CITY OF URBANA
Human Resources Division

## MEMORANDUM

To: Todd Rent, Chief Examiner and the Civil Service Commission
From: Human Resources staff
Re: Passing Score for Police Services Representative/Administrative Assistant II
Date: October 28, 2015

## INTRODUCTION

Staff requests that the Civil Service Commission set a passing score for Office Skills Test at $50 \%$ for the average score. This test will be used to establish a register which can be used for both the Police Services Representative (PSR) and Administrative Assistant II positions. If approved, this will result in a register consisting of 224 individuals with no adverse impact.

## BACKGROUND

The positions of PSR and Administrative Assistant II were opened for applications from July 31 to August 28, 2015. The Administrative Assistant II positions received 272 applications and the PSR position received 216 applications. Most were not discrete applications, as many applicants applied twice, once for each position. A total of 371 applicants met the minimum qualifications for one or both positions and were invited to test.

A total of 36 applicants were found to not meet the qualifications of the position and were therefore not invited to test. Seven applicants for the PSR position were not referred on to the test and 29 applicants for the Administrative Assistant II position were not referred.

Of the 371 invited to test, 240 applicants (65\%) attended one of the exams offered.

| Exam Attendees |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 49 | $20.4 \%$ | Non-Minority | 176 | $73.3 \%$ |
| Female | 188 | $78.3 \%$ | Minority | 58 | $24.2 \%$ |
| N/A | 3 | $1.3 \%$ | N/A | 6 | $2.5 \%$ |
| Total | 240 | $100 \%$ | Total | 240 | $100 \%$ |

Attendees were evaluated on the Ergometrics Office Skills ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Test Battery, which is comprised of the following elements:
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| Office Skills ${ }^{\text {rM }}$ Test Battery Components | \# of Items |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Applicant Job Match Questionnaire | 28 |  |  |
| Proofreading | 19 |  |  |
| Spelling | 32 |  |  |
| Written Expression | 6 |  |  |
| Checking | 32 |  |  |
| Filing | 19 |  |  |
| Coding | 35 |  |  |
| Basic Math | 12 |  |  |
| Business Math | 12 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 195 |

This exam battery was written and scored by Ergometrics \& Applied Personnel Research, Inc., and has been professionally validated and have been shown to consistently have lower adverse impact than written tests.

A composite score for each candidate was tabulated by scoring each of the components reference above (except for the Applicant Job Match Questionnaire) and averaging the total. Each component was given the same weight.

Highest score: 92.06\%
Mean score: 68.84\%
Lowest score: 0.00\%
Based on statistical analyses of applicant demographics, City staff recommends the passing score be established at $50 \%$ as the average score across the above components. This will result in a Civil Service Register of 224 candidates. Adverse and disparate impacts are not found at this proposed passing point. A demographic analysis is as follows:

| 50\% Passing Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | \# | \% of Total | \% of Like <br> Group | Race | $\#$ | \% of Total | \% of Like <br> Group |
| Male | 46 | $20.5 \%$ | $93.9 \%$ | Non- <br> Minority | 167 | $74.6 \%$ | $94.9 \%$ |
| Female | 175 | $78.1 \%$ | $93.1 \%$ | Minority | 51 | $22.8 \%$ | $87.9 \%$ |
| N/A | 3 | $1.3 \%$ | $100 \%$ | N/A | 6 | $2.7 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total | 224 | $100 \%$ |  | Total | 224 | $100 \%$ |  |

## REQUESTED ACTION

Staff requests the Civil Service Commission establish a passing point as discussed above to establish a register for Police Services Representative and Administrative Assistant II.

Attachments: Disparate impact reports at the $70 \%, 60 \%$ and $50 \%$ passing points.
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## Disparate Impact Analysis

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.


## 70.0\% Passing Score (Office Skills)

## 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 Emplovee Selection Procedures

| Rate of Females Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Males Applicants <br> Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Females | Adverse Impact Ratio for Males |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(90 / 188)=0.4787$ | $(24 / 49)=0.4898$ | $(0.4787 / 0.4898)=0.98$ | $(0.4898 / 0.4787)=1.02$ |
| Adverse impact as defined by the $4 / 5$ ths rule was not found in the above data. |  |  |  |


| Rate of Minorities Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Non-Minorities <br> Applicants Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Minorities | Adverse Impact Ratio for Non- <br> Minorities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(11 / 58)=0.1897$ | $(101 / 176)=0.5739$ | $(0.1897 / 0.5739)=0.33$ | $(0.5739 / 0.1897)=3.03$ |

The Adverse Impact Ratio for Minorities is less than 0.80 .
Minorities Applicants are Selected at a rate less than $80 \%$ (4/5ths) of the rate that Non-Minorities Applicants are Selected.

