

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 |

This report presents separate results for both persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD) employed, or seeking employment, with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). As required by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the analysis and report reflect the participation of persons with (targeted) disabilities in two different “clusters” – Cluster GS-1 to GS-10, and Cluster GS-11 to SES (Senior Officer-equivalent for the SEC). The clusters are calculated based on the locality adjusted salary specified in the revised regulations implementing Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. As a point of reference, in FY 2022, the locality adjusted salary of a GS-11, step 1, in the Washington, DC area was \$74,950. The EEOC has established numerical goals for the employment and utilization of persons with disabilities (12%) and persons with targeted disabilities (2%) for each of the two clusters. The SEC’s goal is to meet and exceed these relevant benchmarks for PWD and PWTD for each cluster. The SEC included permanent and temporary employees hired under authorities that take disability into account as PWD under the relevant hiring authority. Permanent and temporary employees who did not self-identify on standard form 256 (SF-256) as having a disability but whose personnel record indicates they received veterans’ preference (e.g., CPS – preference based on compensable service-connected disability of 30% or more) are included in the total PWD workforce data tables. Similarly, permanent and temporary employees not self-identified on SF-256 but whose personnel record documents that they were hired or converted into the competitive service under Schedule A, part u (5 C.F.R. § 213.3102(u) Appointment of persons with intellectual disabilities, severe physical disabilities, or psychiatric disabilities) are included in the total PWD workforce for purposes of utilization analysis. For employees with salaries below a GS-11, step 1, the Agency achieved the numerical goal for PWD participation; three or 30.00% of employees in this cluster were PWD compared to the 12% benchmark. See Table B5. For employees with locality adjusted salaries above a GS-11, step 1, the Agency did not achieve the required numerical goal: 10.14% of employees in this cluster were PWD compared to the 12% benchmark. While the numerical goal was not achieved, the current participation rate represents an increase of 3.57 percentage points since the end of FY 2015. Between FY 2015 and FY 2022, the participation of PWD in the total workforce increased from 6.57% to 9.21%.

In FY 2022, OPM changed the format of Applicant Flow Data with respect to disability identification. A new “disability omitted” category was added, which includes both applicants who did not submit a disability identification form and applicants who selected they did not wish to answer questions on their disability on the disability identification form. The SEC’s MD-715 workforce tables account for persons who did not submit a form in a new “No Form” column, and persons who selected they did not wish to answer questions on their disability in the “Not Identified” column. Since the Agency has no information on the disability status of persons who did not submit a form, persons who did not submit a form are not included in the totals.

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)

Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)

Answer Yes

The SEC achieved the numerical goal established for PWTD in the lower salary cluster during FY 2022. In the lower salary cluster, one of the ten permanent employees is a PWTD. The SEC did not achieve the numerical goal for PWTD among higher-salaried employees, as 1.85% of higher-salaried employees are PWTD.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	0	0	0.00	0	0.00
Grades GS-11 to SES	4247	376	8.85	71	1.67

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

The SEC’s Office of Human Resources (OHR) is implementing the 2022 – 2024 Recruitment Strategy (Recruitment Strategy) to “Increase workforce representation for people with disabilities and people with targeted disabilities.” The Recruitment Strategy employs two goals towards this objective: (1) build a talent pool of qualified Schedule A applicants; and (2) improve veteran recruitment efforts. SEC senior leadership, OHR, the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity (OEEO), and Office of Minority and Women Inclusion (OMWI) are working together to communicate these goals throughout the Agency. OHR continues to communicate opportunities to utilize special hiring authorities, including Schedule A hiring options, in conversations with hiring managers to reinforce how the Agency may improve progress toward achieving numerical goals. A checklist is used by OHR Staffing specialists when vacant positions are identified to ensure hiring managers understand all of their options for filling positions, including using Schedule A and veterans’ hiring authorities for those applicants with a service-connected disability of 30% or more. SEC Division and Office heads have access to the Agency’s Diversity Dashboard, an interactive web-enabled data feed that aggregates workforce data. Multiple views of gender, race, generation, veteran, and disability status provide a real-time status on the progress the Agency is making toward its goals. SEC employees explored and engaged with the Diversity Dashboard throughout the year, resulting in 1,946 total visits in FY 2022. OHR also continues to share workforce data through the Human Capital Reporting & Analytics (HCRA) dashboard. The HCRA provides, among other key human capital metrics, aggregate data on the disability status for self-identified PWD and PWTD. A series of data filters enable leaders to understand employee gains and losses within their particular Division or Office for specific occupations, grades, and duty stations. OHR uses this information to support Human Capital strategic planning. In FY 2022, OHR held Human Capital Review sessions with each SEC Division and Office and shared PWD and PWTD on-board and target data points. These discussions enhanced transparency and awareness of the Agency’s interests in improving workforce diversity.

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

The Agency designated sufficient talent acquisition resources and Full Time Equivalents to Special Programs classification, recruitment, and staffing in support of the disability program.

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	2	0	0	Dia Gonsalves Disability Program Officer gonsalvesd@sec.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	3	0	0	Xiya Li Branch Chief and Lead HR Specialist lixiy@sec.gov
Section 508 Compliance	1	0	0	Sharvon Jones Governance Branch jonessh@sec.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	3	Ray Ferrari, Jinhee Kim, Carla Hairston RA LEED AP Architects and HCIDQ ferrarir@sec.gov, kimjin@sec.gov, hairstonc@sec.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	15	0	0	Xiya Li Branch Chief Lixiy@sec.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	15	0	0	Xiya Li Branch Chief Lixiy@sec.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

Reasonable Accommodation (RA) Program Staff, to include the Disability Program Officer (DPO), receive on-the-job training and periodically attend training programs. The office also reviews recent case law to stay current with developments in this area. The RA Coordinator and the RA Program Staff completed courses specific to recruiting, accommodating disabilities, religious accommodations, performance management, hiring, and retaining PWD and PWTD via webinars sponsored by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), LRP Publications, and through the SEC’s on-demand learning management system, LEAP. More generally, all of the SEC’s HR specialists have completed training courses related to staffing and placement offered by the USDA Graduate School or Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and through various other platforms. The Agency’s training and development office, SECU, also offers learning options that include processing applications for PWD and PWTD. The Agency will continue these practices in the future.

