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Mr. Tom Lewis, Jr.
Department of Management Services
Office of the Secretary
4050 Esplanade Way
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0950

Dear Secretary Lewis:

I have the honor to submit to you *Gender Discrimination in Florida State Agencies: An Analysis of Options*. This report is the product of extensive research and analysis from July through November of 2006. Addressing the problem of gender discrimination in public administration is vital. Currently, the state relies on its requirement for each agency to have an affirmative action plan, a sexual harassment policy, and the Broadband pay schedule to deal with gender discrimination. At present, Florida is not adequately managing this significant issue.

After examining three alternatives for the problem, my recommendation is that Florida should concentrate on the implementation of both the mentor program and the gender discrimination workshop. These options are recommended based on the use of three evaluative criteria: administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and the importance of the option based on the survey results. The mentor program scored high on the adequacy and the importance based on the survey criteria, while still receiving a score of medium on the administrative effectiveness criterion. The gender discrimination workshop scored high for all criteria.

The mentor program would provide opportunities for women in regards to career advancement and the gender discrimination workshop would provide discussion in the area of gender discrimination with an emphasis on more intensive sexual harassment training. These recommendations have the potential to work throughout state agencies. Implementing these options will help Florida effectively cope with issue of gender discrimination.

Respectfully,

Heather L. Orender, BSW
Graduate Student, Public Administration
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Executive Summary

Addressing the problem of gender discrimination in public administration is vital for Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation (FAWI) and Florida. Currently, the state is not satisfactorily managing this significant issue. Florida relies on its requirement for all agencies to have an affirmative action plan, its sexual harassment policy, and the recent institution of Broadband pay schedule to provide employee support and reduce gender discrimination. Unfortunately, state agencies are still struggling with the issue of discrimination based on gender, in particularly with sexual harassment, stereotypes, the “glass ceiling” within organizations, and a masculine state of mind.

Information for this report was collected using four methods. First, popular media, surveys, and academic literature were analyzed in order to provide the historical background. Second, a review of applicable case law, state reports, current agency policies, procedures, and budgetary documents allowed for examination of the current administrative functioning within FAWI and all state agencies, as well as, presented foresight into the current budgeting limitations of the agency. Third, an in-person, semi-structured interview of an FAWI employee was conducted to provide insight into the employee perception of gender discrimination within the agency, as well as discuss alternatives to fix the problem. Fourth, a survey of FAWI employees (n=20) was conducted in order to directly assess employees perceptions of gender discrimination within state agencies, as well as analyze their experiences.

This report presented three alternatives to address the problem of gender discrimination: the status quo, a mentor program, and a gender discrimination workshop.
Each option was evaluated against three criteria: administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and the importance of the option based on the results of the survey.

Based on assessment of the alternatives using the three evaluative criteria, both the mentor program and the gender discrimination workshop were recommended. Implementing them would be the most viable option to reduce gender discrimination. If Florida were to remain at status quo, it would not be meeting the needs of their employees or adequately addressing the issue of gender discrimination in their agencies. Both the mentor program and the gender discrimination workshop would probably have employee support. While the workshop may have a financial impact on the state, it can be easily implemented through the current affirmative action plans. The mentor program would have little financial impact. Both options would help reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination within their agencies.
I. Problem Statement

Modern society has made it evident that women have the ability to perform with equal skill and success in practically every undertaking engaged in by men, including employment, athletics, academics, and politics (Hale, 1999). Yet, discrimination on the basis of gender has a long history in the United States, and its lingering effects still operate to keep women's salaries lower and opportunities fewer in the employment arena.

An exploration of gender in Florida’s public administration has gone relatively unnoticed. However, public administrators must change the way they think in order to reshape the practice and the field of public administration out of a masculine state of mind. “Public administration is structurally masculine despite its apparent neutrality and despite the presence of increasing numbers of women in federal, state, and local governments” (Stivers, 2002, p. 4). Although Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits gender discrimination, it is still a problem within organizations.

Many Florida state agencies are still struggling with issues of sexual harassment, compensation, the actual or perceived “glass ceiling” within organizations, stereotypes, rational bias, and a masculine state of mind. For example, latest available data shows that during the fiscal year 1997-1998, 37 incidents of sexual harassment complaints by staff members of the Florida Department of Corrections were reported to the Inspector General's Office (The Florida Department of Corrections, 1998) and 32 incidents were reported during the fiscal year 1998-1999 (The Florida Department of Corrections, 1999). In addition, Gwen Kesselman filed suit against the Department of Transportation in 1993, claiming a hostile work environment and June M. Smith filed suit against the Department of Management Services in 1994 for sexual harassment (State of Florida Division of
Administrative Hearings, 2006). Furthermore, based on the results of the survey conducted by this researcher, the Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation (FAWI) is one agency, which reveals its deficiency with the six issues listed above.

The purpose of this Action Report is to evaluate gender discrimination in public administration, as it applies to the Florida Agency for Workforce Innovation, and to develop alternative approaches to address this problem, in order to assess how they can be more effective. This problem is analyzed through an examination of the theories and research into why this occurs, the forms of discrimination that block women’s advancement, and solutions for breaking through the barriers. A survey was conducted of FAWI, as well as an employee interview, and these results were incorporated into this study. Understanding the effects of gender discrimination in the workplace is important and relevant to Florida and public administration because it can help to increase organizations effectiveness, lead to higher bureaucratic performance, and help agencies to identify candidates for future positions. For public administration to thrive, it is vital for Florida to realize the significance of gender discrimination in the workplace.

II. Background & Literature Review

Background

This section presents a history of women’s entrance into employment and the legislation that protects individuals against gender discrimination in the workplace. Then it defines key terms covered within that legislation, such as sexual harassment, compensation, and the glass ceiling.
Women's entrance into employment. Initially, women were seen as those who could only do charity work, but then in the mid 1800’s women entered the male world of government employment “not because it required women’s benign, compassionate, and caring influence, but because federal offices needed cheap labor and middle-class women needed good jobs” (Aron, 1987, p.182). Aron (1987, p.183) also suggested that some of the problems that plague women workers today were evident in the early decades of their involvement in public employment, including sexual harassment and discriminatory treatment. These factors led to the development of the Women’s Bureau in 1920 (Stivers, 2002), which focused specifically on the needs of women and equal opportunity employment.

