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

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

    a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)   Answer   No

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

• GS-1 to GS-10 PWD Cluster = 16.2% • GS-11 to SES PWD Cluster = 16.62% • Permanent workforce including all pay plans PWD = 13.49% Source: MD 715 Reporter Table B4P: GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES - Distribution by Disability (Participation Rate)

---

*For GS employees, please use two clusters: GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES, as set forth in 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7). For all other pay plans, please use the approximate grade clusters that are above or below GS-11 Step 1 in the Washington, DC metropolitan region.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

    a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)   Answer   No

    b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)   Answer   No

• GS-1 to GS-10 PWTD Cluster = 5.54% • GS-11 to SES PWTD Cluster = 4.69% • Permanent workforce including all pay plans PWTD = 4.14% Source: MD 715 Reporter Table B4P: GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES - Distribution by Disability (Participation Rate)

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	72494	11704	16.14	2296	3.17
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	27215	4657	17.11	945	3.47

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

The Army communicates the benchmarks for employment of PWD through a variety of means including leadership memorandums, publications during National Disability Employment Awareness Month, a Talent Management newsletter, strategic recruitment discussions between HR specialists and hiring managers, and during human capital strategic planning meetings.

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.

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

> • Some commands do not have a DPM nor sufficient staff to conduct barrier analysis. • The Army recently developed its Section 508 program which has not been fully staffed or funded but great progress was made during FY23 and continues into FY24. • Reasonable accommodations and PAS are funded by the respective commands rather than centralized Army funding. Plan for improvement: • Survey commands to ascertain current staffing, funding, and training status, and where necessary, request manpower studies, and support requests for additional staffing and funding for the disability program. • The Army is currently revising AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program) which will direct staffing levels and funding for each command level EEO office. • Request additional funds for DPM training and explore methods to centrally fund RA and PAS. • Leverage the Army's Civilian Implementation Plan to strengthen the strategic partnership between EEO and Human Capital Management to integrate EEO into Army strategic plans, to obtain support for central funding of reasonable accommodations, to obtain support for increased EEO staffing enterprise-wide, and to endorse support to build the Army Section 508 Program. Civilian Implementation Plan https://api.army.mil/e2/c/downloads/2022/10/31/fa993f31/signedarmypeoplestrategycivilianimplementationplanfy23-25-508-wo-annexes.pdf

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	1989	0	Human Resources Specialist Linda Stout linda.r.Stout.civ@army.mil
Section 508 Compliance	0	2	0	N/A Sally Dixon Sally.a.dixon6.civ@army.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Installation Public Works Office N/A N/A
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	200	0	0	DPM Rosemary Salak rosemary.salak.civ@army.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	200	0	0	DPM Rosemary Salak rosemary.salak.civ@army.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	200	0	0	DPM Rosemary Salak rosemary.salak.civ@army.mil

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If "yes", describe the training that disability program staff have received. If "no", describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Answer   No

• The Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) offers two DPM courses per calendar year and allocates 10 seats in each class to the Army. This is not sufficient to meet the Army's needs. • During FY24, Army will complete an assessment of DPM staffing levels and training. Funds are available to train DPMs. Plans are underway to fund DPM training (EEOC DPM course) for all DPMs, those untrained and those trained prior to Jan 2020. • The revised AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program) will require training for all DPMs.

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   No

• During FY24, the ██ will complete an assessment of staffing levels and training of all DPMs. • Funds are available to train DPMs. • Plans are underway to fund DPM training (EEOC DPM course) for all DPMs, those untrained and those trained prior to Jan 2020. • Funding and staffing levels are not sufficient to implement the program. • In FY24, the Army will assess program requirements against staffing and funding levels to identify and address gaps. • The revised AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program) will require training for all DPMs. • Civilian Implementation Plan E-1.8 includes a task to explore methods to centrally fund RA and PAS. • DA DPM will continue to collaborate with Air Force, Navy, and other federal agencies to leverage proven and promising practices, tools and programs.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	B.4.a.10. to effectively manage its reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)(ii)]		
Objective	Adequately staff the disability program, institute reasonable accommodation training, and process all RA requests timely.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2025		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2023	1. Incorporated tasks in the Civilian Implementation Plan to address EEO deficiencies. 2. Drafted comprehensive Accessibility Statement and posted to Army.mil and the ██ website on 3/31/2023. 3. Began revising the RA tracker to include new RA and PAS tracking system requirements and revised AR 690-12 to include new RA policy and training requirements on 07/10/2023. 4. Revised the No FEAR, EEO and AH training to include training on reasonable accommodation policy and procedures 08/18/2023.	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	B.4.a.8. to effectively administer its special emphasis programs (such as, Federal Women's Program, Hispanic Employment Program, and People with Disabilities Program Manager)? [5 USC § 7201; 38 USC § 4214; 5 CFR § 720.204; 5 CFR § 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR § 315.709]		
Objective	All Army EEO offices are resourced in accordance with guidelines in the new AR 690-12 to support barrier analysis and have a dedicated annual budget for each office.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2026		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2023	1. Conducted an internal manpower study of the ▉ to determine the required staffing levels on 12/17/2021. 2. Forwarded the staffing results to the ASA(M&RA) for review and approval on 03/22/2023. The plan was disapproved on 04/12/2023. 3. Hired a SEPM for the EEO Policy and Program Directorate on 03/15/2023. 4. Published Army policy and guide on Employee Resource Groups and SEP on 06/12/2023. 5. Begin revising AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity ▉) and codified staffing and budget requirements for EEO Offices at each level of command on 09/19/2023.	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.a.6. Do the agency's training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(2)]		
Objective	Published an updated Army Anti-harassment policy and train all managers and supervisors on their responsibilities under the Anti-harassment program.		
Target Date	Oct 1, 2026		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*
Accomplishments	*Fiscal Year*	*Accomplishment*	
	2023	1. The draft policy was staffed to EEOC on 05/27/2022 for review and comments. EEOC reviewed and approved the draft policy for compliance on 06/03/2022. 2. DASA-CP briefed the ASA (M&RA) and principals on the Army developed course of action for decision and approval. 3. The current draft policy received ASA(M&RA) decision approval of the recommended course of action. 4. DASA-CP is on track to finalize the draft policy and staff the policy for action review and comment no later than 09/30/2024.	

