March 5, 2019

MEETING NOTICE

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION AD HOC COMMITTEE

Board Members of the Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee:
   Director Tony Estremera, Chair
   Director Nai Hsueh, Vice Chair
   Director John L. Varela

Staff Support of the Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee:
   Norma J. Camacho, Chief Executive Officer
   Tina Yoke, Chief Operating Officer, Information Management and Administration
   Stanly Yamamoto, District Counsel
   Brian Hopper, Senior Assistant District Counsel
   Anna Noriega, Interim Assistant Administrative Officer
   Michael Baratz, Labor Relations Officer
   Frank David, Supervising Program Administrator
   Dolores Grissom, Management Analyst II
   Janice Lum, Management Analyst II

The meeting of the Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee is to be held on Friday, March 8, 2019, at 11:00 a.m. in the Headquarters Building Boardroom located at the Santa Clara Valley Water District, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, California.

Enclosed are the meeting agenda and corresponding materials. Please bring this packet with you to the meeting.

Enclosures
From Oakland:
- Take 880 South to 85 South
- Take 85 South to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Plaza Way
- Turn right (south) on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Morgan Hill/Gilroy:
- Take 101 North to 85 North
- Take 85 North to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Expressway
- Cross Blossom Hill Road
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Sunnyvale:
- Take Highway 87 South to 85 North
- Take Highway 85 North to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From San Francisco:
- Take 280 South to Highway 85 South
- Take Highway 85 South to Almaden Expressway exit
- Turn left on Almaden Plaza Way
- Turn right (south) on Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Downtown San Jose:
- Take Highway 87 - Guadalupe Expressway South
- Exit on Santa Teresa Blvd.
- Turn right on Blossom Hill Road
- Turn left at Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (first traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance

From Walnut Creek, Concord and East Bay areas:
- Take 680 South to 280 North
- Exit Highway 87-Guadalupe Expressway South
- Exit on Santa Teresa Blvd.
- Turn right on Blossom Hill Road
- Turn left at Almaden Expressway
- At Via Monte (third traffic light), make a U-turn
- Proceed north on Almaden Expressway approximately 1,000 feet
- Turn right (east) into the campus entrance
Santa Clara Valley Water District
Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

HQ Boardroom
5700 Almaden Expressway
San Jose CA 95118

REGULAR MEETING
AGENDA

Friday, March 8, 2019
11:00 AM

DIVERSITY & INCLUSION AD HOC COMMITTEE

Nai Hsueh - District 5
Tony Estremera - District 6
John L. Varela - District 1

All public records relating to an item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Clerk of the Board at the Santa Clara Valley Water District Headquarters Building, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, CA 95118, at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body. Santa Clara Valley Water District will make reasonable efforts to accommodate persons with disabilities wishing to attend Board of Directors’ meeting. Please advise the Clerk of the Board Office of any special needs by calling (408) 265-2600.

Note: The finalized Board Agenda, exception items and supplemental items will be posted prior to the meeting in accordance with the Brown Act.
1. CALL TO ORDER:
   1.1. Roll Call.

2. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA.
   Notice to the public: This item is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on any matter not on this agenda. Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on any item not listed on the agenda should complete a Speaker Form and present it to the Committee Clerk. The Committee Chair will call individuals in turn. Speakers comments should be limited to two minutes or as set by the Chair. The law does not permit Committee action on, or extended discussion of, any item not on the agenda except under special circumstances. If Committee action is requested, the matter may be placed on a future agenda. All comments that require a response will be referred to staff for a reply in writing. The Committee may take action on any item of business appearing on the posted agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
   3.1. Approval of Minutes.

   Recommendation: Approve the September 27, 2018, Meeting Minutes.
   Manager: Michele King, 408-630-2711
   Attachments: Attachment 1: 092718 DaI Ad Hoc DRAFT Mins

4. ACTION ITEMS:

   Recommendation: Receive and discuss information regarding FY18 hires at the District.
   Manager: Anna Noriega, 408-630-3089
   Attachments: Attachment 1: March 8 D&I Ad Hoc Committee
   Est. Staff Time: 20 Minutes
4.2. Considerations and Recommendations of Effective Tools for Measuring the Success of the Diversity and Inclusion Program

Recommendation: Receive and discuss proposed updates to the August 2018 Diversity and Inclusion Program presentation.

Manager: Anna Noriega, 408-630-3089
Attachments:  
Attachment 1: 2018 Great Places to Work Survey Results  
Attachment 2: 2016 Great Places to Work Survey Results  
Attachment 3: D&I Program Success Measures August 13 2018  
Est. Staff Time: 15 Minutes

4.3. Review Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee Work Plan and the Committee’s Next Meeting Agenda.

Recommendation: Review the Committee’s Work Plan to guide the Committee’s discussions regarding policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation.

Manager: Michele King, 408-630-2711
Attachments:  
Attachment 1: D&I Ad Hoc Comm Work Plan  
Est. Staff Time: 10 Minutes

5. CLERK REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION OF COMMITTEE REQUESTS.
This is an opportunity for the Clerk to review and obtain clarification on any formally moved, seconded, and approved requests and recommendations made by the Committee during the meeting.

6. ADJOURN:

6.1. Adjourn.
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee

SUBJECT:
Approval of Minutes.

RECOMMENDATION:
Approve the September 27, 2018, Meeting Minutes.

SUMMARY:
A summary of Committee discussions, and details of all actions taken by the Committee, during all open and public Committee meetings, is transcribed and submitted for review and approval.

Upon Committee approval, minutes transcripts are finalized and entered into the District’s historical records archives and serve as historical records of the Committee’s meetings

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: 092718 D&I Ad Hoc Comm Draft Minutes

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Michele King, 408-630-2711
A meeting of the Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee (Committee) was held on September 27, 2018, at the District Headquarters Building Boardroom, 5700 Almaden Expressway, San Jose, California.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL
A meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Water District Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee was called to order by Chair Tony Estremera at 12:09 p.m.