It could be said that women have made great progress over the past two-hundred years. If it is considered that under the United States Constitution, women were not even considered persons, and of course, had no vote until 1920. Black men who were free and property owners were at least worth two-thirds of a person, but not women. Women have at least progressed to the point that they may now own property, and have the ability to work gainfully outside of the home; however, equity in the work force still has not been achieved. Men continue to hold the vast majority of decision-making positions in both the public and private sector (Bielby, 2000).

According to the State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2004, FAWI’s gender make-up consisted of approximately 65 percent women and 35 percent men. Yet women held only 36 percent of the senior management positions compared to the men who held 63.5 percent (Department of Management Services, 2004). There is no significant change in this since the year 2000, where the Annual Workforce Report shows
women to consist of 66 percent of FAWI population and men only 34 percent. However, women still held only 34 percent of the senior management positions, whereas men held 66 percent (Department of Management Services, 2000).

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In 1964, the federal government passed legislation that is meant to protect employees and applicants for employment from gender discrimination. Under this legislation, it is against the law to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of his/her gender concerning hiring, termination, promotion, compensation, job training, or any other term, condition, or privilege of employment. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 protects individuals against employment discrimination based on gender as well as race, color, national origin, and religion. Title VII applies to employers with fifteen or more employees, including state and local governments, employment agencies, labor organizations, and the federal government (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2006).

Title VII prohibits employment decisions based on stereotypes and assumptions about abilities, traits, or the performance of individuals based on gender. It also prohibits both intentional discrimination and neutral job policies that unreasonably exclude individuals based on gender and that are not job related. It is also illegal to retaliate against an individual for opposing employment practices that discriminate based on gender or for filing a discrimination charge, testifying, or participating in any way in an investigation, proceeding, or litigation under Title VII (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2006).

FAWI, as well as all state agencies, try to ensure equal employment opportunity through programs of affirmative and positive action that will allow full utilization of
women and minorities, enforced by Florida Statute 110.112 (See Appendix A). FAWI, like all state agencies, creates an affirmative action plan and appoints an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EO/AA) officer. The FAWI EO/AA officer is responsible for implementing the mission and scope of responsibilities established in the affirmative action plan. FAWI’s affirmative action plan mission is to ensure nondiscrimination and equal opportunity in employment, programs or services. Their scope of responsibilities are the affirmative action plan update and monitoring; equal opportunity and civil rights training; nondiscrimination; nondiscrimination program monitoring; and complaint resolution (Florida Statute Â§ 110.112).

Sexual Harassment. Title VII's prohibitions against gender-based discrimination also covers sexual harassment. This includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment. Sexual harassment can occur in a multiplicity of conditions. The victim, as well as, the harasser may be a man or a woman. The victim does not have to be of the opposite sex. The harasser can be the victim’s supervisor, an agent of the employer, a supervisor in another area, a co-worker, a non-employee. The victim does not have to be the person harassed but anyone affected by the offensive conduct. Unlawful sexual harassment may occur without economic injury to or discharge of the victim and the harasser’s conduct must be unwelcome. In the fiscal year 2005, the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission received 12,679 charges of sexual harassment (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2006).
FAWI has a well-defined policy on sexual harassment (see Appendix B), which includes almost all of the criteria stated above. However, for any missing criteria the policy instructs the employee to review Title VII for further interpretation of the definition, as well as the procedures for submitting a complaint. The policy also defines the responsibilities of all parties, including the employee, managers and supervisors, and the agency. Employee interviews reveal the knowledge that sexual harassment complaints have been made at FAWI within the past five years, however due to confidentiality issues there are no statistics available regarding these complaints.

*Compensation.* Employees have the right to be free from discrimination in their compensation, several federal laws protect this right, and the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforces these laws. Title VII prohibits employment discrimination based on gender in regards to compensation. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 requires that men and women receive equal pay for equal work in the same establishment. The position does not have to be identical but is has to be considerably equal. The title of the job does not determine its equality, but the content of the job does. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 states, “Employers may not pay unequal wages to men and women who perform jobs that require substantially equal skill, effort and responsibility, and that are performed under similar working conditions within the same establishment” (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2006). There is a need for both laws as, Title VII prohibits compensation discrimination based on gender, and it does not require that the individual’s job be considerably equal to that of a higher paid person of the opposite sex in the same establishment (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2006).
The wage gap between men and women stubbornly remains despite the passage of the Equal Pay Act nearly forty years ago. Women are still not receiving equal pay for equal work, let alone equal pay for comparable work. This disparity not only affects women's spending power, it penalizes their retirement security by creating gaps in social security and pensions. According to the State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2000, an employee in the Senior Management Service (SMS) had an average salary of $92,487. However, men employed at FAWI in the SMS had an average salary of $94,251, whereas women in the SMS only earned an average salary of $89,010 (Department of Management Services, 2000).

There were central changes to the State personnel system because of the Service First legislation in Senate Bill 466, which was passed into law by the Legislature during the 2001 legislative session. The Service First legislation instituted parameters for restructuring the State’s job classification and pay system. This legislation provides a limit to the number of occupational groups in Florida’s personnel classification system to no more than 50, a maximum of six classification levels for each occupation within an occupational group, thus in effect establishing a limit of 300 job classification levels for the State Personnel System. The law also required that the accompanying pay plan provided broad-based salary ranges for each occupational group (Department of Management Services, 2006).

“Broad banding is a classification system that replaced the old state classification system by collapsing numerous classes with similar duties into broad occupational categories. Along with the broad categories, broad pay ranges were also created within this system” (Department of Management Services, 2006). The Broadband system is a
process of grouping like duties and pay while providing a high degree of flexibility to agencies in order to meet the needs and demands of the state workforce (Department of Management Services, 2006). With the institution of the Broadband pay schedule in 2002, the disparity of pay between genders became smaller. The *State of Florida Annual Workforce Report* of 2004 reported FAWI male SMS employees to have an average annual salary of $100,774 and female SMS employees to have an average annual salary of $99,081, bringing the difference to less than $2000 (Department of Management Services, 2004). This is a significant change from a difference of over $5000 in the year 2000, however, a disparity still exists that cannot be explained.

*The Glass Ceiling.* The glass ceiling is one of the most persuasive images for examining the inequalities between men and women in the workplace. It suggests that although women may be able to get through the front door of the management hierarchy, at some point they hit an invisible barrier that blocks any further upward movement. This report defines the glass ceiling as the actual or perceived barrier beyond which few women in organizations are able to progress (Bullard & Wright, 1993). The glass ceiling concept implies that this transparent barrier keeps women from advancing higher simply because they are women. Taken literally, this image of the glass ceiling involves the existence of a solid barrier that blocks the vertical mobility of women; below this barrier, women have the possibility of promotion and beyond this barrier, they do not.