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

The Agency was resourced adequately during the reporting period to successfully implement the disability program.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

The SEC is committed to being a model employer for people with disabilities. The SEC streamlined the approach to the general hiring process using the Schedule A hiring authority for persons with disabilities. This streamlined approach for external hiring requests was filtered through the Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) for review. The SPPC referred qualified applicants to hiring managers prior to or concurrently with the general staffing process. OHR also continued to take steps toward improving the representation of PWD and PWTD in applicant pools. Since implementation of the FY 2022 – 2024 Recruitment Strategy, the SEC has realized an increase in the overall representation of people with disabilities through effective recruitment and outreach efforts that identify the Agency as an Employer of Choice. The SEC used OPM's Agency Talent Portal to search for resumes of individuals with disabilities. Invitations to complete the web form and/or apply to jobs posted on USAJOBS.gov are sent to individuals with disabilities who demonstrated an interest in mission critical occupations (MCO) at the SEC. The SEC noted that in FY 2022, within the MCO of Accountant, Examiner, and IT Management, applications from PWD remained at the same rates as in FY 2021 or slightly declined. Despite the mandatory telework posture, the Agency maintained a strong recruitment presence in FY 2022, and attended 13 virtual career fairs and events supporting disability recruitment efforts in building talent pools for future employment. In FY 2023, OHR will host two job fairs specifically targeting individuals with disabilities and veterans seeking employment opportunities in the SEC's mission critical occupations and will seek opportunities to engage with law and business students interested in internships with the SEC. Further, OHR will continue to retain and review applications from people with disabilities for future openings and will conduct targeted outreach to connect with qualified candidates by collaborating with community-based partners such as nonprofit organizations, national and local disability organizations, and federally-funded state and local employment programs. Finally, OHR will continue to leverage the employee affinity group Disability Interests Advisory Committee (DIAC) for recruitment resources and assistance.

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

The Agency uses a variety of available resources that support hiring through Schedule A and other hiring authorities that take disability into account. The Disability Program Manager and/or SPPC receives notifications and newsletters from the following groups and transmits information to OHR staff engaged in recruitment: • EARN – Employer Assistance Resource Network: <http://askearn.org> • JAN – Job Accommodation Network: <http://askjan.org> • ODEP – Office of Disability Employment Policy, Department of Labor: <http://www.dol.gov/odep/> • OWF – Operation Warfighter Program: <https://warriorcare.dodlive.mil/carecoordination/operation-warfighter/>

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

The following describes two procedures for processing applications under the Schedule A hiring authority for persons with disabilities, one used in response to a specific vacancy posting and the other for unsolicited Schedule A applications. 1. The Office of Human Resources processes Schedule A applications in response to a Job Opportunity Announcement (JOA). Applicants who wish to be considered for a specific vacancy under the Schedule A hiring authority must submit the appropriate documentation when applying for a current open JOA. The SEC defers to the OPM-identified appropriate documentation. Applications are reviewed by HR specialists to determine if the applicant is minimally qualified as identified in the JOA. If the applicant is minimally qualified, that individual is referred to the hiring manager on a separate certificate of eligible candidates. HR specialists provide written guidance to hiring managers via email that explains how Schedule A applicants can be selected once the certificate has been issued. 2. The Office of Human Resources also processes unsolicited Schedule A applications. Applicants who wish to be considered under the Schedule A hiring authority, outside the process for a specific vacancy posting, must submit the appropriate documentation as identified by OPM with their application. The SPPC will proactively contact the prospective applicant if the individual did not submit the required documentation. The application will not be processed until the appropriate documentation is

received. Resumes submitted directly to the SPPC are reviewed to determine the potential job series the applicant may be suitable for based on the knowledge, skills, and abilities identified on the applicant’s application. Building a pool of qualified candidates is important to the SEC; as such, the Agency has developed a Schedule A Resume Database. The SEC process for hiring starts with a Staffing Action Request Form (SARF) submitted by the hiring manager. Upon request, when a SARF is received by OHR, the SPPC compiles a certificate of eligible candidates from the database per the job series and refers candidates to hiring managers. The SPPC conducts a one-on-one consultation with the hiring manager to discuss the certificate of eligible candidates, as appropriate. The SEC’s administrative regulations on its Veterans Employment Program provides instruction for hiring veterans with disabilities and was last updated in December 2021. The Agency’s administrative regulations are available upon request.

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

In FY 2022, OHR Staffing specialists used a hiring checklist in the one-on-one conversation with the hiring manager. The checklist contains a section on Schedule A hiring of persons with disabilities, and the specialist advises the hiring manager on the Schedule A hiring process and offers it as a course of action where applicable. The SEC will continue to promote among hiring managers the successful use of Schedule A hiring to support the SEC’s Recruitment Strategy and Affirmative Action Plan for People with Disabilities. In addition, in FY 2023, OHR will develop and launch a new training for hiring managers describing the various hiring authorities available to them, including Schedule A hiring authority for persons with disabilities.

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 SEC’s SPPC continued to maintain established partnerships with organizations that assist PWD and PWTD in securing and maintaining employment. The SPPC updated the SEC’s list of affinity organizations to maintain contact and foster relationships for recruitment events and candidate sourcing. The SEC continued to leverage the Operation Warfighter (OWF) program during FY 2022. OWF is an internship program created by the Department of Defense that matches qualified wounded, ill, and injured service members with non-funded federal internships for them to gain valuable work experience during recovery and rehabilitation. The SPPC also maintains an ongoing relationship with the SEC’s DIAC and the Veterans Committee members which help support the Agency’s efforts to recruit PWD and PWTD. In addition, the Agency continued work to strengthen partnerships with stakeholders to include SEC program offices, such as OMWI, the National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), DIAC, and employee affinity groups to identify sustainable actions to improve the Agency’s Diversity and Inclusion initiatives for the PWD and PWTD communities. These actions will promote greater inclusion of the PWD and PWTD communities in the SEC workforce and will support their immediate and long-term needs when the Agency transitions back to normal work posture post the COVID-19 pandemic.

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 Yes

In FY 2022, the Agency hired 260 permanent employees, of which PWD and PWTD represented 8.46% and 1.15%, respectively, of all new hires. As such, the Agency did not achieve the numerical goals of 2% participation of PWTD and 12% participation of PWD among permanent new hires. See Table B1.

