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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Cluster (GS or Alternate Pay Plan)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targeted Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Goal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades GS-1 to GS-10</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades GS-11 to SES</td>
<td>5941</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GS-01 - GS-10 cluster: 30% PWD; GS-11 – SES cluster 14%, both above the 12% inclusion PWD goal.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
   a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) Answer: No
   b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) Answer: No

GS-01 - GS-10 cluster: 7% PWTD; GS-11 - SES 3% PWTD – both are above the inclusion goal of 2%

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

DOE’s Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (HC) establishes annual hiring goals for People with Disabilities (PWD) and People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD). In FY22, DOE established hiring goals for PWD and PWTD and communicated these goals to Heads of Departmental Elements. Quarterly assessments of progress toward these established hiring goals for PWD and PWTD are communicated to Human Resources Consultants (HRCs) and Human Resources Business Partners (HRBPs) to inform their customers during hiring and recruitment consultations.

DOE recently finalized the 2023-2027 Human Capital Strategic Plan. Strategic Goal #1 demonstrates the agency’s commitment to: Attract and Recruit a Diverse Workforce. Specifically, it states: Implement expanded recruitment strategies to attract early-career
talent, mid-career experts, and executives who are reflective of the American people. The 2016-2020 Strategic Human Capital Plan set forth the Human Capital goals and strategies to support the mission and goals of the Department and continued into FY22. (See: https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2016/03/f30/DOE-Strategic-Human-Capital-Plan-2016-2020.pdf which is included as Supporting Documents to this report.)

The following actions were taken in support of these strategic objectives:

- DOE established FY22 targeted hiring goals for PWD and PWTD that were distributed to DOE Elements and Human Resources Shared Service Centers (SSCs);
- HRCs and HRBPs communicated the goals to Hiring Managers during hiring and recruitment consultations; and
- The information related to the Department’s hiring goals was made available on the HC intranet site (Hcnet).

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer  No

In FY22, with the full roll-out of the RA/PAS program, it became clear that more personnel were needed. For FY23, DOE plans to address this by adding a Reasonable Accommodation (RA) Program Manager and maintaining a full-time local reasonable accommodation coordinator. The Department has only one full-time staff member responsible for Section 508 Compliance, which is insufficient. To address this issue, the Section 508 Team met with Information Management Governance Board (IMGB) members and requested that a Section 508 Coordinator be identified for each DOE Program Office. Through the IMGB, DOE has established over 60 Section 508 Coordinators (included as “collateral duty,” below) and backup Coordinators across the complex that help us improve transparency and accessibility of DOE information and communications technology (ICT). DOE will assess this approach in FY23.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Program Task</th>
<th>Full Time</th>
<th>Part Time</th>
<th>Collateral Duty</th>
<th>Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing applications from PWD and PWTD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.brown@hq.doe.gov">michelle.brown@hq.doe.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.brown@hq.doe.gov">michelle.brown@hq.doe.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Julie Murphy Director <a href="mailto:julie.murphy@hq.doe.gov">julie.murphy@hq.doe.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Examples of group trainings include: RA and religious accommodation training; Service Animal and RA Training; 508 and RA Training; Software products and RA Training. A Community of Practice has been established with a quarterly meeting at which there is a presentation to the Local Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators (LRACS) and attorneys to enable regular, on-going training on topics of broad interest. Individuals have also attended trainings on a case-by-case basis with organizations, such as National Employment Law Institute; LRP Federal Webinars; and Federal Equity Law Training Group (FELTG).

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

In addition to the ready availability of training for staff, described above, examples of services that have been fully funded through DOE’s Working Capital Fund are:

• The Relay Captioning Program was transferred from the Office of Chief Information Officer to HC. The Office of Policy, Labor, and Employee Relations (OPLER) LRAC has worked closely with the budget office to track usage and ensure that there is sufficient funding to cover the service.

• American Sign Language Interpreting has a budget set-aside. The OPLER LRAC tracks usage and works with Departmental Elements to ensure funding is available to provide services in a timely manner.

• Each Departmental Element is responsible for funding its own products and services needed for an RA. This is described in DOE’s RA PM 100# B.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program
Brief Description of Program Deficiency
C.2.a.6. Do the agency’s training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(2)]

Objective
Add effective examples of disability-based harassment to DOE’s training materials on its anti-harassment program (Policy Memorandum #102).

Target Date
Jan 1, 2024

Completion Date
Planned Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Planned Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sep 1, 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC will review the existing anti-harassment training and consult with the EEO, Assessment, and Compliance Division on potential content to include to address this item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 31, 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC will update Policy Memorandum #102 (anti-harassment program policy) based on the past 18 months of experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30, 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC will submit the updated Policy Memorandum #102 to EEOC for review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 31, 2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>HC will provide at least one anti-harassment program training session. HC will consult with OCR-EEO related to establishment of an assessment survey of attendees to refine and update anti-harassment training, to ensure all topics, including disability-based harassment, were covered effectively to ensure supervisors’ and managers’ ability to accurately implement DOE Anti-Harassment Policy #102. The new slide deck will be posted on Learning Nucleus for Supervisors and Employees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accomplishments

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

DOE leveraged a wide variety of recruitment sources and strategies to attract PWD and PWTD for DOE job opportunities, including:

In FY22, DOE participated in 11 recruitment and outreach events that specifically targeted PWD and PWTD and 20 that targeted or included disabled veterans. Many of these events were virtual job fairs that offered convenient, safe, and no-cost options for veterans with disabilities. Partnerships, including one ORAS established with the Department of Defense (DoD) Operation Warfighter (OWF) Program, have led to successful wounded warrior placements at DOE (n=2 in FY22). Among the 72 Pathways Programs new hires in FY22, three (4.2%) were PWD (no PWTD), all in the Recent Graduates Program. (Note: this includes components not included in this report: BPA, WAPA, and NNSA).