In summary, understanding the defining legislation, which has led to the prohibition of employment discrimination based on gender, is an important step for Florida and the future of public administration. Realizing that sexual harassment is still a very real phenomenon in society and comprehending exactly what constitutes the
definition of sexual harassment, is a key component to any organizational survival. The presence of a glass ceiling is a major issue in American organizational culture (Bullard & Wright, 1993), therefore, acknowledging the concept and realizing its relevance will only offer as a tool for organizations and administrators.

**Literature Review**

The pertinent literature on this topic addresses three themes: the rational-bias theory, the presence of a glass ceiling existing within organizations, and public administrators remaining in a masculine state of mind. The works discussed below clarify these issues.

The literature has shown that the rational bias theory suggests that one source of discrimination is an employee’s willingness to bend to the assumed preferences of those holding power over his or her career. “The theory states that employees attribute preferences to power holders even in the event that objective information is lacking” (Larwood & Trentham, 1998, p. 20). Larwood and Trentham conducted an experimental-survey design study concerning the rational bias theory and utilizing 148 male and 158 female employed participants. The “results show evidence of continuing discrimination, and support the theory predicting rational bias gender discrimination in the workplace”(Larwood & Trentham, 1998, p.1).

“The perceptions that business norms favor discrimination and that compliance with the norms is important to business success are two basic tenets of rational bias theory” (Larwood & Trentham, 1998, p. 3) in accordance with the literature. Studies (Larwood & Trentham, 1998; Crosby, Clayton, Alksnis, & Hemker, 1986; Crosby et al.,
1989) examining situational context show that individuals who may not have any negative prejudices may still “rationally” choose to discriminate under certain conditions. The authors suggest that this may happen because employees believe that those holding power over them and their future career expect this behavior, or it is the organizational norm. This behavior can seem justified to the employee, despite knowledge of policies or laws prohibiting such bias. Employees feel that they must take into account the attitudes and predilections of their superiors and clients in order to further their careers. Therefore, they may choose to discriminate if they believe that their superiors prefer or expect it. Accordingly, the literature claims that an employee who is displaying rational bias is only the result of the perception of external pressures from superiors or clients to discriminate (Larwood & Trentham, 1998).

Second, literature supports the progress made by women in terms of representation and proves it to be impressive as “women now hold nearly half of the white-collar jobs” (Naff, 1994, p. 507); however, women still seem to hit a barrier when it comes to upper level management positions. “Only about one in three supervisors and one in eight executives in state government are women” (Department of Management Services, 2004). These statistics suggest that while employment may no longer be denied based on gender alone, some form of discrimination continues to prevent women from moving on to supervisory and management positions. Bullard views the glass ceiling that exists within organizations to be as “real as steel” (Bullard et al., 1993, p.189). Many studies (Hale, 1999; Bullard, 1993, Naff, 1994; Mani, 1997) have shown that women often encounter glass ceilings when they try to make their way up the promotional ladder. Women often feel excluded from power, sidetracked, and socially isolated. Hale (1999)
has also suggested that “men are reluctant to give up power, they are uncomfortable dealing with women, whom they believe are different from them and are, therefore, unreliable or unpredictable” (p. 410).

However, historically public administration has a better record than the private sector in regards to gender discrimination. According to the State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2000, an employee in the Senior Management Service (SMS) had an average salary of $92,487, with women in the SMS earning an average salary of $89,010 (Department of Management Services, 2000). Since the central changes to the pay schedule in 2002, this has increased and the State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2004 reported an employee in the SMS had an average salary of $100,129 and female SMS employees to have an average annual salary of $99,081. In addition, females held 36% of the SMS positions (Department of Management Services, 2004).

Third, literature supports the idea that professionalism is structurally masculine and that in order for a female to survive as a professional administrator she must distance herself from the status of woman and align herself only with the status of professional expert. Unfortunately, this coincides with the masculine state of mind. Stivers (2002) suggests that professional administrators are expected to be:

(1) technically expert, objective, and impartial; merge without difficulty into the agency’s perspective; (2) display autonomous authority in the exercise of discretion; (3) share a worldview and set of values with like-minded fellow members of the professions; and (4) regard their work as primary in their lives, devoting ling hours and uninterrupted years of service to it, putting it above personal concerns (p. 56).

For men these are seen as the qualities expected, yet women are additionally expected to put home and family ahead of or at least equal to these professional qualities (Stivers,
2002; Gilligan, 1982). Meeting both sets of expectations for women is difficult if they want to hold on to their status as a woman and a professional.

Stivers (2002) holds that to “observe that a number of women have done it successfully is to miss the point” (p. 57). Literature supports that it is a constant effort for women to manage their femaleness on the job and remain authoritative, yet not masculine, and still balance work and home. Stivers (2002), suggests that women constantly struggle between a sense of self and the image of the professional expert.

In summary, the literature has provided a variety of rationales for the rational bias theory and the existence of the glass ceiling in organizations. In addition, the literature provides sufficient reasons as to why public administrators remain in a masculine state of mind. This report builds upon this literature by using specific criteria to critically evaluate three policy options suggested to address the problem of gender discrimination in FAWI.

III. Methodology & Evaluation Criteria

Methodology

Information for this report was collected using the following methods:

- Survey of employees (n=40) of FAWI (see Appendix C);
- Semi-structured interview with one FAWI employee;
- Review of applicable case law, state reports, current agency policies, procedures, and budgetary documents;
- Analysis of gender discrimination related popular media, surveys, and academic literature. Searched years from 1970 to present from JSTOR, and all years to present from Google, and Google Scholar.
In an effort to explore perceptions of gender discrimination within state agencies, this report utilized a survey technique. The sample was drawn from FAWI and included current, full-time employees of the organization from two units: initial claims and adjudication. The initial claims unit consists of 43 employees and the adjudication unit consists of 36 employees, which is a combined average of 40 employees. This number (40) of employees is consistent with the average for each unit within the agency, which has 1,338 employees. Therefore, the researcher concluded that it would be feasible to survey 20 employees from each unit, with a total number of 40 surveys for this sample.