Board Members in attendance were: Director Tony Estremera-District 6, Director Nai Hsueh-District 5 and Director John L. Varela-District 1.

Staff members in attendance were: Salam Baqleh, Michael Baratz, Wade Blackard, Glenna Brambill, Michelle Critchlow, Peggy Donatelli, Amy Fonseca, Dolores Grissom, Laurel Hanchett, Brian Hopper, Cody Houston, Gauri Khanna, and Tina Yoke.

2. TIME OPEN FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON AGENDA
There was no one who wished to speak.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
3.1 Approval of Minutes
It was moved by Director Nai Hsueh, seconded by Director John L. Varela and unanimously carried to approve the minutes of the August 13, 2018, Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee meeting, as presented.

4. ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS
4.1 INTERSHIP PROGRAM REVIEW and
4.3 PRESENTATION REGARDING, “CREATING PIPELINE FOR WATER INDUSTRY CAREERS.”
The two agenda items were joined together for discussion.
Ms. Tina Yoke introduced Ms. Peggy Donatelli who along with Director Nai Hsueh reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda items along with a handout (Pilot
SCVWD Recruitment, Retention, Internship and Scholarship Program Strategic Initiative Proposal (Proposal) with emphasis on the four components 1. Recruitment, 2. Retention, 3. Internships and 4. Scholarship. There was a presentation on Gavilan’s disadvantaged youth program, reviewing the Proposal in comparison with San Jose State University’s model of the Minority Engineering Program.

The Committee discussed having the Diversity and Inclusion Program researching the 4 proposed objectives, developed programs at colleges, such as; Gavilan and West Valley, creating a pool of skilled labor and subsidizing educational costs.

It was moved by Director Nai Hsueh, seconded by Director John L. Varela and unanimously carried to approve having staff research the Proposal being part of the current internship program and bring back an analysis of the four objectives and look at associated costs.

4.2 EMERGING LEADERS DIVERSITY & INCLUSION MASTER PLAN ASSESSMENT CAPSTONE PROJECT
Ms. Tina Yoke introduced the Emerging Leaders Team, Mr. Cody Houston, Ms. Amy Fonseca and Mr. Wade Blackard who reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda item. Handout of the Diversity and Inclusion Master Plan Assessment was disseminated to the Committee.

The Committee thanked the Team for their great work on the assessment of the Plan.

No action taken.

4.4 REVIEW DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION AD HOC COMMITTEE WORK PLAN, THE OUTCOMES OF BOARD ACTION OF COMMITTEE REQUESTS; AND THE COMMITTEE NEXT MEETING AGENDA
Ms. Glenna Brambill, Board Committee Liaison reviewed the materials as outlined in the agenda item and noted the next meeting previously scheduled for Thursday, November 8, 2018, at 12:00 p.m. will be rescheduled. The Clerk of the Board’s office will advise the Committee on the new date.

No action taken.

5. CLERK REVIEW AND CLARIFICATION OF COMMITTEE REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Ms. Glenna Brambill, Board Committee Liaison reported one action item.

Committee Action:
Agenda Item 4.3
The Committee approved unanimously to approve having staff research the Proposal (Pilot SCVWD Recruitment, Retention, Internship and Scholarship Program Strategic Initiative Proposal (Proposal) being part of the current internship program and bring back an analysis of the four objectives (Recruitment, Retention, Internship and Scholarship Program) and look at associated costs.
6. **ADJOURNMENT**  
Chair Director Tony Estremera adjourned the meeting at 1:20 p.m.

Glenna Brambill  
Board Committee Liaison  
Office of the Clerk of the Board

Approved:
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee

SUBJECT:
Hiring and Promotions Report.

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive and discuss information regarding FY18 hires at the District.

SUMMARY:
In August 2018, staff provided the Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee Diversity and Inclusion program success measures. Following that presentation, staff was asked to provide data specific to Fiscal Year 18 recruitments.

This provides a summary of recruitment activities broken down by ethnicity and gender for both internal and external hires.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: FY18 Hiring Report

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Anna Noriega, 408-630-3089
Hiring and Promotions Report

March 8, 2019

Prepared and presented by:
Anna Noriega, Human Resources
1. Internal Hires by Ethnicity and Gender – FY10|14|18
2. External Hires by Ethnicity and Gender – FY10|14|18
Internal Hires by Ethnicity & Gender - FY10/FY14/FY18

*Includes American Indian/Alaskan Native and Two or More
Data run 2019 for FY2014 indicates 32 external hires - gender % based on 2019 data.

*Data run 2019 for FY2014 indicates 32 external hires - gender % based on 2019 data.*
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee

SUBJECT:
Considerations and Recommendations of Effective Tools for Measuring the Success of the Diversity and Inclusion Program.

RECOMMENDATION:
Receive and discuss proposed updates to the August 2018 Diversity and Inclusion Program presentation.

SUMMARY:
At the previous Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) Ad Hoc Committee meeting in August of 2018, staff presented the Ad Hoc Committee with several performance metrics measuring the success and effectiveness of the D&I program at the District. Following the presentation, staff was asked to share the same performance metrics with the entire Board. In preparation for the upcoming presentation, the D&I team has updated the statistics and figures in the initial presentation. Most notably, the updated presentation contains a comparison between the 2016 and 2018 Great Places to Work (GPTW) survey results, the latter of which was not yet available in August of 2018. The following memo outlines key insights and comparisons between the two surveys. In addition to the update to the GPTW results, the presentation to the Board will also contain minor updates to the following metrics to reflect the most current data available:

1. Applicant v. Hire Data (replacing FY18 Q3 data with FY19 Q2 data)
2. Demographics by Job Group Comparison (replacing FY18 Q3 data with FY19 Q2 data)
3. Applications received vs. new external/internal hires (replacing FY18 Q3 data with FY19 Q2 data)

The remainder of this report will go into greater detail regarding the comparison of GPTW results between 2016 and 2018.

I. Great Place to Work

Organizations often measure employee engagement through a semi-regular engagement survey. Since 2016, the District has utilized the Great Place to Work Trust Index Employee Engagement Survey on a biennial basis to measure employee engagement.

