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

HRSA has a trigger involving PWDs in grade cluster GS-11 to SES within the permanent workforce. In FY 2019, the percentage of PWDs in cluster GS-11 to SES was 9.54 percent which is below the 12 percent 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   Yes

    b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

HRSA has triggers involving PWTDs in both grade clusters within the permanent workforce. In FY 2019, the percentage of PWTDs was 0.65 percent in the GS-1 to GS-10 cluster and 1.95 percent in the GS-11 to SES cluster which are below the 2 percent 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.

Numerical goals are communicated to hiring managers at 1) DIP meetings with bureau/office leadership, 2) senior staff meetings, 3) Diversity and Inclusion Council meetings, 4) and Council on Employees with Disabilities formal meetings, and 5) relevant trainings to include reasonable accommodations and unconscious bias trainings.

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 applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Chris Parker Director cparker@hrsa.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	B. Winona Chestnut Disability Employment Program Manager wchestnut2@hrsa.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	B. Winona Chestnut Disability Employment Program Manager wchestnut2@hrsa.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Lauren Taylor IT Specialist ltaylor1@hrsa.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	Katherine Slye-Griffin Reasonable Accommodations Manager kslye-griffin@hrsa.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Katherine Slye-Griffin Reasonable Accommodations Manager kslye-griffin@hrsa.gov

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

• ADA Mid-Atlantic Conference • Barrier Analysis • COR Training • Disability Program Manager Training • JAN (Job Accommodation Network) webinars • Sick Leave and Reasonable Accommodation (hosted by LRP) • Successfully Navigating Performance and Conduct Issues Under the Rehabilitation Act (hosted by LRP) • Training on the Interactive Process (hosted by LRP)

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

HRSA has a central fund for RA services.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If "no", please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.

Objective	Ensure all RA requests are processed within the timeframe set forth in the Agency's procedures for reasonable accommodation.
Target Date	Sep 30, 2018
Completion Date	

	Target Date	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
Planned Activities	Feb 28, 2016	December 31, 2016	Recruit and hire a qualified manager to lead and oversee the activities of HRSA's Accessibility Team.
	Sep 30, 2017	September 30, 2017	Develop "RA Refresher Training for Managers and Supervisors" to acclimate HRSA management to the RAPT System.
	Sep 30, 2017	September 30, 2017	Deploy the web-based RA processing system for use by HRSA employees and management.
	Sep 30, 2017	September 30, 2017	Finalize the RA Policy and Procedures Manual.
	Oct 31, 2017	September 30, 2017	Disseminate the finalized RA Policy and Procedures Manual.
	Sep 30, 2018	September 30, 2018	Perform quarterly RA processing audits to access improvements in RA request processing times.
	Sep 30, 2018	September 30, 2018	Provide "RA Refresher Training for Managers and Supervisors" to acclimate HRSA management to the RAPT System and educate leaders on the revised RA policy and procedures.
	Sep 30, 2018	September 30, 2018	Report findings and key steps to be taken to address any barriers to improving processing times to leadership.
	Sep 30, 2019	September 30, 2019	Continue to perform quarterly RA processing audits to access improvements in RA request processing times.
	Sep 30, 2019	September 30, 2019	Continue to provide "RA Refresher Training for Managers and Supervisors" to HRSA management to discuss the RAPT System and educate leaders on the RA policy and procedures.
	Sep 30, 2019	September 30, 2019	Continue to report findings and key steps to be taken to address any barriers to improving processing times to leadership.
	Jan 31, 2020		Appoint a team lead to provide mentorship, coaching, and support in escalating cases to the Accessibility Manager.
	Mar 31, 2020		Cross train employees on the RA request processing protocol and redirect resources to the HRSA RA Program to process new RA requests.
	Sep 30, 2020		Expand benchmarking within RAPT System to track the effect of non-responsiveness among supervisors.
	Sep 30, 2020		Conduct a comprehensive assessment using RAPT System benchmarking of the supervisory non-responsiveness to identify additional barriers and improve processing times.
	Sep 30, 2020		Report findings and recommendations for corrective actions to leadership for Agency-wide implementation.
	Jan 31, 2021		Use HRSA intranet to report key aggregate RA data including RA processing timeframes and responsiveness
	Mar 30, 2021		Determine the feasibility of requiring all managers and supervisors, including supervisory team leaders, to undergo routine reasonable accommodations training, and make necessary recommendations to Agency Head.
	Sep 30, 2021		Implement stated recommendation(s) per the direction of Agency Head.
Accomplishments			

