FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

GENDER DIVERSITY IN FLORIDA STATE GOVERNMENT:

An analysis of options to break the glass ceiling at the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

AN ACTION REPORT SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

REUBIN O’ D. ASKEW SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY

BY

MONICA RAE HARDY

Tallahassee, Florida
April 2003
April 16, 2003

Mr. Dave McElveen
Program Development Administrator
Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
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Dear Mr. McElveen:

I have the honor to submit to you Gender Diversity in Florida State Governments: An analysis of options to break the glass ceiling at the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The report is the product of extensive research and analysis. Diversity at Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission is important because a diverse workforce offers the agency unique and innovative ways to solve agency problems.

Having examined several options, my recommendation is that the agency should first focus on implementing a mentoring program. This policy option is recommended based on three evaluative criteria: implementation cost, agency feasibility, and political desirability. In summary, the mentoring program scores highly on the implementation cost and moderately on the agency feasibility and political desirability. The mentoring program scores well, because there are not costs associated with implementation. There are two feasibility drawbacks-- leaders taking the time to be mentors and union involvement. The mentoring program is the starting point for the agency to implement a diversity plan. The other three policy options can be implemented gradually. When the mentoring program recruits more executive-level female employees, implementation of the other three options will be easier.

Yours truly,

Monica Hardy
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is important to create gender diversity in state agencies. Agencies such as the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission have an untapped resource of employees. Executive-level women could bring the agency new ideas about how to solve complex problems. It is important that the workforce culture is not homogenous. A homogeneous workforce results in implementation of similar strategic plans. Diverse decision-making employees will discuss the same problem and develop numerous different solutions.

Information for this report was collected using three methods. First, academic literature was analyzed to provide insight into the glass ceiling problem at a state agency level and at a fish and wildlife culture level. Second, Florida Fish and Wildlife personnel records were reviewed to find out the percentages of executive-level women and women employees in general. Third, applicable laws were reviewed to determine how the agency was formed and any requirements on developing agency policies. Fourth, interviews were conducted with eight agency staff members, a representative from the Florida Commission on the Status of Women, the Director of the Becoming an Outdoors Woman, and a representative from the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies Management Assistance Team. Last, the author attended the 68th North American Wildlife Conference.

This report presents four policy options for fish and wildlife agencies: Internship Program, Mentoring Program, Promotional Campaign, and a Recruitment Program. Each
option is evaluated against three evaluative criteria: implementation cost, agency
feasibility, and political desirability.

Based on the assessment of the four options using the three evaluative criteria a
mentoring program is recommended. A mentoring program would be the most viable
option to increase the percentage of executive-level women at Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission.
I. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The 2002 Florida statutes defines the purpose of the Florida Civil Rights Act of 1992:

To secure for all individuals within the state freedom from discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or marital status and thereby to protect their interest in personal dignity, to make available to the state their full productive capacities, to secure the state against domestic strife and unrest, to preserve the public safety, health, and general welfare, and to promote the interests, rights, and privileges of individuals within the state (Florida Civil Rights Act, Chapter 760).

However, the purpose of the Act cannot be achieved when there are obstacles to women obtaining equal employment opportunities. One of these obstacles is the glass ceiling: “a concept that betrays America’s most cherished principles. It is the unseen, yet unbreachable barrier that keeps minorities and women from rising to the upper rungs of the corporate ladder, regardless of their qualifications or achievements” (Glass Ceiling Commission Report, 1995).

Even though women make up 46.5 percent of the national workforce, only 12 percent are corporate officers (Dingell & Maloney, 2002). The glass ceiling affects two-thirds of the American population and it causes a serious economic problem that takes a financial toll on business (Glass Ceiling Commission Report, 1995). Almost all economic growth occurs in one-fifth of the wealthiest households. Incomes for the poor decrease and incomes in the middle class stagnate. The problem is that the breadwinners in the wealthiest American households are white males. Many of the middle and low class households are dual income households or single women are bringing in the only income (Kerr, Miller & Reid, 2002). This unequal distribution of wealth demonstrates the obstacles that women and minority employees face. America boasts its land of the free yet women are struggling to be promoted to executive level positions in the workforce.
In state agencies there appears to be segregation of men and women employees. An analysis of state agencies reveals that most women work at redistributive agencies and that discrimination in the hiring and promotion of women is most severe in distributive and regulatory agencies (Kerr et al., 2002). Currently, these agencies are segregated by gender and there is a glass ceiling making it hard for women to be hired and promoted at these types of agencies (Kerr et al, 2002). The responsibilities of Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC) make the agency both distributive and regulatory. Therefore, it is a candidate for this analysis.

Since government is a major player in the drive to break the glass ceiling, state agencies must lead by example (Glass Ceiling Commission Report, 1995). The problem is distributive and regulatory agencies are not setting a good example. A majority of managers in these agencies are male. Currently at the Commission there are only three women in executive level positions and only 28 percent of employees are female (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003). These statistics indicate that there is a significant difference in the number of men and women in manager-level positions within the Commission.

This report will examine three policy options that will help FFWCC promote more women to managerial positions. Before examining these, the historical background of the agency and gender policy will be reviewed. Following this review, evaluative criteria will be used to determine which policy would be more successful for the Commission. The purpose of this action report is to analyze FFWCC and suggest ways to recruit and promote women into and within the agency.
II. BACKGROUND & LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

Five topics need to be examined to understand the background of glass ceilings in FFWCC: the history of women’s roles in the workforce, what contributes to glass ceilings within agencies, the evolution of FFWCC, the privatization of government services and the status of women in Florida compared to other states.

