

Appendix A

White Paper: Increasing Faculty Diversity at Santa Rosa Junior College

INTRODUCTION

Widely regarded as one of the finest community colleges in the state, Santa Rosa Junior College is known for its academic rigor, its outstanding vocational training programs, superb faculty, comprehensive student services, and excellent facilities.

SRJC's commitment to excellence in education is not limited to the classroom. The College offers an extensive Study Abroad Program with sites in England, France, Italy, Spain and Costa Rica, as well as award winning athletic and forensics teams, talented performing and visual arts programs, and an active student government.

The College District operates two campuses in Sonoma County: a large 100+ acre campus in the heart of Santa Rosa, and a 40-acre campus in Petaluma. The District also operates a regional Public Safety Training Center in Windsor, and a 365-acre self-supporting farm near Forestville, a Culinary Arts Center in downtown Santa Rosa, and a Technology Academy on the Petaluma Campus. In addition, each semester classes are offered at more than 70 locations throughout the District.

SRJC offers a strong general education program for students planning to transfer to four-year colleges and universities, as well as more than 140 occupational programs designed to prepare students for the workforce. The college grants both associate of arts (A.A.) and associate of sciences (A.S.) degrees, and serves more than 35,000 students each semester at all of its locations and attracts students from throughout the state as well as from more than 40 countries around the world.

The demographics of Sonoma County and Santa Rosa are rapidly changing, causing significant changes in the diversity of the student body. At the present time, the diversity of SRJC faculty does not match that of the student body at SRJC, or the diversity of the County of Sonoma. In a short time, the SRJC student body will approach 50% Latino. The Latino population of the Santa Rosa Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, and High Schools is currently rising.

DIVERSITY

Diversity as a concept focuses on a broader set of qualities than race and gender. In the context of the workplace, valuing diversity means creating a workplace that respects and includes differences, recognizing the unique contributions that individuals with many types of differences can make, and creating a work environment that maximizes the potential of all employees. Not only diversity in experience and background, but also diversity in research agendas and pedagogical approaches should be considered. Faculty candidates must be considered on individual merit, on an individual basis.

Diversity is also about having the long-term goal that the campus work force should generally reflect the population it serves in all its dimensions. Recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty will enrich the educational experience of the students and the working environment of the faculty and will create a welcoming environment for all persons at Santa Rosa Junior College.

SONOMA COUNTY DEMOGRAPHICS

The Latino population for Sonoma County is 19.7%, having risen from 11% in the past decade. The Latino population in public schools in Sonoma County is significant because almost half of newly enrolled SRJC students come from Sonoma County.

The elementary schools which feed the secondary schools are 37% Latino. Ten years ago, only one elementary school in Santa Rosa had a majority of Latino students. Today, there are a dozen of them. (Press Democrat, May 2, 2004) Nearly nine out of 10 kindergartners at Lincoln Elementary School are Latino. Of Santa Rosa's 37 elementary schools, 10 schools, including Bellevue, Brook Hill, Burbank, Kawana, Lehman, Lincoln, Meadow View, Monroe, Roseland, and Sheppard, are 72% Latino.

Santa Rosa's middle schools are also showing a marked increase in their Latino populations. Comstock Middle school is presently 54% Latino. Cook Middle School is 46% Latino. The high schools are also showing increases in their Latino populations, as evidenced by Elsie Allen High School which is 50% Latino.

Unfortunately, Latino faculty represents a very small percentage of our total faculty. One of the goals of California Community Colleges is to have the faculty mirror the student body and community they serve. This is also one of the major areas of improvement needed by SRJC, according to the Evaluation Report and the Midterm Progress Evaluation from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

STRATEGIES

There are several strategies to address the lack of diversity in SRJC faculty. Three such strategies are explained below. Of these, drafting the job description and the composition of search committees are being addressed by the departments and administration of SRJC. But one strategy needs funding, that of advertising in publications and on web sites that target underrepresented groups and minorities, in order that SRJC attract a more diverse pool of applicants.

The Job Description

Consider expanding the position to include interdisciplinary or interdepartmental work, which creates a broader applicant pool. Creating opportunities for a variety of pedagogical techniques and approaches are not only more applicable to a greater variety of students and learning styles, but is more likely to bring in a greater variety of candidates. See, e.g., *Does Diversity Make a Difference? Three Research Studies on Diversity in College Classrooms*, American Council on Education & American Association of University Professors (2000).

