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Dear Interested Party:

At the suggestion of the California Elected Women's Association for Education & Research (CEWAER), the California Women Legislator's Caucus requested in January of 1988 that the Senate Rules Committee sponsor The California Board and Commission Project, a research proposal to investigate the representation of women on boards and commissions at both the state and local levels.

The results of this year-long examination are now before you and represent the most comprehensive survey to-date of women's participation on public advisory boards.

In addition to providing hard facts to document the perception that women are under-represented on appointive boards, this study opens our eyes to some of the more subtle impacts of the appointments process.

Not only are there far fewer women on state, county and city boards and commissions, women are less likely to be paid, less likely to regulate, and less likely to serve on boards advising in their non-traditional areas of employment.

To ensure that our public advisory boards are truly representative, we must know who we are appointing to advise. This report, California Women Get on Board, is a positive step in understanding the dynamics of the appointment process and directing our efforts to a more representative democracy.

We thank the Senate Rules Committee for their leadership in sponsoring this research, and hope that you, the reader, will benefit from the information in the report.
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Executive Summary

In January of 1988, the California Women Legislators Caucus requested that the Senate Rules Committee sponsor The California Board and Commission Project, a study to investigate the representation of women on both statewide and local boards and commissions.

More than a decade previously, legislation had been adopted requiring that public records be maintained on state, county and city board and commission appointments. The authorizing Government Codes, Section 12033 adopted in 1974 and Section 54970 adopted in 1975, also established requirements for public noticing of board vacancies.

Using the registries, the purpose of the California Board and Commission Project was to evaluate the extent to which the state's boards and commissions were balanced and representative of the state's general population -- with a particular focus on the participation of women.

Due to the considerable cooperation of local jurisdictions, registries were gathered from a representative sample of 18 counties and 24 cities. The Office of the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Office of the Speaker were also generous in providing information on their more than 3000 state appointments.

The results provide hard facts to back up more informal observations that there is significant under-representation of women on both statewide and local boards and commissions. Moreover, the results aid in the process of identifying where additional attention is needed if parity is to be achieved.

At the state level, women held only 27.6% of all board and commission appointments. In the sample of 18 counties, women held 34.3% of all board seats. In the sample of 24 cities, women held 35.5% of the advisory positions.

Women did not reach parity, or 51%, on any board type at the state level. In counties, women only reached parity on one type of board: health and social services. In cities, women only reached parity on health and social service boards and library boards. At all levels of government, the representation of women decreased dramatically on boards advising in women's non-traditional areas of employment.
HISTORY AND INTRODUCTION

The Legislature finds and declares that a vast and largely untapped reservoir of talent exists among the citizenry of the State of California, and that rich and varied segments of this great human resource are, all too frequently, not aware of the many opportunities which exist to participate in and serve on state regulatory and advisory boards and commissions to which the Governor, the Legislature and others make more than 2,000 appointments. 

Government Code, Section 12033(a)

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. 

Cervantes, Don Quixote

In 1974, the California State Legislature, at the request of the California Commission on the Status of Women, supported a bill sponsored by then Assemblyman Ken Maddy. The legislation required that the Governor “prepare and maintain an Open Central Registry of Appointive Offices, which shall be available to the general public in the offices of the Secretary of State in the Cities of Sacramento and Los Angeles, the State Library, and in each county clerk’s office.” Requirements were also set in place for updating the registry and for timely and adequate public notification of vacancies on statewide boards and commissions.

The following year, similar legislation was adopted for cities and counties. The Maddy Local Appointive List Act of 1975 set forth requirements for local registries and public notification of board vacancies. (Government Code, Section 54970)

Looking back historically, these codes appear to have been adopted in the post-Watergate fervor of open records and accountable government. And while they represent an admirable step forward in providing members of the public with information on public advisory boards, it is not evident that improved public noticing has necessarily resulted in equal “opportunity to participate in and contribute to the operations of local government.”

At the suggestion of the California Elected Women’s Association for Education & Research (CEWAER), the California Women Legislators Caucus requested in January of 1988 that the Senate Rules Committee sponsor The California
Board and Commission Project, a research proposal to investigate the representation of women on boards and commissions at both the state and local levels.

Over the past year, the Project Director has worked with state and local officials to collect and evaluate information on the representation of women on California boards and commissions.

Information on local boards and commissions was provided by City and County Clerks from throughout the state. The Governor's Office, the Senate Rules Committee and the Office of the Speaker also provided information on their appointments.

Key in the formulation of the research strategy and analysis was an active Advisory Board comprised of non-partisan, statewide women's organizations (See Appendix A). Research support was also provided by the Public Service Research and Dissemination Program from the University of California at Davis.4

Section One of the following report examines women's representation on statewide boards and commissions. Section Two reviews the participation of women in a representative sample of local boards and commissions. Section Three summarizes the conclusions of the study and briefly discusses measures adopted by different jurisdictions to increase participation on public advisory boards and commissions.
SECTION ONE
REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN ON STATEWIDE
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Collecting and Coding Information on Statewide Appointments

Information on all board and commission appointments made by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the Assembly are compiled and listed in the Central Registry, as required under Government Code, Section 12033.

As a practical matter, each of the appointing authorities also maintains a computer file on their appointments, including background information on gender, ethnicity, party affiliation -- and in some cases, education and occupation. None of this background information is required by law.

All of the appointing authorities responded affirmatively to the request from the California Board and Commission Project to provide copies of their appointment lists and related background information. The considerable cooperation from the Governor’s Office, the Senate Rules Committee and the Office of the Speaker contributed to a more informative analysis of the appointment process and the backgrounds of the appointees.

The list of Gubernatorial appointments was current as of July 8, 1988. The Senate and Assembly lists were current as of July 15, 1988. Because the information was provided at a set point in time, comparisons between the different appointing authorities are valid. However, it should be noted that the data does not allow for comparisons over time.

After the information was collected, a coding scheme was developed, and all of the information was coded. Displayed as Appendix B, this coding scheme can be adapted for future use in the State of California or in other studies of statewide appointments.
State Results
A total of 3044 appointments to state boards and commissions were analyzed. The Governor made 76.5% (2330) of the total appointments. The Senate Rules Committee and President Pro Tempore of the Senate made 13.3% (404), while the Speaker of the Assembly made 10.2% (310).

• Women are appointed to less than 30% of all state appointments
Of the 3044 state appointments, 27.6% (840) were held by women while 72.4% (2204) were held by men. Two and one-half times more men were appointed than women; or, for every 25 appointments received by men, women received only 10.

None of the three appointing authorities reached parity. The Speaker of the Assembly appointed the highest proportion of women to statewide boards and commissions, appointing 29.4% (91) of his 310 appointments. Out of the Governor's 2330 appointments, 27.8% (648) were women. 25% (101) of the Senate's 404 appointments were women.

• Women did not reach parity on any type of board
An overall analysis of the representation of women is aided not only by considering their overall percentage contrasted to that for men, but also by comparing how women are represented on different types of boards.

After coding all state boards and commissions by type (e.g, health and social services, finance and economic development, etc.), there was not a single board-type that had parity representation of women. Parity was estimated at 51%, based on women's representation in the state population.
• **Highest proportion of women on boards advising in traditional employment areas**

It is only on boards advising in areas of women’s traditional areas of employment that the proportion of appointed women significantly exceeded their overall average of 27.6%.

The highest proportion of women appointees was in the area of health and social services where 41% of the 706 appointments were held by women. The second highest proportion of women appointees was in the area of education where women held 35% of the 204 appointments. While this preponderance of women on boards advising in their traditional areas of employment may not be surprising, it is clear that more than 10 years of public noticing has not achieved a more "level advisory field." Moreover, not even on these "traditional" boards did women achieve 51% or parity representation.