The researcher comprised a six-page questionnaire combining both open and closed-ended questions. A copy of the instrument with a cover letter was provided to the respondents requesting participation in the survey, and there was no mention of gender discrimination in the letter. The respondents had no direct contact with the researcher and it was explained within the cover letter that participation in the study was agency-sanctioned, voluntary, and there was no penalty for non-participation. The respondents were given the option to receive a summary of the findings by contacting the researcher. The respondents were given one week to complete and return the survey. At the end of this week, a reminder notice was sent throughout both participating units in FAWI urging participation with a deadline extension for the receipt of surveys for one more week. Of the original sample of 40 FAWI employees, a total number of 20 surveys were received for a response rate of 50 percent. Of this 50 percent, 65 percent were female and 35 percent were male. In addition, 30 percent of respondents have been employed at FAWI for one year or less, 35 percent for two to five years, and 30 percent for 10 or more years.
The selection of FAWI was based on previous research by the researcher (Orender, 2006), which concluded that there was a significant issue with gender discrimination within the organization. The use of this agency to compile survey research is the basis for a strong claim in this report, as the general size of the organization is consistent with most state agencies.

An in-person, semi-structured interview was conducted with an employee of FAWI. The researcher and the interviewee discussed the basic demographics of the agency, their personal history with gender discrimination and their perception of gender discrimination within the agency. Furthermore, alternatives to fix the problem within FAWI were discussed as well. The employee assessed the different facets of the alternatives in order to determine which one would be the most viable option for the agency. The interview consisted of roughly 90 minutes of questions and answers. Typical questions consisted of items such as: 1) Do you feel you have experienced gender bias within your organization? 2) Do you feel that you are compensated at the same level when performing the same job as your male counterpart? 3) Do you think this policy option would be an asset to the organization? 4) Why or why not? The interview subject was well known to the researcher and was contacted in addition to the interview period when further information was required.

In addition, this report utilized popular media, surveys, and academic literature in order to provide insight into the historical background. A review of applicable case law, state reports, current agency policies, procedures, and budgetary documents allowed for examination of the current administrative functioning within FAWI and all state agencies, as well as, presented foresight into the current budgeting limitations of the agency.
**Evaluation Criteria**

Three criteria were used to evaluate each policy option: administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and the importance based on survey results. Each criterion was measured on a decision matrix with a ranking scale of low, medium, and high. Low will be a very unlikely chance that the policy will be a viable option, medium will be a likely chance that the policy will be a viable option and high will be a more than likely chance that the policy will be viable option.

- **Administrative effectiveness.** This evaluates the usefulness of the option. What is the likelihood that the agency will implement the policy option? Will the option be administratively feasible? Administrative effectiveness is evaluated through interview, popular media, surveys, and academic literature.

- **Adequacy.** This evaluates the ability of the option to reduce gender discrimination and the employee perception of gender discrimination within the agency. Will the implementation of the option have an impact on gender discrimination? Will the option have an impact on the employee’s perception of gender discrimination within the agency? Adequacy is evaluated through the survey of employees and review of state reports and current agency policies and procedures.

- **Importance Based on Survey Results.** This evaluates the importance of the option based on the results of the survey and is evaluated through the survey of employees.
These criteria were selected as representative of the considerations made in the evaluation of alternatives to address the problem of gender discrimination in FAWI. Other criteria such as higher bureaucratic performance, cost, and the creation of a larger promotion pool could not be evaluated due to technical and subjective complexities. These criteria, while important, are secondary and data are unavailable (such as the unavailability of an itemized budget and the inability to account for manager bias).

One limitation of this study was the inability to conduct more interviews with key personnel within FAWI. As the issue of gender discrimination is quite sensitive, the directors and supervisors were unwilling to participate in an interview setting. However, permission was granted for a detailed survey and no limitations were given for participation or content. Despite the interview constraints, the survey results did yield to the researcher a clear perspective into the employees’ perceptions of gender discrimination within FAWI. In addition, there is a lack of state research on the topic of gender discrimination as it pertains to public administration, especially in recent years. This made it difficult for the researcher to obtain the latest available data for this study.

IV. Management Policy Options

The following section explains the three alternatives considered for the gender discrimination problem in state agencies: status quo, a mentor program, and a gender discrimination workshop with an emphasis on sexual harassment training. Each alternative is evaluated using the three criteria detailed previously: administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and the importance based on survey results. The options are
designed to guide policy makers toward the most viable strategic policy to reduce gender discrimination.

**Option One: Status Quo**

For this alternative, Florida state agencies would remain at status quo and continue along their current course of action. As discussed below the status quo consists of an affirmative action plan, a sexual harassment policy, and the Broadband pay schedule.

*Administrative Effectiveness.* FAWI follows Florida Statute 110.112, implementing an affirmative action plan with an effort to ensure freedom from discrimination in employment as provided by the Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992 and to assure equal employment opportunity through programs of affirmative and positive action that will allow full utilization of women and minorities (Florida Statute Â§ 110.112). As of 2004, FAWI’s gender make-up consisted of approximately 65 percent women and 35 percent men, according to the *State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2004*. Men held 63.5 percent of the senior management positions, while women held only 36 percent (Department of Management Services, 2004).

As shown in appendix B, FAWI also has a distinct policy on sexual harassment, which follows state guidelines and is administered through the Department of Management Services Human Resources department. This policy was last updated in 2004. It defines sexual harassment and the procedures for filing a sexual harassment grievance.
In addition, FAWI is in alignment with the state’s Broadband pay system instituted in 2002, which gives agencies flexibility to meet the needs of the workforce (Department of Management Services, 2006). The institution of this Broadband pay schedule reduced the disparity of pay among genders significantly. As noted previously in the report, in the year 2000 there was a difference of more than $5000 between men and women SMS employees, however since the implementation of the Broadband system, the disparity has decreased to a difference of less than $2000 in 2004. It would be managerially viable for the state to remain at status quo and continue to rely on their current policies and programs.

**Adequacy.** Currently, Florida is not adequately addressing the issue of gender discrimination. Despite its efforts, with the institution of the Broadband pay system and a succinct sexual harassment policy, Florida still falls behind in the disparity of women versus men in senior management positions. Men still hold 27 percent more senior management positions than women in Florida state agencies (Department of Management Services, 2004). In addition, there is no effort to move public administrators out of a masculine state of mind in order to avoid even the perception of gender discrimination by the employee. Therefore, if the state remains at status quo it will not do anything to reduce gender discrimination or the employees’ perception of gender discrimination.

