

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

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

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

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

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	2340	328	14.02	50	2.14
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	114	28	24.56	3	2.63

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

HRSA communicated numerical goals to hiring managers at (1) senior staff meetings, (2) Council on Employees with Disabilities meetings, (3) pre-hiring consultations with the Selective Placement Program Coordinator, and (4) relevant trainings to include RA.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Chantal St. Fleur Special Emphasis Program Manager cstfleur@hrsa.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	Chantal St. Fleur Special Emphasis Program Manager cstfleur@hrsa.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Chris Parker Director cparker@hrsa.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Lauren Taylor IT Specialist ltaylor1@hrsa.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	Samir Chandra Accessibility Team Leader schandra@hrsa.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Samir Chandra Accessibility Team Leader schandra@hrsa.gov

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

Answer Yes

• Pregnancy Workers Fairness Act Training • Federal Dispute Resolution Training Conference • Examining Conflicts in Employment Law Training Conference • Disability Program Manager Training • Job Accommodation Network webinars • Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability Meetings and other informational sessions

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

Has the agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period? If “no”, describe the agency’s plan to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources.

Answer Yes

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of individuals with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTDD

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

- 1. Describe the programs and resources the agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities.

HRSA has a Disability Employment Program Manager who also serves as the Agency’s Selective Placement Program Coordinator. This individual is responsible for recruiting individuals with a disability through direct and indirect contact. Additionally, OHR personnel are available to consult with PWDs at various career fairs.

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

HRSA uses special hiring authorities to fill open positions and educate potential applicants on the process. Information is available from (1) HRSA’s website, (2) OHR personnel, and (3) the Selective Placement Program Coordinator.

- 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.

HRSA follows the OPM guidance on appropriate Schedule A letters to determine applicants’ eligibility. When eligible Schedule A applicants apply to HRSA’s government-wide job vacancy announcements, qualified applicants are forwarded to hiring officials via a USA Staffing Certificate of non-competitive eligible applicants. Additionally, HRSA accepts potential candidates who supply their Schedule A certificate and a letter of interest. HRSA’s OHR personnel determines eligibility and notifies the Selective Placement Program Coordinator who will alert the hiring officials of eligibility.

- 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

While HRSA offered training on special hiring authorities, it is not mandatory for hiring officials to participate as most hiring officials receive training one-on-one or in a group as appropriate. Additionally, OHR holds pre-hire consultations with all hiring managers in which the use of special hiring authorities is discussed.

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 PWTDD, in securing and maintaining employment.

HRSA has a list server of disability-serving institutions and uses that list server to communicate job opportunities. Each year, HRSA reaffirms its relationship with these institutions as well as establishes partnerships with others.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

- 1.

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

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

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

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	2113	6.96	0.00	3.41	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	1151	8.60	0.00	4.17	0.00
% of New Hires	29	13.79	0.00	10.34	0.00

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer No

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0404 BIOLOGICAL TECH	2	0.00	0.00
0602 MEDICAL OFF	2	0.00	0.00
0610 NURSE	1	0.00	0.00
0685 PUB HLTH PROG SPEC	19	21.05	15.79
2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPEC	5	0.00	0.00

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

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Using the relevant applicant pool of 9.8 percent PWD and 3.5 percent PWTD among all job series 0685 applicants, 8.5 percent PWD and 3.1 percent PWTD among all job series 0343 applicants, and 9.2 percent PWD and 5.3 percent PWTD among all job series 2210 applicants, there are no triggers for PWD (13.9). A trigger does exist for PWTD (2.1 percent) among the qualified internal applicants for internal competitive promotion within job series 0685. Triggers exist for both PWD (7.0 percent) and PWTD (2.5 percent) among the qualified internal applicants for internal competitive promotion within job series 0343, while there are no triggers for PWD (69.3 percent) nor PWTD (6.8 percent) among the qualified internal applicants for internal competitive promotion

within job series 2210.