New Hires	Total	Reportable Disability	Targeted Disability
-----------	-------	-----------------------	---------------------

	(#)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	3244	21.55	0.12	4.59	0.03
% of Qualified Applicants	2451	20.69	0.05	4.12	0.00
% of New Hires	205	7.80	0.49	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

In FY 2022, the SEC hired and on-boarded a total of 260 permanent staff employees. Among these newly-hired staff members were 197 persons in MCO positions as follows: 130 attorneys; 14 accountants; 18 securities compliance examiners; 20 IT management specialists; and 15 economists. Fifteen of the 197 (7.61%) newly-on-boarded MCO permanent staff were PWD. As a preliminary matter, differences may be observed in comparing the demographic statistics of the qualified applicant pool (QAP), selections, and new hires on-boarded. Reasons for these differences vary. Some newly-hired staff applied for a vacancy posted in the prior fiscal year or may have elected not to volunteer demographic information with their application. In addition, in FY 2022, one Division posted open continuous announcements for which the applicant flow data do not fall into a specific fiscal year based on the close dates of the postings. Triggers comparing the composition of PWD and PWTD in applicant flow versus new hire data should be interpreted with these differences in mind. Triggers were observed for PWD in the hiring of permanent IT Management specialists, Economists, and Attorneys as follows: • For IT Management, 15.00% of new hires were PWD, below their representation in the qualified applicant pool of 45.36%. • For Economists, 20.00% of new hires were PWD, below their representation in the qualified applicant pool of 24.02%. • For Attorneys, 4.62% of new hires were PWD, below their representation in the qualified applicant pool 18.02%. • For Accountants, 7.14% of new hires were PWD, above their representation in the qualified applicant pool of 5.26%. • For Securities Compliance Examiners, 16.67% of new hires were PWD, above their representation in the qualified applicant pool of 9.77%. Triggers were also observed for PWTD in the Attorney, IT Management, Economist, and Accountant occupations: • For Attorneys, the QAP for PWTD was 3.81%; no PWTD was hired. • Sixteen PWTD were in the QAP (5.50%) for IT Management, and no PWTD was hired. • Thirteen PWTD were in the QAP (6.37%) for Economist positions, and no PWTD was hired. • Six PWTD were in QAP (3.45%) for Securities Compliance Examiners, and no PWTD was hired. • One PWTD was in the QAP (2.63%) for an Accountant position, and no PWTD was hired. See Table B6.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0110 ECONOMIST	15	20.00	0.00
0510 ACCOUNTANT	14	7.14	0.00
0905 ATTORNEY-ADVISER	130	4.62	0.00
1831 SECURITIES COMPLIANCE EXAMINER	18	16.67	0.00
2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	20	15.00	0.00

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

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

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)

Answer Yes

In the FY 2022 data presented in Table B6, differences were identified in the participation of PWD in the qualified internal applicants for competitive promotions as compared to the relevant applicant pool (RAP) within the Attorney occupation. Differences were also identified between the RAP and QAP for PWTD within the internal competitive promotion data for the MCOs of Securities Compliance Examiner and Economist. The RAP was defined for each MCO based on the number of employees holding a qualifying occupation series and in the SK-levels encumbered at the Agency between SK-11 and SK-16. Specifically, for Attorneys, the RAP included all employees in the 0905 series. For Accountants, the RAP included all employees in the 0510 series. For Securities Compliance Examiners, the RAP included all employees in the 1831 and the 0501, Financial Administration and Program series. For the Information Technology Management occupation, the RAP included all employees in the 2210 series, and for the Economist occupation, the RAP included all employees in the 0110 series. For Securities Compliance Examiners, the Agency observed a difference between the RAP and qualified internal applicants for PWTD. The RAP for PWTD was 1.38%, and PWTD represented none of the qualified internal applicants. For Economists, the Agency observed a difference between the RAP and qualified internal applicants for PWD. The RAP for PWD was 5.43%, and PWD represented none of the qualified internal applicants. The RAP for PWTD was 3.26%, and there were no PWTD among qualified internal applicants.

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

The selection data indicate a difference for PWD in the Attorney, Accountant, and IT Management occupations. • For Attorneys, the QAP for PWD was 7.03%, and PWD were 5.56% of selections. • For Accountants, the QAP for PWD was 18.18%, and PWD were 0.00% of selections. • For IT Management, the QAP for PWD was 62.60%, and PWD were 50.00% of selections. The selection data also indicate there were differences between selections and the qualified applicant pool for PWTD in the Accountant and IT Management occupations. • For Accountants, the QAP for PWTD was 13.64%, and PWTD were 0.00% of selections. • For IT Management, the QAP for PWTD was 6.50%, and PWTD were 0.00% of selections.

Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

To promote equal employment opportunity, the Agency takes a number of steps to ensure that opportunities for advancement are open and available to all in the workforce, including PWD and PWTD. The following describes efforts to promote opportunities for advancement. Information about training, the Agency’s Mentoring Program, and career development opportunities is widely shared with the workforce via SEC Today which is the SEC’s daily newsletter published agency wide. OHR maintains a user-friendly, interactive portal, AskHR, on the SEC’s intranet, which provides employees with information about hiring, compensation and benefits, employee development, performance management, and disability accommodations, among a number of other topics. The Chief Human Capital Officer (CHCO) is an active member of the SEC Veterans Committee, which hosts a website that includes information concerning veterans’ benefits, to include a link to the Feds Hire Vets website that highlights special hiring authorities for veterans. DIAC regularly communicates with its membership, which includes PWD and PWTD, about its own activities, other events, developmental opportunities, and job postings or support available to the workforce. These more targeted communications help ensure that PWD and PWTD are aware of the available options and any processes for requesting participation or enrollment. In FY 2022, OHR reserved five (5) slots in the 2022 Mentoring Program cohort for employees with disabilities and collaborated with

DIAC to communicate this opportunity. Through this collaboration, the SEC exceeded its goal – 6 PWD participated in the FY 2022 Mentoring Program. In addition, in FY 2021, the SEC launched a cross-office working group comprised of Senior Officers who are champions of disability inclusion, subject matter experts in OHR, OEE0, OMWI, and key members of the Disability Interests Advisory Committee. This working group began meeting in FY 2021 and, leveraging evidence-based data, made 17 recommendations to management in FY 2022 related to the recruitment, hiring, career development, promotion, reasonable accommodation, and retention of PWD and PWTD at the SEC (PWD Recommendations). Subsequently, the SEC launched a new cross-office working group (comprised of accountable experts and/or leads in OHR, OMWI, OEE0, OIT, and OCOO) charged with implementing the PWD Recommendations. The majority of the 17 PWD Recommendations fall within OHR’s jurisdiction, and OHR has already implemented a couple of recommendations, including, the sharing of the Schedule A PWD list with Division/Office hiring managers prior to the publication of a job announcement provided there are qualified candidates in the resume database to refer, and sharing aggregate disability data with Divisions/Offices as part of the Human Capital reviews. The PWD Recommendations serve as guiding principles for this new working group. In FY 2022, for each recommendation accepted by the Agency for implementation, the working group identified the responsible office/branch and established projected timeframes for implementation. To ensure progress is made on the recommended actions, the implementation working group meets on a monthly basis and has scheduled accountability meetings with Agency leaders – including the Agency’s Operations Steering Committee (a standing committee that is consulted on various matters related to the Agency’s human capital), the Chief Operating Officer, and the two Senior Officer co-leads for the working group that developed the recommendations. The accountability meetings not only serve to hold the working group accountable but also as an opportunity to request needed resources and/or support from other Agency stakeholders in the implementation phase. The PWD recommendations will be the focus of intentional effort in FY 2023.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

The SEC provides numerous opportunities for employees to acquire the skills and certifications needed to succeed in their technical positions and to progress in their careers. Classroom-style and e-Learning programs offer an extensive array of learning opportunities in technical areas (e.g., courses on Hedge Funds, Mutual Funds, and Credit Derivatives, etc.), as well as in leadership development, to SEC senior leaders and non-supervisory staff alike. Among the variety of learning and development offerings, the SEC offers the career development training programs highlighted below. Data on participation in these programs is captured along with other training program data in Section IV.B.2 below.