**Importance Based on Survey Results.** Based on the results of the survey, 60 percent of employees feel that stereotypes exist within their agency that may limit the potential of women for career advancement, of this 60 percent, 57 percent were male and 62 percent were female. In addition, 50 percent of employees believe that social connections are a requirement for advancement within their agency, and of this 50
percent, 33.3 percent feel that this requirement places women at a disadvantage with respect to career advancement. This suggests that the employees perceive an atmosphere that involves gender discrimination. Consequently, if Florida continues along their current course of action then it will do nothing to reduce the employees’ perception of gender discrimination or to remove the glass ceiling that exists within agencies.

In summary, the alternative for Florida state agencies to remain at status quo scores low for adequacy and the importance based on survey results criteria. If the state continues along their current course of action, it will not do anything to reduce gender discrimination or the employees’ perception of gender discrimination within agencies. In addition, administrative effectiveness scores high, as it would be organizationally feasible for state to remain at status quo.

**Option Two: Mentor Program**

This alternative would provide career service, selected exempt service and/or senior management service employees from the agency to mentor female employees who are interested in becoming career service, selected exempt service and/or senior management service employees in a Florida state agency. Each employee who is interested in a mentorship would be required to apply in writing for this honor. Each employee within the career service, selected exempt service and/or senior management service will be required to mentor one employee, at least every other year. A mentorship will be at least 20 hours per month and the employee will learn all facets of the position which their holds and what requirements are needed to fill that position.
Administrative Effectiveness. According to the State of Florida Annual Workforce Report of 2005, there are 85,002 career service employees, 18,734 selected exempt service employees, and 561 senior management service employees currently employed within state agencies (Department of Management Services, 2005). Implementation of a mentor program would be uncomplicated for Florida, as it would require little financial allocation and only the time of the staff to implement. It would also be effective for employees and for breaking through the apparent glass ceiling that exists within state agencies, by providing more opportunities for women for career advancement, in order to reduce the disparity between men and women in executive positions.

Adequacy. At present, the survey reveals that Florida is not sufficiently dealing with the problem of gender discrimination within their agencies. As 33.3 percent of females feel that, they are at a disadvantage with respect to career advancement because they are women, and 62 percent feel that stereotypes exist within their agency that limits their potential for career advancement. In addition, 35 percent of females agree that the standards are higher for women than for men, and 30 percent agree that a woman must perform better than a man to be promoted. As a result, if Florida were to implement this mentor program it could reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination by providing more opportunities for women in regards to career advancement.

Importance Based on Survey Results. There is a widespread feeling of employees that women are at a disadvantage in regards to career advancement, and that stereotypes exist within their agency, which may limit the potential of women to advance in their career. When asked if they would favor a mentor program that would give women more
opportunities for promotion in their agency 92 percent of female employees and 86 percent of male employees responded yes. Accordingly, the implementation of this option would be important and would help reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination in state agencies by providing more opportunities for women for career advancement.

In summary, this alternative receives a score of medium on the administrative effectiveness criterion. This option would be easily implemented, however, the competition for mentors in senior management service would be great, as there is only a small amount in Florida agencies and they have very busy schedules. The alternative scores high on both adequacy and the importance based on survey results criteria. The perception of employees within agencies that women are discriminated against based on their gender, and in turn are held back in regards to career advancement is great. The employees seem to be ready to support a mentor program that would give women more opportunities for career advancement. Therefore, implementing this option would help Florida reduce gender discrimination, as well as the employees’ perception of gender discrimination.

**Option Three: Gender Discrimination Workshop**

This alternative would provide a gender discrimination workshop with an emphasis on sexual harassment training. The workshop would include the following guidelines:

1. Workshop shall be provided by trainers or educators with knowledge and expertise in the prevention of harassment, discrimination, and retaliation;
(2) Workshop shall be interactive;

(3) Workshop shall cover federal and state laws related to sexual harassment;

(4) Workshop shall include examples sexual harassment, discrimination and retaliation;

(5) Workshop shall describe the remedies available to victims of sexual harassment;

(6) Workshop shall be at least two hours in length; and

(7) Workshop must be provided on an annual basis to all employees.

*Administrative Effectiveness.* FAWI follows Florida Statute 110.112, implementing an affirmative action plan for their agency, through the affirmative action plan, an affirmative action/equal opportunity officer is appointed and he or she is in charge of carrying out the scope of responsibilities of the plan. As noted earlier in the report some of these responsibilities are equal opportunity and civil rights training; nondiscrimination; nondiscrimination program monitoring; and complaint resolution. Therefore, the AA/EO officer can implement this workshop easily and effectively through his or her administrative capabilities. It will also assist him or her with meeting the mission and scope of the affirmative action plan by providing training that will reduce gender discrimination. Consequently, the implementation of this option would reduce gender discrimination by offering open discussion in the area of gender discrimination and more accurate and intense training on sexual harassment.

*Adequacy.* The survey revealed that 38 percent of females feel that they have been treated differently than their male colleagues and 29 percent of males feel that they have been treated differently than their female colleagues within their agency. In addition, 60 percent of employees feel that stereotypes exist within their agency that may
limit the potential of women for career advancement. While this suggests that employees’ perception of gender discrimination within their agency is relatively high, 65 percent of respondents disclosed that generally women and men are respected equally within their agency. Therefore, implementing this workshop could reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination by providing open discussion in the area of gender discrimination and more accurate and intense training on sexual harassment.

**Importance Based on Survey Results.** The survey revealed that a majority of state employees cannot clearly define sexual harassment, 85 percent of the respondents were incorrect in their definition. While this suggests a lack of employee training, 100 percent of the respondents stated that they had been through sexual harassment training at their current agency and 80 percent thought it was effective. In addition, 98 percent of respondents have experienced, heard about, or seen an act of sexual harassment within their agency. Although, when asked if they would favor the implementation of annual sexual harassment training for all employees, 55 percent of employees stated that they would not favor this training. Yet, the implementation of this workshop would be important and would help reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination through open discussions on gender discrimination and more accurate and intense training on sexual harassment.

In summary, gender discrimination workshops are becoming commonplace in the private sector, as well as in federal agencies, and in many state agencies around the country. This alternative receives a high score on the administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and the importance based on survey results criteria. The alternative could be
easily implemented and administered through the scope and responsibilities of the existing AA/EO officer and implementing this option has the ability to reduce gender discrimination and the employee perception of gender discrimination in state agencies. Furthermore, the implementation of this option will increase training and awareness in the area of gender discrimination.

