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## Executive Summary

In 2019, women made up $32 \%$ of the City of San Diego's ${ }^{1}$ workforce and, on average, their total pay was $17.6 \%$ less than men's. People of color $^{2}$ made up $55 \%$ of the City's workforce and, on average, their total pay was $20.8 \%$ less than Whites'. These findings do not provide direct evidence of deliberate gender or racial bias in the City. Instead, our analysis concludes that the pay gaps are primarily a result of disparities between the groups caused by underlying societal factors. In 2019, almost 90\% of the City's gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps can be explained by group disparities in: occupation, the effect of children, overtime, and demographics ${ }^{3}$.

2019 Citywide Total Pay Gap - Source Breakdown Estimates


*On average, people of color took more overtime than whites, reducing the overall pay gap.

The societal factors that lead to these observed group disparities are largely not in the City's control; however, by conducting this study, the City of San Diego is taking an important step towards identifying what perpetuates the disparities, and thus, the pay gap among their employees. To our knowledge, this is the most scientifically robust and thorough internal pay equity study any municipality in the United States has conducted to date. The City of San Diego is setting the standard for what it means for a municipality to do one's part in addressing this worldwide issue.

This report seeks to identify the issues behind the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps among City of San Diego employees and provide actionable recommendations to mitigate these issues. At first glance, the solutions to the issues we identify seem obvious (e.g., hire more women and people of color, increase their pay, provide daycare, etc.); however, we believe that these generalized solutions can make the problem feel unsolvable and result in no progress (especially when facing budgetary constraints resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic). Therefore, we attempted to make our recommendations targeted, costefficient, and simple in order to facilitate taking action towards solving this complex issue.

## Finding \#1-Occupational Sorting Accounts for Most of the Citywide Pay Gap

Occupational sorting refers to divergent career paths between groups due to personal choices, societal forces, differing barriers to entry, or a combination of these. Within the City, men and Whites are overrepresented in higher paying career paths, while women and people of color are over-represented in lower

[^0]paying career paths. This sorting accounts for approximately $67 \%{ }^{4}$ of the gender pay gap and $82 \%$ of the racial-and-ethnic pay gap (total pay ${ }^{5}$ ).

To study this effect within the City, we created groupings of jobs that required similar skills, required similar education, or were on similar career paths within the City (see appendix for details). There are three elements that significantly increase the impact a given job type has on the overall pay gap.

1. Gender/Racial Imbalance - job types that had a high proportion of one gender/race.
2. High or Low Average Total Pay - total pay significantly different from the City's average.
3. Proportion of City's Workforce - number of employees in the job type as a proportion of all City employees.

Out of the 75 job types identified, three emerged as having the biggest impact on each pay gap due to their occupational sorting: Police Officers, Fire Fighters, and Administrative Support.

City Job Types with Largest Contributions to Pay Gaps Due to Occupational Sorting

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees $^{\text {a }}$ | \% Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Citywide | $\mathbf{9 3 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{3 2 . 3} \%$ | $\mathbf{5 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 , 2 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 , 8 2 8}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 9 , 0 3 0}$ |
| Police Officer | $1823(19.5 \%)$ | $16.5 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ | $\$ 109,853$ | $\$ 14,301$ | $\$ 124,154$ |
| Fire Fighter | $749(8 \%)$ | $4 \%$ | $33.4 \%$ | $\$ 78,576$ | $\$ 50,703$ | $\$ 129,280$ |
| Administrative | $1061(11.4 \%)$ | $83 \%$ | $74.9 \%$ | $\$ 55,583$ | $\$ 1,135$ | $\$ 56,718$ |
| Support |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a2019 full-time, $3 / 4$ time, or $1 / 2$ time employees who were employed for at least half the year and met our other study criteria (see appendix). All pay was prorated for employees working less than full-time and/or all year.

These three roles account for almost 40\% of the City's employees. This large proportion of the City's employees, when combined with these job types' gender and racial imbalances and their above/below average pay, explain their strong effect on the citywide ${ }^{6}$ pay gap. The magnitude of this effect is such that if the gender and race imbalances in these three roles were eliminated, the City's gender pay gap would disappear, and the racial-and-ethnic pay gap would be almost cut in half; therefore, we took a detailed look at each job type to identify specific issues that could be reasonably addressed.

## Police Officers

Analyzing police recruit applicants from January 2016 to January 2019, we found that men were 2.3 times more likely to be considered qualified than women, despite those same women being 1.2 times more likely to have a college degree. Police recruits directly feed into the Police Officer 1 and Police Officer 2 roles, so anything that disproportionately filters women from potentially becoming police officers at this early stage will undoubtedly reduce diversity in the department and increase the citywide pay gap.

## Firefighters

All fire stations in the city must be constantly staffed, so fewer firefighters results in more overtime. Consequently, the average City firefighter had over 1000 overtime hours in 2019. We estimate that if the

[^1]City had somehow eliminated overtime for firefighters, the gender pay gap would have decreased by over 25\%.

Completely removing overtime for firefighters is unrealistic; however, one remedy that can reduce the department's overtime usage is to recruit additional firefighters. The Assistant Fire Chiefs with whom we met expressed two main barriers to recruitment: 1) the San Diego Fire Department pays significantly less than other departments in the area, and 2) only one staff member in the department is dedicated to recruitment. While we did not independently verify that they only have one staff member for recruiting, a few internet searches made it clear that the pay for City of San Diego firefighters is not on par with nearby metropolitan areas.

Firefighter's Starting Salary - San Diego and Nearby Municipalities

| Role | City of San <br> Diego | Orange County <br> Fire Authority | Los Angeles |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Recruit | $\$ 32,947$ | $\$ 63,107$ | $\$ 71,284$ |
| Fire Fighter 1 | $\$ 41,787$ | $\$ 71,402$ | $\$ 71,284$ |

## Administrative Support

Administrative Support roles are one of the lower paying job types in the City, with a total pay $36 \%$ below the City's average. In 2019, $83 \%$ of these positions were held by women. We examined application data for two of the larger roles within this job type: Clerical Assistant 2 and Administrative Aide 1. This data revealed three factors that are contributing to the occupational sorting of women into these roles:

1. Women were more likely to apply than men - 80\% of Clerical Assistant 2 and $71 \%$ of Administrative Aide 1 applicants were women.
2. Women had more experience than men - Women in the Clerical Assistant 2 role were 1.3 times more likely than men to have at least five years of experience. That likelihood was 1.5 times for women in the Administrative Aide 1 role.
3. Women were more likely to have heard about the job opening from an employee referral - Women in the Clerical Assistant 2 role were 1.4 times more likely to have heard about the open position from a City of San Diego employee. That likelihood was 1.3 times for women in the Administrative Aide 1 role.

## Recommended Actions

1. Police Officers - Systematically track pass/fail rates and reasons for failure at each stage of the police recruiting process (including the academy) by gender, race, and ethnicity; make that data available to the City.
2. Fire Fighters - Enable the fire department to be less reliant on overtime:
a. Reduce the difference between City firefighter pay and that of other fire departments.
b. Ensure the fire department has the resources it needs for recruitment.
3. Citywide - Evaluate whether changes to things like job names (e.g., "Office Specialist" instead of "Administrative Aide"), job descriptions, job posting locations, or recruiting locations could reduce the likelihood of women and people of color self-selecting lower paying positions to apply for, and men and Whites self-selecting higher paying positions to apply for.

## Finding \#2 - There is a "Parenthood Penalty" for Women and People of Color

Whether or not an employee had children impacted the pay of each group differently. We refer to this effect as the "Parenthood Penalty." When analyzing regular, non-overtime pay in 2019, we found that White men experienced no fatherhood penalty; however, men of color experienced a $3 \%$ fatherhood penalty. When looking at mothers in the City, we found that both white women and women of color had a motherhood penalty that was larger than the fatherhood penalty for men of color; however, the motherhood penalty was much larger for women of color ( $7.4 \%$ compared with $4.7 \%$ for White women).

Parenthood Effect on Expected Non-Overtime Pay - Citywide

> *Expected pay is adjusted to control for differences in age, gender, tenure, and job type

It is important to note that the differences in pay reported above do not account for differences between the groups in overtime utilization. As shown in our third finding, women generally work less overtime than men, and the differences in overtime are even larger when comparing mothers and fathers.

## Recommended Actions

While anything the City does to diminish the parenthood penalty for mothers and parents of color will decrease the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps, we recommend that the City start this process with the following action:

1. Evaluate options and costs for employee benefits that would directly target the work-life balance needs of mothers and parents of color.

## Finding \#3 - Men Work More Overtime Than Women

Independent of differences in job, tenure, and parenthood status, the average female employee in 2019 worked 48 fewer overtime hours ${ }^{7}$ than the average male employee, contributing approximately $5 \%$ of the 2019 gender pay gap. Conversely, the average employee of color in 2019 worked 22 more overtime hours than the average White employee (after controlling, for job, tenure, gender, and parenthood status), which reduced the racial-and-ethnic pay gap by approximately $2 \%$.

As one might expect, the observed differences in overtime between men and women were more prominent in jobs that utilized more overtime. For example, the average female firefighter worked approximately 272 fewer overtime hours in 2019 than the average male firefighter.

The citywide gender difference in overtime hours exists between non-parents and is even higher between mothers and fathers. After controlling for tenure and job, the average female employee without children in 2019 worked about 21 fewer hours of overtime compared to the average male employee without children. For families of one or two children, mothers worked about 61 fewer hours of overtime than fathers. Mothers and fathers of three or more children saw a difference of about 154 overtime hours between them.

Parenthood Effect on Expected Yearly Overtime Hours

*Expected overtime hours is adjusted to control for differences in tenure and job type

## Recommended Actions

## Fire Department

1. Systematically track and monitor department overtime by gender, race, and ethnicity, and source (i.e., voluntary, mandatory, or wildland fire).
2. Use that data to investigate if female firefighters are volunteering for overtime at lower rates than men and, if so, why.

## All City Departments

1. Conduct further evaluation of reasons why women work less overtime than men:
a. Ensure that methods for distributing overtime within jobs and departments across the City are not unintentionally biased.
b. Evaluate why women might be volunteering for less overtime than men.
2. Evaluate if and how overtime is valued when promoting employees.
[^2]
## Finding \#4 - Twelve Percent of Each Pay Gap Remains Unexplained

Twelve percent of both the gender total pay gap and racial-and-ethnic total pay gap remains unexplained. The unexplained part of the pay gap represents differences in pay between groups resulting from something that is either unmeasured or unmeasurable. Typically, in the research community, this part of the pay gap is attributed to discrimination; however, the City of San Diego does not systematically collect data on things like employees' level of education or performance review results. We know these things are measurable and have an impact on pay, yet we do not know how much of the pay gap can be attributed to them. This makes it harder to identify solutions to most effectively close the pay gap.

## Recommended Actions

1. Systematically collect data on all employees' level of education.
2. Systematically collect other data on all employees that can help describe differences in pay (e.g., performance reviews, bilingual pay bonuses, other lump sum pay sources, etc.).
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## Introduction

The issue of pay equity across genders and across racial and ethnic groups is well-documented nationwide. As representation of women and people of color continues to grow in the workforce, it is vital to analyze trends within the City's own personnel and ensure that the City's practices reflect fairness and equality between representative groups and across job titles. The national pay gap that persists between both men and women and Whites and people of color perpetuates difficulties for minority groups to break down societal barriers to success. Based on the current national gender wage gap, women will earn over $\$ 400,000$ less than men over a 40-year career ("The Wage Gap: The Who, How, Why, and What to Do" 2020). This results in key differences in ability to participate in the economy, such as less spending power, lower ability to invest, and reduced ability to pay back loans which could impact other decisions such as higher-level education and/or home purchasing.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor's 2019 data ("US Census Bureau Personal Income: PINC-05" 2020), women's average earnings was $23.1 \%$ less than their male counterparts across the country. In 2019, the City of San Diego's unadjusted ${ }^{8}$ average pay gap was lower than the national gap. Women employed by the City earned $17.6 \%$ less than men and people of color earned $20.8 \%$ less than their White counterparts in regular pay. The existence of a pay gap does not provide direct evidence of a deliberate gender or racial bias. The pay gap is highly attributable to underlying social structures that give rise to different occupational barriers between groups, resulting in different pay. While these underlying social factors are not entirely within the City's control, there are steps the City can take to identify and mitigate some of the barriers that perpetuate the pay gap. By conducting this study, the City of San Diego is on the forefront of addressing pay inequity across the nation. To our knowledge, this is the most scientifically robust and thorough pay equity study any municipality in the United States has conducted to date. The City of San Diego is setting the standard for what it means to do one's part in addressing this worldwide issue.

## How the City of San Diego Compares

There are a number of ways other municipalities and reports calculate the pay gap ${ }^{9}$. The most common method is an unadjusted comparison of median (mid-point) salaries for men and women. Using this metric, Table 1 below ${ }^{10}$ shows the 2018 gender wage gap of 10 of the largest metropolitan areas across the country ("The Pay Gap in 25 Major US Cities" 2020). The gender pay gap compares the median annual earnings of men and women working full time, year-round in the metropolitan areas, but not specifically as city employees.

Table 1: Comparison of Top Metropolitan Area Pay Gaps

| City | 2018 <br> Gender Pay <br> Gap |
| :--- | :---: |
| Chicago, IL | $22 \%$ |
| Houston, TX | $18 \%$ |
| Philadelphia, PA | $17 \%$ |
| San Francisco, CA | $17 \%$ |

[^3]| City | 2018 <br> Gender Pay <br> Gap |
| :--- | :---: |
| Phoenix, AZ | $16 \%$ |
| City of San Diego Employees | $15.7 \%$ |
| New York City, NY | $15 \%$ |
| Dallas-Fort Worth, TX | $14 \%$ |
| Washington DC | $14 \%$ |
| San Diego, CA | $12 \%$ |
| Los Angeles, CA | $9 \%$ |

Although there are not many reports that detail the pay gap within local government employees, Table 2 compares reports ${ }^{11}$ that use a similar methodology to the analysis in this report. The Comparison Method column denotes whether the report is using average or median values and total or regular pay.

Table 2: Municipality Report Comparison

| Comparison Method | Municipality Report | Year | Gender Pay Gap | City of San Diego Comparable Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average, regular pay | State of Minnesota | 2014 | 11\% | 8.4\% |
|  | U.S. Federal Employees | 2018 | 7\% |  |
| Average, total pay | Los Angeles | 2019 | 24\% | 17.8\% |
| Median, regular pay | State of Oregon | 2015 | 17\% | 7.9\% |
|  | City of Spokane | 2014 | 15\% |  |
|  | City of Cambridge | 2015 | 5.7\% |  |
| Median, total pay | State of California | 2019 | 20.5\% | 15.7\% |

Simple, unadjusted pay comparisons are valuable. However, including controls for key differences such as job type, years of experience, number of children, etc. can lead to a more precise comparison for the pay gap across genders and across racial and ethnic groups. This study breaks down the pay gap using the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition method (Oaxaca 1973; Blinder 1973) ${ }^{12}$. By doing so, we found that almost $90 \%$ of the City's gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps can be explained by group disparities in: occupation, the effect of children, overtime, and demographics. With a targeted analysis of each effect, the City is empowered to more effectively direct efforts to minimize the pay gap.

[^4]
## The Gender Pay Gap

In this study we differentiate between total pay, regular pay, and base pay, as defined below.
Total pay: All pay an employee received including overtime. This is the Box 5 pay on the employees W-2.
Regular pay: All pay an employee received including add-on pay, but excluding overtime.
Base pay: Pay before adding any lump sum, overtime, or other pay.

## 2011-2019 Citywide Gender Pay Gap By Year



Figure 1: 2011-2019 Citywide Gender Pay Gap by Year
The pay gap attributed to regular pay is significantly smaller than the total pay gap, and has steadily declined since 2011. The total pay gap is much larger because a higher proportion of the City's total overtime compensation ( $\$ 64 \mathrm{M}$ total in 2019) goes to men as opposed to women. Police and Fire are two of the largest job types in the City, accounting for 28\% of City employees and $70 \%$ of the total overtime the City paid in 2019. These two departments also have a very large gender imbalance (just 16.5\% and 4\% women, respectively), which means the increased average total pay due to overtime had a substantial impact on the pay gap.

An analysis of the decrease in the pay gap over time is outside of the scope of this study. However, it is highly recommended as an area of future research to understand if/how past policies have impacted the pay gap.

The gender pay gap was broken down into five categories to isolate the most impactful differences that drive the pay gap between men and women. Figure 2 shows the magnitude of impact for each category. This breakdown allowed us to thoroughly analyze causes of the pay gap and identify ways for the City to begin addressing these issues. Each category will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

Gender Pay Gap Source Breakdown


Figure 2: 2019 Citywide Gender Total Pay Gap Source Estimates

## Pay Gap Cause \#1-Occupational Sorting

Occupational sorting refers to differences between career paths for men and women most often based on personal choice, societal forces, differing barriers to entry, or a combination of these. There are three elements that significantly increase the impact a given job type has on the overall pay gap.

1. Gender imbalance: job types that had a high proportion of one gender.
2. Average total pay: total pay significantly different from the city's average.
3. Proportion of City's workforce: Number of employees in the job type as a proportion of all City employees.

Two careers that had a particularly high impact on the pay gap in the City are Police Officers and Firefighters. Police Officers were $83.5 \%$ male, had an average total pay $39 \%$ higher than the City average, and $19.5 \%$ of City employees are in this job type. Firefighters were $96 \%$ male, had average total pay $45 \%$ higher than the City average, and $8 \%$ of City employees are in this job type. The City of San Diego's level of diversity in these roles is similar to that of the national average. However, concerted efforts in improving diversity at these positions and/or adjusting pay structures (e.g., high usage of overtime) has the greatest potential for reducing the pay gap.

For the purposes of this study, all City jobs were placed into groups of job types. The jobs in each job type grouping all required similar skills/education and/or were along a similar career paths within the City ${ }^{13}$.

In Figure 3, roles with many employees (larger circles) near the bottom-left and top-right corners have the largest effect on increasing the citywide pay gap. Roles in the top-right quadrant are high paying and have disproportionately high numbers of men. Roles in the bottom-left quadrant are low paying and have disproportionately high numbers of women.

[^5]Gender Occupational Sorting - Avg Pay vs Gender Proportion by Job Type


Figure 3: Pay vs Gender Proportions by Job Type
Table 3: Gender Diversity by Occupation - City of San Diego vs Nationwide

US Nationwide (2019 Bureau of Labor Statistics)

| Occupation | \% Women |
| :--- | :---: |
| Police and sheriff's patrol officers | $17.6 \%$ |
| Office and administrative support occupations | $70.9 \%$ |
| Firefighters | $3.3 \%$ |
| Civil engineers | $13.9 \%$ |
| Grounds maintenance workers | $6.3 \%$ |
| Librarians | $79.9 \%$ |
| Lawyers | $36.4 \%$ |
| Construction and extraction occupations | $3.5 \%$ |
| Biological scientists, chemists, and materials scientists | $45.2 \%$ |
| Refuse and recyclable material collectors | $7.6 \%$ |

City of San Diego (2019)

| City Job Type | \% Women |
| :--- | :---: |
| Police Officer | $16.5 \%$ |
| Administrative Support | $83 \%$ |
| Fire Fighter | $4 \%$ |
| Engineer - Civil | $29.2 \%$ |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | $13.4 \%$ |
| Librarian | $69.7 \%$ |
| City Attorney | $60 \%$ |
| Building Trades and Facilities Maint | $4.6 \%$ |
| Chemist/Biologist | $51.7 \%$ |
| Refuse Collection | $4.1 \%$ |

## Top Job Types

Table 4: Job Types With The Most Employees

| Job Type | \# Emps <br> in Study | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Avg } \\ \text { Total Pay } \end{array}$ | Top 2 Depts | Top 2 Jobs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer | 1,823 | 16.5\% | 40.6\% | \$124,154 | Police (100\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Police Officer } 2 \text { ( } 51 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Police Sergeant } \\ & (15 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Administrative Support | 1,061 | 83\% | 74.9\% | \$56,718 | Public Util-Admin Svcs (16\%) Police (13\%) | Asoc Mgmt Anlyst (10\%) Administrative Aide 2 (9\%) |
| Fire Fighter | 749 | 4\% | 33.4\% | \$129,280 | SDFD - Suppression (94\%) SDFD - Fire Rescue (6\%) | Fire Fighter 2 (37\%) Fire Captain (26\%) |
| Engineer - Civil | 660 | 29.2\% | 54.1\% | \$93,555 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eng \& Capital Proj (54\%) } \\ & \text { Development SVCS (14\% } \end{aligned}$ | Asst Eng-Civil (35\%) Asoc Eng-Civil (30\%) |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | 440 | 13.4\% | 80.9\% | \$47,703 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (48\%) } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Community Pks (18\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 (56\%) Grounds Maint Mgr (6\%) |
| Librarian | 333 | 69.7\% | 57.1\% | \$62,025 | Library (100\%) | Library Assistant $2(33 \%)$ Library Assistant $3(20 \%)$ |

See the appendix for full details on all the job types.

## Police Officers

In 2019, there were 1823 standard-hour ${ }^{14}$ police officers: 1522 ( $83.5 \%$ ) were men and 301 (16.5\%) were women. The occupational sorting of mostly men into the police officer role had a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 35,125$ above the citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the ratio of men to women among City police officers equaled the citywide average, the total pay gap would have decreased by $30.8 \%$ ( $\$ 5,114$ ).

The extent of police officers' contribution to the citywide pay gap was due to the role's reliance on overtime. The average City police officer had approximately 222 overtime hours in 2019. We estimate that if the police force had somehow eliminated overtime (while maintaining its existing ratio of men to women) the citywide total pay gap would have decreased by $6.7 \%(\$ 1,106)^{15}$.

## Table 5: Police Officer Role vs Citywide

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Officer | 1823 | $16.5 \%$ | $\$ 109,853$ | $\$ 14,301$ | $\$ 124,154$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $32.3 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $19.5 \%$ | $-15.8 \%$ | $+\$ 30,651$ | $+\$ 4,473$ | $+\$ 35,125$ |

Table 6: Jobs in Study's 'Police Officer' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | \% Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Officer 2 | 931 | $14 \%$ | $\$ 107,068$ | $\$ 16,558$ | $\$ 123,626$ |
| Police Sergeant | 270 | $12.2 \%$ | $\$ 138,813$ | $\$ 17,010$ | $\$ 155,824$ |

[^6]|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | $\%$ Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Detective | 237 | $28.3 \%$ | $\$ 115,352$ | $\$ 15,230$ | $\$ 130,581$ |
| Police Officer 1 | 217 | $20.3 \%$ | $\$ 72,657$ | $\$ 9,445$ | $\$ 82,102$ |
| Police Recruit | 82 | $17.1 \%$ | $\$ 62,326$ | $\$ 783$ | $\$ 63,109$ |
| Police Lieutenant | 51 | $15.7 \%$ | $\$ 169,399$ | $\$ 212$ | $\$ 169,610$ |
| Police Captain | 18 | $16.7 \%$ | $\$ 197,411$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 197,411$ |
| Police Officer 3 | 11 | $9.1 \%$ | $\$ 123,330$ | $\$ 29,933$ | $\$ 153,263$ |
| Asst Police Chief | 5 | $20 \%$ | $\$ 217,016$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 217,016$ |
| Police Chief | 1 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 252,026$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 252,026$ |

Police Officer Job Type - Career Progression


Figure 4: Police Officer Job Progression

## Recruitment

We examined recruitment data ${ }^{16}$ to understand if women want to take Police Officer and Firefighter positions (i.e., are applying) but are being filtered out at any specific points in the recruitment process. For both Police Officers and Firefighters the physical demands of the job are often stated as a strong reason for the lack of women in these careers. Ability to meet job requirements and maintain public and personal safety are of the utmost importance in these roles. Further analysis of the physical abilities and written tests may reveal certain aspects that can be altered to maintain rigor and screen for physical ability but allow women to improve their performance.

## Police Recruit

Men were 2.3 times more likely than women to be considered qualified for this position (M: 19.1\%, W: $8.3 \%$; $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). However, once they were considered qualified, women were 2 times more likely to be hired (W: 25.8\%, M: 12.9\%; $p=0.002$ ). The net effect was no significant difference between the gender proportions in the applicants compared to the hired candidates, however it is important to understand why

[^7]women are much less likely to apply to this position and why women who do apply are being filtered out of the qualified applicant pool.


Figure 5: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Recruit
The application process for Police Officers includes an application, a written test, and a physical test; at this time, we were only able to examine the application to analyze differences between men and women's responses. Further analysis on the pass rates and performance on the physical abilities test would provide additional context and information about the differences we are seeing in the likelihood of women to be qualified.

## Education Requirement

Applicants must meet the education requirement using one of the following: graduation from high school, passing the General Education Development (G.E.D.) test/California High School Proficiency Examination, or possession of a two-year, four-year or advanced degree from an accredited college or university. Figure 6 shows the proportion of applicants who met this requirement with a college degree.


Figure 6: Applicants with College Education - Police Recruit
Overall, women were 1.2 times more likely to meet the education requirement with a college degree (W: $33.7 \%$, M : $28.9 \%$; $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). This difference is amplified in the qualified applicant pool, where women were 1.3 times more likely to have a college education than men (W: $55 \%, \mathrm{M}: 41.8 \% ; p=0.006$ ). This may contribute to the increased likelihood of women being hired once they were considered qualified, i.e., while it was harder for women to make it to the qualified stage, once they did, their higher levels of education compared to men increased their chances of being hired.

## Police Officer 1

Men were 1.3 times more likely than women to be considered qualified ( $\mathrm{M}: 21.7 \%, \mathrm{~W}: 16.6 \% ; \mathrm{p}=0.045$ ). The difference in rates of qualified men and women being hired was not statistically significant.


Figure 7: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Officer 1

## Education Requirement

Applicants must meet the education requirement using one of the following: graduation from high school, passing the General Education Development (G.E.D.) test/California High School Proficiency Examination, or possession of a two-year, four-year or advanced degree from an accredited college or university. Figure 8 shows the proportion of applicants who met this requirement with a college degree.


Figure 8: Applicants with College Education - Police Officer 1
Similar to the Police Recruits, in the total applicant pool for Police Officer 1, women were 1.4 times more likely than men to meet the education requirement with a college degree (W: 40.7\%, M: 29.5\%; $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). The differences in education level between gender grow even more in the qualified applicant pool, with women being 1.7 times more likely to have had a college education (W: $62.7 \%, \mathrm{M}: 37.2 \% ; \mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). This could be a contributing factor to women being more likely to be hired once they were qualified. Further analysis of complete application data and hiring qualifications could reveal additional confounding variables.

## Police Officer 2

Men were 2.8 times more likely than women to be considered qualified ( $M: 14.7 \%, W: 5.3 \% ; p=0.042$ ).


Figure 9: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Officer 2
There were significant differences in the responses between men and women for two questions we were able to analyze: 1) how they met the minimum college level education requirement and 2) did they have previous experience as a sworn peace officer.

## Education Requirement

Applicants were asked to separately indicate how they met the high school graduation requirement and how they met the minimum college level education requirement. There were no significant differences in the high school graduation requirement. The options for the college level education requirement were completion of a minimum of 30 semester/45 quarter college-level units, possession of a two or four-year degree, substitution of additional qualifying experience, or none of the above.


Figure 10: Applicants Meeting the Minimum College Level Education Requirement - Police Officer 2
Overall, women were 1.4 times more likely than men to meet the college education requirement with a college degree (W: $57 \%$, $\mathrm{M}: 40.8 \%$; $p=0.003$ ), while men were 2.3 times more likely than women to meet the college education requirement with qualifying experience (M: 16.1\%, W: 7\%; $p=0.018$ ). Years spent gaining experience as an officer instead of going to college may contribute to the differences in qualification rates between women and men; further analysis of the qualification criteria and additional data from the application questions should be analyzed to support this hypothesis.

Previous Experience
Applicants were asked if they had full-time paid experience as a sworn peace officer within the last year and if so, how many years of experience did they have. In the total applicant pool, men were 1.4 times more likely than women to have had previous experience as a peace officer ( $\mathrm{M}: 60.2 \%, \mathrm{~W}: 44 \% ; \mathrm{p}=0.003$ ). All qualified and hired applicants (men and women) had previous experience and there were no significant differences in the years of experience between genders at any recruiting stage.

As noted by Personnel, previous experience is a firm requirement for the Police Officer 2 position and the majority of applicants come from the internal hiring pool stemming from the Police Recruits who were promoted to Police Officer 1. However, the proportion of men and women who applied for this position and answered "No" to this question was unexpectedly high ( $40 \%$ of men and $56 \%$ of women). So, there is a possibility that this question is being misinterpreted by some applicants and causing the automated system to filter them out of the qualified pool. Additional analysis is recommended to understand the impact of this question and whether many applicants are applying without experience or if the question would benefit from being rewritten.

| Men (270/464) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Women (40/94) | $43 \%$ |

Figure 11: Applicants with Previous Experience - Police Officer 2

## Administrative Support

In 2019, there were 1061 standard-hour employees in the Administrative Support role: 180 (17\%) were men and 881 ( $83 \%$ ) were women. The occupational sorting of mostly women into the Administrative Support role had a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 32,312$ below the
citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the Administrative Support role's pay or ratio of men to women equaled the citywide average(s), the total pay gap would have decreased by $55.1 \%$ ( $\$ 9,162$ ).

Table 7: Administrative Support Role vs Citywide

|  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Administrative Support | 1061 | $83 \%$ | $\$ 55,583$ | $\$ 1,135$ | $\$ 56,718$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $32.3 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $11.4 \%$ | $+50.7 \%$ | $-\$ 23,618$ | $-\$ 8,693$ | $-\$ 32,312$ |

Table 8: Top 10 Jobs in Study's 'Administrative Support' Role
Average Pay

| Job | Employees | $\%$ Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Asoc Mgmt Anlyst | 107 | $79.4 \%$ | $\$ 68,990$ | $\$ 799$ | $\$ 69,789$ |
| Administrative Aide 2 | 100 | $89 \%$ | $\$ 56,729$ | $\$ 1,527$ | $\$ 58,256$ |
| Clerical Asst 2 | 91 | $81.3 \%$ | $\$ 41,360$ | $\$ 517$ | $\$ 41,877$ |
| Word Processing Oper | 81 | $92.6 \%$ | $\$ 43,848$ | $\$ 893$ | $\$ 44,741$ |
| Sr Mgmt Anlyst | 70 | $65.7 \%$ | $\$ 77,206$ | $\$ 650$ | $\$ 77,856$ |
| Public Info Clerk | 60 | $85 \%$ | $\$ 43,659$ | $\$ 1,412$ | $\$ 45,071$ |
| Account Clerk | 53 | $84.9 \%$ | $\$ 42,887$ | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 43,626$ |
| Administrative Aide 1 | 47 | $85.1 \%$ | $\$ 47,854$ | $\$ 620$ | $\$ 48,474$ |
| Supv Mgmt Anlyst | 45 | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 88,618$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 88,618$ |
| Payroll Spec 2 | 43 | $95.3 \%$ | $\$ 49,624$ | $\$ 941$ | $\$ 50,565$ |
| Other (57 Jobs) | 364 | $83.8 \%$ | $\$ 54,769$ | $\$ 1,669$ | $\$ 56,437$ |

Due to the high number of roles included in this job type, see appendix for detailed Administrative Support career progression graph.

## Recruitment

## Clerical Assistant 2

The Clerical Assistant 2 position is predominantly occupied by women at all stages of recruitment. Applicants are more likely to be women and these women were 1.4 times more likely to be qualified for this position than the men who applied (W: 40\%, M: 29.5\%; $\mathrm{p}=0.027$ ).


Figure 12: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Clerical Asst 2
From the application data, we can see that women generally apply to the Clerical Assistant 2 position with more experience. Women were 1.3 times more likely to have more than 5 years of experience compared to men (W: $58.8 \%, \mathrm{M}: 45 \%$; $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). This could contribute to women being better qualified and explain the difference we see in men and women reaching the qualified stage.


Figure 13: Percent of All Clerical Assistant 2 Applicants with 5+ Years of Experience - By Gender

Additionally, qualified women were 1.8 times more likely to hear about this role from a City of San Diego Facility/Employee (W: $24.4 \%, \mathrm{M}: 13.2 \%$; $\mathrm{p}=0.012$ ). Employee networks are a great source for recruitment, but it is very likely that the employees are referring other qualified women. To support the diversification of qualified candidates, the City should increase the number of qualified men who hear about the opportunity.

## Administrative Aide 1

The Administrative Aide 1 position is predominately occupied by women. In the hiring process, men and women applied at similar rates and were considered qualified at similar rates. However, women were 1.7 times more likely to be hired (W: $6 \%, \mathrm{M}: 3.3 \% ; \mathrm{p}=0.032$ ). This position falls in the Administrative Support job type, which contributed significantly to the pay gap due to the high proportion of women combined with an average pay that is well below the citywide average. The significant increase in the proportion of women hired compared to the qualified applicant pool further increases the impact of this position on the pay gap.


Figure 14: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Administrative Aide 1

## Fire Fighter

In 2019, there were 749 standard-hour firefighters: 719 ( $96 \%$ ) were men and 30 (4\%) were women. Recruitment of women to firefighting is a difficult task. Representation of women in firefighting is low across the country, and the City of San Diego is taking steps to encourage women to consider firefighting as a career. The Girls Empowerment Camp ("Girls Empowerment Camp" 2020) provided by the San Diego Fire Rescue Foundation is a great example of programs to encourage more female participation in firefighting. The City also has a Fire Cadet program to help youths learn about firefighting as a career; this is another place the department can continue to encourage female participation to take steps towards increasing diversity in the earliest stages of career development.


Figure 15: Gender Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Fire Recruit
The occupational sorting of mostly men into the Firefighter role has a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 40,250$ above the citywide average (total pay). The role's non-overtime pay
was actually $\$ 626$ below the citywide average, so firefighters' above average pay was entirely due to their heavy overtime utilization.

The average City firefighter had approximately 1018 overtime hours in 2019. We estimate that if the City had somehow eliminated overtime for firefighters (while maintaining its ratio of men to women) the citywide total pay gap would have decreased by $26.7 \%$ ( $\$ 4,437$ ). Additionally, this same decrease in the citywide pay gap would be expected if the ratio of men to women among firefighters equaled the citywide average.

Table 9: Fire Fighter Role vs Citywide

|  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Fighter | 749 | $4 \%$ | $\$ 78,576$ | $\$ 50,703$ | $\$ 129,280$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $32.3 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $8 \%$ | $-28.3 \%$ | $-\$ 626$ | $+\$ 40,875$ | $+\$ 40,250$ |

Table 10: Jobs in Study’s 'Fire Fighter' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | $\%$ Women | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Fighter 2 | 275 | $4 \%$ | $\$ 67,562$ | $\$ 36,039$ | $\$ 103,600$ |
| Fire Captain | 193 | $4.1 \%$ | $\$ 88,097$ | $\$ 67,010$ | $\$ 155,107$ |
| Fire Engineer | 192 | $4.7 \%$ | $\$ 75,465$ | $\$ 56,430$ | $\$ 131,895$ |
| Fire Fighter 3 | 38 | $2.6 \%$ | $\$ 74,395$ | $\$ 58,636$ | $\$ 133,032$ |
| Fire Battalion Chief | 32 | $3.1 \%$ | $\$ 116,886$ | $\$ 62,497$ | $\$ 179,383$ |
| Fire Fighter 1 | 9 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 51,989$ | $\$ 7,863$ | $\$ 59,853$ |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 7 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 167,748$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 167,748$ |
| Asst Fire Chief | 2 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 173,024$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 173,024$ |
| Fire Chief | 1 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 226,463$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 226,463$ |

Fire Fighter Job Type - Career Progression


Figure 16: Fire Fighter Job Progression
All fire stations in the city must be constantly staffed, so completely removing overtime for firefighters is unrealistic; however, there may be options for the City to reduce the department's need for overtime. One
remedy that can clearly address the fire department's necessary over-reliance on overtime is to recruit additional firefighters. The Assistant Fire Chiefs with whom we met expressed two main barriers to recruitment: 1) City of San Diego fire department pays significantly less than other departments in the area, and 2) only one staff member in the department is dedicated to recruitment. While we did not independently verify that they only have one staff member for recruiting, a few internet search queries made it clear that the pay for City of San Diego firefighters is not on par with nearby metropolitan areas. Table 11 shows the minimum salary for firefighters at neighboring departments.

Table 11: Fire Fighter's Starting Salary - San Diego vs Nearby Municipalities

| Role | City of San <br> Diego | Orange County <br> Fire Authority | Los Angeles |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Recruit | $\$ 32,947$ | $\$ 63,107$ | $\$ 71,284$ |
| Fire Fighter 1 | $\$ 41,787$ | $\$ 71,402$ | $\$ 71,284$ |

In addition to the taxpayer costs and impact on the citywide gender pay gap that result from the fire department's necessary over-reliance on overtime, there is a toll on the firefighters themselves. The Assistant Fire Chiefs with whom we met, expressed a great deal of concern about the personal strain that is placed on the City's firefighters due to overtime demands (approximately 1018 hours per firefighter in 2019). While this issue is outside the scope of this report, we feel that this particular concern of the Assistant Fire Chiefs will also be addressed if our recommendations are followed.

## Jobs with Above-Average Pay and Disproportionately Low Numbers of Women

These jobs increased the citywide pay gap because they had above-average pay and above-average proportions of men.

