

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

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

In FY 2023, for the GS-10 and below grades, ACF's permanent participation rate in the below GS-10 grade level (GS-4 to GS-9) for persons with disabilities is 37.04% or 10 persons with disabilities. For the GS-11 to GS-15 grades, ACF's permanent participation rate is 16.85% or 276 persons with disabilities. However, ACF was below the Federal goal of 12% at the GS-15 and SES level. The GS-15 level being 11.11% (20 people) and the SES level being 3.57% (1 person)

*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 Yes |

According to Table B4 (Permanent: Participation Rates for General Schedule Grades), in FY 2023, for the GS-10 and below grades, ACF's permanent participation rate in the below GS-10 grade level (GS-4 to GS-9) for persons with targeted disabilities is 14.81% or 4 people. For the GS-11 to GS-15 grades, ACF's permanent participation rate is 2.93% or 48 people with targeted disabilities. However, ACF was below the Federal goal of 2% at the GS-15 and SES level. The GS-15 level being 0.56% (1 person) and the SES level being 0%.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	1689	276	16.34	37	2.19
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	23	7	30.43	1	4.35

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

The Office of Diversity Management and EEO (ODME) briefs senior leadership about the outcomes of the workforce data analyses and triggers found compared to the benchmark goals for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD). In addition, in FY 2023, ODME rolled out the ACF Demographic Dashboard, which includes office specific demographic profiles that include data pertaining to PWD and PWTD. The Executive and Administrative Officers, through their Community of Practice meetings discuss workforce-related concerns with management, and the use of Schedule A appointments and conversions, and detail opportunities, to attract and retain PWD and PWTD. Furthermore, ODME shares information on PWD and PWTD hiring goals through staff meetings, presentations, and posts. ACF continues to convene listening sessions for employees with disabilities and their allies, and senior leadership has attended the sessions.

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

- 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

ODME has a GS-13 Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator; as well as a backup RAC. ODME also has a GS-12 staff member serving as a Special Emphasis Program (SEP) Coordinator; and a Collateral Duty Disability Program Manager (CD DPM). The SEP Coordinator and the CD DPM work closely with Able and Disabled Allies Partnering Together (ADAPT) ERG, the Employee Resource Group (ERG) for employees with disabilities.

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Section 508 Compliance	1	1	0	Janean Chambers 508 Coordinator
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1	0	0	Tara Watson Human Resources Specialist Tara.Watson@hhs.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	2	0	0	Wanda Turner, Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator Wanda.Turner@acf.hhs.gov Beatrice.Schmidtr@acf.hhs.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Tara Watson Human Resources Specialist Tara.Watson@hhs.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Levi Duncan, Facility & Operations Branch Chief ACF levi.duncan@acf.hhs.gov

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	2	0	1	Lola Montgomery, CD Disability Programs Manager lola.montgomery@acf.hhs.gov edgar.reese@acf.hhs.gov

- 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

• FEED: Best Practices for Attracting and Recruiting Employees with Disabilities • Neurodiversity Spotlight: Supporting Mental Health and Emotional Well-Being • Do I Have to Approve This Reasonable Accommodation Request for Telework? • How Do I Know if an Accommodation is an Undue Hardship? • How Long is This Accommodation Supposed to Last? • Neurodiversity Spotlight: ADHD at Work • 2023 EEO Awareness/No FEAR Act Training • FEED: Supporting Effective Communication Access • Everything You Need to Know About the Pregnancy Workers Fairness Act • FELTG Absence Leave Abuse and Medical Issues Week • Revisiting Existing Reasonable Accommodations • How Do I Know if an Accommodation is an Undue Hardship • EEO Litigation for ACF Supervisors • HHS Leading Change Seminar Series (Session 2): Reasonable Accommodation.

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

ACF has sufficient staff, funding and resources to implement the disability program.

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 PWTD

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

ACF receives job applications through the HHS Office of Human Resources, Staffing Recruitment Operations Center (SROC). ACF consults with the HHS Veteran Employment Manager to identify disabled veteran applicants for ACF vacancies. ODME shares with ADAPT (Able and Disabled Allies Partnering Together) ERG vacancy announcements and relevant resources. ADAPT ERG holds annual listening session to address issues that ACF disability employees encounter in the workplace as it relates to employment and reasonable accommodation. In FY23, the Office of Transformation, Business and Management (OTBM) and the ODME Director continued to regularly meet to identify possible collaborations and initiatives to increase the participation of PWD and PWTD. In FY 2023, ACF rolled out a Diversity Outreach Program, which also focus on individuals with disabilities. ACF also rolled out the Department’s first DEIA Paid Internship Program, in which 56% of interns self-reported being part of an underrepresented population including individuals with disabilities and veterans.

