

## Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their affirmative action plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities.

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

*EEOC regulations (29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities in the federal government*

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer No
- b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer Yes

Table B-4 Participation Rates for General Schedule Grades - Permanent PWD in GS-11 to SES cluster of the permanent workforce participate at 9.18% or 1,206 PWD employees out of 13,123 Total Workforce, which is lower than the 12% benchmark goal.

\*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

| Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb) | Total | Reportable Disability |      | Targeted Disability |      |
|--|-------|-----------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|  | #     | #                     | %    | #                   | %    |
| Numerical Goal                                 | --    | 12%                   |      | 2%                  |      |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                           | 0     | 0                     | 0.00 | 0                   | 0.00 |
| Grades GS-11 to SES                            | 0     | 0                     | 0.00 | 0                   | 0.00 |

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

The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has communicated the EEOC's 12% PWD and 2% PWTD hiring goals to hiring officials and agency managers, supervisors, and leadership at meetings and presentations. The agency also completed a national barrier analysis that identified the limited use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority as a barrier to hire PWD. Engagement on the hiring goals has happened at all management levels including EPA senior leadership. OCR also is implementing a measure for regions and AA-ships to increase the percentage of PWD and requiring regions and AA-ships to identify how each intends to do so in FY22, which resulted in OCR further communicating the numeric goals during the end of the FY21. Additionally, the increased use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority is a national priority for EPA. Hiring goals have been communicated to agency management through a combination of briefings and training sessions. OHR and OCR provided five training sessions to approximately 200 managers and

employees in FY21. The training sessions focused on two topics, the “Effective Use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority” and “How to Utilize the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) Database.”

## 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<br>(Name, Title, Office Email)   |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---|
|   | Full Time                           | Part Time | Collateral Duty |   |
| Section 508 Compliance                    | 3                                   | 0         | 58              | David Segovia, Libraries and Accessibility Division Director, OMS<br>segovia.david@epa.gov<br>Sarah Sorathia, Assistant Section 508 Program Manager, OMS<br>sorathia.sarah@epa.gov<br>This includes 58 collateral duty 508 Liaisons Agency-wide: program offices (39) and (19). |
| Architectural Barriers Act Compliance     | 1                                   | 0         | 1               | Yvette Jackson, Director Office of Admission Support, OMS<br>Jackson.yvette@epa.gov   |
| Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTB | 2                                   | 0         | 32              | Tiffany Houser, National Disability Employment Program Manager, OCR<br>houser.tiffany@epa.gov<br>Anthony Napoli, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, DRESO, OHR<br>napoli.anthony@epa.gov  |

| Disability Program Task  | # of FTE Staff By Employment Status |           |                 | Responsible Official<br>(Name, Title, Office Email)  |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--|
|  | Full Time                           | Part Time | Collateral Duty |  |
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 13                                  | 0         | 12              | Anthony Napoli, Diversity and Inclusion Manager, DRES, OHR<br>napoli.anthony@epa.gov<br>Tiffany Houser, EEO Manager, National Disability Employment Program Manager, OCR<br>houser.tiffany@epa.gov<br>There are also 12 Program Management Officers (PMOs), one for each program office at headquarters, who perform this function as a collateral duty. |
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees                     | 2                                   | 0         | 27              | Amanda Sweda, Senior National Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, OCR<br>sweda.amanda@epa.gov<br>Kristin Tropp, National Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, OCR<br>tropp.kristin@epa.gov  |
| Processing applications from PWD and PWTD  | 30                                  | 0         | 0               | Jerome Bonner, Director, Cincinnati Shared Service Center, Office of Mission Support OMS<br>bonner.jerome@epa.gov<br>The 30 full time employees include staff within the Shared Service Centers who are responsible for processing applications.   |

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

In FY21, EPA provided ongoing disability training to its disability program staff using various educational methods, such as online training, on-the-job training, and engagement on EEOC-facilitated Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability (FEED) calls. Training topics included: • EEO and Preventing Discrimination in the Workplace • SEPM training (three presentations): How to Use the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) database, State of Disability Hiring at the EPA, and the Computer/Electronic Accommodation Program (CAP) • Section 508 training on assistive technologies • Effective Use of Schedule A Hiring Authority and How to Utilize the Workforce Recruitment Program Database training (5 training sessions)

**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 PWTDD

### 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.

In FY21, the agency utilized a variety of programs and resources to identify qualified job applicants with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities. These included, but were not limited to: • Office of Personnel Management's web page identifying the Bender Consulting firm's list of Schedule A applicants • OPM's Shared List of People with Disabilities page via MAX.gov • Veteran Employment Programs (e.g., Operations Warfighter, Wounded Warrior, Safe Harbor) • Workforce Recruitment Program • USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal • Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPMs) and Disability Employment Advisory Council • National and Local Disability Employment Program Managers • Virtual Careers and Disability Job Fairs • Pathways-Presidential Management Fellows (PMF) Program • Pathways-Interns/Recent Graduates • Office of Environmental Information, Section 508 – Assistive Technology Program • Disability Employment Program Advisory Council Monthly Meetings • Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Partnerships • Internal/External Outreach Programs/Activities

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 PWTDD for positions in the permanent workforce

The agency uses all available and appropriate hiring authorities to recruit and hire including: • Excepted Service, Schedule A: 5 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) section 213.3102(u) • Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) • Veterans Recruitment Appointments (VRA) • 30 Percent or More Disabled Veterans • Pathways Programs

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.