Job opportunities were disseminated widely through: USAJOBS, www.energy.gov/careers, job boards on a variety of virtual platforms, virtual and in-person job fairs, and external recruitment channels or email lists that targeted organizations offering employment assistance to persons with disabilities. Additionally, DOE’s targeted recruitment efforts to attract individuals with disabilities included various online sources, such as: Workforce Recruitment Program resume database for college students and recent graduates with disabilities; vocational rehabilitation centers; and Handshake. These efforts, combined with increased program and staff office participation in recruitment events, and expanded use of Schedule A hiring authority for PWD, contributed to the increase in the number of people with disabilities onboard in FY22.

DOE has also started engaging its Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) in recruitment and outreach activities. A new DOE ERG called SOAR has been recently established to promote disability inclusion and accessibility for people with disabilities and to
partner across the DOE to support the implementation of accessibility goals related to Executive Order (EO) 14035: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce.

The 2022 DOE Virtual Disability Mentoring Day (virtual, Microsoft Teams Live) was hosted in collaboration with the American Association of People with Disabilities (AAPD) national effort. The event was promoted to military base transition assistance program offices, vocational rehabilitation centers, Work for Warriors, OPM’s FedsHireVets, DoD’s OWF program, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs VR&E, and the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP). It was also announced on Handshake Events and USAJOBS Events and was promoted to various colleges and universities (e.g., Gallaudet University). Participants included veterans, professionals, college students, and alumni. Attendance: 32 participants (4 disabled veterans). Reasonable accommodations for participants were provided. Representatives from 11 DOE program and staff offices introduced participants to DOE mission areas and provided information about available career, apprenticeship, and internship opportunities.

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

1. DOE uses Schedule A and veterans with disabilities hiring authorities to quickly fill positions prior to or in conjunction with job announcements. PWD and PWTD who wish to apply using Schedule A or the 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran hiring authorities may do so by applying through a job announcement open for PWD or PWTD applicants, or they may contact representatives in the SSCs. Positions filled through Schedule A appointments frequently incorporate advancement opportunity to higher grade levels for employees with successful performance.

2. Schedule A applicants may be referred through a non-competitive Certificate of Eligibility or with other applicants from a competitive announcement. Sources for referrals of people with disabilities may include: a standing register, Agency files, unsolicited e-mails from people with disabilities, disability employment programs, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs VR&E and DoD’s OWF Program, networks, internships, and candidates identified through resume mining USAJOBS and Department of Labor WRP, or recruitment events.

3. The promotion of hiring authorities that take disabilities into account (Schedule A, VRA, and 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran) have resulted in a steady increase in the percentage of PWD, disabled veterans, and 30 percent or more disabled veterans in the DOE permanent workforce over the past five fiscal years from FY18 to FY22.

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.

1. Eligibility is determined based on documentation, such as a Schedule A letter or letter from the Veterans Administration, that identifies the individual as a person with a disability who is eligible to be hired through Schedule A or veterans with disabilities authorities. Acceptable documentation for Schedule A is detailed in Title 5 C.F.R. Section 213-3102 (u)(3)(ii).

2. If an eligible applicant is deemed qualified for a vacant position, the applicant’s resume is forwarded to the hiring official. The hiring official is provided with appropriate guidance on how to evaluate, interview, as well as select a desired applicant.

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

1. DOE provides supervisory training to new supervisors, which includes information on the use of Schedule A and hiring authorities for veterans with disabilities to quickly fill positions.
2. Hiring Managers (HM) are advised by their assigned HRC or HRBP, on a routine basis, regarding special hiring authorities which afford them direct access to persons with disabilities and reduce the time to hire when seeking to fill vacant positions quickly.

3. HM and HR Professionals complete mandatory online training sessions through the LN. The courses include, but are not limited to: A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining and Including People with Disabilities, Veterans Employment Training, and Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA). Completion rates for mandatory training on special hiring authorities and Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act:

   a. 1,651 HM and HR Professionals (60% of those assigned) completed the OPM-developed “A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities.” Topics covered include: the business advantages of having employees with disabilities in the workforce, Government-wide hiring goals established in Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, recruiting strategies and available excepted service hiring authorities, recruitment sources and Federal information websites for recruiting people with disabilities, interviewing tips, reasonable accommodations, accessibility, retention strategies, and tips to assist employees experiencing illness or injury in returning to work.

   b. 1,852 HM and HR Professionals (67% of those assigned) completed the “Veteran Employment Training.” Specific topics covered include: the benefits of hiring veterans with disabilities, overview of Veteran’s Preference, special hiring authorities, recruitment sources and Federal information resources, and recruitment strategies to increase hiring of veterans with disabilities.

   c. 1,770 HM and HR Professionals (64% of those assigned) completed the “Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Training.” Federal USERRA law provides protections for return to duty of uniformed service members or recovery from a compensable injury. Course topics include: an overview of who is covered, rights under USERRA for individuals called to duty in the uniformed services, agency obligations, and responsibilities of the service member.

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.

DOE maintained and continued to foster relationships with employment centers, job clubs, military bases, and colleges/universities during FY 2022. Outreach efforts focused on information sessions that offered an introduction to DOE, as well as potential career fields, apprenticeships, and internship opportunities. Many of these are described in A1, above.

