<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A: Department or Agency Identifying Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.a. 2nd level reporting component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.b. 3rd level reporting component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.c. 4th level reporting component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. City, State, Zip Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agency Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FIPS code(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B: Total Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Enter total number of permanent full-time and part-time employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Enter total number of temporary employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enter total number employees paid from non-appropriated funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT [add lines B 1 through 3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Official(s) Responsible For Oversight of EEO Program(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agency Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agency Head Designee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EEO Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affirmative Employment Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complaint Processing Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other EEO Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MD-715 Preparer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Diversity and Inclusion Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disability Special Emphasis Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hispanic Special Emphasis Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Women's Special Emphasis Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Anti-Harassment Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Component and Location (City/State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Administrator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Deputy Administrator, Animal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In FY 2016, the Administrator held numerous town hall meetings in person and virtually to reach all employees. The meetings were held in Headquarters (Riverdale, MD) and other hub sites throughout the United States. The sessions involved the Administrator opening up the floor to employees to have open discussions about any issue and topic. The Administrator will continue to host virtual town hall meetings via webinars. The meetings are recorded and posted on My.APHIS portal which is accessible to 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. APHIS continues to utilize the established two-way communication system between 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. 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 a member of the PLG. Individual members act as internal champions for the projects within their purview. OCRDI membership communicates the leadership’s continuing commitment to the principals of diversity, inclusion and equal employment opportunity within the constructs of its operations.

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 a member of the PLG. Individual members act as internal champions for the projects within their purview. OCRDI membership communicates the leadership’s continuing commitment to the principals of diversity, inclusion and equal employment opportunity within the constructs of its operations.

The APHIS Administrator allocates resources to the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion (OCRDI) to ensure the vision is achieved. 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 Cultural Transformation efforts, Diversity and Inclusion Programs, and Special Emphasis Programs, and providing national policy and leadership on Tribal Consultation. Twenty-Seven employees are assigned to the OCRDI Director with five of the staff on the Management Team.

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 group is comprised of deputy administrators for each APHIS program, the Agency’s Chief Information Officer, the director of APHIS Human Resources, the director of OCRDI, and field representatives from the larger operational programs. The AMT develops APHIS’ strategic plans, annual goals, and priorities as a unified leadership body, with the mission of APHIS in mind. Model EEO Program Essential Elements

As required by the MD-715 annual Status Report, APHIS reviewed, completed and attached to this report, the Self-Assessment Checklist, Part G, to include all corresponding agency documents. The e-recruitment data system has been incorporated into the job application process, and data systems have been utilized to capture applicant flow information. (See Tables A7 and A9, and corresponding B Workforce Tables).

APHIS’ FY 2017 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 includes a summary of the agency’s MD-462 report and workforce data, along with the workforce data tables in Appendix A. OCRDI reviewed the checklist in Part G and identified deficiencies in the APHIS Anti-Harassment Program; therefore, OCRDI listed corrective action items in Part H. The agency’s deficiencies identified by the EEOC in their September, 2017 Technical Assistance Letter is also highlighted in this report.

Element A. Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership:

On May 10th, 2017, The APHIS Acting Administrator issued the annual Civil Rights Policy statement, Diversity and Inclusion statement, Workplace Violence Prevention Policy statement, and Anti-Harassment Policy statements. All policy statements were updated, signed by the Administrator, distributed via email, and posted in every APHIS office. 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 a member of the PLG. Individual members act as internal champions for the projects within their purview. OCRDI membership communicates the leadership’s continuing commitment to the principals of diversity, inclusion and equal employment opportunity within the constructs of its operations.

