

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

Since the DIA permanent workforce starts at GG-7, analysis of the DIA permanent workforce shows that 11.61% of GS-7 to GS-10 population had a reported disability for FY23.

\*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 |

N/A

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

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

EO met with the OHR Recruitment Partnership Committee in FY23 to discuss targeted recruitment efforts.

### Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

N/A

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Section 508 Compliance	5	0	0	Douglas Cossa Chief Information Officer douglas.cossa@dodiis.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Michael.Brobeck2@dodiis.
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	0	
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Colby Dillard Disability Program Manager Colby.Dillard@dodiis.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	3	0	1	Sharon Taylor Disability Program Chief Sharon.Taylor@dodiis.mil
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	0	

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 full-time staff responsible for processing reasonable accommodation requests has been sufficiently trained; training completed includes the EEOC’s Disability Program Managers Course and routine webinars offered by EO practitioners. In addition, the staff attends a weekly collaboration meeting with RA counterparts across the federal government increasing information sharing, best practices, and opportunities to attend training. Collateral duty staff members have completed EEOC Counselors course, mediation, and all attend disability focused webinars.

**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

NA

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

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	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.		
<b>Objective</b>	Ensure that all accommodation requests are processed within established time frames.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Sep 30, 2025		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u><i>Target Date</i></u>	<u><i>Completion Date</i></u>	<u><i>Planned Activity</i></u>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u><i>Fiscal Year</i></u>	<u><i>Accomplishment</i></u>	
	2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EO aligned two additional resources to the Reasonable Accommodations team due to the increase of 106 percent in Reasonable Accommodation requests from FY22 to FY23.</li> </ul>	
	2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EO provided quarterly training sessions to agency supervisors. These sessions emphasized the importance of supervisor acknowledgment, and timeliness in the Reasonable Accommodations process.</li> </ul>	

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	C.2.c.1. Does the agency post its procedures for processing requests for Personal Assistance Services on its public website? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5)(v)] If “yes”, please provide the internet address in the comments column.		
<b>Objective</b>	To establish procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services, post procedures on a public website, and ensure that all accommodation requests are processed within established time frames.		
<b>Target Date</b>	May 29, 2020		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Sep 30, 2019		Post DIA procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services on a public website
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2018	EO developed new disability RA procedures in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3)(i). RA procedures were sent to EEOC for comments, and EO incorporated new requirements into the procedures per EEOC’s feedback. EO then submitted the RA instruction staffing package for DIA approval.	
	2020	•The target completion date for planned activity #4 has been modified to 31 October 2022. DIA informs the public to contact the EO Office at <a href="http://www.dia.mil/careers-and-internships/working-at-DIA/#reasonable-accommodations-in-the-workplace">www.dia.mil/careers-and-internships/working-at-DIA/#reasonable-accommodations-in-the-workplace</a> .	
	2019	FY19 Accomplishments: • EO onboarded a new staff member to the Disability Programs section. The onboarding of the new employee has aided in DIA being better equipped to address incoming request for reasonable accommodations. • Establishment of DIA’s Information Technology (IT) Accessibility Office (508 office), has aided in the fulfillment of requests, as it relates to IT equipment, software, and IT accessibility challenges. • Establishment of Senior Level disability working group, allows Seniors for Mission Services directorate, the Chief Information Officer, and EO to discuss trends as it relates to disability. FY19 Modifications: • The target completion date for C.2.b has been modified to 30 September 2020. • EO determined that item C.2.b.5 is being met so a completion date has been added. However, a new planned activity has been added to this plan to fully accomplish C.2.b.5. • The target completion date for C.2.c has been modified to 29 May 2020. • The target completion date for C.2.c.1 has been modified to 29 May 2020.	
	2023	• EO updated the Reasonable Accommodations Directive to include established procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services that comply with the EEOC. Once the directive is approved by the Office of Strategic Planning, Policy, and Performance Improvement, EO will issue the updated directive to the workforce and post the directive on the public and internal website	