- The C.O.R.E. Connections – Opportunity – Relationships – Equity program is a transformative professional development experience designed to provide employees at the SEC with tools and techniques to increase their effectiveness, span of contributions and engagement within their function, and support their personal well-being and growth. The series equips employees with knowledge, skills and strategies to successfully manage their unique challenges as they strive to reach senior-level positions at the SEC while helping to drive our Agency’s overall success and mission effectiveness. The series has five two-hour webinars, in which participants learn strategies for authentic and difficult conversations, managing conflict and exploring the role that emotions play in leadership outcomes.
- Leadership Development for Women program was developed by SECU in place of the Brookings Institute’s Women in Leadership Program. In FY 2022, CLTD offered three sessions of Lead Forward: Leadership Development for Women at the SEC. This course presents the opportunity for women to engage with other women, increase their support network, and further define their leadership style and mindset. Participants learn more about the leaders they want to be and make commitments about behavioral changes they want to implement to move their own careers forward, advocating for themselves and for other women.
- The EIG Fellows Program, coordinated by the Partnership for Public Service, strengthens the leadership skills of experienced federal employees through a combination of innovative coursework, best practices benchmarking, challenging action-learning projects, executive coaching, and government wide networking. This program is offered to SEC employees in the SK-14 to SK-17 (a mix of supervisory and non-supervisory) levels. SEC’s EIG Fellows attend facilitated sessions to share what they are learning and to explore how this information can be applied to improve organizational performance, workplace relationships, and productivity.
- The Aspiring Leaders Program is an interactive blended-learning program designed to strengthen the leadership and management skills of SEC non-supervisory (SK-13 and SK-14) employees. The program covers: critical leadership skills for effective supervision; first-line management responsibilities; understanding government policy, process, and regulations relevant to management; and increasing self-awareness through guided self-assessments and feedback.
- The Career Advancement Program (CAP) is a 12-month external professional development program geared toward mid-career professionals who aspire to senior leadership roles. CAP is conducted by Management Leadership for Tomorrow (MLT), a nonprofit organization that aims to transform the career trajectories of diverse leaders by providing them the skills, coaching and connections needed to accelerate their careers. CAP’s professional development journey includes realistic business simulations, sustainable strategies and tools for professional growth and development, and a cohort of peers representing various industries and functions.
- The Upward Mobility Program offers SEC employees in support staff positions the opportunity to expand their careers by competing for entry-level program specialist positions (series 301) starting at

the SK-7 or SK-9 level and with promotion potential to the SK-12 level. These positions are open to all SEC employees serving under a permanent appointment. This program includes two years of formal training designed to foster the success of participants. The training, developed by SEC University, includes tailored guidance and mentoring for both the participants and their supervisors. In addition to the career development programs referenced above, the Agency encourages employees, including PWD and PWTD, to pursue leadership development through a variety of program offerings, including both individual coaching and an agency-wide mentoring program. In FY 2022, 56 SEC managers engaged in coaching with an external coach. Due to confidentiality considerations, the SEC does not track demographic information for the employees engaged in coaching opportunities. Non-supervisory offerings developed for leaders without formal authority included, for example: Empowering Your Development and Leading Without Authority (courses are designed to enhance relationship-building and maintain effective relationships for SEC leaders at all levels). In FY 2022, the SEC finalized and launched a leadership evaluation, accession and development program (LEAD Program), which emphasizes the importance of certain leadership skills essential for success at the SEC. The program is designed to improve the process for developing, identifying, and selecting future SEC Senior Officers (SOs) by including standardized leadership assessments that screen candidates on essential leadership competencies in a fair and legally-compliant manner. In August 2022, OHR launched the LEAD website, which serves as a repository of LEAD program information and offers links to training and resources that support self-directed leadership development. The easy-to-navigate website is available to all SEC employees to learn about the program, use leadership development tools, and advocate for their own leadership development opportunities that are aligned to critical SO leadership competencies. The LEAD website also provides assessment information and self-preparation materials for employees interested in applying to SO positions. The Managing Board and LEAD team developed the leadership assessments, and worked with a leading HR consulting firm, to provide automated test delivery that ensures fair and standardized applicant testing. This standardized approach eliminates unintended test bias, providing all applicants a comparable testing process and experience. Trained raters score LEAD assessments, with candidate responses anonymized prior to scoring, where possible. In addition, internal SEC applicants receive feedback on the LEAD assessments, highlighting their leadership strengths and weaknesses, to support their ongoing leadership development. In addition to targeted communications to educate employees and create awareness on the LEAD program, in Q4 FY 2022, OHR offered a series of general informational briefings for all interested employees and provided briefings to Division and Office management teams. After an initial launch of the LEAD assessments with vacancies in the Division of Investment Management and OCOO offices, an agency-wide launch of the LEAD assessments is planned for FY 2023.

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	86	19	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mentoring Programs	31	31	12.90%	12.90%	9.68%	9.68%
Coaching Programs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Career Development Programs	41	35	9.09%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Training Programs	38,837	38,837	9.22%	9.22%	1.67%	1.67%
Detail Programs	86	25	20.93%	16.00%	1.16%	0.00%
Internship Programs	52,770	6,219	3.51%	4.58%	1.68%	1.09%

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

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

From the Career Development Opportunities table in Section IV.B.2 above, data on the participation of PWD and PWTD in applications and selections for various programs were reviewed. For the Internship Program, 3.51% of applicants were PWD and