In FY 2016, the Administrator held numerous town hall meetings in person and virtually to reach all employees. The meetings were held in Headquarters (Riverdale, MD) and other hub sites throughout the United States. The sessions involved the Administrator opening up the floor to employees to have open discussions about any issue and topic. The Administrator will continue to host virtual town hall meetings via webinars. The meetings are recorded and posted on My.APHIS portal which is accessible to employees.
The Administrator continues to answer employees’ questions directly through the “Tell Us What You Think” email box and has a My.APHIS “Up the Chain” email box to allow employees to submit their questions and ideas anonymously. Senior leadership is encouraged to engage with employees who use the “Up the Chain” function in order to engage with employees and be informed 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 outreach and capacity building with underrepresented and underserved groups. This year, APHIS dedicated over $4 million in support of outreach and capacity building of Minority Outreach Programs. In FY 2016, USDA pledged a $1 million initial investment to support three Centers of Excellence with the Council of 1890 Colleges and Universities. APHIS invested $300,000 (30%) of the USDA $1 million investment in FY 2016, and in FY 2017, the $300,000 investment was renewed. It is expected that this project will develop the means to recruit the next generation of the agriculture workforce. Our investments are significant and highlight the commitment of the APHIS Administrator.

Administrator’s Civil Rights Awards
The Administrator’s Civil Rights Award is a prestigious award, given to honor employees who have 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 and effectively 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 EEO Management Directive (MD) - 715 and 29 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part 1614. The APHIS OCRDII Director reports directly to the head of the APHIS Administrator. OCRDII serves under the direct and 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 OCRDII Director is a member of the AMT, which consists of the APHIS Administrator, Associate Administrator, Deputy Administrators for each program area and other senior management officials. The AMT meets weekly and includes at least one full day monthly meeting. The OCRDII Director provides expert guidance to the senior leaders in APHIS, and also reports on EEO initiatives, goals, and accomplishments as they impact the strategic mission.

The OCRDII 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. Also, APHIS provides sufficient resources to ensure adequate staffing and funding to operate the agency’s EEO program in an effective manner. The OCRDII Director is the fund holder and manages the EEO Program resources.

Annual performance plans for both managers and supervisors are aligned with USDA and APHIS’ policies, strategic goals, and objectives. The performance plan includes a Civil Rights element, which allows for an annual evaluation of the employee’s contribution to supporting USDA and APHIS’ civil rights and equal opportunity programs and initiatives. 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: www.aphis.usda.gov/civil_rights/downloads/dr4300-010.pdf.

Senior Executive Service (SES) members have performance plans in place with a mandatory critical Civil Rights element designed to measure the executive’s success in meeting USDA civil rights strategic goals. Each plan includes specific performance measures that have been implemented to ensure that executives are successful in the enforcement of civil rights laws, rules, and regulations. In addition, executive leadership is focused on, and held accountable for, ensuring subordinate supervisors/managers are in compliance and successful in meeting these goals and objectives. An example of the measures can be found at: http://www.aphis.usda.gov/civil_rights/downloads/guidance_on_civil_rights_element.pdf.

APHIS’ Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program is a department within the Human Resources Division, Workplace Resolution Branch. Marketing and Regulatory Programs Business Services (MRPBS), which includes APHIS, has a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Program Coordinator and a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Specialist for handling requests for accommodations. The RA Program strives to promote a workplace that provides reasonable accommodations to remove workplace barriers that would prevent disabled individuals from participating in the application process for Federal employment, and disabled employees from performing essential job functions, while enjoying the same benefits and privileges of employment for non-disabled employees. 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,
The Agency offers the following targeted leadership development programs:

Element D. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination:
Through two distinct programs, APHIS emphasizes the use of ADR in an effort to resolve workplace disputes at the earliest stage possible. The HR Division’s Collaborative Resolution (CR) is geared towards non-EEO related ADR and the ADR 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 APHIS OCRDI Director meets with the APHIS Administrator on a weekly basis to discuss and report on the Agency employment complaint activity, closures, compliance and diversity issues. An analysis measure was put in place in FY 2014, and since, APHIS has continued to provide a summary of EEO cases in the informal and formal stages to the OCRDI Director. The purpose is to provide the Director with the most current and frequent issues and basis(es) cited in the most current occurrences and possible reoccurrences.

OCRDI expanded its role in ensuring equal opportunity in the hiring process by participating on numerous interview panels as an EEO observer. Training for employees in the program area was developed to provide guidance and tips for employees who serve as EEO observers. Additionally, OCRDI staff were featured as speakers at several meetings and conferences; both internal to APHIS and external, to include several national organizations such as the League of United Latin American Citizens National Convention.

