## Subj: REQUEST FOR INFORMATION; DEFENSE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WOMEN IN THE SERVICES (DACOWITS)

## Encl: (I) DACOWITS Officer Analysis.xlsx

(2) DACOWITS Enlisted Analysis.xlsx

1. Purpose. To provide RFI \#9 response to DACOWITS regarding their investigating gender "bias" in the Service's thru the reporting of promotion rates in both the officer and enlisted grades.
2. Conclusion.
a. The trend analysis delineated is skewed due to the dataset being requested is derived from nonconsecutive years and small composition of the sample size. This applies to both officer and enlisted.
b. Officer analysis (Enclosure (1)). There is no statistically significant trend regarding promotion rates by gender within any specific occupational areas within the officer community. In fact, females marginally outperform selection percentages across the sample, with senior boards (O-6) in the last two sample years (FY22 and FY20) having a significantly higher female selection percentage.

Across all sample years females outperformed the male selection rate vs number considered.

c. These are the MOSs with the highest difference in selection rates between populations where females are competing against males. The highest variance (7509) is statistically insignificant due to the small population over time. This trend by MOS becomes progressively less significant as it approaches parity with males.

| MOS | Avg \% Select <br> Rate Male | Avg \% Select <br> Rate Female | Variance | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7566 (CH-53 Pilot) | .66 | .50 | .95 | $\mathbf{1 4}$ females selected from 22 |
| 7509 (AV-8 Pilot) | .92 | .67 | .75 | 5 females selected from 6 |
| 0102 (Manpower) | .81 | .66 | .74 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ females selected from 28 |
| 7557 (WTI instructor) | .65 | .56 | .58 | $\mathbf{7}$ females selected from 12 |
| 4402 (Judge Advocate) | .66 | .60 | .48 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ females selected from 33 |

*Note - 0102 data skewed from 0180 redesignation in Oct 2014.
*Weighted average selection percentages are skewed due to FYs where zero females existed within the eligible population. E.g., 7566 s where 14 of 22 considered equates to an average selection rate of .50 .
d. Enlisted analysis (Enclosure (2)). From the grade analysis tab in enclosure (2), the female selection rate versus the number considered is on par with males (marginally higher) for grades E-7 and E-8 as a total of all MOSs. There is a disparity in E-9's, but that only becomes apparent when broken out by MOS (specifically 8999's).
e. Top Five Enlisted Gender Variances by MOS:

| MOS | Males <br> Considered | Males <br> Selected | Percent | Females <br> Considered | Females <br> Selected | Percent |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2691 (Signals Intel Chief) | 171 | 60 | 35.1 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 2336 (EOD Tech) | 479 | 185 | 38.6 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 7051 (Crash Fire and Rescue) | 209 | 59 | 28.2 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 3052 (Distribution Management) | 31 | 9 | 29.0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 2874 (Metrology Tech) | 43 | 14 | 32.6 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

5. Recommendation. The datasets are challenging to interpret due to the significant disparity of male vs female populations within any MOS subset. An area for improvement would be to assess and retain more females in these MOSs; however, the females in these MOSs are promoting at a rate equal or higher than their male counterparts. The service cannot promote without an inventory to promote from.