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	C.3.b.6. Provide disability accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [ see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(8)]		
<b>Objective</b>	To implement the nine EEO measures for supervisors and managers.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Sep 30, 2026		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	

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 Office of Human Resources creates and distributes Invitation Only vacancy announcements to qualified candidates during our targeted recruiting events. These vacancy announcements uphold merit system principles and are free of unlawful discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex (including gender identity or pregnancy), national origin, disability, political affiliation, marital status, membership in an employee organization, age, sexual orientation, or other non-merit factors, retaliation, and improper hiring practices. Furthermore, the recruitment team collaborates with our Wounded Warrior Internship Program (WWP) that aligns with the DoD Operation Warfighter Program and the 18 IC agencies. The Wounded Warrior Internship Program provides wounded, ill and injured active-duty service members with meaningful work experiences intended to assist with their recuperation and transition into the workforce through internship opportunities within the IC. IC internships provide recovering service members the opportunity to build their resumes with valuable Federal Government work experience, explore employment interests and develop additional job skills. Additionally, through our modernization efforts, the OHR Mission Integration Business Office has developed a dashboard which will allow DIA to track recruitment and placement of applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

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

N/A. DIA does not have a hiring authority equivalent to Schedule A with the goal recruiting and hiring PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

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.

NA

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 N/A

N/A. DIA already utilizes WWP and other Veteran and disability related hiring pools.

**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.

DIA currently has relationships with academic institutions which primarily service PWD, including PWTD. During these visits, we provide invitation only vacancy announcements to encourage attendees to apply for internships and full-time positions within DIA. DIA will also continue to actively work with the military services to recruit Wounded Warriors.

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

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

- a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer No

N/A

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 N/A
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer N/A

N/A

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

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

- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

• Persons with Disabilities represent 11.60% of internal applicants for promotion in the 0132 Occupational Series compared to the qualified applicant rate (individuals eligible for promotion) of 13.90% (2.3 percentage point gap). • Persons with Disabilities represent 13.97% of internal applicants for promotion in the 0301 Occupational Series compared to the qualified applicant rate (individuals eligible for promotion) of 16.31% (2.34 percentage point gap).

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

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

• Persons with Disabilities represent 15.09% of selections for promotion in the 2210 Occupational Series compared to the internal applicant pool of 16.44 (1.35 percentage point gap).

## 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.

DIA is committed to ensuring that PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement. DIA's talent management system encompasses the Agency's plan to ensure advancement opportunities for all employees. It represents a holistic approach to develop and retain a world-class cadre of intelligence officers and leaders to meet the Agency's vital mission. The focus is on developing each officer's skills to meet the demands of a worldwide Defense Intelligence Enterprise. The system comprises three components: career development (including CBTO), promotions, and assignments. Each component plays an equal part in developing all DIA Officers. The career development pillar encourages employees to focus on strengthening their experience, training, and qualifications to help identify interests and define career paths. When employees are ready for more responsibility and consistently demonstrate their ability to work at a higher level of responsibility, they can be evaluated on their qualifications against standard criteria in the promotion process. Finally, employees may seek advancement and broaden their career through meaningful job assignments cross the Agency's worldwide enterprise via rotations and positions in the career marketplace.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

The DIA mentoring program allows mentees to gain professional growth and leadership skills. Mentees consist of employees at all grade levels. DIA offers various avenues of mentoring to the agency such as: speed mentoring, group mentoring, and one-on-one mentoring. The Career Broadening Training Opportunities (CBTO) program enables DIA employees to participate in advanced learning and development programs available externally through seats allocated to DIA or publicly accessible. Training programs within CBTO include academic, leadership, and intermediate service colleges. Programs are short-term and long-term study at various governmental and non-governmental institutions. Employees are selected to attend based on their ability to demonstrate excellence across the following leadership competencies: Enterprise Perspective, Information Sharing, Integration and Organizational Awareness. These opportunities enhance workforce knowledge, abilities, and skills to support the DIA mission and become more well-rounded DoD and Inter-Agency leaders. DIA civilians' grades GG7 through GG15 are eligible to apply for Career Broadening and Training Opportunities upon completion of two years of continued service with DIA and fulfillment of their probationary status.

