethnic groups are near or above, parity.

Technicians

This job category includes those in technical positions, i.e. Communications Specialists, Forensic Specialists, Laboratory Assistants and Programmers. These positions require specialized training.

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	177	63	10	34	20	0	127	15	8	12	15	0	50
	100%	35.6%	5.6%	19.2%	11.3%	0.0%	71.8%	8.5%	4.5%	6.8%	8.5%	0.0%	28.2%
2010 RLM		32.2%	3.7%	13.8%	12.9%	0.1%	62.7%	16.5%	3.0%	7.6%	7.6%	0.1%	34.8%
Difference		3.4%	1.9%	5.4%	-1.6%	-0.1%	9.1%	-8.0%	1.5%	-0.8%	0.9%	-0.1%	-6.6%

In this category, Asian males are under-represented. White females are also under-represented.

Protective Services

This job category includes those in public safety positions such as Firefighter, Police Officer, and Special Services Officer.

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	1390	659	96	357	129	7	1248	82	14	43	1	2	142
	100%	47.4%	6.9%	25.7%	9.3%	0.5%	89.8%	5.9%	1.0%	3.1%	0.1%	0.1%	10.2%
2010 RLM		34.7%	6.6%	24.1%	6.3%	0.4%	72.1%	9.7%	3.8%	9.6%	1.9%	0.1%	25.1%
Difference		12.7%	0.3%	1.6%	3.0%	0.1%	17.7%	-3.8%	-2.8%	-6.5%	-1.8%	0.0%	-14.9%

In this category, males in all ethnic groups are at, or above, parity. All female ethnic groups

are under-represented, except American-Indians. The majority of the classifications in this category are male-dominated occupations.

Para-professionals

This job category includes support positions such as Personnel Assistant, Payroll Specialist, and Administrative Aide.

Totals		Male					Female						
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Male	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Female
2014	126	18	2	16	6	0	42	29	15	25	13	2	84
	100%	14.3%	1.6%	12.7%	4.8%	0.0%	33.3%	23.0%	11.9%	19.8%	10.3%	1.6%	66.7%
2010 RLM		15.7%	2.6%	8.9%	7.0%	0.1%	34.3%	28.0%	5.1%	19.0%	11.0%	0.1%	63.2%
Difference		-1.4%	-1.0%	3.8%	-2.2%	-0.1%	-1.0%	-5.0%	6.8%	0.8%	-0.7%	1.5%	3.5%

In this job category, White, Black, and Asian males are under-represented. White females are also under-represented. Classifications in this category are typically female-dominated occupations.

Office/Clerical

This job category includes those in clerical and secretarial positions, including Customer Service Representatives and Public Safety Dispatchers.

Totals		Male					Female						
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Male	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Female
2014	736	52	19	50	23	1	145	158	102	210	119	2	591
	100%	7.1%	2.6%	6.8%	3.1%	0.1%	19.7%	21.5%	13.9%	28.5%	16.2%	0.3%	80.3%
2010 RLM		8.4%	2.5%	10.6%	4.4%	0.1%	26.0%	26.2%	6.8%	28.5%	9.9%	0.2%	71.6%
Difference		-1.3%	0.1%	-3.8%	-1.3%	0.0%	-6.3%	-4.7%	7.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.1%	8.7%

In this category, White, Hispanic, and Asian males are under-represented. White females are also under-represented.

Skilled Craft.

This job category includes those in trades positions such as Electrician, Plumber, and Carpenter.

Totals		Male					Female						
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Male	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	Subtotal Female
2014	340	160	39	93	37	3	332	5	0	1	2	0	8
	100%	47.1%	11.5%	27.4%	10.9%	0.9%	97.6%	1.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	2.4%
2010 RLM		25.4%	3.3%	55.8%	6.7%	0.2%	91.4%	1.6%	0.3%	4.4%	0.8%	0.0%	7.1%
Difference		21.7%	8.2%	-28.4%	4.2%	0.7%	6.2%	-0.1%	-0.3%	-4.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	-4.7%

In this category, Hispanic males are under-represented. Hispanic females are also under-represented. Again, the positions in this category are male dominated occupations. As it relates to the under-representation of male Hispanics, we made an incremental step towards achieving parity, i.e. we increased by 5.4 percentage points (-34.2 % based on 2000 RLM and -28.4% based on 2010 RLM).

Service/Maintenance.

This job category includes those in service and maintenance positions such as Garage Services Attendant, Maintenance Assistant, and Refuse Operator.

