## Memorandum

## Human Resources Division

| TO: | Todd Rent, Chief Examiner <br> Civil Service Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM: | Human Resources Staff |
| RE: | Establish a Passing Score for Entry-Level Police Officer |
| DATE: | March 23, 2016 |

## A. Summary

City of Urbana Human Resources staff recommends a passing score of $68.00 \%$ for the video exam and $70.0 \%$ for the written and reading portions of the FrontLine National Testing System for Entry-Level Police Officers. This would result in an eligibility register of 86 candidates ( $72 \%$ of the test group) with no adverse or disparate impact.

## B. Background

The position was open for applications from October 16, 2015 - Jan. 16, 2016; Human Resources received 181 applications for the position. Of those, 149 were invited to test and 32 were not. Of the 32, 18 were disqualified due to not meeting the minimum requirements of the position and 14 were disqualified for not providing required documentation.

## C. Video/Written Exam

A total of 119 applicants tested either in-person on Saturday, Jan. 30, 2016 at the Alice Campbell Alumni Center in Urbana or through a National Testing Network testing center. Demographics of the testing candidates are as follows:

|  | $\#$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 96 | $80.7 \%$ |
| Female | 17 | $14.3 \%$ |
| No response or <br> "n/a" | 6 | $5.0 \%$ |


|  | $\#$ | \% of Test <br> Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Minority | 89 | $74.8 \%$ |
| Minority | 20 | $16.8 \%$ |
| No response or <br> "n/a" | 10 | 8.4 |

## D. Passing Score

At the recommended passing score, adverse and/or disparate impact is not observed (additional data is attached).

| Proposed Pass Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\#$ | \% of Total Tested | \% of Like Group <br> Tested | \% of Register |  |
| Male | $\mathbf{6 7}$ | $56.3 \%(67 / 119)$ | $69.8 \%(67 / 96)$ | $77.9 \%(67 / 86)$ |  |
| Female | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | $10.9 \%(13 / 119)$ | $76.4 \%(13 / 17)$ | $15.1 \%(13 / 86)$ |  |
| N/A | $\mathbf{6}$ | $5.0 \%(6 / 119)$ | $100 \%(6 / 6)$ | $7.0 \%(6 / 86)$ |  |
|  | $\#$ | \% of Total Tested | \% of Like Group <br> Tested | \% of Register |  |
| Non-Minority | $\mathbf{6 5}$ | $54.6 \%(65 / 119)$ | $73.0 \%(65 / 89)$ | $75.6 \%(65 / 86)$ |  |
| Minority | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | $10.0 \%(12 / 119)$ | $60.0 \%(12 / 20)$ | $14.0 \%(12 / 86)$ |  |
| N/A | $\mathbf{9}$ | $7.6 \%(9 / 119)$ | $90.0 \%(9 / 10)$ | $1.0 \%(9 / 86)$ |  |



At this passing score, a total of 33 applicants would not pass the exam, which represents a $28 \%$ failure rate.

|  | $\#$ | \% of Total <br> Tested | \% of Like Group <br> Tested |  | $\#$ | \% of Total <br> Tested | \% of Like <br> Group Tested |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Male | $\mathbf{2 9}$ | $24.4 \%(29 / 119)$ | $30.2 \%(29 / 96)$ | Non- <br> Minority | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $20.2 \%$ <br> $(24 / 119)$ | $27.0 \%(24 / 89)$ |
| Female | $\mathbf{4}$ | $3.3 \%(4 / 119)$ | $23.5 \%(4 / 17)$ | Minority | $\mathbf{8}$ | $6.7 \%$ <br> $(8 / 119)$ | $40 \%(8 / 20)$ |

## E. Attachments

- Disparate Impact Report

Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE.

| An Experienced Internet <br> Survey Consultancy |
| :--- | :--- |

## Disparate Impact Analysis <br> (an On-Line Internet based application)

Instructions: Please fill out the information into the form below. Once you have entered your data below, you may select the types of analysis to be conducted by checking the appropriate boxes. Then press the compute button at the bottom of the form to view the results.