First, in order to understand the emergence of glass ceilings, it is vital to know the historical background of women in the workforce. Large numbers of American women began to work during World War II. Between 1950 and 1960, women with full time jobs earned an average of 59-64 cents for every dollar their male counterparts performing identical job duties (Infante, 2001).

There have been three federal Acts that impacted women in the workforce. On June 10, 1963 the Equal Pay Act made it illegal to pay women lower rates for the same job strictly based on their sex. Since then employer gender discrimination has reduced. The Act is still considered one of the best attempts to help women be equal to men in the workforce (Crampton, Hodge & Mishra, 1997). The following year the Civil Rights Act of 1964 eliminated job discrimination in such areas as hiring, job assignments and promotions.

The Civil Rights Act of 1991 created the Glass Ceiling Commission (GCC). The mission of the GCC was to conduct a study and prepare recommendations to eliminate barriers to the advancement of women and minorities, to increase the opportunities of women and minorities, and to foster the advancement of women and minorities to management and decision making positions in business.
The public sector prides itself on being an equal opportunity employer. Florida state agencies strive to treat all employees equitably. They claim that employees are not hired based on race, color and/or gender. However these agencies, such as FFWCC and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to name a few, are unable to attract women employees. Males tend to be more interested in distributive and regulatory job duties whereas females tend to be interested in redistributive job duties (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003).

Second, there are three issues that contribute to the glass ceiling within state agencies; the gender pay gap, the lack of women in executive-level positions, and sexual harassment (De Laat, 1999). First, statistics demonstrate that although women have been in the workforce for over 50 years, their wages still equal three-fourths of their male counterparts (De Laat, 1999). Due to this gap, many women live below poverty level and accept government assistance.

Another contribution to the glass ceiling is that few women have executive-level positions, so women do not have enough career support. In a study conducted on fish and wildlife agency professionals, women felt that the workplace supported men more regarding career development, advice from supervisors and preferential promotion treatment (Angus, 1995). At the Commission men recruit and promote other men because they feel more comfortable working with someone that is like them (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003).

The final contribution is sexual harassment in the workforce. Because the majority of high-level executives are male, many use power to demand sexual favors in exchange for promoting and/or hiring a woman. Many experts believe that if there were more women in high-level positions, the incidences of sexual harassment would decrease. Due to this decrease, many women would be comfortable going to another women if they wanted to be hired and/or
promoted. Currently, many women who are qualified for a position are overlooked, because they are unwilling to partake in sexual favors (Bell, McLaughlin and Sequeira, 2002). The same study conducted on fish and wildlife professionals indicated over 71 percent of women in the fish and wildlife field felt they would receive negative effects if they reported sexual harassment (Angus, 1995). All of these factors make it hard for women within state agencies to break the glass ceiling.

Next, it is important to understand the history of the FFWCC. On July 1, 1999 the Commission was created by a constitutional amendment. The legislature combined all of the staff and commissioners of the former Marine Fisheries Commission, elements of the Division of Marine Resources and Law Enforcement of the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and all of the employees and Commissioners of the former Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission. This made the function of the organization both regulatory (DEP law enforcement) and distributive (Game and Freshwater Fish Commission) (Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Act, Ch. 99-245, 1999). Article IV, Section 9 of the Florida Constitution, amended in 1998, provides that there shall be a Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC). The FFWCC’s mission is to manage fish and wildlife resources for their long-term well being and the benefit of the people. Not only does FFWCC manage natural resources, the agency is responsible for boating safety and navigation.

Distributive agencies typically 1) handle highways and bridges, 2) manage state lands, 3) operate parks and recreational facilities and, 4) develop and manage water resources. Regulatory agencies usually provide safety services such as policing, operate prisons, and regulate businesses. Typical redistributive functions include management of public welfare programs,
employment security, mental health and retardation programs, and programs for the aging (Kerr et al., 2002).

Historically, the Game and Freshwater Fish Commission was known as the “good old boy network” (S. Hardin, personal communication, March 2003). When the constitutional amendment came into effect the Game and Freshwater Fish Commission brought a majority of male employees were unable promote women because there were few women employed (S. Hardin, personal communication, February 2003). However, DEP employed qualified women and made it possible for FFWCC to have women employees that could be promoted. It is evident that women appear to be more interested in marine biology.

This interest makes it hard for the Commission to find women interested in hunting and fresh water fishing (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003). Three years later when surveying agency divisions that used to be part of the Game and Freshwater Fish Commission, it is evident that a majority of employees are still male. As of February 11, 2003, 72 percent of FFWCC employees are male and 28 percent are female (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003). According to a report from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, Management Assistance Team, many fish and wildlife agencies nod their head in agreement when discussing diversity but in reality there is very little commitment to the issue (Angus, 1996). The study on fish and wildlife professionals indicated that 33 percent of women felt that an unmet need at work was career development (Angus, 1995).

The fourth topic is the privatization of governmental services. The personnel director at the Commission mentioned that Governor Bush’s policies to privatize services such as the personnel and administrative functions hinders the agency’s ability to hire women (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003). Over the years the percentage of men working in the
public sector decreased and the percentage of women increased. The public sector provides women higher wages and better access to health benefits and pension plans. (Bernhardt & Dresser, 2002). After analyzing Governor Bush’s privatization movement, it is apparent that he also wants to privatize state agency functions that men typically work in such as the correctional system. Hoffman suggested this possibility because the Governor’s privatization plans would reduce the percentage of women at the Commission. The Administrative Services Division’s employees are mostly female. This Division is scheduled to be privatized and will cause the percentage of women employees at the Commission to reduce.