APHIS, in continuing its efforts to decrease EEO complaints through awareness and education has provided the following training in FY 2017:

Compliance and Evaluation

• CRIA SharePoint/Tracking System (Webinar) – 20 participants

Diversity and Inclusion

• Creating an Opportunity-Driven Career – 36 participants
• Leading a High-Performance Culture – 72 participants
• Breaking The Rules – 80 participants
• A Purpose-Driven Leadership Brand – 68 participants
• Barrier Analysis Training for Wildlife Services (Classroom) – 8 participants
• Barrier Analysis Training for PPQ-Professional Development Center (Classroom) – 8 participants
• Benefits of Hiring Veterans Workshop (Webinar/Classroom) – 50 participants

Counseling and Resolution

• EEO Observer Training (Webinar – 2 Sessions) – 50 participants per session
• FHRM Training (Classroom) – 204 participants
• Sexual Harassment Training (Classroom) – 200+ participants

Administrator’s Civil Rights Diversity and Inclusion Training

In FY 2017, OCRDI provided the Administrator’s Annual Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion Training for APHIS leaders, managers, and supervisors. This year’s trainings were facilitated in Minneapolis, MN, Ft. Collins, CO, Ames, IA, Riverdale, MD, Raleigh, NC and Houston, TX. The training provided supervisors and managers with vital tools needed in our everyday efforts to accomplish prescribed missions. The training received rave reviews, and most managers in attendance believed the subject matters to be “critical” to every successful leader and organization. Over 190 managers and supervisors attended the sessions. The Agency offers the following targeted leadership development programs:
The Basic Leadership Development Program (BLDP) 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 one week of classroom sessions and weekly web-based courses.

FY 2017, participation consisted of two cohorts with a total of 58 employees: 34.5% White Females (WF), 34.5% White Males (WM), 10.3% African American Females, 3.4% African American Males, 1.7% American Indian Females, 1.7% Asian Females (AF), 3.4% Asian Males (AM), 3.4% Hispanic Females, 3.4% Females in Two or More Reported Groups, and 3.4% Males in Two or More Reported Groups.

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

FY 2017, participation consisted of 34 employees: 61.8% WF, 20.6% WM, 5.9% African American Females, 2.9% HM, 5.9% Females in Two or More Reported Groups, and 2.9% 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 2017, participation consisted of 24 employees: 41.7% WF, 20.8% WM, 12.5% African American Females, 8.3% African American Males, 4.2% HM, 4.2% AM, 4.2% American Indian/Alaska Native (AI/AN) Male, and 4.2% Females 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 full-time GS 12-14 employees in supervisory or managerial positions. No cohort was held in FY 2017.

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

FY 2017, participation consisted of 12 employees: 58.3% WF, 16.7% WM, 8.3% African American Females, 8.3% African American Males, and 8.3% AF.

APHIS contracts with the Brookings Institute to deliver leadership development training under the Brookings Executive Education (BEE) Program to a diverse group of the agency's high performing GS 14 level employees. Brookings offers a nine-month interagency cohort-based learning opportunity. 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 2017, participation consisted of 19 employees: 42.1% WF, 21.1% WM, 10.5% African American Females, 5.3% HF, 10.5% HM, and 10.5% AF. In addition to the Brookings program, high performing APHIS GS 14 level employees were also sent to 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 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 2017, participation consisted of 19 employees: 26.3% WF, 42.1% WM, 5.3% African American Females, 5.3% African American Males, 5.3% HF, 5.3% HM, and 10.5% AM.

Element E. Efficiency:

In order to improve efficiency, APHIS emphasizes the use of ADR efforts through two distinct programs: the HR Division’s CR Early Intervention Program and the ADR Program within OCRDI. Both programs have developed guidelines and pamphlets in accordance to the Alternative Dispute Resolution Act of 1998 and USDA’s ADR Program policies.