V. Conclusions

This report presented three alternatives for the gender discrimination problem within Florida state agencies. Each option was evaluated based on administrative effectiveness, adequacy, and its importance based on survey results. Table 1 summarizes these results.

Table 1 Decision Matrix
Summary of Policy Options and Evaluative Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Criteria</th>
<th>Policy Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Effectiveness</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance Based on Survey Results</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These alternatives differ in features, such as continuing along present course, employee mentorship’s, and training. However, the alternatives have a common theme to reduce gender discrimination and the employees’ perception of gender discrimination within state agencies. Evaluated against the decision criteria, with the objective of this report to reduce gender discrimination in Florida state agencies in order for them to be more effective, one of the alternatives is not recommended for further exploration: status quo.

Currently, for option one, Florida follows an affirmative action plan and has a policy on sexual harassment that is not meeting the needs of its employees or adequately addressing the issue of gender discrimination within state agencies. Men continue to hold the majority of senior management service positions and employees do not clearly understand sexual harassment. Employees feel that discrimination based on gender is an issue within their agency and that this discrimination limits women’s opportunities for career advancement. If Florida remains at status quo, they will not be reducing gender discrimination.

Option two, a mentor program would provide opportunities for women in regards to career advancement and has the potential to work throughout state agencies. The majority of employees seem to be in support of a mentor program that would provide women with more career advancement opportunities and there would be little financing involved in implementation of this option. However, for those who are interested in senior management positions, competition would be immense and mentorship’s would be limited.
As for option three, the gender discrimination workshop, it would provide discussion in the area of gender discrimination with an emphasis on sexual harassment training and has the potential to work throughout state agencies. A majority of employees seem to be in support of increased sexual harassment training. The financial implications for the implementation of this program could be significant; however, it would be easily administered through the current affirmative action officer and would offer an effective way to meet the mission of the affirmative action plan required by state law.

Therefore, assessment of the three alternatives using the three evaluative criteria indicates that implementing both the mentor program and the gender discrimination workshop are the most viable options to reduce gender discrimination in Florida state agencies. Therefore, it is the recommendation of this action report for Florida to implement a mentor program and a gender discrimination workshop. A mentor program and a gender discrimination workshop would offer Florida awareness into gender discrimination and provide a chance to remove the glass ceiling that exists within agencies. If Florida remains at status quo, it is apparent as represented by the analysis that gender discrimination and employees perception of gender discrimination within agencies would continue to be a significant problem for the state.
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Appendix A

Florida Statute §§ 110.112
Affirmative action; equal employment opportunity

(1) It shall be the policy of the state to assist in providing the assurance of equal employment opportunity through programs of affirmative and positive action that will allow full utilization of women and minorities.

(2)(a) The head of each executive agency shall develop and implement an affirmative action plan in accordance with rules adopted by the department and approved by a majority vote of the Administration Commission before their adoption.

(b) Each executive agency shall establish annual goals for ensuring full utilization of groups underrepresented in its workforce as compared to the relevant labor market, as defined by the agency. Each executive agency shall design its affirmative action plan to meet its established goals.

(c) An affirmative action-equal employment opportunity officer shall be appointed by the head of each executive agency. The affirmative action-equal employment opportunity officer's responsibilities must include determining annual goals, monitoring agency compliance, and providing consultation to managers regarding progress, deficiencies, and appropriate corrective action.

(d) The department shall report information in its annual workforce report relating to the implementation, continuance, updating, and results of each executive agency's affirmative action plan for the previous fiscal year.

(e) The department shall provide to all supervisory personnel of the executive agencies training in the principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, the
development and implementation of affirmative action plans, and the establishment of annual affirmative action goals. The department may contract for training services, and each participating agency shall reimburse the department for costs incurred through such contract. After the department approves the contents of the training program for the agencies, the department may delegate this training to the executive agencies.

(3) Each state attorney and public defender shall:

(a) Develop and implement an affirmative action plan.

(b) Establish annual goals for ensuring full utilization of groups underrepresented in its workforce as compared to the relevant labor market in this state. The state attorneys' and public defenders' affirmative action plans must be designed to meet the established goals.

(c) Appoint an affirmative action-equal employment opportunity officer.

(d) Report annually to the Justice Administrative Commission on the implementation, continuance, updating, and results of his or her affirmative action program for the previous fiscal year.

(4) The state, its agencies and officers shall ensure freedom from discrimination in employment as provided by the Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992, by s. 112.044, and by this chapter.

(5) Any individual claiming to be aggrieved by an unlawful employment practice may file a complaint with the Florida Commission on Human Relations as provided by s. 760.11.

(6) The department shall review and monitor executive agency actions in carrying out the rules adopted by the department pursuant to this section.
History.--s. 20, ch. 79-190; s. 1, ch. 89-149; s. 3, ch. 91-431; s. 6, ch. 94-113; s. 1397, ch. 95-147; s. 2, ch. 96-399; s. 36, ch. 99-2; s. 3, ch. 99-399; s. 16, ch. 2001-60.
Appendix B

FAWI Policy on Sexual Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT:</th>
<th>POLICY NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PURPOSE/SCOPE:
To provide information and guidance on sexual harassment to all employees of the Agency for Workforce Innovation, including OPS, and volunteers; and to notify employees and other interested persons about the Agency’s procedures for filing sexual-harassment complaints. Replaces previous policy signed 6/24/04 and 8/28/02.

I. AUTHORITY
Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
Executive Order 11246, as amended.
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended.
Section 188 of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA).
Florida Executive Order 79-50 (the Cabinet Resolution, as adopted August 7, 1979).
Section 110.105, Florida Statutes (F.S.) (Employment Policy of the State of Florida).
Section 760.01-760.11, F.S. (Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992).
Rule 60L-36.004, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.) (Sexual Harassment).

II. DEFINITIONS
Agency - The Agency for Workforce Innovation (AWI).
Complainant - The person who presents a formal allegation of discrimination.
Discrimination - Unlawful employment-related practice which gives rise to a complaint.
Equal Opportunity (EO) Designee - Offices designated in this policy as having authority to accept or make determinations regarding sexual harassment complaints. This includes the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), the Office of Human Resource Management, and the Office of the Inspector General (OIG).
Sexual Harassment - In general, means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature from any person directed towards, or in the presence of an employee, applicant, or customer.

III. CROSS REFERENCE
IV. POLICY

Sexual harassment is unlawful, will not be tolerated, and offenders will be subject to disciplinary and/or legal action.

