

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service



Bringing People Together

ANNUAL EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

**Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission**

Management Directive 715

Fiscal Year 2019 Accomplishments

(October 1, 2018 to September 30, 2019)

and

Fiscal Year 2020 Planned Activities

(October 1, 2019 to September 30, 2020)

PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A:	Agency Identifying Information	5
Part B:	Total Employment	5
Part C1:	Head of Agency and Head of Agency Designee	5
Part C2:	Agency Officials Responsible for Oversight of EEO Programs	5
Part D:	Organization Components Covered by Report	7
Part D.1:	List of Subordinate Components	7
Part D.2:	Mandatory and Optional Forms and Documents	8
Part E:	Executive Summary	9
Part F:	Continuing EEO Programs Establishment and Certification	25
Part G:	Agency Self-Assessment Check List Measuring Essential Elements	26
Part H:	Model EEO Program Essential Element Attainment Plan	27
Part H.1.	Model EEO Program Essential Element Attainment Plan	27
Part H.2.	Model EEO Program Essential Elements Attainment Plan	28
Part H.3.	Model EEO Program Essential Elements Attainment Plan	31
Part I.1.	EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier	33
Part J:	Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring and Advancement of Persons with Disabilities	36
	List of Appendices	47
	Acronyms	48

PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

MD-715

Parts A Through E

Part A - Department or Agency Identifying Information

Agency	Second Level Component	Address	City	State	Zip Code	Agency Code	FIPS Code
U.S Department of Agriculture	Forest Service	201 14 th Street, SW	Washington	DC	20250	AG11	01779803

Part B - Total Employment

Total Employment	Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce	Total Workforce
Number of Employees	27,414	7,449	34,863

Part C.1 - Head of Agency and Head of Agency Designee

Agency Leadership	Name	Title
Head of Agency	Sonny Perdue	Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Head of Agency Designee	Victoria C. Christiansen	Chief, Forest Service

Part C.2 - Agency Officials Responsible for Oversight of EEO Programs

EEO Program Staff	Name	Title	Occ. Series	Pay Plan and Grade	Phone Number	Email Address
Principal EEO Director/Official	Ted H. Gutman	Director, Office of Civil Rights	0260	ES-00	202-205-0827	theodore.gutman@usda.gov
Affirmative Employment	Christopher Moore	Assistant Director	0260	GS-15	703-605-4858	christopher.moore@usda.gov

EEO Program Staff	Name	Title	Occ. Series	Pay Plan and Grade	Phone Number	Email Address
Program Manager						
Complaint Processing Program Manager	Debra Harrell	Branch Chief	0260	GS-14	404-273-4010	daharrell3@usda.gov
Diversity & Inclusion Officer	Berlinda Baca	Branch Chief	0301	GS-14	505-842-3863	berlinda.baca@usda.gov
Hispanic Program Manager (SEPM)	Fidel Trujillo	Outreach Specialist	0301	GS-13	505-842-3865	Fidel.Trujillo@usda.gov
Federal Women's Program Manager (SEPM)	Danette Ramirez-Montoya	Outreach Specialist	0301	GS-13	303-250-5374	danette.ramirezmontoya@usda.gov
Disability Employment Program Manager (SEPM)	Gerald P. McLaughran	Program Specialist	0301	GS-13	202-205-9928	jerry.mcgaughran@usda.gov
Special Placement Program Coordinator PWD	Emily Ortiz	Lead HR Specialist	0201	GS-12	505-563-9336	emily.ortiz@usda.gov
Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager	Sherry L. Neal	Branch Chief (Acting)	0260	GS-13	801-625-5806	sherry.neal@usda.gov
Anti-Harassment Program Manager	Shannon Swaziek	Supervisor and HR Specialist (Emp. Relations)	0201	GS-14	414-297-1281	shannon.swaziek@usda.gov
ADR Program Manager	Rhonda A. Thomas	Branch Chief	0301	GS-14	202-205-9507	rhonda.thomas@usda.gov
Compliance Manager	Robert M. Ragos	Branch Chief	0260	GS-14	202-205-0961	robert.ragos@usda.gov
Principal MD-715 Preparer	Linda L. Lynch, PhD	Program Analyst	0343	GS-13	580-755-0404	linda.l.lynch@usda.gov

EEO Program Staff	Name	Title	Occ. Series	Pay Plan and Grade	Phone Number	Email Address
Other EEO Staff	Craig J. Willis	Program Analyst	0343	GS-13	202-401-4463	craig.willis@usda.gov

Part D.1 – List of Subordinate Components Covered in this Report

Please identify the subordinate components within the Agency (e.g., bureaus, regions, etc.).

If the Agency does not have any subordinate components, please check the box.

Subordinate Component	City	State	Agency Code
Northern Region, Missoula, MT	Missoula	MT	AG11
Rocky Mountain Region, Golden, CO	Golden	CO	AG11
Southwestern Region, Albuquerque, NM	Albuquerque	NM	AG11
Intermountain Region, Ogden, UT	Ogden	UT	AG11
Pacific Southwest Region, Vallejo, CA	Vallejo	CA	AG11
Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR	Portland	OR	AG11
Southern Region. Atlanta, GA	Atlanta	GA	AG11
Eastern Region, Milwaukee, WI	Milwaukee	WI	AG11
Alaska Region, Juneau, AK	Juneau	AL	AG11
Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA	Newtown Square	PA	AG11
Pacific Southwest Research Station, Albany, CA	Portland	OR	AG11
Pacific Northwest Research Station, Portland, OR	Albany	CA	AG11
Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins, CO	Fort Collins	CO	AG11
Southern Research Station, Asheville, NC	Asheville	NC	AG11
International Institute of Tropical Forestry	San Juan	PR	AG11
Northeastern Area State & Private Forestry	Newtown Square	PA	AG11
Forest Product Laboratory	Madison	WI	AG11

Part D.2 – Mandatory and Optional Documents for this Report

Did the Agency submit the following mandatory documents?	Yes or No	Comments
Organizational Chart	Yes	Appendix C1
EEO Policy Statement	Yes	Appendix C2
Strategic Plan	Yes	Appendix C3
Anti-Harassment Policy and Procedures	Yes	Appendix C4
Reasonable Accommodation Procedures	Yes	Appendix C5
Personal Assistance Services Procedures	No	
Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures	Yes	Appendix C7

Did the Agency submit the following optional documents?	Yes or No	Comments
Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Report	Yes	Appendix C8
Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) Report	Yes	Appendix C9
Operational Plan for Increasing Employment of Individuals with Disabilities under Executive Order 13548	No	Appendix C10
Diversity and Inclusion Plan under Executive Order 13583	No	Appendix C11
Diversity Policy Statement	No	Appendix C12
Human Capital Strategic Plan	No	
EEO Strategic Plan	No	Appendix C13
Results from most recent Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey or Annual Employee Survey	Yes	Appendix C14

Part E – Executive Summary

Part E.1 - Mission

The Forest Service (FS) mission is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the Nation’s forests and grasslands to meet the needs of present and future generations. This year’s FS Annual Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program Status Report highlights the Agency’s commitment towards creating a culture of safety, respect, inclusion, and freedom from discrimination. The report illustrates marked achievements for critical goals and objectives to become a “Model Equal Opportunity Organization”, but also directly focus on our Section G Self-Assessment, Part H deficiencies and Part I barriers to creating a Model EEO Program.

The MD-715 provides a roadmap for creating effective EEO programs for all federal employees as required by Title VII and the Rehabilitation Act. The stated objective of the Directive is to ensure all employees and applicants for employment enjoy equality of opportunity in the federal workplace, regardless of race, sex, national origin, color, religion, disability or reprisal for engaging in prior protected activity. Additionally, the FS seeks to ensure the same opportunities to all groups regardless of age, genetic information, pregnancy, sexual orientation, or other prohibited bases.

This report requires agencies to take appropriate steps to ensure all employment decisions are free from discrimination. It establishes standards by which Agencies’ EEO programs will be reviewed by the FS, including, but not limited to, the requirement that agencies conduct periodic self-assessments and barrier analysis to identify and remove barriers which may preclude access to equal employment opportunities in the workplace.

As required by the FS, this report was completed utilizing data compiled at the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 covering the period from October 1, 2018 through September 30, 2019. The workforce data utilized includes permanent employees and was extracted from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Finance Center (NFC) database.

Part E.2 - Essential Element A - F

The Agency Self-Assessment Checklist, which is designed to measure the essential elements of the EEO program, was completed. The checklist was updated for FY 2018 with over 80 new questions added. The Agency reviewed its progress in meeting the six Essential Elements necessary to be deemed a model EEO program. However, when gauged against the very specific measures identified in the Self-Assessment Checklist in Part G, several deficiencies were identified. We have commented or created plans in Part H to address those deficiencies.

The six model employer elements include:

- A. Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership
- B. Integration of EEO into Agency's Strategic Mission
- C. Management and Program Accountability
- D. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination
- E. Efficiency
- F. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

The EEOC established specific measures for each of the six elements of a model EEO program. Each FS component reports to the EEOC as to whether each of the 150 specified measures is met, unmet or not applicable. FS decreased its overall rate of compliance with the EEOC measures from 97.42% in FY 2018 to 96.97% in FY 2019. The decreased Element C measures resulted from two situations: Reasonable Accommodation (RA) requests are not processed within 30 calendar days. The Agency is establishing procedures for processing Personal Assistance Services (PAS) requests. However, a standard operating procedure (SOP) has been developed and is currently pending review that encompasses PAS procedures.

The scorecard below shows the percentage of measures met by all FS Components for FY 2018 and FY 2019. Notably, four of the six essential elements show either 100% compliance or remained unchanged from the previous FY.

MODEL EEO PROGRAM SCORECARD		
	FY2018 % Met	FY2019 % Met
Essential Element A: Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership	92.86%	86.87%
Essential Element B: Integration of EEO into the Agency's Strategic Mission	100.00%	100.00%
Essential Element C: Management and Program Accountability	97.73%	95.45%
Essential Element D: Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination	100.00%	100.00%
Essential Element E: Efficiency	100.00%	100.00%
Essential Element F: Responsiveness and Legal Compliance	100.00%	100.00%
Total	97.42%	96.97%
Total Measures	155	150

Essential Element A – Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership

The FS demonstrated a firm commitment to equal opportunity for its employees and applicants. During FY 2019, FS Chief Victoria Christiansen affirmed her commitment to EEO principles and the importance of a diverse and inclusive workforce within the Agency by reaffirming her commitment in support of the USDA policy. Under the Secretary’s *OneUSDA* principles, all mission areas will be held to a consistent standard. This policy is being developed at the USDA level and the FS is awaiting its release. The FS issues supplemental guidance and information on anti-harassment, EEO program and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR). To insure employees and applicants can reference this document, and that it is available as a resource, the policy statement will be posted on the FS internal and external websites, and within new employee orientation materials. Diversity, New Supervisor, and Manager training were available to management, affirming the FS commitment to training and educating its leaders to enhance their knowledge, skills, and abilities.

In accordance with MD-715 guidance, the performance appraisal for all managers and supervisors includes a critical element that evaluates EEO commitment. The element provides that successful performance:

- Demonstrates a personal commitment to Civil Rights (CR) and equal opportunity by ensuring that EO principles are used in the full range of personnel actions, including new hires, promotions, awards, disciplinary actions, and training.

- Adheres to the Federal Government’s merit systems principles through proactive measures to strengthen diversity and to ensure that all employees and applicants for employment with FS are treated fairly and equitably.
- Ensures that the workplace is free of all forms of unlawful discrimination including harassment. Acts promptly and effectively to address reports of unlawful discrimination including harassment. Monitors the work environment to ensure that employees are not subjected to retaliation for reporting unlawful discrimination including harassment or for participating in an inquiry or investigation.
- Cooperates with the Conflict Management and Prevention (CMP) Program.