Table 12: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Increased Citywide Gender Pay Gap
Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  | Regular Pay Gap |  | Total Pay Gap |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% Women | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| Police Officer | 1,823 | $16.5 \%$ | $\$ 109,853$ | $\$ 124,154$ | $\$ 4,007$ | $58.3 \%$ | $\$ 5,114$ | $30.8 \%$ |
| Fire Fighter | 749 | $4 \%$ | $\$ 78,576$ | $\$ 129,280$ | $\$-491$ | $-7.1 \%$ | $\$ 3,946$ | $23.7 \%$ |
| Lifeguard | 100 | $10 \%$ | $\$ 84,634$ | $\$ 105,298$ |  |  | $\$ 134$ | $0.8 \%$ |

## Jobs with Below-Average Pay and Disproportionately Low Numbers of Women

These jobs decreased the citywide pay gap because they had below-average pay and above-average proportions of men.

Table 13: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Decreased Citywide Gender Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  | Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap Regular Pay Gap Total Pay Gap |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% Women | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | 440 | 13.4\% | \$46,447 | \$47,703 | \$-2,018 | -29.3\% | \$-2,206 | -13.3\% |
| Transportation - Labor | 276 | 8.3\% | \$50,621 | \$56,561 | \$-1,446 | -21\% | \$-1,354 | -8.1\% |
| Water System Tech | 219 | 8.2\% | \$54,650 | \$67,052 | \$-881 | -12.8\% | \$-603 | -3.6\% |
| Building Trades and Facilities Maint | 153 | 4.6\% | \$57,997 | \$60,885 | \$-532 | -7.7\% | \$-584 | -3.5\% |
| Refuse Collection | 147 | 4.1\% | \$59,928 | \$67,275 | \$-644 | -9.4\% | \$-568 | -3.4\% |
| Water Utility Worker | 97 | 8.2\% | \$51,201 | \$64,937 | \$-583 | -8.5\% | \$-449 | -2.7\% |

Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  | Regular Pay Gap |  | Total Pay Gap |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% Women | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| Stock Clerk and Store Operations | 38 | 13.2\% | \$45,619 | \$49,547 | \$-137 | -2\% | \$-136 | -0.8\% |

## Jobs with Above-Average Pay and Disproportionately High Numbers of Women

These jobs decreased the citywide pay gap because they had above-average pay and above-average proportions of women.

Table 14: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Decreased Citywide Gender Pay Gap
Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  | Regular Pay Gap |  | Total Pay Gap |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | $\%$ Women | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| City Attorney | 165 | $60 \%$ | $\$ 130,510$ | $\$ 130,510$ | $\$-1,073$ | $-15.6 \%$ | $\$-1,026$ | $-6.2 \%$ |
| Director | 100 | $46 \%$ | $\$ 149,573$ | $\$ 149,573$ | $\$-421$ | $-6.1 \%$ | $\$-403$ | $-2.4 \%$ |
| Program Manager | 116 | $47.4 \%$ | $\$ 124,138$ | $\$ 124,138$ | $\$-319$ | $-4.6 \%$ | $\$-294$ | $-1.8 \%$ |
| Accounting and Finance | 101 | $52.5 \%$ | $\$ 98,433$ | $\$ 98,719$ | $\$-242$ | $-3.5 \%$ | $\$-205$ | $-1.2 \%$ |
| Crime Lab | 37 | $70.3 \%$ | $\$ 101,320$ | $\$ 103,840$ | $\$-169$ | $-2.5 \%$ | $\$-165$ | $-1 \%$ |

## Jobs with Below-Average Pay and Disproportionately High Numbers of Women

These jobs increased the citywide pay gap because they had below-average pay and above-average proportions of women.

Table 15: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Increased Citywide Gender Pay Gap
Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  | Regular Pay Gap |  | Total Pay Gap |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% Women | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| Administrative Support | 1,061 | 83\% | \$55,583 | \$56,718 | \$8,052 | 117.1\% | \$9,162 | 55.1\% |
| Librarian | 333 | 69.7\% | \$59,443 | \$62,025 | \$1,561 | 22.7\% | \$1,688 | 10.2\% |
| Rec Center Leadership | 129 | 50.4\% | \$55,744 | \$55,921 | \$413 | 6\% | \$489 | 2.9\% |
| Chemist/Biologist | 149 | 51.7\% | \$75,173 | \$76,461 | \$93 | 1.4\% | \$146 | 0.9\% |
| Plan Review Spec | 30 | 66.7\% | \$64,894 | \$66,917 | \$81 | 1.2\% | \$95 | 0.6\% |

## Recommended Actions

1. Police Officers - Systematically track pass/fail rates and reasons for failure at each stage of the police recruiting process (including the academy) by gender, race, and ethnicity; make that data available to the City.
2. Fire Fighters - Enable the fire department to be less reliant on overtime:
c. Reduce the difference between City firefighter pay and that of other fire departments.
d. Ensure the fire department has the resources it needs for recruitment.
3. Citywide - Evaluate whether changes to things like job names (e.g., "Office Specialist" instead of "Administrative Aide"), job descriptions, job posting locations, or recruiting locations could reduce
the likelihood of women and people of color self-selecting lower paying positions to apply for, and men and Whites self-selecting higher paying positions to apply for.

## Pay Gap Cause \#2 - Motherhood Effect

About $10 \%$ of the citywide gender pay gap was explained by the negative effect that children had on women's pay compared with men's pay ${ }^{17}$. In our society, women are more likely to be primary caretakers for children, which one could safely assume is a contributing factor to this observed disparity. If women must take on the bulk of the childcare responsibilities in the home, they are much less likely to take on additional work hours. They also may be forced to take unplanned time off or sick days if their children get sick and must stay home. These unplanned days may be negatively perceived during reviews and promotional decisions. Any benefits or policies that address the specific obstacles that mothers face when balancing work and family caretaking responsibilities will minimize the pay gap due to motherhood.

Parenthood Effect on Expected Citywide Regular Pay

*Expected pay is adjusted to control for differences in age, tenure, and job type

Figure 17: Parenthood Effect on Expected Citywide Regular Pay - By Gender

## Recommended Actions

While anything the City does to diminish the parenthood penalty for mothers and parents of color will decrease the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps, we recommend that the City start this process with the following action:

1. Evaluate options and costs for employee benefits that would directly target the work-life balance needs of mothers and parents of color.

## Pay Gap Cause \#3 - Different Overtime Utilization between Men and Women

Citywide, men work about 48 hours more overtime per year than women (after controlling for tenure, job, and parenthood status, $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ).

[^8]Expected Overtime Hours By Gender - Citywid

*Expected overtime hours is adjusted to control for differences in tenure and job type

Figure 18: Expected Overtime Hours By Gender - Citywide
Jobs types with significant differences in yearly overtime utilization between men and women (controlling for specific job, and parenthood status).

Table 16: Job Types with Significant Differences in Overtime Between Genders

| Job Type | Gender Ovtm Hours Diff <br> (Yearly) |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Fire Fighter | $\mathbf{2 7 2}$ (95\% CI: 48-496, $\mathrm{p}=0.018)$ |
| Fire Dispatch | $\mathbf{2 5 9}$ (95\% CI: $33-485, \mathrm{p}=0.026)$ |
| Water Utility Worker | $\mathbf{2 4 7}$ (95\% CI: $2-492, \mathrm{p}=0.048)$ |
| Water System Tech | $\mathbf{1 9 9}(95 \%$ CI: $6-392, \mathrm{p}=0.044)$ |
| Police Officer | $\mathbf{5 5}$ (95\% CI: $22-88, \mathrm{p}=0.001)$ |
| Engineer - Civil | $\mathbf{3 7}(95 \%$ CI: $15-59, \mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |
| Chemist/Biologist | $\mathbf{3 4}(95 \%$ CI: $10-58, \mathrm{p}=0.005)$ |

The differences in overtime are greatly influenced by the Fire Department in particular. The firefighter role makes up $8 \%$ of City employees, is $96 \%$ men, and uses five times the citywide average overtime value. We were able to speak at length with two Assistant Fire Chiefs to further understand the utilization of overtime within the department. Within the San Diego Fire Department, overtime for firefighters comes in three different forms: 1) Voluntary, 2) Mandatory, and 3) Wildland fire strike teams. All stations in the City must be constantly staffed, so the fewer the number of firefighters the City has, the more overtime is required to staff all the fire stations. Firefighters can volunteer for overtime and priority is given to firefighters with the least amount of volunteer overtime hours within a 90-day period. Any remaining scheduling vacancies are filled with mandatory overtime, which is assigned via a separate automated system, in which the firefighters who have had the most time since their last mandatory assignment will be assigned first, regardless of their voluntary overtime hours.

Across the San Diego Fire Department and departments in surrounding municipalities, there are always one or more engine companies on stand-by to become a wildland fire strike team. The engine company or companies on stand-by rotates throughout the year, and should a fire break out, these teams can be gone up to two weeks (and possibly more) and are on-the-clock that entire duration. As a result, the strike teams will earn overtime pay for all hours beyond what they were originally scheduled (e.g., 24 hours/day x 14 days $=336-80$ scheduled hours $=256$ overtime hours). Since all stations in the city must be constantly staffed, the resulting vacancies from the strike team's absence must also be filled, resulting in more department-wide overtime.

Based on this understanding, we feel comfortable saying that the observed difference in overtime hours between male and female firefighters is most likely attributed to: 1) the wildland fire strike teams on-call when fires broke out in 2019 were, by random chance, mostly (if not all) men and/or 2) women volunteering for less overtime.

## Parenthood Effect on Overtime Utilization

The difference in overtime utilization is starker when you compare employees with children to employees without children. After controlling for tenure and job, men without children work about 21 more hours of overtime per year compared to women without children ( $p=0.045$ ). Men with children work about 84 more hours of overtime per year compared to women with children ( $p<0.001$ ).

Parenthood Effect on Expected Yearly Overtime Hours

| No Children | Men | 209 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Women | $\boxed{187}$ |
|  |  |  |



*Expected overtime hours is adjusted to control for differences in tenure and job type

Figure 19: Parenthood Effect on Expected Overtime Hours - By Gender

## Recommended Actions

## Fire Department

1. Systematically track and monitor department overtime by gender, race, and ethnicity, and source (i.e., voluntary, mandatory, or wildland fire).
2. Use that data to investigate if female firefighters appear to be volunteering for overtime at lower rates than men and, if so, why.

## All City Departments

1. Conduct further evaluation on reasons why women work less overtime than men:
a) Ensure that methods for distributing overtime within jobs and departments across the City aren't unintentionally biased.
b) Evaluate why women might be volunteering for less overtime than men.
2. Evaluate if and how overtime is valued when promoting employees.

## Pay Gap Cause \#4 - Different Demographics of Men and Women

Our statistical models utilized four variables that we refer to as 'demographics': age at first child ${ }^{18}$, tenure ${ }^{19}$, percent of the year spent on long-term disability ${ }^{20}$, and age ${ }^{21}$.

- Age at first child - Citywide, people who have children at a younger age and people with no children have lower average pay; women who work at the City were more likely than men to be in both of these categories.


## Table 17: Age At First Child Differences in Gender Proportions <br> Average Pay

| Age at First Child | Regular | Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| No Children | $\$ 76,080$ | $\$ 83,213$ | Women were 1.47 times more likely not to have children than men <br> $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |
| Under 22 | $\$ 72,213$ | $\$ 82,392$Women were 1.51 times more likely to have their first child before <br> age 22 than men $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |  |
| $23-28$ | $\$ 77,751$ | $\$ 90,233$Men were 1.26 times more likely to have their first child at $23-28$ <br> years old than women $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |  |
| $29-35$ | $\$ 86,564$ | $\$ 100,613$Men were 1.46 times more likely to have their first child at 29-35 <br> years old than women $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |  |
| Over 35 | $\$ 86,393$ | $\$ 99,042$Men were 1.46 times more likely to have their first child at Over 35 <br> years old than women $(\mathrm{p}<0.001)$ |  |

- Tenure - There was no statistically significant difference in average tenure between men and women ( $p=0.702$ ). On average, both genders have just over 14 years of tenure.
- Long-Term Disability (LTD) - Citywide, women were 5 times more likely to take long-term disability than men ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). This is to be expected since most women will utilize LTD while pregnant and/or after giving birth. However, women were still 2.5 times more likely to take over 3 months of LTD than men ( $p<0.001$ ). While employees are on LTD they don't normally receive their full regular pay and are unable to take advantage of overtime opportunities, so their pay is less. Since women utilize LTD at higher rates than men, this increases the citywide pay gap.
- Age - Men are more likely to be in age groups (35-39, 40-49) that attain higher pay.

Table 18: Age Groups With Significant Differences in Gender Proportions
Average Pay

| Age at First Child | Regular | Total |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Under 30 | $\$ 62,691$ | $\$ 68,713$ | Insignificant difference between proportions of men and women <br> $(p=0.964)$ |
| $30-34$ | $\$ 70,881$ | $\$ 79,497$ | Insignificant difference between proportions of men and women <br> $(p=0.887)$ |
| $\mathbf{3 5 - 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 8 , 8 2 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 9 , 7 7 9}$ | Men were 1.21 times more likely to be 35-39 years old than <br> women $(\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{0 . 0 2 5})$ |
| $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 8 3 , 1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 9 5 , 3 7 9}$Men were 1.18 times more likely to be 40-49 years old than <br> women $(\mathbf{p}<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1})$ |  |

[^9]Average Pay

| Age at First Child | Regular | Total |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $50-59$ | $\$ 84,581$ | $\$ 95,571$ | Insignificant difference between proportions of men and women <br> $(\mathrm{p}=0.715)$ |
| Over 60 | $\mathbf{\$ 7 4 , 1 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 7 9 , 4 2 3}$ | Women were $\mathbf{1 . 3 4}$ times more likely to be Over $\mathbf{6 0}$ years old <br> than men $(\mathbf{p}<\mathbf{0} . \mathbf{0 0 1})$ |

## Recommended Actions

None at this time. This is almost entirely out of the City's control. However, we do suggest deeper analysis on these findings in future pay equity studies.

## Remaining Unexplained Portion of Gender Pay Gap

The unexplained part of the pay gap accounts for differences in pay between men and women resulting from something that is either unmeasured or unmeasurable. Typically, in the research community, this is the "gender bias" part of the pay gap; however, the City of San Diego does not systematically collect data on things like an employee's level of education or performance review results. We know that these things are measurable and have an impact on pay, yet we don't know how much of the pay gap can be attributed to them. This makes it harder to identify the solution(s) to most effectively close the pay gap. Therefore, we recommend that the City:

1. Systematically collect data on all employees' level of education.
2. Systematically collect other data on all employees that can help describe differences in pay (e.g., performance reviews, bilingual pay bonuses, other lump sum pay sources, etc.).

## The Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap

## 2011-2019 Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap By Year

Regular Pay (i.e. Non-Overtime Pay)


Total Pay


Figure 20: 2011-2019 Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap by Year
The racial-and-ethnic pay gap was broken down into five categories to isolate the most impactful differences that drive the pay gap between Whites and people of color. Figure 21 shows the magnitude of impact for each category. Occupational sorting has an even bigger impact on the racial-and-ethnic pay gap than the gender pay gap. Another noteworthy difference is the impact of overtime. As discussed in later sections, people of color utilize overtime at higher proportions than Whites, which increases their pay; therefore, this category actually has a negative impact on the pay gap (i.e., reduces the pay gap between Whites and people of color). Each category will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

"On average, people of color took more overtime than whites, reducing the overall pay gap.
Figure 21: 2019 Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Total Pay Gap Source Estimates

## Pay Gap Cause \#1-Occupational Sorting

In Figure 22, roles with many employees (larger circles) near the bottom-left and top-right corners have the largest effect on increasing the citywide pay gap. Roles in the top-right quadrant are high paying and have disproportionately high numbers of Whites. Roles in the bottom-left quadrant are low paying and have disproportionately high numbers of people of color.


Figure 22: Pay vs Ethnic-and-Racial Proportions by Job Type
Table 19: Racial-and-Ethnic Diversity by Occupation - City of San Diego vs Nationwide

US Nationwide (2019 Bureau of Labor Statistics)

| Occupation | People of <br> Color $^{a}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Police and sheriff's patrol officers | $41.1 \%$ |
| Office and administrative support occupations | $51.5 \%$ |
| Firefighters | $30.6 \%$ |
| Civil engineers | $38.1 \%$ |
| Grounds maintenance workers | $58.5 \%$ |
| Librarians | $27.4 \%$ |
| Lawyers | $26 \%$ |
| Construction and extraction occupations | $50.7 \%$ |
| Biological scientists, chemists, and materials scientists | $41 \%$ |

US Nationwide (2019 Bureau of Labor Statistics)

| Occupation | People of <br> Color $^{a}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Refuse and recyclable material collectors | $65.8 \%$ |

City of San Diego (2019)

| City Job Type | People of <br> Color |
| :--- | :---: |
| Refuse Collection | $93.9 \%$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Since the US nationwide percent people of color (36.3\%) is significantly less than the percent people of color in the City of San Diego (57.2\%), this number was scaled proportionally to represent the expected value for the occupation in San Diego (Source: 2010 US Census)

## Police Officers

In 2019, there were 1823 standard-hour police officers: 1082 (59.4\%) were White and 741 (40.6\%) were people of color. The occupational sorting of mostly Whites into the police officer role had a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 35,125$ above the citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the ratio of Whites to people of color among City police officers equaled the citywide average, the total pay gap would have decreased by $20.9 \%(\$ 4,378)$.

The extent of police officers' contribution to the citywide pay gap was partly due to the role's reliance on overtime. The average City police officer had approximately 222 overtime hours in 2019. We estimate that if the police force had somehow eliminated overtime (while maintaining its ratio of Whites to people of color) the citywide total pay gap would have decreased by 4.6\% (\$954).

Table 20: Police Officer Role vs Citywide

|  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Officer | 1823 | $40.6 \%$ | $\$ 109,853$ | $\$ 14,301$ | $\$ 124,154$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $19.5 \%$ | $-14.4 \%$ | $+\$ 30,651$ | $+\$ 4,473$ | $+\$ 35,125$ |

Table 21: Jobs in Study's 'Police Officer' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Officer 2 | 931 | $41.1 \%$ | $\$ 107,068$ | $\$ 16,558$ | $\$ 123,626$ |
| Police Sergeant | 270 | $33.7 \%$ | $\$ 138,813$ | $\$ 17,010$ | $\$ 155,824$ |
| Police Detective | 237 | $37.1 \%$ | $\$ 115,352$ | $\$ 15,230$ | $\$ 130,581$ |
| Police Officer 1 | 217 | $46.5 \%$ | $\$ 72,657$ | $\$ 9,445$ | $\$ 82,102$ |
| Police Recruit | 82 | $54.9 \%$ | $\$ 62,326$ | $\$ 783$ | $\$ 63,109$ |
| Police Lieutenant | 51 | $31.4 \%$ | $\$ 169,399$ | $\$ 212$ | $\$ 169,610$ |
| Police Captain | 18 | $44.4 \%$ | $\$ 197,411$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 197,411$ |
| Police Officer 3 | 11 | $54.5 \%$ | $\$ 123,330$ | $\$ 29,933$ | $\$ 153,263$ |
| Asst Police Chief | 5 | $60 \%$ | $\$ 217,016$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 217,016$ |
| Police Chief | 1 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 252,026$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 252,026$ |

## Recruitment

## Police Recruit

White applicants were 1.5 times more likely to be considered qualified than non-white applicants (Wh: $21.4 \%$, POC: $14.7 \% ; \mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). There was not a significant difference in hiring rates between Whites and people of color.


Figure 23: Race/Ethnicity Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Recruit

## Education Requirement

For Police Recruit applicants, we only found significant differences between the answers of men and women for the education requirement. Applicants must meet the education requirement using one of the following: graduation from high school, passing the General Education Development (G.E.D.) test/California High School Proficiency Examination, or possession of a two-year, four-year or advanced degree from an accredited college or university. Figure 24 shows the proportion of applicants that met the requirement with a college degree.


Figure 24: Applicants with College Education by Race/Ethnicity - Police Recruit
Among total applicants, Whites were 1.4 times more likely than people of color to meet the education requirement with a college degree (Wh: 36.4\%, POC: 26.4\%; p<0.001). In the qualified stage, there are no significant differences between the two applicant groups (Wh: 46\%, POC: $40.6 \%$; $\mathrm{p}=0.061$ ). This indicates that education level could be an important factor in selecting qualified applicants.

## Police Officer 1

White applicants were 1.6 times more likely to be qualified (Wh: $27.2 \%, \mathrm{POC}: 17.4 \% ; \mathrm{p}<0.001$ ).


Figure 25: Race/Ethnicity Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Officer 1

## Education Requirement

Applicants must meet the education requirement using one of the following: graduation from high school, passing the General Education Development (G.E.D.) test/California High School Proficiency Examination, or possession of a two-year, four-year or advanced degree from an accredited college or university.


Figure 26: Applicants with College Degree by Race/Ethnicity - Police Officer 1
In the total applicant pool, Whites were 1.4 times more likely than people of color to meet the education requirement with a college degree (Wh: $38.6 \%$, POC: $27.6 \%$; $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). In the qualified pool, Whites were 1.3 times more likely than people of color to meet the education requirement with a college degree (Wh: $46.5 \%$, POC: $36.1 \% ; \mathrm{p}=0.014$ ). Additional analysis should be done to support the hypothesis that education level is a key criteria for being considered qualified.

## Police Sergeant

White applicants were 1.7 times more likely to be qualified (Wh: $56.9 \%$, $\mathrm{POC}: 32.9 \% ; \mathrm{p}=0.005$ ).


Figure 27: Race/Ethnicity Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Police Sergeant
We were able to analyze seven questions from the application and found no significant differences between applications of Whites and people of color.

## Administrative Support

In 2019, there were 1061 standard-hour employees in the Administrative Support role: 266 (25.1\%) were White and 795 ( $74.9 \%$ ) were people of color. The occupational sorting of mostly people of color into the Administrative Support role had a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 32,312$ below the citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the Administrative Support role's pay or ratio of Whites to people of color equaled the citywide average(s), the total pay gap would have decreased by $12.4 \% ~(\$ 2,589)$.

Table 22: Administrative Support Role vs Citywide

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Administrative Support | 1061 | $74.9 \%$ | $\$ 55,583$ | $\$ 1,135$ | $\$ 56,718$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $11.4 \%$ | $+19.9 \%$ | $-\$ 23,618$ | $-\$ 8,693$ | $-\$ 32,312$ |

Table 23: Top 10 Jobs in Study's 'Administrative Support' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asoc Mgmt Anlyst | 107 | $70.1 \%$ | $\$ 68,990$ | $\$ 799$ | $\$ 69,789$ |
| Administrative Aide 2 | 100 | $71 \%$ | $\$ 56,729$ | $\$ 1,527$ | $\$ 58,256$ |
| Clerical Asst 2 | 91 | $78 \%$ | $\$ 41,360$ | $\$ 517$ | $\$ 41,877$ |
| Word Processing Oper | 81 | $80.2 \%$ | $\$ 43,848$ | $\$ 893$ | $\$ 44,741$ |
| Sr Mgmt Anlyst | 70 | $68.6 \%$ | $\$ 77,206$ | $\$ 650$ | $\$ 77,856$ |
| Public Info Clerk | 60 | $86.7 \%$ | $\$ 43,659$ | $\$ 1,412$ | $\$ 45,071$ |
| Account Clerk | 53 | $90.6 \%$ | $\$ 42,887$ | $\$ 739$ | $\$ 43,626$ |
| Administrative Aide 1 | 47 | $76.6 \%$ | $\$ 47,854$ | $\$ 620$ | $\$ 48,474$ |
| Supv Mgmt Anlyst | 45 | $71.1 \%$ | $\$ 88,618$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 88,618$ |
| Payroll Spec 2 | 43 | $81.4 \%$ | $\$ 49,624$ | $\$ 941$ | $\$ 50,565$ |
| Other (57 Jobs) | 364 | $72 \%$ | $\$ 54,769$ | $\$ 1,669$ | $\$ 56,437$ |

## Firefighter

In 2019, there were 749 standard-hour firefighters: 499 ( $66.6 \%$ ) were White and 250 (33.4\%) were people of color. The occupational sorting of mostly Whites into the Fire Fighter role had a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 40,250$ above the citywide average (total pay). The role's non-overtime pay was actually $\$ 626$ below the citywide average, so firefighter's above average pay was entirely due to their heavy overtime utilization.

The average City firefighter had approximately 1018 overtime hours in 2019. We estimate that if the City had somehow eliminated overtime for firefighters (while maintaining its ratio of Whites to people of color) the citywide total pay gap would have decreased by $13.1 \%$ ( $\$ 2,735$ ). Additionally, this same decrease in the citywide pay gap would be expected if the ratio of Whites to people of color among firefighters equaled the citywide average.

Table 24: Fire Fighter Role vs Citywide

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |  |
| Fire Fighter | 749 | $33.4 \%$ | $\$ 78,576$ | $\$ 50,703$ | $\$ 129,280$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $8 \%$ | $-21.7 \%$ | $-\$ 626$ | $+\$ 40,875$ | $+\$ 40,250$ |

Table 25: Jobs in Study's ‘Fire Fighter' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Fighter 2 | 275 | $35.6 \%$ | $\$ 67,562$ | $\$ 36,039$ | $\$ 103,600$ |


|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Captain | 193 | $32.6 \%$ | $\$ 88,097$ | $\$ 67,010$ | $\$ 155,107$ |
| Fire Engineer | 192 | $27.1 \%$ | $\$ 75,465$ | $\$ 56,430$ | $\$ 131,895$ |
| Fire Fighter 3 | 38 | $42.1 \%$ | $\$ 74,395$ | $\$ 58,636$ | $\$ 133,032$ |
| Fire Battalion Chief | 32 | $43.8 \%$ | $\$ 116,886$ | $\$ 62,497$ | $\$ 179,383$ |
| Fire Fighter 1 | 9 | $33.3 \%$ | $\$ 51,989$ | $\$ 7,863$ | $\$ 59,853$ |
| Deputy Fire Chief | 7 | $42.9 \%$ | $\$ 167,748$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 167,748$ |
| Asst Fire Chief | 2 | $50 \%$ | $\$ 173,024$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 173,024$ |
| Fire Chief | 1 | $0 \%$ | $\$ 226,463$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 226,463$ |

## Recruitment

## Fire Recruit

There were no significant differences in race-and-ethnicity at any stage of recruitment for Fire Recruits.


Figure 28: Race/Ethnicity Proportions at Each Recruiting Stage - Fire Recruit

## Parks Grounds Maintenance

In 2019, there were 440 standard-hour employees in the Parks Grounds Maintenance role: 84 (19.1\%) were White and 356 ( $80.9 \%$ ) were people of color. The occupational sorting of mostly people of color into the Parks Grounds Maintenance role has a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 41,326$ below the citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the Parks Grounds Maintenance role's pay or ratio of Whites to people of color equaled the citywide average(s), the total pay gap would have decreased by $9.3 \%(\$ 1,944)$.

Table 26: Parks Grounds Maintenance Role vs Citywide

|  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | 440 | $80.9 \%$ | $\$ 46,447$ | $\$ 1,257$ | $\$ 47,703$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $4.7 \%$ | $+25.9 \%$ | $-\$ 32,755$ | $-\$ 8,571$ | $-\$ 41,326$ |

Table 27: Top 10 Jobs in Study's 'Parks Grounds Maintenance' Role

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 | 245 | $84.1 \%$ | $\$ 42,527$ | $\$ 887$ | $\$ 43,414$ |
| Grounds Maint Mgr | 26 | $61.5 \%$ | $\$ 68,385$ | $\$ 1,011$ | $\$ 69,396$ |
| Greenskeeper | 21 | $81 \%$ | $\$ 43,814$ | $\$ 1,730$ | $\$ 45,544$ |

Average Pay

| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 1 | 15 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 38,485$ | $\$ 1,438$ | $\$ 39,923$ |
| Light Equipment Operator | 15 | $80 \%$ | $\$ 44,906$ | $\$ 416$ | $\$ 45,322$ |
| Equip Operator 1 | 14 | $92.9 \%$ | $\$ 49,787$ | $\$ 748$ | $\$ 50,535$ |
| Seven-Gang Mower Operator | 12 | $83.3 \%$ | $\$ 50,824$ | $\$ 520$ | $\$ 51,344$ |
| Grounds Maint Supv | 10 | $80 \%$ | $\$ 50,062$ | $\$ 1,374$ | $\$ 51,436$ |
| Equip Operator 2 | 9 | $88.9 \%$ | $\$ 55,013$ | $\$ 5,841$ | $\$ 60,854$ |
| Equip Tech 1 | 9 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 47,747$ | $\$ 1,300$ | $\$ 49,047$ |
| Other (18 Jobs) | 64 | $65.6 \%$ | $\$ 52,129$ | $\$ 2,351$ | $\$ 54,479$ |

## Parks Grounds Maintenance Job Type - Career Progression



Figure 29: Parks Ground Maintenance Job Progression

## Transportation - Labor

In 2019, there were 276 standard-hour employees in the Transportation - Labor role: 35 (12.7\%) were White and 241 ( $87.3 \%$ ) were people of color. The occupational sorting of mostly people of color into the Transportation - Labor role has a strong effect on increasing the pay gap because the role pays $\$ 32,469$ below the citywide average (total pay). We estimate that if the Transportation - Labor role's pay or ratio of Whites to people of color equaled the citywide average(s), the total pay gap would have decreased by $5.5 \%(\$ 1,155)$.

Table 28: Transportation - Labor Role vs Citywide
Average Pay

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Transportation - Labor | 276 | $87.3 \%$ | $\$ 50,621$ | $\$ 5,940$ | $\$ 56,561$ |
| Citywide | 9344 | $55 \%$ | $\$ 79,202$ | $\$ 9,828$ | $\$ 89,030$ |
|  | $3 \%$ | $+32.3 \%$ | $-\$ 28,580$ | $-\$ 3,888$ | $-\$ 32,469$ |

Table 29: Top 10 Jobs in Study's 'Transportation - Labor' Role
Average Pay

| Job | Employees | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Utility Worker 2 | 54 | $94.4 \%$ | $\$ 47,089$ | $\$ 5,920$ | $\$ 53,009$ |
| Utility Worker 1 | 40 | $92.5 \%$ | $\$ 41,065$ | $\$ 3,080$ | $\$ 44,145$ |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 2 | 38 | $84.2 \%$ | $\$ 47,889$ | $\$ 4,980$ | $\$ 52,869$ |
| Public Works Supv | 22 | $63.6 \%$ | $\$ 69,438$ | $\$ 13,010$ | $\$ 82,448$ |
| Cement Finisher | 21 | $85.7 \%$ | $\$ 55,760$ | $\$ 6,038$ | $\$ 61,798$ |
| Equip Operator 2 | 21 | $81 \%$ | $\$ 52,689$ | $\$ 3,033$ | $\$ 55,722$ |
| Laborer | 19 | $94.7 \%$ | $\$ 36,679$ | $\$ 4,087$ | $\$ 40,766$ |
| Motor Sweeper Oper | 16 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 55,424$ | $\$ 11,930$ | $\$ 67,354$ |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 1 | 9 | $88.9 \%$ | $\$ 48,959$ | $\$ 419$ | $\$ 49,378$ |
| Equip Operator 1 | 8 | $100 \%$ | $\$ 55,174$ | $\$ 12,141$ | $\$ 67,315$ |
| Other (9 Jobs) | 28 | $78.6 \%$ | $\$ 60,554$ | $\$ 5,753$ | $\$ 66,307$ |

Due to the high number of roles included in this job type, see appendix for detailed Transportation Public Works career progression graph.

## Other Job Types Whose Above/Below Average Pay and Racial-and-Ethnic Ratios Contribute to the Pay Gap

## Jobs with Above Average Pay and Disproportionately High Numbers of Whites

Table 30: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Increased Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Regular Pay Gap | Total Pay Gap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Total | Dollars Percent | Dollars Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Police Officer | 1,823 | $40.6 \%$ | $\$ 109,853$ | $\$ 124,154$ | $\$ 3,425$ | $19.7 \%$ | $\$ 4,378$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## Jobs with Below Average Pay and Disproportionately High Numbers of Whites

These jobs decreased the citywide pay gap because they had below-average pay and above-average proportions of Whites.

Table 31: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Decreased Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap

|  |  |  | Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Average Pay | Regular Pay Gap | Total Pay Gap |  |  |
| Job Type | \# Emps | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Total | Dollars Percent | Dollars Percent |  |
| Golf Operations | 23 | $13 \%$ | $\$ 54,435$ | $\$ 58,402$ | $\$-95$ | $-0.5 \%$ | $\$-97$ |

Jobs with Below Average Pay and Disproportionately High Numbers of People of Color
These jobs increased the citywide pay gap because they had below-average pay and above-average proportions of people of color.

Table 32: Job Types with Occupational Sorting that Increased Citywide Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap
Contribution to Citywide Pay Gap
Average Pay Regular Pay Gap Total Pay Gap

| Job Type | \# Emps | \% People of Color | Regular | Total | Dollars | Percent | Dollars | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Support | 1,061 | 74.9\% | \$55,583 | \$56,718 | \$2,161 | 12.4\% | \$2,589 | 12.4\% |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | 440 | 80.9\% | \$46,447 | \$47,703 | \$1,732 | 10\% | \$1,944 | 9.3\% |
| Transportation - Labor | 276 | 87.3\% | \$50,621 | \$56,561 | \$1,233 | 7.1\% | \$1,155 | 5.5\% |
| Refuse Collection | 147 | 93.9\% | \$59,928 | \$67,275 | \$520 | 3\% | \$443 | 2.1\% |
| Water Utility Worker | 97 | 92.8\% | \$51,201 | \$64,937 | \$578 | 3.3\% | \$431 | 2.1\% |
| Water System Tech | 219 | 83.1\% | \$54,650 | \$67,052 | \$652 | 3.7\% | \$406 | 1.9\% |
| Building Trades and Facilties Facilities Maint | 153 | 73.9\% | \$57,997 | \$60,885 | \$244 | 1.4\% | \$277 | 1.3\% |
| Librarian | 333 | 57.1\% | \$59,443 | \$62,025 | \$235 | 1.4\% | \$264 | 1.3\% |
| Stock Clerk and Store Operations | 38 | 78.9\% | \$45,619 | \$49,547 | \$156 | 0.9\% | \$156 | 0.7\% |
| Fleet Technician | 126 | 68.3\% | \$62,781 | \$67,261 | \$149 | 0.9\% | \$151 | 0.7\% |
| Collections | 22 | 81.8\% | \$54,867 | \$54,867 |  |  | \$78 | 0.4\% |
| Utility Plant Tech | 79 | 74.7\% | \$63,792 | \$74,962 | \$131 | 0.8\% | \$76 | 0.4\% |

## Pay Gap Cause \#2 - Different Parenthood Effects between Whites and People of Color

As seen in the analysis on the motherhood effect in the gender pay gap, having children has a much stronger negative effect on women's pay as opposed to men's. When breaking down this analysis by race and ethnicity, some interesting findings emerge. Within men, the fatherhood penalty only exists for men of color ( $-3 \%$ ). Both white women and women of color have a motherhood penalty that is larger than the fatherhood penalty for men of color; however, the motherhood penalty is much larger for women of color ($7.4 \%$ vs $-4.7 \%$ for white women).

## Parenthood Effect on Expected Citywide Non-Overtime Pay


*Expected pay is adjusted to control for differences in age, gender, tenure, and job type

Figure 30: Parenthood Effect on Expected Citywide Regular Pay

## Pay Gap Cause \#3 - Different Overtime Utilization between Whites and People of Color

Citywide, people of color work about 24 hours more overtime per year than Whites (after controlling for tenure, gender, job, and children, $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ). This difference is most predominantly seen within the City's firefighters, where people of color work about 176 hours more overtime per year than Whites (after controlling for specific job, gender, and if they have children, $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ).

## Pay Gap Cause \#4 - Different Demographics of Whites and People of Color

- Age at first child - People who have children at a younger age have lower average pay; people of color who work at the City were more likely than Whites to have children at younger ages (under 28).

Table 33: Age At First Child Differences in Racial/Ethnic Proportions
Average Pay

| Age at First Child | Regular | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| No Children | $\$ 76,080$ | $\$ 83,213$ | | Whites were $\mathbf{1 . 2 3}$ times more likely not to have children than |
| :--- |
| people of color $(\mathbf{p}<\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1})$ |

- Tenure - There was no statistically significant difference in average tenure between Whites and people of color ( $\mathrm{p}=0.319$ ). On average, both groups have just over 14 years of tenure.
- Long-Term Disability - Citywide, there is not a statistically significant difference in the rates at which Whites and people of color utilize long-term disability ( $\mathrm{p}=0.376$ ).
- $\quad$ Age - People of color were more likely to be in younger age groups (under 30, 30-34), which tend to make less money. Whites were more likely to be in age groups that had higher average salaries (35-39, 40-49).