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 (%)
Training Programs	99.06%	95.68%	14.41%	13.69%	3.02%	2.85%
Other Career Development Programs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Coaching Programs	0.80%	0.38%	20.73%	9.76%	7.32%	3.66%
Mentoring Programs	2.61%	261.0%	12.69%	12.69%	3.36%	26.47%

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Fellowship Programs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Detail Programs	Not Av	Not Av	Not Av	Not Av	Not Av	Not Av
Internship Programs	0.94%	0.94%	12.50%	12.50%	1.04%	1.04%

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

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Coaching Program • Persons with Disabilities represent 9.76% of selections compared to the applicant rate of 20.73% (10.97 percentage point gap). CBTO Program At GG-15: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 18.75% (18.75 percentage point gap). At GG-14: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 16.67% (16.67 percentage point gap). At GG-13: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 13.33% (13.33 percentage point gap). Persons with Disabilities represent 13.33% of CBTO applicants compared to the eligibility rate of 14.77% (1.44 percentage point gap).

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

Coaching Program • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 3.66% of selections compared to the applicant rate of 7.32% (3.66 percentage point gap). CBTO Program At GG-15: • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 6.25% (6.25 percentage point gap). At GG-14: • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO applicants compared to the eligibility rate of 2.98% (2.98 percentage point). At GG-13: • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 6.67% (6.67 percentage point gap).

**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

Time-off Awards: 1-10 hours • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (50.52%) than Persons without a Disability (52.89%), a 2.37 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (46.71%) than Persons without Disabilities (52.89%), a 6.18 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$500 and Under • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (7.21%) than Persons without a Disability (8.38%), a 1.17 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received awards at a lower rate (5.59%) than Persons without Disabilities (8.38%), a 2.79 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$1000-\$1999 • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (68.75%) than Persons without Disabilities (76.90%), an 8.15 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$3000-\$3999 • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (18.92%) than Persons without Disabilities (20.91%), a 1.99 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted

Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (18.42%) than Persons without Disabilities (20.91%), a 2.49 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$4000-\$4999 • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (4.92) than Persons without Disabilities (7.11%), a 2.19 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (5.59%) than Persons without Disabilities (7.11%), a 1.52 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$5000 or more • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (26.26%) than Persons without Disabilities (27.29%), a 1.03 percentage point gap.

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

• Persons with Disabilities received a QSI at a lower rate (4.02%) than Persons without Disabilities (5.26%), a 1.24 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received a QSI at a lower rate (3.62%) than Persons without Disabilities (5.26%), a 1.64 percentage point gap.

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

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

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

• At SES, Persons with Disabilities represent 7.69% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 13.94% (6.25 percentage point gap). • At GG-14, Persons with Disabilities represent 14.46% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 15.76% (1.3 percentage point gap). • At GG-13, Persons with Disabilities represent 12.59% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 14.78% (2.19 percentage point gap).

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 No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

d. Grade GS-13

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

N/A

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

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

Persons with Disabilities represent 12.50% of selections for GS-15 New Hires compared to the qualified applicant pool of 15.38% (2.88 percentage point gap).

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

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

N/A

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 No

• At the Executive level, Persons with Disabilities represent 2.78% of applicants for promotion compared to the qualified internal application rate (eligibility rate) of 13.88% (11.1 Percentage point gap) • At the Supervisor level, Persons with Disabilities represent 13.53% of applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicant rate (individuals eligible for promotion) of 15.01% (1.48 percentage point gap).

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer No

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

N/A

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

N/A

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer No
  - b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer No
  - c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer No

N/A

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

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

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer N/A

N/A. DIA does not have a hiring authority equivalent to Schedule A with the goal recruiting and hiring PWD and PWTD for

positions in the permanent workforce.