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If "no", please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.
Objective	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all RA requests within the time frame set forth in its RA procedures? [MD-715, II(C)] If no, provide percentage of timely-processed requests in the comment column. The current Army MD-715 RA Tracker is outdated and has some limitations which prevent accurate tracking of RA requests.
Target Date	Oct 1, 2024
Completion Date	

Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*

	Fiscal Year	*Accomplishment*
Accomplishments	2023	1. Revised and updated annual EEO, AH, and NFA training for all civilians and military supervisors of civilians and included the Army's RA policy and guidance beginning in 2021 and continuing through FY24. 2. Reasonable accommodations training has been developed and is presented to Army Disability Program Managers attending the DEOMI DPM course since 02/01/2022, and presented to the workforce, supervisors, and leaders throughout the Army at National Disability Employment Awareness Month events in FY22 and 23. 3. In 2020 and continuing, crafting updates to the MD-715 Reporter RA Tacker to improve the functionality and accuracy of the Tracker. 4. On 09/19/2023 began revising AR 690-12 to include updating guidance on RA policy and guidance. 5. On 12/07/2023 began coordination with EEOC for DPM training in 3rd Qtr FY24 for Army DPMs.

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	E.4.a.5. The processing of requests for reasonable accommodation? [29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)]
Objective	E.4.a.5. Does the agency have a system in place to accurately collect, monitor, and analyze processing of reasonable accommodation requests? The current Army MD-715 RA tracker is outdated and has some limitations which prevent accurate tracking of RA requests
Target Date	Oct 1, 2024
Completion Date	

Planned Activities	*Target Date*	*Completion Date*	*Planned Activity*

	Fiscal Year	*Accomplishment*
Accomplishments	2023	1. Revised and updated annual EEO, AH, and NFA training for all civilians and military supervisors of civilians and included the Army's RA policy and guidance beginning in 2021 and continuing through FY24. 2. Reasonable accommodations training has been developed and is presented to Army Disability Program Managers attending the DEOMI DPM course since 02/01/2022 and presented to leaders, supervisors, and the workforce throughout the Army at National Disability Employment Awareness Month events in FY22 and 23. 3. In 2020 and continuing each FY, crafted updates to the MD-715 Reporter RA Tracker to improve functionality and accuracy of the Tracker. 4. On 09/19/2023, began revising AR 690-12 to include updating guidance on RA policy and procedures and adding a requirement to use the RA Tracker. 5. On 12/07/2023, began coordination with EEOC for DPM training in 3rd Qtr FY24 for Army DPMs.

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 Army EEO and HR practitioners collaborate on outreach to national level affinity groups, disability serving organizations, and college and university offices that serve PWD to describe opportunities and hiring authorities that take disability into account. • Programs and resources DA uses include the Special Placement Program Coordinator, Schedule A for PWD resume repository, Wounded Warrior resume repository, WRP, the Soldier for Life Transition Assistance Program (SFL-TAP), outreach to Vocational Rehabilitation Centers, and hiring authorities for Veterans with disabilities. In FY24, Army will explore USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal which potentially can serve as a source of jobseekers with disabilities; over 52,000 individuals have identified as PWD in USAJOBS. • DA is also building an Army Careers page on GoArmy.com to include opportunities for PWD.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency's use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce

• The Army uses Schedule A hiring authority for persons with disabilities, Veterans' Recruitment Appointment authority, and 30% or More Disabled Veteran authority. • In FY24 the Army will explore greater use of USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal and posting a separate vacancy announcement for Schedule A eligible for each recruitment action.

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.

• The process used to accept and review applications from PWD and PWTD is the same process used by staffing specialists for other applications, except they also require the individual to provide proof of disability in accordance with governing regulations. • Individuals considered under appointment under a hiring authority that takes disability into account must provide the required documentation (e.g., Schedule A letter, DD 214, VA disability determination) and meet the qualifications for the job (e.g., education, skills, abilities, knowledge, experience). • The certificate of eligible includes applicants who provide proof of disability and who are determined to meet the qualifications of the job. There is no requirement to be best qualified. • Staffing specialists are advised to discuss hiring authorities that take disability into account during the strategic recruitment discussion with hiring managers, and advised to discuss applicant sources (e.g., Schedule A Resume Repository, USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal, Workforce Recruitment Program).

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

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

• In the Army's Supervisor HR Orientation Course, which all new Army supervisors will have to take once the Supervisor Certification Program Policy is signed, there is a significant discussion on day 2 about Schedule A and Direct Hire Authorities. This information is part of our Recruitment and Hiring module. To date, the Army has already trained about 1000 Army supervisors in this course and execute the training every other week. • In FY24, we will review and modify the content and tracking mechanisms as necessary, for the Supervisor Certification Course (CIP Task D-2.3) and the on-boarding content for supervisors to ensure all hiring managers are trained on hiring authorities that take disability into account. Army leadership published a memo and a message during FY22 to all Army commands, encouraging the use of Schedule A for PWD (5 CFR part 213.3102(u)), Veterans' Recruitment Appointment (5 CFR part 307) and 30% or More Disabled Veteran Authority (5 CFR 316.302(b)(4), 216.402(b)(4) and 5 USC 3112).

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.

