

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 FY2022, the percentage of PWD in the GS-1 to GS-10 cluster was 23%, which exceeds the goal of 12%. The percentage of PWD in the GS-11 to SES cluster was 9.4 which is below the goal of 12% but is an improvement of 1.5% over FY2021 when the level was 7.9%. This demonstrates an incremental increase in the GS 11 - SES cluster. In specific, the GS grades that do not meet the 12% threshold is as follows: GS-11 at 5.9%; GS-13 at 6.7; GS-14 at 9.9%; GS-15 at 10.5%; and GS Other + SES at 0%. Only the GS-12 level in the cluster (GS-11 to SES) meets/exceeds the benchmark at 30.8%.

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

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

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

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

The percentage of PWTD in the GS-1 to GS-10 cluster was 15% in FY2022, which is above the goal of 2%. The percentage of PWTD in the GS-11 to SES cluster was 2.1% in FY2022, which is above the goal of 2%. Of the permanent workforce, PWTD is 2.5%.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	13	3	23.08	2	15.38
Grades GS-11 to SES	384	36	9.38	8	2.08

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

Every year, the Director of EEODI communicates to Agency leadership, including hiring managers and recruiters, the numerical disability hiring goals when debriefing senior leadership on the State of the Agency in compliance with the EEOC MD-715

reporting requirements.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	Randee Artis Disability Employment Program Manager randee.artis@ntsb.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTB	1	0	1	Randee Artis Disability Employment Program Manager/ Advisor randee.artis@ntsb.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1	0	0	Veronica Burrell Selective Placement Program Coordinator veronica.burrell@ntsb.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTB	1	0	0	Veronica Burrell Selective Placement Program Coordinator veronica.burrell@ntsb.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Shamicka Fulson Strategic Planner Shamicka.fulson@ntsb.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	Frank Perla Chief of Facilities frank.perla@ntsb.gov

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

Answer Yes

In FY2022, the Disability Program Staff received a variety of training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period. EEODI Staff collaborated and participated in the following events: Fostering a Mentally Healthy Workplace, Reasonable Accommodation for Mental health Impairments and Disability Etiquette. Lastly, all Disability Program Staff consistently receive informal training while carrying out their responsibilities. These informal opportunities to learn are conducted internally by the Director of EEODI, General Counsel, and/or other members of the Disability Program Staff. In FY22, EEODI staff participated in

EEOC's Excel Conference, the Federal Dispute Resolution Conference (FDR), and Employment Learning Innovations (Civil Treatment).

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Answer Yes

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

The NTSB has a full-time Disability Employment Program Manager (DEPM), who is responsible for serving as agency Point of Contact (POC) for the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) and the DoD Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP). Currently, outreach and targeted recruitment occurs only when Human Resources Division (HRD) notifies EEODI staff of potential vacancies. Current and planned efforts include these: • Maintaining a list and a network of disability recruitment sources. • Using shared registers (for example, the OPM Shared Register) and databases (WRP) to identify candidates for NTSB vacancies. • Increasing outreach through professional organizations and publications, state vocational rehabilitation and disability service agencies, the Internet, and social media. • Posting vacancies nationwide on www.USAJobs.gov. • Expanding use of the Pathways Program to hire student interns and targeting outreach to students with disabilities

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

NTSB may use the following hiring authorities to hire individuals with disabilities into temporary and permanent positions: • 30 percent or More Disabled Veteran (5 U.S.C. § 3112; 5 C.F.R. § 316.302, 316.402, and 315.707) • Schedule A Appointing Authority (5C.F.R. § 213.3102(u)). In FY21, research suggested that NTSB offices did not consistently use hiring tools that targeted candidates with disabilities. EEODI will work with HR to seek commitment by offices to adopt disability specific recruitment and outreach strategies, to include using the Workforce Recruitment Program and increasing contacts with Disability Program Centers at institutions of higher education. NTSB leadership will also seek great commitment by offices to facilitate use of Schedule A by hiring managers before job openings are made available to the public.

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.

