

H-18-103

DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND
SECURITY
U. S. COAST GUARD
CG-4229 (Rev. 6-90)

DIGEST

APPROVAL:
SIGNATURE:
INFORMATION:

From: *Kenneth Venuto*
CG-1

JUL 7 2005

To: G-C *Stator*

Thru: (1) G-CCS *TA/11* → *MCPO CG [unclear]*
(2) G-CV ← *See issue #2 TA*

Subj: SPRING 2005 DIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL (DAC)

1. The Spring 2005 DAC final report is submitted for your review and comments. If you have any questions, I am available to discuss at any time.

Enclosed: Spring 2005 DAC Report

Copy to: G-H
MCPO-CG

FINAL Sign Copies to:

SIGNER'S COMMENTS

- G-CV
- G-CCS
- G-CR
- CG-1
- CG-10
- CG-11
- CG-12
- CG-13



5050

MAY 27 2005

MEMORANDUM

From:  J. M. BUTLER, CAPT
CG-12B, DAC Chair

Reply to
Attn of: LCDR V. E. Patterson

To: G-C

Subj: SPRING 2005 DIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL (DAC) MEETING FINAL
REPORT

1. The Commandant's Diversity Advisory Council met from 18-22 April 05.
2. The Council meeting was held as an open session.
3. Agenda:
 - a. The Council received the following updates and training:
 - (1) Introduction and welcome DAC Chair (CAPT Butler)
 - (2) Insight on Diversity: RDML Rochon (CG-12).
 - (3) Training: Mr. Ralph Hargrove from the (Insight Education Systems)
MICROINEQUITIES: The Power Of Small.
 - b. The Council members met to consider all issues raised for DAC consideration. They then worked identifying issues, in one of four subcommittees: Equal Opportunity, Ethnic, Gender and Workforce. Upon conclusion of the subcommittee work, the council reconvened to prioritize issues and prepare the out-brief.
 - c. The Council discussed eighteen issues pending DAC consideration; three issues pending Program Manager action; and three current issues, including development of recommendations for your consideration. The three current issues are listed below and detailed in enclosure (1). As briefed on 22 April 05, the DAC ranked the current issues by order of "most important/highest value" to the Coast Guard and its family members. The top three issues, presented in descending order are as follows:

Subj: SPRING 2005 DIVERSITY ADVISORY COUNCIL (DAC)
MEETING FINAL REPORT

- (1) Equal Opportunity (EO)-The current EO review program does not look at the operational segment of the Coast Guard population.
- (2) Gender-Quantify the need for assisting personnel with planning family and career.
- (3) Ethnic-Lack of diversity within the COMDT designated CMC positions.

#

Encl: Long Versions of Each Current Issue

Current Issues and Recommendations – Spring 2005

Issue 1

Topic: THE CURRENT EQUAL OPPORTUNITY REVIEW PROGRAM DOES NOT LOOK AT THE OPERATIONAL SEGMENT OF THE COAST GUARD POPULATION

Opened: Spring 2005

Action Office: G-H

DISCUSSION:

As funded, the current EO Review program looks at 10 large units per year that have high concentrations of civilian employees. These units are selected because historically two thirds of formal Civil Rights complaints have come from Civilian Employees. Informal complaints are not tracked by unit at the Headquarters level but are held at the District Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) level.

A review of the 2002 and 2004 OAS data revealed that negative responses are declining uniformly; however, there are some ethnic groups (esp. African American) that seem to experience greater difficulties on WHEC, WMEC and Small Boat Stations. This same group's responses reflected greater acceptance at staff units (ISC's, Area and District commands). Other operational units also have some negative data points that are above the norm. Operational units represent over 60% of CG units. The majority of these units are comprised primarily of enlisted personnel. These units, with high op tempos and stress levels and with large numbers of young junior enlisted personnel are more susceptible to EO problems. And considering that the CG is about 90% men and 80% white, young enlisted women and minorities can often be the "only" or "one of very few" at an operational unit.

The purpose of the Civil Rights, Equal Opportunity (EO), and Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) programs is to proactively pursue a workforce that reflects society and a workplace climate that fully embraces the Coast Guard's core values of honor, respect, and devotion to duty. In addition, in keeping with the Commandant's focus on readiness, people and stewardship, we should be attentive to the EO environment at our operational commands.

In a perfect resource world, it would be ideal to augment our EO staff and budget and add operational units to the list of planned EO reviews. However, realizing budget and resource constraints, targeting 50% of the current EO reviews at operational units would be a sound first step to addressing problems at these units. This would help us obtain a better measurement of the EO climate and EO program at our operational units as well as educating a critical segment of our

population. And, it would accomplish this at no additional cost to the Coast Guard.

RECOMMENDATION: Use 5 of the 10 reviews per year to focus on three large cutters and two other types of operational shore units. This will allow us to still reach a significant number of civilians; which is very valuable. We will also reach a critical and previously untouched segment of our population--the junior enlisted personnel who are oftentimes stationed at their first unit in the Coast Guard.

CG-1 Comments: Concur in principle with DAC recommendation. Because operational units are typically smaller than the shore units targeted by EO reviews now, it should be possible to conduct an EO review at an operational unit in less time and with fewer personnel than are typically used. By adapting the process as appropriate to the size and complexity of the unit, it may be possible to do more than 10 EO reviews per year with the same amount of resources. I will continue to support EO reviews with CG-12B staff members.