Examples of DOE partnerships, which provided opportunities for people with disabilities through employment and internship programs in FY 2022, include:

a. Savannah River (SR) Management and the HR Advisory Office maintained networking relationships with Fort Gordon (Georgia), Submarine Base Kings Bay Fleet and Family Support Center (Georgia), Luke Air Force Base Employer Panel, and the Work for Warriors Program.

b. The Hanford Site partnered with the Columbia Basin Diversity and Inclusion Committee (CBDIC) to recruit and hire one Schedule A applicant. The CBDIC is a local committee in the Hanford commuting area that works to promote and sustain a diverse workforce by uniting the talents of veterans, military spouses, and individuals with disabilities with the employment needs of the Columbia Basin.

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
Of the 827 permanent workforce new hires in FY 2022, PWD accounted for 111 new hires (13%) and PWTD accounted for 23 new hires (3%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targeted Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Permanent Workforce</td>
<td>Temporary Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Applicants</td>
<td>7531</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Qualified Applicants</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of New Hires</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 No

Applicant flow data are flawed for this analysis, so DOE performed a separate analysis of the dynamics data file matched to the status data file to examine the actual number of new hires to major occupational categories. This analysis found that there were 489 permanent employees hired in FY22 (regardless of on-board status at the end of FY22) within the seven largest occupational series. Among these new hires, 49 were PWD (10%), which is lower than the 12% EEOC target, and 10 were PWTD (2%), which meets the 2% EEOC target.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability</th>
<th>Targetable Disability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hires</td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
<td>New Hires (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numerical Goal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301 MISCELLANEOUS PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0343 MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0801 GENERAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0905 GENERAL ATTORNEY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1102 CONTRACTING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301 GENERAL PHYSICAL SCIENCE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 No

Of the 1517 applications for internal competitive promotions included in the USAStaffing dataset, 112 (7%) were PWD, which is
below the 12% target, and 67 (4%) were PWTD, which is above the 2% target.

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: No
   b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer: No

Of the 111 internal selections for competitive promotions included in the USA Staffing dataset, 6 (6%) were PWD; while this was below the 12% target, this was not significantly lower than the 7% PWD among qualified applicants. For PWTD: there were 3 selections (3%), which is above the 2% target and not significantly different from the 4% PWTD in the qualified applicant pool for internal competitive promotions.

As described above in C.3, applications of PWD internal candidates for promotions within the 12 largest DOE occupations was lower than the 12% benchmark during Q4 of FY 2021. However, when analyzing data for the remainder of the application process, the following conclusions were reached:

   (1) Qualification rates were higher for PWD (44.4%) than for all DOE applicants (38.8%) for non-supervisory internal promotions. Qualification rates were the same for PWD as for all DOE employees (about half of applicants were deemed qualified) for supervisory positions.

   (2) For internal competitive promotions to supervisory positions, both qualified PWD applicants were referred and then selected (a 100% selection rate), which exceeded the rate for all DOE employees (25.0%).

   (3) For internal promotions to non-supervisory positions, all qualified PWD, but only 87.7% of all qualified DOE employees, were referred. Among those referred, 17.0% of all DOE employees were selected, but only 12.5% of PWD were selected.

   (4) Analysis of DOE 2019 FEVS data (which includes all of DOE, not just the components included in this report) shows that 37.8% of respondents who said they had a disability, but only 28.7% of all DOE respondents, had negative assessments of their opportunity to get a better job at DOE (note: this item was removed for the 2020 and 2021 FEVS administrations by OPM):

Q67. Satisfaction with opportunity to get a better job in organization
   All DOE: Positive: 43.5%; Negative: 28.7%
   DOE PWD: Positive: 37.2%; Negative: 37.8%

These data and a recent review article by Bonaccio et al (2020) indicate a need to dedicate particular attention to advancement processes.


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.
1. All DOE employees must establish an Individual Development Plan (IDP) in consultation with their supervisor within 60 days of joining DOE or being reassigned, or at the beginning of a new appraisal period. An IDP is a tool for employees to plan, guide, and document self-development. Employees are encouraged to apply for opportunities to broaden their skills and competencies for career progression. Several Program and Staff Offices conduct regular training needs assessments to further identify workforce development needs. Federal employees at DOE can use competency assessments to identify competency-based training and development opportunities that could help them achieve sustained career growth.

2. Learning and development opportunities are promoted through Expressions of Interest (EOI) announcements for internal details, temporary promotions, and reassignment opportunities; consultations provided to employees by managers, organizational leaders, and training administrators; HC’s intranet site (HCNet); diversity managers and ERGs; and internal email distributions lists or newsletters.

3. DOE provides career and leadership development opportunities for employees through a suite of programs, rotational opportunities, corporately sponsored courses, and the departmental learning management system, Learning Nucleus (LN). In addition, HC sponsored a four-month pilot of ExecOnline virtual education (9/30/21-1/31/22) to provide DOE employees unique course offerings in three tracks at no cost. These included: Managing and Working in a Hybrid and Virtual Environment; Critical Projects; and Leadership Development. Many program and staff offices also sponsored employees or offered training through the DOE National Training Center or outside vendors.

4. The LN Mentoring Module aids in establishing mentoring relationships. Of the 60 HQ+ participants, 15% were PWD in FY22. DOE does not have data about mentoring relationships established outside of the LN Mentoring Module.

5. Some Program and Staff Offices conducted workforce analysis to identify potential barriers in the advancement of employees with disabilities. EEO/Diversity Managers play a key role in identifying and eliminating barriers. For example, the Office of Science conducts a workforce analysis to understand if barriers to advancement exist for employees with disabilities.