• During FY23, the Army participated in 12 engagements to include: workshops and mentoring sessions with Army Senior Leader speakers including Civilian Aides to the Secretary of the Army, three Community Of Interest events with 500 participants providing community members an opportunity to learn about the Army's commitment to access and opportunity. The Army also conducted an Outreach and Engagement Planning Workshop to synchronize and draft the 2024 calendar of proposed Outreach and Engagement events. • The Army continues to encourage OSD ███ and DOL to establish a job board for the Workforce Recruitment Program where DA and other organizations can post outreach events, job vacancies, hiring fairs, resume writing workshops, etc.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

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

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

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

• A trigger existed among PWD new hires in the Permanent Workforce where the • Army was 7.31 percentage points lower than the 501 goal of 12%. • PWD and PWTD qualified and were referred at rates significantly lower than the expected participation rates when compared to the selection rates for those without disabilities. • PWD and PWTD qualified and were referred at rates greater than those without disabilities, yet those without disabilities were selected at a significantly higher rate. • The PWD percentage of applications was lower than the 501 goal of 12%. • The PWTD percentage of applications was over twice the rate of the 501 goal of 2%. Source: MD 715 Reporter table B8: New Hires For Type Of Appointment by Disability

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   Yes

    b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

13 PWD and 9 PWTD new hire triggers existed for the following MCOs. • Participation rates for PWD were greater than the 501 goal of 12% for 9 of the 10 MCOs. The exception is General Education and Training (1701) at 8.85%. • Participation rates for PWTD were greater than the 501 goal of 2% for 8 of the 10 MCOs. The two exceptions are Budget Analysis (560) and General Education and Training (1701) at 1.67% and 1.82%, respectively. • The 0080 Security Administration PWD qualified applicant pool was 7.59% and the new hire rate was 4.59%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 4.29% and the new hire rate was 3.44%. • The 0083 Police PWD qualified applicant pool was 4.00% and the new hire rate was 3.63%. • The 0132 Intelligence PWD qualified applicant pool was 7.12% and the new hire rate was 4.88%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 4.75% and the new hire rate was 3.11%. • The 0185 Social Work PWD qualified applicant pool was 3.69% and the new hire rate was 2.94%. • The 0201 Human Resources Management PWD qualified applicant pool was 5.85% and the new hire rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 3.17% and the new hire was 0%. • The 0260 Equal Employment Opportunity PWD qualified applicant pool was

4.59% and the new hire rate was 7.79%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 8.42% and the new hire rate was 0%. • The 0510 Accounting PWD qualified applicant pool was 6.42% and the new hire rate was 5.55%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 3.44% and the new hire rate was 2.77%. • The 0511 Auditing PWD qualified applicant pool was 4.58% and the new hire rate was 5.88%. • The 0560 Budget Analysis PWD qualified applicant pool was 5.45% and the new hire rate was .78%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 2.33% and the new hire rate was 0%. • The 0602 Physician PWD qualified applicant pool was 6.19% and the new hire rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 2.38% and the new hire rate was 0%. • The 0610 Nursing PWD qualified applicant pool was 3.67% for PWD and the new hire rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 2.07% and the new hire rate was 0%. • The 1102 Contracting PWD qualified applicant pool was 7.22% fand the new hire rate was 3.66%; The PWTD qualified applicant pool was 4.40% and the new hire rate was 1.83%. • The 1910 Quality Assurance PWD qualified applicant pool was 7.39% and the new hire rate was 6.06% Source: MD-715 Reporter Table B7P: New Hires For Mission-Critical Occupations by Disability [Permanent]

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   No

      b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   No

3 PWD and 1 PWTD qualified internal applicant triggers existed for the following MCOs: • The 1550 Computer Science PWD relevant applicant pool was 7.21% and the qualified internal selection rate was 0%. • The 1701 General Education and Training PWD relevant applicant pool was 16.50% and the qualified internal selection rate was 4%. • The 1811 Criminal Investigating PWD relevant applicant pool was 7.93% and the qualified internal selection rate was 0%. • The 1811 Criminal Investigating PWTD relevant applicant pool was 1.58% and the qualified internal selection was 0%. Source: MD-715 Reporter Table B9P: Internal Competitive Promotions For Mission-Critical Occupations by Disability [Permanent]

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

Promotion rates to GS-14, GS-15, and SES for PWTD were lower than the PWTD participation rates the workforce. The opposite was true for employees with no disabilities; their promotion rates exceed their participation rates in the workforce. 13 PWD and 10 PWTD promotion triggers exist for the following MCOs: • The 0080 Safety & Occupational Health Management PWD qualified applicants pool was 8.35% and the promotion rate was 7.43%. • The 0132 Intelligence PWD qualified applicants pool was 14.92 % and the promotion selection rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 3.57% and the promotion selection rate was 0%. • The 0180 Psychology PWD qualified applicants pool was 3.03% and the promotion selection rate was 0%. • The 0185 Social Work PWD qualified applicants pool was 4.23% and the promotion selection rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 2.11% and the promotion selection rate was 0%. • The 0201 Human Resources Management PWD qualified applicants pool was 8.88% and the promotion selection rate was 5.18%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 5.10% and the promotion selection rate was 2.40%. • The 0260 Equal Employment Opportunity PWTD qualified applicants pool was 8.44% and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 7.69%. • The 0501 Financial Administration and Program PWD qualified applicants pool was 7.56% and the promotion selection rate was 4.80%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 3.80% and PWTD promotion selection rate was 1.92%. • The 0510 Accounting PWD qualified applicants pool was 7.75% and the promotion selection rate was 4.65%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 4.19% and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 2.32%. • The 0511 Auditing PWD qualified applicants pool was 8.25% and the promotion selection rate was 3.03%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 4.12%

and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 0%. • The 0560 Budget Analysis PWD qualified applicants pool was 6.97% and the promotion selection rate was 5.97%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 3.38% and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 2.98%. • The 0610 Nursing PWD qualified applicants pool was 2.63% and the promotion selections rate was 0%. • The 1102 Contracting PWD qualified applicants pool was 8.08% and the promotion selection rate was 4.09%. • The 1550 Computer Science PWD qualified applicants pool was 9.30% and the promotion selection rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 6.97% and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 0%. • The 2101 Transportation Specialist PWD qualified applicants pool was 8.37% and the promotion selection rate was 0%; The PWTD qualified applicants pool was 6.48% and the PWTD promotion selection rate was 0%. Source: MD-715 Reporter Table B9P: Internal Competitive Promotions For Mission-Critical Occupations by Disability [Permanent]

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.

