

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

**PART J: SPECIAL PROGRAM PLAN FOR
THE RECRUITMENT, HIRING,
ADVANCEMENT, AND RETENTION OF
PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES FY21**

Part J: Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for persons with disabilities (PWD) and those with targeted disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 CFR 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention during the entire life cycle of applicants and employees with disabilities. All agencies, regardless of size, must complete this Part of the MD-715 report.

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)	Yes	X		No
b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)	Yes			NoX

Analysis of DIA employees shows that 13.97% of the total permanent workforce had a reported disability. Segmented by grade cluster, 11.68% of the GS-1 to GS-10 population had a reported disability and 14.18% of the GS-11 to SES population had a reported disability.

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)	Yes			NoX
b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)	Yes			NoX

Analysis of DIA employees shows that 2.83% of the total permanent workforce had a targeted disability. Segmented by grade cluster, 2.11% of the GS-1 to GS-10 population had a targeted disability and 2.90% of the GS-11 to SES population had a targeted disability.

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

- In FY21, the MD-715 Program Manager along with EO leadership briefed the six essential elements and demographic data finding from the MD-715 to Key Leaders across the Agency.
- EO/OHR Recruitment Partnership Committee continues to meet periodically to discuss targeted recruitment efforts, encourage information sharing and explore cross-training opportunities. In partnership with EO, the DIA Recruitment Team continues to utilize the MD-715 in the selection of recruitment events (career fairs and information sessions) and targeted academic institutions.
- In FY21, Barrier Analysis Working Group gathered data on promotions and persons with disabilities.

Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to the regulations implementing Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 CFR §1614.203), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training, and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the Agency has in place.

A. Plan to Provide Sufficient & Competent Staffing for the Disability Program

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

Yes X

No

NIA

4. Identify all Agency staff responsible for implementing the Agency’s disability employment program by the office, staff employment status, and point of contact.

Disability Program Task	Office/Division Responsible (EEO/ HR/ IT/ Facilities)	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Primary Point of Contact (Name, Title)
		Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWID	OHR				
Answering questions from public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	OHR				
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees with disabilities.	EO	3		3	Donna Welch, Policy and Compliance Division Chief, EO, donna.welch@dodiis.mil

Section 508 Compliance	CIO, 508 Compliance Office	4			Douglas O. Cossa, Chief Information Officer, douglas.cossa@dodiis.mil
					Paula Castro, 508 Coordinator, Paula.Castro@dodiis.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	FAC	1			Michael Brobeck Director of Facilities, Michael.Brobeck2@dodiis.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTB	BO	1			Colby Dillard, Disability Program Manager, Colby.dillard@dodiismil

2. 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 full-time staff responsible for processing reasonable accommodation requests has been sufficiently trained; training completed includes the EEOC's Disability Program Managers Course and routine webinars offered by EO practitioners. In addition, the staff attends a weekly collaboration meeting with RA counterparts across the federal government increasing information sharing, best practices, and opportunities to attend training. Collateral duty staff members have completed EEOC Counselors course, mediation, and all attend disability focused webinars.

B. Plan to Ensure Sufficient Funding for the Disability Program

1. Has the Agency provided sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program during the reporting period?

Yes X No

2. Describe the steps that the Agency has taken to ensure all aspects of the disability program have sufficient funding and other resources

- In FY21, 38% of the EO's total budget was allocated to the disability program (compared to 24.66% in FY20).
- In FY22, RA office acquired one additional staff billet.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

Section III: Plan to Recruit and Hire Persons with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 CFR 1614.203(d)(1)(i) and (ii), agencies must establish a plan to increase the recruitment and hiring of persons with disabilities. The questions below are designed to identify outcomes of the Agency's recruitment program plan for PWD and PWTD, such as whether the Agency has a numerical hiring goal, and whether the Agency uses the Schedule A hiring authority or other hiring authorities that take disability into account, during this reporting period.