6. A DOE ERG, SOAR, is currently in the development phase, to address issues for PWD and will focus on a range of issues, including advancement concerns. As ERGs evolve and mature, ERG leaders are also becoming more familiar with DOE’s demographic data, including PWD data. DOE leaders seek to partner with ERGs to further investigate data gaps in talent mobility and composition, including potential barriers related to career and professional development.

7. The 2022 FEVS included a new Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility module with the following question: “I have similar access to advancement opportunities (e.g. promotion, career development, training) as others in my work unit.” DOE PWD were less positive when asked about their advancement opportunities compared to their peers than were DOE employees overall. Whereas 73 percent of DOE employees felt their opportunities were similar to those of others in their work unit, 64 percent of PWD expressed this sentiment. PWD at DOE were also less satisfied and engaged compared to all DOE employees based on the 2022 FEVS results (which are for all DOE, not just the components included in this MD-715 report).

Additional 2022 FEVS results for PWD included the following:
- Similar access to advancement opportunities: PWD 64.1% positive; Gap with DOE overall: -8.9
- Global Satisfaction: PWD 64.5% positive; Gap with DOE overall: -7.1
- Employee Engagement: PWD 72.4% positive; Gap with DOE overall: -5.2.

These data and a recent review article by Bonaccio et al (2020) indicates a need to dedicate particular attention to advancement processes.


B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

1. In FY22, DOE provided career and leadership development opportunities for employees through a suite of different programs, rotational opportunities, detail appointments, corporately sponsored courses, and the LN. Additionally, many Program Offices
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sponsor employees or offer technical training through the National Training Center or outside vendors. For example, the FECM offers a competitive Leadership and Career Development Program for employees interested in external training, such as the Federal Executive Institute, and an Academic Degree Program for employees to complete or obtain a job-related degree. FECM centralized approvals for these programs to ensure a fair and consistent process.

a. Of the 138 OPM Leadership 360-degree program participants, 12.3% were PWD, and 7.2% were veterans with a disability. Of the veterans with a disability, 6.5% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.

b. Of the 49 employees who participated in the DOE Leadership Development Program, 4.1% were PWD. Additionally, 24.5% were veterans with disabilities, of which, 18.4% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.

c. Of the 994 instances of training through the Professional Skills Program, 20.9% were PWD (3.5% PWTD). In addition, 14.4% were veterans with disabilities, of which, 11.4% were veterans with a disability of 30% or more.

d. Of the 808 employees who participated in the Supervisory Training: 20.9% were PWD; 2.5% PWTD; and 8.5% were veterans with disabilities, of which 6.8% were veterans with disabilities of 30% or more.

2. Program Offices offered information sessions to help employees, including veterans and veterans with disabilities, achieve their career aspirations. For example, the SR HR Advisory Office, along with the support of the SR senior management team, held several Professional Growth Seminars to discuss career paths, advancement opportunities, and how to apply and interview for vacant positions within DOE and other Federal agencies.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Development Opportunities</th>
<th>Total Participants</th>
<th>PWD</th>
<th>PWTD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applicants (#)</td>
<td>Selectees (#)</td>
<td>Applicants (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring Programs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Programs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Programs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Career Development Programs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Programs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Programs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail Programs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 N/A

Although there is no evidence to suggest disparities in selection once an individual applies for a career development opportunity, using the 12% goal for PWD as a benchmark for the applicant pool, only one trigger is present: Fellowship Programs, where PWD account for only 2.4% of applicants.

This necessitates additional organizational research, especially in light of the FEVS results. Analysis of DOE 2019 FEVS data (which includes all of DOE, not just the components included in this report) shows that 37.8% of respondents who said they had a disability, but only 28.7% of all DOE respondents, had negative assessments of their opportunity to get a better job at DOE (note: this item was removed from the FY 2020 and FY 2021 FEVS administrations by OPM): Q67. Satisfaction with opportunity to get a
better job in organization:
All DOE Positive: 43.5%; Negative: 28.7%
Individuals with a disability Positive: 37.2%; Negative: 37.8%

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  N/A

Although there is no evidence to suggest disparities in selection once an individual applies for a career development opportunity, using the 2% goal for PWTD as a benchmark for the applicant pool, the following triggers are present:

(1) Fellowship and Detail Programs with 0.0% PWTD applicants; and
(2) Mentoring with 1.6% PWTD applicants.

These rates of participation by PWTD also necessitate additional organizational research, especially in light of the FEVS results, cited earlier.

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  No
   b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)    Answer  No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time-Off Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards</td>
<td>Total (#)</td>
<td>Reportable Disability %</td>
<td>Without Reportable Disability %</td>
<td>Targeted Disability %</td>
<td>Without Targeted Disability %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Awards Given</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 No
   b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

Overall, 2.28% of DOE employees received a QSI, and 4.05% received a performance-based pay increase. For QSIs, the rate for
PWTD was similar (2.21%), and the rate for PWD was not significantly different at 1.56%. For performance-based pay increases, PWD were not significantly less likely to receive one (3.01%), but PWTD (1.66%) were less likely to receive this type of recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Awards</th>
<th>Total (#)</th>
<th>Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disability %</th>
<th>Targeted Disability %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disability %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 No

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

D. PROMOTIONS

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

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

   b. Grade GS-15
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

   c. Grade GS-14
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

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

Similar to other demographic categories, PWD appear to experience challenges with access to the SES. Although 7% of qualified internal applicants were PWD (five percentage points below the 12% goal target), none were selected. At the GS-15 level, 5% of internal qualified applicants were PWD (seven percentage points below the goal target), but only 1% of selectees reported a disability. At both the GS-14 and GS-13 levels, while nearly one-third of qualified internal applicants were PWD (far exceeding the 12% goal target), PWD were less highly represented among selectees, accounting for 14% of GS-14 and 17% of GS-13 selectees.