EPA determines eligibility for individuals who apply using special hiring authorities, such as Schedule A and the 30% or More Disabled Veteran Authority using the following processes: Schedule A Hiring EPA's Shared Service Center Human Resource Management Division announced the development and upcoming rollout of our own EPA Schedule A Repository. The Schedule A Repository will host resumes and writing samples from Schedule A Disability-eligible candidates and the agency will share it with Regions and Offices to streamline and increase our hiring managers' use of the Schedule A hiring authority. This new repository is on track to debut in calendar year in 2022 and the agency will be providing additional information on how to submit and access Schedule A Repository application materials. • Shared Service Centers (SSCs) review all incoming applicants who submit documentation designating their disability status pursuant to special hiring authority Schedule A (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)). • SSCs screen all applicants seeking to be hired through Schedule A for minimum qualifications / selective factors to determine eligibility for noncompetitive, Schedule A appointments. • An eligible person must have an intellectual disability, a severe physical disability, or a psychiatric disability. The agency accepts, as proof of disability, appropriate documentation (e.g., records, statements, or other appropriate information) issued by a licensed medical professional (e.g., a physician or other medical professional duly certified by a state, the District of Columbia, or a U.S. territory, to practice medicine); a licensed vocational rehabilitation specialist (state or private); or, any federal agency, a state agency, or an agency of the District of Columbia or a U.S. territory issuing or provides disability benefits. • An agency may make permanent or time-limited appointments, where an applicant supplies proof of disability, and the agency determines that the individual is likely to succeed in the performance of the duties of the position for which he or she is applying. In determining whether the individual is likely to succeed in performing the duties of the position, the agency may

rely upon the applicant's employment, educational, or other relevant experience, including but not limited to service under another type of appointment in the competitive or excepted services. • Individuals who apply and are certified for a Merit Promotion (MP) External announcement (i.e., open government-wide) are referred to the hiring official through the EZHire/Monster platform. Certificates of qualified individuals are reviewed electronically. • Candidates are appointed following SSC onboarding procedures. After a tentative offer is extended, the selectee is processed through Personnel Security for background investigations (if applicable) and suitability determinations. Once Personnel Security has approved the candidate for employment, the SSC establishes a start date, issues a firm offer letter, and provides new hire documentation for the candidate to complete before onboarding. Veterans Hiring Eligibility is determined based on the guidelines provided in OPM's Vet Guide for HR Professionals. Candidates are referred on the appropriate certificate of eligibles after their veteran authority eligibility is determined, and their qualifications are verified. Individuals who apply and are certified for Delegated Examining (DE) announcement (i.e., open to the public) and are found to have veterans' preference are referred to the hiring official through the EZHire/Monster platform if they are in the highest quality category. Individuals who apply and are certified for a Merit Promotion (MP) External announcement (i.e., open government-wide) are referred to the hiring official through the EZHire/Monster platform. The certificate they are referred on is determined by their veteran authority eligibility (e.g., Compensable Disability Preference (CPS) eligible veterans are referred on the CPS-30% disabled certificate, while Veterans Recruitment Appointment (VRA) eligible individuals are referred on the VRA certificate). Certificates of qualified individuals are reviewed electronically. Hiring managers may receive applications for non-competitive appointments, meaning the applicant is eligible for a hiring authority that does not require public notice (i.e., an announcement on USAJobs) and provide those selections to the SSC for review. In this case, the hiring manager is providing the application to the SSC who then determines eligibility and qualifications. • Disabled veterans with disability ratings of 30% or more may be considered under 30% or More Disabled Veteran Authority (5 CFR § 315.707). Once eligibility for the 30% or More Disabled Veteran Authority is determined, the HR specialist notifies the hiring manager following applicable regulations for further consideration. SSC and HR specialists, along with Selective Placement Program Coordinators (SPPC), work closely with each hiring manager to ensure all pre- and post-appointment procedures are carried out and applicants meet all legal and regulatory requirements for EPA position(s). Candidates may be selected and appointed with or without the typical formal interview process. A hiring manager may fill the position based on the applicant's ability to perform the duties of the position as described in the position description. Applicants can be hired on 1) a temporary position with a Not to Exceed (NTE) date; 2) a non-temporary position with an NTE date; or 3) a non-temporary excepted service position. After two years of successful performance on the job, they may be non-competitively converted to a permanent appointment. The hiring manager notifies SSC of their selection. SSC extends an official offer based on the vacancy's selection factors and determines a start date based on dialogue with the manager and selectee. Before the entry-on-duty, a manager discusses and verifies the need for any accommodation with the selected individual. • Veterans Recruitment Appointment (VRA) Authority (5 CFR Part 307) is a special hiring authority allowing for the appointment of eligible veterans into excepted service positions at any grade level through GS-11 or equivalent, without competition. Candidates must meet basic qualification requirements to be accepted into the excepted service. To be converted to competitive service, the candidate must complete two years of significant, continuous service in a position under VRA and receive a satisfactory job performance rating.