Fiscal Year	*Accomplishment*
2017	For three years, HRSA has been working on revising the HRSA Reasonable Accommodations Policy and Procedures Manual. HRSA's previous RA Policy and Procedures Manual was signed in November 2012 and contained unintended risks to HRSA's RA Program. For example, the EEOC has historically required agencies to process 90 percent of all requests for RA within the timeframes established under agency RA policy. At HRSA, Section III, Part D of the RA Policy and Procedures Manual specifies that the Agency would approve or deny a request for RA in no more than 10 business days. Additionally, if a request was approved, the Agency had 10 business days to provide the accommodation to the requestor. A 5-year trend analysis (FY 2011 to FY 2015) was completed to analyze the appropriateness of these requirements. Despite clear improvements in the program's processing times, the rapid processing requirements were an on-going risk for the Agency as it had been unable to meet the EEOC's 90 percent requirement. Based on the analysis, a more tenable requirement of 15 business days from "request to decision" and 30 days "decision to provision" was established by the modified policy. These changes also brought HRSA's procedures in line with processing times used by other HHS OPDIVs. The process of modifying the policy began in 2014 with a 9-month workgroup tasked with both the evaluation of RA program deficiencies and developing recommendations to improve program efficiency and effectiveness. That workgroup led to a number of critical program changes including the development and implementation of an RA processing system; increased training for HRSA staff and management; and implementation of a tiered, team approach for processing requests (instead of a single staff member processing all requests). HRSA implemented the final recommendation of the workgroup when the RA Policy was signed into effect following receipt of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) final approval on September 13, 2017. The policy itself was repeatedly refined over time as it was bargained with the Agency's union (the National Treasury Employees Union or NTEU) as well as being reviewed and approved by HRSA senior staff, the HHS Office of the Secretary, and the HHS Office of General Council. Additionally, when the EEOC released the final rule on Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 in January of this year, supplementary changes were made to ensure that HRSA's policy was fully compliant with all EEOC requirements. The policy and procedures manual is accessible to all employees and applicants via Internet. The Agency provides a refresher training to employees that covers key elements of the revised RA policy and procedures. With the new RA policy in place, HRSA expects to see a significant improvement in the efficiency of case processing. Improvements are already visible in processing requests for disability services such as sign language interpreting and personal assistant services. These requests occur and require fast processing allowing for real time data analysis. "Typical" requests for accommodation such as telework, schedule changes, and workstation modifications occur over longer periods of time due to the addition of procurement processes and extended periods of time for the interactive process. Accordingly, these results will be fully evaluated at the end of FY 2018.

Fiscal Year	*Accomplishment*
2018	In FY 2018, HRSA significantly improved RA case processing times. Specifically, the Agency processed a total of 238 cases in FY 2018. Fifty-eight percent (139) of HRSA's RA cases were decided within Agency timeline of 15 business days. On average, clients received decisions in 19.0 days. HRSA approved 63.9 percent (152) of the cases processed and, of those, 83.6 percent (127) were provided within Agency timeline of 30 business days. On average, clients received approved accommodations within 12.6 days of the decision. When looking at the overall RA process, total case processing averaged 27.0 days with 80.7 percent (192) of all case processing completed within the Agency timeline of 45 business days. Whereas HRSA processed 32 percent of its cases timely in FY 2017, the improved processing timeframes in FY 2018 reflect a 153 percent increase in the number of RA cases that were processed in a timely manner over the course of a single fiscal year.
2019	In FY 2019, the Agency focused on timely decision making among managers through 1) continued RA training, 2) the implementation of a revised escalation plan outlining the steps to take to address unresponsive managers/supervisors, and 3) the use of DIP meetings to address responsiveness. However, case analysis shows that HRSA supervisors remain slow to respond to RA requests, require reminders to respond, or request extensions to respond. As an example, markers built into the RAPTS system and used by the Accessibility Specialists when a reminder is issued, show that 30 cases required multiple formal (i.e., email) reminders with 11 of those requiring further escalation to include an up-line manager. The reminder rate for informal reminders (i.e., phone calls which are also tracked) is higher. Benchmarking this (and similar) data within the process has proved the most effective way to track processing times for improvement. In response to these trends, HRSA will 1) draft an SOP on case escalation, 2) develop a plan for addition markers and/or reporting on supervisory response time, 3) conduct RA analysis based on case complexity to determine additional factors which impact processing, and 4) develop a short form training for managers and supervisors to bring more management officials into compliance with RA training. Additionally, the Agency will use the HRSA intranet to report key aggregate RA data to include Bureau/Office average processing timeframes and responsiveness.

