

## 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 |

GS-1 to GS-10: 24.51 percent. GS-11 to SES: 16.54 percent. No triggers were identified.

\*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 |

GS-1 to GS-10: 8.82 percent. GS-11 to SES: 2.69 percent. No triggers identified

| Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb) | Total | Reportable Disability |       | Targeted Disability |      |
|--|-------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|------|
|  | #     | #                     | %     | #                   | %    |
| Numerical Goal                                 | --    | 12%                   |       | 2%                  |      |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                           | 102   | 25                    | 24.51 | 9                   | 8.82 |
| Grades GS-11 to SES                            | 1524  | 252                   | 16.54 | 41                  | 2.69 |

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

The EEO Director communicates hiring goals to the Senior Leaders in the Semi-Annual DoD OIG Performance Measures Review. The EEO Director also meets with each Component Head periodically to discuss Component demographics, along with numeric goals

### 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                                   | 1         | 0               | Jacquis Taylor<br>Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC)<br>Jacquis.taylor@dodig.mil |
| Architectural Barriers Act Compliance  | 1                                   | 0         | 0               | WHS.Accessibility@mail.n   |
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 0                                   | 1         | 0               | Jacquis Taylor<br>SPPC<br>Jacquis.taylor@dodig.mil   |
| Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD  | 1                                   | 0         | 7               | Carol Lunsford<br>Affirmative Employment Program Manager<br>carol.lunsford@dodig.mil         |
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees                     | 1                                   | 0         | 0               | Adrian Bennett<br>Disability Program Manager (DPM)<br>adrian.bennett@dodig.mil               |
| Section 508 Compliance   | 0                                   | 0         | 0               | None during the reporting period   |

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

The DPM is fully qualified to perform the responsibilities of the role. No additional ongoing training and development was conducted in FY 2021 due to the continuing COVID-19 pandemic; however, one-on-one training specific to Schedule A(u) hiring and certification of medical documentation was provided by the DPM to the SPPC in FY 2021. A 1-week Special Emphasis Program Manager training course is scheduled for March, 2022.

**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

## 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.

The DoD OIG used USAJobs and the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) in FY 2021. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, these were the only resources used.

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

The DoD OIG used Schedule A(u), onboarding 2, the WRP, onboarding 1, and 30% or more Disabled Veterans Appointment Authority, onboarding 3 in FY 2021.

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.

(1) Appointment eligibility is confirmed by either the SPPC with a certified Schedule A(u) letter, or by the DPM through valid medical documentation. Appointments of 30% or more Disabled Veterans are validated with a certified Veterans Affairs letter. (2) Once the SPPC or the DPM determines eligibility, the application, without medical documentation, is provided to the relevant hiring official.

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

The DPM conducted disability training for HCM staff in FY 2021. Training included the Schedule A(u) hiring authority.

#### 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.

Due to the ongoing global COVID-19 pandemic, outreach was suspended in FY 2021.

#### 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

New Hires for PWD: 6.25 percent New Hires for PWTD: 0 percent The DoD OIG believes this trigger may be an indication newly hired personnel do not understand the importance of filling out the SF-256. DoD OIG also recognizes new employees may not feel comfortable in identifying their status while onboarding (based on resurvey campaign results). In FY 2022, the DoD OIG plans to add a cover page to the SF-256 used during onboarding in the USAStaffing system that discusses the value of this data collection, and the intended use, and to increase communication efforts, promoting self-identification of disability in training settings such as Entrance on Duty, New Employee Orientation, New Supervisor Orientation, Supervisor Refresher training. Additionally, the DoD OIG will conduct a workforce resurvey annually.

| New Hires                 | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability   |                         | Targeted Disability     |                         |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                           |              | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) |
| % of Total Applicants     | 491          | 7.33                    | 0.00                    | 4.07                    | 0.00                    |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 483          | 6.63                    | 0.00                    | 4.14                    | 0.00                    |
| % of New Hires            | 2            | 0.00                    | 0.00                    | 0.00                    | 0.00                    |

- 2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission- critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
  - a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer No
  - b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

There were only external applicants for the 0511 and 0343 series. These data shows that each PWD and PWTD applicant was determined to be qualified, indicating no trigger in the qualified applicant pools. In the MCOs there were only two selections made (both in the 0343 series). As such, not triggers in selections could be identified.

| New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability | Targetable Disability |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|   |              | New Hires (%)         | New Hires (%)         |
| Numerical Goal                            | --           | 12%                   | 2%                    |
| 0343 MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ANALYST       | 2            | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |
| 0511 ACCOUNTANTS/AUDITORS                 | 0            | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |
| 1810 GENERAL INVESTIGATORS                | 0            | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |
| 1811 CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS               | 0            | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |

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

In the 0511 series, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 12.10 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 1.04 percent identified disabilities, which indicates a trigger. The relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 2.20 percent. There were no qualified applicants with targeted disabilities, which indicates a trigger. In the 1811 series, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 6.54 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 0.57 percent identified disabilities, which indicates a trigger. The relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 0.52 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 0.28 percent had targeted disabilities, which does not indicate a trigger. In the 1810 series, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 34.81 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 9.09 percent identified a disability, which indicates a trigger. The relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 7.40 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 5.68 percent had targeted disabilities, which does not indicate a trigger. In the 0343 series, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 22.65 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 8 percent identified a disability, which indicates a trigger. The relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 4.41 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 5.33 percent had targeted disabilities, which does not indicate a trigger. In the MCOs there are triggers in the qualified applicant pool for PWD in all series, and in the qualified applicant pool for PWTD in the 0511 series.

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

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

In the 0511 series, there were only 20 selections made. The qualified applicant pool for PWD is 1.04 percent. Of the qualified PWD applicants, 100 percent were referred, none were selected. The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 0 percent. In the 1811 series, there were only 23 selections made. The qualified applicant pool for PWD is 0.57 percent. Of the qualified PWD applicants, none were referred or selected. The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 0.28 percent. Of the qualified applicant pool, none were referred or selected. In the 1810 series, there were only six selections made. The qualified applicant pool for PWD is 9.09 percent. Of the qualified PWD applicants, none were referred or selected. The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 5.68 percent none were referred or selected. In the 0343 series, there were only 25 selections made. The qualified applicant pool for PWD is 8 percent. Of the qualified PWD applicants, none were referred or selected. The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 5.33 percent. Of the qualified applicants with targeted disabilities, 4.38 percent were referred, none were referred or selected. Due to the small number of selectees in each MCO, it is not possible to identify triggers.

## 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.

Seven Special Emphasis Programs were established in FY 2021, including a Disability/Veterans employment program. Each will explore retention and promotion initiatives in FYs 2022 and 2023.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

The DoD OIG had the following formal Mentoring Programs in FY 2021: • Pathways Partnership: Open to recent college graduates and GS-7 and below. • Career Connections: Open to all GS-7 through GS-14 employees. • Executive and Leader Network: Open to GS-15 and above. • Management Development Program open to GS-14 and above. • FEI Leadership for a Democratic Society (LDS) Program. The DoD OIG also provides New Supervisor Situational Mentoring upon request

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               | 47                 | 47            | 15%            | 15%           | 6.3%           | 6.3%          |
| Training Programs                 | 4                  | 4             | 50%            | 50%           | 25%            | 25%           |
| Fellowship Programs               | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Detail Programs                   | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Mentoring Programs                | 29                 | 29            | 24%            | 24%           | 6.8%           | 6.8%          |
| Other Career Development Programs | 17                 | 17            | 12%            | 12%           | 5.8%           | 5.8%          |
| Coaching Programs                 | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |

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 No
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer No

**C. AWARDS**

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

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

| Time-Off Awards                             | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given  | 308       | 16.97                   | 19.75                           | 11.76                 | 18.14                         |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours   | 2334      | 106.50                  | 154.38                          | 109.80                | 105.75                        |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours | 7.58      | 2.27                    | 0.62                            | 18.29                 | -1.35                         |

| Time-Off Awards                                 | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given     | 266       | 19.13                   | 16.08                           | 19.61                 | 19.03                         |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours      | 3447      | 19.13                   | 256.21                          | 280.39                | -39.82                        |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours    | 12.96     | 0.36                    | 1.27                            | 28.04                 | -5.88                         |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given     | 518       | 26.71                   | 33.36                           | 21.57                 | 27.88                         |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours      | 10796     | 26.71                   | 804.46                          | 517.65                | -84.07                        |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours    | 20.84     | 0.36                    | 1.92                            | 47.06                 | -10.18                        |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given     | 984       | 49.82                   | 63.69                           | 41.18                 | 51.77                         |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours      | 32134     | 49.82                   | 2407.96                         | 1568.63               | -292.92                       |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 32.66     | 0.36                    | 3.01                            | 74.71                 | -16.42                        |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given  | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |

| Cash Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given     | 221       | 11.91                   | 14.25                           | 27.45                 | 8.41                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount     | 201525    | 11264.98                | 12910.51                        | 24647.06              | 8245.13                       |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount   | 911.88    | 341.36                  | 72.13                           | 1760.51               | 21.12                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given   | 239       | 24.91                   | 12.74                           | 27.45                 | 24.34                         |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount   | 597289    | 37546.57                | 36677.55                        | 43150.98              | 36281.86                      |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount | 2499.12   | 544.15                  | 229.23                          | 3082.22               | -28.60                        |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given   | 314       | 14.08                   | 20.78                           | 9.80                  | 15.04                         |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount   | 762182    | 31847.29                | 50994.11                        | 23647.06              | 33697.79                      |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount | 2427.33   | 816.60                  | 195.38                          | 4729.41               | -66.38                        |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given   | 485       | 29.60                   | 29.94                           | 33.33                 | 28.76                         |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount   | 1680220   | 102462.45               | 103651.11                       | 117921.57             | 98973.89                      |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount | 3464.37   | 1249.54                 | 275.67                          | 6936.57               | -33.81                        |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given   | 243       | 11.91                   | 16.08                           | 11.76                 | 11.95                         |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount   | 1073984   | 52697.83                | 71060.75                        | 4.84                  | 64588.73                      |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount | 4419.69   | 1596.90                 | 351.79                          | 0.80                  | 1957.08                       |

| Cash Awards                                 | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given   | 127       | 4.69                    | 8.36                            | 1.96                  | 5.31                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount   | 914058    | 37952.35                | 58869.98                        | 1176.47               | 46251.33                      |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount | 7197.31   | 2919.41                 | 560.67                          | 1176.47               | 3312.73                       |

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

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer No

b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

Of the 57 QSIs awarded this year, 19.30 percent (11) were for PWD. This is above the federal goal of 12 percent. There were no QSIs awarded to PWTD; however, as only 57 QSIs were awarded this year, in order to reach the 2 percent federal goal, the DoD OIG would have had to award one QSI to PWTD. This number is too small to indicate a trigger

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

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

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer No

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

## 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 No

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No

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

For SES applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 19.05 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows no PWD, indicating a trigger. As there were only two SES selections, it is not possible to identify a trigger for selections. For GS-15 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 18.14 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows 4.35 percent PWD, indicating a trigger. As there were only five GS-15 selections made, it is not possible to identify a trigger for selections. For GS-14 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 15.06 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows 4.22 percent of the applicants were PWD, indicating a trigger. Of the 40 selections, none were PWD, indicating a trigger. For GS-13 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 18.32 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows 9.36 percent were PWD. Of the 39 selections, 5.13 percent were PWD, indicating a trigger.

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 No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

For SES applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 3.80 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows no PWTD. There were only two SES selections. Due to the small numbers of applicants and selections, it is not possible to identify a trigger. For GS-15 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 3.02 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows no PWTD. There were only 5 GS-15 selections made. Due to the small number of applicants and selections, it is not possible to identify a trigger. For GS-14 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 2.77 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows 1.90 percent of the applicants were PWD, indicating a trigger. Of the 40 selections, none were PWTD, indicating a trigger. For GS-13 applicants, the relevant applicant pool for PWTD is 2.09 percent. Review of the qualified applicant pool shows 5.04 percent were PWTD, which does not indicate a trigger. Of the 39 selections, 7.69 percent were PWTD, which does not indicate a trigger.

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

- a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer No
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer No
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer No

New Hires to SES (PWD): There were no external new hire applicants or selections. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD): The qualified applicant pool for PWD is 5.00 percent. There were no selections made for this grade. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD): The qualified applicant pool is 7.69 percent. While there were no PWD selections made, with only four total selections, no trigger is identified. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD): The qualified applicant pool is 4.96 percent. Of the selections made, 7.69 percent were PWD, which does not indicate a trigger.

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 No
- 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

New Hires to SES (PWTD): There were no applicants or selections for external SES positions. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD): There were no qualified PWTD applicants, resulting in no trigger for selections. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD): The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 4.81 percent. While there were no PWTD selections, with only four total selections made in this grade, it is not possible to identify a trigger. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD): The qualified applicant pool for PWTD is 2.41 percent. Of the selections made, 7.69 percent were PWTD, which does not indicate a trigger.

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

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

Executives - The relevant applicant pool for internal executives for PWD is 21.82 percent. There were no qualified PWD applicants for executive positions, indicating a trigger. However, as there were no qualified PWD applicants, it is not possible to identify a trigger in selections. Managers, Internal (PWD): N/A- In the MD-715, the DoD OIG uses the Supervisor category for analysis. Supervisors - The relevant applicant pool for internal supervisors for PWD is 20.84 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 3.33 percent were PWD, indicating a trigger. No PWD supervisors were selected, indicating a trigger.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTDD 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 (PWTDD) Answer Yes
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer No

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

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

Executives - The relevant applicant pool for executives for PWTDD is 3.64 percent. There were no qualified PWTDD applicants, indicating a trigger. However, as there were no qualified applicants, it is not possible to identify a trigger with selections. Managers, Internal (PWTDD): N/A- In the MD-715, the DoD OIG uses the Supervisor category for analysis. Supervisors - The relevant applicant pool for PWTDD is 3.55 percent. Of the qualified applicants, 1.67 percent were PWTDD, indicating a trigger. However, as there were only 21 selections for supervisors, it is not possible to identify a trigger.

