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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mid-Term Update to the County of Marin Equal Employment Report and Plan is a report of the County’s Equal Employment efforts since the current Five Year Equal Employment Plan (July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2015) was implemented.

The County of Marin is strongly committed to the principles and goals of a diverse and inclusive workforce. Historically, the County produced annual or biennial Equal Employment updates. As recommended in the Equal Employment Biennial Report 2009-2011, the County is shifting from the biennial report to a mid-term update. In addition, due to the re-categorization of job classes from the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) -4 designations to the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC) system in FY 2009-2010, the County will begin using data from the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan from July 1, 2010 as the baseline for EEO reporting related to this plan.

The Mid-Term Update to the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan document is intended to report on what we know from the first half of the current Five Year Plan (July 1, 2010 – December 31, 2012) and provide an opportunity to adjust the focus, develop additional action items or initiate other steps to achieve the goals of the Five Year Report and Plan. The entire Five Year Report and Plan may be found at http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/HR/Main/docs/FiveYearEEOPlan.pdf.

In addition to the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors on June 7, 2011, the County also developed a Workforce Strategic Plan in 2011, with goals that align with the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan. In particular, a goal of the Workforce Strategic Plan is to “Support our People – demonstrate investment in employee development through programs, services, and initiatives.” The entire Workforce Strategic Plan may be found at http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/HR/Main/docs/StrategicWorkforcePlan.pdf.

Background

The Mid-Term Update is developed by measuring the workforce data from the commencement of the plan to the mid-point of the Five-Year term. The benchmarks that were gathered and measured include:

- Current workforce demographics
- Recruitment activities including demographics of applicants and applicants gaining certifications and appointments.
- Salary gap analysis that measures disparities in earnings by gender and race.
- Inventory of outreach-related initiatives; i.e., career fairs, diversity recruitments, employee development.

The draft findings from this work were shared with key stakeholders to gain feedback and input into the recommended revisions of the Five-Year Plan at this mid-point. The stakeholders include:

- The Equal Employment Advisory Committee
- The Human Rights Commission
- The Marin Women’s Commission
- The staff of the Human Resources Department
• The EEO/HR Department Head Committee (representation includes the Sheriff’s Department, County Counsel, Public Defender, Department of Public Works and the County Administrator’s Office)
• The County’s Department Heads
• The Personnel Commission – this Mid-Term Update was approved the PC on April 18, 2013

Recommendations from each of these groups were incorporated into the following document. Examples of their feedback include expanding the salary analysis from gender only to include minorities and a request that Marin County dedicate resources to diversity recruitments. This is addressed in the revised Action Plan.

Findings

The demographics of the County’s workforce changed during the first half of the Five-Year Plan as follows:

• Women in the workforce decreased from 52.4% of regular employees to 51.9%, a .50% reduction. The number of women in the County’s workforce has remained just over 50% since 1980, with the high being in 2004 at 54.3%.
• The percentage of employees who identified themselves as minorities increased by .80%, from 26.3% to 27.1%. The percent of minority employees has slowly trended upwards from 12.1% in 1980 to the highest percent reported in 2012.

The County has reduced their underutilization for minorities by nearly 11%, from 28 FTEs to 25 FTEs. Most significantly, the underutilization for Law Enforcement has been eliminated. During this same time, the underutilization for minorities in Fire has increased by 3 FTEs. When reviewing the salary gap between white employees and minority employees, there was some progress in closing in on the disparities. During the 30 month period the salary gap moved from whites earning 12.1% more than minorities to 10.5%, reducing the gap by 1.6%.

The greatest opportunities for the County to continue to reduce underutilization of minorities in our available workforce are in the categories of Farming, Fishing & Forestry, Construction & Extraction and Fire.

The underutilization for women in the workforce increased by 25% during this period, from 18 FTEs to 24 FTEs. Half of the underutilized FTE’s are in the area of Healthcare; these occupational categories are benchmarked with women representing between 70% and 97% of the available workforce. In these categories, the County of Marin has an average of 69% female employees. In these cases, the County has been successful in recruiting men into non-traditional roles. The remaining opportunities are primarily in the category of Fire, Food Preparation & Serving, Building & Grounds Maintenance & Cleaning and Installation, Maintenance & Repair. In reviewing the salary gap data, progress has been made in the overall workforce to reduce the gap by 2.5% from male employees making 13.7% more than female employees to 11.2%. Progress was also noted for non-management female employees; the gap moved for 11.8% to 8.9%, reducing the disparities by 2.9%. The gap for female employees in management increased during this 30 month period from 11.2% less than male managers to 12.6%, widening the gap by 1.4%.

The County of Marin has made significant progress towards meeting the goals set forth in the Five-Year Plan. Some of these accomplishments are:

• Hosted Access Marin, an event focused on creating a disability-friendly workplace. This event was conducted in partnership with community advocates and service providers during National Disability Awareness Month.
• Reinstating the Equal Employment Advisory Committee and clarifying its role to the Personnel Commission.
• Fully implementing the Standard Occupational Classification system.
• Demonstrated strong participation in diversity recruitment opportunities such as Job Fairs.
• Tracked and analyzed appointments and certifications to drive outreach efforts.
• Forecast potential retirements and targeted recruiting opportunities.
• Conducted two Career Day events focused on developing members of the current workforce for future opportunities.

**Revised Action Plan**

The proposed revisions to the action steps outlined in the Five-Year Plan are found in Section VI of this Mid-Term Update. These amendments incorporated the feedback, comments and recommendations obtained during the review of the draft plan with stakeholder groups. Proposed actions steps include:

- Partner with community groups to form a Diversity Recruitment Advisory Committee for Marin County Fire’s future workforce needs.
- Conduct annual salary analysis to determine potential patterns of disparate impacts.
- Develop a centralized tuition reimbursement program that would support career development and internal promotions for the County’s workforce.
- Develop onboarding strategies and programs that would readily align new employees with inclusive workplace practices and organizational core values.
- Develop a Diversity Recruitment Plan by January 2014.
- Provide support for a diverse workforce. Develop and initiate diversity and inclusion training and work with the Workforce Investment Board’s Construction and Skilled Trades sub-committee to assist in diversity recruiting.
- Continue to update the Personnel Management Regulations (PMRs).
- Plan and implement future Career Development Day initiatives.
- Continue to offer a course on creating an inclusive workplace within the leadership development program.
- Partner with the Community Development Agency (CDA) to deliver the staff diversity and inclusion training component of the Analysis of Impediments to fair housing.
- Continue to support initiatives for persons with disabilities.

The following report will provide the reader with further detail regarding workforce diversity patterns from July 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012. The full report includes greater detail of current and revised action plans, including timelines for deliverables. The report includes appendices that provide detailed information regarding the Standard Occupational Codes. Survey and evaluation data has also been included to provide the reader with a strong sense of the workforce’s experiences related to creating an inclusionary workplace.
II. COUNTY WORKFORCE

The mid-term report is based upon the Marin County regular hire full-time workforce as of December 31, 2012, the mid-point of the Five Year Plan. On that date, the County had 1816 regular full-time employees. Of these, 874 (48.1%) were men and 942 (51.9%) were women. 1324 employees (72.9%) were white and 27.1% were ethnic minorities, including 100 (5.5%) that were Black, 230 (12.7%) Hispanic, 148 (8.1%) Asian, and 14 (.8%) American Indian/Alaskan Native.