The Institute for Women’s Policy Research report indicated that the privatization of government services would hurt women workers (Bernhardt & Dresser, 2002). “Even though, the public sector is far from a perfectly fair employer—glass ceilings and the gender gap in pay persists as in the private sector—this analysis finds that privatization and the de-unionization that frequently accompanies it, is likely to prove detrimental to the economic welfare of women workers (Bernhardt & Dresser, 2002, p. vi). According to this report the privatization of government services would have a negative impact on women in the workforce. The privatization movement is contributing to the reduction of female employees at the Commission, and negatively affecting state agencies as a whole. Therefore, although other agencies such as the Department of Corrections are being privatized, the overall affect of this movement negatively impacts women.

Finally, it is important to compare the status of women in Florida to other states. The Status of Women in the States Report indicates that there are not any states that have policies that ensure equal rights for women (Caiazza, 2002-2003). The question is how does Florida compare to other states. This report rates the status of women in five areas: political
participation, employment and earnings, social and economic autonomy, reproductive rights, and health and well-being. For the purposes of this paper, the only area discussed is employment and earnings. In order to rank the states employment and earnings status, the report analyzed four topics: women’s earnings, the female/male earnings ratio, women’s labor force participation, and the industries and occupations in which women work. Women in mountain states and the South Central states tend to score poorly. Although the other topics are important, the problem here is the lack of women in executive level positions. The most important topic to analyze is women’s participation in the labor force. Florida has the lowest percentage of women in the labor force at 55.7 percent. The percentage of executive-level women is in the bottom third percentile of all states (Caiazza, 2002-2003). These percentages indicate that the glass ceiling is a problem and policies need to be implemented to get the state in the upper percentiles.

The knowledge of FFWCC, the contributors to the glass ceiling, the history of females in the workforce, the analysis of privatization policies and the status of working women in Florida is important background information and assists with the analysis of the agency and policy options.

**Literature Review**

An analysis of literature can assist in understanding the glass ceiling in state agencies. The pertinent literature addresses four themes: results of gender discrimination in the workforce, how the glass ceiling negatively affects women and the employer, how the glass ceiling relates to public sector employment practices and the glass ceiling in Florida.

The first theme is the results of gender discrimination in the workforce. Authors indicate there are numerous results when there is gender discrimination in the workplace (Bell et al., 2002; Angus, 1995; Kerr, Brink, Miller and Reid, 2002; Naff, 1995). One result is sexual
harassment. Several authors claim at least half of all US women will be sexually harassed during some point of their career (Bell et al. 2002; Kerr et al., 2002). These authors confirm that sexual harassment contributes to the sex segregation at work. Women enter careers that are predominately female to avoid sexual harassment (Bell et al., 2002 Kerr et al., 2002). Women in male-dominated environments experience sexual harassment when males are attempting to deter women from entering historically male jobs (Bell et al., 2002).

The second result is the glass ceiling in the workplace. Opinions of authors researching the glass ceiling differ on the reasons why there are so few women in executive level positions within state government. Some research claims that women could not advance to executive-level positions because women bear children. When women have children the focus is on the child not on work advancement (DeLaat, 1999). Another reason is women’s lack of education (Fisher, 2002). However, there are more women college graduates than men. Other authors had a different opinion of the glass ceiling. They claim that women face invisible barriers that keep them from advancing. Some of these barriers include gender stereotypes, the insufficient number of women available to fill executive level positions, and lack of top management commitment to gender equity and equal employment initiatives (De Laat, 1999; Angus, 1996).

Extensive research has been conducted on the glass ceiling in the natural resource field. Some women who have been in the natural resources field for years refer to this as the “krypton” ceiling (S. Guynn, personal communication, March, 2003). Dr. Guynn conducts extensive research regarding the “krypton” ceiling. In one of her reports, she indicates that due to the cultural uniqueness of fish and wildlife agencies, they tend to be “clannish” (Guynn, 2002). When employees are culturally the same, there is an absence of different ideas to solve complex problems. The clan-like cultural does not permit change, therefore it is nearly impossible for
women to advance to executive-level positions (Guynn, 2002). In order for this to change, executive-level employees do not just need to nod their head in agreement to diversity but actually be proactive in developing policies to create workforce diversity (Angus, 1996).

The third result is the gender pay gap. One author claims that some researchers believe that the reason women are not equally paid is due to their lack of experience in the workforce, the time they are willing to work, time they take off for child bearing, and women’s personality of not being able to negotiate higher pay (De Laat, 1999). Other literature indicates women cannot work long hours like their male counterparts, because they bear children and typically take care of the family. For instance, the Economic Policy Foundation indicates that single women without children earn slightly more than their male counterparts (Fisher, 2002). One author indicates the glass ceiling is caused by the failure of organizations to develop policies in the workplace and in society as a whole that support working mothers (Hewlett, 2002). The pay gap and glass ceiling fits together like a puzzle. Employers can believe that because women are paid less than men, their work product is not equal. Also, the glass ceiling is relative to the pay gap. If women are not advancing within the workforce then of course there is going to be a gender pay gap.

The second theme is how the glass ceiling negatively affects women and the employer. Most authors agree that the glass ceiling causes women to not be able to support themselves as well as men (Fisher, 2002; DeLaat, 1999). For the most part, this affects women who are single with children. For instance, a certain percentage of poverty would be reduced if there were not a gender pay gap. Authors did disagree on how the glass ceiling affects employers. Some authors claim that promoting women in the workforce creates employer diversity (Bell et al, 2002; Brink et al. 2002). This would allow employers to develop diverse problem solving techniques. Other
authors claim that research indicates that the glass ceiling is the feminist ploy to get women advanced through the workforce (Fisher, 2002; Infante, 2001).