Table 34: Age Groups With Significant Differences in Racial/Ethnic Proportions
Average Pay

| Age | Regular | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 30 | \$62,691 | \$68,713 | People of color were 1.29 times more likely to be Under 30 years old than Whites ( $p=0.028$ ) |
| 30-34 | \$70,881 | \$79,497 | People of color were 1,16 times more likely to be 30-34 years old than Whites ( $p=0.012$ ) |
| 35-39 | \$78,829 | \$89,779 | Whites were 1.3 times more likely to be 35-39 years old than people of color ( $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) |
| 40-49 | \$83,180 | \$95,379 | Whites were 1.1 times more likely to be 40-49 years old than people of color ( $\mathrm{p}=0.036$ ) |
| 50-59 | \$84,581 | \$95,571 | People of color were 1,15 times more likely to be 50-59 years old than Whites ( $p=0.003$ ) |
| Over 60 | \$74,159 | \$79,423 | Insignificant difference between proportions of Whites and people of color ( $p=0.065$ ) |

## Remaining Unexplained Portion of Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap

The unexplained part of the pay gap accounts for differences in pay between Whites and people of color resulting from something that is either unmeasured or unmeasurable. Typically, in the research community, this is the 'bias' part of the pay gap; however, the City of San Diego does not systematically collect data on things like an employee's level of education or performance review results. We know that these things are measurable and have an impact on pay, yet we don't know how much of the pay gap can be attributed to them. This makes it harder to identify the solution(s) to most effectively close the pay gap. Therefore, we recommend that the City:

1. Systematically collect data on all employees' level of education.
2. Systematically collect other data on all employees that can help describe differences in pay (e.g., performance reviews, bilingual pay bonuses, other lump sum pay sources, etc.).

## Appendix

## Suggested Areas of Research for Future Pay Equity Studies

Much of the time on this initial pay equity study was spent collecting and aggregating data and forming the job type groups for occupational sorting analysis. The amount of effort needed to do this work, forced us to limit the scope of this study. Fortunately, this preliminary work should not need to be repeated in future studies since the analysis code developed for this work has been provided to the City. We recommend the City ensure that procedures for collecting the data for this study are easily repeatable for future pay equity studies by documenting the processes performed and automating as much of the process as possible. Additionally, we believe that the scope of future pay equity studies should also include research to better understand:

1. What are the sources of the pay gap that remain unexplained?
2. How has the gender pay gap changed since this study was conducted? How have the underlying sources of the pay gap identified in this report (i.e., occupational sorting, the parenthood penalty, overtime, and demographics) changed?
3. What is driving the changes in the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gap over time?
4. How do men/women and Whites/people of color differ in how they progress through their career in the City? How does the effect of children play into the differences in outcomes we observed?
5. Does utilization of the current dependent care FSA have an effect on the parenthood pay penalty?
6. Do those employees who work more overtime and/or take fewer sick/PTO days have higher likelihoods of being promoted?
7. Break down sources of racial-pay-inequity into specific races/ethnicities instead of just white/nonwhite.
8. Revisit the job types:
a) Integrate new job titles and departments that have been established since the writing of this report.
b) Share the detailed job type analysis in this report with the relevant department heads within the city to determine if further modifications might be fruitful.
c) Explore the occupational groups that Personnel uses for its annual Equal Employment Opportunity report to the Civil Service Commission.
d) Look into possible ways to re-organize the Administrative Support job type into smaller, more meaningful groups that would enable better study of occupational sorting.
9. Look at specific add-on pays by gender and race/ethnicity.
10. Explore the utilization and benefits of part-time employment by gender and race/ethnicity.
11. Study pay and advancement for women's careers before and after having a child.

## Other Recommendations

## Job Types

In order to understand the effect that occupational sorting had on the pay gap within the City of San Diego, we first needed to group the City's jobs into occupations (i.e., job types). Our goal in creating these job types was to create groupings of jobs that all required similar skills/education and/or were along a similar career paths within the City. To do that, we analyzed the position changes that employees made within the City from 2015-2019. The more employees that moved between two positions, the more likely those two positions were similar enough to be grouped together as a single job type. Draft versions of the job type visualizations seen in this section were reviewed with various department heads before finalizing the job types utilized in the study and seen in Table 35.

Table 35: Summary of All Job Types

| Job Type | \# Emps <br> in Study | Women | \% People <br> of Color | Avg <br> Total Pay | Top 2 Depts | Top 2 Jobs |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |


| Job Type | \# Emps in Study | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Avg Total Pay | Top 2 Depts | Top 2 Jobs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water Utility Worker | 97 | 8.2\% | 92.8\% | \$64,937 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection (97\%) } \\ & \text { Public Util }- \text { Wtr Constrct Maint (2\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Equịp Oper 1(Sewer Maint Equip Oper) ( $24 \%$ ) Utility Worker 1 (20\%) |
| Development Inspector | 80 | 2.5\% | 35\% | \$78,165 | Development Svcs (100\%) | Combination Inspctr 2 (30\%) Combination Inspctr 1 (15\%) |
| Utility Plant Tech | 79 | 2.5\% | 74.7\% | \$74,962 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal } \\ & \text { (97\%) Util - Admin Svcs (3\%) } \\ & \text { Public Uti } \end{aligned}$ | Plant Tech 2 (24\%) <br> Plant Tech 3 (18\%) |
| City Council Support | 77 | 53.2\% | 49.4\% | \$79,987 | City Council (79\%) Council Administration (19\%) | Council Rep 1 (68\%) <br> Council Assistant (10\%) |
| Wastewater <br> Plant Operations | 67 | 16.4\% | 61.2\% | \$93,637 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | Wstwtr Plant Operator (52\%) <br> Wstwtr Operations Supv (31\%) |
| Disposal Site Operations | 65 | 6.2\% | 63.1\% | \$62,114 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Environ Svcs - Refuse ( } 52 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction } \\ & \text { Division (35\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Utility Worker 2 (26\%) <br> Landfill Equip Oper (25\%) |
| Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl | 64 | 1.6\% | 57.8\% | \$79,218 | READ Facilities Svcs (31\%) <br> Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal $\text { ( } 27 \% \text { ) }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Electrician (48\%) } \\ & \text { Plant Procs Cntrl Electrician } \\ & \text { (34\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Program Coordinator | 63 | 55.6\% | 46\% | \$108,665 | Information Technology (27\%) Performance \& Analytics (11\%) | Program Coordinator (100\%) |
| Land Surveying | 60 | 6.7\% | 30\% | \$86,131 | Eng \& Capital Proj (85\%) Development Svcs (13\%) | Land Survyng Assist (47\%) Principal Survey Aide (25\%) |
| Parking Enforcement | 58 | 34.5\% | 70.7\% | \$65,174 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Police (83\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (17\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Parking Enfrc Ofcr 1 (62\%) Parking Enfrc Ofcr 2 ( $26 \%$ ) |
| Utilities Tech Other | 54 | 5.6\% | 72.2\% | \$73,468 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (35\%) <br> Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (20\%) | ```Instrumentation & Control Tech (22%) Sr Backflow & Cross Connection Spec (19%)``` |
| Other Equip Tech | 47 | 2.1\% | 55.3\% | \$80,085 | Transportation - Streets (38\%) City Treasurer (19\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Traffic Signal Technician } 2 \\ & \text { (28\%) } \\ & \text { Parking Meter Tech (17\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Fire Dispatch | 45 | 51.1\% | 53.3\% | \$85,157 | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | Fire Dispatcher (67\%) <br> Fire Dispatch Supv (16\%) |
| Park Ranger | 42 | 35.7\% | 35.7\% | \$60,669 | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (60\%) Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (40\%) | Park Ranger (74\%) <br> Sr Park Ranger (24\%) |
| Code Compliance Officer | 39 | 33.3\% | 59\% | \$56,441 | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction <br> Division (49\%) <br> Transportation - Storm Wtr (15\%) | Code Compliance Ofcr (79\%) Code Compliance Supv (10\%) |
| Stock Clerk and Store Operations | 38 | 13.2\% | 78.9\% | \$49,547 | ```Purchasing & Contracting (37%) Fleet Ops (26%)``` | Storekeeper 1 (29\%) Stock Clerk (18\%) |
| Crime Lab | 37 | 70.3\% | 29.7\% | \$103,840 | Police (100\%) | Criminalist 2(DNA) (32\%) Criminalist 2 ( $30 \%$ ) |
| Development Project Manager | 37 | 43.2\% | 48.6\% | \$89,705 | Development Svcs (84\%) Planning (14\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Development Project Manager } \\ & \text { 2 (46\%) } \\ & \text { Development Project Manager } \\ & 3 \text { (38\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Communications Tech | 36 | 0\% | 61.1\% | \$78,642 | Information Technology (97\%) Communications (3\%) | Commctn Tech (47\%) Asoc Commctns Eng (11\%) |
| Property Agent | 33 | 51.5\% | 51.5\% | \$69,020 | Police (45\%) <br> Real Estate Assets (42\%) | Police Property \& Evid Spec (36\%) Property Agent (27\%) |
| Fire Prevention | 32 | 21.9\% | 43.8\% | \$122,763 | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fire Prevention Inspctr } 2 \\ & \text { (62\%) } \\ & \text { Fire Prevention Inspctr 2/Civ } \\ & (19 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Plan Review Spec | 30 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$66,917 | Development Svcs (100\%) | Plan Review Spec 3 (37\%) <br> Supv Plan Review Spec (20\%) |
| Custodian | 29 | 37.9\% | 93.1\% | \$39,685 | READ Facilities Svcs (52\%) <br> Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (48\%) | Custodian 2 (76\%) Custodian 3 (21\%) |
| Executive Assistant | 29 | 100\% | 69\% | \$69,617 | City Attorney (10\%) <br> Department of Finance (7\%) | Executive Asssistant (72\%) Asst to the Director (7\%) |
| Zoning Investigator | 29 | 37.9\% | 65.5\% | \$64,827 | Development Svcs (97\%) <br> Parks \& Rec - Open Space (3\%) | Zoning Investigator 2 (62\%) Zoning Investigator 1 (21\%) |
| Cmnty Dev Spec | 28 | 64.3\% | 50\% | \$80,461 | Economic Development (100\%) | Cmnty Dev Spec 2 (39\%) Cmnty Dev Spec 4 (25\%) |
| Water Plant Operations | 28 | 7.1\% | 53.6\% | \$96,341 | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | Water Plant Operator (79\%) Sr Water Operations Supv (11\%) |
| City Atty Invstgtr | 27 | 40.7\% | 22.2\% | \$81,163 | City Attorney (100\%) | City Atty Invstgtr (74\%) Sr City Atty Invstgtr (19\%) |
| Risk Mgmt Claims | 27 | 55.6\% | 59.3\% | \$75,721 | Risk Management (100\%) | Workers' Compensation Claims Rep 2 ( $41 \%$ ) <br> Claims Rep 2(Liability) (26\%) |


| Job Type | \# Emps <br> in Study | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Avg <br> Total Pay | Top 2 Depts | Top 2 Jobs |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |

## Accounting and Finance

# Accounting and Finance Job Type - Career Progression 



Table 36: Accounting and Finance Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Finance Analyst 3 | Department of Finance (100\%) | 29 | 48.3\% | 62.1\% | \$89,546 | \$587 | \$90,133 |
| Finance Analyst 2 | Department of Finance (100\%) | 18 | 44.4\% | 66.7\% | \$81,068 | \$448 | \$81,516 |
| Principal Accountant | Department of Finance ( $71 \%$ ), City Treasurer (18\%) | 17 | 76.5\% | 52.9\% | \$127,415 | \$0 | \$127,415 |
| Finance Analyst 4 | Department of Finance (100\%) | 10 | 50\% | 70\% | \$110,644 | \$5 | \$110,649 |
| Accountant 4 | City Treasurer ( $62 \%$ ), City Retirement ( $25 \%$ ) | 8 | 50\% | 75\% | \$102,244 | \$0 | \$102,244 |
| Financial Operations Manager | Department of Finance (100\%) | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | \$134,952 | \$0 | \$134,952 |
| Accountant 3 | City Treasurer (75\%) <br> Public Util - Admin Svics (25\%) | 4 | 25\% | 50\% | \$77,335 | \$709 | \$78,044 |
| Accountant 1 | City Treasurer (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$59,374 | \$0 | \$59,374 |
| Accountant 2 | City Treasurer (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$74,830 | \$0 | \$74,830 |
| Finance Analyst 1 | Department of Finance (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$70,223 | \$242 | \$70,465 |
| Accountant Trainee | City Treasurer (50\%), Department of Finance (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$58,027 | \$227 | \$58,254 |
| Chief Accountant | Department of Finance (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$226,788 | \$0 | \$226,788 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | 101 | $52.5 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ | $\$ 98,433$ | $\$ 286$ | $\$ 98,719$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Finance Analyst 2 (3 excluded)

## Administrative Support

## Administrative Support Job Type - Career Progression



Table 37: Administrative Support Job Type - Study Population (2019)

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asoc Mgmt Anlyst | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Admin Svcs (21\%), } \\ & \text { Eng \& Capital Proj (12\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 107 | 79.4\% | 70.1\% | \$68,990 | \$799 | \$69,789 |
| Administrative Aide 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (15\%), Police (12\%) | 100 | 89\% | 71\% | \$56,729 | \$1,527 | \$58,256 |
| Clerical Asst 2 | City Attorney (20\%) SDFD - Fire Rescue (12\%) | 91 | 81.3\% | 78\% | \$41,360 | \$517 | \$41,877 |
| Word Processing Oper | Police (38\%) <br> Development' Svcs (15\%) | 81 | 92.6\% | 80.2\% | \$43,848 | \$893 | \$44,741 |
| Sr Mgmt Anlyst | Public Util - Admin Svcs (26\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (13\%) | 70 | 65.7\% | 68.6\% | \$77,206 | \$650 | \$77,856 |
| Public Info Clerk | Development Svcs (57\%), City Treasurer (23\%) | 60 | 85\% | 86.7\% | \$43,659 | \$1,412 | \$45,071 |
| Account Clerk | Public Util - Admin Svcs (25\%), City Treasurer (11\%) | 53 | 84.9\% | 90.6\% | \$42,887 | \$739 | \$43,626 |
| Administrative Aide 1 | Eng \& Capital Proj (30\%) Public Util - Admin Svcs ('9\%) | 47 | 85.1\% | 76.6\% | \$47,854 | \$620 | \$48,474 |
| Supv Mgmt Anlyst | Public Util - Admin Svcs (22\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (9\%) | 45 | 66.7\% | 71.1\% | \$88,618 | \$0 | \$88,618 |
| Payroll Spec 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util-Admin Svcs (16\%), } \\ & \text { Police (12\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 43 | 95.3\% | 81.4\% | \$49,624 | \$941 | \$50,565 |
| Cust Servs Rep | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 36 | 83.3\% | 91.7\% | \$46,780 | \$4,961 | \$51,741 |
| Sr Clerk/Typist | Police (31\%), City Attorney' (26\%) | 35 | 88.6\% | 74.3\% | \$48,138 | \$1,451 | \$49,589 |
| Legal Secretary 2 | City Attorney (100\%) | 31 | 100\% | 61.3\% | \$62,268 | \$19 | \$62,287 |
| Police Records Clerk | Police (100\%) | 30 | 56.7\% | 56.7\% | \$48,301 | \$4,827 | \$53,129 |
| Court Support Clrk 2 | City Attorney (100\%) | 18 | 83.3\% | 72.2\% | \$43,484 | \$285 | \$43,769 |
| Court Support Clrk 1 | City Attorney (100\%) | 14 | 100\% | 71.4\% | \$43,997 | \$0 | \$43,997 |
| Payroll Audit Spec 2 | Personnel (50\%), <br> Department of Finance (36\%) | 14 | 100\% | 71.4\% | \$55,520 | \$35 | \$55,555 |
| Asoc Pers Anlyst | Personnel (100\%) | 13 | 76.9\% | 69.2\% | \$77,815 | \$0 | \$77,815 |
| Deputy City Clerk 1 | City Clerk (100\%) | 13 | 92.3\% | 76.9\% | \$44,921 | \$1 | \$44,922 |
| Asst Mgmt Anlyst | Public Util- Admin Svcs (31\%), Police (15\%) | 13 | 69.2\% | 76.9\% | \$58,819 | \$279 | \$59,098 |
| Claims Clerk | Risk Management (100\%) | 9 | 77.8\% | 88.9\% | \$40,658 | \$1,207 | \$41,865 |
| Sr Pers Anlyst | Personnel (100\%) | 8 | 37.5\% | 75\% | \$86,288 | \$0 | \$86,288 |
| Sr Account Clrk | City Treasurer (38\%) <br> Eng \& Capital Proj (12\%) | 8 | 87.5\% | 87.5\% | \$47,589 | \$640 | \$48,229 |
| Asoc Department HR Analyst | Human Resources (57\%) Public Util - Admin Svcs (29\%) | 7 | 71.4\% | 71.4\% | \$69,646 | \$0 | \$69,646 |
| Retirement Assistant | City Retirement (100\%) | 6 | 100\% | 100\% | \$46,857 | \$0 | \$46,857 |
| Sr Customer Srvs Rep | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 6 | 83.3\% | 100\% | \$45,040 | \$4,433 | \$49,473 |
| Cust Servs Supv | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 5 | 100\% | 80\% | \$77,908 | \$10,328 | \$88,236 |
| Employee Benefits Specialist 2 | Risk Management (100\%) | 5 | 80\% | 40\% | \$66,030 | \$0 | \$66,030 |
| Sr Legal Secretary | City Attorney (100\%) | 5 | 100\% | 40\% | \$72,713 | \$329 | \$73,042 |
| Sr Mgmt Anlyst(Hland Secur Coord) | Offc of Homel\& Security (100\%) | 5 | 80\% | 0\% | \$77,511 | \$513 | \$78,024 |
| Sr Police Records Clerk | Police (100\%) | 5 | 100\% | 100\% | \$54,115 | \$3,132 | \$57,248 |
| Cashier | Public Util - Admin Svcs (60\%), Development Svcs (20\%) | 5 | 100\% | 40\% | \$41,988 | \$564 | \$42,551 |
| Payroll Supv | Public Util - Admin Sves (40\%), Development Svcs (20\%) | 5 | 100\% | 80\% | \$57,507 | \$2,920 | \$60,427 |
| Account Audit Clerk | Department of Finance (100\%) | 4 | 100\% | 75\% | \$44,934 | \$8 | \$44,942 |
| Deputy City Clerk 2 | City Clerk (100\%) | 4 | 100\% | 100\% | \$50,240 | \$0 | \$50,240 |
| Legislative Recorder 2 | City Clerk (100\%) | 4 | 75\% | 50\% | \$56,240 | \$27 | \$56,268 |
| Asoc Mgmt <br> Anlyst(Arts Mgmt <br> Asoc) | Offc of Boards \& Commissions $\begin{aligned} & (75 \%), \\ & \text { Library (25\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 75\% | 50\% | \$69,524 | \$0 | \$69,524 |
| Asoc Mgmt <br> Anlyst(Records Mgmt Anlyst) | Police (100\%) | 3 | 33.3\% | 100\% | \$76,601 | \$12,834 | \$89,435 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cal-Id Technician | Police (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 66.7\% | \$47,681 | \$744 | \$48,425 |
| Supv Cal-Id Tech | Police (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 100\% | \$56,789 | \$7,841 | \$64,630 |
| Workers' <br> Compensation Claims <br> Aide | Risk Management (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 100\% | \$52,772 | \$613 | \$53,385 |
| Clerical Asst 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Library (67\%), } \\ & \text { Police }(33 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$40,892 | \$2,543 | \$43,436 |
| Payroll Audit Supv | Personnel (67\%), <br> Department of Finance (33\%) | 3 | 100\% | 100\% | \$72,117 | \$2,122 | \$74,239 |
| Asst Mgmt <br> Anlyst(Litrcy Tut/Lrng Coord) | Library (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$64,170 | \$0 | \$64,170 |
| Claims Aide | Risk Management (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$51,324 | \$0 | \$51,324 |
| Contracts Processing Clrk | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$44,626 | \$392 | \$45,018 |
| Legal Secretary 1 | City Attorney (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$59,260 | \$0 | \$59,260 |
| Payroll Audit Spec 1 | Personnel (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$56,074 | \$62 | \$56,136 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sr Mgmt Anlyst(Ret } \\ & \text { Fncl Spec 3) } \end{aligned}$ | City Retirement (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$79,838 | \$0 | \$79,838 |
| Sr Offset Press Operator | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$53,016 | \$0 | \$53,016 |
| Supv Department HR Anlyst | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$92,669 | \$0 | \$92,669 |
| Test Administration Spec | Personnel (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$36,846 | \$881 | \$37,728 |
| Payroll Spec 1 | Airports (50\%), Risk Managemént (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$51,326 | \$1,026 | \$52,353 |
| Asoc Mgmt Anlyst(Ret Fncl Spec 2) | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$77,634 | \$0 | \$77,634 |
| Asst Department HR Anlyst | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,772 | \$0 | \$67,772 |
| Asst Mgmt Anlyst(Sr <br> Victm Servs Coord) | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$62,708 | \$0 | \$62,708 |
| Asst Pers Anlyst | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,275 | \$0 | \$67,275 |
| Benefits Rep 2 | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$52,499 | \$0 | \$52,499 |
| Legislative Recorder 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$56,129 | \$0 | \$56,129 |
| Principal Clerk | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$57,674 | \$586 | \$58,260 |
| Principal Test Admnstrn Spec | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,800 | \$3,809 | \$71,609 |
| Public Info Spec | City Clerk (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$53,441 | \$0 | \$53,441 |
| Sr Account Audit Clrk | Department of Finance (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$48,697 | \$0 | \$48,697 |
| Sr Cashier | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$41,064 | \$32 | \$41,096 |
| Sr Department HR Analyst | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$89,005 | \$0 | \$89,005 |
| Sr Test Admin Spec | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$57,145 | \$2,220 | \$59,365 |
| Test Monitor 2 | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$35,244 | \$255 | \$35,499 |
|  |  | 1,061 | 83\% | 74.9\% | \$55,583 | \$1,135 | \$56,718 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Clerical Asst 2(Temp Pool) (7 employees), Employee Benefits Specialist 1 (1), Police Records Data Spec (1), Police Records Data Spec Supv (1), Supv Mgmt Anlyst(Supv Lndscp Cnsv Dsnr) (1), and Test Monitor 1 (1)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women People <br> of Color | Regular Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asst Mgmt Anlyst(Litrcy Tut/Lrng Coord) (48 excluded), Clerical Asst 2 (35), Cust Servs Rep (15), Administrative Aide 1 (12), Sr Mgmt Anlyst (12), Asoc Mgmt Anlyst (11), Administrative Aide 2 (8), Payroll Spec 2 (8), Police Records Clerk (7), Supv Mgmt Anlyst (7), Account Clerk (6), Asst Mgmt Anlyst (6), Clerical Asst 1 (6), Legal Secretary 2 (6), Word Processing Oper (5), Court Support Clrk 2 (4), Public Info Clerk (4), Sr Clerk/Typist (3), Deputy City Clerk 2 (2), Sr Mgmt Anlyst(Hland Secur Coord) (2), Sr Mgmt Anlyst(Ret Fncl Spec 3) (2), Sr Pers Anlyst (2), Workers' Compensation Claims Aide (2)

## Auditor

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 38: Auditor Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Performance Auditor | Offc of the City Auditor (100\%) | 15 | $46.7 \%$ | $46.7 \%$ | $\$ 103,474$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 103,474$ |
| City Auditor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Performance Auditor (4 excluded)

## Building Trades and Facilities Maint

Table 39: Building Trades and Facilities Maint Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Bldg Service Tech | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 20 | 10\% | 75\% | \$43,936 | \$1,656 | \$45,592 |
| Painter | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 20 | 5\% | 75\% | \$53,945 | \$2,455 | \$56,400 |
| Carpenter | READ Facilities Svcs (94\%), Public Util - Wtr Constrct Máint (6\%) | 16 | 0\% | 81.2\% | \$57,316 | \$1,015 | \$58,331 |
| Bldg Maint Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 11 | 18.2\% | 72.7\% | \$79,922 | \$2,221 | \$82,143 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Welder | Fleet Ops (64\%), Public Util - Wstw'tr Treat \& Disposal (18\%) | 11 | 0\% | 72.7\% | \$60,663 | \$8,354 | \$69,017 |
| Plumber | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 10 | 0\% | 60\% | \$65,138 | \$5,730 | \$70,868 |
| Roofer | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 8 | 0\% | 87.5\% | \$49,906 | \$24 | \$49,930 |
| HVACR Technician | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 7 | 14.3\% | 57.1\% | \$64,708 | \$1,005 | \$65,714 |
| Sr HVACR Technician | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 7 | 0\% | 42.9\% | \$71,105 | \$1,435 | \$72,540 |
| Bldg Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (80\%) <br> Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (20\%) | 5 | 20\% | 80\% | \$56,246 | \$3,486 | \$59,732 |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 100\% | \$39,490 | \$3,906 | \$43,396 |
| Stadium Maintenance Tech | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 100\% | \$49,319 | \$3,526 | \$52,844 |
| Equip Painter | Fleet Ops ( $50 \%$ ), <br> Public Util - Wstw'tr Treat \& Disposal (50\%) | 4 | 0\% | 75\% | \$55,233 | \$10,964 | \$66,197 |
| Plasterer | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$55,019 | \$377 | \$55,396 |
| Apprentice 2-HVACR Technician | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$62,501 | \$470 | \$62,970 |
| Bldg Service Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$58,086 | \$1,141 | \$59,226 |
| Carpenter Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$56,028 | \$238 | \$56,267 |
| Heat Vent, \& Air Condit Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$74,696 | \$1,513 | \$76,208 |
| Locksmith | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$54,672 | \$86 | \$54,758 |
| Painter Supervisor | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$61,402 | \$894 | \$62,296 |
| Stadium Groundskpr | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$60,379 | \$9,525 | \$69,904 |
| Cement Finisher | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (50\%), Public Util - Wstwtr Collection (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$58,807 | \$16,008 | \$74,815 |
| Apprentice 1-HVACR Technician | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$39,577 | \$0 | \$39,577 |
| Apprentice 2-Plumber | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$47,874 | \$223 | \$48,097 |
| Construction Estimator | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$75,491 | \$0 | \$75,491 |
| Plumber Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$77,841 | \$106 | \$77,947 |
| Roofing Supervisor | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$60,989 | \$0 | \$60,989 |
| Sr Building Maint Supv | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$92,390 | \$242 | \$92,632 |
| Sr Locksmith | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$61,393 | \$0 | \$61,393 |
|  |  | 153 | 4.6\% | 73.9\% | \$57,997 | \$2,888 | \$60,885 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Stadium Turf Mgr (1 employee)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Welder (6 excluded), Bldg Service Tech (4), HVACR Technician (4), Carpenter (2), and Plumber (2)

## Chemist/Biologist

## Chemist Biologist Job Type - Career Progression



Table 40: Chemist/Biologist Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asst Chemist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 45 | 57.8\% | 64.4\% | \$74,046 | \$428 | \$74,474 |
| Laboratory Technician | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 27 | 40.7\% | 59.3\% | \$59,373 | \$1,848 | \$61,221 |
| Asoc Chemist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 17 | 47.1\% | 47.1\% | \$90,660 | \$594 | \$91,255 |
| Biologist 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (71\%) Transportation - Storm Wtr (29\%) | 17 | 29.4\% | 35.3\% | \$75,315 | \$1,484 | \$76,800 |
| Marine Biologist 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 11 | 54.5\% | 36.4\% | \$75,006 | \$420 | \$75,426 |
| Environmental Biologist 3 | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (40\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (20\%) | 10 | 80\% | 50\% | \$85,787 | \$4,043 | \$89,830 |
| Biologist 3 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 5 | 100\% | 40\% | \$80,401 | \$2,192 | \$82,593 |
| Biologist 1 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 50\% | 50\% | \$65,318 | \$1,746 | \$67,064 |
| Marine Biologist 3 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 75\% | 25\% | \$77,586 | \$1,820 | \$79,405 |
| Sr Chemist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 50\% | 50\% | \$100,010 | \$1,405 | \$101,414 |
| Jr Chemist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | \$67,958 | \$3,830 | \$71,788 |
| Environmental Biologist 2 | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$73,142 | \$0 | \$73,142 |
| Sr Biologist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$110,449 | \$0 | \$110,449 |
|  |  | 149 | 51.7\% | $51 \%$ | \$75,173 | \$1,288 | \$76,461 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Marine Biologist 1 (3 employees), Sr Marine Biologist (2), Storm Water Environmental Specialist 3 (2), and Asst Laboratory Tech (1)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Laboratory Technician (6 excluded), Asst Chemist (2), and Marine Biologist 3 (2)

## City Attorney



Table 41: City Attorney Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Deputy City Atty (26 excluded)

City Atty Invstgtr

City Atty Invstgtr Job Type - Career Progression


Table 42: City Atty Invstgtr Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| City Atty Invstgtr | City Attorney (100\%) | 20 | $45 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $\$ 78,983$ | $\$ 81$ | $\$ 79,064$ |
| Sr City Atty Invstgtr | City Attorney (100\%) | 5 | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $\$ 84,311$ | $\$ 422$ | $\$ 84,733$ |
| Principal City Atty <br> Invstgtr | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 92,964$ | $\$ 809$ | $\$ 93,773$ |
| Sr City Atty <br> Invtgr(Env Prot <br> Invstgtr) | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 92,677$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 92,677$ |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: City Atty Invstgtr (22 excluded)

## City Council Support Job Type - Career Progression



## City Council Support

Table 43: City Council Support Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Council Rep 1 | City Council (90\%) <br> Council Administration (10\%) | 52 | 51.9\% | 55.8\% | \$69,606 | \$0 | \$69,606 |
| Council Assistant | City Council (100\%) | 8 | 50\% | 25\% | \$126,246 | \$0 | \$126,246 |
| Council Committee Consultant | Council Administration (100\%) | 8 | 50\% | 37.5\% | \$89,041 | \$0 | \$89,041 |
| Council Rep 2 A | City Council (75\%), Council Administration (12\%) | 8 | 62.5\% | 50\% | \$85,822 | \$0 | \$85,822 |
| Council Rep 2 B | Council Administration (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$130,641 | \$0 | \$130,641 |
|  |  | 77 | 53.2\% | 49.4\% | \$79,987 | \$0 | \$79,987 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Student Intern-Mayor/Council (21 employees), Management Intern-Mayor/Council (9)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Council Rep 1 (20 excluded), and Council Rep 2 A (2)


Table 44: Cmnty Dev Spec Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Cmnty Dev Spec 2 | Economic Development (100\%) | 11 | 72.7\% | 54.5\% | \$66,595 | \$153 | \$66,748 |
| Cmnty Dev Spec 4 | Economic Development (100\%) | 7 | 42.9\% | 71.4\% | \$85,500 | \$0 | \$85,500 |
| Cmnty Dev Coord | Economic Development (100\%) | 6 | 50\% | 0\% | \$99,211 | \$0 | \$99,211 |
| Cmnty Dev Spec 3 | Economic Development (100\%) | 4 | 100\% | 75\% | \$81,230 | \$0 | \$81,230 |
|  |  | 28 | 64.3\% | 50\% | \$80,401 | \$60 | \$80,461 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Cmnty Dev Spec 4 (2 excluded)

## Code Compliance Officer

## Code Compliance Officer Job Type - Career Progression



Table 45: Code Compliance Officer Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Code Compliance Ofcr | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Environ Svis - Waste Reduction } \\ & \text { Division (55\%), } \\ & \text { Transportation'- Storm Wtr (16\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 31 | 41.9\% | 64.5\% | \$50,029 | \$3,694 | \$53,723 |
| Police Code Compl Ofcr | Police (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 25\% | \$58,816 | \$17,407 | \$76,223 |
| Code Compliance Supv | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (50\%) <br> Public Util-Ad'min Svcs (25\%) | 4 | 0\% | 50\% | \$56,653 | \$1,072 | \$57,725 |
|  |  | 39 | 33.3\% | 59\% | \$51,609 | \$4,832 | \$56,441 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Sr Code Compliance Supv (1 employee)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Code Compliance Ofcr (8 excluded)

## Collections

Table 46: Collections Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Collections Invstgtr 1 | City Treasurer (100\%) | 12 | 58.3\% | 75\% | \$49,134 | \$0 | \$49,134 |
| Collections Invstgtr 3 | City Treasurer (100\%) | 4 | 25\% | 100\% | \$66,699 | \$0 | \$66,699 |
| Collections Invstgtr 2 | City Treasurer (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$55,977 | \$0 | \$55,977 |
| Collections Invstgtr 1(Legal) | City Treasurer (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$59,197 | \$0 | \$59,197 |
| Collections Invstgtr Trainee | City Treasurer (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$38,742 | \$0 | \$38,742 |
| Collections Manager | City Treasurer (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$84,799 | \$0 | \$84,799 |
|  |  | 22 | 54.5\% | 81.8\% | \$54,867 | \$0 | \$54,867 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Collections Invstgtr 1 (2 excluded)

## Communications

Table 47: Communications Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Sr Public Info Ofcr | Communications ( $88 \%$ ) <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (12\%) | 8 | 50\% | 37.5\% | \$69,992 | \$1,138 | \$71,130 |
| Supv Public Info Ofcr | Communications (100\%) | 5 | 40\% | 60\% | \$71,001 | \$1,635 | \$72,636 |
| Graphic Designer | Communications (50\%), Purchasing \& Contracting (50\%) | 4 | 50\% | 75\% | \$57,560 | \$154 | \$57,713 |
| Multimedia Prod Coord | Communications (100\%) | 3 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | \$68,195 | \$717 | \$68,912 |
| Public Info Ofcr | Communications (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 0\% | \$51,860 | \$0 | \$51,860 |
| Multimedia Prod Spec | Communications (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$57,223 | \$0 | \$57,223 |
|  |  | 24 | 54.2\% | 41.7\% | \$65,107 | \$835 | \$65,942 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Sr Public Info Ofcr (3 excluded)

## Communications Tech

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.


Table 48: Communications Tech Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commctn Tech | Information Technology (94\%), Communications (6\%) | 17 | 0\% | 76.5\% | \$76,923 | \$1,439 | \$78,362 |
| Asoc Commctns Eng | Information Technology (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 0\% | \$103,306 | \$44 | \$103,350 |
| Equip Tech 1(Communctns) | Information Technology (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 75\% | \$48,598 | \$440 | \$49,038 |
| Sr Commctns Tech | Information Technology (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 50\% | \$79,216 | \$2,328 | \$81,544 |
| Commctn Tech Supv | Information Technology (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$80,800 | \$1,964 | \$82,764 |
| Apprentice 1Commctns Tech | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$56,877 | \$323 | \$57,200 |
| Apprentice 2Commctns Tech | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$74,583 | \$5,349 | \$79,932 |
| Equip Tech 2(Commctns) | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$48,502 | \$1,995 | \$50,497 |
| Sr Commctns Engineer | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$106,839 | \$0 | \$106,839 |
| Sr Commctns Tech Supv | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$102,459 | \$758 | \$103,217 |
|  |  | 36 | 0\% | 61.1\% | \$77,307 | \$1,335 | \$78,642 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Equip Tech 1(Communctns) (2 excluded)

## Crime Lab



Table 49: Crime Lab Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Criminalist 2(DNA) | Police (100\%) | 12 | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | \$106,950 | \$4,494 | \$111,444 |
| Criminalist 2 | Police (100\%) | 11 | 72.7\% | 45.5\% | \$95,225 | \$1,567 | \$96,793 |
| Criminalist 3 | Police (100\%) | 5 | 40\% | 0\% | \$102,182 | \$3,590 | \$105,772 |
| Supv Criminalist | Police (100\%) | 5 | 100\% | 0\% | \$111,739 | \$791 | \$112,530 |
| Laboratory Technician | Police (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$61,633 | \$47 | \$61,681 |
| Crime Laboratory Manager | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$163,477 | \$0 | \$163,477 |
|  |  | 37 | 70.3\% | 29.7\% | \$101,320 | \$2,519 | \$103,840 |

## Crime Scene Spec and Print Examiners

Table 50: Crime Scene Spec and Print Examiners Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Latent Print Examiner 2 | Police (100\%) | 10 | 50\% | 40\% | \$79,976 | \$418 | \$80,394 |
| Crime Scene Specialist | Police (100\%) | 8 | 87.5\% | 50\% | \$75,824 | \$6,280 | \$82,104 |
| Latent Print Examiner Aide | Police (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 33.3\% | \$50,953 | \$249 | \$51,202 |
| ${ }_{3}$ Latent Print Examiner | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$97,543 | \$0 | \$97,543 |
| Supv Crime Scene Specialist | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$86,214 | \$8,046 | \$94,260 |
| Supv Latent Print Examiner | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$89,469 | \$1,814 | \$91,283 |
|  |  | 24 | 66.7\% | 37.5\% | \$76,351 | \$2,710 | \$79,061 |

## Custodian

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

## Custodian Job Type - Career Progression

Custodian 2
Parks \& Recreation - Metro Parkustodian 1
Custodian 2
Parks \& Recreation - Metro Parks
Custodian 3
READ-Facilities Services


Table 51: Custodian Job Type - Study Population (2019)
Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Custodian 2 | READ Facilities SVCs (59\%) <br> Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (41\%) | 22 | 31.8\% | 90.9\% | \$36,804 | \$865 | \$37,669 |
| Custodian 3 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (83\%), READ Facilities Svcs (17\%) | 6 | 66.7\% | 100\% | \$47,833 | \$448 | \$48,280 |
| Custodian 1 | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$30,847 | \$1,616 | \$32,463 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Custodian 2 (4 excluded)

## Development Inspector

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Development Inspector Job Type - Career Progression


Table 52: Development Inspector Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Combination Inspctr 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 24 | 4.2\% | 37.5\% | \$72,313 | \$784 | \$73,097 |
| Combination Inspctr 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 12 | 0\% | 50\% | \$71,695 | \$400 | \$72,095 |
| Structural Inspector 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 11 | 0\% | 9.1\% | \$74,587 | \$4,636 | \$79,223 |
| Sr Combination Inspector | Development Svcs (100\%) | 8 | 0\% | 25\% | \$83,177 | \$271 | \$83,448 |
| Electrical Inspector 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 7 | 0\% | 42.9\% | \$78,323 | \$6,298 | \$84,621 |
| Mechanical Inspector $2$ | Development Svcs (100\%) | 7 | 14.3\% | 42.9\% | \$75,762 | \$6,882 | \$82,644 |
| Electrical Inspector 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | \$71,400 | \$10,120 | \$81,520 |
| Sr Structural Inspector | Development Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | \$80,371 | \$4,072 | \$84,443 |
| Sr Mechanical Inspector | Development Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$83,438 | \$11,232 | \$94,670 |
| Mechanical Inspector <br> 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$70,046 | \$2,616 | \$72,662 |
| Sr Electrical Inspector | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$73,828 | \$12,052 | \$85,880 |
| Structural Inspector 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$73,161 | \$4,885 | \$78,046 |
|  |  | 80 | 2.5\% | 35\% | \$74,994 | \$3,170 | \$78,165 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Life Safety Inspector 1 (2 employees)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Combination Inspctr 1 (6 excluded), and Combination Inspctr 2 (6)

## Development Project Manager

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.