PWD were 4.58% of selections. As selections had a higher percentage of PWD than the percentage of PWD among applicants, there was no trigger for internships. For the Agency’s Economist, Accountant and Attorney Fellows Programs, the Agency noted no difference in the participation of PWD among (external) applicants for these programs and eventual selections for positions. While 0.00% of applicants were PWD, none of the Fellows hired were PWD (0.00%). Within the Agency’s Mentoring Program (selections were on a first-come, first-served basis), the Agency found no evidence of a trigger in the participation rate among those who applied for the Mentoring Program (i.e., applicants) as compared to participation of PWD in the permanent workforce (9.21%). PWD represent 12.90% of those employees who expressed interest in the Mentoring Program and 12.90% of those selected for mentoring. In FY 2022, training data includes trainings approved on standard form 182 through the Agency’s learning management system, LEAP, trainings from Pluralsight, Becker, the Practising Law Institute, and Udemy. Aggregate PWD participation in training programs matched their participation on rolls: 9.22% of trainings were completed by PWD, compared to 9.21% of permanent employees who are PWD. No trigger was found for applications or selections. Data about detailed employees show evidence of differences in selection disadvantaging PWD among those who applied for details and among those selected. While 9.21% of permanent staff were PWD, 20.93% of applicants for temporary promotion were PWD, and PWD were 16.00% of selections. Selection data for PWD on Other Career Development Programs indicated no evidence of a trigger for PWD. PWD were 9.09% of selectees among the consolidated selectees of the Excellence in Government and Aspiring Leaders programs, and 9.21% of permanent SEC employees.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer Yes
 - b. Selections (PWTB) Answer Yes

From the Career Development Opportunities table in Section IV.B.2 above, data on the participation of PWTB in various programs were reviewed for equality of employment opportunity in the applications and selections for these programs. In the Agency’s Economist, Accountant, and Attorney Fellows Programs, 0.00% of applicants were PWTB, thus, no PWTB were selected as Fellows in FY 2022. For the Internship Program, 1.68% of applicants were PWTB, and PWTB were 1.09% of selections. Within the Agency’s Mentoring Program, the participation rate for PWTB among applicants (9.68%) exceeded the percentage of PWTB among permanent staff (1.86%). Thus, no trigger was found among applicants. The participation of PWTB among employees selected for mentoring in FY 2022 (9.68%) exceeded the participation rate of PWTB in the permanent workforce. Thus, no trigger was found among selections. No evidence of a trigger was found among applicants or selections in the training programs. In the aggregate, training records show that PWTB participated in training programs slightly above their participation on rolls; 1.67% of training opportunities requiring special approval were completed by PWTB, compared to 1.86% of permanent employees. Data about Detailed employees show evidence of a difference disadvantaging PWTB among those who applied for Temporary Promotion and among those selected. While 1.16% of applicants for temporary promotion were PWTB, PWTB represent 0.00% of permanent staff employees selected. Selection data for PWTB on Other Career Development Programs suggested a trigger at the application phase. Of 41 selectees among the consolidated selectees for the Excellence in Government and Aspiring Leaders programs, no applicants were PWTB, and as a result, none were selected.

C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer Yes

Table B9-2 presents information on awards distributed to employees during the year as part of the SEC’s employee recognition program. The EEOC has suggested that agencies consider awards distribution based on inclusion rates, the degree to which each employee group is distributed across workforce indicators, e.g., awarded or separated. This analysis requires aggregating data to the person level as presented in Table B9-2. Employees who received at least one award in any particular award category are counted once in this table. Aggregated data enables inclusion to be calculated as the proportion for all PWD and PWTB who received each

type or category of award. In contrast, Table B9-1 presents participation rates among awards distributed. One employee can and often does receive more than one award in a year. In Table B9-1, one employee is represented more than once if he or she received more than one award in that category. Differences in calculation should be noted when interpreting data from Tables B9-1 and B9-2. The inclusion rate for PWD was calculated by comparing the number and percent of employees with disabilities who received at least one award in each applicable program element to the number and percent of employees without a disability (this category combines persons with no disability and those who did not identify as having a disability) who received at least one award in each applicable program element. The inclusion rate for PWTD was calculated by comparing the number and percent of employees with targeted disabilities who received at least one award in each applicable program element to the number and percent of employees without a targeted disability (this category combines persons with no disability, those who did not identify as having a disability, and those with a disability that is not targeted) who received at least one award in each applicable program element. The Agency found a trigger in the distribution of time-off awards of 11-40 hours for PWD. The inclusion rate for PWD was 18.05%, while the inclusion rate for people without disability was 19.07%. The inclusion rate for PWTD was 18.07%. For cash awards, the Agency found triggers for PWD and PWTD for cash awards of \$1,000-\$1,999 and \$2,000-\$2,999. For cash awards at the \$1,000-\$1,999 level, the inclusion rate for PWD was 31.46%, and the inclusion rate for persons without disability was 41.07%. The inclusion rate for PWTD was 28.92%, and the inclusion rate for persons with no targeted disability was 40.40%. For cash awards at the \$2,000-\$2,999 level, the inclusion rate for PWD was 6.34%, and the inclusion rate for persons without disability was 10.17%. The inclusion rate for PWTD was 6.02%, and the inclusion rate for persons with no targeted disability was 9.89%. OEE0 researched the observed differences in the distribution of discretionary awards, made recommendations, and is actively monitoring the implementation as part of our barrier analysis program.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	1196	28.78	27.08	31.33	28.13
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	8065	180.24	184.45	181.93	179.82
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	6.74	1.53	0.18	7.00	0.14
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	584	11.71	13.17	9.64	12.23
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	9324	186.34	210.37	149.40	195.72
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	15.97	3.88	0.42	18.67	0.13
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	330	8.29	7.23	9.64	7.95
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	7987	201.95	174.57	231.33	194.50
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.2	5.94	0.63	28.92	0.11
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	55	1.95	1.20	0.00	2.45
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	1985	70.24	43.60	0.00	88.07
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	36.09	8.78	0.95	0.00	11.01
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	100	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	1061	23.17	24.04	27.71	22.02

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	822356	17311.71	18713.43	19809.64	16677.68
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	775.08	182.23	20.38	861.29	9.87
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	2093	35.37	48.28	30.12	36.70
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	2762941	45046.34	64058.60	37692.77	46912.84
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1320.09	310.66	34.74	1507.71	6.83
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	452	6.34	10.81	6.02	6.42
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	985565	13719.51	23602.15	12951.81	13914.37
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2180.45	527.67	57.15	2590.36	4.12
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	64	0.98	1.52	0.00	1.22
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	206854	4000.49	4777.48	0.00	5015.90
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3232.09	1000.12	82.37	0.00	1253.98
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer No

b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

The Agency did not have a trigger for PWD or PWTD for performance-based pay increases.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	4317	97.56	97.12	97.59	97.55

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

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

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

N/A

D. PROMOTIONS

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

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
- 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