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.3.b.6. Provide disability accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(8)]		
Objective	1) Establish a method to better rate managers and supervisors on their efforts to ensure EEO. Date initiated 7/1/19; target date 9/30/20. 2) Ensure managers and supervisors are fully rated on their commitment to EEO. Date initiated 9/30/20; target date 1/31/21.		
Target Date	Jan 31, 2021		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Jan 31, 2021		Same as "Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective" list under Part H, Section C.3.b.1
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2019	After several discussions between OCRDI and OHR, the Agency determined that it was not feasible to establish new performance measures that would fully rate managers/supervisors on their commitment to EEO; however, the Agency decided to devise a guide sheet that educates rating officials on activities that should be taken into account when using the existing EEO performance standard to rate managers/supervisors. As a result, the OCRDI MD-715 Workgroup was charged with developing an objective set of factors that the rater would use to review managers/supervisors' full commitment to EEO. Simultaneously, the OCRDI Director was engaged in several meetings with the HHS EEO Director as well as other OpDiv EEO Directors in which it became apparent that this program deficiency was present in several HHS OpDivs. As a result, the deficiency was deemed an HHS EEO Director's priority. This paved the way for the HHS EEO Director to lead the efforts to establish new EEO performance standards with HHS-wide implementation, thus halting the work of the OCRDI MD-715 Workgroup in support of full participation at the HHS-level. Per routine communication with the HHS EEO Director, the new performance measures will be anticipated by the end of the FY 2020 reporting period with HHS-wide implementation occurring in FY 2021. HRSA will continue to support HHS and will comply with the new performance rating requirements, thus eliminating this program deficiency. Accomplishments and/or plan modifications will be highlighted in the FY 2020 MD-715 Report.	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	E.4.b. Does the agency have a system in place to re-survey the workforce on a regular basis? [MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]		
Objective	Engage OHR and OCIO		
Target Date	May 31, 2020		
Completion Date	May 31, 2020		
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	May 31, 2020	May 31, 2020	Briefed OHR and OCIO on high-level issues
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2020	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	
Objective	Plan of Action		
Target Date	Jun 30, 2020		
Completion Date	Jun 30, 2020		
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Jun 30, 2020	June 30, 2020	Met with OHR/OCIO and developed plan of action to address changeover in EHCM
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2020	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	
Objective	Correction period		
Target Date	Nov 30, 2020		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Nov 30, 2020		Individual OpDivs work with OHR/OCIO to correct migration errors
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2021	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	
Objective	Prepare for Re-Survey of the Workforce		
Target Date	Dec 31, 2020		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Dec 31, 2020		-EEODI work with OHR/OCIO to develop platform for resurvey -EEODI/ EEO OpDiv EEO Offices develop communications strategy to encourage employee participation in resurvey -Test platform
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2021	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	
Objective	Communications Plan		
Target Date	Feb 28, 2021		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Feb 28, 2021		Implement communications plan
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2021	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	

Objective	Re-Survey of the Workforce		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2021		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
	Sep 30, 2021		Initiate Re-Survey of the Workforce
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2021	This is a new program deficiency. Progress and accomplishments will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.	

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.

HRSA has a Disability Employment Program Manager who also serves as the Agency's Selective Placement Program Coordinator. This individual is primarily responsible for recruiting individuals with a disability through direct and indirect contact. Additionally, human resources personnel are available to consult with persons with disabilities at various career fairs.

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

HRSA fully utilizes special hiring authorities to fill the Agency's open positions and educates potential applicants on the process. Information can be obtained from 1) the Agency's website, 2) human resources personnel, and 3) the Selective Placement Program Coordinator.

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.

HRSA follows the OPM guidance on appropriate Schedule A letters to determine applicants' eligibility. When eligible Schedule A applicants apply to HRSA's Government-wide job vacancy announcements, qualified applicants are forwarded to hiring officials via a USA Staffing Certificate of non-competitive eligible applicants. Additionally, the Agency accepts potential candidates who supply their Schedule A certificate and a letter of interest. The Agency's human resources personnel determines eligibility and notifies the Selective Placement Program Coordinator who will alert the hiring officials of eligibility.