Select the type of employment decision: Selection $\checkmark$
Enter a title for your report:
Entry-Level Police Officer (Feb. 2016)

| Sex | Race | Age | Disability |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Male | Number of Non-Minority | Number of Younger | Number of Non-Disabled |
| 96 Applicants | 89 Applicants | Applicants | Applicants |
| 67 Selected | 65 Selected | Selected | Selected |
| Number of Female | Number of Minority | Number of Older | Number of Disabled |
| 17 Applicants | 20 Applicants | Applicants | Applicants |
| 13 Selected | 12 Selected | Selected | Selected |


| $\nabla$-Adverse Impact | Select the Statistical Tests you wish to execute by checking or <br> unchecking the boxes on the left. Then press the 'Compute' button below. <br> $\nabla$-Chi-Square <br> $\nabla$-Standard Deviation <br> $\nabla$-Confidence Intervals <br> $\nabla$ Probability Distribution |
| :--- | :--- |
| Display: $\nabla$ Description of Statistic $\nabla$ Interpretation of Results |  |

## Entry-Level Police Officer (Feb. 2016)

## Adverse-Impact Report

Adverse Impact and the "four-fifths rule." - A selection rate for any race, sex, or ethnic group which is less than four-fifths (4/5ths) (or eighty percent) of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded by the Federal enforcement agencies as evidence of adverse impact. Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures

| Rate of Female Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Male Applicants <br> Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Female | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Male |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(13 / 17)=0.7647$ | $(67 / 96)=0.6979$ | $(0.7647 / 0.6979)=1.1$ | $(0.6979 / 0.7647)=0.91$ |

Adverse impact as defined by the $4 / 5$ ths rule was not found in the above data.

| Rate of Minority <br> Applicants Selected | Rate of NonMinority <br> Applicants Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Minority | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> NonMinority |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(12 / 20)=0.6$ | $(65 / 89)=0.7303$ | $(0.6 / 0.7303)=0.82$ | $(0.7303 / 0.6)=1.22$ |
| Adverse impact as defined by the $4 / 5$ ths rule was not found in the above data. |  |  |  |

## Chi-Square Report

| Observed <br> Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 67 | 29 | 96 |
| Female | 67.9646 | 28.0354 | 17 |
| Column Total | 13 | 4 | 113 |
| Chis | 80 | 4.9646 | 33 |

Chi-Square $=\mathbf{0 . 3 1 1 6}$
The value of the statistic is less than $\mathbf{3 . 8 4 1}$. This indicates that there is a 95 percent chance that these results have been obtained absent any form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results fall within normal random variations and are not the result of bias.

| Observed Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NonMinority | $\begin{aligned} & 65 \\ & 62.8716 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 26.1284 \end{aligned}$ | 89 |
| Minority | $12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 5.8716 \end{aligned}$ | 20 |
| Column Total | 77 | 32 | 109 |
| Chi-Square $=1.3376$ <br> The value of the statistic is less than 3.841 . This indicates that there is a 95 percent chance that these results have been obtained absent any form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results fall within normal random variations and are not the result of bias. |  |  |  |

Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE...

## Standard-Deviation Report

The difference between the proportion of the protected class Selected and the proportion of all Applicants Selected has a normal distribution with a mean and standard deviation. The statistic is shown below:


## Analysis of proportion of Female Selectedwhere:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Female Selected.
- $\mathrm{n}=$ number of Selected (Female and Male).
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Applicants that are Female.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 67 | 29 | 96 |
| Female | 13 | 4 | 17 |
| Column Total | 80 | 33 | 113 |

$\mathrm{r}=13$
$\mathrm{n}=80$
$\mathrm{p}=17 / 113=0.15$
$\mathrm{q}=(13+67) /(17+96)=0.708$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=0.558$
These results show that the proportion of Female Selected is $\mathbf{0 . 5 5 8}$ standard deviations above the proportion of Applicants Selected.A result of less than 2 standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

Analysis of proportion of Minority Selectedwhere:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Minority Selected.
- $\mathrm{n}=$ number of Selected (Minority and NonMinority).
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Applicants that are Minority.