- The DIA Strategic Programs Recruitment Team Executes and supports strategic recruitment efforts at the Agency level. In FY21, the team collaborated with Agency directorates, commands, discipline SMEs and career field representatives to participate in 49 events: 13 STEM, 5 Veteran, and 36 General. Of these 49 events, 35 were in-person and 14 were virtual.
- The OHR Internship Team participates in the WRP monthly steering committee meetings to discuss lessons learned and share best practices to enhance DoD's and DIA's population of PWD. In collaboration with the Recruiting Team, the Internship Team met with career development officials and hiring managers to assess/adjust processes to effectively use the Internship Programs (to include WRP) to support the Agency's future mission requirements.
- In FY21, the DIA WWP managed 5 WW interns and attended approximately 5 DoD and TC recruiting events. These were convened to strengthen and enhance recruitment partnerships and to integrate and align common recruitment practices.

1. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. 1614.203(a)(3), describe your 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.

DIA does not have a hiring authority equivalent to Schedule A with the goal recruiting and hiring PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
 Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

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

DIA does not have a hiring authority equivalent to Schedule A with the goal recruiting and hiring PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

3. Has the Agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the Agency's plan to provide the training.

Yes No *N/A X*

DIA does not use Schedule A hiring authority because it is an excepted service organization. EO plans to inform management about the use of Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) as a hiring option. DIA already utilizes WWP and other Veteran and disability related hiring pools.

B. 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.

The DIA WWP strategic outreach efforts in the NCR includes six recruiting events that were held in the NCR, two events were virtual. These events are outlined in the table below.

Event Name	Event Type	Event Location	Population
FT Belvoir Soldier Removal Unit (SRU) Career Education Readiness (CER) Fall Festival	Ft. Belvoir Military Event	Ft. Belvoir	PWD/PWTD
WW Pram Hiring event	Ft. Belvoir Military Event	Ft. Belvoir	PWD/PWTD
OWF-E2I Virtual Federal Internship and Employment Fair	Virtual Event	Virtual Event	PWD/PWTD
Cleared Virtual Hiring Fair Defense, IT, Cyber & Intel	Virtual Event	Virtual Event	PWD/PWTD
WW Event at Fort Belvoir	Ft. Belvoir Military Event	Ft. Belvoir	PWD/PWTD
Ft. Belvoir for the SRU	Ft. Belvoir Military Event	Ft. Belvoir	PWD/PWTD

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

C. Progression Towards Goals (Recruitment and Hiring)

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

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

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

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? "yes", please describe the triggers below.

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Yes No

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Yes No

Data analyzed for the 0132, 0301, and 2210 mission critical occupations shows a higher-than-expected percentage of applicants who did not report a disability. With applicants who identify as not having a disability 88.55% for the 0132 MCO, 100% for the 0301 MCO, and 88.33% for the 2210 MCO, PWD would fall short of the 12% benchmark.

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? "yes", please describe the triggers below.

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Yes No

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Yes No

For promotions in the MCO (0132 Occupational Series), PWD applicants represented 7.90% of the qualified pool compared to the relevant applicant pool at 13.57% (5.67 percentage point gap). In the MCO (0301), PWD applicants represented 5.43% of the qualified pool compared to the relevant applicant pool at 14.19% (8.76 percentage point gap). In the MCO (2210), PWD applicants represented 5.66% of the qualified pool compared to the relevant applicant pool at 15.82% (10.16 percentage point gap).

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations? "yes", please describe the triggers below.

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Yes No

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Yes No

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

Although qualified applications fell well below relevant pool representation for all MCOs, PWD and PWID representation for applicants selected for promotion was consistent with qualified applicant pool representation.

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

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

A. Advancement Program Plan

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

DIA is committed to ensuring that PWD, including PWID, have sufficient opportunities for advancement. DIA's talent management system encompasses the Agency's plan to ensure advancement opportunities for all employees. It represents a holistic approach to develop and retain a world-class cadre of intelligence officers and leaders to meet the Agency's vital mission. The focus is on developing each officer's skills to meet the demands of a worldwide Defense Intelligence Enterprise.