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

Using the qualified applicant pool of 9.7 percent PWD and 3.1 percent PWTD as a benchmark, triggers exist among PWTDs in all three of HRSA’s most populous MCOs (14.1 percent and 2.2 percent of internal competitive promotions within job series 0685 were respectively PWD and PWTD; 11.1 percent and 2.2 percent of internal competitive promotions within job series 0343 were respectively PWD and PWTD), while no PWDs nor PWTDs were internally promoted within job series 2210.

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.

To ensure PWDs have sufficient opportunities for advancement, HRSA: • Fosters strategic partnerships among the HRSA Learning Institute and HRSA’s Disability Employment Program Manager to assess the applicant flow data associated with career development programs and provides recommendations for improving participation rates among PWDs as necessary, • Communicates advancement opportunities to HRSA’s Council on Employees with Disabilities to ensure broad dissemination, and • Posts detail opportunities on HRSA’s intranet for easy access among PWDs.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

HRSA offers employees multiple career development opportunities which include but are not limited to formal career development, mentoring, and individual development plans. The Agency has three formal career development programs which are the Mid-Level Leadership Development Program (MLDP), Team Lead Development Program and the Senior Leadership Fellowship Program (SLFP). The MLDP is a capacity-building initiative targeting HRSA employees at the GS-12 and GS-13 levels who have expressed an interest in leadership development and have a desire to become part of a pool of highly skilled and qualified employees who HRSA can call upon to step into leadership roles as needs arise. Graduates of the program increase their knowledge and skills in leadership; gain interdepartmental project experience; have exposure to HRSA leaders; and gain an increased understanding of HRSA’s mission, challenges, and opportunities. Given that the largest population of employees at HRSA is found within the GS-12 and -13 levels, developing leaders at those levels is crucial to HRSA’s future success. SLFP gives GS-14/15, or CO-04/05/06 who occupy GS-14/15 equivalent positions, the opportunity to develop their leadership skills. SLFP fosters inspired front-line leadership development through tools and resources, such as in-person sessions, applied learning, and individualized consultation. Team Lead Development Program provides Team Leads from various HRSA B/Os with competencies/knowledge, skills, and abilities to be effective in their role while assessing proficiency in HRSA core and leadership competencies. The Program gives participants an opportunity to facilitate peer learning and increase their proficiency in Team Lead competencies through seven modules over the course of seven months. In addition to the three formal career development programs, employees are provided opportunities to seek career development through the agency’s Mentoring Program as well as through individual development plans (IDPs). The

Mentoring Program connects mentors and mentees from across the agency to provide opportunities for them to develop and build leadership, mission-critical knowledge and skills, and increase employee performance and retention. Through the use of IDPs, HRSA employees collaborate with their supervisors to create individually tailored action plans that develop specific competencies (knowledge and skills) needed to improve current performance or to prepare for new responsibilities. IDPs usually consist of a wide array of development opportunities that span the scope of the agency’s formal career development programs. Individuals use these plans to invest in long-term self-development while accomplishing important day-to-day work.

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 (%)
Other Career Development Programs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Detail Programs	UNAVBL	UNAVBL	UNAVBL	UNAVBL	UNAVBL	UNAVBL
Internship Programs	1797	42	UNAVBL	4.8	UNAVBL	0.0
Fellowship Programs	1797	18	UNAVBL	5.6	UNAVBL	0.0
Mentoring Programs	98	98	17.3	17.3	2.0	2.0
Coaching Programs	130	122	13.8	14.8	3.1	3.3
Training Programs	114	39	12.4	7.7	3.5	5.1

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

Using the relevant applicant pool equivalents of 16.5 percent PWD within HRSA’s GS-12/13 workforce for the MLDP, and 11.2 percent PWD within HRSA’s GS-14/15 workforce for the SLFP, triggers exist for the 13.3 percent PWD among the MLDP applicants and for the 9.7 percent PWD among the SLFP applicants. Using the actual applicant pools of 13.3 percent PWD for the MLDP; 9.7 percent PWD for the SLFP; and the relevant applicant pool equivalent of 14.6 percent PWD within HRSA’s total permanent and temporary civilian workforce for the Mentoring Now Program, a trigger exists only for the 5.0 percent PWD among the MLDP selectees.