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

In FY21, the agency hosted several agency-wide training sessions for various EPA region and program offices. The increased use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority is a national priority for EPA. Hiring goals have been communicated to agency management through a combination of briefings and training sessions. OHR and OCR provided five training sessions to approximately 200 managers and employees in FY21. The training sessions focused on two topics, the "Effective Use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority" and "How to Utilize the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) Database." The training sessions were conducted virtually and recorded because of the Covid-19 pandemic. The videos are currently available on the agency intranet site and on Microsoft Teams video system for all EPA employees to view. In addition, EPA regions and program offices conducted their own Disability Employment Awareness, Reasonable Accommodation, and Schedule A Hiring Authority training sessions.

## **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.

• The agency continued to implement established Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with Gallaudet University (GU), Rochester Institute of Technology/National Technical Institute for the Deaf (RIT/NTID), and Texas School for the Deaf (TSD). • EPA and Northwest Indian College (NWIC) signed an MOU in FY21. NWIC is a minority serving institution (MSI). The MOU focuses on collaboration to increase interest in careers related to protecting human health and the environment and awareness about publicly available recruitment and environmental education opportunities. • In FY21, EPA HQ and EPA Region 4 were in ongoing discussions to identify an organization to initiate another MOU. • Through the MOUs, EPA continues to collaborate on the advancement of environmental education to improve awareness of national employment opportunities and other opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Through the established MOUs with the institutions, students are given notice of publicly available career opportunities at EPA, through paid and unpaid internships. In FY21, the agency conducted virtual mock interviews with GU students. • OMS encourages the use of the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) and the Agency Talent Portal (ATP) and shares information on the WRP and the ATP with the region and program offices. • In FY21, Louis Orslene, Director of the Employer and Workplace Policy Team, Office of Disability Employment Policy, U.S. Department of Labor was the keynote speaker for EPA’s People with Disabilities Observance event to share the priorities of the Federal Government for people with disabilities.

**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

| New Hires                 | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability   |                         | Targeted Disability     |                         |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                           |              | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) | Permanent Workforce (%) | Temporary Workforce (%) |
| % of Total Applicants     | 14331        | 13.93                   | 0.00                    | 7.23                    | 0.00                    |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 12065        | 12.22                   | 0.00                    | 6.20                    | 0.00                    |
| % of New Hires            | 271          | 8.49                    | 0.00                    | 3.69                    | 0.00                    |

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

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

Table B-7 Monster: Application and Hires for Major Occupations by Disability. PWD triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • General Biological Science (0401): Selection at 6.90% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 9.68%. • Environmental Engineer (0819): Selection at 4.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 10.13%. • Environmental Engineer (1301): Selection at 6.67% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 9.89%. • Attorney Advisor (0905): Selection at 0.00 % is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 13.20%. PWTD triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • General Biological Science (0401): Selection at 1.72% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 5.03%. • Environmental Engineer (0819): Selection at 4.00% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 5.19%. • Physical/ Environmental Scientist (1301): Selection at 2.67% is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 5.79%. • Attorney Advisor (0905): Selection at 0.00 % is less than expected compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of 6.16%.

| New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations | Total<br>(#) | Reportable Disability | Targetable Disability |
|---|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|   |              | New Hires<br>(%)      | New Hires<br>(%)      |
| Numerical Goal                            | --           | 12%                   | 2%                    |
| 0028 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST  | 19           | 21.05                 | 10.53                 |
| 0301 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE               | 5            | 40.00                 | 20.00                 |
| 0343 MANAGEMENT ANALYSIS                  | 12           | 25.00                 | 16.67                 |
| 0401 BIOLOGIST                            | 116          | 6.90                  | 1.72                  |
| 0819 ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING            | 25           | 4.00                  | 4.00                  |
| 0905 ATTORNEY                             | 19           | 0.00                  | 0.00                  |
| 1301 GENERAL PHYSICAL SCIENCE             | 75           | 6.67                  | 2.67                  |

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

Table B-9 Monster – Selections for Internal Competitive Promotions for Major Occupations by Disability. EPA utilized Table B9: Qualified Internal Applicants for MCO. The total applications received were used as the benchmark for the following. PWD triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • Environmental Protection Specialist (0028): PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.11% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 3.90%. • Management/Program Analyst (0343): PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 3.06% is less than expected compared to PWD Applications Received at 4.57%. • General Biological Science (0401): PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.55% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 4.35%. • Environmental Engineer (0819): PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 5.26% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 6.98%. • Physical Scientist/Environmental Scientist (1301): PWD Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.33% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 2.94%. PWTD triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • Environmental Protection Specialist (0028): PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.41% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 2.84%. • Management/Program Analyst (0343): PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.51% is less than expected compared to PWTD Applications Received at 1.62%. • General Biological Science (0401): PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.51% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applications Received at 1.52%. • Environmental Engineer (0819): PWTD Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.32% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 2.33%.