Development Project Manager 3
Development Services

Table 53: Development Project Manager Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Development Project <br> Manager 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 17 | $23.5 \%$ | $70.6 \%$ | $\$ 84,528$ | $\$ 778$ | $\$ 85,306$ |
| Development Project <br> Manager 3 | Development Svcs (57\%), <br> Planning (36\%) | 14 | $78.6 \%$ | $21.4 \%$ | $\$ 101,038$ | $\$ 1,800$ | $\$ 102,838$ |
| Development Project <br> Manager 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 6 | $16.7 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\$ 71,370$ | $\$ 153$ | $\$ 71,523$ |
|  | 37 | $43.2 \%$ | $48.6 \%$ | $\$ 88,641$ | $\$ 1,064$ | $\$ 89,705$ |  |


| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> \% | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Development Project Manager 2 (3 excluded), and Development Project Manager 3 (3)

## Director

Table 54: Director Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Deputy Director | Eng \& Capital Proj (13\%), Development Svcs (12\%)' | 52 | 42.3\% | 26.9\% | \$141,167 | \$0 | \$141,167 |
| Asst Deputy Director | Development Svcs (38\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (31\%) | 13 | 53.8\% | 30.8\% | \$130,666 | \$0 | \$130,666 |
| Department Director | Debt Management (10\%) Department of Finance (10\%) | 10 | 60\% | 40\% | \$183,675 | \$0 | \$183,675 |
| Asst Department Director | Department of Finance (22\%), <br> Public Util - Admin Svcs (22\%) | 9 | 55.6\% | 33.3\% | \$154,416 | \$0 | \$154,416 |
| Deputy Pers Director | Personnel (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$134,658 | \$0 | \$134,658 |
| Asst Development Services Dir | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$154,318 | \$0 | \$154,318 |
| Asst Environmental Services Dir | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Environ Svcs-Resource Mgmt } \\ & \text { Refuse (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$149,638 | \$0 | \$149,638 |
| Asst Metro Wstwtr Dir | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$150,169 | \$0 | \$150,169 |
| Asst Pers Director | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$154,131 | \$0 | \$154,131 |
| Asst Planning Director | Planning (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$139,872 | \$0 | \$139,872 |
| Deputy Planning Director | Planning (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$130,715 | \$0 | \$130,715 |
| Development Services Dir | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$187,838 | \$0 | \$187,838 |
| Environmental Services Dir | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Environ Svcs - Resource Mgmt } \\ & \text { Refuse (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$259,756 | \$0 | \$259,756 |
| Governmental Rel Dir | NA (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$188,434 | \$0 | \$188,434 |
| Park \& Recreation Director | Parks \& Rec - Other (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$150,013 | \$0 | \$150,013 |
| Personnel Director | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$180,016 | \$0 | \$180,016 |
| Planning Director | Planning (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$192,391 | \$0 | \$192,391 |
| Real Estate Assets Dir | Real Estate Assets (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$195,096 | \$0 | \$195,096 |
| Risk Management Director | Risk Management (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$189,720 | \$0 | \$189,720 |
|  |  | 100 | 46\% | 29\% | \$149,573 | \$0 | \$149,573 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Public Utilities Director (2 employees)

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Deputy Director (16 excluded), Asst Deputy Director (4), Department Director (3), and Asst Department Director (2)

## Disposal Site Operations

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 55: Disposal Site Operations Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Utility Worker 2 | Environ Svcs - Collection (47\%), <br> Environ Svcs-Waste Reduction <br> Division (41\%) | 17 | 0\% | 82.4\% | \$43,217 | \$5,818 | \$49,035 |
| Landfill Equip Oper | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 16 | 0\% | 56.2\% | \$60,029 | \$18,821 | \$78,851 |
| Laborer | Environ Svcs - Refuse (88\%), <br> Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction <br> Division (12\%) | 8 | 0\% | 37.5\% | \$40,416 | \$9,779 | \$50,195 |
| Equip Operator 2 | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 7 | 14.3\% | 57.1\% | \$54,818 | \$17,406 | \$72,223 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 2 | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 5 | 0\% | 80\% | \$46,282 | \$2,557 | \$48,839 |
| Utility Worker 1 | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 4 | 25\% | 75\% | \$41,405 | \$503 | \$41,908 |
| Public Works Supv | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 66.7\% | \$63,704 | \$16,147 | \$79,851 |
| General Util Supv | Environ Svcs - Refuse (67\%), <br> Environ Svcs-Waste Reduction Division (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$74,066 | \$20,676 | \$94,742 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction } \\ & \text { Division (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$48,852 | \$881 | \$49,733 |
|  |  | 65 | 6.2\% | 63.1\% | \$50,927 | \$11,187 | \$62,114 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Laborer (5 excluded), and Utility Worker 2 (2)

## Elected Official

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 56: Elected Official Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Council Member | City Council (100\%) | 9 | 55.6\% | 44.4\% | \$88,894 | \$0 | \$88,894 |
| City Atty | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$197,287 | \$0 | \$197,287 |
| Mayor | NA (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$99,147 | \$0 | \$99,147 |
|  |  | 11 | 54.5\% | 45.5\% | \$99,680 | \$0 | \$99,680 |

## Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

## Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl Job Type - Career Progression

Electrician

## Plant <br> Procs Cntrl Electrician <br> Plant Procs Cntrl Supv

Electrician Suipv

Table 57: Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Electrician | $\begin{aligned} & \text { READ Facilities Svcs (48\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation -Streets (39\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 31 | 0\% | 61.3\% | \$65,950 | \$2,441 | \$68,391 |
| Plant Procs Cntrl Electrician | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (55\%), <br> Public Uti - Wstwtr Collection <br> (14\%) | 22 | 4.5\% | 50\% | \$77,225 | \$10,121 | \$87,346 |
| Plant Procs Cntrl Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (50\%), <br> Public Util - Wstwtr Collection (17\%) | 6 | 0\% | 50\% | \$86,183 | \$24,678 | \$110,861 |
| Electrician Supv | Transportation - Streets (67\%), READ Facilities Svcs (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 100\% | \$75,386 | \$9,518 | \$84,904 |
| Apprentice 2Electrcn(5 Yr) | READ Facilities Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$51,182 | \$2,992 | \$54,174 |
|  |  | 64 | 1.6\% | 57.8\% | \$71,704 | \$7,514 | \$79,218 |


| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Plant Procs Cntrl Electrician (6 excluded), and Electrician (2)

## Engineer - Civil

Engineer Civil Job Type - Career Progression


Table 58: Engineer - Civil Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asst Eng-Civil | Eng \& Capital Proj (72\%) Public Util-Admin Svcs (10\%) | 229 | 26.6\% | 58.1\% | \$78,942 | \$2,396 | \$81,338 |
| Asoc Eng-Civil | Eng \& Capital Proj (59\%) <br> Public Util-Admin Svcs ('13\%) | 197 | 32.5\% | 48.7\% | \$97,397 | \$2,844 | \$100,241 |
| Sr Civil Engineer | Eng \& Capital Proj (56\%), <br> Public Util - Admin Svcs (12\%) | 57 | 26.3\% | 45.6\% | \$124,339 | \$3,292 | \$127,632 |
| Jr Engineer-Civil | Eng \& Capital Proj (39\%), Development Svcs (16\%) | 57 | 33.3\% | 59.6\% | \$64,212 | \$995 | \$65,208 |
| Asst Eng-Traffic | Transportation - Traffic Eng <br> (73\%)', Development Svcs (10\%) | 30 | 16.7\% | 86.7\% | \$75,425 | \$2,635 | \$78,060 |
| Asoc Eng-Traffic | Transportation - Traffic Eng (48\%) ${ }^{48}$ ) | 27 | 37\% | 51.9\% | \$99,455 | \$3,072 | \$102,527 |
| Structural Engrng Asoc | Development Svcs (100\%) | 20 | 35\% | 55\% | \$100,182 | \$21,982 | \$122,164 |
| Sr Traffic Engineer | Transportation - Traffic Eng (50\%), <br> Develópment Svcs (17\%) | 12 | 8.3\% | 25\% | \$119,089 | \$4,814 | \$123,903 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structural Engrng Sr | Development Svcs (100\%) | 9 | 0\% | 22.2\% | \$123,328 | \$31,485 | \$154,814 |
| Asoc Eng-Civil(Sr Cntrct Spec) | Eng \& Capital Proj (56\%) Public Util-Admin Svcs ( $44 \%$ ) | 9 | 66.7\% | 55.6\% | \$85,659 | \$19 | \$85,678 |
| Asst Eng-Civil(Cntrct Spec) | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 7 | 42.9\% | 85.7\% | \$73,397 | \$0 | \$73,397 |
| Asoc Eng-Civil(Asoc Eng-Geol) | Development Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$110,433 | \$16,484 | \$126,917 |
| Sr Civil Engineer(Princ Cntrc Spec ) | Eng \& Capital Proj (50\%) <br> Public Util - Admin Svcs ( $50 \%$ ) | 2 |  |  | \$105,217 | \$74 | \$105,292 |
| Structural Engrng Asst | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$70,635 | \$0 | \$70,635 |
|  |  | 660 | 29.2\% | 54.1\% | \$90,000 | \$3,555 | \$93,555 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asst Eng-Civil (36 excluded), Jr Engineer-Civil (28), Asoc Eng-Civil (12), Sr Civil Engineer (8), Asst EngCivil(Cntrct Spec) (2)

## Engineer - Electrical

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 59: Engineer - Electrical Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asoc Eng-Electrical | Eng \& Capital Proj (36\%), Development Svcs (27\%) | 11 | 9.1\% | 27.3\% | \$96,793 | \$11,919 | \$108,712 |
| Asst Eng-Electrical | Eng \& Capital Proj ( $83 \%$ ), <br> Development Svcs (17\%) | 6 | 0\% | 50\% | \$81,348 | \$8,480 | \$89,828 |
| Sr Electrical Engineer | Development Svcs (50\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$115,268 | \$16,260 | \$131,528 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sr Electrical } \\ & \text { Engineer(Sr Cntrl Sys } \\ & \text { Eng) } \end{aligned}$ | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$121,376 | \$0 | \$121,376 |
|  |  | 20 | 5\% | 30\% | \$95,236 | \$10,726 | \$105,962 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Jr EngineerElectrical (1 employee)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asst Eng-Electrical (3 excluded), Asoc Eng-Electrical (2)

## Engineer - Other

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 60: Engineer - Other Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asoc Eng-Mechanical | Development Svcs (80\%) Public Util - Admin Svcs (20\%) | 5 | 40\% | 100\% | \$89,230 | \$16,464 | \$105,693 |
| Sr Mechanical Engineer | Development Svcs (67\%), Environ Svcs - Refuse (33'\%) | 3 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$122,299 | \$22,116 | \$144,415 |
| Asoc Eng-Corrosion | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$114,922 | \$7,012 | \$121,934 |
| Asst Eng-Corrosion | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$99,833 | \$4,864 | \$104,697 |
| Asst Eng-Mechanical | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$75,500 | \$0 | \$75,500 |
| Asst EngMechanical(Motve Equip Eng) | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$90,152 | \$953 | \$91,106 |
| Sr Engineer-Fire Protection | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$130,084 | \$11,738 | \$141,822 |
| Sr Engineering Geologist | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$139,983 | \$2,564 | \$142,547 |
|  |  | 15 | 20\% | 46.7\% | \$105,230 | \$12,187 | \$117,417 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asoc Eng-Mechanical (3 excluded)

## Env Haz Mat Inspctr

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 61: Env Haz Mat Inspctr Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |  |
| Haz Mat Inspctr 2 | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 6 | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $\$ 72,663$ | $\$ 1,316$ | $\$ 73,980$ |
| Haz Mat Inspctr 3 | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 89,461$ | $\$ 894$ | $\$ 90,355$ |
| Haz Mat Inspctr 1 | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 54,066$ | $\$ 1,265$ | $\$ 55,331$ |
| Supv Haz Mat Inspctr | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 89,949$ | $\$ 2,373$ | $\$ 92,322$ |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Haz Mat Prgrm Mgr (1 employee)

## Executive

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 62: Executive Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Executive Director | Offc of Boards \& Commissions (43\%), <br> City Attorney (14\%) | 7 | 71.4\% | 42.9\% | \$141,542 | \$0 | \$141,542 |
| Deputy Chief Oper Offr | Neighborhood Svcs (20\%), Offc of the Mayor (20\%) | 5 | 20\% | 20\% | \$217,722 | \$0 | \$217,722 |
| Asst Deputy Chief Oper Ofcr | Offc of the Mayor (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$202,958 | \$0 | \$202,958 |
| Asst Chief Oper Ofcr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Assistant COO (50\%), } \\ & \text { NA (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$287,516 | \$0 | \$287,516 |
| Chief Financial Officer | Chief Financial Offcr (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$240,847 | \$0 | \$240,847 |
| Chief Operating Officer | Offc of the COO (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$289,423 | \$0 | \$289,423 |
|  |  | 18 | 44.4\% | 33.3\% | \$199,479 | \$0 | \$199,479 |

## Executive Assistant

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 63: Executive Assistant Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Executive Assistant | Department of Finance (10\%), Offc of Boards \& Commissions' (10\%) | 21 | 100\% | 71.4\% | \$55,392 | \$151 | \$55,543 |
| Asst to the Director | Offc of the City Auditor (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$70,374 | \$0 | \$70,374 |
| Asst to the Fire Chief | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$146,599 | \$0 | \$146,599 |
| Conf Secretary to Chief Oper Ofcr | Offc of the COO (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$91,501 | \$0 | \$91,501 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conf Secretary to City } \\ & \text { Atty } \end{aligned}$ | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$150,793 | \$0 | \$150,793 |
| Conf Secretary to Mayor | Offc of the Mayor (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$101,721 | \$0 | \$101,721 |
| Conf Secretary to Police Chief | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$79,591 | \$0 | \$79,591 |
| Principal Asst to City Atty | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$141,549 | \$0 | \$141,549 |
|  |  | 29 | 100\% | 69\% | \$69,508 | \$109 | \$69,617 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Executive Assistant (5 excluded), and Asst to the Director (2)

## Fire Dispatch

## Fire Dispatch Job Type - Career Progression



Table 64: Fire Dispatch Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Dispatcher | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 30 | $50 \%$ | $56.7 \%$ | $\$ 66,232$ | $\$ 18,002$ | $\$ 84,234$ |
| Fire Dispatch Supv | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 7 | $42.9 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $\$ 73,257$ | $\$ 20,967$ | $\$ 94,224$ |
| Dispatcher 2 | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 6 | $66.7 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 55,400$ | $\$ 17,954$ | $\$ 73,354$ |
| Dispatcher 1 | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 56,830$ | $\$ 3,267$ | $\$ 60,097$ |
| Fire Dispatch <br> Administrator | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 90,882$ | $\$ 54,377$ | $\$ 145,259$ |
|  | 45 | $51.1 \%$ | $53.3 \%$ | $\$ 66,219$ | $\$ 18,938$ | $\$ 85,157$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Fire Dispatcher (4 excluded), and Dispatcher 2 (2)

## Fire Fighter

Fire Fighter Job Type - Career Progression


Table 65: Fire Fighter Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Fire Fighter 2 | SDFD - Suppression (99\%), <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (1\%) | 275 | 4\% | 35.6\% | \$67,562 | \$36,039 | \$103,600 |
| Fire Captain | SDFD - Suppression (93\%), <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (7\%) | 193 | 4.1\% | 32.6\% | \$88,097 | \$67,010 | \$155,107 |
| Fire Engineer | SDFD - Suppression (99\%), <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (1\%) | 192 | 4.7\% | 27.1\% | \$75,465 | \$56,430 | \$131,895 |
| Fire Fighter 3 | SDFD - Suppression (87\%), <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (13\%) | 38 | 2.6\% | 42.1\% | \$74,395 | \$58,636 | \$133,032 |
| Fire Battalion Chief | SDFD - Suppression ( $66 \%$ ), <br> SDFD - Fire Rescue (34\%) | 32 | 3.1\% | 43.8\% | \$116,886 | \$62,497 | \$179,383 |
| Fire Fighter 1 | SDFD - Suppression (100\%) | 9 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$51,989 | \$7,863 | \$59,853 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SDFD - Fire Rescue ( } 57 \% \text { ), } \\ & \text { SDFD - Suppression (43\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 0\% | 42.9\% | \$167,748 | \$0 | \$167,748 |
| Asst Fire Chief | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$173,024 | \$0 | \$173,024 |
| Fire Chief | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$226,463 | \$0 | \$226,463 |
|  |  | 749 | 4\% | 33.4\% | \$78,576 | \$50,703 | \$129,280 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Fire Recruit (59 employees)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Fire Fighter 1 (61 excluded), Fire Fighter 2 (44), Fire Captain (27), Fire Engineer (17), Fire Fighter 3 (8), and Fire Battalion Chief (3)

Table 66: Fire Prevention Job Type - Study Population (2019)

## Fire Prevention Job Type - Career Progression



Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ <br> of Colorle <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fire Prevention <br> Inspctr 2 | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 20 | $10 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $\$ 94,167$ | $\$ 20,657$ | $\$ 114,825$ |
| Fire Prevention <br> Inspctr 2/Civ | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 6 | $33.3 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $\$ 103,546$ | $\$ 7,514$ | $\$ 111,059$ |
| Asst Fire Marshal/Civ | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 155,925$ | $\$ 49,464$ | $\$ 205,389$ |
| Fire Prevention Supv | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 123,430$ | $\$ 22,991$ | $\$ 146,421$ |
| Fire Prevention <br> Supv/Civ | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 114,437$ | $\$ 16,544$ | $\$ 130,982$ |
|  | 32 | $21.9 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $\$ 102,881$ | $\$ 19,882$ | $\$ 122,763$ |  |

## Fleet Technician

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Fleet Technician Job Type - Career Progression

> Fleet
> Team Leader


Table 67: Fleet Technician Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fleet Technician | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 60 | 0\% | 78.3\% | \$60,047 | \$4,260 | \$64,307 |
| Asst Fleet Technician | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 21 | 4.8\% | 71.4\% | \$49,892 | \$3,478 | \$53,370 |
| Master Fleet Technician | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 14 | 0\% | 50\% | \$66,494 | \$5,526 | \$72,020 |
| Fleet Repair Supv | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 10 | 0\% | 70\% | \$85,145 | \$7,540 | \$92,685 |
| Fleet Team Leader | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 9 | 0\% | 55.6\% | \$72,679 | \$8,092 | \$80,771 |
| Body \& Fender Mech | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 50\% | \$60,992 | \$229 | \$61,220 |
| Fleet Manager | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 25\% | \$98,530 | \$0 | \$98,530 |
| Apprentice 1-Fleet Technician | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$43,242 | \$2,456 | \$45,698 |
| Machinist | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$62,008 | \$0 | \$62,008 |
| Motive Serv Tech | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$36,791 | \$4,508 | \$41,299 |
|  |  | 126 | 0.8\% | 68.3\% | \$62,781 | \$4,481 | \$67,261 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Fleet Technician (17 excluded), and Asst Fleet Technician (4)

## Golf Operations

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 68: Golf Operations Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Golf Starter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses } \\ & \text { (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | \$49,208 | \$4,452 | \$53,661 |
| Rec Spec(Golf) | Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 25\% | \$59,322 | \$2,132 | \$61,455 |
| Golf Course Mgr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$89,092 | \$3,506 | \$92,598 |
|  |  | 23 | 4.3\% | 13\% | \$54,435 | \$3,967 | \$58,402 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Rec Aide (9 employees)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Golf Starter (20 excluded)

## Information Systems



Table 69: Information Systems Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Info Sys Anlyst 3 | Information Technology (22\%), Public Util - Admin Svcs (22\%) | 36 | 38.9\% | 63.9\% | \$79,608 | \$0 | \$79,608 |
| Info Sys Anlyst 2 | Police (17\%), <br> Public Util - Ádmin Svcs (17\%) | 30 | 13.3\% | 60\% | \$70,045 | \$0 | \$70,045 |
| Info Sys Anlyst 4 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (19\%), Information Technology (14\%)' | 21 | 28.6\% | 66.7\% | \$88,489 | \$0 | \$88,489 |
| Info Sys Tech | Library (25\%) <br> City Attorney (12\%) | 8 | 37.5\% | 50\% | \$51,888 | \$68 | \$51,955 |
| Info Sys Admnstr | Development Svcs (33\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (33\%)' | 3 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$99,929 | \$0 | \$99,929 |
| Info Sys Anlyst <br> 4(Supy Cntrl Sys Prgmr) | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (50\%), <br> Public Util - Wtr' Sys Ops (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$89,846 | \$0 | \$89,846 |
| Info Sys Mgr | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$106,928 | \$0 | \$106,928 |
|  |  | 101 | 26.7\% | 61.4\% | \$77,495 | \$5 | \$77,500 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Info Sys Anlyst 2 (4 excluded), Info Sys Anlyst 3 (4), and Info Sys Tech (3)


Table 70: Land Surveying Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Land Survyng Assist | Eng \& Capital Proj (89\%), Development Svcs (11\%) | 28 | 7.1\% | 32.1\% | \$80,228 | \$1,457 | \$81,684 |
| Principal Survey Aide | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 15 | 13.3\% | 26.7\% | \$67,012 | \$1,255 | \$68,268 |
| Land Survyng Asoc | Eng \& Capital Proj (58\%), Development Svcs (33\%) | 12 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$106,934 | \$6,319 | \$113,253 |
| Sr Land Surveyor | Eng \& Capital Proj ( $67 \%$ ), Development Svcs (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | \$125,438 | \$5,624 | \$131,062 |
| Sr Survey Aide | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$51,163 | \$1,079 | \$52,242 |
|  |  | 60 | 6.7\% | 30\% | \$83,557 | \$2,574 | \$86,131 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Land Survyng Asoc (2 excluded)

## Librarian

## Librarian Job Type - Career Progression



Table 71: Librarian Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Library Assistant 2 | Library (100\%) | 111 | 64.9\% | 69.4\% | \$49,378 | \$2,581 | \$51,958 |
| Library Assistant 3 | Library (100\%) | 68 | 69.1\% | 64.7\% | \$61,453 | \$4,738 | \$66,190 |
| Library Assistant 1 | Library (100\%) | 49 | 77.6\% | 63.3\% | \$39,030 | \$2,728 | \$41,759 |
| Librarian 2 | Library (100\%) | 40 | 77.5\% | 30\% | \$71,847 | \$2,534 | \$74,381 |
| Librarian 3 | Library (100\%) | 27 | 74.1\% | 40.7\% | \$76,556 | \$206 | \$76,762 |
| Librarian 4 | Library (100\%) | 24 | 58.3\% | 29.2\% | \$81,400 | \$284 | \$81,684 |
| Supv Librarian | Library (100\%) | 6 | 83.3\% | 66.7\% | \$95,286 | \$45 | \$95,331 |
| Librarian 1 | Library (100\%) | 5 | 60\% | 40\% | \$63,928 | \$671 | \$64,599 |
| Deputy Library Dir | Library (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$127,686 | \$0 | \$127,686 |
| City Librarian | Library (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$181,207 | \$0 | \$181,207 |
|  |  | 333 | 69.7\% | 57.1\% | \$59,443 | \$2,582 | \$62,025 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Library Assistant 1 (178 excluded), Library Assistant 3 (39), Librarian 2 (24), Library Assistant 2 (21), Librarian 1 (7), Librarian 3 (3), and Librarian 4 (2)

## Lifeguard

## Lifeguard Job Type - Career Progression



Table 72: Lifeguard Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lifeguard 2 | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 54 | $11.1 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ | $\$ 75,601$ | $\$ 13,435$ | $\$ 89,036$ |
| Lifeguard 3 | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 21 | $4.8 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $\$ 86,674$ | $\$ 32,931$ | $\$ 119,605$ |
| Lifeguard Sergeant | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 19 | $10.5 \%$ | $10.5 \%$ | $\$ 96,358$ | $\$ 29,155$ | $\$ 125,512$ |
| Marine Safety | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 4 | $25 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\$ 109,986$ | $\$ 23,837$ | $\$ 133,823$ |
| Lieutenant | 1 |  |  | $\$ 162,888$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 162,888$ |  |
| Lifeguard Chief | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 127,209$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 127,209$ |
| Marine Safety Captain | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Lifeguard 1 (294 employees)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Lifeguard 2 (6 excluded)

## Mayor Representative

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 73: Mayor Representative Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| ${ }_{2}$ Mayor Representative | Offc of the Mayor (100\%) | 14 | 71.4\% | 71.4\% | \$93,529 | \$0 | \$93,529 |
|  |  | 14 | 71.4\% | 71.4\% | \$93,529 | \$0 | \$93,529 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Mayor Representative 2 (6 excluded)

## Other

Table 74: Other Job Type - Study Population (2019)

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asst Investment Ofcr | City Retirement ( $67 \%$ ), City Treasurer (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 0\% | \$128,896 | \$0 | \$128,896 |
| Quality Mgmt Coord | SDFD - Fire Rescue (67\%) Emergency Medical Svcs (33\%) | 3 | 33.3\% | 0\% | \$111,107 | \$0 | \$111,107 |
| Airport Manager | Airports (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$71,624 | \$2,944 | \$74,567 |
| Compliance \& Metering Mgr | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$86,391 | \$0 | \$86,391 |
| Environmental Health Coordinator | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$79,089 | \$1,442 | \$80,531 |
| Field Rep | $\underset{(100 \%)}{\text { Transportation - Storm Wtr }}$ | 2 |  |  | \$46,759 | \$436 | \$47,194 |
| Fire Engineer-Mast | SDFD - MAST (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$69,831 | \$68,520 | \$138,352 |
| Paramedic 2 (Terminal) | Emergency Medical Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$77,745 | \$6,164 | \$83,910 |
| Polygrapher 3 | Police (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$98,480 | \$143 | \$98,622 |
| Public Art Prgm Admnstr | Offc of Boards \& Commissions (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$87,929 | \$0 | \$87,929 |
| Publishing Specialist 2 | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$41,539 | \$214 | \$41,754 |
| Pump Station Oper Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$55,944 | \$31,368 | \$87,313 |
| Recycling Spec 1 | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$49,669 | \$138 | \$49,807 |
| Sr Airport Operations Asst | Airports (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$52,371 | \$1,758 | \$54,130 |
| Supv Disposal Site Rep | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$49,316 | \$11,378 | \$60,693 |
| Supv Recycling Spec | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$86,498 | \$0 | \$86,498 |
| Utility Worker 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$39,164 | \$14,476 | \$53,640 |
| Utility Worker 2 | Airports (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$46,912 | \$742 | \$47,654 |
| Water Production Superintendent | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$106,987 | \$7,546 | \$114,532 |
| Water Sys District Mgr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$86,990 | \$2,335 | \$89,325 |
| Investment Officer | City Retirement (50\%), City Treasurer (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$189,158 | \$0 | \$189,158 |
| Org Efec Spec 3 | Human Resources (50\%) <br> Public Util - Admin Svcs ('50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$79,396 | \$0 | \$79,396 |
| Plant Procs Cntrl Supv(Plnt Maint Coord) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (50 \%) \\ & \text { Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops ( } 50 \% \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$75,010 | \$17,405 | \$92,414 |
| Recycling Prgm Mgr(Asset Mgmt Coord) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (50\%), <br>  <br> Disposal (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$99,961 | \$0 | \$99,961 |
| Supv Rec Spec | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (50\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Other (50\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$64,006 | \$2,128 | \$66,134 |
| Air Operations Chief | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$136,452 | \$82,599 | \$219,051 |
| Asoc Economist | Debt Management (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,927 | \$0 | \$67,927 |
| Asst for Community Outreach | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$100,630 | \$0 | \$100,630 |
| Asst Retirement Administrator | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$210,066 | \$0 | \$210,066 |
| Asst Retirement General Counsel | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$143,655 | \$0 | \$143,655 |
| Boat Operator | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$55,575 | \$798 | \$56,373 |
| Business Systems Analyst 2 | Information Technology (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$80,513 | \$0 | \$80,513 |
| City Clerk | City Clerk (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$164,629 | \$0 | \$164,629 |
| Deputy Fire Chief | Emergency Medical Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$150,699 | \$0 | \$150,699 |
| Dispatcher 1 | Transportation - General Svcs Station 38 (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$68,812 | \$5,622 | \$74,434 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DNA Technical Manager | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$92,693 | \$7,039 | \$99,732 |
| Electronics Tech | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,586 | \$0 | \$67,586 |
| Environmental Health Manager | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$91,722 | \$2,451 | \$94,173 |
| Equal Employment Invstgtns Mgr | Personnel (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$142,082 | \$0 | \$142,082 |
| Equip Operator 1 | Airports (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$54,342 | \$0 | \$54,342 |
| Equip Operator 2 | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$65,176 | \$488 | \$65,664 |
| Executive Assistant Police Chief | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$350,595 | \$0 | \$350,595 |
| Facility Manager | Qualcomm Stadium Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$145,563 | \$0 | \$145,563 |
| Fire Battalion Chief | Emergency Medical Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$153,864 | \$67,503 | \$221,367 |
| Fire Captain(Emer Mgmt Coord) | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$131,949 | \$13,671 | \$145,620 |
| Fire Fighter 2 | Emergency Medical Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$93,820 | \$15,798 | \$109,618 |
| Fleet Attendant | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$37,600 | \$1,484 | \$39,084 |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 | Airports (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$41,302 | \$0 | \$41,302 |
| Haz Mat Inspctr 2(Solid Wst Insp 2) | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$65,817 | \$0 | \$65,817 |
| Independent Budget Anlyst | Independent Budget Analyst (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$250,955 | \$0 | \$250,955 |
| Librarian 3(Law Librn) | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$84,046 | \$0 | \$84,046 |
| Literacy Prgm Admnstr | Library (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$106,363 | \$0 | \$106,363 |
| Medical Review Officer | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$110,552 | \$0 | \$110,552 |
| Metal Fabrication Supv | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$70,567 | \$0 | \$70,567 |
| Org Efec Spec 2 | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$75,406 | \$0 | \$75,406 |
| Org Efec Spec <br> 3(Outrch \& Ed Coord) | SDFD - Lifeguard (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$81,029 | \$0 | \$81,029 |
| Org Efec Supv | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$98,419 | \$0 | \$98,419 |
| Paramedic Coord | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$116,118 | \$0 | \$116,118 |
| Principal Auditor | Offc of the City Auditor (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$114,510 | \$0 | \$114,510 |
| Principal Legal Sec | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$80,674 | \$0 | \$80,674 |
| Print Shop Supv | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$68,968 | \$2,334 | \$71,302 |
| Public Works Dispatch Supv | Transportation-General Svcs Station 38 (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,225 | \$2,602 | \$69,827 |
| Ranger/Diver 2 | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$61,285 | \$7,208 | \$68,493 |
| Ranger/Diver Supv | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,845 | \$6,750 | \$74,595 |
| Rec Spec | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$58,525 | \$1,745 | \$60,270 |
| Recycling Prgm Mgr | Environ Svcs - Waste Reduction Division (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$92,124 | \$0 | \$92,124 |
| Retirement Administrator | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$275,581 | \$0 | \$275,581 |
| Retirement General Counsel | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$206,201 | \$0 | \$206,201 |
| Security Officer | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$78,629 | \$565 | \$79,194 |
| Sr Boat Operator | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$77,082 | \$1,785 | \$78,867 |
| Sr Corrosion Specialist | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$117,943 | \$5,356 | \$123,299 |
| Sr Disposal Site Rep | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$48,379 | \$6,380 | \$54,759 |
| Sr Legislative Recoder(Docket Coord) | Offc of the COO (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$60,115 | \$0 | \$60,115 |
| Sr Library Tech | Library (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$75,042 | \$0 | \$75,042 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sr Paralegal (Sr Retire Paralegal) | City Retirement (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$79,508 | \$234 | \$79,742 |
| Sr Power Plant Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& } \\ & \text { Disposal (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$81,326 | \$15,972 | \$97,298 |
| Sr Publishing Specialist | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$52,205 | \$4,949 | \$57,154 |
| Sr Water Distribution Operations Supv | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$107,325 | \$37,402 | \$144,727 |
| Supv Economist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$89,826 | \$0 | \$89,826 |
| Supv Procurement Contracting Officer | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$86,814 | \$4,096 | \$90,910 |
| Water Distribution Operations Supv | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$87,116 | \$19,468 | \$106,584 |
|  |  | 203 | 40.4\% | 40.4\% | \$80,711 | \$8,194 | \$88,905 |

## Other Equip Tech

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 75: Other Equip Tech Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Traffic Signal Technician 2 | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 13 | 0\% | 30.8\% | \$71,733 | \$24,159 | \$95,892 |
| Parking Meter Tech | City Treasurer (100\%) | 8 | 0\% | 50\% | \$52,617 | \$0 | \$52,617 |
| Equip Tech 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & \text { (80\%), } \\ & \text { Enviroń Svcs - Refuse (20\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 0\% | 80\% | \$55,936 | \$26,929 | \$82,866 |
| Aquatics Tech 2 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 4 | 25\% | 75\% | \$59,482 | \$4,207 | \$63,689 |
| Traffic Signal Supervisor | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 100\% | \$89,559 | \$19,962 | \$109,521 |
| Marine Mechanic | SDFD - Lifequard (67\%), <br> Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops' (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$59,398 | \$4,610 | \$64,009 |
| Aquatics Tech 1 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$60,584 | \$10,264 | \$70,848 |
| Equip Tech 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$52,230 | \$26,252 | \$78,482 |
| Traffic Signal Technician 1 | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$72,853 | \$5,665 | \$78,518 |
| Aquatics Tech Supv | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$69,214 | \$18,513 | \$87,727 |
| Equip Tech 3 | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$66,618 | \$12,102 | \$78,720 |
| Helicopter Mechanic | SDFD - Fire Rescue (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$63,857 | \$67,629 | \$131,486 |
| Master Fleet Technician | Environ Svcs - Refuse (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$87,886 | \$13,561 | \$101,447 |
| Sr Parking Meter Tech | City Treasurer (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$51,725 | \$0 | \$51,725 |
|  |  | 47 | 2.1\% | 55.3\% | \$64,438 | \$15,647 | \$80,085 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Equip Tech 1 (3 excluded)

## Paralegal

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

## Paralegal Job Type - Career Progression



Table 76: Paralegal Job Type - Study Population (2019)
Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ <br> People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Paralegal | City Attorney (100\%) | 18 | $83.3 \%$ | $38.9 \%$ | $\$ 67,473$ | $\$ 932$ | $\$ 68,406$ |
| Sr Paralegal | City Attorney (100\%) | 5 | $80 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $\$ 75,845$ | $\$ 104$ | $\$ 75,948$ |
| Paralegal(Ret <br> Paralegal) | City Retirement (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 71,643$ | $\$ 762$ | $\$ 72,404$ |
| Principal Paralegal | City Attorney (100\%) | 1 |  |  | $\$ 68,022$ | $\$ 3,520$ | $\$ 71,542$ |
|  | 26 | $84.6 \%$ | $38.5 \%$ | $\$ 69,425$ | $\$ 859$ | $\$ 70,284$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Paralegal (2 excluded)

## Park Ranger

## Park Ranger Job Type - Career Progression

Sr Park Ranger<br>Parks \& Recreation - Open Space

Sr Park Ranger
Parks \& Recreation - Metro F

Table 77: Park Ranger Job Type - Study Population (2019)
Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Park Ranger | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Open Space(55\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (45\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 31 | 38.7\% | 35.5\% | \$54,635 | \$2,878 | \$57,513 |
| Sr Park Ranger | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Open Space (70\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (30\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 30\% | 30\% | \$68,763 | \$3,334 | \$72,097 |
| Park Ranger Aide | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$40,831 | \$3,400 | \$44,231 |
|  |  | 42 | 35.7\% | 35.7\% | \$57,670 | \$2,999 | \$60,669 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Park Ranger (2 excluded)

## Parking Enforcement



Table 78: Parking Enforcement Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Parking Enfrc Ofcr 1 | ```Police (78%), Transportation - Storm Wtr (22%)``` | 36 | 36.1\% | 63.9\% | \$54,464 | \$6,416 | \$60,881 |
| Parking Enfrc Ofcr 2 | ```Police (93%), Transportation - Storm Wtr (7%)``` | 15 | 33.3\% | 86.7\% | \$56,537 | \$10,865 | \$67,401 |
| Parking Enfrc Supv | ```Police (86%), Transportation - Storm Wtr (14%)``` | 7 | 28.6\% | 71.4\% | \$64,209 | \$18,275 | \$82,484 |
|  |  | 58 | 34.5\% | 70.7\% | \$56,176 | \$8,998 | \$65,174 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Sr Parking Enfrc Supv (1 employee)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Parking Enfrc Ofcr 1 (13 excluded), and Parking Enfrc Ofcr 2 (4)

