

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

PART A Department or Agency Identifying Information	1. Agency	1. USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
	1.a 2nd level reporting component	
	2. Address	2. 1400 Independence Ave., SW
	3. City, State, Zip Code	3. Washington, DC 20205
	4. Agency Code 5. FIPS code(s)	4. AG34 5. 11001

PART B Total Employment	1. Enter total number of permanent full-time and part-time employees	1. 5654
	2. Enter total number of temporary employees	2. 2277
	3. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT [add lines B 1 through 2]	4. 7931

PART C	Title Type	Name	Title
Agency Official(s) Responsible For Oversight of EEO Program(s)	Head of Agency	Kevin Shea	Administrator
	Head of Agency	George Ervin "Sonny" Perdue	Secretary of Agriculture
	Principal EEO Director/Official	Michon Oubichon	Director, Office of Civil Rights, Diversity & Inclusion
	Affirmative Employment Program Manager	Michon Oubichon	Director, Office of Civil Rights, Diversity & Inclusion
	Complaint Processing Program Manager	La Shon Cole	Deputy Director, Office of Civil Rights
	Diversity & Inclusion Officer	Shayla Spann	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
	Diversity & Inclusion Officer	Patrick Johnson	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
	Hispanic Program Manager (SEPM)	Shayla Spann	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
	Women's Program Manager (SEPM)	Adrienne Burch	Management & Program Analyst
	Disability Program Manager (SEPM)	Adrienne Burch	Management & Program Analyst
	Special Placement Program Coordinator (Individuals with Disabilities)	Amber Kiel	HR Specialist
	Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager	David Walton	HR Specialist
	Anti-Harassment Program Manager	Marjorie Bolden	Branch Chief, Administrative Investigations & Compliance Branch
	ADR Program Manager	Cynthia Dickens	Branch Chief, Counseling and Resolution
	Compliance Manager	Steven Shelor	Branch Chief, Compliance and Evaluation
	Principal MD-715 Preparer	Shayla Spann	Diversity & Inclusion Specialist
Other EEO Staff	Dr. Terry Clark	Deputy Director, Office of the National Tribal Liaison	
Other EEO Staff	Sophia Kirby	Deputy Director, Office of Administration and Outreach	

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

PART D List of Subordinate Components Covered in This Report	Subordinate Component and Location (City/State)	Country	Agency Code
EEOC FORMS and Documents	Required	Uploaded	
Personal Assistance Services Procedures	Y	Y	
Anti-Harassment Policy and Procedures	Y	Y	
Agency Strategic Plan	Y	Y	
Organization Chart	Y	Y	
EEO Policy Statement	Y	Y	
Reasonable Accommodation Procedure	Y	Y	
Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures	Y	Y	
Diversity Policy Statement	N	N	
EEO Strategic Plan	N	N	
Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Report	N	N	
Human Capital Strategic Plan	N	N	
Results from most recent Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey or Annual Employee Survey	N	N	
Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP) Report	N	N	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: MISSION

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) is an integral part of the United States Department of Agriculture's overall mission to provide leadership on food, agriculture, natural resources, and related issues based on sound public policy, the best available science, and efficient management. Though there are nine program mission areas, the various programs work cohesively to safeguard the health and value of America's agriculture and natural resources.

APHIS program mission areas include: Animal Care; Biotechnology and Regulatory Services; International Services; Plant Protection & Quarantine; Veterinary Services; Wildlife Services; Legislative and Public Affairs; Marketing & Regulatory Program Business Services; and Policy & Program Development. APHIS employees work in a wide variety of positions and grades, however 50 percent of the positions are in the General Biological Science, Veterinary Medical Science; or Wildlife Animal, Plant Protection Technicians job series.

APHIS is a progressive organization that understands the value in having a diverse workforce while committing to inclusion efforts. The APHIS Administrator's efforts towards making civil rights, diversity, and inclusion an important standpoint continues with his established commitment to allocate resources to the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion (OCRDI). According to Goal Seven of APHIS Strategic Plan, it is a goal of the Administrator to "Create an APHIS for the 21st Century that is high performing, efficient, adaptable, and embraces Civil Rights," and he do to ensure the vision is achieved.

The OCRDI Director reports directly to the APHIS Administrator and is an active member of the APHIS Management Team (AMT). The AMT is the Agency's senior management group that is led by the Administrator and Associate Administrators. The AMT develops APHIS's strategic plans, annual goals, and priorities as a unified leadership body, with the mission of APHIS in mind.

The OCRDI Director is the principal Equal Employment Opportunity Official responsible for managing and administering APHIS' Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion Program. OCRDI's overall mission is to promote a non-discriminatory environment and equal access to APHIS employment and programs. OCRDI accomplishes its mission by managing APHIS' formal and informal complaints program; conducting outreach to minority organizations and institutions; supporting the development and implementation of Agency- wide Diversity & Inclusion programs, Special Emphasis Programs; and providing national policy and leadership on Tribal Consultation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

APHIS' FY 2018 progress are examined through the six elements prescribed by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Each element is described below along with supporting actions, documents, and accomplishments. This report also includes a summary of the Agency's MD-462 report, and an analysis of the workforce data.

Element A. Demonstrated Commitment From Agency Leadership:

On July 27th, 2018, The APHIS Administrator issued the annual Workplace Violence Prevention Policy Statement. Implemented for the usage of all agencies within the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture released the Civil Rights Policy statement and the Anti-Harassment Policy statement on May 25th, 2018. The Workplace Violence Prevention Policy Statement was updated and signed by the APHIS Administrator. All statements were distributed via email and posted in every APHIS office for visibility.

The Program Leaders Group (PLG) whose primary purpose is to monitor and assist in the implementation of Agency priority projects known as "The APHIS Operational Plan," is still active. The PLG also serves as the management body for vetting, deciding, and communicating resolutions on other agency operational issues as they arise. The Deputy Director of Civil Rights, OCRDI, is an active member of the PLG. OCRDI's membership showcases the continuing commitment from leadership to the principals of diversity, inclusion, and equal employment opportunity within the constructs of its operations.

APHIS continues to utilize the established two-way communication with senior management and employees. Management actively seeks out and listens to employee opinions and concerns through town hall meetings, forums, and on-line portals that allow for open communication.

In FY 2018 the Administrator held numerous town hall meetings virtually and in person to reach all employees. The meetings were held in Headquarters (Riverdale, MD) and other hub sites throughout the United States. The sessions allowed for employees to have open discussions about any issue and topic with the Administrator. The meetings are recorded and posted on the My.APHIS portal; accessible to all employees. The "Tell Us What You Think" email box is still active on the My.APHIS portal, and the Administrator continues to answer employees' questions directly through it. Senior leadership are encouraged to engage with employees in order to keep employees abreast on topics that may concern their staff.

In FY 2015, the APHIS Administrator established the Employee Engagement Committee. The committee was re-established in FY 2017 in order to discuss how to improve engagement with Agency leaders, as well as other important leaders. The committee is comprised of a diverse group of APHIS employees from all mission programs and all locations, including field offices.

APHIS continues to maintain and expand its proactive partnering with diverse organizations in an effort to improve service delivery and capacity building by conducting outreach to underrepresented groups. This year APHIS has dedicated over \$2.6 million in support of capacity building towards Minority Outreach Programs. Our investments are significant, and highlight the commitment of the APHIS Administrator.

Administrator's Civil Rights Awards

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

The Administrator's Civil Rights Award is an award of prestige, given to honor employees who've made outstanding contributions to APHIS' Civil Rights program. The award is a demonstration of the value in which management places upon employees, supervisors, and managers, who actively contribute to the civil rights program. The award gives due, proper honor, and distinction to those who excel in providing equal opportunity to others seeking employment, or employees currently in the Federal service. It also effectively gives impetus to the civil rights program, by publicizing the superior accomplishments of the award recipients, and recognizing the positive impact those accomplishments have had on other individuals.

Element B. Integration of EEO into the Agency's Strategic Mission:

APHIS operates in accordance with the EEOC MD-715 and 29 Code of Federal Regulation Part 1614. The Director for the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion (OCRDI), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, reports directly to the head of the Agency (Administrator, APHIS) and serves under the personal supervision of the Administrator. This close collaboration enables APHIS leadership to execute its mission in accordance with EEO, Civil Rights, and Diversity laws, regulations, and policies.

The OCRDI Director provides quarterly briefings to the Administrator and other senior officials, as well as an annual "Status of the Agency" briefing. These briefings provide management officials with civil rights updates and other valuable tools to ensure EEO compliance. The OCRDI Director also provides expert guidance to the senior leaders in APHIS, and reports on EEO initiatives, goals, and accomplishments as they impact the strategic mission. Sufficient resources to ensure adequate staffing and funding is provided in order to operate the agency's EEO program in an effective manner. The OCRDI Director is the fund holder and manages the EEO program's resources.

Annual performance plans for both managers and supervisors are aligned with USDA and APHIS' policies, strategic goals, and objectives. Though there is no longer a standalone Civil Rights element, the highly weighted element of Mission Results includes the language for civil rights and EEO. Managers and supervisors are also held accountable for ensuring employee performance plans are aligned with USDA and APHIS' objectives for civil rights and equal opportunity.

Element C. Management and Program Accountability:

APHIS ensures that Departmental Regulation 4300-010, Civil Rights Accountability Policy and Procedures, effective January 18, 2006, is administered to current and new employees. This accountability policy reinforces USDA's and APHIS' no tolerance stance in regard to workplace discrimination. This regulation can be obtained in hard copy and also on line at: <https://www.ocio.usda.gov/document/departmental-regulation-4300-010>

APHIS' Reasonable Accommodation (RA) Program is housed within the Marketing and Regulatory Programs Business Services (MRPBS), Human Resources (HR) Division, Workplace Resolutions and Wellness Branch. The RA Program has a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Program Coordinator and two full-time Reasonable Accommodation Specialists. The primary function of the RA Program is to remove workplace barriers by handling requests for reasonable accommodations. The program promotes a workplace where disabled individuals would not be prevented from performing essential job functions or from participating in the federal employment application process. The RA staff assists employees and supervisors through the interactive process to determine the employee's essential job functions; identify the employee's functional limitations in performing those job functions, and identifying potential

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

accommodations. The RA program actively strives for disabled individuals to enjoy the same benefits and privileges of employment for non-disabled employees.

In addition to handling accommodation requests, the RA staff provides training on various topics, including: medical confidentiality, hidden disabilities, and the interactive process (as webinars or instructor led, classroom format, upon request). In FY 2018, the RA staff delivered 11 presentations/webinars detailing the accommodation process; focusing on telework as an accommodation. On January 31st, 2018, the RA staff trained 50 members of the Safety and Health Committee. Forty members of the PPQ management team were trained over the course of three training sessions dating January 30th, March 22nd, and September 3rd.

In partnership with the OCRDI, the RA staff presented five RA overview sessions as part of the Federal Human Resources Management (FHRM) Training. The RA staff also developed a customized Reasonable Accommodation case study scenario. This case study was used to train 50 experienced supervisors during the Experienced Supervisor Pilot Training Program, developed by the HR Training and Development Staff. The training required supervisors to engage in role-play – providing them the opportunity for skills-based practice. The trainings were held on May 17 and July 12.

APHIS continues to manage a comprehensive RA program and maintains an informative website: [https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/business-services/HRD/Reasonable Accommodations Program](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/business-services/HRD/Reasonable_Accommodations_Program)

In order to maintain a knowledgeable workforce on the efforts of OCRDI and HR, quarterly updates are provided to the National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committees (NCRDAC) and management officials. The OCRDI and Human Resources Division meet monthly to ensure the effective coordination of the Agency Recruitment Plan, the EEOC Management Directive-715 (MD-715), the Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP), and the Disabled Veterans Affirmative Action Program (DVAAP). The HR Broadcast Newsletter is published on a quarterly basis to provide valuable information to managers, supervisors, and employees on various topics such as disability hiring, outreach efforts, etc.

Element D. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination:

Through two distinct programs, APHIS emphasizes the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in an effort to resolve workplace disputes at the earliest stage possible. The Human Resources Division's Counseling Resolution (CR) is geared towards non-EEO related ADR and the Alternative Dispute Resolution Program within OCRDI is geared towards EEO related alternative dispute resolutions. The APHIS Intranet website alerts APHIS' employees of the Title VII ADR process through a mediation video that was developed through collaboration with Justice Center of Atlanta mediation training and services.

The OCRDI Director is a member of the APHIS Management Team (AMT), which consists of the APHIS Administrator, Associate Administrator, the Deputy Administrator of each program area, and other senior management officials. During AMT meetings, the OCRDI Director reports the Agency's employment complaint activity, closures, compliance, and diversity issues. A summary of EEO cases in the informal and formal stages are provided to keep senior leaders well-versed on the most current and frequent issues cited in current complaints. This allows OCRDI to develop training, education and awareness strategies to reduce the likelihood of initial occurrences and possible reoccurrences.

OCRDI ensures equal opportunity in the hiring process by participating as EEO Observers on interview panels throughout the fiscal year. OCRDI administers EEO Observer training to employees in other

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

program areas who may be interested in serving in the role. The training provides guidance and tips on how to be an effective EEO Observer during interviews.

APHIS continues to take a proactive approach to reducing EEO discrimination complaints. In FY 2018, APHIS yielded 40 formal complaints as compared to the 60 formal complaints filed in FY 2017. This represents a 33% decrease in formal EEO complaint activity. Informal EEO complaint activity also exhibited a similar decrease, with 77 informal contacts in FY 2018 compared with 101 contacts in FY 2017 (a decrease in activity by 24%). As a proponent of the use of ADR in addressing EEO employment concerns, APHIS has utilized ADR skills such as mediation and settlement negotiation to achieve informal complaint resolution at the earliest possible stage of the EEO process. This has resulted in 6 negotiated settlement agreements and 21 voluntary withdrawals.

APHIS takes proactive measures to reduce EEO complaint activity, and engages in an aggressive training schedule to educate and provide guidance in the areas of EEO and Civil Rights to agency employees and stakeholders. The following training was provided in FY 2018, to continue efforts towards decreasing EEO complaints through awareness and education:

Compliance and Evaluation

- Implementation Training for Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) Database – 50+ participants

Diversity and Inclusion

- How To Sponsor Others – 50+ participants
- The F Word: Failure – 90 participants
- Five Ways To Transform from a Manager to a Leader – 50+ participants
- Speak Up and Lead! – 80 participants
- Leading Boldly – 64 participants
- Lead From Where You Are – 50+ participants
- Dress for Success Veterans Workshop – 20+ participants
- Office of Diversity & Inclusion Mission Training – 30 participants per training
- Special Emphasis Program Manager Training – 10 participants
- Barrier Analysis Training Sessions (IS, BRS, and AC) – 60+ participants total

Counseling and Resolution

- FHRM Training (Classroom) – 146 participants total

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

- Experienced Supervisors' Training – 30+ participants
- Prevention of Sexual Harassment Training – 113+ participants
- EEO Observer Training (Webinar – 2 Sessions) – 50 participants per session

The Agency offers the following targeted leadership development programs:

The Foundational Leadership Development Program (FLDP, formerly Basic LDP) targets employees at GS 4 – 6 levels to prepare participants with the essential knowledge, skills and abilities to meet the agency's succession planning needs and to achieve excellence, regardless of position or grade level. This program is a blended learning program that supports two separate weeks of classroom sessions and weekly web-based courses in between.

FY 2018 participation consisted of one cohort with a total of 20 employees: 30% White females, 40% White males, 5% African American females, 5% African American males, 5% Asian females, 5% Hispanic females, 5% Hispanic males, and 5% females in two or more reported groups.

The Intermediate Leadership Development Program (ILDP) targets employees at the GS 7 – 11 grade levels and consists of a blended learning curriculum, shadow assignments, and learning team projects.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 30 employees: 56.7% White females, 23.3% White males, 6.7% African American females, 3.3% Hispanic males, 6.7% females in two or more reported groups, and 3.3% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females.

The Leadership Development for Project/Program Managers (LDPM) targets employees at GS 12 – 14 levels and consists of development of project and program management skills for those who lead teams.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 28 employees: 53.6% White females, 14.3% White males, 10.7% African American females, 3.6% African American males, 3.6% Asian females, 7.1% Asian males, 3.6% females in two or more reported groups, and 3.6% Males in two or more reported groups.