The third theme is how the glass ceiling affects public sector employment practices. Authors state that since other employers mimic public sector practices, then the public sector should be the first to implement policies to break the glass ceiling (Bell et al; Naff, 1995). Further opinions indicate that women in high-level state government positions could change the mentality of government (Stanley and Jarrell, 1998). One report analyzes the parallel between women representation in elected office and women-friendly policy (Caiauzza 2002). This report found that the relationship between women-friendly policy and women’s representation is very strong. “States with higher levels of women’s representation also have more women friendly policies” (Caiauzza, 2002, p. 2). More women representation in the Florida legislature could lead to the development of women-friendly policies to assist with the shattering of the glass ceiling.

The final theme addressed in the literature is the status of women in Florida. The Status of Women in the States report measures the overall status of women in five areas; political participation, employment and earnings, social and economic autonomy, reproductive rights and health and well-being. All 50 states were placed in the top, middle or bottom third percentile. For these five areas Florida always ranked in the middle or bottom third percentile. Florida ranked in the middle third percentile for the areas of employment and earnings and reproductive rights. The state ranked in the bottom third percentile in the areas of political participation, social and economic autonomy and health and well-being. These results indicate that Florida needs to focus on developing polices that improve the status of women.

In summary, the literature indicates numerous reasons to examine policy options to break the glass ceiling in Florida agencies, more specifically in fish and wildlife agencies. However,
the literature does not evaluate policy options to break the glass ceiling. The present study builds upon this literature by using specific criteria to critically evaluate three leading alternatives.
III. METHODOLOGY & EVALUATION CRITERIA

Methodology

The information and data for this report was collected using the following methods:


- Review of legislation and policies from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (www.eeoc.gov), the state of Florida (www.myflorida.com) and FFWCC (www.floridaconservation.org). The analysis consists of the author’s previous knowledge of the agency (as an employee), researching statutes and laws that created the agency, agency personnel reports that indicate the percentage of women in executive-level positions and comparing this to the percentage of executive-level men.

- Review of the Status of Women in the States Report and other status of women reports specific to women employment in fish and wildlife agencies.

- Thirty-minute unstructured interviews with the appropriate agency representatives, non-profit organizations and interest groups. Interviews with agency representatives include: the Executive Director of FFWCC, three female executives, the director of the planning department who implements policy, interviews with two of the Commission’s male executives and an interview with the Commission’s personnel director. Non-profit and interests group interviews include: an interview with a representative from the Florida Commission on the Status of Women, an interview with a representative from Becoming an Outdoors Woman (BOW). To receive a viewpoint from a federal level, US Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance Team representative, Dr. Sally Guyn was interviewed.

- Attendance of the North American Environmental Conference where environmental policy makers meet annually to discuss problems and how to solve them.

Academic literature and reports found in databases provided different viewpoints on the causes of the glass ceiling and whether or not the glass ceiling is a problem in state agencies. The review of legislation and policies provided a historical background and described the evolution of women in the workforce. Laws and statutes were reviewed to discover information about the creation of FFWCC and certain acts passed to ensure women equality. The agency’s Department of Personnel employment records were used to calculate the percentage of women in the agency, more specifically the percentage of women in executive level positions.
The status of women reports allowed a comparison of women employment in Florida to other states. Research on the status of fish and wildlife agency employees provided insight into obstacles to women in the fish and wildlife field.

Interviews with agency employees (n=eight) provided qualitative research and assisted with the analysis of policy options. These interviews were 20-30 minutes of questions and answers. The interviewees were asked to comment on the problem and to explain any barriers that women in the organization might have. After questions, they were asked to comment on the four policy options and the strengths and weaknesses of each policy. Each subject was an expert on policy implementation in the agency. An interview with a representative from the Florida Commission on the Status of Women provided a general viewpoint of improving the status of women in Florida. Interviews with US Fish and Wildlife Services Management Assistance Team provided insight into obstacles women face specific to fish and wildlife organizations at a national level.

An interview with a representative from Becoming an Outdoors Woman, a non-profit organization that offers an outdoor skills program for women to learn and become interested in outdoor hobbies such as fishing, boating, hunting, bird watching and canoeing, provided expertise on how to recruit women into a fish and wildlife based program. In addition this interview gave expert opinions on developing a program that successfully gets women interested in outdoor hobbies. The author attended a North American Environmental Conference where policy actors not normally accessible were informally interviewed about policy options to solve the problem. At this conference Directors from conservation agencies nationwide, non-profit organizations (Recreational Fishing and Boating Foundation, Becoming an Outdoors Woman, National Rifle Association, Wildlife Society, International Association of Fish and Wildlife...
Agencies etc.), the US Fish and Wildlife Services policymakers and representatives from the US Department of Interior were available to give their expert opinions.

**Evaluation Criteria**

Three criteria were used to evaluate the proposed policy options: implementation cost, agency feasibility, and political desirability.

- The expense of implementation is the cost to deploy the policy agency wide. Definition of costs includes personnel, materials and supplies and contractor costs (for example personnel cost would be the amount of money necessary to provide staff to adequately fund the implementation). If the expense is high, the agency is not likely to effectively implement the policy. The data source is interviews with executive employees at the Commission. Each option is ranked low, moderate or high. The cost that ranks high will be the least expensive and the cost ranking low will be the most expensive.

- Agency feasibility is defined by employee acceptance of the policy, if the policy solves the problem without changing the structure of the agency and if it recruits more women into executive-level positions, it is more likely to be implemented. Also, if executive-level employees make implementation a priority it is more likely to be successful. If the acceptance for implementation is low and the structure of the agency has to be changed to implement than the policy is not feasible. More importantly, if executive-level staff does not believe in the benefits of implementation than the policy will not succeed. The data source is interviews conducted with agency staff. For each option, feasibility ranks low, moderate or high. The option with a low rank will be the least feasible.