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| NonMinority | 65 | 24 | 89 |
| Minority | 12 | 8 | 20 |
| Column Total | 77 | 32 | 109 |

- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
$\mathrm{r}=12$
$\mathrm{n}=77$
$\mathrm{p}=20 / 109=0.183$
$\mathrm{q}=(12+65) /(20+89)=0.706$


## Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 1 . 1 5 7}$

These results show that the proportion of Minority Selected is $\mathbf{- 1 . 1 5 7}$ standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants Selected.A result of less than 2 standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE...

## Confidence Interval Report

The proportion of the protected class Selected has an expected value that would fall within a specified confidence interval. The statistic is shown below:
Observed value $=(\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{n})$
Expected value $=$ p
Standard Deviation $=\operatorname{sqrt}(\mathrm{p} *(1-\mathrm{p}) / \mathrm{n}) * \operatorname{sqrt}(1-\mathrm{q})$
Confidence Interval:
Lower Bound $=\mathrm{p}-1.96$ * Std Dev
Upper Bound $=p+1.96$ * Std Dev

Analysis of proportion of Female Applicants Selectedwhere:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Female Selected.
- $\mathrm{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Female among those Selected.
- $q$ = proportion of Applicants Selected.
$r=13$
$\mathrm{n}=80$
$\mathrm{p}=(17 /(17+96))=0.15$
$\mathrm{q}=((13+67) /(17+96))=0.708$
$(\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{n})=13 / 80=\mathbf{0 . 1 6 2 5}$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 1 5 - ( 1 . 9 6 * 0 . 0 2 2 ) = 0 . 1 0 8 1}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.15+(1.96 * 0.022)=0.1928$
Confidence Interval = 0.1081 to 0.1928
These results show that the proportion of Female Female ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathrm{n}=\mathbf{0 . 1 6 2 5}$ ) is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

Analysis of proportion of Minority Applicants Selectedwhere:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Minority Selected.
- $\mathrm{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Minority among those Selected.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
$\mathrm{r}=12$
$\mathrm{n}=77$
$\mathrm{p}=(20 /(20+89))=0.183$
$\mathrm{q}=((12+65) /(20+89))=0.706$
$(r / n)=12 / 77=0.1558$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 1 8 3 - ( 1 . 9 6 * 0 . 0 2 4 )}=\mathbf{0 . 1 3 6 6}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 1 8 3 + ( 1 . 9 6 * 0 . 0 2 4 )}=\mathbf{0 . 2 3 0 3}$
Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 1 3 6 6}$ to $\mathbf{0 . 2 3 0 3}$
These results show that the proportion of Minority Minority ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{0 . 1 5 5 8}$ ) is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE...