The SEC crosswalks the Agency’s SK alternative pay plan’s senior grade levels to the General Schedule according to the following equivalencies: SES = SO and EX; GS-15 = SK-15 and SK-17; GS-14 = SK-14 and SK-16; GS-13 = SK-13. We note that the relevant applicant pools for the SK grade equivalencies of the GS-14 and GS-15 levels combine data across SK-grade levels. This combination was made to conform analyses to the format provided, though the actual RAPs for the individual SK-levels differ. Table B7 presents the relevant FY 2022 data to assess whether triggers exist with regard to promotions to senior grade levels. Of 1,044 qualified internal applications for senior grade level positions, 374 (35.82%) were submitted by PWD. A trigger was observed for qualified applicants compared to the Relevant Applicant Pool for PWD at the SES-equivalent level. However, there was only one posting, and two self-identified applicants. The Relevant Applicant Pool was 7.44%, and neither of the two applicants were PWD. No differences were observed among qualified applicants at any of the other senior grades. Among internal selections, differences were observed at the GS-15, GS-14, and GS-13 equivalent levels, but not the SES-equivalent level. Of the 100 selections for internal promotions to senior grade levels in Table B7, 8.00% were PWD, which was below their availability in the QAP at 35.82%. At the GS-15 equivalent level, PWD represented 31.31% of qualified applicants, while they represented 3.85% of selections. At the GS-14 equivalent level, PWD represented 29.69% of qualified applicants, while they represented 15.00% of selections. At the GS-13 equivalent level, PWD represented 53.25% of qualified applicants, while no selections were PWD.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	No
b. Grade GS-15		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
c. Grade GS-14		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
d. Grade GS-13		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	Yes

Applying the same comparisons to PWTD as described in Section IV.D.1, the Agency presents information on trigger identification for PWTD in promotions to senior grade levels. Of 1,044 qualified internal applications for senior grade level positions, 61 (5.84%) were submitted by PWTD, and no selections were PWTD. A difference was observed in the qualified applicant pool for the SES-equivalent level, compared to the Relevant Applicant Pool. The Relevant Applicant Pool was 1.33% PWTD, and no qualified applicants were PWTD. However, there was only one posting, and it had two self-identified applicants. No differences were observed among qualified applicants at any of the other senior grades. Among selections, triggers were observed at the GS-15, GS-14, and GS-13 equivalent levels. At the GS-15 equivalent level, PWTD represented 6.31% of qualified applicants, and represented no selections. At the GS-14 equivalent level, PWTD represented 3.39% of qualified applicants, and represented no selections. At the GS-13 equivalent level, PWTD represented 8.94% of qualified applicants, and represented no selections.

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

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

The QAP from Table B7 summarizes data where the applicant self-identified with a disability and qualified for the position. Data in this table describe vacancies for permanent positions with the SEC that were posted in USAJOBS with a closing date during the fiscal year. In contrast, Table B7 also presents data on new hires on-boarded during the course of the fiscal year; some of whom applied for a vacancy posted prior to the start of the fiscal year, and some of whom were on-boarded from open, continuous postings. Differences may be observed in the demographic statistics of those selected versus those on-boarded as new hires. Triggers comparing the composition of PWD and PWTD (See Question 5 immediately below) in applicant flow versus new hire data should be interpreted with these differences in mind. Applying the same grade equivalencies that were described in Section IV.D.1, the Agency presents information on trigger identification for PWD new hires to senior grade levels based on reviewing Table B7. Among the 260 newly-hired staff members in FY 2022 were 207 persons hired into senior grade level positions: four SOs, three into GS-15 equivalent positions, 109 into GS-14 equivalent positions, and 87 into GS-13 equivalent positions. Sixteen of those 207 (7.73%) newly-hired permanent staff in senior grade levels identified as PWD. The following evaluates participation of PWD in each senior grade equivalent level. At the SES equivalent level, the QAP was 10.42% PWD, and none of the four newly-hired permanent SOs identified as PWD. At the GS-15 equivalent level, the QAP was 31.94% PWD, and 14.29% of the 7 newly-hired permanent staff for those positions identified as PWD. At the GS-14 equivalent levels, the QAP was 19.94% PWD, and 9.17% of the 109 newly-hired permanent staff were PWD. At the GS-13 equivalent level, the QAP was 24.24% PWD, while 5.75% of the

87 new hires to GS-13 equivalent positions identified as PWD.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer No
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTB) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTB) Answer Yes
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTB) Answer Yes

Applying the same grade equivalencies that were described in Section IV.D.1, the Agency presents information on trigger identification for PWTB new hires to senior grade levels. The qualified applicant pool for PWTB was 2.32%. The Agency found triggers in participation of PWTB between qualified applicants and new hires at the SES, GS-15, GS-14, and GS-13 equivalent levels. More detail about each senior grade level follows in descending order by level. At the SES equivalent level, none of the qualified applicants were PWTB, and none were hired. At the GS-15 equivalent level, the QAP was 5.76%; no newly-hired staff members were PWTB (0.00%). At the GS-14 equivalent level, the QAP was 4.59% PWTB; 1.83% of the newly-hired GS-14 equivalent staff were PWTB. At the GS-13 equivalent level, the QAP was 5.37% PWTB; 1.15% of the newly-hired staff members were PWTB.

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

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

The SEC cross-walked the Agency’s alternative pay plan supervisory levels to the Executive, Manager, and Supervisor levels according to the following equivalencies: Executives = SO; Managers = SK-17 and the supervisory Administrative Law Judges in pay plan Administrative Law (AL); and Supervisors = employees or positions at SK-levels below SK-17 who hold supervisory status. The Agency notes that, similar to the senior grade level equivalencies, the relevant applicant pools for supervisory levels at the Agency combine data across multiple SK levels. This combination was made to conform analyses to the format provided, though the actual RAPs for the specific leadership levels differ. FY 2022 data underlying Table B8 are relevant for assessing whether triggers exist with regard to promotions to supervisory or managerial positions. Among the promotions in FY 2022 were 54 persons promoted to a leadership position at the supervisor, manager, or executive level: one SO, 27 managers, and 24 supervisors. The following evaluates participation of PWD in each leadership level. For executives, a trigger was observed for qualified

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

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer Yes

Differences were found in the new hire data for PWTD at the executive, manager, and supervisor levels. For executives, the QAP was 2.08% PWTD, and no PWTD were hired for executive positions in FY 2022. For managers, the QAP was 3.85% PWTD, and no PWTD were hired for manager positions in FY 2022. For supervisors, the QAP was 7.22% PWTD, and no PWTD were hired for supervisor positions in FY 2022.