## Chi-Square Report

| Observed <br> Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 24 | 25 | 49 |
| Females | 23.5696 | 25.4304 | 188 |
| Column Total | 90 | 98 | 23.5696 |
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| Observed | Selected | Not Selected |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Expected | Row Totals |  |  |
| Non-Minorities | 101 | 75 | 176 |
| Minorities | 84.2393 | 91.7607 | 58 |
| Column Total | 11 | 37 | 50.2393 |
| 27.7607 | 112 | 122 | 234 |

Chi-Square $=25.8055$
The value of the statistic is greater than 6.635. This indicates that there is a less than 1 percent chance that these results would have been obtained absent any form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results may have been the result of bias.

## 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:

```
        (r/n) - p
```

```
sqrt(p * (1-p) / n) * sqrt(1-q)
```


## Analysis of proportion of Females Selected where:

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

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 24 | 25 | 49 |
| Females | 90 | 98 | 188 |
| Column Total | 114 | 123 | 237 |

$\mathrm{r}=90$
$\mathrm{n}=114$
$\mathrm{p}=188 / 237=0.793$
$\mathrm{q}=(90+24) /(188+49)=0.481$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 0 . 1 3 8}$
These results show that the proportion of Females Selected is $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 3 8}$ standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants Selected. A result of less than $\mathbf{2}$ standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

## Analysis of proportion of Minorities Selected where:

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

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non- <br> Minorities | 101 | 75 | 176 |
| Minorities | 11 | 47 | 58 |
| Column Total | 112 | 122 | 234 |

$\mathrm{r}=11$
$\mathrm{n}=112$
$\mathrm{p}=58 / 234=0.248$
$\mathrm{q}=(11+101) /(58+176)=0.479$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 5 . 0 8}$
These results show that the proportion of Minorities Selected is more than two standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants (Minorities plus Non-Minorities) Selected.

## 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 $=(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n})$
Expected value = p
Standard Deviation $=\operatorname{sqrt}(\mathbf{p} *(1-p) / \mathbf{n}) * \operatorname{sqrt}(1-\mathbf{q})$
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Confidence Interval:
Lower Bound = p-1.96* Std Dev
Upper Bound = p + 1.96 * Std Dev

Analysis of proportion of Females Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Females Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Females among those Selected.
- $q$ = proportion of Applicants Selected.
$\mathbf{r}=90$
$\mathrm{n}=114$
$p=(188 /(188+49))=0.793$
$q=((90+24) /(188+49))=0.481$
$(r / n)=90 / 114=0.7895$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $0.793-(1.96 * 0.027)=0.7397$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.793+(1.96 * 0.027)=0.8468$


## Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 7 3 9 7}$ to 0.8468

These results show that the proportion of Females Females $(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{0 . 7 8 9 5})$ is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

## Analysis of proportion of Minorities Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Minorities Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Minorities among those Selected.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
$r=11$
$\mathrm{n}=112$
$p=(58 /(58+176))=0.248$
$\mathrm{q}=((11+101) /(58+176))=\mathbf{0 . 4 7 9}$
$(\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{n})=11 / 112=\mathbf{0 . 0 9 8 2}$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 2 4 8} \mathbf{- ( 1 . 9 6 *} \mathbf{0 . 0 2 9})=\mathbf{0 . 1 9 0 1}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.248+(1.96 * 0.029)=0.3056$
Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 1 9 0 1}$ to 0.3056
These results show that the proportion of Applicants Selected who were Minorities ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathrm{n}=0.0982$ ) is not contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is supported by this data.


## Probability Distribution Report

## Please note:

Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 2 which may have an effect on the probability distributions. *All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 2 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