## Probability Distribution Report

| Number |  | Rate of Female | Rate of Male | Adverse | Adverse |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Female | Number Male | Applicants | Applicants | Impact Ratio | Impact against |  | Cumulative |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected | of Female | Female? | Probability | Probability |
| 0 | 80 | (0/17) | (80/96) | 0 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 79 | (1/17) | (79/96) | 0.0715 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 78 | (2/17) | (78/96) | 0.1448 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 77 | (3/17) | (77/96) | 0.22 | YES | 0.000001 | 0.000001 |
| 4 | 76 | (4/17) | (76/96) | 0.2972 | YES | 0.000014 | 0.000015 |
| 5 | 75 | (5/17) | (75/96) | 0.3765 | YES | 0.000135 | 0.00015 |
| 6 | 74 | (6/17) | (74/96) | 0.4579 | YES | 0.000919 | 0.00107 |
| 7 | 73 | (7/17) | (73/96) | 0.5415 | YES | 0.004648 | 0.005718 |
| 8 | 72 | (8/17) | (72/96) | 0.6275 | YES | 0.017674 | 0.023392 |
| 9 | 71 | (9/17) | (71/96) | 0.7158 | YES | 0.050901 | 0.074293 |
| 10 | 70 | (10/17) | (70/96) | 0.8067 | NO | 0.111198 | 0.185491 |
| 11 | 69 | (11/17) | (69/96) | 0.9003 | NO | 0.183458 | 0.368949 |
| 12 | 68 | (12/17) | (68/96) | 0.9965 | NO | 0.226047 | 0.594996 |
| Selected->13 | 67 | (13/17) | (67/96) | 1.0957 | NO | 0.203862 | 0.798858 |
| 14 | 66 | (14/17) | (66/96) | 1.1979 | NO | 0.130083 | 0.928941 |
| 15 | 65 | (15/17) | (65/96) | 1.3032 | NO | 0.05539 | 0.984332 |
| 16 | 64 | (16/17) | (64/96) | 1.4118 | NO | 0.014064 | 0.998396 |
| 17 | 63 | (17/17) | (63/96) | 1.5238 | NO | 0.001604 | 1 |

Given that 80 were Selected from a pool of 96 Male and 17 Female it was possible to have Selected from 0 to 17 females.
Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected 9 or fewer Female.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0.0743 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 9 or fewer Female).

Since the probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the selection was random (i.e. unbiased) is less than $10 \%$, an observed Adverse Impact may be significant since there is a low probability that Adverse Impact would have occurred by chance.

## Probability Distribution of the variable: Number of Female Selected.



The probability distribution of having Selected from 0 to 17 females is displayed above. As can be seen, the most likely event (highest probability) to have occurred by chance (or decisions not affected by any form of bias) is to have Selected 12 female Applicants. This represents the mean of the probability distribution. Approximately half of the probability distribution is above this point and approximately half is below this point. The total area contained in the probability distribution is equal to 1 . Thus, probabilities for each number of female Applicants Selected are a fraction of the total probability distribution. The larger areas of the distribution represent higher probabilities of occurance. Adding the individual probabilities up to a certain point enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or fewer females Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more females Applicants.

The characteristics of the probability distribution--its mean and standard deviation--are a function of the number of female and male Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected. Though it is possible to have Selected from 0 to 17 female Applicants, the individual probabilities of having Selected each number of female Applicants can be computed and accumulated. As noted before, these individual probabilities are a function of the number of female and male Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected.

Using the distribution above, a 90 percent confidence interval on the variable 'Number of Female Selected' would have a lower bound of 9 and an upper bound of 15 .

The significance of having Selected 13 or fewer Female is graphically displayed below.


As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the 4/5ths rule, would be found if you Selected 9 or fewer female Applicants.
You have Selected 13 female Applicants. The probability of having Selected 13 or fewer Female is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 13 Female Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 13 female Applicants is 0.7989 and is graphically displayed, in red, above.

Since the probability is greater than $10 \%$, we are unable to reject the hypothesis that the decisions occurred due to chance. Therefore, we must conclude that it is entirely possible that having Selected 13 or fewer female Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.

Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE...

