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

DOD Department of the Army - FY 2025

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)	Answer: Yes
b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)	Answer: Yes

Army analysis of the permanent workforce reveals that a trigger is activated when the representation of People with Disabilities (PWD) falls below 11 Percent, against a 12 Percent goal. For People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD), the trigger is a representation below 1 Percent, against a 2 Percent goal.

The analysis identified that PWD representation is below the trigger threshold in the lowest entry-level grades and across all senior pay categories, indicating potential barriers to entry and advancement.

The specific triggers identified are as follows:

GS-01 representation is 0 Percent.
GS-02 representation is 8.33 Percent.
GS-03 representation is 10.75 Percent.
GS-04 representation is 10.65 Percent.
Other Non-Senior Pay representation is 10.75 Percent.
Senior Executive Service (SES) representation is 7.38 Percent.
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) representation is 9.09 Percent.
Total Senior Pay representation is 7.88 Percent.

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

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

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

The Army has a trigger involving People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce.

The established goal for PWTD is 2 Percent representation. The trigger for this is defined as representation falling more than 1 percentage point below the goal, meaning any level below 1 Percent.

An Army analysis of the permanent workforce by grade level revealed that a trigger was identified for the following grades:

GS-01, with a PWTD representation of 0 Percent.

GS-02, with a PWTD representation of 0 Percent.

For all other GS grades (GS-03 through GS-15) and all senior pay categories, no trigger was identified, as the representation of PWTD exceeded the 1 Percent threshold.

Grade Level Cluster (GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability Total	Reportable Disability Percentage (Numerical Goal 12 Percent)	Targeted Disability Total	Targeted Disability Percentage (Numerical Goal 2 Percent)
Grades GS-11 to SES	153871	24642	16.01	3811	2.48
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	72737	10305	14.17	1750	2.41

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 and PWTD 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 human capital strategic planning meetings. Additionally the Army organizations utilize the following hiring authorities available to veterans:

• Increase use of hiring authorities that take disability into account.
• Increase outreach to PWD.
• Increase use of sources of qualified PWD job seekers, such as the Workforce Recruitment Program, USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal, the Wounded Warrior Program, the Army Schedule A resume repository, and the Army Transition Assistance Program.
• Strengthen partnerships with Disability Serving Institutions and Employee Resource Groups.
• Promote PWD participation in internships, fellowships, career development opportunities, and formal mentoring.
• Comply with annual reporting requirements on PWD outreach, recruitment, hiring, and development efforts and results.
• Interact with public and private organizations involved in the placement of applicants with disabilities.
• Comply with Title 5, Code of Federal Regulations Part 213.3102(u) and Part 315.709 to noncompetitively convert to the competitive service employees appointed under Schedule A for PWD, who complete two years of satisfactory service.

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: No

Identified Program Deficiencies
A primary challenge is the insufficient staffing of the Army's Disability Program. Many commands lack a dedicated Disability Program Manager (DPM) or the necessary personnel to conduct effective barrier analysis. Furthermore, funding for reasonable accommodations and Personal Assistance Services (PAS) is decentralized, relying on individual command budgets rather than a central Army fund, which creates inconsistencies.

Plan for Improvement

To address these deficiencies, the following actions are planned:
• Assess Command-Level Resources: Survey commands to determine the current status of their staffing, funding, and training for disability programs. Where necessary, initiate manpower studies and support requests for additional resources. (Note: This action was deferred in FY 2026 and FY 2027 due to Army-level staffing shortages.)
• Update Regulatory Guidance: The revision of Army Regulation (AR) 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Programs) is projected for completion in FY 2026. This update will mandate specific staffing levels for command EEO offices and require formal training for all Disability Program Managers and Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators.
• Strengthen Strategic Partnerships: Continue leveraging the Army’s Civilian Implementation Plan to better integrate EEO principles into Army strategic plans. This partnership will be used to advocate for centralized funding for reasonable accommodations, increased EEO staffing, and enhanced support for the Army's Section 508 Program.
• Utilize Data Analytics: Leverage Army data analyst resources to perform in-depth workforce analysis to better identify and address potential barriers.

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	Total Full Time	Total Part Time	Total Collateral Duty	Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	200	0	Dianne S. Hibbs Acting Disability Program Manager dianne.s.hibbs.civ@army.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	200	0	Dianne S. Hibbs Acting Disability Program Manager dianne.s.hibbs.civ@army.mil
Section 508 Compliance	0	1	0	Lisa G. Wilcox Army Section 508 Program Manager Lisa.G.Wilcox3.civ@army.mil
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	1	0	Linda R. Stout Human Resource Specialist Linda.R.Stout.civ@army.mil
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	200	0	0	Dianne S. Hibbs Acting Disability Program Manager dianne.s.hibbs.civ@army.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	0	200	0	Dianne S. Hibbs Acting Disability Program Manager dianne.s.hibbs.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. Due to lack of funding the Army was unable to cover associated travel expenses for its Disability Program Managers for FY25.

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

Challenges in Program Staffing and Training
A significant challenge remains in the execution of the Army's disability program, as staffing levels at both the Army EEO Office and command levels are insufficient to meet all responsibilities.
This impacts key areas, particularly training for Disability Program Managers (DPMs):

• FY 2024: While funds were budgeted for essential DPM training—specifically the EEOC course for new managers and those requiring recertification—the final allocation was dependent on federal government funding. Despite this, forty Army DPMs successfully received this training in FY 2024.

