If you have issues viewing or accessing this file, please contact us at NCJRS.gov.

back ground poterol

ANALYSIS OF
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION
RESULTS

Prepared By

Law Enforcement

Community Outreach and Career

Program

68255

75-8F-99-0025

ANALYSIS OF

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION RESULTS

On April 9 and 10, 1975, the University of Chicago Industrial Relations Center, under contract to the City of Miami administered a Civil Service Examination, the results of which were used to create a register of potential recruits for the City of Miami Police Department. The following brief narrative and attached statistical tables constitute an attempt to conduct an initial analysis of the performance of candidates recruited and/or instructed by the Law Enforcement Community Outreach and Career Program (LECOCP), otherwise known as the Tricultural Program, funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and intended to increase minority (Blacks, Latins, and women) representation in the ranks of the City of Miami Police Department.

Assumptions and Givens:

- (A) All statistics about the overall composition of the candidates, both those who competed and those who did not appear, and the results of the examination were compiled and provided by the Civil Service

 Board and were, for the purposes of this analysis,

 assumed to be accurate and complete.
- (B) All statistics about the overall composition of LECOCP candidates and students were compiled and checked for accuracy by LECOCP staff.
- (C) All computations of percentages were made on an electronic calculator set to three-digit accuracy and were, thus, subject to a maximum error of 0.09% due to automatic truncation.

- (D) It was assumed, for the purposes of this analysis, that the areas and degrees of success or failure of LECOCP endeavors could, at least partially, be assessed by a systematic examination of the performance of LECOCP candidates and students on the examination and by a comparison of their performance to the performance of other candidates.
- (E) The LECOCP instructional phase, in which candidates were to be aided in preparing for the examination, was designed and implemented on the basis of incorrect information to the effect that the examination would be predominantly intended to measure cognitive skills, not affective skills.

 Consequently, the relationship between attendance in LECOCP classes and subsequent performance is
- (F) The objectives of LECOCP were stated strictly in terms of increasing the number of minority persons actually hired as police officers. Therefore, this analysis can only serve as an interim evaluation and an indicator of the likelihood of eventual success.

Appendix I:

Appendix I consists of 24 separate tables which delineate by ethnicity and gender the comparative test performances of selected groups of candidates: specifically, those candidates whose applications were accepted by LECOCP (i.e., "LECOCP CANDIDATES") versus candidates whose applications were accepted by the Civil Service Board (i.e., "Non-LECOCP CANDIDATES").

Significant Figures: Appendix I:

- (A) 97.3% of LECOCP candidates were Black or Latin; 28.4% were female. 59.0% of Non-LECOCP candidates were Black or Latin; 22.6% were female.
- (B) 64.2% of all minority candidates were LECOCP candidates, although only 56.1% of all candidates were LECOCP candidates.
- (C) The proportion of LECOCP candidates who did not appear for the examination (32.3%) was essentially equal to the proportion of Non-LECOCP candidates who did not appear (32.5%).
- (D) 41.5% of Black LECOCP candidates were female. 25.0% of Black Non-LECOCP candidates were female.
- (E) 19.7% of Latin LECOCP candidates did not appear.

 38.2% of Latin Non-LECOCP candidates did not appear.
- (F) 96.7% of LECOCP candidates who competed on the .

 examination were Black or Latin; 21.6% were female.

 54.8% of Non-LECOCP candidates who competed were

 Black or Latin; 18.8% were female.
- (G) 65.8% of all minority candidates who competed were LECOCP candidates.
- (H) 77.2% of all candidates who passed the examination were minority candidates.
- (I) -52.7% of all candidates who passed were minority LECOCP candidates.
- (J) 68.2% of all minority candidates who passed were minority LECOCP candidates.
- (K) 75.0% of Black candidates who passed were LECOCP candidates, although only 66.3% of Black candidates who competed were LECOCP candidates.

- (L) 75.0% of Latin candidates who passed were LECOCP candidates, 72.6% of Latin candidates who competed were LECOCP candidates.
- (M) 45.6% of all female candidates who competed passed.
- (N) 53.8% of female candidates who passed were LECOCP candidates; 59.6% of female candidates who competed were LECOCP candidates.

Appendix II:

Appendix II consists of 24 separate tables (parallel to those in Appendix I) which delineate by ethnicity and gender the comparative test performances of selected groups of candidates: specifically, those candidates who attended LECOCP instructional classes (i.e., "LECOCP STUDENTS") versus candidates who did not attend (i.e., "NON-LECOCP STUDENTS").

