

## 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*

1. 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 Yes |

For grade levels GS 1-10 (PWD) represented 14.5% of total workforce. For grade levels GS 11-SES (PWD) represented 8% of total workforce. Both numbers demonstrate growth from the previous year. DCAA continues to resurvey the workforce on an on-going basis. Employees receive an email on their employment anniversary date indicating their self-identification and encouraging them to check its accuracy. See Table B4P.

\*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.

2. 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 Yes |

For grade levels GS 1-10 (PWTD), they represented 3% of total workforce. For grade levels GS 11-SES (PWTD), they represented 1.4% of total workforce. DCAA continues to resurvey the workforce. Employees receive an email on their employment anniversary date indicating their self-identification and encouraging them to check its accuracy. See Table B4P.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	593	86	14.50	17	2.87
Grades GS-11 to SES	3766	281	7.46	54	1.43

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

The numerical goals are communicated to Agency hiring officials during EEO for Managers training provided by the EEO Office.

### 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 (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	2	Patrick Grimes, Recruitment Team Supervisor, Patrick.grimes@dcaa.mil (Schedule A 213.3012 (u)) (Workforce Recruitment Program)
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	Darlene Washington, Human Resources Specialist, Darlene.Washington@dcaa
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	2	Benjamin Nidus, Reasonable Accommodation Manager, Benjamin.nidus@dcaa.mil Debbie Cruz, Affirmative Employment Program & Compliance Branch Chief, Debbie.Cruz@dcaa.mil
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Jamie Markol, Chief OIT, Jamie.Markol@dcaa.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	Mark Simon, Facilities & Space Management Branch Chief, Mark.Simon@dcaa.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	Benjamin Nidus, Reasonable Accommodation Manager, Benjamin.nidus@dcaa.mil

- 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

Yes, Reasonable Accommodation Manager attended Disability Program Manager training.

**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.b. Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC’s regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]		
<b>Objective</b>	Revise Reasonable Accommodation Instruction to be fully compliant with EEOC regulations.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Oct 31, 2019		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Sep 30, 2018		EEO updates draft Reasonable Accommodation Instruction revision which includes required language from the Affirmative Action for Individuals with Disabilities EEOC Final Rule.
	Nov 1, 2020		Final coordination prior to issuance.
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2021	Reasonable Accommodation draft instruction has been submitted to EEOC for preliminary review prior to final Agency coordination.	
	2020	EEO updated Record Schedule for maintaining medical documentation.	

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	C.2.b.2. Has the agency established a firewall between the Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager and the EEO Director? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(A)]		
<b>Objective</b>	The RA Program Manager is in the Affirmative Employment Compliance Branch of the DCAA EEO Office. It is separate from the EEO Complaint Branch. However the EEO Director is the direct supervisor of the RA Manager. DCAA believes its workforce is best served with the RA Manager in the EEO Office.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Sep 10, 2020		
<b>Completion Date</b>	Sep 10, 2020		
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2020	The RA Program Manager is in the Affirmative Employment Compliance Branch of the DCAA EEO Office. It is separate from the EEO Complaint Branch. However the EEO Director is the direct supervisor of the RA Manager. DCAA believes its workforce is best served with the RA Manager located in the EEO Office.	

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	C.2.c. Has the agency established procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services that comply with EEOC’s regulations, enforcement guidance, and other applicable executive orders, guidance, and standards? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(6)]		
<b>Objective</b>	To set procedures in place for processing requests for personal assistance services.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Oct 31, 2019		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Oct 31, 2019		EEO updates draft Reasonable Accommodation Instruction to include the use of Personal Assistance Services.
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2021	Reasonable Accommodation draft instruction has been submitted to EEOC for preliminary review prior to final Agency coordination.	

<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>	Update public website with updated instruction as soon as final Agency coordination is completed.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Dec 31, 2021		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2021	Reasonable Accommodation draft instruction has been submitted to EEOC for preliminary review prior to final Agency coordination.	