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.

<div align="center">Answer   No</div>

While the Agency has offered training on special hiring authorities, it is not mandatory for hiring officials to participate as most hiring officials receive training one-on-one or in a group as appropriate. Additionally, OHR holds pre-hire consultations with all

hiring managers in which the use of special hiring authorities is discussed.

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.

HRSA has a list-serv of disability serving institutions and utilizes that list-serv to communicate job opportunities. Each year, the Agency reaffirms its relationship with these institutions as well as establishes partnerships with others.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

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

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

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

Using the goal of 12 percent as a benchmark, HRSA has a trigger involving PWDs among new hires in the permanent workforce which had a new hire rate of 10.91 percent in FY 2019. And, using the goal of 2 percent as a benchmark, HRSA has a trigger involving PWTDs among new hires in the permanent workforce which had a new hire rate of 0.91 percent in FY 2019.

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

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   No

   b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

Using the qualified applicant pool of 4.79 percent as a benchmark, a trigger exists among PWTDs in 0685 positions, the Agency's most populous MCO, as no PWTDs were hired in FY2019.

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   No

    b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

Utilizing HRSA's relevant applicant pool of 4.57 percent as the benchmark, the Agency identified triggers for PWTDs among qualified internal applicants for the top two most populous MCOs, 0685 (2.63 percent) and 0343 (0 percent).

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   Yes

Utilizing HRSA's qualified applicant pool of 4.79 percent as the benchmark, the Agency identified triggers for PWTDs among employees promoted to in the Agency's top two most populous mission-critical occupations in FY 2019. There were no promotions among PWTDs in MCO series 0343, and 2.63 percent of the qualified applicant pool of PWTDs were promoted in MCO 0685 in FY 2019.

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.

To ensure PWDs have sufficient opportunities for advancement, HRSA: • Fosters strategic partnerships among HLI and the Agency's Disability Employment Program Manager to assess the applicant flow data associated with the Agency's career development programs and provide recommendations for improving participation rates among PWDs as necessary. • Communicates advancement opportunities to the Agency's Council on Employees with Disabilities to ensure broad dissemination. • Posts detail opportunities on the Agency's SharePoint for easy access among PWDs.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

HRSA offered three formal career development programs in FY 2019: Mid-Level Development Program (MLDP), Senior Leadership Fellows Program (SLFP), and the Administrative Professionals Career Enhancement Program (APCEP). Mid-Level Development Program (MLDP) is a capacity-building initiative targeting HRSA employees at the GS-12 and GS-13 levels who have expressed an interest in leadership development and have a desire to become part of a pool of highly skilled and qualified employees who can be called upon to step into leadership roles as needs arise. Graduates of the Program increase their knowledge and skills in leadership, gain interdepartmental project experience, have exposure to HRSA leaders, and gain an increased understanding of HRSA's mission, challenges, and opportunities. As the largest population of employees at HRSA, developing leaders at this level is crucial to HRSA's future success as an Agency. Senior Leader Fellowship Program (SLFP) is designed to

ensure HRSA leaders are among the best in the Federal Government. Participants experience a broad spectrum of development opportunities based on best practices of renowned leadership programs in the public and private sector. The program includes self-reflection, industry and federal speakers, networking, outside study and activities, executive coaching, and engaging discussion focused on the OPM Executive Core Qualifications (ECQs) and HRSA leadership competencies. The Administrative Professionals Career Enhancement Program (APCEP) is a structured framework that employees who are in administrative roles/functions may use in developing and enhancing their current job performance as well as providing guidance for a long term career path in the administrative profession or an alternative career path. The Program aims to help employees in administrative roles/functions enhance their skills necessary to be successful in their current position while promoting career growth and development. In addition to the three formal career development programs, HRSA offered the Mentoring Now Program and the implementation of Individual Development Plans (IDPs) during this reporting period. The Mentoring Now Program is an OPDIV-wide mentoring program that creates a culture of knowledge-sharing with colleagues and prepares future leaders. The program serves to motivate, develop and retain talent by providing comprehensive mentoring on professional development and career advancement to the mentees. Lastly, HRSA employees seek guidance from their supervisors in the development of Individual Development Plans (IDPs). IDPs usually consist of a wide array of development opportunities that span the scope of the Agency's formal career development programs. IDPs are individually-tailored action plans that are used to develop specific competencies (knowledge and skills) needed to improve current performance or to prepare for new responsibilities. These plans are used to invest in long term self-development while accomplishing important day-to-day work.