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

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

Table B-9 Monster– Selections for Internal Competitive Promotions for Major Occupations by Disability: EPA utilized Table B9: Selections for Internal Competitive Promotions for MCO. The qualified applicant pool was used as the benchmark for the following. PWD, triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • Misc. Administration and Program Specialist (0301): PWD Promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to Qualified Benchmark of 3.90%. This is a trigger. • Biologist/ Life Scientist (0401): PWD Promoted at 2.55% is less than expected compared to Qualified Benchmark of 0.00%. This is a trigger. • Environmental Engineer (0819): PWD Promoted at 5.26% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 2.33%. PWTD, triggers were identified in the following Major Occupation series: • Environmental Protection Specialist (0028): PWTD Promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to Qualified Benchmark of 1.41%. This is a trigger. • Management Analyst (0343): PWTD Promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to Qualified Benchmark of 0.51%. This is a trigger.

Environmental Engineer (0819): PWTD Promoted at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applications Received at 1.32%.

## 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.

Increased communication. EPA informs all employees of advancement opportunities through 1) the Talent Hub website (a centralized experiential learning resource promoting a range of career development opportunities available across the agency); 2) broadcasting open vacancy announcements; 3) fee/non-fee based in-person/online training. Opportunities are marketed through email to all users, office announcements, intranet postings, and newsletters. Employees are encouraged to participate in skill-building trainings and courses related to federal employment, such as how to search USAJOBS, resume writing, and improving interviewing skills. Technical Assistance Visits: OCR conducted visits to two regions and two program offices in FY21. These visits served, in part, to educate managers on how to support opportunities for advancement and retention of employees with disabilities, provide information on the Schedule A hiring authority, and stress the importance of timely conversion for those participating in the program. Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan: EPA's 2017-2021 Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan (DISP) guides the agency's efforts in sustaining EPA as a leader in creating and maintaining a high-performing workforce embracing diversity and inclusion and empowers all employees to achieve their full potential to advance the agency's mission. The multi-year plan outlines goals, priorities, specific action items, and measures developed by senior leadership and the EPA Human Resources community. The DISP received concurrence from EPA's Diversity and Inclusion Advisory Committee (DIAC), a subcommittee of the Human Resources Council. DISP goals are outlined below. • Goal 1: Diversify the federal workforce through active engagement of leadership: a) senior leaders conducted regular informational sessions open to all employees to share information on training and career development opportunities and resources; b) OMS ensured all hiring managers received training on the use of appropriate hiring authorities and flexibilities. • Goal 2: Include and engage all agency employees: senior leadership and managers used Talent Hub to promote and encourage all employees to apply for temporary, full-time detail assignments, part-time projects/special assignments, temporary promotions, SES rotations, and other developmental assignments. • Goal 3: Optimize inclusive diversity efforts using data-driven approaches: a) utilized the MD-715 reports, applicant flow data, and focus groups to identify actions taken to address any potential barriers to career development and advancement identified by the agency; b) senior leaders used the results of the annual Employee Viewpoint Surveys and other workforce feedback to respond to employee concerns regarding opportunities for employee training, development, and advancement. The DISP expired at the end of FY21, and the agency is in the process of drafting a new DISP. OCR has proposed the new DISP specifically address the agency's lower than expected participation rate for persons with disabilities. This concern will be addressed in the new DISP per Executive Order (EO) 14035 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) in the Federal Workforce. EPA's Successful Leaders Program: Mandatory year-long program for newly promoted or hired supervisors and managers. The program contains information regarding the various hiring authorities (such as Schedule A) to reach a wide range of candidates training on the Disability Hiring Tool such as the WRP, CAP, as well as training on how to manage Reasonable Accommodation requests. The agency restructured the course to be entirely virtual, effective FY2022. Miscellaneous: The agency launched FedTalent in FY18 and continues to use this learning management system interfacing with the agency's HR system of record (FPPS). The interface allows EPA to track selectees in its training and coaching programs and allows offices to provide information on the robust learning opportunities afforded on career development within the FedTalent course library.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

Employee career development is available through a variety of programs. Training is designed to promote professional and personal development. Entry Level: Mindful EPA; EPA Coaching; New Hire Onboarding; Talent Hub & Skills Marketplace Details; Leaders



& Learners Mentoring Program. Mid-Career: Individual Development Plan Support; LEGIS-Capital Hill Fellowship; President's Management Council Rotational Program; Stepping-up to Supervision; Treasury Executive Institute; Talent Development Programs. Supervisors/Managers & Senior Level: Skillssoft Leader Development Program; Successful Leaders Program; Strategic Start; Coaching (TEI); OPM & EPA's SES Orientation; Executive Rotations for SES. - FedTalent/Skillssoft: 15,084 courses - Skillssoft books/videos: 30,000 - Mandatory Training -Support for Individual/Executive Development Plans

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 (%) |
| Mentoring Programs                | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Training Programs                 | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Coaching Programs                 | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Fellowship Programs               | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Other Career Development Programs | N/A                | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           | N/A            | N/A           |
| Internship 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           |

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 N/A
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

EPA does not currently capture data for Career Development Opportunities (CDOs) that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate. OCR is coordinating with OHR to develop a process that will collect applicant flow data from training program applicants.

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 N/A
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

EPA does not currently capture data for Career Development Opportunities (CDOs) that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate. OCR continues to coordinate with OHR to develop a process that will collect applicant flow data from training program applicants.