The USDA is releasing a new RA policy and procedures which the FS will adopt once it’s released. Training is being provided on requesting and providing RAs and all Agency-wide announcements for events which provide information on accessing the RA Program.

The Agency insured its policies and procedures concerning EEO matters were available to all employees. In each job vacancy announcement, under the “Special Employment Consideration” section, all applicants are provided the process to request RAs.

Essential Element B – Integration of EEO into the Agency’s Strategic Mission

This element requires the Agency's EEO programs be organized and structured in a manner which maintains a workplace free from discrimination in all the Agency's policies, procedures and practices to support the Agency's strategic vision of equality and inclusion. EEO is an integral part of achieving the goals included in the Agency's strategic mission.

The Director, of FS Office of Civil Rights (OCR) reports to the Undersecretary of Natural Resources and Environment and meets regularly with the USDA FS Agency-Head (Chief). The OCR Director also has access to the Chief, Director, Human Resources Management (HRM), Deputy Chief, Business Operations and Director, Workforce Environment Performance Office (WEPO) to discuss any EEO related matters. Accessibility to these key personnel is essential to open discussions about EEO related matters.

Office of Civil Rights communicates information to key drivers of the Agency strategic mission to assist in uncovering and remedying barriers which may impede performance of strategic objectives. OCR and HRM have periodic meetings to discuss issues relating to EEO, Diversity and Inclusion, employee development and other workplace issues. They work together in the review of management policies, procedures and practices on an ongoing basis. This continuous collaboration synergizes the Agency’s efforts towards a workplace focused on equality and opportunity.

The OCR Director has been delegated the authority to ensure implementation of Agency EEO plans to improve program efficiency and/or eliminate barriers to the realization of equality of opportunity, once they have been identified. Funds have been allocated for the operation of this program.

Included in the OCR structure is the Assistant Director, Accountability and Compliance, Assistant Director, Field Operations, EEO Complaints Management Branch, Outreach and Diversity Branch, and Reasonable Accommodation Branch.

Essential Element C – Management and Program Accountability

In FY 2019, OCR provided leadership, direction and guidance in carrying out the Agency's EEO program. As part of this responsibility, OCR administers the Agency-wide CR program which includes the EEO complaint processing program, Outreach and Diversity program, and RA program. WEPO administers the anti-harassment program and CMP program. OCR conducts regular program reviews to ensure adherence to

regulatory requirements. The Agency has established policies and guidelines that are available to all its employees. These policies and guidelines have been put in place as an effort to prevent any form of discrimination, including but not limited to harassment and retaliation. The Agency provides a separate, but equally important, set of guidelines regarding the provision of reasonable accommodations to qualified individuals with disabilities. OCR coordinates the development and implementation of EEO plans and guidance with the appropriate Agency officials, including HRM and WEPO. OCR, working in collaboration with HRM and WEPO, facilitates action when improvement to existing policy is required or when new policy is to be developed, or implemented.

The following initiatives were taken to ensure accountability:

As of January 5, 2020, the Agency closed 88% of the 2,215 harassment cases reported since August 2017. We found misconduct in 427 nearly 22% of those cases. The Agency took corrective action in roughly 85% of the closed cases where misconduct was identified, removing or terminating 31 employees. In the roughly 15% of cases where misconduct was found but no disciplinary action was taken, largely because the offender was either not a USD FS employee at the time of the report or left the Agency before action could be taken.

Implementing Office of Inspector General Recommendations

The USDA Office of the Inspector General closed its audit of the Pacific Southwest Region and we are addressing all of its recommendations on a national level to improve how we take care of those who have been harassed, hold offenders accountable, and eliminate all forms of harassment.

Reducing Report Processing Timelines

The Agency's Harassment Assessment Response Team now completes investigations in an average of 25 days, down from 42. The program is more transparent, efficient, and effective than ever at addressing underlying issues and being victim-centered and trauma-informed rather than process-heavy.

Essential Element D – Proactive Prevention

This element requires the Agency to intercede early to prevent inappropriate workplace interactions from becoming discriminatory and eliminate barriers to EEO in the workplace.

The FS demonstrated a firm commitment to EEO for its employees and applicants. During FY 2019, FS Chief Victoria Christiansen affirmed her commitment to EEO principles and the importance of a diverse and inclusive workforce within the Agency by reaffirming her commitment in support of the USDA policy. This statement will include information on anti-harassment, EEO program and ADR. To ensure that employees and applicants can reference this document, and that it is available as a resource, the policy statement is posted on FS's internal and external websites and is included in the new employee orientation. Diversity training and New Supervisor and Manager training were also available to management. This training affirmed FS commitment to training and educating its leaders to enhance their knowledge, skills and abilities.

Agency leadership has undertaken a comprehensive effort to heighten communication and transparency, invest in employees, foster inclusive workplaces, and strengthen the engagement and productivity of FS employees. The scores in this report validate past efforts and will help the Agency focus future efforts.

The FS HRM staff, in coordination with OCR, annually complete the Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Report and the DVAAP. The results from these reports identify the current progress of the Agency to employ a diverse workforce that is inclusive of veterans. These reports provide valuable information as to the Agency's success rate for achieving its current goals and serves as a tool for setting future goals and targets.

The OCR will continue to partner with HRM on agency-wide Diversity and Inclusion initiatives. Additionally, OCR will also continue its collaborative relationships with the Agency leadership to strengthen the Agency's

Special Emphasis Programs (SEPMs).

To ensure we as an Agency address EEOC's goals for Proactive Prevention, we have adopted the following initiatives to address harassment:

Harassment Reporting Center

The Agency is working aggressively to end harassment, provide protection, and hold accountable those who commit these acts. Based on employee feedback, the Agency improved our Anti-Harassment Program, adding case managers to evaluate every new report. New case management liaisons keep affected employees informed. The Harassment Reporting Center is available to all employees and anyone who conducts business with the FS.

Wall-to-Wall Services

For reports not under a formal inquiry or investigation, our program ensures appropriate leadership attention with guidance from the case managers and assistance from the CMP Center, which offers ADR services including coaching, mediation, facilitated discussion, and group intervention. In addition, we offer alternative reporting options through EEO and the Office of the Inspector General hotline.

New Rules for Supervisors

Our enhanced anti-harassment policy mandates anti-harassment training for all requiring supervisors to report all allegations of sexual harassment and/or sexual misconduct within 24 hours. Supervisors must also contact local law enforcement within 24 hours if an allegation includes sexual assault or other criminal activity of a sexual nature and report non-sexual harassment/misconduct within three days.

Information and Resources

The Agency issued an anti-harassment Leader Guide, Leader Quick Reference, and a Pocket Card for all employees to get help if they experience harassment or conflict in the workplace. These are available online along with webinars, tools, and resources aimed at demystifying the harassment reporting process.

Adapting Processes

The FS is committed to doing more to end harassment, assault, bullying, and retaliation. Active exchanges between Agency leadership and employees include "Listen and Learn" sessions, a Chief's Employee Advisory Group, and dozens of networks across the Agency. We use these channels to explore initiatives such as a Peer Support Program to help employees know all the resources available to them, and an Ombud's Program to offer a confidential, informal, independent problem-solving resource.

Essential Element E – Efficiency

This element requires the Agency ensures effective systems for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the Agency's EEO Programs are in place as well as an efficient and fair dispute resolution process.

The FS envisions a work environment where every employee feels safe, valued, and respected. To achieve it, we are creating a values-based organization, taking steps to prevent harassment, bullying, and retaliation, and assessing our progress along the way. We are providing support programs to empower employees, addressing harassment when concerns do arise, and ensuring accountability.

Skill-Building

Employees wanted better skills to speak up early when they felt there was inappropriate behavior, which resulted in the Agency providing *Bystander Intervention Training*. More than 7000 people learned how to safely

intervene when witnessing unacceptable behaviors. We also offered high-quality trainings on harassment, bullying, misconduct, civility in the workplace, CR, gender, bias, diversity, and inclusion.

Banning Alcohol in Shared Government-Furnished Quarters

Employee comments and national data indicated alcohol is a contributing factor in many cases of assault, harassment, and other inappropriate behaviors. For the safety of employees, the Agency issued a ban in July 2019 on the possession and consumption of alcohol in shared government-furnished quarters. We anticipate a reduction in inappropriate behaviors in shared government-furnished quarters.

Federal Employment Acceptability

All individuals employed under contract, other formal agreements, and Administratively Determined personnel must submit the OPM form, OF-306, Declaration for Federal Employment. This will help eliminate the hiring of individuals who have been fired, or quit after being told they would be fired, for workplace harassment, indiscretions, or criminal activity.

Reasonable Accommodation

During FY 2019, the Agency established a Reasonable Accommodation Branch within the Office of CR, designating an Acting Branch Chief. Prior to that, all RA Specialists reported to designated CR service center directors. One of the key initiatives undertaken by the RA Branch was to address a backlog of over 300 cases. Since then, as of the end of FY 2019, the RA Branch accomplished the following objectives.

- Backlog prior to branch chief was approximately 400 cases. Of these, all back logged cases were closed at end of FY19
- Since FY15 only 16 cases out of 1256 (1.27%) were denied
- Both pre-and-formal complaints citing RA have decreased since FY2016.
- Over the past four years, the percentage of cases citing RA as an issue ranged from 14%-18%.
- Half (4) of the (8) findings of discrimination issued between 2016-present involved RA issues

During FY 2019, the Agency received and processed 317 RA requests. Of these, 79.55% or 80%, or <-10.45% were processed, which is below the required 90% of RA requests are processed within the 30-calendar day timeframe.

EEO Complaints Processing

OCR utilized the I-Complaints data tracking system to ensure accurate tracking of all deadlines related to EEO complaint activity. This data was used by the OCR Director in periodic meetings with the senior Agency staff to assess their progress and to discuss ways to advance the efforts of the Agency. OCR continues to measure its results in accordance with the year-end "Statistical Report of Discrimination Complaints," FORM 462. Workforce data is obtained from the USDA NFC database.

During FY 2019, the Formal EEO Complaints staff prepared and published quarterly EEO Complaint Trend analysis reports. Within the report, several activities were highlighted including filing trends such as number and type of complaints filed by bases and issues, knowledge gained, and actions taken or planned as a result of these analyses.

The following observations were captured from FY 2019 EEO Complaint trends analysis:

- In FY 2019, the number of FS complaints *per capita* rate was lower than the USDA complaints *per capita* rate. The FS FY 2019 complaints *per capita* rate was 0.28% comparative to the USDA FY 2019

complaints *per capita* rate of 0.48%. Over the past three years, the FS experienced a consistent downward trend in formal complaint activity. In FY 2019 a total of 100 formal complaints were filed, comparative to FY 2018 with a total of 141 formal complaints filed.

- In FY 2019, the FS experienced a -29.08% decrease in the number of formal complaints filed as compared to FY 2018. In FY 2019, there were 100 formal complaints filed comparative to the 141 formal complaints filed in FY 2018. The data shows FS's efforts to address the work environment and improve the EEO pre-complaint process were beginning to positively impact formal complaint activity.
- The FS continually develops, conducts, monitors, and evaluates its CR programs, events, documentation, and trainings to ensure all employees and managers are knowledgeable of CR regulations, processes, policies, practices, procedures, and requirements. In addition, we are actively placing greater emphasis on creating and sustaining a safe, resilient, and respectful working environment through its national Work Environment and Performance Office (WEPO) and CR initiatives.

