

## Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

*EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government*

- Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer No

The percentage of PwD in the GS-1 to GS-10 cluster was 13.59%, and the percentage of PwD in the GS-11 to SES was 12.97%, which exceeds the goal of 12%.

\*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

- Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) Answer No

The percentage of PWTD in the GS-1 to GS-10 cluster was 6 (3.26%), and the PWTD in the GS-11 to SES was 2.34%, exceeding the goal of 2%.

| Grade Level Cluster (GS or Alternate Pay Plan b) | Total number | Reportable Disability number | Reportable Disability Percentage | Targeted Disability Number | Targeted Disability Percentage |
|--|--------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Numerical Goal                                   | --           | 12%                          | 12%                              | 2%                         | 2%                             |
| Grades GS-11 to SES                              | 2953         | 383                          | 12.97                            | 70                         | 2.37                           |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                             | 184          | 25                           | 13.59                            | 6                          | 3.26                           |

- Describe how the agency has communicated the numerical goals to the hiring managers and/or recruiters.

WHS utilized a variety of methods to include Training (HR & Leadership for New Supervisors; annual EEO and Diversity Training); quarterly newsletter, quarterly Leadership meetings, and the annual policy.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

### **A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

1. Has the agency designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to improve the staffing for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

N/A

2. Identify all staff responsible for implementing the agency's disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and responsible official.

| Disability Program Task | # of FTE Staff By Employment Status |           |                 | Responsible Official<br>(Name, Title, Office<br>Email) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
|                         | Full Time                           | Part Time | Collateral Duty |  |
|                         |                                     |           |                 |  |

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes”, describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer Yes

Disability Program Manager (EEOC), ADA and RA Training (NELI)

### **B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer Yes

N/A

### Section III: Program Deficiencies in The Disability Program

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b> | C.2.c.1. Does the agency post its procedures for processing requests for Personal Assistance Services on its public website? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5)(v)] If “yes”, please provide the internet address in the comments column. |
| <b>Objective</b>                               | Post procedures for processing PAS requests on the WHS public website.   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                             | Dec 30, 2023   |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                         |  |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                      | <i>Target Date      Completion Date      Planned Activity</i>  |

| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | <b>Accomplishment</b>  |
|--------------------|--|
| 2023               | <p>In FY 2023, the RA team established an RA Working Group to review all aspects of the RA programs. The team reviewed and updated Form SD-827, which is currently being coordinated. In addition, the team developed new brochures (virtual and printed versions) for the agency workforce; restored the RA mailbox, revised, and updated the RA training, and intranet website.</p> <p>Currently, the RA office is in the process of hiring another RA Program Manager to continue to advance and service the needs of the Agency. The RA and PAS procedures (AI-114) were developed, highlighting the roles and responsibilities of various stakeholders throughout the RA process. WHS Office of General Counsel (OGC) is currently performing a legal sufficiency review of the RA instruction. The RA Coordinator continued to provide RA guidance and training to allow PwDs to apply for jobs, perform job functions, and enjoy equal access to benefits to advance within the Agency. WHS actively promoted RA awareness to supervisors and the workforce during customer-focused forums, town halls, leadership meetings, EEO trainings, and Senior Executive Diversity Seminars (SEDS). In addition, RA continued to provide mandatory Disability training to managers, supervisors, and LMER, as requested, and one-on-one consultation support to managers and employees.</p> |

### Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD

#### A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

To assist job applicants with disabilities and targeted disabilities, WHS engaged in various outreach activities. In addition to extensive outreach programs, WHS also sought out individuals with Disabilities and Individuals with Targeted Disabilities through various programs (i.e., Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP), Wounded Warriors, and Schedule A).

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency’s use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

Inclusion of a specific statement in vacancy announcements related to Special Appointing Authorities, including veterans with a disability rating of 30% or more, with links to informative webpages that further explain and clarify those appointment types. Continue utilization of special hiring authorities and job development programs for veterans, to include veterans with a disability rating of 30% or more. To this end, HRD will continue to educate hiring managers on the use of special appointing authority for 30% or more disabled veterans. Additionally, WHS will seek to include veteran employees with disabilities as recruitment and outreach consultants. Continued utilization of OPM shared (Bender) list to place individuals with reportable and targeted disabilities.