The system comprises three components: career development (including CBTO), promotions, and assignments. Each component plays an equal part in developing all DIA Officers. The career development pillar encourages employees to focus on strengthening their experience, training and qualifications to help identify interests and define career paths. When employees are ready for more responsibility and consistently demonstrate their ability to work at the higher level of responsibility, they can be evaluated on their qualifications against standard criteria in the promotion process. Finally, employees may seek advancement and broaden their career through meaningful job assignments cross the Agency's worldwide enterprise via rotations and positions in the career marketplace.

B. Career Development Opportunities

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

The career broadening training opportunities (CBTO) program enables DIA employees to participate in advanced learning and development programs that are available externally through seats allocated to DIA or publicly accessible. Fourteen programs include training for short-term and long-term study at various governmental and non-governmental institutions. Employees are selected to attend based on their ability to demonstrate excellence across the following leadership competencies: Enterprise Perspective, Information Sharing, Integration and Organizational Awareness. These opportunities enhance workforce knowledge, abilities, and skills in order to support the DIA mission and become more well-rounded DoD and Inter-Agency leaders. DIA civilians' grades 007 through GS 15 are eligible to apply for Career Broadening and Training Opportunities upon completion of two years of continued service with DIA and fulfillment of their probationary status. Programs include DoD's Service Schools and War Colleges, Office of Personnel Management (OPM) leadership programs and full-time university study.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
 Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs	8.86%	17.84%	4.36%	9.71%	0.85%	1.94%
Fellowship Programs (CBTO)	0.43%	0.02%	8.70%	9.09%	0.00%	0.00%
Mentoring Programs	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
Coaching Programs	5.90%	5.90%	1027%	1027%	1.51%	1.51%
Training Programs	0.45%	0.18%	1493%	19.05%	2.99%	2.99%
Detail Programs (IDA)	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available
Other Career Development Programs	NIA	NIA	NIA	NIA	NIA	NIA

Note: Internship Applicant percentages represent the percentage of FY21 applicants that consisted of interns, while the selectees represent the percentage of selections that interns represented

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

3 Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (the appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for the applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|----|
| a. Qualified Applicants (PWD) | Yes X | No |
| b. Selections (PWD) | Yes X | No |

PWD applied for a CBTO at a lower rate based on their representation in the applicant pool (from GS-10 thru SES). PWD were selected for a CBTO at a lower rate based on their applications (from GS-10 thru GS-14). Data shows that GS-10 thru GS-12 PWD were 12.05% of the applicant pool for CBTOs, but there were no applications for GS-10 thru GS-12. GS-13 and GS-14 PWD were 14.97% of the applicant pool for CBTOs and represented 12.50% (2.47 percentage point gap). GS-15 and SES PWD were 13.97% of the applicant pool for CBTOs but were not represented in the GS-15 and SES CBTO applications.

4 Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs identified? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|----|
| a. Qualified Applicants (PWD) | Yes X | No |
| b. Selections (PWD) | Yes X | No |

PWTD were not selected for a CBTO at any grade in FY21 and experienced lower than expected applications rates at all levels as well. Data shows that GS-10 thru GS-12 PWTD were 1.99% of the relevant applicant pool but accounted for 0.00% of CBTO applications. GS-13 and GS-14 PWTD were 3.23% of the relevant applicant pool but only accounted for 2.50% of CBTO applications (0.73 percentage point gap).

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)
Model Agency Accomplishment Report - FY21

C. Awards

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

- | | | |
|---|-------|------|
| a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) | Yes | No X |
| b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWID) | Yes X | No |

In FY21, the Agency identified a trigger involving the percentage of PWD and PWTD who received incentives. The following are the identified deficiencies (barrier analysis plan provided below):

Monetary Awards:

PWID received monetary awards in the \$2000 - \$2999 category at a lower rate (19.60%) than PWOD (24.82%), which is a 5.22 percentage point gap.

PWID received monetary awards in the \$5000 or more category at a slightly lower rate (9.22%) than PWOD (10.58%), which is a 1.36 percentage point gap

Time-Off Awards:

PWID received time-off awards in the 11 -20-hour category at a lower rate (10.77%) than PWOD (17.92%), which is a 7.15 percentage point gap.