The Agency adopts the policy of the State of Florida with regard to sexual harassment contained in Rule 60L-36.004, F.A.C. which states:

"Sexual Harassment" means unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature from any person directed towards or in the presence of an employee, applicant, or customer when:

a) submission to such conduct is either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment;

b) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or,

c) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

A woman or a man may be the victim of sexual harassment. The harasser does not have to be the victim's supervisor. The victim does not have to be of the opposite gender from the harasser. A victim does not have to be the person toward whom the conduct is aimed, but could be anyone affected by the offensive conduct.

Employees are provided a copy of Rule 60L-36.004, F.A.C., and this Agency policy, which are the Agency's expectations regarding sexual harassment. A copy of each employee's written acknowledgement indicating that he or she has received and understands the Rule and Policy shall be retained in the official personnel file.

Retaliation against an individual because such person has, in good faith, reported any offense involving a violation of this policy; made a charge; or testified, assisted or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing involving an alleged violation of this policy is prohibited. An individual who feels he or she has been subjected to retaliatory action following the filing of a sexual-harassment complaint may file an additional complaint alleging retaliation.

The Agency also recognizes that false accusations of sexual harassment can have serious effects on innocent individuals. Any individual who knowingly files a false complaint of sexual harassment against another individual shall be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.
V.  RESPONSIBILITIES

A.  Employees

An employee who believes he or she is being sexually harassed should immediately tell the harasser that the conduct is not welcome and that he or she wants it stopped. If the employee does not feel comfortable confronting the harasser directly, he or she should immediately advise his or her supervisor or higher-level manager. If the employee confronts the harasser directly and the behavior continues, the employee should immediately contact his or her supervisor, or one of the offices listed in Section VII, to advise them of the alleged conduct and to file a complaint. Any individual who believes that he or she was sexually harassed by an Agency employee or an employee of a contractor of the Agency is strongly encouraged to inform the appropriate supervisor or an EO Designee immediately, and use the Agency’s formal discrimination complaint procedures as needed.

All employees should ensure that they do not take part in any form of sexual harassment. Any employee who is determined by an impartial investigation to have harassed another individual is subject to legal action, and to appropriate disciplinary action up to and including termination.

B.  Managers and Supervisors

Each Agency manager and supervisor is responsible for ensuring that employees are aware of this policy. Any supervisory or managerial employee who has knowledge of or has been advised of allegations of sexual harassment must immediately report the matter directly to an EO Designee. A supervisor or manager who fails to properly report a possible violation of this policy is subject to disciplinary action in accordance with Rule 601-36.004(8), F.A.C. Based on the judgment of the manager or supervisor, in consultation with an EO Designee, the Agency may take temporary measures appropriate to the circumstances, until the investigation is completed. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, placing an employee on administrative leave and reassigning employee duties or work sites.

C.  Agency

The Agency’s OCR or OIG will promptly investigate allegations of possible violations. EO Designees are also available to provide technical assistance, advice, and training on the Agency’s sexual-harassment policy upon request.

The Agency encourages any employee to raise questions regarding sexual harassment or sex discrimination with an EO Designee. Given the nature of this type of discrimination, the Agency recognizes that any question of whether a particular action or incident is of a
personal, social nature without a discriminatory employment effect requires a factual determination based on the circumstances.

D. Third Parties

If an investigation reveals that a non-employee has subjected an employee of the Agency to sexual harassment in the workplace, an EO Designee will inform the individual of the Agency's sexual-harassment policy and initiate other appropriate action in an effort to ensure that the conduct is not repeated.

VI. COMPLAINT PROCEDURES

A. Complaints Filed with the Agency

Verbal and written complaints of violations of this policy are addressed immediately and fairly by the OCR or the OIG. Complaints may be filed with one of the Agency’s EO Designees; contact information is provided in Section VII. Anonymous complaints that cannot be verified or clarified may not be accepted for formal investigation.

Contents of the Complaint

In order for a formal investigation to be conducted, the complaint must be received in writing, signed by the complainant, and provide the information set forth in Rule 60L-36.004 (3), F.A.C, specifically:

1) the name, business address, and telephone number of the person filing the complaint;
2) the names of the person who allegedly committed the act of sexual harassment and the alleged victim; and,
3) a clear and concise statement of the facts, including pertinent dates, locations, witnesses and other evidence in support of the complaint.

If the complaint does not contain all of this information, the EO Designee shall, in writing, request the complainant to furnish it.

B. Complaints Filed Outside the Agency

Individuals who do not wish to file a complaint with the Agency may have the option of filing with the U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) or the Florida Commission on Human Relations (FCHR) regarding employment discrimination. If the allegation of discrimination involves a program or activity of the Agency that receives federal financial assistance under the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA), the individual may also file a complaint with the Civil Rights Center (CRC), U.S. Department of Labor in Washington, D.C. Contact information for the EEOC, FCHR or CRC is
available from the Agency's OCR by phone or by e-mail. The filing of a complaint pursuant to Agency procedure, regardless of disposition, shall not preclude an individual from also filing a complaint with the FCHR, EEOC or CRC.

C. Time Limits for Filing Complaints

1) Complaints filed under the provisions of the WIA must be filed with the OCR or CRC within 180 days of the alleged discrimination, unless the deadline for filing is extended by the director of the CRC.
2) Complaints filed with the EEOC must be filed within 300 days of the alleged discrimination.
3) Complaints filed with either the OCR, except under the provisions of the WIA as discussed above, or with the FCHR must be filed within 365 days of the alleged discrimination.

D. Confidentiality of Complaints and Related Records

Section 119.0711(1), F.S. (2005) states that all records in the custody of any agency in the executive branch of state government that relate to a charge of discrimination are not public record until the investigation is completed either by a final determination or until a finding is made relating to probable cause, the investigation of the complaint becomes inactive, or the complaint or other record is made part of the official record of any hearing or court proceeding. Once the OCR issues a Notice of Final Action and the OCR can confirm that it has been delivered to the complainant, the complaint file becomes a public record and, unless exempted by another part of the public records law, the file is open for public inspection. Confirmation of delivery by the United States Postal Service, return receipt, shall serve as documentation that the notice has been issued.