The Army does not have a specific program for advancement or mentoring for PWD. All employees who meet the criteria for various career development opportunities are eligible to apply.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

The Army Career Program system includes all employees. All are aligned into a career program that provides a structured path to obtain education, training, and development. The career programs are centrally funded and managed. Army Commands design and implement formal mentorship programs to provide leadership development opportunities to GS-11 and GS-12 grade employees with the potential and desire to lead, such as the "Emerging Enterprise Leaders" (EEL). This program is nested within Army Directive 2015-2024, "Department of the Army Senior Enterprise Talent Management Program and Enterprise Talent Management Program," or SETM and ETM respectively. SETM is a leader development program for GS-14s and GS-15s, composed of five modules: Enterprise Placement Program, Project-Based Temporary Duty Assignments (TDY), Army Senior Civilian Fellowship, Senior Service College, and Defense Senior Leader Development Program, which tailor their leadership development road maps through professional development, Senior-level education, or experiential learning opportunities. ETM provides GS-12s and GS-13s the opportunity to participate in four modules consisting of Shadowing Assignment, Project-Based Temporary Duty Assignment (TDY), Command and General Staff Officer Course, and the DoD program "Executive Leadership Development Program, where they gain a better understanding of the DoD mission, while being developed as future leaders with joint and interagency perspectives and skills. The mentoring process is used to facilitate partnerships between experienced professionals with less experienced employees to enhance the employee's professional development and growth by sharing insights and experiences. The mentoring process promotes career planning, job enrichment, and potential for advancement.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	21	3	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Detail Programs	2,064	110	4.60	0	1.25	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internship Programs	13,128	437	7.20	3.38	4.30	3.36

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

• Applicant rates for the PWD Internship Program were lower than the relevant applicant pool (946 to 13,128) at 7.20%. Selectee rates for PWD were lower than the PWD applicant pool (32 of 946) at 3.38%. • Applicant rates for the PWD Presidential Management Fellows were lower than the relevant applicant pool (0 to 21) at 0%. Additionally, the PWTD selectees were 0% of all selections. • Applicant rates for the PWD Detail Program were lower than the relevant applicant pool (95 to 2,064) at 4.60%. Additionally, the PWD selectees were lower than the PWD applicant pool (0 to 95) at 0% of all selections. Source: Advana MD-715 Applicant Flow tables by appointment

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

• Applicant rates for the PWTD Internship Program were lower than the relevant applicant pool (565 of 13,128) at 4.30%. Additionally, The PWTD selectee rates were lower than the PWD applicant pool (19 of 565) at 3.36% of all selections. • Applicant rates for the PWTD Presidential Management Fellows were lower than the relevant applicant pool (0 of 21) at 0%. Additionally, the PWTD selectee rates were 0% of all selections. • Applicant rates for the PWTD Detail Program were lower than the relevant applicant pool (26 of 2,064) at 1.25%. Additionally, the PWD selectee rates were lower than the PWD applicant pool (0 of 26) at 0% of all selections. Source: Advana MD-715 Applicant Flow tables by appointment

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

• Army awards data and analysis reflect only those awards presented during July through September 2023. The Army awards tracking system collects awards data quarterly instead of annually. In FY24 and beyond, the Army plans to analyze awards data quarterly to provide a more accurate depiction of awards trends across the enterprise for each fiscal year. PWD Awards • Participation rates for PWD were greater than their percentage of the permanent workforce awards in 8 of the 14 award categories.

The exceptions were Time-Off awards or 41 or more hours, Cash awards $501-$999, $1,000-$1,999, $3,000-$3,999, $4,000-$4,999 and $5,000 or more. PWTD Awards • Participation rates for PWTD were greater their percentage of the permanent workforce awards in 10 of the 14 award categories with the exceptions being Time-Off awards or 41 or more hours, Cash awards $501-$999, $4,000-$4,999, and $5,000 or more. • The awards data depicted an inverse relationship between those without disabilities and those with disabilities as follows: • Time-off awards of up to 40 hours and Pay increases (QSIs and PBPI) were below the participation rates of those without disabilities, and above the participation rates of PWD and PWTD. • Time-off awards of 41 or more hours and cash awards were above the participation rates of those without disabilities, and below the participation rates of PWD and PWTD. Source: MD 715 Reporter Table B13: Employee Recognition And Awards by Disability

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	7946	6.30	4.64	6.24	6.31
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	59724	48.04	34.69	47.44	48.19
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	7	0.03	0.01	0.15	0.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	5831	4.56	3.40	3.81	4.75
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	99300	78.35	57.72	65.32	81.65
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17	0.07	0.01	0.37	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	5170	4.22	2.97	3.86	4.31
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	129747	105.49	74.75	96.36	107.81
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	25	0.11	0.02	0.52	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	14113	12.77	7.80	11.94	12.98
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	546737	494.66	301.93	459.47	503.59
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	38	0.17	0.03	0.82	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	11135	6.76	7.23	7.45	6.59
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount	8306458	5067.02	5379.37	5498.33	4957.65
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount	745	3.28	0.63	15.97	0.07
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given	35537	22.58	22.82	24.52	22.09
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount	51314684	32437.10	33034.96	35363.58	31695.03
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount	1443	6.29	1.23	31.24	-0.03