Great Place to Work ("GPTW"), a third-party organization which markets itself as the “global authority on building, sustaining, and recognizing high-trust organizational cultures,” created and administered
the survey. The Great Place to Work Trust Model is built on 25 years of research and data collected through their Trust Index Employee Survey, which is taken by millions of employees annually worldwide. Responses to the survey are anonymous.

II. Changes Between 2016 and 2018 GPTW Surveys

511 staff (71% of District staff) completed the GPTW survey in 2016 and 548 staff (74% of District staff) completed the survey in 2018. While the two surveys are largely the same, there are some key differences between the two. Firstly, in 2016, employees were asked to respond to 64 statements, including 6 of which were submitted by the District. In 2018, 9 statements were removed and replaced by 5 new statements. The modified statements are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Removed</th>
<th>Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a friendly place to work.</td>
<td>Our executives fully embody the best characteristics of our company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a &quot;family&quot; or &quot;team&quot; feeling here.</td>
<td>We celebrate people who try new and better ways of doing things, regardless of the outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We're all in this together.</td>
<td>People here quickly adapt to changes needed for our organization’s success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the District has effective processes in place to ensure the delivery of quality products and services.</td>
<td>I would strongly endorse my company to friends and family as a great place to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are not ridiculed due to their background, personal traits, or characteristics.</td>
<td>Our customers would rate the service we deliver as &quot;excellent.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences for poor performers in our organization are reasonable and timely.</td>
<td>My manager/Supervisor provides me with timely feedback on my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can raise issues without fear of retaliation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to turn for guidance at work about ethical issues, harassment or discrimination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, while in 2016 employees were asked to respond to each statement on the survey twice (once for how employees felt about the statement with the organization in mind, and the other with their individual work group in mind), that was not the case in 2018. In 2018, GPTW sought a more holistic approach to each statement. Throughout this memorandum, I will refer to the 2016 data as an average between the two scores it received in 2016 for comparison purposes with the 2018 data.

III. Overview of Results

The statements and results in the GPTW Survey are grouped into five main categories: (1) credibility, (2) respect, (3) fairness, (4) pride, and (5) camaraderie. At the end of the survey, respondents were asked their level of agreement on the statement: “Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work.”
In 2018, 76% of District staff agreed with the statement, "Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work," which is an increase of 12% from the 64% response in 2016. Furthermore, the average agreement between the 60 shared questions between 2016 and 2018 increased from 58.8% in 2016 to 66% in 2018. Comparison of these data points show a large increase in employee satisfaction, and in 2018, the District met the threshold on the statement average and qualified for a Great Place to Work© certification. The data in the table below contains more detail.

### IV. Comparison of District Data between 2016 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>↑ 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>↑ 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>↑ 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>↑ 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>↑ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Place to Work</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>↑ 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of All Statements</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>↑ 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the survey, employees were asked to respond to three statements specifically related to diversity and bias through age, race, and sex. The three charts below illustrate a comparison between the responses from 2016 and 2018, with the 2016 responses being shown in yellow, and the 2018 responses being shown in blue.
People here are treated fairly regardless of their age

- African American/Black: 88% (2018), 50% (2016)
- Asian: 64% (2018), 65% (2016)
- Caucasian/White: 71% (2018), 77% (2016)
- Hispanic/Latino: 77% (2018), 54% (2016)
- Two or More Races: 65% (2018), 65% (2016)

People here are treated fairly regardless of their race

- African American/Black: 47% (2018), 75% (2016)
- Asian: 75% (2018), 68% (2016)
- Caucasian/White: 80% (2018), 75% (2016)
- Hispanic/Latino: 59% (2018), 88% (2016)
- Two or More Races: 83% (2018), 83% (2016)
In the last two years, the numbers have increased or held steady in nearly all areas across the board.

The following charts contain a further breakdown, by demographic, of the survey results.

1. In 2016, employees born in 1981 to 1997 - the Millennial age group - rated the District significantly better than employees who were born between 1946-1964 or 1965-1980. In 2018, the ratings from employees born between 1946-1964 and 1965-1980 have increased 12% and 13%, respectively. Within the Millennial group, 83% rated the District as a great place to work in 2018. This percentage has held steady over the past two years.
2. New employees (2 years or less) rated the District quite favorably in 2016 at 86%. This year, that percentage is up to 89%. Employees who have been at the District for 6 to 10 years gave the lowest ratings in both 2016 and 2018, although in 2018, it has increased from 57% to 67%.
3. In 2018, the business area of the organization that rated the District most favorably was the Watershed group at 80%. Watersheds also achieved the highest satisfaction rating in 2016 when it came in at 69%. Individualized data from the Office of the CEO, BAO, and Administration was unavailable in 2016. Instead, the 3 business areas were combined into a single group, 62% of which rated the District as a Great Place to Work.

![Bar chart showing satisfaction ratings for different business areas in 2016 and 2018.]

4. At the managerial level in 2018, the Leadership Team were 100% in agreement that the District is a great place to work. MLT followed at 78% and individual contributors came in at 77%. The managerial level that ranked the District lowest was frontline supervisors at 73%. MLT’s scores have dropped this year from 84% to 78%. 
5. In 2016, there were no significantly noticeable differences between how men and women perceived the District. Both thought the District was a great place to work at 67%. In 2018, while the percentage of men and women who consider the District a great place to work have both gone up - women at 75% and men at 80% - there is now a pronounced difference between how men and women rate the District. As was the case in 2016, staff who selected the third option (in 2016 “other”, in 2018 “not listed”), rated the District very low.
6. While the overall satisfaction of LGBT employees has increased in the past two years - 67% in 2016 to 73% in 2018 - there is a significant difference in the experience of LGBT v. non-LGBT employees. LGBT employees rate the District lower by 6 percent. Again, employees who chose not to respond to this demographic question rated the District poorly - in 2016 40%, and in 2018 49%.
Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work (LGBT)