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

Using the relevant applicant pool equivalents of 3.6 percent PWTD within HRSA’s GS-12/13 workforce for the MLDP, and 2.5 percent PWTD within HRSA’s GS-14/15 workforce for the SLFP, a trigger exists for the 2.4 percent PWTD among the MLDP applicants, but not for the 6.5 percent PWTD among the SLFP applicants. Using the actual applicant pools of 2.4 percent PWTD for the MLDP; 6.5 percent PWTD for the SLFP; and the relevant applicant pool equivalent of 3.0 percent PWTD within HRSA’s total permanent and temporary civilian workforce for the Mentoring Now Program, triggers exist for the 5.3 percent PWTD among the SLFP selectees and for the 2.0 percent PWTD among the Mentoring Now Program participants.

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

• 16.5 percent of PWD and 8.2 percent of PWTD received 11 to 20-hour Time-Off Awards compared to 16.6 percent of PWOD. • 5.5 percent of PWTD received 21 to 30-hour Time-Off Awards compared to 8.3 percent of PWOD. • 20.2 percent of PWD and 19.2 percent of PWTD received 31 to 40-hour Time-Off Awards compared to 21.2 percent of PWOD. • 28.6 percent of PWD and 20.6 percent of PWTD received \$501-\$999 Cash Awards compared to 31.6 percent of PWOD. • 30.8 percent of PWD and 21.9 percent of PWTD received \$1000-\$1999 Cash Awards compared to 33.2 percent of PWOD. • 18.2 percent of PWD received \$3,000-\$3,999 Cash Awards compared to 19.0 percent of PWOD. • 10.4 percent of PWD and 6.9 percent of PWTD received \$4,000-\$4,999 Cash Awards compared to 11.4 percent of PWOD. • 7.0 percent of PWD received \$5,000-\$5,999 Cash Awards compared to 8.2 percent of PWOD. • 0.6 percent of PWD and 0.0 percent of PWTD received \$6,000-\$6,999 Cash Awards compared to 1.7 percent of PWOD.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	328	14.57	13.66	15.09	14.47
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	2813	121.01	119.16	135.85	118.42
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	8	2.24	0.44	16.98	-0.33
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	349	14.01	14.10	11.32	14.47
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	6925	282.07	280.18	192.45	297.70
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	19	5.60	1.05	32.08	0.99
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	189	7.28	7.98	5.66	7.57
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	5252	197.20	225.33	135.85	207.89
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	27	7.56	1.54	45.28	0.99
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	509	20.17	21.20	18.87	20.39
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	20542	794.12	858.15	754.72	800.99
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	40	10.92	2.20	75.47	-0.33
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	908	32.77	36.84	24.53	34.21
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	648348	22979.55	26242.57	18013.21	23845.39

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	714	196.36	39.21	1384.91	-10.86
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	882	34.17	37.11	22.64	36.18
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	1216184	47008.40	51248.79	33737.74	49322.04
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1378	385.15	75.99	2811.32	-37.83
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	480	21.57	19.60	24.53	21.05
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	1180335	53115.97	48184.47	60137.74	51891.78
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2459	689.64	135.30	4624.53	3.62
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	465	18.21	19.27	20.75	17.76
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	1588114	62163.31	66016.96	71360.38	60559.87
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3415	956.30	188.60	6486.79	-7.89
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	273	10.08	12.11	7.55	10.53
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	1220669	44316.53	54363.33	33515.09	46199.67
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4471	1230.81	247.08	8377.36	-15.13
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	266	8.96	11.89	7.55	9.21
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	1750198	63412.32	77885.13	54290.57	65002.63
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	6579	1981.51	360.57	13571.70	-39.14

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

• 7.0 percent of PWD and 8.2 percent of PWTD received quality step increases compared to 9.1 percent of PWOD. • 1.1 percent of PWD received performance-based pay increases compared to 1.2 percent of PWOD.

