

Demographic Profiles

The purpose of this demographic review is to evaluate the effectiveness of the Equal Opportunity programs and processes to:

- Detect areas of potential discrimination;
- Identify any difference in treatment accorded applicants, whether intentional or unintentional; and
- Make recommendations for corrective action.

In order to determine if recipients for WIA services are being treated equitably, it is first important to understand the target populations with the civilian labor force. The following data from the Illinois Department of Employment Security (IDES) Economic Information and Analysis Division depicts the workforce availability for Vermillion County.

Table 1

	US Census Labor Force		Employed	Unemployed	Unemployment %
Total Population	83,919	37,418	34,288	3,130	8.4%
White	72,032	33,956	31,466	2,490	7.3%
Black or African American	8,882	2,704	2,136	568	21.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native	201	57	55	2	3.5%
Asian*	498	258	253	5	1.9%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	2,504	819	718	105	12.8%
Some other Race	1,212	443	378	65	14.7%
Male	41,291	19,616	18,001	1,615	8.2%
Female	42,628	17,802	16,287	1,515	8.5%

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2000 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File, Matrices PL1, PL2, PL3, and PL4. Unemployment Data from Illinois Department of Employment Security, Economic Information and Analysis Division, Workforce Availability Information 2004 (www.ILWorkInfo.com)

* IDES Asian unemployment data includes Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander

As shown in Table 1, the Black or African American population has the highest rate of unemployment (21%) in Vermillion County, far exceeding the total population unemployment rate at 8.4%. The second highest unemployment rate that is identifiable is Hispanic at 12.8%. The Asian population had the lowest unemployment rate at 1.9%. Male and female unemployment rates are relatively similar at 8.2% and 8.5% respectively.

Based on the information from Table 1, the largest target audience for LWIA to market outreach programs to should include Black or African American and Hispanic since their proportion of unemployment is higher than the total population.

Applicant and registrant data was extracted from the Illinois Workforce Development System (IWDS), which is the data collection system utilized by the State of Illinois Bureau of Workforce Development. Through the use of IWDS, a Target Population Summary report was generated on 11/04/2004 for a reporting period from 7/01/03 to 6/30/04. IWDS data was further broken down by race/ethnicity and sex for applicants, registrants, new registrants, and exiters [Appendix I].

The following data was generated from the Illinois Workforce Development System Target Population Report Summary:

Table 2

	<u>Applicants</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Registrants</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>New Registrants</u>	<u>%</u>
Total Population	117		91		18	
White	58	49.6%	58	63.7%	9	50.0%
Black or African American	56	47.9%	31	34.1%	9	50.0%
American Indian and Alaska Native	1	0.9%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	1	0.9%	5	5.5%	0	0.0%
Male	48	41.0%	34	37.4%	7	38.9%
Female	69	59.0%	57	62.6%	11	61.1%
Disabled	6	5.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Individual w/disability Affecting Employment	0	0.0%	1	1.1%	0	0.0%
Developmental Disability	3	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Learning Disabled	14	2.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
LEP (Limited English Proficient)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

Male and Female Applicants and New Registrants

In table 2, there were 117 total applicants that applied for WIA job training services from 7/01/03 to 6/30/04 in LWIA 18. Of the 117 applicants, only 18 were registered in training services (about 15.3% of the total applicants). Seven males (39.9%) were selected from 48 applicants and eleven females (61.1%) were selected from 69 applicants.

The proportion of male and female applicants and new registrants is acceptable considering the female unemployment rate is slightly higher than the male unemployment rate. LWIA 18 should continue its efforts to ensure that an equivalent level of information regarding services and training is provided to both male and female populations eligible for participation.

Racial/Ethnic Group Applicants and New Registrants

New registrants from the Black or African American and White populations were equally registered at 50% from a group of 56 and 58 applicants respectively. As there is an equal distribution between White and African American applicants, there statistically is a disparity of training opportunities for African American (remember: African American unemployment rate is 21%, which is considerably higher than the White unemployment rate).

Only one Hispanic applied for training services in LWIA 18, even though the Hispanic population has an unemployment rate over 12%. The single Hispanic applicant was not accepted

as a new registrant. Only five Hispanic registrants are currently participating in the LWIA 18’s training services.

Because of the higher rates of unemployment and the small applicant pool, LWIA 18 needs to better include the Black or African American and Hispanic populations in their targeted outreach plans. The outreach plan needs to be integrated in LWIA 18’s Methods of Administration to include efforts to broaden the composition of the pool for those considered for participation or employment in their programs and activities.

Disabled Applicants and New Registrants

Of the 23 applicants (19.6%) who identified themselves as having some form of disability, none were accepted as new registrants for training services. The largest segment of the disabled population (14) was those who identified themselves with a learning disability.

Considering that almost 20% of LWIA 18’s applicant population identified themselves as having a form of disability, and none of which were accepted as new registrants, LWIA 18 needs to increase efforts to broaden the composition of disabled applicants considered for participation and employment in their programs and activities.

Exiters, Entered Employment and Average Wage at Placement

Information from the Illinois Workforce Development System Target Population Report Summary depicts the total number of exiters or terminations included below in **Table 3**.

Table 3

	<u>Exiters</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Entered Employment</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Average Wage at Placement</u>
Total Population	47		26		\$10.47
White	32	68.1%	21	80.8%	\$11.16
Black or African American	13	27.7%	4	15.4%	\$8.94
American Indian and Alaska Native	1	2.1%	1	2.1%	\$2.20
Asian	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	4	8.5%	4	8.5%	\$8.92
Male	22	46.8%	13	50.0%	\$9.46
Female	25	53.2%	13	50.0%	\$14.48
Disabled	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
Individual w/disability Affecting Employment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
Developmental Disability	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
Learning Disabled	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00
LEP (Limited English Proficient)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	\$0.00

In Table 3, of the 47 participants exiting from training services, 26 or 55.3% successfully entered employment at an average wage of \$10.47.