Essential Element F – Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

The Agency was in 100% compliance with this essential element. MD-715 guidance which requires the Agency to fully comply with EEO statutes, EEOC regulations, EEOC policy guidance and other written instructions. For example, the Agency compliance included timely posting of quarterly No FEAR Act data, in accordance with 29 C.F.R. Sections 1614.703-705. In FY 2019, a total of 114 investigations were completed FS. Of the 114 investigations completed, 89 were completed within the prescribed timeframe of 180 days or less, resulting in 78.07% completion rate. In FY 2018 a total of 108 investigations were completed. Of the 108 completed investigations, 90 were completed within the prescribed timeframe of 180 days, resulting in a 90.74% completion rate.

Part E.3 – Workforce Analyses

Workforce Composition

In support of the Agency mission to achieve EEO in all areas, this report analytically summarizes the FS workforce makeup, emphasizing areas of underrepresentation, and in the case of separations “overrepresentation”, when compared to relevant benchmarks. FY 2019 Federal Agency EEO Program Status Report (MD 715) objectives and action items progress is also reviewed.

Workforce Analysis Topics:

1. FY 2017 – FY 2019 Total Workforce Overview
2. FY 2017 – FY 2019 Permanent Workforce Overview
3. Table A6 & B6 Participation Rates for Mission Critical Occupations (MCOs)
4. Table A8 & B8 Permanent New Hires
5. Table A10 & B10 Non-Competitive Promotions
6. Table A13 & B13 Employee Recognition and Awards
7. Table A14 & B14 Separations
8. Veteran Hires

Total Workforce

Total Workforce composition declined from FY 2017 through FY 2019 by 1887 employees. The groups with the most declines were: WM (-1036), WF (-682), AI/ANF (-61), BF (-58) and HF (-52). Additionally, PWD declined by 87 and PWTD by 39.

The following groups exceeded the 2010 Civilian Labor Force (CLF) or EEOC Federal Goal indicator for Persons with Disabilities or Persons with Targeted Disabilities: WM, NH/OPIIM, NH/OPIF, AI/ANM, AI/ANF, TMRM, TMRF and PWTD.

Table 1 features Total Workforce numbers for FY 2019. Onboard percentages “below CLF” are highlighted in red. Note: Total Workforce numbers contain Permanent and Temporary employee counts which ebb and flow situationally throughout the FY.

A detailed analysis of the “Two or More Races” Male and Female categories was omitted resulting from employee ERI codes number fluctuations. Hispanic and Latino employees often report in both Hispanic Latino and Two or More Races categories, skewing the correct counts. Nevertheless, the FS conducted supplemental Separations and New Hires analyses by Nature of Action type to gain additional insight concerning the significant increase beginning in FY 2017 to FY 2019. See Table 1.

Table 1. FY 2017 – FY 2019 “Total” Workforce Participation Rates: Permanent & Temporary

Race, Gender, Disability	CLF	FY19	FY19	FY18	FY18	FY17	FY17	Net Change %	Difference
	2010	TOTAL	%	TOTAL	%	TOTAL	%	FY17-FY19	FY17-FY19
TOTAL	100.00%	34863	100.00%	35700	100.00%	36750	100.00%	-1887	-5.13%
HM	5.17%	1799	5.16%	1881	5.27%	1904	4.91%	-105	-5.51%
HF	4.79%	845	2.42%	880	2.46%	897	2.31%	-52	-5.80%
WM	38.33%	18087	51.88%	18570	52.02%	19123	49.31%	-1036	-5.42%
WF	34.03%	9399	26.96%	9688	27.14%	10081	26.00%	-682	-6.77%
BM	5.49%	673	1.93%	699	1.96%	725	1.87%	-52	-7.17%
BF	6.53%	562	1.61%	589	1.65%	620	1.60%	-58	-9.35%
AM	1.97%	377	1.08%	381	1.07%	406	1.05%	-29	-7.14%
AF	1.93%	283	0.81%	290	0.81%	294	0.76%	-11	-3.74%
NH/OPIIM	0.07%	88	0.25%	89	0.25%	98	0.25%	-10	-10.20%
NH/OPIF	0.07%	23	0.07%	24	0.07%	30	0.08%	-7	-23.33%
AI/ANM	0.55%	895	2.57%	928	2.60%	936	2.41%	-41	-4.38%
AI/ANF	0.53%	436	1.25%	471	1.32%	497	1.28%	-61	-12.27%
TMRM	0.26%	1071	3.07%	938	2.63%	842	2.17%	229	27.20%
TMRF	0.28%	320	0.92%	266	0.75%	216	0.56%	104	48.15%
PWD	12.00%	2374	6.81%	2387	6.69%	2461	6.70%	-87	-3.54%
PWTD	2.00%	763	2.19%	782	2.19%	802	2.18%	-39	-4.86%
MALES	51.86%	22992	65.95%	23489	65.80%	24088	65.55%	-1096	-4.55%
FEMALES	48.14%	11871	34.05%	12211	34.20%	12662	34.45%	-791	-6.25%

Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A1 and B1 (November 8, 2019).

Permanent Workforce

Table 2 depicts the “Permanent Workforce” from FY 2017 to end of FY 2019. Groups below CLF onboard percentages are highlighted in red.

The FS “Permanent Workforce” composition declined by 83 employees from FY 2017 through FY 2019. The groups with the most decline were: White Males, White Females, Hispanic Males, Two or More Races Males, and American Indian/ Alaskan Native Males.

At the end of FY 2019 PWD were below the 12% goal at (7.47%) and PWTD were above their 2.00% goal at (2.49%). See Table 2.

Table 2. FY 2016 – FY 2019 “Permanent” Workforce Participation Rates

Race, Gender, Disability	CLF	FY19	FY19	FY18	FY18	FY17	FY17	Net Change %	Difference
	2010	TOTAL	%	TOTAL	%	TOTAL	%	FY17-FY19	FY17-FY19
TOTAL	100.00%	27414	100.00%	27468	100.00%	27331	100.00%	83	0.30%
HM	5.17%	1401	5.11%	1439	5.24%	1904	4.91%	-503	-26.42%
HF	4.79%	758	2.77%	769	2.80%	897	2.31%	-139	-15.50%
WM	38.33%	14208	51.83%	14126	51.43%	19123	49.31%	-4915	-25.70%
WF	34.03%	7519	27.43%	7684	27.97%	10081	26.00%	-2562	-25.41%
BM	5.49%	591	2.16%	604	2.20%	725	1.87%	-134	-18.48%
BF	6.53%	543	1.98%	562	2.05%	620	1.60%	-77	-12.42%
AM	1.97%	273	1.00%	272	0.99%	406	1.05%	-133	-32.76%
AF	1.93%	247	0.90%	250	0.91%	294	0.76%	-47	-15.99%
NH/OPIIM	0.07%	66	0.24%	58	0.21%	98	0.25%	-32	-32.65%
NH/OPIF	0.07%	20	0.07%	19	0.07%	30	0.08%	-10	-33.33%
AI/ANM	0.55%	705	2.57%	726	2.64%	936	2.41%	-231	-24.68%
AI/ANF	0.53%	383	1.40%	397	1.45%	497	1.28%	-114	-22.94%
TMRM	0.26%	517	1.89%	414	1.51%	842	2.17%	-325	-38.60%
TMRF	0.28%	178	0.65%	142	0.52%	216	0.56%	-38	-17.59%
PWD	12.00%	2049	7.47%	2387	6.69%	2094	7.54%	-45	-2.15%
PWTD	2.00%	682	2.49%	782	2.19%	704	2.54%	-22	-3.13%
MALES	51.86%	17763	64.80%	17642	64.23%	17419	63.73%	344	1.97%
FEMALES	48.14%	9651	35.20%	9826	35.77%	9912	36.27%	-261	-2.63%

Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A1 and B1 (November 8, 2019).

Permanent MCO Participation Rates

Among permanent positions that typify field-based, natural resource vocations, the FS generally outpaces the “occupational CLF” (OCLF) benchmarks. At the end of FY there were 16,236 permanent employees in the ten MCO series which accounted for 60% of the permanent workforce. Occupations falling below their associated CLF are depicted in red. See Table 3.

Although White Males demonstrated below OCLF triggers in multiple MCOs, the overall focus concerned the underrepresentation of females and minorities. A barrier analysis among 0301 Hispanic Women precipitated an action plan supporting their representation. The FS is closely monitoring and further analyzing all MCO categories below OCLF.

Groups Experiencing the Greatest Below OCLF Gaps

0301 Miscellaneous Admin and Program:	White Females (-5.71%)	
0340 Program Management:	White Females (-10.92%)	Black Female (-6.34%)
0408 Ecology	White Males (-28.75%)	White Females (-25.23%)

0454 Rangeland Management
 0454 Forestry
 0462 Forestry Technician
 0810 Civil Engineering
 1170 Realty

White Males (-26.15%)
 White Males (-13.48%)
 White Females (-20.63%)
 White Males (-16.15%)
 White Males (-6.06%)

The Agency will continue working on this situation within the Workforce Planning Process, Strategic Hiring Engagement Sessions, and National Hiring Collective. Categories with onboard percentages below CLF are highlighted in red. See Table 3.

Table 3. FY 2019 Permanent MCO Series CLF Comparison

Below the CLF is in red font	Hispanic		White		Black		Asian		NHOPI		AIAN		Two or More Races	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
0301 Miscellaneous Admin and Program	85	80	826	655	44	93	24	19	2	2	53	39	5	0
	4.41%	4.15%	42.86%	33.99%	2.28%	4.83%	1.25%	0.99%	0.10%	0.10%	2.75%	2.02%	0.26%	0%
CLF	4.70%	5.30%	30.20%	39.70%	4.90%	7.80%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%	0.40%	2.60%	2.30%	0.30%	0.40%
0340 Program Management	39	8	354	204	23	10	6	6	1	0	25	6	2	1
	5.69%	1.17%	51.68%	29.78%	3.36%	1.46%	0.88%	0.88%	0.15%	0%	3.65%	0.88%	0.29%	0.15%
CLF	4.70%	5.30%	30.20%	39.70%	4.90%	7.80%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%	0.40%	2.60%	2.30%	0.30%	0.40%
0401 General Biological Science	76	54	948	833	30	23	15	29	1	2	21	12	5	6
	3.70%	2.63%	46.13%	40.54%	1.46%	1.12%	0.73%	1.41%	0.05%	0.10%	1.02%	0.58%	0.24%	0.29%
CLF	1.90%	2.10%	47.30%	35.00%	1.20%	1.80%	0.00%	0.00%	0.40%	0.20%	4.10%	4.30%	0.40%	0.30%
408 Ecology	5	7	136	103	1	1	5	4	1	0	2	3	0	0
	1.87%	2.61%	50.75%	38.43%	0.37%	0.37%	1.87%	1.49%	0.37%	0%	0.75%	1.12%	0%	0%
CLF	1.40%	0.50%	79.50%	13.20%	1.80%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	1.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.20%	0.40%	0.00%
454 Rangeland Management	11	11	167	109	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	7	2	0
	3.51%	3.51%	53.35%	34.82%	0%	0%	0.32%	0%	0%	0%	1.60%	2.24%	0.64%	0%
CLF	1.40%	0.50%	79.50%	13.20%	1.80%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	1.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.20%	0.40%	0.00%
460 Forestry	55	13	878	290	31	6	12	10	0	0	25	7	3	0
	4.14%	0.98%	66.02%	21.80%	2.33%	0.45%	0.90%	0.75%	0%	0%	1.88%	0.53%	0.23%	0%
CLF	1.40%	0.50%	79.50%	13.20%	1.80%	0.20%	0.00%	0.00%	1.30%	0.30%	0.30%	0.20%	0.40%	0.00%
0462 Forestry Technician	915	109	5594	1086	144	4	82	25	41	1	355	57	90	4
	10.76%	1.28%	65.76%	12.77%	1.69%	0.05%	0.96%	0.29%	0.48%	0.01%	4.17%	0.67%	1.06%	0.05%
CLF	3.40%	3.40%	40.20%	33.40%	3.70%	4.50%	0.10%	0.00%	0.50%	0.30%	4.10%	4.30%	0.60%	0.40%
0810 Civil Engineering	40	14	299	104	12	5	13	8	1	1	13	4	2	0
	7.75%	2.71%	57.95%	20.16%	2.33%	0.97%	2.52%	1.55%	0.19%	0.19%	2.52%	0.78%	0.39%	0%
CLF	3.70%	0.60%	74.10%	7.50%	2.90%	0.60%	0.00%	0.00%	0.30%	0.10%	7.40%	1.10%	0.80%	0.10%
1101 General Business & Industry	6	22	57	231	6	26	0	5	0	2	4	13	0	0
	1.61%	5.91%	15.32%	62.10%	1.61%	6.99%	0%	1.34%	0%	0.54%	1.08%	3.49%	0%	0%
CLF	4.70%	5.30%	30.20%	39.70%	4.90%	7.80%	0.10%	0.10%	0.20%	0.40%	2.60%	2.30%	0.30%	0.40%
1170 Realty	6	10	89	133	4	6	0	4	0	0	2	8	0	1
	2.28%	3.80%	33.84%	50.57%	1.52%	2.28%	0%	1.52%	0%	0%	0.76%	3.04%	0%	0.38%
CLF	3.50%	4.20%	39.90%	40.90%	3.10%	4.10%	0.10%	0.00%	0.20%	0.40%	1.20%	0.90%	0.40%	0.40%

(Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A6 and B6 (November 8, 2019).)

