

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 | No |

15.91% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark. 15.76% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark.

*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 | No |

3.28% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark 2.28% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10					
Grades GS-11 to SES					

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

DLA has consistently communicated through Disability self-identification video, self-identification articles and demographic charts. DLA also promotes National Disability Awareness Month presentations and seminars, which state our commitment to increase the representation of PWTDs to 2% and PWDs to 12% of our workforce.

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

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 reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	8	0	3	Nancy Rivera, DLA DPM; nancy.rivera@dla.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	9	0	0	Nancy Rivera, DLA DPM; nancy.rivera@dla.mil
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	90	Pam Ries, SPPC; pamela.ries@dla.mil Michele Brandt, SPPC; Michele.Brandt@dla.mil
Section 508 Compliance	8	4	0	Christine Larsen, Program Manager J62LD, Christina.Larsen@dla.mil
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	Pam Ries, SPPC; pamela.ries@dla.mil Michele Brandt, SPPC; Michele.Brandt@dla.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	7	Gus Zakhem, Chief of Facilities Sustainment and Equipment, Installation Operations, Gus.Zakhem@dla.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

DLA has a full-time DPM who works with seven DPCs at the MSC EEO offices.

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

The DPM and all DPCs have attended a Disability Program Manager training course, and regularly attend workshops and webinars hosted by the National Employment Law Institute, the Job Accommodation Network, and the Employer Assistance and Resource Network. They also participate in the Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability, hosted by the EEOC, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Department of Labor. DO hosts a roundtable every other month to discuss RA, SEP, and AEP matters, conduct on-the-spot training, and share best practices, trends, and solutions. The DPM hosts a quarterly meeting to discuss RA issues.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

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.

Job applicants may use Schedule A hiring authority to apply for vacancy announcements. If hired with Schedule A hiring authority, selectees are required to complete SF-256 to identify their disability. DLA searches the WRP database to identify qualified PWD.

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

DLA opens all vacancy announcements to PWD, via Schedule A hiring authority, and to 30% or more disabled veterans.

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.

Individuals requesting consideration through Schedule A hiring authority are required to provide a letter from a physician or other care provider certifying their eligibility for Schedule A hiring authority. Individuals who request consideration as a 30% or more disabled veteran are required to provide DD Form 214, Military Discharge and a letter from the Department of Veteran's Affairs or branch of the armed forces certifying an overall service-connected disability. Individuals must meet eligibility requirements for the appointment authority and minimum qualifications for the vacancy. HR refers qualified applicants to the selecting official in veteran's preference order and then if they identify as being eligible for Schedule A hiring authority, for 30% or more disabled veteran's authority, or both.

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

All new supervisors are trained on Schedule A hiring authority during the HR Management class, which is refreshed every three years.

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.

Organizations that assist PWD and PWTD with securing employment: DLA currently maintains contact with: • Department of Labor for the WRP • State Rehabilitation Service • Veteran Employment Centers • Gallaudet University • National Institute of the Blind • National Technical Institution of the Deaf • Disabled American Veterans • Social Security Administration • Wounded Warrior Project • Philadelphia Veterans Contact and Advocacy Program • Job Fairs that target PWD and PWTD populations, such as the Careers and the Disabled Expo. • Local college and university campus disability programs to inform them of job opportunities with DLA and to raise awareness of the different hiring authorities and programs. DLA also works with the Job Accommodation Network and the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program who assist PWD and PWTD maintain employment.