In fact, it was women's representation on these "traditional" boards which bolstered their representation statewide. When appointments to the health and social service boards and the education boards were removed from the analysis, the overall proportion of women on statewide boards and commissions fell to 22%, just over one-fifth of all appointments.
• Appointment of women to boards in non-traditional employment areas was dismally low

The proportions of women on what might be called non-traditional boards were considerably lower than their overall average of 27.6%. Only 10% of the 77 positions on public safety boards and 11% of the 119 positions on transportation and public works boards were held by women. 19% of the 242 positions advising in the area of the environment and natural resources, 20% of the 355 positions dealing with tourism, and 21% of the 212 finance and economic development appointments were held by women.
• **Women somewhat less likely to hold salaried board positions**

The study examined the percentages of women and men that received no compensation, expenses and/or per diem, or salaries for their work as state commissioners.

Overall, women were appointed to 26% of the 660 non-compensated positions and 27% of the 1913 board positions receiving only expenses and/or per diem. Women held 22% of the 73 salaried positions. Information was not available for 13% of the appointees.⁸

<p>| Women's Percentage Share of Compensated and Non-Compensated Appointments on State Boards |
|---------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Compensation</th>
<th>Expenses/ Per Diem</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's Share (%)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focusing on salaried positions, we found that the Governor made 92% of the appointments to the salaried positions (67/73), and 19% of the Governor's appointments (13/67) to salaried positions were women. Information was not available for 12% of the Governor's appointees. The Senate made 3 salaried appointments, 2 men and 1 woman. The Speaker also made 3 salaried appointments, 2 women and 1 man.

27% of the Governor's appointments to both non-compensated boards and expenses/per diem boards were women. In contrast, 18% (11/62) of the Senate's appointments to non-compensated boards were women, while 23% (62/267) of the positions receiving expenses or per diem were women. Information on compensation was not available for 18% of the Senate appointments.
The Speaker appointed women to 23% (10/44) of his non-compensated appointments and to 27% (61/225) of his appointments receiving expenses or per diem. Information on compensation was not available for 12% of the Speaker's appointments.

- **Men more likely to hold regulatory positions while women more likely to hold advisory positions**

Men were more likely to be appointed to regulatory positions (50%) than they were to hold advisory positions (44%), while women were more likely to hold advisory positions (47%) than they were to hold regulatory positions (44%). (For both men and women, the remaining percentages included appointments to quasi-judicial boards or missing information.)

Women held only 25% of the 1477 regulatory positions, while men held 75% (1105). Women held 29% of the 1367 advisory positions, while men held 71%. Information was available for all but 6.5% of the population.

Not only did a higher proportion of male appointees hold regulatory positions, men also held a larger share of the regulatory positions than of the advisory positions. In short, men were more likely to be appointed to positions with regulatory decision-making power than were women.

---

**Percentages of Women Appointed to Advisory and Regulatory State Boards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>Regulatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Men appointed to three-fourths of appointments requiring Senate confirmation

23%, or 529, of the Governor’s 2330 appointees required Senate confirmation.¹⁰

Compared to men, women had a somewhat reduced opportunity to be appointed to boards requiring Senate confirmation. 24% of all male Gubernatorial appointees held positions requiring Senate confirmation, compared to 20% of all women appointees.

Women held 29% of the 1798 positions not requiring confirmation, but only 25% of the positions requiring confirmation.

![Percentage of Men and Women Holding Board Appointments Requiring Senate Confirmation (Governor’s Appointments Only)](chart)

• Republican men most likely to be appointed and Democratic women least likely to be appointed

Republican men received 48% (1453) of all statewide appointments; Republican women received 20% (595); Democratic men received 14% (428); and Democratic women received 5% (145). 14% of the population (423) reported either no party information or affiliation with a party other than the two major parties.

These proportions contrast significantly with the proportions of Republican and Democratic men and women in the state’s voting population. Using unpublished data from the Field Institute, voter registration can be estimated to include 20% Republican men, 21% Republican women, 22% Democratic men, and 27% Democratic women, with the remainder declined-to-state.¹¹ Thus, it would appear that Republican men hold appointments at more than twice the rate of their representation in the voting public, while Democratic women are appointed at a rate one-fifth their representation in the voting population.
The Governor, a Republican, is the appointing authority with the greatest number of appointees, and has major impact on the overall percentages. It appears that his appointments may be made on a more partisan basis than the Speaker's, a Democrat, who is the only other appointing authority with reliable information on party affiliation.

60% (1400) of the Governor's appointments were Republican men, and 25% (585) were Republican women. Only 9% (211) of his appointments were Democratic men, while a mere 2% (42) were Democratic women. These figures are a fair representation of the Governor's appointment priorities in that party affiliation was available for all but 92 appointees, or 4%, of his 2330 total appointments.

Party affiliation was not available for 73% of the Senate appointments, making any conclusions inappropriate. However, party affiliation was available for all but 12% of the Speaker's appointments. 47% (145) of the Speaker's 310 appointments were Democratic men; 26% (81) were Democratic women; 12% (38) were Republican men; and 3% (8) were Republican women.

Two conclusions can be drawn from the above information. First, 85% of the Governor's appointees were from his own party, while 73% of the Speaker's appointments were from his own party, although this statement must be tempered by the higher proportion of missing information for the Speaker's appointments. While partisanship clearly plays a role in both of their decision-making processes, it may weigh more heavily in the case of the Governor. It also appears that women from the opposite party of the appointing authority, be it Democratic or Republican, have the least likelihood of being appointed.

**Partisan Affiliation and Gender of Governor's Appointments**

(2330 appointments)
Partisan Affiliation and Gender of the Speaker's Appointments
(310 appointments)

- Ethnic background information inconclusive -- but may point to significant under-representation of Latinos

Ethnic information was not available for 26% (789) of the population, but for those that did report: 57% (1733) of all appointments were Caucasian, 7% (208) were Latinos, 5% (165) were African-American, and 4% (125) were Asian/Pacific Islander. As mentioned earlier, the source for this information was the rosters supplied by the three appointing authorities.

Statewide population statistics as projected by the Department of Finance for 1988 show the Caucasian population at 59.5%, the Latino population at 23.7%, and the African-American population at 7.5%. The Department does not have specific 1988 projections for the Asian/Pacific Islander population, but the 1980 Census figures reported 5.5% for 1980.

Given the fact that ethnic information for one-quarter of the appointees was not available, it is not possible to make any definitive statements comparing the representation of ethnic groups. However, the possibility of significant Latino under-representation deserves further scrutiny.

- African-American appointments nearest to gender-balance

Caucasian women and Latinas had 27% of the appointments held by their ethnic group, the approximate percentage of women's overall appointment rate. African-American women were the only ethnic group that came close to equal-
ing the number of appointments held by their male counterparts, holding 41% (68) of the 165 appointments held by African-American appointees as a whole. Asian/Pacific Islander women held 35% (44) of the 125 appointments held by their ethnic group. Again, these conclusions are based on data where ethnicity was not available or not reported for about one-fourth of the respondents.

The Governor's appointees were far more likely not to report ethnicity. 30% of the Governor's appointees, compared to 15% of the Senate's appointees and 7% of the Assembly appointees, did not have information on ethnicity.\textsuperscript{14}

54% of the Gubernatorial appointees were Caucasian; 7% were Latino; 4% were African-American; 3% were Asian/Pacific Islander; 1% identified an "other" ethnic group, and the remaining 30% were not identified by ethnicity. Many appointees identified themselves as Armenian, the Governor's ethnic background, but there was no separate code for this group.\textsuperscript{15}

71% of the Senate appointees were Caucasian; 6% were Asian/Pacific Islander; 5% were Latino; and 2% were African-American. 15% were not identified by ethnicity.

59% of the Speaker's appointments were Caucasian; 17% were African-American; 9% were Hispanic; 7% were Asian/Pacific Islander; 1% identified an "other" ethnic category, and the remaining 7% were not identified by ethnicity.

• **Occupational and educational backgrounds of Gubernatorial appointees**

Information on the occupational and educational backgrounds was obtained for the Gubernatorial appointments only. While this information suffers from a high percentage of missing data, it nevertheless provides some insights into the backgrounds of the men and women who received state appointments. Percentages in the following discussion are based on a total of 2330 appointments, including 1682 men and 648 women.

11% (260) of the appointees were self-employed -- 12% of the male appointees and 9% of the female employees. Information on self-employment was not available for 38% of of the 2330 appointments.