Permanent New Hires

There were a total of 1773 permanent New Hires during the FY. Between September 30, 2017 and September 30, 2019, there was an overall net increase of 148 new hires, up from 1625. As of September 30, 2019, the following groups exceeded their 2010 CLF benchmark: All Males, Hispanic Males, Hispanic Females, White Males, Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander Males, Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander Females, Asian Males, American

Indian/Alaska Native Males and Females, and Two or More Races Males and Females. Groups hired below their CLF were: All Females, White Females, Black Females and Asian Males and Females.

Table 4. Permanent New Hire Rates

Gender / Race / Disability	Q4 FY 2019				Q4 FY 2018			Q4 FY 2017		
	CLF Percent	Perm Hire Number	Perm Hire	Difference Percent CLF & Perm Hire	Perm Hire Number	Perm Hire	Difference Percent CLF & Perm Hire	Perm Hire Number	Perm Hire	Difference Percent CLF & Perm Hire
Total	100%	1773	100%		1517	100%		1625	100%	
All Males	51.86%	1158	65.31%	13.45%	1075	70.86%	19.00%	1080	66.46%	14.60%
All Females	48.14%	615	34.69%	-13.45%	442	29.14%	-19.00%	545	33.54%	-14.60%
HM	5.17%	155	8.74%	3.57%	134	8.83%	3.66%	140	8.62%	3.45%
HF	4.79%	87	4.91%	0.12%	41	2.70%	-2.09%	75	4.62%	-0.17%
WM	38.33%	861	48.56%	10.23%	810	53.39%	15.06%	797	49.05%	10.72%
WF	34.03%	448	25.27%	-8.76%	348	22.94%	-11.09%	399	24.55%	-9.48%
BM	5.49%	36	2.03%	-3.46%	34	2.24%	-3.25%	42	2.58%	-2.91%
BF	6.53%	30	1.69%	-4.84%	22	1.45%	-5.08%	34	2.09%	-4.44%
AM	1.97%	20	1.13%	-0.84%	15	0.99%	-0.98%	21	1.29%	-0.68%
AF	1.93%	14	0.79%	-1.14%	9	0.59%	-1.34%	11	0.68%	-1.25%
NH/OPIM	0.07%	8	0.45%	0.38%	5	0.33%	0.26%	7	0.43%	0.36%
NH/OPIF	0.07%	4	0.23%	0.16%	0	0.00%	-0.07%	1	0.06%	-0.01%
AI/ANM	0.55%	43	2.43%	1.88%	21	1.38%	0.83%	50	3.08%	2.53%
AI/ANF	0.53%	17	0.96%	0.43%	5	0.33%	-0.20%	18	1.11%	0.58%
TMRM	0.26%	35	1.97%	1.71%	56	3.69%	3.43%	23	1.42%	1.16%
TMRF	0.28%	15	0.85%	0.57%	17	1.12%	0.84%	7	0.43%	0.15%
PWD	12.00%	158	8.91%	-3.09%	112	7.38%	-4.62%	161	9.91%	-2.09%
PWTD	2.00%	38	2.14%	0.14%	34	2.24%	0.24%	42	2.58%	0.58%

(Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A8 and B8 (November 8, 2019).)

Non-Competitive Promotions

There were a total of 2325 employees eligible for career-ladder non-competitive promotions overall in the permanent workforce during FY 2019. These groups had promotion eligibility rates above their onboard representation rates: All Females; Hispanic Males and Females; Asian Males and Females; Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander Males and Females; and Two or More Races Males and Females and PWDs. All other groups experienced eligibility rates that were below their corresponding workforce participation rates. Non-Competitive Promotion Eligibility rates are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Non-Competitive Promotion and Onboard Participation Comparison

FY 2019 Non-Competitive Promotion Eligibility Compared to Onboard Participation Rates																	
Gender / Race / Disability	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q3 FY19	Q3 FY19	Q3 FY19	Q3 FY19	Q2 FY19	Q2 FY19	Q2 FY19	Q2 FY19	Q1 FY19	Q1 FY19	Q1 FY19	Q1 FY19	
	PWF Percent	Eligible Number	Eligible Percent	Difference Percent PWF & Eligible	PWF Percent	Eligible Number	Eligible Percent	Difference Percent PWF & Eligible	PWF Percent	Eligible Number	Eligible Percent	Difference Percent PWF & Eligible	PWF Percent	Eligible Number	Eligible Percent	Difference Percent PWF & Eligible	
Total	100%	2325	100%		100%	2392	100%		100%	1881	100%		100%	1850	100%		
All Males	64.80%	1482	63.74%	-1.06%	64.88%	1585	66.26%	1.38%	64.63%	1159	64.00%	-0.63%	64.26%	1166	63.03%	-1.23%	
All Females	35.20%	843	36.26%	1.06%	35.12%	807	33.74%	-1.38%	35.64%	652	36.00%	0.36%	35.74%	684	36.97%	1.23%	
HM	5.11%	123	5.29%	0.18%	5.18%	127	5.31%	0.13%	5.12%	73	4.03%	-1.09%	5.20%	78	6.94%	1.74%	
HF	2.77%	79	3.40%	0.63%	2.70%	71	2.97%	0.27%	2.76%	74	4.09%	1.33%	2.78%	79	4.16%	1.38%	
WM	51.83%	1134	48.77%	-3.06%	51.80%	1204	50.33%	-1.47%	51.68%	917	50.64%	-1.04%	51.51%	908	48.38%	-3.13%	
WF	27.43%	627	26.97%	-0.46%	27.49%	619	25.88%	-1.61%	27.91%	484	26.73%	-1.18%	27.97%	499	30.80%	2.83%	
BM	2.16%	47	2.02%	-0.14%	2.18%	52	2.17%	-0.01%	2.22%	46	2.54%	0.32%	2.21%	53	2.04%	-0.17%	
BF	1.98%	35	1.51%	-0.47%	1.98%	33	1.38%	-0.60%	2.02%	31	1.71%	-0.31%	2.04%	31	2.22%	0.18%	
AM	1.00%	28	1.20%	0.20%	1.00%	29	1.21%	0.21%	0.97%	16	0.88%	-0.09%	0.99%	18	0.37%	-0.62%	
AF	0.90%	21	0.90%	0.00%	0.88%	23	0.96%	0.08%	0.89%	18	0.99%	0.10%	0.91%	19	0.56%	-0.35%	
NH/OPI/M	0.24%	8	0.34%	0.10%	0.23%	7	0.29%	0.06%	0.21%	5	0.28%	0.07%	0.20%	5	0.09%	-0.11%	
NH/OPI/F	0.07%	2	0.09%	0.02%	0.08%	3	0.13%	0.05%	0.09%	1	0.06%	-0.03%	0.08%	1	0.00%	-0.08%	
AI/AN/M	2.57%	54	2.32%	-0.25%	2.62%	66	2.76%	0.14%	2.63%	45	2.48%	-0.15%	2.63%	41	1.11%	-1.52%	
AI/AN/F	1.40%	30	1.29%	-0.11%	1.39%	22	0.92%	-0.47%	1.42%	21	1.16%	-0.26%	1.43%	27	1.11%	-0.32%	
TMRM	1.89%	88	3.78%	1.89%	1.87%	100	4.18%	2.31%	1.54%	57	3.15%	1.61%	1.51%	63	1.57%	0.06%	
TMRF	0.65%	47	2.02%	1.37%	0.59%	34	1.42%	0.83%	0.54%	21	1.16%	0.62%	0.52%	26	0.56%	0.04%	
PWD	7.47%	186	8.00%	0.53%	7.42%	166	6.94%	-0.48%	7.46%	141	7.79%	0.33%	7.35%	35	3.24%	-4.11%	
PWTD	2.49%	50	2.15%	-0.34%	2.46%	36	1.51%	-0.95%	2.49%	28	1.55%	-0.94%	2.43%	150	13.88%	11.45%	

(Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A10 and B10 (November 8, 2019).

Employee Recognition and Awards

At the end of the FY 2019, a total of 19,873 employees received recognition or awards. Because some employees received multiple awards, workforce percentage was not a factor. Groups with award rates below their workforce rates: All Males, White Males, Asian Males, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Males, American Indian/Alaska Native Males, and Two or More Races Males and Females. All “percentages below” are presented in red and summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. FY 2019 Awards and Onboard Rates Comparison

Gender / Race / Disability	FY19	FY19	FY19	FY19	FY18	FY18	FY18	FY18	FY17	FY17	FY17	FY17
	PWF %	Awards #	Awards %	Difference : % PWF & Awards	PWF %	Awards #	Awards %	Difference : % PWF & Awards	PWF %	Awards #	Awards %	Difference : % PWF & Awards
Total	100%	19873			100%	18347	100%		100%	18872	100%	
All Males	64.80%	11587	58.31%	-6.49%	64.36%	10538	57.44%	-6.92%	63.61%	10828	57.38%	-6.23%
All Females	35.20%	8286	41.69%	6.49%	35.64%	7809	42.56%	6.92%	36.39%	8044	42.62%	6.23%
HM	5.11%	1068	5.37%	0.26%	5.12%	837	4.56%	-0.56%	5.21%	885	4.69%	-0.52%
HF	2.77%	733	3.69%	0.92%	2.76%	646	3.52%	0.76%	2.85%	632	3.35%	0.50%
WM	51.83%	9351	47.05%	-4.78%	51.68%	8680	47.31%	-4.37%	51.06%	8883	47.07%	-3.99%
WF	27.43%	6383	32.12%	4.69%	27.91%	6079	33.13%	5.22%	28.46%	6331	33.55%	5.09%
BM	2.16%	496	2.50%	0.34%	2.22%	414	2.26%	0.04%	2.20%	407	2.16%	-0.04%
BF	1.98%	586	2.95%	0.97%	2.20%	521	2.84%	0.64%	2.12%	492	2.61%	0.49%
AM	1.00%	180	0.91%	-0.09%	0.97%	178	0.97%	0.00%	1.00%	179	0.95%	-0.05%
AF	0.90%	205	1.03%	0.13%	0.89%	198	1.08%	0.19%	0.90%	198	1.05%	0.15%
NH/OPI M	0.24%	28	0.14%	-0.10%	0.21%	22	0.12%	-0.09%	0.20%	34	0.18%	-0.02%
NH/OPI F	0.07%	16	0.08%	0.01%	0.09%	19	0.10%	0.01%	0.08%	17	0.09%	0.01%
AI/ANM	2.57%	406	2.04%	-0.53%	2.63%	364	1.98%	-0.65%	2.67%	392	2.08%	-0.59%
AI/ANF	1.40%	326	1.64%	0.24%	1.42%	322	1.76%	0.34%	1.50%	355	1.88%	0.38%
TMRM	1.89%	54	0.27%	-1.62%	1.54%	39	0.21%	-1.33%	1.25%	44	0.23%	-1.02%
TMRF	0.65%	32	0.16%	-0.49%	0.54%	22	0.12%	-0.42%	0.47%	17	0.09%	-0.38%
PWD	7.47%	1578	7.94%	0.47%	7.46%	1423	7.76%	0.30%	7.78%	1440	7.63%	-0.15%
PWTD	2.49%	519	2.61%	0.12%	2.49%	494	2.69%	0.20%	2.62%	324	1.72%	-0.90%

(Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A13 and B13 (November 8, 2019).)