Overly rigid criteria should be avoided. Criteria like years of service might exclude promising candidates from less traditional backgrounds who could make substantial contributions to the institution and may not be necessary for the position. In addition, tying the description closely to the real range of skills needed is a strong argument against claims that race or sex was

impermissibly considered in hiring. Work up front to create a well thought-out and focused position description avoids problems later on.

Well-crafted job descriptions are particularly useful in states where state law forbids considering race and ethnicity in hiring at all. Even in California, institutions may consider whether the expertise and interests of a candidate meet the particular institutional or curricular goals of the institution, program or department. Thus if the institution has expressed diversity as part of the definition of academic excellence, it can give positive consideration to candidates' agendas that enhance understanding of race, ethnicity, gender, multiculturalism, etc. Similarly, curricular initiatives that focus on issues like comparative cultural studies and social justice mean that candidates considered to teach those classes should have experience and research issues in those areas. *See, e.g.,* Sheila O'Rourke, *Strategies for Achieving Faculty Diversity at the University of California in a Post-Proposition 209 Legal Climate (Part One)*, Concurrent Session Paper, Keeping Our Faculties Conference, University of Minnesota 2002.

The Search Committee

The appointment of search committee members committed to diversity is essential to influencing the outcome of a search. Heads and deans should appoint senior faculty members from other departments who are known for their commitment to diversity.

Provide search committee members with information and education about diversity. Committee members need to understand the importance of a diverse faculty as well as how to properly evaluate individual candidates. Alternative means of diversifying which are not based on race ("race-neutral alternatives") should be considered.

Examine all phases of the recruitment/hiring/retention of faculty members. Attempts to assess and improve diversity should include all levels and stages of the recruitment and evaluation process, all policies and practices, all individual offices, departments, and people involved. Interrupting routines that have led to the non-diverse status quo is the key to keeping non-diverse faculties from constantly replicating themselves. *See, e.g.,* Smith, Daryl G., Turner, Caroline S.V., Osei-Kofi, Nana, Richards, Sandra, *Interrupting the Usual: Successful Strategies for Hiring Diverse Faculty*, *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75:2 133 (March/April 2004).

Search committees are often the weak link in discrimination lawsuits. It is unfair and unrealistic to expect faculty committees to understand the nuances of the issues and legal restraints in this area without information and support from the administration and its policies. Even well meaning people often misunderstand diversity and can unwittingly say or do things that cause candidates to feel they are being discriminated against or misrepresent the position or the institution's commitment to diversity.

Briefing search committees ahead of time is a benefit to the committee and to the institution. Committees should receive guidance about reaching out to the complete pool of qualified applicants, subtle forms of discrimination that can creep into the process, ways to evaluate candidates in a way that values diversity, and what they should and shouldn't say and promise.

Choose search committees wisely: faculty members who are active researchers and attendees at professional conferences are more likely than others to have encountered minority faculty in their area of study. Human nature provides that search committees are likely to replicate themselves, because people value and are most comfortable with that with which they are most familiar. The more diverse the committee, the more diverse the candidates are likely to be.

Advertising

An effective action plan begins with the search process. A search that advertises in the normal ways and draws exclusively on the pool of applicants that responds to those announcements as historically posted may not produce the deepest possible pool of candidates and may result in persistent under representation of candidates from diverse cultural, intellectual and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Advertise in journals and periodicals that make special efforts to reach minority faculty and graduate students. There are over 100 academic journals publishing research of interest to racial and ethnic groups.

THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE

State laws can be more protective than federal law, providing protection to additional classes of people, (*see, e.g.*, California law barring discrimination on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, marital status, sex, or sexual orientation (Ca. Gov. Code §12940); or they can be more restrictive, banning any form of affirmative action (see laws limiting consideration of race in California (California Proposition 209, Cal. Const. Art. I, §31);

Recent U.S. Supreme Court opinions involving the University of Michigan gave more clarity and direction to public institutions. The Supreme Court's recent decisions in *Gratz v. Bollinger* and *Grutter v. Bollinger* deal with student admissions and do not directly address affirmative action in hiring. However, many elements of the decisions lend support to the faculty diversity legal debate, and some lessons can be drawn from these decisions that are applicable in other contexts. For further information on the *Gratz* and *Grutter* cases, see Springer, Ann D., *Affirming Diversity at Michigan*, 89 *Academe* 54 (September/October 2003).

