SUBJ: DACOWITS RFI #7 - June QBM

FROM: PSC-OPM/EPM, CG-1B2, CG-1D1

TO: DACOWITS Committee
THRU: Office of Diversity & Inclusion (CG-1D1)

PREGNANCY IN THE MILITARY

In 2019, the Committee recommended the Secretary of Defense "establish a DoD policy that defines and provides guidance to eliminate conscious and unconscious gender bias" with a view to tackling the bias that has impeded servicewomen's promotion and advancement opportunities. The Committee continues to be interested in the gender barriers servicewomen confront during their service. Women in the military and across all industries have historically lagged behind men in career progression opportunities and promotion rates, and women in male-dominated industries (such as the military) typically encounter even greater barriers and resistance to career progression. Gender bias is among the barriers that servicewomen have and continue to experience in their career progression.

To better examine whether potential remedial measures should be undertaken, such as eliminating gender indicators, the Committee requests a written response from the Defense Department, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, Space Force, and Coast Guard on the following:

DACOWITS:

a. Military Services: Promotion results in 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2022: (PSC-OPM-1) (PSC-EPM-1) (CG-1B2)

       i. by gender, grade, occupational specialty/MOS/community, number and percentage of males/females considered;

       Ii. by gender, grade, occupational specialty/MOS/community, number and percentage of males/females selected for enlisted (E-7 thru E-9) and officer (O-4 thru O-6) competitive promotion selection boards; and

       Iii. the top 5 gender promotion variances by MOS/rating, for enlisted (E-7 thru E-9) and officer (O-4 thru O-6).

b. Military Services: Identify the trends and compare promotion rates of females and males by occupational specialty/MOS/community to the degree possible. In other words, in what occupational areas do servicewomen's promotion rates lag behind servicemen? (PSC-EPM-1) (PSC-OPM-1) (CG-1B2) (CG-1D1)

c. Navy: Identify what gender information was removed from officer selection board records, when removed, and from which documents within the file, i.e. on some or all documents in the selection folder. Are gendered pronouns visible in any of the documents found in the promotion record file (e.g. on award citations); if so, on which documents.

d. Defense Department: Provide the report and findings of the Institute of Defense Analysis study commissioned regarding bias removals including gender-specific biases.

CG Response:

9a:

PSC-OPM-1: The Coast Guard does not hold officer promotion boards by Officer specialty and does not capture this data. Regarding the relationship between promotion results in the grades specified and gender, please see the following data table that captures the quantitative data and percentages:

CAPT Selection Rates by demographic and year	2010	2015	2020	2022
Overall In-Zone Selection	56/98 (57%)	52/93 (56%)	77/156 (49%)	79/163 (48%)
Male	50/90 (56%)	49/83 (59%)	60/129 (47%)	67/134 (50%)
Female	6/8 (75%)	3/10 (30%)	17/27 (63%)	12/29 (41%)
CDR Selection Rates by demographic and year	2010	2015	2020	2022
Overall In-Zone Selection	117/169 (69%)	156/237 (66%)	182/283 (64%)	137/228 (60%)
Male	103/139 (74%)	123/191 (64%)	133/221 (60%)	108/181 (60%)
Female	14/30 (47%)	33/46 (72%)	49/62 (79%)	29/47 (62%)
LCDR Selection Rates by demographic and year	2010	2015	2020	2022
Overall In-Zone Selection	173/214 (81%)	217/329 (66%)	306/404 (76%)	281/358 (78%)
Male	141/178 (79%)	175/265 (66%)	240/313 (77%)	197/257 (77%)
Female	32/36 (89%)	42/64 (66%)	66/91 (73%)	84/101 (83%)

PSC-EPM-1: It was determined best to omit any rating that did not have 30 women cumulatively observed across the 4 sample years (effectively a 4-year weighted average). This sample size of 30 prevents us from reporting statistical anomalies as significant events. Attached is an updated spreadsheet and new answers to the questions. All data remains the same.

Military Services: Promotion results in 2010, 2015, 2020 and 2022:

   i. by gender, grade, occupational specialty/MOS/community, number and percentage of males/females considered;

    1. *Interpreted as total populations for paygrades E6-E8 at the beginning of those study years. If a rating did not have a cumulative 30 samples for population in either gender then it was "not observed" due to issues with statistical significance.*

ii. by gender, grade, occupational specialty/MOS/community, number and   percentage of males/females selected for enlisted (E-7 thru E-9) and officer(O-4 thru O-6) competitive promotion selection boards; and

   1. *Interpreted as paygrade change to E7-E9 during the entire study year.*

iii. the top 5 gender promotion variances by MOS/rating, for enlisted (E-7 thru E-9) and officer (O-4 thru O-6).

   1. *The ratings with the largest gender discrepancies for advancement are as follows: Electrician's Mate (EM), Information Systems Technician (IT), Maritime Law Enforcement Specialist (ME), Machinery Technician (MK), and Public Affairs Specialist (PA). These ratings exhibited a difference in advancements of 3.1 percentage points or greater between genders.*

9b: Military Services: Identify the trends and compare promotion rates of females and males by occupational specialty/MOS/community to the degree possible. In other words, in what occupational areas do servicewomen's promotion rates lag behind servicemen

iv. *The ratings where female advancement rates lagged behind male advancement rates are as follows: Electrician's Mate (EM), Maritime Law Enforcement Specialist (ME), Public Affairs Specialist (PA), Musician (MU), and Damage Controlman (DC). These ratings had females advancing at rates slower than men by 2.6 percentage points or more.*