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  No
   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  Answer  No

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  No
   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  Answer  Yes

Similar to other demographic categories, PWTD appear to experience challenges with access to the SES. There were no qualified internal applicants for the three position vacancies. At the GS-15 level, 3% of internal qualified applicants were PWTD, and just over 1% were selected, indicating neither an application nor selection trigger. Similar to the case for PWD and the GS-14 and GS-13 internal selections, more than 18% of qualified applicants were PWTD, but PWTD were less likely to be selected at 4% and 7%, respectively. Again, while these selections exceed the 2% goal target, they are far smaller than the prevalence of PWTD in the qualified applicant pools for internal selections for GS-13 and GS-14 positions.

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

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

Among qualified new hire applicants. PWD accounted for 4% of applicants for SES, 6% of applicants for GS-15, 19% of applicants for GS-14, and 17% of applicants for GS-13.

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

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

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)  Answer No

Among those selected, no PWD were selected for the SES positions, 3% were selected for GS-15 (half their presence in the qualified applicant pool) positions, 18% were selected for GS-14 positions, and 14% were selected for GS-13 positions.

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

USA Staffing Data not available. The underlying variable that would differentiate executives, managers, and supervisors has not yet been included in OPM data standards and in the USA Staffing database.

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 N/A
   ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)  Answer N/A

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

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

USA Staffing Data not available. The underlying variable that would differentiate executives, managers, and supervisors has not yet been included in OPM data standards and in the USA Staffing database.
been included in OPM data standards and in the USA Staffing database.

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

   USAStaffing Data not available. The underlying variable that would differentiate executives, managers, and supervisors has not yet been included in OPM data standards and in the USA Staffing database.

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

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

   USAStaffing Data not available. The underlying variable that would differentiate executives, managers, and supervisors has not yet been included in OPM data standards and in the USA Staffing database.

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 45 Schedule A employees hired in FY20. Of these, eleven were converted to Appointment type 10 or 15 (Career competitive or conditional, permanent.). Three had left DOE as of FY22. The other 31 were not converted but were still on board at DOE in FY22.

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
All DOE: Of 542 total separations, 2.0% were involuntary.
PWD: Of 97 total separations, 1.0% were involuntary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separations</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Reportable Disabilities %</th>
<th>Without Reportable Disabilities %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Removal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Resignation</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Retirement</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Other Separations</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Total Separations</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

All DOE: Of 542 total separations, 2.0% were involuntary.
PWT: Of 24 total separations, 0% were involuntary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separations</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Targeted Disabilities %</th>
<th>Without Targeted Disabilities %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Removal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Resignation</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Retirement</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Other Separations</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Workforce: Total Separations</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.energy.gov/cio/department-energy-doe-and-section-508

DOE has issued a notice explaining employee and applicant rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. A description of how to file a complaint is also on this public website.

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.

After consultation with the DOE Office of Management, OCR-EEO has added information regarding the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) to its webpage. The ABA information is available at the following web link: https://www.energy.gov/diversity/information-regarding-architectural-barriers-act

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

In FY 2022, the Agency did not implement any projects to improve accessibility of facilities during the reporting period. The DOE Headquarters building is fully ADAAA compliant.

In FY22, improvements in technology accessibility include:
• Training personnel and providing job aids on creating ICT that works with assistive technology. Over 60 Section 508 Coordinators and hundreds of customers have been trained across the complex on numerous Section 508 topics, including website compliance, testing, procurement, document accessibility, forms accessibility, Section 508 Reporting, Siteimprove Tool Training, etc.
• Providing guidance on testing ICT with screen readers, color contrast analyzers, and other tools.
• Meeting with DOE, General Counsel, Public Affairs, Web Council, DOJ, Reasonable Accommodation Contacts, U.S. Access Board, General Services Administration, Siteimprove, and others to support DOE Section 508 efforts.
• Leveraging the use of a Web Governance Tool called Siteimprove to monitor and improve the accessibility of DOE’s public facing Energy.Gov websites.
• Supporting the SOAR, DOE’s ERG that focuses on issues for PWD.
• Remediating widely distributed documents and forms for Section 508 compliance and employing Trusted Tester techniques and principles to help support accessible DOE ICT.

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.)

Due to the COVID-19 vaccine mandate, the RA Program received over 200% more requests than the previous year. That increase, coupled with the increase in requests for COVID-19 related telework, put significant strain on the RA Program. OPLER assigned an Employee Relations specialist to provide administrative support, and other Departmental Elements utilized contractor support to ensure timely processing of cases. Given the significant increase, the processing times were still impacted. To address this, Interim Accommodations were provided for employees requesting full-time telework for COVID-19 related concerns. This ensured that there was additional time to process the case without a negative impact on the employee.

DOE has Local Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators (LRACs) and a Headquarters Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator (HRAC). The DOE Headquarters plus eleven DOE components (HQ+) included in this MD-715 Report averaged 37.5 days to process RA requests, exclusive of those associated with the COVID-19 vaccine mandate or with COVID-19 telework requests.

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.

DOE's Reasonable Accommodation Program information is located here: www.energy.gov/hc/department-energy-reasonable-accommodation-program.