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

N/A

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

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

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

N/A

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

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

N/A

## 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.

The link to information on Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act can be found on the DOD public website. The link to this website is on the “Web Policy & Security” of the DIA public website. <https://www.dia.mil/> <https://www.defense.gov/Legal-Administrative/Privacy-Security/> Direct Link to section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act: [https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std\\_Stmt.aspx](https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Std_Stmt.aspx)

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

Information on the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, and how to file a complaint can be found through the DIA public website at: <https://www.dia.mil/About/Equal-Opportunity-Diversity/>. Direct website address: [www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/buildings-and-sites/about-the-aba-standards](http://www.access-board.gov/guidelines-and-standards/buildings-and-sites/about-the-aba-standards) <https://www.dia.mil/About/Equal-Opportunity-Diversity/www.access-board.gov/aba-enforcement/file-a-complaint>

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.

• In FY23, EO launched an Accessibility Building Check Program with the Office of Facilities, to complete Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance checks across the DIA enterprise. • In FY23, the CIO launched its Accessibility Advocacy Program, which will teach Agency employees how to build accessibility into products produced in the Agency. • In FY23, the Disability Program Manager updated the Reasonable Accommodations Directive to include the procedures and process on Personal Assistance Services requests. • In FY23, the Reasonable Accommodations Team provided updated training on the Reasonable Accommodations process, educating the workforce and supervisors on the Reasonable Accommodations process and their specific part in the process. • In FY24, the Reasonable Accommodations Team updated the Standard Operating Procedures to further define roles, responsibilities, and procedures. • In FY24, EO began the soft startup of the Accessibility program. The Accessibility program is geared towards ensuring DIA is overall accessible for Persons with Disabilities.

### 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.)

The average timeframe for processing reasonable accommodations from completed request (Appendix A and medical documentation when necessary) to decision letters is twenty days. The exception is software requests and reassignments, which can take additional time due to software testing for IC security compliance or additional position vetting from OHR.

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 Reasonable Accommodations team has processed 94% of requests within the timeframe set in DIA policy. On average the decision letters are provided to customers within five days of the completed request which is well under the 45 business days in DIA policy. In FY23, accommodations and RA training were provided by both the RA Team and EO Business Partners to RA customers across DIA's CONUS and OCONUS locations. EO provided training in the Art of Supervision on Reasonable Accommodations to supervisors boosting the visibility of the Reasonable Accommodation Program. The training offered supervisors a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities.

### 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.

EO is currently in the process of awarding an interim Personal Assistance Services (PAS) program contract to an uncleared vendor as the agency begins the next steps to complete the Facility Clearance procedures. EO has updated the Reasonable Accommodations Directive to include policy on PAS. Once approved internally, the updated directive will be posted to the DIA public website and EO's internal website. EO included PAS procedures in the Reasonable Accommodations Standard of Operating Procedures document. DIA's current Procedures on PAS can be located on DIA's public website, which includes contact information for anyone requesting PAS.

## 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 Yes

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

Answer Yes

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

N/A. Settlement agreement was the result.

### 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 Yes

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

Answer Yes

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

N/A. Settlement agreement was the result.

## 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

<b>Source of the Trigger:</b>	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)					
<b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>	Workforce Data Table - B1					
<b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b>  Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.  How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Persons with Disabilities continue to experience lower-than-expected representation at the GG-7 to GG-10 population of DIA’s permanent workforce. Persons with Disabilities experience lower-than-expected elections for new hire at GG-15 in comparison to the qualified applicant pool. Permanent Workforce Underrepresentation: • Permanent workforce shows that 11.61% of GG-7 to GG-10 population had a reported disability compared to the regulatory goal of 12%. Senior Grade Level Gaps: • At GG-15, Persons with Disabilities represent 12.50% of new hire selections compared to the qualified applicant pool of 15.38% (2.88 percentage point gap).					
<b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities					
<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>	N					
<b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>	N					
<b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b>  Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	<b>Barrier Name</b>		<b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>			
	Unidentified Barrier		Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.			
<b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>						
<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b>	<b>Date Modified</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>	<b>Objective Description</b>	
10/01/2018	09/30/2020	Yes	05/30/2025		Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.	
<b>Responsible Official(s)</b>						
<b>Title</b>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>		
Chief		EO		Yes		
N/A		Barrier Analysis Working Group		Yes		
<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>						
<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Planned Activities</b>			<b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>	<b>Modified Date</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
09/30/2024	Update policy to include mandatory Unconscious Bias and EO training for all hiring managers and panel members.			Yes		