|  |  | Rate of Females | Rate of Males | Adverse Impact |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Number Females | Number Males | Applicants | Applicants | Adverse Impact | against | Cumulative |  |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected Ratio of Females | Females ? | Probability | Probability |  |
| 65 | 49 | $(65 / 188)$ | $(49 / 49)$ | 0.3457 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 67 | 47 | $(67 / 188)$ | $(47 / 49)$ | 0.3715 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 69 | 45 | $(69 / 188)$ | $(45 / 49)$ | 0.3996 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 71 | 43 | $(71 / 188)$ | $(43 / 49)$ | 0.4304 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 73 | 41 | $(73 / 188)$ | $(41 / 49)$ | 0.4641 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 75 | 39 | $(75 / 188)$ | $(39 / 49)$ | 0.5012 | YES | 0.000001 | 0.000001 |
| 77 | 37 | $(77 / 188)$ | $(37 / 49)$ | 0.5424 | YES | 0.00002 | 0.000021 |
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| 79 | 35 | $(79 / 188)$ | $(35 / 49)$ | 0.5883 | YES | 0.000292 | 0.000313 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 81 | 33 | $(81 / 188)$ | $(33 / 49)$ | 0.6397 | YES | 0.002632 | 0.002945 |
| 83 | 31 | $(83 / 188)$ | $(31 / 49)$ | 0.6978 | YES | 0.015138 | 0.018083 |
| 85 | 29 | $(85 / 188)$ | $(29 / 49)$ | 0.7639 | YES | 0.056661 | 0.074744 |
| 87 | 27 | $(87 / 188)$ | $(27 / 49)$ | 0.8398 | NO | 0.139836 | 0.21458 |
| 89 | 25 | $(89 / 188)$ | $(25 / 49)$ | 0.9279 | NO | 0.229332 | 0.443912 |
| 91 | 23 | $(91 / 188)$ | $(23 / 49)$ | 1.0312 | NO | 0.250772 | 0.694684 |
| 93 | 21 | $(93 / 188)$ | $(21 / 49)$ | 1.1543 | NO | 0.182676 | 0.87736 |
| 95 | 19 | $(95 / 188)$ | $(19 / 49)$ | 1.3032 | NO | 0.088188 | 0.965548 |
| 97 | 17 | $(97 / 188)$ | $(17 / 49)$ | 1.4872 | NO | 0.027935 | 0.993483 |
| 99 | 15 | $(99 / 188)$ | $(15 / 49)$ | 1.7202 | NO | 0.005717 | 0.9992 |
| 101 | 13 | $(101 / 188)$ | $(13 / 49)$ | 2.025 | NO | 0.000739 | 0.999939 |
| 103 | 11 | $(103 / 188)$ | $(11 / 49)$ | 2.4405 | NO | 0.000058 | 0.999997 |
| 105 | 9 | $(105 / 188)$ | $(9 / 49)$ | 3.0408 | NO | 0.000003 | 1 |
| 107 | 7 | $(107 / 188)$ | $(7 / 49)$ | 3.984 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 109 | 5 | $(109 / 188)$ | $(5 / 49)$ | 5.6819 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 111 | 3 | $(111 / 188)$ | $(3 / 49)$ | 9.6436 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 113 | 1 | $(113 / 188)$ | $(1 / 49)$ | 29.4521 | NO | 0 | 1 |

Given that 114 were Selected from a pool of 49 Males and 188 Females it was possible to have Selected from 65 to 114 Females.
Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 85 or fewer Females.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 2.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0.0747 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 85 or fewer Females).

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 Females Selected.



The probability distribution of having Selected from 65 to 114 Females is displayed above. The graph above is shown starting with 77 since the probabilities below this point are near zero. 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 91 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 female Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more female 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 65 to 114 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 Females Selected' would have a lower bound of 85 and an upper bound of 95 .

The significance of having Selected 90 or fewer Females is graphically displayed below.
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As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the $4 / 5$ ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 85 or fewer female Applicants.
The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 2.
You have Selected 90 female Applicants. The probability of having Selected 90 or fewer Females is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 90 Females Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 90 female Applicants is 0.4439 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 90 or fewer female Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.
Please note:
Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 2 which may have an effect on the probability distributions.
*All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 2 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

| Number Minorities | Number NonMinorities | Rate of Minorities Applicants | Rate of NonMinorities Applicants | Adverse Impact Ratio of | Adverse Impac against |  | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected | Minorities | Minorities? | Probability | Probability |
| 0 | 112 | (0/58) | (112/176) | 0 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 110 | (2/58) | (110/176) | 0.0552 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 108 | (4/58) | (108/176) | 0.1124 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 106 | (6/58) | (106/176) | 0.1718 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 104 | (8/58) | (104/176) | 0.2334 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 102 | (10/58) | (102/176) | 0.2975 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 100 | (12/58) | (100/176) | 0.3641 | YES | 0.000002 | 0.000002 |
| 14 | 98 | (14/58) | (98/176) | 0.4335 | YES | 0.000032 | 0.000034 |
| 16 | 96 | (16/58) | (96/176) | 0.5057 | YES | 0.000384 | 0.000418 |
| 18 | 94 | (18/58) | (94/176) | 0.5811 | YES | 0.002964 | 0.003381 |
| 20 | 92 | (20/58) | (92/176) | 0.6597 | YES | 0.015255 | 0.018636 |
| 22 | 90 | (22/58) | (90/176) | 0.7418 | YES | 0.053169 | 0.071805 |
| 24 | 88 | (24/58) | (88/176) | 0.8276 | NO | 0.126976 | 0.198781 |
| 26 | 86 | (26/58) | (86/176) | 0.9174 | NO | 0.209493 | 0.408274 |
| 28 | 84 | (28/58) | (84/176) | 1.0115 | NO | 0.24002 | 0.648294 |
| 30 | 82 | (30/58) | (82/176) | 1.1102 | NO | 0.191423 | 0.839717 |
| 32 | 80 | (32/58) | (80/176) | 1.2138 | NO | 0.106245 | 0.945962 |
| 34 | 78 | (34/58) | (78/176) | 1.3227 | NO | 0.040921 | 0.986883 |
| 36 | 76 | (36/58) | (76/176) | 1.4374 | NO | 0.010876 | 0.997759 |
| 38 | 74 | (38/58) | (74/176) | 1.5582 | NO | 0.001977 | 0.999736 |
| 40 | 72 | (40/58) | (72/176) | 1.6858 | NO | 0.000243 | 0.999979 |
| 42 | 70 | (42/58) | (70/176) | 1.8207 | NO | 0.00002 | 0.999999 |
| 44 | 68 | (44/58) | (68/176) | 1.9635 | NO | 0.000001 | 1 |
| 46 | 66 | (46/58) | (66/176) | 2.1149 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 48 | 64 | (48/58) | (64/176) | 2.2759 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 50 | 62 | (50/58) | (62/176) | 2.4472 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 52 | 60 | (52/58) | (60/176) | 2.6299 | NO | 0 | 1 |
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| 54 | 58 | $(54 / 58)$ | $(58 / 176)$ | 2.8252 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 56 | 56 | $(56 / 58)$ | $(56 / 176)$ | 3.0345 | NO | 0 | 1 |
| 58 | 54 | $(58 / 58)$ | $(54 / 176)$ | 3.2593 | NO | 0 | 1 |