The Advanced Leadership Development Program (ALDP) targets employees at GS 12 – 14 levels and consists of helping participants perform successfully in advanced supervisory and managerial level positions. The ALDP is filled via a competitive process open to fulltime GS 12 -14 employees in supervisory or managerial positions. The ALDP was re-launched in the summer of 2018, after taking a year hiatus to evaluate and redesign.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 24 employees: 33.3% White females, 45.8% White males, 8.3% African American females, 4.2% Asian males, and 8.3% males in two or more reported groups.

The Federal Executive Institute (FEI) – Leadership for a Democratic Society targets employees at the GS 15 level and Senior Executive Service level.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 12 employees: 45% White females, 32% White males, 14% African American females, 4.5% African American males, and 4.5% Hispanic males.

APHIS contracts with the Brookings Institute to deliver leadership development training for a diverse

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

group of the agency's high performing GS 14 level employees, under the **Brookings Executive Education (BEE) Program**. Brookings offers a nine-month interagency cohort-based learning opportunity. The program highlights include an SES Application Package workshop to provide insights into the Executive hiring process. Program completion yields a Certificate of Public Leadership and an option to transfer program credit towards a Master's of Science in Leadership degree granted by Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis, MO.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 31 employees: 51.6% White females, 35.5% White males, 3.2% African American females, 6.5% Hispanic females, and 3.2 % Asian females.

In addition to the Brookings program, high performing GS 14 level employees participated in the **Harvard Kennedy School-Senior Executive Fellow Program**; a four-week residential program that takes place on the University's Cambridge, MA campus. Participants received valuable training and practice in making decisions about real world challenges and scenarios. The program's curriculum included: Authentic Leadership, Decision Lab, Lexington Concord Leadership Tour, a Classroom Demo from an executive chef on the importance of healthy eating and wellness, and a lunch and learning opportunity with visiting Diplomats and Dignitaries. Participants received a Certificate of Completion from Harvard and invitations to future alumni events.

FY 2018 participation consisted of 24 employees: 17% White females, 63% White males, 4% African American females, 4% African American males, 4% Hispanic males, 4% Asian Males, and 4% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander Males.

Applicant Flow Data

Applicant flow data is used as the basis for several barrier analysis trainings to help leadership determine why participation rates are low in certain groups. Civil Right Diversity Advisory Committee (CRDAC) members are encouraged to conduct barrier analysis within their program areas and submit quarterly reports on their findings to OCRDI. Three barrier analysis trainings were conducted by the OCRDI staff in FY 2018: Animal Care, Biotechnology Regulatory Services, and International Services.

Element E. Efficiency:

In order to improve efficiency, APHIS emphasizes the use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) efforts through two distinct programs: the Human Resources Division's Collaborative Resolution (CR) Early Intervention Program and the Alternative Dispute Resolution Program within the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion (OCRDI). Both programs have developed guidelines and pamphlets in accordance to the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998 and USDA's ADR Program's Policies.

ADR Programs

- APHIS' Counseling and Resolution Branch, within OCRDI is responsible for providing ADR during the informal and formal EEO complaints process in accordance to CFR 1614 and MD 110. ADR methods are offered and conducted for the voluntary participation of employees and managers.
- APHIS, Collaborative Resolution Program located within the Human Resources Division, Workplace Resolutions and Wellness Branch (WRWB), is an Early Intervention

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

Program (for non-EEO related issues) that utilizes ADR techniques to help employees and managers work through conflict situations. The program helps employees and managers prevent, manage, and resolve workplace challenges more effectively, and in compliance with the USDA ADR regulation, DR 4701- 001.

APHIS, OCRDI, Counseling and Resolution Branch offers ADR to all employees seeking counseling and resolution services. Each case is documented in i-Complaints database system. In accordance with 29 CFR 1614, Management Directive 110, and DR 4701-001, all employees (complainants) are advised in writing of their choice between counseling and ADR. In addition to receiving an oral explanation of the ADR process with an Intake Specialist and an ADR/EEO Counseling Specialist, new complainants are mailed a "Guide to the Employment Discrimination Complaint Process," which describes the ADR process and outlines the roles and responsibilities of all participants in the EEO complaints and mediation process. OCRDI shares this guide with management officials who participate in the mediation process.

Resolving officials and responding management officials are informed of their responsibility to participate in mediation sessions in "good faith." It is mandatory for all managers/supervisors to participate in the mediation process should a complainant choose ADR for case processing. The APHIS Administrator trusts the effectiveness of the process, and believes that it is an essential part of restoring harmony and productivity to the workplace. Individuals who seek pre-complaint counseling are made aware of their right to file a formal complaint if ADR does not achieve a resolution.

APHIS uses an effective mediation plan starting with the intake process, through which a dispute is initially brought to the attention of the Civil Rights Office. During the intake process, Intake Specialists gather information from the complainant about the issue(s) that underlies their complaint. The specialist uses this information to help determine if the dispute is suitable for ADR. APHIS' Intake Specialists gather sufficient information about the complaint, determine if mediation is appropriate, and educate the complainant about the process to enable a voluntary and informed choice about mediation.

The agency dedicates resources to OCRDI to provide ADR services for employees. OCRDI supports conducting mediations in field locations nationwide by making travel funds available. As part of this commitment, the ADR/EEO Counseling Specialists receive mediation training and certifications annually. OCRDI ensures that mediations are conducted in confidential and safe environments, which may entail partnering with other USDA agencies and EEO offices to use their facilities when conducting ADR in remote locations. APHIS contracts this service to GSA approved vendors or other USDA agency mediators if a contact presents a conflict of interest.

APHIS ensures that all offers of ADR (informal, formal, and non-EEO) are documented. In FY 18, APHIS received and offered 78 applicants the option to participate in either formal or informal ADR. Of the 78 applicants, 16 individuals accepted the invitation to participate in ADR. Four complaints were settled in FY 2018, and three were carried over.

Because of APHIS approach, approximately \$112,000 was saved in investigative costs (not including agency resources). Both ADR programs and the APHIS complaints ensure that cases are processed in a timely and effective manner. The time to process cases has decreased from an average of 52 days in FY 2017, to 40 days in FY 2018, with an initial goal of 49 days processing time.

APHIS, HR Division, Collaborative Resolution Branch provides ADR services, to include: Conflict Management Training, Mediation/Facilitation/Conciliation, Conflict Advice/Guidance/Coaching, and Team

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

Collaboration Service. There are four Collaborative Resolution (CR) Specialists dedicated to providing ADR services to APHIS and other USDA employees as necessary. Services are provided through a variety of means including on-site/in-person, telephonically, video teleconference, and webinar. In FY 2018, CR received 766 requests, which included: 636 one-on-one coaching sessions, 64 group conflict sessions/trainings, 6 requests for other services, and 60 mediations (which resulted in 16 agreements, 11 declinations, 5 no agreements, 17 withdrawals, 3 pending mediations, and 8 mediations not completed due to other reasons). 581 supervisors and 784 non-supervisors sought or participated in CR services during FY 2018.

The following CR services were provided to external customers: conflict coaching for D.C. courts employees (March 29th), and mediation services for General Services Administration due to the need of an outside mediator for a conflict of interest case (August 21st).

Compliance Reviews and Civil Rights Impact Analysis

In FY 2018, OCRDI Compliance and Evaluation Branch conducted civil rights compliance reviews in the following states:

Kansas

Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS

Number of employees covered: 37

Maryland

Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS

Number of employees covered: 70

Texas

Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS

Number of employees covered: 353

Nevada

Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS

Number of employees covered: 22

North Carolina

Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS

Number of employees covered: 220

All employees were given the opportunity to participate in a confidential web-based survey, which also provided valuable information to assess compliance with civil rights and equal opportunity laws and regulations. Over 700 employees participated in the review process. Programs received the results of the review in three stages: 1) out-briefing for state program management immediately following the interview, 2) briefing for Deputy Administrators on critical issues, and 3) a written report and recommendations for the state level.

A revised reporting structure was implemented to provide clarity on methodologies used in reporting results and identifying recommendations. A recommendation tracking system was developed and implemented to track responses.

APHIS Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) Tracking System, housed in SharePoint, provides standardized forms and procedures, samples and other resources for all APHIS programs. APHIS uses

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

the system to prepare analyses required for actions related to employees.

In FY 2018, APHIS completed CRIAs for the following employment related actions:

- Veterinary Services (VS) Champlain and Derby Line, NY Ports of Entry Closure
- Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Coraopolis PA Office Closure
- PPQ Science and Technology (S&T) Division Organizational Realignment
- Animal Care (AC) Information Technology to Marketing and Regulatory Programs Business Services Realignment
- Investigative and Enforcement Services Realignment
- PPQ S&T Biloxi, MS Office Closure
- PPQ Professional Development Center Reorganization
- APHIS Transfer of Debt Management Function to Food Safety and Inspection Service
- VS Customer Service Improvement Reformation
- PPQ Gulfport, MS Laboratory Employee Directed Reassignment
- Wildlife Services Crook County, WY Employee Directed Reassignment

APHIS Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committees

The APHIS National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committee (NCRDAC) serves as a strategic advisor to ODI by providing management officials and employees with solutions that enhance equal opportunity employment and program delivery issues. Each program in APHIS has one member who serves on the NCRDAC for two years.

The APHIS Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committees (CRDACs) serves as an advisory board to management to address the unique concerns of underserved and underrepresented groups regarding employment and access for its respective program area.

The mission of the CRDAC is accomplished through barrier analysis, special emphasis programs, and Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPM)'s relationship with affinity groups. CRDACs in the field units are connected to the NCRDAC. APHIS funds the programs, and OCRDI's National SEPMs lead each special emphasis program, ensuring implementation.

Element F. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance:

APHIS developed a formal written ADR policy in 2000, which provides operating guidelines on their Alternative Dispute Resolution process. This issuance outlines the policies and procedures used by the

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ESSENTIAL ELEMENT A-F

APHIS Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Center to provide counseling and mediation (informal and formal), in complaints of employment discrimination raised by employees, former employees or applicants for employment. The ADR policy can be found on the APHIS' website at: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/civilrights/sa_program_overview/ct_office_director

APHIS responds to the EEOC and OASCR in a timely manner, whether via MD-715 submission, Compliance Reports, etc. APHIS maintains an open line of communication with the assigned EEOC representative, and participates in bi-yearly meetings to discuss findings reported in the Technical Assistance letter.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

In FY 2018, there were 7,931 total employees. This total includes: 5,654 permanent and 2,277 temporary. The total workforce is comprised of 59.32% male and 40.68% female.

White males represent the majority of the APHIS workforce with 42.55% (3,375) representation, followed by White females with 27.39% (2,172); Hispanic males 6.76% (536); Black females 5.42% (430); Asian males 4.17% (331); Hispanic females 3.87% (307); Black males 3.18% (252); Asian females 2.28% (181); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) males 1.06% (84); American Indian males with 0.81% (64); Two or more races males 0.79% (63); Two or more races females 0.77% (61); American Indian females with 0.63% (50); and NHOPI females 0.32% (25).

Hispanic females, White females, Black males, Black females, and females (as a group) have a low participation rate, in comparison to their respective Civilian Labor Force (CLF).

All other groups are at or above their respective CLF in FY 2018.

Underrepresented Groups	Total Workforce Rep. (%)	CLF (%)	FY 2018 Difference (Total workforce – CLF)
Hispanic females	3.87	4.79	-0.92
White females	27.39	34.03	-6.64
African Am/Black males	3.18	5.49	-2.31
African Am/Black females	5.42	6.53	-1.11
Females	40.68	48.14	-7.46

In comparison to FY 2017, the participation levels for Hispanic males (HM), Hispanic females (HF), White males (WM), White female (WF), Black males (BM), Black females (BF), Asian males (AM), and Asian females (AF) have decreased.

Recruitment activities and efforts continue to focus on groups with low participation. A targeted recruitment plan is developed each year to address groups with low participation.

Summary of APHIS Workforce by Race, National Origin (RNO) and Sex

Hispanic Employees

Total employment for Hispanics in FY 2018 is 843 (decrease compared to FY 2017) or 10.63% (decrease compared to FY 2017) of the total workforce. *Hispanic females are underrepresented by -0.92, and the participation rate for Hispanic females decreased in comparison to FY 2017 (-0.70). Hispanic males are well*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

represented and have been for the past 7 years.

White Employees

Total employment for White males and females in FY 2018 is 5,547 or 69.94% of the total workforce. **White females are underrepresented by -6.64, and the participation rate for White females decreased in comparison to FY 2017 (-0.06). White males are above their respective CLF in FY 2018.**

African-American/Black Employees

Total employment for African Americans in FY 2018 is 682 or 8.6% (decrease compared to FY 2017) of the total workforce. **African American males are underrepresented by -2.31 and African American females are underrepresented by -1.11. In comparison to previous fiscal years, the participation rate for African American males and females continue to decrease.**

Asian Employees

Total employment for Asian Americans in FY 2018 is 512 or 6.45% of the total APHIS workforce. Both Asian males and females are above their respective CLF in FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) Employees

Total employment for NHOPIs in FY 2018 is 109 or 1.38% (increase compared to FY 2017) of the total workforce. In FY 2016 the number of NHOPI females increased by 7. Both NHOPI males and females are above their respective CLF in FY 2017 and FY 2018.

American Indian/Alaskan Native (AIAN) Employees

Total employment for AIANs in FY 2018 is 114 or 1.44% (increase compared to FY 2017) of the total workforce. In FY 2018, the number of AIANs increased by 5. Both AIAN males and females are above their respective CLF in FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Two or More Races

Total employment for Two or More Races in FY 2018 is 124 or 1.56% (a significant increase compared to FY 2017) of the total workforce. In FY 2018 the number of people identifying as Two or More Races almost doubled, with the number of Two or More Race males increasing by 25, and the number of Two or More Race females increasing by 30. Both Two or More Race males and females are above their respective CLF in FY 2017 and FY 2018.

Official and Managers

Of the 5,654 total permanent employees, 1,759 or 31.11% are classified as "Official and Managers" 50.26% identified as male and 49.74% identified as female.

The race/ethnicity breakdown of the "Official and Managers" category is as follows: Hispanic – 7.1% (6.69% in FY 2017); White – 68.79% (68.89% in FY 2017); African American – 17.28% (17.66% in FY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

2017); Asian American – 4.32% (4.48% in FY 2017); Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander – 0.45% (0.39% in FY 2017); American Indian/Alaska Native – 1.65% (1.6% in FY 2017); and Two or More Races – 0.4% (0.28% in FY 2017).

There are 2,353 (41.62%) identified in the “Professional” category, 822 (14.54%) identified in the “Technician” category, and 537 (9.5%) identified in the “Administrative Support” category.

Of the 2,353 employees identified in the “Professional” category, males represent 57.63% and females represent 42.37%. The race/ethnicity breakdown of the “Professional” category are as follows: Hispanic – 10.07% (9.53% in FY 2017); White – 73.22% (73.96% in FY 2017); African American – 7.78% (7.54% in FY 2017); Asian American – 6.8% (6.87% in FY 2017); Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander – 0.55% (0.50% in FY 2017); American Indian/Alaska Native – 1.23% (1.23% in FY 2017), and Two or More Races – 0.34% (0.38% in FY 2017).

Participation Rate for General Schedule (GS) Grades

Participation rates in various grade levels should mirror the participation rate of the workforce. A glass ceiling may be present if the participation rate of lower grade levels are higher than that of higher grade levels/leadership positions.

Though the Hispanic males and females participation rate in the GS-12 grade level is 9.83%, the participation rate in the GS- 13 level is 5.51%. This is not only below the Hispanic participation rate of the workforce (-5.12), but it is below the Hispanic participation rate in the GS-12 grade level (-4.71). This is also reflected in the GS-14 and GS-15 levels.

Though the participation rate of African American females in the GS-14 grade level is 7.29% and the participation rate in the GS-15 grade level is 9.29%, the SES participation rate is 2.78%. This is below the African American female participation rate of the workforce (-2.64) and below the African American female participation rate in the GS-14 (-4.51) and GS-15 (-6.51) grade levels.