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 No

12.15% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark 2.74% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	0				
% of Qualified Applicants	0				
% of New Hires	0				

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

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.) MCOs with enough hires (≥ 8) for the trigger to be significant are marked with *. 0089 (0% of 4 hires < 7.14%) Emergency Management 0301 (11.30% of 115 hires < 11.30%)* Equal Employment Opportunity 0340 (0% of 3 hires < 3.71%) Program Management 0346 (5.00% of 20 hires < 8.21%)* Logistics Management 0510 (6.15% of 65 hires < 6.25%)* Accounting 0801 (0% of 13 hires < 0.50%)* General Engineering 0905 (0% of 20 hires < 5.79%)* General Attorney 1035 (0% of 6 hires < 9.80%) Public Affairs 2003 (6.67% of 15 hires < 8.32%)* Supply Program Management 2030 (0% of 7 hires < 5.38%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management Triggers exist for PWTD in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.) MCOs with enough hires (≥ 50) for the trigger to be significant are marked with *. 0089 (0% of 4 hires < 4.20%) Emergency Management 0201 (4.00% of 50 hires < 5.03%)* Human Resources Management 0260 (0% of 7 hires < 12.60%) Human Resources Management 0301 (0.87% of 115 hires < 4.54%)* Equal Employment Opportunity 0340 (0% of 3 hires < 1.59%) Program Management 0346 (0% of 20 < 5.42%) Logistics Management 0501 (2.56% of 39 hires < 4.60%) Financial Administration and Program 0510 (0% of 65 hires < 2.63%)* Accounting 0801 (0% of 13 hires <

0.50%) General Engineering 0905 (0% of 20 hires < 3.18%) General Attorney 1035 (0% of 6 hires < 7.84%) Public Affairs 1101 (0% of 12 hires < 3.71%) General Business & Industry 1102 (3.24% of 278 hires < 4.10%)* Contracting 1104 (0% of 22 hires < 3.28%) Property Disposal 1811 (0% of 2 hires < 3.88%) Criminal Investigating 2001 (3.85% of 52 hires < 4.27%)* General Supply 2003 (0% of 15 hires < 4.61%) Supply Program Management 2030 (0% of 7 hires < 4.04%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 (1.67% of 60 hires < 5.18%)* Information Technology Management

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	

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 Yes

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs: (Percent of qualified applicants in that MCO.) 0080 (7.93% of 164 applicants < 15.56%) Security Administration 0089 (10.45% of 67 applicants < 20.69%) Emergency Management 0201 (13.31% of 541 applicants < 18.93%) Human Resources Management 0260 (22.83% of 127 applicants < 54.67%) Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 (8.00% of 3864 applicants < 17.29%) Miscellaneous Administration and Program 0340 (0.58% of 173 applicants < 9.09%) Program Management 0343 (10.81% of 3405 applicants < 20.82%) Management Program Analysis 0346 (8.05% of 1143 applicants < 18.04%) Logistics Management 0501 (11.80% of 356 applicants < 13.96%) Financial Administration and Program 0510 (10.29% of 204 applicants < 7.36%) Accounting 0511 (0% of 11 applicants < 17.65%) Auditing 0801 (0.70% of 142 applicants < 6.02%) General Engineering 0905 (5.79% of 535 applicants < 2.24%) General Attorney 1035 (9.80% of 102 applicants < 17.07%) Public Affairs 1101 (5.95% of 605 applicants < 10.08%) General Business & Industry 1102 (9.54% of 1856 applicants < 13.53%) Contracting 1104 (7.38% of 1422 applicants < 19.92%) Property Disposal 2001 (7.90% of 2013 applicants < 15.73%) General Supply 2003 (8.32% of 1214 applicants < 15.79%) Supply Program Management 2030 (5.38% of 446 applicants < 14.14%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 (9.39% of 2408 applicants < 17.87%) Information Technology Management
 Triggers exist for PWTD in the following MCOs: (Percent of qualified applicants in that MCO.) 0801 (0.70% of 142 applicants < 0.75%) General Engineering