17% (407) of the appointees worked in the public sector, and this percentage was approximately the same for both male and female appointees. 39% (906) overall worked in the private sector -- 42% of the male appointees and 31% of the female appointees. Only 2% (49) of all appointees reported working for public interest organizations, including 2% of the male appointees and 3% of
the female appointees. Information on employment in the public or private sector was not available for 38% of the 2330 appointees.

Women comprised 24% of the appointees that reported they were attorneys, or 23 out of 97. Women held 21% (84) of the 406 positions reported in administration, 23% (35) of the 151 reported in the medical profession, and 40% (41) of the 102 reported in education. Occupational information was missing for 39% of the population.

21% of all appointees were college graduates, including 20% of the women and 22% of the men. We found that a higher proportion of women (30%) than men (20%) had completed some college, while a higher proportion of men (35%) than women (26%) had obtained graduate degrees. Information on the appointee’s level of education was not available for 21% of the population.

There appear to be differences between men and women in educational backgrounds, though any conclusions are tempered by the fact that information on educational background was not available for 38% of the women and 37% of the men. 1% of the women had educational backgrounds in agriculture, 4% in law, 4% in math or science, 9% in medicine, and another 9% in business. 11% of the women appointees reported an educational background in both liberal arts and in education, while 13% reported an educational background in the social sciences.

The educational backgrounds of the male appointees differed, with 14% reporting business, 10% medicine, 10% science or math, 8% social science, 6% agriculture, 4% liberal arts, and 3% education.

While the above information on employment and education is not conclusive, it does suggest that men and women either self-select and/or are recruited from very different educational and professional backgrounds.16

• **Women less likely to be married**

Information on marital status was either not available or not reported for 21% of the board members. 75% reported being married, with a greater proportion of men (80%) than women (65%). A greater proportion of women did not report marital status (30%) than did men (17%).

Research on elected men and women has demonstrated that women are less likely to be married than elected men.17 The above results on appointees, while inconclusive, may add evidence that the political role for women, even in an advisory capacity, may be more difficult to combine with the roles of wife, mother and/or professional. It could also be that marital status is a more sensitive characteristic for women, and they may simply be more unwilling to report it.18
Discussion of Results on State Appointments

Despite more than a decade of public noticing, the proportion of women on statewide boards and commissions has not reached their percentage in the population. In fact, women did not reach parity representation on any type of board. The problem of under-representation appears to be particularly acute on boards where women have not traditionally been employed.

Other more subtle findings warrant further attention. Women were appointed to a slightly smaller share of salaried positions than they were to boards receiving expenses and/or per diem or no compensation at all.

Women were more likely to hold advisory positions than regulatory positions, while men were more likely to hold regulatory positions than advisory. A higher proportion of male appointees held positions on boards requiring Senate confirmation.

Women of the opposite party from the appointing authority appeared to be the group least likely to be appointed. Men of the same party as the appointing authority received the lion's share of appointments.

Although 25% of the population did not report ethnicity, there is a strong likelihood of significant Latino under-representation. Compared to women in other ethnic groups, African-American women came the closest to parity with their male counterparts.

Finally, information on the Governor’s appointments suggests that men and women may be recruited from different educational and occupational backgrounds.
SECTION TWO
REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN
ON LOCAL BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Selecting Cities and Counties to Study
Limited resources dictated that every city and county in the state could not be analyzed, and that a representative sample had to be selected.

Unfortunately, discussions with researchers at the League of California Cities, the County Supervisor's Association of California and many academic institutions made it clear that no standard practice existed for selecting a sample of local jurisdictions.

Moreover, it was determined that the practice of random sampling, common in most social science research, would not be completely appropriate. As Fred Springer, a professor of political science at the University of Missouri, so succinctly stated, "In this kind of study, you can't afford not to include Los Angeles!" The implication is that a purely random sample could, by chance, exclude major political, cultural and economic centers of the state.

Consequently, a method for selecting a sample had to be adopted that would take into account the political, as well as the theoretical and methodological concerns of the study. This approach, called "stratified sampling," selects cities or counties not simply at random, but perhaps more importantly, based on their size, nature or political impact.

The first decision was to include high population cities in order to evaluate the appointment process as it affects most Californians. By including high population cities and counties, we can examine the dynamics of representation for more than a majority of the population. Including the six highest population counties evaluates levels of representation for 60% of the state's population, while the top six cities encompass 30% of the state's population.

The remainder of the sample was selected based on whether or not the cities or counties could be described as "urban" or "non-urban." It was felt that cities and counties should be chosen with some sensitivity to the different political systems, work profiles, and family systems that may be operative in urban and non-urban areas.
Using Census Bureau definitions, an urban county was defined as any county which was a component of a "metropolitan statistical area." Not including the six high population counties, there were 26 urban and 26 non-urban counties.

An urban city was defined as any incorporated municipality that was included, in whole or in part, in an "urbanized area," as defined by the Census Bureau. Any city not included in the urbanized area became a "non-urban city." There were 247 urban cities (not including the 6 high population cities) and 169 non-urban cities out of a total of 422 cities incorporated at the time of the 1980 census.

After determining which cities and counties were urban and non-urban, a sample was randomly selected from each group, proportional to the total number within each category.

18 counties and 24 cities were selected for study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTIES (18)</th>
<th>CITIES (24)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-Population (6)</td>
<td>High Population (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Long Beach (Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles (Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Oakland (Alameda)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>San Diego (San Diego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>San Francisco (San Francisco)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Jose (Santa Clara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (6)</td>
<td>Urban (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>Compton (Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>El Cerrito (Contra Costa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>Gardena (Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>Rocklin (Placer County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Salinas (Monterey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Urban (6)</td>
<td>San Bernardino (San Bernardino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>San Clemente (Orange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>San Rafael (Marin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>Redlands (San Bernardino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>Non-Urban Cities (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>Holtville (Imperial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>Kingsburg (Fresno)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ojai (Ventura)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palmdale (Los Angeles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portola (Plumas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonora (Tuolumne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turlock (Stanislaus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willows (Glenn)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collecting and Coding the Data

Once the sample was selected, a letter was sent out requesting that Clerks of the Board of Supervisors and City Clerks provide an updated copy of their board and commission registries. In addition, Clerks were asked to note if the appointees were elected officials, city or county staff, or, in the case of "gender-neutral names" such as Kim or Chris, whether the individual was male or female.

The response rate for the study was 100%. We attribute this rare rate of response to three factors. First, the participating cities and counties displayed considerable cooperation and interest in the study. Secondly, follow-up calls were placed to each jurisdiction within two weeks of mailing the letter. And finally, the sponsorship of the Senate was undoubtedly a key factor in communicating the importance of the research effort.

All of the cities and counties forwarded copies of their registries, but all did not identify gender-neutral names. All of the data was collected within a period of two months.27

Once the information had been collected, we proceeded to code. For city appointees, calls were placed to individuals identified as staff contacts in order to determine if the board members with gender-neutral names were male or female. An analysis of the identified names showed that approximately the same number of men and women had gender-neutral names. Consequently, in analyzing the county data, where phone calls to identify the gender-neutral names would have been in the hundreds, the data was analyzed without the gender-neutral names.28

Appendix C provides the code book which may be of use for similar studies.
Results of the Research on City Boards

- **Women received just over one-third of all city appointments**

Based on the results of the 24 cities in the sample, we found that women received just over one-third (35.5%) of all appointments, or 1007 out of a total of 2835 seats. This difference was not a result of sample fluctuations, but represents a significant difference from women's 51% representation in the general population.

- **Significant variation in City appointments**

Percentages varied for each of the 24 cities examined — from a low of 0% for the City of Portola to highs of 44% for the City of San Francisco and 50% for the City of Willows. The table below arrays the percentages of women appointed to boards and commissions for each city. It should be recalled that these data were collected during a two month period in July and August in 1988. While these percentages may or may not reflect the current representation of women, the research provides an accurate snapshot in time and an appropriate database for comparing the different jurisdictions.
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• **Board-type affected the appointment of women**

The appointment of women varied significantly depending on the type of board. We analyzed women's appointment to types of boards independent of the city of appointment, and found that only 1 out of 14 board types had more than 51% representation of women.\(^\text{32}\)

• **Women only reached parity on two types of board**

It was only in the area of health and social services that the percentage of women appointed was more than 51%. However, statistical tests showed that the appointment of women to social service boards was not significantly different from 51%, nor was the appointment of women to library boards.\(^\text{33}\)

Women's representation on all other board types was significantly less than 51%.\(^\text{34}\) The table below provides the percentages of women appointed to each of the analyzed board-types.