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Awards Given	26742	17.41	17.28	16.68	17.60
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount	64063968	41601.84	41438.81	39799.68	42058.82
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount	2395	10.46	2.03	51.67	0.02
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Awards Given	15247	9.26	10.07	8.75	9.39
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount	51140288	30885.78	33834.44	29001.95	31363.47
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount	3354	14.61	2.85	71.77	0.12
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Awards Given	6814	3.81	4.66	3.64	3.85
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount	29671337	16559.75	20279.71	15772.36	16759.41
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount	4354	19.05	3.70	93.87	0.08
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Awards Given	4739	2.81	3.15	2.36	2.92
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount	31532897	18029.37	21195.33	15292.68	18723.32
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount	6653	28.12	5.70	140.29	-0.32

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

See above. Source: MD 715 Reporter Table B13: Employee Recognition And Awards by Disability

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   N/A

        b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD)   Answer   N/A

Data is not consolidated and tracked enterprise-wide for other types of employee recognition programs.

D. PROMOTIONS

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

        a. SES

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer Yes

  b. Grade GS-15

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer Yes

  c. Grade GS-14

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer Yes

  d. Grade GS-13

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer No

   ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer Yes

• Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for SES (0 of 0 selected) at 0%; GS-15 (9 of 317 selected) at 2.83%; GS-14 (28 of 1,126 selected) at 2.49%, and GS-13 (101 of 3,185 selected) at 3.17%. • Promotion rates to GS-14, GS-15, and SES for PWD were lower than the PWD participation rates of the workforce. The opposite was true for employees with no disabilities; their promotion rates were greater than their participation rates of the workforce. Source: Advana: Senior Grade Levels (Sheets 11,15) GS) GS-13 to 15 Internal Competitive Promotions.

---

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 Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer Yes

  b. Grade GS-15

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer Yes

  c. Grade GS-14

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer Yes

   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer Yes

  d. Grade GS-13

   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer No

   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer No

• Internal selection rates for PWTD were lower than the qualified applicants pool for GS-14 (11 of 600 selected) at 1.83%. The Army did not have any SESs who identified as PWTD selected in FY23. • Promotion rates to GS-14, GS-15, and SES for PWD

---

were lower than the PWD participation rates of the workforce. The opposite is true for employees with no disabilities; their promotion rates exceed their participation rates of the workforce. Source: Advana: Senior Grade Levels (Sheets 11,15) GS) GS-13 to 15 Internal Competitive Promotions.

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	Yes
b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD)	Answer	Yes
c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)	Answer	Yes
d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)	Answer	Yes

• New hire selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for SES (11 of 11 selected) at 9%; GS-15 (0 of 53 selected) at 0%; GS-14 (6 of 340 selected) at 1.76%; and GS-13 (27 or 838 selected) at 3.22%. • Promotion rates to GS-14, GS-15, and SES for PWD were lower than the PWD participation rates of the workforce. The opposite was true for employees with no disabilities; their promotion rates exceed their participation rates of the workforce. • The percentage of applications was below the PWD workforce 501 goal of 12%. Source: Advana: Senior Grade Levels (Sheets 11,15) GS) GS-13 to 15 New Hires

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	Yes
b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)	Answer	No

• New hire selection rates for PWTD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for SES (0 of 4 selected) at 0% and GS-15 (0 of 35 selected) at 0%. • Promotion rates to GS-14, GS-15, and SES for PWTD were lower than the PWD participation rates of the workforce. The opposite was true for employees with no disabilities; their promotion rates exceed their participation rates of the workforce. • The percentage of applications for PWTD was over twice the rate of the 501 goal of 2%. Source: Advana: Senior Grade Levels (Sheets 11,15) GS-13 to 15 New Hires

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

    a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer	Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer	Yes

    b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer	No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

• Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for Executives (9 of 274 selected) at 10.11%; Managers (46 of 1,563 selected) at 10.53%; and Supervisors (50 of 725 selected) at 11.88%. Source: FedSEP analysis of MD-715 TABLE B8: MANAGEMENT POSITIONS – Distribution by Disability (Participation Rate)

---

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

• Internal selection rates for PWTD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for Executives (5 of 153 selected) at 5.62%; Managers (23 of 854 selected) at 5.26%; and Supervisors (23 of 426 selected) at 5.46%. Source: FedSEP analysis of MD-715 TABLE B8: MANAGEMENT POSITIONS – Distribution by Disability (Participation Rate)

---

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)   Answer   Yes

b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)   Answer   Yes

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)   Answer   Yes

• New hire selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for Executive (1 of 43 selected) at 2.32%; Managers (10 of 386 selected) at 2.59%; and Supervisors (1 or 114 selected) at .87%.New hire selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for Executive (1 of 43 selected) at 2.32%; Managers (10 of 386 selected) at 2.59%; and Supervisors (1 or 114 selected) at .87%. Source: ADVANA MD-715 Applicant flow tables for Management Positions

---

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

    a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

• New hire selection rates for PWTD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for Executive (0 of 25 selected) at 0%; Managers (5 of 228 selected) at 2.19%; and Supervisors (1 or 62 selected) at 1.61%. Source: ADVANA MD-715 Applicant flow tables for Management Positions

---

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

                                                            Answer   No

---

• During the FY22 MD-715 Report reporting period, the ▮▮▮ determined that not all eligible Army Schedule A employees were converted to competitive service. • The Army BAWG is currently working to develop a recommendation to implement a system similar to the within grade increase system where Schedule A conversions will be automatic unless the supervisor determines that a conversion is not warranted.