7. One of the biggest areas of change was how employees with disabilities feel about the District. In 2016, only 40% of employees with disabilities said the District was a great place to work. In 2018, 77% of employees with disabilities think it’s a great place to work. As is the case throughout the survey, if employees prefer not to answer a demographic, they often rate the District lower. "Prefer not to answer" was not an option in the 2016 survey.
8. In 2018, the District added a new demographic to the survey which asked employees to identify whether they are members of an Employee Resource Group. Employees who were in an Employee Resource Group were more likely to think the District is a great place to work by three percentage points. The survey also revealed that nearly 45% of employees at the District participate in Employee Resource Groups.
More in-depth analysis can be found in the attached Excel spreadsheet and further data cuts can be extrapolated through the Great Place to work portal. Also included in the portal are the open-ended comments from employees, which can also be sorted by demographic.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: 2018 Great Place to Work Survey Results
Attachment 2: 2016 Great Place to Work Survey Results
Attachment 3: D&I Program Success Measures August 13 2018

UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Anna Noriega, 408-630-3089
GUIDELINES FOR READING SPREADSHEETS

Enclosed are spreadsheets depicting results for Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall). Survey statements are presented in the far left column according to the five dimensions of the Great Place to Work® Trust Index©: Credibility, Respect, Fairness, Pride and Camaraderie. These dimensions are followed by one overarching statement, "Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work." The numbers to the left of the statements indicate the order in which the statements appeared on the survey instrument. Additional information about this spreadsheet is below.

RESPONSE PATTERNS

Employees were instructed to respond to each statement using a 1-5 scale. The positive responses to the affirmative survey statements, indicating either a 4 (“often true”) or a 5 (“almost always true”), are counted as a percentage of the total number of responses received for that statement. Blanks are not included in calculating the response percentage. For example, responses for the statement, "Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work," were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Option</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Blank)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Almost always untrue)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Often untrue)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Sometimes untrue/ sometimes true)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Often true)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Almost always true)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 4 and 5 (or True) Responses</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of &quot;True&quot; Responses</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of “true” responses (shown here in italics) is presented on the spreadsheets for each statement and demographic segmentation.

BENCHMARKS

Survey results are compared with one or more benchmarks. Your results may include the list of Best Companies or derivative benchmarks. These benchmarks represent the average responses of the nation’s top employers as established in the annual selection process conducted by Great Place to Work® each year.

DATA PRESENTATION

Responses sorted by demographic categories are presented in separate columns on the spreadsheet. To protect the confidentiality of respondents, only those categories in which 5 or more people responded are reported as separate columns. If a demographic category is too small to appear by itself, its data will be merged with another demographic or not shown as a separate column and only included in the totals column. Some data cells are shaded blue to direct attention to the most positive survey results as compared to the benchmark. Yellow shading indicates results that are the least positive in comparison to the benchmark. In a few cases, slight and insignificant anomalies appear in the data totals because of rounding or because of confidential demographic data appearing only in the totals column.

©2018 Great Place to Work® Institute, Inc. All rights reserved.
### Overall Recognition

The Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall) received an overall recognition score of 66, indicating that it is a great place to work. The district performed particularly well in the categories of Credibility and Respect, with scores of 59 and 67, respectively. However, it was rated lower in the categories of Fairness and Pride, with scores of 65 and 71, respectively. The district's overall performance is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

### Results by Category

#### Credibility

The district scored 58 in the Credibility category, indicating that it is seen as a company that is competent, trustworthy, and honest. This score is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

#### Resilience

The district scored 65 in the Resilience category, indicating that it is seen as a company that is respectful of the contributions of everyone it employs. This score is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

#### Respect

The district scored 65 in the Respect category, indicating that it is seen as a company that treats everyone with dignity and respect. This score is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

#### Pride

The district scored 71 in the Pride category, indicating that it is seen as a company where people feel good about the ways its work contributes to the community. This score is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

#### Fairness

The district scored 65 in the Fairness category, indicating that it is seen as a company where people feel they are treated fairly regardless of their gender or sexual orientation. This score is comparable to other organizations in its size range.

#### Results by Region

The district's results by region are as follows:

- **Top 150 Small and Medium Workplaces**
  - Credibility: 54
  - Resilience: 52
  - Respect: 67
  - Pride: 71
  - Fairness: 65

- **Between 1946 and 1964**
  - Credibility: 58
  - Resilience: 58
  - Respect: 67
  - Pride: 71
  - Fairness: 65

- **Between 1965 and 1980**
  - Credibility: 59
  - Resilience: 59
  - Respect: 67
  - Pride: 71
  - Fairness: 65

- **Between 1981 and 2007**
  - Credibility: 58
  - Resilience: 58
  - Respect: 67
  - Pride: 71
  - Fairness: 65

### Comparison

- **Comparison with Other Companies**
  - Credibility: 58 (compared to 60)
  - Resilience: 52 (compared to 55)
  - Respect: 67 (compared to 70)
  - Pride: 71 (compared to 75)
  - Fairness: 65 (compared to 70)

### Note

- Blue shading highlights results that are less than 14 points below the corresponding benchmark. Yellow shading indicates responses more than 40 points higher than the benchmark.
- Categories with fewer than 5 respondents are not shown to protect confidentiality.
### Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall)