Significant Figures: Appendix II:

- (A) 93.6% of LECOCP students were Black or Latin; 24.7% were female. 71.0% of all other candidates were Black or Latin; 26.7% were female.
- (B) 14.9% of LECOCP students did not appear for the examination. 45.1% of all other candidates did not appear.
- (C) 21.9% of Black LECOCP students did not appear. 54.6% of all other Black candidates did not appear.
- (D) 8.6% of Latin LECOCP students did not appear. 48.6% of all other Latin candidates did not appear.
- (E) 25.5% of female LECOCP students did not appear. 60.9% of all other female candidates did not appear.
- (F) 93.2% of LECOCP students who competed on the

examination were Black or Latin; 21.6% were female.
61.8% of all other candidates who competed were Black
or Latin; 19.0% were female.

- (G) 60.2% of all minority candidates who competed were LECOCP students.
- (H) 45.4% of all candidates who passed the examination were LECOCP students.
- (I) 58.8% of all minority candidates who passed were LECOCP students.
- (J) 56.2% of Black candidates who passed were LECOCP students; 56.6% of Black candidates who competed were LECOCP students.
- (K) 68.1% of Latin candidates who passed were LECOCP students; 69.8% of Latin candidates who competed were LECOCP students.
- (L) 57.6% of female candidates who passed were LECOCP students; 56.1% of female candidates who competed were LECOCP students.

Summary Conclusions:

As previously alluded, an objective analysis of LECOCP's efforts is seriously hampered by a lack of definite correlatives and/or cause-and-effect relationships between program activities and probable success on the Civil Service Examination. Nonetheless certain, cautiously stated conclusions can legitimately be drawn:

(A) Although comparison data about previous examinations are not available, since statistics by ethnicity and gender were not generated by the Civil Service Board (in compliance with Federal guidelines then in effect),

it can be safely postulated that the extremely large proportion of minority candidates competing on the most recent examination marked a radical upswing. This supposition is supported in part by the fact that the City of Miami Police Department, like other local institutions, is involved in affirmative action to increase minority representation in its ranks.

- (B) It is probable that LECOCP's advertisement and recruitment activities were partially responsible for the fact that a substantial majority of the candidates whose applications were accepted by the Civil Service Board were minority persons.
- (C) 36.3% of all minority candidates who competed passed, while 55.5% of Anglo males who competed passed; and 34.7% of all Black or Latin candidates who competed passed, while 56.6% of Anglo candidates who competed passed. This very significant difference in success rates indicates a continuing need for revision of testing procedures and further efforts in providing support for minority candidates.
- (D) Despite numerous potential difficulties, threefourths of those persons who passed the examination
 were minority candidates. This tends to lead to the
 conclusion that intensive recruiting of minority
 candidates can have an impact, in fact, a very
 significant impact.

It is important to remember that any evaluation of LECOCP's activities should not be based solely upon an inspection of numbers. LECOCP has directed itself not only to recruiting the maximum quantity of minority candidates, but also to providing supportive services to those candidates who have correctible deficiencies. That is, neither LECOCP nor any other conceivable program can hope to convert a candidate who lacks the requisite qualities and abilities to one who has those qualities and abilities.

APPENDIX I

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

		LECOCP ALL CANDIDATES			NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES	
	#	%	#		#	%
TOTALS	232	56.1%	413	100.0%	181	43.8
Male	166	40.1%	306	74.0%	140.	33.8%
Female	66	15.9%	107	25.9%	41	9.9%
Black	130	31.4%	190	46.0%	60	14.5%
Black Male	76	18.4%	121	29.2%	45	10.8%
Black Female	54	13.0%	69	16.7%	15	3.6%
Latin	96	23.2%	143	34.6%	47	11.3%
Latin Male	86	20.8%	127	30.7%	41	9.9%
Latin Female	10	2.4%	16	3.8%	6	1.4%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	6 4 2	1.4% 0.9% 0.4%	80 58 22	19.3% 14.0% 5.3%	74 54 20	17.9% 13.0% 4.8%
DID NOT APPEAR	75	18.1%	134	32.4%	59	14.2%
Male	43	10.4%	84	20.3%	41	9.9%
Female	32	7.7%	50	12.1%	18	4.3%
Black	55	13.3%	77	18.6%	22	5.3%
Black Male	26	6.2%	38	9.2%	12	2.9%
Black Female	29	7.0%	39	9.4%	10	2.4%
Latin Latin Male Latin Female	19	4.6%	37	8.9%	18	4.3%
	16	3.8%	33	7.9%	17	4.1%
	3	0.7%	4	0.9%	1	0.2%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	-1 1	0.2% 0.2% 0.0%	20 13 -7	·:-3.1%	19 12 7	4.6% 2.9% 1.6%