Separations

During FY 2019, 2313 employees separated from the permanent workforce. Compared to FY 2017 and FY 2018, the number of separations overall has increased by 55 or 2.44%. During FY 2019, as in the preceding two FYs, the reasons for separations were the same. The three most prominent FY 2019 “separation reasons” year to date: Voluntary Retirement (1072, 46.35%), Resignation (730, 31.56%), Termination Appointment (342, 14.79%). Groups experiencing separation rates “exceeding” their corresponding onboard workforce rates: All Females, Hispanic Males and Females, White Females, Black Males and Females, Asian Females, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Females, American Indian/Alaska Native Males and Females, PWDs, and PWTDs. Separation rates exceeding their corresponding onboard participation rates are highlighted in red. See Table 7.

Table 7. FY 2019 Q4 Permanent Separation and Workforce Rates Comparison

Gender / Race / Disability	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY19	Q4 FY18	Q4 FY18	Q4 FY18	Q4 FY18	Q4 FY17	Q4 FY17	Q4 FY17	Q4 FY17
	PWF %	Separation #	Separation %	Difference: % PWF & Separation	PWF %	Separation #	Separation %	Difference: % PWF & Separation	PWF %	Separation #	Separation %	Difference: % PWF & Separation
Total	100%	2313	100%		100%	2185	100%		100%	2258	100%	
All Males	64.80%	1379	59.62%	-5.18%	64.36%	1337	61.19%	3.01%	63.61%	1398	61.91%	-1.70%
All Females	35.20%	934	40.38%	5.18%	35.64%	848	38.81%	0.01%	36.39%	860	38.09%	1.70%
HM	5.11%	180	7.78%	2.67%	5.12%	120	5.49%	0.90%	5.21%	133	5.89%	0.68%
HF	2.77%	81	3.50%	0.73%	2.76%	62	2.84%	0.36%	2.85%	53	2.35%	-0.50%
WM	51.83%	1038	44.88%	-6.95%	51.68%	1068	48.88%	2.52%	51.06%	1106	48.98%	-2.08%
WF	27.43%	740	31.99%	4.56%	27.91%	682	31.21%	3.21%	28.46%	687	30.43%	1.97%
BM	2.16%	51	2.20%	0.04%	2.22%	48	2.20%	0%	2.20%	53	2.35%	0.15%
BF	1.98%	48	2.08%	0.10%	2.20%	49	2.24%	0.14%	2.12%	51	2.26%	0.14%
AM	1.00%	20	0.86%	-0.14%	0.97%	27	1.24%	0.24%	1.00%	25	1.11%	0.11%
AF	0.90%	22	0.95%	0.05%	0.89%	16	0.73%	0.17%	0.90%	19	0.84%	-0.06%
NH/OPIM	0.24%	5	0.22%	-0.02%	0.21%	6	0.27%	0.07%	0.20%	5	0.22%	0.02%
NH/OPIF	0.07%	3	0.13%	0.06%	0.09%	3	0.14%	0.04%	0.08%	3	0.13%	0.05%
AI/ANM	2.57%	67	2.90%	0.33%	2.63%	61	2.79%	0.19%	2.67%	70	3.10%	0.43%
AI/ANF	1.40%	34	1.47%	0.07%	1.42%	32	1.46%	0.04%	1.50%	45	1.99%	0.49%
TMRM	1.89%	17	0.73%	-1.16%	1.54%	7	0.32%	0.08%	1.25%	6	0.27%	-0.98%
TMRF	0.65%	6	0.31%	-0.34%	0.54%	4	0.18%	0.08%	0.47%	2	0.09%	-0.38%
PWD	7.47%	211	9.60%	2.13%	7.46%	231	10.57%	3.17%	7.78%	275	10.57%	3.17%
PWTD	2.49%	59	2.69%	0.20%	2.49%	68	0.31%	2.40%	2.62%	47	0.31%	2.40%

(Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center MD-715 Tables A14 and B14 (November 8, 2019).)

Veteran Hiring:

As of November 8, 2019, total permanent New Hires were 1773. Of these, 345 (19.46%) were Veterans and 1428 (80.54%) were non-Veterans, resulting in the Veteran hiring rate scoring below the 25% USDA goal. The USDA FS will continue to monitor hiring trends by documenting those hired under special hiring authorities such as the Veterans Employment Opportunity Act, Veteran’s Recruitment Appointment and PWD Schedule-A Appointments. Veteran hiring information was extrapolated from the USDA NFC Reporting Center Hires Minority Profile Report and is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8. Distribution of Permanent New Hires by Veteran Status

Non Veterans	Veterans	Total New Hires
1428	345	1773
80.54%	19.46%	100.00%

Source: USDA NFC Reporting Center, Hires Minority Profile Report (November 8, 2019)

Part E.4 - Accomplishments

Multiple policies and plans were updated and issued in FY 2019 The Agency Strategic Plan for FY 2015-2020 remained in place, providing the Agency its mission, vision, and objectives. Some of the key accomplishments regarding work environment include the following:

Evolving Supervision

We are leading a national effort called “Evolving Supervision” to evaluate the supervisory system in the FS. More than 230 employees nation-wide participated in “Evolving Supervision” dialogues across the Agency, identifying high-impact actions to develop Agency leaders so they can deliver quality support to employees and supervisors.

Supervisor Enhancements

Supervisors play a high leverage role in achieving the changes we want in our work environment. In the past year we have strengthened supervisors’ performance plans to emphasize leadership competencies that favor a safe, respectful, and resilient work environment free from harassment and discrimination. We updated Agency processes for interviewing candidates and conducting employment reference checks to better align hiring and promotion decisions with agency values. Supervisors must also take training on the Merit System Principles and Prohibited Personnel Practices.

Training

The Agency offered a robust menu of trainings including on harassment, preventing bullying and violence, and handling stress. In 2019 the Agency updated its online training courses, Experienced Supervisor and New Supervisor training, and New Employee Orientation sessions to ensure supervisors and employees know about Agency harassment reporting requirements. Supervisors must ensure that all employees receive training on CR and sexual harassment prevention within the first 30 days of employment.

National Work Environment Survey

In our drive to be a values-based, purpose-driven, relationship-focused organization, the USDA FS has been taking a hard look at itself and employee experience. In the summer of 2019, USDA FS permanent, temporary, and term employees were invited to participate in a survey designed to assess work satisfaction, perceptions of the work environment, and workplace experiences. This survey was anonymous, conducted and analyzed by contractors. Survey results will be used as a baseline to track progress and identify next steps in creating a culture where all employees feel safe, valued and respected for delivering the priority work of the Agency.

This is Who We Are

We are changing our culture, so all employees feel safe, valued, and respected. Living our core values helps create a work environment that is free from harassment, bullying, and retaliation of any kind. At the heart of this work is “This is Who We Are,” a guide to Agency culture and our core values of service, conservation, interdependence, diversity, and safety. In 2020 all employees will get a chance to learn more about the Agency’s values and bring them to life. National New Employee Orientation and Middle and Senior Leadership Programs (SLP) will also anchor employees into the Agency’s culture and values.

Delivery of Improving Work Environment through Communicating Across Differences Workshop

In a continuing effort to improve the working environment, a new workshop entitled “Communicating Across Differences (CAD)” was developed and launched in the Pacific Southwest Region by the Pacific Southwest Region CR Service Center for the purpose of engaging with employees and promoting a better understanding of cross-cultural communication. Region 5 conducted 24 CAD workshops; there were approximately 35 employees per workshop with total of 720 attendees. The attendees were Forest Leadership Teams, Forest Supervisors, Deputy Forest Supervisors, District Rangers and supervisors or managers. Based on the positive feedback and support from the Region’s leadership, the workshop will be conducted with non-supervisory employees in the near future.

Part E.5 - Planned Activities

Parts H, I, and J of the MD-715 report illustrate the objectives to become a “Model Equal Opportunity Organization”. The plans are based on identified program deficiencies, barriers, recruitment, hiring and advancement of PWTD.

PART F

Continuing Equal Employment Opportunity Programs Establishment and Certification

SEE APPENDIX C12

PART G
Agency Self-Assessment Check List Measuring Essential Elements

SEE APPENDIX C8

Part H.1.

Agency EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency

Type of Program Deficiency	Brief Description of Program Deficiency
Part G - C.2.b.5; C.2. c.	Ninety percent (90%) of Reasonable Accommodation Requests (RAs) are not processed within the timeframe set forth in the Agency procedures for RA. In September 14, 2015, the EEOC issued a letter reminding the Agency to re-submit RA procedures when they are updated and or revised.

Objectives and EEO Plan Dates

Date Initiated	Objective	Target Date	Modified Date	Completion Date
08/01/2014	Ensure 90% of RAs are processed within 30 business days minimum.	09/30/2020		

Responsible Officials

Title	Name	Performance Standards Address the Plan?
Branch Chief (Acting), Reasonable Accommodations, OCR	Sherry L. Neal	Yes

Planned Activities Towards Objective Completion

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2018	1. Provide quarterly national RA trend analyses to Agency leadership and field CR Directors in the field.	Yes	09/30/2020	09/30/2019
09/30/2019	2. Ensure all employees who work on, oversee or supervise the RA process are trained and skilled regarding RA and PAS administration requirements.	Yes	09/30/2019	09/30/2019
09/30/2019	3. Monitor all RA requests to report progress towards 90% RAs processing within 30 business days	Yes	09/30/2020	09/30/2019 Ongoing
06/30/2019	4. Report RA negative and positive processing time	Yes	09/30/2020	09/30/2019

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Completion Date
	impacts and update RA processing practitioners			

Report of Accomplishments

FY	Accomplishments
2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MD-715 Report score for FY19 period (10/1/2018 to 9/30/2019), is 79.55% or 80%, or <-10.45% below the required 90% of RA requests to be processed within the 30-day timeframe • Training concerning Labor and Employee Relations Information System was provided to all RA specialists • RA process training, lecture, documentation, and interactive processes dates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 30; June 9; June 17; July 30; August 15; August 20; Sep 3 • Meetings were held with HRM staff regarding the Accommodation of Last Resort SOP process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 5-7; June 26-28 (face-to-face) ▪ July 23 briefing conducted by Mark Green, Acting National Director, HRM • Northeastern Service Center (NESC): NESC offered two trainings in FY 2019. The first training, entitled <i>The Reasonable Accommodations Process</i> was conducted by RA Specialist, Juliet Charity-Moore on March 27, 2019, via Adobe Connect. There were approximately 80+ connections. Please note: some connections had multiple employees in attendance. • NESC planned an additional training in the fourth quarter. <i>Using Rehabilitation Services and the Reasonable Accommodations Process to Increase Recruitment and Retention</i> was offered on September 19, NESC SEPMs, the OCR RA Unit and the Consortium of State Administrators for Vocational Rehabilitation (CASVR). The training illustrated how managers and employees could use the services of CASVR with the RA process to assist employee recruitment as well as how VR along with RA can boost employee retention among the current workforce who experience a disability. The training also highlighted the 10-year historic partnership between the NESC and CSAVR and how the return on the investment made for the Service Center has been multifold. The benefits of the partnership include customized services, resources and consultations for needs such interpretative services, employment law, training, workplace assessments, outreach, recruitment and retention services. This training has approximately 100+ connections. Note: some connections had multiple employees in attendance. • The Pacific Southwest Region CRCS conducted four Functional Assistance Trips (FATs) in FY 2019: 1) Regional Office Engineering Staff (June 3-7, 2019); 2) Mendocino National

	Forest in northern California (July 29-August 1, 2019); 3) Regional Office Information Management (August 13, 2019); and 4) Sequoia National Forest (September 16-19 2019). Information packets were provided to all the employees and contained the RA Process. The packet also included EEO laws and policies that prohibit discrimination, prevent sexual harassment; a listing of contacts of the R5-CR staff and R5 Forest CR Officers; and resources and processes that are available to employees such as the CMP Program and the EEO Complaint Process.
--	---

MD-715 – Part H.2.