### Percentage of Women on City Board-types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Soc. Services</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Eco. Dev.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Planning Related</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp. &amp; Pub. Works</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Women had highest representation on boards dealing with subject areas of women’s traditional employment**

In addition to the majority appointment of women on health and human service boards, we found that 48% (32/66) of the appointments to library boards and 46% (169/368) of the appointments to arts and culture boards were women.
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• **Women were significantly under-represented on boards advising in women's non-traditional employment areas**

City boards with the lowest percentage of female representation were in non-traditional employment areas for women. Women held only 12% (8/66) of the seats on construction boards, 17% (43/249) on the transportation/public works boards, 20% (15/76) on the redevelopment boards, 26% (72/278) on the planning and planning-related boards, and 27% (63/236) on the finance and economic development boards. Women held only 27.5% (33/120) of the appointments advising in the area of public safety.

It is important to remember that despite the fact that these boards deal with areas of non-traditional employment for women, they typically have an average of 7 to 9 members. It is hard to imagine that an aggressive outreach effort could not find qualified and interested women to fill these slots.
Women were almost two times as likely to be appointed to social service, library, and arts and culture boards than to fiscal and development boards.

We found that women were almost two times as likely to be appointed to boards in traditional employment areas (social service, arts & culture, libraries) than to boards that deal with non-traditional employment areas (construction, transportation/public works, redevelopment, planning, finance and public safety). 43% of all women were appointed to traditional employment boards, but only 23% of all women were appointed to non-traditional employment boards.
• **Men more likely to be appointed to fiscal or development boards than to social service and arts and culture boards**

In stark contrast to the appointment pattern of women, only 23% of all male appointees served on social service, cultural or library boards, while 43% of all male appointees served on construction, transportation/public works, planning, finance, or public safety boards.

### Percentages of Men Appointed to City Boards Advising in Men’s Traditional and Non-Traditional Employment Areas

- **Traditional**: 43%
- **Non-traditional**: 23%
- **Other**: 34%

• **Excluding social service seats, women held 32% of city board appointments**

When all appointments to city boards and commissions were analyzed, excluding seats on health and social service boards, we found that women held only 32% of the seats. This percentage dropped further to 31% when women’s rights commissions were subtracted from the total.

• **Women may not be appointed to power boards**

Women’s limited appointment to planning boards (26%) is of particular interest. Given the strong representation of women in the real estate profession and their traditional involvement in neighborhood associations, one would be hard pressed to argue that qualified women were not available for planning commission positions.

A more likely explanation is that planning commission appointments are highly competitive, and, viewed as “political plums,” are passed on to political insiders. Land use is a bread and butter issue for local government, and planning commission positions are often seen as launching pads for political office.

Indeed, a survey of 12 local jurisdictions (8 cities, 4 counties) found that planning commissions were the only boards uniformly identified as “power boards” by all jurisdictions. As one interviewee stated, planning commissions “make decisions which have great economic and environmental
implications for many people."

Thus, it may be that women's limited appointment to planning commissions is related to the fact that these important commissions are considered "power boards."

**City Characteristics**
The study of appointments to local boards and commissions also afforded an opportunity to examine how some structural variables, such as population, ethnic population and party registration, impact the appointment of women.

- **Higher population cities more likely to appoint women**
  Higher population cities were significantly more likely to appoint women to boards than were lower population cities (s=.55; p=.005). While the explanation is not clear, it could be that these jurisdictions are more likely to have political organizations and expectations that would call for balanced and representative advisory boards.

- **Higher representation of women in cities with higher African-American populations**
  We found that the percentage of women on city boards was significantly and positively associated with the percentage of African-American citizens in the population (s=.44; p=.03). The same effect was nearly significant for higher Asian/Pacific Islander populations, but was not found for the percentage of Latinos or for the total ethnic population.

- **Party registration had no impact**
  The percentage of Democrats or Republicans in the cities was not significantly related to the percentage of women appointed to boards and commissions.

- **More women in office correlated with more women on boards**
  The percentage of women elected to the community's city councils in 1982 was positively and highly correlated with the number of women serving on boards and commissions (s=.73; p<.0001). Thus, cities with a higher percentage of women serving on their city councils were more likely to have a higher percentage of women appointed to boards and commissions.

The percentage of women on city councils in 1988 was not correlated with the number of women on boards in 1988. This is most likely explained by the fact that appointments generally run in two to four year cycles, and it takes several years for the appointing authority to have an impact on the composition of the city boards.
Discussion of City Results

As with state appointments, the results from the research on city boards and commissions demonstrates that public noticing has not led to a "level advisory field." While women reached parity on boards in the areas of health and social services and libraries, most board-types, particularly in advisory areas outside of women's traditional employment, had significant under-representation of women.

Characteristics of the cities themselves were associated with the appointment of women. Taken together, it appears that urban characteristics -- higher population and higher African-American populations -- had a positive association with the increased appointment of women. A final, important finding is that cities with more women in elected office in 1982 tended to have a higher percentage of women appointed to boards and commissions in 1988.
**Results of the Research on County Boards**

For the 18 counties analyzed, there were a total of 7,649 board and commission appointments. Information on gender was available for 7,417 positions, or 97% of the appointees. Data were analyzed using only those positions for which we had information on gender.⁴²

- **Women held 34.3% of all county appointments**

Women appointees comprised 34.3% of the total appointees where gender was identified, or 2,545 of the 7,417 appointments.⁴³ Women's representation on county boards was significantly below their representation in the population.⁴⁴
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- **Counties varied significantly in their appointment of women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siski</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butte</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lassen</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Women reached or approached parity only on boards advising in areas of women's traditional employment**

In examining the type of boards on which women serve, the counties displayed a pattern similar to that of the cities. With the exception of women’s rights boards which had 100% female representation (137/137), health and social services was the only board-type with nearly 51% female representation; 1,031 out of the 2,040 appointees were women, or 50.5%.

As with the cities, women were more likely to have representation nearing parity on boards advising in areas of women’s traditional employment. The appointment of women to art and culture boards was at the 45% level, or 174 out of 385 seats. Women held 39.5% of the parks and recreation seats (64/162), and 37% of the education positions (32/86). However, statistical tests indicated that women’s representation was below their percentage in the population on all but the women’s rights boards and the health and social services boards.45
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• **Women had limited representation on boards outside areas of traditional employment**

In contrast to their parity representation on health and social services boards, women held only 5% of the construction positions (6/117), 9% of the agricultural positions (26/297), 14% of the transportation and public works seats (71/507), 20% of the positions on environmentally-related boards (37/188), and 21% of the seats on finance and economic development boards (89/426). Women held only 3% of the board seats (5/147) dealing with veteran’s issues and veteran’s building issues.
Parity

Percentages of Women Appointed to County Boards Advising in Women's Non-Traditional Employment Areas

- Few women found on district boards, more on inter-jurisdictional boards

Women’s representation on inter-jurisdictional boards — where appointments to the board are made by more than one jurisdiction — was much higher than on boards where members had specific geographic or regulatory authority. Women’s representation on inter-jurisdictional boards was at 37% (180/490), while their representation on appointed district or service area boards was at 25% (141/575).46

- Representation of women reduced to 28% when social service boards excluded

Excluding health and social service positions, we found that women’s representation was reduced to 28%. By removing the women’s rights boards, we found that women’s representation was barely over one-quarter of the seats — 26%.