As of July 1, 2010, the County had 1874 regular full-time employees. (See Appendix A) Of these, 47.6% were male, 52.4% were female, and 26.3% were ethnic minorities. As of the mid-term (December 31, 2012) of the current Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan, workforce representation for females has slightly decreased from 52.4% to 51.9%, and ethnic minorities has slightly increased by .8%. The overall decrease in numbers is the result of budget reductions leading to layoffs and the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP).

Workforce Summary

The two charts below show the historical trends from 1980 through 2012 for the workforce with regard to the percentage of ethnic minorities and women. The percentage of ethnic minorities in 1980 was 12.2% and grew to 27.1% by 2012. The percentage of women grew at a slower pace, having been 50.6% in 1980 and 51.9% in 2012. However, the percentage of females fluctuated from year to year with the largest percentage occurring in 2000 when the total was 54.3%. In the next reporting period (2004), the percentage of females was 52.3% or a decline of 2%. The current percentage of females is 51.9%, a .5% increase from 2011 but a decrease of .5% from June 30, 2009, the designated baseline date. These numbers are statistically small and overall women represent more than 50% of the County workforce.
The chart below shows the trending during the current Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan for both females and ethnic minorities.
The following groups show growth in representation by females since the current Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan went into effect: Finance (7.4%), Probation (1.8%), Public Defender (4.4%), and Retirement (9.4%). Growth in representation of ethnic minorities occurred in: Child Support Services (9.7%), Finance (2.8%), District Attorney (8%), Human Resources (3.4%), Public Defender (6.2%), and Sheriff (1.3%).
The following groups show growth in representation by ethnic minorities since the current Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan went into effect: Child Support Services (9.7%), Finance (2.8%), District Attorney (8%), Human Resources (3.4%), Public Defender (6.2%), and Sheriff (1.3%).

### Workforce Statistics – Incumbency Compared to Availability

The Comparison of Incumbency to Availability charts indicates the percentage of females and ethnic minorities in each job category relative to their availability in the general labor market. “Incumbency” reflects the ethnic/racial and gender composition of the SOC Job Groups of the current County of Marin workforce, while “availability” indicates the approximate local labor market level at which each race/ethnicity and gender could reasonably be expected to be represented in a job group when employment decisions were totally devoid of any extraneous non-job related factors. The local labor area was derived by use of zip codes of the County workforce to determine a percentage of the labor area in which all current County of Marin employees reside. The County of Marin uses the zip code of the existing county workforce to determine the “local” labor area. All other Bay Area Counties use the demographics of their county zip codes.

In the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan 2010-15, comparison of the numbers was not easily performed due to the change of the job groups from the EEO-4 categories to the SOC categories. (See Appendix B). A comparison may now be done based on data in the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan compared to the mid-term data to point out areas in which recruitment targets for females and/or ethnic minorities have not been met, based upon an analysis of availability in the local labor market as determined by zip code analysis.
In the chart below, the comparison of incumbency to availability shows the following areas County-wide where there are identified “deficiencies” in representation by females in job groupings because the percentage of availability is higher than the percentage of representation in the work force: Community & Social Services; Food Preparation & Serving; Healthcare Support; Protective Services- Fire; Legal Office-Clerical; Office & Administrative Support; and Installation, Maintenance & Repair. However, all of these job categories either show improvement, or do not statistically show under-representation since the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan was implemented. Furthermore, representation in Healthcare Support incumbency has almost doubled.

It should be noted that while some job groups, for example Community & Social Services, have a high percentage of females represented in the workforce (67.2%, which is an increase of 3.4% from the July 1, 2010 data), the percentage of availability of females in this labor area is slightly higher (70.1%) leading to the determination of a “deficiency”. The comparison of incumbency to availability indicates a need for 4 additional females to eliminate “deficiency” in this group despite the fact that this group is dominated by females.
The next chart identifies the following categories where there are identified deficiencies countywide in representation by ethnic minorities in job groupings because the percentage of availability is higher than the percentage of representation in the work force: Education, Training & Library Professionals; Architecture & Engineering Technicians; Production; Protective Services- Fire; Farming, Fishing & Forestry; Construction & Extraction; and Installation, Maintenance & Repair. Despite being below the labor market availability, only three of these categories statistically show underutilization (Farming, Fishing & Forestry; Protective Services- Fire; and Construction and Extraction). However these three categories increased in ethnic minority representation since the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan was implemented. Incumbency also increased for Education, Training & Library- Professionals. Production remained the same.

Three categories do not statistically show underutilization. Four out of seven increased in incumbency though still below LMA, and one stayed the same.
The following two graphs depict examples of occupational job groups in which incumbency is greater than the labor market availability for both females and ethnic minorities.

For females, two categories decreased but remain above availability (Education, Training & Library Professionals and Architecture & Engineering Professionals). Incumbency increased in Protective Service-Law Enforcement (7%), Management (3.6%), and Farming, Fishing & Forestry (4.2%).

While representation of ethnic minorities in Architectural & Engineering Professionals remained the same, the following occupational job groups showed growth: Community & Social Services (2.8%); Legal Office/Clerical (2.6%); Education, Training & Library- Clerical (3.6%); and Office and Administrative Support (3.6%).
III. UNDERUTILIZATION AND SALARY

The following tables show the total numbers of employees needed to fill the “deficiencies” outlined above. Once again, it should be noted that in some groups, such as Community and Social Services, there is already a high percentage of females in this group. For example, the most current data in the Underutilization chart for the first half of fiscal year 2012 – 2013 on page 14 indicate that 4 females are needed to “eliminate deficiency” in Community and Social Services. However in that group, there are 88 females and 43 males. A salary analysis would show that males and females in the same job class are paid at the same rate, so there does not appear to be either a real deficiency or a salary gap in this SOC group. The same analysis can be applied to SOC group 29-A, Healthcare Professionals. In this group, males fill the two highest paid positions but the majority of jobs are filled by women in job classes eligible for overtime and differentials, resulting in potentially higher salaries.

In the SOC Group 31, Healthcare Support, there are just 7 employees in two job classes, with a male being in the one higher-level class. Similarly in the SOC Group 35, Food Preparation & Serving, there are just 9 employees with males dominating the lower paid positions and a female in the managerial position.

In the SOC Groups 33-B, Protective Services – Fire, there is underutilization of both females and ethnic minorities. Out of a total work group of 76 positions (this excludes senior level management jobs), there are 2 white females, one each at Fire Engineer and Fire Engineer Paramedic, job classes that are one level up from the entry-level Firefighter positions. There are six ethnic minorities, with two at the higher Fire Captain level. Therefore, overall, salaries for women and ethnic minorities are lower than for their white male counterparts.

Males dominate the SOC Group 37, Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance, with females in the lower paid job classes of Custodian and Landscape Services Worker II. There are no females in SOC Group 49, Installation, Maintenance & Repair, and as such, there is no data upon which to conduct a salary analysis.

While the numbers of females in SOC Groups 45, Farming, Fishing & Forestry and SOC Group 47, Construction & Extraction, are low, the data does not indicate underutilization. However, there is significant data to show underutilization of ethnic minorities. Salaries of ethnic minorities in these groups are not

---

Example of Ethnic Minorities Representation in Occupational Job Groups Above the Labor Market Availabilities December 31, 2012

- Community & Social Service: Incumbency 46.6%, Availability 27.0%
- Legal Support Workers: Incumbency 35.4%, Availability 17.5%
- Education, Training, & Library Cl.: Incumbency 28.6%, Availability 17.2%
- Office & Administrative Support: Incumbency 35.2%, Availability 21.4%
- Architectural & Engineering Prof.: Incumbency 25.0%, Availability 17.1%

---
necessarily limited to entry level positions, most are also not at the highest level of senior or supervising levels within the groups. Many of the jobs in these groups are filled at higher levels by departmental promotion or sliding classes, so it is possible by the end of the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan period, the numbers will show increases in levels and therefore salaries at the higher levels.