APHIS developed a formal written ADR policy in 2000, which provides operating guidelines on its ADR process. This issuance outlines the policies and procedures used by the APHIS ADR Program 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/CT_Adr_issuance. 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’ CR Program located within the HR Division, Workplace Resolutions and Wellness Branch (WRWB), is an Early Intervention Program for non-EEO related issues that uses ADR techniques to help employees and managers work through conflict situations, and develop skills to help them prevent, manage, and resolve workplace challenges more effectively in compliance with the USDA ADR regulation, Departmental Regulation (DR) 4701-001.

APHIS, OCRDI, Counseling and Resolution Branch offered ADR to all employees seeking counseling and resolution services, as documented in the i-Complaints database system. In accordance with 29 CFR 1614, MD 110, and DR 4701-001, OCRDI Intake Specialists advised all employees (complainants) in writing of their choice between counseling and ADR. In addition to receiving an oral explanation of ADR with an Intake Specialist and an ADR/EEO Counseling Specialist, new complainants were mailed a Guide to the Employment Discrimination Complaint Process, which included a description of ADR process (see below).
OCRDI has shared this same guide with management officials who participate in the mediation process, as the guide outlines the roles and responsibilities of all participants in the EEO complaints and mediation process.

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) in dispute that underlies their complaint. The Specialists use 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 agreeing to mediation.

The APHIS Administrator made it mandatory for all managers and supervisors to participate in the mediation process should a complainant choose ADR for case processing. This shows APHIS’ commitment to the ADR process and belief that management participation is an essential part of restoring harmony and productivity in the workplace. All employees who seek pre-complaint counseling are fully informed of how the ADR program works, to include opportunities for participation, and the right to file a formal complaint if ADR does not achieve a resolution.

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 for EEO formal or informal cases are documented, as well as, ADR for non-EEO cases. ADR is offered throughout the administrative complaint process. In FY 2017, APHIS received and offered 108 applicants the option to participate in either formal or informal ADR. Of the 108 applicants, 23 individuals accepted the invitation to participate in ADR. Two complaints were settled in FY 2017, and four complaints were carried over into FY 2018.

The CR Program provides ADR services, to include: Mediation/Facilitation/Conciliation, Team Collaboration Services, Conflict Advice/Guidance/Coaching, and, Conflict Management Training. The CR Early Intervention Program falls under the HR Division, WRWB. WRWB, CR is a confidential Early Intervention Program that uses effective conflict resolution and communication tools in compliance with the USDA ADR regulation, DR 4701-001.

There are four CR Specialists dedicated to providing ADR services to all APHIS employees and other USDA employees as necessary. Services are provided through a variety of means including on-site/in person, telephonically, through video conference, and by webinar. For FY 2017, CR received 783 requests, which included: 659 one-on-one coaching sessions, 46 group conflict sessions/trainings, 70 mediations (this included 27 agreements; 8 declinations; 6 no agreements; 17 withdrawals; 7 pending mediations, and 5 mediations not completed due to other reasons), and 8 requests for other services.

CR also tracked the number of participants by supervisors and non-supervisors. For FY 2017, 553 supervisors and 804 non-supervisors sought or participated in CR services. In addition to the general conflict management training for the MRP agencies and Foreign Agricultural Services, CR conducted Workplace Collaboration Training and Generational Impact Training for the USDA Lease, Accountability and Strategy Division Administration and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Compliance Reviews and Civil Rights Impact Analysis

In FY 2017, OCRDI Compliance and Evaluation Branch conducted civil rights compliance reviews in five states to include the following states, locations, and number of employees covered:

South Carolina
Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS
Locations: Columbia, SC and Charleston, SC
Number of employees covered: 84

Louisiana & Mississippi
Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS
Locations: Baton Rouge, LA and Flowood, MS
Number of employees covered: 113

Indiana & Illinois
Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ & WS
Locations: West Lafayette, IN, Indianapolis, IN & Springfield, IL
Number of employees covered: 52

California
Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ and WS
Locations: Sacramento, CA
Number of employees covered: 294

Georgia
Programs Reviewed: VS, PPQ and WS
Locations: Conyers, GA & Athens, GA
Number of employees covered: 73

All employees in the five states 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 600 employees participated in the review process.