Neither the complainant nor the respondent has a right to see information gathered as part of the investigation until the Notice of Final Action has been issued. Nonetheless, the investigator may disclose information submitted by the complainant and respondent where it is necessary to further the investigation. The identities of parties to a complaint and witnesses contacted during the course of the investigation will be kept confidential to the extent possible, consistent with a fair investigation of the complaint and as provided under law.
VII. INQUIRIES

Questions regarding this policy should be directed to:

A. **Office for Civil Rights**, Agency for Workforce Innovation
   107 East Madison Street, MSC 150
   Tallahassee, FL 32399-4129
   Telephone: (850) 921-3201
   SunCom: 291-3201
   Via the Florida Relay Service (TTY): 711
   E-mail address: CivilRights@awi.state.fl.us

B. **Office of Human Resource Management**, Agency for Workforce Innovation
   107 East Madison Street, MSC 100B
   Tallahassee, FL 32399-4120
   Telephone: (850) 245-7177
   SunCom: 205-7177
   Via the Florida Relay Service (TTY): 711

   107 East Madison Street, MSC 131
   Tallahassee, FL 32399-6545
   Telephone: (850) 245-7141
   SunCom: 205-7141
   Via the Florida Relay Service (TTY): 711

VIII. FORMS

The Agency’s discrimination-complaint filing instructions and complaint form are available from the OCR. They are also available online at: http://www.floridajobs.org/civilrights/moa/compl_form_instructions.doc

IX. ATTACHMENTS

None.
Dear Sir or Madam:

My name is Heather Orender; I am a Graduate student at The Florida State University in the field of Public Administration and Social Work. I am doing a project on Human Resource Management. Through your participation, I hope to understand employees’ perceptions of their agency and the impact these perceptions have on the agency and the employee. I hope that the results of the survey will be useful in the future of public administration and to your future employment.

I would like you to participate in this study by taking some time to fill out this 5-page questionnaire, it should take approximately 10-15 minutes from start to finish. Please follow the directions noted at the beginning of each section. This information will be completely anonymous; no identifiers will be on this form. Your participation in this survey is agency-sanctioned and voluntary, with no penalty for non-participation. I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it.

By completing and returning this questionnaire, you will have shown your agreement to participate in this study. Regardless of whether you choose to participate, please let me know if you would like a summary of my findings. To receive a summary or if you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about being in this study, you may contact me at the email address listed above.

Thank you in advance for your participation!

Sincerely,

Heather L. Orender, BSW
1. What are the formal requirements for advancement within your agency?

Please mark (x) any or all that applies, and list any additional requirements:

☐ Seniority
☐ Experience
☐ Education
☐ Licensure
☐ Performance
☐ Career Service Status
☐ Other ________________________________________________________

2. What are the informal requirements for advancement within your agency?

☐ Willingness to Learn
☐ Social Connections
☐ To be liked by Management/Popularity
☐ Interview Skills
☐ Work Ethic
☐ Working Well with Others
☐ Professionalism
☐ Willingness to Work Extra Hours or on Special Projects
☐ Other ________________________________________________________

3. Do you feel that any of these requirements place women at a disadvantage with respect to career advancement?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Explain __________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

4. What stereotypes or assumptions do you feel exist within your agency that may limit women’s potential for career advancement?

☐ Women give more priority to their personal goals, such as marriage, family, & children.
☐ Women are less assertive
☐ Women use more sick/personal days.
Men are more intellectual than women.
Women are more emotional than men…due to menstrual cycle, pregnancy &/or menopause.
Men should hold positions of authority.
Women are not able to perform in all positions.
Women are less effective leaders.
Women will not be taken seriously in a position of authority.
None
Other

5. What is your gender? □ Male □ Female

6. If you are female, do you feel you have been treated differently than your male colleagues within your current agency?
□ Yes □ No  (If yes, please give examples)

7. If you are male, do you feel you have been treated differently than your female colleagues within your current agency?
□ Yes □ No  (If yes, please give examples)

8. How long have you been with your current agency?
□ 1 year or less
□ 2-5 years
□ 6-9 years
□ 10 years or more
For the next section…. Numbers 9-14
Please circle the response, which coincides with your perception of your organization.
SA =   Strongly Agree
A =   Agree
N =   Neutral
D =   Disagree
SD =   Strongly Disagree

In general, in my organization……

9.   Women and men are respected equally.          SA   A   N   D   SD

10.  A woman must perform better than a man to be promoted.             SA   A   N   D   SD

11.  Standards are higher for women than men.                      SA   A   N   D   SD

12.  The viewpoint of a woman is not heard at a meeting until it is repeated by a man.  SA   A   N   D   SD

13.  Once a woman assumes a top management position, that position often loses much of its power and prestige.  SA   A   N   D   SD

14.  People who hold comparable jobs receive equal pay.          SA   A   N   D   SD
In my organization, I have………..

15. ☐ Experienced ☐ Heard About ☐ Seen ☐ N/A
   Unwelcome Sexual Advances

16. ☐ Experienced ☐ Heard About ☐ Seen ☐ N/A
   Requests for Sexual favors
   By work colleagues

17. ☐ Experienced ☐ Heard About ☐ Seen ☐ N/A
   Other Offensive Physical
   Contact of a sexual nature

18. ☐ Experienced ☐ Heard About ☐ Seen ☐ N/A
   Offensive Verbal Behavior

For the next section…. Numbers 19-24
Please mark (x) as applies, use blank to write in appropriate answer, or circle appropriate answer where applicable.

19. Have you gone through sexual harassment training at your current agency?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

20. If yes, do you feel the sexual harassment training you received was effective?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

21. If you do not feel it was effective, why not? What would you change?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

For the next section…. Numbers 15-18
Please mark the appropriate response, as to whether you have experienced, have heard about, or seen any of the events in question, or you may choose not applicable (N/A) if you have never experienced, heard about, or seen the event.
22. **What is Sexual Harassment?**
   Please mark all of the following, which are included in the definition.

   - □ unwelcome sexual advances
   - □ requests for sexual favors
   - □ verbal conduct of a sexual nature
   - □ physical conduct of a sexual nature
   - □ physical conduct of a non-sexual nature
   - □ conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment
   - □ conduct unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance
   - □ conduct creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment
   - □ victim must be discharged from employment
   - □ victim must incur economic injury
   - □ victim does not have to be of the opposite sex
   - □ victim does not have to be the person harassed but anyone affected by the offensive conduct
   - □ harasser’s conduct must be unwelcome
   - □ may occur without economic injury to or discharge of the victim

23. **Would you be in favor of the implementation of annual face-to-face sexual harassment training for all employees?**

   □ Yes  □ No

24. **Would you be in favor of a Mentor Program, which would give women more opportunities for promotion in your agency?**

   □ Yes  □ No

*Thank you for your participation!*
**About the Author**
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