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2019	The Barrier Analysis working group will conduct barrier analysis into identified triggers and coordinate with stakeholders to develop action plan(s) to address the root cause(s).	Yes	05/30/2025	
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on the FY20 data, the FY19 (10.26) MD-715 trigger of PWD New Hires not meeting the EEOC goal of 12% no longer exists.</li> <li>Based on the FY20 data, FY19 MD-715 trigger of PWD involuntarily separated at 2.10% compared to PWOD (1.97%) with a 0.13 percentage point gap no longer exists.</li> </ul>			
2018	Implemented a Barrier Analysis and Data management workgroup to determine necessary data requirements and develop policies across the employee lifecycle that affect PWD and PWTD. EO, OHR, and ADI collaborated to ensure responsible employees receive adequate training to fully execute barrier analysis.			
2018	EO and OHR resurveyed the workforce to ensure accurate disability data.			
2018	Worked with OHR to assess current tracking mechanisms regarding PWD / PWTD and explore ways to accurately track applicable data across the employee lifecycle. EO was able to report FY18 applicant flow data for PWD/PWTD for the first time on the MD-715 report.			
2018	DO, recognizing the importance of this initiative for members of the workforce, helped to fund the DIA Deaf and Hard of Hearing captioning initiative. The EO Office and the Office of Facilities (FAC) are presently working to bring captioning and unclassified video services to DIA Officers who are deaf or hard of hearing. The initiative will help provide our deaf or hard of hearing community, equal access to communication tools.			
2019	FY19 Accomplishments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Included performance objectives for the responsible official to ensure accountability for disability program management to include identifying Disability Outreach opportunities; participate in mission-specific recruitment activities or hiring events geared towards individuals with disabilities.</li> <li>Develop/Coordinate/Provide agency-wide disability education program(s); meet periodically with SEP observance lead to chart event progress throughout the event-planning phase; keep leadership abreast of observance plans and planning challenges. Assist RAC in processing requests in accordance with Agency policy; compile quarterly RA spend report; ensure that expenditures are necessary/accurate; track of property assignment through the use of inventory markers; ensure RA related equipment/resources are still in use and guarded against misuse and/or fraud. Complete all projects/assignments by suspense date; advise supervisor of potential problems/concerns and present innovative solutions. In January 2019, the Automated Captioning in DIA's Tighe Auditorium and Leadership Hall was launched.</li> <li>In FY19, EO launched the SF-256 Campaign to educate the workforce on how to self-identify a disability or non-disability in myHR for agency tracking purposes.</li> </ul>			
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Barrier Analysis Working group facilitated focus groups, sensing sessions, and themes to investigate marketing, recruiting, quality of life, and attrition.</li> </ul>			
2022	Persons with Targeted Disabilities did not experience voluntary or involuntary separation at a higher rate than Persons without Disabilities.			