Given that 112 were Selected from a pool of 176 Non-Minorities and 58 Minorities it was possible to have Selected from 0 to 58 Minorities.

Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 22 or fewer Minorities.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 2.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0.0718 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 22 or fewer Minorities).

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 Minorities Selected.



The probability distribution of having Selected from 0 to 58 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 28 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 minority Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more minority Applicants.

The characteristics of the probability distribution--its mean and standard deviation--are a function of the number of minority and nonminority Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected. Though it is possible to have Selected from 0 to 58 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 Minorities Selected' would have a lower bound of 22 and an upper bound of 34 .

The significance of having Selected 11 or fewer Minorities is graphically displayed below.
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[^0]Disparate Impact analysis: a program by hr-software.net to analyze employment decisions for a variety of EE.
As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the $4 / 5$ ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 22 or fewer minority Applicants.
The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 2.
You have Selected 11 minority Applicants. The probability of having Selected 11 or fewer Minorities is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 11 Minorities Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 11 minority Applicants is 0 and is graphically displayed, in red, above.

Since the probability is less than $10 \%$, we must reject the hypothesis that the decisions occurred due to chance. Therefore, we must conclude that the result 11 minority Applicants were Selected supports (based on statistics) a finding of Adverse Impact.

View Source Code
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## Disparate Impact Analysis

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.


## 60.0\% Passing Score (Office Skills Test)

## 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 Emplovee Selection Procedures

| Rate of Females Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Males Applicants <br> Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Females | Adverse Impact Ratio for Males |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$|$| $(0.8163 / 0.8138)=1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adverse impact as defined by the $4 / 5$ ths rule was not found in the above data. |


| Rate of Minorities Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Non-Minorities <br> Applicants Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Minorities | Adverse Impact Ratio for Non- <br> Minorities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(37 / 58)=0.6379$ | $(153 / 176)=0.8693$ | $(0.6379 / 0.8693)=0.73$ | $(0.8693 / 0.6379)=1.36$ |

The Adverse Impact Ratio for Minorities is less than 0.80 .
Minorities Applicants are Selected at a rate less than $80 \%$ (4/5ths) of the rate that Non-Minorities Applicants are Selected.

## Chi-Square Report

| Observed <br> Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 40 | 39.903 | 9.097 |
| Females | 153 |  |  |
| 153.097 | 35 | 49 |  |
| Column Total | 193 | 44.903 | 188 |
| Chi-Square $=\mathbf{0 . 0 0 1 6}$ <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 <br> absent any form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results fall within normal random variations and are not the <br> result of bias. |  |  |  |
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| Observed | Selected | Not Selected |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Expected |  | Row Totals |  |
| Non-Minorities | 153 | 23 |  |
| Minorities | 34.906 | 33.094 | 176 |
| Column Total | 47.094 | 10.906 | 58 |
| Con | 44 | 234 |  |

Chi-Square $=15.2978$
The value of the statistic is greater than 6.635. This indicates that there is a less than 1 percent chance that these results would have been obtained absent any form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results may have been the result of bias.

## 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:

$$
(r / n)-p
$$

```
sqrt(p * (1-p) / n) * sqrt(1-q)
```


## Analysis of proportion of Females Selected where:

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

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 40 | 9 | 49 |
| Females | 153 | 35 | 188 |
| Column Total | 193 | 44 | 237 |

$\mathrm{r}=153$
$\mathrm{n}=193$
$\mathrm{p}=188 / 237=0.793$
$\mathrm{q}=(153+40) /(188+49)=0.814$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 0 . 0 4}$
These results show that the proportion of Females Selected is $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 4}$ standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants Selected. A result of less than 2 standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

## Analysis of proportion of Minorities Selected where:

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

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non- <br> Minorities | 153 | 23 | 176 |
| Minorities | 37 | 21 | 58 |
| Column Total | 190 | 44 | 234 |

$\mathrm{r}=37$
$\mathrm{n}=190$
$\mathrm{p}=58 / 234=0.248$
$\mathrm{q}=(37+153) /(58+176)=0.812$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 3 . 9 1 1}$
These results show that the proportion of Minorities Selected is more than two standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants (Minorities plus Non-Minorities) Selected.