Though the participation rate for Asian Americans in the GS-11 grade level is 9.25%, the participation rate for Asian Americans in the GS-12 grade level is 4.06%. This is below the Asian American’s participation rate of the workforce (-2.39) and below the participation rate for Asian Americans in the GS-11 grade level (-5.19). This is also reflected in the participation rates of Asian American males in the GS-13 through SES levels.

Though the participation rate of NHOPIs in the GS-12 grade level is 0.42%, the participation rate for NHOPIs in the GS-13 grade level is 0.13%. This is below NHOPIs’ participation rate of the workforce (-1.25), and below the participation rate of NHOPIs in the GS-12 grade level (-0.29). This is also reflected in the participation rate of NHOPIs in the GS-15 and SES levels.

Though the participation rate of AIANs in the GS-14 grade level is 1.59%, the participation rate for AIANs in the GS-15 grade level is 0%. This is below AIANs’ participation rate of the workforce (-1.44), and below the participation rate of AIANs in the GS-14 grade level (-1.59). This is also reflected in the participation rate of AIANs in the SES level.

Participation Rates for Major Occupations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

In comparison to their respective OCLF, females as a group have a low participation rate in the following MCOs: 0401 – General Biological Science (-8.79); 0486 – Wildlife Biology (-33.49); 0704 – Animal Health Technician (-44.23); 2210 – Information Technology (-5.15); 0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician (-15.29); 0404 – Biological Science Technician (-9.44); and 0201 – Human Resources Management (-1.56). Hispanics have a low participation rate in the 0201 – Human Resources Management series (-5.87). African Americans have a low participation rate in the following MCOs: 0486 – Wildlife Biology (-2.44); 0704 – Animal Health Technician (-8.56); 0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician (-1.48); and 0404 – Biological Science Technician (-6.9). AIANs have a low participation rate in the following MCOs: 0401 – General Biological Science (-6.89); 0486 – Wildlife Biology (-7.28); 0704 – Animal Health Technician (-1.85); 2210 – Information Technology (-9.48); 0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician (-9.94); 0404 – Biological Science Technician (-10.33) and 0403 - Microbiology (- 8.40).

Applicant Flow Data

APHIS recognizes nine series as major occupations (MCOs), with two designated government wide MCOs. The nine MCOs include: 0201 – Human Resources Management; 0401 – General Biological Science; 0403 – Microbiologist; 0404 – Biological Science Technician; 0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician; 0486 – Wildlife Biologist; 0701 – Veterinary Medical Officer; 0704 – Animal Health Technician; and 2210 – Information Technology.

0201 – Human Resources Management

In FY 2018, APHIS received 678 applications for the 0201 job series, and 15 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 12.55% qualified (0% selected); White – 26.02% qualified (73.33% selected); African American – 50.56% qualified (20% selected); Asian American – 3.14% qualified (6.67% selected); Two or more Races – 5.17% qualified (0% selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males 37.27% qualified (46.67% selected); and Females – 62.36% qualified (53.33% selected).

0401 – General Biological Science

In FY 2018, APHIS received 3,021 applications for the 0401 job series and 45 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 24.84% of qualified (28.89% of selected); White – 45.23% of qualified (51.11% of selected); African American – 11.03% of qualified (6.66% of selected); Asian American - 12.89% of qualified (11.11% of selected); NHOPIs – 0.17% of qualified (0% of selected); AIANs – 0.59% of qualified (2.22% of selected); and TMRs - 3.2% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 61.77% of qualified (57.78% of selected); and Females – 38.15% of qualified (42.22% of selected).

0403 – Microbiology

In FY 2018, APHIS received 123 applications for the 0403 job series and 5 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 9.8% of qualified (20% of selected); White – 59% of qualified (80% of selected); African American - 9.8% of qualified (0% of selected); Asian American - 18.62% of qualified (0% of selected); and TMRs –4.9% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 41.18% of qualified (40% of selected); and Females – 58.82% of qualified (60% of selected).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

0404 – Biological Science Technician

In FY 2018, APHIS received 723 applications for the 0404 job series and 14 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 20.49% of qualified (7.14% of selected); White – 58.51% of qualified (78.58% of selected); African American – 8.68% of qualified (0% of selected); Asian American – 6.38% of qualified (14.29% of selected); NHOPI – 1.73% of qualified (0% of selected); AIAN – 0.52% of qualified (0% of selected); and TMRs – 2.94% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 44.62% of qualified (35.71% of selected); and Females – 55.03% of qualified (64.29% of selected).

0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician

In FY 2018, APHIS received 274 applications for the 0421 job series and 7 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 45.95% of qualified (85.72% of selected); White – 31.06% of qualified (14.29% of selected); African American – 12.34% of qualified (0% of selected); Asian American – 4.68% of qualified (0% of selected); AIAN – 0.86% of qualified (0% of selected); and TMRs – 4.25% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 63.83% of qualified (85.71% of selected); and Females – 36.17% of qualified (14.29% of selected).

0701 – Veterinary Medical Officer

In FY 2018, APHIS received 1083 applications for the 0701 job series and 31 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 10.14% of qualified (19.35% of selected); White – 66.79% of qualified (67.75% of selected); African American – 12.24% of qualified (12.91% of selected); Asian American – 6.06% of qualified (0% of selected); AIAN – 1.17% of qualified (0% of selected); and TMRs – 1.63% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 35.20% of qualified (35.48% of selected); and Females – 64.69% of qualified (64.52% of selected);

0704 – Animal Health Technician

In FY 2018, APHIS received 326 applications for the 0704 job series and 9 permanent positions were filled. The race/ethnicity breakdown is as follows: Hispanic – 16.18% of qualified (33.33% of selected); White – 67.54% of qualified (66.67% of selected); African American – 7.92% of qualified (0% of selected); Asian American – 2.88% of qualified (0% of selected); AIAN – 1.08% of qualified (0% of selected); and TMRs – 3.6% of qualified (0% of selected). The gender breakdown is as follows: Males – 44.96% of qualified (44.44% of selected); and Females - 55.04% of qualified (55.56% of selected).

2210 – Information Technology

In FY 2018, APHIS received 476 applications for the 2210 job series and 2 positions were filled. Out of the two positions, one White male and one African American male was selected.

New Hires

In FY 2018, there were a total of 777 new hires (184 permanent and 593 temporary). Of the total new hires, 57.53% (447) were male and 42.47% (330) were female; 17.37% were Hispanic; 70.4% were White; 5.15% were African American; 3.47% were Asian; 1.80% were NHOPI; 1.42% were AIAN; 0.39%

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

were Two or More Races. With the exception of White males, all other groups' participation rate in retrospect to new hires are at or above the CLF (or below the CLF with a margin less than 1%).

Promotions

In FY 2018, there were a total of 414 promotions received (508 in FY 2017). Males received 48.55% (201) and females received 51.45% (213) of the total promotions.

Promotions received by groups with low participation are as follows: Hispanic females – 6.76% (28); White females – 30.43% (126); African American males – 6.76% (28), and African American females – 9.18% (38).

Internal Selections for Senior Levels

In FY 2018, 924 applications were received for the GS-13 level (18 selected), 766 applications were received for the GS-14 level (25 selected), and 114 applications were received for the GS-15 level (8 selected). The race/ethnicity breakdown of the internal selections for senior level positions is as follows:

Hispanic Employees

For GS-13 level positions, Hispanics were 9.36% of the relevant applicant pool. Hispanics were 16.88% of the total applications received, 16.76% of those qualified, and 5.56% of those selected. For GS-14 positions, Hispanics were 5.62% of the relevant applicant pool. Hispanics were 11.75% of the total applications received, 11.83% of those qualified, and 12% of those selected. For GS-15 positions, Hispanics were 5.69% of the relevant applicant pool. Hispanics were 7.02% of the total applications received, 7.07% of those qualified, and 12.5% of those selected. **No Hispanic females were selected in the GS-13, GS-14, or GS-15 level.**

White Employees

For GS-13 level positions, White employees were 72.02% of the relevant applicant pool. **White employees were 42.43% of the total applications received, 42.79% of those qualified, and 88.88% of those selected.** For GS-14 level positions, White employees were 73.78% of the relevant applicant pool. White employees were 46.61% of the total applications received, 46.01% of those qualified, and 68% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, White employees were 76.42% of the relevant applicant pool. White employees were 54.38% of the total applications received, 53.98% of those qualified, and 62.50% of those selected.

African American Employees

For GS-13 level positions, African Americans were 12.49% of the relevant applicant pool. African Americans were 29.12% of the total applications received, 28.94% of those qualified, and 5.56% of those selected. For GS-14 level positions, African Americans were 13.61% of the relevant applicant pool. African Americans were 30.28% of the total applications received, 30.59% of those qualified, and 16% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, African Americans were 9.97% of the relevant applicant pool. African Americans were 28.94% of the total applications received, 29.2% of those qualified, and 25% of those selected.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

Asian American Employees

For GS-13 level positions, Asian Americans were 4.05% of the relevant applicant pool. Asian Americans were 3.9% of the total applications received, 3.91% of those qualified, 0% of those selected. For GS-14 level positions, Asian Americans were 4.87% of the relevant applicant pool. Asian Americans were 3.78% of the total applicants received, 3.86% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, Asian Americans were 5.85% of the relevant applicant pool. Asian Americans were 5.27% of the total applications received, 5.3% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

NHOPI Employees

For GS-13 level positions, NHOPI employees were 0.33% of the relevant applicant pool. No NHOPI employees applied for positions in the GS-13 level. For GS-14 level positions, NHOPI employees were 0.12% of the relevant applicant pool. NHOPI employees were 0.13% of the total applications received, 0.13% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, NHOPI employees were 0.48% of the relevant applicant pool. No NHOPI employees applied for positions in the GS-15 level.

AIAN Employees

For GS-13 level positions, AIAN employees were 1.36% of the relevant applicant pool. AIAN employees were 0.86% of the total applications received, 0.79% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. For GS-14 level positions, AIAN employees were 1.62% of the relevant applicant pool. AIAN employees were 0.78% of the total applications received, 0.8% of those qualified, and 4% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, AIAN employees were 1.58% of the relevant applicant pool. AIAN employees were 0.88% of the total applications received, 0.88% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

Two or More Races Employees

For GS-13 level positions, TMR employees were 0.33% of the relevant applicant pool. TMR employees were 4.11% of the total applications received, 4.02% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. For GS-14 level positions, TMR employees were 0.37% of the relevant applicant pool. TMR employees were 4.18% of the total applications received, 4.25% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. For GS-15 level positions, TMR employees were 0% of the relevant applicant pool. TMR employees were 2.63% of the total applications received, 2.68% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

APHIS' Table A11 does not depict the applicant flow for the SES level because this data is captured on a department level.

Awards*Time-Off Awards 1 – 9 Hours*

There were a total of 240 Time-Off Awards (1 – 9 Hours) given for a total of 1784 hours (average hours = 7). Males received 45.42% and females received 54.58% of the awards. Asian females, NHOPI males and females, AIAN males, and TMR males are the only groups that did not receive an award in this category.

Time-Off Awards +9 Hours

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

There were a total of 462 Time-Off Awards (9+ Hours) given for a total of 11,778 hours (average hours = 25). Males received 43.72% and females received 56.28% of the awards. All RNOs were recipients of an award in this category.

Cash Awards \$100 – \$500

There were a total of 1,296 Cash Awards (\$100 – \$500) given for a total amount of \$467,140 (average amount = \$360). Males received 46.37% and females received 53.63% of the awards. All RNOs were recipients of an award in this category.

Cash Awards \$500+

There were a total of 5,104 Cash Awards (\$500+) given for a total amount of \$5,674,205 (average amount = \$1,112). Males received 48.67% and females received 51.33% of the awards. All RNOs were recipients of an award in this category.

Quality Step Increases (QSI)

There were a total of 216 QSIs given for a total benefit of \$459,789 (average benefit = \$2129). Males received 43.06% and females received 56.94% of the awards. All RNOs were recipients of an award in this category with the exception of AIAN males.

Separations

In comparison to FY 2017, APHIS saw an increase in separations in FY 2018. There were 420 total separations (400 voluntary and 20 involuntary). Of the total, 52.38% were males and 47.62% were females. The RNO groups with a total separation rate that is above their participation rate in the total permanent workforce are as follows: White males (TWF – 37.25%; Voluntary – 39.50%; Involuntary – 50%); White females (TWF – 31.69%; Voluntary – 35.50%); African American males (TWF – 4.14%; Voluntary – 4.75% Involuntary – 10%); Asian females (TWF – 2.05%; Voluntary – 2.50%); and TMR males (TWF – 0.18%; Voluntary - 5%).

5 - Year Trend Analysis FY 2014 - FY 2018

HF participation rate in the total workforce decreased between FY 2014 – FY 2017 and increased in FY 2018. WF participation rate in the total workforce increased from FY 2014 to FY 2015, and decreased from FY 2016 through FY 2018. BM participation rate in the total employment decreased in FY 2015, increased in FY 2016, and decreased from FY 2017 through FY 2018. BF participation rate in the total workforce increased from FY 2015 – FY 2016, and decreased in FY 2017 and FY 2018. We believe that the participation rates have decreased for all groups (except for HF) in FY 2018 due to the high separation rate of the entire workforce.

Persons with Disabilities and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWD/PWTD)

In FY 2018, there were a total of 679 permanent employees who identified as a Persons with Disabilities (PWD), and 194 permanent employees who identified as a Persons with Targeted

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

Disabilities (PWTD). In comparison to FY 2017, there was a decrease of 34 PWDs and a decrease of 9 PWTDs in FY 2018.

PWDs represent 12.01% of the permanent workforce and PWTDs represent 3.43% of the permanent workforce. APHIS exceeded the EEOC goal of 12% for PWDs and 2% for PWTDs in FY 2018. Recruitment activities and efforts continue to focus on PWDs, PWTDs, and veterans. A targeted recruitment plan is developed each year to address these groups.

Officials and Managers

Of the 1,759 permanent employees classified as "Official and Managers," 11.47% (197) identify as PWD, and 3.84% (66) identify as PWTD. PWDs occupy 8.93% (10) of Executive/Senior Level positions. PWTDs occupy 6.25% (7) of Executive/Senior Level positions. PWDs occupy 8.23% (40) of Mid-Level grades (GS-13 – 14) and PWTDs occupy 2.88% (14) of Mid-Level grades. PWDs occupy 7.98% of First Level grades (GS-12 and below) and PWTDs occupy 2.76% of First Level grades.

Of the 2,353 employees identified in the "Professional" category, 9.86% (232) identify as a PWD, and 2.59% (61) identify as a PWTD.

Participation Rate for General Schedule (GS) Grades

The EEOC has set a goal for agencies to achieve a 12% participation rate for PWD at the GS-11 and above (including SES) and at the GS-10 level and below. **Out of the 3,662 employees in the GS-11 to SES, 395 (9.27%) identify as PWD and 120 (3.27%) identify as PWTD.** APHIS meets the goal for PWTD in the GS-11 through SES cluster, however APHIS is below the goal with PWD. A goal to address the trigger involving PWD is highlighted in Part H.

Out of the 1,866 employees in the GS-10 level and below, 265 (14.20%) identify as PWD and 68 (3.64%) identify as PWTD. APHIS meets the EEOC goal for both PWD and PWTD in the GS-10 and below cluster.

Participation Rates for Major Occupations

PWDs have a low participation (in comparison to EEOC goals) in the following MCOs: 0401 – General Biological Science (9.87% participation rate); 0403 – Microbiology (7.50% participation rate); 0404 – Biological Science Technician (7.36% participation rate); 0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician (11.34% participation rate); 0486 – Wildlife Biology (3.35% participation rate); 0701 – Veterinary Medical Science (10.08% participation rate); and 0704 – Animal Health Technician (7.35% participation rate).

PWTDs have a low participation rate (in comparison to EEOC goals) in the following MCOs: 0403 – Microbiology (0% participation rate); 0486 – Wildlife Biology (1.96% participation rate); and 0704 – Animal Health Technician (1.76% participation rate).

Applicants & Hires

In FY 2018, APHIS received a total of 14,271 applications and filled 316 permanent positions. 7.99% (1,140) of applicants identified as PWD and 3.08% (439) identified as PWTD. Out of the 316 new hires,

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

4.75% (15) identified as PWD and 1.58% (5) identified as PWTD.