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 (%)
Detail Programs	--	--	--	--	--	--
Fellowship Programs	33	21	6.06	4.76	0	0
Coaching Programs	119	63	10.92	12.69	0.84	0
Training Programs	89	42	12.36	16.67	1.12	0
Other Career Development Programs	--	--	--	--	--	--
Internship Programs	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mentoring Programs	248	248	4.03	4.03	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   No

       b. Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

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   Yes

Using HRSA's relevant applicant pool for applicants and/or selectees as a benchmark, triggers exist involving PWTDs among

applicants and selectees for career development programs at HRSA in FY2019. PWTDs comprised 0.84 percent of the qualified applicants and none of the selections.

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

Using the inclusion rate of 9.82 percent as a benchmark, HRSA has triggers involving PWDs receiving time-off awards between 1-10 hours (9.16 percent) and 31-40 (7.50 percent) hours as well as cash awards in all categories except in the dollar amount range of $1000-$1999 (10.06 percent). Further, using the inclusion rate of 1.85 percent for PWTDs as a benchmark, HRSA has triggers involving the distribution of time-off awards in each category and the awarding of cash awards in the dollar ranges of $500-$999 (0.89 percent) and $2000-$2999 (1.79 percent).

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

Using the inclusion rate of 9.82 percent for PWDs and 1.85 percent for PWTDs as benchmarks, HRSA has triggers involving the distribution of QSIs and performance-based pay increases. In FY 2019, PWDs (7.66 percent) and PWTDs (1.35 percent) received QSIs below their respective inclusion rates. Performance-based pay increases among PWDs (6.90 percent) and PWTDs (0 percent) were also below their respective inclusion rates.

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   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   No

  ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

 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

Utilizing the relevant applicant pool of 6.55 percent for qualified internal applicants as the benchmark, HRSA identified triggers among PWDs for qualified internal applicants and selectees for promotions to the GS-13 level, as there were no PWDs among the qualified internal applicants and subsequent selectees.

---

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

 a. SES

  i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

  ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   No

 b. Grade GS-15

  i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

  ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   No

 c. Grade GS-14

  i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

  ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

 d. Grade GS-13

  i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

  ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

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	N/A
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

Despite having new SES hires in FY 2019, applicant pool data is unavailable. Therefore, HRSA is not able to determine whether a trigger exists for PWDs hired into SES.

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

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)	Answer	N/A
b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)	Answer	No
c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)	Answer	No
d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)	Answer	No

Despite having new SES hires in FY 2019, applicant pool data is unavailable. Therefore, HRSA is not able to determine whether a trigger exists for PWTDs hired into SES.

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	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer	No

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer	No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

Using the relevant applicant pool of 4.88 percent as a benchmark, HRSA has a trigger involving PWDs as this group was below the qualified applicant pool for promotions to managers in FY 2019.

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   Yes

        ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    c. Supervisors

        i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

        ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

Utilizing the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants of 4.88 percent as the benchmark, HRSA has a trigger involving PWTDs as they were not among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions.

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

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   Yes

    c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

Utilizing the qualified applicant pool of 4.79 percent as a benchmark, HRSA has a trigger involving PWTDs for new hires for managerial and supervisory positions as no PWTDs were among the FY 2019 selectees.

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.

<div align="right">Answer   Yes</div>

All Schedule A employees eligible for conversion in FY 2019 were converted into the competitive service with the exception of one employee whose conversion was delayed until October 2019.

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

Seperations	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

Seperations	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.

No trigger exists involving the separation rates of PWDs and PWTDs in FY 2019.

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://www.hrsa.gov/about/508-resources.html

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.

HRSA headquarters and regional offices are located in privately owned buildings which are governed by ADA. Accordingly, no ABA notice is posted on the website.

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.