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

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

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

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

N/A

D. PROMOTIONS

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

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer 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 No

Using the relevant internal applicant pool of 9.7 percent PWD to SES, 5.8 percent PWD to GS-15, 8.1 percent PWD to GS-14, and 8.2 percent PWD to GS-13 as benchmarks, triggers exist among PWDs for qualified internal applicants to the SES as well as the GS-14 and GS-15 senior grade levels, as seen in comparison to the benchmarks that follow in the next paragraph. Using the qualified internal applicant pool of 2.5 percent PWD to GS-15, 6.6 percent PWD to GS-14, and 9.5 percent PWD to GS-13 as benchmarks, triggers exist among PWDs for internal selections to the GS-14 and GS-15 senior grade levels, as no internal selections to the GS-14 and GS-15 levels were PWDs. No triggers exist among PWDs for their 13.3 percent representation among internal selections to the GS-13 senior grade level. There were no internal SES PWD applicants; thus, no internal SES PWD selections were made.

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 No

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

Using the relevant internal applicant pool of 2.4 percent PWTD to SES, 3.1 percent PWTD to GS-15, 3.5 percent PWTD to GS-14, and 3.4 percent PWTD to GS-13 as benchmarks, triggers exist among PWTDs for qualified internal applicants to the SES as well as the GS-13 and GS-15 senior grade levels, as seen in comparison to the benchmarks that follow in the next paragraph. Using the qualified internal applicant pool of 0.6 percent PWTD to GS-15, 3.5 percent PWTD to GS-14, and 2.7 percent PWTD to GS-13 as benchmarks, triggers exist among PWTDs for internal selections to the SES as well as the GS-14 and GS-15 senior grade levels, as no internal selections to the GS-14 and GS-15 levels were PWTDs. No triggers exist among PWTDs for their 5.7 percent representation among internal selections to the GS-13 senior grade level. There were no internal SES PWTD applicants; thus, no internal SES PWTD selections were made.

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

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

There is no trigger.

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

- a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer No
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer No

Using the qualified applicant pool of 4.3 percent PWTD to SES, 2.0 percent PWTD to GS-15, 2.1 percent PWTD to GS-14, and 3.8 percent PWTD to GS-13 new hire announcements as benchmarks, triggers exist among PWTDs for new hires to the GS-15 senior grade level, as no new hires to the GS-15 level were PWTDs; whereas no triggers exist among PWTDs for new hires to the SES senior grade level, because there were no new SES hires in the first place, nor among PWTDs as 7.1% of new hires to the GS-14 senior grade level, nor among PWTDs as 6.9% of new hires to the GS-13 senior grade level.

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

Using the relevant applicant pool of 9.3 percent PWD for qualified internal applicants for promotion, and the qualified applicant pool of 9.7 percent PWD for internal selectees for promotion, as benchmarks — triggers exist involving PWD among qualified internal applicants for promotion to Executive (1.9 percent), Manager (9.0 percent), and Supervisor (4.9 percent) positions, and involving PWD among internal selectees for promotion to all Executive/Manager/Supervisor positions (0 percent; no PWDs were selected).

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 Yes
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer Yes

c. Supervisors

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

Using the relevant applicant pool of 3.7 percent PWTD for qualified internal applicants for promotion, and the qualified applicant pool of 3.1 percent PWTD for internal selectees for promotion, as benchmarks — triggers exist involving PWTD among qualified internal applicants for promotion to Executive (1.0 percent), Manager (1.3 percent), and Supervisor (1.1 percent) positions, and involving PWTD among internal selectees for promotion to all Executive/Manager/Supervisor positions (0 percent; no PWTDs were selected).