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

ACF utilized hiring authorities (for example, Schedule A, 5 CFR 213.3102(u) and Disabled Veterans).

3. When individuals apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account (e.g., Schedule A), explain how the agency (1) determines if the individual is eligible for appointment under such authority; and, (2) forwards the individual's application to the relevant hiring officials with an explanation of how and when the individual may be appointed.

The HHS Staffing Recruitment Operations Center (SROC) evaluates the applications and submits qualified applicants to the hiring official for consideration under Schedule A appointments.

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

Answer Yes

ACF regularly provides training to hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities for PWD and PWTD. SROC and ACF’s Office of Transformation, Business and Management (OTBM) provides technical advice to hiring managers and Administrative Officers within each program office involved in the hiring process. Additionally, hiring managers are reminded of Schedule A hiring authority at various leadership meetings.

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.

In FY23, ODME continued meeting regularly with internal and external stakeholders (e.g., ACF DEI Executive Team; ACF Equity Advisory Board; OA People’s Strategy/DEIA Work Group; HHS/EEODI, EEOC, FEEDS, etc.) to expand networking. The agency's Diversity Outreach Program is targeting organizations working with PWD/PWTD in their outreach efforts.

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 Yes

Using data from the agency-wide internal data warehouse (BIIS) workforce tables (Table B1), there were 230 new hires at ACF in FY23. Of that number, 42 (18.26%) out of the 230 new hires identified as having a disability, which was above the 12% goal. However, the hiring rate for PWTD, 3 (1.30%) was below the federal benchmark (2%).

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants					

% of Qualified Applicants					
% of New Hires					

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

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

In FY 2023, the 6 MCOs in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210, identified in Table B6. New Hires According to our Applicant Flow Data, in the • In the 0101 job series, 385 PWD were qualified, 10 referred and none were selected. • In the 0301 job series, 106 PWD were qualified, 4 referred and none selected. • In the 0343 job series, 52 PWD were qualified, 9 referred and 2 selected. • In the 0501 job series, 0 PWD were qualified, or referred, or were selected. • In the 1109 job series, 0 PWD were qualified, or referred, or were selected. • In the 2210 job series, 28 PWD were qualified, 9 referred and 3 selected. According to our workforce data, • In the 0101 job series, 75 PWTDs were qualified, 1 referred and none selected. • In the 0301 job series, 21 PWTDs were qualified, 2 referred and none selected. • In the 0343 job series, 12 PWTD were qualified, 4 referred and 2 selected. • In the 0501 job series, 0 PWTD were qualified, or referred, or were selected. • In the 1109 job series, 0 PWTD were qualified, or referred, or were selected. • In the 2210 job series, 7 PWTD were qualified, 4 referred and none selected. We identified triggers based upon the workforce data below. • MCO 0101: Of the 84 new hires, 10 (11.9%) were PWD and 0 were PWTD. • MCO 0301: Of the 34 new hires 7 (20.59%) were PWD and 0 were PWTD. • MCO 0343: Of the 25 new hires 10 (40.0%) were PWD and 1 (4.0%) was PWTD. • MCO 0501: Of the 2 new hires 0 were PWD and 0 were PWTD. • MCO 1109: Of the 17 new hires 2 (11.76%) was PWD and 0 were PWTD. • MCO 2210: Of the 3 new hires 0 were PWD and 0 were PWTD.