Applications are submitted via USAJobs. Applicants can upload their Schedule A letter, and/or their Disabled Veteran documentation, to be considered under one of the special hiring authorities. HRD reviews the applicants resume to determine if they

meet the minimum qualifications of the position for which they applied. If they are determined to meet the minimum qualifications of the position, they are referred to the hiring authority on a Schedule A/non-competitive cert, and/or Disabled Veteran 30% or more cert, for their consideration. Once the hiring official makes a selection, the applicant is notified and provided instructions for completing the pre-employment requirements as outlined in the tentative job offer. Once the applicant has completed and passed all pre-employment requirements, they are provided an appointment letter.

- 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

The Agency continued to strengthen its Disability Employment Program by informing and educating HRD and all supervisors and managers on the Schedule A Hiring Authority.

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.

The DEPM served as the Agency’s point of contact for the WRP and the DoD CAP and also served as the point of contact for a vocational rehabilitation counselor to assist an employee with exploring career options, occupational interests, strengths, and developmental needs, and alternate accommodations. Additionally, the DEPM conducted research and identified valuable tools and recruitment options and worked with HRD to conduct training on recruitment options and special hiring authorities.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

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

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

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

The percentage of new hires with disabilities in FY22 was 10.64% (5 out of 47) a significant improvement over FY 21 at 3.56% (1 out of 28 new hires). Although the agency was under the 12% goal, the agency demonstrated a targeted effort of achieving 7.08% over prior year metrics. The percentage of new hires with targeted disabilities was 2.13% (1 out of 47) . This too was an improvement over FY21 performance. when there were zero individuals hired with targeted disabilities. Recruitment and hiring of PWD and PWTD is trending upward based on FY22 hiring statistics.

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	581	4.13	0.00	3.79	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	109	7.34	0.00	7.34	0.00
% of New Hires	28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

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

Of NTSB's eight (8) MCOs, 3 MCOs (0801-General Engineer, 0830-Mechanical Engineer, and 1815-Air Safety Investigator) had no qualified applicants PWD and PWTD. One (1) MCO (1801-Accident Investigator) had no external new hires. All positions for 1801 were internal promotions. Four (4) MCOs had qualified applicants PWD and PWTD. MCO 0861-Aerospace Engineering had one (1) qualified applicant in both PWD and PWTD which was 7.69% each of the qualified applicant pool. MCO 1083-Technical Writer and 2101-Transportation Safety both had 3 qualified applicants each in PWD and PWTD which was 8.82% and 23% of the qualified applicants respectively. MCO 2121-Railroad Accident Investigator had 1 qualified applicant in both PWD and PWTD comprising 11% of each category.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0801 GENERAL ENGINEER	3	0.00	0.00
0830 MECHANICAL ENGINEERING	1	0.00	0.00
0861 AEROSPACE ENGINEERING	1	0.00	0.00
1083 TECHNICAL WRITER	1	0.00	0.00
1801 ACCIDENT INVESTIGATOR	10	0.00	0.00
1815 AIR SAFETY INVESTIGATOR	10	0.00	0.00
2101 TRANSPORTATION SAFETY	0	0.00	0.00
2121 RAILROAD ACCIDENT INVESTIGATOR	2	0.00	0.00

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer No
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

The relevant applicant pool for Internal Promotions was not calculated because of unknown data: the number of existing individuals in each MCO with the level of experience and time in grade to qualify for the promotional opportunity. However, if the assumption is that everyone in had the time-in-grade and level of experience to qualify, then the relevant applicant pool for MCO internal promotions would be a population of 208 individuals with 166 (79.8%) without a disability, 21 (10.1%) not identified, 15 (7.21%) with a disability, and 6 (2.88%) with a targeted disability. 100% of all promotions were internally selected. A total of 14 internal promotions were selected in MCOs. Of the selections 5 did not have a disability (35.7%) and 9 did not identify a disability (64.3%). The promotional opportunities were primarily at the GS13 through SES level. Of the qualified applicants for MCO internal promotions, 7 PWD and 6 PWTD qualified out of 15 announcements with 377 internal applications.

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

There were no PWD or PWTD who were promoted during FY22. As indicated, there were 7 PWD and 6 PWTD who qualified for

the 15 job announcements with 377 internal applicants for promotion. The current MCO workforce for PWD and PWTD is 7.21% and 2.88% respectfully. The agency is seeing incremental increases as the hiring rate for consistently increases for PWD and PWTD as evidenced by FY22 7.08 and 2.13 percentage point increases in new hires for PWD and PWTD over FY21 results. The PWD and PWTD hiring rate is showing an upward trend and the agency expects incremental increases to occur yearly through attrition.