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 Yes

The SEC maintains discretion on conversions to a career or career-conditional appointment among employees on Schedule A appointments. As a general practice, those Schedule A employees who were not converted voluntarily accepted a new Schedule A appointment within the Agency. During FY 2022, one employee was converted to the competitive service under the Schedule A hiring authority within two years of their most recent Schedule A appointment. Five employees are currently serving on their most recent Schedule A appointment that was processed within the past two years. All five employees are serving on an initial Schedule A appointment that has not reached the two-year threshold. One staff member was newly-hired under Schedule A during FY 2022. A review of records for other Schedule A employees, who were hired or transferred to the SEC and remain on rolls at the close of FY 2022, confirms that all were converted to the competitive service within two years of their most recent Schedule A appointment.

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

Data from Table B1-2 on voluntary and involuntary separations by disability were used to calculate the inclusion rates. Inclusion rates were calculated as the number of PWD who separated among all PWD in the workforce, compared to the same proportion among persons with no disability (this category is combined with those who did not self-identify as having a disability). The Agency did not have a trigger for voluntary separations in FY 2022. The inclusion rate on voluntary separations was 3.41% for PWD, and 5.76% for persons with no disability. The inclusion rate on involuntary separations was 0.24 % for PWD and 0.05% for persons with no disability.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Removal	3	0.23	0.05
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	135	0.69	3.08
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	90	2.53	1.84
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	22	0.00	0.51
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	250	3.46	5.48

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

Using data from Table B1-2, the inclusion rates were calculated as the number of PWTD who separated among all PWTD in the workforce, compared to that same proportion among persons with no targeted disability (this group also includes those who did not self-identify as having a disability and those with a disability that is not targeted). The Agency did not have a trigger for voluntary separations in FY 2022. For PWTD, the inclusion rate on voluntary separations was 1.20%, and the inclusion rate for persons without targeted disability was 5.63%. For PWTD, there were no involuntary separations in FY 2022, and among persons with no targeted disability, the inclusion rate for involuntary separations was 0.07%.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	3	0.00	0.06
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	135	0.00	2.91
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	90	1.16	1.92
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	22	0.00	0.47
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	250	1.16	5.37

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.

Not applicable. There were no triggers involving separation rates in FY 2022.

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.

Information about the SEC’s Accessibility/Disability Program is posted on [www.sec.gov](http://www.sec.gov/disability/sec_access.htm): http://www.sec.gov/disability/sec_access.htm and www.sec.gov/accessibility/sec-accommodation-procedures.pdf. The SEC has also made available a Section 508 Resource Center to all SEC personnel. This online resource center provides links to accessibility training and resources, federal regulations and general guidance, as well as “how-to” instructions to make documents, presentations, and electronic files 508-compliant. Information specific to the accessibility of SEC facilities and technology under Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act is also available in a variety of sources, including 17 C.F.R. §§ 200.601 to 200.670, Enforcement of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs or Activities Conducted by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC 504 regulations), SEC Administrative Regulation 24-10 (SECR 24-10), Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

Section 508/Accessibility Program, and SEC Administrative Regulation 11-3 (SECR 11-3), Leasing Program. The SEC continues to improve upon current practices in place to ensure all Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is accessible to internal and external parties, as mandated by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The Agency's testing and validation process includes dedicated resources, testing tools, documented test processes, and a remediation process. The majority of ICT products and tools are tested before they are deployed. If a product is deemed not 508-compliant, project teams are instructed to submit a Remediation Plan indicating a plan of action or timeline in which the vendor will make the respective product 508-compliant and obtain an approval from senior management before deploying. Every SEC vacancy announcement posted to USAJOBS includes information about obtaining accommodations, including alternative methods to apply. The name of SEC's Selective Placement Program Coordinator is posted on OPM's website. OHR has built a separate page providing more in-depth information about hiring PWD (<https://www.sec.gov/sec-disability-programs-overview>). This page includes a link to an online form (<https://www.sec.gov/forms/ADA-4Applicants>) for requesting accommodations in the technology-enabled job application process and information on alternate methods for contacting the Disability Program at the SEC. The SEC also posts information on how to file an EEO complaint under, inter alia, Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act at <https://www.sec.gov/eeoinfo/eecomplaints.htm>.

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.

Information is posted on SEC.gov: http://www.sec.gov/disability/sec_access.htm. This page contains the required notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including how to file a complaint alleging violations of the 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.

The SEC continues to improve upon current practices in place to ensure all ICT is accessible to internal and external parties, as mandated by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The Agency's testing and validation process includes dedicated resources, testing tools, documented test processes, and a remediation process. The majority of ICT products and tools are tested before they are deployed. Upon completion of testing, project teams are notified of the defects and are instructed to submit, for approval, a Remediation Plan, indicating a definitive timeline in which the vendor will make the respective product 508-compliant. The Office of Public Affairs has been instrumental in educating SEC staff on the guidelines and importance of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. Training courses have been offered, as well as "how to" videos that inform staff of the process with making electronic information technologies accessible to all parties. The Office of Information Technology will be active in supporting the SEC Administrative Regulation that defines roles and responsibilities of SEC staff to address formal Section 508 Complaint Procedures related to accessibility of IT programs and services.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

In FY 2022, the SEC met its goal of processing 100% of accommodation requests within 45 business days, the timeframe specified in the Agency's policy, which has been approved by the EEOC.

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.

Beginning in FY 2019, the SEC conducted an internal review of the SEC Reasonable Accommodation Regulation (SECR 6-80) and SEC Reasonable Accommodation Operating Procedures (SECOP 6-80), collected input from SEC stakeholders, negotiated with the