1. Supporting Arguments:

- a. The strong statement in *Grutter* in support of diversity as a compelling state interest lends support to the argument for the educational importance of a diverse faculty.
- b. The Court again endorsed the concept of deference to educators to make educational decisions. When the makeup of the faculty is tied to the educational mission and pedagogical decisions of the university and its faculty, faculty hiring should also be entitled to such deference.
- c. The court stressed the importance of context in analyzing racial classifications, and that strict scrutiny was a framework for considering the importance and sincerity of the reasons for the use of race in that particular context. Given the Court's acceptance of the educational value of diversity, and deference to academic decisionmakers, this focus on context may apply beyond the student admissions scenario.

d. This may be particularly true given the Court's willingness to accept the arguments of amici that diversity is important to functioning in today's global economy. The Court recognized the importance of diversity in preparing students for leadership roles in society, and the role of colleges and universities in preparing those leaders. All of these arguments can also be applied to the need for faculty diversity. See, e.g., *Petit v. City of Chicago*, 352 F.3d 1111 (7th Cir. 2003) (noting that the *Grutter* court relied on military and civic amici in concluding that a racially diverse officer corps and work force is a substantially compelling benefit of diversity, and considering that reliance important in its own application of *Grutter* to the employment context).

d. In endorsing diversity as a compelling state interest, the Court did not limit the use of race to remedial arguments, and in fact recognized that other non-remedial arguments might pass strict scrutiny.

e. The Court also cited favorably prior decisions involving remedial race conscious hiring. However, the Michigan cases did not directly support, or address, diversity in faculty hiring, and the Court has, in the past, rejected the idea of faculty role models as a basis for race based hiring.

2. Lessons:

a. Like student diversity, faculty diversity initiatives should be approached with a broad definition of diversity. As in admissions, any consideration of faculty diversity should consider many characteristics in addition to race, gender and national origin. Not only diversity in experience and background, but also diversity in research agendas and pedagogical approaches should be considered.

b. Faculty candidates must be considered on individual merit, on an individual basis. Just as the court found the mechanistic point system in Michigan's undergraduate admissions program problematic, so too are any employment quotas, separate tracks for consideration, special diversity hires, or any other automatic mechanisms likely to be problematic. Race should be considered as a "plus" factor, not the deciding factor.

c. Alternative means of diversifying which are not based on race ("race-neutral alternatives") should be considered. This is perhaps more practical in the employment context than in the admissions context, as a focus on diversity of research agendas and curricular programs can go a long way toward diversifying the faculty without focusing on the race of the particular applicant. To the extent that race is considered, the burden on those who do not get a plus factor should be considered as part of the analysis of the impact of the diversity program.

d. Given the Supreme Court's desire to see the end of the need for affirmative action programs in the next 25 years, any programs should be treated as non-permanent and subjected to periodic review.

Example 1:

Petit v. City of Chicago, 352 F.3d 1111 (7th Cir. 2003): This case was the first federal appellate attempt to apply *Grutter* in the employment setting, and in doing so the court upheld a race-conscious affirmative action plan in the Chicago police department. The court reasoned that there was a "compelling need for diversity in a large metropolitan police force charged with protecting

a racially and ethnically divided major American city like Chicago." It also held that "the CPD had a compelling interest in a diverse population at the rank of sergeant in order to set the proper tone in the department" and that "the presence of minority supervisors is an important means of earning the community's trust."

Example 2:

University of Nevada v. Farmer, 930 P.2d 730 (1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1004 (1998). The U.S. Supreme Court declined to review a faculty employment case in which the Nevada Supreme Court upheld the University's right to consider race as a factor to diversify its faculty. The plaintiff (Farmer) had been a finalist for position in the sociology department in 1991 when the University instead hired an African-American and paid him more than the posted salary range. At that time, only 1% of the University's faculty members were black, and the University maintained a "minority bonus program" that allowed a department to hire an additional faculty member if it first hired a minority. One year later, the sociology department filled the additional slot created by the minority bonus program by hiring the plaintiff. She was offered \$7,000 less per year than the black male when he was hired.