## 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 $=(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n})$
Expected value = p
Standard Deviation $=\operatorname{sqrt}(\mathbf{p} *(1-p) / \mathbf{n}) * \operatorname{sqrt}(1-\mathbf{q})$
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Confidence Interval:
Lower Bound = p-1.96* Std Dev
Upper Bound = p + 1.96 * Std Dev

Analysis of proportion of Females Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Females Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Females among those Selected.
- $q$ = proportion of Applicants Selected.
$r=153$
$\mathrm{n}=193$
$p=(188 /(188+49))=0.793$
$\mathrm{q}=((153+40) /(188+49))=0.814$
$(r / n)=153 / 193=0.7927$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 7 9 3 - ( 1 . 9 6 * ~} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 3})=\mathbf{0 . 7 6 8 6}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.793+(1.96 * 0.013)=0.8179$


## Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 7 6 8 6}$ to $\mathbf{0 . 8 1 7 9}$

These results show that the proportion of Females Females ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathrm{n}=\mathbf{0 . 7 9 2 7}$ ) is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

## Analysis of proportion of Minorities Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Minorities Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Minorities among those Selected.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
$\mathbf{r}=\mathbf{3 7}$
$\mathrm{n}=190$
$\mathrm{p}=(58 /(58+176))=0.248$
$\mathrm{q}=((37+\mathbf{1 5 3}) /(58+\mathbf{1 7 6}))=\mathbf{0 . 8 1 2}$
$(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n})=37 / 190=\mathbf{0 . 1 9 4 7}$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $\mathbf{0 . 2 4 8} \mathbf{- ( 1 . 9 6 *} \mathbf{0 . 0 1 4})=\mathbf{0 . 2 2 1 2}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.248+(1.96 * 0.014)=0.2745$
Confidence Interval = 0.2212 to 0.2745
These results show that the proportion of Applicants Selected who were Minorities ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathrm{n}=0.1947$ ) is not contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is supported by this data.


## Probability Distribution Report

## Please note:

Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 3 which may have an effect on the probability distributions. *All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 3 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

|  |  | Rate of Females | Rate of Males | Adverse Impact |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| Number Females | Number Males | Applicants | Applicants | Adverse Impact | against | Cumulative |  |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected Ratio of Females | Females ? | Probability | Probability |  |
| 144 | 49 | $(144 / 188)$ | $(49 / 49)$ | 0.766 | YES | 0.000034 | 0.000034 |
| 147 | 46 | $(147 / 188)$ | $(46 / 49)$ | 0.8329 | NO | 0.015761 | 0.015795 |
| 150 | 43 | $(150 / 188)$ | $(43 / 49)$ | 0.9092 | NO | 0.231316 | 0.247111 |
| Selected-> | 40 | $(153 / 188)$ | $(40 / 49)$ | 0.9969 | NO | 0.489838 | 0.73695 |
| 153 | 37 | $(156 / 188)$ | $(37 / 49)$ | 1.0989 | NO | 0.231991 | 0.968941 |
| 156 | 34 | $(159 / 188)$ | $(34 / 49)$ | 1.2189 | NO | 0.029892 | 0.998833 |
| 159 | 31 | $(162 / 188)$ | $(31 / 49)$ | 1.362 | NO | 0.001152 | 0.999984 |
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| 165 | 28 | $(165 / 188)$ | $(28 / 49)$ | 1.5359 | NO | 0.000014 | 0.999998 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 168 | 25 | $(168 / 188)$ | $(25 / 49)$ | 1.7515 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 171 | 22 | $(171 / 188)$ | $(22 / 49)$ | 2.0259 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 174 | 19 | $(174 / 188)$ | $(19 / 49)$ | 2.3869 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 177 | 16 | $(177 / 188)$ | $(16 / 49)$ | 2.8833 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 180 | 13 | $(180 / 188)$ | $(13 / 49)$ | 3.6088 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 183 | 10 | $(183 / 188)$ | $(10 / 49)$ | 4.7697 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |
| 186 | 7 | $(186 / 188)$ | $(7 / 49)$ | 6.9255 | NO | 0 | 0.999998 |

Given that 193 were Selected from a pool of 49 Males and 188 Females it was possible to have Selected from 144 to 188 Females.
Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 144 or fewer Females.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 3.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 144 or fewer Females).

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 Females Selected.