## Parks Grounds Maintenance

# Parks Grounds Maintenance Job Type - Career Progression 



Table 79: Parks Grounds Maintenance Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (44\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Community Pks } \\ & (31 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 245 | 17.6\% | 84.1\% | \$42,527 | \$887 | \$43,414 |
| Grounds Maint Mgr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Open Space (77\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (23\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 26 | 3.8\% | 61.5\% | \$68,385 | \$1,011 | \$69,396 |
| Greenskeeper | Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (100\%) | 21 | 4.8\% | 81\% | \$43,814 | \$1,730 | \$45,544 |
| Light Equipment Operator | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks ( } 80 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses }(20 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 0\% | 80\% | \$44,906 | \$416 | \$45,322 |
| Grounds Maint Wrkr 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (60\%), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (33\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 33.3\% | 100\% | \$38,485 | \$1,438 | \$39,923 |
| Equip Operator 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks ( } \left.79 \%)^{( }\right) \\ & \text {Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses }(21 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 14 | 0\% | 92.9\% | \$49,787 | \$748 | \$50,535 |
| Seven-Gang Mower Operator | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (83\%) } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (17\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 12 | 0\% | 83.3\% | \$50,824 | \$520 | \$51,344 |
| Grounds Maint Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks ( } 70 \% \text { ), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec- Community Pks- } \\ & \text { Disabled Svcs (20\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 10 | 40\% | 80\% | \$50,062 | \$1,374 | \$51,436 |
| Equip Operator 2 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 9 | 11.1\% | 88.9\% | \$55,013 | \$5,841 | \$60,854 |
| Equip Tech 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks ( } 89 \%)_{6} \\ & \text { Parks } \& \text { Rec }- \text { Golf Courses }(11 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 9 | 0\% | 100\% | \$47,747 | \$1,300 | \$49,047 |
| Equip Tech 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (62\%) } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (38\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 12.5\% | 62.5\% | \$53,797 | \$1,252 | \$55,048 |
| Pesticide Applicator | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (50\%) } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec-Golf Courses }(25 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 25\% | 50\% | \$52,627 | \$1,088 | \$53,714 |
| Laborer | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (100\%) | 6 | 0\% | 100\% | \$40,531 | \$4,001 | \$44,531 |
| Greenskeeper Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 0\% | 20\% | \$60,060 | \$4,869 | \$64,929 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 1 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 5 | 0\% | 80\% | \$42,038 | \$3,925 | \$45,963 |
| Irrigation Specialist | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses ( } 60 \% \text { ), } \\ & \text { Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks }(40 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 5 | 0\% | 40\% | \$53,552 | \$3,511 | \$57,063 |
| Utility Supv(Park Utility Supv) | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 50\% | \$57,703 | \$315 | \$58,018 |
| Utility Worker 1 | Parks \& Rec - Open Space (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 100\% | \$46,932 | \$2,542 | \$49,474 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Utility Supv | Parks \& Rec - Open Space ( $50 \%$ ), Parks \& Rec - Community Pks Disabled Svcs (25\%) | 4 | 0\% | 100\% | \$63,375 | \$4,027 | \$67,402 |
| Tree Trimmer | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 100\% | \$43,207 | \$466 | \$43,674 |
| Utility Worker 2 | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$43,521 | \$398 | \$43,919 |
| Nursery Gardener | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$49,012 | \$522 | \$49,534 |
| Equip Tech 3 | Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (50\%), <br> Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (50\%) | 2 |  |  | \$62,628 | \$2,024 | \$64,652 |
| Golf Course Supt | Parks \& Rec - Golf Courses (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$83,066 | \$3,226 | \$86,292 |
| Nursery Supv | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$55,895 | \$322 | \$56,217 |
| Pesticide Supv | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$55,646 | \$0 | \$55,646 |
| Sr Utility Supv | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$64,775 | \$7,430 | \$72,205 |
| Tree Maint Crewleader | Parks \& Rec - Metro Pks (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$48,542 | \$0 | \$48,542 |
|  |  | 440 | 13.4\% | 80.9\% | \$46,447 | \$1,257 | \$47,703 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Grounds Maint Wrkr 1 (36 excluded), Grounds Maint Wrkr 2 (30), Greenskeeper (6), Laborer (4), and Equip Tech 2 (2)


Table 80: Plan Review Spec Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Plan Review Spec 3 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 11 | $54.5 \%$ | $72.7 \%$ | $\$ 63,285$ | $\$ 309$ | $\$ 63,594$ |
| Supv Plan Review | Development Svcs (100\%) | 6 | $50 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 77,155$ | $\$ 8,043$ | $\$ 85,199$ |
| Spec | 5 | $100 \%$ | $80 \%$ | $\$ 70,915$ | $\$ 1,575$ | $\$ 72,490$ |  |
| Plan Review Spec 4 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 4 | $50 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\$ 53,737$ | $\$ 8$ | $\$ 53,745$ |
| Plan Review Spec 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 4 | $100 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\$ 54,560$ | $\$ 280$ | $\$ 54,839$ |
| Plan Review Spec 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 30 | $66.7 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 64,894$ | $\$ 2,023$ | $\$ 66,917$ |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Plan Review Spec 3 (7 excluded), Plan Review Spec 1 (5), and Plan Review Spec 2 (3)

## Planner

Planner Job Type - Career Progression<br>Park Designer

Principal
Plañner

Table 81: Planner Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asoc Planner | Development Svcs (49\%) <br> Transportation - Storm Wtr (14\%) | 43 | 60.5\% | 37.2\% | \$75,552 | \$197 | \$75,749 |
| Sr Planner | Planning ( $35 \%$ ), <br> Development Sv́cs (30\%) | 43 | 51.2\% | 37.2\% | \$90,353 | \$1,659 | \$92,012 |
| Asst Planner | Development Svcs (40\%), <br> Eng \& Capital Proj (30\%)' | 10 | 60\% | 60\% | \$63,224 | \$449 | \$63,672 |
| Park Designer | Eng \& Capital Proj (50\%), <br> Parks \& Rec - Other (25\%) | 8 | 37.5\% | 25\% | \$92,140 | \$179 | \$92,319 |
| Sr Planner(Wtr Resrcs Spec) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$80,510 | \$2,269 | \$82,778 |
| Jr Planner | Development Svcs (50\%), <br> Eng \& Capital Proj (50\%)' | 2 |  |  | \$59,294 | \$3,052 | \$62,346 |
| Principal Planner | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Environ Svcs-Resource Mgmt } \\ & \text { Refuse (100\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$101,316 | \$0 | \$101,316 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sr Planner(Code Enfrc } \\ & \text { Coord) } \end{aligned}$ | Development Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$100,595 | \$0 | \$100,595 |
|  |  | 110 | 57.3\% | 38.2\% | \$81,680 | \$876 | \$82,556 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Sr Planner (11 excluded), Asoc Planner (9), Jr Planner (3), Asst Planner (2), and Park Designer (2)

## Police Dispatch

Police Dispatch Job Type - Career Progression


Table 82: Police Dispatch Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Dispatcher 2 | Police (100\%) | 66 | 78.8\% | 56.1\% | \$64,115 | \$13,490 | \$77,605 |
| Police Dispatcher | Police (100\%) | 56 | 83.9\% | 53.6\% | \$76,471 | \$7,547 | \$84,017 |
| Police Dispatch Supv | Police (100\%) | 14 | 85.7\% | 57.1\% | \$95,312 | \$16,837 | \$112,149 |
| Police Lead Dispatcher | Police (100\%) | 11 | 100\% | 18.2\% | \$81,011 | \$6,373 | \$87,385 |
| Dispatcher 1 | Police (100\%) | 7 | 71.4\% | 42.9\% | \$53,511 | \$4,177 | \$57,688 |
| Police Dispatch Admnstr | Police (100\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | \$113,826 | \$13,367 | \$127,193 |
|  |  | 157 | 82.2\% | 51.6\% | \$72,965 | \$10,752 | \$83,717 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Dispatcher 2 (14 excluded), Dispatcher 1 (8), Police Dispatcher (6), and Police Lead Dispatcher (2)

## Police Officer

Police Officer Job Type - Career Progression


Table 83: Police Officer Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Officer 2 | Police (100\%) | 931 | 14\% | 41.1\% | \$107,068 | \$16,558 | \$123,626 |
| Police Sergeant | Police (100\%) | 270 | 12.2\% | 33.7\% | \$138,813 | \$17,010 | \$155,824 |
| Police Detective | Police (100\%) | 237 | 28.3\% | 37.1\% | \$115,352 | \$15,230 | \$130,581 |
| Police Officer 1 | Police (100\%) | 217 | 20.3\% | 46.5\% | \$72,657 | \$9,445 | \$82,102 |
| Police Recruit | Police (100\%) | 82 | 17.1\% | 54.9\% | \$62,326 | \$783 | \$63,109 |
| Police Lieutenant | Police (100\%) | 51 | 15.7\% | 31.4\% | \$169,399 | \$212 | \$169,610 |
| Police Captain | Police (100\%) | 18 | 16.7\% | 44.4\% | \$197,411 | \$0 | \$197,411 |
| Police Officer 3 | Police (100\%) | 11 | 9.1\% | 54.5\% | \$123,330 | \$29,933 | \$153,263 |
| Asst Police Chief | Police (100\%) | 5 | 20\% | 60\% | \$217,016 | \$0 | \$217,016 |
| Police Chief | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$252,026 | \$0 | \$252,026 |
|  |  | 1,823 | 16.5\% | 40.6\% | \$109,853 | \$14,301 | \$124,154 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Police Recruit (99 excluded), Police Officer 2 (72), Police Officer 1 (23), Police Detective (17), Police Sergeant (15), and Police Lieutenant (4)

## Police Property and Evidence

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 84: Police Property and Evidence Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Documents Examiner 3 | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$94,293 | \$0 | \$94,293 |
| Sr Police Prop \& Evid Supv | Police (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$68,130 | \$3,896 | \$72,026 |
|  |  | 2 | 50\% | 0\% | \$81,212 | \$1,948 | \$83,160 |

## Procurement

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 85: Procurement Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Asoc Procurement Contracting Officer | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 5 | 60\% | 60\% | \$71,433 | \$873 | \$72,307 |
| Sr Procurement Contracting Officer | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 5 | 60\% | 60\% | \$78,081 | \$3,931 | \$82,012 |
| Fleet Parts Buyer | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 4 | 25\% | 25\% | \$55,482 | \$12,573 | \$68,055 |
| Fleet Parts Buyer Supv | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$69,353 | \$7,612 | \$76,965 |
| Fleet Parts <br> Buyer(Wstwtr Parts Buyer) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$51,794 | \$7,654 | \$59,448 |
| Procurement Spec (Terminal) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$67,854 | \$0 | \$67,854 |
|  |  | 17 | 41.2\% | 47.1\% | \$68,147 | \$5,270 | \$73,416 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asoc Procurement Contracting Officer (3 excluded)

## Program Coordinator

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 86: Program Coordinator Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Program Coordinator | Information Technology ( $27 \%$ ), Performance \& Analytics ( $11 \%$ ) | 63 | 55.6\% | 46\% | \$108,665 | \$0 | \$108,665 |
|  |  | 63 | 55.6\% | 46\% | \$108,665 | \$0 | \$108,665 |


| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Program Coordinator (24 excluded)

## Program Manager

Table 87: Program Manager Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Program Manager | Information Technology (19\%), Development Svcs (7\%) | 116 | 47.4\% | 36.2\% | \$124,138 | \$0 | \$124,138 |
|  |  | 116 | 47.4\% | 36.2\% | \$124,138 | \$0 | \$124,138 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Program Manager (63 excluded)

# Proj Offcr and Eng Aide Job Type - Career Progression 



Principal


Table 88: Proj Offcr and Eng Aide Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Principal Engrng Aide | Eng \& Capital Proj (74\%), Public Util - Wstwtr Collection (10\%) | 58 | 19\% | 63.8\% | \$66,330 | \$2,687 | \$69,017 |
| Project Assistant | Eng \& Capital Proj (78\%) Public Util - Admin Svcs (ל\%) | 27 | 29.6\% | 77.8\% | \$77,123 | \$409 | \$77,532 |
| Sr Engineering Aide | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & \text { (539\%) } \\ & \text { Eng \& 'Capital Proj (27\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 15 | 6.7\% | 80\% | \$58,076 | \$1,096 | \$59,171 |
| Project Ofcr 2 | Eng \& Capital Proj (46\%), <br> Neighborhood Svcs (8\%) | 13 | 53.8\% | 38.5\% | \$102,113 | \$1,681 | \$103,794 |
| Project Ofcr 1 | Eng \& Capital Proj (62\%) READ Facilities Svcs (25\%) | 8 | 37.5\% | 62.5\% | \$81,337 | \$368 | \$81,705 |
| Sr Drafting Aide | Public Util - Admin Svcs (83\%), Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (17\%) | 6 | 16.7\% | 83.3\% | \$57,560 | \$202 | \$57,763 |
| Principal Drafting Aide | Eng \& Capital Proj (50\%) <br> Public Util-Admin Svcs ( $50 \%$ ) | 6 | 66.7\% | 50\% | \$69,340 | \$4 | \$69,344 |
| Prin Corrosion Engineering Aide | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$64,612 | \$776 | \$65,388 |
| Project Ofcr 2(Prin Wtr Resrc Spec) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$92,622 | \$5,031 | \$97,652 |
| Jr Engineering Aide | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$58,339 | \$0 | \$58,339 |
|  |  | 138 | 26.1\% | 65.2\% | \$71,833 | \$1,602 | \$73,435 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Principal Engrng Aide (13 excluded), Project Ofcr 1 (5), Project Assistant (4), Project Ofcr 2 (2), Project Ofcr 2(Prin Wtr Resrc Spec) (2), and Sr Engineering Aide (2)

## Property Agent

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Property Agent Job Type - Career Progression


Table 89: Property Agent Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women <br> \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Police Property \& Evid Spec (6 excluded), Property Agent (4), and Supv Property Agt (2)

## Public Utilities Field Rep

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.


Table 90: Public Utilities Field Rep Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Field Rep | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 22 | $0 \%$ | $77.3 \%$ | $\$ 42,270$ | $\$ 819$ | $\$ 43,088$ |
| Supv Field Rep | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 56,417$ | $\$ 3,197$ | $\$ 59,614$ |
| Supv Meter Reader | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 53,996$ | $\$ 2,056$ | $\$ 56,052$ |
|  | 26 | $0 \%$ | $76.9 \%$ | $\$ 44,260$ | $\$ 1,097$ | $\$ 45,357$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Field Rep (30 excluded)

Rec Center Leadership Job Type - Career Progression


## Rec Center Leadership

Table 91: Rec Center Leadership Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) |  |  |  |


| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> \% People <br> Women Color | RegularOvertime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Rec Aide (35 employees), Therap Recreatn Leader (22), and Rec Leader 2(Dance Instr) (18)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Asst Rec Ctr Dir (6 excluded), and Rec Cntr Dir 3 (4)

## Refuse Collection



Table 92: Refuse Collection Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Sanitation Driver 2 | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 100 | 2\% | 96\% | \$62,176 | \$7,787 | \$69,963 |
| Sanitation Driver 1 | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 13 | 0\% | 100\% | \$48,264 | \$4,155 | \$52,419 |
| Sanitation Driver Trainee | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 13 | 15.4\% | 92.3\% | \$40,462 | \$1,824 | \$42,286 |
| Sanitation Driver 3 | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 11 | 9.1\% | 100\% | \$63,386 | \$13,845 | \$77,231 |
| Area Refuse Collect Supv | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 8 | 12.5\% | 62.5\% | \$73,493 | \$8,314 | \$81,807 |
| District Refuse Collect Supv | Environ Svcs - Collection (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$76,574 | \$2,414 | \$78,987 |
|  |  | 147 | 4.1\% | 93.9\% | \$59,928 | \$7,347 | \$67,275 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Sanitation Driver 2 (14 excluded), Sanitation Driver Trainee (10), and Sanitation Driver 1 (3)

## Reservoir Mgmt

Table 93: Reservoir Mgmt Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Lake Aide 2 | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 8 | 0\% | 62.5\% | \$37,913 | \$2,338 | \$40,250 |
| Reservoir Keeper | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 7 | 57.1\% | 28.6\% | \$51,525 | \$2,851 | \$54,376 |
| Asst Reservoir Keeper | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 6 | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | \$48,733 | \$2,226 | \$50,959 |
| Golf Course Mgr(Resvr Maint Supv) | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$75,574 | \$1,314 | \$76,888 |
| Lakes Prgm Mgr | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$82,987 | \$365 | \$83,352 |
|  |  | 24 | 37.5\% | 41.7\% | \$49,605 | \$2,292 | \$51,897 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Lake Aide 1 (9 employees)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Lake Aide 2 (3 excluded)

## Risk Mgmt Claims

# Risk Mgmt Claims Job Type - Career Progression <br> Workers' <br> Compensation Claims Rep 1 



Table 94: Risk Mgmt Claims Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Workers' <br> Compensation Claims Rep 2 | Risk Management (100\%) | 11 | 63.6\% | 81.8\% | \$76,709 | \$1,187 | \$77,896 |
| Claims Rep <br> 2(Liability) | Risk Management (100\%) | 7 | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | \$69,202 | \$1,199 | \$70,401 |
| Sr Workers' <br> Compensation Claims Rep | Risk Management (100\%) | 5 | 80\% | 40\% | \$80,478 | \$1,003 | \$81,481 |
| Sr Claims Rep | Risk Management (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 100\% | \$67,537 | \$2,945 | \$70,482 |
| Supv Claims Rep(Liability) | Risk Management (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$75,957 | \$0 | \$75,957 |
|  |  | 27 | 55.6\% | 59.3\% | \$74,414 | \$1,308 | \$75,721 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Management Trainee (1 employee), Workers' Compensation Claims Rep 1 (1)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Workers' Compensation Claims Rep 2 (3 excluded)

## Safety Rep Ofcr

Table 95: Safety Rep Ofcr Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Safety Rep 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (80\%), Risk Management (20\%) | 10 | 40\% | 50\% | \$63,389 | \$131 | \$63,519 |
| Safety Ofcr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Admin Svcs (29\%), } \\ & \text { Risk Management (29\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 14.3\% | 42.9\% | \$73,811 | \$655 | \$74,467 |
|  |  | 17 | 29.4\% | 47.1\% | \$67,680 | \$347 | \$68,027 |

## Service Officer

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 96: Service Officer Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Police Invstgtv Serv Ofcr 2 | Police (100\%) | 16 | 50\% | 43.8\% | \$55,309 | \$3,329 | \$58,638 |
| Police Serv Ofcr <br> 2 2) Indochinese Srv Of | Police (100\%) | 4 | 25\% | 100\% | \$57,358 | \$6,835 | \$64,193 |
| Police Invstgtv Serv Ofcr 1 | Police (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$49,350 | \$1,368 | \$50,718 |
|  |  | 22 | 45.5\% | 50\% | \$55,140 | \$3,788 | \$58,928 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Police Serv Ofcr 1(Indochinese Srv Ofcr) (1 employee), and Police Serv Ofcr 2(African Srv Ofcr) (1)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Police Invstgtv Serv Ofcr 2 (2 excluded)

## Stock Clerk and Store Operations



Table 97: Stock Clerk and Store Operations Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Storekeeper 1 | Fleet Ops (36\%), <br> Public Util - Admín Svcs (27\%) | 11 | 18.2\% | 81.8\% | \$49,907 | \$5,550 | \$55,457 |
| Stock Clerk | Public Util - Admin Svcs (57\%), Purchasing \& Contracting (29\%) | 7 | 28.6\% | 100\% | \$42,044 | \$2,694 | \$44,738 |
| Stock Clerk(Auto Parts Stock Clrk) | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 6 | 0\% | 50\% | \$46,392 | \$4,069 | \$50,462 |
| Auto Messenger 1 | Purchasing \& Contracting ( $60 \%$ ), City Attorney (40\%) | 5 | 0\% | 100\% | \$36,193 | \$3,414 | \$39,607 |
| Auto Messenger 2 | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 100\% | \$45,448 | \$2,046 | \$47,493 |
| Storekeeper 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (67\%), Purchasing \& Contracting ( $33 \%$ ) | 3 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | \$51,022 | \$3,299 | \$54,320 |
| Storekeeper <br> 3(Warehouse Mgr) | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$39,406 | \$7,937 | \$47,343 |
| Stores Operations Supv | Purchasing \& Contracting (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$56,664 | \$1,849 | \$58,513 |
|  |  | 38 | 13.2\% | 78.9\% | \$45,619 | \$3,928 | \$49,547 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Auto Messenger 1 (5 excluded), Stock Clerk(Auto Parts Stock Clrk) (4), Auto Messenger 2 (3), and Storekeeper 1 (3)

## Storm Water Inspector

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 98: Storm Water Inspector Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Storm Water Inspctr 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | \$72,709 | \$4,667 | \$77,375 |
| Storm Water Inspctr 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$60,715 | \$2,361 | \$63,075 |
| Supv Storm Water Inspctr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$84,822 | \$495 | \$85,316 |
| Storm Water Inspctr 1 | $\underset{\substack{\text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\(100 \%)}}{ }$ | 1 |  |  | \$59,972 | \$396 | \$60,368 |
|  |  | 8 | 25\% | 37.5\% | \$71,146 | \$2,513 | \$73,660 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Haz Mat/Prt Trainee (3 employees)

## Swimming Pool Mgmt

Note: due to the high racial imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the racial-and-ethnic pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 99: Swimming Pool Mgmt Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Swimming Pool Mgr 3 | Parks \& Rec - Community Pks Disabled Svcs (100\%) | 7 | 42.9\% | 0\% | \$53,992 | \$368 | \$54,360 |
| Swimming Pool Mgr 2 | Parks \& Rec - Community Pks Disabled Svcs (100\%) | 5 | 40\% | 60\% | \$53,161 | \$305 | \$53,466 |
| District Manager | Parks \& Rec - Community Pks Disabled Svcs (100\%) | 4 | 75\% | 50\% | \$91,466 | \$74 | \$91,540 |
| Supv Rec Spec | Parks \& Rec - Community Pks Disabled Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 100\% | 0\% | \$68,020 | \$0 | \$68,020 |
| Rec Spec(Senior Citizens) | Parks \& Rec - Community Pks - <br> Disabled Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$58,572 | \$0 | \$58,572 |
|  |  | 20 | 60\% | 30\% | \$63,612 | \$220 | \$63,832 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Pool Guard 1 (76 employees), Pool Guard 2 (76), and Swimming Pool Mgr 1 (20)

## Training

Note: due to the low sample size of at least one group in this job type, is was placed in the 'Other' job type for analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 100: Training Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Trainer | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Admin Svcs (83\%), } \\ & \text { Eng \& Capital Proj (17\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 50\% | 16.7\% | \$65,577 | \$634 | \$66,210 |
| Safety \& Train Mgr | Public Util - Admin Svcs (50\%), Eng \& Capital Proj ( $17 \%$ ) | 6 | 16.7\% | 50\% | \$89,371 | \$3,451 | \$92,822 |
| Training Supervisor | Public Util - Admin Sves (67\%), Eng \& Capital Proj (33\%) | 3 | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | \$83,228 | \$165 | \$83,393 |
| Asst Trainer | Eng \& Capital Proj (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$58,070 | \$211 | \$58,281 |
| Equip Trainer | Fleet Ops (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$62,611 | \$0 | \$62,611 |
|  |  | 17 | 47.1\% | 29.4\% | \$76,474 | \$1,483 | \$77,957 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Trainer (2 excluded)

## Transportation - Labor

## Transportation Public Works Job Type - Career Progression



Table 101: Transportation - Labor Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Utility Worker 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets }(69 \%) \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm wtr (31\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 54 | 16.7\% | 94.4\% | \$47,089 | \$5,920 | \$53,009 |
| Utility Worker 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets (82\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (18\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 40 | 12.5\% | 92.5\% | \$41,065 | \$3,080 | \$44,145 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets }(76 \%) \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr }(24 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 38 | 2.6\% | 84.2\% | \$47,889 | \$4,980 | \$52,869 |
| Public Works Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets ( } 73 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (27\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 22 | 9.1\% | 63.6\% | \$69,438 | \$13,010 | \$82,448 |
| Cement Finisher | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets }(86 \%) \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr }(14 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 21 | 0\% | 85.7\% | \$55,760 | \$6,038 | \$61,798 |
| Equip Operator 2 | Transportation - Streets (86\%) <br> Transportation - Storm Wtr (14\%) | 21 | 0\% | 81\% | \$52,689 | \$3,033 | \$55,722 |
| Laborer | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets (74\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (26\% } \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 0\% | 94.7\% | \$36,679 | \$4,087 | \$40,766 |
| Motor Sweeper Oper | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 16 | 25\% | 100\% | \$55,424 | \$11,930 | \$67,354 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 1 | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 9 | 11.1\% | 88.9\% | \$48,959 | \$419 | \$49,378 |
| Equip Operator 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & \text { (75\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Streets ( } 25 \% \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 12.5\% | 100\% | \$55,174 | \$12,141 | \$67,315 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public Works Supt | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Transportation - Streets (67\%) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (33\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 6 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$85,451 | \$1,228 | \$86,679 |
| Traffic Striper Operator | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 75\% | \$50,548 | \$2,515 | \$53,062 |
| Tree Trimmer | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 75\% | \$44,878 | \$8,130 | \$53,009 |
| Equip Operator 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Streets ( } 75 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr (25\%) } \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 0\% | 75\% | \$57,171 | \$5,135 | \$62,306 |
| Equip Oper 1 Sewer Maint Equip Oper) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$53,326 | \$8,683 | \$62,008 |
| Motor Sweeper Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$81,140 | \$14,502 | \$95,642 |
| Sign Painter | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$51,874 | \$219 | \$52,094 |
| Tree Maint Crewleader | Transportation - Streets (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$47,942 | \$6,540 | \$54,482 |
| Utility Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Transportation - Storm Wtr } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$51,928 | \$15,356 | \$67,283 |
|  |  | 276 | 8.3\% | 87.3\% | \$50,621 | \$5,940 | \$56,561 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Laborer (9 excluded), Heavy Truck Drvr 2 (6), Utility Worker 2 (6), Cement Finisher (3), Utility Worker 1 (3), and Equip Operator 3 (2)

## Utilities Equip Oper

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 102: Utilities Equip Oper Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Equip Operator 2 | Public Util - Wstwtr Collection (50\%) <br> Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint (43\%) | 14 | 0\% | 78.6\% | \$53,711 | \$23,048 | \$76,759 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 2 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (60\%), <br> Public Util - Wst'wtr Collection (20\%) | 5 | 0\% | 100\% | \$46,897 | \$7,388 | \$54,285 |
| Equip Operator 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$62,647 | \$18,676 | \$81,322 |
| Heavy Truck Drvr 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$42,952 | \$20,348 | \$63,300 |
|  |  | 22 | 0\% | 86.4\% | \$52,486 | \$18,969 | \$71,454 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Equip Operator 2 (2 excluded)

Table 103: Utilities Tech Other Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Instrumentation \& Control Tech | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (67\%), Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (33\%) | 12 | 8.3\% | 66.7\% | \$79,988 | \$7,589 | \$87,578 |
| Sr Backflow \& Cross Connection Spec | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 10 | 10\% | 70\% | \$56,335 | \$5,525 | \$61,860 |
| Equip Tech 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (62 \% \text { ) } \\ & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (38 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 12.5\% | 100\% | \$46,606 | \$14,900 | \$61,505 |
| Equip Tech 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (86 \%) \\ & \text { Public Util - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (14 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 0\% | 71.4\% | \$59,294 | \$21,881 | \$81,175 |
| Prin Backflow \& Cross Connection Spec | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 5 | 0\% | 80\% | \$63,746 | \$12,465 | \$76,210 |
| Machinist | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 4 | 0\% | 50\% | \$58,902 | \$5,404 | \$64,305 |
| Irrigation Specialist | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$44,764 | \$962 | \$45,726 |
| Electronics Tech | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (67\%), <br> Public Util - Adḿnin Svcs (33\%) | 3 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$64,746 | \$15,127 | \$79,873 |
| Instrumentation \& Control Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& } \\ & \text { Disposal } 50 \% \text { ), } \\ & \text { Public Util }- \text { Wtr' Sys Ops ( } 50 \% \text { ) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 2 |  |  | \$88,840 | \$22,374 | \$111,213 |
|  |  | 54 | 5.6\% | 72.2\% | \$62,438 | \$11,030 | \$73,468 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Equip Tech 3 (1 employee)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Equip Tech 1 (2 excluded)

## Utility Plant Tech

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 104: Utility Plant Tech Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Plant Tech 2 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 19 | 0\% | 73.7\% | \$55,621 | \$7,769 | \$63,390 |
| Plant Tech 3 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 14 | 0\% | 50\% | \$61,085 | \$5,754 | \$66,839 |
| Pump Station Oper | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 13 | 7.7\% | 84.6\% | \$65,792 | \$22,171 | \$87,963 |
| Plant Tech 1 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 9 | 0\% | 100\% | \$51,171 | \$6,821 | \$57,992 |
| Plant Tech Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 8 | 0\% | 75\% | \$73,261 | \$17,175 | \$90,436 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plant Procs Cntrl Supv(PInt Maint Coord) | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 6 | 0\% | 66.7\% | \$79,319 | \$14,667 | \$93,987 |
| Sr Plant Tech Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (67\%), <br> Public Util - Adḿn Svcs (33\%) | 6 | 16.7\% | 66.7\% | \$84,826 | \$6,549 | \$91,375 |
| Equip Tech 1 | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 3 | 0\% | 100\% | \$48,646 | \$11,218 | \$59,864 |
| Principal Plant Tech Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Treat \& Disposal (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$94,820 | \$6,329 | \$101,149 |
|  |  | 79 | 2.5\% | 74.7\% | \$63,792 | \$11,170 | \$74,962 |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Plant Tech 1 (4 excluded), Plant Tech 2 (4), Equip Tech 1 (2), and Plant Tech 3 (2)

## Wastewater Plant Operations

Wastewater Plant Operations Job Type - Career Progression
Wstwtr Plant Operator


Asst
Wastewater Plant Oper

Table 105: Wastewater Plant Operations Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ <br> People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Wstwtr Plant Operator |  <br> Disposal (100\%) | 35 | $14.3 \%$ | $57.1 \%$ | $\$ 73,821$ | $\$ 10,043$ | $\$ 83,864$ |
| Wstwtr Operations <br> Supv |  <br> Disposal (100\%) | 21 | $14.3 \%$ | $76.2 \%$ | $\$ 88,833$ | $\$ 13,880$ | $\$ 102,713$ |
| Sr Wstwtr Oper Supv |  <br> Disposal (100\%) | 5 | $20 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $\$ 96,413$ | $\$ 6,766$ | $\$ 103,178$ |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Wstwtr Treatment <br> Supt |  <br> Disposal (100\%) | 4 | $25 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $\$ 116,028$ | $\$ 5,030$ | $\$ 121,058$ |
| Sr Wstwtr Plant <br> Operator |  <br> Disposal (100\%) | 2 |  |  | $\$ 78,008$ | $\$ 12,650$ | $\$ 90,658$ |
|  |  | 67 | $16.4 \%$ | $61.2 \%$ | $\$ 82,857$ | $\$ 10,780$ | $\$ 93,637$ |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Asst Wastewater Plant Oper (1 employee), and Plant Operator Trainee (1)

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Wstwtr Operations Supv (2 excluded), and Wstwtr Plant Operator (2)

## Water Plant Operations

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.


Table 106: Water Plant Operations Job Type - Study Population (2019)
Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Water Plant Operator | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 22 | $4.5 \%$ | $54.5 \%$ | $\$ 83,359$ | $\$ 11,681$ | $\$ 95,040$ |
| Sr Water Operations <br> Supv | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 3 | $0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $\$ 94,726$ | $\$ 6,294$ | $\$ 101,020$ |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Water Operations <br> Supervisor | Public Util - Wtr Sys Ops (100\%) | 3 | $33.3 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 93,888$ | $\$ 7,310$ | $\$ 101,198$ |
|  | 28 | $7.1 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ | $\$ 85,705$ | $\$ 10,636$ | $\$ 96,341$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Plant Operator Trainee (1 employee)

## Water System Tech

## Water System Tech Job Type - Career Progression



Table 107: Water System Tech Job Type - Study Population (2019)

| Job | Primary Dept(s) |
| :--- | :--- |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | $\%$ People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 219 | $8.2 \%$ | $83.1 \%$ | $\$ 54,650$ | $\$ 12,402$ | $\$ 67,052$ |  |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Laborer (34 excluded), Water Sys Tech 3 (10), and Water Sys Tech 4 (5)

## Water Utility Worker

## Water Utility Worker Job Type - Career Progression



Table 108: Water Utility Worker Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Equip Oper 1(Sewer Maint Equip Oper) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 23 | 8.7\% | 91.3\% | \$47,969 | \$11,012 | \$58,982 |
| Utility Worker 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 19 | 15.8\% | 100\% | \$39,856 | \$10,062 | \$49,917 |
| Water Utility Worker | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (82 \% \text { (i) } \\ & \text { Putul - Wtr Constrct Maint } \\ & (12 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 17 | 5.9\% | 94.1\% | \$45,843 | \$14,716 | \$60,560 |
| Sr Water Utility Supv | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 13 | 7.7\% | 92.3\% | \$64,344 | \$21,419 | \$85,762 |
| Water Utility Supv | $\underset{\substack{\text { Public Util } \\(100 \%)}}{ }$ | 11 | 0\% | 90.9\% | \$54,981 | \$15,917 | \$70,898 |
| Laborer | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 7 | 0\% | 100\% | \$41,002 | \$9,097 | \$50,099 |
| Plant Procs Cntrl Supv(PInt Maint Coord) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 4 | 25\% | 75\% | \$89,266 | \$9,934 | \$99,200 |

Average Pay

| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | $\%$ <br> Women | \% People <br> of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| General Water Util <br> Supv | Public Util - Wstwtr Collection <br> $(100 \%)$ | 3 | $0 \%$ | $66.7 \%$ | $\$ 80,428$ | $\$ 26,948$ | $\$ 107,376$ |
|  |  | 97 | $8.2 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $\$ 51,201$ | $\$ 13,736$ | $\$ 64,937$ |

Jobs in this job type with an employee excluded from study population: Laborer (13 excluded), Water Utility Worker (7), Utility Worker 1 (6), Equip Oper 1 (Sewer Maint Equip Oper) (4), and Water Utility Supv (3)

## Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr

Note: due to the high gender imbalance in this job type, it was placed in the Other job type for the gender pay gap analysis. See methods appendix for more details.

Table 109: Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  | Average Pay |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr 2 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 5 | 20\% | 80\% | \$74,467 | \$0 | \$74,467 |
| Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr 3 | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 3 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | \$91,318 | \$191 | \$91,509 |
| Supv Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 2 |  |  | \$96,286 | \$1,946 | \$98,231 |
| Wstwtr Pretrmt <br> Inspctr 3(Fewd Prgm $\mathrm{Mgr})$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public Util - Wstwtr Collection } \\ & (100 \%) \end{aligned}$ | 1 |  |  | \$97,194 | \$8,392 | \$105,586 |
| Wstwtr Pretrmt Prgm Mgr | Public Util - Admin Svcs (100\%) | 1 |  |  | \$114,595 | \$6,239 | \$120,834 |
|  |  | 12 | 25\% | 66.7\% | \$87,554 | \$1,591 | \$89,146 |

Jobs in this job type with zero employees who met the study's inclusion criteria: Haz Mat/Prt Trainee (3 employees)

## Zoning Investigator

# Zoning Investigator Job Type - Career Progression 

Sr Zoning Investigator
Development Services

Zoning Investigator 2 Development Services


Table 110: Zoning Investigator Job Type - Study Population (2019)

|  |  |  |  |  | Average Pay |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job | Primary Dept(s) | \# Emps | \% <br> Women | \% People of Color | Regular | Overtime | Total |
| Zoning Investigator 2 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 18 | 44.4\% | 83.3\% | \$64,857 | \$58 | \$64,915 |
| Zoning Investigator 1 | Development Svcs (100\%) | 6 | 0\% | 33.3\% | \$57,373 | \$80 | \$57,453 |
| Sr Zoning Investigator | Development Svcs (80\%), <br> Parks \& Rec - Open Space' (20\%) | 5 | 60\% | 40\% | \$73,006 | \$350 | \$73,356 |
|  |  | 29 | 37.9\% | 65.5\% | \$64,714 | \$113 | \$64,827 |

## Methods

To ensure full transparency and replicability, this report was written entirely in R Markdown, and that code has been provided to the City's Performance and Analytics team. This enables the report and its findings to be reproduced, from the raw data sources to the finished product, at the click of a button. Therefore, any questions on the methods that aren't answered in this appendix can be answered with the provided source code.

## Data Sources

Compensation - We received compensation data from 2010-2019 that was nearly identical to the compensation reports that the City publishes each year ${ }^{22}$. The only differences were that the data was in CSV format and had a randomized employee ID (for de-identification purposes) that enabled us to join it to the other data with that same ID. It should be noted that we only ended up using data from 2011-2019 because the 2010 data only had total compensation.