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 Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Triggers exist for PWD in the following MCOs: (Percent of promotions in that MCO.) MCOs with enough promotions (8) for the trigger to be significant are marked with *. 0080 (0% of 5 promotions < 7.76%) Security Administration 0089 (0% of 1 promotions < 7.14%) Emergency Management 0340 (0% of 5 promotions < 3.71%) Program Management 0346 (0% of 23 promotions < 8.21%)* Logistics Management 0560 (0% of 3 promotions < 0.92%) Budget Analysis 0801 (0% of 16 promotions < 0.50%)* General Engineering 1035 (0% of 3 promotions < 7.84%) Public Affairs 1515 (0% of 3 promotions < 13.33%) Operations Research 1811 (0% of 1 promotions < 6.98%) Criminal Investigating 2003 (7.25% of 69 promotions < 8.32%)* Supply Program Management 2030 (8.16% of 49 promotions < 8.38%)* Distribution Facilities & Storage Management
 Triggers exist for PWTD in the following MCOs: (Percent of promotions in that MCO.) MCOs with enough promotions (50) for the trigger to be significant are marked with *. 0080 (0% of 5 promotions < 4.18%) Security Administration 0089 (0% of 1 promotions < 4.20%) Emergency Management 0201 (0% of 87 promotions < 5.03%)* Human Resources Management 0301 (3.48% of 287 promotions < 4.54%)* Miscellaneous Administration and Program 0340 (0% of 5 promotions < 1.59%) Program Management 0343 (3.80% of 184 promotions < 5.29%)* Management Program Analysis 0346 (0% of 23 promotions < 5.42%) Logistics Management 0501 (1.96%

of 51 promotions < 4.60%)* Financial Administration and Program 0510 (0% of 33 promotions < 2.63%) Accounting 0560 (0% of 3 promotions < 0.92%) Budget Analysis 0801 (0% of 16 promotions < 0.50%) General Engineering 0905 (0% of 17 promotions < 3.18%) General Attorney 1035 (0% of 3 promotions < 7.84%) Public Affairs 1101 (0% of 51 promotions < 3.71%)* General Business & Industry 1102 (3.07% of 683 promotions < 4.10%)* Contracting 1104 (0% of 83 promotions < 3.28%)* Property Disposal 1515 (0% of 3 promotions < 6.67%) Operations Research 1811 (0% of 1 promotions < 3.88%) Criminal Investigating 2001 (1.83% of 164 promotions < 4.27%)* General Supply 2003 (0% of 69 promotions < 4.61%)* Supply Program Management 2030 (0% of 49 promotions < 4.04%) Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 (1.12% of 89 promotions < 5.18%)* Information Technology Management

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.

Several of the DLA organizations use the Pathways to Career Excellence program, which is a 2 year entry level program that include successfully completing performance-based measures for advancement and promotions. Plans for additional programs in FY19: DO will continue to recommend improvements to track and advertise mentoring. The DLA Career Mapping Program continues to develop the DLA Career Guide, the DLA Career Pyramid, DLA Career Paths and DLA Career Checklists for specific job series, which will be available to all employees to assist them with advancement of their careers. The Career Mapping Program will continue to publish new career field specific tools, which will assist with planning employee's career development and progression. Special Emphasis Committee groups for PWD have been created to voice concerns from employees who have disabilities.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

DLA Enterprise Tuition Assistance Program: Provides financial support for continued education courses at the undergraduate or graduate level. Permanent, full-time civilian employees are eligible after their initial one-year probationary/trial period in Federal civilian service. DLA Enterprise Leader Development Program: An Agency-wide leadership development program designed to build and enhance the leadership skills of DLA employees at all levels. The competencies include supervisory certification, coaching, mentoring, the use of leadership development guides, multi-source feedbacks, and behavior-based interviewing techniques. Defense Civilian Emerging Leader Program: A DoD cohort and competency-based leadership development program for entry level and emerging leaders. Permanent full-time, civilians in grades 7 through 12 are eligible, including Federal Wage System employees. DLA Enterprise Rotation Program (Cross-Organizational): Cross-organizational rotational assignments within DLA. (Intra-organizational rotations are also available) Rotational assignments were listed seeking GS-11 to GS-14 employee participation. Logistics for the 21st Century: A 5 ½-day course designed by the Institute for Defense and Business to provide early-career, high-potential logisticians with a comprehensive and tailored educational experience. GS-11 through GS-13 early-career civilian logisticians are eligible. DoD Defense Pricing and Contracting Acquisition Exchange Program: A unique developmental 6- to 9-month experience through rotational assignments for high caliber individuals in acquisition related career fields. Permanent civilian acquisition employees in grades GS 11 and above are eligible. OSD Sustainment Fellowship Program: A 12-month hands-on leadership and management program to enhance the career development of mid-level logisticians professionals. Civilian logisticians employees in grades GS-13 and GS-14 are eligible. In-House Coaching Program Pilot for FY19: Through in-house coaching, improve leadership capability across the agency. Employees who have completed ELDP Level 3 and managers are eligible. DLA Executive Development Program: A program that allows managers to nominate high potential, highly motivated individuals to attend up to two training programs, for approval by DLA's executive board. Permanent civilians in grades GS-13 through GS-15 with at least 18-months of continuous service with DLA are eligible.