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

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

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

In FY 2023, the 6 MCOs in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210, identified in Table B6. We identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9)
 1. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9): a. MCO 0101: Of the 233 qualified applicants, 19 (8.15%) were PWD and 10 (4.29%) were PWTD. b. MCO 0301: Of the 342 qualified applicants, 90 (26.31%) were PWD and 15 (4.38%) were PWTD. c. MCO 0343: Of the 273 qualified applicants, 85 (31.13%) were PWD and 21 (7.69%) were PWTD. d. MCO 0501: There were no Qualified internal applicants. e. MCO 1109: Of the 69 qualified applicants, 10 (14.49%) were PWD and 3 were (4.35%) PWTD. f. MCO 2210: Of the 200 qualified applicants, 38 (19.0%) were PWD and 8 (4.0%) was PWTD. 2. Qualified External applicant New Hires data (Table B7): a. MCO 0101: Of the 4,276 qualified applicants, 380 (8.89%) were PWD and 75 (1.75%) were PWTD. b. MCO 0301: Of the 838 qualified applicants, 104 (12.41%) were PWD and 21(2.50%) were PWTD. c. MCO 0343: Of the 318 qualified applicants, 50 (15.72%) were PWD and 12 (3.77%) were PWTD. d. MCO 0501: There were no Qualified New Hire applicants. e. MCO 1109: There were no Qualified New Hire applicants. f. MCO 2210: Of the 330 qualified applicants, 28 (8.48%) were PWD and 7 (2.12%) were PWTD.

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

In FY 2023, the 6 MCOs identified in Table B6 in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210. We identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data and B6 BIIS Tables: • MCO 0101: Of the 97 internal promotions, 3 (3.09%) were PWD and 1 (1.03%) was PWTD. MCO, • MCO 0101: Of the 84 internal promotions, 10 (11.90%) were PWD and 0 (0.0%) was PWTD. • MCO 0301: Of the 24 internal promotions, 1 (4.17 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 0343: Of the 16 internal promotions, 4 (25.00 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 0501: There were no internal promotions. • MCO 1109: Of the 20 internal promotions, 4 (20.00 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 2210: There were no internal promotions.

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.

ACF offers opportunities for advancement to all employees, including PWD/ PWTD. All employees are encouraged to collaborate with their supervisors and develop an individual Learning Action Plan (LAP) to identify professional development opportunities, goals, and outcomes that support the organization's mission. Through staff feedback and needs analysis, ACF has expanded its Learning and Development (L&D) offerings, and an improved employees’ L&D experience overall. ACF University, a holistic and strategic learning and development program, provides a central source for employees to easily access educational resources, learn more about development opportunities, and fulfill mandatory training requirements. For example, in response to ACF employees’ desire for more leadership opportunities for “emerging leaders” (non-supervisory GS-12s through GS-13s) ACF selected 25 employees as part of a new competitive selection process to attend the Foundations in Public Service Leadership Program. For the development of the 107 applicants who were not selected, ACF sent out communication with the top application improvement areas, and attached the top three applications as examples, taking out any identifying information.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

Prior to FY23, ACF had no official mentoring program as a way for employees to continue growth and belonging through formal mentoring relationships. ACF stood up a formal Mentor Program in June 2023. ACF’s Mentor Program offers employees a space to work alongside a mentor who is committed to supporting the mentee’s personal and professional development journey. The program provides an opportunity for both the mentee and mentor to build a developmental relationship, grow new skills and gain knowledge through sharing their experience. While the ACF Onboarding Program was running at an effective steady state, improvement areas were identified to enhance program offerings and to include other key stakeholders in the process. A New Supervisor Onboarding Session was established in March 2023, and a supplemental “second-week” onboarding sessions were added in January 2023. The New Supervisor Onboarding Session was developed to provide additional support and guidance to ACF’s newly hired and newly promoted supervisors, above and beyond the New Employee Briefing.

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 (%)
Fellowship Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Mentoring Programs	173	172	26	25	4	4
Coaching Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Internship Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Detail Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Career Development Programs	145	25	22	3	3	1
Training Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

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

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B12 (Career Development for Senior Grades by Disability) and B20 (Career Development for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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

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

FY 2023 data not available for Worksheet Table B12 (Career Development for Senior Grades by Disability) and B20 (Career Development for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data. Below limited available data: • GS-13: Of the 106 applicants 6 (5.6%) were persons with Disabilities. • GS-14: Of the 29 applicants 1 (3.4%) were persons with Disabilities. • GS-15: Of the 28 applicants 0 (0.0%) were persons with Disabilities. • SES: Of the 5 applicants 0 (0.0%) were persons with Disabilities.