- Political Desirability is defined by whether the policy parallels existing policies implemented by the Senate, House and Executive branch and how interests groups such
as Becoming an Outdoors Woman (BOW) interpret the success of a particular policy. An example of a policy reinforcing the legislature is the mentoring policy, because Governor Bush encourages mentoring. The data source for this method is responses from Jackie Fauls, Legislative Director, Diane Luek, BOW program director James James, a representative from Florida Commission on the Status of Women, and Dr. Sally Guyn, US Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance Team. Politically Desirability will be ranked low, moderate or high. An option with a low score is not politically desirable.

- Other criteria such as effectiveness and efficiency were not used in this qualitative analysis, because effectiveness is measured with agency feasibility criterion and efficiency is measured by the agency cost criterion.

One limitation to this study is the lack of reports on the executive level women employed by the state of Florida. Reports such as the Status of Women in the States were analyzed to gauge how women employees in Florida compared to other states. Unfortunately, this report did not break down its findings into public and private sectors.
IV. MANAGEMENT POLICY OPTIONS

Section IV explains four policy options that could increase the number of executive-level women at Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission—an agency internship program, an agency mentoring program, a promotional campaign to encourage women to participate in fish and wildlife activities and a recruitment effort to recruit women to work at the agency. Each alternative is evaluated using the criteria explained in the previous section: cost implementation, agency feasibility and political desirability.

The goal of this section is to suggest policy options to decision makers in an attempt to increase the number of women in executive level positions within the agency. Another possible option is to implement all four of the policies. The Commission on the Status of Women representative felt this was the only way to solve the problem at FFWCC (J. James, personal communication, March, 2003). However, the purpose of this paper is to select the “best” possible option, not to suggest implementing all options. Unfortunately, state agency budgets incrementally change so the cost factor of implementing all three options makes it impossible. Although, “the glass ceiling will be shattered in the new millennium only through a strategy that uses small wins—incremental changes aimed at biases so entrenched in the system that they’re not even noticed until they’re gone” (Meyerson and Fletcher, 2000, p. 69). When analyzing each suggested option it is important to remember incremental changes tend to be successful in state agencies. Incremental state budgets and policies can work together to eventually break the glass ceiling.
Option One: Internship Program

Many organizations implement an internship program to attract students and train them at a young age to become an asset to the organization. FFWCC does not have an agency-wide internship program. It does receive numerous inquiries from interested students. When these students call, there is not a program for them unless they would like to be an OPS employee and OPS employees typically perform clerical duties (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February, 2003). A part of the agency, the Florida Marine Research Institute, has an internship program that is successful and could be used as an example to develop an agency-wide program (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003).

Internships should benefit both the agency and the intern. The internship program would be implemented in 11 Divisions/Offices. Employees within Divisions/Offices would be asked to volunteer to oversee an intern. The employee volunteers should have a particular project that the intern can assist with. The number of interns depends on the need of each Division/Office. The interns must be enrolled in post secondary education, have at least a 2.5 G.P.A and be receiving college credit for the internship. Interns will be required to work 10-15 hours a week for one 16-week semester and would receive a small stipend ($500 for the semester). At the end of the internship, interns will be required to do a presentation at a seminar for agency staff.

Agency Cost

In order to implement the proposed program the cost of implementation is moderate. The interns must have the qualifications listed above so a screening process is needed. The screening process takes employee time.

Executive-level agency personnel indicated that an internship program would not be too costly. The only cost that the Legislative Director could think of was the cost of the intern’s
desk, computer and office space (J. Fauls, personal communication, February, 2003). This is a relatively low cost. There is no indication that the program would require additional personnel hours or the hours of an outside contractor. In fact, the interns would be assisting employees and reducing the time spent on specific projects (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February 2003).

The stipend would give the interns a benefit and allow them to stay in the program long enough to learn about the agency (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003). The Executive Director suggested a stipend, and he indicated that funding this stipend would not be hard to find in the budget.

Personnel would take time from their normal duties to screen an applicant, which costs the agency money. A cost would be materials and supplies but these costs are minimal. The agency would not have to hire a contractor to implement this policy. However, they would have to give the intern a stipend. The stipend cost is low compared to contractor cost. Therefore, this policy cost is moderate.

**Agency Feasibility**

Agency feasibility is defined by employee acceptance, if the policy solves the problem without changing the agency structure, if it recruits more women into executive-level positions and implementation is a priority of executive-level employees. According to Ken Hadad and Scott Hardin, the only way an internship program would be feasible is if the supervisor hosts the intern and there is a specific project the intern can work on for a specific length of time. (S. Hardin & K. Hadad, personal communication, February 2003). Therefore in order for this policy to be accepted by employees, the agency must not require employees to host an intern.
An internship program would not change the structure of the agency. Divisions/Offices would not be changed or eliminated. The only change would be an addition of an intern to the particular Division/Office. The next question that measures feasibility is will an internship program recruit more women into executive level positions? A program could assist in recruiting students, but there is not a guarantee that these interns will be female (K. Hadad, personal communication, February 2003). Since the FMRI internship program is successful, it is more likely that the structure of the agency would not change to implement an internship program.

The final measurement is where the internship program ranks as a priority on executive level employees’ agenda. Scott Wiley indicated that due to all his other job duties, it would be hard for him to find the time to dedicate towards an internship program (personal communication, February 2003). However, the Executive Director indicated that if this option would work, then he would be willing to make sure the resources were there to successfully implement the internship program (K. Hadad, personal communication, February 2003). The internship program is feasible as long as there are employees that want to volunteer to host an intern and executive-level employees make the internship program a priority.