County Characteristics

- More women on boards in counties with high population and high income

As with the cities, the size of the county’s population was positively associated with increases in the representation of women on the community’s boards and commissions (s=.54, p<.02). Unlike the cities, increases in the median income level of the county were also associated with increases in the county’s female board representation (s=.78; p=.0001).
• More women in counties with higher Asian/Pacific Islander populations

Increases in Asian/Pacific Islander population were positively correlated with female board representation (r=.63; p<.0005), but there was no significant association with the size of any other ethnic group, including African-Americans.\(^47\)

• No association between women's appointed representation and the county's percentage of elected women

Unlike the cities, counties with a higher percentage of elected women did not have a higher appointed representation of women, but this could have been due to the fact that there is such limited female representation among county supervisors, and as a consequence, limited variation to correlate with changes in the appointed representation of women. It is interesting to note that only one county, Santa Clara, had 3 female supervisors out of 5 in both 1982 and 1988, and this is also the county with the highest representation of appointed women.\(^48\)

• Voter's party affiliation had no association with appointment of women to boards

As with the cities, the percentage of registered Democrats or Republicans had no correlation with the representation of women on boards and commissions.\(^49\)

Discussion of County Results

As with state and city appointments, there appears to be significant under-representation of women on county boards, with the exception of the health and social services boards. Women were few and far between on boards advising in their non-traditional areas of employment.

As with the cities, urban characteristics, in this instance population, income, and Asian/Pacific Islander population, had a positive association with increased numbers of women on boards and commissions. However, no association was found between the percentage of women on county boards in 1988 and the percentage of elected women serving in either 1982 or 1988.
SECTION THREE
CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Appointment of women significantly less than 51% for all three levels of government

Women's appointment to statewide, county and city boards and commissions was significantly less than 51%, their proportion in the general population. Women's participation on statewide boards was only 27.6% for the 3044 appointments made by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee or Senate Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the Assembly. A representative sample of 24 cities and 18 counties found that women held approximately one-third of the board seats in cities and counties: 35.5% in the cities and 34.3% in the counties.

State Appointments

At the state level, women did not reach parity, or 51%, on any board-type. The highest representation was on health and social services boards (41%), followed by education boards (35%).

Participation on state boards was particularly low on boards advising in fields where women have not been traditionally employed. Women held only 10% of the public safety appointments, 11% of the transportation and public works appointments, 19% of the appointments to boards dealing with environmental and natural resources issues, 20% of the appointments to tourism boards, and 21% of the appointments to boards advising on finance and economic development.

We also found that women were somewhat less likely to hold salaried positions. Overall, women held 26% of the board positions receiving no compensation and 27% of the positions providing expenses or per diem, but 22% of the positions receiving salaries.

Men were more likely to hold regulatory positions (50%) than they were to hold advisory positions (44%), while women were more likely to hold advisory positions (47%) than they were to hold regulatory positions (44%).

Compared to men, women had a somewhat reduced opportunity to be appointed to boards requiring Senate confirmation. 24% of all male Gubernatorial appointees held positions requiring Senate confirmation, compared to 20% of all women appointees.

The appointee's political party appears to affect the likelihood of appointment.
The percentage of male Republican appointees was more than two times their representation in the voting population. In stark contrast, the percentage of Democratic female appointees was one-fifth their representation in the voting population. Republican men received 48% of all statewide appointments; Republican women received 20%; Democratic men received 14%; and Democratic women received 5%.

It appears that women from the opposite political party of the appointing authority, be it Democratic or Republican, had the least likelihood of being appointed. 60% of the Republican Governor’s appointments were Republican men and 25% were Republican women, while only 9% of his appointments were Democratic men and 2% were Democratic women. 47% of the Democratic Speaker’s appointments were Democratic men; 26% were Democratic women; 12% were Republican men; and 3% were Republican women. Party information was not available for 4% of the Gubernatorial appointments and 12% of the Speaker’s appointments. Reliable information on political party was not available for Senate appointments.

While ethnic information was not available for 26% of the population, 57% of all appointments were Caucasian, 7% were Latino, 5% were African-American, and 4% were Asian/Pacific Islander.

Caucasian women and Latinas had 27% of the appointments held by their ethnic group, while Asian/Pacific Islander women had 35%. African-American women were the nearest to parity with their male counterparts, holding 41% of the appointments by their ethnic group.

**Local Appointments**

In our sample of 24 cities, we found that women reached parity participation on only two types of boards -- health and social services and libraries. Women’s participation on arts and culture boards neared parity at 46%, but statistically, was significantly less than 51%.

As with state appointments, women’s representation on city boards advising in non-traditional employment areas was much lower than their appointment to boards advising in traditional employment areas. Women were almost two times as likely to be appointed to city social service, library, and arts and culture boards than to fiscal and development boards. The opposite held true for men.

In our sample of 18 counties, 100% of the appointments to women’s rights boards were women. Health and social service boards were the only other board-type where women’s participation was at parity. All other board-types had below-parity representation.
For both cities and counties, we found that increases in population were significantly and positively associated with the appointment of women. More women were also appointed in cities with higher African-American populations and in counties with higher Asian/Pacific Islander populations. The percentage of Democratic or Republican voters in the communities was not associated with the percentages of women on boards and commissions. Cities with a higher percentage of women elected in 1982 had a higher percentage of women in appointed office, but this association was not found for the counties.

**Future Directions**
The California Board and Commission Project represents a one-time analysis of the appointment of women to statewide and local boards and commissions. Additional research would enable the appointing authorities to track their progress over time.

- **Methodology established for ongoing tracking of appointments**
  Several products have resulted from this project that would assist with further research efforts. To begin with, a methodology has been established to sample cities and counties. In addition, codebooks have been developed to analyze various characteristics of the boards, including the different types of boards, a characteristic found to have significant impact on the appointment of women.

- **Adoption of a common information format would assist future research**
  Future research efforts would be assisted by the adoption of a common format for the collection of information on statewide and local appointees. As it currently stands, every jurisdiction develops its own format or computer program to maintain its records. The adoption of a common format would systematize the information collected. It would also be valuable to conduct a thorough review of the statewide and local registries to ensure that they include the information mandated by law.

- **Consider research on applicants as well as appointees**
  Appointing authorities, with minimal set-up time and cost, could develop reporting forms that would allow them to collect information on the pool of applicants as well as the appointees. Thus, information could be gathered to determine if the low percentages of appointment are due to low application rates and/or low appointment rates. Strategies could then be developed to increase outreach and/or to attend to the composition of boards when the appointment process is underway.
• Models exist for increased institutional commitment to gender-balanced boards

During the course of this study, it became clear that different jurisdictions place different priorities on the importance of gender-balance on their boards and commissions and the degree that they dedicate resources to accomplish this goal.

Several communities have established in-house outreach programs to solicit the applications of women and minorities. For example, the City of Visalia applied its affirmative action policies to their boards and commissions, and conducted a study of the representation of women and minorities. Their Director of Voluntary Services works actively to publicize and conduct outreach for board and commission vacancies.52

The County of San Diego has a Community Involvement Office under the jurisdiction of the County Administrator's Office which tracks appointments and makes official reports on age, ethnic and gender-balance.53

The Commission on the Status of Women in the City and County of San Francisco makes available "How to Get that Appointment," an impressive publication that educates interested individuals on the details of the appointments process, in addition to providing background information on the community's boards and commissions. The handbook is a successful example of a public-private partnership in that Chevron U.S.A. provided a corporate grant to publish the handbook.54

Other appointment projects throughout the country, most notably the New Jersey Bipartisan Coalition for Women's Appointments55 and the national Coalition for Women's Appointments sponsored by the National Women's Political Caucus and other national women's organizations, are examples of non-governmental organizations that have monitored the appointment of women and worked with the appointing authorities to recruit candidates.

Finally, the American Association of University Women has successfully proposed legislation that would require gender-balance on boards and commissions. Such a law was passed in the State of Iowa, and legislation is pending or under consideration in at least ten states throughout the country.56

CONCLUSION

It is hoped that the research produced by the California Board and Commission Project and the resulting discussion will contribute to the Legislature's goal of providing equal "opportunity to participate in and contribute to the operations of . . . government."57


4. Ms. Julia Brootkowski provided invaluable research assistance and was supported by a training grant from the Public Research and Dissemination Program at the University of California at Davis. Professor Noreen Dowling is the Director of the Program.