• FY 2025: Currently, no funding is available for DPM training in FY 2025.
Planned Corrective Actions
To address these resource and training gaps, the Army will take the following steps:
1. Conduct a Needs Assessment: In FY 2025, the Army will perform a comprehensive assessment of program requirements against existing staffing levels to identify specific shortfalls and justify resource requests.
2. Mandate Training: The forthcoming revision of Army Regulation (AR) 690-12 will mandate required training for all DPMs, ensuring a consistent standard of expertise across the force.
3. Enhance Collaboration: The Department of the Army DPM will continue to collaborate with other federal agencies to leverage proven practices, innovative tools, and successful programs to enhance the Army's disability initiatives.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Program name 1	C.2.b.5
Description of Program Deficiency	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	Process all Army RA requests within 30 calendar days IAW Army policy and monitor the requests to completion/decision.
Fiscal Year	2025
Responsible Official Name	Rosemary Salak
Responsible Official Title	Disability Program Manager
Program name 2	B.4.a.10
Description of Program Deficiency	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.
Fiscal Year	2025
Responsible Official Name	Ms. Rosemary Salak
Responsible Official Title	ASA(M&RA), EEO-MEO Division, EEOPP
Program name 3	C.2.a.6
Description of Program Deficiency	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.
Fiscal Year	2025
Responsible Official Name	Mr. Larry Noggle
Responsible Official Title	Assistant Deputy for Civilian Personnel (L/MER, Benefits, and Work/Life Programs)

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.

   Army EEO and HR practitioners collaborate on outreach to disability-serving organizations, as well as college and university offices that serve people with disabilities (PWD), to describe opportunities and hiring authorities that consider disability.

   The programs and resources the DA uses include the Special Placement Program Coordinator, a Schedule A for PWD resume repository, a Wounded Warrior resume repository, the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP), the Soldier for Life - Transition Assistance Program (SFL-TAP), outreach to Vocational Rehabilitation Centers, and hiring authorities for Veterans with disabilities. The USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal, which potentially can serve as a source of jobseekers with disabilities: https://atp-help.usajobs.gov/getting-started/who-can-use-atp

   The Army is also building an "Army Careers" page at https://www.goarmy.com/benefits/veterans/services 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.

   Use of Special Hiring Authorities for Individuals with Disabilities

   In accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(a)(3), the Department of the Army actively utilizes several hiring authorities to recruit and appoint Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) into the permanent workforce.

   These authorities include:
   • Schedule A for persons with disabilities.
   • Veterans' Recruitment Appointment (VRA).
   • 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran authority.

   A clear need has been identified to provide comprehensive training on the proper and effective use of these hiring authorities for all hiring managers, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) practitioners, and Human Resources (HR) professionals across the Army.

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.

   Process for Adjudicating and Forwarding Applications Under Disability-Related Hiring Authorities

   When an individual applies for a position citing a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), the following process is used to determine eligibility and refer the application to hiring officials.

   1. Determination of Eligibility
   The review process is managed by staffing specialists and mirrors the standard procedure for all applications, with one critical addition: verification of eligibility under the specific hiring authority. To be deemed eligible, an applicant must meet two criteria:
   • Provide Proof of Disability: The applicant must submit the required documentation in accordance with governing regulations. This may include a Schedule A letter from a licensed medical professional or vocational rehabilitation specialist, a DD Form 214, or a disability determination letter from the Department of Veterans Affairs.
   • Meet Job Qualifications: The applicant must meet the minimum qualifications for the position, including any requirements for education, knowledge, skills, and experience.
   2. Forwarding Applications to Hiring Officials
   Once an applicant is confirmed to meet both criteria, their application is forwarded to the hiring official on a certificate of eligibles for consideration.
   • Referral and Appointment: Staffing specialists are responsible for explaining the mechanics of the specific hiring authority to the hiring manager. This includes advising them that an eligible candidate from this certificate does not need to be the "best qualified" and may be selected for a non-competitive appointment.
   • Strategic Recruitment: Staffing specialists are also advised to proactively discuss these hiring authorities with managers during recruitment

planning. They are encouraged to leverage targeted applicant sources, such as the Schedule A Resume Repository, the USAJOBS Agency Talent Portal, and the Workforce Recruitment Program, to build a robust pool of qualified candidates with disabilities.

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: No

No, the Army has not yet provided dedicated training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account. However, a formal training program is in place for new supervisors, and this is supplemented by ongoing leadership directives and communications to encourage the use of these authorities.
Formal Training Initiatives

The primary mechanism for this training is the Supervisor HR Orientation Course.

• Content and Mandate: The course curriculum includes a significant module on Recruitment and Hiring, with a specific focus on Schedule A and other Direct Hire Authorities. This course will become mandatory for all new Army supervisors once the Supervisor Certification Program Policy is officially signed.
• Progress to Date: Approximately 1,000 Army supervisors have already completed this course. The training is currently executed every other week.
• Identified Gaps: Insufficient staffing in FY 2024 delayed a planned review and modification of the course content and its associated tracking mechanisms. This work is necessary to ensure the training effectively reaches all required managers.
Leadership Directives and Communications
In addition to the formal course, Army leadership has issued several directives to promote awareness and use of these critical hiring tools:
• April 2024 Memo: The Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower & Reserve Affairs (ASA M&RA) directed all Army organizations to increase the use of hiring authorities for individuals with disabilities. The memo also mandated increased outreach to qualified job seekers through sources like the Workforce Recruitment Program, the Army Schedule A resume repository, and the Army Transition Assistance Program.
• FY 2022 Directives: Army leadership published a memo and a message to all commands encouraging the use of Schedule A, the Veterans' Recruitment Appointment (VRA), and the 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran authorities.
• August 2024 Self-ID Campaign: The Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) issued a memo encouraging the entire civilian workforce to update their disability status, which helps improve data for targeted recruitment efforts.
Supporting Outreach and Awareness Efforts
To further reinforce these goals, the Army has promoted awareness through various channels:
• Publication: An article on reasonable accommodations was featured in the Fall 2024 edition of the Army Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (Army AL&T) Magazine.
• Accessibility Review: Arlington National Cemetery (ANC) partnered with the DOD Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) to conduct a site visit, reviewing facilities and services to enhance accessibility for the workforce and the public.