Totals		Male					Subtotal Male	Female					Subtotal Female
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Amer. Indian	
2014	400	70	120	137	30	4	361	8	8	23	0	0	39
	100%	17.5%	30.0%	34.3%	7.5%	1.0%	90.3%	2.0%	2.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%
2010 RLM		16.9%	3.3%	57.5%	6.1%	0.2%	84.0%	4.2%	1.3%	6.6%	2.4%	0.0%	14.5%
Difference		0.6%	26.7%	-23.3%	1.4%	0.8%	6.3%	-2.2%	0.7%	-0.9%	-2.4%	0.0%	4.8%

In this job category, Hispanic males are under-represented. White and Asian females are also under-represented. (Note: This job category depicts a significant change in the RLM from 2000, which was 34.2%, to the RLM in 2010, which is now 57.5%. Without this change, we would have been at or near parity with male Hispanics in this job category).

As previously noted, the City’s overall workforce only reflects under-representation in females, as a whole. Recognizing that there are differences in specific job categories, each department is required to identify objectives to address under-representation by job category, and is encouraged to utilize these objectives when making hiring decisions.

NEW HIRES ANALYSIS

An analysis of the new hires permanent full-time positions for 2012 – 2014 YTD was also undertaken (attached). For several years, City Manager departments have been operating under a hiring freeze, with only positions in critical service delivery areas (Public Safety, Building Inspection, etc.) being filled, with an emphasis placed on hiring current City employees. This indirectly served to restrict the City’s efforts to align our workforce with the RLM. For the calendar years 2012 and 2013, there were 158 and 266 hires, respectively. The hiring freeze has been loosened for 2014, and we have 327 hires through November 1, 2014.

As is shown in the chart, over the past three years, progress has been made in most gender/ethnic groups, though there is still room for improvement in Hispanic males and most female ethnic groups. The City continues to hire minorities at a higher rate than what is depicted in the *Workforce Analysis*.

Other circumstances that have hindered our ability to hire male Hispanics in those job categories where we are grossly under-represented include low turnover rates and we do not

have the budget to hire that many employees during the fiscal year.

STRATEGIES

In an effort to address EEO challenges and opportunities for improving female and minority hires and promotions, as identified in the EEOP, the City continues to utilize various strategies for recruitment, retention and professional development, including enhanced outreach efforts in areas where females and/or minority candidates are concentrated. Department managers are encouraged to promote the EEOP objectives and provide professional development training to existing City staff.

The Human Resources and Civil Service Departments have implemented hiring efficiencies by utilizing electronic media recruitment tools, such as Governmentjobs.com, Twitter, Facebook, CareerBuilder, Sologig, and LinkedIn. These tools have reduced recruitment costs and have assisted the City in reaching out to demographic areas with a high concentration of minorities and females.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 570-6140 or Sherriel L. Murry, Human Resources Officer, at 570-6304.

DRM.SLM:or
AA/share/EEO Status Report/2012
R:\Affirmative Action\Share\EEO Status Reports\2012 Status Report\memoCouncil2012

Attachments

CC: Tom Modica, Assistant City Manager
Charles Parkin, City Attorney
Department Heads
Jyl Marden, Assistant to the City Manager