<b>Source of the Trigger:</b>	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
<b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>	Workforce Data Table - B9				
<b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b>  Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.  How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Targeted Disabilities receive awards (monetary, time-off, QSI) at a lower-than-expected rate compared to Persons without Disabilities. Time-off Awards: 1-10 hours • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (50.52%) than Persons without a Disability (52.89%), a 2.37 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (46.71%) than Persons without Disabilities (52.89%), a 6.18 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$500 and Under • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (7.21%) than Persons without a Disability (8.38%), a 1.17 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received awards at a lower rate (5.59%) than Persons without Disabilities (8.38%), a 2.79 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$1000-\$1999 • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (68.75%) than Persons without Disabilities (76.90%), an 8.15 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$3000-\$3999 • Persons with Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (18.92%) than Persons without Disabilities (20.91%), a 1.99 percentage point gap. • Persons with Targeted Disabilities received an award at a lower rate (18.42%) than Persons without Disabilities (20.91%), a 2.49 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$4000-\$4999 • PWD received an award at a lower rate (4.92) than Persons without Disabilities (7.11%), a 2.19 percentage point gap. • PWTD received an award at a lower rate (5.59%) than Persons without Disabilities (7.11%), a 1.52 percentage point gap. Cash Awards: \$5000 or more • PWD received an award at a lower rate (26.26%) than Persons without Disabilities (27.29%), a 1.03 percentage point gap. QSI • PWD received a QSI at a lower rate (4.02%) than Persons without Disabilities (5.26%), a 1.24 percentage point gap. • PWTD received a QSI at a lower rate (3.62%) than Persons without Disabilities (5.26%), a 1.64 percentage point gap.				
<b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities				
<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>	N				
<b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>	N				
<b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b>  Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	<b>Barrier Name</b>		<b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>		
	Unidentified Barrier		Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.		
<b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>					
<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b>	<b>Date Modified</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>	<b>Objective Description</b>
01/17/2019	09/30/2020	Yes	09/26/2026		Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.
<b>Responsible Official(s)</b>					
<b>Title</b>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>	
N/A		Barrier Analysis Working Group		Yes	
Chief		EO		Yes	

<b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>				
<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Planned Activities</b>	<b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>	<b>Modified Date</b>	<b>Completion Date</b>
01/30/2023	The Barrier Analysis Working Group will conduct barrier analysis into the entire awards process.	Yes	09/29/2026	
<b>Report of Accomplishments</b>				
<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Accomplishment</b>			
2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Based on FY20 data, the FY19 MD-715 trigger of PWD and PWTD underrepresentation within internal promotions in the 2210 mission critical series no longer exists.</li> </ul> <p>Note * Completion dates of October 1, 2019 were reported in the FY19 report.</p>			
2018	None			
2019	FY19 Accomplishments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All DIA Supervisors and CDOs are required to take Annual DIA EO Training which includes a module tailored to supervisors’ role in reasonable accommodations.</li> <li>• EO has reviewed and confirmed that the DIA Promotion Program’s documents, technology systems, and training materials are 508 compliant.</li> <li>• EO met with OHR to discuss the feasibility of implementing blind promotion panels at DIA and determined that due to technology limitations for proper redactions and security concerns a truly blind promotion panel is not feasible.</li> <li>• EO collaborated with OHR to ensure that EO training is required for all Promotion Panel Members prior to the panel execution.</li> <li>• OHR conducted an evaluation of the Promotion Program’s feedback mechanism and has implemented procedural improvements for the FY20 Promotion Cycle. Additionally, the DIA Promotion Program requires that both Rating Officials and Employees validate and document the date in the Promotion Assessment Form (PAF) that a feedback conversation took place between the Rating Official and the employee.</li> </ul>			
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Barrier Analysis Working group facilitated focus groups, sensing sessions, and themes to investigate the impact of previous opportunities on an employee’s award rate and potential bias in the selection process.</li> </ul>			