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.

Efforts to Partner with Disability Support Organizations

The Department of the Army is committed to establishing and maintaining strong partnerships with organizations that assist Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) in securing and maintaining employment. Our strategy for FY25 is built upon the successful outreach, advocacy, and marketing initiatives executed in FY 2024.

Direct Engagement and Outreach

The Army will continue its robust schedule of direct engagement activities. In FY 2024, these efforts included:
• Targeted Engagements: Participation in 22 events, including specialized workshops and mentoring sessions. These events featured senior Army leaders, including General Officers and members of the Senior Executive Service, to demonstrate high-level commitment.
• Community of Interest Events: Execution of five large-scale "Community of Interest" events, which provided 767 participants an opportunity to learn directly about the Army's commitment to access and equal opportunity.
Strategic Advocacy

The Army continues to advocate for systemic improvements that benefit PWD job seekers. A key effort includes:
• Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) Job Board: Actively encouraging the Department of Labor (DOL) and the OSD Office of Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity Policy (OCREOP) to establish a centralized job board for the WRP. This platform would allow the Army and other federal agencies to directly post vacancies, hiring fair information, and career workshops to a pool of qualified candidates with disabilities.

National Marketing and Awareness

To broaden our reach, the Army leverages its national marketing campaigns.
• Civilian Marketing Plan: A significant accomplishment was the launch of the Army's first-ever national Civilian Marketing Plan in May 2024. Approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Army Chief of Staff, this campaign promotes awareness of Army Civilian careers through various media outlets in both English and Spanish, ensuring our message reaches the widest possible audience, including the disability community.

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", describe the trigger(s) below.

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

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

Yes, using the goals of 12 Percent for People with Disabilities (PWD) and 2 Percent for People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) as benchmarks, triggers exist for both PWD and PWTD among new hires in the permanent workforce.

Key Findings:
An analysis of new hires shows widespread underrepresentation for PWD, with 24 out of 31 Job Series failing to meet the 12 Percent goal. Underrepresentation for PWTD is also common, with 19 out of 31 Job Series failing to meet the 2 Percent goal.

Job Series with No Triggers:
The following Job Series met or exceeded both PWD and PWTD hiring goals: 0101 (Social Science), 0501 (Financial Administration and Program), 0610 (Nursing), and 1910 (Quality Assurance).

Job Series with PWD Trigger Only:
The following Job Series met the PWTD goal but failed to meet the PWD goal: 0085 (Security Guard), 0132 (Intelligence), 0185 (Social Work), 0510 (Accounting), 0560 (Budget Analysis), 1102 (Contracting), and 1515 (Operations Research).

Job Series with Both PWD and PWTD Triggers:
Triggers for both PWD and PWTD were identified in the following Job Series: 0018 (Safety & Occupational Health Management), 0080 (Security Administration), 0083 (Police), 0180 (Psychology), 0201 (Human Resources Management), 0260 (Equal Employment Opportunity), 0505 (Financial Management), 0511 (Auditing), 0602 (Physician), 0630 (Dietetics and Nutrition), 0631 (Occupational Therapy), 0671 (Health System Specialist), 0801 (General Engineering), 0855 (Electronics Engineering), 0856 (Electronics Technical), 0896 (Industrial Engineering), 1550 (Computer Science), 1750 (Instructional Systems), and 2152 (Air Traffic Control).

Note: Data was not available to determine triggers for Job Series 2101 (Transportation Specialist).

New Hires	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage)	Reportable Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage)	Targeted Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage)	Targeted Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage)
% of Total Applicants	2153	84.12	15.88	84.07	15.88
% of Qualified Applicants	1382	83.36	16.64	83.36	16.64
% of New Hires	37	94.59	5.41	94.59	5.41

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

es, using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, triggers exist for both People with Disabilities (PWD) and People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) among new hires for several Mission Critical Occupations (MCOs).

A trigger is identified when the percentage of PWD or PWTD among new hires is lower than their respective representation in the qualified

applicant pool. This disparity points to potential areas that should be reviewed through further studies.

PWD Triggers Identified:
A trigger for PWD was identified in the following Job Series, where the percentage of new hires was lower than the applicant pool:
0018, 0080, 0083, 0132, 0180, 0201, 0260, 0511, 0602, 0630, 0631, 0671, 0801, 0855, 0856, 0896, 1102, 1550, 1750, and 2152.

PWTD Triggers Identified:
A trigger for PWTD was identified in the following Job Series, where the percentage of new hires was lower than the applicant pool:
0018, 0080, 0083, 0180, 0201, 0260, 0511, 0602, 0630, 0671, 0801, 0855, 0896, 1550, 1750, and 2152.

No Triggers Identified:
No triggers for either PWD or PWTD were identified in the following Job Series, where new hire percentages met or exceeded the applicant pool representation:
0085, 0101, 0185, 0501, 0505, 0510, 0560, 0610, 1515, and 1910.

Note: Data was not available to determine triggers for Job Series 2101 (Transportation Specialist).