LECOCP

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	DID NOT AP	PEAR		
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	232.	100.0%	75	32.3%
Male	166	71.5%	43	18.5%
Female	66	28.4%	32	13.7%
Black	130	56.0%	55	23.7%
Black Male	76	32.7%	26	11.2%
Black Female	54	23.2%	29	12.5%
Latin	96	41.3%	19	8.1%
Latin Male	86	37.0%	16	6.8%
Latin Female	10	4.3%	3	1.2%
Anglo	6	2.5%	1	0.4%
Anglo Male	4	1.7%	1	.0.4%
Anglo Female	2	0.8%	0	0.0%

NON-LECOCP

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع والمساوين	DID NO	r Appear		
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	181	100.0%	59	32.5%
Male	140	77.3%	41	22.6%
Female	41	22.6%	18	9.9%
Black	60	33.1%	22	12.1%
Black Male	45	24.8%	12	6.6%
Black Female	15	8.2%	10	5.5%
Latin	47	25.9%	18	9.9%
Latin Male	41	22.6%	17	9.3%
Latin Female	6	3.3%	1	0.5%
Anglo	74	40.8%	19	10.4%
Anglo Male	54	29.8%	12	6.6%
Anglo Female	20	11.0%	7	3.8%

BLACK

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

geria de la composición del composición de la c	CANDI	ECOCP DATES				
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	130	68.4%	190	100.0%	60	31.5%
Male Female	76 54	40.9% 28.4%	121 69	63.6% 36.3%	45 15	23.6% 7.8%
DID NOT APPEAR	55	28.9%	77	40.5%	22	11.5%
Male Female	26 29	13.6% 15.2%	38 39	20.0% 20.5%	12 10	6.3% 5.2%

BLACK LECOCP

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	TOTA	<u>LS</u>	Γ	ID NOT A	PPEAR
	#	%	#		
TOTALS	130	100.0%	55		42.3%
Male Female	76 54	58.4% 41.5%	26 29		20.0% 22.3%

BLACK NON-LECOCP

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	TOTAL	<u>s</u>	DI	D NOT A	PPEÄR	
	#	%	#		-%	
TOTALS	60	100.0%	22		36.	. 6%
Male Female	45 15	75.0% 25.0%	12 10			. 0% . 6%

LATIN -

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	CANDIDA		CANDII		NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES		
	#:	%	:#	75	#	%	
TOTALS	96	67.1%	143	100.0%	47	32.8%	
Male Female	86 10	60.1% 6.9%	127 16	88.8% 11.1%	41 6	28.6% 4.1%	
DID NOT APPEAR	<u>R</u> 19	13.2%	37	25.8%	18	12.5%	
Male Female	16 3	11.1% 2.0%	33 4	23.0% 2.7%	17 1	11.8% 0.6%	

LATIN LECOCP

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	TOTA	ALS	DID NOT	APPEAR
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	96	100.0%	19	1,9.7%
Male Female	86 10	89.5% 10.4%	16 3	16.6% 3.1%

LATIN NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	TOTALS	DID NOT APPEAR
	* %	* 7
TOTALS	47 100.0%	18 38.2%
Male Female	41 87.2% 6 12.7%	17 1 36.1% 2.1%

ANGLO CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

en de la compania de La compania de la co	LECOCP CANDIDATES		CANDIDA	ATES	NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES	
	#	%	#	7.	#	%
TOTALS	6	7.5%	80	100.0%	74	92.5%
Male Female	4 2	5.0% 2.5%	58 22	72.5% 27.5%	54 20	67.5% 25.0%
DID NOT APPEAR	1	1.2%	20	25.0%	19	23.7%
Male Female	10	1.2%	13 7	16.2% 8.7%	12 7	15.0% 8.7%

ANGLO LECOCP CANDIDATES

SCHEDULED FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	ا المراجعة المراجعة ا	TOTAL	<u>LS</u>		DID NOT	APPEAR	<u> </u>
		#	%		#	%	
TOTALS		6	100.0%		1	16.	. 6%
	9 1						
Male Female		4	66.6% 33.3%		1 0		. 6% . 0%

ANGLO NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES

SCHEDULED FOR THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	TOTA	ALS ·		DID NO	T APPEAR
	# .	-%		# - ::	%
TOTALS	74	100.0%		19	25.6%
Male Female	54 20	72.9% 27.0%		12 7	16.2% 9.4%