PWID received time-off awards in the 31-40-hour category at a lower rate (3.85%) than PWOD (6.56%), which is a 7.15 percentage point gap.

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

- | | | |
|-------------------------|-----|------|
| a. Pay Increases (PWD) | Yes | No X |
| b. Pay Increases (PWID) | Yes | No X |

Using the inclusion rate as a benchmark, PWOD received quality step increases at a rate of 28% while PWD were awarded at a rate of 1.5% (1.3% percentage point gap) and PWID were awarded at a rate of 10% (1.8% percentage point gap).

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|----|------|
| a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) | Yes | No | NA X |
| b. Other Types of Recognition (PWID) | Yes | No | NA X |

I DIA does not have any other recognition programs.

D. Promotions

1. Does your Agency have a trigger involving _____ among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

- SES Promotion: PWD represented 14.23% of the relevant applicant pool and 12.37% of qualified internal applicants (1.86 percentage point gap) and were selected at 9.52% (2.85 percentage point gap).
- GS-15 Promotions: PWD represented 15.97% of the relevant applicant pool and 8.15% of qualified internal applicants (7.82 percentage point gap).
- GS-14 Promotion: PWD represented 14.36% of the relevant applicant pool and 4.77% of qualified internal applicants (9.59 percentage point gap).
- GS-13 Promotion: PWD represented 12.53% of the relevant applicant pool and 5.80% of qualified internal applicants (6.73 percentage point gap).

2. Does your Agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non--GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If " yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

- SES Promotion: PWTD were not selected for a promotion compared to 4.12% of the qualified internal applicants (4.12 percentage point gap).
- GS-15 Promotions: PWTD represented 4.19% of the qualified applicant pool and 2.68% of applicants selected for promotion (15.1percentage point gap).

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your Agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

N/A

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your Agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

N/A

5. Does your Agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

- At the Executive stage, PWD were 15.41% of the relevant applicant pool and 8.89% of qualified applicants (6.52 percentage point gap).
- At the Manager stage, PWD were 13.80% of the relevant applicant pool and 5.19% of qualified applicants (8.61 percentage point gap).
- At the Supervisors stage, PWD were 25.00% of the qualified pool and 0.00% of the internal selections. (11.19 percentage point gap).

6. Does your Agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives

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

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Yes	NoX
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Yes	NoX

c. Supervisors

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

At the Executive stage, PWTB were 4.17% of qualified internal applicants and 2.35% of selections (1.82 percentage point gap).
 At the Supervisor stage, PWTB were 2.01% of the relevant applicant pool and 0.00% of qualified applicants (2.01 percentage point gap).

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your Agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)	Yes	No X
b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)	Yes	No X
c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)	Yes	No X

N/A

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your Agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Yes No X
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Yes No X
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Yes No X

N/A

Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

- Voluntary and Involuntary Separations

1. In this reporting period, did the Agency fail to convert all of the eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 CFR 2133.102(u)(6)(i))? If "yes", please explain why the Agency did not convert all eligible Schedule A employees.

Yes No N/A X

DIA does not hire under the Schedule A hiring authority as an Excepted Service organization.

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

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

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If "yes", describe the trigger below.

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

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

Exit interview results are not available.

- Accessibility of Technology and Facilities

Pursuant to 1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform job applicants and employees of their accessibility rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Architectural Barriers Act and explain how to file complaints under those laws. In addition, agencies are also 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 of 1973, including a description of how to file a complaint.

<https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508.aspx>
"For persons with disabilities experiencing difficulties accessing content on a particular website, please use the form@DoD Section 508 Form. In this form, please indicate the nature of your accessibility issue or question"
DoD Section 508 Issues, Complaints and Concern Form <https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Section-508-Form/>

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 of 1968, including a description of how to file a complaint.

- Clearance is approved for text of product only – not content found beyond the hyperlinks. The appearance of external hyperlinks does not constitute endorsement by the United States Department of Defense (DoD) for the linked websites, the information, the products, or the services contained therein. The DoD does not exercise any editorial, security, or other control over the information you may find in these locations.