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

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer No

Using the qualified applicant pool of 7.8 percent PWD as a benchmark, no triggers exist involving PWD among 10.0% of new hires to Executive positions, nor among 11.1% of new hires to Manager positions, nor among 10.5% of new hires to Supervisor 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 No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer No

Using the qualified applicant pool of 3.0 percent PWTD as a benchmark, triggers exist involving PWD among new hires to Executive, as no PWTDs were hired to Executive positions, but no triggers exist involving PWTD among 11.1% of new hires to Manager positions, nor involving PWTD among 5.3% of new hires to Supervisor 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

Three employees, who were due for their conversions in FY 2023, were not converted because their Bureaus or Offices did not recommend them for conversion. The Selective Placement Program Coordinator has notified human resources personnel of the matter and continues making sure managers are aware of opportunities to convert employees.

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

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	2	0.00	0.09
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	30	1.10	1.19
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	32	1.92	1.14
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	61	3.84	2.15
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	125	6.85	4.57

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

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	2	0.00	0.08
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	30	0.00	1.20
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	32	1.85	1.24
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	61	1.85	2.40
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	125	3.70	4.92

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

N/A

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

- 1. Please provide the internet address on the agency’s public website for its notice explaining employees’ and applicants’ rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

Public website: <https://www.hrsa.gov/about/508-resources.html> File a complaint: HRSAAccessibility@hrsa.gov

- 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.

Public website: <https://www.hrsa.gov/eeo/no-fear-act/lawsandprotections>

- 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.

508 Accessibility Hoteling To further support workspace flexibilities, improve workspace efficiencies, and foster a collaborative working environment, HHS established guidelines for receiving dedicated space and utilizing alternative workspace assignments while at the agency worksite. Under the guidelines, employees working onsite six or more days per civilian pay period will receive a dedicated workspace, while employees working onsite fewer than six days per civilian pay period will participate in alternative workspace assignments. These guidelines were incorporated in the 2023 Collective Bargaining Agreement between HHS and the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), and shared with employees in the HRSA Workplace Space Policy memorandum on August 15, 2023. In light of the recent workspace policy, the Agency is working to ensure that employees with disabilities are reasonably accommodated in hoteling space. OCRDI continues to include Section 508 requirements in its RA Training for Managers and Supervisors, RA Refresher Training for Managers and Supervisors, RA Training for Employees, and New Employee Orientation to increase accessibility awareness throughout the agency. OCRDI has also maintained its practice of providing TA to HRSA B/Os to ensure equal access for PWDs. The HRSA's 508 Team continues to improve the accessibility of HRSA's Information and Communications Technology by: a. Updating the Section 508 SharePoint page to increase 508 awareness. b. Ensure all HRSA acquisition requests are reviewed to add the appropriate Section 508 language that requires vendors to submit an HHS Accessibility checklist with every document deliverable. Having the 508 language added will assist Contracting Officer Representatives in verifying the accessibility of deliverables. c. Continue to train customers on Section 508 to align with HHS' Policy. Safety and Evacuations for PWDs HRSA's Safety Team HRSA continues to work towards the following goals/practices to help increase accessibility: a. Monitor and assess the workplace to ensure a safe environment for all employees. b. In partnership with the Program Support Center and the other tenants of the building, perform a functional and comprehensive review of the Occupant Emergency Plan, focused on identifying areas of improvement. c. Develop supporting roles with HRSA staff in the regions focused on both their unique security and safety requirements/constraints.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

The average time frame for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations in FY 2023 is not available. However, the agency did process requests (measured from date of request to the date of the final action for the case, e.g., denial or RA provision) in 42 days on average in FY 2022 with a 93% timeliness rate.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency's reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