**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

Comparing Time-off Awards of 1-9 hours for PWD/PWTD (Table B-13) to Total Workforce for PWD/PWTD (Table B1), there are triggers in the following Awards, Bonuses, and Incentives categories. PWD Time-off Awards 1-9 hours: PWD received awards at 25.5%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 26.8%. This is a trigger. PWTD Time-off Awards 1-9 hours: PWTD received awards at 11.9%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 27.0%. This is a trigger. PWTD Time-off Awards 9+ hours: PWTD received awards at 17.6%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 28.6%. This is a trigger. Comparing Cash Awards \$100-\$500 for PWD/PWTD (Table 13) to Total Workforce for PWOD (Table B1), there are triggers in the following Awards, Bonuses, and Incentives categories. Cash Awards \$100 - \$500: • PWTD received awards at 15.3%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 23.2%. This is a trigger. Cash Awards \$501+: • PWD received awards at 87.6%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 95.1%. This is a trigger. Cash Awards \$501+: • PWTD received awards at 54.5%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 95.4%. This is a trigger. Senior Executive Service Performance Awards: • PWTD received awards at 0.0%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 100.0%. This is a trigger.

| Time-Off Awards                                 | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|---|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given      | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours       | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours     | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given     | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours      | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours    | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given     | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours      | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours    | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given     | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours      | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| 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   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |

| Cash Awards                                  | Total (#) | Reportable Disability % | Without Reportable Disability % | Targeted Disability % | Without Targeted Disability % |
|--|-----------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount   | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given    | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount    | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount  | 0         | 0.00                    | 0.00                            | 0.00                  | 0.00                          |

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

Comparing Employee Recognition and Awards for PWD/PWTD (Table B-13 Employee Recognition Awards) to Total Workforce for PWD (Table B1 - Total Workforce - Permanent), there are triggers in the following Awards, Bonuses, and Incentives categories: PWD Qualify Step Increase (QSI): PWD received awards at 1.9%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 2.6%. This is a trigger. PWTD Qualify Step Increase (QSI): PWTD received awards at 1.1%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 2.5%. This is 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 Yes

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer Yes

The Other Awards category is broad-based and includes a variety of awards (see list below). PWD Other Awards: PWD received awards at 3.6%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 4.7%. This is a trigger. • Other Awards for PWD consist of (code-award): 815/ Recruitment Incentive 841/ Group Cash Award CH 45 847/ Group Time Off Award 889/ Group Award - Other PWTD Other Awards: PWTD received awards at 3.7%, which is less than expected compared to people without disabilities at 4.5%. This is a trigger. • Other Awards for PWTD consist of (code-award): 815/ Recruitment Incentive 841/ Group Cash Award CH 45 847/ Group Time Off Award 889/ Group Award – Other

**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 N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

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

SES PWD promotion data is not available. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data. For FY21, EPA utilized Monster Table B11 – Internal Selections for Senior Level Positions. Using the PWD Applications Received when analyzing the applicant flow of internal applicants and/or selections for promotions by grade (Table B11), the following triggers are identified for GS-13 thru GS-15. PWD GS-13: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 3.02% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applicants Received at 5.66%. This is a trigger. • PWD Selected Internal Applications at 1.69% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applications at 3.02%. This is a trigger. GS-14: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 2.68% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applicants Received at 3.64%. This is a trigger. • PWD Selected Internal Applications at 2.01% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applications at 2.68%. This is a trigger. GS-15: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 3.02% is less than expected compared to the PWD Applicants Received at 4.23%. This is 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 N/A

|   |        |     |
|---|--------|-----|
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer | N/A |
| b. Grade GS-15                          |        |     |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer | No  |
| c. Grade GS-14                          |        |     |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer | No  |
| d. Grade GS-13                          |        |     |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)          | Answer | Yes |

SES PWTD promotion data is not available. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data. For FY21, EPA utilized Monster Table B11 – Internal Selections for Senior Level Positions. Using the PWTD Applications Received when analyzing the applicant flow of internal applicants and/or selections for promotions by grade (Table B11), the following triggers are identified for GS-13 thru GS-15. PWTD GS-13: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.34% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applicants Received at 1.77%. This is a trigger. • PWTD Selected Internal Applications at 0.00% is less than expected compared to the Qualified Applications at 0.34%. This is a trigger. GS-14: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 0.70% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applicants Received at 1.56%. This is a trigger. GS-15: • Qualified Internal Applicants at 1.37% is less than expected compared to the PWTD Applicants Received at 1.84%. This is 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 | N/A |
| b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) | Answer | N/A |
| c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) | Answer | N/A |
| d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) | Answer | N/A |

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWD in the senior grades of GS-13, 14, 15 and SES. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

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

|                              |        |     |
|------------------------------|--------|-----|
| a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)   | Answer | N/A |
| b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) | Answer | N/A |
| c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) | Answer | N/A |
| d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) | Answer | N/A |

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWD in the senior grades of GS-13, 14, 15 and SES. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

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 N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
  - b. Managers
    - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
  - c. Supervisors
    - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide promotion data on PWD for executives, managers, and supervisors. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

6. 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 (PWTDD) Answer N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A
  - b. Managers
    - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTDD) Answer N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A
  - c. Supervisors
    - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTDD) Answer N/A
    - ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide promotion data on PWTDD for executives, managers, and supervisors. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

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 N/A
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer N/A

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWD for executives, managers, and supervisors. OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

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 N/A
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer N/A

EPA’s workforce tables do not provide information on New Hires of PWTD for executives, managers, and supervisors OCR continues to coordinate with OMS to create a process to collect the required data.