5. 3044 appointments to state boards and commissions were analyzed. Not included in this analysis were Gubernatorial appointments to County Boards of Supervisors. All analyses were in the form of percentages. Statistical tests were not necessary because the entire population, not a sample, was under study.

Based on information provided in the Index of the 1988 Central Registry, the Governor appointed to 318 boards. The Senate Rules Committee and the Senate Pro Tempore and the Speaker of the Assembly appointed to 178 boards (of which 37 are not listed as having Gubernatorial appointments.) Thus, there appear to be approximately 355 boards and commissions to which the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee and Senate Pro Tempore, and the Speaker of the Assembly appoint. (This is an approximate figure in that the Registry included the vast majority, but not all of the boards and commissions listed in the records provided by the appointing authorities.)

6. Included in this analysis were all board-types that "captured" at least 75 appointees. See Appendix B for the specific coding categories.

7. The Demographic Research Unit of the California State Department of Finance projected that as of July, 1988, there were 14,115,306 women out of a total of 27,847,242 million residents in California. The proportion of women is 51%, the parity figure used in this report. This data is unpublished background material for "Population Projections for California Counties: 1980-2020 with Age/Sex Details to 2020" which is published by the Demographics Research Unit, Department of Finance. See Report #86 P-3, December 1986.

8. Information on compensation was derived from the Central Registry located at the Office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento, California.

9. Boards were coded as regulatory, advisory, quasi-judicial, other, or no information. Only 22 positions were coded quasi-judicial of which 5, or 22.73%, were held by women.

Information on the purpose of the board was derived from the Registry at the Office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento, California. The codes were reviewed and some of the missing information was provided by The Office of the Governor. Thanks are extended to Bella Meese, Deputy Appointments Secretary in the Office of the Governor, for contributing to this effort.
10. Only the Governor's appointments require Senate confirmation. Information was missing for 3 of the Governor's appointees, or .1% of the data.

11. Percentages are based on a Field Institute survey released on Monday, February 1, 1988 in Release #1420 and information provided from a phone conversation with Managing Editor Mark DiCamillo.

Release #1420 reports party identification in the state at 45% Democrat, 45% Republican, and 10% other. Voter registration figures from the same release estimate Democratic registration at 49%, Republican at 41% and 10% other.

These figures were interpolated using the following information from the Field Institute's working documents: Party identification for Democrats breaks down 45% male and 55% female. Party identification for Republicans: 51% male and 49% female. Voter registration for Democrats includes 44% male and 56% female; for Republicans — 48% male and 52% female. These estimates are aggregate percentages based on six Field surveys completed in 1988.

The California Board and Commission Project provided the reader (on page 9) with the interpolated percentages for voter registration, as it was reasoned that board appointees are most likely to refer to their party registration when dealing with a governmental appointing authority.

The percentages for party identification is as follows: Democratic men - 20%; Democratic women - 25%; Republican men - 23%; Republican women - 22%.

12. "Projected Total Population for California by Race/Ethnicity: 1970-2020 with Age/Sex Detail for 1980-2020." Demographics Research Unit, Department of Finance; February, 1988; Report 88 P-4. The terms Latino and African-American are used in this report in that they are the preferred usages by the two groups.


14. It is worth reiterating that the high proportions of unreported ethnicity make comparisons between the appointing authorities inappropriate.

15. Each of the individuals coding the information on Gubernatorial appointees made unsolicited reports on the number of appointees who self-identified as Armenian.

16. Specific information on the backgrounds of the applicants can be useful in identifying directions to renew or expand recruitment efforts.


18. The Demographic Research Unit at the California State Department of Finance reports that approximately 55% of both men and women over the age of 15 in the state report being married. Thus, it could be that the appointee population, particularly male appointees, is more likely to be married.

19. Personal communication, Fred Springer.
20. See Snedecor, George and Cochran, William, *Statistical Methods*. The Iowa State University Press, 1967, pages 520-527, for a discussion of stratified sampling. Thanks to Professor Greg Guagnano, from the Department of Applied Behavioral Sciences at the University of California, Davis, for his time and advice on the statistical analysis. Thanks are also extended to Professor Karen Thiel from the University of Southern California for her advice and interest.

21. Percentages are based on 1987 population estimates from the "Ranking of Cities by Total Population," provided by the Population Research Unit, Department of Finance.

22. See "Component Counties of Metropolitan Statistical Areas by State, Appendix 5, October 1984," in the State and Metropolitan Area Data Book, 1986, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. This Appendix provides a list of California counties that were components of metropolitan statistical areas.


24. Cities incorporated since 1980 were not included because their political and bureaucratic climates can be significantly different from cities with longer civic identities and histories.

25. While the contract with the Senate Rules Committee required the evaluation of 36 communities, the design of the research was best suited by including 42 local communities.

In addition to the 6 high population counties, 6 urban counties were selected from a total of 26 and 6 non-urban counties were selected from a total of 26.

In addition to the 6 high population cities included in the sample, 10 urban cities were chosen from 277, while 8 non-urban cities were randomly selected from the sub-sample of 169.

26. Based on the advice of Professor Al Sokolow at the University of California, Davis, the City and County of San Francisco was treated as a City for the purposes of this study. Both Mayoral and Board of Supervisors appointments were included in the study.

27. All of the cities and counties responded within two months to the Project's request for their local registries. There was, however, some variation in what information was provided. Cities and counties are required by law to update their registries by the end of the calendar year. While most of the jurisdictions provided an additional update for the Project in July, about 5 communities provided the lists that had been updated the previous December.

28. Out of a total of 7649 total county appointments, there were 232 appointees with names that could not be identified by gender. This represents 3% of the entire county appointment population.

In the sample of cities, the gender-neutral names were identified through phone calls. The names were then analyzed for three cities — San Jose, Santa Barbara, and Gardena — to determine the resulting percentage of identified males and females. 51% of the gender-neutral names were men, 49% were women.

29. The percentage of women on city boards was estimated in the same manner as that for state boards — by taking the total number of women serving on city boards and dividing it by the total number of appointees.
There are other estimates of women’s participation which provide less flattering views of their appointive representation. After the overall percentage of women for each city is estimated, the average mean for all of these city percentages is 29.2%. The median for these percentages of women on boards for the 24 cities is 30.2%.

30. $\chi^2 = 272$; p < .001. All Chi-squares are based on a comparison of the sample’s percentage of women with the 51% proportion expected in the general population.

31. Please see the notes on coding included in Appendix C.

32. The analysis of board types was conducted for board types that "captured" at least 50 appointees or more, resulting in an analysis of 14 board types.

33. Although the percentage of women on library boards was less than 50% for the sample, the Chi-Square test indicates that there is less than a 5% likelihood that this percentage represents a population mean that is significantly different from 51%.

34. Chi-square tests were conducted for each of the 14 board types, comparing the proportion of women appointed to the expected values based on their 51% representation in the population. The tests indicated that women appointees in cities are below parity representation on all but two board types: Health & Social Services and Libraries.

The following Chi-square values were derived: Health & Social Services — $\chi^2 = 2.7$; Libraries — $\chi^2 = 2.25$; Arts & Culture — $\chi^2 = 3.9$; Employment — $\chi^2 = 7.4$; Housing — $\chi^2 = 20.1$; Parks & Recreation — $\chi^2 = 9.45$; General Services — $\chi^2 = 9.5$; Cable TV — $\chi^2 = 9.5$; Public Safety — $\chi^2 = 26.1$; Finance & Economic Development — $\chi^2 = 55.1$; Planning & Planning-Related — $\chi^2 = 70.5$; Redevelopment — $\chi^2 = 30.34$; Transportation & Public Works — $\chi^2 = 113.4$; Construction — $\chi^2 = 41.01$. $p_{.05} = 3.84$; $p_{.01} = 6.635$.

35. For cities, the average board size was about 7 members, as determined by dividing the average total seats for each city by the average number of boards. Using the same method, the average county board size was 9.