The Office of Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity (OCR-EEO), Equal Employment Opportunity, Assessment, and
Compliance Division (EEO-ACD) developed three Agency Specific Items (ASIs) that were added to the 2021 FEVS to determine DOE employees’ knowledge of the RA/PAS policies and procedures and awareness of unfair treatment of PWD. Two of the three ASIs were kept in the 2022 FEVS (with a slight modification to one of the ASIs). EEO-ACD analysis found:

- In the 2022 FEVS (administered in June/July 2022), most DOE respondents said they knew how to request an RA/PAS (76%), an increase over the 72% who reported this in the 2021 FEVS (which was administered in November 2021).
- In the 2021 FEVS, 7% of DOE respondents indicated they had “witnessed or experienced an instance of unfair treatment of a person with a disability” at DOE, with 8% responding “Don’t know” on this item. In the 2022 FEVS, when asked a similar question (but restricted to “within the past 12 months” timeframe), 4% of DOE respondents reported witnessing or experiencing such an instance, with 7% saying they didn’t know.
- The 2022 FEVS included the first published results of a set of three accessibility items added by OPM in support of the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Strategic Plan. Results for DOE for these, separately by self-reported disability status on the FEVS were as follows:

  - I can easily make a request of my organization to meet my accessibility needs. 74.1% PWD, 8.5 percentage points lower than DOE overall
  - My organization responds to my accessibility needs in a timely manner. 68.6% PWD, 8.8 percentage points lower than DOE overall
  - My organization meets my accessibility needs. 71.3% PWD, 9.2 percentage points lower than DOE overall

On average, about 24% of PWD answered “No basis to judge” or “No accessibility needs.” Although PWD scores were more than eight percentage points lower than those of persons without a disability, the percentage positive scores on each of these items are all above the OPM criterion of 65% positive.

HC’s OPLER provided oversight of LRACs across DOE. Together, they work with managers and supervisors to provide reasonable accommodations for qualified employees and applicants with disabilities, including veterans with disabilities.

i. DOE HC took over the Relay Conference Captioning contract from the Office of the Chief Information Officer. The use of remote captioning has significantly increased throughout DOE, providing accessibility to people who are deaf or hard of hearing. A fact sheet was developed to help explain the process for ordering services. The fact sheet is available on HCnet.

ii. OPLER provided Sign Language Interpreting for applicants in the interviewing process.

iii. OPLER LRAC provided consultation and training to field LRACS.

iv. OPLER LRAC put out data request to LRACS to monitor average processing times and type of requests. This information contributes to the agenda items for the Community of Practice meetings.

Nineteen training sessions were provided to employees and supervisors on reasonable accommodation. Exclusive of COVID-19 vaccine exemption cases, over 408 reasonable accommodations were requested. Over 833 COVID-19 vaccine exemption requests were received, and the interactive process was started for all the cases until the injunction was put in place, temporarily suspending engagement. This is a significant increase from the previous year, where 191 cases were processed. DOE continues to remain committed to increasing awareness and knowledge of the program with a combination of onsite and virtual training planned on the RA process and products and support that can remove workplace barriers. Additional factsheets are planned to help increase awareness on using American Sign Language (ASL) interpreters for interviews. There is a low number of applicants that request ASL for interviews. To ensure that applicants are getting the support they need, DOE will develop an online training supported by a factsheet that is specifically about ordering and effectively working with interpreters.

DOE has made training on hiring, retaining, and including people with disabilities available through Learning Nucleus (LN), DOE’s online Learning Management System (LMS). This training, “A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities,” was originally developed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). DOE updated the course in 2020. This training is mandatory for Human Resources (HR) Professionals and Hiring Managers, and topics include:

a) Business advantages of having employees with disabilities in the workforce;
b) Government-wide hiring goals established in Section 501 of the rehabilitation Act of 1973;
c) Recruiting strategies and available excepted service hiring authorities;
d) Recruitment sources and Federal information websites for recruiting People with Disabilities; and
e) Interviewing tips, reasonable accommodations, and retention strategies.

During the reporting period, OPLER coordinated DOE’s COVID-19 vaccine exemption process for both reasonable accommodation requests based on disability and reasonable accommodation requests based on religion. To ensure consistency and timely responses to requests, OPLER developed and provided:

1. Technical assistance and guidance to DOE’s LRACS at weekly LRAC meetings
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2. Fact Sheets Related to:
   a. Requests for Medical Review
   b. Deciding Management Official Responsibilities
3. Template emails for LRACS to use when administering the RA vaccine exemption process
4. RA templates specific for the vaccine exemption process

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.

Information about PAS is located at: https://hcnet.doe.gov/reasonable-accommodation. In FY22, DOE received no requests for PAS. To be prepared for such requests, DOE developed a Statement of Work for a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) with a vendor to provide support, as needed.

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 government-wide 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  Yes

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

1. FEVS 2019 data analysis comparing responses of PWD and those without disabilities includes findings consistent with the research literature about issues for PWD related to career development. PWD were less optimistic (37% positive, 38% negative) than those without disabilities (44% positive, 28% negative) about their opportunities for advancement at DOE. FY 2022: While there have been improvements in PWD opinions associated with Employee Engagement and Global Satisfaction at DOE, the gap between opinions of PWD and DOE employees overall has been persistent, with PWD expressing lower levels of engagement and satisfaction on a number of dimensions.

2. In FY 2020 and FY 2021, DOE noted lower than expected rates of applications to career development programs: fellowships (PWD and PWTD); and mentoring, coaching, and other career development programs (PWTD). In FY2022, however, DOE has noted that, with the exception of Coaching programs, PWD and PWTD participate on par with DOE employees overall (and compared to PWD and PWTD representation in the DOE workforce) in five other career development programs: Mentoring, Pre-Supervisory, Supervisory, Management, and Leadership development programs.

3. Applicant flow data for internal competitive promotions suggests: (1) potential qualification issues for PWD advancement from GS14 to GS15; and (2) potential bias in selection at the GS14 level for PWD.

## STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with Targeted Disabilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Name</th>
<th>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWD/PWTD Promotions</td>
<td>Analysis of full FY22 applicant flow data for internal competitive promotions: GS15 PWD/PWTD qualifications; for GS13/GS14: selection bias issues may need to be explored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</th>
<th>Date Modified</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Objective Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/31/2021</td>
<td>12/31/2022</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Applicant Flow Analysis of newly-available USA Staffing data to support on-going identification of barriers. Use FEVS and other data sources at DOE to continue to address issues for PWD at DOE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</th>
<th>Date Modified</th>
<th>Date Completed</th>
<th>Objective Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/15/2021</td>
<td>03/31/2022</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>09/01/2021</td>
<td>Conducted further barrier analysis in this area, including investigation of feasibility of establishing a disability-focused employee resource group (ERG). Research completed by Equal Employment Opportunity Assessment and Compliance Division (EEO-ACD) and ERG planning and development still in progress. Additional activities in FY 2022 to be undertaken in alignment with the DOE Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA) Strategic Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Responsible Official(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Standards Address The Plan?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EEO Specialist</td>
<td>Bradley Shaff</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief, EEO, Assessment, and Compliance Division</td>
<td>Jaime Claudio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Office of Recruitment and Advisory Services</td>
<td>Nikki King</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Research Analyst</td>
<td>Lisa Frehill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, Employee Relations Division, Office of Policy, Labor and Employee Relations</td>
<td>Catherine Sobel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date</th>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
<th>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</th>
<th>Modified Date</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2021</td>
<td>Investigate use of qualitative methodologies to better understand the low participation levels of PWD in fellowship programs and PWTD in mentoring, coaching, fellowship, and other career development programs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>09/30/2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/30/2021</td>
<td>Increase collaboration with an ad-hoc working group with HC to: (a) discuss triggers related to PWD/PWTD in this area; (b) Review/assess DOE's implementation of OPM’s best practices for retention of PWD (see: <a href="https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/disability-employment/retention/">https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/disability-employment/retention/</a>); and (c) Review best practices identified by EEOC for individuals with disabilities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/30/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/2021</td>
<td>Analyze DOE FEVS agency demographic report data associated with disability status. Identify extent to which assessments of items associated with engagement, the New IQ, and career development (in alignment with GAO 20-592) by respondents with disabilities differed from those of respondents without disabilities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/15/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Date</td>
<td>Planned Activities</td>
<td>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</td>
<td>Modified Date</td>
<td>Completion Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/31/2021</td>
<td>Develop draft Agency-Specific Items (ASIs) for the 2021 FEVS to determine extent to which (a) DOE employees are aware of reasonable accommodations and other disability-related policies and procedures; and (b) DOE employees perceive the DOE workplace as welcoming and inclusive of PWD.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>05/18/2021</td>
<td>05/18/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2022</td>
<td>Complete a draft joint EEO-ACD/HC, Office of Policy, Labor and Employee Relations (OPLER), Employee Relations Division, and HC Office of Training and Management (OTM) report of DOE's FEVS 2021 ASIs about issues for PWD at DOE.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07/31/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2022</td>
<td>Continue to work with the disability awareness ERG formation team. Establish and support an appropriate ERG and integrate into the community of DOE ERGs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12/31/2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/2022</td>
<td>Provide a briefing to the disability awareness ERG formation team based on the draft joint EEO-ACD/HC OPLER report (FEVS ASI data, other FEVS indices, and DOE workforce data). Briefed draft report to the Director of the Office of Economic Impact and Diversity and the Deputy Directors of OCR-EEO and ODEIA (10/6/2022).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>07/15/2022</td>
<td>10/06/2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>(1) Analyses of the FY 2021 FEVS Agency Specific Items (ASIs) related to disability topics were incorporated into the FY 2021 MD-715, along with other key FEVS findings. These analyses documented a persistent gap between PWD versus the overall DOE workforce including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Lower levels of job satisfaction (especially satisfaction with recognition for doing a good job and pay).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Lower levels of employee engagement overall and on the three sub-factors that constitute the Employee Engagement Index (Leaders lead, Supervisors, and Intrinsic work experience).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Less positive views about their perceptions of the opportunity to get a better job at DOE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Less agreement with the FEVS item: &quot;I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Less agreement with the FEVS item: &quot;My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In all of these cases, PWD were less likely to agree by at least three percentage points than DOE employees overall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A briefing of FEVS demographic results was presented, in collaboration with HC-OTM, to DOE's ERGs in June 2022.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) On the ASIs, DOE learned that there was still more work to do to ensure all employees know how to request a reasonable accommodation (RA) and how to report a suspected instance of discrimination against a PWD. DOE also learned that 7% of employees* had witnessed or experienced disability-based discrimination, and 8% reported they did not know if they had witnessed or experienced disability-based discrimination. These findings and those described under Item 1, above, were included in the Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document. With the implementation of the new Policy Memorandum (PM) #100, which included a robust set of resources for PWD to make RA/PAS requests, there were many training sessions that targeted supervisors and managers; DOE is planning training for the entire workforce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) DOE retained two of the three (with a slight modification to one of the two) 2021 FEVS ASIs in the 2022 FEVS administration. Additionally, DOE shared FEVS findings described here with DOE's lead on the Department's DEIA Strategic Plan. Five other ASIs were added to the DOE FY 2022 FEVS to learn about employee experiences associated with harassment, discrimination, and retaliation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) EEO-ACD organized a National Disability Employment Awareness Month (NDEAM) observance held virtually on October 26, 2021. The theme was “America’s Recovery: Powered by Inclusion.” The purpose of NDEAM is to acknowledge and celebrate the ongoing contributions and achievements of employees with disabilities. On a broader scale, NDEAM also serves to dispel harmful myths and stereotypes that are sometimes associated with PWD. This event focused on mental health issues in the workplace, and specifically, the impact of COVID-19 on mental health of employees everywhere. The keynote address was provided by Mr. Chris Bouneff, the Executive Director of the Oregon Office of the National Alliance of Mental Illness (NAMI). Ms. Rita Hollins, Director, OPLER Employee Relations Division, informed the audience about the basics of how to request an RA/PAS, where to find the name and contact information for the LRAC for each DOE Element, and where to find additional resources, such as DOE/HC PM #100A, which details the RA/PAS request process, and types of RA/PAS that may be available for PWD at the Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*With a 65% response rate and a census rather than a sample survey, FEVS results are statistically generalizable to the population of DOE employees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) EEO-ACD engages with SOAR (the PWD-focused ERG) as it continues to build out its organization. EEO-ACD and the DOE Headquarters Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator (HRAC) collaborate on an ongoing basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2021        | (1) The Special Emphasis Program observance of National Disability Employment Awareness Month (NDEAM) was a training conducted in October 2021 by DOE's EEO-ACD Equal Employment Specialist.  
(2) EEO-ACD completed FEVS demographic analysis and a brief review of recent literature associated with the employee cycle and issues for persons with disabilities. These analyses were used in concert with appropriate social science survey methodologies to develop a set of proposed Agency Specific Items for the 2021 DOE FEVS to understand knowledge and awareness of disability-related policies and procedures, and the climate for persons with disabilities at DOE.  
DOE's analyses are included in the FY 2021 Workforce Analysis Report: MD-715 Supporting Document.  
(3) Via EEO-ACD's public presentations of workforce and FEVS data to Employee Resource Groups (ERG) in FY 2021, a group of individuals interested in forming an ERG to address issues related to PWD was identified. EEO-ACD staff provided organizational and data support to the group (e.g., sharing workforce data and FEVs similar to what was shared with other ERGs), and collaborated with the group with respect to the FY 2022 Special Emphasis Program Observance of Disability Awareness Month in October 2021. |
| 2023        | Demographic data about the DOE workforce, including disability status, were briefed to the DEIA Senior Leadership Council in November 2022.  
With OPM's new Accessibility Index, DOE will retain one of the disability-related ASIs (to avoid duplication) for the 2023-2026 FEVS administrations. Additionally, OCR-EEO social scientists developed two new ASIs that were approved to be included in the FEVS for 2023-2026 in order to (with five other existing FEVS items) measure the concept of psychological safety. For marginalized categories, such as PWD and PWTD, OCR-EEO will examine trends in this foundational organizational metric with respect to its implications for providing equal employment opportunity for PWD and PWTD.  
The five ASIs added to the 2022 FEVS about employee experiences of harassment, discrimination, and retaliation were approved for continuation for the 2023-2026 FEVS administrations. |