[^10]Personnel - Demographic and job info for each City employee from 2009 to 2020. For any given year, an individual employee might appear many times on the personnel's dataset. This can be because they changed their position, or something about their position changed (e.g. went from hourly to salary). Each row in this dataset contained the following information:

- Job (with start and end date), Department, Gender, Ethnic Origin, Age Group (3-year windows), Hire Date (Original and Most Recent), Separation Date, Classified/Unclassified, Hourly/Salary, Hours (Non-Standard, Full-Time, Half Time, $3 / 4$ Time).


## Employee Benefits

- Medical Benefit Plans - Plan, dates, dependents birthdays, employee contributions, etc.
- Flex Spending Accounts - Type (medical or dependent care), dates, and employee contribution.
- Long Term Disability Claims - Start and end date, claimant type (industrial, non-industrial, or pregnancy), and medical diagnosis code.
- Retirement Plan - Plan, dates, and contribution
- Transportation Assistance Programs - Plan type and dates.

Recruitment - We examined application data from January 2016 - January 2019. A total of 22400 applications were analyzed across 12 roles that showed significant imbalance in their gender and/or racial-and-ethnic makeup. We narrowed the number of positions down to ensure data collection was manageable during the study timeline. The positions we chose to analyze were selected based on the hired personnel data that met a combination of: gender and/or racial-and-ethnic imbalance (over 70\% of one group), impact on pay gap, and potential application sample size. The jobs that were selected are listed below.

Table 111: Application Data Summary

|  |  | Applications |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type | Job Title | Total | Qualifie d | Hired |
| Administrative Support | Administrative Aide 1 | 2,334 | 1,772 | 88 |
|  | Clerical Assistant 2 | 1,472 | 564 | 170 |
| Engineer - Civil | Assistant Engineer - Civil | 713 | 412 | 80 |
|  | Junior Engineer - Civil | 873 | 769 | 114 |
| Fire Fighter | Fire Fighter 1 | 466 | 227 | 183 |
|  | Fire Recruit | 5,417 | 2,508 | 190 |
| Police Officer | Police Detective | 319 | 184 | 110 |
|  | Police Officer (Recruit Level) | 7,226 | 1,227 | 174 |
|  | Police Officer 1 | 2,558 | 531 | 371 |
|  | Police Officer 2 | 558 | 73 | 11 |
|  | Police Officer 3 | 42 | 14 | 11 |
|  | Police Sergeant | 422 | 193 | 107 |
|  | Total | 22,400 | 8,474 | 1,609 |

Personnel assigned random IDs to each unique applicant in the data. We received two separate datasets:

1. Qualified applications $(\mathrm{n}=10009)$
2. Not qualified applications $(n=15826)$

## Data Aggregation

## Personnel

For the purposes of this study, we needed to get one observation per employee per year. The compensation data was already in this format; however, there was substantial engineering that was required to get the personnel data in this format.

1. Departments which were consolidated and/or had their names changed over the years were standardized to have consistent naming from one year to the next.
2. Any employment record that indicated a status of 'Withdrawn' or 'Inactive' was removed
3. Any employee whose employment began after $12 / 31 / 2019$ or ended before $1 / 1 / 2011$ was removed.
4. Separate aggregations were performed to get the following variables for each employee per year:
a. Percent of given year employed
b. Primary job and percent of given year in that job
c. Primary department and percent of given year in that department
d. Primary job type (see separate appendix on job types) and percent of year in that job type.
e. Primary hours (i.e., non-standard, full-time 80, etc.) and percent of year with those hours.
5. Used the benefits data to calculate the number of dependents and their birthdays for each employee.
6. Used the disability data to calculate the percent of each year that each employee spent on long term disability.

## Recruitment

In many instances one applicant (i.e., unique ID) submitted multiple applications but was inconsistent in how they filled in the data (sometimes missing gender or ethnic origin). In these cases we made the following assumptions to fill in the missing gender and ethnic origin values where possible:

- If there was only one distinct combination of ID, gender, and ethnic origin, simply fill in the missing values with these.
- If an applicant had the same ID and ethnic origin, but entered two different genders, we left these instances.
- If any different applications by one unique ID entered two different minority (i.e., not White) ethnic origin choices, we filled all values with "Other/Two or More Races."
- If any different applications by one unique ID entered White and any other ethnic origin choice, we replaced all applications using White with the minority group.

Once these were filled in, we were able to match the unique random IDs across datasets and fill in missing gender and ethnic origin information in the qualified applications, giving us a more completed dataset. For the recruitment analysis, we took the unique combinations of: applicant ID, job title, gender, qualified status, and hired status, giving us a final dataset of 22400.

## Study Inclusion Criteria

For an employee to be included in our study sample, they must have met the following criteria for the given year of study:

1. All employees must have worked standard hours (i.e., full-time, $3 / 4$ time, or $1 / 2$ time)
2. All employees must have had compensation data for the given year.
3. All employees must have been employed at least half of the year.
4. All employees must have worked the same hours all year (i.e., full-time, $3 / 4$ time, or $1 / 2$ time).
5. All employees must have worked in same job type all year long.
6. All employees must not have been on long term disability all year long.
7. All employees prorated total pay must have been $>80 \%$ of stated position minimum if they were not on long-term disability during the year. This was done to protect against including erroneous pay values, removes likely workman's comp employees, and still allows for likely underfilled positions and those on long-term disability.
8. For all analysis involving controls for children, employees must have utilized employee health benefits any time before age 50 . This was done to protect against declaring an employee did not have children, when they had grown children who were no longer dependents.

Figure 31 below shows how many employees were filtered out at each step and the resulting study populations: one for analysis involving controls for children and one population for analysis that didn't involve controls for children.


Sample of employees used for all analysis without controls for children

Sample of employees used for all analysis with controls for children

Figure 31: Breakdown of Inclusion Criteria

## How we measured the pay gap

Most analyses of gender pay gaps look at two numbers:

1. Unadjusted Pay Gap - This is simply a comparison between the average pay of the two groups. It is the most common statistic cited when looking at the gender pay gap (e.g., "women make 76 cents to the dollar that men make"). While simple, it is inherently misleading and fraught with opportunities for misinterpretation. These misinterpretations can lead to policy changes that don't address root causes and are wasteful as a result. For these reasons, we chose to report this number for benchmarking purposes only.
2. Adjusted Pay Gap - This measure attempts to address the flaws with the unadjusted measure by accounting for differences between the groups (e.g., occupation, tenure, age, etc.) utilizing a statistical technique known as multivariate regression. This method is helpful and was part of our analysis toolbelt; however, it has one main drawback: it assumes that the labor market treats both groups equitably - that is, it assumes that an extra year of tenure or having a child will have the same effect on both groups. For this reason, our main tool for analyzing the City of San Diego's
pay gaps was a methodology known as Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition (Oaxaca 1973; Blinder 1973). However, standard multivariate regression was also utilized to explore specific findings in more detail.

## Oaxaca-Blinder Decomposition

The Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition breaks the pay gap into two parts:

1. Explained - That which can be explained by differences in the average characteristics between the two groups (e.g., the average man is more likely to work a higher paying job type than the average woman or the average woman takes less overtime than the average man).
2. Unexplained - The unexplained part of the pay gap accounts for differences in pay between the groups resulting from something that is either unmeasured or unmeasurable. Mathematically, when the groups have different coefficients for an observed variable, that is an unexplained contributor to the pay gap. For example, if the coefficient for the tenure variable was different between men and women, it would indicate that men and women get different returns in the labor market for their tenure.

All Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition analysis performed in this report was done utilizing the oaxaca R package by Marek Hlavac (2014). The mathematical details behind this technique can be found in the package's documentation. Additionally, Glassdoor's 2016 gender pay gap report (Chamberlain 2016) provides a great high-level overview of the technique's math, while Jann (2008) provides an excellent detailed description of the math behind the technique.

At a high-level, the two-fold Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition analysis performed in this report requires three separate multivariate regression models/equations: one performed on the data from each group (e.g., men and women), and one whose resulting coefficients represent what the values are in a world with 'nodiscrimination.' The coefficients of the latter model are used as a reference to compare against the coefficients of the models of the two groups. Any statistically significant differences between the coefficients are considered unexplained contributors to the pay gap.

Techniques for establishing the set of reference coefficients differ. Often, either just the male or female coefficients are used; however, this assumes that only one of the two groups faces discrimination and it caused problems in our analysis due to highly unbalanced samples between genders and races in certain job types (e.g., Fire Fighter). Another method is to do a weighted average of the coefficients of each group with either equal weights (Reimers 1983) or weights based on the proportion of each group (Cotton 1988); however, this caused some un-intuitive results in our analysis that were difficult to explain given other findings. The last technique used by researchers involves using the coefficients of a regression model utilizing all observations from both groups (e.g., men and women). This model either does not include (Neumark 1988) or includes (Jann 2008) the group indicator variable as an additional regressor. This report uses the latter of these two methodologies.

## Complete Results

## Overall pay gap source breakdown

For the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps, the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition analyses was performed on the 2019 child-control study population ( $\mathrm{n}=8482$ ).

## Y Variable

- $\quad \log ($ Prorated Total Pay)


## $\underline{X}$ Variables

- Approximate City Tenure (years)
- Percent of Year on LTD Group (None, Under 3 Months, or Over 3 Months) - As a continuous variable, 'Percent of Year on LTD' was not linearly related with pay. Therefore, this variable was binned into discrete groups.
- Age Group (Under 30, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) - As a continuous variable, age was not linearly related with pay. Therefore, this variable was binned into age groups.
- Age at First Child (No Children, under 23, 23-28, 29-35, Over 35)
- Overtime Difference From Job Mean (Z-Score) - the average number of overtime hours for each job was calculated and each employee's overtime hours were compared to their job's average to determine how their overtime usage compared to their peers. This number was standardized into a z-score so inter-job comparisons could be made.
- Job Type - A job type was placed into an 'Other’ group if the probability of detecting a large effect (Cohen's $\mathrm{d}=1$ ) between the groups within that job type was less than $20 \%$. That other group was split into two separate job types: one in which the job types were more than $90 \%$ men and one containing all the rest.

The following tables show the complete results from this analysis. For the gender pay gap, Table 112 shows the explained portion, while Table 113 shows the unexplained portion. For the racial-and-ethnic pay gap, Table 114 shows the explained portion, while Table 115. These resulting percent pay gaps seen in these tables were extrapolated to the full study population ( $\mathrm{n}=9344$ ) to get a complete picture of the role that children play on the pay gap. These are the results reported in the body of the report.

Table 112: 2019 Gender Pay Gap - Explained Portion Full Results

| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | \% of Pay Gap | Source Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 |  | 0\% |  |
| approx_city_tenure_yrs | 0.0018 | 0.0020 | $\mathrm{p}=0.182$ | 1.04\% | Demographics |
| LTD_Under_3mo*** | 0.0043 | 0.0009 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 2.45\% | Demographics |
| LTD_Over_3mo* | 0.0024 | 0.0010 | $\mathrm{p}=0.011$ | 1.35\% | Demographics |
| age_30_34 | -0.0010 | 0.0012 | $\mathrm{p}=0.202$ | -0.6\% | Demographics |
| age_35_39 | 0.0019 | 0.0015 | $\mathrm{p}=0.099$ | 1.09\% | Demographics |
| age_40_49 | 0.0044 | 0.0028 | $\mathrm{p}=0.062$ | 2.5\% | Demographics |
| age_50_59 | -0.0024 | 0.0027 | $p=0.186$ | -1.36\% | Demographics |
| age_60_ovr | -0.0012 | 0.0015 | $\mathrm{p}=0.212$ | -0.67\% | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_23_28* | -0.0008 | 0.0004 | $p=0.018$ | -0.44\% | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_29_35* | -0.0007 | 0.0004 | $p=0.031$ | -0.41\% | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_Over_35 | -0.0004 | 0.0003 | $p=0.085$ | -0.23\% | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_Under_22** | 0.0013 | 0.0004 | $p=0.001$ | 0.74\% | Demographics |
| ovtm_hrs_job_z*** | 0.0091 | 0.0022 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 5.2\% | Overtime |
| job_tp_Accounting_and_Finance*** | -0.0022 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -1.24\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Administrative_Support*** | 0.0964 | 0.0058 | $p<0.001$ | 55.12\% | Occ Sorting |
| iob ${ }_{\text {a }}$ _tp_Building_Trades_and_Facilities_Maint** | -0.0061 | 0.0008 | $p<0.001$ | -3.51\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Chemist_Biologist*** | 0.0015 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 0.88\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Attorney*** | -0.0108 | 0.0020 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -6.17\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Atty_Invstgtr | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.288$ | 0.03\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Council_Support | -0.0002 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.302$ | -0.1\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Cmnty_Dev_Spec | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | $\mathrm{p}=0.081$ | 0.19\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Code_Compliance_Officer | 0.0003 | 0.0006 | $p=0.317$ | 0.15\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Collections* | 0.0011 | 0.0006 | $p=0.036$ | 0.61\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Communications | 0.0004 | 0.0003 | $p=0.096$ | 0.21\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Crime_Lab*** | -0.0017 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -1\% | Occ Sorting |
| ís | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | $p=0.479$ | 0.01\% | Occ Sorting |


| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | \% of Pay Gap | Source Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| job_tp_Custodian | 0.0009 | 0.0009 | $\mathrm{p}=0.159$ | 0.49\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Development_Project_Manager | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.308$ | -0.03\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Director** | -0.0042 | 0.0015 | $\mathrm{p}=0.002$ | -2.42\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Engineer_Civil | 0.0006 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}=0.188$ | 0.32\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Dispatch | -0.0003 | 0.0002 | $\mathrm{p}=0.077$ | -0.18\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Fighter*** | 0.0415 | 0.0027 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 23.74\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Prevention | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.180$ | 0.17\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Information_Systems | -0.0003 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.161$ | -0.17\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Land_Surveying | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.126$ | 0.19\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Librarian*** | 0.0178 | 0.0022 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 10.16\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Lifeguard*** | 0.0014 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 0.81\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Other_Job_Tp_Over_90pct_Male*** | -0.0188 | 0.0020 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -10.78\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Park_Ranger | 0.0004 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}=0.244$ | 0.24\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Parking_Enforcement | -0.0001 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}=0.387$ | -0.07\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Parks_Grounds_Maintenance*** | -0.0232 | 0.0021 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -13.27\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Plan_Review_Spec** | 0.0010 | 0.0004 | $p=0.007$ | 0.57\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Planner | -0.0001 | 0.0004 | $p=0.394$ | -0.06\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Police_Dispatch* | -0.0023 | 0.0010 | $p=0.015$ | -1.3\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Police_Officer*** | 0.0538 | 0.0042 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 30.76\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Program_Manager** | -0.0031 | 0.0011 | $p=0.002$ | -1.77\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Proj_Offcr_and_Eng_Aide | -0.0004 | 0.0004 | $p=0.145$ | -0.25\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Rec_Center_Leadership*** | 0.0051 | 0.0016 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 2.94\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Refuse_Collection*** | -0.0060 | 0.0007 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -3.41\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Reservoir_Mgmt | 0.0000 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}=0.477$ | 0.02\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Risk_Mgmt_Claims | 0.0002 | 0.0001 | $p=0.059$ | 0.11\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Stock_Clerk_and_Store_Operations** | -0.0014 | 0.0006 | $p=0.010$ | -0.82\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Swimming_Pool_Mgmt* | 0.0010 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}=0.023$ | 0.55\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Transportation_Public_Works*** | -0.0142 | 0.0015 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -8.14\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Wastewater_Plant_Operations* | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | $p=0.048$ | 0.16\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Water_System_Tech*** | -0.0063 | 0.0009 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -3.63\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Water_Utility_Worker*** | -0.0047 | 0.0008 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -2.7\% | Occ Sorting |
| (Base) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | $\mathrm{p}=0.270$ | 0\% | Occ Sorting |

$* \mathrm{p} \leq 0.05, * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.01, * * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.001$
Table 113: 2019 Gender Pay Gap - Unexplained Portion Full Results

| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | \% of <br> Pay Gap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| (Intercept)* | Source Group |  |  |  |
| approx_city_tenure_yrs* | -0.0560 | 0.0305 | $\mathrm{p}=0.033$ | $-32.01 \%$ |
| LTD_Under_3mo | 0.0221 | 0.0126 | $\mathrm{p}=0.039$ | $12.65 \%$ | Unexplained | Unexplained |
| :--- |
| LTD_Over_3mo |
| age_30_34 |


| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | \% of <br> Pay | Gap |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | Source Group

*p $\leq 0.05, * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.01, * * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.001$
Table 114: 2019 Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap - Explained Portion Full Results

| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err P-Value | \% Of <br> Pay Gap | Source Group |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | $0 \%$ |  |
| approx_city_tenure_yrs | -0.0014 | $0.0016 \mathrm{p}=0.190$ | $-0.55 \%$ | Demographics |
| LTD_Under_3mo | -0.0002 | $0.0004 \mathrm{p}=0.269$ | $-0.09 \%$ | Demographics |
| LTD_Over_3mo | 0.0013 | $0.0010 \mathrm{p}=0.094$ | $0.52 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_30_34* | -0.0020 | $0.0010 \mathrm{p}=0.029$ | $-0.77 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_35_39*** | 0.0047 | $0.0011 \mathrm{p}<0.001$ | $1.81 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_40_49*** | 0.0076 | $0.0023 \mathrm{p}<0.001$ | $2.96 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_50_59* | -0.0048 | $0.0024 \mathrm{p}=0.023$ | $-1.88 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_60_ovr | -0.0017 | 0.0010 | $\mathrm{p}=0.057$ | $-0.64 \%$ |
| age_at_first_child_23_28*** | 0.0019 | $0.0004 \mathrm{p}<0.001$ | $0.73 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_29_35 | -0.0002 | $0.0002 \mathrm{p}=0.168$ | $-0.07 \%$ | Demographics |
| age_at_first_child_Over_35 | -0.0003 | $0.0004 \mathrm{p}=0.245$ | $-0.1 \%$ | Demographics |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Pay Gap } \end{gathered}$ | Source Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| age_at_first_child_Under_22*** | 0.0027 | 0.0007 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 1.05\% | Demographics |
| ovtm_hrs_job_z** | -0.0061 | 0.0022 | $p=0.003$ | -2.36\% | Overtime |
| job_tp_Accounting_and_Finance | -0.0008 | 0.0006 | $p=0.064$ | -0.33\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Administrative_Support*** | 0.0319 | 0.0028 | $p<0.001$ | 12.36\% | Occ Sorting |
| $j_{*}^{\text {job_tp_Building_Trades_and_Facilities_Maint** }}$ | 0.0034 | 0.0008 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 1.32\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Chemist_Biologist | -0.0001 | 0.0002 | $p=0.277$ | -0.05\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Attorney*** | 0.0087 | 0.0015 | $p<0.001$ | 3.37\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Atty_Invstgtr | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.192$ | -0.04\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_City_Council_Support | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.331$ | 0.03\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Cmnty_Dev_Spec | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.451$ | 0\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Code_Compliance_Officer | 0.0003 | 0.0006 | $p=0.312$ | 0.1\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Collections** | 0.0010 | 0.0004 | $p=0.005$ | 0.37\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Communications | -0.0002 | 0.0002 | $p=0.164$ | -0.06\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Communications_Tech | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.235$ | 0.04\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Crime_Lab** | 0.0011 | 0.0004 | $p=0.006$ | 0.42\% | Occ Sorting |
| job | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.395$ | 0.02\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Development_Inspector | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.477$ | 0\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Director*** | 0.0061 | 0.0013 | $p<0.001$ | 2.35\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Disposal_Site_Operations | 0.0006 | 0.0006 | $p=0.182$ | 0.22\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Electrician_and_Plant_Proc_Cntrl | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.491$ | 0\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Engineer_Civil | 0.0001 | 0.0008 | $p=0.429$ | 0.06\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Executive_Assistant* | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | $p=0.045$ | 0.19\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Dispatch | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | $p=0.435$ | -0.01\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Fighter*** | 0.0331 | 0.0031 | $p<0.001$ | 12.81\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fire_Prevention | 0.0005 | 0.0004 | $p=0.121$ | 0.2\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Fleet_Technician*** | 0.0019 | 0.0005 | $p<0.001$ | 0.72\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Golf_Operations** | -0.0012 | 0.0005 | $p=0.006$ | -0.46\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Information_Systems | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | $p=0.095$ | 0.1\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Land_Surveying | 0.0004 | 0.0003 | $p=0.054$ | 0.17\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Librarian** | 0.0033 | 0.0012 | $p=0.004$ | 1.26\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Lifeguard*** | 0.0033 | 0.0007 | $p<0.001$ | 1.27\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Other_Equip_Tech | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.453$ | 0.01\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Paralegal | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.154$ | -0.04\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Park_Ranger* | -0.0008 | 0.0005 | $p=0.033$ | -0.33\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Parking_Enforcement* | 0.0008 | 0.0004 | $p=0.019$ | 0.29\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Parks_Grounds_Maintenance*** | 0.0240 | 0.0024 | $p<0.001$ | 9.28\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Plan_Review_Spec | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | $p=0.199$ | 0.07\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Planner | 0.0002 | 0.0002 | $p=0.096$ | 0.1\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Police_Dispatch | 0.0002 | 0.0003 | $p=0.202$ | 0.09\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Police_Officer*** | 0.0540 | 0.0044 | $p<0.001$ | 20.91\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Program_Manager** | 0.0030 | 0.0010 | $p=0.002$ | 1.15\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Proj_Offcr_and_Eng_Aide* | 0.0007 | 0.0003 | $p=0.016$ | 0.26\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Public_Utilities_Field_Rep* | 0.0013 | 0.0006 | $p=0.020$ | 0.49\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Rec_Center_Leadership* | 0.0018 | 0.0010 | $p=0.039$ | 0.68\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Refuse_Collection*** | 0.0055 | 0.0008 | $p<0.001$ | 2.11\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Reservoir_Mgmt | -0.0004 | 0.0005 | $p=0.232$ | -0.15\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Risk_Mgmt_Claims | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | $p=0.279$ | 0.01\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Safety_Rep_Ofcr | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.234$ | -0.04\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Stock_Clerk_and_Store_Operations*** | 0.0019 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 0.74\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Transportation_Public_Works*** | 0.0142 | 0.0016 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 5.52\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Utilities_Tech_Other* | 0.0005 | 0.0003 | $p=0.041$ | 0.18\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Utility_Plant_Tech** | 0.0009 | 0.0003 | $p=0.001$ | 0.36\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Wastewater_Plant_Operations | -0.0003 | 0.0002 | $p=0.067$ | -0.11\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Water_Plant_Operations | 0.0000 | 0.0001 | $p=0.440$ | 0.01\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Water_System_Tech*** | 0.0050 | 0.0008 | $p<0.001$ | 1.94\% | Occ Sorting |
| job_tp_Water_Utility_Worker*** | 0.0053 | 0.0010 | $p<0.001$ | 2.06\% | Occ Sorting |
| (Base) | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | $p=0.260$ | 0\% | Occ Sorting |


| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err P-Value |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | | \% of |
| :---: |
| Pay Gap | Source Group

Table 115: 2019 Racial-and-Ethnic Pay Gap - Unexplained Portion Full Results

| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | \% of Pay Gap | Source Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Intercept)*** | -0.0892 | 0.0239 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -34.57\% | Unexplained |
| approx_city_tenure_yrs | 0.0021 | 0.0116 | $p=0.427$ | 0.83\% | Unexplained |
| LTD_Under_3mo | -0.0005 | 0.0008 | $p=0.266$ | -0.2\% | Unexplained |
| LTD_Over_3mo* | 0.0014 | 0.0007 | $\mathrm{p}=0.022$ | 0.56\% | Unexplained |
| age_30_34*** | 0.0175 | 0.0042 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 6.77\% | Unexplained |
| age_35_39*** | 0.0136 | 0.0028 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 5.28\% | Unexplained |
| age_40_49*** | 0.0412 | 0.0080 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 15.97\% | Unexplained |
| age_50_59*** | 0.0360 | 0.0077 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 13.96\% | Unexplained |
| age_60_ovr*** | 0.0174 | 0.0037 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 6.76\% | Unexplained |
| age_at_first_child_23_28*** | 0.0070 | 0.0020 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 2.72\% | Child Effect Diff |
| age_at_first_child_29_35 | 0.0007 | 0.0027 | $\mathrm{p}=0.403$ | 0.26\% | Child Effect Diff |
| age_at_first_child_Over_35* | 0.0038 | 0.0022 | $\mathrm{p}=0.042$ | 1.46\% | Child Effect Diff |
| age_at_first_child_Under_22* | 0.0021 | 0.0009 | $p=0.012$ | 0.8\% | Child Effect Diff |
| ovtm_hrs_job_z | -0.0001 | 0.0002 | $p=0.367$ | -0.03\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Accounting_and_Finance | -0.0001 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}=0.398$ | -0.05\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Administrative_Support** | -0.0070 | 0.0026 | $\mathrm{p}=0.004$ | -2.72\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Building_Trades_and_Facilities_Maint* | -0.0010 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}=0.039$ | -0.4\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Chemist_Biologist** | -0.0010 | 0.0004 | $p=0.009$ | -0.4\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_City_Attorney** | 0.0016 | 0.0007 | $\mathrm{p}=0.009$ | 0.64\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_City_Atty_Invstgtr | 0.0003 | 0.0002 | $p=0.079$ | 0.11\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_City_Council_Support** | 0.0014 | 0.0005 | $p=0.003$ | 0.55\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Cmnty_Dev_Spec | 0.0001 | 0.0002 | $p=0.269$ | 0.06\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Code_Compliance_Officer | 0.0001 | 0.0003 | $p=0.320$ | 0.05\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Collections | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | $\mathrm{p}=0.144$ | -0.06\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Communications | -0.0001 | 0.0002 | $p=0.345$ | -0.03\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Communications_Tech | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | $p=0.478$ | -0.01\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Crime_Lab | 0.0003 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.149$ | 0.12\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Crime_Scene_Spec_and_Print_Examine | 0.0000 | 0.0003 | $p=0.438$ | 0.02\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Development_Inspector | -0.0002 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.280$ | -0.07\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Director | 0.0003 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}=0.274$ | 0.12\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Disposal_Site_Operations | -0.0001 | 0.0004 | $p=0.434$ | -0.02\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Electrician_and_Plant_Proc_Cntrl | -0.0004 | 0.0003 | $\mathrm{p}=0.085$ | -0.17\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Engineer_Civil | 0.0004 | 0.0014 | $p=0.401$ | 0.14\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Executive_Assistant | 0.0002 | 0.0004 | $p=0.307$ | 0.07\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Fire_Dispatch | -0.0003 | 0.0002 | $\mathrm{p}=0.083$ | -0.12\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Fire_Fighter | 0.0002 | 0.0021 | $\mathrm{p}=0.452$ | 0.1\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Fire_Prevention | 0.0006 | 0.0008 | $p=0.239$ | 0.23\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Fleet_Technician* | -0.0012 | 0.0006 | $\mathrm{p}=0.015$ | -0.46\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Golf_Operations | 0.0001 | 0.0003 | $p=0.421$ | 0.02\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Information_Systems | -0.0006 | 0.0005 | $p=0.114$ | -0.22\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Land_Surveying | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | $\mathrm{p}=0.053$ | 0.25\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Librarian | 0.0007 | 0.0012 | $p=0.272$ | 0.28\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Lifeguard*** | 0.0016 | 0.0005 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 0.62\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Other_Equip_Tech | 0.0000 | 0.0005 | $p=0.497$ | 0\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Paralegal | -0.0001 | 0.0001 | $p=0.266$ | -0.03\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Park_Ranger** | 0.0007 | 0.0003 | $p=0.005$ | 0.27\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Parking_Enforcement** | -0.0006 | 0.0002 | $p=0.005$ | -0.24\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Parks_Grounds_Maintenance** | -0.0040 | 0.0014 | $\mathrm{p}=0.002$ | -1.56\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Plan_Review_Spec | 0.0000 | 0.0002 | $p=0.440$ | -0.01\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Planner | 0.0004 | 0.0004 | $p=0.185$ | 0.15\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Police_Dispatch | -0.0006 | 0.0007 | $\mathrm{p}=0.168$ | -0.25\% | Unexplained |
| job_tp_Police_Officer | 0.0040 | 0.0032 | $\mathrm{p}=0.110$ | 1.53\% | Unexplained |


| Variable | Coefficient | Std Err | P-Value | $\%$ <br> Pay Gap | Gource Group |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |

$* \mathrm{p} \leq 0.05, * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.01, * * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.001$

## Parenthood Penalty

For both the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps, the parenthood penalty analyses were performed on the 2019 child-control study population ( $\mathrm{n}=8482$ ). Given that this was a targeted analysis resulting from a Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition finding, standard multivariate regression with the following variables was utilized:

## Y Variable

- Prorated Non-Overtime Pay


## $\underline{X}$ Variables

- Approximate City Tenure (years)
- Age Group (Under 30, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60+) - Same methodology at Oaxaca analysis.
- Gender (Male or Female)
- Race/Ethnicity (White or Non-White)
- Has Children (Yes or No)
- Interaction of Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Have Children $(Y, N)$ variables.
- Job Type - Same methodology at Oaxaca analysis.

Table 116 shows the results of the multivariate regression analysis used as the basis for Figure 30. The base case for each categorical variable are as follows: Age Group = '30-34,' Gender = 'Female,' Race/Ethnicity = 'Non-White,' Has Children = 'No,' and Job Type = 'Engineer - Civil.' The expected values that Figure 30 are displaying are point estimates and prediction standard errors from this regression for an employee with: average tenure ( $\sim 13$ years), Age 30-34, and with the 'Engineer - Civil' job type. This job type is the closest to the City average for non-overtime pay while still with an sufficient sample size. The reported $p$-values on Figure 30 are from $t$-tests utilizing the group sample size and the prediction standard error.

Table 116: Complete Regression Results - Parenthood Penalty Findings

| Term | Estimate | $p$-value | 95\%-Lower | 95\%-Upper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept*** | 74,343 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 72,258 | 76,429 |
| Race/Ethnicity: White** | 2,807 | $p=0.004$ | 899 | 4,715 |
| Age Group: 35-39*** | 5,759 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 4,115 | 7,402 |
| Age Group: 40-49*** | 9,578 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 8,283 | 10,873 |
| Age Group: 50-59*** | 9,682 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 8,082 | 11,282 |
| Age Group: 60 ovr*** | 4,425 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 2,441 | 6,408 |
| Age Group: Under 30*** | -9,414 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -11,625 | -7,203 |
| Approximate City Tenure (Years)*** | 724 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 666 | 782 |
| Has Children: Yes*** | -6,138 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -7,985 | -4,291 |
| Gender: Male* | 2,038 | $\mathrm{p}=0.018$ | 343 | 3,733 |
| Race/Ethnicity: White $\times$ Has Children: Yes | 2,102 | $\mathrm{p}=0.148$ | -746 | 4,950 |
| Race/Ethnicity: White x Gender: Male | -1,040 | $\mathrm{p}=0.384$ | -3,383 | 1,302 |
| Has Children: Yes x Gender: Male** | 3,581 | $\mathrm{p}=0.002$ | 1,371 | 5,791 |
| Race/Ethnicity: White x Has Children: Yes x Gender: Male | 550 | $\mathrm{p}=0.751$ | -2,851 | 3,951 |
| Job Type: Other*** | -14,031 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -17,037 | -11,024 |
| Job Type: Accounting and Finance*** | 10,388 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 6,575 | 14,200 |
| Job Type: Administrative Support*** | -33,455 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -35,419 | -31,491 |
| Job Type: Auditor*** | 22,066 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 13,135 | 30,998 |
| Job Type: Building Trades and Facilities Maint*** | -33,511 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -37,034 | -29,987 |
| Job Type: Chemist/Biologist*** | -15,877 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -19,259 | -12,495 |
| Job Type: City Attorney*** | 38,411 | $p<0.001$ | 35,186 | 41,635 |
| Job Type: City Atty Invstgtr*** | -13,769 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -21,602 | -5,936 |
| Job Type: City Council Support | -3,703 | $\mathrm{p}=0.097$ | -8,081 | 674 |
| Job Type: Cmnty Dev Spec*** | -12,363 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -19,431 | -5,294 |
| Job Type: Code Compliance Officer*** | -42,278 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -48,406 | -36,150 |
| Job Type: Collections*** | -34,196 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -42,032 | -26,359 |
| Job Type: Communications*** | -24,423 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -32,856 | -15,990 |
| Job Type: Communications Tech*** | -21,049 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -27,651 | -14,447 |
| Job Type: Crime Lab** | 9,402 | $\mathrm{p}=0.002$ | 3,415 | 15,389 |
| Job Type: Crime Scene Spec and Print Examiners*** | -12,835 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -20,181 | -5,488 |
| Job Type: Custodian*** | -48,593 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -56,249 | -40,937 |
| Job Type: Development Inspector*** | -15,647 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -20,928 | -10,367 |
| Job Type: Development Project Manager* | -6,340 | $p=0.043$ | -12,470 | -210 |
| Job Type: Director*** | 51,892 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 47,943 | 55,840 |
| Job Type: Disposal Site Operations*** | -46,695 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -51,674 | -41,717 |
| Job Type: Elected Official | 10,877 | $p=0.089$ | -1,677 | 23,431 |
| Job Type: Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl*** | -18,480 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -23,784 | -13,177 |
| Job Type: Engineer - Electrical | 3,675 | $p=0.420$ | -5,258 | 12,609 |
| Job Type: Engineer - Other** | 14,579 | $\mathrm{p}=0.005$ | 4,303 | 24,856 |
| Job Type: Env Haz Mat Inspctr* | -16,081 | $\mathrm{p}=0.029$ | -30,549 | -1,614 |
| Job Type: Executive*** | 104,446 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 95,771 | 113,122 |
| Job Type: Executive Assistant*** | -17,872 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -24,979 | -10,765 |
| Job Type: Fire Dispatch*** | -21,250 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -26,877 | -15,623 |
| Job Type: Fire Fighter*** | -15,431 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -17,402 | -13,460 |
| Job Type: Fire Prevention | 4,176 | $\mathrm{p}=0.208$ | -2,325 | 10,678 |
| Job Type: Fleet Technician*** | -30,444 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -34,106 | -26,783 |
| Job Type: Golf Operations*** | -38,707 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -47,149 | -30,265 |
| Job Type: Information Systems*** | -17,245 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -21,363 | -13,127 |
| Job Type: Land Surveying | -4,805 | $p=0.076$ | -10,105 | 494 |
| Job Type: Librarian*** | -33,093 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -35,775 | -30,410 |
| Job Type: Lifeguard*** | -14,984 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -18,869 | -11,099 |
| Job Type: Mayor Representative | 10,394 | $p=0.070$ | -850 | 21,638 |
| Job Type: Other Equip Tech*** | -30,267 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -35,781 | -24,752 |
| Job Type: Paralegal*** | -18,321 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -26,548 | -10,094 |
| Job Type: Park Ranger*** | -31,698 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -37,667 | -25,729 |


| Term | Estimate | $p$-value | 95\%-Lower | 95\%-Upper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type: Parking Enforcement*** | -37,335 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -42,625 | -32,045 |
| Job Type: Parks Grounds Maintenance*** | -45,144 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -47,454 | -42,835 |
| Job Type: Plan Review Spec*** | -23,045 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -29,869 | -16,220 |
| Job Type: Planner*** | -8,589 | $p<0.001$ | -12,391 | -4,787 |
| Job Type: Police Dispatch*** | -12,989 | $p<0.001$ | -16,221 | -9,757 |
| Job Type: Police Officer*** | 18,336 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 16,662 | 20,010 |
| Job Type: Procurement*** | -31,092 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -42,333 | -19,852 |
| Job Type: Program Coordinator*** | 17,917 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 13,063 | 22,770 |
| Job Type: Program Manager*** | 28,670 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 24,899 | 32,441 |
| Job Type: Proj Offcr and Eng Aide*** | -20,721 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -24,261 | -17,182 |
| Job Type: Property Agent*** | -34,506 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -42,517 | -26,496 |
| Job Type: Public Utilities Field Rep*** | -47,537 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -54,876 | -40,197 |
| Job Type: Rec Center Leadership*** | -37,024 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -40,591 | -33,456 |
| Job Type: Refuse Collection*** | -33,996 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -37,285 | -30,706 |
| Job Type: Reservoir Mgmt*** | -44,957 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -53,181 | -36,734 |
| Job Type: Risk Mgmt Claims** | -12,916 | $\mathrm{p}=0.001$ | -20,760 | -5,072 |
| Job Type: Safety Rep Ofcr*** | -23,223 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -32,445 | -14,000 |
| Job Type: Service Officer*** | -35,752 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -43,964 | -27,540 |
| Job Type: Stock Clerk and Store Operations*** | -44,706 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -51,408 | -38,003 |
| Job Type: Storm Water Inspector* | -16,452 | $\mathrm{p}=0.010$ | -28,998 | -3,906 |
| Job Type: Swimming Pool Mgmt*** | -33,886 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -42,121 | -25,652 |
| Job Type: Training*** | -19,481 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -29,011 | -9,952 |
| Job Type: Transportation - Labor*** | -42,323 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -44,997 | -39,650 |
| Job Type: Utilities Equip Oper*** | -46,550 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -54,399 | -38,702 |
| Job Type: Utilities Tech Other*** | -30,550 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -35,957 | -25,143 |
| Job Type: Utility Plant Tech*** | -32,351 | $p<0.001$ | -36,825 | -27,877 |
| Job Type: Wastewater Plant Operations*** | -12,819 | $p<0.001$ | -17,789 | -7,849 |
| Job Type: Water Plant Operations** | -12,039 | $p=0.001$ | -19,382 | -4,697 |
| Job Type: Water System Tech*** | -37,119 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -40,014 | -34,225 |
| Job Type: Water Utility Worker*** | -45,544 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -49,523 | -41,565 |
| Job Type: Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr | -3,742 | $\mathrm{p}=0.494$ | -14,463 | 6,980 |
| Job Type: Zoning Investigator*** | -27,504 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -34,439 | -20,568 |

$* \mathrm{p} \leq 0.05, * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.01, * * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.001$

## Overtime Utilization

For both the gender and racial-and-ethnic pay gaps, the overtime utilization analyses were performed on the 2019 child-control study population ( $n=8482$ ). Additionally, any employee who was ever on long term disability during $2019(n=175)$ or were not hourly employees $(\mathrm{n}=856)$ were removed from the analysis, so 7451 employees were ultimately included in this analysis. Given that this was a targeted analysis resulting from a Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition finding, standard multivariate regression with the following variables was utilized:

## Y Variable

- Estimated Overtime Hours - Overtime hours were estimated for each employee. Their hourly rate was calculated from their yearly base pay. Their overtime pay was then divided by 1.5 times this hourly rate to get an estimated number of overtime hours. This methodology better enables an apples-to-apples comparison of actual overtime worked.