Example 3:

Kokes v. Angelina College, 220 F. Supp. 2d 661 (2002): White male applicant challenged the institution's refusal to hire him for a faculty position. The job description required a master's degree and "some college teaching," indicated that the instructor would be teaching freshman and sophomore level courses, and expressed a preference for candidates with experience in community college teaching and "the ability to interact with a diverse student body." Kokes argued that he had a PhD, had taught longer (at 4 year institutions) and had published much more than Jackson, the African-American woman hired. The college argued that while both candidates were highly ranked by the search committee, Jackson had more general teaching experience, more community college teaching experience, had already taught several semesters at the College, and had better teaching references. The court, in dismissing Kokes' federal claims, noted that everyone agreed that both candidates were qualified for the job, and "different employers may weigh candidates' qualities in various ways and the qualities that one employer would say are essential might not be that important to another employer in the same field." The court also noted that different schools with different communities and missions would value qualifications differently.

CONCLUSION

In order that SRJC provide a learning environment that embraces the diversity of the students and community it serves, a more diverse faculty needs to emerge. Of the many strategies to increase the diversity among faculty, the one that needs outside funding is that of advertising. Below are the media that target diverse populations, including underrepresented groups and minorities. Grant monies are being sought to advertise in these media outlets to attract a more diverse pool of applicants for faculty employment opportunities at SRJC.

Four different programs have been designed, based upon the amount of money that may become available: \$4,000, \$5,000, \$10,000, and \$25,000. Some of the media are listed below:

1. CareersNow-Online.com
2. Craigslist
3. Hispanic Outlook
4. La Voz
5. El Mensajero

Sonoma County Grand Jury

Citizen Response Form

We Want to Hear from You!

Mail to: Grand Jury, P.O. Box 5109, Santa Rosa, CA 95402 (707-565-6330)

To Our Residents:

Please give us your confidential comments for future Grand Jury consideration. This Final Report is a change from the previous booklet format and is a cost saving effort while still aiming to reach as many residents as possible. This Report may also be viewed at public libraries. Individual copies are available by phone, mail or at:
www.sonomasuperiorcourt.com/pages/gjury_info.php.

What do you think of this new report format?

Any comments on individual reports?

Suggestions for subject of future reports? (See also Citizen Complaint Form)

Name/Address/Phone: *(optional here)*

* * * * *

Please send me: ___ Application to Serve on Grand Jury
 ___ Citizen Complaint Form

Name/Address/Phone: *(required here)*

Thank you!

2006-2007 Sonoma Grand Jury Citizen Complaint and Investigation Status

| Date | Subject | Committee | Disposition |
|-----------------|---|------------------|--------------------|
| From Prior Jury | Measure O | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | SR Sign Permits | Cities | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | County Purchasing | County | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | Correctional Officer Overtime | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | Rohnert Park Gen Plan Complaints | Cities | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | Cloverdale Police Department | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | Rohnert Park Gen Plan Complaints | Cities | Case Closed |
| From Prior Jury | Child Protective Services Child Removal | Human Services | Case Closed |
| June 2006 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Welch | Law & Justice | REPORT |
| June 2006 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Thurston | Law & Justice | To next jury |
| July 2006 | Rohnert Park Gen Plan | Cities | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Correctional Officer Overtime | Law & Justice | REPORT |
| July 2006 | Schools Consolidation | Human Services | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Monte Rio Wastewater | County | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Unlicensed Drivers | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Risk Management | Human Services | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | 9-1-1 Calls | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Adult Care Concerns | Human Services | Case Closed |
| July 2006 | Conflict of Interest - SRPD | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | Private Use of Public Property | Cities | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | Fatal Incident Protocol - DeCosta | Law & Justice | REPORT |
| August 2006 | Unfair Labor Practices | Cities | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | Cotati Police Misconduct | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | Open Space District Practices | County | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | County Inmate Complaint | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | County Conflict of Interest | County | Case Closed |
| August 2006 | Sebastopol Housing | Cities | Case Closed |
| September 2006 | Permit & Resources Mgmt General Plan | County | Case Closed |
| September 2006 | Sheriff Recording Devices | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| Self Generated | School Background Checks | Human Services | REPORT |
| September 2006 | Lack of Representation | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| October 2006 | District Attorney Misconduct | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| Self Generated | Signs of The Times | Cities | REPORT |
| October 2006 | Creekside Nurses | Human Services | Case Closed |
| October 2006 | Open Space District Funds Use | County | Case Closed |
| October 2006 | Santa Rosa Junior College Employment | Human Services | REPORT |
| November 2006 | Sheriff Brutality | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Winery Approval | County | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Trespass / Theft | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Big Springs Cleanup | County | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Fatal Incident Protocol - McDowell | Law & Justice | To next jury |
| November 2006 | Farmers Markets | County | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Santa Rosa Code Harassment | Cities | Case Closed |
| November 2006 | Wage Dispute | Human Services | Case Closed |
| December 2006 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Tolosko | Law & Justice | REPORT |
| Self Generated | Emergency Preparedness | County | REPORT |
| January 2007 | Sheriff Assault | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| January 2007 | Child Protective Services Child Abuse | Human Services | Case Closed |
| Self Generated | Wastewater | Cities | REPORT |
| January 2007 | Child Support | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| January 2007 | Use of Force | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| Self Generated | Open Space District | County | REPORT |
| February 2007 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Chass | Law & Justice | To next jury |
| February 2007 | Child Support | Human Services | To next jury |
| February 2007 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Nace | Law & Justice | REPORT |
| March 2007 | Chass Fatal Shooting Complaint 1 | Law & Justice | Case Closed |