The probability distribution of having Selected from 144 to 188 Females is displayed above. The graph above is shown starting with 144 since the probabilities below this point are near zero. 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 153 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 female Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more female 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 144 to 188 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 Females Selected' would have a lower bound of 150 and an upper bound of 156 .

The significance of having Selected 153 or fewer Females is graphically displayed below.
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As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the 4/5ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 144 or fewer female Applicants.
The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 3 .
You have Selected 153 female Applicants. The probability of having Selected 153 or fewer Females is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 153 Females Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 153 female Applicants is 0.7369 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 153 or fewer female Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.
Please note:
Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 3 which may have an effect on the probability distributions. *All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 3 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

| Number Minorities | Number NonMinorities | Rate of Minorities Applicants | Rate of NonMinorities Applicants | Adverse Impact Ratio of | Adverse Impac against |  | Cumulative |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected | Minorities | Minorities? | Probability | Probability |
| 14 | 176 | (14/58) | (176/176) | 0.2414 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 17 | 173 | (17/58) | (173/176) | 0.2982 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 170 | (20/58) | (170/176) | 0.357 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 23 | 167 | (23/58) | (167/176) | 0.4179 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 26 | 164 | (26/58) | (164/176) | 0.4811 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 29 | 161 | (29/58) | (161/176) | 0.5466 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 32 | 158 | (32/58) | (158/176) | 0.6146 | YES | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | 155 | (35/58) | (155/176) | 0.6852 | YES | 0.000024 | 0.000024 |
| 38 | 152 | (38/58) | (152/176) | 0.7586 | YES | 0.00153 | 0.001554 |
| 41 | 149 | (41/58) | (149/176) | 0.835 | NO | 0.032099 | 0.033654 |
| 44 | 146 | (44/58) | (146/176) | 0.9145 | NO | 0.219319 | 0.252973 |
| 47 | 143 | (47/58) | (143/176) | 0.9973 | NO | 0.458477 | 0.71145 |
| 50 | 140 | (50/58) | (140/176) | 1.0837 | NO | 0.257952 | 0.969402 |
| 53 | 137 | (53/58) | (137/176) | 1.1739 | NO | 0.0302 | 0.999602 |
| 56 | 134 | (56/58) | (134/176) | 1.2681 | NO | 0.000398 | 1 |

Given that 190 were Selected from a pool of 176 Non-Minorities and 58 Minorities it was possible to have Selected from 14 to 58 Minorities.

Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 38 or fewer Minorities.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 3.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0.0016 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 38 or fewer Minorities).

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 Minorities Selected.
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The probability distribution of having Selected from 14 to 58 Minorities is displayed above. The graph above is shown starting with 14 since the probabilities below this point are near zero. 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 47 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 minority Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more minority Applicants.

The characteristics of the probability distribution-its mean and standard deviation--are a function of the number of minority and nonminority Applicants and the number of Applicants to be Selected. Though it is possible to have Selected from 14 to 58 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 Minorities Selected' would have a lower bound of 44 and an upper bound of 50 .

The significance of having Selected 37 or fewer Minorities is graphically displayed below.


Number of minority Applicants Selected
As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the $4 / 5$ ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 38 or fewer minority Applicants.
The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 3.
You have Selected 37 minority Applicants. The probability of having Selected 37 or fewer Minorities is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 37 Minorities Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 37 minority Applicants is 0 and is graphically displayed, in red, above.

Since the probability is less than $10 \%$, we must reject the hypothesis that the decisions occurred due to chance. Therefore, we must conclude that the result 37 minority Applicants were Selected supports (based on statistics) a finding of Adverse Impact.

Send questions or comments to webmaster@hr-guide.com. Thank you.
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## Disparate Impact Analysis

(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.

|  | Enter a title for your report:50.0\% Passing Score (Office Skills) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Male | Number of Non-Minority |  | Number of Younger <br> $\square$ <br> Applicants <br>  <br> Selected | $\|$Number of Non-Disabled  <br> $\square$ Applicants <br>  Selected |  |
| 49 Applicants | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 176 \\ \hline 167 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Applicants |  |  |  |
| 46 Selected |  | $\qquad$ Selected |  |  |  |
| Number of Female | Number of Minority |  | Number of Older$\square$ Applicants | Number of Disabled |  |
| 188 Applicants | 58 | Applicants |  | Applicants |  |
| 175 Selected |  |  | Selected | $\square$ Selected |  |
| $\checkmark$-Adverse Impact |  |  | Select the Statistical Tests you wish to execute by checking or unchecking the boxes on the left. Then press the 'Compute' button below. |  |  |
| $\checkmark$-Chi-Square |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| V-Standard Deviation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$-Confidence Intervals |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Probability Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |
| Display: $\square$ Description of | V In | rpretation of |  |  |  |