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
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	260	171	14.23	15.20	0.38	0.58
Detail Programs	36	35	13.89	14.29	5.56	5.71
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 No

14.23% of the 260 applicants to the Training programs were PWD, which is below the permanent PWD workforce of 14.70%. 13.89% of the 260 applicants to the Detail programs were PWD, which is below the permanent PWD workforce of 14.70%.

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

0.38% of the 260 applicants to the Training programs were PWTD, which is below the permanent PWTD workforce of 2.45%.

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

25.39% of Persons without Disabilities (PWOD) received large Time-Off awards, whereas 23.15% of PWD and 20.68% of PWTD received large Time-Off awards. 46.91% of PWOD received small Cash awards, whereas 43.09% of PWD and 42.51% of PWTD received small Cash awards. 77.60% of PWOD received large Cash awards, whereas 75.46% of PWD and 74.24% of PWTD received large Cash awards.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
-------------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

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 Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer Yes

3.45% of PWOD received a Quality Step Increase, whereas 2.83% of PWD: and 1.14% of PWTD received a Quality Step Increase.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Performance Based Pay Increase	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 No

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

DO and HR are not aware of other employee recognition programs.

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 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 Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

0% of SES applicants were PWD. None were qualified or selected. 6.46% of applicants to GS-15 were PWD. Only 5.07% were qualified, and none were selected. 7.17% of applicants to GS-14 were PWD. Only 5.83% were qualified and only 2.24% were selected. 9.15% of applicants to GS-13 were PWD. Only 8.05% were qualified and only 3.29% were selected.

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 Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes
- b. Grade GS-15
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes
- c. Grade GS-14
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

0% of SES applicants were PWTB. None were qualified or selected. 3.17% of applicants to GS-15 were PWTB. Only 1.87% were qualified, and none were selected. 4.04% of applicants to GS-14 were PWTB. Only 3.14% were qualified and none were selected. 5.41% of applicants to GS-13 were PWTB. Only 4.97% were qualified and only 1.20% were selected.

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

0% of 3 SES new hires were PWTB, vs 100.00% of qualified applicants. 0% of 16 new hires to GS-15 were PWTB, vs 5.11% of qualified applicants. 1.38% of 54 new hires to GS-14 were PWTB, vs 5.80% of qualified applicants. 7.83% of 136 new hires to GS-13 were PWTB, vs 7.66% of qualified applicants.

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

0% of 3 SES new hires were PWTD, vs 0% of qualified applicants. 0% of 16 new hires to GS-15 were PWTD, vs 1.98% of qualified applicants. 0% of 54 new hires to GS-14 were PWTD, vs 3.10% of qualified applicants. 4.00% of 136 new hires to GS-13 were PWTD, vs 4.60% of qualified applicants.