As noted on page 19 of the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan and used as the baseline, the EEO-4 codes were “translated” into the new SOC codes. However, in moving to the SOC codes and in consultation with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the categorization of the jobs in the County of Marin were allocated to the correct categories as reflected in the second table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Job Group</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Additional # of whole persons needed to eliminate deficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Social Service</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training &amp; Library Professionals</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training &amp; Library Professionals</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Practitioners-Professionals</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Practitioners-Technicians</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Support</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services-Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services-Fire</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services-Fire</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation &amp; Serving</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Grounds Cleaning &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Extraction</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, Maintenance &amp; Repair</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MINORITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comparison of Change in Underutilization July 1, 2010 – December 31, 2012

*Reflects Corrections Made in SOC Transition*

See analyses in Section IV below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Job Group</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Additional # of whole persons needed to eliminate deficiency</th>
<th>Change in Under-utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Data July 1, 2010</td>
<td>December 31, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Social Service</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Practitioners - Professionals</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Support</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective Services – Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services - Fire</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective services - Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Preparation &amp; Serving</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &amp; Grounds Cleaning &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing &amp; Forestry</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Extraction</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, Maintenance, &amp; Repair</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MINORITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: in the chart above in the column titled “Change in Underutilization”, the term “reduced by” indicates that there were fewer whole bodies needed to eliminate deficiency in the SOC category indicated and “increased by” indicates additional numbers needed to achieve parity.
IV. ANALYSIS OF CERTIFICATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

July 1, 2010

During fiscal year 2009-10, the same year in which the County changed from classifying jobs according to the EEO-4 codes to the Standard Occupation Classifications (SOC), 540 applicants were certified to 104 vacancies and 98 appointments made.

Certifications: There were 309 males and 231 females certified Countywide. There were 387 white and 145 ethnic minorities (eight did not declare ethnicity).

Appointments: There were 49 males and 49 females appointed Countywide. There were 73 white and 25 ethnic minorities.

During this period of time, underutilization (number needed to achieve parity) is reported in the chart above under the heading July 1, 2010.

Analysis: The numbers of persons certified and subsequently the numbers appointed closely mirror the representation of females and ethnic minorities in the County workforce. However, according to the underutilization report, there were 18 females and 28 ethnic minorities needed to achieve parity. Part of this change is the result of moving the Deputy Probation Officers (DPO’s) from the Community & Social Services category to Protective Services – Law. In the first chart above, the data according to SOC categories showed that Community & Social Services was deficient in females by 13. There was no deficiency of females in Protective Services – Law Enforcement. A review of the Community & Social Services SOC showed that Deputy Probation Officers were included in this group. When analyzed and reviewed by an SOC consultant, it was determined that the DPO’s were in fact appropriate to the law enforcement category due to the nature of their work. The impact of the change was that fewer females were needed in Community & Social Services for parity. There was no impact on the Protective Services – Law Enforcement group for females as there were no deficiencies in that area for females.

Females were underrepresented in Community & Social Services (SOC 21), Healthcare Professionals (SOC 29-A), Health Care Support (SOC 31), Protective Services – Fire (SOC 33-B), and Installation, Maintenance & Repair (SOC 49). A review of the numbers of incumbents in the first three groups indicates that these are female-dominated SOC groups and therefore availability is high, which tends to skew the data towards showing underutilization. Of more concern, is that the latter two SOC groups are male-dominated groups. Further review is needed then of the opportunities to hire within these groups. In Protective Services – Fire, there were no females on any of the certification lists and therefore no opportunities to hire. In Installation, Maintenance & Repair, again there were no females on the certification lists and, as such no opportunities to hire. Several of the appointments within both groups were departmental promotional opportunities, which leads to the conclusion that more outreach needs to be done in the SOC groups that show underutilization of females but no opportunities to hire.

Ethnic minorities were underrepresented in Protective Services – Law Enforcement (SOC 33-A), Farming, Fishing & Forestry (SOC 45), and Construction & Extraction (SOC 47). There was one opening in the Farming, Fishing & Forestry group, but no ethnic minorities on the certification list. In the Construction & Extraction group, there were no vacancies. In Protective Services – Law Enforcement group, there were some opportunities that were utilized to hire minorities in this underutilized group. There were 7 opportunities to hire ethnic minorities, and two Hispanics were hired. There were no ethnic minorities on four certification lists so there were no opportunities to hire.
Mid-Term: December 31, 2012

During the first six months of fiscal year 2012 – 13 (July 1, 2012 – December 31, 2012), 405 applicants were certified to 69 vacancies and 65 appointments made.

Certifications: There were 254 males and 161 females certified Countywide. There were 262 white and 133 ethnic minorities (ten did not declare ethnicity).

Appointments: There were 33 males and 32 females appointed Countywide. There were 45 white and 20 ethnic minorities.

During this period of time, underutilization is reported in the chart above under the heading December 31, 2012.

Analysis: The numbers of persons certified and subsequently the numbers appointed closely mirror the representation of females and ethnic minorities in the County workforce. However, when compared to the 2009 – 2010 appointments (data as of July 1, 2010), the number of whites is below the numbers represented in the workforce, but ethnic minorities remain nearly the same as in the County workforce. In addition, when comparing 2009 – 2010 (data as of July 1, 2010), ethnic minorities at the mid-point of the 2012-2013 fiscal year were appointed at a rate of 31%, while in the former period the representation of ethnic minorities was just 20% of the total.

Despite this significant growth of 11% in appointments of ethnic minorities, there was still underutilization of ethnic minorities (as well as females) in various SOC job categories.

Groups with underutilization of females are Community & Social Services (SOC 21), Healthcare Professionals (SOC 29-A), Healthcare Support (SOC 31), Protective Services – Fire (SOC 33-B), Food Preparation & Serving (SOC 35), Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance (SOC 37), Installation, Maintenance & Repair (SOC 49). Once again the first three groups are female-dominated. However, there was one opportunity to hire a female in Healthcare Professionals, but a male was hired. There were no vacancies in Protective Services – Fire, Food Preparation & Serving, and Installation, Maintenance & Repair, and therefore no opportunities to hire. In Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance, there was one opportunity to hire a female, but a male was hired via conversion from extra-hire to regular hire.

Ethnic minorities were underutilized in Protective Services-Fire, Farming, Fishing & Forestry, and Construction & Extraction. There were no vacancies in Protective Services – Fire. In the latter two groups, there were vacancies but no ethnic minorities on the certification lists.

Comparison of the change in underutilization between July 1, 2010 and December 31, 2012:

Although the overall numbers in underutilization of females increased from July 1, 2010 (18) to the mid-point of 2012-2013 (24), there were fewer opportunities to hire females due to lack of vacancies. The numbers for minorities have improved from 2009-2010 (data as of July 1, 2010) (28) to the mid-point (data as of December 31, 2012) (25) and there was an increase of 11% in hiring of minorities from one year to the other.