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

- In FY21, DIA developed the Reasonable Accommodation Steering Committee (RASC). The purpose the RASC is to develop a team of stakeholders from across the agency to discuss reasonable accommodation needs/concerns based upon functional responsibility areas. The purpose is to establish processes identifying how the reasonable accommodation team can best engage and achieve successful accommodation outcomes. As a result, the team has developed process maps and process improvements for the development of the RA Standards Operating Procedures (SOP).
- In September 2021, The DIA IT Accessibility Program Management Office (PMO) held DIA's first ever IT Accessibility Symposium to promote awareness of accessibility issues covered by Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.
- DIA Accessibility PMO developed the DIA Accessibility Course (annual/mandatory) schedule for release May 2022.
- The DIA IT Accessibility PMO is launching DIA's IT Accessibility Advocacy Program for May 2022.

• Reasonable Accommodation Program

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

4. 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 interpretive services.)

Average time frame for processing reasonable accommodations from completed request (Appendix A and medical documentation when necessary) to decision letters is 5 days. The exception is software requests and reassignments, which can take additional time due to software testing for IC security compliance or additional position vetting from OHR. The time taken to process reasonable accommodations has significantly improved from the reported 18days inFY19.

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

The Reasonable Accommodations team has processed 88.9% within the timeframe set in DIA policy. On average the decision letters are provided to customers within 5 days of the completed request which is well under the 30 business days in DIA policy. In FY21, the RA team provided both in office and at-home accommodations to employees with or needing reasonable accommodations implemented as the Agency continues to navigate the COVID-19 pandemic. As guidance in reference to COVID-19 continues to evolve, in particular for high-risk personnel, the Reasonable Accommodation team provided ad hoc training at the Agency, Directorate, and Office level. These trainings allowed reasonable accommodation questions to be addressed in conjunction with Agency COVID-19 guidance; thus, boosting the visibility of the program, and increasing request. In FY21, 13 Reasonable Accommodation trainings were instructed.

- **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 personal assistance services to employees who need them because of a targeted disability, unless doing so would impose an undue hardship on the Agency.

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

EO is in the process of acquiring contactors to support the PAS program. Once the program is ready to stand up DIA will update the draft PAS policy. If a requester request PAS, the request is facilitated by the RA team in coordination with an existing contract with the medical clinic for coordination.

Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO Complaint Data Involving the Failure to Accommodate

1. Did failure to accommodate fall within the top three issues alleged in the Agency's EEO counseling activity during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

2. Did failure to accommodate fall within the top three issues alleged in the Agency's formal complaints during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

3. In cases alleging the failure to provide reasonable accommodation, did any result in a finding against the Agency or a settlement agreement during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

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

There were no findings against the Agency. A settlement agreement occurred for the one complaint on a failure to provide reasonable accommodation.

B. EEO Complaint Data Involving Discrimination Based on Disability Status (Excluding Failure to Accommodate)

1. Did disability status fall within the top three bases alleged in the Agency's EEO counseling activity during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

2. Did disability status fall within the top three bases alleged in the Agency's formal complaints during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

3. In cases alleging discrimination based on disability status, did any result in a finding against the Agency or a settlement agreement during the last fiscal year?

Yes No NIA

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

There were no findings against the Agency. A settlement agreement occurred for the two complaints based on disability.

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 the employment opportunities of PWD and/or PWTD?

Yes No X

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

Yes No N/A X

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

Identified Trigger #1

Trigger 1	InFY21, DIA had a slight underrepresentation of PWD and PWTD at the GS 1- GS 10 levels at 11.68% PWD when compared to the Federal benchmark of 12% for PWD (0.32 percentage point gap). PWTD are voluntarily separating at a higher rate (4.56%) than PWOTD (3.40%), 1.17 percentage point gap. PWTD are involuntarily separating at a higher rate (0.35%) higher rate than PWOTD (0.09%), 0.26 percentage point gap.	
Barrier(s)	Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.	
Objective(s)	Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.	
Responsible Official(s)	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)	
EO, Office of Human Resources (OHR), Career Development Officers (CDOs)	Yes (EO)	
Barrier Identified (Yes or No?)	Barrier Analysis Completed? (Yes or No?)	
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	Review of Tables B1, B4
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	