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 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

4.99% of 741 qualified applicants for promotions to Executive positions were PWD, vs 12.85% in the relevant applicant pool. 0% of the 23 selected for those promotions were PWD. 7.33% of 3,561 qualified applicants for promotions to Manager positions were PWD, vs 15.29% in the relevant applicant pool. 2.00% of the 200 selected for those promotions were PWD. 13.37% of 3,217 qualified applicants for promotions to Supervisor positions were PWD, vs 14.59% in the relevant applicant pool. 6.15% of the 195 selected for those promotions were PWD.

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 Yes
- b. Managers
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer No

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

1.75% of 741 qualified applicants for promotions to Executive positions were PWTD, vs 1.22% in the relevant applicant pool. 0% of the 23 selected for those promotions were PWTD. 4.24% of 3,561 qualified applicants for promotions to Manager positions were PWTD, vs 2.13% in the relevant applicant pool. 0.50% of the 200 selected for those promotions were PWTD. 3.89% of 3,217 qualified applicants for promotions to Supervisor positions were PWTD, vs 2.81% in the relevant applicant pool. 2.05% of the 195 selected for those promotions were PWTD.

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

0% of 34 selectees for new hires to Executive positions were PWD, vs 5.05% in the qualified applicant pool. 1.98% of 202 selectees for new hires to Manager positions were PWD, vs 7.30% in the qualified applicant pool. 6.28% of 207 selectees for new hires to Supervisor positions were PWD, vs 12.71% in the qualified applicant pool.

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

0% of 34 selectees for new hires to Executive positions were PWTD, vs 1.89% in the qualified applicant pool. 0.50% of 202 selectees for new hires to Manager positions were PWTD, vs 4.23% in the qualified applicant pool. 2.42% of 207 selectees for new hires to Supervisor positions were PWTD, vs 3.62% in the qualified applicant pool.

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

During FY19, seven employees of DLA were converted to permanent positions. All employees were converted to permanent positions after two years of satisfactory performance. The employees were converted to permanent positions after two years of satisfactory performance. The EEO office inquired, DLA HR Services intervened, and the employees were converted.

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

8.63% PWD vs 7.10% PWOD 0.52% PWD vs 0.32% PWOD

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
-------------	---------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------

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

8.38% PWTD vs 7.10% PWOD 1.30% PWTD vs 0.32% PWOD

Separations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
-------------	---------	-------------------------	---------------------------------

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; no triggers.

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.

DLA web page www.dla.mil, has a link that reads “Accessibility/Section 508.” This link takes visitors to the DLA Section 508 page: <http://www.dla.mil/508.aspx>. This page instructs individuals who are having difficulty accessing any part of the DLA website to email the DoD Section 508 mailbox at DODSection508@osd.mil. Sending emails to the DoD mailbox starts the current complaint process.

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.

<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/ABA/>

- 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.

The DLA Section 508 Office has published helpful documents on eWorkplace, such as: • Accessibility guidelines. • Cheat sheets on how to create accessible documents in various Microsoft formats. • Guidance on how to complete the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) • Suggested contract solicitation language. The DLA Section 508 Office presented five workshops on topics of: • Web Page Testing with JAWS • Creating Accessible Documents • Overview of the Section 508 Refresh Standards. The DLA Section 508 Office also purchased a set of fifteen on-demand training courses on accessibility topics, for FY2020. Our AT Support contract will continue to provide training to the agency personnel every other month in FY2020. Additionally, the DLA Section 508 Office is coordinating with GSA to present the Accessibility Requirement Tool (ART) application to DLA's acquisition community. The DLA Section 508 Office provided contract solicitation language to DLA Acquisition in July 2019 and August 2019 and helped test GSA's Solicitation Review Tool. DLA Acquisition explored using this tool to ensure that Section 508 requirements are included in all Information and Communication Technology solicitations and issued a procurement policy letter for implementing Section 508 requirements. Contracting officers must ensure they use appropriate requirements language in: • Performance of Work Statements (PWS) • Statements of Objectives (SOO) • Statements of Work (SOW) The procurement policy letter also recommends the use of the ART to generate a VPAT for all IT products and services. Our objective is to ensure that we define and communicate accessibility and usability requirements to our vendors. During a quarterly COR training session, the Director of DLA's Business Systems Service Requirements Management (BSSRM) trained CORs on Section 508 compliance, including Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG), and strongly emphasized that the CORs should take a proactive role to ensure all PWS' includes the provisions of Section 508 and WCAG 2.0, level AA. During FY20 the Section 508 office is planning to arrange a training session on the ART, and to partner with BSSRM to find a solution for the problem of DLA not having Section 508 language in solicitations.