## 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 Yes

In FY21, EPA converted all twenty-five (25) of its eligible Schedule A-Disability employees into the competitive service.

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 Yes
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes

PWD Voluntary Separations (Table B1 and B14): • The PWD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 6.6%. • The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 6.4%. • The PWD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations (6.6%) is greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations (6.4%). This indicates a trigger. PWD Involuntary Separations (Table B1 and B14): • The PWD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.4%. • The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.1%. • The PWD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations (0.4%) is

greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations (0.1%). This indicates a trigger.

| Seperations                             | Total # | Reportable Disabilities % | Without Reportable Disabilities % |
|---|---------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 0       | 0.00                      | 0.00                              |

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 Yes

b.Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer Yes

PWTD Voluntary Separations (Table B1 and B14): • The PWTD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 6.5%. • The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations is 6.4%. • The PWTD inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations (6.5%) is greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate for Voluntary Separations (6.4%). This indicates a trigger. PWTD Involuntary Separations (Tables B1 and B14): • The PWTD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.3%. • The People Without Disabilities inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations is 0.1%. The PWTD inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations (0.3%) is greater than the People Without Disability inclusion rate for Involuntary Separations (0.1%). This indicates a trigger.

| Seperations                             | Total # | Targeted Disabilities % | Without Targeted Disabilities % |
|---|---------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 0       | 0.00                    | 0.00                            |

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.

Based on information available in OBIEE (Table B14): • Of the 98 PWD Separations in FY21, 92 were voluntary and 6 were involuntary. • Of the 24 PWTD Separations in FY21, 23 were voluntary and 1 was involuntary. OCR and OHR collaborated to modify the FY21 employee exit survey to include disability-specific questions. Based on information available from agency-wide employee exit survey: • In FY21, 158 exit surveys were received and of those surveys, four employees reported separation due to disability. Two employees left the agency and reported retiring due to disability; one employee responded, “Perceived barrier to career development due to my disability;” and one employee chose the “other” option, stating “Perceived failure to provide accommodations (religious or disability-related).

**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 Accessibility Statement explains employees' and applicants' rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. EPA's Accessibility Statement can be found on EPA's website: <https://www.epa.gov/accessibility/epa-accessibility-statement> EPA follows the same process for Section 508 complaints as for other complaints related to disability discrimination. Details can be found on EPA's website: <https://www.epa.gov/ocr/employmentcomplaint-resolutions>

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.

EPA's website: <https://www.epa.gov/ocr/affirmative-employment-analysis-andaccountability#architectural> provides a link to the United States Access Board (<https://www.accessboard.gov/enforcement/>), which provides information on employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to 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.

EPA Section 508 Directives: In August 2021, the CIO signed an updated Section 508 Policy and 3 new procedures. These directives align with the Revised Section 508 Standards issued by the U.S. Access Board and establish the EPA's policy for ensuring access to the agency's Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and for complying with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U.S.C. § 794d). These directives take the first step to fully integrating Section 508 technical requirements into the entire IT lifecycle. The Section 508 Acquisition Procedure incorporates specific Section 508 technical requirements and acceptance criteria in the planning stage of the acquisition. The Section 508 Testing Procedure establishes a standard for how and when to test ICT for accessibility. The Section 508 Exceptions Procedure introduces the fundamental alteration exception and defines signature authority requirements for the different exceptions. These procedures include certification forms to help document how each organization integrates the 508 technical requirements as they acquire, develop, and maintain ICT. In FY22, EPA will strengthen efforts to increase awareness of these directives through the development of training, resources, and an agency-wide outreach campaign. Section 508 Training Campaign: In FY21, the 508 Program contracted with a vendor and initiated the development of role-based training courses designed to address specific requirements for the identified audiences based on their function at the agency. The training includes knowledge checks and a final quiz through FedTalent, which would allow us to measure critical takeaways to change behavior. In FY22, EPA will work to publish the role-based training to the agency's learning management systems and launch a communication and awareness campaign to promote the training. Section 508 Compliance Process for Mandatory training at EPA: EPA's Section 508 Program is providing guidance and support to the Office of Human Resources (OHR) to identify the requirements for ensuring that all mandatory training provided by the agency is 508 compliant. In FY22, EPA will focus on developing guidance and resources for creating accessible on-line training and begin the remediation for the existing mandatory training. EPA Compliance Assessment and Remediation Plan: EPA's Compliance Assessment and Remediation Plan (CARP), aligns to the U.S. Access Board ICT Testing Baseline which describes how to evaluate conformance to the Revised 508 Standards. EPA's CARP aims to assess and enhance the accessibility of EPA's ICT, develop a baseline to measure improvements, and report bi-annually to the OMB on Section 508 Program Maturity. Through FY21, EPA continued to inventory internal non-enterprise systems and applications, evaluated accessibility documentation from vendors, and conducted manual accessibility assessments of agency owned ICT. Additionally, the EPA Section 508 Program developed and enhanced the formal process for reviewing Accessible Conformance Reports (ACR), which is used to assess the level of conformance to Section 508 through the acquisition process. Using the lessons learned from FY21 results, in FY22, EPA plans to clarify the processes for assessing the level of conformance for existing systems and navigating the remediation process toward full compliance. The CARP will also align with the recently signed Section 508 procedures for testing and acquisition established processes and documentation for ensuring the accessibility of newly procured ICT. These two efforts will work together to create a full picture of the accessibility of EPA's Systems and applications. Additional Activities for FY22: • Establish workgroups to support the implementation of Executive Order (EO) 14035 Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) in the Federal Workforce. OCR-Led Accessibility Workgroup In FY21, OCR convened a workgroup to address accessibility-related concerns within the EPA community. This effort had an initial focus on issues impacting the deaf and hard of hearing community that resulted from the agency's transition to a virtual workforce due to the COVID-19 pandemic. This OCR-led Accessibility Workgroup collaborated with the Office of Public Affairs (OPA) to improve and standardize access to agency-wide virtual events. This collaboration included several actions to meet accessibility needs, including: • How events were presented • Clearly articulating the accessible features of virtual meetings • How to request a reasonable accommodation, if needed This workgroup laid the foundation for work to continue through the agency's Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) efforts, per Executive Order 14035. EPA Compliance with Executive Order (EO) 14035 on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility: DEIA efforts directly support and sustain the agency's mission and