| Program 2018 Recognition | Overall | Employee/Individual Contributor | Manager (runs mid-level leader) | Manager (has employees who manage other managers) | Executive/C-Ceo/President | CEO/President | HR/Individual | HRO/Individual | HRO/Mid-Level Leader | Mid-Level Leader | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Manager | Exec/Man
| Category | Percentage | White | African American | Hispanic/Latino | Elders | Neither children nor elders | 10 years to 14 years | 11 years to 15 years | 12 years to 15 years | 13 years to 16 years | 14 years to 16 years | 15 years to 18 years | 16 years to 20 years | Overall Recognition | Overall Recognition (Split by Gender) | Overall Recognition (Split by Race) | Overall Recognition (Split by Gender and Race) | Overall Recognition (Split by Age) | Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Race) | Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Gender) | Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Gender and Race) |
|----------|------------|-------|-----------------|----------------|--------|----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Camaraderie | 84 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 79 | 91 | 77 | 75 | 80 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Pride | 76 | 72 | 77 | 80 | 68 | 84 | 73 | 70 | 80 | 75 | 92 | 76 | 73 | 75 | 73 | 72 | 74 | 68 | 72 | 72 | 80 | 83 | 72 | 75 | 92 | 66 | 64 | 71 | 68 | 78 | 73 | 75 | 74 | 70 | 67 | 74 |
| Respect | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Fairness | 71 | 68 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Responsibility | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Credibility | 73 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Trust | 83 | 78 | 79 | 86 | 81 | 90 | 80 | 78 | 84 | 82 | 91 | 88 | 75 | 86 | 71 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Gender) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Race) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Gender and Race) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Age) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Race) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Gender) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |
| Overall Recognition (Split by Age and Gender and Race) | 74 | 70 | 70 | 77 | 78 | 81 | 77 | 75 | 78 | 78 | 87 | 84 | 70 | 81 | 68 | 59 | 65 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 76 | 69 | 63 | 68 | 73 | 61 | 69 | 73 | 58 | 69 | 76 |

Note: Blue shading highlights results that are more than 14 points below the corresponding benchmark. Yellow shading indicates responses more than 40 points below the corresponding benchmark. Comparisons with other companies are not shown to respect confidentiality. Numbers may vary slightly due to rounding and confidential data appearing only in the totals column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Recognition Region</th>
<th>Executive/Managerial</th>
<th>Other Professionals</th>
<th>Technical/Engineering Professional</th>
<th>Operations/Service</th>
<th>Scientific Professional</th>
<th>Maintenance/Repair</th>
<th>Administrative/CL</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
- Blue shading highlights results that are less than 14 points below the corresponding benchmark.
- Yellow shading indicates responses more than 40 points above the corresponding benchmark.
- Numbers may vary slightly due to rounding and confidential data appearing only in the totals column.
- Categories with fewer than 5 respondents are not shown to protect confidentiality.

Camaraderie: 71
Fairness: 50
Respect: 44
Credibility: 65
Professional: 51
Overall: 57
GUIDELINES FOR READING SPREADSHEETS

Enclosed are spreadsheets depicting Organization and Work Group results for Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall). Survey statements are presented in the far left column according to the five dimensions of the Great Place to Work® Trust Index®: Credibility, Respect, Fairness, Pride and Camaraderie. These dimensions are followed by one overarching statement, "Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work." The numbers to the left of the statements indicate the order in which the statements appeared on the survey instrument.

RESPONSE PATTERNS

Employees were instructed to respond to each statement using a 1-5 scale. The positive responses to the affirmative survey statements, indicating either a 4 ("often true") or a 5 ("almost always true"), are counted as a percentage of the total number of responses received for that statement. Blanks are not included in calculating the response percentage. For example, responses for the statement, "Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work," were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Option</th>
<th>Organization responses</th>
<th>Work Group responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Blank)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Almost always untrue)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Often untrue)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Sometimes untrue/ sometimes true)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Often true)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Almost always true)</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of "true" responses (shown here in italics) is presented on the spreadsheets for each statement and demographic segmentation.

BENCHMARKS

Survey results are compared with one or more benchmarks. Your results may include the list of Best Companies or derivative benchmarks. These benchmarks represent the average responses of the nation's top employers as established in the annual selection process conducted by Great Place to Work® Institute each year.

DATA PRESENTATION

Responses sorted by demographic categories are presented in separate columns on the spreadsheet. To protect the confidentiality of respondents, only those categories in which 5 or more people responded are reported as separate columns. If a demographic category is too small to appear by itself, its data will be merged with another demographic or not shown as a separate column and only included in the totals column. Some data cells are shaded blue to direct attention to the most positive survey results as compared to the benchmark. Yellow shading indicates results that are the least positive in comparison to the benchmark. In a few cases, slight and insignificant anomalies appear in the data totals because of rounding or because of confidential demographic data appearing only in the totals column.

©2016 Great Place to Work® Institute, Inc. All rights reserved.
People here are willing to give extra to get the job done.

I want to work here for a long time.

Other management genuinely seeks and responds to suggestions and ideas.

People here are treated fairly regardless of their age.

This is a fun place to work.

I can ask management any reasonable question and get a straight answer.

We're all in this together.

I'm proud to tell others I work here.
If I am unfairly treated, I believe I'll be given a fair shake if I appeal.

Management genuinely seeks and responds to suggestions and ideas.

Indian

I am offered training or development to further myself professionally.

Watershed

This is a physically safe place to work.

This is a fun place to work.

I want to work here for a long time.

Chinese

Management is honest and ethical in its business practices.

Management hires people who fit in well here.

There is a "family" or "team" feeling here.

Organizational Area

This is a psychologically and emotionally healthy place to work.

My work has special meaning: this is not "just a job".

People here are given a lot of responsibility.

I am treated as a full member here regardless of my position.

People care about each other here.

Management trusts people to do a good job without watching over their shoulders.

Everyone has an opportunity to get special recognition.

People are treated fairly regardless of their age.

Management does a good job of assigning and coordinating people.

People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.

Hispanic/Latino

Managers avoid playing favorites.

I believe management would lay people off only as a last resort.

Management does a good job of assigning and coordinating people.

People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.

Elders

My work has special meaning: this is not "just a job".

People here are treated fairly regardless of their sex.

People here are treated fairly regardless of their sexual orientation.

People here are treated fairly regardless of their age.

Management avoids playing favorites.

I believe management would lay people off only as a last resort.

Management does a good job of assigning and coordinating people.

People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.

Camaraderie

Pride

Credibility

©2016 Great Place to Work® Institute, Inc.  All rights reserved.