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

WHS created searchable applicant database that can be used for Disabled Veterans, Pathways Interns, and recent graduates. Applicants must submit all supporting documentation to Special Employment Program (SEP) employees, who verify eligibility before adding applicants to the WHS database. Efforts to improve use of the database is ongoing.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

Answer Yes

WHS utilized a variety of methods to include Training (HR & Leadership for New Supervisors; annual EEO and Diversity Training); quarterly newsletter, quarterly Leadership meetings, and the annual policy.

## **B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS**

Describe the agency's efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

The Special Employment Program employees maintain current relationships with vocational rehabilitation offices, state employment offices, veterans' organizations, colleges/universities and other facilities to obtain applications from disabled veterans. They participate in a DoD department-wide recruiter's consortium to share ideas and information to improve recruitment efforts.

## **C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)**

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If "yes", please describe the triggers below.

a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

In FY 2023, the Agency hired 54 employees who reported having a disability and 12 who reported having a targeted disability. PwTDs comprised 1.54% of the workforce of WHS and Serviced Components. Employees with reportable disabilities were 6.95% of the total workforce, compared to 9.84% at the end of FY 2022. WHS continues to work closely with Gallaudet University, other major local universities, and disability interest institutions in the National Capital Region. WHS attends prioritized events focused on disabled veterans and people with targeted disabilities, including the Hiring our Heroes career event.

| <b>New Hires</b>          | <b>Total Number</b> | <b>Reportable Disability Permanent Workforce Percentage</b> | <b>Reportable Disability Temporary Workforce percentage</b> | <b>Targeted Disability Permanent Workforce percentage</b> | <b>Targeted Disability Temporary Workforce percentage</b> |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|
| % of Total Applicants     | 3536                | 8.71  | 0.00  | 4.04  | 0.00  |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 2061                | 8.10  | 0.00  | 3.59  | 0.00  |
| % of New Hires            | 51                  | 1.96  | 0.00  | 1.96  | 0.00  |

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

c. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

d. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Among the new hires with disabilities who voluntarily identified their disability, triggers existed for PwDs in the following most populous MCOs: Series 0080 – 8.90% qualified compared to 0.00% selected. Series 0130 – 0.00% qualified compared to 0.00% selected Series 0301 – 6.94% qualified compared to 0.00% selected Series 1102 – 1.68% qualified compared to 0.00% selected Series 2210 – 7.23% qualified compared to 0.00% selected, a disparity in those who applied versus those who qualified among PwDs. Among the new hires with disabilities who voluntarily identified their disability, triggers existed for PwTDs MCOs: Series 0080 - 5.51% qualified compared to 0.33% selected. Series 0130 – 4.00% qualified compared to 0.00% selected. Series 0301 – 3.62% qualified compared to 0.00% selected. Series 0343 – 3.32% qualified compared to 0.00% selected. Series 1102 – 0.00% qualified compared to 0.00% selected. Series 2210 – 3.24% qualified compared to 0.00% selected, a disparity in those who applied versus those who qualified among PwTDs.

| <b>New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations</b> | <b>Total (#)</b> | <b>Reportable Disability New Hires Percentage</b> | <b>Targetable Disability New Hires Percentage</b> |
|--|------------------|---|---|
| Numerical Goal                                   | --               | 12%   | 2%  |
| 0080 SECURITY                                    | 3                | 33.33   | 33.33   |
| 0130 FOREIGN AFFAIRS                             | 1                | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 0301 MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM    | 23               | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 0343 MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS             | 9                | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 1102 CONTRACTING SERIES                          | 2                | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| 2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT           | 13               | 0.00  | 0.00  |

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

e. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

f. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Among the qualified internal applicants with disabilities who voluntarily identified their disability, triggers existed for PwD in the following series: • Series 0080 MCO – 3.95% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 0130 MCO – 0.00% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 0301 MCO – 9.33% qualified applicants and 7.69% selected. • Series 0343 MCO – 8.26% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 1102 MCO – 4.17% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 2210 MCO – 6.67% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. Among the qualified internal applicants with disabilities, who voluntarily identified their disability, triggers existed for PwTD in the following series: • Series 0080 MCO – 2.04% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 0130 MCO – 0.00% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 0301 MCO – 5.16% qualified applicants and 2.56% selected. • Series 0343 MCO – 3.91% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected. • Series 1102 MCO – 4.17% qualified applicants and 0.00% selected.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PwTD among employees promoted to any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- |                              |            |
|------------------------------|------------|
| g. Promotions for MCO (PWD)  | Answer Yes |
| h. Promotions for MCO (PwTD) | Answer Yes |