Agency EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency

Type of Program Deficiency	Brief Description of Program Deficiency
Part G - A.2. b.3.	Procedures for RA are posted on World Wide Web or Internet. This is covered under 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(5)

EEO Plan Objectives and Dates

Date Initiated	Objective	Target Date	Modified Date	Completion Date
10/01/2017	Ensure RA written materials are prominently posted in all personnel and EEO offices throughout the workplace to support informing <i>all employees and applicants</i> of the variety of EEO programs and administrative and judicial remedial procedures available. (A.2.b.3).	10/31/2019	10/31/2020	

Responsible Officials

Title	Name	Performance Standards Address the Plan?
Assistant Director, Accountability and Compliance, Office of Civil Rights	Christopher Moore	Yes
Assistant Director, Field Operations, Office of Civil Rights	Ricky D. Balolong	Yes
Branch Chief (Acting), Reasonable Accommodations, Office of Civil Rights	Sherry L. Neal	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objectives

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Completion Date
03/30/2019	1. Create and post on the FS WWW RA Procedures: approved by the EEOC	Yes	09/30/2020	
03/30/2019	2. Ensure approved RA Procedures contain a subsection featuring information to attain PAS.	Yes	03/30/2020	
02/15/2019	3. Provide a response to the US EEOC June 27, 2018 Technical Assistance Letter, regarding corrective actions. (Appendix C13)	Yes	02/15/2020	
05/30/2019	4. Establish numerical goals for PWD adopting the 12% goal for grade ranges GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to Senior Executive Service (SES).	Yes	05/30/2020	
09/30/2019	5. Submit compliant RA Procedures to EEOC for review prior to posts on Agency public website.	Yes	09/30/2020	

Report of Accomplishments

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The USDA FS adopted the PWD 12% numerical goal. USDA FS RA procedures were posted on the Agency public website which will change once the USDA finalized their policy and the USDA FS adopts it. Reasonable Accommodation Procedures Link: Designated an Acting Branch Chief for RA. Reasonable Accommodation Specialists were previously supervised by Service Center CR Directors in separate field units. Procedures that are being taken to address both internal and external website are being addressed to have the most up-to-date information regarding the RA Process, forms, RA Specialist contact information. Both websites will also address PAS, to include definitions, how to request PAS, request forms, processing timelines, and frequently asked questions. The recently drafted revised policy and procedures for RA will have a section that will address procedures for providing PAS for PWTD. NESC: Provides to all three units serviced written information on EEO programs, and administrative and judicial remedial procedures. This information is made available on at least an annual basis and readily provides information upon request. Additionally, whenever training is conducted such as our EEO Complaints Process (May 15) for Managers and EEO Complaints Process for Employees (June 5), written materials are made available to employees. ISC: During the 4th quarter, we identified the need to hold several EEO Trainings in FY20 and

	<p>are working with our Counselors and Office of General Council (OGC) to schedule some trainings in the Region. The RA Specialist conducted two training sessions at the Regional Office: one for supervisors and the other for all employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISC: The RA policy and SOPs are in the process of being updated in the 4th quarter and are scheduled to be rolled out beginning in FY 20 to all Regions. • PNWSC: August 12, 2019 – The Republic Ranger District held a RA Training session in which there were a total of 19 attendees. The 8-hour training session featured an Attorney trainer from OGC. Participants included all supervisors and leaders from the district, and representatives from HR, CR, ER, LR and RA participated. • RMSC: During the third quarter of FY 2019, four RA requests were submitted in the Rocky Mountain Service Center - three cases in Region 2, and one case in the Rocky Mountain Research Station. Three cases (75%) were processed within 30 days. One case was processed within 38 days. • During the 4th quarter Sherry Neal, Acting RA Branch Chief / R4 CR Director hosted weekly meetings and trainings on the new SOPs for the RA rewrites. She was training the specialists on the new procedures. Monthly Cross talks were held throughout the 4th quarter, where CR, ER, HR and Labor Relations met with the Deputy Regional Forests to update them on new or updated issues throughout the region. CR reported out on several EEO Cases that have been ongoing throughout the fiscal year. • Sherry Neal, Acting Branch Chief of RA provided weekly trainings to the RA Specialists in Quarter 4 as the SOPs have been updated and will take effect beginning of 1st quarter of FY20. The weekly trainings included soliciting input from the RA Specialists for the RA SOP, that included processing timelines.
--	---

MD-715 – Part H.3.

Agency EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

Statement of Model Program Essential Element Deficiency

Program Deficiency	Brief Description of Program Deficiency
Part G – A.1.a – b.	The Agency does not have an annual EEO Policy statement addressing all protected bases, which communicates the annual commitment to EEO for all employees and includes continual Barrier Analysis conduct and resulting remedial Action Plans.

Objectives and EEO Plan Dates

Date Initiated	Objective	Target Date	Modified Date	Completion Date
09/30/2019	Under the Secretary’s OneUSDA principles, we are awaiting USDA to issue an updated policy statement for all of USDA. The most current policy statement was issued in FY 2018.	09/30/2020		

Responsible Officials

Title	Name	Performance Standards Address the Plan?
National Civil Rights Director	Ted H. Gutman	Yes

Planned Activities Towards Objective Completion

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Completion Date
04/30/2020	1. Develop a USDA FS Barrier Analysis directive supporting identifying and removing EEO Barriers	Yes		
05/30/2020	2. Develop a USDA FS training module to assist Agency-wide BA conduct and EEO Barrier removal	Yes		
09/30/2020	3. Issue updated USDA FS EEO Policy statement among employees and officials upon release	Yes		

MD-715 – Part I.1.
Agency EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier

Statement of Condition

Trigger Source	Specific Workforce Data Table	Trigger Narrative Description
Workforce Data Tables	A14	Over the past three years, 0301 Hispanic Women (HW) have remained below their expected 5.30% Occupational CLF (OCLF) representation percentage.

Impacted Group

EEO Group
0301 Hispanic Women: GS-7 thru SES

Barrier Analysis Process

Data Sources	Source Reviewed?	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Percentages	Yes	Trigger data demonstrated a steady decline in population, promotion, new hires, and increased separations over the past several years
Promotion	Yes	See Appendix C19 Barrier Analysis
New Hires	Yes	
Separations	Yes	
Complaint Data (Trends)	Yes	EEO Complaint Trend Analyses Reports are developed and published on a quarterly basis
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	Not available
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	Yes	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	Yes	
Exit Interview (EI) Data	N/A	Not available
Focus Groups	Yes	Two Focus Groups planned for FY 2020

Data Sources	Source Reviewed?	Identify Information Collected
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	

Barrier Analysis Process Status

Barrier Analysis Process Completed?	Barrier Identified?
No	Not presently

Statement of Identified Barrier

Policy, Procedure, or Practice Description
The barrier has not yet been defined.

EEO Plan Objectives and Dates

Objective	Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding & Staffing?	Modified Date	Completion Date
To reduce 0301 HW separations and increase their OCLF percentages	08/01/2019	09/30/2020	Yes		

Responsible Officials

Title	Name	Performance Standards Address the Plan?
Director of Policy and Analysis, WEPO (Acting)	Ellen Shaw	Yes
National Federal Women's Program Manager	Dani Ramirez-Montoya	Yes
National Hispanic Employment Program Manager (Acting)	Fidel Trujillo	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date	Planned Activities	Modified Date	Completion Date
06/20/2019	1. Develop the Barrier Analysis Plan		06/20/2019
06/20/2019	2. Review trigger data		06/20/2019
06/30/2019	3. Review results		09/20/2019
09/10/2019	4. Plan and Conduct Focus Group interview of 0301 HW		09/20/2019
10/2019	5. Conduct Focus Group interviews		10/20/2019
12/10/2019	6. Review Focus Group data and define the 0301 barrier		12/10/2019
02/30/2020	7. Meet to discuss the 0301 Action Plan suggested career enhancement opportunity remedy – and how to measure impact.		
03/30/2020	8. Enact Action Plan		

Report of Accomplishments

FY	Accomplishments
2019	Developed a Barrier Analysis with data collection methods and selected a Focus Group interview to uncover barriers
2019	HRM provided a list of “74” 0301 Hispanic Women employees, who were subsequently contacted individually by email to support anonymity. Each person was individually invited to attend one or two Focus Group virtual discussions concerning 0301 Equal Employment Opportunities. The invitation gave invitees the option to participate in either or both of two ninety-minute sessions, on October 3 rd or 9 th . They were notified that each 90-minute session included a GS 14 0301 HW who would discuss her career, prior to a moderated question and answer open-forum discussion.
2019	Thirty-four 0301 HW accepted the emailed invitations to a focus group discussion.
2020	Focus group discussions completed. Barrier statement developed and report written. Action Plan going forward discussed. See FY2020 Quarterly Report 1.

MD-715 – Part J
**Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement,
and Retention of Persons with Disabilities**

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with reportable and PWTD 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) Yes X No
 - b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Yes X No

The grade level cluster for GS-01 to GS-10 is at 7.65% which is below the benchmark.
The grade level cluster for GS-11 to SES is at 7.15% which is below the benchmark.

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

MD-715 B Tables provide total workforce data for PWD, including grade, job series groupings, applicant flow, and selection rates.

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

The numerical goals are displayed on the Cultural Transformation Accountability Report (CTAR) and discussed during the Workforce Planning Sessions on the USDA Cultural Transformation Metrics.

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 PWD and PWTD administer the RA program and SEP, 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.

Yes X No

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	Full Time Employed Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Officials
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	

Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	132			Erica Nieto, Asst. Director, HR Field Operations erica.nieto@usda.gov
Answering public questions about hiring authorities that take disability into account	132			Erica Nieto, Asst. Director, HR Field Operations erica.nieto@usda.gov
Processing RA requests from applicants and employees	6			Sherry L. Neal, Branch Chief, Reasonable Accommodations (Acting) Sherry.Neal@usda.gov
Section 508 Compliance	1			Stacey Martinez Information Technology Specialist stacey.a.martinez@usda.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1			Matthew Arnn Chief Landscape Architect Recreation, Heritage, and Volunteer Resources matthew.arnn@usda.gov
SEP for PWD and PWTD	1		6	Gerald P. McGaughran Disability Employment Program Manager (DEPM) jerry.mcgaughan@usda.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.

Yes X No

The National DEPM and collateral duty SEPMS participate in quarterly meetings and training sponsored by the USDA OASCR. Personnel also participate in the Federal Exchange and Disability (FEED) meetings where participants learn about policies/guidelines, standard operating procedures, tools and partnerships. Some of the activities included with the FEED meetings can suffice as in-service training for practitioners.