It appears that with the upcoming numbers of employees expected to retire in the next few years (approximately 394 employees are likely to retire within the next three years—20.13% of the total workforce) the opportunity to focus on targeted recruitments should not be lost. By the time there are significant vacancies, departments will be positioned to hire in groups where there is underutilization and so continue to improve overall diversity in the County workforce.
Overall Mid-Term 5-Year Plan Period: July 1, 2010 to December 31, 2012

During the first half of the current Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan, 1,996 applicants were certified to 423 vacancies and 414 appointments made.

Certifications: There were 1,119 (56%) males and 877 (44%) females certified Countywide. There were 1,302 (65.2%) white and 655 (32.8%) ethnic minorities (39/ 1.9% did not declare ethnicity).

Appointments: There were 192 (46.4%) males and 222 (53.6%) females appointed Countywide; 285 (68.8%) white and 129 (31.2%) ethnic minorities.

Analysis: The numbers of males certified is slightly higher than the percent of males represented in the workforce. The number of appointed males and females closely mirrors the representation of the current County workforce. However, the number of ethnic minorities both certified and appointed is higher than the average representation of minorities in the current workforce (5.7% higher for certifications and a 4.1% increase in appointments). If this current trend continues throughout the period of this Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan, the County could see a 4-5% increase in minority representation in the workforce which would result in almost one-third of the workforce being ethnic minorities rather than one-fourth, which is the recent trend.

It should also be noted that between July of 2011 and January of 2013, the Sheriff’s Department hired a total of 31 new employees. Out of these employees, 8 (25.8%) were minorities [1 Black male; 4 Hispanics (2 male and 2 female); 3 Asians (2 males and 1 female). Females comprised 38.7% of all hires for this period. The following shows the job classes into which females and minorities were hired:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Class</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Minority Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Dispatcher I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Dispatcher Mgr</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coroner’s Investigator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Black, 1 Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Sheriff Trainee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Systems Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is significant to note that a female was hired into the Communications Dispatch Manager position and that females and minorities were hired into the Deputy Sheriff Trainee and Deputy Sheriff positions. In particular the latter classes have significant steps in career ladders, including Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain (the Sheriff is elected and the Undersheriff appointed). The Sheriff has made significant progress in promoting women and ethnic minorities to Sergeant and Lieutenant positions.
V. COMPENSATION ANALYSIS

Compensation analyses for the Mid-Term Update were conducted by comparing the salaries for men versus women.

The information is clear that County of Marin does not compensate women less favorably than men because of gender. Men and women in the same job title are accorded identical salary treatment within the same salary matrix, based upon merit and time worked. For example, there are currently 11 people in the Deputy District Attorney III job class title in the Office of the District Attorney, four men and seven women, and all are compensated identically at each of the five salary steps of their job title. Thus, within any step of the salary matrix, their salaries will be identical. (It is interesting to note that previous data showed 12 Deputy District Attorney III positions, with six men and six women). It should also be noted that the same comparison might be made for ethnic minorities within a particular job class.

Despite the parity between men and women in the same job classes (general descriptions of individual positions within a classification system), there may not be overall parity between men and women across job groups (groupings of jobs by similar duties and qualifications). A workforce salary analysis, under the auspices of the Marin Women’s Commission, has been performed periodically since 1996 and up through fiscal year 2009. The fiscal year 2006 through 2009 used the EEO-4 categories. The data used for this report and compiled by Human Resources staff is based upon the SOC categories and includes salary data for males and females as well as for whites and ethnic minorities.
## County of Marin Equal Employment Report and Plan
### Mid-Term Update – July 1, 2010 to December 31, 2012

### SALARY DATA

#### Median Salary Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data as of July 1, 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Data as of December 31, 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of EEs</td>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td># of EEs</td>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td># of EEs</td>
<td>Median Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workforce</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>88,213</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>76,170</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>88,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>123,552</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>109,720</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>125,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Management</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>83,242</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>73,445</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>83,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10% Salary</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>136,864</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>142,417</td>
<td>(5,553)</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2009-10 Median Salary Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Data as of July 1, 2010</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Data as of December 31, 2012</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>TOTAL MINORITIES</td>
<td>FY 2009-10 Median Salary Gap</td>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>TOTAL MINORITIES</td>
<td>Median Salary Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of EEs</td>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td># of EEs</td>
<td>Median Salary</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workforce</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>83,096</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>73,008</td>
<td>$10,088</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>114,098</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>109,720</td>
<td>$4,378</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Management</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>79,414</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>69,659</td>
<td>$9,755</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 10% Salary</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>136,864</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>145,267</td>
<td>(8,403)</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Light green = significant progress; light red = lack of progress; yellow = no significant change.
Analysis

Fiscal year 2009 – 2010 was the first year that the SOC was used to classify County jobs by the SOC groupings. Median gaps for the total workforce as well as SOC Management and SOC Non-Management groups were reported as well as the top 10% wage earners for both males and females and whites and ethnic minorities. The results are indicated in the chart above. The percentage changes between the 2009 – 2010 fiscal year (data as of July 1, 2010) and the mid-term of the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan are shown in the far right column. Negative percentages indicate that there has been some progress towards closing a gap over the two and one-half year period. In most cases, positive percentages indicate a lack of progress. However when the numbers have been shaded in yellow, it indicates there has been little change. For example, in the top 10% wage earnings of males and females, females were 4.1% higher than males as of July 1, 2010 and at mid-term, females were 1.8% higher than males, showing a small decrease. However, the best outcome would be parity in salaries for all employees.

The charts reflect a snapshot in time, as the demographics of the County workforce is a fluid number that can change on a bi-weekly basis due to appointments, promotions, and separations. Changes may occur throughout the window of time, but it necessary to determine a date to use as a point for data collection. There are references in this report to fiscal year 2009 – 2010, which ended on June 30, 2010, and fiscal year 2010-2011, which began on July 1, 2010. Both dates are referenced because the change of the fiscal year was on a Thursday (July 1, 2010) and payroll data would not have changed from June 30 and July 1 as payroll actions take place effective with the beginnings of pay periods, which are on Sundays.

In the charts, salaries are reflected for management, non-management and the top 10% of wage earners. Salaries are listed do not include overtime or any special pays.

Equally, if not more important to note is that within the top 10% of wage earners only 40% are in management occupations. The remaining 60% are comprised of highly skilled professionals, such as attorneys, nurse practitioners, information and technology analysts, whose job skills and requirements equate to a higher compensation level in their specific labor markets based on salary analysis of comparable positions. The County successfully recruits highly skilled professional women, but is less successful in attracting and hiring women into the higher compensated management positions. The three female department heads are in traditionally female dominated top-level management positions – Human Resources, the Library, and Parks. The County is focusing on attracting and hiring females into management and top wage positions, as positions open. As far as minorities, there appears to be progress in closing the wage gap as shown by the total workforce and non-management changes between July 1, 2010 and the mid-term. In management and the top 10%, the numbers have remained steady, with ethnic minorities continuing to maintain a 4 – 6% gap.
VI. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT UPDATED PLAN - RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Update to General Action-Oriented Steps – from original 5 year EEO Plan

The 2010-2015 Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan included general action-oriented steps to achieve the goals of the plan, as well as specific action-oriented steps, which included the Human Resources Director working with departments with low percentages of females and/or ethnic minorities relative to Countywide percentages and outline any necessary corrective action steps or goals.