In comparison to the benchmarks, triggers exist among the selections for promotion involving the following positions in FY 2023. 0083 - Police Officer: PwD (2.86%) and PwTD (0.14%) 0130 - Foreign Affairs: PwD (3.72%) and PwTD (0.00%) 0301 - Miscellaneous Administration and Program: PwTD (2.00%) 1102 - Contracting: PwD (4.00%) and PwTD (1.94%)

## Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

### A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PwTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

The SEP employees endeavor to place PWD/IWTD employees in a billet that has promotion potential, when possible. Managers are encouraged to provide PWD/IWTD employees training for promotion to the next higher grade. DDR works with the Section 508 coordinator to insure that PWD/IWTD employees are provided appropriate accessible technology to enable them to perform the essential functions of their jobs, as well as participate in training and development opportunities.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

WHS has a standard training budget to allow employees to explore opportunities within or to stretch outside their functional area. Additionally, over 4,000 online courses are available through iCompass. Detail opportunities are encouraged. WHS also offers competitive Leader Development Programs, to include assessment tools, leadership development workshops (Leading at the Speed of Trust), assessment tools (Myers Briggs, StrengthsFinder, Benchmarks 360 surveys), executive coaching, and competitive leader development programs. These include Executive Leadership Development Program, White House Leadership Program, WHS Aspiring Leader Program, and the Key Executive Leadership Certificate Program, to name a few. WHS informs employees of OPM negotiated tuition reduction partnerships with post-secondary institutions.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/ approval to participate.

| <b>Career Development Opportunities</b> | <b>Total Participant Applicants (#)</b> | <b>Total Participant Selectees (#)</b> | <b>PWD Applicants (%)</b> | <b>PWD Selectees (%)</b> | <b>PWTD Applicants (%)</b> | <b>PWTD Selectees (%)</b> |
|---|---|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Fellowship Programs                     |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Other Career Development Programs       |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Internship Programs                     |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Mentoring Programs                      |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Coaching Programs                       |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Training Programs                       |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |
| Detail Programs                         |   |  |                           |                          |                            |                           |

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

In FY 2023, triggers exist for PWD in all of the career development programs. PwD (3.19%) were selected for career development programs. and PwTD (0.14%)

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

In FY 2023, triggers exist for PWTD in all career development programs. PwTDs (0.14%) were selected for career development programs.

### **C. AWARDS**

5. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer Yes

Triggers were identified for the following awards: • Cash awards \$500 and under: The average award amount for PwDs (11.17%) is lower than that for all recipients. • Cash awards between \$501 and \$999: The average award amount for PwDs (7.59%) and PwTDs (1.27%) is lower than the average award amount for all recipients. • Cash awards between \$4,000 and \$4,999: The average award amount PwDs (11.24%) is lower than the average award amount for all recipients. • Cash awards greater than \$5,000: The average award amount for PwDs (9.21%) and PwTDs (1.40%) is lower than the average for all recipients.

| <b>Time-Off Awards</b>                          | <b>Total (#)</b> | <b>Reportable Disability %</b> | <b>Without Reportable Disability %</b> | <b>Targeted Disability %</b> | <b>Without Targeted Disability %</b> |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given      | 179              | 3.72                           | 3.80                                   | 5.26                         | 3.39                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours       | 1438             | 30.11                          | 30.53                                  | 42.11                        | 27.54                                |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours     | 8.03             | 1.51                           | 0.21                                   | 8.42                         | 0.02                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given     | 187              | 5.02                           | 3.67                                   | 8.42                         | 4.29                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours      | 3029             | 81.04                          | 59.70                                  | 138.95                       | 68.62                                |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours    | 16.2             | 3.00                           | 0.43                                   | 17.37                        | -0.08                                |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given     | 216              | 4.46                           | 4.96                                   | 3.16                         | 4.74                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours      | 5276             | 111.90                         | 108.19                                 | 75.79                        | 119.64                               |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours    | 24.43            | 4.66                           | 0.58                                   | 25.26                        | 0.24                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given     | 598              | 10.41                          | 12.41                                  | 9.47                         | 10.61                                |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours      | 23106            | 408.18                         | 478.53                                 | 378.95                       | 414.45                               |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 38.64            | 7.29                           | 1.02                                   | 42.11                        | -0.18                                |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given  | 100              | 0.00                           | 0.00                                   | 0.00                         | 0.00                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours   | 0                | 0.00                           | 0.00                                   | 0.00                         | 0.00                                 |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours | 0                | 0.00                           | 0.00                                   | 0.00                         | 0.00                                 |