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED

		COCP DATES	AL CANDI		NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES	
	#	7	#	%		%
TOTALS	157	56.2%	27,9	100.0%	. 122	43.7%
Male	123	44.0%	222	79.5%	99	35.4%
Female	34	12.1%	.57	20.4%	23	8.2%
Black	75	26.8%	113	40.5%	38	13.6%
Black Male	50	17.9%	83	29.7%	33	11.8%
Black Female	25	8.9%	30	10.7%	5	1.7%
Latin	77	27.5%	106	37.9%	29	10.3%
Latin Male	70	25.0%	94	33.6%	24	8.6%
Latin Female	7	2.5%	12	4.3%	5	1.7%
Anglo	5	1.7%	60	21.5%	55	19.7%
Anglo Male	3	1.0%	45	16.1%	42	15.0%
Anglo Female	2	0.7%	15	5.3%	13	4.6%
PASSED	60	21.5%	110	39.4%	50	17.9%
Male	46	16.4%	84	30.1%	38	13.6%
Female	14	5.0%	26	9.3%	12	4.3%
Black	24	8.6%	32	11.4%	8	2.8%
Black Male	15	5.3%	21	7.5%	6	2.1%
Black Female	9	3.2%	11	3.9%	2	0.7%
Latin	33	11.8%	44	15.7%	11	3.9%
Latin Male	29	10.3%	38	13.6%	9	3.2%
Latin Female	4	1.4%	6	2.1%	2	0.7%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	3 2 1	1.0% 0.7% 0.3%	34 25 9	12.1% 8.9% 3.2%	31 23 8	11.1% 8.2% 2.8%
FAILED	97	34.7%	169	60.5%	72	25.8%
Male	. 77	27.5%	138	49.4%	61	21.8%
Female	20	7.1%	31		11	3.9%
Black	51	18.2%	81	29.0%	30	10.7%
Black Male	35	12.5%	62	22.2%	27	9.6%
Black Female	16	5.7%	19	6.8%	3	1.0%

٠		_			
	*	7 7			
	Page	- 1 (_	~~ 4	
	IGE	1.0		(11)	(1)

	LECOCP CANDIDATES	ALL CANDIDATES	NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES
Latin	44 15.7%	62 22.2%	18 6.4%
Latin Male	41 14.6%	56 20.0%	15 5.3%
Latin Female	3 1.0%	6 2.1%	3 1.0%
A company of the second	2 0.7%	26 9.3%	24 8.6%
Anglo	1 0.3%	20 7.1%	19 6.8%
Anglo Male			5 1.7%
Anglo Female .	1 0.3%	6 2.1%	1.16.

LECOCP CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION:

	TOT	ALS	PAS	SSED	FAI	LED
	#	%		%	#.	%
TOTALS	157	100.0%	60	38.2%	97	61.7%
Male	123	78.3%	46	29.2%	77	49.0%
Female	34	21.6%	14	8.9%	20	12.7%
Black	75	47.7%	24	15.2%	51	32.4%
Black Male	50	31.8%	15	9.5%	35	22.2%
Black Female	25	15.9%	9	5.7%	16	10.1%
Latin	77	49.0%	33	21.0%	44	28.0%
Latin Male	70	44.5%	29	18.4%	41	26.1%
Latin Female	7	4.4%	4	2.5%	3	1.9%
Anglo	5	3.1%	3	1.9%	2	1.2%
Anglo Male	3	1.9%	2	1.2%	1	0.6%
Anglo Female	2	1.2%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%

NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED

	TOT	ALS .	. <u>PA</u>	<u>SSED</u>	<u>FAI</u>	LED
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS:	122	100.0%	-50	40.9%	-72	59.0%
Male	99	81.1%	38	31.1% 9.8%	61	50.0%
Female	23	18.8%	12		11	9.0%
Black	38	31.1%	8	6.5%	30	24.5%
Black Male	33	27.0%	6	4.9%	27	22.1%
Black Female	5	4.0%	2	1.6%	3	2.4%
Latin	29	23.7%	11	9.0%	18	14.7%
Latin Male	24	19.6%	9	7.3%	15	12.2%
Latin Female	5	4.0%	2	1.6%	3	2.4%
Anglo	55	45.0%	31	25.4%	24	19.6%
Anglo Male	42	34.4%	23	18.8%	19	15.5%
Anglo Female	13	10.6%	8	6.5%	5	4.0%