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

The available data for FY23 in Table B9-2 (BIIS) shows that out of the total 1,690 employees receiving awards, 1,403 did not have a disability, 287 (16.98%) were PWD and 52 (3.08%) were PWTD. Time-off awards: 1-10 hours: out of the total of 423 (25.03%) employees receiving this award, 346 (24.66%) did not have a disability, 77 (26.83%) were PWD and 11 (21.15%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWTD) 11-20 hours: out of the total of 352 (20.83%) employees receiving this award, 295 (21.03%) did not have a disability, 57 (19.86%) were PWD and 8 (15.38%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD) 21-30 hours: out of the total of 202

(11.95) employees receiving this award, 167 (11.90%) did not have a disability, 35 (12.20%) were PWD and 9 (17.31%) were PWTD (no trigger identified for PWD and PWTD) 31 – 40 hours: out of the total of 2,023 (119.70%) employees receiving this award, 1,692 (120.60%) did not have a disability, 331 (115.33%) were PWD and 62 (119.23%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD) Cash awards: \$500 and Under: out of the total of 314 (18.58%) employees receiving this award, 271 (19.32%) did not have a disability, 43 (14.98%) were PWD and 11 (21.15%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD) \$501 - \$999: out of the total of 305 (18.05%) did not have a disability, 51 (17.77%) were PWD, and 12 (23.08%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD) \$1,000 - \$1,999: out of the total 512 (30.30%) employees receiving this award, 415 (29.58%) did not have a disability, 97 (33.80%) were PWD and 16 (30.77%) were PWTD (no trigger identified for PWD and PWTD) \$2,000 - \$2,999: out of the total 655 (38.76%) employees receiving this award, 570 (40.63%) did not have a disability, 85 (29.62%) were PWD and 13 (25.00%) were PWTD (no trigger identified for PWD and PWTD) \$3,000-\$3,999: out of the total 387 (22.90%) employees receiving this award, 315 (22.45%) did not have a disability, 72 (25.09%) were PWD and 11 (21.15%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWTD) \$4,000 - \$4,999: out of the total 9 (0.57%) did not have a disability, 1 (0.35%) were PWD and 0 (0%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD) \$5000-\$5999: out of the total 2 (0.12%) employees receiving this award, 2 (0.14%) did not have a disability, 0 (0%) were PWD and 0 (0%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD) \$6000 - \$6999: out of the total 1 (0.06%) employees receiving this award, 1 (0.07%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.0%) were PWD and 0 (0.0%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD) \$10,000 - \$19,999: out of the total 8 (0.47%) employees receiving this award, 0 (0.0%) were PWD and 0 (0.0%) were PWTD (Trigger for PWD and PWTD).

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	337	22.54	19.59	21.05	22.76
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	3005	195.77	173.28	160.53	201.22
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	8	2.82	0.68	18.42	0.41
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	250	14.79	15.44	13.16	15.04
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	4863	277.82	301.61	221.05	286.59
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	19	6.34	1.61	42.11	0.81
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	192	11.97	11.03	18.42	10.98
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	4786	289.79	277.78	442.11	266.26
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24	8.45	2.12	63.16	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	1378	78.87	83.04	76.32	79.27
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	77085	4381.69	4748.52	4442.11	4372.36
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	55	19.37	4.83	152.63	-1.22
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	310	18.31	17.47	28.95	16.67
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	260102	15685.92	14550.13	24928.95	14258.13

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	839	301.41	70.57	2265.79	-2.03
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	531	36.27	30.28	28.95	37.40
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	735305	50507.39	41921.63	42221.05	51787.40
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1384	490.14	117.39	3836.84	-26.83
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	667	29.23	42.41	18.42	30.89
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	1707479	74940.49	108503.31	47894.74	79118.29
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2559	902.82	216.96	6842.11	-14.63
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	393	26.41	24.26	26.32	26.42
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	1337124	89861.62	82601.61	90757.89	89723.17
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3402	1197.89	288.80	9073.68	-18.70
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	9	0.35	0.59	0.00	0.41
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	41019	1633.10	2729.52	0.00	1885.37
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4557	1633.10	389.91	0.00	1885.37
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	11	0.00	0.93	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	144372	0.00	12245.29	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	13124	0.00	1113.15	0.00	0.00

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance-based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer Yes

The available data in Table B 9-2 (BIIS) shows that triggers exist for QSIs and Performance-Based awards. Quality Step Increases (QSIs): out of the total of 50 (2.96%) employees receiving this award, 45 (3.21%) did not have a disability, 5 (1.74%) was a PWD and 2 (3.85%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). Performance-Based awards: out of the total of 19 (1.12%) employees receiving this award, 18 (1.28%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.00%) were PWD and 1 (0.35%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD).