| Cash Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given     | 237       | 3.35                    | 5.07                            | 3.16                  | 3.39                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount     | 171514    | 2497.03                 | 3648.64                         | 2421.05               | 2513.32                       |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount   | 723.69    | 138.72                  | 19.00                           | 807.02                | -4.59                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given   | 419       | 17.10                   | 7.39                            | 18.95                 | 16.70                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount   | 542487    | 22581.60                | 9510.77                         | 25086.32              | 22044.47                      |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount | 1294.72   | 245.45                  | 33.97                           | 1393.68               | -0.78                         |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given   | 548       | 13.57                   | 10.85                           | 16.84                 | 12.87                         |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount   | 1263576   | 31404.09                | 24902.40                        | 40106.32              | 29537.92                      |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount | 2305.8    | 430.19                  | 60.59                           | 2506.64               | -15.09                        |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given   | 407       | 9.29                    | 7.68                            | 8.42                  | 9.48                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount   | 1386135   | 31573.79                | 26229.07                        | 28080.00              | 32323.02                      |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount | 3405.74   | 631.48                  | 90.13                           | 3510.00               | 14.19                         |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given   | 436       | 9.11                    | 9.06                            | 9.47                  | 9.03                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount   | 1955151   | 40610.78                | 40731.53                        | 41902.11              | 40333.86                      |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount | 4484.29   | 828.79                  | 118.75                          | 4655.79               | 8.10                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given    | 1715      | 29.37                   | 37.73                           | 25.26                 | 30.25                         |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount    | 15377116  | 252597.96               | 342046.92                       | 173731.58             | 269510.61                     |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount  | 8966.25   | 1598.72                 | 239.36                          | 7238.82               | 389.22                        |

6. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PwTD for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Pay Increases (PwTD) Answer No

For Quality Step Increases - Thirty-eight (12.22%) PwDs and seven (2.25%) PwTDs received Quality Step Increases. Triggers were identified for the following performance-based pay increases: • Three (0.60%) PwDs and zero (0.00%) PwTDs received performance-based pay increases: PwDs and PwTDs are significantly lower than the average award amount for all recipients.

| Other Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded | 496       | 0.56                    | 10.69                           | 0.00                  | 0.68                          |

7. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PwTD recognized disproportionately less than employees without disabilities? (The appropriate benchmark is the inclusion rate.) If “yes”, describe the employee recognition program and relevant data in the text box.

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Other Types of Recognition (PwTD) Answer N/A

WHS did not have any other types of recognition programs during FY 2023.

## D. PROMOTIONS

8. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

Relevant applicant pool data is not available. PwDs Qualified Internal Applicants by Senior Grade are as follows: SES – 0.00% GS-15 - 6.35% GS-14 – 9.63% GS-13 – 12.32% Triggers were identified for selections of PwDs within the SES and GS-15 levels. SES – 0.00% GS-15 - 0.00% GS-14 – 3.13% GS-13 – 16.67%

9. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

Relevant applicant pool data is not available. PwTDs Qualified Internal Applicants by Senior Grade as follows: SES – 0.00% GS-15 - 4.76% GS-14 – 5.00% GS-13 – 5.69% Triggers were identified for selections of PwTDs within the SES, GS-15, and GS-14 levels. SES – 0.00% GS-15 - 0.00% GS-14 – 0.00% GS-13 – 8.33%

10. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer No

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer No

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer No

Based on a review of MD-715 B-15 Senior Grade Level (New Hires), WHS identified a trigger for PwD new hires at the SES level when compared to the qualified applicant pool.

11. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer N/A

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer N/A

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer N/A

Based on a review of MD-715 B-15 Senior Grade Level (New Hires), WHS identified a trigger for PwTD new hires at the SES level when compared to the qualified applicant pool.

12. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

When reviewing the internal qualified applicants and selections, triggers were identified for PwDs in the Executive, Manager, and Supervisor categories.

13. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

When reviewing the internal qualified applicants and selections, triggers were identified for PwTDs in the Executives, Managers, and Supervisors categories. PwTDs Executive Qualified Applicant: 3.16% Selections: 0.00% PwTDs Manager Qualified Applicant: 2.04% Selections: 0.00% PwTDs Supervisor Qualified Applicant: 0.00% Selections: 0.00%

14. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer Yes

When reviewing the selections for PWDs compared to the qualified applicant pool benchmark, triggers were identified for PWDs in the categories of Executives, Managers, and Supervisors. PwDs Executive Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 10.47% PwDs Manager Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 7.00% PwDs Supervisor Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 10.00%

15. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer Yes

When reviewing the selections for PwTDs compared to the qualified applicant pool benchmark, triggers were identified for PwTDs in the Executives, Managers, and Supervisors categories. PwTDs Executive Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 10.47% PwTDs Manager Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 7.00% PwTDs Supervisor Selections: 0.00% Qualified External Applicants: 10.00%

## Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In this section, agencies should: (1) analyze workforce separation data to identify barriers retaining employees with disabilities; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the reasonable accommodation program and workplace assistance services.

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)(6)(i))? If “no”, please explain why the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Answer No

The agency has not established a system to monitor the status of Schedule A employees with disabilities. The agency plans to implement a tracking system in FY 2024.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

In FY 2023, 9.73% of PwDs separated the Agency. For PwDs, there were 33.33% removal, 8.89% resignation, and 10.27% retirement.

| Separations                             | Total # | Reportable Disabilities % | Without Reportable Disabilities % |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 3       | 0.17                      | 0.04                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 111     | 1.98                      | 1.85                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 181     | 2.97                      | 3.04                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 139     | 2.48                      | 2.31                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 434     | 7.59                      | 7.24                              |

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTB among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTB) Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTB) Answer No

The Agency had 1.71% of PwTBs separated from the Agency. For PwTBs, there were 2.22% resignation and 2.16% retirement.

| Separations                             | Total # | Targeted Disabilities % | Without Targeted Disabilities % |
|---|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 3       | 0.00                    | 0.05                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 111     | 1.83                    | 1.86                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 181     | 3.67                    | 3.02                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 139     | 0.92                    | 2.36                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 434     | 6.42                    | 7.29                            |

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTB, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

The Agency revised the exit survey in FY 2022 and FY 2023. To date, 50 employees have taken the survey. The agency plans to collect and analyze exit interview data in FY 2024.

**B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES**

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform applicants and employees of their rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. § 794(b), concerning the accessibility of agency technology, and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. § 4151-4157), concerning the accessibility of agency facilities. In addition, agencies are required to inform individuals where to file complaints if other agencies are responsible for a violation.

5. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

For information about Section 508: <http://dodcio.defense.gov/DODSection508.aspx>. Complaints should be addressed to the DoD Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity (ODMEO) – <http://diversity.defense.gov>.

6. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

For questions or concerns about architectural barriers, individuals may visit <https://my.whs.mil/services/accessibility>. Individuals may visit, <https://www.whs.mil/Directorates/WHS-Immediate-Office-Staff/EEOP/EEO-Laws-and-Regulations/> for specific rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, but complaints must be addressed to the DoD Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity (ODMEO). <https://my.whs.mil/services/accessibility>.

7. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

Installed curb cuts at Mark Center kiss and ride; developed a revised Mark Center evacuation strategy for PWD; addressed installation of a relief area for service animals; continuing to study alternative mobility access options that are more feasible for the Mark Center location; publication of tactile maps at the Pentagon to assist visually impaired individuals.

### C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

8. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

The average processing time and implementation of accommodation requests in FY 2023 were 20 days, including receiving and reviewing medical documentation. The RA program is located under the management of the Labor Management and Employee Relations (LMER) Division. However, the RAPM, the Assistant Director, LMER, and the Employee Relations team members are fully available to advise managers before, during, and following the RA process to ensure the effectiveness of an accommodation.

9. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

WHS processes RA requests and timely approves accommodations. RA training for managers and supervisors is an integral part of the following training: HR and Leadership for New Employees, and LMER and EEO Diversity and Inclusion Training for Supervisors. The RAPM regularly monitors accommodation requests and advises leadership of any trends.