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.

- 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.)

On average, it took 20 workdays to approve or deny a request for an RA, and 34 workdays from the initial request to provide the RA.

- 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.

DLA has Instructions and detailed procedures for the Reasonable Accommodation Process that outline the process and the required actions for each stakeholder role. During FY19, DLA processed 88% of RA requests within 45 workdays. Our goal is 90%. DLA provides interim accommodations while requestors are waiting for their final RA decision. This allows employees to continue to work while waiting on the RA process. DLA supervisors, managers, and employees are required to take RA training in LMS every two years. In addition, face-to-face training has been instituted to augment the RA training in LMS. DO holds quarterly DPC meetings to review the RA process.

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.

DLA created a new webpage to explain PAS rights and procedures: (<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/Offers/PersonalAssistanceServices/>) and is working to update the DLA's OPAS right on RA procedure (<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/Offers/PersonalAssistanceServices/>) any PAS requests, but they are ready to provide PAS once requested. DLA is working towards a decentralized contract that will provide the PAS to each MSC.

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 Yes

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.

N/A: No findings of discrimination.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

1. 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

2. 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.

Finding one (DLAR-14-0105): CP received an "acceptable RA"; RMO ordered to have a 4-hour training on RA, and a notice to employees was posted. Finding two (DLAN-15-0241): No corrective measures have been taken while waiting for OFO to decide on DLA's appeal. The AJ found that DLA failed to have the interactive process, but DLA has appealed because the complainant refused to interact. To ensure everyone understands the reasonable accommodation process, DLA continues to provide face-to-face RA training to senior leaders, supervisors, and employees, to augment the LMS mandatory online training.

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 Yes

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

Answer Yes

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

<p>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</p> <p>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</p>	<p>1) Glass ceiling for PWTB above the GS-12 level. 2) 2.25% of the permanent workforce has reported a targeted disability, but 3.13% of the employees who voluntarily separated from DLA had reported a targeted disability.</p>				
<p>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</p>	<p><i>Barrier Group</i></p> <p>People with Targeted Disabilities</p>				
<p>BARRIER ANALYSIS:</p> <p>Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.</p>					
<p>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.</p>	<p>DLA policy documents are not accessible to all employees. DLAs, DLARs, DLAMs, and DLA SOPs do not pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.</p>				
<p>Objective</p>	<p>Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation act.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="487 924 779 1071"> <tr> <td>Date Objective Initiated</td> <td>Dec 1, 2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target Date For Completion Of Objective</td> <td>Sep 30, 2021</td> </tr> </table>	Date Objective Initiated	Dec 1, 2018	Target Date For Completion Of Objective	Sep 30, 2021
Date Objective Initiated	Dec 1, 2018				
Target Date For Completion Of Objective	Sep 30, 2021				
<p>Responsible Officials</p>	<p>Marcus Bowers Director, DLA Transformation (DT) Greg Wicklund Deputy Director, DLA Transformation (DT) Thomas Doyle Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT) Todd Lloyd Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG) Michael Dingle DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO) Patricia Wright Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG) Sylvia Nance DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO) Bryon Grosvalet DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO) Heidi Daverede Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B) Kathryn Hammer-Wells Division Chief (J72) Anne Burleigh Business Process Analyst (J72) Various HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities</p>				