## 50.0\% Passing Score (Office Skills)

## 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 Females Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Males Applicants Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for Females | Adverse Impact Ratio for Males |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $(175 / 188)=0.9309$ | $(46 / 49)=0.9388$ | $(0.9309 / 0.9388)=0.99$ | $(0.9388 / 0.9309)=1.01$ |
| Adverse impact as defined by the 4/5ths rule was not found in the above data. |  |  |  |


| Rate of Minorities Applicants <br> Selected | Rate of Non-Minorities <br> Applicants Selected | Adverse Impact Ratio for <br> Minorities | Adverse Impact Ratio for Non- <br> Minorities |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(51 / 58)=0.8793$ | $(167 / 176)=0.9489$ | $(0.8793 / 0.9489)=0.93$ | $(0.9489 / 0.8793)=1.08$ |
| Adverse impact as defined by the 4/5ths rule was not found in the above data. |  |  |  |

## Chi-Square Report

| Observed <br> Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 46 | 3 | 49 |
| Females | 45.692 | 3.308 | 188 |
| Column Total | 175 | 13 | 12.692 |
| Chi-Square $\mathbf{= 0 . 0 3 8 8}$ <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 <br> form of bias. Therefore, you may conclude that these results fall within normal random variations and are not the result of bias. |  |  |  |


| Observed <br> Expected | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Non-Minorities | 167 | 9 | 176 |
| Minorities | 163.9658 | 12.0342 | 58 |
| Column Total | 51 | 7 | 3.9658 |
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Chi-Square = 3.313
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.

## 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:

$$
(\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{n})-\mathrm{p}
$$

sqrt(p * (1-p) / n) * sqrt(1-q)

## Analysis of proportion of Females Selected where:

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

|  | Selected | Not Selected | Row Totals |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Males | 46 | 3 | 49 |
| Females | 175 | 13 | 188 |
| Column Total | 221 | 16 | 237 |

$\mathrm{r}=175$
$\mathrm{n}=221$
$\mathrm{p}=188 / 237=0.793$
$\mathrm{q}=(175+46) /(188+49)=0.932$
Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 0 . 1 9 7}$
These results show that the proportion of Females Selected is $\mathbf{- 0 . 1 9 7}$ standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants Selected. A result of less than 2 standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

Analysis of proportion of Minorities Selected where:

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

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{r}=51 \\
& \mathrm{n}=218 \\
& \mathrm{p}=58 / 234=0.248 \\
& \mathrm{q}=(51+167) /(58+176)=0.932
\end{aligned}
$$

Standard Deviation Statistic $=\mathbf{- 1 . 8 2}$
These results show that the proportion of Minorities Selected is $\mathbf{- 1 . 8 2}$ standard deviations below the proportion of Applicants Selected. A result of less than 2 standard deviations is generally considered non-significant.

## 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 $=(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n})$
Expected value $=\mathbf{p}$
Standard Deviation $=\operatorname{sqrt}(\mathbf{p} *(1-p) / \mathbf{n}) * \operatorname{sqrt}(1-q)$
Confidence Interval:
Lower Bound = p-1.96 * Std Dev
Upper Bound $=$ p + 1.96 * Std Dev