G-H Comments: We have developed an alternative to the DAC's recommendation that will address the need they identified. After meeting with the Chief of Staff to discuss funding support, we will conduct 12 additional EO reviews each year using the newly established Area Civil Rights Program Managers and others (including the support from CG-12B and the field Civil Rights service providers) to fill the staffing gaps. All 12 of these additional reviews will be conducted at operational units.
Fixed per discussion

G-C Comments:

*Concur with CG-1, G-H
action*

Current Issues and Recommendations – Spring 2005

Issue 2

Topic: LACK OF DIVERSITY WITHIN THE COMDT DESIGNATED CMC POSITIONS.

Opened: Spring 2005

Action Office: CGPC-epm, CG-131

DISCUSSION:

There is an imbalance among the COMDT designated CMC (Gold Badge) billets. Our research indicated that the CMC network is not reflective of the diversity our current Coast Guard active duty and reserve workforce. While this has not caused significant problems throughout the service, it may be a concern as the racial and gender accessions and retention continue to trend in a positive direction.

The DAC reviewed Gold Badge billet assignments and out of the 28 active duty accessions CMC's, we have only two minorities and one woman. To highlight this concern, in AY05 there were a total of 10 applicants, of which two applicants were minority and one woman. Of those, two majority male applicants were selected. Discussions with CGPC-epm revealed a lack of diverse applicants as a major contributing factor. Minority and women CMC representation is not proportional to representation demographics in the enlisted workforce. Currently minorities comprise 19.8% and women 11% of the enlisted workforce, respectively. The reserve workforce has minority representation of 18 % and 14.3 % of women and has no minorities CMC's and only one woman CMC out of 11 assigned billets

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend incorporating language into CGPC ALCCENL encouraging minorities and women to apply for these prestigious, highly visible CMC positions. In that regard, the DAC will draft appropriate language to be included in the next solicitation for CMC. This requested change has been briefed to and approved by CGPC-epm.

Handwritten notes:
Trend in positive
concern that the budget program path
the sector promote in the career path
the help services for now
Will help services for now

Also recommend MCPPOCG to review the CMC instruction to see if any changes are warranted.

CG-1 Comments: Concur with DAC recommendation. With the establishment of CMC positions at all Sectors, there will be a growth in the number of personnel needed to fill these roles. I am working with the MCPPOCG to include a healthy mix of E8s and E7s in the Gold Badge positions at Sectors. Our proposal is in clearance with the Areas. This will improve the likelihood of more diverse representation within the gold badge network, and expand the candidate pool and experience level for subsequent E9 positions. In addition to language in message traffic, CGPC-epm will contact high performing female and minority senior enlisted members to suggest they apply for CMC positions. The MCPPOCG's office and the CMC network are actively recruiting good performers, including women and minorities, to apply for CMC positions. Personal contact from someone, especially those already doing the job, to encourage a member to apply is far more effective than a general statement in a solicitation message.

Route to MCPPOCG for comment prior to G-C.
G-C Comments:

Handwritten signature: Agree with CG-1 comment

Current Issues and Recommendations – Spring 2005

Issue 3

Topic: QUANTIFY THE NEED TO ASSIST MEMBERS WITH PLANNING FAMILY AND CAREER

Opened: Spring 2005

Action Office: CG-1

DISCUSSION:

As the Coast Guard endeavors to become an employer of choice, career-oriented personnel increasingly find it challenging to balance family and career.

This issue has reached the DAC over the last several years from various sources. It has been a topic of interest brought forth from the field via DAC members; the Gender Policy office receives calls on the subject; family and career balance is a frequent topic of offline discussion at Women's Symposiums; and during travel in support of the Sexist Behavior Study. COs/OINCs often expressed a need for a means to provide family and career guidance to their crews.

Members report difficulty finding guidance on timing pregnancy and/or parenthood, continuing a successful career after bringing children into the family, and balancing priorities of both career and family. Furthermore, commands have requested guidance in talking to their crews about planning families around their career.

In order to retain a diverse workforce while ensuring operational readiness, the Coast Guard should assess the need for assisting members with career and family planning.

RECOMMENDATION:

Fund a formal family and career planning survey to assess how the Coast Guard can prepare members to best plan for families while members remain successful and career-oriented performers. Based on the results, appropriate tools should be developed and provided to Coast Guard members.

CG-1 Comments: There is already information that demonstrates the need for some tools to help members plan their careers, balanced against their family plans. Since the DAC meeting was held, the CG-1B staff has completed an analysis of retention of female officers, DMDC has published new survey results on Workplace Issues, and we have numerous anecdotal evidence of the need from unit visits and focus groups. I intend to form a tiger team that will partner with the DAC Gender subcommittee to address the development of career planning tools, as well as examine what we can do within the enlisted and officer assignment staffs to better focus our attention, to help members better coordinate career and family planning.

→ Unit level resource needed
G-C Comments:

*CG-1
This should be part of top/down
review of W/L programs
That I have requested.
Please address at O&B brief
to me on this issue.*