**Political Desirability**

Political desirability is defined a few ways-- if current legislation parallels with an agency wide internship program. For example, if legislation is implemented that requires all state agencies to implement an internship program. The second way it is defined is if interests groups support the program, because they believe it is has the potential to increase the number of women in executive level positions at FFWCC. According to Jackie Fauls, Legislative Director, the only question legislators would ask is how much the option will cost to implement (J. Fauls, personal communication, February, 25, 2003). The Executive Director indicated that he could
find the money in the existing budget, so there are not any legislative obstacles to implementing the internship program (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003).

An interview with the interest group, Becoming an Outdoors Woman, indicated that an internship program would be desirable, but it might not successfully target women. Assistant Director, Diane Lueck indicated that the best way to get more women employed at the Commission is to get women interested in the goals of the agency (personal communication, March, 2003). Therefore this program does not appear to be as politically desirable as other options.

In summary, the costs associated with the internship program are moderate which gives this criterion a moderate score. The feasibility criterion also receives a moderate score because there is not a guarantee that the program will recruit females. Political desirability receives a low score because interests groups feel it is not a program designed to meet the needs of females.

**Option Two: Mentoring Program**

Governor Bush encourages state employees to take the time to be mentors (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003). This program would differ from Governor Bush’s, because agency employees would not be mentors for school aged children. Instead, the program would be implemented just in the agency. Current agency leaders would be asked to choose employees that have leadership potential. Leaders would then guide them through the agency. Program participants and mentors would monthly meet as a group to speak about obstacles they encounter at work. Participants would have someone to go to and talk about the obstacles they encounter. Leaders would discuss perceived obstacles with employees and how to overcome these obstacles. One part of overcoming these obstacles would be for the mentor to introduce the
potential leader to other executive-level employees that can help them be promoted through the agency. These executive-level employees would have the same interest as the potential leader and communicate their agency experience to the participant.

According to Angus, fish and wildlife female employees felt they need more opportunities for career development (1996). Cindy Hoffman stated that men feel comfortable with other men so they tend to hire men. A mentoring program gives both genders an opportunity. Having a program gives women a place to network with leaders that can guide career development. A survey discovered that men and women in natural resources feel there are not enough female professionals to serve as role models for young women entering the natural resources field (Angus, 1995). This program would serve as a network group to increase the confidence of future leaders.

Agency Cost

The cost of implementing an agency wide mentor program is low. There are not any personnel costs. Leaders would be asked to select an employee on a volunteer basis. The agency would not have to purchase materials or supplies. Since the agency is utilizing existing employees to mentor there is not any contractor costs.

Agency Feasibility

FFWCC leaders realize that the agency is not diverse and policies need to be implemented to increase diversity. Therefore, leaders may accept the policy and participate. Future leaders would accept the policy because having a mentor makes advancing through the agency more easily. They would look up to their mentors and feel privileged to be recognized. According to Sandra Porter, a mentoring program would give her the opportunity to reach out to future leaders (personal communication, February, 2003). The structure of the agency would not
have to change to implement policy except that agency leaders would have to find the time to be a mentor (S. Porter, personal communication, February, 2003). This program would give mentors a chance to reach out to other Divisions to recognize an employee that interests them and form a bond with that employee (S. Porter, personal communication, February 2003).

The mentoring program would successfully recruit women if leaders made it a priority to reach out to females. Also, if female executive-level employees participated in the program future leaders would recognize that women at the agency can succeed. The issue of time also relates to executive-level employees making implementation a priority. Agency leaders need to agree that the policy will recruit more women into executive-level positions. They need reach out to these potential leaders and make mentoring them a priority. According to Ken Hadad, this is the best policy, because it gives the agency the ability to train leaders (personal communication, February 2003). Having the Executive Director endorse the policy indicates that it would be a priority for agency leaders. Overall the only feasibility problem is leaders making the time to be mentors.

**Political Desirability**

The policy reinforces policies already implemented by the legislature. However, the Executive Director indicated that one impediment is the involvement of unions (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003). If the agency only recruited women and minorities into the mentoring program, than the union would say that the agency was not treating employees equally. The director also indicated that the program could not exclude male involvement because that is against the law. The program could focus on women and minorities, but it could not be the sole purpose. The purpose of the program would need to be to select diverse agency leaders (C. Hoffman, personal communication, February, 2003).
The BOW program demonstrates that when women reach out to other women it is a success. This is not to say that men cannot successfully reach out to other women. Diane Lueck also stated that women witness other successful women in this program and they reach out to each other. Having the support of someone who understands what you are going through makes less complicated (personal communication, March, 2003). The Florida Commission on the Status of Women felt that a mentoring program would give women the opportunity to meet with leaders and voice their opinions regarding advancement obstacles (J. James, personal communication, March, 2003). The only issue identified as not politically desirable was the involvement of unions. Unions might feel that a mentoring program specifically focused on women and minorities is not treating the white male employee equal. However, if the program could be structured so the purpose was to diversify the agency versus promoting women and minorities, this would not create a problem. When analyzing the other measures of political desirability, there are not any drawbacks.

Overall, the mentoring program receives a high score when measuring cost. The only hindrance to feasibility is the time constraint, giving this policy a moderate feasibility score. The possible involvement of unions is the only political drawback; therefore political desirability receives a moderate score.