<b>Source of the Trigger:</b>		Workforce Data (if so identify the table)			
<b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>		Workforce Data Table - B9			
<b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b>		Persons with Disabilities experience lower-than-expected applications for promotion in the 0132 and 0301 Occupational Series, and lower-than-expected selections for promotion in the 2210 Occupational Series. Persons with Disabilities experience lower-than-expected applications for promotion at GG-13 to SES, and at the supervisor and executive level of management positions. MCO Gaps: • Persons with Disabilities represent 11.60% of internal applicants for promotion in the 0132 Occupational Series compared to the qualified applicant rate (individuals eligible for promotion) of 13.90% (2.3 percentage point gap). • Persons with Disabilities represent 13.97% of internal applicants for promotion in the 0301 Occupational Series compared to the qualified applicant rate (individuals eligible for promotion) of 16.31% (2.34 percentage point gap). • Persons with Disabilities represent 15.09% of selections for promotion in the 2210 Occupational Series compared to the internal applicant pool of 16.44 (1.35 percentage point gap). Senior Grade Level Gaps: • At SES, Persons with Disabilities represent 7.69% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 13.94% (6.25 percentage point gap). • At GG-14, Persons with Disabilities represent 14.46% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 15.76% (1.3 percentage point gap). • At GG-13, Persons with Disabilities represent 12.59% of internal applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicants (eligible for promotion) of 14.78% (2.19 percentage point gap). Management Position Gaps: • At the Executive level, Persons with Disabilities were 2.78% of applicants for promotion compared to the qualified internal application rate (eligibility rate) of 13.88% (11.1 Percentage point gap) • At the Supervisor level, Persons with Disabilities were 13.53% of applicants for promotion compared to the qualified applicant rate (i			
Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.					
How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?					
<b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>		<i>Barrier Group</i>			
		People with Disabilities			
<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>		N			
<b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>		N			
<b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b>		<b>Barrier Name</b>		<b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>	
Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.		Unidentified Barrier		Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.	
<b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>					
<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b>	<b>Date Modified</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>	<b>Objective Description</b>
10/01/2019	09/30/2020	No	09/29/2025		Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.
<b>Responsible Official(s)</b>					
<b>Title</b>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>	
Chief		EO		Yes	
N/A		Barrier Analysis Working Group		Yes	

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2020	Analyze data to determine if reasonable accommodations for PWD/ PWTD are a factor affecting promotion qualification.	Yes	09/29/2023	12/04/2023
09/30/2020	Analyze data to determine if mobility requirements for CBTO is resulting in a lower-than-expected CBTO participation rate for PWD / PWTD and if this is a factor affecting promotion qualification.	Yes	09/29/2025	12/04/2023
09/29/2025	The Barrier Analysis working group will conduct barrier analysis into identified triggers and coordinate with stakeholders to develop action plan(s) to address the root cause(s).	Yes		
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•CBTO created a NIPR channel on MS Teams to help advertise for CBTO.</li> <li>•COVID-19 delayed the use of the overview tab function for the directorate level panel, which was created in February/March 2020. OHR plans to use overview tab function in May 2021 for the Academic programs' applications. This oversight build is for the directorate level panel to complete the scoring process on the CBTO portal will efficiently track the directorate level panel and consolidate where the panel process takes place. Allows directorates to use the portal and easier for panel members to score and provide feedback to applicant. This will create a one stop shop for the whole CBTO process (from the local, directorate, and Agency level review process).</li> <li>•Based on the FY20 data, the FY19 MD-715 trigger of PWTD applied for a CBTO at a lower rate based on their representation in the applicant pool at GG-15 and SES no longer exists.</li> </ul>			
2018	<p>The ADI has established a regular annual schedule for Career Development Program application processes with two applications periods each year. This regular release schedule increases visibility and planning for program coordinators, liaisons, employees and their supervisors.</p> <p>Data shows that PWD were 9.86% of CBTO applications and 10.34% of CBTO selectees (0.48% gap). DIA PWD were more likely to be selected for a CBTO than expected based on their application rate.</p> <p>Data shows that PWTD were 2.82% of the CBTO applicant pool and represented 5.63% of CBTO applications (2.81% gap). This does not represent a trigger; DIA PWTD were more likely to apply for a CBTO than expected based on their representation in the applicant pool.</p>			
2019	DIA removed planned activities that are ongoing and executed year-round and refocused and refined existing planned activities. With a new barrier analysis focus, DIA will be able to better identify, address, and track barriers.			
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Barrier Analysis Working group facilitated focus groups, sensing sessions, and themes to investigate potential barriers for pre-application career paths, reasons for non-application, impact of conditions on career opportunities, and potential biases in the selection panels.</li> </ul>			