| Row Labels | Average of \% Selected vs Considered (Female) | Average of \% Selected vs Considered (Male) | Sum of Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7509 | 0.67 | 0.92 | 0.38 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 0.50 | 0.88 | 0.75 |
| 7566 | 0.50 | 0.66 | 0.32 |
| LTCOL | 0.30 | 0.69 | 1.31 |
| MAJ | 0.69 | 0.62 | -0.11 |
| 0102 | 0.66 | 0.81 | 0.23 |
| COL | 0.00 | 0.67 | \#DIV/0! |
| LTCOL | 0.73 | 0.92 | 0.25 |
| MAJ | 0.92 | 0.77 | -0.16 |
| 7557 | 0.56 | 0.65 | 0.18 |
| LTCOL | 0.44 | 0.66 | 0.48 |
| MAJ | 0.67 | 0.65 | -0.02 |
| 7202 | 0.67 | 0.74 | 0.11 |
| LTCOL | 0.67 | 0.74 | 0.11 |
| 4402 | 0.60 | 0.66 | 0.09 |
| COL | 0.00 | 0.33 | \#DIV/0! |
| LTCOL | 0.86 | 0.74 | -0.14 |
| MAJ | 0.94 | 0.89 | -0.06 |
| 7210 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.07 |
| MAJ | 0.83 | 0.90 | 0.07 |
| 7565 | 0.69 | 0.74 | 0.07 |
| COL | 0.00 | 0.67 | \#DIV/0! |
| LTCOL | 0.75 | 0.83 | 0.11 |
| MAJ | 0.89 | 0.70 | -0.21 |
| 0602 | 0.61 | 0.63 | 0.04 |
| COL | 0.33 | 0.42 | 0.27 |
| LTCOL | 0.69 | 0.71 | 0.03 |
| MAJ | 0.73 | 0.72 | -0.02 |
| 0802 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |


| 7315 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 0204 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 0206 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 1802 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 1803 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| 0180 | 0.68 | 0.66 | -0.03 |
| COL | 0.50 | 0.75 | 0.50 |
| LTCOL | 0.75 | 0.63 | -0.17 |
| MAJ | 0.73 | 0.65 | -0.11 |
| 6602 | 0.76 | 0.73 | -0.04 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 0.70 | 0.66 | -0.06 |
| 7563 | 0.75 | 0.71 | -0.06 |
| LTCOL | 0.67 | 0.63 | -0.06 |
| MAJ | 0.83 | 0.78 | -0.06 |
| 6002 | 0.76 | 0.71 | -0.07 |
| LTCOL | 0.67 | 0.58 | -0.13 |
| MAJ | 0.83 | 0.81 | -0.03 |
| 7208 | 1.00 | 0.90 | -0.10 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.90 | -0.10 |
| 5803 | 1.00 | 0.89 | -0.11 |
| COL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 0.87 | -0.13 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.86 | -0.14 |
| 7532 | 0.84 | 0.74 | -0.12 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 0.78 | -0.22 |
| MAJ | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.04 |
| 0402 | 0.81 | 0.71 | -0.13 |
| COL | 0.70 | 0.42 | -0.40 |


| LTCOL | 0.80 | 0.75 | -0.06 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MAJ | 0.89 | 0.81 | -0.08 |
| 1702 | 1.00 | 0.87 | -0.13 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.87 | -0.13 |
| 3002 | 0.85 | 0.72 | -0.15 |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.64 | -0.36 |
| LTCOL | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.04 |
| MAJ | 0.92 | 0.81 | -0.11 |
| 7564 | 1.00 | 0.81 | -0.19 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.63 | -0.38 |
| 1302 | 0.74 | 0.60 | -0.19 |
| COL | 0.50 | 0.38 | -0.23 |
| LTCOL | 0.67 | 0.58 | -0.13 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.78 | -0.22 |
| 7562 | 0.67 | 0.54 | -0.20 |
| LTCOL | 0.50 | 0.44 | -0.13 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.73 | -0.27 |
| 0202 | 0.98 | 0.75 | -0.23 |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.66 | -0.34 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 0.75 | -0.25 |
| MAJ | 0.94 | 0.78 | -0.17 |
| 7588 | 0.92 | 0.71 | -0.23 |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.67 | -0.33 |
| LTCOL | 0.83 | 0.83 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.50 | -0.50 |
| 4502 | 0.85 | 0.65 | -0.23 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 0.78 | 0.48 | -0.38 |
| 4302 | 0.90 | 0.68 | -0.24 |
| COL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 0.83 | -0.17 |
| MAJ | 0.75 | 0.38 | -0.50 |
| 7525 | 1.00 | 0.73 | -0.27 |


| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.60 | -0.40 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 0 4}$ | 1.00 | 0.73 | $-\mathbf{0 . 2 7}$ |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.73 | -0.27 |
| $\mathbf{3 4 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 2 7}$ |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.45 | -0.55 |
| LTCOL | 0.83 | 0.79 | -0.05 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.72 | -0.28 |
| $\mathbf{7 5 2 3}$ | 1.00 | $\mathbf{0 . 6 6}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 3 4}$ |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.33 | -0.67 |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.63 | -0.37 |
| $\mathbf{0 2 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 8}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 3}$ |
| LTCOL | 1.00 | 0.00 | -1.00 |
| MAJ | 1.00 | 0.75 | -0.25 |
| $\mathbf{8 0 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 3}$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 6 7}$ |
| COL | 1.00 | 0.33 | -0.67 |
| Grand Total | $\mathbf{0 . 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 0 9}$ |


| FY | Rank | PMOS | Female Cons | Female Sel | \% Selected vs Considered (Female) | Male Cons | Male Sel | \% Selected vs Considered (Male) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FY12 | MAJ | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 70 | 61 | 87\% |
| FY15 | MAJ | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 68 | 53 | 78\% |
| FY20 | MAJ | 0102 | 6 | 5 | 83\% | 23 | 19 | 83\% |
| FY20 | MAJ | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 96 | 87 | 91\% |
| FY22 | MAJ | 0102 | 10 | 10 | 100\% | 18 | 13 | 72\% |
| FY22 | MAJ | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 76 | 64 | 84\% |
| FY12 | LTCOL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 74 | 59 | 80\% |
| FY15 | LTCOL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 41 | 41 | 100\% |
| FY22 | LTCOL | 0102 | 6 | 4 | 67\% | 6 | 5 | 83\% |
| FY22 | LTCOL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 68 | 44 | 65\% |
| FY12 | COL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 74 | 59 | 80\% |
| FY15 | COL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 27 | 15 | 56\% |
| FY20 | COL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 43 | 20 | 47\% |
| FY22 | COL | 0102 | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 3 | 2 | 67\% |
| FY22 | COL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 26 | 15 | 58\% |
| FY20 | LTCOL | 0102 | 5 | 4 | 80\% | 3 | 3 | 100\% |
| FY20 | LTCOL | 0302 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 67 | 49 | 73\% |


| Count of BOARDNAME Row Labels | Column Labels N |  | Y | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E-7 |  | 70.50\% | 29.50\% | 100.00\% |
| F |  | 68.57\% | 31.43\% | 100.00\% |
| M |  | 70.67\% | 29.33\% | 100.00\% |
| E-8 |  | 65.38\% | 34.62\% | 100.00\% |
| F |  | 65.32\% | 34.68\% | 100.00\% |
| M |  | 65.39\% | 34.61\% | 100.00\% |
| E-9 |  | 70.25\% | 29.75\% | 100.00\% |
| F |  | 78.65\% | 21.35\% | 100.00\% |
| M |  | 69.78\% | 30.22\% | 100.00\% |
| Grand Total |  | 69.07\% | 30.93\% | 100.00\% |

*Note: Data derived is from the Above zone and In Zone population only. Below Zone is not reflected as it is not a $100 \%$ consideration rate. $\mathrm{N}=$ Considered
Y=Selected


| Count of BOARDNAME Row Labels | Column Labels N | Y | Grand Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | 68.51\% | 31.49\% | 100.00\% |
| E-7 | 68.57\% | 31.43\% | 100.00\% |
| E-8 | 65.32\% | 34.68\% | 100.00\% |
| E-9 | 78.65\% | 21.35\% | 100.00\% |
| M | 69.09\% | 30.91\% | 100.00\% |
| E-7 | 70.61\% | 29.39\% | 100.00\% |
| E-8 | 65.45\% | 34.55\% | 100.00\% |
| E-9 | 69.83\% | 30.17\% | 100.00\% |
| Grand Total | 69.05\% | 30.95\% | 100.00\% |

$\mathrm{N}=$ Considered
Y= Selected