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

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

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

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 N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

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

In FY 2023, we identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data (Mission Critical Occupations within ACF (i.e., 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210)) identified in Table B6. The following data is from Table B6 (BIIS): • MCO 0101: Of the 84 internal promotions, 10 (11.90%) were PWD and 0 (0.0%) was PWTD. • MCO 0301: Of the 24 internal promotions, 1 (4.17 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 0343: Of the 16 internal promotions, 4 (25.00 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 0501: There were no internal promotions. • MCO 1109: Of the 20 internal promotions, 4 (20.00 %) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) was PWTD. • MCO 2210: There were no internal promotions. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9 Applicant Flow Data): • MCO 0101: Of the 233 qualified applicants, 19 (8.15%) were PWD and 10 (4.29%) were PWTD. • MCO 0301: Of the 342 qualified applicants, 92 (26.9%) were PWD and 15 (4.38%) were PWTD. • MCO 0343: Of the 273 qualified applicants, 86 (31.5%) were PWD and 21 (7.69%) were PWTD. • MCO 0501: There were no Qualified internal applicants. • MCO 1109: Of the 69 qualified applicants, 10 (14.49%) were PWD and 3 were (4.35%) PWTD. • MCO 2210: Of the 200 qualified applicants, 38 (19.0%) were PWD and 8 (4.0%) was PWTD. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 847 qualified internal applicants at the GS-13 level; of which 188 (22.19%) were PWD versus 208 (24.55%) with no disability and 42 (4.96%) not identified. • There were 564 referred applicants in which 139 (24.64%) were PWD versus 128 (22.69%) with no disability and 32 (5.67%) not identified. • There were 31 total selections. 11 (35.48%) were No Disability, 1 (3.23%) Not identified, 6 (19.35%) PWD and 0 PWTDs. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 286 qualified internal applicants at the GS-14 level; of which 25 (8.74%) were PWD versus 76 (26.57%) with no disability and 12 (4.20%) not identified. • There were 263 referred applicants in which 33 (12.54%) were PWD versus 70 (26.61%) with no disability and 12 (4.56%) not identified. • There were 31 total selections. 11 (35.48%) were No Disability, 3 (9.68%) Not identified, 2 (6.45%) PWD and 2 (6.45%) PWTDs. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 10 qualified internal applicants at the GS-15 level; of which 0 (0.00%) were PWD versus 0 (0.00%) with no disability and 0 (0.00%) not identified. • There were 10 referred applicants in which 0 (0.00%) were PWD versus 0 (0.00%) with no disability and 0 (0.00%) not identified. • There were 1 total selections. 0 (0%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 0 (0%) PWD and 0 (0%) PWTDs. There was no additional data

available for SES or Equivalent levels.

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

a. SES

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

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

In FY 2023, we identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data (Mission Critical Occupations within ACF (i.e., 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210)) identified in Table B6. The following data is from Table B6 (BIIS): • MCO 0101: Of the 84 internal promotions, 0 were PWTD • MCO 0301: Of the 24 internal promotions, 0 were PWTD • MCO 0343: Of the 16 internal promotions, 0 were PWTD. • MCO 0501: There were no internal promotions. • MCO 1109: Of the 20 internal promotions, 0 were PWTD. • MCO 2210: There were no internal promotions. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9 Applicant Flow Data): • MCO 0101: Of the 233 qualified applicants, 19 (8.15%) were PWD and 10 (4.29%) were PWTD. • MCO 0301: Of the 342 qualified applicants, 90 (26.31%) were PWD and 15 (4.38%) were PWTD. • MCO 0343: Of the 273 qualified applicants, 85 (31.13%) were PWD and 21 (7.69%) were PWTD. • MCO 0501: There were no Qualified internal applicants. • MCO 1109: Of the 69 qualified applicants, 10 (14.49%) were PWD and 3 were (4.35%) PWTD. • MCO 2210: Of the 200 qualified applicants, 38 (19.0%) were PWD and 8 (4.0%) was PWTD.