## 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.

DCAA uses our Outreach Recruitment Program to identify applicants with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities. Recruiters attend numerous career fairs and networking events that target persons with disabilities and targeted disabilities. These encompass but are not limited to: career fairs for Wounded Warriors including those put on by DoD Hiring Heroes as well as the U.S. Chamber Hiring our Heroes; CAREERS and the disabled; Diversity Employment Day in Arlington VA, Hire A Hero/Hire A Veteran, and Soldier for Life. We have partnerships with Wounded Warrior Battalions/Units; Other Agency Disability Program Managers; Department of Veteran Affairs Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (DVOP) specialists; and the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP). In 2020, the pandemic forced many of our partnerships entities to transition career fairs and other events into virtual platforms. DCAA did not actually conduct any events in 2020 due to the logistical issues of those virtual sessions.

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

DCAA uses Schedule A 213.3102(u), Direct Hire Authority for Auditors, Veteran Hiring authorities, and the Workforce Recruitment Program for College Students With 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.

Human Resources Specialists (HRS) determine applicant eligibility by using the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) qualification standards. If the applicant is deemed eligible and qualified, the HRS sends the application package (resume and transcripts for DCAA positions) to the manager for consideration using the appropriate hiring authority.

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

DCAA's workforce is comprised of 88% auditors. As such, DCAA uses a centralized recruitment approach: HR refers all eligible and qualified candidates to Interview Hiring Panels. Each Interview Panel is comprised of Auditors (hiring officials) and makes multiple selections based upon hiring goals. HR assembles these panels twice a year, rotating Auditors. For Fiscal Year 2021, HR is educating all panel members not only on the interview processes to be followed, but also on the various disability hiring authorities. DCAA also utilizes over 200 Auditors as "field recruiters." Annual training is provided to these recruiters regarding all pertinent hiring authorities. DCAA is also working to update their information on HR's internal and external websites about various hiring authorities.

## **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.

DCAA has long standing relationships with many entities across the public and private sector. To that end, recruiters attend numerous career fairs that target persons with disabilities and targeted disabilities, which include but are not limited to: career fairs for wounded warriors including those put on by DoD Hiring Heroes and the U.S. Chamber Hiring our Heroes; CAREERS and the disabled; Diversity Employment Day in Arlington VA, Hire A Hero/Hire A Veteran, and Soldier for Life. DCAA has partnerships with Wounded Warrior Battalions/Units; Other Agency Disability Program Managers; Department of Veteran Affairs Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (DVOP) specialists; and the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP). DCAA is also a member in DoD's Recruiters consortium where we share best practices on the recruitment and retention of PWD and PWTD. By attending

these career fairs and other outreach venues, which are identified in our overall Recruitment Strategy each year, and through our established partnerships, DCAA is very successful in maintaining solid and productive relationships with each entity.

**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 No
- b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

New hires for PWD was 11% (35 out of 330), which is below the benchmark of 12%. However, New Hires for PWTD was 0.6% (2 out of 330), which is very close to the benchmark. See Table B8.

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	2646	6.39	0.00	3.51	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	1009	6.84	0.00	3.96	0.00
% of New Hires	73	1.37	0.00	1.37	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.

- a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, triggers exist for PWD and PWTD. PWD were 7% (69 out of 1009) of Qualified External Applicants however, they were 1.44% (1 out of 73) of selections. Additionally PWTD were 4% (40 out of 1009) of Qualified Applicants however, there was one selection. See Table B7-P.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
0511AUDITOR	8	862.50	12.50	500.00	12.50

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.

- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

The relevant applicant pool for internal applicants for MCO positions are GS-0511-12, 13, 14, and 15. For PWD, the relevant applicant pool is 7.3% (240 out of 3269). The Qualified PWD Applicants for MCO positions were 2.5% (35 out of 1378), which is below their availability. For PWTD, the relevant applicant pool is 1.4% (46 out of 3269). The Qualified PWTD Applicants for MCO positions were 2.4% (33 out of 1378), which is above their availability. See Table B6-P and B9-P.

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.

- a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer No
- b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

Qualified PWD Applicants for MCO positions was 2.5% (35 out of 1378). PWD was 1% (1 out of 104) of total MCO selections, which closely reflects their availability in the Qualified PWD Applicants. Qualified PWTD Applicants for MCO positions was 2.4% (33 out of 1378), PWTD was 1% (1 out of 104). See Table B9-P.