BLACK

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	LE CANDI	COCP DATES	ALL CANDIDA		-NON-LECOCP CANDIDATES	
	#	%	#	%	1	%
TOTALS	75	66.3%	113	100.0%	38	33.6%
Male Female	50 25	44.2% 22.1%	83 30	73.4% 26.5%	33 5	29.2% 4.4%
PASSED	24	21.2%	32	28.3%	8	7.0%
Male Female	15 9	13.2% 7.9%	21 11	18.5% 9.7%	6 2	5.3% 1.7%
AILED	51	45.1%	81	71.6%	30	. 26.5%
Male Female	35 16	30.9% 14.1%	62 19	54.8% 16.8%	27 3	23.8% 2.6%

BLACK LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

	TOT.	ALS 7	<u>PASSED</u> ∦ %	<u>F</u> 2	AILED %
TOTALS	75	100.0%	24 32.	0% 51	68.0%
Male Female	50 25	66.6% 33.3%	15 20. 9 12.	0% 35 0% 16	46.6% 21.3%

BLACK NON-LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

	TOTA	<u>LS</u>	PASSED	FAILED
	#	%	# %	# %
TOTALS	38	100.0%	8 21.0%	78.9%
Male Female	33 5	86.8% 13.1%	6 15.7% 2 5.2%	27 71.0% 3 7.8%

LATIN

CANIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	LEC - CANDII	COCP DATES	ALI CANDII			LECOCP [DATES
	#	%	#.	%	#	
TOTALS	77	72.6%	106	100.0%	29	27.3%
Male Female	70 7	66.0% 6.6%	94 12	88.6% 11.3%	24 5	22.6% 4.7%.
PASSED	. 33	31.1%	44	41.5%	11	10.3%
Male Female	29 4	27.3% 3.7%	38 6	35.8% 5.6%	9 2	8.4% 1.8%
FAILED	44	41.5%	62	58.4%	18	16.9%
Male Female	41 3	38.6% 2.8%	56 6	52.8% 5.6%	15 3 .	14.1% 2.8%

LATIN LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

The same the same was a series of the same	TOTA	LS	PASS	ED	FAI	<u>LED</u>
	#	%	#	%	**************************************	. %
TOTALS	77	100.0%	33	42.8%	- 44	57.1%
Male Female	70 7	90.9% 9.0%	29 4	37.6% 5.1%	41 3	53.2% 3.8%

LATIN NON-LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON .

	TOT	ALS	PASS		<u>FA</u>	ILED
	# #	. %	#	%	#	%
TOTALS -	29	100.0%	. 11	37.9%	18	62.0%
Male Female	24 5	82.7% 17.2%	9 2	31.0%	15 3	51.7% 10.3%

ANGLO

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	LEO CAND	COCP LDATES	AL CANDI	L DATES		LECOCP IDATES
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	5	8.3%	60	100.0%	55	91.6%
Male Female	3 2	5.0% 3.3%	45 15	75.0% 25.0%	42 13	70.0% 21.6%
PASSED	. 3	5.0%	. 34	56.6%	31	51.6%
Male Female	2 1	3.3% 1.6%	25 9	41.6% 15.0%	23 8	38.3% 13.3%
FAILED	2	3.3%	26	43.3%	24	40.0%
Male Female	1	1.6% 1.6%	20 6	33.3% 10.0%	19 5	31.6% 8.3%

ANGLO LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

	TOTA	ALS	PASS	SED	FAI	<u>LED</u> .:
	#	%	#.	%	#	%
TOTALS	5	100.0%	3	60.0%	2	40.0%
Male Female	3 2	60.0% 40.0%	2 1	40.0% 20.0%	1 1	20.0% 20.0%

ANGLO NON-LECOCP

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON.

	TOTA	LS	PASSED	The state of the s	AILED
	#	%	# %	#	%
TOTALS	 55	100.0%	31 56.	. 3% 24	43.6%
Male Female	42 13	76.3% 23.6%		.8% 19 .5% 5	34.5% 9.0%