36. Individuals in 8 cities and 4 counties were interviewed to determine their impressions as to which boards in their communities were the "power boards." Interviews were conducted in the following randomly selected cities: Oakland, San Diego, San Rafael, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, San Jose, Gardena, and Palmdale. Interviews were also conducted in the following randomly-selected counties: Calaveras, Fresno, San Luis Obispo, and Sonoma. The individuals interviewed in each jurisdiction were either an elected representative (randomly selected) or their Administrative Assistant -- if the individual had worked in local government for at least one year. The respondents were first asked to provide their observations about power boards, and they were subsequently asked to rate the degree that certain boards were powerful in their communities.

37. The Spearman correlation, which correlates the rank orders of the variables, was the appropriate statistical test due to the small sample size. The percentage of women on city boards was correlated with various socio-economic indicators, such as population, as reported in Fay, J. California Almanac - 3rd Edition, Pacific Data Resources, 1987. A significant correlation was found for population, but none was found for 1985 per capita income: $s = .24$; $p = .25$. 

36
There was no significant correlation between the proportion of Asians/Pacific Islander residents in the community and the percentage of women on city boards (s = .38; p = .07); nor for Latinos (s = .12; p = .57); nor for the total percentage of ethnic population (s = .13; p = .5).

The percentage of women on city boards was not significantly correlated with the percentage of Democrats in the community (s = .01; p = .94), nor with the percentage of Republicans in the community (s = -.09; p = .67).

This is one of the most important findings in the study. Researchers in the area of women and politics have long been interested in whether or not women in elected office have impacts different from their male counterparts. This finding suggests that elected women do have an impact on the political system by bringing more women into the public advisory process. When women are elected to city councils, the proportion of women on boards and commissions is higher.

The percentage of women on city boards was not significantly correlated with the percentage of Democrats in the community (s = .01; p = .94), nor with the percentage of Republicans in the community (s = -.09; p = .67).

This is one of the most important findings in the study. Researchers in the area of women and politics have long been interested in whether or not women in elected office have impacts different from their male counterparts. This finding suggests that elected women do have an impact on the political system by bringing more women into the public advisory process. When women are elected to city councils, the proportion of women on boards and commissions is higher.

The percentage of women on city boards was not significantly correlated with the percentage of Democrats in the community (s = .01; p = .94), nor with the percentage of Republicans in the community (s = -.09; p = .67).

This is one of the most important findings in the study. Researchers in the area of women and politics have long been interested in whether or not women in elected office have impacts different from their male counterparts. This finding suggests that elected women do have an impact on the political system by bringing more women into the public advisory process. When women are elected to city councils, the proportion of women on boards and commissions is higher.
47. The Spearman correlation between the percentage of Latinos in the county and the percentage of women on county boards was: \( s = .23 \); \( p = .37 \). For the total ethnic percentage: \( s = .15 \); \( p = .55 \).

48. The Spearman correlation between the percentage of women on county boards and a) the percentage of elected women in 1982 was: \( s = .14 \); \( p = .59 \); and b) the percentage of elected women in 1988 was: \( s = -.25 \); \( p = .31 \).

In 1982, 10 of the 18 counties in the sample had no women on their 5 member Boards of Supervisors. 5 counties had 1 woman, 1 county had 2 women (out of a total of 4 at the time of the study). 2 counties had 3 women. No counties had 4 or 5 women on their Boards.

In 1988, 5 counties had no women supervisors, 6 counties had 1 woman supervisor, 4 counties had 2 women supervisors, and 3 counties had 3 women supervisors.

The County of Santa Clara had the highest percentage (45%) of women on boards than any other county in the sample. There were 3 women on the 5 member Board of Supervisors in both 1982 and 1988.

49. The Spearman correlation between the percentage of Democrats in the county and the percentage of women on county boards was: \( s = -.09 \); \( p = .73 \). For the percentage of Republicans: \( s = .09 \); \( p = .71 \).

50. Information from the *California Almanac* indicates that former Governor Jerry Brown appointed women to 29% of this appointments over 8 years. The Appointments Section of the Office of the Governor reported in 1987 that women had been appointed to 26% of Governor Deukmejian's appointments. See Fay, J. *California Almanac - 3rd Edition*, Pacific Data Resources, 1987, page 276.

51. By examining the applicant pool, appointing authorities can determine whether or not their outreach efforts have successfully attracted a diverse pool of candidates. By comparing demographic information from the applicant pool and the appointed population, the appointing authorities can discern whether or not under-representation is due to limited application or unrepresentative appointments.

Communities have typically evaluated the following applicant characteristics: gender, ethnicity, and age. It was never observed that disability was analyzed as an applicant or appointee characteristic.

52. The City of Visalia, at the request of Mayor Collins, conducted a demographic survey of board and commission appointments. Released in February of 1989, the survey showed that women held 44% of all board appointments. The report revealed ethnic balance, but pointed to a need to balance individual committees. For more information, contact: Mr. Ed Jost, Director of Voluntary Services, City of Visalia, P.O. Box 4002, Visalia, CA 93278.

53. The County of San Diego publishes a "Citizen Advisory Committees Cost/Benefit Analysis." There were "48,247.5 hours of voluntary service reported by 824 committee members during FY '86-'87 (which) represents a value equivalent to $540,098.97 worth of technical, professional and community assistance to the County and Board of Supervisors." (page 3)

The report also provides information on the gender, ethnic and age balance for each committee, as well as the overall percentages for the entire committee structure. In 86-87, women held 39% of the seats. Approximately 15% of the seats were held by American Indian, Asian, Black, or Hispanic citizens.
For more information, contact: the Community Involvement Office, County of San Diego, 1600 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101.

54. The publication provides information on how to apply for state as well as local appointments. For more information, contact: the Commission on the Status of Women, City and County of San Francisco, 1095 Market Street, Room 409, San Francisco, CA 94103.


56. A national effort has been spearheaded by Ms. Kappie Spencer of the American Association of University Women to encourage the adoption of legislation and ordinances that would require gender-balanced boards.

Gender-balance legislation is under consideration in at least ten states: Alaska, California, Florida, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, and Rhode Island. In the State of Iowa, gender balance legislation has already been adopted. At the time this report was being written, California State Senator Diane Watson was circulating draft language for consideration by potential co-authors.

For more information on the A.A.U.W. project, contact Kappie Spencer, Director for Women's Issues, American Association of University Women, 1700 S.W. Bell Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50315.

57. Government Code, Section 54970(d).
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APPENDIX A
California Board and Commission Project
Advisory Board
Invited Members*

Government Representatives

Senator Rose Ann Vuich
Chair, Women Legislators Caucus (1988)

Assemblywoman Sally Tanner
Vice-Chair, Women Legislators Caucus (1988)

California Commission on the Status of Women

County Supervisors Association of California

League of California Cities

Women's Organizations

American Association of University Women

Asian Pacific Women's Network

California Federation of Business and Professional Women

California Elected Women's Association for Education and Research

California Women Lawyers

Comision Feminil Mexicana National, Inc.