HRSA, through the work of OCRDI, will continue to: • include Section 508 requirements in its RA Trainings for Managers and Supervisors, RA Training for Employees, and New Employee Orientation. • work collaboratively with HRSA's 508 Team in OIT to track Section 508 complaints and work to provide immediate, alternative options in circumstances where a system is not fully accessible. • provide technical assistance to HRSA Bureaus and Offices to ensure equal access for persons with disabilities. • review building plans for compliance with 2010 DOJ ADA Standards on an as-needed basis. In FY 2019, OCRDI consulted on plans for a regional office that is under construction where patients would be regularly seen and treated by Agency medical providers. Additionally, OCRDI staff completed four in-person physical accessibility reviews of regional offices.

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.)

HRSA processed a total of 235 cases in FY 2019. Forty-one percent (96) of HRSA's RA cases were decided within Agency timeline of 15 business days. On average, clients received decisions in 29.2 days. HRSA approved 77.0 percent (181) of the cases processed and, of those, 58.6 percent (106) were provided within Agency timeline of 30 business days. On average, clients received approved accommodations within 6.3 days of the decision. When looking at the overall RA process, total case processing averaged 32.7 days with 63.8 percent (150) of all case processing completed within the Agency timeline of 45 business days.

2. 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.

HRSA has reported a program deficiency related to timely processing of RA requests since the FY 2014 MD-715 report. Since that time HRSA has diligently worked to improve its RA process; provide RA training to employees, managers, and supervisors; train the Accessibility Specialists who process cases; develop and rollout an RA Processing and Tracking System; and rewrite the RA policy and procedures to improve the effectiveness of the process. Over the years, HRSA has focused on accommodation solution effectiveness during the interactive process. Multiple employees continue to comment that their accommodations have improved their work environments and allowed them to engage successfully in their work. However, timeliness remains a critical goal for the program. Case analysis shows that HRSA supervisors remain slow to respond to RA requests, require reminders to respond, or request extensions to respond. As an example, markers built into the RAPTS system and used by the Accessibility Specialists when a reminder is issued, show that 30 cases required multiple formal (i.e., email) reminders with 11 of those requiring further escalation to include an up-line manager. The reminder rate for informal reminders (i.e., phone calls which are also tracked) is higher. Benchmarking this (and similar) data within the process has proved the most effective way to track processing times for improvement. Such data is also able to be used to make a business case for supervisory training which remains the key strategy for creating a responsive RA process. HRSA has a multifaceted RA training program with two new employee orientation trainings (one live for all new employees and one pre-recorded online video), two supervisory trainings, one employee training, and specialized

trainings which are available upon request. When all parties within the RA process have been trained, Accessibility Specialists report greater success facilitating the interactive process and bringing cases to successful closure.

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.

HRSA has one employee who is eligible for PAS services. The employee used the service in FY 2019 and reported no problems. As with other disability services, the program is monitored through quarterly reviews, which include client check-ins and data analysis on request processing and service provision. Based on the data collected, the program is fully effective as all request processing and service provision was 100 percent timely. Further, the client reports being fully satisfied with the services received. Regarding training, HRSA's RA Training for Managers/Supervisors and the subsequent course, RA Refresher for Managers/Supervisors, review the similarities and differences between PAS and other service types (sign language interpreting, readers, escorts, etc.), as well as the process used to make a request for such services.

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?

<div align="right">Answer   Yes</div>

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?

<div align="right">Answer   Yes</div>

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.

There were no findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability during the last fiscal year.

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?

<div align="right">Answer   Yes</div>

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?

<div align="right">Answer   Yes</div>

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.

There were no findings of discrimination involving failure to provide reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year.

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   N/A

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

STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	N/A - Disregard what we listed in the "Specific Workforce Data Table" field - FEDSEP chose that answer by default. In FY 2019, the Agency did not undergo a barrier analysis of disability employment.

STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	*Barrier Group*
	People with Disabilities

BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	N/A

Objective	N/A - In FY 2019, the Agency did not undergo a barrier analysis of disability employment.
	Date Objective Initiated May 1, 2019
	Target Date For Completion Of Objective Sep 30, 2021

Responsible Officials	N/A N/A

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
09/30/2021	N/A	Yes		

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2019	The Agency recognizes that a thorough barrier analysis has not been performed on the Disability Employment Program in a number of years. As a result, the Agency is exploring the feasibility of conducting barrier analysis in FY 2021 to determine whether the barriers that were identified in previous MD-715 reports remain relevant and/or whether new barriers should be noted and eliminated. Outcomes will be highlighted in subsequent MD-715 reports.

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).

N/A

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.

N/A