Currently, Table B7 does not display the percentage of qualified applicants or applicant flow by MCOs for persons with disabilities. However, using NFC Reporting Center's report for new hires, APHIS is able to state the total new hires of PWD/PWTD per MCO.

New Hires

In FY 2018, there were a total of 184 permanent new hires. Of the total permanent new hires, 9.24% (17) identified as PWD and 2.72% (5) identified as PWTD. Though APHIS did not reach the 12% goal of new hires for PWD, APHIS exceeded the goal of 2% of new hires for PWTD.

Internal Competitive Promotions

0201 – Human Resources Management

In FY 2018, 16.57% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 7.47% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. PWDs were 25% of those selected and PWTDs were 12.50% of those selected. No triggers were found in the 0201 job series.

0401 – General Biological Science

In FY 2018, 9.92% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 4.96% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. PWDs were 7.14% of those selected and PWTDs were 0% of those selected. A trigger was found in regards to the selection of PWTDs in the 0401 job series.

0403 – Microbiology

In FY 2018, 21.43% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 28.57% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. **PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected.** A trigger was found in regards to the selection of PWDs and PWTDs in the 0403 job series.

0404 – Biological Science Technician

In FY 2018, 14.29% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 7.14% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. **PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected.** A trigger was found in regards to the selection of PWDs and PWTDs in the 0404 job series.

0421 – Plant Protection and Quarantine Technician

In FY 2018, 17.31% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 9.62% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. PWDs were 50% of those selected and PWTDs were 0% of those selected. With only two applicants selected in the 0421 job series, no triggers were found.

0486 – Wildlife Biologist

In FY 2018, 9.65% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 3.95% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. **PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected.** A trigger was found in regards to the selection of PWDs and PWTDs in the 0486 job series.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

0701 – Veterinary Medical Officer

In FY 2018, 5.51% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 1.97% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. **PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected.** Two triggers were found in the 0701 job series: PWD's relevant applicant pool is 9.88% and PWTD's relevant applicant pool is 3.65% but PWDs and PWTDs are only 5.49% and 1.96% of the applicants respectively; The lack of selection of PWDs and PWTDs to the 0701 job series.

0704 – Animal Health Technician

In FY 2018, 4% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 4% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected. With only three applicants selected in the 0704 job series, no triggers were found.

2210 – Information Technology

In FY 2018, 10.822% of the qualified applicants identified as PWD, and 4.64% of the qualified applicants identified as PWTD. PWDs and PWTDs were not among those selected. With only two applicants selected in the 2210 job series, no triggers were found.

Promotions

In FY 2018, of the total of 414 promotions received, 12.32% (51) were employees who identified as PWD and 3.14% (13) were employees who identified as PWTD.

Internal Selections for Senior Levels

In FY 2018, 1,151 applications were received for the GS-13 level (27 selected), 980 applications were received for the GS-14 level (32 selected), and 154 applications were received for the GS-15 level (9 selected).

GS-13 positions

For GS-13 level positions, PWDs and PWTDs were 12.57% and 3.71% of the relevant applicant pool respectively. PWD were 10.34% of the total applications received, 10.40% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. PWTD were 4.34% of the total applications received, 4.3% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

GS-14 positions

For GS-14 level positions, PWDs and PWTDs were 12.61% and 3.75% of the relevant applicant pool respectively. PWD were 11.94% of the total applications received, 12.12% of those qualified, and 3.13% of those selected. PWTD were 4.39% of the total applications received, 4.46% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

GS-15 positions

For GS-15 level positions, PWDs and PWTDs were 6.49% and 2.22% of the relevant applicant pool

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

respectively. PWD were 14.29% of the total applications received, 14.38% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected. PWTD were 9.74% of the total applications received, 9.80% of those qualified, and 0% of those selected.

APHIS' Table B11 does not depict the applicant flow for the SES level because this data is captured on a departmental level.

Awards

Time-Off Awards 1 – 9 Hours

There were a total of 240 Time-Off Awards (1 – 9 Hours) given for a total of 1784 hours (average hours = 7). PWDs received 14.58% and PWTDs received 5% of the awards.

Time-Off Awards +9 Hours

There were a total of 462 Time-Off Awards (9+ Hours) given for a total of 11,778 hours (average hours = 25). PWDs received 13.20% and PWTDs received 4.55% of the awards.

Cash Awards \$100 – \$500

There were a total of 1,296 Cash Awards (\$100 – \$500) given for a total amount of \$467,140 (average amount = \$360). PWDs received 13.58% and PWTDs received 3.55% of the awards.

Cash Awards \$500+

There were a total of 5,104 Cash Awards (\$500+) given for a total amount of \$5,674,205 (average amount = \$1,112). PWDs received 11.06% and PWTDs received 3.16% of the awards.

Quality Step Increases (QSI)

There were a total of 216 QSIs given for a total benefit of \$459,789 (average benefit = \$2129). PWDs received 12.5% and PWTDs received 3.70% of the awards.

Separations

In FY 2018, There were 420 total separations (400 voluntary and 20 involuntary). Of the total, 15% were PWDs (14.75% of voluntary; 20% of involuntary) and 3.33% were PWTDs (3.5% of voluntary; 0% of involuntary). A trigger is present with PWDs, because PWDs are only 12.01% of the total workforce.

Barrier Analysis

This report includes all of the required workforce data tables except for the applicant flow components of table B7, SES components of tables A/B-11, and tables A/B-12. The checklist in Part G was reviewed and all deficiencies include planned action items as shown in Part H. A barrier analysis was conducted for Hispanics. Although triggers were found in regards to upward

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: WORKFORCE ANALYSES

mobility, no known barriers for Hispanics were found.

There are four areas for potential barriers identified.

- Barriers to Executive Level Positions (SES). (Discussed in Part I)
- Glass Ceiling for Minorities to Higher Grade Positions (Discussed in Part I)
- Underrepresented Groups (Discussed in Part I)
- Establish and Meet Hiring and Retention Goals for Employees with Disabilities & Targeted Disabilities. (Discussed in Part J)

APHIS continues to work on promoting diversity and recruiting a dynamic and first-class workforce. In doing so, the Agency continues to focus on increasing the employment of Veterans/Disabled Veterans and individuals with disabilities.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

As required by the MD-715 annual Status Report, the Self-Assessment Checklist, Part G is completed and attached. The Agency conducted the required review and all agency documents are in place. Below are the accomplishments of the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity & Inclusion and each of APHIS' program Civil Rights Diversity Advisory Committee:

Office of Civil Rights, Diversity & Inclusion

The OCRDI, Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) serves as the leader and primary advisor in support of Executive Order 13583, a government-wide initiative to promote and manage diversity and inclusion within the federal workforce. ODI provides support and guidance to special emphasis programs and managers, by sponsoring training/educational opportunities and cultural programs to expand the diversity and inclusion mission.

In FY 2018, the following APHIS National SEP events and programs were held (all National SEP programs were offered via livestream which increased participation and accessibility):

- The Benefits of Hiring Veterans | September 6th, 2017
- Disability Employment Awareness Month Celebration | October 26th, 2017
- Veterans Day Special Observance | November 7th, 2017
- National Native American Heritage Month Special Observance | November 9th, 2017
- Black History Month Special Observance | February 8th, 2018
- Women's History Month Special Observance | March 8th, 2018
- Workplace Harassment: Intent vs. Impact | May 3rd, 2018
- Asian American/Pacific Islander Heritage Month | May 10th, 2018
- LGBT Pride Month | June 6th 2018
- Women's Equality Day | August 9th, 2018
- Changing Lanes: Dressing for the Occasion (Sponsored by Veterans Employee Organization) | September 6th, 2018
- Hispanic Heritage Month | September 13th, 2018
- Disability Employment Awareness Workshop | September 25th, 2018

Emerging Women's Leadership (EWL) Series Webinars:

- Lead From Where You Are | October 31st, 2017
- Leading Boldly | December 12th, 2017
- Speak Up and Lead! | February 20th, 2018
- Five Ways To Transform from a Manager to a Leader | April 17th, 2018
- The F Word: Failure | June 19th, 2018
- How To Sponsor Others | August 21st, 2018

APHIS Women's Forum Lean In Circles is an APHIS initiative in collaboration with the Lean In Organization. The initiative forms small peer groups within the agency that allows women the chance to network with other women in higher grade level/management positions, collaborate, and participate in training. The mission of the Lean In Circles is to "empower women to achieve their ambitions."

The OCRDI Office of Outreach and Administration Branch focuses on providing students with opportunities to gain valuable experience through employment and scholarship opportunities. In FY 2018, APHIS provided over \$2.6 million in funding to various professional organizations, universities, internships, scholarships, conference support, and research and development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The Office of National Tribal Liaison (ONTL) works to improve youth opportunities in agriculture, natural resources, and related science fields. APHIS expanded its Safeguarding Natural Heritage (SNH) Summer Youth Program to five in FY 2018. The SNH is a 2-week summer outreach program that help students ages 14-17 explore careers in plant and animal science, wildlife management, and agribusiness. The summer programs are co-hosted with Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU) and/or other Native American Serving Institutions (NASI).

ONTL continues to assist Navajo Technical University (NTU) and its Veterinary Technology Program, by providing funding for curriculum enhancement and acquisition of personnel. The program creates and provides opportunities for Vet Tech students to gain work experience within APHIS. It procures program specific supplies and provisions by maintaining full accreditation status with the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA).

ONTL continues to expand its internship opportunities for students attending various Native American higher educational institutions. APHIS provided funding through a cooperative agreement that assists several TCUs, NASIs, and students attending these institutions. The agreement pays for travel, lodging, and salaries for students who participate in an APHIS internship. Many of the students receive college credit for participating as well. Current partners include: Navajo Technical University, NM; Southwest Indian Polytechnic Institute, NM; Dine College, AZ; University of North Carolina at Pembroke, NC; and Oklahoma State University, OK.

In FY 2018, ONTL coordinated and delivered its first Pathways onsite application event. In addition, an overview of the Pathways Program, USDA Jobs & Federal Resume Training, and mock interviews were conducted at the following three TCUs: Navajo Technical University, NM; Southwest Indian Polytechnic Institute, NM; and Diné College, AZ.

APHIS, provided a sponsorship to the 2018 Southwestern Indian Agricultural Association (SWIAA) conference. The \$2,000.00 sponsorship was part of the agency's FY 2018 outreach efforts. SWIAA is a non profit group governed by 12 executive board members elected on an annual, rotating basis from four membership categories: individual, tribal organization, associate and corporate. SWIAA holds annual meetings regularly to provide vital agricultural information for Indian ranchers and farmers.

APHIS also provided a \$5,000.00 sponsorship to the 2018 Native American Fish and Wildlife Society (NAFWS). The Society's mission is to assist Native American and Alaska Native Tribes with the conservation, protection, and enhancement of their fish and wildlife resources. The \$5,000.00 sponsorship is part of the agency's outreach efforts.

The Anti-Harassment program is housed within APHIS' Human Resources division and is a separate entity from the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity, & Inclusion. The Anti-Harassment program has established policies and procedures that are viewable on the APHIS portal. The cases are tracked through the Labor and Employee Relations Information System and the inquiry into harassment allegations begins within 10 days of notification

Biotechnology Regulatory Services (BRS)

For National Disabilities Employment Awareness Month, BRS's Disabilities SEPM held a Brown Bag Discussion in collaboration with LPA. The National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) of Montgomery County presented "Awareness in the Workplace."

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The BRS CRDAC presented their activities, outreach, and how to involve staff in planning and executing diversity and inclusion programs. Presentations occurred during All-Hands meetings were upper management were presented.

BRS CRDAC created an Affinity Conference Process to streamline the selection process for attending conferences. The process aligns the prioritization of attendance with that of the Agency, and requires attending staff to develop/host Brown Bag presentations in order to bring back vital information and share experiences.

BRS CRDAC hosted an Asian-American and Pacific Islander Brown Bag for BRS Staff.A

BRS CRDAC co-sponsored the LGBT Pride program "Remember the Past, Create the Future: LGBT+ youth - their challenges and triumphs.

BRS CRDAC disseminated an email for Caribbean-American Heritage Month to BRS Staff.

BRS CRDAC hosted "Follow the Yellow Brick Road - A Career Path Symposium." The symposium was an Aphis-wide program in recognition of Hispanic Heritage Month.

International Services (IS)

In FY 2018, International Services established and executed a Strategic Recruitment Plan that incorporated two main objectives: Increase the number of veterinarians within Foreign Service cadre; and reach limitation goals established by the department. Efforts centered on outreach were made to generate a diverse an applicant pool for all International Services positions advertised. IS reached contacted over 25 organizations as recommended by the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity, and Inclusion. IS uses various

tools to increase participation from low participating groups. When IS has a vacancy, it uses as many communication vehicles as possible, including social media to reach a larger audience and inform them of the job opportunities. In addition, IS has trained its personnel on non-bias interview techniques, and utilizes EEO observers during the interview process. Special Emphasis managers also participate in outreach and recruitment efforts, promoting IS and the diverse nature of its business.

Legislative and Public Affairs (LPA)

In FY 2018, a barrier analysis was conducted on the LPA workforce, to identify potential areas of barriers that impede equal employment. Though LPA has determined that the program unit is underrepresented in Hispanic males, White males, and Asian females, LPA concluded that no known barriers were found. LPA's employment increased by a net of 3 employees, from 67 in FY 2017 to 70 in FY 2018. To increase participation in underrepresented groups, LPA utilizes and will continue to use various hiring authorities, to include Not to Exceed (NTE), Pathways, and Contractors.

LPA CRDAC held its first SEPM Offsite Strategic Planning Meeting. As a part of the preparation for this meeting, LPA developed and distributed a survey to all LPA employees, soliciting their input regarding the committee's role and effectiveness. This one day session resulted in the re-development of the LPA Committee Action Plan. The purpose of the re-

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

development was to make the plan more reflective of LPA culture regarding planned activities, and areas of collaboration. The plan also provides an opportunity for event-based participation without the commitment of a separate SEPM performance element. This method of operating gives employees the chance to perform functions that will allow them to exceed fully successful in their mandatory EEO performance element.

Special Emphasis Observances

- Hispanic Heritage Month (Sept 15 – Oct. 15)

The committee hosted a “Poetry writing by Hispanics” display. Each Friday for 5 weeks LPA distributed a poem with a picture of the poet. The displays were printed poster size and posted in the LPA work areas.

- Disability Awareness Month (October)

LPA collaborated with PPD to sponsor “Disability Awareness Day,” a half-day event consisting of various speakers, vendors, and disability information stations.

- American Indian Observance (November 9, 2018)

LPA collaborated with OCRDI for the American Indian Observance and provided funding to assist with the cultural food tasting. W

- Black History Month Observance (February 2018)

LPA sponsored a 5-part story telling theme chronicling the lives of 2 African Americans who served in our country’s military during times of war.

- Asian American Pacific Islander Month (May 2018)

LPA sponsored a Tai Chi Demonstration open to all Riverdale, MD employees.

- Caribbean American Heritage Month (June 2018)

LPA created a newsletter highlighting various aspects of the Caribbean culture

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Marketing & Regulatory Programs Business Services (MRPBS)

MRPBS provides training and education to all employees and supervisors on various topics aimed at understanding and embracing diversity. Additionally, MRPBS employees are monitored to ensure that the mandatory annual Civil Rights training is completed. Each year the MRPBS CRDAC works with leadership to determine barriers and provides training to MRPBS employees to address any barriers found. In FY 2018, the training was in relation to Internal Communication skills. Past trainings included topics such as: internal interviewing, the application process, dressing for success, creating an IDP, and generational communication. MRPBS CRDAC is fully staffed with active SEPM members. Below are the accomplishments of each SEP:

American Indian & Alaska Native Special Emphasis Program

In FY 2018, AIAN SEPMs provided emails of historic information and current trending information in support Indian country to all of MRPBS and kept MRPBS employees aware of events going on in the DC Riverdale, Raleigh and or Ft. Collins. AIAN SEPMs attended the annual SAIGE conference and brought back information and connections to best work with the ANAWG Tribal Liaison Team. AIAN SEPMs also gave a presentation to Native Students at MIGIZI Communications and attended a community meeting to share information about APHIS and the services provided on Tribal Lands. AIAN SEPMs provided APHIS jobs and all Federal jobs available to the Minnesota BIA List Serve to encourage the hiring of Native Americans in the Federal Government.