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

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

FY 2023 data not available for Worksheet Table B15 (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability). ACF is currently

reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis. According to our B15 Table (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 2,863 qualified internal applicants at the GS-13 level; of which 363 (12.67%) were PWD versus 1,276 (44.56%) with no disability and 120 (4.19%) not identified. • There were 371 referred applicants in which 54 (14.55%) were PWD versus 105 (28.3%) with no disability and 25 (6.74%) not identified. • There were 41 total selections. 16 (39.02%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 5 (12.20%) PWD and 2 (4.88%) PWTDS. According to our B11 Table (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 964 qualified internal applicants at the GS-14 level; of which 119 (8.74%) were PWD versus 391 (40.56%) with no disability and 45 (4.67%) not identified. • There were 188 referred applicants in which 15 (7.98%) were PWD versus 36 (19.14%) with no disability and 12 (6.38%) not identified. • There were 12 total selections. 0 (0%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 4 (33.33%) PWD and 0 (0%) PWTDS. According to our B11 Table (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2023: • There were 448 qualified internal applicants at the GS-15 level; of which 66 (13.39%) were PWD versus 165 (36.83%) with no disability and 14 (3.13%) not identified. • There were 258 referred applicants in which 26 (9.30%) were PWD versus 91 (35.27%) with no disability and 8 (3.1%) not identified. • There were 29 total selections. 12 (0%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 0 (0%) PWD and 0 (0%) PWTDS. There was no additional data available for SES or Equivalent levels.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWT/D 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 (PWT/D) Answer N/A
 - b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWT/D) Answer N/A
 - c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWT/D) Answer N/A
 - d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWT/D) Answer N/A

According to our B19 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 787 qualified internal applicants at the Supervisory level; of which 30 (3.81%) were PWT/D versus 131 (16.65%) with no disability and 27 (3.43%) not identified. • There were 722 referred applicants in which 29 (4.02%) were PWT/D versus 111 (15.37%) with no disability and 27 (3.74%) not identified. • There were 36 total selections. 9 (25.00%) were No Disability, 2 (5.556%) Not identified, 4 (11.11%) PWD and 1 (2.78%) PWT/Ds.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
 - a. Executives
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
 - b. Managers
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
 - c. Supervisors
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

According to our B19 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 787 qualified internal applicants at the Supervisory level; of which 135 (17.15%) were PWD versus 131 (16.65%) with no disability and 27 (2.94%) not identified. • There were 722 referred applicants in which 129 (17.87%) were PWD versus 111 (15.37%) with no disability and 27 (3.74%) not identified. • There were 36 total selections. 9 (25.00%) were No Disability, 2 (5.556%) Not identified, 4 (11.11%) PWD and 1 (2.78%) PWTDS.

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTDD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTDD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTDD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTDD) Answer N/A

ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis. According to our B18 Table (New Hires for Management Positions by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 783 qualified internal applicants at the Supervisory level; of which 10 (1.28%) were PWTDD versus 287 (36.65%) with no disability and 23 (2.94%) not identified. • There were 390 referred applicants in which 10 (2.56%) were PWTDD versus 93 (23.85%) with no disability and 7 (1.79%) not identified. • There were 24 total selections. 6 (25.00%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 2 (8.33%) PWD and 0 (0.0%) PWTDS.

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

According to our B18 Table (New Hires for Management Positions by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 783 qualified internal applicants at the Supervisory level; of which 58 (7.41%) were PWD versus 287 (36.65%) with no disability and 23 (2.94%) not identified. • There were 390 referred applicants in which 37 (9.49%) were PWD versus 93 (23.85%) with no disability and 7 (1.79%) not identified. • There were 24 total selections. 6 (25.00%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 2 (8.33%) PWD and 0 (0.0%) PWTDS. ACF/ODME continues to upgrade its data collection and analysis to ensure all relevant data is available.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTDD 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 (PWTDD) Answer N/A

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

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

According to our B18 Table (New Hires for Management Positions by Disability), it shows that for • FY 2023 there were 783 qualified internal applicants at the Supervisory level; of which 10 (1.28%) were PWTD versus 287 (36.65%) with no disability and 23 (2.94%) not identified. • There were 390 referred applicants in which 10 (2.56%) were PWTD versus 93 (23.85%) with no disability and 7 (1.79%) not identified. • There were 24 total selections. 6 (25.00%) were No Disability, 0 (0%) Not identified, 2 (8.33%) PWD and 0 (0.0%) PWTDS. ACF/ODME continues to upgrade its data collection and analysis to ensure all relevant data is available.

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

There were delays in converting two (2) Schedule A employee in FY23. In FY24, ACF will continue to monitor and provide guidance Schedule A activity to ensure timely conversions.