APPENDIX II

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	LECOCP		ALL		NOT LECOCP	
	STUDENTS		CANDIDATES		STUDENTS	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	1 74	42.1%	. 413	100.0%	239	57.8%
Male	131	31.7%	306	74.0%	175	42.3%
Female	43	10.4%	107	25.9%	64	14.4%
Black	82	19.8%	190	46.0%	108	26.1%
Black Male	52	12.5%	121	29.2%	69	16.7%
Black Female	30	7.2%	69	16.7%	39	9.4%
Latin	81	19.6%	143	34.6%	62	15.0%
Latin Male	71	17.1%	127	30.7%	56	13.5%
Latin Female	10	2.4%	16	3.8%	6	1.4%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	11 8 3	2.6% 1.9% 0.7%	80 58 22	19.3% 14.0% 5.3%	69 50 19	16.7% 12.1% 4.6%
DID NOT APPEAR	26	6.2%	134	32.4%	108	26.1%
Male	15	3.6%	84	20.3%	69	16.7%
Female	11	2.6%	50	12.1%	39	9.4%
Black	18	4.3%	77	18.6%	59	14.2%
Black Male	9	2.1%	38	9.2%	29	7.0%
Black Female	9	2.1%	39	9.4%	30	7.2%
Latin	7	1.6%	37	8.9%	30	7.2%
Latin Male	5	1.2%	33	7.9%	28	6.7%
Latin Female	2	0.4%	4	0.9%	2	0.4%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	1 1 0	0.2% 0.2% 0.0%	20 13 7	4.8% 3.1% 1.6%	19 12 7	4.6% 2.9% 1.6%

LECOCP .

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

	TOT	ALS	DID N	OT APPEAR
	#	%	#	9/
TOTALS	174	100.0%	26	14.9%
Male Female	131 43	75.2% 24.7%	15 11	8.6% 6.3%
Black Black Male Black Female	82 52 30	47.1% 29.8% 17.2%	18 9 9	10.3% 5.1% 5.1%
Latin Latin Male Latin Female	81 71 10	46.5% 40.8% 5.7%	7 5 2	4.0% 2.8% 1.1%
Anglo Anglo Male Anglo Female	11 8 3	6.3% 4.5% 1.7%	1 0	0.5% 0.5% 0.0%

NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

	TOTAL	L <u>S</u> .	I	DID NOT APPEAR	
	#	%	#	%	
TOTALS	239	100.0%	108	8 45.1	
Male Female	175 64	73.2% 26.7%	69 39	9 28.8	3%
Black Black Male Black Female	108 69 39	45.1% 28.8% 16.3%	59 29 30	9 12.1	%
Latin Latin Male Latin Female	62 56 6	25.9% 23.4% 2.5%	30		1%
Anglo Anglo Male Anglo Female	69 50 19	28.8% 20.9% 7.9%	1 1)%

BLACK
CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

	LEC	OCP ENTS	ALL CANDIDA		NOT L	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	82	43.1%	190	100.0%	108	56.8%
Male Female	52 30	27.3% 15.7%	121 69	63.6% 36.3%	69 3 9	36.3% 20.5%
DID NOT APPEAR	2 18	9.4%	77.	40.5%	59	31.0%
Male Female	9 9	4.7% 4.7%	38 39	20.0% 20.5%	29 30	15.2% 15.7%

BLACK LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

•	TOTA	<u>LS</u>	DID	NOT APPEAR
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	82	100.0%	18	21.9%
Male Female	52 . 30	63.4% 36.5%	9 9	10.9% 10.9%

BLACK NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

		TOT	ALS		DID NOT APPEAR
		.#	%	#	7,
TOTALS		108	100.0%	. 59	54.6%
Male Female	•	69 39	63.8% 36.1%	29 30	26.8% 27.7%

LATIN

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

			COCP IDENTS	<u>.</u>	ALL. ANDIDATES	NO ST	TUDENTS
		#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	* .*.	81	56.6%	14	3 100.0	% 62	43.3%
Male Female		71 10	49.6% 6.9%	12	•		39.1% 4.1%
DID NOT							
DID NOT APPEAR		7	4.8%	3	7 25.85	% 30	20.9%
Male Female		5 2	3.4% 1.3%	3	3 23.0° 4 2.7°		19.5% 1.3%

LATIN LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

		ALS	DID N	OT APPEAR
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	81	100.0%	7	8.6%
Male Female	71 10	87.6% 12.3%	5 2	6.1% 2.4%

LATIN NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

	TOT	ALS .	DID	NOT APPEAR	· · · · · · ·
	#	%	·· #	%	
TOTALS	62	100.0%	30	48.	3%
Male Female	56 6	90.3%	28		1% 2%

ANGLO

CANDIDATES SCHEDULED FOR

THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

LECOCP STUDENTS			ALL NOT LECO CANDIDATES STUDENT			
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	11	13.7%	80	100.0%	69	86.2%
Male Female	8	10.0% 3.7%	58 22	72.5% 27.5%	50 19	62.5% 23.7%
DID NOT APPEAR	· 1	1.2%	20	25.0%	19	23.7%
Male Female	10	1.2%	13 7	16.2% 8.7%	12 7	15.0% 8.7%

ANGLO LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

	TOTA	ALS .		DID NOT	APPEAR
	# #	%		#	%.
TOTALS	11	100.0%	•	1	9.0%
Male Female	8 3	72.7% 27.2%		10	9.0% 0.0%