## $\underline{X}$ Variables

- Approximate City Tenure (years)
- Number of Children - This was either a binary variable: No Children or 1+ Children, or a variable with three groups: No Children, 1-2 Children, or 3+ Children.
- Gender (Male or Female) or Race/Ethnicity (White or Non-White) - Depends on which pay gap was being studied.
- Job Type or Job - For Citywide analysis, job type was used. For the analysis within job types, the employee's specific job was used.
- Interaction of Group (Gender or Race/Ethnicity) and Number of Children

Table 117 shows the results of the multivariate regression analysis used as the basis for Figure 18. The base case for each categorical variable are as follows: Gender = 'Female,' Number of Children Group = 'No Children,' and Job Type = 'Police Officer.' The expected values that Figure 18. are displaying are point estimates and prediction standard errors from this regression for an employee with: average tenure ( $\sim 13$ years) and in the 'Police Officer' job type. This job type was used because it is the closest to the City average yearly overtime hours per employee (Mean Citywide $=237.9$ hours, Police Officers $=233.4$ hours) while still with a sufficient sample size.

Table 117: Complete Regression Results - Overtime by Gender and Number of Children

| Term | Estimate | $p$-value | 95\% Lower | 95\% Upper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Intercept*** | 165.1 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 143 | 187 |
| Gender: Male* | 21.8 | $p=0.039$ | 1 | 43 |
| Approximate City Tenure (Years)*** | 1.8 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 1 | 2 |
| 1 or 2 Children | 0.7 | $\mathrm{p}=0.959$ | -25 | 27 |
| 3 or More Children | -24.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.267$ | -66 | 18 |
| Gender: Male $\times 1$ or 2 Children* | 39.1 | $\mathrm{p}=0.011$ | 9 | 69 |
| Gender: Male x 3 or More Children*** | 131.5 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 84 | 179 |
| Job Type: Other | -5.6 | $\mathrm{p}=0.814$ | -53 | 41 |
| Job Type: Accounting and Finance*** | -185.6 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -259 | -113 |
| Job Type: Administrative Support*** | -156.2 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -182 | -130 |
| Job Type: Building Trades and Facilities Maint*** | -161.1 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -211 | -111 |
| Job Type: Chemist/Biologist*** | -181.2 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -230 | -132 |
| Job Type: City Atty Invstgtr*** | -229.2 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -346 | -112 |
| Job Type: Cmnty Dev Spec* | -187.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.010$ | -331 | -45 |
| Job Type: Code Compliance Officer | -64.8 | $\mathrm{p}=0.174$ | -158 | 29 |
| Job Type: Collections** | -195.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.001$ | -315 | -75 |
| Job Type: Communications** | -183.6 | $p=0.006$ | -313 | -54 |
| Job Type: Communications Tech*** | -219.1 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -319 | -120 |
| Job Type: Crime Lab*** | -163.2 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -256 | -71 |
| Job Type: Crime Scene Spec and Print Examiners* | -139.8 | $p=0.019$ | -257 | -23 |
| Job Type: Custodian** | -157.8 | $\mathrm{p}=0.007$ | -272 | -44 |
| Job Type: Development Inspector*** | -173.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -251 | -95 |
| Job Type: Development Project Manager*** | -204.2 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -296 | -112 |
| Job Type: Disposal Site Operations | 32.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.392$ | -42 | 107 |
| Job Type: Electrician and Plant Proc Cntrl | -75.8 | $p=0.056$ | -154 | 2 |
| Job Type: Engineer - Civil*** | -155.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -180 | -130 |
| Job Type: Engineer - Electrical | -19.3 | $\mathrm{p}=0.777$ | -153 | 114 |
| Job Type: Engineer - Other | -21.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.784$ | -175 | 132 |
| Job Type: Env Haz Mat Inspctr | -210.8 | $\mathrm{p}=0.057$ | -428 | 6 |
| Job Type: Executive Assistant** | -181.2 | $p=0.006$ | -312 | -51 |
| Job Type: Fire Dispatch*** | 317.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 231 | 403 |
| Job Type: Fire Fighter*** | 789.7 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 766 | 813 |
| Job Type: Fire Prevention | 95.6 | $p=0.056$ | -2 | 194 |
| Job Type: Fleet Technician*** | -130.9 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -184 | -78 |
| Job Type: Golf Operations | -90.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.161$ | -216 | 36 |
| Job Type: Information Systems | -210.4 | $\mathrm{p}=0.058$ | -428 | 7 |
| Job Type: Land Surveying*** | -172.4 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -250 | -95 |
| Job Type: Librarian*** | -121.6 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -159 | -84 |
| Job Type: Lifeguard*** | 203.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 147 | 259 |


| Term | Estimate | $p$-value | 95\% Lower | 95\% Upper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Job Type: Other Equip Tech* | 105.6 | $\mathrm{p}=0.011$ | 24 | 187 |
| Job Type: Paralegal** | -171.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.008$ | -298 | -45 |
| Job Type: Park Ranger** | -127.7 | $\mathrm{p}=0.005$ | -216 | -39 |
| Job Type: Parking Enforcement | 40.1 | $\mathrm{p}=0.317$ | -39 | 119 |
| Job Type: Parks Grounds Maintenance*** | -189.1 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -219 | -159 |
| Job Type: Plan Review Spec** | -159.4 | $p=0.003$ | -263 | -56 |
| Job Type: Planner*** | -182.6 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -239 | -127 |
| Job Type: Police Dispatch*** | 79.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 33 | 125 |
| Job Type: Procurement | 10.9 | $p=0.904$ | -167 | 189 |
| Job Type: Proj Offcr and Eng Aide*** | -196.3 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -247 | -145 |
| Job Type: Property Agent | -114.2 | $\mathrm{p}=0.068$ | -237 | 8 |
| Job Type: Public Utilities Field Rep*** | -193.9 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -308 | -80 |
| Job Type: Rec Center Leadership*** | -209.7 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -262 | -158 |
| Job Type: Refuse Collection* | -56.8 | $p=0.016$ | -103 | -10 |
| Job Type: Reservoir Mgmt* | -156.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.013$ | -279 | -33 |
| Job Type: Risk Mgmt Claims** | -164.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.007$ | -284 | -45 |
| Job Type: Safety Rep Ofcr** | -214.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.003$ | -357 | -71 |
| Job Type: Service Officer* | -132.6 | $\mathrm{p}=0.034$ | -255 | -10 |
| Job Type: Stock Clerk and Store Operations | -70.4 | $\mathrm{p}=0.166$ | -170 | 29 |
| Job Type: Storm Water Inspector | -137.9 | $p=0.151$ | -326 | 50 |
| Job Type: Swimming Pool Mgmt*** | -211.3 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -334 | -88 |
| Job Type: Training** | -193.8 | $\mathrm{p}=0.008$ | -336 | -51 |
| Job Type: Transportation - Labor** | -52.1 | $p=0.005$ | -88 | -16 |
| Job Type: Utilities Equip Oper*** | 249.6 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 133 | 367 |
| Job Type: Utilities Tech Other | 67.4 | $\mathrm{p}=0.096$ | -12 | 147 |
| Job Type: Utility Plant Tech | 33.3 | $\mathrm{p}=0.315$ | -32 | 98 |
| Job Type: Wastewater Plant Operations | -49.0 | $\mathrm{p}=0.191$ | -123 | 24 |
| Job Type: Water Plant Operations | -51.5 | $\mathrm{p}=0.355$ | -161 | 58 |
| Job Type: Water System Tech*** | 126.8 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 86 | 167 |
| Job Type: Water Utility Worker*** | 149.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | 91 | 207 |
| Job Type: Wstwtr Pretrmt Inspctr* | -188.1 | $\mathrm{p}=0.022$ | -349 | -27 |
| Job Type: Zoning Investigator*** | -210.0 | $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ | -315 | -105 |

*p $\leq 0.05, * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.01, * * * \mathrm{p} \leq 0.001$
Table 118 shows the complete results from Table 16.
Table 118: Complete Regression Results - Differences in Overtime Between Genders by Job Type

| Job Type | Gender Ovtm Hours Diff (Yearly) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Fire Fighter* | 272 (95\% CI: 48-496, p=0.018) |
| Fire Dispatch* | 259 (95\% CI: 33-485, p=0.026) |
| Water Utility Worker* | 247 (95\% CI: 2-492, p=0.048) |
| Water System Tech* | 199 (95\% CI: 6-392, p=0.044) |
| Lifeguard | 138 (95\% CI: -66-342, $\mathrm{p}=0.182$ ) |
| Fire Prevention | 122 (95\% CI: -164-408, p=0.387) |
| Stock Clerk and Store Operations | 72 (95\% CI: -157-301, $\mathrm{p}=0.518$ ) |
| Transportation - Labor | 68 (95\% CI: -27-164, p=0.159) |
| Custodian | 60 (95\% CI: -12-133, $\mathrm{p}=0.095$ ) |
| Building Trades and Facilities Maint | 55 (95\% CI: -76-187, $\mathrm{p}=0.404$ ) |
| Police Officer** | 55 (95\% CI: 22-88, p=0.001) |
| Plan Review Spec | 45 (95\% CI: -52-142, $\mathrm{p}=0.343$ ) |
| Risk Mgmt Claims | 43 (95\% CI: -12-97, p=0.115) |
| Other | 40 (95\% CI: -1-81, $\mathrm{p}=0.054$ ) |
| Engineer - Civil*** | 37 (95\% CI: 15-59, $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ ) |


| Job Type | Gender Ovtm Hours Diff (Yearly) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Crime Scene Spec and Print Examiners | 37 (95\% CI: -38-111, $\mathrm{p}=0.305$ ) |
| Chemist/Biologist** | 34 (95\% CI: 10-58, p=0.005) |
| Librarian | 26 (95\% CI: -24-77, p=0.303) |
| Development Project Manager | 23 (95\% CI: -13-58, p=0.208) |
| Code Compliance Officer | 20 (95\% CI: -128-168, $\mathrm{p}=0.782$ ) |
| Proj Offcr and Eng Aide | 9 (95\% CI: -36-54, p=0.681) |
| Cmnty Dev Spec | 5 (95\% CI: $-5-16, \mathrm{p}=0.289)$ |
| Reservoir Mgmt | 3 (95\% CI: -68-74, p=0.925) |
| Administrative Support | 3 (95\% CI: -15-21, p=0.750) |
| Accounting and Finance | 2 (95\% CI: -11-14, p=0.768) |
| Crime Lab | 1 (95\% CI: -29-31, $\mathrm{p}=0.954$ ) |
| Collections | 0 (95\% CI: 0-0, NA) |
| Rec Center Leadership | 0 (95\% CI: $-4-3, \mathrm{p}=0.841$ ) |
| Parks Grounds Maintenance | -1 (95\% CI: $-22-20, p=0.927$ ) |
| Park Ranger | -2 (95\% CI: $-42-39, \mathrm{p}=0.930$ ) |
| Swimming Pool Mgmt | -2 (95\% CI: -11-7, p=0.610) |
| City Atty Invstgtr | -4 (95\% CI: -11-4, p=0.334) |
| Refuse Collection | -5 (95\% CI: -181-171, p=0.957) |
| Wastewater Plant Operations | -7 (95\% CI: -123-108, p=0.901) |
| Communications | -10 (95\% CI: -73-52, p=0.720) |
| Parking Enforcement | -15 (95\% CI: -186-156, p=0.862) |
| Land Surveying | -18 (95\% CI: -112-75, p=0.696) |
| Planner | -21 (95\% CI: -44-2, $\mathrm{p}=0.068$ ) |
| Other Job Tp Over 90pct Male | -30 (95\% CI: -177-117, p=0.687) |
| Police Dispatch | -80 (95\% CI: -205-45, p=0.208) |

## Recruitment

We first identified jobs where there were differences between recruiting stages (i.e., total applicants, qualified applicants, and hired applicants). If there were statistically significant differences at any of these stages, we looked at the available application questions for that position to see if there were any additional insights in differences between gender and/or race-and-ethnicity for any individual question.

## Differences in Gender Between Recruiting Stages

Clerical Assistant 2
Table 119: Clerical Assistant 2 Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clerical Assistant 2 | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1461$ | 1163 Women 298 Men | 79.6\% | $\begin{gathered} -4.5 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.027 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=553$ | 465 Women 88 Men | 84.1\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -3 \% \\ p=0.411 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | 148 Women 22 Men | 87.1\% |  |  |

Table 120: Clerical Assistant 2 Yes/No Application Questions - Gender

| Question | Recruitment Stage | Women | Men | Estimated Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully completed a formalized (classroom) clerical training program consisting of a minimum of 520 hours of training in clerical or office procedures? | Total Applicants $n=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.9 \% \\ (282 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.6 \% \\ (122 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -14.7 \% \\ & p<0.001 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.4 \% \\ (117 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39.6 \% \\ (42 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -16.2 \% \\ \mathrm{p}<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.7 \% \\ (38 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.5 \% \\ & (12 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -28.8 \% \\ p=0.006 \end{gathered}$ |
| Do you possess an Associate's Degree in Business Office Technology or a closely related field? | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.9 \% \\ (282 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 36.6 \% \\ (122 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -14.7 \% \\ p<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.4 \% \\ (117 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39.6 \% \\ (42 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -16.2 \% \\ & \mathrm{p}<0.001 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 25.7 \% \\ (38 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.5 \% \\ & (12 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -28.8 \% \\ p=0.006 \end{gathered}$ |
| Do you possess a typing certificate with the ability to type at a corrected speed of at least 30 net WPM on a computer keyboard? | Total Applicants $n=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \% \\ (695 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48.9 \% \\ (163 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.1 \% \\ p=0.097 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 60.6 \% \\ (303 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 53.8 \% \\ (57 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.8 \% \\ p=0.194 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.3 \% \\ (107 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.7 \% \\ (16 / 22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.4 \% \\ p=0.966 \end{gathered}$ |
| I understand that my typing certificate must be issued under International Typing Contest Rules, etc. | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 96.3 \% \\ (1239 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 95.5 \% \\ (318 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.8 \% \\ p=0.471 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \% \\ (485 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.1 \% \\ (104 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.1 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.528 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.6 \% \\ (146 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (22 / 22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.4 \% \\ p=0.583 \end{gathered}$ |
| Do you have current/prior City of San Diego experience in a classification that meets or exceeds 30 net WPM? | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.4 \% \\ (275 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.7 \% \\ (79 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.3 \% \\ p=0.357 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 23.2 \% \\ (116 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33 \% \\ (35 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -9.8 \% \\ p=0.034 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.6 \% \\ (32 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.8 \% \\ & (7 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -10.2 \% \\ p=0.289 \end{gathered}$ |
| Are you requesting a waiver of the written test because you are currently in or have previously held a City of San Diego CLERICAL position as a government/municipal employee equal to or higher than a Clerical Assistant 2? | Total Applicants $n=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.8 \% \\ (100 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.3 \% \\ (31 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.5 \% \\ p=0.360 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 14 \% \\ (70 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.9 \% \\ (20 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -4.9 \% \\ p=0.200 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.8 \% \\ (10 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.5 \% \\ (1 / 22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \% \\ p=0.694 \end{gathered}$ |
| I understand the documents I am required to submit at the time of application. | Total Applicants $n=1619$ | $\begin{gathered} 99 \% \\ (1273 / 1286) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.4 \% \\ (331 / 333) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.4 \% \\ p=0.486 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=606$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.2 \% \\ (496 / 500) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.1 \% \\ (105 / 106) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.1 \% \\ p=0.882 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 98 \% \\ (145 / 148) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (22 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2 \% \\ p=0.500 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 121: Clerical Assistant 2 Full Time Experience - Gender
How many years of full-time experience do you have performing clerical duties?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | None | <1 year | $\begin{aligned} & 1-2 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 5+ years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2.9\%* } \\ & (37 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \% * \\ & (49 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 9.2 \% * * \\ (118 / 1286 \\ ) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.2 \% \\ & (144 / 1286 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.6 \% \\ & (98 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (84 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.8 \% * * * \\ & (756 / 1286 \\ & )^{\prime} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \% * \\ & (17 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.9 \% * \\ & (23 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% * * \\ & (47 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.6 \% \\ & (42 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.4 \% \\ & (28 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.8 \% \\ & (26 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \% * * * \\ & (150 / 333) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=606$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \% \\ & (2 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \% \\ & (33 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.6 \% \\ & (53 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (35 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \% \\ & (24 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.4 \% \\ & (352 / 500) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & (1 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \% \\ & (6 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \% \\ & (13 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \% \\ & (9 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \% \\ & (9 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64.2 \% \\ & (68 / 106) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | Female |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8.1 \% \\ & (12 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (17 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \% \\ & (11 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.4 \% \\ & (8 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67.6 \% \\ & (100 / 148) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (3 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (3 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (3 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \% \\ & (2 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & (11 / 22) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 122: Clerical Assistant 2 Months of Full Time Experience - Gender
How many months of full-time experience do you have in a position where your PRIMARY job responsibility is clerical in nature and includes a wide range of clerical duties?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | None | $<6$ <br> months | $6-12$ <br> months | $12-18$ <br> months | $18-24$ <br> months | $24-30$ <br> months | $30+$ <br> months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \% * * \\ & (55 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.1 \% \\ & (40 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.4 \% \\ & (69 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.4 \% * * \\ & (108 / 1286 \\ & ) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.9 \% \\ & (63 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.6 \% \\ & (98 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66.3 \% * * * \\ & (853 / 1286 \\ & ) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 7.8 \% * * \\ & (26 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \% \\ & (16 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \% \\ & (25 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.2 \% * * \\ & (44 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \% \\ & (22 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.1 \% \\ & (27 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52 \% * * * \\ & (173 / 333) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $n=606$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \% \\ & (4 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (15 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \% \\ & (37 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.4 \% \\ & (27 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & (40 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.2 \% \\ & (376 / 500) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & (1 / 106) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \% \\ & (3 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \% \\ & (9 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \% \\ & (3 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.3 \% \\ & (12 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 73.6 \% \\ & (78 / 106) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | Female |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.1 \% \\ & (6 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.1 \% * \\ & (12 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.4 \% \\ & (8 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.4 \% \\ & (11 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75 \% \\ & (111 / 148) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 22.7\%* } \\ & (5 / 22) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18.2 \% \\ & (4 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.1 \% \\ & (13 / 22) \end{aligned}$ |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05$, $^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.001$

Table 123: Clerical Assistant 2 Reference Site - Gender
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | City of San <br> Diego <br> Employment Information Center | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government <br> Jobs.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1619$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 22.9 \% * * \\ & (295 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.8 \% * \\ & (267 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.8 \% \\ & (422 / 1286) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 31.5 \% * * \\ & (105 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% * \\ & (50 / 333) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.2 \% \\ & (114 / 333) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $n=606$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 25.6 \% \\ & (128 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24.4 \%^{*} \\ & (122 / 500) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.8 \% \%^{*} \\ & (149 / 500) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 27.4 \% \\ & (29 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.2 \%^{*} \\ & (14 / 106) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.5 \% * \\ & (45 / 106) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 23.6 \% \\ & (35 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.4 \% \\ & (42 / 148) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.4 \% * * \\ & (39 / 148) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 22.7 \% \\ & (5 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (3 / 22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54.5 \% * * \\ & (12 / 22) \end{aligned}$ |

## Administrative Aide 1

Table 124: Administrative Aide 1 Recruitment Summary - Gender

|  | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified <br> to Hired |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=2231$ | 1580 Women <br> 651 Men | $70.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Administrative Aide 1 | Qualified Applicants <br> $n=1704$ | 1181 Women <br> 523 Men | $69.3 \%$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.321$ |  |
|  | Hired Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=88$ | 71 Women <br> 17 Men | $80.7 \%$ |  | $-11.4 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}=0.032$ |

## Application Questions

Table 125: Administrative Aide 1 College Completion - Gender

| Question | Recruitment Stage | Women | Men | Estimated Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully completed at least 60 semester/90 quarter units of college-level course work? | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2812$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.6 \% \\ (1486 / 2046) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 87.3 \% \\ (669 / 766) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -14.7 \% \\ p<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2250$ | $\begin{gathered} 80.2 \% \\ (1299 / 1619) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 92.6 \% \\ (584 / 631) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -12.4 \% \\ p<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=88$ | $\begin{gathered} 59.2 \% \\ (42 / 71) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 76.5 \% \\ (13 / 17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -17.3 \% \\ & p=0.185 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 126: Administrative Aide 1 Full Time Experience - Gender
How many years of full-time clerical experience do you have in a supervisory capacity?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | NA | None | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-2 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2812$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \% \\ & (1 / 2046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.1 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (472 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \% \\ & (153 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \% * \\ & (225 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | 12\% (246/20 46) | $\begin{aligned} & 8.4 \% \\ & (171 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (133 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.5 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (645 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32.6 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (250 / 76 \\ & 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \% \\ & (69 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \% * \\ & (107 / 76 \end{aligned}$ 6) | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & (92 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.2 \% \\ & (55 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.6 \% \\ & (35 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (158 / 76 \\ & 6) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2250$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & (1 / 1619) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.5 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (413 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.5 \% \\ & (122 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% * * \\ & (162 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.6 \% \\ & (187 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.7 \% \\ & (125 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (102 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.3 \% * * \\ & \text { * } \\ & \text { (507/16 } \\ & \text { 19) } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  | $\begin{aligned} & 34.5 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (218 / 63 \\ & 1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \% \\ & (52 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.9 \% * * \\ & (88 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.3 \% \\ & (71 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.1 \% \\ & (45 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \% \\ & (30 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.1 \% * * \\ & \text { * } \\ & \text { (127/63 } \\ & 1) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=88$ | Female |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18.3 \% \\ & (13 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.6 \% \\ & (4 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% \\ & (10 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% \\ & (10 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.6 \% \\ & (4 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (5 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.2 \% \\ & (25 / 71) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (1 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (1 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.5 \% \\ & (4 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \% \\ & (2 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (3 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (1 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.4 \% \\ & (5 / 17) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 127: Administrative Aide 1 Time in Subprofessional Experience - Gender
How many months/years of full-time subprofessional experience do you have performing administrative, budgetary, personnel, or related work or studies?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | None | $\begin{aligned} & <6 \\ & \text { months } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { mo. - } \\ & 1 \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $1-2$ <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2812$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 17.1 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (350 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \% * * \\ & (72 / 204 \\ & 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5 \% \\ & (92 / 204 \end{aligned}$ <br> 6) | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \% \\ & (195 / 20 \end{aligned}$ 46) | $\begin{aligned} & 12.3 \% \\ & (252 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% * \\ & (204 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (134 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.5 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (746 / 20 \\ & 46) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \% * * * \\ & (207 / 76 \\ & 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.1 \% * * \\ & (47 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.1 \% \\ & (47 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (88 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | 13.4\% <br> (103/76 <br> 6) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7.2\%* } \\ & (55 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.6 \% \\ & (43 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% * * * \\ & (176 / 76 \\ & 6) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2250$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 17.2 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (279 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \% \\ & (55 / 161 \end{aligned}$ 9) | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% * \\ & (64 / 161 \\ & 9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (142 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.1 \% \\ & (196 / 16 \end{aligned}$ 19) | $\begin{aligned} & 10.3 \% \\ & (166 / 16 \end{aligned}$ 19) | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (106 / 16 \\ & 19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 37.7 \% * * \\ * \\ (610 / 16 \\ 19) \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 28.2 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (178 / 63 \\ & 1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.9 \% \\ & (31 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.2 \% * \\ & (39 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.4 \% \\ & (72 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (86 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.9 \% \\ & (50 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (37 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.9 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (138 / 63 \\ & 1) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $n=88$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 9.9 \% \\ & (7 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.2 \% \\ & (3 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \% \\ & (2 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% \\ & (10 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.5 \% \\ & (11 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.5 \% \\ & (6 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \% \\ & (2 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.3 \% \\ & (30 / 71) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (3 / 17) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \% \\ & (2 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (3 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.5 \% \\ & (4 / 17) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 29.4 \% \\ & (5 / 17) \end{aligned}$ |

How many months/years of full-time subprofessional experience do you have performing administrative, budgetary, personnel, or related work or studies?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | None | $<6$ <br> months | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { mo. - } \\ & 1 \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | 1-2 <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $3-4$ <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 5+ years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 128: Administrative Aide 1 Reference Site - Gender
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | City of San Diego <br> Employment Information Center | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2812$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 30.5 \% \\ & (624 / 2046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.5 \% * * \\ & (338 / 2046) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.6 \% * * * \\ & (585 / 2046) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 26.8 \% \\ & (205 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.4 \% * * \\ & (95 / 766) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.3 \% * * * \\ & (293 / 766) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2250$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 31.5 \% * \\ & (510 / 1619) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% * \\ & (271 / 1619) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.2 \% * * * \\ & (472 / 1619) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 27.1 \%^{*} \\ & (171 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.3 \% * \\ & (84 / 631) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.3 \% * * * \\ & (248 / 631) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=88$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 43.7 \% \\ & (31 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.8 \% \\ & (19 / 71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% \\ & (10 / 71) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 52.9 \% \\ & (9 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (3 / 17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (3 / 17) \end{aligned}$ |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05$, , $^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$, *** $^{* *}<0.001$


## Assistant Engineer - Civil

There were no significant differences in gender for Assistant Engineer - Civil.
Table 129: Assistant Engineer - Civil Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assistant Engineer Civil | Total Applicants $n=693$ | 183 Women <br> 510 Men | 26.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=404$ | 106 Women 298 Men | 26.2\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.2 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.927 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=80$ | 20 Women <br> 60 Men | 25\% |  |  |

## Junior Engineer - Civil

There were no significant differences in gender for Assistant Engineer - Civil.

Table 130: Junior Engineer - Civil Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Junior Engineer Civil | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=862$ | 227 Women 635 Men | 26.3\% | $\begin{gathered} -0.7 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.790 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=758$ | 205 Women <br> 553 Men | 27\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -7.2 \% \\ p=0.140 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=114$ | 39 Women 75 Men | 34.2\% |  |  |

## Fire Recruit

There were no significant differences in gender for Fire Recruits.
Table 131: Fire Recruit Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Recruit | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=5410$ | 356 Women <br> 5054 Men | $6.6 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=2501$ | 169 Women <br> 2332 Men | $6.8 \%$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.806$ |  |
|  | Hired Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=190$ | 16 Women <br> 174 Men | $8.4 \%$ |  | $-1.7 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}=0.468$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Fire Fighter 1

There were no significant differences in gender for Fire Fighter 1.
Table 132: Fire Fighter 1 Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Fighter 1 | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=466$ | 32 Women 434 Men | 6.9\% | $\begin{gathered} -0.2 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=227$ | 16 Women 211 Men | 7\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \% \\ p=0.349 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=183$ | 8 Women 175 Men | 4.4\% |  |  |

## Police Recruit

Table 133: Police Recruit Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer (Recruit <br> Level) | Total Applicants <br> $n=7224$ | 1447 Women <br> 5777 Men | $20 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}<0.001$ |  |


| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualified Applicants <br> $n=1225$ | 120 Women <br> 1105 Men | $9.8 \%$ |  |  |
| Hired Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=174$ | 31 Women <br> 143 Men | $17.8 \%$ |  | $-8 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{n}=0.002$ |  |

## Application Questions

Table 134: Police Recruit Education Requirement - Gender
Specify which option you are using to meet the education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | Earned College Degree | Completed High School | Passed GED | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=8355$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 33.7 \% * * * \\ & (556 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60.1 \% * * * \\ & (993 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \% \\ & (85 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & (17 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 28.9 \% * * * \\ & (1939 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 65.3\%*** } \\ & (4381 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \% \\ & (298 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \% \\ & (86 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=1229$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% * * \\ & (66 / 120) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44.2 \% * \\ & (53 / 120) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \% \\ & (1 / 120) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 41.8 \% * * \\ & (464 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53.7 \% * \\ & (596 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.1 \% \\ & (46 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \% \\ & (3 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=175$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 61.3 \% \\ & (19 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.5 \% \\ & (11 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \% \\ & (1 / 31) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 44.4 \% \\ & (64 / 144) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.1 \% \\ & (75 / 144) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \% \\ & (5 / 144) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Table 135: Police Recruit Reference Site - Gender
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=8355$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 11.7 \% \\ & (193 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.4 \% \\ & (552 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.2 \% \\ & (416 / 1651) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 10.9 \% \\ & (734 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.7 \% \\ & (2193 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.2 \% \\ & (1755 / 6704) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1229$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (24 / 120) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.8 \% \\ & (25 / 120) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.8 \% \\ & (43 / 120) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 18.9 \% \\ & (210 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.7 \% \\ & (296 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.5 \% \\ & (338 / 1109) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=175$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 25.8 \% \\ & (8 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.6 \% \\ & (7 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.3 \% \\ & (10 / 31) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 27.1 \% \\ & (39 / 144) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.6 \% \\ & (34 / 144) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.2 \% \\ & (42 / 144) \end{aligned}$ |

Police Officer 1
Table 136: Police Officer 1 Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 1 | Total Applicants $n=2558$ | 488 Women 2070 Men | 19.1\% | $\begin{gathered} 3.8 \% \\ p=0.045 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=531$ | 81 Women 450 Men | 15.3\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -5.2 \% \\ p=0.051 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=371$ | 76 Women 295 Men | 20.5\% |  |  |

## Application Questions

Table 137: Police Officer 1 Education Requirement - Gender
Specify which option you are using to meet the education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | Earned College Degree | Completed High School | Passed GED | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2695$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 40.7 \% * * * \\ & (209 / 513) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.4 \% * * * \\ & (269 / 513) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \% * \\ & (17 / 513) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \% \\ & (18 / 513) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 29.5 \% * * * \\ & (643 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63 \% * * * \\ & (1374 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.5 \% * \\ & (119 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \% \\ & (46 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 62.7 \% * * * \\ & (52 / 83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.9 \% * * * \\ & (29 / 83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \% \\ & (2 / 83) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 37.2 \% * * * \\ & (168 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.7 \% * * * \\ & (270 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.9 \% \\ & (13 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 452) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $n=374$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 65.4 \% * * * \\ & (51 / 78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.6 \% * * * \\ & (27 / 78) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 39.5 \% * * * \\ & (117 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.4 \% * * * \\ & (173 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \% \\ & (6 / 296) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Table 138: Police Officer 1 CA POST Certification - Gender
Specify which option you are using to meet the minimum requirement for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification.

|  |  | Basic |  |  | Employmen |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Gender | P.O.S.T. <br> Certificate <br> within past <br> year | Enrolled at <br> Police <br> Academy | Graduated <br> Police <br> Academy | t as paid <br> sworn <br> Peace <br> Officer | None of the <br> above |

Specify which option you are using to meet the minimum requirement for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | Basic P.O.S.T. Certificate within past year | Enrolled at Police Academy | Graduated Police Academy | Employmen t as paid sworn Peace Officer | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \% \\ & (18 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.4 \% * * * \\ & (318 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.2 \%^{*} \\ & (64 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.8 \% * * \\ & (49 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \% * \\ & (3 / 452) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants <br> $n=374$ | Female |  | $\begin{aligned} & 91 \% \\ & (71 / 78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \% \\ & (4 / 78) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \% * * \\ & (3 / 78) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & (3 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 87.5 \% \\ & (259 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \% \\ & (28 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \% \\ & (5 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \% * * \\ & (1 / 296) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 139: Police Officer 1 Reference Site - Gender
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2695$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 18.1 \% \\ & (93 / 513) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.7 \% \\ & (147 / 513) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \% \\ & (123 / 513) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 19.5 \% \\ & (425 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28.8\% } \\ & (628 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.5 \% \\ & (579 / 2182) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 32.5 \% \\ & (27 / 83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.5 \% \\ & (17 / 83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.1 \% \\ & (25 / 83) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 32.7 \% \\ & (148 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.9 \% \\ & (108 / 452) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.7 \% \\ & (125 / 452) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=374$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 34.6 \% \\ & (27 / 78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.5 \% \\ & (16 / 78) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.8 \% \\ & (24 / 78) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 38.2 \% \\ & (113 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.2 \% \\ & (51 / 296) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.7 \% \\ & (88 / 296) \end{aligned}$ |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.001$


## Police Officer 2

Table 140: Police Officer 2 Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 2 | Total Applicants $n=558$ | 94 Women 464 Men | 16.8\% | $\begin{gathered} 10 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.042 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=73$ | 5 Women 68 Men | 6.8\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -2.2 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 1 Women 10 Men | 9.1\% |  |  |

## Application Questions

Table 141: Police Officer 2 High School Education Requirement - Gender
Specify which one of the following options you are using to meet the high school education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | Passed <br> High <br> School <br> Proficiency <br> Exam | Passed GED | Completed High School | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=590$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \% \\ & (3 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & (8 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81 \% \\ & (81 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & (8 / 100) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \% \\ & (9 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (32 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.2 \% \\ & (398 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.4 \% \\ & (51 / 490) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=73$ | Female |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (5 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Male |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 98.5 \% \\ & (67 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \% \\ & (1 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | Female |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (1 / 1) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | Male |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (10 / 10) \end{aligned}$ |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * * \mathrm{p}<0.001$

Table 142: Police Officer 2 College Education Requirement - Gender
Specify which one of the following options you are using to meet the minimum college level education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | College degree | Minimum required units | None of the above | Qualifying experienc e |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants$\mathrm{n}=590$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 57 \% * * \\ & (57 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \% \\ & (22 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \% \\ & (14 / 100) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 7\%* } \\ & (7 / 100) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 40.8 \% * * \\ & (200 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.8 \% \\ & (141 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.3 \% \\ & (70 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16.1\%* } \\ & \text { (79/490) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=73$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% * \\ & (5 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% * \\ & (34 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.2 \% \\ & (26 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (4 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (4 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (1 / 1) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (4 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (4 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (1 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (1 / 10) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 143: Police Officer 2 CA POST Certification - Gender
Specify which option you are using to meet the minimum requirement for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification.

|  |  | Basic <br> P.O.S.T. |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Gender | Gertificate <br> within <br> past year | Golice <br> Academy | Waiver | None of <br> the above |

Table 144: Police Officer 2 Full Time Experience Yes/No - Gender

| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | Women | Men | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you have full-time paid <br> experience as a sworn officer <br> with a city police, county <br> sheriff, state or federal law <br> enforcement agency performing <br> correction duties, patrol | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=590$ | $44 \%$ <br> $(44 / 100)$ | $60.2 \%$ <br> $(295 / 490)$ | $-16.2 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}=0.003$ |
| Qualified Applicants <br> functions, or traffic enforcement <br> within the past year? | Hired Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=11$ | $100 \%$ <br> $(5 / 5)$ | $100 \%$ <br> $(68 / 68)$ | $0 \%$ |

Table 145: Police Officer 2 Years of Experience - Gender
Specify the number of years of full-time paid experience you have obtained as a sworn peace officer with a city police, county sheriff, state or federal law enforcement agency performing correction duties, patrol functions, or traffic enforcement. Do NOT count time spent in a training environment as part of a law enforcement academy.

| Recruitment <br> Stage | Gender | None | $<1$ <br> year | $1-2$ <br> years | $2-3$ <br> years | $3-4$ <br> years | $4-5$ <br> years | $5+$ <br> years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Female | $52 \% * * *$  <br> $(52 / 100)$ $4 \%$ | $2 \%$ $2 / 100)$ | $(2 / 100)$ | $7 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $7 / 100)$ | $(9 / 100)$ | $(3 / 100)$ | $(23 / 100)$ |  |  |

Specify the number of years of full-time paid experience you have obtained as a sworn peace officer with a city police, county sheriff, state or federal law enforcement agency performing correction duties, patrol functions, or traffic enforcement. Do NOT count time spent in a training environment as part of a law enforcement academy.

| Recruitment Stage | Gender | None | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-2 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=590$ | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 33.1 \% * * \\ & * \\ & (162 / 49 \\ & 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \% \\ & (8 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.9 \% \\ & (24 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.9 \% \\ & (63 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.4 \% \\ & (46 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \% \\ & (28 / 490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.4 \% \\ & (159 / 49 \\ & 0) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $n=73$ | Female |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (1 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & (4 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 32.4 \% \\ & (22 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.1 \% \\ & (13 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \% \\ & (8 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.8 \% \\ & (25 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | Female |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (1 / 1) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & (6 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (1 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (1 / 10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (2 / 10) \end{aligned}$ |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05, * * \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * * \mathrm{p}<0.001$