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.

Continuing the use of telework and alternative work schedules as workplace flexibilities. Continue to utilize exit interview surveys in FY2022 to identify retention tools for individuals with disabilities via Survey Monkey. Conducting workshops on reasonable accommodations, to include the resources available for people with disabilities and targeted disabilities, to educate all NTSB hiring managers and HRD staff officials. Utilize and market NTSB’s Career Development Roadmap Program to employees with disabilities. The Career Roadmap will also offer mentor opportunities to all employees, including employees with disabilities.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

FY22 saw the further refinement of the NTSB Career Development Roadmap which match the right learning with the right time in employees’ career, whether its leading self, managing projects, leading and managing people or leading and managing organizations. The roadmap offers free training/webinars on leadership, management, and employee self-development. The Career Development Advisor will also roll out a revised mentor program for NTSB in FY23.

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	6	6	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internship Programs	2	2	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 No

b. Selections (PWD)

Answer No

In FY22, the agency had (6) participants for the Excellence in Government (EIG) Fellow's program in FY22. The six participated in a 1-year Leadership Development Program. All applicants who applied were accepted. No PWD or PWTD applied for the program. The 2 pathways internes elected not to identify a disability.

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 No

b. Selections (PWTD)

Answer No

In FY22 no PWD nor PWTD applied for the career development program.

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

There were 4 triggers using the inclusion rate for PWD and 1 trigger for PWTD in awards, bonuses, and incentives. C1a. - 1. Time Off Awards 21-30 hours - PWD received 2.56% compared to 5.08% for those without a disability representing a difference of -2.47%. C1a. - 2. Cash Awards \$500 and under - PWD received 12.82% compared to 14.53% for those without a disability representing a difference of -1.71%. C1a. - 3. Cash Awards \$3000 - \$3999 - PWD received 10.26% compared to 18.44% for those without a disability representing a difference of -8.18%. C1a. - 4. Cash Awards \$5000+ - PWD received 5.13% compared to 9.78% for those without a disability representing a difference of -4.65%. C1b. - 1. Cash Awards \$4000-\$4999 - PWTD received 20.0% compared to 20.67% for those without a targeted disability representing a difference of -0.67%. The most significant difference in inclusion rate awards for PWD is at the \$3000-\$3999 and \$5000+ award levels. PWTD Awards are under 1%.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	11	0.00	3.47	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	136	0.00	42.90	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	12.36	0.00	3.90	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	23	10.26	4.73	0.00	13.79
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	406	184.62	84.54	0.00	248.28
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.65	46.15	5.64	0.00	62.07
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	19	2.56	5.36	0.00	3.45
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	500	61.54	142.59	0.00	82.76
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	26.32	61.54	8.39	0.00	82.76

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	1	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	32	0.00	10.09	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	32	0.00	10.09	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	33	15.38	7.89	20.00	13.79
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	118239	34758.97	30332.49	66980.00	23648.28
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	3583	5793.15	1213.30	33490.00	-3757.48
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	110	41.03	27.44	30.00	44.83
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	356014	121876.92	91457.73	49960.00	146675.86
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	3236.49	7617.31	1051.24	16653.30	4501.45
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	73	20.51	18.93	20.00	20.69
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	224921	61879.49	59359.62	45250.00	67613.79
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	3081.11	7734.95	989.33	22625.00	2600.45
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	70	10.26	19.87	0.00	13.79
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	279579	38071.79	79687.38	0.00	51200.00
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3993.99	9517.95	1264.88	0.00	12800.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	82	23.08	21.77	20.00	24.14
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	402087	108348.72	107524.29	95380.00	112820.69
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4903.5	12038.74	1558.32	47690.00	-254.79
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	37	5.13	10.41	10.00	3.45
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	231756	31715.38	65942.27	59250.00	22220.69
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	6263.68	15857.69	1998.25	59250.00	894.83

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 No

C2a. - 1. Quality Step Increases – PWD received 5.13% of awards in this category compared to 5.87% of those without a disability representing a difference of -0.74%. C2a. - 2. Performance Based Pay Increase – PWD received 5.13% of awards in this category compared to 6.42% of those without a disability representing a difference of -1.29%. There were no triggers for PWTD using the inclusion rate.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	25	5.13	6.62	0.00	6.90