### D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

*Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.*

Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the PAS requirement. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests for PAS, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

WHS has finalized the PAS policy as part of AI 114, "Reasonable Accommodation for Individuals with Disabilities," which is currently being reviewed. To date, WHS has processed no requests for PAS. Reasonable Accommodation Policy and Procedures, which included information on PAS policy and procedures, remain published and posted on the internal website as a resource to all managers and supervisors.

## Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

### A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging harassment, as compared to the governmentwide average?

Answer No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer No

3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

In FY 2023, there were no findings of discrimination as a result of harassment based on disability status.

## **B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION**

4. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer No

5. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging failure to provide reasonable accommodation result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

Answer No

6. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

In FY 2023, PFPA implemented a policy in an effort to better accommodate the affected individuals involved.

## **Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers**

*Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.*

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer No

2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer No

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments



|   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Source of the Trigger:</b>   | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B3   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b><br><br><b>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</b><br><br><b>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</b> | Lower than expected representation of PwDs and PwTDs into Managerial Positions Table B3: Occupational Categories by Disability Trigger(s): Executive/Senior Level is below the goal of 12% for PwDs 49 (8.78%). Trigger(s): Executive/Senior Level is below the goal of 2% for PwTDs eight (1.43%). Trigger(s): Out of 8 occupational categories, 3 are below the goal of 12% for PwDs. Professionals (10.31%), Craft Workers (4.96%), and Service Workers (3.35%). Four of the eight occupational categories are below the 2% goal for PwTDs. Professionals (1.53%), Technicians (1.39%), Craft Workers (0.71%), and Service Workers (0.39%). Table B4: General Schedule (GS) Grades by Disability Trigger(s): GS-14 cluster (64 employees) is below the PwDs 12% goal at 11.55%. Trigger(s): GS-15 cluster (89 employees) is below the PwDs 12% goal at 8.99%. Trigger(s): SES cluster (17 employees) is below the PwDs 12% goal at 6.39%. Trigger(s): GS-14 cluster (8 employees) is below the PwTDs 2% goal at 1.44%. Trigger(s): SES cluster (1 employees) is below the PwTDs 2% goal at 0.38%. Table B6: Mission-Critical Occupations by Disability Trigger(s): PwDs is below the 12% goal in the 0083, 0130, and 1102 series. Trigger(s): PwTDs is below the 2% goal in the 0083, 0130, and 1102 series. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>   | <b>Barrier Group</b>  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | People with Disabilities  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | People with Disabilities  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | People with Targeted Disabilities   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>   | N   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>  | Y   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b><br><br><b>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.</b>                       | <b>Barrier Name</b>   | <b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Increase Advancement for PwDs and PwTDs   | Increase advancement, and workforce recruitment for PwD and PwTD in Mission Critical Occupations |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Increase Advancement for PwDs and PwTDs   | Increase advancement, and workforce recruitment for PwD and PwTD in Mission Critical Occupations |  |  |  |  |  |

**Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan**

| Date Initiated | Target Date | Sufficient Funding / Staffing? | Date Modified | Date Completed | Objective Description  |
|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------|----------------|--|
| 10/20/2022     | 10/20/2024  | Yes                            |               |                | Increase outreach and recruitment efforts for PwDs in the senior grade levels. |

**Responsible Official(s)**

| Title   | Name            | Standards Address the Plan? |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Chief Human Resources Officer/HRD               | Christine Nalli | No                          |
| Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Programs | Pamela Sullivan | No                          |

**Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective**

| <b>Target Date</b> | <b>Planned Activities</b>  | <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | <b>Modified Date</b> | <b>Completion Date</b> |
|--------------------|--|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| 06/01/2023         | Update the EEO external website to include 504/508 complaint information in the Disability Outreach section.   | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 08/30/2023         | Collaborate w/HRD to identify whether triggers exist within the Career Development Program for PWDs and PWTDs. | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 09/30/2023         | Develop a Disability Newsletter for WHS Agency   | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 09/30/2023         | Collaborate with HR to create a drive for WHS employees to update their SF 256                                 | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 05/31/2023         | Establish Disability Working Group   | Yes                                       |                      | 05/31/2023             |

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

Lack of personnel and resources

5. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barrier(s).

The agency has not had sufficient time to assess the impact of the planned activities.

6.If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

The agency has not had sufficient time to assess the impact of the planned activities.