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

There were no external SES selections made, and two external supervisor selections made, making it impossible to identify trigger

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTDD 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 (PWTDD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTDD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTDD) Answer No

There were no external SES selections made, and two external supervisor selections made, making it impossible to identify triggers.

## 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

- 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

Three eligible Schedule A(u) employees were converted within the reporting period. The DoD OIG will encourage supervisors to increase Schedule A(u) conversions in FY 2022.

- 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

Voluntary Separations (PWD): Of the voluntary separations, 13.68 percent were PWD, of which, 8.55 percent were retirements of PWD. This is lower than our workforce representation rate, and does not indicate a trigger. Involuntary Separations (PWD): Of the involuntary separations, 11.54 percent were PWD, which does not indicate a trigger.

| Separations                             | Total # | Reportable Disabilities % | Without Reportable Disabilities % |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 23      | 0.34                      | 1.54                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 42      | 1.37                      | 2.66                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 54      | 3.42                      | 3.08                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 2       | 0.00                      | 0.14                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 121     | 5.14                      | 7.41                              |

- 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

Voluntary Separations (PWTD): Of the voluntary separations, 0.85 percent were PWTD. This represents one PWTD retirement. This is lower than our workforce representation rate and does not indicate a trigger. Involuntary Separations (PWTD): There were no involuntary separations of PWTD.

| Separations                             | Total # | Targeted Disabilities % | Without Targeted Disabilities % |
|---|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |

| Seperations                            | Total # | Targeted Disabilities % | Without Targeted Disabilities % |
|--|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Removal           | 23      | 0.00                    | 1.38                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation       | 42      | 0.00                    | 2.52                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement        | 54      | 1.89                    | 3.18                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations | 2       | 0.00                    | 0.12                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations | 121     | 1.89                    | 7.19                            |

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

N/A

## B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

- 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.dodig.mil/Disclaimers/Accessibility-Section-508/> This site provides the following: For information about Section 508 accessibility for the Department of Defense, please visit: [http://docio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std\\_Stmt.aspx](http://docio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std_Stmt.aspx) Once link above is selected, site provides the following: For persons with disabilities experiencing difficulties accessing content on a particular website, please use the form @ DoD Section 508 Form. The form is labeled: DoD Section 508 Issues, Complaints and Concerns Form. The DoD OIG has identified the need for a 508 Manager who will work to clarify the internet page to ensure personnel can easily understand where to file a complaint in FY 2022

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

<https://www.dodig.mil/Disclaimers/Accessibility-Section-508/> Facilities Management is run by the Washington Headquarters Service (WHS) and the following contact information is listed at the link above: [facilities@dodig.mil](mailto:facilities@dodig.mil). Additional, the following is also provided: Information on the complaint process may be found at: <https://www.access-board.gov/aba-enforcement>

- 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.

Washington Headquarters Services holds a quarterly Facility Accessibility Task Force meeting with all stakeholders including the DoD OIG, to identify and track current and emerging issues and concerns related to facilities and accessibility.

## 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.)

The DoD OIG processed 57 requests for RA and began processing 32 medical and religious exemption requests per Executive

Order 14043 in FY 2021. Despite a 98 percent increase in RA requests from FY 2020 to FY 2021, The DoD OIG Disability Program had an average processing time of 27 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.

The DoD OIG Disability Program works diligently throughout the process to facilitate an interactive discussion between employees and supervisors to build relationships based on transparency and trust. The Disability Program places a heavy emphasis on time management and follow-through in each stage of the process to keep all parties informed and address their questions as they arise. In addition to supervisory training, supervisors are provided one-on-one guidance with the DPM to ensure they understand the RA process, requirements under the law, and the opportunity to express any concerns they may have. The Office of EEO also emphasizes the importance of documentation through the process for both the DPM and supervisor. The Disability Program conducted several outreach events in FY 2021, including individualized Component training, an Equality Matters Series focused on RA, and a Disability Services, Rights, and Entitlements pre-recorded panel discussion.

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

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

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

The DoD OIG published an EEOC approved RA instruction in July 2019 that included PAS processes.

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

**A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT**

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

Answer No
2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?  

Answer No
3. If the agency had one or more findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year, please describe the corrective measures taken by the agency.

N/A

**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 No

- 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.

N/A

### 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

- 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