**Option Three: Promotional Campaign**

Promotional campaigns are strategically designed to reach a particular target audience. This would use public relations and special events to encourage Florida women to participate in outdoor activities such as fishing, hunting and boating. The question is when do females discover that they like to participate in fish and wildlife activities? The target audience of this program
would be all women in the state of Florida. The campaign would be multi-faceted. Media tools utilized would be television, radio, and outdoor board promotion. Another tool used would be public relations. Public relations tools include agency personnel interviews on radio and television shows, along with editorials being placed in large-scale newspapers (Orlando, Tampa, Miami, Jacksonville). The articles would discuss the joys of fishing and wildlife activities and discuss the lack of women involvement and focus on the women audience. A promotional campaign of this scale would cost approximately $100,000 per year and would need to run for at least five years. The results of this campaign would be long-term. Angus states that, “fish and wildlife agencies can be proactive, choosing to invest in the long-term commitment with sincerity and the systematic changes necessary to their strategic operations that will sustain an effective workforce diversity program” (1996). The campaign would not immediately impact the percentages of executive-level women but it would be a proactive approach to recruit women into the natural resource field.

**Agency Cost**

There are extensive costs associated with implementing a promotional campaign. FFWCC has two choices, the agency could hire a person solely to promote natural resources to females or a contractor could be hired. If the agency hired a contractor, there would be agency personnel costs associated with overseeing the contract. The contract would cost approximately $80,000 a year depending on the extent of promotions (D. Case, personal communication, April, 2003). There would also be materials and supplies costs. Materials and supplies such as t-shirts, touch tanks, fishing rods, guns, binoculars etc. would be purchased for special events. There would be personnel, materials and supplies and contractor costs to implement this option.
Agency Feasibility

A promotional campaign could not recruit more women into executive-level positions without changing the structure of the agency. An individual in the agency would have to take time to oversee a promotional campaign taking away time from other tasks. However, this policy could recruit women into fish and wildlife agencies. Due to the cost of this option, it would be hard for executive-level employees to make this a priority. A promotional campaign does not directly help to achieve the mission of the agency. The strength of the option is that it would recruit women into fish and wildlife. The two weaknesses are the structure of the agency would have to change, and executive-level employees would find it hard to make implementation a budget priority.

Political Desirability

The legislature would not support this option due to the cost. According to the agency Executive Director, politically it would be hard to get funds for a promotional campaign (K. Hadad, personal communication, February, 2003). Scott Hardin indicated that a promotional campaign could be politically desirable if the agency used a private contractor due to the governor’s increase of contracting out government services (personal communication, February, 2003). However, one part of the agency’s budget that the governor wants to cut are the outreach and education sections and usually these sections are responsible for promotions (S. Hardin, personal communication, February, 2003).

There are numerous organizations such as the Recreational Boating and Fishing Foundation (RBFF) that are specifically funded to provide services to state fish and wildlife agencies. RBFF has numerous promotional tools that the agency could use, so the agency would not have to pay for someone to create a new campaign. Also, RBFF data indicate that promoting
to females and minorities increases participation in fish and wildlife activities and gets women interested in a fish and wildlife career. The Florida Commission on the Status of Women representative stated that this would be an option that is proactive instead of reactive (J. James, personal communication, March, 2003). Politically there are two sides, one funding of this option is virtually impossible and the other side is interest groups understand that this pro-active approach would solve the problem.

All in all, the option is costly. In regards to feasibility the structure of the agency would have to change and executive employees would have trouble making implementation a priority; however it would be a pro-active approach to solve the problem. Politically there is mixed measurements. The legislature would balk at costs but interests groups understand that this option would solve the problem for the next generation of female employees.

**Option Four: Recruitment Campaign**

A recruitment campaign would be designed to reach women four times a year at a high school, community college and university level. Education Institutions can be selected by measuring the number of women enrolled. The institutions with the greater number of women would be targeted. Currently, FFWCC does not have any formal strategic recruitment plans. Although the agency realizes the lack of women in executive-level positions, there are not agency-wide recruitment plans. However, the Director of Law Enforcement has a strategic recruitment plan with implementation stages. The Law Enforcement Division has 714 sworn officers. Of those only 38 are women (J. Jones, personal communication, March, 2003). The numbers are staggering but the Director has a complete plan to remedy the problem in her division.
This program would recruit at a high school, community college and university level. Many time students are not aware of the opportunities at Fish and Wildlife agencies. Private organizations recruit students throughout their education. Numerous agency employees would be selected to recruit students at all education levels. At a high school level employees would go speak to biology classes. In community college when students are trying to decide what they want to do employees could go to job fairs. At a university level, employees could attend job fairs and career conferences. A campaign is proactive and would proactively recruit women and other employees interested in the field.

**Agency Cost**

Similar to the promotional campaign, a recruitment program would be a long-term investment. Personnel cost for this option is high. According to Scott Hardin, he would have to hire one-full time person just for his Division to oversee a recruitment program. However, Col. Julie Jones made the recruitment campaign in her Division. In fact, she already has a recruitment coordinator and she became the Director in August 2002. The agency would need 11 full-time positions for recruitment coordinators in each Division/Office. If each employees salary was $30,000 that would equal $330,000 plus benefits. In addition, there would also be materials and supplies costs. For instance, each Division would need a display, brochure or a handout to pass out to students at school visits. The final cost is contractor cost. This option would not require a contractor cost. Due to the personnel, materials and supply costs implementation would be expensive.
Agency Feasibility

Employee acceptance of this policy would vary. Some employees feel that recruitment is a waste of time because the agency pay is low compared to private companies, whereas others realize that the agency needs to recruit to compete with private organizations for the best job candidates. The problem is that the structure of the agency would have to change. Currently, there are not any recruitment coordinators except in DLE. Each, Division/Office would have to be restructured to accommodate the new employee (S. Hardin, personal communication, March, 2003). Executive level employees and the personnel department would have to make policy implementation a priority. With budget cuts it would be hard for these employees to fund the high costs. Overall, this policy may not be feasible.