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
12/01/2018	Identify all DLAI, DLARs, DLAMs, DTMs and DLA SOPs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
12/01/2018	Identify all DLA GOs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
06/30/2019	Alter all GO templates to ensure approved GO documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		06/30/2019
02/28/2019	Alter the DLAI, DLAR, DLAM, DTM and DLA SOP templates to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		01/30/2019
02/28/2019	Alter Enterprise Organizational Alignment procedures (DLAI 5010.05) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state: Current: 1) GO packages created/revised will be 508 compliant 2) DT will be responsible for making GO templates and resource documents compliant 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their current Mission and Functions and *organization charts 508 compliant 4) *Organization charts will be depicted in the Missions and Functions document; a stand-alone organization chart is not required 5) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense Historical (year 2000 and after): 1) Historical (non-current) GOs dated 2000 and after must be altered to be 508 compliant. 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must alter their historical (non-current) GOs to be 508 compliant. 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT	Yes		02/04/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLAI 4000.19, Agreements Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all documents signed by the agency's senior designee meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state: 1) All agreements created/revised will be 508 compliant 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making supporting documentation 508 compliant. Organizational Support Agreements Managers will ensure their organization agreements and supporting documentation meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		01/09/2019
09/30/2021	Using the normal 3-year Issuance life cycle, replace all inaccessible policy and procedure documents with documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
09/30/2021	Replace historical inaccessible GOs with altered GOs that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
04/30/2020	Supervisors add relevant planned activities to the performance standards of their non-supervisory Responsible Officials. (All)	Yes	12/31/2019	
06/01/2019	Alter Defense Logistics Management System documents to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J67B)	Yes		09/05/2019
06/30/2019	HQ J/D codes and MSCs provide compliance action plans to DT for: 1) Policy and procedures 2) Current Mission and Functions 3) Historical (non-current) GOs (DT)	Yes		12/20/2019
04/30/2020	Alter DLA Acquisition Directive template to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J72)	Yes	12/31/2019	

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
12/31/2020	Conduct a forms survey on active DLA-level forms for continued use, revision, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2019	
12/31/2019	Conduct a forms survey on active MSC-level forms for continued use, revision, and re-designating to DLA-level forms, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes		01/10/2020
12/31/2018	Alter DLAI 7750.07, Forms Management Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all forms created/revised meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		02/04/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLA Issuance procedures (DLAI 5025.01, DLAM 5025.01, DLAI 5025.13) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all policy and procedure documents signed by DT and J/D code/ MSC Issuing Authorities meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuances must state: 1) All policy and procedure documents created/revised will be 508 compliant. 2) HQ J/D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their existing policy and procedure documents 508 compliant. 3) HQ J/D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense. DT will monitor and report on progress of compliance action plans to leadership on a quarterly basis. (DT)	Yes		02/04/2019
06/30/2021	HQ J/D codes and MSCs have to provide all altered policy and procedure documents to DT using the 3-year Issuance life-cycle from 2019-2021. (All)	Yes		
09/30/2021	Replace current inaccessible GOs and Mission and Function documents with altered documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		
06/30/2019	Address 508 compliance requirements in planned revision of DLAI 5105.02, Annual Operating Plan, to ensure HQ J/D codes and MSC's Dynamic Operating Plans meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		06/12/2019
Fiscal Year	Accomplishments			
2018	The barrier and its root causes were identified. The templates that the MSCs, J-codes, and D-codes are using to draft policies do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. No administrative control existed to ensure that the final document meets WCAG 2.0 guidelines.			
2019	The D&I committee met repeatedly to discuss the barrier and how DLA should remove it. Most of the planned activities for FY19 were accomplished, as documented above.			

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

During FY19, DLA completed almost all the planned activities in Part VII of the FY18 report, however the target dates for two of the activities were overly aggressive and had to be retargeted to FY20.

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

Our upgraded policy templates allow for new policy documents to be accessible. Current policy documents will become accessible as they are reviewed during the normal policy review cycle.

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.

DLA's efforts so far have made good progress in making policy documents accessible, so the plan does not need improvement.