| | | | |
|------------|--|----------------|--------------|
| March 2007 | Chass Fatal Shooting Complaint 2 | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| March 2007 | IMPACT Fee Collection | Cities | To next jury |
| March 2007 | Inmate Rights | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| March 2007 | Wage Dispute | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| April 2007 | Development Issues | County | To next jury |
| April 2007 | Inmate Right to Privacy | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| April 2007 | Russian River Sanitation - Misuse of Funds | County | Case Closed |
| April 2007 | Public Defender Dispute | Law & Justice | Case Closed |
| April 2007 | Russian River Redevelopment Agency | County | Case Closed |
| April 2007 | Fatal Incident Protocol - Heller | Law & Justice | To next jury |
| April 2007 | Schools Emergency Preparedness | County | To next jury |
| April 2007 | Sebastopol Hospital Tax | Cities | To next jury |
| April 2007 | Child Support | Human Services | To next jury |

Response Requirements

RESPONSE REQUIREMENTS

Following are pertinent excerpts from the California Penal Code concerning responses to Civil Grand Jury reports.

“Section 933(b) No later than 90 days after the grand jury submits a final report on the operations of any public agency subject to its reviewing authority, the governing body of the public agency shall comment to the presiding judge of the superior court on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of the governing body, and every elected county officer or agency head for which the grand jury has responsibility pursuant to section 914.1 shall comment within 60 days to the presiding judge of the superior court, with an information copy sent to the board of supervisors, on the findings and recommendations pertaining to matters under the control of that county officer or agency head and any agency or agencies which that officer or agency head supervises or controls. In any city and county, the mayor shall also comment on the findings and recommendations. All of these comments and reports shall forthwith be submitted to the presiding judge of the superior court who impaneled the grand jury.

“A copy of all responses to grand jury reports shall be placed on file with the clerk of the public agency and the office of the county clerk, or the mayor, when applicable, and shall remain on file in those offices. One copy shall be placed on file with the applicable grand jury final report by, and in control of the currently impaneled grand jury, where it shall remain for a minimum of five years.”

Copies of the Responses to the 2006-2007 Sonoma County Grand Jury Final Report will be evaluated by the 2007-2008 grand jury and will be available in the Family Law division, Room 101-J of the Sonoma County Superior Court. This report will also be available for review at all branches of the county library, by emailing the grand jury at gjury@sonoma-county.org or online <http://www.sonomasuperiorcourt.com> or by mailing a request to Sonoma County Superior Court, 600 Administration Dr. Room 107-J, Santa Rosa.

“Section 933.05 (a) For purposes of the subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury finding, the responding person or entity shall indicate one of the following: (1) the respondent agrees with the finding; (2) The respondent disagrees wholly or partially with the finding, in which case the response shall specify the portion of the finding that is disputed and shall include an explanation of the reasons therefore.