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

Overall, the percentage of both voluntary and involuntary separations, using the inclusion rate as benchmark, did not exceed that of persons without disabilities. In FY 2023 (per the B01-2 BIIS Table - agency-wide internal data warehouse), there were a total of 126 separations from the ACF permanent workforce. Of the 126 separations, 25 (19.84% inclusion rate) were PWD. The inclusion rate percentage of separation of Persons without Disability was 80.15% (Persons with No Disability 60.31%, not identified 19.84%). There were 1 PWD involuntary separations in FY 2023 (removal), out of a total of 2 (with no disability).

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	4	0.33	0.19
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	23	2.00	1.10
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	23	1.67	1.17
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	45	3.33	2.27
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	95	7.33	4.74

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

Overall, the percentage of both voluntary and involuntary separations, using the inclusion rate as benchmark, did not exceed that of persons without disabilities. In FY 2023 (per the B01-2 BIIS Table - agency-wide internal data warehouse), there were a total of 126 separations. Of the 126 separations, there were 4 PWTD (7.27% inclusion rate). Of the 4 PWTDs, 0 resigned (0.00% inclusion rate), 2 retired (3.85% inclusion rate, and 2 separated for other reasons (3.85% inclusion rate). There were no involuntary separations (removal) of PWTD.

Separations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	4	0.00	0.22
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	23	0.00	1.28
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	23	2.38	1.22
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	45	2.38	2.45
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	95	4.76	5.17

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.

<https://www.hhs.gov/web/section-508/index.html>

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.hhs.gov/web/section-508/index.html>

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.

ACF continues to ensure that all technology is accessible to people with disabilities. Through its Reasonable Accommodation Program, the agency continues to provide software, laptops and other equipment to employees with disabilities to improve their accessibility to appropriate technology.

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.)

When an interim accommodation was approved, it was provided upon receipt of the request or within 1 business day. The average time to issue a decision and provide an approved accommodation was 38.3 days, which in most cases included up to 30 days for medical expert review and recommendations.

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.

ACF reasonable accommodation requests are coordinated by a full time Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator. (In FY23, ODME onboarded a backup RA Coordinator.) In FY 2023 ACF provided RA training for supervisors/managers and all staff. ODME also provided program-specific RA training upon request. In FY23, ACF processed 110 new RA requests. The FY23 total inventory was 125 cases. Over 67% of the new requests involved full time/remote work. Other accommodations requests included laptops, software, ergonomic assessments and the corresponding purchases and deliveries, changes in work schedule/tour of duty, reassignment, etc. ODME provided monthly RA activity reports to ACF leadership and quarterly data to each program office.

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.

In FY22, ODME continued diligently processing PAS requests for agency employees. Ongoing PAS is provided to employees as requested for in-office, telework locations or for agency-related travel.

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

- 1.

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Answer Yes

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

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:		The FY 2023 participation rate (16.95% /287 employees) for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) showed an increase from FY 2022 (8.02% /121 employees). It exceeded the 12% federal benchmark. In FY 2023, the participation rate (3.07%/52 employees) for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) exceeded the (2%) benchmark. There are still some areas of improvement—e.g., the hiring rate for PWTDs (1.3%) was below the federal benchmark (2%); PWD were below the federal benchmark in grade GS-15 (11.11%). PWTD were not represented in the SES.				
Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.						
How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?						
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:		<i>Barrier Group</i>				
		People with Disabilities				
		People with Targeted Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:		Y				
Barrier(s) Identified?:		Y				
STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:		Barrier Name		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice		
Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.		Employees with Disabilities		Despite significant strides to improve recruitment and retention of persons with disabilities, there are still challenges that need to be addressed--for example, lack of recurrent/routine workforce demographic survey tools; need to increase dissemination amongst hiring officials and management about hiring flexibilities and professional development opportunities; and need to address existing and/or perceived cultural and language bias in the hiring and selection process.		
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan						
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description	
10/01/2020	09/30/2022	Yes	09/30/2025		Continue increasing participation of PWD and PWTD in ACF's workforce (particularly in higher GS level positions) to meet federal benchmarks.	
Responsible Official(s)						
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
Director, ODME		Laura M. Irizarry		Yes		
OTBM Director / Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration		Lisa Griffin		Yes		
Chief Equity Officer		Dia Harris		Yes		
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective						
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
07/30/2022	Participate in Department's Workforce Demographic Resurvey.			Yes		10/14/2022