The reviews included briefings for the management officials on-site in each state to provide them with overall review information.
for period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

as well as EEO and civil rights issues cited by the employees. OCRDI also worked with VS, WS, and PPQ senior level management to develop strategies to address those issues. The OCRDI Compliance and Evaluation Teams further briefed members of the AMT and other headquarters SES officials responsible for managing the APHIS program areas. Senior program area leadership were briefed by the OCRDI Director on any critical EEO and civil rights or workplace issues that were identified during the compliance review process.

In FY 2017, APHIS completed a Business Process Improvement (BPI) Project for a Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) Tracking System. The system, housed in SharePoint, provides standardized forms and procedures, samples and other resources for all APHIS programs to use in preparing the analyses required for actions related to employees. The BPI identified areas of improvement in processing, training, and tracking to strengthen the CRIAs for APHIS employment actions.

In FY 2017, APHIS completed CRIAs on the following five actions impacting employees:

- VS NVSL Proposed Restructuring
- WS Shop Closure in Yakima, WA
- PPQ Field Ops Realignment
- WS Crook County WY Directed Reassignment
- PPQ Huntsville, AL Office Closure

The CRIAs included detailed requirements for the program areas involved, to provide for “mitigating strategies” to lessen the impact on employees. APHIS worked closely with managers and supervisors at headquarters, regional, and state/local levels to ensure full consideration of civil rights impact in APHIS decision making for employment and programs.

Applicant Flow Data
Applicant flow data, information extracted from the E-recruit system, has been reviewed by the Agency Senior Leadership and is the basis for several barrier analysis trainings to help leadership determine why the participation of some groups are lower than expected. Two barrier analysis training were conducted by OCRDI in FY 2017: one for Wildlife Services and one for Plant Protection Quarantine’s Professional Development Center. The Agency plans to have the CRDAC members conduct barrier analysis in FY 2018.

Element F. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance:
The OCRDI, Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI) served as the leader and primary advisor in support of Executive Order 13583, a government-wide initiative to promote and manage Diversity and Inclusion in the Federal Workforce. ODI provided support and guidance to special emphasis programs and managers represented throughout the APHIS workforce, by sponsoring training/educational opportunities and cultural programs to enhance the diversity and inclusion mission.

APHIS Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committees
The APHIS Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committees (CRDACs) serve as an advisory board to management to address the unique concerns of underserved and underrepresented groups regarding employment and access to APHIS and USDA programs. The mission of the CRDACs is accomplished through barrier analysis, APHIS funded special emphasis programs (SEPs), and Special Emphasis Program Mangers’ (SEPM) relationship with the affinity groups they represent and the CRDAC infrastructure. The CRDAC at the field units are connected to the NCRDAC. OCRDI National SEPM are designated to lead and ensure implementation of each SEP.

The purpose of APHIS National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committee (NCRDAC) is to serve as a strategic advisor to ODI in providing management officials and employees with a vehicle that enhances EEO and program delivery issues. It was developed in 2015 as the product of a finalized re-alignment for SEPs by consolidating Civil Rights committees, Cultural Transformation committees, Diversity and Inclusion committees, and EEO Advisory committees. Each program in APHIS has one member who serves on the NCRDAC for two years. The NCRDAC also establishes lines of communication between employees and management through views on civil rights issues.

APHIS Special Emphasis Program
In FY 2017, ODI and SEPM held the following APHIS National SEP events (all National SEP events were offered via live stream, which increased employee participation and accessibility to all of the events):

- Disability Employment Awareness Month Celebration, October 13, 2016, with keynote speaker Ms. Ginger Miller
- Veterans Day Special Observance on November 10, 2016, with keynote speaker Lt. Gen. Kathleen Gainey
- Black History Month Observance on February 9, 2017, with keynote speaker Dr. Joyce Ladner
- Women’s History Month Observance on March 9, 2017, with keynote speaker Ms. Jen Cronenberger
- Asian American/Pacific Islander Heritage Month Observance on May 11, 2017, with keynote speaker Ms. Lei Wang
- LGBT Month Special Observance on June 8, 2017, with keynote speaker Ms. Mara Keisling
- Women’s Equality Day Observance on August 26, 2017, with keynote speaker Ms. Wendy Johnson
- Hispanic Heritage Month, September 28, 2017, with keynote speaker Mrs. Carmen G. Cantor