Junior League of California

League of Women Voters of California

Minority Women's Legislative Roundtable

National Association for University Women

National Council of Jewish Women

Older Women's League

Soroptimist International

* Advisory Board Members served solely in an advisory capacity. Their listing does not imply an endorsement of the research findings.
## APPENDIX B
CODEBOOK FOR STATEWIDE BOARDS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARNAME</th>
<th>VARLABEL</th>
<th>VARVALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPTR</td>
<td>Appointer</td>
<td>1=Governor 1=Governor 2=Senate 3=Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFODATE</td>
<td>Date of information</td>
<td>MMDDYY 99999=Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Page no. on printout</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG</td>
<td>Board Registry No.</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOT</td>
<td>Type of Slot</td>
<td>1=Public 2=Not Public 3=Elected official 4=Government staff 9=Missing info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPTDATE</td>
<td>Date of appointment</td>
<td>MMDDYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENCONF</td>
<td>Senate confirmation</td>
<td>1=Required 2=Not Required 3=Not applicable 9=Missing info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDATE</td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>MMDDYY 999999=Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTY</td>
<td>Political party</td>
<td>1=Democrat 2=Republican 3=Independent 4=Other 9=Missing info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSTAT</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>1=Single 2=Married 3=Divorced/Separated 4=Widowed 5=Other 9=Missing info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>County of residence</td>
<td>Coded 1-58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This codebook is specific to statewide boards and includes information such as appointer, date of information, page number, board registry number, type of slot, date of appointment, senate confirmation, date of birth, political party, marital status, and county of residence. The codebook uses a variety of value labels to indicate different types of information and statuses.
| GENDER | Gender       | 1=Male       |
|        |             | 2=Female     |
|        |             | 9=Missing information |
| ETHNIC | Ethnicity   | 1=Caucasian  |
|        |             | 2=Hispanic   |
|        |             | 3=Black      |
|        |             | 4=Asian/Pacific Islander |
|        |             | 5=Other      |
|        |             | 9=Missing info |
| ZIP    | Zip code    | 12345        |
|        |             | 99999=Mising |
| OCC1   | Employer    | 1=Self-employed |
|        |             | 2=Not self-employed |
|        |             | 3=CEO or President - Employer unclear |
|        |             | 4=Homemaker, Retired, Unemployed |
|        |             | 5=Not Clear   |
|        |             | 9=Missing info |
| OCC2   | Public/Private Sector | 1=Public Sector |
|        |             | 2=Private Sector |
|        |             | 3=Private Sector (public interest) |
|        |             | 8=N.A.       |
|        |             | 9=Missing/Not Clear |
| OCC3   | Occupational Categories | 1=General Administration (services, professional) |
|        |             | 2=Gen. Admin. (industry) |
|        |             | 3=Gen. Admin. (general/misc.) |
|        |             | 4=Medical    |
|        |             | 5=Legal      |
|        |             | 6=Education  |
|        |             | 7=Social Work/Counseling |
|        |             | 8=Finance/Insurance |
|        |             | 9=Tourism/Arts/Culture |
|        |             | 10=Technical |
|        |             | 11=Trades/Vocational |
|        |             | 12=Sales     |
|        |             | 13=Ag-Related |
|        |             | 14=Clerical  |
|        |             | 15=Elected   |
|        |             | 16=Retired   |
|        |             | 17=Homemaker |
|        |             | 19=Unemployed |
|        |             | 20=Other     |
|        |             | 30=Public Safety |
|        |             | 99=Missing Info. |
| PRIVED   | Attendance at a public or private school | 1=Public  
|         |                                          | 2=Private  
|         |                                          | 3=Not clear  
|         |                                          | 9=Missing info  
| HLOE    | Highest level of education               | 1=Not HS grad  
|         |                                          | 2=HS grad  
|         |                                          | 3=Some college, A.A.  
|         |                                          | 4=College grad  
|         |                                          | 5=Some post-grad  
|         |                                          | 6=Graduate/Professional  
|         |                                          | (MA, PhD, EdD, MD, JD)  
|         |                                          | 9=Missing info  
| EDAREA  | Content area for HLOE                    | 1=Ag/Ag Science  
|         |                                          | 2=Business  
|         |                                          | 3=Education  
|         |                                          | 4=Humanities/Lib. Arts  
|         |                                          | 5=Law  
|         |                                          | 6=Medical-related  
|         |                                          | 7=Science/Math/Engineering  
|         |                                          | 8=Soc. Science  
|         |                                          | 9=Not clear/other  
|         |                                          | 10=Trade/vocational  
|         |                                          | 11=Public Administration  
|         |                                          | 99=Missing info  
| COMP    | Compensation                             | 1=No compensation  
|         |                                          | 2=Expenses only  
|         |                                          | 3=Per diem  
|         |                                          | 4=Annual salary  
|         |                                          | 5= Per diem and expenses  
|         |                                          | 9=Missing info  
| PURPOSE | Purpose of board                         | 1=Advisory  
|         |                                          | 2=Regulatory  
|         |                                          | 3=Quasi-Judicial  
|         |                                          | 4=Other  
|         |                                          | 9=Missing info  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BDTYPE</th>
<th>Type of Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Construction/Code Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic Development/Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Energy/Utility Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Environment/Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Finance/Budget/Taxation/Revenue/Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Government Services/Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Health and Social Services/Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Housing/Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Human/Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Labor/Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legal/Judicial/Courts/Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Planning/Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tourism/Parks &amp; Rec./Culture and Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Trade Examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Women's Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Coding Note: In the analysis of statewide boards, all appointments in the Registries were coded and analyzed with the exception of any Gubernatorial appointments made to fill vacancies on Boards of Supervisors.
### APPENDIX C
#### CODEBOOK FOR CITY AND COUNTY BOARDS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARNAME</th>
<th>VARLABEL</th>
<th>VARVALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name of City or County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECTYPE</td>
<td>Record Type</td>
<td>1=City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POPTYPE</td>
<td>Type of City or County</td>
<td>1=High Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3=Non-Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFODATE</td>
<td>Date of information</td>
<td>MMDDYY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOSO</td>
<td>Northern or Southern part of the state</td>
<td>1=North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2=South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP</td>
<td>Community population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPOP</td>
<td>Male population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPOP</td>
<td>Female population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>Caucasian population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>Black population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISPAN</td>
<td>Hispanic population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIAN</td>
<td>Asian population</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>Other ethnic pop.</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGVOT</td>
<td>Total number of registered voters</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMS</td>
<td>Number of Democrats</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPS</td>
<td>Number of Republicans</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>Per capita income</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCCOUNT</td>
<td>Total no. of boards per community</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCFTOTAL</td>
<td>Total no. of women on boards per community</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTOTAL</td>
<td>Total no. of people on boards per community</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELE88</td>
<td>No. of women on Board or Council in 1988</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELE88</td>
<td>No. of persons on Board or Council in 1988</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELE82</td>
<td>No. of women on Board or Council in 1982</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELE82</td>
<td>No. of persons on Board or Council in 1982</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Board Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BDID</th>
<th>Board ID No.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDPTOTAL</td>
<td>Total no. of people on board</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDFTOTAL</td>
<td>Total no. of women on board</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDNTOTAL</td>
<td>Total no. of gender-neutral names on board</td>
<td>1,2,3,+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BDTYPE**

Type of Board

1-Agriculture/Ag-Related
2-Cable TV
3-Construction/Code Monitoring
4-Culture/Art/Tourism
5-Economic Development/Commerce
6-Education
7-Employment/Labor/Civil Service/Personnel
8-Energy/Utility Regulation
9-Environment/Hazardous Waste/Pollution
10-Finance/Budget/Taxation/Revenue
   - Insurance/Licenses/Claims/Bonds
11-General Services/Public Building
12-Health and Social Services/Hospitals
13-Housing
14-Human/Civil Rights
15-Legal/Judicial/Courts/Criminal Justice
16-Parks & Recreation/Fish & Game
17-Libraries
**BDTYPE**  
**Type of Board**  
(continued)

18-Planning  
19-Planning-Related/Design/  
   Architecture/Engineering  
20-Public Safety/Police/Fire/Animal Control  
21-Public Works  
22-Redevelopment  
23-Transportation/Roads/Parking/Airports  
24-Women's Rights  
25-Other  
26-Cemeteries  
27-Veterans/ Armed Services  
28-Trade Examiners  
29-Consumer Affairs  
30-Inter-jurisdictional  
31-Districts (non-elected members only)

*Coding Notes: All boards and board members listed in the local registries were included in the analysis with the exceptions described below.

Any board listed as inactive or non-functioning was not included. A decision was made not to include the Random Access Network boards because of their unclear status in most communities. The same decision was made for Underground Utility Committees. Working committees of the Boards of Supervisors or City Councils were not included, nor were associational assignments (e.g., a City Council representative to the League of California Cities). Inter-jurisdictional boards were counted — but only those appointments made by the appointing authority under study. Districts were included — but only if they were comprised in part or in whole by non-elected members.

Only voting members of the boards and commissions were counted. Staff members, elected officials, and ex-officio members were not included in the counts if they could be identified. Neither were members whose positions were pre-designated by their official positions. If an appointee was an appointment selected by the board itself, the appointee was counted only if the appointing authority made the majority of the appointments to the board. Board members that were not appointed by the appointing authority (e.g., appointed to an interjurisdictional board by another jurisdiction) were not included.