The general action-oriented steps can be found on pages 27 – 30 of the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan. They are on-going and for the most part successful except as follows:

- Job Advancement:
  - Tuition reimbursement is available, depending on budget limitations and if necessary funds will be requested, for all employees for eligible courses directly related to an employee’s current position or to a position to which may be reasonably anticipated in the near future to make the employee more upwardly mobile.
    - *Due to budget reductions, tuition reimbursement funds were not available in an equal manner across departments. However, tuition reimbursement is being reviewed for modification under Personnel Management Regulation (PMR 42) so that it is more readily available to employees for upward mobility purposes. A tuition assistance proposal is scheduled to be presented to the Board of Supervisors by December 31, 2013, as lack of tuition reimbursement is a potential barrier to the upward mobility of minorities and women.*

- Other:
  - When resources are made available, the County will create and implement a campaign promoting the County of Marin as an “Employer of Choice, an equal opportunity employer that welcomes diversity.”
    - *While the County continues to embrace diversity as a value, funds have not yet been available for this campaign, but plans are underway for a “branding” strategic direction as part of the Workforce Strategic Plan, which may be found at [http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/HR/Main/docs/StrategicWorkforcePlan.pdf](http://www.co.marin.ca.us/depts/HR/Main/docs/StrategicWorkforcePlan.pdf).*

NOW Consent Decree

Regarding the 1980 NOW Consent Decree, the County surveyed all female employees, those in job classes eligible for 20 hours per year release time for upward mobility training and those who may have been in eligible classes at some point in their County career. While employees were aware of the Consent Decree, few availed themselves of its release time provision and of those surveyed very few had been denied use of release time. One of the questions asked in the survey was “If you could offer one suggestion to make the County a better place for women to work, what would it be?” The main themes that resulted from this question were: work/life balance, mentoring, training, fairness/equality, attitudes/biases, and budget. Based on the survey, three focus groups with representatives from all levels of employees as well as labor and Marin Women’s Commission were held. The focus groups responded to the question “What can the County do to better promote women?” Similar themes emerged from the focus groups, including: mentoring, better communication, more training, promotional opportunities, hiring women into non-traditional jobs. Building on the feedback from the survey and the themes from the focus groups, the County embarked on its first career development day in April 2012. The goals of the day were: encourage participants to develop a career plan, provide resources to support a career plan, and strengthen a culture of growing our own and investing in employee development. The success of the day has resulted in support from the Board of
Supervisors for a second career development day that was held on May 8, 2013, focusing on career opportunities with the County. With this focus on and strategic action towards upward mobility, plans are underway to petition the court for release from the consent decree, as substantial compliance has been achieved, many of the requirements are now codified in law, and the County plans to take steps to provide release time to all employees in eligible job classes. This action is in line with the strategic plan direction of working to release the County from the NOW consent decree by creating a compelling vision and program to advance women in the workforce as well as being part of the County’s commitment to diversity and to growing its own employees. The Human Resources Department has been working closely with the Marin Women’s Commission in this effort.

In addition, the County Board of Supervisor’s agreed to fund the County’s first ever Career Development Day for males and females, which aligned with the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan as well as the Workforce Strategic Plan. In partnership with the Marin Women’s Commission and community partners, the County held its first Career Development Day on April 18, 2012 with 122 participants. The success of the day, as determined by participants’ evaluations, resulted in the Board of Supervisors supporting and funding a second Career Development Day, held on May 8, 2013. (An evaluation summary appears as Appendix D.) Career Ladders were updated and posted on the MIN for employee review and information. Cuts in the Human Resources staffing budget were restored, with an Analyst position added and dedicated to executive recruitments. An improved Employee Survey was conducted in 2011, which indicated that employees are interested in career opportunities with the County.

The specific action-oriented steps can be found on pages 30 and 31 of the Five Year Equal Opportunity Report and Plan. It is apparent that in overall statistical percentages, the County does well in the employment of females and ethnic minorities. However, percentages vary by both department and job group and underutilization has been identified. Because of this, the specific action steps that called for the Director of Human Resources to work with departments that had SOC job categories with underutilization of females and ethnic minorities continue to be carried out.

Updated General Action-Oriented Steps – from 2012 Update

In the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan and the update adopted by the Board in 2012, the following action plans were agreed upon. Below is the report of the progress.

- Request that the Board of Supervisors provide direction to the Personnel Commission regarding the role of the Equal Employment Advisory Committee in dealing only with specific issues.
  - The EEAC has been reinstated and its role updated by the Personnel Commission.

- Continue to review and refine the job groupings of the Standard Occupational Classification system.
  - The SOC has been reviewed specific to Deputy Probation Officers, moving them from Community and Service to Protective Services – Law Enforcement. The SOC will continue to be reviewed and modified as appropriate.

- County staff will participate in job fairs if there are sufficient numbers of openings to warrant participation.
  - County staff responsible for the recruitment of paid employees, volunteers and student interns have participated in several job fairs during the time period of July 1, 2010 – December 31, 2012. In addition, staffing personnel actively seek opportunities to participate in job fairs that highlight diversity. In 2012, for instance, we participated in the Bay Area 11th Annual Diversity Employment Day.
Additional outreach efforts include: (1) presentations to client job seekers of Marin Employment Connection; (2) coordination with a County team of employees charged with developing a “robust” student internship program; (3) the purchase of software that will redirect the significant amount of staff time currently spent completing administrative tasks to the creation of stronger relationships with more local colleges and universities for filling available opportunities; (4) the development of a contact list of diversity resources/organizations to post our employment and volunteer/student internship opportunities; (5) partnership with Davidson Middle School in San Rafael in the creation of a program involving Sr. Leadership to discuss working at, and career opportunities with, the County of Marin.

- Use the corrected data from July 1, 2010 as the baseline for the Five Year Equal Opportunity Report and Plan;
  - The corrected data is being utilized.
- Compare certifications to applicants when no underutilized groups are on the certification list and determine why and, if necessary, design a method to recruit applicants from underutilized groups.
  - Appointments and Certifications are tracked and analyzed. Increased outreach and diversity recruitment planning are being improved as provided for in the Workforce Strategic Plan.
- Forecast where there will be potential retirements and identify opportunities to hire from the data in order to plan for recruitment of underutilized groups.
  - The data is regularly being collected and analyzed. Reports are provided to departments to identify retirement risks and hiring opportunities.
- Track the progress of these goals with those of the 2010-2015 Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan and the 2011 Workforce Strategic Plan.
  - We continue to align both documents as they are essential in supporting our workforce.

**Mid-term Addition to Action-Oriented Steps – Proposed in July 2013**

In order to determine the interests of and receive input from stakeholders in equal employment efforts, the draft mid-term report was presented at publicly held meetings of the following groups: Personnel Commission, Marin Women’s Commission, Human Rights Commission, and the Equal Employment Advisory Committee. Labor representatives were provided with schedules of these meetings in order for them to attend and provide input. Other stakeholders provided the opportunity to comment include the County Department Heads, the Department Head/Human Resources/Equal Employment Opportunity committee, and Human Resources staff. The actions listed below are based on input from the stakeholder groups.

- Design and staff a Diversity Recruitment Advisory Committee focused on future workforce needs in the Marin County Fire Department. The committee will include members of the Marin Women’s Commission, Veteran’s organizations, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce and representatives of area educational institutions including high schools, community colleges and youth sports organizations. This group’s focus will be on identifying and engaging potential future firefighters early in their career decision-making process.
- Conduct annual salary analysis to determine potential patterns of disparate impacts.
- Develop a centralized tuition reimbursement program that would support career development and internal promotions for the county’s workforce.
Develop onboarding strategies and programs that would readily align new employees with inclusive workplace practices and organizational core values.