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.

Yes X No

Section III: 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 PWD. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the agency’s recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD.

C. Plan to Identify Job Applicants with Disabilities:

1. Describe the programs and resources the Agency uses to identify job applicants with disabilities, including PWTD.

Key Programs, Resources, Strategies:

- The FY20 FS Recruitment Plans - participation with National Talent Acquisition Network and other coordinated national recruitment events focusing on outreach/ recruitment of PWD/PWTD candidates.
- Customized Recruitment Plans for specific event are developed, including assignment of members of the national cadre to attend each event.
- Recruiter cadre are trained/informed regarding updated guidance, use of Schedule A Authority, and shared key PWD/PWTD recruitment network sources.
- FY 20 FS Recruitment Plans will utilize recruitment sources including: Resume Mining USAJOBS, Department of Labor's Workforce Recruitment Program of Schedule A eligible college students and recent graduates, Job Corps Centers, POCs at local schools/colleges serving students with disabilities, American Job Centers, Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehab, National Employment Team (NET), Veteran Recruitment Agencies, Centers for Independent Living, Disability & Veterans Community Resources Directory, Employment Networks, and Recruit Ability.
- The FS negotiated the Union Agreement which supports flexibility of Selecting Officials to fill vacancies noncompetitively via Schedule A at any grade level.

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.

- HR conducts applicant eligibility reviews for competitive and non-competitive hiring authorities based on the area of consideration in a JOA and refers eligible applicants to the selecting officials.
- Agency Union Agreement supports flexibility of Selecting Officials to fill vacancies noncompetitively via Schedule A at any grade level.
- Agency Employment Outreach Database provides eligible external and internal Schedule A candidates the opportunity to respond directly to selecting officials posting Outreach Notices before officials have opted to post their vacancies on USAJobs and thus a chance of convincing officials, in advance, to consider or even select them noncompetitively, rather than proceeding to post their vacancy on USAJobs.

3. When individuals apply for positions under a hiring authority taking 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.

- Agency Union Agreement supports flexibility of Selecting Officials to fill vacancies noncompetitively via Schedule A at any grade level.
- Agency Employment Outreach Database provides eligible external and internal Schedule A candidates the opportunity to respond directly to Selecting Officials posting Outreach Notices before Officials have opted to post their vacancies on USAJobs and thus a chance of convincing Officials, in advance, to consider or even select them noncompetitively, rather than proceeding to post their vacancy on USAJobs.

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 types of training and frequency. If "no", describe the Agency plan to provide this training.

Yes X

No

N/A

All new Supervisors complete core training that includes updated modules on recruiting using Schedule A Authority, RA, and resources available through SEPs.

D. Plan to Establish Contacts with Disability Employment Organizations

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

- Agency Union Agreement supports flexibility of Selecting Officials to fill vacancies noncompetitively via Schedule A at any grade level.
- Agency Employment Outreach Database provides eligible external and internal Schedule A candidates the opportunity to respond directly to Selecting Officials posting Outreach Notices before Officials have opted to post their vacancies on USAJobs and thus a chance of convincing Officials, in advance, to consider or even select them noncompetitively, rather than proceeding to post their vacancy on USAJobs.
- The FY 20 FS Recruitment Plans - participation with NTAN and other coordinated national recruitment events focusing on outreach/ recruitment of PWD/PWTD candidates.
- Customized Recruitment Plans for specific event are developed, including assignment of members of the national cadre to attend each event.
- Recruiter cadre are trained/informed regarding updated guidance, use of Schedule A Authority, and shared key PWD/PWTD recruitment network sources.
- FY 20 FS Recruitment Plans will utilize recruitment sources including: Resume Mining USAJOBS, Department of Labor's WRP of Schedule A eligible college students and recent graduates, Job Corps Centers; and POCs at local schools/colleges serving students with disabilities, AJCs, Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation, NET, Veteran Recruitment Agencies, Centers for Independent Living, Disability & Veterans Community Resources Directory, ENs, and Recruit Ability.
- Agency negotiated Union Agreement supports flexibility of Selecting Officials to fill vacancies noncompetitively via Schedule A at any grade level.

E. 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?

- | | | | |
|---|-----|---|------|
| a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce PWD | Yes | X | No |
| b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce PWTD | Yes | | No X |

A trigger among permanent workforce New Hires: PWD are presently at 8.91% which is below the EEOC 12% goal. However, this number increased from 7.38% in FY 2018.

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 MCOs?

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----|----|-------|
| a. New Hires for MCO PWD | Yes | No | N/A X |
| b. New Hires for MCO PWTD | Yes | No | N/A X |

MD-715 Table B9 does not provide complete applicant flow rates for MCO job series. The only information available is the number and percentage of selections. In the meantime, other means are being developed to monitor this information.

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 MCO?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|
| a. Qualified Applicants for MCO PWD | Yes | No | N/A X |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO PWTB	Yes	No	N/A X
--------------------------------------	-----	----	-------

MD-715 Table B9 does not provide complete applicant flow rates for MCO job series. The only information available is the number and percentage of selections. In the meantime, other means are being developed to monitor this information.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTB among employees promoted to any of the MCO?

a. Promotions for MCO PWD	Yes	No X	N/A X
b. Promotions for MCO PWTB	Yes	No X	N/A X

MD-715 Table B9 does not provide complete applicant flow rates for MCO job series. The only information available is the number and percentage of selections. In the meantime, Other means are being developed to monitor this information.

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

A. Advancement Program Plan

Describe the Agency's plan to ensure PWD and PWTB have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

The Agency has two Leadership Training Programs: 1) The Senior Leader Program (SLP) follows a competitive internal selection process, with final vetting by the Agency's Executive Leadership Team; 2) The National New Leader Program. Any permanent employee with one full year of Agency service at the time of application submission can apply at the GS 7-11 level. Individuals are nominated for this program based on their desire and interest to develop their leadership potential and their high self-motivation to complete all requirements and participate fully in all components of the program. The unit will collect applications and establish its review process for prioritizing nominations. Once the applicant has completed their portion of the application package, the applicant will forward the package to their supervisor. The supervisor will then complete the supervisor assessment and endorsement and include with the application package. Employees with disabilities 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.

B. Career Development Opportunities

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

Methods are being developed to monitor and report this information, which is readily available to line officers and management officials through official request to the WO HRM DMAT. USDA is responsible for all aspects of SES program administration, selections and placements.

2. In the table below, please provide the data for career development opportunities that require competition and/or supervisory recommendation/approval to participate (Collection begins with the FY 2019 MD-715 report, which is due on February 28, 2020).

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs						
Fellowship Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						
Training Programs		80		0.00%		2.50%
Detail Programs						
Other Career Development Programs		429		1.17%		3.50%

Limited information was provided above. However, alternate reporting and monitoring methods are under development to report this information with more details, which is readily available to line officers and management officials through official request to the HRM Data Metrics and Analysis Team (DMAT).

3. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs?
- | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|----|-----|---|
| a. Applicants PWD | Yes | No | N/A | X |
| b. Selections PWD | Yes | No | N/A | X |

Methods are being developed to monitor and report this information, which is readily available to line officers and management officials through official request to the DMAT.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs identified?
- | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|----|-----|---|
| a. Applicants (PWTD) | Yes | No | N/A | X |
| b. Selections (PWTD) | Yes | No | N/A | X |

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 time-off awards, bonuses, or other incentives?
- | | | | |
|---|-----|----|----|
| a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) | Yes | No | X |
| b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWOD) | Yes | X | No |

The PWD inclusion rate was 76.10% compared to PWOD rate which is 76.25%

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?

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|----|---|
| a. Pay Increases PWD | Yes | No | X |
| b. Pay Increases PWTD | Yes | No | X |

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.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|----|----|---|
| a. Other Types of Recognition PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| b. Other Types of Recognition PWTD | Yes | No | NA | X |

Routinely, the Chief, Regional Foresters and Station Directors National Leadership Council reward employees through Honor Awards. Likewise, local line officers, managers, supervisors issue performance awards, and staff recommend “Spot Awards” (cash) or time-off awards. However, there is no existing structured report to document these trends. Therefore, the FS in the meantime is developing reports to track and monitor this information because the current tables do not.

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.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----|----|---|
| a. SES* | | | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| ii. Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| b. Grade GS-15 | | | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| ii. Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| c. Grade GS-14 | | | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| ii. Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| d. Grade GS-13 | | | | |
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |
| ii. Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA | X |

The USDA is responsible for all aspects of SES selections and placements. USDA, not the FS, hires SES employees. However, the FS monitors conversions from career appointments to SES and career appointments for both PWTD and PWD.

The FS is developing reports to track and monitor this information because the present tables do not. USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants.

- a. Internal Selections for Promotions SES
- b. Internal Selections for Promotions PWD 6/4.29%
- c. Internal Selections for Promotions PWD 16/6.11%
- d. Internal Selections for Promotions PWD 47/7.30%

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 triggers in the text box.

a. SES*				
i. Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
ii. Internal Selections PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
b. Grade GS-15				
iii. Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
iv. Internal Selections PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
c. Grade GS-14				
v. Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
vi. Internal Selections PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
d. Grade GS-13				
vii. Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
viii. Internal Selections PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X

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.

a. New Hires to SES* PWD	Yes	No	NA	X
b. New Hires to GS-15 PWD	Yes	No	NA	X
c. New Hires to GS-14 PWD	Yes	No	NA	X
d. New Hires to GS-13 PWD	Yes	No	NA	X

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your Agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels.

a. New Hires to SES* PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
b. New Hires to GS-15 PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
c. New Hires to GS-14 PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X
d. New Hires to GS-13 PWTD	Yes	No	NA	X

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants.

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 triggers in text box.

Executives:

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA X |

Managers:

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA X |

Supervisors

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWD | Yes | No | NA X |

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants.

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.

Executives:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |

Managers:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |

Supervisors:

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| i. | Qualified Internal Applicants PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |
| ii. | Internal Selections PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants

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?
- | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| a. | New Hires for Executives* PWD | Yes | No | NA X |
| b. | New Hires for Managers PWD | Yes | No | NA X |
| c. | New Hires for Supervisors PWD | Yes | No | NA X |

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants

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?
- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| a. | New Hires for Executives PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |
| b. | New Hires for Managers PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |
| c. | New Hires for Supervisors PWTD | Yes | No | NA X |

USA Staffing does not provide information on Qualified Internal Applicants

Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be a model employer for PWD, 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 PWDs; (2) describe efforts to ensure accessibility of technology and facilities; and (3) provide information on the RA program and workplace PAS.

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.

Yes No X

The FS is developing reports to track and monitor this information. Agency leaders may noncompetitively convert employees to the competitive service who have completed two or more years of satisfactory service on a non-temporary Schedule A appointment. FS encourages leaders/managers/supervisors to convert Schedule A employees. The conversion must be at the same grade level and a separate action processed for a career ladder promotion, if applicable. However, there is no requirement to convert the employee whom may remain under a Schedule A appointment.

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of PWDs?

a. Voluntary Separations PWD	Yes X	No
b. Involuntary Separations PWD	Yes X	No

Voluntary Separations: The inclusion rate for PWD is 9.71% compared to 7.99% for PWOD
Involuntary Separation: The inclusion rate for PWD is 10.32% compared to 7.39% for PWOD

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of PWTD?

a. Voluntary Separations PWTD	Yes X	No
b. Involuntary Separations PWTD	Yes X	No

Voluntary Separations: PWTD Inclusion: 8.21% compared to 8.12% for PWOTD
Involuntary Separation: PWTD Inclusion: 0.44% compared to 0.32% for PWOTD

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

Currently the EI Survey does not collect PWD or PWTD information. The Agency does however monitor separations by Nature of Action code. Based on this information, the most frequently occurring separations by Nature of Action codes are: Retirement-Voluntary; Resignation; and Termination-Appointment In (another federal agency).