SEC's union, and revised the reasonable accommodation policy and procedures. In March 2021, as required by regulation, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) approved the SEC's procedures. The new procedures include a revised timeframe to process requests for accommodation – from 20 business days to 45 business days – absent undue hardship. The SEC published in FY 2022 the revised RA policy and operating procedures. These policy and operating procedure documents ensure that employees and applicants know their right to receive a reasonable accommodation for disability-related limitations under the Rehabilitation Act, if needed, to perform the essential functions of their position, enjoy equal benefits and privileges of employment, or apply for a job at the SEC. Related operational guidance further explains stakeholder responsibilities for the provision of disability-related accommodation, how to request an accommodation, and how such requests are processed. The procedures also include information about the interactive process and how requestors may seek review of decisions when a request has been denied. A 508-compliant version of each document and form is available on the SEC's public website at www.sec.gov, as required under the Section 501 Affirmative Action Regulations. The documents are also available on the SEC's internal interactive portal AskHR. AskHR provides employees with information about reasonable accommodation and the processes for making requests. The SEC published additional resources and information for employees, supervisors, and managers on its AskHR portal that provides a general overview and insight into its reasonable accommodation program process. Changes to RA procedures necessitated updates to training, job aids, notices, and other information sources in FY 2022. Information sessions describing updates, applicable forms, and procedures have been made available to manager/supervisors, employees, and all staff with responsibilities under the new policy and procedures. The updated RA procedures have been incorporated in the mandatory New Supervisors and New Employee trainings, and the on-demand trainings available in the SEC's LEAP training platform made available to Agency employees. At least annually, the Agency communicates to the entire SEC workforce regarding the reasonable accommodation program to assist managers and employees in their understanding of the SEC's disability accommodation program. In FY 2022, the SEC remained in a maximum telework/voluntary return to the office posture for its non-essential employees. The SEC's Temporary Medical Telework (TMT) program provides temporary telework to employees with short-term medical conditions that may not constitute a covered disability under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 when supervisory officials and the Disability Program Office determine that it is appropriate. Since the SEC continued its maximum telework posture, the RA Program office administratively closed four (4) TMT requests without decision in FY 2022. Given the issuance of the newly revised RA policy and procedures, general training for managers and supervisors was offered on the Rehabilitation Act, their role and responsibilities in the reasonable accommodation process to include the interactive process provision, and how to respond appropriately when an individual places them on notice of the need for reasonable accommodation. New managers and supervisors are also required to attend scheduled training to obtain an in-depth overview for the provision of reasonable accommodation. This includes disseminating program-specific information during the New Employee Orientation and CLTD 307 Fundamentals of Human Resources Management course offered by the SEC University's College of Leadership and Team Development. In FY 2022, the SEC converted all in-person CLTD 307 content into a final capstone eLearning module to be added to the other CLTD 307 eLearning modules. This capstone offers self-paced review and practice opportunities that were previously encompassed by the live trainings, and serves to replace any need for live content. All CLTD 307 content is now in a fully self-paced eLearning format. CLTD 307 eLearning provides real-time, scenario-based specific illustrations for supervisors and managers to heighten their awareness of the: (1) Schedule A hiring authority; (2) SEC's RA Program; (3) TMT to ensure their awareness of their role in hiring and retaining employees with temporary or permanent disabilities; (4) types of requests made by employees with disabilities; and (5) roles and responsibilities with respect to the Agency's Reasonable Accommodation Program. This training was enhanced by the Reasonable Accommodation Program Office to ensure awareness of the SEC's newly published RA Program policy and operating procedures. In-depth, situation-specific training was provided as-needed to individual managers who supervise employees with disabilities. Additional information about CLTD 307 is provided earlier in this report, supra. Moreover, refresher on-demand training course offerings are readily available online for employees and managers through the Agency's learning platform, Learn Engage Achieve Platform (LEAP), which provides an effective overview of the Rehabilitation Act and the federal and SEC reasonable accommodation process. The SEC maintains a contract vehicle with Deaf Access Solutions (DAS) for its Sign Language Interpretation Program. DAS provides enhanced interpretation solutions to include Communication Access Realtime Translation and Federal Relay Service to provide a more diverse pool of interpreters who can provide a greater array of support services for the Deaf/Hard-of-Hearing community. In FY 2022, to complement the Agency's reasonable and religious accommodation processes, the SEC continued working with the Office of Information Technology to vet and configure an automated reasonable and religious accommodation case management solution. The system will enable the Agency to monitor trends and manage, track, and enhance reporting capabilities on all reasonable and religious accommodation requests, including requests for personal assistance services. The system will have a built-in reporting capability to produce all reporting and record keeping requirements consistent with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5) and Executive Order 13164. The case management system is expected to simplify case tracking, help identify systemic delays, improve customer service by allowing employees to request reasonable accommodations personally and privately, and allow the Agency to continue to meet timeliness standards. The Agency expects to fully deploy the system in FY 2023. In the interim, OHR continues the current manual tracking process, including tracking timeliness for processing RA requests, and meeting on a monthly basis with the CHCO to review and discuss timeliness and processing of all RA cases.

D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (PAS) to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the agency.

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

As reflected in the section immediately above, and incorporated herein by reference, the SECOP 6-80 Reasonable Accommodation Operating Procedures includes information regarding the process for requesting PAS, the process for determining whether such services are required, and the process for denying PAS requests when it would pose an undue hardship to the Agency. Similarly, medical information to include medical confidentiality and disclosure provisions and the responsibilities of the Disability Program Officer, the employee, and other relevant staff (e.g., supervisors, Reasonable Accommodation Coordinators) during the interactive process, as discussed in the Reasonable Accommodations Operating Procedures, apply to all requests for PAS. In FY 2022, the materials related to PAS were updated to explain eligibility requirements, types of PAS, how to request services, where to submit requests, and contact information. Program provisions for requesting and providing decisions on PAS reasonable accommodation requests are the same as the process for reasonable accommodation described in the new policy and related operating procedures and on the SEC public and internal websites. The SEC continues to use the SEC Form 2943 Request for Personal Assistance Services to capture requests, and data obtained by this form will provide the RA Program critical information that may be used to understand program adoption and effectiveness going forward. The SEC has a contract in place to support employees with targeted disabilities needing PAS services including reader and nurse services. In FY 2022, the SEC did not receive or process any new requests for PAS services. The Agency will continue to monitor its current contract for personal assistant and reader services to ensure the consistent delivery of healthcare services and will enhance the level of support as required. During FY 2022, the Agency conducted general training for managers and supervisors on the Rehabilitation Act, their role and responsibilities in the reasonable accommodation process to include the interactive process provision, and how to respond appropriately when an individual places them on notice of the need for reasonable accommodation. New managers and supervisors are required to attend scheduled training to obtain in-depth overview for the provision of reasonable accommodation. This includes disseminating program-specific information during the New Employee Orientation and through the College of Leadership & Team Development Fundamentals of Human Resources Management course offered by the Agency’s learning office, SEC University. The CLTD 307 training provides real-time, scenario-based specific illustrations for supervisors and managers to heighten awareness about the RA Program, details general characteristics of available accommodations typically requested by employees with disabilities (e.g., PAS) and clarifies assumptions about roles and responsibilities with respect to the Agency’s reasonable accommodation program. Moreover, refresher training course offerings are readily available for employees and managers through the Agency’s SECU learning platform LEAP; the training provides an effective overview of the Rehabilitation Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, and the federal and SEC reasonable accommodation process.

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.

During FY 2022, the Agency did not have any findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status.

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.

During FY 2022, the Agency did not have any findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide reasonable accommodation.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer No

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

Answer N/A

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

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

Not applicable for the FY 2022 reporting period.

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

Not applicable for the FY 2022 reporting period.

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.

Not applicable for the FY 2022 reporting period.