The HRSA RA Policy and Procedures Manual continues to be an effective set of guidance for processing RA requests, as it provides a succinct approach to ensuring full participation in the interactive process. In FY 2023, the Agency focused on providing targeted training (RA for Managers: A practical approach) to managers and supervisors to reinforce the guidance by further emphasizing the importance of the interactive process and detailing supervisors' responsibilities. The agency also collaborated with the Council on Employees with Disabilities to conduct Bureau/Office level RA briefings on invisible disabilities. In the upcoming fiscal year, the agency will increase the offerings of targeted trainings to support the timely processing of RA requests. RA requests were processed in accordance with agency policy, HHS and EEOC guidance during a year of significant change in guidance for RA programs across the federal sector due to E.O. 14043 (vaccine mandate) and the return-to-work process. Due to instruction from HHS/OS/ASA and the injunction related to COVID-19 requests, RA processing was inhibited from September 9, 2021, until early January 2022 impacting 125 cases. Then the injunction of January 21, 2022, prevented processing any COVID-19 vaccine related requests (20 disability-based, 61 religion-based). These 81 cases remain suspended. Of the remaining contacts and requests processed by the program in FY 2022 (283 without the COVID-19 cases), 139 related to returning to the workplace. Separately, 68 of the 283 were contacts whereas the other 215 were actionable requests. The information on case timeliness above relates to the 215 actionable requests. Public Website: Please note that HRSA made the RA policy and procedures publicly available on the HRSA website since it modified and updated the policy. The document link has remained public since its posting on September 28, 2017: <https://www.hrsa.gov/sites/default/files/hrsa/eo/ra-manual.pdf>. As of January 2021, OCRDI has extended its public-facing web presence, and the manual is now prominently featured: <https://www.hrsa.gov/about/organization/bureaus/ocrdi#reasonable-accommodations>

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.

As part of the agency’s Disabilities Services Program, the Agency provided PAS and workplace assistance services (WAS) such as sign language interpreting, readers, and escorts, etc. within the reporting period. PAS was provided to the Agency’s one eligible employee. Additionally, whereas no employee utilized WAS in FY22, five employees requested and received services in FY 23. PAS and WAS requests were processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures manual. Employees who utilized these services continue to report being fully satisfied with program operations and the serviced received. Regarding training, HRSA’s RA Training for Managers/Supervisors and the subsequent course, RA Refresher for Managers/Supervisors, review the similarities and differences between PAS and other service types (sign language interpreting, readers, escorts, etc.) as well as the process used to make a request for such services. Public Website: Please note HRSA made the PAS policy and procedures publicly available on the HRSA website on September 28, 2017. The PAS procedures begin on page 31 of the HRSA Policy on RA: <https://www.hrsa.gov/sites/default/files/hr/nofearact/forms/ramanual.pdf>. As of January 2021, OCRDI has extended its public-facing web presence, and the manual is now prominently featured: <https://www.hrsa.gov/about/organization/bureaus/ocrdi#reasonable-accommodations>.

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

- 1. During the last fiscal year, did a higher percentage of PWD file a formal EEO complaint alleging failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, as compared to the government-wide average?

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

1. Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?

Answer No

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

Answer N/A

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

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?	<p>HRSA’s PWTd permanent workforce representation within two of the most populous MCOs is less than the respective benchmarks. Triggers also exist for PWDs and PWTds by MCO for qualified applicants and for promotions—and within the larger permanent workforce for awards, QSIs, and pay increases, as well as for career development programs. PWTds within Two of the Top Three Most Populous MCOs 0685 PWTds=2.1 percent versus 3.0 percent qualified-applicant-pool benchmark 2210 PWTds=2.8 percent versus 3.0 percent qualified-applicant-pool benchmark PWDs and PWTds continue to have triggers in the recruitment and selection processes for new hires and promotions to senior grade levels and management positions. PWD and/or PWTd Qualified Applicants, and Promotions for MCO See details in Part J, Section III,, C.3 and C.4. PWD Applicants/Selectees and PWTd Applicants to Career Development Programs See details in Part J, Section IV, B.3 and B.4. PWD and/or PWTd for Time-Off Awards, Cash Awards, QSIs, and Performance-Based Pay Increases See details in Part J, Section IV, C.1 and C.2.</p>				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i>				
	People with Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	N				
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		
	N/A		N/A		
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
03/30/2022	06/30/2023	Yes	09/30/2023		Conduct barrier analysis to determine whether barriers cause the identified triggers. Establish remedial action plan if barrier(s) exist.
Responsible Official(s)					
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?	
EEO Director		Anthony F. Archeval		Yes	
Diversity and Inclusion Manager		LaKaisha T. Yarber Jarrett		Yes	
Complaints Manager		Jacqueline Calix		Yes	
Accessibility Team Lead		Samir Chandra		Yes	
Deputy EEO Director		Shelma Middleton Little		Yes	