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability New Hires (Percentage)	Targetable Disability New Hires (Percentage)
Numerical Goal	--	**12%**	**2%**
0083 POLICE	2	100.00	100.00
0085 SECURITY GUARD	9	100.00	100.00
0101 SOCIAL SCIENCE	4	100.00	100.00
0132 INTELLIGENCE	5	100.00	100.00
0185 SOCIAL WORK	1	100.00	100.00
0501 FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	3	100.00	100.00
0510 ACCOUNTING	1	100.00	100.00
0560 BUDGET ANALYSIS	2	100.00	100.00
0631 OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY	1	100.00	100.00
0801 GENERAL ENGINEERING	1	100.00	100.00
1102 CONTRACTING	2	100.00	100.00
1515 OPERATIONS RESEARCH	1	100.00	100.00
1910 QUALITY ASSURANCE	3	100.00	100.00

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

   b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer: N/A

Yes, using the relevant applicant pool as a benchmark, triggers exist for both People with Disabilities (PWD) and People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) among qualified internal applicants for numerous Mission Critical Occupations (MCOs).

A trigger is identified when the selection percentage of PWD or PWTD is lower than their representation in the qualified internal applicant pool.

PWD Triggers Identified (Internal Applicants):
A trigger for PWD was identified in the following Job Series because the selection percentage was lower than the internal applicant pool percentage:
0018, 0080, 0083, 0132, 0180, 0201, 0260, 0505, 0511, 0602, 0630, 0631, 0671, 0801, 0855, 0856, 0896, 1102, 1550, 1750, and 2152.

PWTD Triggers Identified (Internal Applicants):
A trigger for PWTD was identified in the following Job Series because the selection percentage was lower than the internal applicant pool percentage:
0018, 0080, 0083, 0180, 0201, 0260, 0511, 0602, 0630, 0671, 0801, 0855, 0856, 0896, 1550, 1750, and 2152.

No Triggers Identified (Internal Applicants):
No triggers were identified for either PWD or PWTD among internal applicants for the following Job Series:
0085, 0101, 0185, 0510, 0560, 0610, 1515, 1910, and 2101.

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

Triggers for Persons with Disabilities (PWD)

For employees with disabilities, a trigger was identified in most of the MCOs analyzed. The external selection rate for PWD was consistently lower than their representation among qualified applicants.

• Financial Administration and Program (Job Series 0501): PWD represented 7.34 Percent of the qualified applicant pool but accounted for only 2.00 Percent of external selections.
• Budget Analysis (Job Series 0560): PWD represented 8.03 Percent of the qualified applicant pool but accounted for only 2.17 Percent of external selections.
• Human Resources Management (Job Series 0201): PWD represented 11.60 Percent of the qualified applicant pool but accounted for only 8.46 Percent of external selections.
• Police (Job Series 0083): PWD represented 5.92 Percent of the qualified applicant pool, yet 0 Percent were externally selected.
• General Engineering (Job Series 0801): PWD represented 3.38 Percent of referred applicants but accounted for only 1.10 Percent of external selections.
Triggers for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD)
A similar and often more pronounced trigger was identified for employees with targeted disabilities, where their selection rates were also well below their representation in the applicant pool.
• Contracting (Job Series 1102): PWTD represented 5.19 Percent of the referred applicant pool but accounted for only 2.30 Percent of external selections.
• Budget Analysis (Job Series 0560): PWTD represented 5.49 Percent of the qualified applicant pool but accounted for only 1.09 Percent of external selections.
• Human Resources Management (Job Series 0201): PWTD represented 7.94 Percent of the qualified applicant pool but accounted for only 5.33 Percent of external selections.
• Electronics Engineering (Job Series 0855): PWTD represented 0.97 Percent of the referred applicant pool, yet 0 Percent were externally selected.
• Computer Science (Job Series 1550): PWTD represented 0.67 Percent of the referred applicant pool, yet 0 Percent were externally selected.
Source: Table B9P: MCO by Disability

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's strategy for ensuring sufficient advancement opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) is rooted in the principle of universal inclusion and merit-based competition.

Rather than creating a separate advancement or mentoring program, the Army ensures that all career development programs, leadership courses, and promotional opportunities are open to the entire workforce. This model guarantees that all employees, including PWD and PWTD, who meet the established qualifications and criteria for a given opportunity are eligible to apply and compete on an equal basis.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

Department of the Army Civilian Talent Development Programs

The Department of the Army offers several key programs designed to attract, develop, and retain a talented civilian workforce. These initiatives provide structured pathways for students, recent graduates, and emerging leaders to build successful careers as Army Civilians.

_____

1. Student Intern Program (SIP)
The Student Intern Program (SIP) is an initiative designed to introduce talented college students to federal service and build a pipeline for future Army Civilian careers, including the Army Fellows Program.
• Program Structure: Interns are hired into positions across ten career fields. The program combines formal instruction with hands-on, informal training tailored to organizational requirements.
• Eligibility: Open to qualified U.S. citizens currently enrolled in undergraduate or graduate programs at accredited post-secondary institutions.
• Hiring and Employment:
o The Army hires approximately 100-150 new Student Interns annually, maintaining a total of around 200 interns in the program at any given time.
o Hiring authorities include the Direct Hire Authority for Post-Secondary Students and the Cyber Excepted Service.
• Benefits: For certain difficult-to-fill positions, the program may offer:
o Tuition assistance up to $10,000 per academic year.
o Recruitment incentives up to 25 Percent of the annual salary.
• How to Apply: Vacancies are typically announced on USAJOBS.gov in September and October.

_____

2. Army Fellows Program (AFP)
The Army Fellows Program (AFP) is a two-year program designed to attract and recruit high-caliber civilian talent for entry-level developmental positions, with a clear path for career progression.
• Program Structure:
o Fellows are hired at the GS-05 or GS-07 grade level, with a full performance potential of GS-09, GS-11, or GS-12.
o Training follows a Master Fellows Training Plan tailored to one of eleven career fields, incorporating both formal and informal development.
o Upon successful completion, Fellows are eligible for non-competitive promotion and outplacement within their training command.
• Eligibility: Open to qualified U.S. citizens, including recent graduates from accredited post-secondary institutions and other qualified candidates.
• Hiring and Employment:
o The Army hires approximately 500-700 Fellows annually.
o Hiring authorities include the Direct Hire Authority for Post-Secondary Students and Schedule A for persons with disabilities.
• Benefits:
o Recruitment incentives up to 25 Percent of the annual salary may be offered for difficult-to-fill positions.
o Funded Permanent Change of Station (PCS) is typically offered for positions requiring relocation.
• How to Apply: Vacancies are posted throughout the year on USAJOBS.gov. Recruitment also occurs through Handshake and at university career fairs.

3. Emerging Leader Fellows Program (ELFP)
The Emerging Leader Fellows Program (ELFP) is a competitive two-year fellowship designed to accelerate the development of recent graduates with advanced degrees for future senior civilian leadership roles.
• Program Structure:
o This centrally funded program places Fellows in key permanent positions across the Army, including at the Headquarters level, Combatant Commands, and Army Service Component Commands.
o Fellows are hired at the GS-11 level, promoted to GS-12 in their second year, and are eligible for placement into permanent GS-13 positions upon successful completion.
• Eligibility: Open to successful applicants who possess an advanced degree from an accredited institution and have experience on three- or four-star level staffs. The Direct Hire Authority for Post-Secondary Students is typically used.
• Developmental Opportunities: The program provides challenging developmental opportunities designed to build a foundation for senior leadership, including:
o Creation of an Individual Development Plan (IDP).
o Assignment of a dedicated mentor.
o Completion of at least one rotational assignment of 90 days or more.
o Participation in a variety of training activities as required by the Army Civilian Career Management Activity (ACCMA).
Source: Civilian Human Resources Agency (CHRA) - Army Civilian Career Management Activity (ACCMA) Information Papers

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 Applicants (Percentage)	Total Participants Selectees (Percentage)	PWD Applicants (Percentage)	PWD Selectees (Percentage)	PWTD Applicants (Percentage)	PWTD Selectees (Percentage)
Fellowship Programs	27	4	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	110	8	5.45	0	2.73	0
Internship Programs	8396	31	6.56	9.68	4.05	0.54

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

Triggers were identified for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) across all leadership programs, where the selection rate for employees with disabilities was substantially lower than their representation in the qualified applicant pool. For executive positions, PWD made up 13.62 Percent of the relevant applicant pool but accounted for only 2.47 Percent of internal selections. For manager positions, PWD represented 16.38 Percent of the applicant pool but only 3.10 Percent of selections. Similarly, for supervisory roles, PWD constituted 15.79 Percent of the applicant pool but only 4.01 Percent of selections.

In the internship and new graduate programs, there were 8,396 total applicants, resulting in 31 selections. The applicant pool included 551 individuals with disabilities (6.56 Percent of applicants) and 340 with targeted disabilities (4.05 Percent of applicants). Of the 31 selections made, 3 were persons with disabilities and 3 were persons with targeted disabilities, meaning that both PWD and PWTD each made up 9.68 Percent of the selected individuals.

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

Triggers for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD)
Similarly, a significant trigger was identified for employees with targeted disabilities, where their selection rates were well below their representation in the applicant pool for all three categories.
• Executives: PWTD made up 3.56 Percent of the relevant applicant pool but accounted for only 1.23 Percent of internal selections.
• Managers: PWTD made up 4.55 Percent of the relevant applicant pool but accounted for only 1.91 Percent of internal selections.
• Supervisors: PWTD made up 5.43 Percent of the relevant applicant pool but accounted for only 2.83 Percent of internal selections.

C. AWARDS

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

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

An analysis of employee recognition and awards reveals that the inclusion rate for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) exceeds the 2 Percent goal across all categories. The inclusion rate for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) meets or exceeds the 12 Percent goal in several areas, including Time Off Awards (16.21 Percent), Performance Awards (12.58 Percent), and Quality Step Increases (14.24 Percent). However, the PWD inclusion rate falls below the 12 Percent goal for On-The-Spot Cash Awards (11.75 Percent), Special Act/Service Act Awards (10.27 Percent), and Demo Performance Awards (8.21 Percent). These inclusion rates are calculated by dividing the number of PWD or PWTD receiving an award by the total number of personnel receiving that same award.

Time-Off Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	4056.00	21.13	78.87	3.18	96.82
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	31471.00	21.16	78.84	3.27	96.73
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	7.76	7.77	7.76	7.97	7.75
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	3442.00	22.20	77.80	2.59	97.41
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	60351.00	21.59	78.41	2.44	97.56
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.53	17.05	17.67	16.54	17.56
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	2195.00	21.96	78.04	3.42	96.58
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	54619.00	21.95	78.05	3.39	96.61
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.88	24.87	24.89	24.67	24.89
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	5367.00	23.55	76.45	3.60	96.40
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	210272.00	23.74	76.26	3.60	96.40
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	39.18	39.49	39.08	39.21	39.18
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Cash Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Cash Awards $500 and Under: Awards Given	17127.00	17.02	82.98	2.76	97.24
Cash Awards $500 and Under: Total Amount	7166602.00	16.90	83.10	2.69	97.31
Cash Awards $500 and Under: Average Amount	418.44	415.51	419.04	408.23	418.73
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Awards Given	3434.00	15.32	84.68	2.21	97.79
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount	2558099.00	15.42	84.58	2.21	97.79
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount	744.93	749.80	744.05	742.88	744.98
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given	12187.00	15.62	84.38	2.15	97.85
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount	16918337.00	15.86	84.14	2.22	97.78
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount	1388.23	1409.45	1384.30	1430.37	1387.30
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Awards Given	12680.00	15.37	84.63	2.18	97.82
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount	30764817.00	15.32	84.68	2.19	97.81
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount	2426.25	2418.63	2427.63	2437.16	2426.00
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Awards Given	7223.00	16.78	83.22	2.28	97.72
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount	24112594.00	16.82	83.18	2.35	97.65
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount	3338.31	3346.12	3336.73	3436.96	3336.00
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Awards Given	3449.00	15.34	84.66	2.26	97.74
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount	14792480.00	15.43	84.57	2.27	97.73
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount	4288.92	4314.46	4284.29	4298.74	4288.69
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Awards Given	2730.00	14.29	85.71	1.76	98.24
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount	16366411.00	14.72	85.28	1.79	98.21
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount	5995.02	6175.41	5964.96	6097.85	5993.18

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", describe the trigger(s) below.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer: No

b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer: No

In the category of Quality Step Increases, the inclusion rate for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) was 14.24 Percent, with 1,474 out of 10,350 recipients identifying as PWD. This figure exceeds the 12 Percent goal. Similarly, the inclusion rate for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) was 5.45 Percent, as 564 of the 10,350 recipients were PWTD. This rate also surpasses the 2 Percent goal.

Other Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer: N/A

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

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 (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: Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for SES (11 of 26), additionally PWD were referred at a lower rate from the qualified pool (2 of 11) with a selection rate of 0 Percent (0 of 2) while those without disabilities were selected at higher rates.
Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for GS 15 (176 of 302), additionally PWD were referred at a lower rate from the qualified pool (160 of 176) with a selection rate of 3.12 Percent (5 of 160) while those without disabilities were selected at higher rates.
Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for GS 14 (771 of 1074) additionally PWD were referred at a lower rate from the qualified pool (640 of 717) with a selection rate of 1.09 Percent (7 of 640) while those without disabilities were selected at higher rates.
Internal selection rates for PWD were lower than the qualified applicant pool for GS 13 (1331 of 2161) additionally PWD were referred at a lower rate from the qualified candidate pool (1216 of 1331) with a selection rate of 2.63 Percent (32 of 1216) while those without disabilities were selected at higher rates.
Source: MD 715 Reporter System: 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: Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer: Yes

n analysis of internal competitive promotions to senior grade levels reveals a significant disparity between the representation of employees with disabilities in the qualified applicant pool and their selection rates. For promotions to GS-13, GS-14, and GS-15, triggers were identified for both Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD), as the percentage of those selected was significantly lower than their representation among qualified internal applicants.

Specifically, for GS-13 promotions, PWD constituted 8.95 Percent of qualified applicants but only 4.19 Percent of selections, while PWTD made up 6.00 Percent of applicants but only 2.79 Percent of selections. At the GS-14 level, PWD were 8.99 Percent of the applicant pool but only 4.02 Percent of those selected, and PWTD were 5.93 Percent of applicants but only 2.41 Percent of selections. This trend continued for GS-15 promotions, where PWD represented 7.17 Percent of qualified applicants but only 2.22 Percent of selections, and PWTD represented 4.86 Percent of applicants but only 1.11 Percent of selections.

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

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

Analysis: The data shows the representation of PWD at various stages of the hiring process, from applicant pools to actual selections, at senior grade levels (GS-13, GS-14, GS-15, and SES).

Breakdown by grade level:

GS-13:
o Qualified External Applicants: 7.17 Percent PWD (4.34 Percent Targeted Disability)
o External Selections: 1.92 Percent PWD (0.96 Percent Targeted Disability)
GS-14:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 6.41 Percent PWD (3.75 Percent Targeted Disability)
o Internal Selections: 3.16 Percent PWD (3.16 Percent Targeted Disability)
GS-15:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 7.38 Percent PWD (4.70 Percent Targeted Disability)
o Internal Selections: 5.88 Percent PWD (5.88 Percent Targeted Disability)
SES:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 5.67 Percent PWD (4.96 Percent Targeted Disability)

o Internal Selections: 20.00 Percent PWD (0 Percent Targeted Disability)
Total Senior Grades :
o Total Senior Grades Percent 6.96 Percent PWD (4.42 Percent Targeted Disability)
Source: B15P 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: Yes

• New hire selection rates for PWTD were equal to the qualified applicant pool for SES (0 of 0) additionally PWTD were referred at same rate from the qualified pool (0 of 0) with a selection rate of 0 Percent and equal to those without disabilities that were not selected.
• New hire selection rates for PWTD were equal to the qualified applicant pool for GS 15 (0 of 0) additionally PWTD were referred at the same rate from the qualified pool (0 of 0) with a selection rate of 0 Percent while those without disabilities were selected at higher rates.

Breakdown by grade level:
• GS-13:

o Qualified External Applicants: 4.34 Percent PWTD
o External Selections: 0.96 Percent PWTD
• GS-14:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 3.75 Percent PWTD
o Internal Selections: 3.16 Percent PWTD
• GS-15:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 4.70 Percent PWTD
o Internal Selections: 5.88 Percent PWTD

• SES:
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 4.96 Percent PWTD
o Internal Selections: 0 Percent PWTD
• Total Senior Grades :
o Total Senior Grades Percent 4.42 Percent PWTD
Do triggers exist specifically for PWTD?

Yes:

Source: B15P: 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: Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer: Yes

c. Supervisors

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

Qualified Internal Applicants and Internal Selections) is compared to the "Relevant Applicant Pool Percent" .
• Executives:
o Relevant Applicant Pool: 13.62 Percent PWD (3.56 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 7.39 Percent PWD (5.16 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -6.23 Percent PWD (1.6 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Internal Selections: 2.47 Percent PWD (1.23 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -11.15 Percent PWD (-2.33 Percent with Targeted Disability)
• Managers:
o Relevant Applicant Pool: 16.38 Percent PWD (4.55 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 8.94 Percent PWD (5.93 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -7.44 Percent PWD (1.38 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Internal Selections: 3.10 Percent PWD (1.91 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -13.28 Percent PWD (-2.64 Percent with Targeted Disability)
• Supervisors:
o Relevant Applicant Pool: 15.79 Percent PWD (5.43 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Qualified Internal Applicants: 7.03 Percent PWD (4.59 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -8.76 Percent PWD (-0.84 Percent with Targeted Disability)
o Internal Selections: 4.01 Percent PWD (2.83 Percent with Targeted Disability)
§ Difference: -11.78 Percent PWD (-2.6 Percent with Targeted Disability)
Source: B19P Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability

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

a. Executives

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

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer: Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer: Yes

Based on the "B19P Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability" source, triggers were identified in the selection process for Executives, Managers, and Supervisors. For Executives, a trigger was found at the final selection stage, where the PWTD percentage for internal selections was 1.23 Percent against a benchmark of 5.16 Percent. No trigger was indicated for qualified internal applicants in this category. Similarly, for Managers, a trigger was identified at the final selection stage, with a PWTD percentage of 1.91 Percent for internal selections compared to a 5.93 Percent benchmark. For Supervisors, triggers were indicated at both the qualification and selection stages. The PWTD percentage for qualified internal applicants was 4.59 Percent against a 5.43 Percent benchmark, and for internal selections, it was 2.83 Percent against a 4.59 Percent benchmark.

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

B19P Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability, triggers were indicated across all management levels due to lower selection rates for People with Disabilities (PWD) compared to their representation in the qualified applicant pools. For executives, the selection rate for PWD was 2.47 Percent, which was significantly lower than their 7.39 Percent representation in the qualified applicant pool. In the manager category, the PWD selection rate was 3.10 Percent, a figure 6 percentage points below their 8.94 Percent presence in the

qualified pool. Similarly, for supervisors, the selection rate for PWD was 4.01 Percent, which was also notably lower than their 7.03 Percent representation among qualified applicants for those 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

B18P New Hires for Management Positions by Disability (Permanent) source, triggers were identified for new hires across all management levels due to a lack of selection of Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD). For executive positions, no PWTD candidates were selected, even though they constituted 4.78 Percent of the qualified external applicant pool. A similar situation occurred with manager positions, where no PWTD candidates were chosen from a qualified internal applicant pool in which they represented 3.95 Percent. For supervisor new hires, the selection rate for PWTD was 3.16 Percent, which was lower than their 4.27 Percent representation among the qualified internal applicants, also resulting in a trigger.

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

   No, the agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees into the competitive service during this reporting period.
   An analysis for the FY 2024 MD-715 Report determined that 44 eligible Army Schedule A employees were not converted to the competitive service after completing two years of satisfactory service.
   The Army's Barrier Analysis Working Group (BAWG), which addresses such issues, did not convene in FY 2025. Once the BAWG is reorganized, it will continue developing a recommendation to implement an automatic conversion system. This proposed system would function similarly to a within-grade increase, where the conversion to competitive service occurs automatically unless a supervisor provides justification 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

   No

Separations	Total (Number)	Reportable Disabilities (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disabilities (Percentage)
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(s) in the text box.

   a.Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: No

   b.Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: No

   No

Separations	Total (Number)	Targeted Disabilities (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disabilities (Percentage)
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.

The Department of the Army is currently unable to provide a data-driven explanation for separation rate triggers involving Persons with Disabilities (PWD) or Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD). This is due to the following limitations in our current data collection capabilities:

• No Centralized Exit Survey Program: The Army does not have an enterprise-wide exit survey program that systematically collects and analyzes reasons for departure across all commands. While some individual commands utilize their own exit or stay surveys, this information is not consolidated in a way that allows for a comprehensive, Army-wide analysis.
• Future Plans: To address this gap, the Department of the Army is actively researching the requirements and costs for a standardized Exit and/or Stay Survey with a goal of potential implementation within the next three years.
• Current Information: The insights currently available are based on informal engagements between Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) specialists and individual employees, which do not provide the quantitative data necessary for a formal analysis.

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 o the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

https://www.army.mil/armyeeo-meo#org-army-accessibility-

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.

https://www.army.mil/armyeeo-meo

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.

Army Section 508 Program: Overview and FY 2025 Activities
The U.S. Army's Section 508 Program is managed by the Information Technology & Compliance Directorate (ITCD) within the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). The program is responsible for providing oversight, guidance, and policy to ensure compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which mandates that federal agencies make their Information and Communication Technology (ICT) accessible to people with disabilities.
Key Accomplishments and Activities in FY 2025
The Army Section 508 Program achieved several key milestones and managed a significant operational workload during Fiscal Year 2025:
• Establishment of Foundational Policy: The program authored and codified the Army’s first-ever Section 508 Proponent Policy Memorandum (PPM). This foundational document formally establishes the Army 508 Program, reinforces existing federal law, and consolidates available training and resources for the workforce.
• Compliance and Testing:
o Conducted compliance testing on 51 public-facing websites and 278 high-profile public documents.
o Developed and implemented new testing plans for public-facing documents and applications to be used by the Army's 508 Trusted Testers.
• Technical Support and Guidance:

o Responded to 56 formal requests for information (RFIs) concerning policy clarification, technical guidance, and ICT compliance questions.
o Managed 35 support cases, which included a range of activities from helping to get assistive technology approved on the network to providing direct assistance with document remediation and application compliance.
Collaboration and Awareness Initiatives
To increase Section 508 awareness and integration, the Program Manager initiated several collaborative efforts:
• Established an informal, recurring Assistive Technology Working Group with key stakeholders including NETCOM, 7th Signal Command, and GCC.
• Maintained continuous collaboration with the Army's Disability Program Managers to align efforts and support shared program initiatives.
Status of Government-wide Assessment
The Government-wide Section 508 Assessment report from the General Services Administration (GSA) for FY 2025 has been delayed due to the government shutdown. Once released, it will be accessible at the official Section 508 website.
Future Plans
Looking ahead, the Army Section 508 Program will release further policy and guidance on the management of assistive technology for Reasonable Accommodations and on mandatory 508 compliance testing procedures.

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 Fiscal Year 2025, while a specific average processing time in days is not available, an analysis of timeliness for reasonable accommodation requests was conducted. During this period, 8,181 out of a total of 9,453 formal requests, or 86.5 Percent, were processed in a timely manner. A breakdown by category shows timeliness rates of 86.4 Percent for Disability requests under the Rehabilitation Act (7,689 out of 8,895), 90.7 Percent for Pregnant Workers under the PWFA (331 out of 365), 80.6 Percent for Personal Assistance under the Rehabilitation Act (87 out of 108), and 87.1 Percent for Religious accommodations under Title VII (74 out of 85). The Army's efficiency in handling these requests is bolstered by an updated enterprise-wide RA tracker launched in June 2024, which features a more user-friendly interface and better data processing. Furthermore, a forthcoming revision to Army Regulation 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program) will mandate the use of this tracker. This new policy is expected to create a more complete and accurate accounting of RA requests, thereby improving the Army's ability to track precise processing times, outcomes, and the overall cost of accommodations.

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 Fiscal Year 2025, the Army advanced its Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program by submitting its procedures to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) for review and continuing to enhance its enterprise RA Tracker as part of a comprehensive strategy to improve the processing and oversight of both RA and Personal Assistance Services (PAS) requests. Key initiatives supporting this effort included the continuous agile improvement of the automated RA/PAS tracking tool, a significant update to the governing regulation, AR 690-12 (Equal Employment Opportunity Program), and updating the mandatory Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), Anti-Harassment (AH), and No FEAR Act (NFA) training to include RA policy. The Army also continues to review supervisor and employee onboarding training and performs active trend analysis to identify root causes for disability-related complaints.

The Army's policies for implementing the Personal Assistance Services (PAS) requirement are effective due to their direct alignment with the robust RA program, ensuring a consistent and timely process. Given the very low volume of PAS requests, the program uses a highly effective, hands-on approach where the servicing EEO office works directly with the Army's Disability Program Manager (DPM) on every case. This model leverages the established RA framework, ensures expert-led processing, facilitates a strong interactive process, and uses the broader RA training to prepare managers. This case-by-case oversight guarantees compliance and effectiveness for each request.

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.

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

The effectiveness of the Army's Personal Assistance Services (PAS) program stems from its direct alignment with the established and robust Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program, which ensures a consistent, compliant, and timely process for all requests. Given the very low volume of

PAS requests, the program utilizes a highly effective, hands-on approach where the servicing Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) office collaborates directly with the Army's Disability Program Manager (DPM) for every case, ensuring expert oversight from start to finish. This model's success is built on several key features: it leverages the proven and compliant framework of the RA procedures, guarantees timely and expert-led processing through centralized oversight, and fosters a highly effective individualized interactive process by involving the DPM directly with the employee and supervisor. Furthermore, the existing RA training for managers and supervisors inherently prepares them to handle infrequent PAS requests, and the DPM's involvement in every case serves as a form of real-time, case-by-case monitoring that ensures compliance and the effectiveness of the accommodation.

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: Yes

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

During FY25, there was one finding recorded on the 462 report as being on non-sexual harassment on the basis of both disability (mental) and (physical). However, while it is recorded on the 462 Report as non-sexual harassment, the finding was truly due to a determination that per se retaliation had occurred. No other issue was involved in the finding. Harassment (non-sexual) was entered as a placeholder issue so the case would be counted on the report. Regardless, corrective actions for this case included reassignment, backpay, and potentially compensatory damages and attorneys fees.

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 accommodatior 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: 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 FY25, the Army had 3 findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide RA which cost a total of $0 to date.
Case #1 was comprised of an RA issue only, on the basis of disability (mental). The non-monetary corrective measure was a posting of the notice. The complainant was advised they were entitled to a further decision on compensatory damages and attorney's fees, but no claim for either was submitted.
Case #2 was comprised of an RA issue only, on the basis of disability (physical). This case resulted in $200,000 in compensatory damages; $56,345 in attorney fees; and the non-monetary corrective measures were training for the management official and the posting of the notice.
Case #3 was comprised of an RA issue only but involved a finding on the basis of both disability (mental) and disability (physical). This case resulted in $150,000 in compensatory damages; $16,920 in attorney fees; and the non-monetary corrective measures were 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

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities. Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

   The Army has not established a formal plan for FY25. The Barrier Analysis Working Group (BAWG), which is responsible for developing such corrective plans, did not convene during this reporting period.

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

   The Army has suspended its barrier analysis effort pending updated guidance from OSD and EEOC. Applicable to Section VII.

   The Army is awaiting additional guidance from OSD and EEOC.

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 Army has suspended its barrier analysis effort pending updated guidance from OSD and EEOC. Applicable to Section VII.

   The Army is awaiting additional guidance from OSD and EEOC.