## 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.

All applicants to include PWD and PWTD, have ample opportunities for advancement. Auditors constitute 88% percent of DCAA positions. These positions include career ladder Auditors, GS-0511-07 through GS-0511-12, as well as Auditors and Supervisory Auditors, GS-0511-13 through GS-0511-15. Employees advance non-competitively through the career ladder. Once employees reach the GS-12 full performance level, they may apply for higher level opportunities through merit promotion. Announcements are posted in USAJOBS and are open to all qualified employees. DCAA also uses an internal Auditor Rotation Program which assists in the career development of the auditors. Non-auditor positions grant the same opportunities for all eligible candidates applying to agency positions. Some of those positions have room for advancement based upon the full performance level of the position. Non-auditors assigned to the agency also have an opportunity to train and become auditors as part of the DCAA Upward Mobility Program. In FY2021, DCAA is pursuing development of Upward Mobility Programs for other non-auditor series as well.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

DCAA provides live and computer-based technical (primarily 0511) and leadership competency-based (all occupational series) training opportunities across the assigned workforce. Training is available at both the non-supervisory and supervisory levels. Additionally, DCAA enables talent and career development through the Agency’s Mentoring, Developmental Assignment, Rotation, Pathways and Succession Programs. The DCAA Director’s Development Program in Leadership (DDPL) provides the Agency the means to develop senior-level civilians with the knowledge, skills, and abilities for effective managerial and executive-level leadership performance. DCAA also integrates available DoD leadership development programs on a competitive basis. The participation in the Agency’s career development opportunities are captured below as Other Career Development Programs except for the Mentoring Program.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	144	144	5	5	1	1
Other Career Development Programs	83	44	6	5	1	1

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 Yes
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Total representation of PWD is 8% (367 out of 4359). PWDs represented 5% of all applicants for training which is below their availability in the workforce. PWDs represent 4% of selections for Career Development Opportunities which is approximate to their availability.

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 Yes
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer No

Total representation of PWTD is 1.6% (71 out of 4359). PWTDs represented 1% of all applicants for training which is below their availability in the workforce. PWTDs represent 1% of selections for Career Development Opportunities which matches their application rate.

**C. AWARDS**

1. 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 No
- b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer No

The Inclusion Rate for PWD is 8.4% and for PWTD is 1.6%. See Table B1. PWD Time Off Award Participation Rate: 7% (150 out of 2190) PWTD Time Off Award Participation Rate: 1.5% (32 out of 2190) PWD Cash Award Participation Rate: 7% (291 out of 4134) PWTD Cash Award Participation Rate: 1.3% (53 out of 4134) PWD QSI Participation Rate: 3.4% (2 out of 59) Note: QSIs represent 1% of the total awards issued in FY 2020. PWTD QSI Participation Rate: 0% See Table B13



Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	1339	22.07	31.44	19.72	22.64
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	9757	155.04	229.51	126.76	161.82
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	7.29	1.91	0.19	9.06	0.20
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	365	10.90	8.18	14.08	10.14
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	6303	188.83	141.14	240.85	176.35
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.27	4.72	0.45	24.08	0.08
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	66	1.36	1.57	1.41	1.35
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	1569	31.61	37.48	30.99	31.76
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	23.77	6.32	0.61	30.99	0.41
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	419	6.27	10.01	9.86	5.41
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	16467	248.23	393.11	390.14	214.19
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	39.3	10.79	1.01	55.73	0.01
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	1	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.34
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	48	13.08	0.00	0.00	16.22
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	48	13.08	0.00	0.00	16.22

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	638	12.26	14.91	12.68	12.16
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	470760	9203.81	10986.90	9756.34	9071.28
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	737.87	204.53	19.01	1084.04	-6.44
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	1053	15.53	24.97	8.45	17.23
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	1491214	22041.96	35386.51	11536.62	24561.82
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1416.16	386.70	36.56	1922.77	18.25
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	555	11.17	13.18	12.68	10.81
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	1322228	25357.49	31500.95	27515.49	24839.86
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2382.39	618.47	61.65	3057.28	33.49
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	156	2.18	3.74	2.82	2.03
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	529390	7209.26	12703.46	8728.17	6844.93
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3393.53	901.16	87.61	4364.08	70.52