“Section 933.05 (b) For purposes of subdivision (b) of Section 933, as to each grand jury recommendation, the responding persons or entity shall report one of the following actions: (1) The recommendation has been implemented, with a summary regarding the implemented action; (2) The recommendation has not yet been implemented, but will be implemented in the future, with a timeframe for implementation; (3) The recommendation requires further analysis, with an explanation and the scope and parameters of an analysis or discussion by the officer or head of the agency or department being investigated or reviewed, including the governing body of the public agency when applicable. This timeframe shall not exceed six months from the date of publication of

Response Requirements

the grand jury report; (4) The recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or is not reasonable, with an explanation therefore.”

“Section 933.05(c) However, if a finding or recommendation of the grand jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a county agency or department headed by an elected officer, both the agency or department head and the board of supervisors shall respond if requested by the grand jury, but the response of the board of supervisors shall address those budgetary or personnel matters over which it has some decision-making authority. The response of the elected agency or department head shall address all aspects of the findings or recommendations affecting his or her agency or department.”

The Penal Code also requires that the Grand Jury Foreperson be available to the respondents for 45 days to clarify the recommendations of the jury’s report.

Sonoma County Grand Jury
 Historical Investigations by Agency/Department -15-year Summary

| AGENCY / DEPARTMENT | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 | 1997 | 1995 | 1994 | 1993 | 1992 |
|-----------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Administration | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Airport | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | |
| Animal Control | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Assessor/Assets | X | X | X | | | | | | | X | | X | | | |
| Auditor/Auditing | | X | | X | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Board of Supervisors | X | | | | X | X | | | | X | | | X | X | |
| Building Dept | | X | | | | | | | X | | | | | X | |
| Cemeteries | | | | | | | | | | X | X | | | | |
| Child Protective Services | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Child Support Services | | | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Cotati | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Cotati Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Cloverdale | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Cloverdale Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Healdsburg | X | X | X | X | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| City of Healdsburg Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Petaluma | X | X | X | X | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| City of Petaluma Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Rohnert Park | X | X | X | X | | | X | | X | X | X | | | X | |
| City of Rohnert Park Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Santa Rosa | X | X | X | X | | X | XX | | X | | | X | | | |
| City of Santa Rosa Police | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Sebastopol | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| City of Sebastopol Police | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Collection Services | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Commissions | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Coroner and Morgue | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| County Clerk | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Attorney | X | | X | | X | | | | X | | | | | | |

85

Sonoma County Grand Jury
 Historical Investigations by Agency/Department -15-year Summary

| AGENCY / DEPARTMENT | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 | 1997 | 1995 | 1994 | 1993 | 1992 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Emergency Services | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Facilities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Support Div | | | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fire Services | | | | X | | | | | X | X | | | | X | |
| Grand Jury | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| Health Services | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hospitals | | X | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | |
| Human Services | X | | | | X | | X | X | X | X | | | | | |
| Information Services | | | X | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Jail | | X | X | X | | | X | | X | X | X | | | X | X |
| LAFCO | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Library | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Juvenile Hall | | | X | | | X | X | | | X | X | | | X | |
| Mental Health | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | | | | |
| N. Co. Detention | | X | | | | | | | | | X | | X | X | X |
| Open Space District | X | X | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| PRMD | X | X | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | | | |
| Personnel Department | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Planning Commission | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Planning Department | | X | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | X |
| Probation Youth Camp | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Printing Dept | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Defender | | | X | | X | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Public Health | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X | |
| Public Works | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | |
| Purchasing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Redevelopment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | X |
| Schools | X | X | X | X | X | X | | | | X | | X | | | |
| Sheriff/Police | X | | X | X | X | | | | | X | X | X | X | | |

98

Sonoma County Grand Jury
 Historical Investigations by Agency/Department -15-year Summary

| AGENCY / DEPARTMENT | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 | 2001 | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 | 1997 | 1995 | 1994 | 1993 | 1992 |
|---------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Sierra Youth Center | | | X | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Special Districts | X | X | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| SRJC | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tax Collector | | X | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Court | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Treasurer | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| VOM Children Home | | | X | | | | | X | | | | X | | | |
| Water Agency | X | | X | X | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Youth Camp | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |