

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

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)

Answer Yes

In FY 2022, for the GS-10 and below grades, ACF's permanent participation rate in the below GS-10 grade level (GS-4 to GS-9) for persons with disabilities is 23.81% (total number of below GS-10 level is 21, with 5 persons with disabilities). For the GS-11 to GS-15 grades, the ACF's permanent participation rate for persons with disabilities is 7.65% (total number of grades between GS-11 to GS-15 is 1,478, with 113 persons with disabilities). This is below the Federal goal of 12%. There was a total of 21 SES and 1 other Senior Pay level employees, and 0% person with disabilities.

*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

In FY 2022, for the GS-10 and below grades, ACF's permanent participation rate in the below GS-10 grade level (GS-4 to GS-9) for persons with targeted disabilities is 4.76% (total number of below GS-10 level is 21, with 1 person with targeted disabilities). For the GS-11 to GS-15 grades, the ACF's permanent participation rate for persons with targeted disabilities is 1.01% (total number of grades between GS-11 to GS-15 is 1,478, with 15 persons with targeted disabilities). This is below the Federal goal of 2%. There was a total of 21 SES and 1 other Senior Pay level employees, and 0% person with targeted disabilities.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	21	5	23.81	1	4.76
Grades GS-11 to SES	1500	113	7.53	15	1.00

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

The Office of Diversity Management and EEO (ODME) briefs senior leadership about the outcomes of the workforce data analyses and triggers found compared to the benchmark goals for persons with disabilities (PWD) and persons with targeted disabilities (PWTD). In addition, in FY 2022, ODME regularly provided scorecards to each ACF office, which includes an individualized demographic profile that includes data pertaining to PWD and PWTD. The Executive and Administrative Officers within the agency program areas discuss workforce-related concerns with management, and the use of Schedule A appointments and conversions, detail opportunities, to attract and retain PWD and PWTD. Furthermore, ODME shares information on PWD and PWTD hiring goals through its staff meetings and newsletter. ACF continues to convene listening sessions for employees with disabilities and their allies, and senior leadership has attended the sessions.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

ODME has a GS-12 staff member serving as a Special Emphasis Program (SEP) Coordinator. ODME has a new Collateral Duty Disability Program Manager (CD DPM) for 2022-2023. The SEP Coordinator and the CD DPM work closely with Able and Disabled Allies Partnering Together (ADAPT), the Employee Resource Group (ERG) for employees with disabilities. ODME also has a GS-13 Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator.

- 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	
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Lisa Griffin, Facility and Security, ACF Lisa.griffin@acf.hhs.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	2	0	1	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Tara Watson Human Resources Specialist Tara.Watson@hhs.gov
Section 508 Compliance	1	1	0	Janean Chambers 508 Coordinator
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1	0	0	Tara Watson Human Resources Specialist Tara.Watson@hhs.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	2	0	0	

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

• 2022 Cyber Security Training • FELTG Absence, Leave Abuse and Medical Issues Week • 2022 Records Management Training • Webinar: "Spotlight on ODEP: What Can the Office of Disability Employment Policy Do for You?" • Navigating the Return to the Post pandemic Federal Workplace Harassment Reasonable Accommodation and Misconduct • 2022 HHS Cybersecurity Awareness Training • The Art of Inclusive Leadership: Leveraging your Role as a Leader to Develop and Sustain an Empowered and Diverse Workforce

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Answer Yes

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

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

ACF receives job applications through the HHS Office of Human Resources, Staffing Recruitment Operations Center (SROC). ACF consults with the HHS Veteran Employment Manager to identify disabled veteran applicants for ACF vacancies. In FY 2022, ACF employees with disabilities participated in interviews and focus groups conducted during the DEIA Data Sprint Assessment. ODME shared with ADAPT (Able and Disabled Allies Partnering Together) ERG vacancy announcements and relevant resources. In FY22, the Office of Transformation, Business and Management (OTBM) and the ODME Director continued to meet monthly to identify possible collaborations and initiatives to increase the participation of PWD and PWTD.

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

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

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

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

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

Answer Yes

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

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

In FY22, ODME continued meeting regularly with internal and external stakeholders (e.g., ACF DEI Executive Team; ACF Equity Advisory Board; OA People’s Strategy/DEIA Work Group; HHS/EEODI, EEOC, FEEDS, etc.) to expand networking. The Diversity Outreach Program is targeting organizations working with PWD/PWTD in their outreach efforts.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

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

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

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

Using data from our agency-wide internal data warehouse (BIIS) workforce tables, there were 171 new hires at ACF in FY 22. Of that number, 21 (12.28%,) out of the 171 new hires identified as having a disability, which is above the 12% goal and an increase from 8.52% in FY 21. 2.34%, 4 out of 171, of new hires identified as having a targeted disability, which is above the 2% goal and an increase of .057% in FY 21.

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

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)

Answer Yes

In FY 2022, the 6 MCOs in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210, identified in Table B6. According to our Applicant Flow Data, in the 0101 job series, 279 PWD were qualified, 42 referred and 2 (2.13%) selected. In the 0301 job series, 84 PWD were qualified, 37 referred and none selected. In the 0343 job series, 128 PWD were qualified, 24 referred and 2 selected (18.18%). In the 0501 job series, 2 PWD were qualified, and referred, but neither were selected. In the 1109 job series, 27 were qualified PWD, 9 referred and none selected. In the 2210 job series, 17 PWD were qualified, 1 referred and none selected. According to our workforce data, in the 0101 job series, 68 PWTDs were qualified, 11 referred and 2 (2.13%) selected. In the 0301 job series, 8 PWTDs were qualified, 4 referred and none selected. In the 0343 job series, 24 PWTD were qualified, 8 referred and 1 selected (9.09%). In the 0501 job series, no PWTD was qualified, referred, nor selected. In the 1109 job series, 8 were qualified PWTD, 3 referred and none selected. In the 2210 job series, 4 PWTD were qualified, 1 referred and none selected. We identified triggers based upon the workforce data below. MCO 0101: Of the 75 new hires, 6 (8%) were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO, 0301: Of the 23 new hires 3 (13.04 %) were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 0343: Of the 16 new hires 2 (12.50 %) were PWD and 1 (6.25%) was PWTD. MCO 0501: Of the 2 new hires 0 were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 1109: Of the 3 new hires 1 (33.33 %) was PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 2210: Of the 6 new hires 1 (16.67 %) were PWD and 0 were PWTD.

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

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

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)

Answer Yes

In FY 2022, the 6 MCOs in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210, identified in Table B6. We identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9): MCO 0101: Of the 3,82 qualified applicants, 279 (73.04%) were PWD and 6 (1.57%) were PWTD. MCO 0301: Of the 257 qualified applicants, 84 (32.68%) were PWD and 10 (3.89%) were PWTD. MCO 0343: Of the 391 qualified applicants, 128 (32.74%) were PWD and 15 (3.84%) were PWTD. MCO 0501: Of the 5 qualified applicants, 2 (40.00%) were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 1109: Of the 95 qualified applicants, 27 (28.42%) were PWD and 3 were (3.16%) PWTD. MCO 2210: Of the 28 qualified applicants, 17 (60.71%) were PWD and 1 (3.57%) was PWTD. Qualified External applicant New Hires data (Table B7): MCO 0101: Of the 3,420 qualified applicants, 279 (8.16%) were PWD and 68 (1.99%) were PWTD. MCO, 0301: Of the 686 qualified applicants, 84 (12.24%) were PWD and 8 (1.17%) were PWTD. MCO 0343: Of the 883 qualified applicants, 128 (14.50%) were PWD and 24 (2.72%) were PWTD. MCO 0501: Of the 38 qualified applicants, 2 were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 1109: Of the 347 qualified applicants, 27 were PWD and 8 were (2.31%) PWTD. MCO 2210: Of the 206 qualified applicants, 17 (8.25%) were PWD and 4 (1.94%) were PWTD.

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

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)

Answer Yes

In FY 2022, the 6 MCOs in ACF were: 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210, identified in Table B6. We identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data. Data from B6 BIIS Tables: MCO 0101: Of the 97 internal promotions, 3 (3.09%) were PWD and 1 (1.03%) was PWTD. MCO, 0301: Of the 27 internal promotions, 2 (7.41 %) were PWD and 1 (3.70%) was PWTD. MCO 0343: Of the 10 internal promotions, 1 (10.00 %) was PWD and 1 (10.00%) was PWTD. MCO 0501: There were

no internal promotions. MCO 1109: Of the 11 internal promotions, 0 were PWD and 0 were PWTD. MCO 2210: Of the 7 internal promotions, 0 were PWD and 0 were PWTD.

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

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

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

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

ACF offers opportunities for advancement to all employees, including PWD/ PWTD. All employees are encouraged to collaborate with their supervisors and develop an individual Learning Action Plan (ALP) to identify professional development opportunities, goals, and outcomes that support the organization's mission. In 2022, ACF developed and implemented a Curiosity & Growth strategy that promotes continuous learning, development, and use of better-organized methods Continuous delivery of offerings, like Mindful Moments, The Exchange, Courageous Conversations, and Well@Work. In 2022, ACF formalized training policy requiring offices to include info in all ACF-sponsored/hosted trainings about process for RA requests. . In 2022, ODME continued developing the ERG Grassroots Mentoring Initiative, which includes, among other things, lunch and learns, workshops, peer-to-peer mentoring, networking, and DiSC and SDI assessments. FY22 training funds were allocated to provide follow up Purposeful Leadership Coaching and Training to ERG chairs and members: offering three (3) group coaching sessions for ERG leadership and members, particularly those who have been participating in the ongoing ERG Grassroots.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

HHS Learning Portal -Offers full access to certification programs, including more than 3,000 courses and 20,000 free downloadable books and videos. Creating more opportunities for career and leadership development was a clear area of opportunity from the ACF-wide 2022 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) results showed the need to create new—and expand existing—opportunities for career and leadership development. In addition, to existing resources such as the HHS Learning Portal or the Acquisitions Training, ACF is currently its ACF University initiative, to provide employees training and development opportunities to grow and thrive by leveraging the Three E's Framework – Experience, Exposure and Education – to deliver tailored learning methods.

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 (%)
Internship Programs						
Fellowship Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						
Training Programs						
Detail Programs						
Other Career Development Programs						

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

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

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

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

a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

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

C. AWARDS

1. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for any level of the time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer Yes

The available data in Table B 9-2 (BIIS) shows that out of the total of 1508 employees receiving awards, 1,387 did not have a disability, 121 (8.02%) were PWD and 36 (2.38%) were PWTD. Time-off awards: 1-10 hours: out of the total of 255 (16.91%) employees receiving this award, 241 (17.38%) did not have a disability, 14 (11.57%) were PWD and 2 (5.56%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). 11-20 hours: out of the total of 352 (23.34%) employees receiving this award, 331 (23.86%) did not have a disability, 21 (17.36%) were PWD and 2 (5.56%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). 21-30 hours: out of the total of 1,214 (80.50%) employees receiving this award, 1,125 (81.11%) did not have a disability, 89 (73.557%) were PWD and 27 (75.00) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). 31-40 hours: out of the total of 1,386 (91.91%) employees receiving this award, 1,286 (92.728%) did not have a disability, 100 (82.647%) were PWD and 33 (91.67%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). Cash Awards: \$500 and under: out of the total of 556 (36.87%) employees receiving this award, 513 (36.99%) did not have a disability, 43 (35.54%) were PWD and 9 (25.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). \$501-\$999: out of the total of 146 (9.68%) employees receiving this award, 134 (9.66%) did not have a disability, 12 (9.92%) were PWD and 3 (8.33%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWTD). \$1000-\$1,999: out of the total of 863 (57.23%) employees receiving this award, 798 (57.53%) did not have a disability, 65 (53.72%) were PWD and 19 (52.78%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). \$2000-\$2,999: No trigger identified for PWD nor PWTD. \$3000-\$3,900: out of the total of 348 (23.08%) employees receiving this award, 334 (24.08%) did not have a disability, 14 (11.57%) were PWD and 9 (25.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD). \$4000-\$4,999: out of the total of 2 (0.13%) employees receiving this award, 2 (0.14%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.00%) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). \$5000-\$5,999: out of the total of 3 (0.20%) employees receiving this award, 3 (0.22%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.00%) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). \$10,000-\$19,000: out of the total of 10 (0.66%) employees receiving this award, 10 (0.72%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.00%) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD).

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	213	12.71	13.37	12.50	12.75
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	2011	94.92	128.32	75.00	98.04
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	9	5.93	0.75	37.50	0.98
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	270	11.86	18.19	12.50	11.76
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	5169	223.73	347.84	200.00	227.45
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	19	15.25	1.58	100.00	1.96
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	954	59.32	64.78	50.00	60.78
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	29424	1852.54	1968.11	1375.00	1927.45
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	30	26.27	2.49	168.75	3.92
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	1064	61.02	73.59	68.75	59.80
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	49208	3003.39	3366.11	3700.00	2894.12
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	46	41.53	3.74	331.25	-3.92
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	118	8.47	7.81	0.00	9.80
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	91522	6651.69	6000.17	0.00	7695.10
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	775	664.41	63.79	0.00	768.63
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	833	54.24	56.56	50.00	54.90
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	1343866	84541.53	91359.14	85625.00	84371.57
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1613	1320.34	134.14	10700.00	-150.98
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	76	6.78	4.98	18.75	4.90
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	169128	15239.83	11100.08	42393.75	10980.39
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2225	1904.24	184.97	14131.25	-13.73
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	348	11.86	25.66	25.00	9.80
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	1080667	36779.66	79714.87	77500.00	30392.16

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3105	2627.12	257.97	19375.00	0.00
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	11	0.00	0.91	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	146929	0.00	12203.41	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	13357	0.00	1109.39	0.00	0.00

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

a. Pay Increases (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTD)

Answer Yes

The available data in Table B 9-2 (BIIS) shows that triggers exist for QSIs and Performance-Based awards. Quality Step Increases (QSIs): out of the total of 30 (1.99%) employees receiving this award, 29 (2.09%) did not have a disability, 1 (0.83%) was a PWD and 0 (0.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD). Performance-Based awards: out of the total of 16 (1.06%) employees receiving this award, 16 (1.15%) did not have a disability, 0 (0.00%) were PWD and 0 (0.00%) were PWTD. (Trigger for PWD and PWTD).

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

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

a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD)

Answer N/A

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD)

Answer N/A

N/A

D. PROMOTIONS

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

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

- | | | |
|--|--------|-----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| c. Grade GS-14 | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| d. Grade GS-13 | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) | Answer | Yes |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWD) | Answer | Yes |

In FY 2022, we identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data (Mission Critical Occupations within ACF (i.e., 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210)) identified in Table B6. The following data is from Table B6 (BIIS): MCO 0101: Of the 97 internal promotions, 3 (3.09%) were PWD. MCO 0301: Of the 27 internal promotions, 2 (7.41 %) were PWD. MCO 0343: Of the 10 internal promotions, 1 (10.00 %) was a PWD. MCO 0501: There were no internal promotions. MCO 1109: Of the 11 internal promotions, 0 were PWD. MCO 2210: Of the 7 internal promotions, 0 were PWD. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9 Applicant Flow Data): MCO 0101: Of the 382 qualified applicants, 279 (73.04%) were PWD. Two PWD selected. MCO 0301: Of the 257 qualified applicants, 84 (32.68%) were PWD. No PWD selected. MCO 0343: Of the 391 qualified applicants, 128 (32.74%) were PWD. Two PWD selected. MCO 0501: Of the 5 qualified applicants, 2 (40.00%) were PWD. No PWD selected. MCO 1109: Of the 95 qualified applicants, 27 (28.42%) were PWD. One PWD selected. MCO 2210: Of the 28 qualified applicants, 17 (60.71%) were PWD. No PWD selected. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 743 qualified internal applicants at the GS-13 level; of which 125 (16.82%) were PWD versus 120 (16.15%) with no disability and 15 (2.02%) not identified. There were 522 referred applicants in which 119 (22.80%) were PWD versus 59 (11.30%) with no disability and 9 (1.72%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 176 qualified internal applicants at the GS-14 level; of which 41 (23.30%) were PWD versus 19 (10.80%) with no disability and 1 (0.57%) not identified. There were 150 referred applicants in which 39 (26.00%) were PWD versus 13 (8.67%) with no disability and 1 (0.67%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 23 qualified internal applicants at the GS-15 level; of which 0 (0.00%) were PWD versus 2 (8.70%) with no disability and 1 (4.35%) not identified. There were 23 referred applicants in which 0 (0.00%) were PWD versus 2 (8.70%) with no disability and 1 (4.35%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. There was no additional data available for SES or Equivalent levels.

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

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

- | | | |
|---|--------|-----|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer | Yes |
|---|--------|-----|

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)

Answer Yes

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)

Answer Yes

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)

Answer Yes

In FY 2022, we identified triggers based upon the data below using our Applicant Flow Data (Mission Critical Occupations within ACF (i.e., 0101, 0301, 0343, 0501, 1109, and 2210)) identified in Table B6. The following data is from Table B6 (BIIS): MCO 0101: Of the 97 internal promotions, 1 (1.03%) was a PWTB. MCO 0301: Of the 27 internal promotions, 1 (3.70%) was a PWTB. MCO 0343: Of the 10 internal promotions, 1 (10.00%) was a PWTB. MCO 0501: There were no internal promotions. MCO 1109: Of the 11 internal promotions, 0 were PWTB. MCO 2210: Of the 7 internal promotions, 0 were PWTB. Qualified Internal applicant data for competitive promotions (Table B9 Applicant Flow Data): MCO 0101: Of the 382 qualified applicants, 6 (1.57%) were PWTB. One PWTB selected. MCO 0301: Of the 257 qualified applicants, 10 (3.89%) were PWTB. No PWTB selected. MCO 0343: Of the 391 qualified applicants, 15 (3.84%) were PWTB. No PWTB selected. MCO 0501: Of the 5 qualified applicants, 0 were PWTB. No PWTB selected. MCO 1109: Of the 95 qualified applicants, 3 were (3.16%) PWTB. One PWTB selected. MCO 2210: Of the 28 qualified applicants, 1 (3.57%) was a PWTB. No PWTB selected. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 743 qualified internal applicants at the GS-13 level; of which 21 (2.83%) were PWTB versus 120 (16.15%) with no disability and 15 (2.02%) not identified. There were 522 referred applicants in which 19 (3.64%) were PWTB versus 59 (11.30%) with no disability and 9 (1.72%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 176 qualified internal applicants at the GS-14 level; of which 8 (5.33%) were PWTB versus 19 (10.80%) with no disability and 1 (0.57%) not identified. There were 150 referred applicants in which 8 (5.33%) were PWTB versus 13 (8.67%) with no disability and 1 (0.67%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. According to our B11 Table (Internal Competitive Promotions for Senior Grade Levels by Disability), it shows that for FY 2022 there were 23 qualified internal applicants at the GS-15 level; of which 0 (0.00%) were PWTB versus 2 (8.70%) with no disability and 1 (4.35%) not identified. There were 23 referred applicants in which 0 (0.00%) were PWTB versus 2 (8.70%) with no disability and 1 (4.35%) not identified. There was no data regarding the number of selections. There was no additional data available for SES or Equivalent levels.

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

a. New Hires to SES (PWD)

Answer N/A

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD)

Answer N/A

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)

Answer N/A

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)

Answer N/A

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B15 (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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 N/A

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTB)

Answer N/A

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTB)

Answer N/A

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)

Answer N/A

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B15 (New Hires for Senior Grade Levels by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)

Answer N/A

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B19 (Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)

Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)

Answer N/A

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B19 (Internal Competitive Promotions for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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

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

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B18 (New Hires for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

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

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

FY 2022 data not available for Worksheet Table B18 (New Hires for Management Positions by Disability). ACF is currently reviewing and upgrading data collection and analysis.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer No

There were delays in converting one Schedule A employee at the end of FY22, due to delay in classifying the employee's PD. The PD has been duly classified and is being processed for conversion. In FY23, additional guidance will be provided to ensure timely conversions.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without disabilities? If “yes”, describe the trigger below.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD)	Answer	No
b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)	Answer	No

In FY 2022 (per the B01-2 BIIS Table - agency-wide internal data warehouse), there were a total of 100 separations from the ACF permanent workforce. Of the 100 separations, 10 (8.26% inclusion rate) were PWD. The inclusion rate percentage of separation of Persons without Disability was 6.49% (Persons with No Disability 6.38%, not identified 7.18%). There were no PWD involuntary

separations in FY 2022 (removal), out of a total of 2 (with no disability). Overall, the percentage of both voluntary and involuntary separations, using the inclusion rate as benchmark, did not exceed that of persons without disabilities.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	2	0.00	0.13
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	25	2.38	1.48
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	33	2.38	2.02
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	33	3.17	1.95
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	93	7.94	5.59

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 FY 2022 (per the B01-2 BIIS Table - agency-wide internal data warehouse), there were a total of 100 separations. Of the 100 separations, there were 3 PWTD (8.33% inclusion rate). Of the 3 PWTDs, 1 resigned (2.78% inclusion rate), 1 retired (2.78% inclusion rate, and 1 separated for other reasons (2.78% inclusion rate). There were no involuntary separations (removal) of PWTD. Overall, the percentage of both voluntary and involuntary separations, using the inclusion rate as benchmark, did not exceed that of persons without disabilities.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	2	0.00	0.13
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	25	6.25	1.50
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	33	0.00	2.07
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	33	6.25	2.01
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	93	12.50	5.71

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

N/A

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

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

2.