---

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

• Over a quarter of the involuntary separations were PWD. • PWD involuntary separations were greater than the PWD participation rate in the workforce. • Resignation rates were slightly lower than the PWD participation rate in the workforce, and retirement rates were nearly twice the PWD participation rate in the workforce. • Separation rates for employees without disabilities were well below their participation rate in the work force.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	3	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	488	0.50	0.25
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	2576	1.43	1.50
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	3629	3.52	1.86
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	3416	2.23	1.93
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	10086	7.66	5.52

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

• PWTD involuntary separation rates were more than twice the PWTD participation rate in the workforce. • Resignation rates were almost equal to the PWTD participation rate in the workforce, and retirement rates were a little more than half the PWTD participation rate in the workforce. • Separation rates for employees without disabilities were well below their participation rate in the work force.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	3	0.02	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	488	0.53	0.27
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	2576	1.75	1.48
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	3629	3.13	2.06
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	3416	1.81	1.98
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	10086	7.21	5.78

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.

• There was no enterprise-wide exit survey program. Some commands use exit surveys and some use stay surveys or interviews. • The Army does not consolidate survey information in a way that allows for an accurate response to this question. • Civilian Implementation Plan Task R-1.4 intended outcome is to implement an enterprise approach to stay and exit surveys. Source: Informal engagements with EEO Specialist and individual employees.

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.

████████████████████████████████████

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.

████████████████████████████████████

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, the U.S. Army Enterprise Services Agency (ESA) within the Army Office of Chief Information Officer was assigned the responsibility for establishing policy and procedures governing the Army Section 508 Program. • POCs are Mr. Curtiss Branham curtiss.a.branham.civ@army.mil; and Ms. Shariha Garrett shariha.n.garrett.civ@army.mil • The ESA initiated action in FY23 to stand up a new Directorate (Information Technology & Compliance Directorate (ITCD)) which will be responsible for the Army Section 508 mission. The office was established in October 2023 (FY24). The Army will release a job announcement and determine staff levels for the Army Section 508 Program manager in FY24. In the interim, the ESA staff is developing policy and procedures, and resolving Section 508 issues. • The ESA received nine requests for assistance (RFA) in FY23 (this number does not include the

---

many instances where the ESA assisted stakeholders with other issues that did not meet the threshold to track). The nature of the requests included assistance with assistive technology network approvals, assistance with Army electronic training, and a request for assistance on a USAJOBs issue. As of the February 2024, 3 of the 9 requests remain in resolution stage. The ESA submitted the Army's report for the FY23 Government-wide Section 508 Assessment and that report can be viewed at https://www.section508.gov/manage/section-508-assessment/annual-reports/. • The ESA was a stakeholder in the revision of AR 25-1 (Army Information Technology). This regulation will contain an updated Section 508 policy section which will include ensuring there are Section 508 coordinators (as an additional duty) at certain Army organizational levels. AR 25-1 (Army Information Technology) is still in the staffing process and not yet published. The ESA is also drafting interim policy guidance to distribute to the Army Enterprise.

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 Army processed 72% of its RA requests on time in FY23 according to the enterprise-wide tracking tool. However, some Army organizations use their tracker rather than the enterprise-wide tracker, and report processing time rates of 90% and greater. • The Army is updating the enterprise-wide tracker to make it more user friendly and capable of processing the data required. • Additionally, in the revision of the Army Regulation 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program), DPMs will be required to use the enterprise-wide tracker which will enable the Army to have a more complete and accurate accounting of RA requests, processing times, and the overall cost of accommodations granted.

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.

• In several EEO offices across the Army, and at the Secretariat level, staffing levels were insufficient to monitor trends and to implement programs fully to improve RA and PAS processing time. Actions planned to improve processing time include: • The development of a guide for RA and PAS processing, an update to the governing Army Regulation 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program), additional RA and PAS training, modifications to the automated RA and PAS tracking tool, and training on the tracking tool. • The mandatory supervisor training and certification course and the on-boarding process are being reviewed to ensure reasonable accommodation policy and procedures are included. • The mandatory EEO, AH, and NFA training will be updated in FY24 to include reasonable accommodation policy and procedures. The Human Resources procedures for processing requests for reassignment as a reasonable accommodation will be updated in FY24.

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.

• Requests for PAS follow the same procedures as those for requests for RA. • Requests for PAS were so few, that when requested, the servicing EEO office worked directly with the Army DPM to process the request. • In FY22, a contract for PAS was developed in addition to an existing contract in a separate Army command.

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   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.

• During FY23, the Army had a total of 847 complaints filed. • Of the 847 complaints, PWD filed 99 non-sexual harassment complaints on the basis of disability (mental) and 100 on the basis of disability (physical) which equated to 11.68% and 11.80% respectively, and combined was 199/847 for 23.49%, exceeding the government-wide average. • During FY23, there were no findings of non-sexual harassment on the basis of disability (mental) nor disability (physical). • Settlement agreements were completed in 52 cases where non-sexual harassment on the basis of disability (physical) was alleged, and 60 on the basis of disability (mental). Please note there may be duplicate settlements as both bases were alleged in some cases. • During FY23, the Army had no findings on the issue of harassment and the basis of disability.

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.