Human Resources will develop a Diversity Recruitment Plan by January 2014 with the following components:

- A toolkit for hiring supervisors including behavioral interviewing questions that focus on the values of the organization;
- A targeted internship program;
- A training video for supervisors and managers to eliminate any potential biases in the selection process;
- Revision of the classification system to provide for broader classes more conducive to promotion.

Review of any major job classification changes with the Classification and Compensation division of Human Resources prior to production of each Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan to determine if any SOC updates are appropriate due to such issues as job evolution.

Provide support for a diverse workforce. Develop and initiate diversity and inclusion training and work with the Workforce Investment Board’s Construction and Skilled Trades subcommittee to assist in diversity recruiting.

Results during this mid-term: provided diversity and inclusion awareness training to the general assistance division of HHS; provided managers of the general assistance division- HHS with individualized training pods to address employee relations and other issues; taught equal employment principles in the Human Resources Management Academy; initiated a Leadership Management Academy Program at Dominican University which provides one entire session on diversity and inclusion principles and practices.

Conduct discussions between staffing personnel and hiring supervisors regarding workplace underutilization.

Continue to update the Personnel Management Regulations (PMRs);

Results during this mid-term: PMR21, which provides for an appeal process for discrimination complaints consistent with State regulations was recently updated;

Plan and implement future Career Development Day initiatives;

Continue the course on creating an inclusive workplace within the leadership development program;

Partner with the Community Development Agency (CDA) to deliver the staff diversity and inclusion training component of the Analysis of Impediments to fair housing.

Continue to support initiatives for persons with disabilities.
VII. PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

October is National Disability Employment Awareness Month. In 2012, the County engaged in a variety of activities to educate its employees and the public on disability employment issues and the role they play in fostering a disability-friendly work culture. These efforts included:

- Hosting “Access Marin” on October 4th, 2012, featuring guest speakers from Department of Rehabilitation, California Foundation for Independent Living, and Marin Center for Independent Living
- Exhibiting throughout the Marin County Civic Center a series of 22 museum quality posters portraying the history of the disability rights movement
- Dedicating October as National Disability Employment Awareness Month in Marin per proposed Board of Supervisors resolution

For more information, watch the video or visit the website.

VIII. IN SUMMARY - THE FUTURE: CONTINUING ON A SUCCESSFUL PATH

Since the implementation of the 2010 – 2015 Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan through the mid-term of December 31, 2012, the County has made great strides towards the goals of the Five Year Plan and its own commitment to diversity in the workplace. In addition to the Workforce Strategic Plan, an Employee Survey was completed that showed employees have an interest in career opportunities with the County. Career Development Day was supported by the Board of Supervisors, as indicated by funding for a second event in 2013. Career Ladders were updated and made available via the MINE. Staffing for executive recruitments was funded. The County also created a partnership with Dominican University to provide a custom leadership development program to Marin County employees, which includes 11 full-day sessions and a 360-degree feedback assessment for emerging leaders within the workforce. Three programs have been successfully completed, with a fourth one currently being planned. As noted above, diversity continues to increase in SOC job groups. For example, between July 2011 and January 2013, the Sheriff’s Office hired a total of 31 new employees, including 8 (25.8%) ethnic minorities and 12 (38.7%) females.

Statistically, the mid-term update shows continued growth in representation by ethnic minorities, a steady representation by females in the workforce, and improvement in some areas of underutilization as shown by comparison of incumbency to availability.

As stated in the Five Year Equal Employment Report and Plan, diversity is important in all aspects of life, especially within the workplace, and the benefits vary for each individual business entity. Benefits for the County of Marin are numerous. Diversity allows for variety within the Marin County talent base, ranging from the traditional differences like gender, ethnicity and disability, to the more modern recognized differences such as generation, work/life experience and education. A culture of inclusion and an environment of acceptance can decrease costs accrued from labor turnover and absenteeism, allowing for a more productive workforce. Diversity allows for the decrease in lawsuits, a boost in marketing prospects, recruitment, originality, and business image. It increases adaptability and allows for a flow of ideas from different viewpoints to surface, allowing for adaptation and growth around new systems and circumstances. An inclusive, diverse workforce allows for a diverse assortment of skills and experiences, allowing for more comprehensive problem solving, permitting the organization to reach customers on a more fundamental basis and provide exceptional service. Based on the successes shown in this mid-term update, it is expected that the next Five-Year Plan will show even more improvement in the diversity of the County workforce.
The County is at an important place in its forward movement in diversity and inclusion, with the prospect of upcoming retirements and the dedication of employees to County career opportunities allowing more opportunities to promote and hire females and minorities in the County workforce, achieving success in the equal employment arena, as well as in the Workforce Strategic Plan and in the interests indicated by the Employee Survey.
IX. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Data Findings from the Equal Employment Biennial Report 2009-2011

![Workforce by Gender Full-Time Regular Hire](image1)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Minority</th>
<th>Full-Time Workforce</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Amr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Transition from EEO-4 Categories to SOC Categories

The County of Marin has previously divided all of its job titles into the eight EEO-4 categories: Officials and Administrators, Professionals, Technicians, Protective Services, Para-Professionals, Office/Clerical, Skilled Crafts and Services/Maintenance. Based upon the recommendation of the Personnel Commission, the County of Marin began using the Standard Occupational Classification system (SOC), in the five-year report and plan. The Personnel Commission made this recommendation because it determined that the SOC is more widely used, is a better system for benchmarking job classes, and is recommended by the federal government. There has been a growing concern that there was not an alignment among existing systems. All federal government agencies and by other collectors and reporters of occupational information use the SOC.

According to the Department of Labor, the new SOC system covers all occupations in which work is performed for pay or profit (it excludes volunteers). This system better reflects the current occupational structure of the United States and has sufficient flexibility to assimilate new occupations. The occupations are classified on the basis of work performed, required skills, education, training or credentials. Supervisors of professional and technical workers usually have a background similar to the workers they supervise and are therefore classified with the workers they supervise. Likewise, team leaders, lead workers, and supervisors of production workers who spend at least 20 percent of their time performing work similar to the workers they supervise are classified with the workers they supervise.

New SOC Job Groups and Sample of Job Titles

The 19 major groups from the SOC used by Marin County are listed below including the associated numerical code along with examples of County job titles falling within that job group. These examples of job titles are illustrative only and do not represent an all inclusive or exhaustive list of job titles for each group. For purposes of comparing the incumbency to the labor market availability, some of the major groups below were further divided into subgroups as indicated below.

- **11-0000 Management occupations**
  - County Administrator; Building and Maintenance Manager; Deputy Director Public Works; Director of Information Services; Public Health Officer; Natural Resources Program Manager; Director/Deputy Director Cultural Services; District Attorney Administrator.

- **13-0000 Business and financial operations occupations**
  - Worker’s Compensation Analyst; Safety Officer; Employee Benefits Supervisor; Deputy Clerk to Board of Supervisors; Organization Development and Training Manager; Accountant I, II; Auditor Appraiser I, II; HHS Fiscal Supervisor.

- **15-0000 Computer and mathematical occupations**
  - Senior Program Analyst; Technology Systems Specialist I, II, III; Accounting Systems Coordinator; Network Analyst II; Supervising Technology Systems Specialist.