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

not applicable

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 No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer No

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer No

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer No

FY22 Applicant flow data for internal promotions using inclusion rates indicates: D1a.i. and ii - Note: There was 1 SES selection, that had 5 internal applicants and 2 qualified/referred applicants. All applicants were individuals without a disability. D1b.i. - There were 8 GS15 selections. The inclusion rate of qualified/referred internal applicants was 3.57% compared to 96.43% for individuals without a disability. The inclusion rate for GS-15 participation PWD was 10.47% as compared to 89.53% for individuals without a

disability. D1c.i.and ii - Although there were no triggers for internal selections at the GS14 level, it is important to note that there is a trigger for GS14 participation rate overall. PWD are 9.89% of the GS14 workforce as compared to 90.11% are individuals without a disability. D1d.i.and ii - There were 2 GS13 selections. The inclusion rate of qualified/referred internal applicants had a 9.09% PWD inclusion rate as compared to 90.1% of individuals without a disability. The overall participation rate at the GS13 level had a participation rate of 6.67% for PWD as compared to 93.33% of individuals without a disability.

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 No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer No

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

FY22 Applicant flow data for internal promotions using inclusion rates indicates: D2b.i. - There were 8 GS15 selections. The inclusion rate of qualified /referred internal applicants of PWTD was 2.38% compared to 97.62% for individuals without a targeted disability. D2d.i. - There were 2 GS13 selections. The inclusion rate of qualified/referred internal applicants had a 6.49% of PWTD as compared to 93.51% of individuals without a targeted disability. The overall participation rate at the GS13 level had a participation rate of 1.67% for PWTD as compared to 98.33% of individuals without a targeted disability.

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

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

Based on FY22 applicant flow data, there were no new hires at the SES, GS15, and GS13 levels; however, there were 12 external selections at the GS14 level. There was not a trigger at the GS14 qualified external applicants; however, there was 1 trigger for

GS14 referred applicants with a rate of 4.58% for PWD compared to 95.42% for individuals without a disability.

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

Based on FY22 applicant flow data, there were no new hires at the SES, GS15, and GS13 levels; however, there were 12 external selections at the GS14 level; however, there were no triggers for new hires for PWTD.

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 | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | No |
| b. Managers | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | No |
| c. Supervisors | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | No |

FY22 applicant flow data indicates: D5bi. - Qualified internal applicants for PWD had a rate of 4.11% compared to 95.89% of individuals without a disability.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- | | | |
|---|--------|----|
| a. Executives | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| b. Managers | | |

- | | | |
|---|--------|----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| c. Supervisors | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer | No |

FY22 applicant flow data indicates no triggers for PWTD among executive, managers, and supervisors qualified applicants and/or selections.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|----|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) | Answer | No |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) | Answer | No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Answer | No |

In FY22 applicant flow data, supervisory positions were filled using internal promotions. There were no external hires for supervisory positions.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------|----|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) | Answer | No |

In FY22 applicant flow data, Executives, Managers, and Supervisory positions were filled using internal promotions. There were no external hires for these positions.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer N/A

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 Yes
- b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

In FY22 for the permanent workforce, PWD had a voluntary separation rate of 25%; however, the rate for those without a disability was 8.56%. The inclusion rate for PWD in the permanent workforce is 9.82% but had a significant separation rate with 25% in FY22.

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	6	5.00	1.07
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	21	10.00	4.55
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	15	10.00	2.94
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	42	25.00	8.56

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

In FY22 for the permanent workforce, PWTD had a voluntary separation rate of 9.09% which represents 1 PWTD.

Separations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	6	0.00	1.49
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	21	9.09	4.96
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	15	0.00	3.72
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	42	9.09	10.17

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.

Exit interview data indicates that 71% of the respondents indicated the type of separations was retirement. In addition, 31% of those interviewed indicated that they were leaving because they became eligible for retirement.