African American Special Emphasis Program

The African American Special Emphasis Program Managers (AASEPMs) assisted in creating the Special Emphasis Program Manager pilot training for APHIS and offered recommendations for the future launch. AASEPMs marketed and participated in eight diversity awareness events which increased the overall attendance numbers by 20%. AASEPMs recruited over 90 minorities at the 2018 MANRRS Career Fair and briefed approximately forty 1890 Scholars and faculty on ways students can secure entry level positions at APHIS. AASEPMs collaborated with the Department, AMS and VS at the LULAC and HACU Expo. AASEPMs showcased USDA's student career opportunities to over 100 students, resulting in an offer to speak on HACU's panel in the future.

Veterans Employment Program

The Veterans' Employment Program Managers (VEPMs) participated in 12 Veteran Employment Program Office conference calls regarding veteran employment, job fairs, accomplishments, issues, etc. VEPMs received and forwarded all USDA job vacancies and job

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

fairs to Colorado National Guard (CONG) Employment Director and forwarded veteran information regarding free training, veteran Social Security benefits, Hire Our Heroes, and new 'Forever G.I. Bill' program to USDA veterans. VEPMs are an active member of Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve; assisting USDA employees/employers understand Uniformed Services Employment Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA). The VEPM conducted outreach to a Freedom Service Dog organization-spoke with Veterans Outreach Coordinator regarding assistance for struggling veterans.

Hispanic Employment Program

The Hispanic Employment Program Manager (HEPM) participated as a presenter in the MRPBS sponsored Ag-Discovery Program at Delaware State University.

Caribbean Employment Program

The Caribbean Program Manager co-sponsored a program in Raleigh, NC, related to the Caribbean culture.

Federal Employed Women's Program

The Federal Women's Program Manager (FWPM), conducted Internal Communication training in all MRPBS locations and by webinar.

Diversity Liaison

The Diversity Liaison (DL) conducted outreach by sharing and expressing the importance of middle and high school scholars' engagement in the Ag-Discovery Programs. The DL delivered Ag-Discovery booklets/applications to schools, barber shops, hair salons, social events, and libraries.

Several MRPBS CRDAC members participated as an EEO Observer for job interviews. Members were able to review interview questions and observe employment procedures. As active participants, they ensured that the interview process was free from discrimination.

Veterinary Services

Veterinary Service - Ames hosted Ag-Discovery at Iowa State University, where 16 students

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

from 12 different states participated. VS Ames also hosted an 8 week outreach event at the Navajo Technical University. VS Ames members attended the following affinity conferences/college fairs and conducted outreach at the USDA booth:

- Society for the Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
- Society of American Indian Government Employees (SAIGE)
- League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)
- Iowa State Conference on Race & Ethnicity (ISCORE)
- Iowa State University College Fair
- Kansas State University College Fair

VS Ames hosted multiple high school and college students at the National Centers for Animal Health (Ames, IA) and the Foreign Animal Disease Lab (Plum Island, NY) to introduce the students to the various work performed by USDA

VS – District 1 CRDAC members were active participants during a management meeting on policy, advocating for support in regards to budget issues. District 1 CRDAC members accomplished 100% of their FY 2018 work plan, under the leadership and support of management.

VS – District 2 CRDAC members participated in the Ag-Discovery mini-career fair and forum hosted by Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University. VS counseled students about careers within APHIS, VS, the Pathways Internship program, USAjobs application process, and the important work done by Veterinary Services to protect our nation's food supply against foreign animal diseases. 19 students attended this event. District 2 CRDAC members also attended and supported the outreach efforts at the Nashville Veteran's Job Fair.

VS – District 3 CRDAC members work alongside "advocates" in each state to ensure hiring goals are acknowledged and carried out throughout the district. CRDAC members actively work to make employees aware of both the administrative and EEO grievance processes. 58 District 3 employees have participated in a collective 159 outreach activities in FY 2018.

VS – District 4 CRDAC members established a full roster of SEPMs in FY 2018, after a year of vacancies in various SEPM positions. District 4 CRDAC members actively support and participated in three outreach activities for the Ag-Discovery program. Many additional outreach efforts were made at various veterinary conventions, minority focused conferences,

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

and trade fairs.

VS – District 5 CRDAC members not only participated in outreach events, but they provided advice/leadership in helping with arrangements for coverage during outreach events. District 5 CRDAC members organized coverage for a national outreach event at the IMAGE Conference. District 5 CRDAC members attended and presented at the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Day held at Washburn University in Topeka, KS. The event is held every October and geared towards girls in the 7th grade who have interest in STEM. District 5 CRDAC members also sponsored an outreach booth at the Women Managing the Farm conference in Manhattan, KS and at the 2018 Women in Agriculture conference in Kearney, NE. District 5 CRDAC members participated in student outreach efforts at Fort Hays State University. The program was in recognition of Agriculture week, and District 5 CRDAC members presented information about VS and various agriculture related topics. District 5 CRDAC members also presented at the Large Animal Diseases class, educating students on Foreign Animal Diseases and the VS response. District 5 CRDAC members participated in a USDA outreach booth at the Nebraska State Fair in Grand Island, NE along with Wildlife Services and PPQ. District 5 CRDAC members actively participates in outreach efforts at various campuses hosting Ag-Discovery. District 5 CRDAC members also actively participated in outreach efforts at the

District 5 CRDAC members collected amenities for hospitalized and homeless veterans to enhance their lives during the Christmas season. The items were given directly to veterans in conjunctions with the VA Nebraska-Western Iowa Health Care System. Flyers requesting donations were distributed to federal agencies throughout the Lincoln/Omaha area. District 5 CRDAC members also conducted a drive for the local homeless shelter.

In honor of each heritage month, District 5 CRDAC members distributed articles on various figures who made significant contributions to society. A District 5 CRDAC member is an active member of the National Center for Transgender Equality, and works with the center to organize and promote trans-rights. District 5 CRDAC members lead the “Lean In Circle” monthly conference call designated to support women in their roles at APHIS. Due to District 5’s promotion, participation in the Lean In Circles increase with each event. District 5 CRDAC members assist with foreign student education by hosting Chinese students through the US China Center for Animal Health. The students gain field experience at the Topeka office and shadow NIES staff for a day.

VS – District 6 CRDAC members promoted and participated in outreach efforts for the following events:

- Solano Education Agriculture Day

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Kinders Go To College Event
- Ag-Discovery
- Education Agriculture Day
- And other local recruitment events

The CRDACs for VS in districts 1, 3, 4, and 6 administer an EEO newsletter, with the goal to inform district employees of their right to work in an environment where they are respected, awarded, promoted, trained, etc. VS CRDAC members of Ft. Collins, District 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 participated as EEO Observers when needed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: PLANNED ACTIVITIES

FY19 Recruiting Goals.

APHIS will continue to develop and pursue innovative recruiting opportunities, combining past experiences and coupling them with the current challenges such as fiscal budgets, increased hiring activity, and monitoring of hiring exceptions. The following are the APHIS Recruiting goals for FY19:

- Increase the APHIS recruiting team contact network among the scholastic and education institutions nationwide to attract viable employment candidate interest from the diverse groups identified above as well as using a database of 800 + targeted colleges and universities that would serve as tools for seeking candidates to fill specific hiring needs.
- Continue to build a diverse APHIS recruiting team that can represent the organization at a variety of Career Fairs and events on a rotating cycle. The goal of the recruiting team members is to mirror the demographics of society and be drawn from the committees, Branches, and Programs of APHIS. They will develop a positive rapport with USDA's Regional Directors and USDA Liaison Officers.
- Conduct monthly APHIS Recruitment Advisory Committee meetings with representatives from each of the program areas, HR, and Civil Rights to identify shortfalls and barriers in targeted recruiting areas and coordinate planning and execution to correct them.
- Maintain our web page to increase the exposure of APHIS, attracting a diverse candidate pool while reducing travel expenses often associated with the traditional career fairs. Explore options to expand the use of social media organizations to augment our national recruitment efforts.

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

**CERTIFICATION of ESTABLISHMENT of CONTINUING
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS**

[Redacted] am the
(Insert Name Above) (Insert official title/series/grade above)

Principal EEO Director/Official for

[Redacted]
(Insert Agency/Component Name above)

The agency has conducted an annual self-assessment of Section 717 and Section 501 programs against the essential elements as prescribed by EEO MD-715. If an essential element was not fully compliant with the standards of EEO MD-715, a further evaluation was conducted and, as appropriate, EEO Plans for Attaining the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program, are included with this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report.

The agency has also analyzed its work force profiles and conducted barrier analyses aimed at detecting whether any management or personnel policy, procedure or practice is operating to disadvantage any group based on race, national origin, gender or disability. EEO Plans to Eliminate Identified Barriers, as appropriate, are included with this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report.

I certify that proper documentation of this assessment is in place and is being maintained for EEOC review upon request.

[Redacted]
Signature of Principal EEO Director/Official
Certifies that this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report is in compliance with EEO MD-715.

[Redacted]
Date

[Redacted]
Signature of Agency Head or Agency Head Designee



[Redacted]
Date

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



Essential Element: A Demonstrated Commitment From agency Leadership

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	A.1. The agency issues an effective, up-to-date EEO policy statement.				
	A.1.a. Does the agency annually issue a signed and dated EEO policy statement on agency letterhead that clearly communicates the agency's commitment to EEO for all employees and applicants? If "Yes", please provide the annual issuance date in the comments column. [see MD-715, II(A)]	X			The Secretary of Agriculture issued a Civil Rights Policy statement on behalf of all agencies with the Department of Agriculture, however it is not signed or dated. 5/25/2018
	A.1.b. Does the EEO policy statement address all protected bases (age, color, disability, sex (including pregnancy, sexual orientation and gender identity), genetic information, national origin, race, religion, and reprisal) contained in the laws EEOC enforces? [see 29 CFR § 1614.101(a)] If the EEO policy statement covers any additional bases (e.g., marital status, veteran status and political affiliation), please list them in the comments column.	X			APHIS and all other USDA agencies were instructed to follow official guidance stating to use the Civil Rights statement administered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018



Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	A.2. The agency has communicated EEO policies and procedures to all employees.				
	A.2.a. Does the agency disseminate the following policies and procedures to all employees:				
	A.2.a.1. Anti-harassment policy? [see MD 715, II(A)]	X			
	A.2.a.2. Reasonable accommodation procedures? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(3)]	X			
	A.2.b. Does the agency prominently post the following information throughout the workplace and on its public website:				
	A.2.b.1. The business contact information for its EEO Counselors, EEO Officers, Special Emphasis Program Managers, and EEO Director? [see 29 C.F.R § 1614.102(b)(7)]	X			
	A.2.b.2. Written materials concerning the EEO program, laws, policy statements, and the operation of the EEO complaint process? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(5)]	X			
	A.2.b.3. Reasonable accommodation procedures? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(3)(i)] If so, please provide the internet address in the comments column.		X		APHIS has met with EEOC representatives on finalizing the RA procedures. Once the procedures are approved, the public website will be updated.
	A.2.c. Does the agency inform its employees about the following topics:				
	A.2.c.1. EEO complaint process? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(a)(12) and 1614.102(b)(5)] If "yes", please provide how often and the means by which such training is delivered.	X			Monthly
	A.2.c.2. ADR process? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(II)(C)] If "yes", please provide how often.	X			Monthly
	A.2.c.3. Reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(7)(ii)(C)] If "yes", please provide how often.	X			Monthly
	A.2.c.4. Anti-harassment program? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.1] If "yes", please provide how often.	X			Monthly
	A.2.c.5. Behaviors that are inappropriate in the workplace and could result in disciplinary action? [5 CFR §2635.101(b)] If "yes", please provide how often.	X			Monthly

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	A.3. The agency assesses and ensures EEO principles are part of its culture.				
A.3.a. Does the agency provide recognition to employees, supervisors, managers and units demonstrating superior accomplishment in equal employment opportunity? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(9)] If "yes", provide one or two examples in the comments section. .		X			Diversity Champion APHIS Administrator's Civil Rights Award
A.3.b. Does the agency utilize the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey or other climate assessment tools to monitor the perception of EEO principles within the workforce? [see 5 CFR Part 250]		X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist





Essential Element: B Integration of EEO into the agency's Strategic Mission

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	B.1. The reporting structure for the EEO program provides the principal EEO official with appropriate authority and resources to effectively carry out a successful EEO program.				
	B.1.a. Is the agency head the immediate supervisor of the person ("EEO Director") who has day-to-day control over the EEO office? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)]	X			
	B.1.a.1. If the EEO Director does not report to the agency head, does the EEO Director report to the same agency head designee as the mission-related programmatic offices? If "yes," please provide the title of the agency head designee in the comments.			X	EEO Director reports directly to the agency head.
	B.1.a.2. Does the agency's organizational chart clearly define the reporting structure for the EEO office? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)]	X			
	B.1.b. Does the EEO Director have a regular and effective means of advising the agency head and other senior management officials of the effectiveness, efficiency and legal compliance of the agency's EEO program? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(1); MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	B.1.c. During this reporting period, did the EEO Director present to the head of the agency, and other senior management officials, the "State of the agency" briefing covering the six essential elements of the model EEO program and the status of the barrier analysis process? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I] If "yes", please provide the date of the briefing in the comments column.	X			December 11th, 2017 February 13th, 2018
	B.1.d. Does the EEO Director regularly participate in senior-level staff meetings concerning personnel, budget, technology, and other workforce issues? [see MD-715, II(B)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018


Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	B.2. The EEO Director controls all aspects of the EEO program.				
	B.2.a. Is the EEO Director responsible for the implementation of a continuing affirmative employment program to promote EEO and to identify and eliminate discriminatory policies, procedures, and practices? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(III)(A); 29 CFR §1614.102(c)] If not, identify the office with this authority in the comments column.	X			
	B.2.b. Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the completion of EEO counseling? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(4)]	X			
	B.2.c. Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the fair and thorough investigation of EEO complaints? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(5)] [This question may not be applicable for certain subordinate level components.]	X			
	B.2.d. Is the EEO Director responsible for overseeing the timely issuance of final agency decisions? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(5)] [This question may not be applicable for certain subordinate level components.]	X			
	B.2.e. Is the EEO Director responsible for ensuring compliance with EEOC orders? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(e); 1614.502]	X			
	B.2.f. Is the EEO Director responsible for periodically evaluating the entire EEO program and providing recommendations for improvement to the agency head? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	X			
	B.2.g. If the agency has subordinate level components, does the EEO Director provide effective guidance and coordination for the components? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(c)(2); (c)(3)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures	B.3. The EEO Director and other EEO professional staff are involved in, and consulted on, management/personnel actions.	Yes	No	N/A	
	B.3.a. Do EEO program officials participate in agency meetings regarding workforce changes that might impact EEO issues, including strategic planning, recruitment strategies, vacancy projections, succession planning, and selections for training/career development opportunities? [see MD-715, II(B)]	X			
	B.3.b. Does the agency's current strategic plan reference EEO / diversity and inclusion principles? [see MD-715, II(B)] If "yes", please identify the EEO principles in the strategic plan in the comments column.	X			Goal 1 - Deliver efficient, effective, and responsive programs Objective 1.5 - Leverage workforce difference to better serve the Agency's customers.