Emerging Women’s Leadership (EWL) Series Webinars:

- October 2016 | Questions That Leaders Ask Themselves and Others
- December 2016 | 9 Types of Courage for Emerging Leaders
- February 21, 2017 | Creating an Opportunity-Driven Career
- April 18, 2017 | Leading a High-Performing Culture
APHIS Outreach and Sponsorships

The OCRDI Office of Outreach and Administration Branch focused on providing students with opportunities to gain valuable experience through employment and scholarship opportunities. In FY 2017, APHIS provided over $3.3 million in funding to professional organizations, universities, internships, scholarships, conference support, and research and development for the following initiatives:

- **Ag-Discovery Program**
  - $1,086,941

- **Thurgood Marshall College Fund Internship Program**
  - $450,000

- **Florida A&M University Veterinary Technology Program**
  - $400,000

- **USDA/1890 National Scholars**
  - $200,000

- **Navajo Technical College Vet Tech Program**
  - $127,000

- **The Safeguarding Natural Heritage Program**
  - $186,868

- **Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund**
  - $105,000

- **Rural Coalition**
  - $205,000

- **National Hmong American Farmers Conference Sponsorship**
  - $5,000

- **National Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Internship Program**
  - $57,240

- **Fort Valley State University**
  - $68,200

- **Native American Intern Program**
  - $132,412

- **Pembroke Intern Program**
  - $35,000

- **Florida A&M University Outreach**
  - $50,000

- **University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Outreach**
  - $50,000

- **Conference on Asian Pacific American Leadership (CAPAL)**
  - $21,000

- **Professional Agricultural Workers Conference (PAWC)**
  - $20,000

- **Society for Advancement of Hispanics/Chicanos and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)**
  - $12,000

- **Federal Asian Pacific American Council (FAPAC)**
  - $10,000

- **National Women in Agriculture Association (NWIAA)**
  - $8,000

- **Martin Luther King Essay Contest**
  - $5,000

- **The Patriots Technology Training Center (PTTC)**
  - $10,000

- **Common Good City Farm**
  - $7,000

- **National Black Farmers Association Annual Conference**
  - $5,000

- **Tuskegee Veterinary Symposium**
  - $20,000

- **Incorporated Mexican-American Government Employees (IMAGE)**
  - $1,500

- **Oklahoma Black Historical Research Project Sponsorship**
  - $2,500

- **League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Conference Sponsorship**
$5,000
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Conference Sponsorship

$15,000
MANRRS Professional Development Sponsorship

$2,500
Cal Poly Career Services

$300
TOTAL

$3,303,461

The Ag-Discovery Program and the Thurgood Marshall Program are two of the agency’s premier programs designed to reach students and exposed them to careers in agriculture. Additional details regarding other outreach activities and partnerships are provided in Appendix B at the end of this report.

APHIS Tribal Outreach Activities

Outreach: In FY 2017, the APHIS Office of National Tribal Liaison (ONTL) continued to strengthen partnerships between APHIS and the Native American Tribes. APHIS ONTL attended and presented at numerous tribally sponsored meetings and conferences including: National Congress of American Indians, United South and Eastern Tribes, Inc., First Americans Land-Grant Consortium, American Indian Science and Engineering Society, Native American Fish & Wildlife Society, Intertribal Agriculture Council, Southwest Indian Agriculture Association (SWIAA), Inter Timber Council, Indian Nations Conservation Alliance, and other meetings to enhance APHIS’ outreach efforts. ONTL continued to improve and update its tribal specific outreach materials, including brochures, factsheets, pamphlets and its tribal website.

Partnerships: In FY 2017, ONTL took significant steps to improve youth opportunities in agriculture, natural resources, and related science fields. APHIS expanded its Safeguarding Natural Heritage (SNH) Summer Youth Program from one in 2013, to four in 2017. The SNH is a 2-week summer outreach program that helps 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) or other Native American Serving Institutions.

ONTL also assisted Navajo Technical University (NTU) and its Veterinary Technology Program, by providing funding for curriculum enhancement, acquisition of personnel and procuring program specific supplies in preparing for full accreditation. On May 4th, 2017, NTU became the first tribal university to achieve accreditation with the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA).

ONTL expanded its internship opportunities for students attending various Native American higher educational institutions in 2017. APHIS provided funding through a cooperative agreement that assists several TCU and other Native American educational serving institutions and students attending these schools. The agreement pays for travel, lodging and salaries for the students who participate in an internship within APHIS. Many of the students receive college credit for participating in the internship. Current partners include: Navajo Technical University, NM; Southwest Indian Polytechnic Institute, NM; Dine College, AZ and the University of North Carolina at Pembroke, NC.

Sponsorships: APHIS, provided a $1,000.00 sponsorship for the 2017 Shiprock Ag Days. Dine Agriculture Inc. hosted the annual Shiprock Agriculture Days, which is a two-day event that brings together producers, farmers, ranchers, educators, students and agency representatives to learn more about Farming and Ranching topics. The $1,000.00 sponsorship is part of the agency’s outreach efforts. APHIS, provided a sponsorship for the 2017 Southwestern Indian Agricultural Association (SWIAA) conference. The $2,000.00 sponsorship is part of the agency’s 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.

Technical Assistance Letter

On September 1st, 2017, APHIS received a Technical Assistance letter from the EEOC, giving the updated status of deficiencies detailed in the 2014 Technical Assistance letter, as well as current deficiencies found by the EEOC that exist within APHIS’ EEO program.

The EEOC commended APHIS on correcting the following deficiencies:

• Implementing adequate data collection and analysis systems to collect applicant flow data;
• Providing sufficient resources to enable the agency to conduct a thorough barrier analysis of its workforce;
• Allocating sufficient budget for all employees to use the EEO program, including the complaint processing program, ADR, reasonable accommodation program;
• Establishing a centralized fund for reasonable accommodation requests.

However, after reviewing the FY 2016 MD-715 report, MD-462 report, and conducting a teleconference meeting with OCRDI on March 30th, 2017, the EEOC identified seven program deficiencies. The deficiencies and corrections made towards the deficiencies in FY 2017 are as follows:

Failure to submit reasonable accommodation procedures for review:
• Currently, the Reasonable Accommodation staff uses the RA procedures set forth by USDA. The MRP Reasonable Accommodation policy is administered as appropriate to process requests for reassignments as a reasonable accommodation.
All requests for reasonable accommodations are forwarded to the agency RA program staff for review and processing in accordance with applicable laws and departmental regulations. 


Failure to timely complete EEO counseling:

- While APHIS made progress in FY 2017 to increase timely completions of EEO counseling, the agency expects even better results in FY 2018. APHIS will continue to engage employees in the earliest stage, and engage management officials earlier, which can be critical, especially in situations where there are difficulties having initial dialogue with the complainant. The process typically is contingent on first engaging the aggrieved party, followed by dialogue with responding management official(s). Instances have occurred in which delayed initial interaction with the complainant, has hindered the process from a timeliness standpoint. However, APHIS will make every effort to timely process EEO counseling within the 30 day timeframe.

Failure to timely process EEO investigations:

- The USDA Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights (OASCR), Employment Investigation Division has sole responsibility for the EEO investigation process; however, APHIS OCRDI adheres to internal processing procedures in an effort to reduce processing delays within its control. APHIS remains proactive in notifying all Responding Management Officials immediately of accepted issues and maintains an internal processing timeframe of five days for responding to all requests for documents. All Deputy Administrators, managers and supervisors are advised of the urgency in cooperating with EEO investigators in providing documents and scheduling interviews. APHIS maintains constant contact with OASCR during the investigation process to provide assistance as needed.