Please provide the internet address on the agency's public website for its notice explaining employees' and applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

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

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

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

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

When an interim accommodation was approved, it was provided upon receipt of the request or within 1 business day. The average time to issue a decision and provide an approved accommodation was 44.4 days, which in most cases included up to 30 days for medical expert review and recommendations.

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

ACF reasonable accommodation requests are coordinated by a full time Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator. (In FY23, ODME will onboard a back up RA Coordinator.) In FY 2022 ACF provided RA training for supervisors/managers and all staff. ODME also provided program-specific RA training upon request. In FY22, ACF processed 98 new RA requests. The FY22 total inventory was 103 cases. Most requests were filed in late spring, and the increase was directly related to the Return to the Workplace (RTWP) activity. Over 90% of the new requests involved full time/remote work. Other accommodations requests included ergonomic assessments and the corresponding purchases and deliveries, changes in work schedule/tour of duty, reassignment, etc. ODME provided monthly RA activity reports to ACF leadership and quarterly data to each program office.

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

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

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

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

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

N/A.

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Answer Yes

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

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1				
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	PWDs are below the federal benchmark.				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y				
STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: 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 Employees with Disabilities		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice Despite agency's efforts, the recruitment and retention of persons with disabilities continue to be below the established benchmarks.		
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
10/01/2020	09/30/2022	Yes			Increase participation of PWD in ACF's workforce to meet federal benchmark.
Responsible Official(s)					
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?	
Director, ODME		Laura M. Irizarry		Yes	
OTBM Director / Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration		Lisa Griffin		Yes	
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective					
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date
07/30/2022	Participate in Department's Workforce Demographic Resurvey.			Yes	10/14/2022

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
07/30/2022	Conduct a DEIA Data Assessment; develop a roadmap with quick wins to embed DEIA in the agency's strategic planning and long-term processes.	Yes		02/08/2022
09/30/2022	Establish and train Barrier Analysis Work Group.	Yes	09/30/2023	
09/30/2022	Continue collaboration with ACF leadership in the development and implementation of the agency's Diversifying Leadership Action Plan. Ongoing activity.	Yes	09/30/2023	
09/30/2022	Continue participating in recurring meetings with ACF leadership and the Office of Transformation, Business & Management (OTBM) to discuss DEIA activity and strategies to increase diversity of workforce. Ongoing activity.	Yes	09/30/2023	
09/30/2022	Promote mentoring and professional development opportunities among ACF employees with disabilities. Ongoing activity.	Yes	09/23/2023	
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued to support and collaborate with ACF's DADAPT ERG. Monitored the ERG Mentoring Initiative, a key strategy of ODME's Diversifying Leadership Workplan. Conducted the agency's first DEIA Data Assessment. ACF staff participation has helped address inaccuracies and undercounts. As of FY23Q1, ACF had met/exceeded federal benchmarks for PWD and PWTD. Managers and supervisors received annual mandatory training on reasonable accommodation, while staff receives optional training. ODME continued issuing regular EEO/DEIA scorecards to individual ACF offices. ODME selected a Collateral Duty Special Emphasis Program Manager for ACF's Disability Program. 			

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

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

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

ODME continues to implement the approved revised RA procedures, (which included the PAS), which increases the efficiency of RA request process. ODME continues to seek a back-up RA Coordinator, and a collateral duty Disability Employment Manager who will assist ACF to address issues pertaining to ACF employees with disabilities, including recruitment effort. ODME will also continue to collaborate with the ADAPT ERG, which also provides significant input to addressing reasonable accommodation for ACF employees with needs to accommodations. In FY22, ODME continued meeting regularly with internal and external stakeholders (e.g., ACF DEI Executive Team; ACF Equity Advisory Board; OA People's Strategy/DEIA Work Group; HHS/EEODI, EEOC, FEEDS, etc.) to expand networking. The Diversity Outreach Program is targeting organizations working with PWD/PWTD in their outreach efforts.

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

ODME continues to utilize the ERG for employees with disabilities to enhance barrier analysis. ODME and OA/RMD continue exploring strategies to address the need to increase participation rate of PWD and PWTD at ACF. ODME will collaborate in HHS-wide efforts to improve data collection and upgrade barrier analysis.