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018





Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator	Measures	Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
	B.4. The agency has sufficient budget and staffing to support the success of its EEO program.				
	B.4.a. Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(1), has the agency allocated sufficient funding and qualified staffing to successfully implement the EEO program, for the following areas:				
	B.4.a.1. to conduct a self-assessment of the agency for possible program deficiencies? [see MD-715, II(D)]	X			
	B.4.a.10. to effectively manage its reasonable accommodation program? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)(ii)]	X			
	B.4.a.11. to ensure timely and complete compliance with EEOC orders? [see MD-715, II(E)]	X			
	B.4.a.2. to enable the agency to conduct a thorough barrier analysis of its workforce? [see MD-715, II(B)]	X			
	B.4.a.3. to timely, thoroughly, and fairly process EEO complaints, including EEO counseling, investigations, final agency decisions, and legal sufficiency reviews? [see 29 CFR §§ 1614.102(c)(5); 1614.105(b) – (f); MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D) & 5(IV); MD-715, II(E)]	X			
	B.4.a.4. to provide all supervisors and employees with training on the EEO program, including but not limited to retaliation, harassment, religious accommodations, disability accommodations, the EEO complaint process, and ADR? [see MD-715, II(B) and III(C)] If not, please identify the type(s) of training with insufficient funding in the comments column.	X			
	B.4.a.5. to conduct thorough, accurate, and effective field audits of the EEO programs in components and the field offices, if applicable? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]	X			
	B.4.a.6. to publish and distribute EEO materials (e.g. harassment policies, EEO posters, reasonable accommodations procedures)? [see MD-715, II(B)]	X			
	B.4.a.7. to maintain accurate data collection and tracking systems for the following types of data: complaint tracking, workforce demographics, and applicant flow data? [see MD-715, II(E)] If not, please identify the systems with insufficient funding in the comments section.	X			
	B.4.a.8. to effectively administer its special emphasis programs (such as, Federal Women’s Program, Hispanic Employment Program, and People with Disabilities Program Manager)? [5 USC § 7201; 38 USC § 4214; 5 CFR § 720.204; 5 CFR § 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR § 315.709]	X			
	B.4.a.9. to effectively manage its anti-harassment program? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I; EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C. 1]	X			
	B.4.b. Does the EEO office have a budget that is separate from other offices within the agency? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(a)(1)]	X			
	B.4.c. Are the duties and responsibilities of EEO officials clearly defined? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(III)(A), 2(III), & 6(III)]	X			
	B.4.d. Does the agency ensure that all new counselors and investigators, including contractors and collateral duty employees, receive the required 32 hours of training, pursuant to Ch. 2(II) (A) of MD-110?	X			
	B.4.e. Does the agency ensure that all experienced counselors and investigators, including contractors and collateral duty employees, receive the required 8 hours of annual refresher training, pursuant to Ch. 2(II)(C) of MD-110?	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	B.5. The agency recruits, hires, develops, and retains supervisors and managers who have effective managerial, communications, and interpersonal skills				
	B.5.a. Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(5), have all managers and supervisors received orientation, training, and advice on their responsibilities under the following areas under the agency EEO program:				
	B.5.a.1. EEO complaint process? [see MD-715(II)(B)]	X			
	B.5.a.2. Reasonable Accommodation Procedures? [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(d)(3)]	X			
	B.5.a.3. Anti-harassment policy? [see MD-715(II)(B)]	X			
	B.5.a.4. Supervisory, managerial, communication and interpersonal skills in order to supervise most effectively in a workplace with diverse employees and avoid disputes arising from ineffective communications? [see MD-715, II(B)]	X			
	B.5.a.5. ADR, with emphasis on the federal government's interest in encouraging mutual resolution of disputes and the benefits associated with utilizing ADR? [see MD-715(II)(E)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
	B.6. The agency involves managers in the implementation of its EEO program.				
	B.6.a. Are senior managers involved in the implementation of Special Emphasis Programs? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	B.6.b. Do senior managers participate in the barrier analysis process? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	B.6.c. When barriers are identified, do senior managers assist in developing agency EEO action plans (Part I, Part J, or the Executive Summary)? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	B.6.d. Do senior managers successfully implement EEO Action Plans and incorporate the EEO Action Plan Objectives into agency strategic plans? [29 CFR §1614.102(a)(5)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



Essential Element: C Management and Program Accountability

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	C.1. The agency conducts regular internal audits of its component and field offices.				
	C.1.a. Does the agency regularly assess its component and field offices for possible EEO program deficiencies? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)] If "yes", please provide the schedule for conducting audits in the comments section.	X			Quarterly
	C.1.b. Does the agency regularly assess its component and field offices on their efforts to remove barriers from the workplace? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)] If "yes", please provide the schedule for conducting audits in the comments section.	X			Quarterly
	C.1.c. Do the component and field offices make reasonable efforts to comply with the recommendations of the field audit? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018



Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator	 Measures	Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
	C.2. The agency has established procedures to prevent all forms of EEO discrimination.				
	C.2.a. Has the agency established comprehensive anti-harassment policy and procedures that comply with EEOC's enforcement guidance? [see MD-715, II(C); Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (Enforcement Guidance), EEOC No. 915.002, § V.C.1 (June 18, 1999)]	X			
	C.2.a.1. Does the anti-harassment policy require corrective action to prevent or eliminate conduct before it rises to the level of unlawful harassment? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.1]	X			
	C.2.a.2. Has the agency established a firewall between the Anti-Harassment Coordinator and the EEO Director? [see EEOC Report, Model EEO Program Must Have an Effective Anti-Harassment Program (2006)]	X			
	C.2.a.3. Does the agency have a separate procedure (outside the EEO complaint process) to address harassment allegations? [see Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (Enforcement Guidance), EEOC No. 915.002, § V.C.1 (June 18, 1999)]	X			
	C.2.a.4. Does the agency ensure that the EEO office informs the anti-harassment program of all EEO counseling activity alleging harassment? [See Enforcement Guidance, V.C.]	X			
	C.2.a.5. Does the agency conduct a prompt inquiry (beginning within 10 days of notification) of all harassment allegations, including those initially raised in the EEO complaint process? [see Complainant v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Appeal No. 0120123232 (May 21, 2015); Complainant v. Dep't of Defense (Defense Commissary Agency), EEOC Appeal No. 0120130331 (May 29, 2015)] If "no", please provide the percentage of timely-processed inquiries in the comments column.	X			
	C.2.a.6. Do the agency's training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(2)]	X			
	C.2.b. Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]		X		
	C.2.b.1. Is there a designated agency official or other mechanism in place to coordinate or assist with processing requests for disability accommodations throughout the agency? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)(D)]	X			
	C.2.b.2. Has the agency established a firewall between the Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager and the EEO Director? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(A)]	X			
	C.2.b.3. Does the agency ensure that job applicants can request and receive reasonable accommodations during the application and placement processes? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(ii)(B)]	X			
	C.2.b.4. Do the reasonable accommodation procedures clearly state that the agency should process the request within a maximum amount of time (e.g., 20 business days), as established by the agency in its affirmative action plan? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)(i)(M)]	X			
	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If "no", please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.	X			
	C.2.c. Has the agency established procedures for processing requests for personal assistance services that comply with EEOC's regulations, enforcement guidance, and other applicable executive orders, guidance, and standards? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(6)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018





Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

C.2.c.1. Does the agency post its procedures for processing requests for Personal Assistance Services on its public website? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(5)(v)] If “yes”, please provide the internet address in the comments column.		X			https://www.aphis.usda.gov/mrpbs/hr/downloads/Brochure_Reasona
 Compliance Indicator	C.3. The agency evaluates managers and supervisors on their efforts to ensure equal employment opportunity.	Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
C.3.a. Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(5), do all managers and supervisors have an element in their performance appraisal that evaluates their commitment to agency EEO policies and principles and their participation in the EEO program?		X			
C.3.b. Does the agency require rating officials to evaluate the performance of managers and supervisors based on the following activities:					
C.3.b.1. Resolve EEO problems/disagreements/conflicts, including the participation in ADR proceedings? [see MD-110, Ch. 3.I]		X			
C.3.b.2. Ensure full cooperation of employees under his/her supervision with EEO officials, such as counselors and investigators? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(6)]		X			
C.3.b.3. Ensure a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, including harassment and retaliation? [see MD-715, II(C)]		X			
C.3.b.4. Ensure that subordinate supervisors have effective managerial, communication, and interpersonal skills to supervise in a workplace with diverse employees? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]		X			
C.3.b.5. Provide religious accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(7)]		X			
C.3.b.6. Provide disability accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(8)]		X			
C.3.b.7. Support the EEO program in identifying and removing barriers to equal opportunity?. [see MD-715, II(C)]		X			
C.3.b.8. Support the anti-harassment program in investigating and correcting harassing conduct?. [see Enforcement Guidance, V.C.2]		X			
C.3.b.9. Comply with settlement agreements and orders issued by the agency, EEOC, and EEO-related cases from the Merit Systems Protection Board, labor arbitrators, and the Federal Labor Relations Authority? [see MD-715, II(C)]		X			
C.3.c. Does the EEO Director recommend to the agency head improvements or corrections, including remedial or disciplinary actions, for managers and supervisors who have failed in their EEO responsibilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]		X			
C.3.d. When the EEO Director recommends remedial or disciplinary actions, are the recommendations regularly implemented by the agency? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(c)(2)]		X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018



Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	C.4. The agency ensures effective coordination between its EEO program and Human Resources (HR) program.				
	C.4.a. Do the HR Director and the EEO Director meet regularly to assess whether personnel programs, policies, and procedures conform to EEOC laws, instructions, and management directives? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(2)]	X			
	C.4.b. Has the agency established timetables/schedules to review at regular intervals its merit promotion program, employee recognition awards program, employee development/training programs, and management/personnel policies, procedures, and practices for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in the program by all EEO groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	C.4.c. Does the EEO office have timely access to accurate and complete data (e.g., demographic data for the workforce, applicants, training programs, etc.) required to prepare the MD-715 workforce data tables? [see 29 CFR §1614.601(a)]		X		A7, A9, A11, A12, B7, B9, B11, B12
	C.4.d. Does the HR office timely provide the EEO office with access to other data (e.g., exit interview data, climate assessment surveys, and grievance data), upon request? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			
	C.4.e. Pursuant to Section II(C) of MD-715, does the EEO office collaborate with the HR office to:				
	C.4.e.1. Implement the Affirmative Action Plan for Individuals with Disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d); MD-715, II(C)]	X			
	C.4.e.2. Develop and/or conduct outreach and recruiting initiatives? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			
	C.4.e.3. Develop and/or provide training for managers and employees? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			
	C.4.e.4. Identify and remove barriers to equal opportunity in the workplace? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			
	C.4.e.5. Assist in preparing the MD-715 report? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
	C.5. Following a finding of discrimination, the agency explores whether it should take a disciplinary action.				
	C.5.a. Does the agency have a disciplinary policy and/or table of penalties that covers discriminatory conduct? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(6); see also Douglas v. Veterans Administration, 5 MSPR 280 (1981)]	X			
	C.5.b. When appropriate, does the agency discipline or sanction managers and employees for discriminatory conduct? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(6)] If "yes", please state the number of disciplined/sanctioned individuals during this reporting period in the comments.	X			There has been no findings of discrimination.
	C.5.c. If the agency has a finding of discrimination (or settles cases in which a finding was likely), does the agency inform managers and supervisors about the discriminatory conduct (e.g., post mortem to discuss lessons learned)? [see MD-715, II(C)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist





 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	C.6. The EEO office advises managers/supervisors on EEO matters.				
	C.6.a. Does the EEO office provide management/supervisory officials with regular EEO updates on at least an annual basis, including EEO complaints, workforce demographics and data summaries, legal updates, barrier analysis plans, and special emphasis updates? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I] If "yes", please identify the frequency of the EEO updates in the comments column.	X			EEO Director meets with programs annually, however other members of OCRDI meet more frequently to address any concerns regarding EEO.
	C.6.b. Are EEO officials readily available to answer managers' and supervisors' questions or concerns? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist





Essential Element: D Proactive Prevention

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	D.1. The agency conducts a reasonable assessment to monitor progress towards achieving equal employment opportunity throughout the year.			N/A	
	D.1.a. Does the agency have a process for identifying triggers in the workplace? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	D.1.b. Does the agency regularly use the following sources of information for trigger identification: workforce data; complaint/grievance data; exit surveys; employee climate surveys; focus groups; affinity groups; union; program evaluations; special emphasis programs; and/or external special interest groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			
	D.1.c. Does the agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures	D.2. The agency identifies areas where barriers may exclude EEO groups (reasonable basis to act.)	Yes	No	N/A	
	D.2.a. Does the agency have a process for analyzing the identified triggers to find possible barriers? [see MD-715, (II)(B)]	X			
	D.2.b. Does the agency regularly examine the impact of management/personnel policies, procedures, and practices by race, national origin, sex, and disability? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	X			
	D.2.c. Does the agency consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making human resource decisions, such as re-organizations and realignments? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	X			
	D.2.d. Does the agency regularly review the following sources of information to find barriers: complaint/grievance data, exit surveys, employee climate surveys, focus groups, affinity groups, union, program evaluations, anti-harassment program, special emphasis programs, and/or external special interest groups? [see MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I] If "yes", please identify the data sources in the comments column.	X			Focus groups, employee climate surveys, Special emphasis programs, reasonable accommodation program, workforce data, etc.

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	D.3. The agency establishes appropriate action plans to remove identified barriers.	Yes	No	N/A	
	D.3.a. Does the agency effectively tailor action plans to address the identified barriers, in particular policies, procedures, or practices? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(a)(3)]	X			
	D.3.b. If the agency identified one or more barriers during the reporting period, did the agency implement a plan in Part I, including meeting the target dates for the planned activities? [see MD-715, II(D)]	X			
	D.3.c. Does the agency periodically review the effectiveness of the plans? [see MD-715, II(D)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures	D.4. The agency has an affirmative action plan for people with disabilities, including those with targeted disabilities.	Yes	No	N/A	
	D.4.a. Does the agency post its affirmative action plan on its public website? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)] If yes, please provide the internet address in the comments.	X			https://www.aphis.usda.gov/ourfocus/civilrights/reports
	D.4.b. Does the agency take specific steps to ensure qualified people with disabilities are aware of and encouraged to apply for job vacancies? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(i)]	X			
	D.4.c. Does the agency ensure that disability-related questions from members of the public are answered promptly and correctly? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(ii)(A)]	X			
	D.4.d. Has the agency taken specific steps that are reasonably designed to increase the number of persons with disabilities or targeted disabilities employed at the agency until it meets the goals? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(7)(ii)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018



Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

Essential Element: E Efficiency

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	E.1. The agency maintains an efficient, fair, and impartial complaint resolution process.				
	E.1.a. Does the agency timely provide EEO counseling, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.105?	X			
	E.1.b. Does the agency provide written notification of rights and responsibilities in the EEO process during the initial counseling session, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.105(b)(1)?	X			
	E.1.c. Does the agency issue acknowledgment letters immediately upon receipt of a formal complaint, pursuant to MD-110, Ch. 5(I)?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.d. Does the agency issue acceptance letters/dismissal decisions within a reasonable time (e.g., 60 days) after receipt of the written EEO Counselor report, pursuant to MD-110, Ch. 5(I)? If so, please provide the average processing time in the comments.	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.e. Does the agency ensure that all employees fully cooperate with EEO counselors and EEO personnel in the EEO process, including granting routine access to personnel records related to an investigation, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(6)?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.f. Does the agency timely complete investigations, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.108?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.g. If the agency does not timely complete investigations, does the agency notify complainants of the date by which the investigation will be completed and of their right to request a hearing or file a lawsuit, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.108(g)?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.h. When the complainant did not request a hearing, does the agency timely issue the final agency decision, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.110(b)?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
	E.1.i. Does the agency timely issue final actions following receipt of the hearing file and the administrative judge's decision, pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.110(a)?	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

E.1.j. If the agency uses contractors to implement any stage of the EEO complaint process, does the agency hold them accountable for poor work product and/or delays? [See MD-110, Ch. 5(V)(A)] If "yes", please describe how in the comments column.	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
E.1.k. If the agency uses employees to implement any stage of the EEO complaint process, does the agency hold them accountable for poor work product and/or delays during performance review? [See MD-110, Ch. 5(V)(A)]	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights
E.1.l. Does the agency submit complaint files and other documents in the proper format to EEOC through the Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP)? [See 29 CFR § 1614.403(g)]	X			Function completed by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights





 Compliance Indicator	Measure Has Been Met	Yes	No	N/A	For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures					
E.2. The agency has a neutral EEO process.					