Categories with fewer than 5 respondents are not shown to protect confidentiality.
### Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall)

#### Organization Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Status</th>
<th>Technical/Engineering</th>
<th>Managerial/Supervisory</th>
<th>Operations/Service</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Medical/Dental</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checked</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Camaraderie

| Overall 2016 | 58                    | 45                     | 42                | 38          | 37            | 34    | 35      | 31  | 28 |
| Total       | 92                    | 76                     | 66                | 56          | 52            | 47    | 47      | 41  | 37 |

#### Pride

| Overall 2016 | 58                    | 45                     | 42                | 38          | 37            | 34    | 35      | 31  | 28 |
| Total       | 92                    | 76                     | 66                | 56          | 52            | 47    | 47      | 41  | 37 |

#### Other Notes

- Numbers may vary slightly due to rounding and confidential data appearing only in the totals column.
- Categories with fewer than 5 respondents are not shown to protect confidentiality.
- Bolded/highlighted results are the best for groups for the corresponding benchmarks.
- Yellow shading indicates responses more than 50% higher in the District versus the national benchmarks.
- Green shading indicates responses more than 50% lower in the District versus the national benchmarks.
- Notes: values are calculated from raw data.
- Drilldown results may be found in the District's comprehensive data report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organization Data</th>
<th>Client-Specific Statements</th>
<th>Great Place to Work® Model© Statements</th>
<th>Totals - Organization Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall)

Organization Data

Client-Specific Statements

Great Place to Work® Model© Statements

Totals - Organization Perspective

Fairness
- People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.
- I can ask management any reasonable question and get a straight answer.
- Everyone has an opportunity to get special recognition.
- People celebrate special events around here.
- Management is competent at running the business.
- This is a friendly place to work.
- Management is approachable, easy to talk with.
- Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work.
- Management shows a sincere interest in me as a person, not just an employee.
- Management keeps me informed about important issues and changes.
- This is a fun place to work.
- When I look at what we accomplish, I feel a sense of pride.
- I am able to take time off from work when I think it's necessary.
- When people change jobs or work units, they are made to feel right at home.
- I am given the resources and equipment to do my job.
- I feel I make a difference here.
- Unclassified
- I believe management would lay people off only as a last resort.
- Management does a good job of assigning and coordinating people.
- People look forward to coming to work here.
- People are treated fairly regardless of their sex.
- People are treated fairly regardless of their age.
- People are encouraged to balance their work life and their personal life.
- Management's actions match its words.
- People care about each other here.
- People are not ridiculed due to their background, personal traits, or characteristics.
- People here are willing to give extra to get the job done.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their religion.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their sexual orientation.
- People here are given a lot of responsibility.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their race.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their marital status.
- If I am unfairly treated, I believe I'll be given a fair shake if I appeal.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their national origin.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their physical characteristics.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their gender identity.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their physical appearance.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their education.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their appearance.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their disability.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their ethnicity.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their national origin.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their health.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their language.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their religious affiliation.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their country of origin.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their citizenship.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their cultural background.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their social class.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their political beliefs.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their gender.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their age.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their income.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their job status.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their employment status.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their employment level.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their status.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their role.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their position.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their seniority.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their seniority level.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work status.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work level.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work experience.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work type.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work environment.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work atmosphere.
- People here are treated fairly regardless of their work culture.
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### Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall): Work Group Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Difference (2016 Over 2014)</th>
<th>150+ Employees</th>
<th>20-149 Employees</th>
<th>10-19 Employees</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Between Unionized and Non-Unionized</th>
<th>Between More than 75% Minority and Other</th>
<th>Between 150 and 200</th>
<th>Between 201 and 300</th>
<th>Between 301 and 500</th>
<th>500 or Less</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Management - Frontline or Department or Executive/C-Level Leader</th>
<th>Management - Mid Manager</th>
<th>Management - Senior Manager</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals - Work Group Perspective</th>
<th>Management - Frontline or Department or Executive/C-Level Leader</th>
<th>Management - Mid Manager</th>
<th>Management - Senior Manager</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals - Work Group Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Great Place to Work®**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall): Work Group Data</th>
<th>2016 WG</th>
<th>2015 WG</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>150+ Employees</th>
<th>10-19 Employees</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
<th>Between Unionized and Non-Unionized</th>
<th>Between More than 75% Minority and Other</th>
<th>Between 150 and 200</th>
<th>Between 201 and 300</th>
<th>Between 301 and 500</th>
<th>500 or Less</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Management - Frontline or Department or Executive/C-Level Leader</th>
<th>Management - Mid Manager</th>
<th>Management - Senior Manager</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals - Work Group Perspective</th>
<th>Management - Frontline or Department or Executive/C-Level Leader</th>
<th>Management - Mid Manager</th>
<th>Management - Senior Manager</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals - Work Group Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camaraderie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel the District has effective processes in place to ensure the delivery of quality products and services.
## Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall): Work Group Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
<th>Credible</th>
<th>Uncreditable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management keeps me informed about important issues and changes.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to work here for a long time.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management is approachable, easy to talk with.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can raise issues without fear of retaliation.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know where to turn for guidance at work about ethical issues, harassment or discrimination.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be myself around here.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management trusts people to do a good job without watching over their shoulders.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management has a clear view of where the organization is going and how to get there.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management delivers on its promises.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management shows appreciation for good work and extra effort.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are encouraged to balance their work life and their personal life.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have special and unique benefits here.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I receive a fair share of the profits made by this organization.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am offered training or development to further myself professionally.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am given the resources and equipment to do my job.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average of all Great Place to Work® Model© Statements

| Average Rating | 68 |

### Number of Responses

| | 61 | 75 | 72 | 84 | 74 | 67 | 64 | 70 | 63 | 70 | 69 | 70 | 77 | 65 | 66 | 70 | 70 | 69 | 69 |
| Great Place to Work® | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### Credibility

- Blue shading highlights results that are less than 17 points below the corresponding benchmark.
- Yellow shading indicates responses more than 30 points above the corresponding benchmark.

### Notes

- Results shaded in blue are at least 17 points below the corresponding benchmark.
- Results shaded in yellow are more than 30 points above the corresponding benchmark.
## Santa Clara Valley Water District (Overall): Work Group Data

### 2016 WG

**Unclassified**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Pride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 WG</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Pride</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016 WG</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- **Credibility** includes items related to the organization's reputation and trustworthiness.
- **Respect** focuses on the respect and consideration individuals receive from their colleagues.
- **Fairness** examines how fairly individuals feel they are treated.
- **Pride** investigates the extent to which individuals feel proud of their work and their organization.