- **17-0000-A Architecture and engineering occupations-Professionals**
  - Assistant Engineer; Associate Architect; Associate Civil Engineer; Chief of Construction; Chief of Surveys; Geographic Information Systems Analyst II; Junior Engineer; Principal Civil Engineer; Senior Civil Engineer; Transportation Engineer.
17-0000-B Architecture and engineering occupations-Technicians
Cadastral Mapping Technician; Engineering Assistant; Engineering Technician III; Engineering Technician II; Supervising Cadastral Mapping Technician.

19-0000 Life, physical and social science occupations
Microbiologist I, II, III; Open Space Interpretive Naturalist; Volunteer Program Coordinator; Clinical Psychologist I, II; Park Planner; Affordable Housing Strategist; Disability Access Coordinator; Principal Transportation Planner; Laboratory Technician I, II; Park Planning Aide.

21-0000 Community and social services occupations
Child Welfare Worker I, II; Licensed Mental Health Practitioner; Social Service Worker I, II; Group Counselor I, II, III; Health Educator; Public Health Investigator; Deputy Probation Officer I, II, III, IV; Support Service Worker I, II.

23-0000-A Legal occupations-Professionals
Assistant Public Defender; Chief Deputy County Counsel; Chief Deputy District Attorney; Chief Deputy Public Defender; County Counsel; County Counsel III and IV; Deputy Child Support Attorney III; Deputy District Attorney II, III and IV; Deputy Public Defender II, III and IV.

23-0000-B Legal occupations-Legal Support Workers
Administrative Assistant to County Counsel; Child Support Officer II and II Bilingual; Consumer Services Coordinator; County Counsel Legal Research Assistant; Legal Assistant; Legal Process Specialist; Legal Research Assistant; Probate Specialist; Senior Child Support Officer; Supervising Child Support Officer; Victim Witness Program Supervisor; Victim Witness Advocate.

25-0000-A Education, training, and library occupations-Professionals
Electronic Services Librarian I and II; Librarian I; MariNet Systems Administrator; Senior Librarian.

25-0000-B Education, training, and library occupations-Technicians
Community Library Specialist; Library Desk Supervisor; Library Technical Assistant I and II; Supervising Library Technical Assistant.

29-0000-A Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations-Professionals
Detention Nurse Practitioner and Supervisor; Detention Registered Nurse; Food & Support Services Manager; Mental Health Nurse Practitioner; Mental Health Registered Nurse; Nutritionist; Physical Therapist; Public Health Nurse II; Staff Psychiatrist; Supervising Nurse Practitioner.

29-0000-B Healthcare practitioners and technical occupations-Technicians
Emergency Medical Services Specialist; Dental Hygienist; Medical Records Supervisor.

31-0000 Healthcare support occupations
Registered Dental Assistant; Medical Transcriber Typist.

33-0000-A Protective service occupations-Law Enforcement
Chief District Attorney Inspector; Chief Investigator Special Investigations Unit; Chief Public Defender Investigator; Deputy Sheriff; Deputy Sheriff Specialist; Deputy Sheriff Trainee; District Attorney Inspector; Jail Control Dispatcher; Parking Enforcement Officer II; Public Defender Investigator; Sheriff’s Lieutenant; Sheriff’s Sergeant; Supervising District Attorney Inspector; Welfare Fraud Investigator.

33-0000-B Protective service occupations—Fire
Fire Captain; Fire Emergency Medical Officer; Fire Engineer; Fire Engineer Paramedic; Fire Fighter I and II; Fire Fighter Paramedic I and II; Fire Marshal; Fire Operations Battalion Chief; Fire Training Officer; Senior Fire Captain.

35-0000 Food preparation and serving related occupations
Food Services Supervisor; Cook.

37-0000 Building and grounds cleaning and maintenance occupations
Custodian; Landscape Supervisor; Custodial Supervisor; Housekeeper; Landscape Services Worker I, II.

43-0000 Office and administrative support occupations
Senior Deputy County Clerk; Library Assistant II; Supervising Communications Dispatcher; Assistant Clerk to Board of Supervisors; Accounting Services Specialist; Assessment Recording Supervisor; Legal Process Supervisor; Supervising Elections Clerk; Collections Manager; Accounting Assistant; Purchaser I, II; Senior Building Permit Technician; Sheriff’s Service Technician; Eligibility Worker I, II; III; Library Branch Aide I, II; Equal Employment Specialist; Fire Dispatcher; Sheriff’s Property & Evidence Clerk; Shipping and Receiving Clerk; Administrative Secretary; Sheriff’s Secretary; Legal Secretary; Fair Assistant; Office Assistant I, II, III; Therapy Aide.

45-0000 Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations
Supervising Park Ranger; Supervising Agricultural Weights/Measures Inspector; Agriculture Program Assistant; Open Space Park Ranger.

47-0000 Construction and extraction occupations
Road Maintenance Supervisor; Road Maintenance Worker I, II; Maintenance Electrician; Code Enforcement Specialist; Building Inspector I, II.

49-0000 Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations
Assistant Garage Supervisor; Building Maintenance Supervisor; Building Maintenance Worker I, II, III; Installer; Communications Technician; Mechanic; Park Equipment Mechanic; Fire Heavy Equipment Mechanic.

51-0000 Production occupations
Supervising Reprographic Technician; Reprographic/Equipment Maintenance Technician; Stationary Engineer; Sign Fabricator.

53-0000 Transportation and material moving occupations
Airport Attendant; Airport Manager; Maintenance Equipment Operator.

Overview
Survey was designed with input from the Marin Women’s Commission and HR Staff

Two surveys:
One for females eligible for release time under the NOW Consent Decree
279 respondents of 571 recipients = 48% response rate

One for females not eligible for release time under the NOW Consent Decree
249 respondents of 463 recipients = 54% response rate

Eligibility based on EEO-4 codes

Eligible EEO-4 codes by name and number:
Technicians (30)
Protective Services (40)
Paraprofessionals (50)
Administrative Support (60)
Skilled Craft (70)

Non-eligible EEO-4 codes by name and number
Elected/Appointed (00)
Officials and Administrators (10)
Professionals (20)

Employees’ Knowledge of the NOW Consent Decree

Eligible Employees 77.6%
Non-Eligible Employees 62.5%

How employees became aware of consent decree

Eligible Employees
Following recent e-mail announcement 30.3%
At time of application for County job 11.3%
At new employee orientation 19.0%
From a co-worker 14.3%
From a supervisor 8.2%
Other 16.9%

Non-Eligible Employees
Following recent e-mail announcement 17.5%
At time of application for County job 12.2%
At new employee orientation 26.5%
From a co-worker 16.9%
From a supervisor 8.5%
Other 18.5%
Employees’ Knowledge of NOW Release Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Employees</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Eligible Employees</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Employees Became Aware of Release Time

Eligible Employees:
- Following recent e-mail: 32.1%
- When you were first hired: 11.5%
- During new employee orientation: 15.8%
- From a co-worker: 13.9%
- From a supervisor: 12.4%
- Other: 14.4%

Non-Eligible employees:
- Following recent e-mail: 21.8%
- When you were first hired: 17.0%
- During new employee orientation: 21.2%
- From a co-worker: 15.2%
- From a supervisor: 8.5%
- Other: 16.4%

Years of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 31</td>
<td>2.2% (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-31</td>
<td>4.7% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>12.4% (34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>12.8% (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-13</td>
<td>35.0% (96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7</td>
<td>28.1% (77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or less</td>
<td>4.7% (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Eligible Employees
- More than 31: 1.2% (3)
- 26-31: 2.8% (7)
- 20-25: 10.5% (26)
- 14-19: 16.6% (41)
- 8-13: 29.6% (73)
- 3-7: 36.2% (87)
- 2 or less: 4% (10)
Used Now Release Time