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	28	0.54	0.67	0.00	0.68
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	121856	2428.34	2913.18	0.00	3010.81
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4352	1214.17	112.05	0.00	1505.41
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	32	0.27	0.80	0.00	0.34
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	314995	1647.14	7968.79	0.00	2042.23
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	9843.59	1647.14	257.06	0.00	2042.23

2. 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 No
- b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

PWD QSI Participation Rate: 3.4% (2 out of 59) Note: QSIs represent 1% of the total awards issued in FY 2020. PWTD QSI Participation Rate: 0% See Table B13 See Table B13.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

3. 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

N/A

**D. PROMOTIONS**

1. 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 No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- 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 No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- d. Grade GS-13
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

SES positions: The relevant applicant pool for SES positions (GS-15) is 8.6% (6 out of 70) . There were no internal selections for SES. GS-15 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 positions (GS-14) is 7% (17 out of 232) . The PWD made up 1.3% (2 out of 150) of qualified applicants. None were selected (0 out of 8). GS-14 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 positions (GS-13) is 7% (70 out of 968). The PWD made up 5.1% (12 out of 234) of qualified applicants. PWD were 6.3% of selections (1 out of 16). GS-13 positions: The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions (GS-12) is 8% (178 out of 2216) . The PWD made up 3.8% (40 out of 1067) of qualified applicants. PWD were 0% of selections (0 out of 60). See Table B11.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer No
- b. Grade GS-15
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes
- c. Grade GS-14
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

SES positions: The relevant applicant pool for SES positions (GS-15) is 1.4% (1 out of 70). There were no internal selections for SES. GS-15 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 positions (GS-14) is 1.7% (4 out of 232) . The PWTB made up 1.3% (2 out of 150) of qualified applicants. None were selected (0 out of 8). GS-14 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 positions (GS-13) is 1% (11 out of 968). The PWTB made up 3% (7 out of 234) of qualified applicants. None were selected (0 out of 16). GS-13 positions: The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions (GS-12) is 1.5% (33 out of 2216). The PWTB made up 2.4% (26 out of 1067) of qualified applicants. None were selected (0 out of 60). See Table B11.

3. 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 No
- 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

SES positions: The relevant applicant pool for SES positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 14). There were 2 external vacancy announcements. There were 0% PWD selected (0 out of 2). GS-15 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 4% (6 out of 150) as there was one external vacancy announcements for GS-15. GS-14 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 7% (5 out of 72). No selections 0% (0 out of 2). Note: There were 2 external vacancy announcements for GS-14. GS-13 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-13 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 5% (11 out of 212) as there were 5 external vacancy announcements for GS-13. There were 0% selected (0 out of 2). See Table B15.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWT D 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 (PWT D) Answer No
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWT D) Answer No
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWT D) Answer No
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWT D) Answer No

SES positions: The relevant applicant pool for SES positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 14 ). There were 2 external vacancy announcements. There were 0% PWT D selected (0 out of 2). GS-15 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-15 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 1% (2 out of 150) as there was one external vacancy announcements for GS-15 GS-14 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-14 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 72). There were 2 external vacancy announcements for GS-14. GS-13 positions: The relevant applicant pool for GS-13 positions (Qualified Applicants) is 3% (6 out of 212). There were 0% selected (0 out of 2). See Table B15.

5. 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 No
- b. Managers
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- c. Supervisors

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
- ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Executive positions (SES & GS-15): The relevant applicant pool for PWD Executive positions is 7.5% (14 out of 187). The PWD made up 2% (2 out of 112) of qualified applicants. No PWD's were selected (0 out of 7). Manager positions (GS-14): The relevant applicant pool for PWD Manager positions is 7% (39 out of 590). The PWD made up 5% (6 out of 120) of qualified applicants and 11% of selections (1 out of 9). Supervisor positions (GS-13): The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions (GS-12) is 8% (178 out of 2216). The PWD made up 5% (18 out of 385) of qualified applicants. No PWD's were selected out of 32 selections. See Tables B4P, B17, B19.