Political Desirability

Unlike the mentoring program, a recruitment campaign would not parallel existing legislative policies. In fact, since legislatures are attempting to cut the agency’s budget, this policy does not reinforce existing legislation. The problem is everyone agrees that there needs be diversity in the workplace, but nobody is willing to make it a priority. Both the Florida Commission on the Status of Women and BOW think that a recruitment campaign would be a desirable way to proactively recruit women into executive-level positions.

In summary a recruitment campaign would be costly and not be feasible due to the agency restructuring. Politically, this option is not very desirable to the agency or the legislature. However, interest groups thought the recruitment campaign would be a proactive policy to increase executive-level female employees.
V. Conclusion

The report presented four gender diversity policy options. Each option was evaluated based on implementation cost, agency feasibility and political desirability. Table one summarized the results.

Table One – Summary of Policies and Evaluative Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Implementation Cost</th>
<th>Agency Feasibility</th>
<th>Political Desirability</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One: Internship Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two: Mentoring Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three: Promotional</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four: Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ranking scale: low, moderate and high with low being negative and high being positive in relation to the evaluative criteria)

All four policies could increase the percentage of women in executive-level positions. In fact if all four policies were implemented, the results would be substantial. Implementing all policies should be a long-term agency goal. In the short-term, FFWCC should concentrate on implementing the policy that has the highest rating.

The internship program costs and feasibility score was moderate. The only significant cost is a small stipend and material and supply costs. The feasibility score is moderate because employees would have to volunteer to participate and executive-level individuals would have to make implementation a priority. The internship received a low political desirability score because the interests groups felt the internship would not increase the number of executive women employees. BOW specifically sited the fact that the program would not be specifically targeted at women. The overall internship program score is moderate.
The mentoring program does not have cost associated with it, so that criterion was scored high. Agency personnel indicated that a mentoring program would be feasible. The only drawback was leaders taking the time to be mentors, but if the agency gets leaders interested in the program participation will not be an issue. Mentoring program feasibility received a moderate score. The BOW program, the Florida Commission on the Status of Women and the agency indicated that there were not any political drawbacks to this option. However, FFWCC Executive Director said that unions might get involved and claim an internship program did not treat all employees equitable, therefore the purpose of the program would be to “diversify” the agency not recruit minorities and women to executive-level management. The overall score of the mentoring program is moderate. Although, the internship program’s score was moderate, the mentoring program did not have any “low” criteria scores whereas the internship program’s political desirability was low.

The promotional campaign received an overall score of moderate. The campaign’s weakest criterion would be implementation cost and agency feasibility. Cost could be $50,000-$100,000 per year just for a contractor to implement a campaign. Supplies and materials for the campaign is an additional cost. In measuring agency feasibility, a campaign would cause the agency’s structure to change because it would need an employee to oversee a large-scale campaign. Also, due to the cost executive-level employees would have a hard time making a promotional campaign a priority. The campaign’s political desirability score is moderate. Interests groups felt this was the best option to recruit women into executive-level positions.

The recruitment campaign’s score is low. Similar to the promotions campaign, it would be very costly. The program has a low agency feasibility score because each division would need an employee to oversee a recruitment program. Politically, the legislature would not fund
the cost, but interests groups felt this was a pro-active way to increase executive-level women now and for the future.

Assessment of options using the evaluative criteria indicates that the mentoring program would be the best policy to increase the number of executive-level women at FFWCC. A mentoring program could start internally, and then the other options could be implemented to recruit females externally. Even though the criteria scores were close, it is evident that the mentoring program would be not as complex to implement as the other options. The mentoring program received two moderate scores, agency feasibility and political desirability, and ways to overcome the obstacles with these two criteria were suggested in the policy options section.
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Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Implements Mentoring Program

Tallahassee, FL—For years, the majority of executive-level employees at the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission have been males. Starting today the agency is implementing a new mentoring program to advance more women into executive-level positions.

Through an extensive analysis conducted by a Florida State University graduate student, the agency discovered that the agency needed diversity to develop innovative ideas to solve complex problems.

According to Ken Hadad, Executive Director of the agency, “As the agency progresses new solutions are needed to solve complex problem. Having women in decision-making positions allows the agency to have a different viewpoint.”

The graduate student also discovered that the nationwide the fish and wildlife profession is not diverse. According to Dr. Sally Guyn, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Management Assistance Team, “We have been trying for years to change the perception of women in the fish and wildlife field. Many men who have worked in the field for years are not used to seeing executive-level women, so they are uncomfortable with their presence.”

Success of the mentoring program could lead to implementation of other policy options. The student suggested that the agency develop a long-term strategic plan for diversity. The plan should include the following recommended options—an internship program, a promotional campaign and a recruitment plan.

-MORE-
According to Monica Hardy, Florida State University graduate student, “The internship program should be the second policy implemented. A promotional campaign and a recruitment campaign should be planned and implemented jointly.”

Ms. Hardy worked closely with the agency to suggest the most successful policy option. She interviewed eight agency employees, contacted interest groups and discussed the problem with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services.

The research that Ms. Hardy conducted was so thorough that the agency decided to immediately implement the first recommended policy. Since a mentoring program is inexpensive, the agency does not have to fund the program.

All agency employees are excited to have this new program. According to Sandra Porter, Director of the agency’s Administrative Service Division, “This gives me an opportunity to reach out to other divisions such as fisheries and wildlife and spend time with an employee that shows interest and potential.”

Ms. Hardy graduated from the University of Florida with a BS in public relations. In May, she will receive her master’s in public administration from Florida State University. She currently works for a public relations firm that specializes in environmental communication.

For more information about the program and the analysis contact Monica Hardy at 574-258-0100.

-END-