B. Accessibility of Technology and Facilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 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.

The USDA FS public website at <https://www.fs.fed.us> contains a link to the USDA Accessibility Statement addressing rights under Section 508: plus a link to the Nondiscrimination Statement instructions on how to file a complaint. FS FY 2018 Facility Accessibility Survey Results is available in Appendices C17.

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.

The USDA FS public website at <https://www.fs.fed.us/recreation/programs/accessibility/> contains a section titled Accessibility Laws, Regulations, Policies and Guidelines. This section contains additional links to rights under ABA, ABAAS, Section 504, 508, and ADA Title V Section 508c: plus, a link to the nondiscrimination statement/instructions on how to file a complaint.

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

The FS continues administration of USDA Regulations 7 CFR Parts 15a through 15e, 7CFR Part 15.4 (a)(1), and USDA FS Manuals 1300, 6100, and 6600, and USDA FS Handbooks 1709.11; 2709.11; and 7309.11 to ensure Agency plans and practices implemented and monitored FY18-FY19 improve accessibility of Agency program information, facilities, and/or technology. Example 1: Updates to the USDA FS policy to ensure effective telecommunication system is in place and in use for applicants and beneficiaries. Example 2: Issuance of accessible and effective communications resources to guarantee electronic and information technology compliance in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Example 3: the USDA FS-Wide Facility Accessibility Survey and Program Results indicate the Agency' Recreation Site Maintenance and Capital Improvement Funding Program continues to focus on rehabilitation and/or replacement of facilities which are outdated and not in compliance with current accessibility guidelines. FY18-FY19 projects represent the improvements which are being made to administrative facilities, and recreation sites across the Agency to ensure that opportunities are available to PWDs. FY 2018 Facility Accessibility Survey Results are available in Appendix C17.

C. Reasonable Accommodation Program

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

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

The FY 2019 Average RA Request Processing Time Frame (10/1/2018 to 9/30/2019), is 79.55% or 80%, which is <-10.45% below the required 90% processed within the 30-day timeframe.

2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the Agency RA 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.

- RA procedures/policy posted, with addendum developed regarding provision of PAS.
- The Agency continues to display its [508 Accessibility Information](#) link on its front page (intranet/internet CR and USDA FS), with links included to pages on “Understanding Disabilities”, Awareness, Education and Training, FAQs, Web, Procurement, and Legal.

D. Personal Assistance Services Allowing Employees to Participate in the Workplace

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide 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.

The FS continues to enhance the quality of its customer service by continually educating employees, managers, and supervisors, through periodic training and resources posted on its Intranet website. Part H.2. advocates education and training of DEPM, supervisors, managers, and employees regarding building RA and PAS administration competencies.

Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO Harassment Complaint Data

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

Yes X No N/A

Through September 30, 2019, there were 22 of 55 complaints (40%) alleging harassment, compared to the government-wide average of 19.69%.

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?

Yes X No N/A

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.

There was one finding of discrimination issued during the EEOC Hearing process. As of September 30, 2019, corrective measures were being determined by the Agency based on an EEOC AJ Decision.

B. EEO Reasonable Accommodation Complaint Data

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?

Yes No N/A

Through September 30, 2019, there were 6 of 7 complaints (85.71%) alleging failure to provide an RA, compared to the government-wide average of 13.53%.

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

Yes No N/A

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

There was one (1) finding of discrimination issued during the EEOC Hearing process. As of September 30, 2019, corrective measures were being determined by the Agency based on an EEOC AJ Decision.

Section VII: 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?

Yes No

2. Has the Agency established a plan to correct the barriers involving PWD and/or PWTD?

Yes No N/A

3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barriers, including the identified barriers, objectives, responsible officials, planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments.

Trigger 1	PWDs grade level representation in GS-01 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES is 7.15% which is below EEO 12% (Table B-4 FY19 Q4).	
Barriers	This barrier is presently not defined.	
Objective	Identify a policy procedure or practice impacting PWD GS-1 to GS-10 and GS-11 to SES experience below expected levels and develop an Action Plan to support their numbers.	
Responsible Officials		Performance Standards Address the Plan?
FS Leadership, CR, and HRM Directors		No
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?		Barriers Identified?

A statistical analysis was conducted for total workforce participation of MD-715 tables B1, B3-1, B4		No		
Sources of Data		Sources Reviewed?	Identify Information Collected	
Workforce Data Tables		Yes	MD-715 B tables, Promotions, Awards, Separations, Leadership Opportunities	
Complaint Data (Trends)		Yes	Data is provided in Quarterly EEO Complaint Trend analysis reports	
Grievance Data (Trends)		Yes	Working to make this data available	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)		No		
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)		No	FEVS and Unit Surveys	
Applicant Flow Data		N/A	Temporarily unavailable.	
Focus Groups		No		
Interviews		No		
Surveys		No		
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No		
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding	Modified Date	Completion Date
09//30/2020	Manager Barrier Analysis Training			
09/30/2020	Collect PWD GS-11 to SES applicant flow data			
09//30/2020	Conduct PWD GS-11 to SES Focus Groups or surveys to find out their opinion what is causing low numbers			
09//30/2020	Conduct PWD GS-11 to SES Hiring Manager Focus Groups or surveys to learn low number source			
09/30/2018	Train SCS to conduct BA SC Training to supporting uncovering local PWD GS-11 to SES barriers	Yes	09/30/2020	
09/30/2018	CR, HRM and WEPO will collaborate to edit data collections, and suggest additional data fields to add to increase data value	Yes	09/30/2020	
FY	Accomplishments			
2019	Collected trigger data demonstrating PWD Grade related Barriers exist			
2019	Selected one PWD Group to focus FY 2020. Barrier Analysis efforts			

1. Please explain the factors that prevented the Agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

N/A

2. For the completed planned activities describe the actual activity impact toward eliminating the barriers.

Collected trigger data among a selected group of PWDs, supporting uncovering EEO barrier and implementing a successful Action Plan.

3. If the planned activities did not correct the triggers and/or barriers, please describe how the Agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

N/A

Trigger 2	PWD GS-11 to SES are separating at rates exceeding their permanent workforce participation rates.			
Barrier	Barriers impacting PWD GS-11 to SES separation rates are presently unknown.			
Objective	Identify a policy procedure or practice impacting PWD GS-11 to SES experience below expected levels and develop an Action Plan to support their numbers.			
Responsible Officials		Performance Standards Address the Plan?		
FS Leadership, WEPO, CR and HRM Directors		No		
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?		Barriers Identified?		
No		No		
Data Sources	Sources Reviewed?	Identify Information Collected		
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	MD-715 B Tables, Promotions, Awards, Separations		
Complaint Data	N/A	We in the process of adding PWD info to this report.		
Grievance Data	N/A	We in the process of adding PWD info to this report.		
Decisions Findings	No			
Climate Assessment Survey: FEVS	Yes	FEVS and Unit Surveys		
EI Survey Data	N/A	We in the process of adding PWD info to this report.		
Focus Groups	No			
Interviews	No			
Reports	No			
Other	No			
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding	Modified Date	Completion Date
06/01/2020	Amend Complaint data collection parameters to include more definitive demographics: PWD status, GS Level	Yes		
07/30/2020	Review PWD GS-11 to SES complaints data to inform this barrier analysis	Yes		
07/30/2020	Collect and review PWD GS-11 to SES Exit surveys and comments about why they are leaving	Yes		
07/30/2020	Conduct PWD GS-11 to SES Focus groups research to learn why numbers are low	Yes		
07/30/2020	Develop and deploy a PWD GS-11 to SES Survey			

	to learn why numbers are low	Yes		
07/30/2020	Develop and Conduct a PWD GS-11 to SES hiring manager Focus group experience or survey	Yes		
08/30/2020	Review data and define the barrier	Yes		
09/30/2020	Develop Barrier Action Plan and communicate to USDA FS SCs	Yes		
09/30/2020	Present end of FY Results	Yes		
FY	Accomplishments			
2019	Collected trigger data demonstrating a PWD Barrier exists over multiple years.			
2019	Selected PWD Groups to focus Barrier Analysis upon: PWD GS-11 to SES			
2019	Determined continuous PWD GS-11 to SES below expected numbers over multiple years indicating a barrier exists.			

1. Please explain the factors that prevented the Agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

N/A

2. For the planned activities that were completed, please describe the actual impact of those activities toward eliminating the barriers.

Uncovered trigger data among PWD GS-11 to SES PWDs, indicates a barrier exists. We are in the process of defining the barrier and developing an Action Plan to impact it.

3. If the planned activities did not correct the triggers and/or barriers, please describe how the Agency intends to improve the plan for the next fiscal year.

We are presently collecting data to define the barrier among PWD GS-11 to SES resulting in below expected WF numbers.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Number	Title	Location
C1:	Organizational Chart	Tab 1
C2:	EEO Policy Statement	Tab 2
C3:	Strategic Plan	Tab 3
C4:	Anti-Harassment Policy and Procedures	Tab 4
C5:	Federal EO Recruitment Program Report (FEORP)	Tab 8
C6:	Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) Report	Tab 9
C7:	462 No Fear Report	Tab 10
C8:	Part G - Self-Assessment	Tab 11
C9:	FY 2019 Third Quarter MD-715 Report	Tab 12
C10:	FY 2018 USDA FS Civil Rights Compliance Review	Tab 13
C11:	FY 2018 Workforce A and B Tables	Tab 14
C12:	Continuing EEO Programs Establishment and Certification	Tab 15
C13:	Diversity & Inclusion Plan	Tab 16
C14:	Diversity Policy Statement	Tab 17
C15:	FEVS Results	Tab 18
C16:	Part F - Continuing EEO Programs Establishment and Certification	Tab 19
C17:	FY 2019 Civil Rights Compliance Review	Tab 20
C18:	301 Hispanic Women's Barrier Analysis and Action Plan	Tab 21
C19:	Employee Conduct Policy	Tab 22
C20:	FY 2019 Example Quarterly MD-715 Report	Tab 23
C21:	Part J Diversity Observance Calendar	Tab 24

ACRONYMS

ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution	NET	National Employment Team
AI/AN	American Indian/Alaska Native	NFC	National Finance Center
CLF	Civilian Labor Force	NESC	Northeastern Service Center
CMP	Conflict Management and Prevention	NNEO	National New Employee Orientation
CAD	Communicating Across Distances	NH/OPI	Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
CLF	Civilian Labor Force	NTAN	National Talent Acquisition Network
CASVR	Consortium of State Administrators for Vocational Rehabilitation	OCLF	Occupational Civilian Labor Force
CR	Civil Rights	OCR	Office of Civil Rights
CTAR	Cultural Transformation Accountability Report	PAS	Personal Assistance Services
EEO	Equal Employment Opportunity	PWD	Persons with Disabilities
DEPM	Disability Employment Program Manager	PWOD	Persons Without Disabilities
DVAAP	Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program	PWTD	Persons with Targeted Disabilities
EEOC	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	RA	Reasonable Accommodation
EI	Exit Interview	SEP	Special Emphasis Program
EN	Employment Networks	SEPM	Special Emphasis Program Manager
FEORP	Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program	SLP	Senior Leadership Program
FS	Forest Service	SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
FY	Fiscal Year	USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
HRM	Human Resources Management	VR	Vocational Rehabilitation
IITF	International Institute of Tropical Forestry	WEPO	Work Environment Performance Office
MCO	Mission-Critical Occupation	WO	Washington Office
MD	Management Directive	WRP	Workforce Recruitment Program
MLP	Middle Leader Program	WEPO	Work Environment and Performance Office
MCO	Mission-Critical Occupation		