workforce, now and into the future. The OCR Director and Deputy Director were appointed to the agency's Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Implementation Team (DEIA IT); the Director serves as a liaison to two of the eight new workgroups and the Deputy Director serves a liaison to one of the eight new workgroups. SES co-chairs will be appointed to lead the eight workgroups. Each workgroup will include two co-chairs, approximately ten members from the EPA community, and one or two members of the DEIA IT. The workgroups will play an important role in drafting EPA's DEIA Strategic Plan, due to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in FY22. DEIA Workgroups: • Data Collection, Analysis, and Measurement (OCR Director, DEIA IT liaison) • Outreach, Recruitment, and Hiring • Career Development and Training • Creating an Agency Culture of DEIA and Employee Engagement • Agency Organization for DEIA Sustainability • Accountability • LGBTQ+ (OCR Director, DEIA IT liaison) • Accessibility (OCR Deputy Director, DEIA IT liaison)

### C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(3), agencies must adopt, post on their public website, and make available to all job applicants and employees, reasonable accommodation procedures.

1. Please provide the average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations during the reporting period. (Please do not include previously approved requests with repetitive accommodations, such as interpreting services.)

In FY21, the Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program processed a total of 316 requests. Of the 316 requests, 288 were initiated in FY21 and 28 were initiated in FY20. The 28 requests initiated in FY20 were in pending status on September 30, 2020, and were carried over and completed in FY21. In FY21, the agency received 288 new requests and 243 were completed in FY21. EPA processed and completed all 243 requests (or 100%) within the time frames identified in EPA RA Procedures with an average processing time of 13.4 days. EPA has attained a 90% or greater processing rate for eleven consecutive years.

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 following is a summary and analysis of the RA requests that were initiated in FY 2021: Of the 288 requests initiated in FY 2021, 243 requests were processed and completed. There were 45 requests initiated in FY21 that were in pending status as of September 30, 2021; these requests will be carried over to FY22. Processing and completing a reasonable accommodation request refer to the steps taken starting when the employee or applicant first makes a request to the conclusion of the process usually with the decision-maker issuing a decision or in some cases when the request is withdrawn or closed. Breakdown of the 243 requests completed in FY 2021: • 210 requests were approved • 2 requests were denied • 4 requests were denied under reasonable accommodation (RA) but were offered some relief outside of the RA process • 17 requests were withdrawn by the employee • 10 requests were closed (employee resigned, retired, or separated from the agency or in some cases passed away; therefore, a decision for the request was no longer needed and was closed without a final decision). In FY21, the Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program processed a total of 316 requests. Of the 316 requests, 288 were initiated in FY21 and 28 were initiated in FY20. The 28 requests initiated in FY20 were in pending status on September 30, 2020, and were carried over and completed in FY21. In FY21, the agency received 288 new requests and 243 were completed in FY21. EPA processed and completed all 243 requests (or 100%) within the time frames identified in EPA RA Procedures with an average processing time of 13.4 days. EPA has attained a 90% or greater processing rate for eleven consecutive years. In FY 2021, the most requested items or types of accommodations were: 1. Assistive technology (AT) equipment as well as ergonomic equipment such as ergonomic keyboards and chairs (combined) with 71 requests 2. Telework (full-time, additional day, episodic, etc.) with 64 requests 3. Computer equipment such as larger monitor, mouse, etc. with 54 requests 4. Modified work schedule (start/end times) with 25 requests 5. Facilities related requests such as small refrigerators, space heaters, workspace modification, and changes to lighting with 10 requests 6. Sit/stand desks with 8 requests 7. Change in duty station with 7 requests. The National Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators (NRACs) delivered 27 training sessions to a total of 1,345 participants. The training sessions included four (4) agency-wide trainings delivered virtually, as well as trainings for the offices below: 1. Region 3 (Philadelphia) 2. Region 5 (Chicago) 3. Region 9 (San Francisco) 4. Region 10 (Seattle) 5. Office of the Administrator (AO) 6. Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) 7. Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance (OECA) 8. Office of Research and Development (ORD) In FY 2021, six (6) new Local Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators (LORACs) were trained on the EPA reasonable accommodation process. \*\*\*Table to be added as a Supplemental Document for Section V, C: Reasonable Accommodation Program, Question #2.\*\*\*

**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.

There were no Personal Assistance Services (PAS) requests initiated in FY 2021.