Male and Female Exiters

From the total population, 22 males and 25 females exited the program, and 13 of each entered employment. Female's average wage at placement was 35% greater than males at \$14.48 as opposed to males at \$9.46.

Racial/Ethnic Group Exiters

The White population had the highest rate of exiters (32 participants or 68.1%) and the highest rate of employment (21 successfully employed or 80.8%). The White population also had the highest average wage at placement at \$11.16. In comparison, the Black or African American population exited 13 participants (27.7% of total) and only four entered employment (15.4%) with an average wage of \$8.94.

The Hispanic population exited four participants (8.5% of total) with all four entering employment with an average wage of \$8.92.

The statistical data shows that the White population is still achieving the highest rate of employment after training, despite the highest rates of unemployment for Black or African American and Hispanic populations. LWIA needs to reevaluate the success of efforts to broaden the composition of those considered for participation and success of employment in their training programs and activities. LWIA 18 needs to develop and maintain targeting, outreach, and recruitment plans to better serve those segments of the populations that are unemployed.

Disabled Exiters

There were *no* participants that exited the program identified as disabled.

Much improvement is needed in helping to broaden the composition the disabled applicants considered for participation in training services. LWIA needs to adopt and maintain criteria for determining priority service, as 20% of the total applicant pool tried to receive training services.

Selection Rate and Statistical Significance

To test for statistical significance, the 80% rule was used to determine the level of equity of services delivered to applicants and registrants of LWIA 18. The 80% (or 4/5th) Rule is derived from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (UGESP). UGESP was jointly published by the Department of Labor, the Department of Justice, the Equal Opportunity Commission and the Office of Personnel Management. The Guidelines were developed in light of the Supreme Court case, *Griggs v. Duke Power*, 401 U.S. 424 (1971), which recognized that a selection procedure, while neutral on its face, could be discriminatory if it had an adverse impact on the employment opportunities of members of different race, sex, or ethnic groups.

When using the 80% Rule, adverse impact is said to exist when the selection rate of any race, sex, or ethnic group is less than 80% of the most favorable selection rate. (Keep in mind at this point of the analysis, adverse impact does not mean discrimination.)

White Selection Rate	=	$\frac{9 \text{ new registrants}}{58 \text{ Applicants}} = 15.5\%$
Black or African American Selection Rate	=	$\frac{9 \text{ new registrants}}{56 \text{ Applicants}} = 16.1\%$
American Indian/Alaska Native Selection Rate	=	$\frac{0 \text{ new registrants}}{1 \text{ Applicant}} = 0.0\%$
Asian Selection Rate	=	$\frac{0 \text{ new registrants}}{0 \text{ Applicant}} = 0.0\%$
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	=	$\frac{0 \text{ new registrants}}{0 \text{ Applicant}} = 0.0\%$
Hispanic Selection Rate	=	$\frac{0 \text{ new registrants}}{1 \text{ Applicant}} = 0.0\%$

The group with the most favored rate is Black or African American (16.1% acceptance rate) as no other population group had any new registrants.

Adverse Impact Calculation

While policies governing decision-making may be neutral, they may still be considered discriminatory if they have a discriminatory effect upon the employment, training, or other such opportunities of an identifiable group. This discrimination theory, called “*disparate effect*,” also derives from *Griggs v Duke Power* and may be revealed from the adverse impact calculation utilizing the 80% (or 4/5ths rule). Disparate impact is defined as a “substantially different rate of selection in hiring, promotion, or other employment decision which works to the disadvantage of members of a race, sex or ethnic group. While this *substantial rate* can be determined in a variety of ways, the Bureau of Workforce Development utilizes the 80% or 4/5ths rule as a practical means of determining adverse impact.

To calculate for adverse impact, all other population groups are divided by the highest selection rate (Black or African American):

$$\frac{\text{White Acceptance Rate}}{\text{Black Acceptance Rate}} = \frac{15.5\%}{16.1\%} = 96.3\%$$

American Indian & Alaska Native Acceptance Rate = 0.0% = 0.0% **Adverse**
Impact

Black Acceptance Rate 16.1%

Asian Acceptance Rate = 0.0% = 0.0% **Adverse**
Impact

Black Acceptance Rate 16.1%

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Acceptance Rate = 0.0% = 0.0% **Adverse**
Impact

Black Acceptance Rate 16.1%

Hispanic Acceptance Rate = 0.0% = 0.0% **Adverse**
Impact

Black Acceptance Rate 16.1%

The White population was the only group that had a greater than 80% favorable selection rate. The other populations did not have any new registrants in the program, and therefore, the selection rate was 0%. Based on the very low unemployment levels of Asian, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, the pool of potential applicants is limited, thereby affecting low participant levels.

Only one applicant from the Hispanic population, which accounts for 12.8% of the unemployment, applied for services. Even though the Hispanic population typically has seasonal and migrant workers, this population still needs to be included in VCJTP's marketing and outreach programs.

In conclusion, other than the White and Black or African American populations, no other ethnic or racial group had applicants that were accepted and registered in training services. Based on these 80% rule, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and Hispanic populations were statistically adversely impacted. LWIA 18 needs to include these groups in their universal access and target outreach plans to ensure that these groups are not adversely impacted. There appears to be a disparate effect considering that only two population groups were serviced as new registrants.