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2022	Continue collaboration with ACF leadership in the development and implementation of the agency's action plans to diversify leadership. (Ongoing activity.)	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2022	Continue participating in recurring meetings with ACF leadership and the Office of Transformation, Business & Management (OTBM) to discuss DEIA activity and strategies to increase diversity of workforce. Ongoing activity.	Yes	09/30/2023	
09/30/0202	Continue collaborating with OTBM (ACF's HR liaison) and the HHS Staffing, Recruitment, and Operations Center (SROC) and other stakeholders, to review at regular intervals its merit promotion program, employee recognition awards program, employee development/training programs, and management/personnel policies, procedures, and practices. (Ongoing activity.)	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2022	Maintain and strengthen Department-wide and agency-specific efforts to ensure accuracy and integrity in data collection and tracking systems for workforce demographics, recruitment activities, and applicant flow data. (Ongoing activity.)	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/0025	Continue implementation of OA's People Strategy, a comprehensive approach to support every aspect of an ACF's employee journey, from start to finish.	Yes		
09/30/2025	Reassess and Improve ACF Diversity Outreach Program, currently targeting minority and Hispanic serving institutions.	Yes		

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment
2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACF, with strong ERG support, successfully promoted ACF staff’s participation in the 2022 HHS-wide Workforce Demographic Survey. ACF had one of the highest participation rates among HHS OPDIVs. Data has helped address existing data inaccuracies and undercounts—for example, self-reporting for employees with disabilities significantly increased from 8% in FY22 to 17% in F23. • ACF onboarded the agency’s first Chief Equity Officer whose role is to enhance and sustain a culture of diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility within ACF as well as extending these principles to funded organizations and human services workforce. • ACF has continued to expand its DEIA structure and allocate additional resources and staff—e.g., through the agency’s first DEIA Staffing Contract, on boarded Data and Recruitment & Retention Officers and a EEO Support Specialist; and increased FY2023 funds for ODME’s DEIA in the Workplace Training Portfolio, etc. • ODME developed and rolled out the ACF’s Demographic Dashboard, which automatically provides quarterly information on ACF’s and its individual offices’ demographic profile, for example, race, ethnicity, sex, age, disability status, and veteran’s status of ACF-wide and program-specific permanent workforce. • ACF has continued to support and strengthen an active, thriving and engaged Employee Resource Group (ERG) community, including ACF’s ADAPT (Able and Disabled Allies Partnering Together) ERG. . ACF and the ERGs conduct quarterly meetings to identify and collaborate in cross-cutting DEIA issues and initiatives. ODME rolled out the 2023 ERG Development Fund Pilot, which allocated funds to selected proposals for ERG developed learning and development opportunities. ODME also rolled out the agency’s first ERG Speed Mentoring Initiative. ACF has continued to support and collaborate with ADAPT to facilitate observance events, listening sessions; etc. to address issues that ACF disability employees encounter in the workplace as they relate to employment and reasonable accommodation. • ACF launched Paid Internship Program with DEIA focus, hiring 46 Interns with 58% identified as being in a minority category. • ACF, through its Office of Administration, continue to implement and enhance a comprehensive People’s Strategy to support ACF’s people in every aspect of their employee journey, from start to finish focusing on six aspects: work, people, places, well-being, organization and technology. • ACF has established a Community of Practice for Executive and Administrative Officers, which regularly provides presentations and training on hiring flexibilities and other best practices.

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

ACF is currently reviewing its recruitment policies, practices, and procedures to identify potential DEIA barriers, and develop appropriate corrective action.

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

ODME continues to implement the approved revised RA procedures, (which included the PAS); and was able to onboard a back up RA coordinator which increased the efficiency of RA request process. ODME has a collateral duty Disability Programs Manager assisting ACF to address issues pertaining to ACF employees with disabilities, including recruitment effort. ODME will also continue to collaborate with the ADAPT ERG, which also provides significant input to addressing reasonable accommodation for ACF employees with needs to accommodations. In FY23, ODME continued meeting regularly with internal and external stakeholders (e.g., ACF DEI Executive Team; ACF Equity Advisory Board; OA People’s Strategy/DEIA Work Group; HHS/EEODI, EEOC, FEEDS, etc.) to expand networking. The Diversity Outreach Program is targeting organizations working with PWD/PWTD in their outreach efforts.

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.

ODME continues to utilize the ERG for employees with disabilities to enhance barrier analysis. ODME , OTBM and the Equity

Office will continue exploring strategies to address the need to increase participation rate of PWD and PWTD at ACF. ODME will continue to upgrade its efforts, (and collaborate in HHS-wide efforts) to improve data collection and upgrade barrier analysis.