**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 Yes

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

Answer Yes

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments

|   |  |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------------|------------------------|
| <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><br><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.<br><br>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | See Appendix I: PWD Barrier Analysis Report FY21   |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
| <b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>   | <i>Barrier Group</i>   |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>   | Y  |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>  | Y  |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
| <b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b><br><br>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>   |   |                              |                        |
|   | Infrequent use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority  |                                       | The inadequate use of Schedule A Authority by hiring officials is a barrier to EPA achieving the 12% hiring goal for people with disabilities required by law. |   |                              |                        |
| <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> |                        |
| <b>Responsible Official(s)</b>  |  |                                       |  |   |                              |                        |
| <b>Title</b>  |  | <b>Name</b>                           |  | <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>        |                              |                        |
| Director, Office of Civil Rights (OCR)  |  | JuanCarlos Hunt                       |  | Yes                                       |                              |                        |
| Director, Office of Human Resources (OHR)   |  | Mara Kamen                            |  | No  |                              |                        |
| <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> |
| 11/01/2021  | OCR to identify an Executive Champion to work with senior management to identify a National Schedule A Champion who can promote and advocate for the program at the most senior level. Identify an SES co-lead for the Diversity, Equity, inclusion, Accessibility (DEIA) Workgroup. |                                       |  | Yes                                       |                              | 11/01/2021             |

| <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> |
| 11/01/2021   | The Research Triangle Park (RTP) Shared Service Center (SSC) to provide OCR with detailed automated reports related to the use of Schedule A.   | Yes                                       |                      | 10/01/2021             |
| 02/28/2022   | The RTP SSC will develop a repository of qualified Schedule A candidates' resumes. Managers will have access to the resumes through USAJobs. Shared Service Centers will provide written instructions on how to access and use the resume repository to EEOOs, PMOs, HROs, and hiring managers who have requested access. | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 02/22/2022   | Begin conducting training sessions on findings and recommendations of barrier analysis report; Schedule A Hiring Authority for Persons with Disabilities; and Workforce Recruitment training sessions to managers.  | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 09/30/2022   | Data collected on Schedule A to be analyzed. Engage Deputy Civil Rights Officials (DCROs) to set numerical goals and potential performance metrics.   | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 09/30/2022   | EPA leadership to issue a separate policy statement specifically to emphasize its commitment to hiring individuals with disabilities.   | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| 09/30/2022   | OMS (including the SSCs and OHR), DCROs, and the Office of the Administrator (including OCR) to develop a unified disability recruitment strategy that incorporates the agency's Disability Program Managers (DPMs). These recruitment plans will be developed and implemented by EPA regions and program offices.        | Yes                                       |                      |                        |
| <b>Report of Accomplishments</b>                         |   |   |                      |                        |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>                                       | <b>Accomplishment</b>   |   |                      |                        |
| 2021   | Barrier Analysis report was completed. Recommendations have been approved by EPA Senior Leadership.   |   |                      |                        |

| <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><br><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.<br><br>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? |   | Infrequent use of the Schedule A Hiring Authority  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</b>   |   | <i>Barrier Group</i><br>People with Disabilities<br>People with Targeted Disabilities  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:</b>   |   | N  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?:</b>  |   | N  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</b><br><br>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.                |   | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Barrier Name</th> <th>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> |               |                                    |   | Barrier Name    | Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice |  |  |
| Barrier Name  | Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
|   |   |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan</b>  |   |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| Date Initiated  | Target Date                                   | Sufficient Funding / Staffing?   | Date Modified | Date Completed                     | Objective Description   |                 |   |  |  |
| 06/01/2019  | 04/01/2021                                    | Yes  |               | 04/01/2021                         | 1. Conduct analysis of EPA policies, practices, and procedures related to disability recruitment to identify barriers.                              |                 |   |  |  |
| 03/01/2020  | 04/01/2021                                    | Yes  |               | 04/01/2021                         | 2. Assemble key findings as a result of analysis.   |                 |   |  |  |
| 03/01/2020  | 04/01/2021                                    | Yes  |               | 04/01/2021                         | 3. Construct recommendations for the consideration of senior leaders that will have a meaningful impact on the hiring of Persons with Disabilities. |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Responsible Official(s)</b>  |   |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Title</b>  |   | <b>Name</b>  |               | <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b> |   |                 |   |  |  |
| <b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b>  |   |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| Target Date   | Planned Activities                            |  |               | Sufficient Staffing & Funding?     | Modified Date   | Completion Date |   |  |  |
| <b>Report of Accomplishments</b>  |   |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |
| Fiscal Year   | Accomplishment                                |  |               |                                    |   |                 |   |  |  |

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).

Barrier Analysis identified the need to increase the use of the Schedule A – Hiring Authority to increase the hiring of persons with disabilities.

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 as barrier analysis completed in FY21 and recommendations to be implemented in FY22.