## Police Officer 3

There were no significant differences in gender for Police Officer 3.
Table 146: Police Officer 3 Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 3 | Total Applicants $n=42$ | 4 Women 38 Men | 9.5\% | $\begin{gathered} -4.8 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=14$ | 2 Women 12 Men | 14.3\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 5.2 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 1 Women 10 Men | 9.1\% |  |  |

## Police Detective

There were no significant differences in gender for Police Detective.
Table 147: Police Detective Recruitment Summary - Gender

|  | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified <br> to Hired |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Police Detective | Total Applicants <br> $n=318$ | 69 Women <br> 249 Men | $21.7 \%$ |  |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=183$ | 39 Women <br> 144 Men | $21.3 \%$ | $\mathrm{p}>0.999$ | $-0.5 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}>0.999$ |


| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=110$ | 24 Women 86 Men | 21.8\% |  |  |

## Police Sergeant

There were no significant difference in gender for Police Sergeant.
Table 148: Police Sergeant Recruitment Summary - Gender

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> Women | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Sergeant | Total Applicants $n=422$ | 49 Women 373 Men | 11.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \% \\ p=0.481 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=193$ | 18 Women 175 Men | 9.3\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -1.9 \% \\ p=0.748 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=107$ | 12 Women 95 Men | 11.2\% |  |  |

Application Questions
Table 149: Police Sergeant Completed College Units - Gender

| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | Women | Men | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully <br> completed at least 60 | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=484$ | $86 \%$ <br> $(49 / 57)$ | $82.9 \%$ <br> $(354 / 427)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.1 \%$ <br> semester/90 quarter units of <br> college-level course work from <br> a P.O.S.T. approved or |
| Qualified Applicants |  |  |  |  |
| accredited college/university? | $\mathrm{n}=205$ | $89.5 \%$ | $85.5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
|  | Hired Applicants | $\mathrm{n}=107$ | $83.3 \%$ | $85.3 \%$ |
|  | $(10 / 12)$ | $(81 / 95)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.860$ |  |

Table 150: Police Sergeant Reference Site - Gender

|  |  | How did you first hear about <br> this employment opportunity? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Gender | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Notified by <br> Mail/Email |
| Total | Female | $42.1 \%$ <br> $(24 / 57)$ | $29.8 \%$ <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=484$ |
|  | Male | $39.8 \%$ <br> $(170 / 427)$ | $26.7 \%$ <br> $(114 / 427)$ |


|  |  | How did you first hear about this employment opportunity? |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recruitment Stage | Gender | City of San Diego Facility/Employe e | Notified by Mail/Email |
| Hired <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=107$ | Female | $\begin{aligned} & 58.3 \% \\ & (7 / 12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (4 / 12) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Male | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (38 / 95) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.4 \% \\ & (27 / 95) \end{aligned}$ |

## Differences in Race-and-Ethnicity Between Recruiting Stages

## Clerical Assistant 2

Table 151: Clerical Assistant 2 Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clerical Assistant 2 | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1439$ | 1153 People of Color 286 Whites | 80.1\% | -1.6\% |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=547$ | 447 People of Color 100 Whites | 81.7\% | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | 139 People of Color 31 Whites | 81.8\% |  |  |

## Application Questions

Table 152: Clerical Assistant 2 Yes/No Application Questions - Race/Ethnicity

| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | People of <br> Color | Whites | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully <br> completed a formalized <br> (classroom) clerical training <br> program consisting of a <br> minimum of 520 hours of <br> training in clerical or office <br> procedures? | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=1596$ | $23 \%$ <br> $(294 / 1279)$ | $31.9 \%$ <br> $(101 / 317)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.9 \%$ |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=600$ |  |  |  |


| Question | Recruitment Stage | People of Color | Whites | Estimated Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| type at a corrected speed of at least 30 net WPM on a computer keyboard? | Qualified Applicants $n=600$ | $\begin{gathered} 58.7 \% \\ (286 / 487) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 62.8 \% \\ (71 / 113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -4.1 \% \\ p=0.423 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 72.7 \% \\ (101 / 139) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 71 \% \\ (22 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.7 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.849 \end{gathered}$ |
| I understand that my typing certificate must be issued under International Typing Contest Rules, etc. | Total Applicants $n=1596$ | $\begin{gathered} 95.9 \% \\ (1227 / 1279) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97.2 \% \\ (308 / 317) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.3 \% \\ p=0.308 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=600$ | $\begin{gathered} 96.9 \% \\ (472 / 487) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.2 \% \\ (111 / 113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.3 \% \\ p=0.450 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 98.6 \% \\ (137 / 139) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (31 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.4 \% \\ p=0.502 \end{gathered}$ |
| Do you have current/prior City of San Diego experience in a classification that meets or exceeds 30 net WPM? | Total Applicants $n=1596$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.9 \% \\ (280 / 1279) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.1 \% \\ (70 / 317) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.2 \% \\ p=0.942 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=600$ | $\begin{gathered} 24.2 \% \\ (118 / 487) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.3 \% \\ (32 / 113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -4.1 \% \\ p=0.366 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 23 \% \\ (32 / 139) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.6 \% \\ & (7 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.4 \% \\ p=0.958 \end{gathered}$ |
| Are you requesting a waiver of the written test because you are currently in or have previously held a City of San Diego CLERICAL position as a government/municipal employee equal to or higher than a Clerical Assistant 2? | Total Applicants $n=1596$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \% \\ (102 / 1279) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.8 \% \\ (28 / 317) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.8 \% \\ p=0.617 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=600$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.6 \% \\ (71 / 487) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.8 \% \\ (19 / 113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.2 \% \\ p=0.549 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.5 \% \\ (9 / 139) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.5 \% \\ (2 / 31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ p=0.996 \end{gathered}$ |
| I understand the documents I am required to submit at the time of application. | Total Applicants $n=1596$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.1 \% \\ (1267 / 1279) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.1 \% \\ (314 / 317) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.989 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=600$ | $\begin{gathered} 99 \% \\ (482 / 487) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \\ (113 / 113) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1 \% \\ p=0.279 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | $\begin{gathered} 97.8 \% \\ (136 / 139) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & (31 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.2 \% \\ p=0.409 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 153: Clerical Assistant 2 Full Time Experience - Race/Ethnicity
How many years of full-time experience do you have performing clerical duties?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | None | $<1$ <br> year | $\begin{aligned} & 1-2 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $2-3$ <br> years | $3-4$ <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | 5+ years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1596$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \% \\ & (44 / 127 \end{aligned}$ <br> 9) | $\begin{aligned} & 4.6 \% \\ & (59 / 127 \\ & 9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.3 \% \\ & (132 / 12 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & (154 / 12 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \% \\ & (105 / 12 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | 6.9\% (88/127 <br> 9) | $\begin{aligned} & 54.5 \% * \\ & (697 / 12 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \% \\ & (10 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \% \\ & (12 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.8 \% \\ & (31 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (28 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (20 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (20 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.8 \% * \\ & (196 / 31 \\ & 7) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants$\mathrm{n}=600$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \% \\ & (29 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (56 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \% \\ & (33 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5 \% \\ & (22 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70.8 \% \\ & (345 / 48 \\ & 7) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & (1 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.9 \% \\ & (1 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (10 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (10 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (10 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (10 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.8 \% \\ & (71 / 113) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Non-White |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8.6 \% \\ & (12 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (16 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.9 \% \\ & (11 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \% \\ & (6 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67.6 \% \\ & (94 / 139) \end{aligned}$ |

How many years of full-time experience do you have performing clerical duties?

| Recruitment <br> Stage | Ethnicity | None | $<1$ <br> year | $1-2$ <br> years | $2-3$ <br> years | $3-4$ <br> years | $4-5$ <br> years | $5+$ <br> years |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hired <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=170$ | White |  |  | $9.7 \%$ <br> $(3 / 31)$ | $12.9 \%$ <br> $(4 / 31)$ | $9.7 \%$ <br> $(3 / 31)$ | $12.9 \%$ <br> $(4 / 31)$ | $54.8 \%$ <br> $(17 / 31)$ |

[^11]Table 154: Clerical Assistant 2 Months of Full Time Experience - Race/Ethnicity
How many months of full-time experience do you have in a position where your PRIMARY job responsibility is clerical in nature and includes a wide range of clerical duties?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | None | $\begin{aligned} & <6 \\ & \text { months } \end{aligned}$ | $6-12$ <br> months | $12-18$ <br> months | $18-24$ <br> months | $24-30$ <br> months | $30+$ <br> months |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1596$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2 \% \\ & (66 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.8 \% \\ & (48 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.6 \% \\ & (72 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \% \\ & (117 / 1279 \\ & )^{(117 / 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.5 \% \\ & (70 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.1 \% \\ & (104 / 1279 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62.7 \% \\ & (802 / 1279 \\ & ) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 4.7 \% \\ & (15 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \% \\ & (7 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \% \\ & (21 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.1 \% \\ & (32 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \% \\ & (14 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (20 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 65.6 \% \\ & (208 / 317) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $n=600$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 0.6 \% \\ & (3 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.3 \% * \\ & (11 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.2 \% * * \\ & (30 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.3 \% \\ & (26 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8.8 \% \\ & (43 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76.6 \% \\ & (373 / 487) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 1.8 \% \\ & (2 / 113) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6.2 \% * \\ & (7 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.3 \% * * \\ & (15 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \% \\ & (4 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.1 \% \\ & (8 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 68.1\% } \\ & (77 / 113) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | Non-White |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2.2 \% * \\ & (3 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.9 \% \\ & (11 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (7 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.4 \% \\ & (13 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 75.5 \% \\ & (105 / 139) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 9.7 \% * \\ & (3 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.4 \% \\ & (6 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.2 \% \\ & (1 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (2 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.3 \% \\ & (19 / 31) \end{aligned}$ |

$* \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * * \mathrm{p}<0.001$
Table 155: Clerical Assistant 2 Reference Site - Race/Ethnicity
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San Diego Employment Information Center | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1596$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24.8\% } \\ & (317 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20.7\%* } \\ & (265 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.1 \% \\ & (410 / 1279) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 24.9 \% \\ & (79 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.8 \% * \\ & (47 / 317) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.3 \% \\ & (115 / 317) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants$\mathrm{n}=600$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 26.3 \% \\ & (128 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.8 \% \\ & (111 / 487) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.4 \% \\ & (158 / 487) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% \\ & (26 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.4 \% \\ & (23 / 113) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31 \% \\ & (35 / 113) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 24.5 \% \\ & (34 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% * \\ & (32 / 139) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.1 \% \\ & (46 / 139) \end{aligned}$ |

How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San <br> Diego <br> Employment <br> Information <br> Center | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=170$ | White | $\begin{aligned} & 19.4 \% \\ & (6 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41.9 \% * \\ & (13 / 31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.1 \% \\ & (5 / 31) \end{aligned}$ |

## Administrative Aide 1

Table 156: Administrative Aide 1 Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Administrative Aide 1 | Total Applicants $n=2207$ | 1642 People of Color 565 Whites | 74.4\% | $\begin{gathered} 0.2 \% \\ p=0.918 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1690$ | 1254 People of Color <br> 436 Whites | 74.2\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -3.1 \% \\ p=0.604 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=88$ | 68 People of Color 20 Whites | 77.3\% |  |  |

Application Questions
Table 157: Administrative Aide 1 College Completion - Race/Ethnicity

| Question | Recruitment Stage | People of Color | Whites | Estimated Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully completed at least 60 semester/90 quarter units of college-level course work? | Total Applicants $n=2788$ | $\begin{gathered} 75.1 \% \\ (1572 / 2093) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 80.6 \% \\ (560 / 695) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -5.5 \% \\ p=0.003 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=2236$ | $\begin{gathered} 83.2 \% \\ (1397 / 1679) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 84.7 \% \\ (472 / 557) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.5 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.351 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=88$ | $\begin{gathered} 64.7 \% \\ (44 / 68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 55 \% \\ (11 / 20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.7 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.431 \end{gathered}$ |

Table 158: Administrative Aide 1 Full Time Experience - Race/Ethnicity
How many years of full-time clerical
experience do you have in a supervisory capacity?

| Recruitment <br> Stage | Ethnicity | None | $<1$ <br> year | $1-2$ <br> years | $2-3$ <br> years | $3-4$ <br> years | $4-5$ <br> years | $5+$ <br> years | NA |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total |  | $26.1 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $8.5 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ | $28.7 \%$ |  |
| Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=2788$ | Non-White | $2747 / 20$ $(152 / 20$ | $(244 / 20$ $(251 / 20$ | $(178 / 20$ | $(121 / 20$ | $(600 / 20$ |  |  |  |

How many years of full-time clerical experience do you have in a supervisory capacity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | None | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $1-2$ <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years | NA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \% \\ & (167 / 69 \end{aligned}$ 5) | $\begin{aligned} & 9.4 \% \\ & (65 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.4 \% \\ & (86 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.1 \% \\ & (84 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (45 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \% \\ & (47 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28.8 \% \\ & (200 / 69 \end{aligned}$ 5) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & (1 / 695) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=2236$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 28.4 \% \\ & (476 / 16 \end{aligned}$ 79) | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \% \\ & (118 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.4 \% \\ & (192 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (193 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \% \\ & (135 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.7 \% \\ & (95 / 167 \end{aligned}$ 9) | $\begin{aligned} & 28 \% \\ & (470 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 27.1 \% \\ & (151 / 55 \\ & 7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.2 \% \\ & (51 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.2 \% \\ & (57 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% \\ & (64 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (33 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.6 \% \\ & (37 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | 29.3\% <br> (163/55 <br> 7) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.2 \% \\ & (1 / 557) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=88$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 16.2 \% \\ & (11 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (4 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.2 \% \\ & (11 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \% \\ & (8 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (6 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.9 \% \\ & (4 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.3 \% \\ & (24 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & (3 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (1 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & (3 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (4 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (1 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (2 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \\ & (6 / 20) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Table 159: Administrative Aide 1 Time in Subprofessional Experience - Race/Ethnicity
How many months/years of full-time subprofessional experience do you have performing administrative, budgetary, personnel, or related work or studies?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | None | $\begin{aligned} & <6 \\ & \text { months } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \text { mo. - } \\ & 1 \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1-2 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2788$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 20.8 \%^{*} \\ & (435 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.2 \% \\ & (87 / 209 \\ & 3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.8 \% \\ & (101 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (210 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \% \\ & (252 / 20 \end{aligned}$ 93) | $\begin{aligned} & 9.3 \% \\ & (195 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (131 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.6 \% \\ & (682 / 20 \\ & 93) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 16.8 \%^{*} \\ & (117 / 69 \\ & 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \% \\ & (30 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.2 \% \\ & (36 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.8 \% \\ & (68 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.1 \% \\ & (98 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.1 \% \\ & (63 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.5 \% \\ & (45 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34.1 \% \\ & (237 / 69 \end{aligned}$ 5) |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2236$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 21.2 \%^{*} \\ & (356 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.6 \% \\ & (61 / 167 \\ & 9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \% \\ & (74 / 167 \end{aligned}$ 9) | $\begin{aligned} & 9.6 \% \\ & (161 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.1 \% \\ & (203 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.6 \% \\ & (162 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.3 \% \\ & (105 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.2 \% \\ & (557 / 16 \\ & 79) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 17.2 \%^{*} \\ & (96 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5 \% \\ & (25 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (28 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.2 \% \\ & (51 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.6 \% \\ & (76 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \% \\ & (53 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.8 \% \\ & (38 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.9 \% \\ & (189 / 55 \end{aligned}$ 7) |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=88$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \% \\ & (6 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.4 \% \\ & (3 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.5 \% \\ & (1 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.7 \% \\ & (10 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.2 \% \\ & (11 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.8 \% \\ & (8 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.9 \% \\ & (2 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39.7 \% \\ & (27 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (4 / 20) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (1 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (2 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \% \\ & (3 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (2 / 20) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (8 / 20) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 160: Administrative Aide 1 Reference Site - Race/Ethnicity
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San <br> Diego <br> Employment <br> Information Center | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government <br> Jobs.com |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2788$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 30.7 \% * \\ & (643 / 2093) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.6 \% \\ & (326 / 2093) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.7 \% \\ & (642 / 2093) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 26.6 \%{ }^{*} \\ & (185 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.8 \% \\ & (103 / 695) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.2 \% \\ & (224 / 695) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2236$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 31.3 \% \\ & (525 / 1679) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.5 \% \\ & (261 / 1679) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.6 \% \\ & (530 / 1679) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 27.8 \% \\ & (155 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.3 \% \\ & (91 / 557) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.9 \% \\ & (183 / 557) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=88$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 42.6 \% \\ & (29 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.6 \% \\ & (14 / 68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% \\ & (12 / 68) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 55 \% \\ & (11 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (8 / 20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \% \\ & (1 / 20) \end{aligned}$ |

## Assistant Engineer - Civil

There were no significant differences in race or ethnicity for Assistant Engineer - Civil.
Table 161: Assistant Engineer - Civil Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Assistant Engineer Civil | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=682$ | 392 People of Color 290 Whites | 57.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 3.8 \% \\ p=0.244 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=399$ | 214 People of Color 185 Whites | 53.6\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -6.4 \% \\ p=0.357 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=80$ | 48 People of Color 32 Whites | 60\% |  |  |

## Junior Engineer - Civil

There were no significant differences in race-or-ethnicity for Assistant Engineer - Civil.
Table 162: Junior Engineer - Civil Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> People of <br> Color | Difference <br> - Applied <br> to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Junior Engineer - <br> Civil | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=845$ | 496 People of |  |  |  |


| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=743$ | 439 People of Color 304 Whites | 59.1\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -1.4 \% \\ p=0.850 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=114$ | 69 People of Color 45 Whites | 60.5\% |  |  |

## Fire Recruit

There were no significant differences in race-or-ethnicity for Fire Recruits.
Table 163: Fire Recruit Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Recruit | Total Applicants $n=5349$ | 2648 People of Color <br> 2701 Whites | 49.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 0.6 \% \\ p=0.655 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=2483$ | 1215 People of Color <br> 1268 Whites | 48.9\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \% \\ p=0.298 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=190$ | 85 People of Color 105 Whites | 44.7\% |  |  |

## Fire Fighter 1

There were no significant differences in race-or-ethnicity for Fire Fighter 1.
Table 164: Fire Fighter 1 - Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fire Fighter 1 | Total Applicants $n=458$ | 214 People of Color 244 Whites | 46.7\% | 6.6\% |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=227$ | 91 People of Color <br> 136 Whites | 40.1\% | $\mathrm{p}=0.118$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.8 \% \\ p=0.782 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=183$ | 70 People of Color 113 Whites | 38.3\% |  |  |

## Police Recruit

Table 165: Police Recruit Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer (Recruit Level) | Total Applicants $n=7154$ | 4668 People of Color 2486 Whites | 65.2\% | $\begin{gathered} 8.9 \% \\ p<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1220$ | 687 People of Color 533 Whites | 56.3\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 6.3 \% \\ p=0.137 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=174$ | 87 People of Color 87 Whites | 50\% |  |  |

Application Questions
Table 166: Police Recruit Education Requirement - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which option you are using to meet the education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | Earned College Degree | Completed High School | Passed GED | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=8282$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 26.4 \% * * * \\ & (1453 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 67.6 \% * * * \\ & (3715 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.7 \% \\ & (257 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \% \\ & (72 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 36.4 \% * * * \\ & (1014 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58.2 \% * * * \\ & (1620 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \% \\ & (121 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \% \\ & (30 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1224$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 40.6 \% \\ & (280 / 689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55.3 \% \\ & (381 / 689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.9 \% \\ & (27 / 689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.1 \% \\ & (1 / 689) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \% \\ & (246 / 535) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.9 \% \\ & (267 / 535) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.7 \% \\ & (20 / 535) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \% \\ & (2 / 535) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=175$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 47.1 \% \\ & (41 / 87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.4 \% \\ & (43 / 87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \% \\ & (3 / 87) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 47.7 \% \\ & (42 / 88) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.9 \% \\ & (43 / 88) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.4 \% \\ & (3 / 88) \end{aligned}$ |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05,^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.001$

Table 167: Police Recruit Reference Site - Race/Ethnicity
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government <br> Jobs.com | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=8282$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 10.7 \% \\ & (586 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.6 \% \\ & (1849 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24.9\%** } \\ & (1369 / 5497) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 12.1 \% \\ & (336 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31.5 \% \\ & (878 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.9 \% * * \\ & (777 / 2785) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 17 \% * \\ & (117 / 689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.9 \% \\ & (192 / 689) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.2 \% \\ & (208 / 689) \end{aligned}$ |

How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=1224$ | White | $\begin{aligned} & 21.7 \% * \\ & (116 / 535) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.7 \% \\ & (127 / 535) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32 \% \\ & (171 / 535) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=175$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 23 \% \\ & (20 / 87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \% \\ & (24 / 87) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.9 \% \\ & (26 / 87) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 30.7 \% \\ & (27 / 88) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.3 \% \\ & (17 / 88) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.5 \% \\ & (26 / 88) \end{aligned}$ |

## Police Officer 1

Table 168: Police Officer 1 Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 1 | Total Applicants $n=2530$ | 1596 People of Color 934 Whites | 63.1\% | $\begin{gathered} 10.9 \% \\ p<0.001 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=531$ | 277 People of Color 254 Whites | 52.2\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.9 \% \\ p=0.276 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=371$ | 179 People of Color 192 Whites | 48.2\% |  |  |

## Application Questions

Table 169: Police Officer 1 Education Requirement - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which option you are using to meet the education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | Earned College Degree | Completed High School | Passed GED | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total <br> Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=2667$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 27.6 \% * * * \\ & (469 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 63.3\%*** } \\ & (1074 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6.1\%** } \\ & (104 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.9 \% * \\ & (50 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 38.6 \% * * * \\ & (374 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56.7 \% * * * \\ & (550 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.3 \% * * \\ & (32 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.4 \% * \\ & (14 / 970) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 36.1 \% * \\ & (100 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59.2 \% \\ & (164 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.3 \% * \\ & (12 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.4 \% \\ & (1 / 277) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 46.5 \% \%^{*} \\ & (120 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52.3 \% \\ & (135 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.2 \% * \\ & (3 / 258) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Hired <br> Applicants $n=374$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 41.3 \% \\ & (74 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55.9 \% \\ & (100 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.8 \% \\ & (5 / 179) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 48.2 \% \\ & (94 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51.3 \% \\ & (100 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & (1 / 195) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Specify which option you are using to meet the education requirement.

|  |  | Earned | Completed |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Ethnicity | College <br> Col | High <br> Degree | School | GED | None of |
| :--- |

$$
\text { * } \mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01, \text { *** } \mathrm{p}<0.001
$$

Table 170: Police Officer 1 CA POST Certification - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which option you are using to meet the minimum requirement for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | Basic P.O.S.T. Certificate within past year | Enrolled at Police Academy | Graduated Police Academy | Employmen t as paid sworn Peace Officer | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2667$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 3.5 \% \\ & (60 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.3 \% * * * \\ & (447 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.7 \% \\ & (165 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.7 \% \\ & (164 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50.7 \% * * * \\ & (861 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \% \\ & (23 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.2 \% * * * \\ & (390 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.3 \% \\ & (90 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.9 \% \\ & (115 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.3 \% * * * \\ & (352 / 970) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 5.1 \% \\ & (14 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.6 \% \\ & (201 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.4 \% \\ & (37 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.3 \% \\ & (23 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.7 \% \\ & (2 / 277) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 1.9 \% \\ & (5 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74 \% \\ & (191 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12.4 \% \\ & (32 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.1 \% \\ & (26 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.6 \% \\ & (4 / 258) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $n=374$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 1.1 \% \\ & (2 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.3 \% \\ & (158 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.9 \% \\ & (16 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.7 \% \\ & (3 / 179) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 0.5 \% \\ & (1 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88.2 \% \\ & (172 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.2 \% \\ & (16 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \% \\ & (2 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.1 \% \\ & (4 / 195) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 171: Police Officer 1 Reference Site - Race/Ethnicity
How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | City of San <br> Diego <br> Facility/Employe <br> e | Government Jobs.com | Other |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=2667$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 17.6 \% * * \\ & (298 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.1 \% * * * \\ & (545 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23.8 \% * * * \\ & (404 / 1697) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 22.5 \% * * \\ & (218 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22.7 \% * * * \\ & (220 / 970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29.8 \% * * * \\ & (289 / 970) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=535$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 32.9 \% \\ & (91 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27.4\%* } \\ & (76 / 277) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25.6 \% \\ & (71 / 277) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 32.6 \% \\ & (84 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19\%* } \\ & (49 / 258) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30.6 \% \\ & (79 / 258) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=374$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 40.2 \% \\ & (72 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.2 \% \\ & (38 / 179) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26.8 \% \\ & (48 / 179) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 34.9 \% \\ & (68 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.9 \% \\ & (29 / 195) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32.8 \% \\ & (64 / 195) \end{aligned}$ |

How did you first hear about this employment opportunity?

|  |  | City of San |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Ethnicity | Diego <br> Facility/Employe | Government | Jobs.com |
|  |  | e Other |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$, *** $^{* *}<0.001$


## Police Officer 2

Table 172: Police Officer 2 Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 2 | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=553$ | 324 People of Color 229 Whites | 58.6\% | 0.3\% |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=72$ | 42 People of Color 30 Whites | 58.3\% | $\mathrm{p}>0.999$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.9 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.634 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 5 People of Color 6 Whites | 45.5\% |  |  |

## Application Questions

Table 173: Police Officer 2 High School Education Requirement - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which one of the following options you are using to meet the high school education requirement.

|  |  | Passed <br> High |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | Ethnicity | School <br> Proficiency | Passed <br> Exam | Completed <br> High <br> School | None of <br> the above |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05, * * \mathrm{p}<0.01, * * * \mathrm{p}<0.001$

Table 174: Police Officer 2 College Education Requirement - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which one of the following options you are using to meet the minimum college level education requirement.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | College degree | Minimum required units | None of the above | Qualifying experienc e |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=585$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 40.6 \% \\ & (138 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.4 \% \\ & (93 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18.5 \% * * * \\ & (63 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.5 \% \\ & (46 / 340) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 47.3 \% \\ & (116 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28.2\% } \\ & (69 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.6 \% * * * \\ & (21 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15.9 \% \\ & (39 / 245) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=72$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 47.6 \% \\ & (20 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40.5 \% \\ & (17 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \% \\ & (4 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.4 \% \\ & (1 / 42) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & (18 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \% \\ & (9 / 30) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (3 / 30) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (2 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (2 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (1 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 50 \% \\ & (3 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (1 / 6) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 175: Police Officer 2 CA POST Certification - Race/Ethnicity
Specify which option you are using to meet the minimum requirement for California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicity | Basic P.O.S.T. Certificate within past year | Graduated Police Academy | Waiver | None of the above |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=585$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 10.3 \% \\ & (35 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.5 \% * * \\ & (39 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.1 \% \\ & (24 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.2 \% \\ & (242 / 340) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 12.2 \% \\ & (30 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.9 \% * * \\ & (12 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.6 \% \\ & (26 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72.2 \% \\ & (177 / 245) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=72$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (7 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14.3 \% \\ & (6 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.1 \% \\ & (3 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61.9 \% \\ & (26 / 42) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (5 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (5 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.7 \% \\ & (2 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \% \\ & (18 / 30) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | Non-White | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (2 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (1 / 5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \% \\ & (2 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 176: Police Officer 2 Full Time Experience Yes/No - Race/Ethnicity

| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | People of <br> Color | Whites | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you have full-time paid <br> experience as a sworn officer <br> with a city police, county <br> sheriff, state or federal law <br> enforcement agency performing <br> correction duties, patrol | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=585$ | $53.8 \%$ <br> $(183 / 340)$ | $63.3 \%$ <br> $(155 / 245)$ | $-9.5 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{p}=0.023$ |
| Qualified Applicants <br> functions, or traffic enforcement <br> within the past year? | $100 \%$ <br> $(42 / 42)$ | $100 \%$ <br> $(30 / 30)$ | $0 \%$ |  |

Table 177: Police Officer 2 Years of Experience - Race/Ethnicity
Specify the number of years of full-time paid experience you have obtained as a sworn peace officer with a city police, county sheriff, state or federal law enforcement agency performing correction duties, patrol functions, or traffic enforcement. Do NOT count time spent in a training environment as part of a law enforcement academy.

| Recruitment Stage | Ethnicit <br> y | None | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | $1-2$ <br> years | $\begin{aligned} & 2-3 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3-4 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-5 \\ & \text { years } \end{aligned}$ | $5+$ <br> years |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=585$ | NonWhite | $\begin{aligned} & 40.3 \% * \\ & (137 / 34 \\ & 0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.9 \% \\ & (10 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.7 \% \\ & (16 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (34 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (34 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.1 \% \\ & (14 / 340) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27.9 \% \\ & (95 / 340) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White | $\begin{aligned} & 30.2 \% * \\ & (74 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.8 \% \\ & (2 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.1 \% \\ & (10 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13.9 \% \\ & (34 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.6 \% \\ & (21 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.9 \% \\ & (17 / 245) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.5 \% \\ & (87 / 245) \end{aligned}$ |
| Qualified <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=72$ | NonWhite |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23.8 \% \\ & (10 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21.4 \% \\ & (9 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11.9 \% \\ & (5 / 42) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.9 \% \\ & (18 / 42) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 36.7 \% \\ & (11 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (5 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \% \\ & (3 / 30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36.7 \% \\ & (11 / 30) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hired <br> Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | NonWhite |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \% \\ & (4 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \% \\ & (1 / 5) \end{aligned}$ |
|  | White |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (1 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.7 \% \\ & (1 / 6) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.3 \% \\ & (2 / 6) \end{aligned}$ |

## Police Officer 3

There were no significant differences in race-or-ethnicity for Police Officer 3.
Table 178: Police Officer 3 Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference - Applied to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified <br> to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Officer 3 | Total Applicants $n=41$ | 18 People of Color 23 Whites | 43.9\% | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |  |


| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent <br> People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference <br> - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Qualified Applicants $n=14$ | 6 People of Color 8 Whites | 42.9\% |  | $\begin{gathered} -2.6 \% \\ p>0.999 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=11$ | 5 People of Color 6 Whites | 45.5\% |  |  |

## Police Detective

There were no significant differences in race-or-ethnicity for Police Detective.
Table 179: Police Officer Detective Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Detective | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=306$ | 127 People of Color 179 Whites | 41.5\% | $\begin{gathered} 5.6 \% \\ p=0.261 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=181$ | 65 People of Color 116 Whites | 35.9\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 2.3 \% \\ p=0.789 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $\mathrm{n}=110$ | 37 People of Color 73 Whites | 33.6\% |  |  |

## Police Sergeant

Table 180: Police Sergeant Recruitment Summary - Race/Ethnicity

| Job Title | Recruitment Stage | Applicants | Percent People of Color | Difference <br> - Applied to Qualified | Difference - Qualified to Hired |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Police Sergeant | Total Applicants $\mathrm{n}=409$ | 170 People of Color 239 Whites | 41.6\% | $\begin{gathered} 12.4 \% \\ p=0.005 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Qualified Applicants $\mathrm{n}=192$ | 56 People of Color <br> 136 Whites | 29.2\% |  | $\begin{gathered} 3 \% \\ \mathrm{p}=0.675 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Hired Applicants $n=107$ | 28 People of Color 79 Whites | 26.2\% |  |  |

Application Questions
Table 181: Police Sergeant Completed College Units - Race/Ethnicity

| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | People of <br> Color | Whites | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you successfully <br> completed at least 60 | Total Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=471$ | $84.1 \%$ <br> $(174 / 207)$ | $81.8 \%$ <br> $(216 / 264)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.523$ |


| Question | Recruitment <br> Stage | People of <br> Color | Whites | Estimated <br> Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| semester/90 quarter units of | Qualified Applicants | $89.8 \%$ | $84.1 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ |
| college-level course work from |  |  |  |  |
| a P.O.S.T. approved or | $\mathrm{n}=204$ | $(53 / 59)$ | $(122 / 145)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.291$ |
| accredited college/university? | Hired Applicants <br> $\mathrm{n}=107$ | $89.3 \%$ | $83.5 \%$ | $5.8 \%$ |
|  |  | $(25 / 28)$ | $(66 / 79)$ | $\mathrm{p}=0.464$ |

Table 182: Police Sergeant Reference Site - Race/Ethnicity

|  |  | How did you first hear about <br> this employment opportunity? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Recruitment <br> Stage | City of San |  |

* $\mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.001$


## List of Interviews

This report could not have been possible without the support of everyone within the city. Throughout the project, the Analytica team needed insights from various experts within the city. Initial interviews were conducted early in the project to understand overall processes and what data was available to use for the study. This included interviews with representatives from the following departments:

- Risk Management
- Personnel
- Human Resources

Once the Analytica team had initial job types created based on the career progressions seen in the data, these job types were reviewed (and subsequently revised) with representatives from the following departments:

- Parks and Recreation
- Department-wide
- Open Space
- Metro Parks
- Golf
- Engineering
- Libraries
- City Treasurer
- Public Utilities
- Public Works


#### Abstract

An initial draft of findings and recommendations were reviewed with representatives from the following departments:


- Personnel
- Risk Management
- Fire Department
- Police Department
Analytica Consulting would like to thank everyone who took time out of their schedule to help make this report a success.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ All future mentions of "the City" refer to the City of San Diego
    ${ }^{2}$ Within the City, this group is comprised of the following races/ethnicities: Hispanic or Latino (52\%), Black or African American (21.9\%), Asian ( $13.6 \%$ ), Filipino $(7.4 \%)$, Other/Two or more races ( $3.5 \%$ ), American Indian or Alaska Native ( $1 \%$ ), and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (0.5\%).
    ${ }^{3}$ This was determined utilizing a statistical technique known as Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition (Oaxaca 1973; Blinder 1973). See appendix for details.

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ All numerical findings presented in the executive summary are statistically significant at $p<0.05$. Detailed results can be found in the body of the report and the appendix.

    5 Total pay is all pay an employee receives, including overtime and add-on pay.
    ${ }^{6}$ Unless otherwise stated, any references to 'citywide' are referring to the City of San Diego's municipal employees, resources, etc.

[^2]:    ${ }^{7}$ Overtime hours were estimated for each employee based on their overtime pay and their base pay. See appendix for details.

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ Unadjusted - comparison of the difference in men and women's salary overall, not accounting for any differences in job type, years of experience, industry, etc.
    ${ }^{9}$ In later sections of our report, we will focus on the adjusted comparison of mean (average) salaries. However, for this section we rely on unadjusted median comparisons to be able to compare equivalent calculations.
    ${ }^{10}$ All data was from ("The Pay Gap in 25 Major US Cities" 2020) except the City of San Diego Employees (calculated in this study) and the data for San Diego, CA (calculated from US ACS Data("American Community Survey 2018 5-Year Estimates - Table Dpo3" 2020) for San Diego city).

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ All references for reports in this table can be found in the References section of the Appendix
    ${ }^{12}$ For further details, refer to the Methodology appendix

[^5]:    ${ }^{13}$ See appendix for details on each job type and the methodology by which they were created.

[^6]:    ${ }^{14}$ Our study sample for this and all subsequent analysis included employees who: 1) had compensation data, 2) worked at least half of the year, 3) worked standard hours (full-time, $3 / 4$ time, or $1 / 2$ time), 4) worked the same schedule all year, 5) worked in the same job type all year, 6) had regular pay (prorated for time worked) that was at least $80 \%$ of the stated minimum salary for the position or were on long term disability (LTD) during the year (protects against including erroneous pay values, removes likely workman's comp employees, and still allows for likely underfilled positions and those on LTD), and 7) were not on long term disability the entire year. All pay was prorated for employees who worked less than the entire year and/or worked $3 / 4$ or $1 / 2$ time.
    ${ }^{15}$ This and other similar occupational sorting estimates are based on pay gap calculations using the average log of total pay. When calculated this way, the pay gap is slightly different than the unadjusted pay gap(s) reported elsewhere in the report (e.g., $18.5 \%$ vs $17.6 \%$ for 2019 gender pay gap). This does not affect the overall findings of the report.

[^7]:    ${ }^{16}$ We examined recruitment data from January 2016 - January 2019 across 12 roles that showed significant imbalance in their gender and/or racial-and-ethnic makeup. See appendix for additional details.

[^8]:    ${ }^{17}$ Number of children was determined from the dependents an employee declared for any utilized benefits. For any analysis involving number of children, the employee must have utilized City benefits before age 50 . This was done to reduce the likelihood of declaring an employee has no children, when they actually have grown children who are no longer dependents.

[^9]:    ${ }^{18}$ For modeling purpose an employees age when they had their first child was put into one of six groups: No Children, Under 22, 23-28, 29-35, and Over 35.
    ${ }^{19}$ Determined based on the employee's hire date.
    ${ }^{20}$ For modeling purpose the percent of the year spent on long-term disability (LTD) was put into one of three groups: No LTD, 0-3 Months, over 3 Months.
    ${ }^{21}$ Age is approximate to within a 3 year window. This is because the authors were provided three-year age groups as part of the city's efforts to de-identify the research data set. For modeling purpose an employees age was put into one of six groups: Under 30, 30-34, 35-39, 40-49, 50-59, and Over 60.

[^10]:    ${ }^{22}$ City of San Diego Employee Compensation Reports

[^11]:    * $\mathrm{p}<0.05,{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$, *** $\mathrm{p}<0.001$