E.2.a. Has the agency established a clear separation between its EEO complaint program and its defensive function? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)] If "yes", please explain.	X				The EEO complaint program is handed by the Office of Civil Rights, while the defensive function is handled by the Employment Law and Hearings Branch housed under Human Resources.
E.2.b. When seeking legal sufficiency reviews, does the EEO office have access to sufficient legal resources separate from the agency representative? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)] If "yes", please identify the source/location of the attorney who conducts the legal sufficiency review in the comments column.	X				Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights (OASCR) and the Office of General Counsel (OGC)
E.2.c. If the EEO office relies on the agency's defensive function to conduct the legal sufficiency review, is there a firewall between the reviewing attorney and the agency representative? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)]	X				
E.2.d. Does the agency ensure that its agency representative does not intrude upon EEO counseling, investigations, and final agency decisions? [see MD-110, Ch. 1(IV)(D)]	X				
E.2.e. If applicable, are processing time frames incorporated for the legal counsel's sufficiency review for timely processing of complaints? [see EEOC Report, Attaining a Model Agency Program: Efficiency (Dec. 1, 2004)]	X				

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018



Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	E.3. The agency has established and encouraged the widespread use of a fair alternative dispute resolution (ADR) program.				
	E.3.a. Has the agency established an ADR program for use during both the pre-complaint and formal complaint stages of the EEO process? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(2)]	X			
	E.3.b. Does the agency require managers and supervisors to participate in ADR once it has been offered? [see MD-715, II(A)(1)]	X			
	E.3.c. Does the Agency encourage all employees to use ADR, where ADR is appropriate? [See MD-110, Ch. 3(IV)(C)]	X			
	E.3.d. Does the agency ensure a management official with settlement authority is accessible during the dispute resolution process? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(III)(A)(9)]	X			
	E.3.e. Does the agency prohibit the responsible management official named in the dispute from having settlement authority? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(I)]	X			
	E.3.f. Does the agency annually evaluate the effectiveness of its ADR program? [see MD-110, Ch. 3(II)(D)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
	E.4. The agency has effective and accurate data collection systems in place to evaluate its EEO program.				
	E.4.a. Does the agency have systems in place to accurately collect, monitor, and analyze the following data:				
	E.4.a.1. Complaint activity, including the issues and bases of the complaints, the aggrieved individuals/complainants, and the involved management official? [see MD-715, II(E)]	X			
	E.4.a.2. The race, national origin, sex, and disability status of agency employees? [see 29 CFR §1614.601(a)]	X			
	E.4.a.3. Recruitment activities? [see MD-715, II(E)]	X			
	E.4.a.4. External and internal applicant flow data concerning the applicants' race, national origin, sex, and disability status? [see MD-715, II(E)]		X		
	E.4.a.5. The processing of requests for reasonable accommodation? [29 CFR §1614.203(d)(4)]	X			
	E.4.a.6. The processing of complaints for the anti-harassment program? [see EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Vicarious Employer Liability for Unlawful Harassment by Supervisors (1999), § V.C.2]	X			
	E.4.b. Does the agency have a system in place to re-survey the workforce on a regular basis? [MD-715 Instructions, Sec. I]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist





 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	E.5. The agency identifies and disseminates significant trends and best practices in its EEO program.				
E.5.a. Does the agency monitor trends in its EEO program to determine whether the agency is meeting its obligations under the statutes EEOC enforces? [see MD-715, II(E)] If "yes", provide an example in the comments.		X			The agency monitors its workforce based on three to five year trends and there is also an ongoing collaboration between OCRDI and HR.
E.5.b. Does the agency review other agencies' best practices and adopt them, where appropriate, to improve the effectiveness of its EEO program? [see MD-715, II(E)] If "yes", provide an example in the comments.		X			Agency representatives regularly collaborate with different EEO departments of various USDA agencies for SEPM programs, workforce analysis, etc.
E.5.c. Does the agency compare its performance in the EEO process to other federal agencies of similar size? [see MD-715, II(E)]		X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist



Essential Element: F Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	N/A	
 Measures	F.1. The agency has processes in place to ensure timely and full compliance with EEOC orders and settlement agreements.				
	F.1.a. Does the agency have a system of management controls to ensure that its officials timely comply with EEOC orders/directives and final agency actions? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(e); MD-715, II(F)]	X			
	F.1.b. Does the agency have a system of management controls to ensure the timely, accurate, and complete compliance with resolutions/settlement agreements? [see MD-715, II(F)]	X			
	F.1.c. Are there procedures in place to ensure the timely and predictable processing of ordered monetary relief? [see MD-715, II(F)]	X			
	F.1.d. Are procedures in place to process other forms of ordered relief promptly? [see MD-715, II(F)]	X			
	F.1.e. When EEOC issues an order requiring compliance by the agency, does the agency hold its compliance officer(s) accountable for poor work product and/or delays during performance review? [see MD-110, Ch. 9(IX)(H)]	X			
 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
	F.2.a. Does the agency timely respond and fully comply with EEOC orders? [see 29 CFR §1614.502; MD-715, II(E)]	X			
	F.2.a.1. When a complainant requests a hearing, does the agency timely forward the investigative file to the appropriate EEOC hearing office? [see 29 CFR §1614.108(g)]	X			
	F.2.a.2. When there is a finding of discrimination that is not the subject of an appeal by the agency, does the agency ensure timely compliance with the orders of relief? [see 29 CFR §1614.501]	X			
	F.2.a.3. When a complainant files an appeal, does the agency timely forward the investigative file to EEOC's Office of Federal Operations? [see 29 CFR §1614.403(e)]	X			
	F.2.a.4. Pursuant to 29 CFR §1614.502, does the agency promptly provide EEOC with the required documentation for completing compliance?	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Agency Self-Assessment Checklist

 Compliance Indicator		Measure Has Been Met			
 Measures		Yes	No	N/A	For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
	F.3. The agency reports to EEOC its program efforts and accomplishments.				
	F.3.a. Does the agency timely submit to EEOC an accurate and complete No FEAR Act report? [Public Law 107-174 (May 15, 2002), §203(a)]	X			
	F.3.b. Does the agency timely post on its public webpage its quarterly No FEAR Act data? [see 29 CFR §1614.703(d)]	X			

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Attain Essential Elements

PART H.1

STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	A.2.b.3. Reasonable accommodation procedures? [see 29 CFR § 1614.203(d)(3)(i)] If so, please provide the internet address in the comments column.	
Reasonable Accommodations policy and procedures posted on the agency's public website		
OBJECTIVE:	<u>Date Objective Initiated:</u> Oct 1, 2018	<u>Target Date For Completion Of Initiative:</u> Mar 21, 2019
Finalize & display Reasonable Accommodations and Personal Assistance Services policies and procedures.		
Responsible Official	Charlotte Jones	
Planned Activities	Target Date	Planned Activity
	Mar 31, 2010 12:00 AM	Finalize RA and PAS procedures. Receive approval from the Director of Human Resources.
	Oct 31, 2018 12:00 AM	Meet with EEOC representatives and receive official feedback on RA and PAS procedures.
Mar 31, 2019 12:00 AM	Upload RA and PAS procedures to external website	
Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective		

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Attain Essential Elements

PART H.2

STATEMENT of
MODEL PROGRAM
ESSENTIAL ELEMENT
DEFICIENCY:

C.2.b. Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]

Establishing disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulation and guidance.

OBJECTIVE:

Date Objective Initiated: Oct 1, 2018 *Target Date For Completion Of Initiative:* Mar 31, 2019

Finalize & display Reasonable Accommodations and Personal Assistance Services policies and procedures.

Responsible Official

Charlotte Jones

Planned Activities

<i>Target Date</i>	<i>Planned Activity</i>
Mar 31, 2018 12:00 AM	Finalize RA and PAS procedures. Receive approval from Director of Human Resources
Oct 31, 2018 12:00 AM	Meet with EEOC representatives and received official feedback on RA and PAS procedures.

**Report of Accomplishments
and Modifications to
Objective**

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Attain Essential Elements

PART H.3

STATEMENT of
MODEL PROGRAM
ESSENTIAL ELEMENT
DEFICIENCY:

C.4.c. Does the EEO office have timely access to accurate and complete data (e.g., demographic data for the workforce, applicants, training programs, etc.) required to prepare the MD-715 workforce data tables? [see 29 CFR §1614.601(a)]

Accurate and complete workforce data tables

OBJECTIVE:	<i>Date Objective Initiated:</i> Oct 1, 2018	<i>Target Date For Completion Of Initiative:</i> Sep 30, 2019
	Obtain accurate and complete workforce and applicant flow data.	
Responsible Official	Sarah Blasko Nancy Varichak	
Planned Activities	<i>Target Date</i> Jan 22, 2019 12:00 AM	<i>Planned Activity</i> Quarterly meetings on best practices to capture applicant flow data for Tables A12/B12
	Jan 22, 2019 12:00 AM	Establish contact with departmental heads to capture SES applicant flow data.
Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective		

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Attain Essential Elements

PART H.4

STATEMENT of
MODEL PROGRAM
ESSENTIAL ELEMENT
DEFICIENCY:

E.4.a.4. External and internal applicant flow data concerning the applicants' race, national origin, sex, and disability status? [see MD-715, II(E)]

Accurate and complete workforce data tables

OBJECTIVE:

<u><i>Date Objective Initiated:</i></u>	<u><i>Target Date For Completion Of Initiative:</i></u>
Oct 1, 2018	Sep 30, 2019

Obtain accurate and complete workforce and applicant flow data.

Responsible Official

Sarah Blasko
Nancy Varichak

Planned Activities

<i>Target Date</i>	<i>Planned Activity</i>
Jan 22, 2019 12:00 AM	Quarterly meetings on best practices to capture applicant flow data for Tables A12/B12
Jan 22, 2019 12:00 AM	Establish contact with departmental heads to capture SES applicant flow data.

**Report of Accomplishments
and Modifications to
Objective**

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Eliminate Identified Barriers

PART I.1

STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:

The participation rate for total women are below the CLF level.

Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.

How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?

STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:

Barrier Group

All Women

BARRIER ANALYSIS:

Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:

Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

APHIS speculates that the barriers preventing women from achieving SES positions are attitudinal (unconscious bias, conscious stereotyping, etc.) APHIS also speculates that the lack of knowledge, education, and training on the Senior Executive Service process and qualifications prevents self-promotion. APHIS has determined that the agency's workforce is not equipped with enough information on the SES process, as a whole, to reflect exemplary figures in this employment category. Course offerings starting at the GS-14 level for SES introduction maybe too late for ultimately building proper workforce for SES candidacy and attending the various Leadership Development Programs is not sufficient for SES candidacy. The Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Agency SES Appraisal System Certification and Recertification is the official certification of a candidate and the SES hiring is handled on the departmental level.

Objective

SES Barrier Analysis (Report, Action Plan, Data, Survey)

Date Objective Initiated | Nov 15, 2015

Target Date For Completion Of Objective | Sep 30, 2017

Responsible Officials

Michon Oubichon Director, OCRDI

Patrick Johnson Diversity & Inclusion Specialist

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Eliminate Identified Barriers

	Planned Activity	Target Date
	Focus Groups with female candidates who have completed any SES leadership development programs.	Sep 30, 2017
	SES Barrier Analysis (Report, Action Plan, Data, Survey)	Sep 30, 2019
	Workshop/Training to understand the SES selection process, identify the typical background and experience of individuals selected to the SES and other senior pay positions, meet with members of interview panels about their processes for identifying the best-qualified applicants, interview employees from HR about their screening process, and compare the qualifications of female applicants to the selectees' qualifications.	Sep 30, 2018
	Continue to train the agency workforce on the process for becoming an SES (understanding the different SES application processes, SES appointments, SES application methods).	Sep 30, 2019
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective	The Task Force will meet quarterly to: (1) identify the typical background and experience of individuals selected to the SES and other senior pay positions; (2) review the qualifications of females seeking career advancement; (3) examine the recruitment of females into the senior grade levels and management positions; (4) investigate every phase of the merit promotion process for the SES; (5) interview employees from the human resources office about their screening process; (6) meet with members of the interview panel about their process of identifying best-qualified applicants and their interview questions;(7) compare the qualifications of female applicants to the selectees' qualifications; (8) review the various voting stages for disapproval of female candidates; (9) review the participation of females by grade level in the occupations with upward mobility. (10) Meet with selecting officials to examine their experience and discuss their perception of female candidates.	Sep 30, 2017

Report of Accomplishments and Modifications to Objective	<p>The National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committee (NCRDAC) started the barrier analysis process for the Barriers to Executive Level Positions analysis, as recommended by the EEOC at the end of FY 2016. OCRDI focused on the cause of the possible glass ceiling and blocked pipeline barriers for females. Moving forward in FY 2017, OCRDI will be utilizing the agency's Diversity Liaisons to assist the NCRDAC with the barrier analysis.</p> <p>In FY 2018, APHIS hired 3 new SES positions. All three positions were filled by candidates identifying as female.</p> <p>Members of the National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committee and Diversity & Inclusion Specialists attended a workshop presented by Nancy Segal of Solutions for the Workplace, LLC. The workshop was entitled "So You Want to be SES" and gave in-depth details on the SES process and qualifications. It was learned that the Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) Agency SES Appraisal System Certification and Recertification is the official office with the ability to certify a candidate.</p>
---	--

PART I.2

<p>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</p> <p>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</p>	<p>The following groups are underrepresented: Hispanic females, White females, African American males, African American females, and females as a group. The condition was recognized as a potential barrier because the participation rate is low in comparison to the CLF.</p>
<p>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</p>	<p>Barrier Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Women Hispanic or Latino Females White Females Black or African American Males Black or African American Females

USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2017 to September 30, 2018

Plan to Eliminate Identified Barriers

PART I.3

STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:

Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.
How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?

Blocked pipeline and glass ceiling scenarios are evident within data, affecting women and minorities. Groups that has data supporting signs of a glass ceiling, are also showing high separation rates. APHIS does not currently complete data for tables A/B12, however APHIS does have access to the demographics of each career development program. Though women and minorities are applying for higher grade positions, they are not being selected at a rate that would diversify high level positions. No Hispanic females were selected in the GS-13, GS-14, or GS-15 level.

STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:

Barrier Group

- All Women
- Hispanic or Latino Males
- Hispanic or Latino Females
- White Females
- Black or African American Males
- Black or African American Females
- Asian Males
- Asian Females
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Males
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Females
- American Indian or Alaska Native Males
- American Indian or Alaska Native Females

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

In FY 2018, there were 395 employees (10.79%) with disabilities in the GS-11 to SES cluster. This is 1.21% below the 12% benchmark.

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

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

- | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|----|
| a.Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| b.Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) | Answer | No |

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

Human Resources (HR) and the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity, and Inclusion (OCRDI) has established a direct line of communication through our HR/OCRDI monthly meetings. The goals are communicated by OCRDI to HR staff, and HR includes the fiscal year's goals in the annual Outreach and Recruitment Plan. The Recruitment Plan is used to declare outreach and recruitment intentions for each special emphasis group. It is given to all hiring managers and recruiters, so that they are aware of APHIS' annual goals.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	3	0	0	Nancy Varichak Deputy Director, HR Operations nancy.c.varichak@usda.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1	0	1	Adrienne Burch Management Analyst adrienne.m.burch@usda.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	3	0	0	David Walton RA Coordinator david.walton@usda.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	0	Vacant
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	GSA
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	15	Adrienne Burch Management Analyst adrienne.m.burch@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.

Answer Yes

APHIS’ AgLearn training system provides Accessibility and Section 508 Awareness training and Disability Legislation & Reasonable Accommodation (A Practical Guide) training, Hidden Talent: How Leading Companies Hire, Retain, and Benefit from People with Disabilities, Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) training, AbilityOne Program training, Perfectly Able: How to Attract and Hire Talented People with Disabilities, etc. Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPMs) Training is mandatory for all SEPMs, including Disability Employment Program Managers.

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Answer Yes

Section III: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

APHIS collaborates with Association of People Supporting Employment First (APSE) in order to perform outreach and recruitment efforts. We also use the Job Accommodation Network (JAN) database in order to recruit applicants with disabilities.

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

Many of the merit promotion announcements that the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) posts state that applications will be accepted from individuals eligible for noncompetitive appointment. Targeted recruitment outside of USDAJOBS is also conducted to contact applicants with disabilities. APHIS uses Schedule A 213.3102 (u) to hire individuals with physical, psychiatric, and/or intellectual disabilities. In addition, the authorities to make noncompetitive appointments of veterans with service-connected disabilities of 30 percent or more with the prospect of conversion to a permanent appointment are also frequently utilized to appoint persons with disabilities. A wide variety of positions at all grade levels in both the General Schedule and Federal Wage System are filled using these authorities.