• During FY23, the Army had a total of 847 complaints filed. • Of the 847 complaints, PWD filed 60 RA complaints on the basis of disability (mental) and 67 on the basis of disability (physical) which equates to 7.08% and 7.91% respectively, and combined was 127/847 for 14.99%, exceeding the government-wide average. • Of the 847 complaints, PWD filed no complaints on the basis of the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) or Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA). • During FY23, four findings were issued due to a failure to accommodate the complainant. • Settlement agreements were completed in 36 cases alleging a failure to accommodate on the basis of disability (physical), and 32 cases on the basis of disability (mental). • There may be duplicate settlements as both bases were alleged in some cases. • There were no RA complaints filed on the basis of PDA or PWFA. • During FY23, the Army had four findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide RA which costs a total of $622,972.71. • Case #1 was comprised of an RA issue only and resulted in $78.831.97 in compensatory damages; $300 in attorney fees; the back pay cost is still to be determined; and the non-monetary corrective measures were reinstatement, training for the management official, and a posting of the notice. • Case #2 was comprised on an RA issue only and resulted in $100,000 in compensatory damages; $65,297.04 in attorney fees; and the non-monetary corrective measure was the posting of the notice. • Case #3 was comprised of an RA issue plus at least one other issue and disability was not the only basis and resulted in $100,000 in compensatory damages; $76,903.70 in attorney fees; and the non-monetary corrective measures were training for the management official and the posting of the notice. • Case #4 was comprised of an RA issue plus at least one other issue and disability was not the only basis and resulted in $80,000 in compensatory damages; $121,640 in attorney fees; the back pay cost is still to be determined; and the non-monetary corrective measures were reinstatement, the RA was granted, training for the management official and the posting of the notice.

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

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Results of interviews with hiring managers and focus groups with HR specialists, inquiries from EEO specialists, number and nature of disability-based complaints, and review of the RA Tracker revealed untimely RA processing and gaps in knowledge of RA processing procedures.
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	*Barrier Group*
	People with Disabilities
	People with Targeted Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

	Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan	

Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
06/30/2023	09/30/2023	Yes			• Establish RA training for EEO specialists, HR specialists, recruiters, hiring officials, supervisors, and the workforce. • Revise AR 690-12 and provide an on-line resource for RA information and training materials. • Revise the RA Tracker. • Increase EEO staffing levels. • Establish exit interviews during out-processing

	Responsible Official(s)	
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Disability Program Manager	Rosemary Salak	Yes

	Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective			
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
05/31/2023	Conduct research and clarify policy on release of medical information and incorporate in AR 690-12 revision.	Yes	05/31/2023	05/31/2023
09/30/2023	Canvas EEO community for input to AR 690-12 revisions and review history of queries from the field to inform revision.	No	09/30/2024	
09/30/2023	Update mandatory EEO, AH, and No FEAR, training material to include information on the RA policy and procedures.	Yes	09/30/2024	
09/30/2024	CIP Task A-3.2. Incorporate RA training and establish policy and procedure to mandate the content during onboarding of all civilian employees and military supervisors of civilian employees	No		
09/30/2024	Provide DPM training for all EEO specialists involved in disability program management and reasonable accommodations.	Yes		
09/30/2024	CIP Task D-2.3. Incorporate RA training in a comprehensive, mandatory supervisor development and certification program.	No		
09/30/2024	CIP Task A-2.1. Incorporate RA training for recruiters in the centralized recruitment and outreach services to commands.	No		
09/30/2024	Update reasonable accommodation guidance in AR 690-12.	Yes		
09/30/2024	Develop templates for reasonable accommodation processes and notices.	No		
09/30/2024	Update the RA Tracker with functionality to provide accurate processing times and sufficient information to track the process.	Yes		
09/30/2025	CIP Task R-1.4, Explore options for exit interview that include questions on how the Army could improve the recruitment, hiring, ▓▓▓▓ retention, and advancement persons with disabilities (29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C).	No		
09/30/2025	Establish a resource to support EEO specialists and supervisors in complying with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act (CIP E-1-8).	No		
09/30/2025	Develop courses of action for central funding of reasonable accommodations and personal assistance services (CIP E-1-8).	No		

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**
2023	• Updates to the mandatory EEO, AH, and NFA training have been made and the action is on track to complete updates in FY24. • Policy was published on reasonable accommodations under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. • Procedures for personal assistance services were codified and posted on the Army's website. • Reasonable accommodation procedures and a comprehensive Accessibility Statement was posted to the website. • Reasonable accommodation training has been provided to disability program managers, leaders, and supervisors. • Functional requirements have been provided to the RA Tracker developers. • Revisions to AR 690-12 have been drafted and staffed. • Program evaluation/audit assessments have been updated to include assessment of knowledge of and compliance with reasonable accommodation policy and procedure. • The RAND report of their barrier analysis to identify root causes to entry, advancement and retention of persons with disabilities was completed and published. • Army conducted an assessment in accordance with the National Security Memorandum, Revitalizing America's Foreign Policy and National Security Workforce, Institutions and Partnerships. The assessment identified a robust, effective reasonable accommodation program as a high impact action, and identified electronic and information technology accessibility as a challenge. In accordance with the requirement of Executive Order 14035, Army conducted a preliminary assessment of the current state of EEO in the Department of the Army. These efforts augment the annual assessment reported in multiple forms (EEOC MD 715, FEORP, DVAAP). The assessment highlights the criticality of collaboration with Human Resources professionals responsible for outreach, recruitment, hiring, development, and retention of a diverse, talented workforce. The assessment underscores the criticality of adequate resources to conduct barrier analysis and data analysis.

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Results of interviews with hiring managers, focus groups with HR specialists, inquiries from EEO specialists and review of Schedule A hiring data and data on Schedule A conversions from excepted service to competitive service revealed limited knowledge and use of Schedule A hiring authority for PWD and of sources of Schedule A eligible jobseekers.