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

In FY 2021 some planned activities were delayed, as an OCR-EEO D&I Specialist and Social Science Research Analyst provided significant support to the Department-wide DEIA Assessment (in alignment with EO 14035) and then the development of DOE's DEIA Strategic Plan. This work was in alignment with the intent of the planned activities to remove barriers to PWD and PWTD advancement at DOE. On-going collaboration of EEO-ACD with HC and the DEIA Office, including any related working groups, will discuss data, potential barriers, and methods to address them.

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

1. DOE HQ+ had an FY 2022 permanent Federal workforce of 6,611, of whom 937 were PWD (14.2%) and 187 were PWTD (2.8%), both of which exceed the EEOC goals (which were 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD). The 69 PWD Schedule A employees represented 1.0% of DOE’s workforce in FY 2022 and 23.2% of all Schedule A employees.

2. In FY 2022, the EEOC goals were approved by the Chief Human Capital Officer and tracked quarterly. Additional hiring goals were: 2% for Schedule A hires, 11% for veterans with disabilities, and 7% for veterans with disabilities of 30% or more. Hires of individuals with disabilities met or exceeded the targeted goals in most areas. In FY 2021, PWD represented 13.5% of new hires, while PWTD represented 1.9%, Schedule A hires 2.6%, veterans with disabilities 14.4%, and veterans with disabilities of 30% or more accounted for 12.9% of new hires in FY 2022.

Progress was assessed through quarterly reviews against the hiring goals and shared with HR Business Partners to inform hiring and
recruitment consultations with their customers. Some Program Offices have established their own oversight process and metrics to further monitor activities within their areas of responsibility. Lists of upcoming recruiting events and sources are also offered to help them target a diverse recruitment strategy.

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.

For FY 2022, DOE is in the process of hiring ~1,000 new employees for the "Clean Energy Corps". The DEIA Deputy Director is spearheading working groups that are examining recruitment and hiring processes, including developing training for hiring managers and the interviewers who will be involved with this large personnel surge. The trainings will include unconscious bias training, which includes segments on PWD and PWTD, for officials with hiring responsibilities. Additionally EEO-ACD is supporting this effort using the MD-715 workforce data, the newly-released EEOC/Census Bureau 2014-2018 American Community Survey data tool, and FedScope data to provide contextual information about representation of PWD and PWTD (among other demographic categories) in the DOE workforce in many of DOE's largest occupational series. Additional barrier analyses are planned that will focus on low participation levels of PWD and PWTD, especially in key occupations in which PWD were below the 12% benchmark (e.g., 0340 Program Management, 0801 General Engineering, and 0905 General Attorney).