Grievance Data (Trends)		No			
Findings from Decisions (e.g. EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)		No			
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)		No			
Exit Interview Data		No			
Focus Groups		No			
Interviews		No			
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No			
Other (Please Describe)		No			
#	Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date	Completion Date
1	09/30/2021	Development of PAS policy	No	09/30/2022	
2	09/30/2019	The Barrier Analysis working group will conduct barrier analysis into identified triggers and coordinate with stakeholders to develop action plan(s) to address the root cause(s).	Yes	05/30/2023	
3	09/30/2020	OHR will include BO to review and conduct oversight on the review and oversight of all DIA recruiting strategies and goals and recruiting materials (including websites and printed materials).	Yes		09/30/2020
4	09/30/2020	Career Development Officers will require all individuals involved in any step of the recruiting process - including resume reviewers, recruiting event attendees, hiring panel members, and writing test raters - to complete the "Equal Opportunity & Diversity Course" and Unconscious bias training.	Yes	09/30/2022	

5	09/30/2020	EO and OHR will conduct an informational campaign on Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) to encourage Agency-wide increased usage of this program.	Yes		03/01/2020
---	------------	--	-----	--	------------

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

For planned activities with modified dates, DIA pushed back the target dates due to impact of COVID-19.

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

The ability to track PWD and PWTD data across the employee lifecycle enables a more accurate analysis of workforce data to conduct barrier analysis.

EO's inclusion into the recruitment review and conduct oversight ensures PWD and PWTD inclusion into recruitment strategies and goals.

The Disability Program team will continue to collaborate with various Agency directorates to conduct outreach efforts and increase Agency usage of the Workforce Recruitment Program.

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

N/A

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
 (DIA)

Identified Trigger #2

Trigger 1	In FY21, internal promotions in the 0132, 0301, and 2210 mission critical occupational series for PWD shows that PWD employees were less likely to apply for a promotion. In the 0132 MCO, data identified triggers when applying for promotion with 7.90% compared to 13.57% in the relevant applicant pool (5.67percentage point gap). In the 0301 MCO, data identified triggers when applying for promotion with 5.43% compared to 14.19% in the relevant applicant pool (8.76 percentage point gap). In the 2210 MCO, data identified triggers when applying for promotion with 5.66% compared to 15.82% in therelevant applicant pool (10.16 percentage point gap). For PWTD, data identified similar disparities with regards to the 2210 mission critical occupations as they applied for promotion at a rate of 3.28% compared to 4.72% in the qualified internal applicant pool (1.44 percentage point gap).	
Barrier(s)	Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.	
Objective(s)	Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.	
Responsible Official(s)	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)	
EO and Office of Human Resources (OHR)	No	
Barrier Analysis Process Completed (Yes or No)?	Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)	
No	No	
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	Review of Tables B6, B7, B5
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Finding from Decisions (e.g. EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	No	

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
 (DIA)

Focus Groups		No			
Interviews		No			
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No			
Other (Please Describe)					
#	Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date	Completion Date
1	09/30/2020	Analyze data to determine if reasonable accommodations for PWD /PWID are a factor affecting promotion qualification.	Yes	04/29/2022	
2	09/30/2020	Analyze data to determine if mobility requirements for CBTO is resulting in a lower-than-expected CBTO participation rate for PWD /PWID and if this is a factor affecting promotion qualification.	Yes	04/29/2022	
FY21 Accomplishment: Based on FY21 data, the FY19 MD-715 trigger of PWD and PWTD underrepresentation within internal promotions in the 2210 mission critical series no longer exists.					