## Analysis of proportion of Females Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Females Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Females among those Selected.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
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```
r=175
n=221
p=(188/(188+49))=0.793
q = ((175 + 46)/(188 + 49))=0.932
(r/n)=175/221=0.7919
```

The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $0.793-\left(1.96^{*} 0.007\right)=0.7794$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.793+(1.96 * 0.007)=0.8071$
Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 7 7 9 4}$ to $\mathbf{0 . 8 0 7 1}$
These results show that the proportion of Females Females $(\mathbf{r} / \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{0 . 7 9 1 9})$ is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

Analysis of proportion of Minorities Applicants Selected where:

- $\mathbf{r}=$ number of Minorities Selected.
- $\mathbf{n}=$ number of Applicants Selected.
- $\mathbf{p}=$ proportion of Minorities among those Selected.
- $q=$ proportion of Applicants Selected.
$\mathrm{r}=51$
$\mathrm{n}=218$
$\mathrm{p}=(58 /(58+176))=0.248$
$\mathrm{q}=((51+167) /(\mathbf{5 8}+\mathbf{1 7 6}))=\mathbf{0 . 9 3 2}$
$(\mathrm{r} / \mathrm{n})=51 / 218=0.2339$
The lower bound of the confidence interval is: $0.248-(\mathbf{1 . 9 6 *} \mathbf{0 . 0 0 8})=\mathbf{0 . 2 3 2 9}$
The upper bound of the confidence interval is: $0.248+(1.96 * 0.008)=0.2629$


## Confidence Interval $=\mathbf{0 . 2 3 2 9}$ to $\mathbf{0 . 2 6 2 9}$

These results show that the proportion of Minorities Minorities ( $\mathbf{r} / \mathrm{n}=\mathbf{0 . 2 3 3 9}$ ) is contained in the confidence interval. Therefore a finding of disparate impact is not supported by this data.

## Probability Distribution Report

## Please note:

Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 3 which may have an effect on the probability distributions. *All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 3 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

| Number Females | Number Males | Rate of Females <br> Applicants | Rate of Males <br> Applicants | Adverse Impact |  | Adverse Impact | Cumulative |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Selected | Selected | Selected | Selected | Ratio of Females against Females? Probability | Probability |  |  |
| 172 | 49 | $(172 / 188)$ | $(49 / 49)$ | 0.9149 | NO | 0.064175 | 0.064175 |
| Selected-> | 175 | 46 | $(175 / 188)$ | $(46 / 49)$ | 0.9916 | NO | 0.754151 |
| 0.818326 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 178 | 43 | $(178 / 188)$ | $(43 / 49)$ | 1.0789 | NO | 0.177138 | 0.995464 |
| 181 | 40 | $(181 / 188)$ | $(40 / 49)$ | 1.1794 | NO | 0.003213 | 0.998677 |
| 184 | 37 | $(184 / 188)$ | $(37 / 49)$ | 1.2961 | NO | 0.000005 | 0.998682 |
| 187 | 34 | $(187 / 188)$ | $(34 / 49)$ | 1.4335 | NO | 0 | 0.998682 |

Given that 221 were Selected from a pool of 49 Males and 188 Females it was possible to have Selected from 172 to 188 Females.
Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 0 or fewer Females.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 3 .
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 0 or fewer Females).

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 Females Selected.
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The probability distribution of having Selected from 172 to 188 Females is displayed above. The graph above is shown starting with 172 since the probabilities below this point are near zero. 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 175 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 female Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more female 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 172 to 188 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 Females Selected' would have a lower bound of 172 and an upper bound of 178 .

The significance of having Selected 175 or fewer Females is graphically displayed below.
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As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the $4 / 5$ ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 0 or fewer female Applicants. The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 3.

You have Selected 175 female Applicants. The probability of having Selected 175 or fewer Females is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 175 Females Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 175 female Applicants is 0.8183 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 175 or fewer female Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.
Please note:
Due to the large number selected, the results will be shown in increments of 3 which may have an effect on the probability distributions. *All* computed probabilities will be multiplied by the increment of 3 . The use of the increment was necessary to reduce the processing load on our web server which has to compute all of the input \{Distribution\} probabilities.

| Number | Number Non- Rate of Minorities |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Minorities | Minorities | Applicants |
| Selected | Selected | Selected |
| 42 | 176 | $(42 / 58)$ |

Rate of Non-
Minorities
Applicants
Selected
$(176 / 176)$

| Adverse Impact |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Ratio of | Adverse Impact <br> against |  | Cumulative |
| Minorities | Minorities? | Probability | Probability |
| 0.7241 | YES | 0 | 0 |
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| 45 | 173 | $(45 / 58)$ | $(173 / 176)$ | 0.7893 | YES | 0.000004 | 0.000004 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 48 | 170 | $(48 / 58)$ | $(170 / 176)$ | 0.8568 | NO | 0.002594 | 0.002597 |
| Selected-> 51 | 167 | $(51 / 58)$ | $(167 / 176)$ | 0.9267 | NO | 0.143132 | 0.14573 |
| 54 | 164 | $(54 / 58)$ | $(164 / 176)$ | 0.9992 | NO | 0.699872 | 0.845602 |
| 57 | 161 | $(57 / 58)$ | $(161 / 176)$ | 1.0743 | NO | 0.151771 | 0.997372 |

Given that 218 were Selected from a pool of 176 Non-Minorities and 58 Minorities it was possible to have Selected from 42 to 58 Minorities.
Adverse Impact would be found if you Selected approximately 45 or fewer Minorities.
The word "approximately" was used since the results are shown in increments of 3.
The probability of Adverse Impact occurring even if the employment decisions were random (i.e. unbiased) is 0 (the sum of the probabilities of having Selected 45 or fewer Minorities).

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 Minorities Selected.
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The probability distribution of having Selected from 42 to 58 Minorities is displayed above. The graph above is shown starting with 42 since the probabilities below this point are near zero. 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 54 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 minority Applicants. Adding the individual probabilities from a certain point and higher enable you to compute the probability of having Selected that many or more minority 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 42 to 58 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 Minorities Selected' would have a lower bound of 51 and an upper bound of 57 .

The significance of having Selected 51 or fewer Minorities is graphically displayed below.
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As noted earlier, Adverse Impact, according to the 4/5ths rule, would be found if you Selected approximately 45 or fewer minority Applicants. The word "approximately " was used since the results were computed in increments of 3.

You have Selected 51 minority Applicants. The probability of having Selected 51 or fewer Minorities is equal to the cumulative probability for having Selected 51 Minorities Applicants. The cumulative probability of having Selected 51 minority Applicants is 0.1457 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 51 or fewer minority Applicants is an event that occurred due to chance and not from discriminatory actions by the employer.
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