**Survey Results** are compared with one or more benchmarks. Your results may include the list of Best Companies or derivative benchmarks. These numbers may vary slightly due to rounding and confidential data appearing only in the totals column.

Categories with fewer than 5 respondents are not shown to protect confidentiality.

Blue shading highlights results that are less than 17 points below the corresponding benchmark. Yellow shading indicates responses more than 30 points below the comparison benchmark.

This chart highlights high ratings (+2) and low ratings (-2) relative to the corresponding benchmark. Positive ratings indicate responses more than 17 points above the benchmark, while negative ratings indicate responses more than 17 points below the benchmark. For example, positive ratings for **Credibility** could be due to high ratings for items such as **Employees feel the District has effective processes in place to ensure the delivery of quality products and services.**

---

*©2016 Great Place to Work® Institute, Inc. All rights reserved.*
Current D&I Program Success Measures

I. Great Place to Work Engagement Survey
II. Annual Disparate Impact Report
III. FY 18 Q3 Applicant v. Hire Demographics
IV. FY 18 Q3 Workforce Demographics
V. FY 18 Q2-Q3 Outreach Effort Results
VI. FY 18 Summer Intern Demographics
VII. Diversity Training for Current Staff
VIII. Diversity and Inclusion Hours for Current Staff
IX. Employee Resource Group Metrics
X. Diversity Snapshots
XI. Master Plan Tracking
### Great Place to Work®

Taking everything into account, I would say this is a great place to work.

58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Management keeps me informed about important issues and changes.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Management makes its expectations clear.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I can ask management any reasonable question and get a straight answer.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Management is approachable, easy to talk with.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Management is competent at running the business.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Management hires people who fit in well here.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Management does a good job of assigning and coordinating people.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Management trusts people to do a good job without watching over their shoulders.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 People here are given a lot of responsibility.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Management has a clear view of where the organization is going and how to get there.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Management delivers on its promises.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Management’s actions match its words.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 I believe management would lay people off only as a last resort.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Management is honest and ethical in its business practices.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Credibility Average**: 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 I am offered training or development to further myself professionally.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am given the resources and equipment to do my job.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Management shows appreciation for good work and extra effort.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Management recognizes honest mistakes as part of doing business.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Management genuinely seeks and responds to suggestions and ideas.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Management involves people in decisions that affect their jobs or work environment.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 This is a physically safe place to work.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 This is a psychologically and emotionally healthy place to work.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Our facilities contribute to a good working environment.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 I am able to take time off from work when I think it’s necessary.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 People are encouraged to balance their work life and their personal life.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Management shows a sincere interest in me as a person, not just an employee.</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 We have special and unique benefits here.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Respect Average**: 52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel I receive a fair share of the profits made by this organization.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Everyone has an opportunity to get special recognition.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I am treated as a full member here regardless of my position.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Promotions go to those who best deserve them.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Managers avoid playing favorites.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>People avoid politicking and backstabbing as ways to get things done.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their age.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their race.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their sex.</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their sexual orientation.</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>If I am unfairly treated, I believe I'll be given a fair shake if I appeal.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fairness Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pride</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I feel I make a difference here.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My work has special meaning: this is not &quot;just a job&quot;.</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>When I look at what we accomplish, I feel a sense of pride.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>People here are willing to give extra to get the job done.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I want to work here for a long time.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I'm proud to tell others I work here.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>People look forward to coming to work here.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I feel good about the ways we contribute to the community.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pride Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Camaraderie</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I can be myself around here.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>People celebrate special events around here.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>People care about each other here.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This is a friendly place to work.</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>This is a fun place to work.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>When you join the company, you are made to feel welcome.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>When people change jobs or work units, they are made to feel right at home.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>There is a &quot;family&quot; or &quot;team&quot; feeling here.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>We're all in this together.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>You can count on people to cooperate.</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camaraderie Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2016 Great Place To Work Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>African American/ Black</th>
<th>American Indian/Native Hawaiian</th>
<th>Caucasian/ White</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Filipino</th>
<th>Hispanic/ Latino</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Vietnamese</th>
<th>Two or more</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number who took survey</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their age</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their race</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here are treated fairly regardless of their sex</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Below Overall Benchmark**

**Above Overall Benchmark**
Annually, an outside consultant provides a disparate impact report to EEO.

The report monitors hiring, employee movement and compensation.

Identification of any potential disparate impact.

EEO reviews results and identifies justifications where they exist.

District’s counsel can provide Board with report as a confidential attorney-client communication.
## FY 18 Q3 Workforce Demographics

### FY18 Q3 DEMOGRAPHIC BY JOB GROUP COMPARISON - DISTRICT / SANTA CLARA COUNTY WORKFORCE *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Group</th>
<th>White (%) **</th>
<th>Black (%) **</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino (%) **</th>
<th>Asian (%) **</th>
<th>American Indian/NHOPI/Two or More (%) **</th>
<th>Minority %</th>
<th># of Ees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Organization</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Officials &amp; Managers</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Supervisors</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Eng/Tech Professionals</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Scientific Professionals</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Admin Professionals</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Sr Technicians</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Technicians</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Sr Clerical</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Office &amp; Clerical</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Skilled Craft</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Service &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Distribution of Demographics across job groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Demographics across job groups</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* District data as of March 31, 2018; Santa Clara County Data as of 2010 Census mapped to District Classifications

** 24.3% of employees have not self disclosed their ethnicity; EEOP has identified ethnicity for those individuals as allowed by law.

+ Totals may not add up to 100% due to rounding.