<b>Source of the Trigger:</b>	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
<b>Specific Workforce Data Table:</b>	Workforce Data Table - B12				
<b>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</b>  Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.  How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Targeted Disabilities experience lower-than-expected selections for the coaching program compared to the applicant rate. Persons with Disabilities and Targeted Disabilities experience non-selection for GG-13 thru GG-15 CBTO. Persons with Disabilities experience lower-than-expected applications for CBTO at GG-13 compared to the eligibility rate. Coaching Program • Persons with Disabilities represent 9.76% of selections compared to the applicant rate of 20.73% (10.97 percentage point gap). • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 3.66% of selections compared to the applicant rate of 7.32% (3.66 percentage point gap). CBTO Program GG-15 Gaps: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 18.75% 18.75 percentage point gap). • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 6.25% (6.25 percentage point gap). GG-14 Gaps: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 16.67% (16.67 percentage point gap). • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO applicants compared to the eligibility rate of 2.98% (2.98 percentage point). GG-13 Gaps: • Persons with Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 13.33% (13.33 percentage point gap). Persons with Disabilities represent 13.33% of CBTO applicants compared to the eligibility rate of 14.77% (1.44 percentage point gap). • Persons with Targeted Disabilities represent 0.00% of CBTO selections compared to the applicant rate of 6.67% (6.67 percentage point gap).				
<b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities				
<b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>	N				
<b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>	N				
<b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b>  Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	<b>Barrier Name</b>		<b>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</b>		
	Unidentified Barrier		Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.		
<b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>					
<b>Date Initiated</b>	<b>Target Date</b>	<b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b>	<b>Date Modified</b>	<b>Date Completed</b>	<b>Objective Description</b>
10/01/2019	01/30/2023	Yes	09/29/2026		Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.
<b>Responsible Official(s)</b>					
<b>Title</b>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>	
Chief		EO		Yes	
N/A		Barrier Analysis Working Group		Yes	

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
01/30/2023	The Barrier Analysis Working Group will partner with the CBTO Program Officials to conduct barrier analysis into the entire CBTO lifecycle process.	Yes	09/29/2026	
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2018	Average hours awarded in Time Off Awards were slightly higher for PWD and PWTD compared to awardees with no disability. For Time Off Awards of one to nine hours, employees with no disability received an average of 7.05 hours, compared to 7.60 hours for PWD and 7.70 hours for PWTD. Similarly, for Time Off Awards of more than nine hours, employees with no disability received an average of 23.40 hours, compared to 24.20 hours for PWD and 26.00 hours for PWTD.			
2019	The only FY18 planned activity was completed. However, after further review, it was determined that the completed action plan had no meaningful impact on the trigger identified. The impact of integrating EO training and presence into Bonus Panel training for panel members and mock panels remains to be seen. The Barrier Analysis Working Group will investigate in impact in future fiscal years. Further barrier analysis will be conducted to determine if the planned activity corrected the trigger and DIA also added an additional planned activity.			
2020	None			
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Barrier Analysis Working group facilitated focus groups, sensing sessions, and themes to investigate themes preventing employees from applying, the impact of previous opportunities on an employee’s selection potential and potential bias in the selection process.</li> </ul>			
2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CBTO included employee ID on the CBTO application. This allows for demographic data to be tracked throughout the process.</li> <li>• CBTO updated their portal to ensure oversight into the local and agency level CBTO process.</li> <li>• Applicants can view live status of their application throughout the entire process.</li> <li>• If an applicant is not selected, they do receive feedback in reference to their non-selection.</li> <li>• Persons with Disabilities did not experience a trigger at the GG-14 CBTO selections stage.</li> </ul>			

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