ANGLO NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS SCHEDULED FOR

	ATOT	<u>LS</u>	DID NO	T APPEAR
	#	%	#	%
TOTALS	69	100.0%	19	27.5%
			•	
Male Female	50 19	72.4 27.5%	12 7	17.3% 10.1%

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	LECO STUDE		ALI CANDII		NOT L STUD	
	#	%	#		#	%
TOTALS	148	53.0%	279	100.0%	131	46.9%
Male	116	41.5%	222	79.5%	106	37.9%
Female	32	11.4%	57	20.4%	25	8.9%
Black	64	22.9%	113	40.5%	49	17.5%
Black Male	43	15.4%	83	29.7%	40	14.3%
Black Female	21	7.5%	30	10.7%	9	3.2%
Latin	74	26.5%	106	37.9%	32	11.4%
Latin Male	66	23.6%	94	33.6%	28	10.0%
Latin Female	8	2.8%	12	4.3%	4	1.4%
Anglo	10	3.5%	60	21.5%	50	17.9%
Anglo Male	7	2.5%	45	16.1%	38	13.6%
Anglo Female	3	1.0%	15	5.3%	12	4.3%
PASSED	54	19.3%	110	39.4%	56	20.0%
Male	39	13.9%	84	30.1%	45	16.1%
Female	15	5.3%	26	9.3%	11	3.9%
Black	18	6.4%	32	11.4%	14	5.0%
Black Male	10	3.5%	21	7.5%	11	3.9%
Black Female	8	2.8%	11	3.9%	3	1.0%
Latin	30	10.7%	44	15.7%	14	5.0%
Latin Male	25	8.9%	38	13.6%	13	4.6%
Latin Female	5	1.7%	6	2.1%	1	0.3%
Anglo Male Anglo Female	6 4 2	2.1% 1.4% 0.7%	34 25 9	12.1% 8.9% 3.2%	28 21 7	10.0% 7.5% 2.5%
FAILED	94	33.6%	169	60.5%	.75	26.8%
Male	77	27.5%	138	49.4%	61	21.8%
Fcmale	17	6.0%	31	11.1%	14	5.0%

	LECOCP		AL	L	NOT LECOCP	
	STUDENTS		CANDI	DATES	STUDENTS	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Black Black Male Black Female	46 -33 -13	16.4% 11.8% 4.6%	62	29.0% 22.2% 6.8%	29	12.5% 10.3% 2.1%
Latin	44	15.7%	62	22.2%	18	6.4%
Latin Male	41	14.6%	56	20.0%	15	5.3%
Latin Female	3	1.0%	6	2.1%	3	1.0%
Anglo	4	1.4%	26	9.3%	22	7.8%
Anglo Male	3	1.0%	20	7.1%	17	6.0%
Anglo Female	1	0.3%	6	2.1%	5	1.7%

LECOCP
STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON
THE CIVIL SERVICE EXMAINATION

TOTALS			PAS	SED · : ·	<u>FAILED</u>		
	# #	. %	#	%	#.	9/	
TOTALS	148	100.0%	54	36.4%	94	63.5%	
Male	116	78.3%	39	26.3%	77	52.0%	
Female	32	21.6%	15	10.1%	17	11.4%	
Black	64	43.2%	18	12.1%	46	31.0%	
Black Male	43	29.0%	10	6.7%	33	22.2%	
Black Female	21	14.1%	8	5.4%	13	8.7%	
Latin	74	50.0%	30	20.2%	44	29.7%	
Latin Male	66	44.5%	25	16.8%	41	27.7%	
Latin Female	8	5.4%	5	3.3%	3	2.0%	
Anglo Male Anglo Female	10	6.7%	6	4.0%	4	2.7%	
	7	4.7%	4	2.7%	3	2.0%	
	3	2.0%	2	1.3%	1	0.6%	

NOT LECOCP
STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON
THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

TOTALS		<u>S</u>	PASS	ED	FAILED		
	#	%	# :	%	#	%	
OTALS	131	100.0%	56	42.7%	75	57.2%	
lale Female	106 25	80.9% 19.0%	45 11	34.2% 8.3%	61 14	46.5% 10.6%	
olack Slack Male Slack Female	49 40 9	37.4% 30.5% 6.8%	14 11 3	10.6% 8.3% 2.2%	35 29 6	26.7% 22.1% 4.5%	
Latin Male Latin Female	32 28 4	24.4% 21.3% 3.0%	14 13 1	10.6% 9.9% 0.7%	18 15 3	13.7% 11.4% 2.2%	
inglo Male Inglo Female	50 38 12	38.1% 29.0% 9.1%	28 21 7	21.3% 16.0% 5.3%	22 17 5	16.7% 12.9% 3.8%	