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.nts.gov/about/Policies/Pages/accessibility.aspx>

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.nts.gov/about/Policies/Pages/accessibility.aspx>

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 the past, the Agency has updated wheelchair accessibility maps indicating signage and routes to various NTSB facilities within L'Enfant Plaza. The Office of EEODI ensures that persons with disabilities technological needs are met. In the future, NTSB may relocate its HQ to a new building. EEODI will ensure that accessibility concerns are addressed, should that happen. In FY22, EEODI continued to lead the Agency's efforts in utilizing an interpreter services contract to assist the Agency's hard of hearing employees engage in virtual meetings. Interpreter services were used 58 times in FY22.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

The average processing time for processing initial requests for reasonable accommodations in FY2022 was 13 days.

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.

Adhering to the completion of reasonable accommodation requests within a 30- day timeframe, this allows for individuals with time sensitive requests to receive the assistance they need to be effective and productive as employees in the workplace. Implementing the practice of tracking reasonable accommodation using a spreadsheet, we've been able to effectively update the status of each request and this coordination helps limit the processing time.

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.

To date, the Agency has not received any requests for PAS services. The agency has a contract in place for individuals requiring PAS services.

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 - B9					
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?	There were 2 significant triggers involving cash awards. One trigger involved Cash Awards \$3000 - \$3999 - where PWD received 10.26% compared to 18.44% for those without a disability representing a difference of -8.18%. Another trigger was Cash Awards \$5000+ where PWD received 5.13% compared to 9.78% for those without a disability representing a difference of -4.65%. (This trigger was updated and modified based on FY22 data.)					
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities					
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y					
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y					
STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	Barrier Name Disability representation and tenure segment		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice Trend analysis from 2019-2021 compares the percentage of onboard versus new hires disability representation and shows that the agency is increasing PWD representation with new hires over the percentage of onboarded employees.			
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan						
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description	
07/31/2020	12/31/2021	Yes			Conduct barrier analysis to identify and eliminate any potential barriers in promotion and career enhancement opportunities for Agency employees who identify as PWTD.	
Responsible Official(s)						
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
EEO Director		Fara Guest		Yes		
Disability Employment Program Manager		Ranee Artis		Yes		
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective						
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
07/31/2020	Establish quarterly meetings with HRD to obtain more comprehensive applicant flow data in order to monitor the participation rates of PWTD in the actual applicant pool and relevant applicant pool.			Yes		07/31/2020
07/31/2020	Create Barrier Analysis Working Group			Yes		07/31/2020

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
10/15/2020	Examine FEVS data	Yes	05/01/2022	02/02/2022
11/15/2020	Examine Career Trajectories of PWTD in the Agency	Yes	05/01/2022	02/01/2022
11/30/2020	Train Barrier Analysis Working Group on identifying triggers and conducting investigation to pinpoint actual barriers.	Yes	05/01/2022	05/01/2022
03/01/2021	Complete investigation for barrier analysis process and identify any potential barriers	Yes	05/01/2023	05/01/2022
06/01/2021	Establish and Implement plan of action to resolve identified barriers.	Yes	07/01/2023	05/01/2022
12/31/2022	Develop DEIA hiring/awareness campaign to recruit/retain individuals with disabilities.	Yes		
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2021	Barrier Analysis initiated in FY21 and completed in FY22.			
2021	Disability representation showed improvement; however, the increase was not statistically significant.			

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)					
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1					
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	PWD represent 9.82% of the permanent workforce as opposed to the Federal goal of 12%.					
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities					
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y					
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y					
STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	Barrier Name		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice			
	Representation of people with disabilities		Disability self-identification is 9.82% as compared to the federal benchmark of 12%.			
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan						
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description	
10/01/2022	09/30/2023	Yes			Improve self-identification of PWD.	
Responsible Official(s)						
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
EEO Specialist		Emma James		Yes		
Disability Employment Program Manager		Ranee Artis		Yes		
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective						
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2023	Re-survey the workforce 1 - 2 or more times within FY23 to encourage the workforce to self-identify disabilities.			Yes		
09/30/2023	Webinar on Workplace Recruitment Program targeted to hiring managers.			Yes		
09/30/2023	Schedule A hiring webinar for hiring managers.			Yes		

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment

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

N/A

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

The planned activities that were completed enabled the Agency to complete the barrier analysis process. The Agency hired a contractor to complete the barrier analysis process by FY2022.

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

The barrier analysis results will enable the Agency to further drill down and improve the plan to eliminate barriers relating to PWD and PWTD.