^ The categories of American Indian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Two or More have been combined.
## FY 18 Q3 Applicant v. Hire Data

### FY18 Q3: QUARTERLY APPLICATIONS RECEIVED VERSUS NEW EXTERNAL/INTERNAL HIRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African American/Black</th>
<th>Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>American Indian/Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander/Two or More</th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce for Positions Hired</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Applicant Pool</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications Received</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hires</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Hires Percent</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. Applicant Pool includes all applications received in response to 45 Open Recruitments filled with start date in Q2 or Q3
2. Hires includes all external and internal new hires from open job postings with start date in Q2 or Q3
3. Percentages rounded to nearest full number

^The categories of American Indian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander and Two or More have been combined
Recent efforts to increase diversity in the applicant pool seem to have been unsuccessful

- Careers in Government Contract
The diversity of District summer college interns has steadily increased over the past 5 years, with the most marked difference this current summer.

This summer, for the first time, the D&I Program joined HR and screened all applications with identifying information, GPA, school names removed.

**Summer College Intern Demographics 2013-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>AmInd/An</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Two+</th>
<th>Und</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In FY18, for the first time, D&I conducted a training for Emerging Leaders and MLT on bias and privilege. Below are the results of the anonymous surveys that came out of the Emerging Leaders Training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) was/were prepared and knowledgeable about the topic</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content of this course is useful to my present job and/or career development</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity and Inclusion Hours and Workplan Goals

- In FY18, for the first time ever, all staff were allocated 5 hours to charge to D&I to attend trainings, ERG events, and ERG meetings.
- Collectively, staff other than D&I staff, used 2,259 hours.
- In FY19, all staff were again allocated 5 hours to dedicate to D&I.
- As of mid-year evaluations in FY2018, 94% of staff had either achieved or were on target to achieve their Diversity and Inclusion goal.

Work Plan Goal

Demonstrate a commitment to diversity, inclusion, increasing employee morale, and employee engagement through participation in ERG events and initiatives, Employee Recognition events and initiatives, Inclusion events and initiatives, or other relationship building activities. This goal can also be achieved by enhancing managerial soft skills through training, coaching or self-learning.
## Employee Resource Groups

Participation and spending in ERGs has increased significantly since the 2011 Audit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Resource Group</th>
<th>2011 Audit Actual Expenditures per ERG</th>
<th>FY18 Expenditures</th>
<th>2011 Audit ERG Members*</th>
<th>2018 ERG Members*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Resource Group</td>
<td>$950</td>
<td>$1,565</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Black Employees</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Awareness</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-American Association</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT/SA</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Latino/a Affairs</td>
<td>$977</td>
<td>$1,700.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Advisory Network</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Awareness Group</td>
<td>$184</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing and Recognizing Y Gen Professionals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Team</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,586</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,315</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>582</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Many employees participate in multiple ERGs
**Employee Resource Group Event Surveys**

ERG Event attendance over the past 2 years is, on average, about 100 attendees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% of Attendees Who Agree**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This event was informative. I learned something I wouldn’t have known if I had not attended.*</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a great community building event.*</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statement varied slightly over the years  **"Strongly Agree" and "Agree" combined
“Seeing how the ERGs encourage camaraderie and cooperation amongst District employees in different groupings than occur during the course of business, and do so in such an open and inclusive way.”

“This event was fun! Before Salam advocated for mingling with new coworkers, I was approached by a coworker from a different building and spoke with him about his background. It was a great way to meet new people.”

“Food and people—was nice to mingle. Also, I know people have diverse background, but physically seeing them and chatting with them at their ERG booth really brought their stories to life.”
Diversity Snapshots, a initiative out of D&I, are very popular with staff.

While the average post by D&I often receives about 105 unique page views, Diversity Snapshots receive around 360 with many employees commenting on the post.
Of the 53 specific tactics, 46 are ongoing or have been completed.
COMMITTEE AGENDA MEMORANDUM

Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee

SUBJECT:
Review Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee Work Plan and the Committee’s Next Meeting Agenda.

RECOMMENDATION:
Review the Committee’s Work Plan to guide the Committee’s discussions regarding policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation.

SUMMARY:
The Committee’s Work Plan outlines the Board-approved topics for discussion to be able to prepare policy alternatives and implications for Board deliberation. The work plan is agendized at each meeting as accomplishments are updated and to review additional work plan assignments by the Board.

BACKGROUND:

Governance Process Policy-8:
The District Act provides for the creation of advisory boards, committees, or committees by resolution to serve at the pleasure of the Board.

Accordingly, the Board has established Advisory Committees, which bring respective expertise and community interest, to advise the Board, when requested, in a capacity as defined: prepare Board policy alternatives and provide comment on activities in the implementation of the District’s mission for Board consideration. In keeping with the Board’s broader focus, Advisory Committees will not direct the implementation of District programs and projects, other than to receive information and provide comment.

Further, in accordance with Governance Process Policy-3, when requested by the Board, the Advisory Committees may help the Board produce the link between the District and the public through information sharing to the communities they represent.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment 1: Diversity & Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee 2019 Work Plan
UNCLASSIFIED MANAGER:
Michele King, 408-630-2711
The annual work plan establishes a framework for committee discussion and action during the annual meeting schedule. The committee work plan is a dynamic document, subject to change as external and internal issues impacting the District occur and are recommended for committee discussion. Subsequently, an annual committee accomplishments report is developed based on the work plan and presented to the District Board of Directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>WORK PLAN ITEM</th>
<th>MEETING</th>
<th>INTENDED OUTCOME(S) (Action or Information Only)</th>
<th>ACCOMPLISHMENT DATE AND OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hiring and Promotions Report</td>
<td>3-8-19</td>
<td>• Receive and discuss information regarding FY18 hires at the District. <em>(Action)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review Outcomes the Success of the Diversity and Inclusion Program</td>
<td>3-8-19</td>
<td>• Review Outcomes the Success of the Diversity and Inclusion Program. <em>(Action)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review of Diversity and Inclusion Ad Hoc Committee Work Plan, the Outcomes of Board Action of Committee Requests and the Committee’s Next Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>3-8-19</td>
<td>• Receive and review the 2018 Committee work plan. <em>(Action)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit requests to the Board, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>