## Probability Distribution Report

| Number <br> Minority | Number NonMinority | Rate of Minority Applicants | Rate of NonMinority Applicants | Adverse Impact Ratio | Adverse <br> Impact against |  | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected | of Minority | Minority? | Probability | Probability |
| 0 | 77 | (0/20) | (77/89) | 0 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 76 | (1/20) | (76/89) | 0.0586 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 75 | (2/20) | (75/89) | 0.1187 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 74 | (3/20) | (74/89) | 0.1804 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 73 | (4/20) | (73/89) | 0.2438 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 72 | (5/20) | (72/89) | 0.309 | YES | 0.000003 | 0.000003 |
| 6 | 71 | (6/20) | (71/89) | 0.3761 | YES | 0.000031 | 0.000034 |
| 7 | 70 | (7/20) | (70/89) | 0.445 | YES | 0.000232 | 0.000267 |
| 8 | 69 | (8/20) | (69/89) | 0.5159 | YES | 0.001322 | 0.001588 |
| 9 | 68 | (9/20) | (68/89) | 0.589 | YES | 0.00579 | 0.007378 |
| 10 | 67 | (10/20) | (67/89) | 0.6642 | YES | 0.019685 | 0.027063 |
| 11 | 66 | (11/20) | (66/89) | 0.7417 | YES | 0.052131 | 0.079194 |
| Selected->12 | 65 | (12/20) | (65/89) | 0.8215 | NO | 0.10752 | 0.186713 |
| 13 | 64 | (13/20) | (64/89) | 0.9039 | NO | 0.172031 | 0.358745 |
| 14 | 63 | (14/20) | (63/89) | 0.9889 | NO | 0.211731 | 0.570475 |
| 15 | 62 | (15/20) | (62/89) | 1.0766 | NO | 0.197615 | 0.768091 |
| 16 | 61 | (16/20) | (61/89) | 1.1672 | NO | 0.136743 | 0.904834 |
| 17 | 60 | (17/20) | (60/89) | 1.2608 | NO | 0.067678 | 0.972512 |
| 18 | 59 | (18/20) | (59/89) | 1.3576 | NO | 0.022559 | 0.995071 |
| 19 | 58 | (19/20) | (58/89) | 1.4578 | NO | 0.00452 | 0.99959 |
| 20 | 57 | (20/20) | (57/89) | 1.5614 | NO | 0.00041 | 1 |

Given that 77 were Selected from a pool of 89 NonMinority and 20 Minority it was possible to have Selected from 0 to 20 minorities.

Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected 11 or fewer Minority.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0.0792 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 11 or fewer Minority).

Since the probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the selection was random (i.e. unbiased) is less than $10 \%$, an observed Adverse Impact may be significant since there is a low probability that Adverse Impact would have occurred by chance.

## Probability Distribution of the variable: Number of Minority Selected.



The probability distribution of having Selected from 0 to 20 minorities is displayed above. As can be seen, the most likely event (highest probability) to have occurred by chance (or decisions not affected by any form of bias) is to have Selected 14 minority Applicants. This represents the mean of the probability distribution. Approximately half of the probability distribution is above this point and approximately half is below this point. The total area contained in the probability distribution is equal to 1 . Thus, probabilities for each number of minority Applicants Selected are a fraction of the total probability distribution. The larger areas of the distribution represent higher probabilities of occurance. Adding the individual probabilities up to a certain point enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or fewer minorities Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more minorities Applicants.

The characteristics of the probability distribution--its mean and standard deviation--are a function of the number of minority and non-minority Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected. Though it is possible to have Selected from 0 to 20 minority Applicants, the individual probabilities of having Selected each number of minority Applicants can be computed and accumulated. As noted before, these individual probabilities are a function of the number of minority and non-minority Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected.

Using the distribution above, a 90 percent confidence interval on the variable 'Number of Minority Selected' would have a lower bound of 11 and an upper bound of 17 .

The significance of having Selected 12 or fewer Minority is graphically displayed below.


As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the $4 / 5$ ths rule, would be found if you Selected 11 or fewer minority Applicants.

You have Selected 12 minority Applicants. The probability of having Selected 12 or fewer Minority is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 12 Minority Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 12 minority Applicants is 0.1867 and is graphically displayed, in red, above.

Since the probability is greater than $10 \%$, we are unable to reject the hypothesis that the decisions occurred due to chance. Therefore, we must conclude that it is entirely possible that having Selected 12 or fewer minority Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.