BLACK CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	LECOCP	STUDENTS	ALI CANDI	DATES	NON-	LECOCP ENTS
TOTALS	#	%	#	%	#	%
	64	56.6%	113	100.0%	49	43.3%
Male	43	38.0%	83	73.4%	40	35.3%
Female	21	18.5%	30	26.5%	9	7.9%
PASSED	18	15.9%	32	28.3%	14	12.3%
Male	10	8.8%	2 <u>1</u>	18.5%	11	9.7%
Female	8	7.0%	11	9.7%	3	2.6%
FAILED	46	40.7%	81	71.6%	3 5	30.9%
Male	33	29.2%	62	54.8%	29	25.6%
Female	13	11.5%	19	16.8%	6	5.3%

BLACK LECOCP STUDENTS WHO

COMPETED ON THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	TOTALS		PASS	SED .		FAILED	
Tarana da Arana da Arana Arana da Arana da Arana da Arana Arana da Arana da Arana da Arana da Arana	# 9	,	#	%	#	%	
TOTALS	64 10	0.0%	18	28.1%	46	71.8%	
Male	43 6	57.1%	10	15.6%	33	51.5%	
Female .	21 3	32.8%	8	12.5%	13	20.3%	

BLACK NON-LECOCP STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON THE CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION

	TOTA	<u>LS</u>	PASSED	FAILED
	#	.%	# %	
TOTALS	49	100.0%	14 28.5%	
		•		
Male Female	40 0	81.6% 18.3%	11 22.4% 3 6.1%	

LATIN ... CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

		LECOCP TUDENTS			ALL CANDIDATES			NOT LECOCP STUDENTS		
	#	%		#	%	#		%		
TOTALS	7.4	69.8%		106	100.0%	3:	2	30.1%		
Male Female	66 8	· 62.2% 7.5%		94 12	88.6% 11.3%	2	3 4	26.4% 3.7%		
PASSED	30	28.3%		44	41.5%	14	4	13.2%		
Male Female	25 5.	23.5% 4.7%		38 6	35.8% 5.6%	1		12.2% 0.9%		
	•									
FAILED	44	41.5%		62	58.4%	1	3	16.9%		
Male Female	41 3	38.6% 2.8%		56 6	52.8% 5.6%	1		14.1% 2.8%		

LATIN LECOCP

STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON

TOTALS		PASSED	FAILED
# %	#	%	# %
<u>TOTALS</u> .74 100.0%	30	0 40.5%	59.4%
Male 66 89.1% Female 8 10.8%	2	33.7% 6.7%	41 55.4% 3 4.0%

LATIN NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON

	TOT	ALS		P	ASSED		FA	ILED	
	- #	%		#	%		# :	%	
TOTALS -	::32	100.0%	•	14	43.77	6	18	56.2%	
Male Female	28 4	87.5% 12.5%		13 1	40.6% 3.1%		15 .3	46.8% 9.3%	

ANGLO

CANDIDATES WHO COMPETED ON

STUDENTS			ALL DIDATES	STUDENTS		
	#	%		%	#	· % ·
TOTALS	10	16.6%	60	100.0%	50	83.3%
Male Female	7 3	11.6% 5.0%	45 15	75.0% 25.0%	38 12	63.3% 20.0%
PASSED	6	10.0%	34	56.6%	28	46.6%
Male Fcmale	4 2	6.6% 3.3%	25 9	41.6% 15.0%	2 <u>1</u> 7	35.0% 11.6%
FALED	4.	6.6%	26	43.3%	22	36.6%
Male Female	3 1	5.0% 1.6%	20 6	33.3% 10.0%	17 5	28.3% 8.3%

ANGLO LECOCP

STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON

	TOTALS	PASSED	FAILED
	# %	# %	# %
TOTALS	10 100.0%	6 60.0%	40.0%
Male Female	7 70.0% 3 30.0%	4 40.0% 2 20.0%	3 30.0% 1 10.0%

ANGLO NOT LECOCP

STUDENTS WHO COMPETED ON

	TOTALS	PAS	SSED	FAILED	_
	# %-	#	%	# %	
TOTALS	50 100.0%	28	56.0%	22 44.0)%
Male Female	38 76.0% 12 24.0%	21 7	42.0% 14.0%	17 34.0 5 10.0	

#