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

NIA

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

NIA

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

NIA

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
 (DIA)

Identified Trigger #3

Trigger3	PWD applied for a CBTO at a lower rate based on their representation in the applicant pool (from GS- 10thru SES). PWD were selected for a CBTO at a lower rate based on their applications (from GS-10 thru GS-14). Data shows that GS-10 thru GS-12 PWD were 12.13% of the applicant pool for CBTOs and represented only 5.13% of CBTO applications (-7 percentage point gap) and 0% of selections (-5.13percentage point gap). GS-13 and GS-14 PWD were 15.16% of the applicant pool for CBTOs and represented 12.59% (-2.57 percentage point gap) and 9.09% of selections (-3.5 percentage point gap). GS-15 and SES PWD were 14.75% of the applicant pool for CBTOs and represented 10.53% of CBTO applications (4.22 gap) PWID were not selected for a CBTO (from GS-10 thru GS-14). Data shows that GS-10 thru GS-12 PWTD were 2.56% of CBTO applications and 0% of selections (-2.56 percentage point gap). GS-13 and GS-14 PWTD were 2.96% of CBTO applications and 0% of selections (-2.96 percentage point gap).	
Barrier(s)	Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the year-round barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.	
Objective(s)	Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.	
Responsible Official(s)	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)	
EO, Office of Human Resources (OHR), Academy for Defense Intelligence (ADI)	No	
Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)	
No	No	
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	MD-715 Table B7, BS
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti- Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g. FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	No	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
 (DIA)

Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No			
Other (Please Describe)					
#	Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date	Completion Date
	01/30/2022	Coordinate with ADI and CDOs to define a process to provide EO with CBTO applicant demographic data from both the CBTO Directorate Level Panels.	Yes		
2	01/30/2023	Once the Barrier Analysis Working Group is stood up, conduct barrier analysis into the entire CBTO lifecycle process.	Yes		

FY21 Accomplishments:

- CBTO created a NIPR channel on MS Teams to help advertise for CBTO.
- COVID-19 delayed the use of the overview tab function for the directorate level panel, which was created in February/March 2020. OHR plans to use overview tab function in May 2021 for the Academic programs' applications. This oversight build is for the directorate level panel to complete the scoring process on the CBTO portal will efficiently track the directorate level panel and consolidate where the panel process takes place. Allows directorates to use the portal and easier for panel members to score and provide feedback to applicant. This will create a one stop shop for the whole CBTO process (from the local, directorate, and Agency level review process).
- Based on the FY21 data, the FY21 data, the FY MD-715 trigger of PWTD applied for a CBTO at a lower rate based their representation in the applicant pool at GS-15 and SES no longer exists.

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

NIA

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
(DIA)

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

NIA

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

NIA

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
 Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
 (DIA)

Identified Trigger #4

Trigger 4	In FY21, PWD received Monetary Awards at a lower rate (1% or greater) in all categories as compared to their representation in the permanent workforce (13.97%) than PWOD, which were awarded above their representation in the permanent workforce at an average of 2% higher. Analysis shows PWD received Quality Step Increases (QSI) awards at a significantly lower rate (7.52%) when compared to the representation in the DIA workforce (13.97%), which is a 6.45 percentage point gap. PWID also received QSI awards at a lower rate of 0.88% when compared to the representation in the DIA workforce (13.97%), which is a 1.95 percentage point gap. PWD received Time Off Awards at a lower rate (greater than 2%) in all Time Off Award categories, while PWTD experienced underrepresentation in the 11-20-hour category at 1.44% (1.39 percentage point gap), and 31-40 hours at 1.39% (1.44 percentage point gap).	
Barrier(s)	Where under-representation or under participation exists, DIA will utilize the barrier analysis working group to conduct barrier analysis, review the results, identify any root causes, and coordinate the implementation of action plans to eradicate barriers.	
Objective(s)	Upon completion of barrier analysis, DIA will be able to state an alternative or revised Agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to eliminate the identified barrier.	
Responsible Official(s)	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)	
EO and Office of Human Resources (OHR)	No	
Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)	Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	
No	No	
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	MD-715 Table B9
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	No	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other (Please Describe)		

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
Department of Defense (DoD), Defense Intelligence Agency
(DIA)

#	Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date	Completion Date
	01/30/2023	Once the Barrier Analysis Working Group is stood up, conduct barrier analysis into the entire Awards process.	Yes		
FY21 Accomplishments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">NIA					

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

NIA

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

NIA

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

NIA