**City of Long Beach
Workforce Analysis
by Job Category - Gender/Ethnicity
2014 YTD (as of November 1, 2014)**

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Officials / Administrators	275	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
120	10	19	25	1	175			
43.6%	3.6%	6.9%	9.1%	0.4%	63.6%			
38.5%	2.7%	11.6%	9.7%	0.1%	62.6%			
5.1%	0.9%	-4.7%	-0.6%	0.3%	1.0%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
48	15	17	20	0	100			
17.5%	5.5%	6.2%	7.3%	0.0%	36.4%			
19.3%	2.8%	7.3%	6.0%	0.1%	35.5%			
-1.8%	2.7%	-1.4%	1.3%	-0.1%	0.9%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Professionals	686	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
145	22	66	79	1	313			
21.1%	3.2%	9.6%	11.3%	0.1%	45.6%			
27.9%	2.6%	10.4%	10.8%	0.1%	51.8%			
-6.8%	0.6%	-0.8%	0.7%	0.0%	-6.2%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
147	53	60	111	2	373			
21.4%	7.7%	8.7%	16.2%	0.3%	54.4%			
21.3%	3.7%	9.2%	11.8%	0.1%	46.1%			
0.1%	4.0%	-0.5%	4.4%	0.2%	8.3%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Technicians	177	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
63	10	34	20	0	127			
35.6%	5.6%	19.2%	11.3%	0.0%	71.8%			
32.2%	3.7%	13.8%	12.9%	0.1%	62.7%			
3.4%	1.9%	5.4%	-1.6%	-0.1%	9.1%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
15	8	12	15	0	50			
8.5%	4.5%	6.8%	8.5%	0.0%	28.2%			
16.5%	3.0%	7.6%	7.6%	0.1%	34.8%			
-8.0%	1.5%	-0.8%	0.9%	-0.1%	-6.6%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Protective Services	1390	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
659	96	357	129	7	1248			
47.4%	6.9%	25.7%	9.3%	0.5%	89.8%			
34.7%	6.6%	24.1%	6.3%	0.4%	72.1%			
12.7%	0.3%	1.6%	3.0%	0.1%	17.7%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
82	14	43	1	2	142			
5.9%	1.0%	3.1%	0.1%	0.1%	10.2%			
9.7%	3.8%	9.6%	1.9%	0.1%	25.1%			
-3.8%	-2.8%	-6.5%	-1.8%	0.0%	-14.9%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Para-professional	126	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
18	2	16	6	0	42			
14.3%	1.6%	12.7%	4.8%	0.0%	33.3%			
15.7%	2.6%	8.9%	7.0%	0.1%	34.3%			
-1.4%	-1.0%	3.8%	-2.2%	-0.1%	-1.0%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
29	15	25	13	2	84			
23.0%	11.9%	19.8%	10.3%	1.6%	66.7%			
28.0%	5.1%	19.0%	11.0%	0.1%	63.2%			
-5.0%	6.8%	0.8%	-0.7%	1.5%	3.5%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Office/Clerical	736	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
52	19	50	23	1	145			
7.1%	2.6%	6.8%	3.1%	0.1%	19.7%			
8.4%	2.5%	10.6%	4.4%	0.1%	26.0%			
-1.3%	0.1%	-3.8%	-1.3%	0.0%	-6.3%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
158	102	210	119	2	591			
21.5%	13.9%	28.5%	16.2%	0.3%	80.3%			
26.2%	6.8%	28.5%	9.9%	0.2%	71.6%			
-4.7%	7.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.1%	8.7%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Skilled Craft	340	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
160	39	93	37	3	332			
47.1%	11.5%	27.4%	10.9%	0.9%	97.6%			
25.4%	3.3%	55.8%	6.7%	0.2%	91.4%			
21.7%	8.2%	-28.4%	4.2%	0.7%	6.2%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
5	0	1	2	0	8			
1.5%	0.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	2.4%			
1.6%	0.3%	4.4%	0.8%	0.0%	7.1%			
-0.1%	-0.3%	-4.1%	-0.2%	0.0%	-4.7%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
Service/Maintenance	400	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
70	120	137	30	4	361			
17.5%	30.0%	34.3%	7.5%	1.0%	90.3%			
16.9%	3.3%	57.5%	6.1%	0.2%	84.0%			
0.6%	26.7%	-23.3%	1.4%	0.8%	6.3%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
8	8	23	0	0	39			
2.0%	2.0%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	9.8%			
4.2%	1.3%	6.6%	2.4%	0.0%	14.5%			
-2.2%	0.7%	-0.9%	-2.4%	0.0%	-4.8%			

Job Category	Totals		
	2014	2010 RLM	Difference
TOTAL (Gender/Ethnicity)	4,130	100%	
	2010 RLM		
	Difference		

Male							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Male	Female	Male	Female
1,287	318	772	349	17	2,743			
31.2%	7.7%	18.7%	8.5%	0.4%	66.4%			
22.1%	2.8%	19.3%	7.7%	0.1%	52.0%			
9.1%	4.9%	-0.6%	0.8%	0.3%	14.4%			

Female							Subtotal	
White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	American Indian	Female	Male	Female	Male
492	215	391	281	8	1,387			
11.9%	5.2%	9.5%	6.8%	0.2%	33.6%			
18.8%	4.0%	14.3%	8.6%	0.1%	45.8%			
-6.9%	1.2%	-4.8%	-1.8%	0.1%	-12.2%			

Summary of Hires FY 2012 - FY 2014

	2010 LMA %		Actual 2012		2013 Actual		2014 YTD		over/under-utilization
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Total	158		266	327					
Total Females	61	46.8%	103	120	38.7%	36.7%			-10.1%
Black	3	4.0%	14	16	5.3%	4.9%			0.9%
Hispanic	21	14.3%	38	47	14.3%	14.4%			0.1%
Asian	9	8.6%	15	16	5.6%	4.9%			-3.7%
American Indian	1	0.1%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%			-0.1%
White	27	18.8%	36	41	13.5%	12.5%			-6.3%
Total Males	97	53.2%	163	207	61.3%	63.3%			10.1%
Black	7	2.8%	9	36	3.4%	11.0%			8.2%
Hispanic	26	19.3%	53	59	19.9%	18.0%			-1.3%
Asian	10	7.7%	24	30	9.0%	9.2%			1.5%
American Indian	2	0.1%	1	2	0.4%	0.6%			0.5%
White	52	22.1%	76	80	28.6%	24.5%			2.4%
Total Minorities	79	59.2%	154	206	57.9%	63.0%			3.8%
White Females & Minorities	106	78.0%	190	247	71.4%	75.5%			-2.5%