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

Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	**Target Date**	**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?**	**Date Modified**	**Date Completed**	**Objective Description**
06/30/2023	09/30/2024	Yes			• Establish training for EEO specialists, HR specialists, recruiters, hiring officials, and supervisors on affirmative employment (hiring authorities such as Schedule A that take disability into account, Workforce Recruitment Program, and other sources of jobseekers with disabilities). • Expand the use of the Agency Talent Portal as a resource of eligible jobseeker with disabilities as intended and encouraged by OPM. • Replace the Army Schedule A resume repository with the Agency Talent Portal

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Disability Program Manager	Rosemary Salak	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
09/30/2023	Update mandatory EEO, AH, and NFA, training material to include content on affirmative employment and implement attendance tracking and enforcement mechanisms.	Yes	04/30/2024	
09/30/2024	Incorporate affirmative employment training in mandatory supervisor and development training for civilian and military supervisors of civilian employees (CIP Task D-2.3)	No	09/30/2024	
09/30/2024	Incorporate affirmative employment training for civilian recruiters supporting Army sponsored recruitment and outreach events conducted by ACCMA annually (CIP Task A-2.1).	No	09/30/2024	
09/30/2024	Explore options for automating a notice of conversion to supervisors and Schedule A hires as they approach two years of service.	Yes		
09/30/2025	Improve the civilian hiring process for applicants, hiring managers, and HR specialists by incorporating policy and procedures for using, tracking and reporting on use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (Schedule A, etc.) and leverage the Agency Talent Portal as a repository for PWD/PWTD, and other capabilities designed to improve the civilian hiring process. (CIP Task A-3.4.)	No		

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**
2023	• In FY22, ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇ distributed a memorandum encouraging all civilian employees to update their disability status, and collaborated with Air Force, Navy, and DISA to include the update notice on civilian employee leave and earning statements. • In FY22, Army collaborated with Air Force and Navy to initiate a proposal to OPM (that OPM accepted) for the Agency Talent Portal to serve as a repository of potentially eligible Schedule A candidates given that there are 52,000 people in USA Jobs who claim to be PWD. • In FY22, DoD adopted Army's proposal to expand the SECDEF Disability awards program enabling more than one person from each DoD Component to be recognized. • Updates to the mandatory EEO, AH, NFA training have been made and plans are in place to complete updates in FY24 on affirmative employment. • Revisions to AR 690-12 addressing affirmative employment have been drafted and staffed. • Initial exploration of an automated notice system regarding conversion of Schedule A hires has begun. • Army senior leadership published memos explaining and encouraging the use of Schedule A for PWD. • Program evaluation/audit assessments have been updated to include assessment of knowledge of and compliance with reasonable accommodation policy and procedure. • Established Office of Primary Responsibility for policies and programs that ensure early consideration and increased use of Schedule A (CIP Task A-2.7) • Briefed Schedule A and WRP at the HR CHRA Town Hall and to Civilian Aides to SECARMY • In FY22 Army completed the DOL WRP survey and met with DOL and DoD to discuss necessary improvements to make WRP a more viable resource. One key improvement recommended was to add a job board similar to the Peace Corps, where DA and other agencies can post information on vacancies and events to enable WRP candidates to reach out to DA and other organizations regarding specifics posted on the job board. • In FY23, the RAND report of their barrier analysis to identify root causes to entry, advancement, and retention of individuals with disabilities, was completed and published. • In accordance with the requirement of Executive Order 14035, Army conducted a preliminary assessment of the current state of equal employment opportunity (EEO) in the Department of the Army. These efforts augment the annual assessment reported in multiple forms (EEOC MD-715, Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program, Disabled Veteran Affirmative Action Program). The assessment highlights the criticality of collaboration with Human Resources (HR) professionals responsible for outreach, recruitment, hiring, development, and retention of a diverse, talented workforce. The assessment underscores the criticality of adequate resources to conduct barrier analysis and data analysis.

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Absence of an Army Section 508 Program, and presence of inaccessible information and communication technology in violation of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

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

Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
10/31/2023	12/31/2024	Yes			Establish policy, procedures, training, and a Section 508 Program

Responsible Official(s)

Title	Name	Standards Address The Plan?
Disability Program Manager	Rosemary Salak	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
10/31/2023	Establish the Information Technology & Compliance Directorate (ITCD) within OCIO, responsible for the Army Section 508 mission (CIP Task E-1.8)	Yes		10/31/2023
09/30/2024	Draft and staff the Army Section 508 Program policy and procedures.	Yes		
09/30/2024	Hire a Section 508 Program Manager.	Yes		

<table>
<tr><th colspan="5">Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</th></tr>
<tr><th>Target Date</th><th>Planned Activities</th><th>Sufficient Staffing & Funding?</th><th>Modified Date</th><th>Completion Date</th></tr>
<tr><td>12/31/2024</td><td>Determine staffing and funding requirements.</td><td>No</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="5">Report of Accomplishments</th></tr>
<tr><th>Fiscal Year</th><th colspan="4">Accomplishment</th></tr>
<tr><td>2023</td><td colspan="4">• In FY21, efforts to establish a Section 508 Program Office began and continue. In FY23, the U.S. Army Enterprise Services Agency (ESA) within the Army Office of Chief Information Officer was assigned the responsibility for establishing the Information Technology & Compliance Directorate (ITCD) responsible for the Army Section 508 mission. The ESA staff is developing policy and procedures and resolving Section 508 issues.

• Reduced the processing time of Section 504 and Architectural Barriers Act complaints from 37 months to 7 months, revised procedures resulted in expeditious and effective resolution of complaints and provides systemic solutions addressing root causes of accessibility challenges.

• Developed and posted to the Army.mil website, a comprehensive Accessibility Statement were posted to the website.</td></tr>
</table>

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

Insufficient staffing of disability program management at all levels of the Army.

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

• Progress is being made through integration of EEO, HR, and data analytics practitioners. • The expectation is that the planned actions will lead to more reliable data; quicker access to accurate data; data driven decisions; timely reasonable accommodation processing; increase use of Schedule A for PWD/PWTD; timely appropriate conversion of Schedule A hires; increased capability of the workforce, supervisors, EEO and HR specialists to understand and properly execute their respective responsibilities with regard to reasonable accommodation and affirmative employment; increased accessibility of information and communication technology; and increased capability to access the talents of PWD and PWTD.

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.

The BAWG will continue its barrier analysis on PWD and PWTD applicants and employees throughout FY24 and FY25.