Eligible Employees 13.5% (275 responded)
Non-Eligible Employees 8% (249 responded)

Data Related to Use of NOW Release Time for Eligible Employees

Number of Calendar Years of Use
1 - 2 82.9% (29)
3-4 8.6% (3)
5-6 5.7% (2)
6-7 2.9% (1)
(241 respondents skipped question)

Approximate Amount Used in Any Calendar Year
1 – 5 hours 18.4% (7)
6 – 10 hours 21.1% (8)
11 – 15 hours 10.5% (4)
16-19 hours 7.9% (3)
20 hours 42.1% (16)
(240 respondents skipped question)

Total Amount of NOW Release Time Used during County Employment
None 71.1% (113)
1 – 20 hours 17.6% (28)
21 – 40 hours 4.4% (7)
41 – 60 hours 2.5% (4)
61 – 80 hours 0.6% (1)
81 – 100 hours 0.0%
Other 3.8%
(123 respondents skipped question)

Denied Use of NOW Release Time
Yes 5.4% (12)
No 94.6% (211)

Given a Reason for Denial
Yes 27.8% (10)
No 72.2% (26)
(240 respondents skipped question)

Reason for Denial
No Reason Given 5.0% (1)
Workload Issues 20.0% (4)
Supervisor not Familiar with Consent Decree 5.0% (1)
Other 70.0% (14)
Examples: class not during work hours, choice of class not approved, no funding for reimbursement
Use of Training during NOW Release Time Assisted with Advancement within Eligible Job Classes

| Yes | 51.2% (21) |
| No | 48.8% (20) |

(235 respondents skipped question)

Eligible Employee who responded felt it did not assist with advancement because

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were no openings</td>
<td>19.3% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else hired or promoted</td>
<td>32.2% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training not applicable to position</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32.2% (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:  
- Opportunity for promotion difficult due to economic situation & layoffs  
- Training increased my skill level but not considered when promotion was available

(For non-eligible employees, 42.2% or 14 respondents felt this training assisted with advancement and 57.6% or 19 respondents did not. 219 respondents skipped question)

Overall, results showed that of the respondents approximately 50% felt that NOW release time assisted with advancement, but only 74 respondents in total responded to the question.

THEMES

The following themes were extracted from both surveys in response to the question “If you could offer one suggestion to make the County a better place for women to work, what would it be?”

- WORK/LIFE BALANCE
- MENTORING
- TRAINING
- FAIRNESS/EQUALITY
- ATTITUDES/BIASES
- BUDGET
Appendix D: Summary of Evaluations – Career Development Day 2013

Total Attendance: 109 Regular-Hire Employees  
Evaluation Participants: 63 – 58% response rate

Most questions were rated on a 1-4 likert scale. See questions and ranking below.

1. Which Session(s) of Career Development Day did you attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I attended all sessions</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome and Keynote</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel: Employee Success Stories</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Forum</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness: Building Resiliency</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing Skills / Resume &amp; Application Writing</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Overall, did Career Development Day achieve its stated goal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: 23% of respondents included a comment. They noted that sessions were uplifting and informative, and claimed they learned a lot about other Departments, and how they look at advancement. Some respondents commented that they felt a sense of community and commitment, and Career Development Day helped define where they would like to take their career at this point. Though this session scored fairly high, some respondents felt as though there is limited space for advancement in their current field/Department. Some stated their frustration of having many years dedicated to the County, but little to no lateral movement.
3. **Overall, did Career Development Day meet your expectations?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: 28% of respondents responded with a comment. Respondents found the day to be very helpful, and that each session had a valuable message. Some participants noted that they were confused about the agenda of the day, mainly that they were unclear what was being covered at each session. There was also mention that sessions didn’t go deep enough into the material.

4. **Will the keynote Inside Job: Three Secrets to Real Career Security be likely to assist you in advancing in your career with the County?**

1 = Not Likely , 2 = Somewhat Likely , 3 = Very Likely , 4 = Extremely Likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: No responses collected.

5. **Will the Employees’ Success Stories panel be likely to assist you in developing career wisdom and sharpening your upward mobility skills?**

1 = Not Likely , 2 = Somewhat Likely , 3 = Very Likely , 4 = Extremely Likely , 5 = N/A - did not attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: No responses collected.

6. **Did you meet one-on-one with a career coach?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: No responses collected.
7. If you met with a career coach, do you think the experience will be helpful in your career advancement with the County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - Did Not Attend</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** 42% of respondents responded with a comment. Generally, those who received career coaching found the experience helpful and meaningful. Some commented that additional one-on-one time would be extremely helpful (versus 20mins). Common themes included raving reviews of the coaches.

8. If you visited with the exhibitors, did they provide useful information about resources available to you?

1 = Not useful, 2 = Somewhat useful, 3 = Very useful, 4 = Extremely useful, 5 = N/A - did not visit booths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** No responses collected.

9. Did the Interviewing Skills / Resume and Application Writing session provide you with tools and insights helpful to you in applying and interviewing for County jobs?

1 = Not helpful, 2 = Somewhat helpful, 3 = Very helpful, 4 = Extremely helpful, 5 = N/A - did not attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** No responses collected.
10. How helpful was the Wellness session to you in learning to build resiliency?

1 = Not helpful, 2 = Somewhat helpful, 3 = Very helpful, 4 = Extremely helpful, 5 = N/A - did not attend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Rating Score*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** 19% of respondents responded with a comment. Participants noted the session gave them a renewed perspective and outlook on how to perform their job better, and feel encouraged to take care of themselves and their own needs. Though this session scored highly, some participants mentioned the information was good, participants noted sessions with focus on smaller groups and opportunities for personalized interaction would be more meaningful.

11. Did the representatives at the Departmental Forum provide information that would be helpful should you want to apply for a position in their department?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A - did not attend</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** No responses collected.

12. If Career Development Day was offered again, would you attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Responses:** 31% of respondents responded with a comment. Participants generally found CDD to be a positive, enriching, and uplifting experience. Some respondents commented that the workshops would be meaningful for those who opted out of the training. A common theme among responses was that CDD was meaningful and would be of value if made a requirement for all County employees.
13. If Career Development day was offered again, would you recommend to your colleagues to attend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Response Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Summary of Responses**: 23% of respondents responded with a comment. Respondents noted that the experience was eye-opening and thought provoking, and that it would be worthwhile training for all County employees. The common theme upon responses was that CDD would be highly recommended to colleagues – it was a hit!

14. What will be different for you as a result of your participation in Career Development Day?

- **Summary of Responses**: 100% of respondents responded with a comment. There was a consensus that respondents felt called to take action and control over their careers. They were provided tools that encouraged self-reflection; received confirmation that they can proactively seek advancement through other departments. Common themes included emphasis on communication, being a team player, goal setting, and exploring the job latter.

15. What was the single most important thing that you experienced as a part of Career Development Day?

- **Summary of Responses**: 100% of respondents responded with a comment. Respondents indicated various levels of increased communication between colleagues. They related most to the keynote presentations, departmental forum, career coaching, and the panel discussions. There was a general sense of unity, respect, and thankfulness. A common theme was personal accountability, a sense of unity, and emphasis on cross-departmental communication.