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
03/30/2022	Perform comprehensive trigger identification targeting disability employment.	Yes	01/31/2023	01/27/2023
04/30/2022	Leverage the agency’s partnership with the Council on Employees with Disabilities to ascertain a deeper understanding/insight into key findings.	Yes	10/31/2024	
06/30/2023	Review DEIA survey results for PWDs and determine whether additional triggers may exist.	Yes	08/31/2024	
07/31/2022	Analyze additional information for possible barriers.	Yes	03/31/2025	
09/30/2022	Report findings to leadership inclusive of remediation plan should barriers exist.	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2023	Devise a framework for establishing a special emphasis program advisory committee.	Yes		09/30/2023
09/30/2023	Create the scope of work for pay equity contract.	Yes		09/30/2023
10/01/2023	Award and execute pay equity contract	Yes		
04/15/2024	Establish a special emphasis program advisory committee.	Yes		
06/30/2024	Through the committee, prioritize the identified triggers for further exploration.	Yes		
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2021	This is a newly established plan. HRSA will report accomplishments and/or plan in subsequent MD-715 reports.			
2022	HRSA conducted trigger identification which led to the uncovering of the triggers identified in this action plan. As a next step, the agency will review the findings of the DEIA needs assessment as they pertain to disability employment—the agency is expecting a June 2023 release date—as well as collaborate with the Council on Employees with Disabilities ERG to gain further insight into the key findings and determine whether barriers exist. HRSA will report accomplishments and/or plan modifications in subsequent MD-715 reports.			
2023	<p>In FY 2023, HRSA conducted a DEIA needs assessment in which employees were given opportunities to provide information on their experiences as HRSA employees. The agency also 1) solicited contractual support to assess pay equity and 2) devised a framework for establishing a special emphasis program advisory committee to support the agency’s future barrier analysis efforts.</p> <p>In FY 2024, the agency will continue to assess additional data sources such as the DEIA needs assessment findings and partner with the Council on Employees with Disabilities to determine whether additional triggers (and possible barriers) associated with disability recruitment and selections exist. Additionally, HRSA will disseminate the DEIA assessment findings to key stakeholders to include the HRSA DEIA Council as well as establish a special emphasis program advisory committee. The committee will review the assessment findings, in part, and determine priority barrier analysis focus areas associated with the agency’s disability employment program and disability workforce.</p> <p>Note, the representation of PWDs and PWTs in the permanent workforce is no longer a trigger, as the percentage of both groups in the HRSA workforce exceeds the 12 percent and 2 percent goals, respectively. Therefore, the committee will devote attention to prioritizing and exploring the remaining abovementioned triggers which includes examining the findings of the pay equity assessment that may yield additional details pertaining to disability employment. Updates including accomplishments and action plan modifications will be provided in subsequent MD-715 reports.</p>			

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

Aside from conducting the initial trigger identification process, other planned activities were modified to reflect the impact that the DEIA needs assessment findings would have on the agency's trigger identification and barrier analysis process. Target dates were changed to allow for both activities to conclude so that the newly obtained information could be used to further inform the barrier analysis process.

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

Conducting the initial trigger identification process allows the agency to have a clearer understanding of the conditions that exist in the Disability Employment Program that warrant further inquiry and provides a roadmap to determining whether barriers exist.

6. If the planned activities did not correct the trigger(s) and/or barrier(s), please describe how the agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

N/A