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

If a Schedule A applicant applies to a vacancy announcement, an HR Staffing Specialist/Assistant reviews the PWD's application materials to determine qualifications and eligibility. If the applicant is deemed qualified and eligible via Schedule A, he/she is forwarded to the selecting official via a non-competitive list (certificate). If the Schedule A applicant is selected, the servicing HR specialist provides guidance to the selecting official on the Schedule A appointment process.

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

Answer Yes

Newly selected hiring managers, as a part of their training process, attend Fundamentals of Human Resource Management (FHRM) training. During FHRM training, special hiring authorities like Schedule A are discussed as a major topic area. FHRM training occurs six times a year. We also provide selecting officials with ad hoc trainings on topics like Schedule A and OPM's Bender List.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

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

In FY 2018, APHIS collaborated with organizations such as Lighthouse for the Blind, Association of People Supporting Employment First, Employer Assistance and Resource Network on Disability Inclusion (EARN), etc. APHIS developed a process to procure a sign language interpreter and closed captioning for our special observances, and plans to use this process for events in FY 2019. We maintain connections not only for employment reasons, but to teach basic communication skills to APHIS employees that will assist with communicating with other employees who may be vision or hearing impaired.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

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

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

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) Answer Yes

In FY 2018, there were 777 new hires. 44 were PWD (5.66%) and 7 were PWTD (0.90%). Both are below the benchmark goals.

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Qualified applicant pool data was not provided with Table B7; therefore, we are unable to use qualified applicant pool data as a benchmark. A plan has been put in place to address this issue.

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

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

0704 – Animal Health Technician 7.65% of the relevant applicant pool are PWD, however, only 3.95% of the total applications received were PWD. 2210 – Information Technology 19.60% of the relevant applicant pool are PWD, however only 10.77% of the total applications received were PWD. 5.20% of the relevant applicant pool are PWTD, however, only 4.62% of the total applications received were PWTD.

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

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

0401 – General Biological Science PWD were 9.92% of those who qualified, however only 7.14% of those selected were PWD. PWTD were 4.96% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 0403 – Microbiology PWD were 28.57% of those who qualified, however none were selected. PWTD were 14.29% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 0404 – Biological Science Technician PWD were 14.29% of those who qualified, however none were selected. PWTD were 7.14% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 0486 – Wildlife Biology PWD were 9.65% of those who qualified, however none were selected. PWTD were 3.95% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 0701 – Veterinary Medical Science PWD were 5.51% of those who qualified, however none were selected. PWTD were 1.97% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 0704 – Animal Health Technician PWD and PWTD were both 4% of those who qualified, however none were selected. 2210 – Information Technology Management PWD were 10.82% of those who qualified, however none were selected. PWTD were 4.64% of those who qualified, however none were selected.

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

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

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

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

PWD and PWTD are given the same opportunities to participate in career development programs that are afforded to all APHIS employees. APHIS will continue to provide individuals with disabilities assistive technology to utilize throughout the career development programs, as well as for day-to-day duties. A plan has been put in place to address the collection of PWD/PWTD data for career development programs.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

The Agency offers the following targeted leadership development programs: The Foundational Leadership Development Program (FLDP, formerly Basic LDP) targets employees at GS 4 – 6 levels to prepare participants with the essential knowledge, skills and abilities to meet the agency’s succession planning needs and to achieve excellence, regardless of position or grade level. This program is a blended learning program that supports two separate weeks of classroom sessions and weekly web-based courses in between. The Intermediate Leadership Development Program (ILDP) targets employees at the GS 7 – 11 grade levels and consists of a blended learning curriculum, shadow assignments, and learning team projects. The Leadership Development for Project/Program Managers (LDPM) targets employees at GS 12 – 14 levels and consists of development of project and program management skills for those who lead teams. The Advanced Leadership Development Program (ALDP) targets employees at GS 12 – 14 levels and consists of helping participants perform successfully in advanced supervisory and managerial level positions. The ALDP is filled via a competitive process open to fulltime GS 12 -14 employees in supervisory or managerial positions. The ALDP was re-launched in the summer of 2018, after taking a year hiatus to evaluate and redesign. The Federal Executive Institute (FEI) – Leadership for a Democratic Society targets employees at the GS 15 level and Senior Executive Service level. APHIS contracts with the Brookings Institute to deliver leadership development training for a diverse group of the agency’s high performing GS 14 level employees, under the Brookings Executive Education (BEE) Program. Brookings offers a nine-month interagency cohort-based learning opportunity. The program highlights include an SES Application Package workshop to provide insights into the Executive hiring process. Program completion yields a Certificate of Public Leadership and an option to transfer program credit towards a Master’s of Science in Leadership degree granted by Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis, MO. In addition to the Brookings program, high performing GS 14 level employees participated in the Harvard Kennedy School-Senior Executive Fellow Program; a four-week residential program that takes place on the University’s Cambridge, MA campus. Participants received valuable training and practice in making decisions about real world challenges and scenarios. The program’s curriculum included: Authentic Leadership, Decision Lab, Lexington Concord Leadership Tour, a Classroom Demo from an executive chef on the importance of healthy eating and wellness, and a lunch and learning opportunity with visiting Diplomats and Dignitaries. Participants received a Certificate of Completion from Harvard and invitations to future alumni events.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)
Internship Programs						
Fellowship Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						
Training Programs						
Detail Programs						
Other Career Development Programs						

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

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

Data is not available. Action plan will be in place to collect this data in FY 2019.

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

- a. Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

Data is not available. Action plan will be in place to collect this data in FY 2019.

C. AWARDS

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

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

A trigger is present in the Cash Award \$500+ category for PWD and PWTB. The inclusion rate for PWD is 83.65%, in comparison to PWOD inclusion rate of 91.78%. The inclusion rate for PWTB is 83.51%, in comparison to PWOTD inclusion rate of 91.06%.

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

- a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer No
- b. Pay Increases (PWTB) Answer No

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

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

Not applicable. APHIS does not have other types of employee recognition programs.

D. PROMOTIONS

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

- a. SES
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Grade GS-15
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. Grade GS-14
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

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

SES applicant flow data is collected on a departmental level, therefore we do not have access to SES applicant flow data for FY 2018. In GS 13 to GS 15 grade levels, qualified PWD applicants are applying for these positions, however they are not being selected. In the GS-13 grade level, PWD were 12.57% of the relevant applicant pool, however PWD were only 10.34% of those who applied.

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

a. SES		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer	N/A
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer	N/A
b. Grade GS-15		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer	Yes
c. Grade GS-14		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer	Yes
d. Grade GS-13		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer	No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer	Yes

SES applicant flow data is collected on a departmental level, therefore we do not have access to SES applicant flow data for FY 2018. In GS 13 to GS 15 grade levels, qualified PWTB applicants are applying for these positions, however they are not being selected.

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

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS level for new hire positions (Please see Table B7 in the Appendix). However, outside of Schedule A applicants, only 4.75% of new hires to permanent positions were PWD.

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

a. New Hires to SES (PWTB)	Answer	N/A
b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTB)	Answer	N/A
c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTB)	Answer	N/A

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS level for new hire positions (Please see Table B7 in the Appendix). However, outside of Schedule A applicants, only 1.58% of new hires to permanent positions were PWTD.

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions in which internal applicants are selected for promotions. However, in regards to GS 13, GS 14, and GS 15 grade levels, please see below: GS Level: GS 13 Rel App Pool: 12.57 PWD Qualified: 10.40 PWD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 13 Rel App Pool: 3.71 PWTD Qualified: .430 PWTD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 14 Rel App Pool: 12.61 PWD Qualified: 12.12 PWD Selected: 3.13 GS Level: GS 14 Rel App Pool: 3.75 PWTD Qualified: 4.46 PWTD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 15 Rel App Pool: 6.49 PWD Qualified: 14.38 PWD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 15 Rel App Pool: 2.22 PWTD Qualified: 9.8 PWTD Selected: 0

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions in which internal applicants are selected for promotions. However, in regards to GS 13, GS 14, and GS 15 grade levels, please see the table below: GS Level: GS 13 Rel App Pool: 12.57 PWD Qualified: 10.40 PWD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 13 Rel App Pool: 3.71 PWTD Qualified: .4.30 PWTD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 14 Rel App Pool: 12.61 PWD Qualified: 12.12 PWD Selected: 3.13 GS Level: GS 14 Rel App Pool: 3.75 PWTD Qualified: 4.46 PWTD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 15 Rel App Pool: 6.49 PWD Qualified: 14.38 PWD Selected: 0 GS Level: GS 15 Rel App Pool: 2.22 PWTD Qualified: 9.8 PWTD Selected: 0

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

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions for new hires nor qualified applicant pool data. However, in Table B3-1, APHIS is able to review data for occupational categories distributed by disability. Executive/Senior Level (GS 15 and above) All: 112 PWD: 10 (8.93%) - Trigger PWTD: 7 (6.25%) Mid-Level (GS 13 - 14) All: 486 PWD: 40 (8.23%) - Trigger PWTD: 14 (2.88%) First Level (GS 12 and below) All: 326 PWD: 26 (7.98%) - Trigger PWTD: 9 (2.76%) Other Officials All: 794 PWD: 121 (15.24%) PWTD: 36 (4.53%) TOTAL All: 1718 PWD: 197 (11.47%) PWTD: 66 (3.84%)

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

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions for new hires nor qualified applicant pool data. However, in Table B3-1, APHIS is able to review data for occupational categories distributed by disability. Executive/Senior Level (GS 15 and above) All: 112 PWD: 10 (8.93%) - Trigger PWTD: 7 (6.25%) Mid-Level (GS 13 - 14) All: 486 PWD: 40 (8.23%) - Trigger PWTD: 14 (2.88%) First Level (GS 12 and below) All: 326 PWD: 26 (7.98%) - Trigger PWTD: 9 (2.76%) Other Officials All: 794 PWD: 121 (15.24%) PWTD: 36 (4.53%) TOTAL All: 1718 PWD: 197 (11.47%) PWTD: 66 (3.84%)

Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer Yes

There are four employees who have not been converted. APHIS plans to alert each employee’s program, and also establish a procedure to ensure that Schedule A employees are converted within a timely fashion.

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer Yes

Total Separations W/O: 7.18 PWD: 9.28 - Trigger Voluntary Separations W/O: 6.85 PWD: 8.69 - Trigger Involuntary Separations W/O: 0.32 PWD: 0.59 - Trigger

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

Total Separations W/O: 7.44 PWTD: 7.22 Voluntary Separations W/O: 7.07 PWTD: 7.22 - Trigger Involuntary Separations W/O: 0.37 PWD: 0

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

Will review exit interview results during the barrier analysis process in FY 2019.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

APHIS' website is 508 compliant. Although APHIS does not have a web page dedicated to 508 compliance, its website includes links to USDA's 508 website: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/business-services/Information_Technology <https://www.usda.gov/accessibility-statement>

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.

APHIS' facilities are General Services Administration (GSA) owned or leased facilities; therefore, compliance with the Architectural Barriers Act is the responsibility of GSA. APHIS continues to collaborate with GSA to ensure that our facilities meet the requirements.

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.

APHIS plans to fill the vacant 508 program manager collateral duty position. To support the 508 compliance program, APHIS plans to:

- Begin program training staff to ensure 508 compliance is understood. The suggestion has been made to create an Aglearn training program and require it annually.
- Train all IT support staff to support users using assistive technology.
- Perform a health check on our public and internal websites to determine compliance with applicable laws.
- Collaborate with enterprise software manufacturers to obtain understanding and training in 508 compliance with their software. For example: Contact Microsoft to obtain training and user guides for Word, Excel, etc., for 508 compliance.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

The average processing time is approximately 25 days. It's important to understand that the processing timeframe depends upon how quickly the employee or requester provides the requested medical information.

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

APHIS manages a comprehensive Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program and maintains an informative website: https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/business-services/HRD/Reasonable_Accommodations_Program The site includes a link to the MRP Directive for the Reasonable Accommodation Program, the Departmental Directive, as well as other information and resources. The agency has a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Program Coordinator and 2 full-time Reasonable Accommodation Specialists for handling accommodation requests. The RA staff delivered 11 presentations/webinars detailing the accommodation process, focusing on telework as an accommodation. The RA staff trained 50 members of the Safety and Health Committee on January 31, and 40 members of the PPQ management team during 3 training sessions on January 30, March 22, and September 3. In partnership with OCRDI, the RA staff presented 5 RA overview sessions as part of the Federal Human Resources Management (FHRM) Training on March 1, April 18, June 25, July 23, and August 22. The RA staff also developed a customized Reasonable Accommodation case study scenario and participated in training 50 experienced supervisors as part of the Experienced Supervisor Pilot Training Program. The training program was developed by the HR Training and Development Staff and required supervisors to engage in a role-play, providing them the opportunity for skills-based practice. The trainings were held on May 17 and July 12. Reasonable accommodations and Work Life Wellness (WLW) information is available to disabled veteran applicants during the recruitment process. Through WLW, veterans have access to WorkLife4You, an agency-paid benefit which offers counseling. APHIS ensures reasonable accommodations are being made to qualified individuals with disabilities in accordance to applicable laws and departmental regulations. All requests for reasonable accommodations are forwarded to the agency Reasonable Accommodations staff for review and processing in accordance with applicable laws and departmental regulations. The Reasonable Accommodations staff and the TARGET Center often work together to coordinate accommodations solutions. The staff collaborates with ITD to obtain the support needed for the assistant technology and assistant software used as reasonable accommodations. The MRP Reasonable Accommodation policy is administered as appropriate to process requests for reassignments as a reasonable accommodation. In FY 2018, the Reasonable Accommodation Program opened 513 cases. Of that number 425 were closed within the fiscal year. (See table for breakdown of accommodations by program area.) In FY17, RA opened 188 cases. This is a 165% increase. The increase is due to the change in the Departmental telework policy, effective January 4, 2018. As a result of the telework policy change, the RA staff provided numerous presentations to senior leaders and management teams regarding the RA process and telework as a RA, developing FAQs to address general questions. In FY 2018, there were 87 requests for technology items and/or equipment through the centralized funds for reasonable accommodations. Purchases included assistive technology (e.g., dragon software, read/write gold software) and ergonomic equipment. The total cost for funding these requests was \$23,215. The cost of providing interpreting services for 4 APHIS hearing impaired employees was \$ 112,222. APHIS Reasonable Accommodation Program has the resources to fund the cost of interpreting reduces a significant barrier to employment for deaf employees who work in APHIS. Total Cases: 513 Type of Accommodations Requested Telework: 275 Change in Official Duty Station: 12 Modify Job Duties: 28 Office Equipment: 78 Special Software: 9 Total: 402

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

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

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

APHIS has revised Directive MRP 4300.2, Reasonable Accommodations Program, and developed a new HR Desk Guide subchapter, to include PAS information. Requests for PAS will following reasonable accommodations procedures and the funding process can be discussed with the Reasonable Accommodations Specialist. The draft directive and HR desk guide subchapter are currently being reviewed by the agency's EEOC representative to ensure compliance prior to finalizing the documents. In addition, APHIS has developed a new Reasonable Accommodations Brochure to include PAS information that will be posted on the external and internal websites.

Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer Yes

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

Answer No

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

In FY 2018, there were 40 formal complaints total, and of the 40, 12 of the cases cited disability and harassment as the basis (30%). This is above the government-wide average of 14.23%. APHIS did not find any discrimination based on disability status in FY 2018.

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

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

Answer Yes

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

Answer No

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

In FY 2018, there were 40 formal complaints total, and of the 40, 6 cases cited failure to provide a reasonable accommodation as the basis (15%). This is above the government-wide average of 9.74%. APHIS did not find any discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during FY 2018.

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?

Answer Yes

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

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

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

Currently, the United States Department of Agriculture is moving towards a new data workforce data system. It is our hope that the transition to the new system will allow us to collect complete and accurate data for FY 2019.

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

APHIS will continue to host the activities we completed in FY 2018, to see if the data supports a significant impact when we review the data quarterly in FY 2019.

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

APHIS will continue to host the activities we completed in FY 2018, to see if the data supports a significant impact when we review the data quarterly in FY 2019.