6. 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 No

b. Managers

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

c. Supervisors

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

Executive positions (SES & GS-15): The relevant applicant pool for Executive positions is 1.6% (3 out of 187). The PWTD made up 2% (2 out of 112) of qualified applicants. No PWTD's were selected 0% (0 out of 7). Manager positions (GS-14): The relevant applicant pool for Manager positions is 1.2% (7 out of 590). The PWTD made up 3% (4 out of 120) of qualified applicants. No PWTD's were selected 0% (0 out of 9). Supervisor positions (GS-13): The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions is 1.5% (33 out of 2216). The PWTD made up 3% (12 out of 385) of qualified applicants. No PWTD's were selected (0 out of 32). See Tables B4P, B17, B19.

7. 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 No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer No

Executive positions (SES & GS-15): The relevant applicant pool for Executive positions (Qualified Applicants) is 4% (6 out of 152). There were two external selections. None were PWD. Manager positions (GS-14): The relevant applicant pool for Manager positions (Qualified Applicants) is 4% (2 out of 49). One external selection and was not identified as having a disability. Supervisor positions (GS-13): The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 0). There were no external selections for Supervisor positions. See Table B18.

8. 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 No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer No

Executive positions (SES & GS-15): The relevant applicant pool for Executive positions (Qualified Applicants) is 1.3% (2 out of 152). There were two external selections. None were PWTD. Manager positions (GS-14): The relevant applicant pool for Manager positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 49). There was one external selection. Selectee was not identified as having a disability. Supervisor positions (GS-13): The relevant applicant pool for Supervisor positions (Qualified Applicants) is 0% (0 out of 0). There were no external selections for Supervisor positions. See Table B18.

## 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 N/A

This Agency had one Schedule A hire and that employee resigned after one month.

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 No
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

The Inclusion Rate for PWD is 8% (367 out of 4359). Table B1 The Voluntary Separation Rate for PWD is 11% (51 out of 465). Table B16 The Involuntary Separation Rate for PWD is 27% (4 out of 15). The Inclusion Rate for persons without a disability is 92% (4029 out of 4397). The Voluntary Separation Rate for persons without a disability is 89% (414 out of 465). The Involuntary Separation Rate for persons without a disability is 73% (11 out of 15). See Table B1 and B16.

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	15	1.09	0.27
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	86	2.45	1.91
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	131	6.25	2.68
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	240	4.89	5.51
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	472	14.67	10.37

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

- a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

The Inclusion Rate for PWTD is 1.6% (71 out of 4397). Table B1 The Voluntary Separation Rate for PWTD is 2.6% (12 out of 465). The Involuntary Separation Rate for PWTD is 0% (0 out of 15). The Inclusion Rate for persons without a disability is 92% (4029 out of 4397). The Voluntary Separation Rate for persons without a disability is 89% (414 out of 465). The Involuntary Separation Rate for persons without a disability is 73% (11 out of 15). See Table B1 and B16.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	15	0.00	0.35
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	86	4.23	1.92
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	131	8.45	2.89
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	240	4.23	5.48
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	472	16.90	10.63

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

N/A

**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.

1. 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.

[https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std\\_Stmt.aspx](https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std_Stmt.aspx)

2. 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.

<https://www.dcaa.mil/Architectural-Barriers-Act/>

3. 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.

DCAA Communications Office is in the process of updating Agency external website and thoroughly reviewing for 508 compliance.

**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.

1. 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.)

In FY 2020, the average timeframe for the processing of 84 completed reasonable accommodation requests was 16 days.

- 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.

The Reasonable Accommodation team engages with deciding officials as soon as a request is received (no later than 2 business days) to discuss the request. This engagement educates Deciding Officials on their roles and responsibilities, explores temporary and alternate accommodations, & ensures Deciding Officials make well informed & timely decisions. There is a dedicated government purchase card holder assigned to the reasonable accommodation team for the procurement of accommodations.

## **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.

The Agency has incorporated Personal Assistance Services into its revised Reasonable Accommodation Instruction which has been submitted to EEOC for review.

## **Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data**

### **A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT**

- 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 Yes

- 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 Yes

- 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.

The Agency had no finding of discrimination.

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

- 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

- 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 Yes

3. 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.

The Agency had no finding of discrimination.

## 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

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

N/A

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

In FY 2019 HR worked with EEO to revise entrance and exit surveys to include information regarding reasonable accommodations and hostile work environment.

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.

HR and EEO will review the results of the entrance and exit surveys to determine if employees indicate an issue with reasonable accommodations or disability related harassment.