Failure to timely issue final agency decisions on the merits:

- USDA OASCR has sole responsibility for issuing Final Agency Decisions (FAD) on the merits for EEO complaints where either a FAD has been requested by the complainant or no election has been made by the complainant. APHIS consistently works with the OASCR Complaints Adjudication Division in an effort to expedite the processing of EEO complaints pending a FAD.

Low ADR participation rate during the pre-complaint stage:

- APHIS continues to offer ADR to all complainants throughout all stages of the EEO process. However, it remains the sole decision of the counselee and/or complainant to choose to participate in ADR. APHIS encourages all persons engaging the EEO process to consider ADR as a valued forum for addressing their employment concerns.

APHIS has not submitted FY 2016 MD-715 report:

- APHIS submitted the FY 2016 report on September 21, 2017 and certified it in FedSep.

Non-compliant harassment policy:

- OCRDI declared the anti-harassment program a critical element to complete for FY 2018. A detailed plan in regards to the anti-harassment program, policies, and procedures are outlined in Part H of the MD-715 Report.

Barrier Analysis

A workforce profile summary is included in Appendix A. OCRDI conducted a barrier analysis for Hispanics in GS-12 through SES clusters. Though Hispanic Females have a lower participation in comparison to the Civilian Labor Force (CLF), the difference was 1.15%. Thus, OCRDI did not find any known barriers for Hispanics, and we are actively combatting the low participation rate.

OCRDI identified two areas for potential barriers:

- Barriers to Executive Level Positions (SES). (Discussed in Part I)
- Establish and Meet Hiring and Retention Goals for Employees with Targeted Disabilities. (Discussed in Part J)

Part I: Barriers to Executive Level Positions (SES)

In FY 2017, APHIS focused on the cause of the possible glass ceiling and blocked pipeline barriers for females. Moving forward, OCRDI will use the agency’s Diversity Liaisons to assist the NCRDAC with the analysis. All Diversity Liaisons from the agency’s program units were or were not selected based upon grade level.

Based upon the EEOC’s Technical Assistance Letter to APHIS, OCRDI will: (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 HR employees 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) conduct a longitudinal review of applicant flow statistics found in tables A7 and A9; (10) review the participation of females by grade level in the occupations with upward mobility; and, (11) meet with selecting officials to examine their experiences in the hiring process and to discuss their perception of female applicants.

APHIS is committed to determining the various reasons for low participation rates among females at senior grade levels.
Part J: Establish and Meet Hiring and Retention Goals for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (updated):
APHIS continues to work on promoting diversity and recruiting a dynamic and first-class workforce. In doing so, the agency is focusing on increasing the employment of Veterans, Disabled Veterans and PWTD.
In FY 2017, APHIS hired a total of 13 PWTD: 8 permanent hires and 5 temporary hires. The following chart shows the agency’s 3-Year Hiring Trend for PWTD:
(See Appendix A: Table B8)
Though APHIS hired less PWTD in FY 2017, OCRDI contributes the decrease in hiring to the hiring freeze that occurred during the fiscal year. Recruitment activities and efforts by OCRDI and HR continue to focus on groups with low participation. HR has developed an annual targeted recruitment plan to address groups with low participation.

MD-462 Report Summary Analysis
During FY 2017, there was an increase in the number of formal complaints filed against APHIS. A total of 60 formal complaints were filed in FY 2017 compared to 41 filed in FY 2016. The 101 informal counseling sessions in FY 2017 illustrated no major increase or decrease compared to the 102 informal sessions in FY 2016. Information and guidance given to APHIS employees from EEO Counselors, helped resolve 16% of the informal counseling sessions at the earliest possible stage of the EEO process; thereby resulting in 2 negotiated settlements and 14 withdrawals by the complainant. The top issues and bases are captured in the table below:

Top 4 Issues - # of Complaints, # of Complainants
Harassment (Non-Sexual) - 41, 38
Terms/Conditions of Employment - 29, 26
Promotion/Non Selection - 10, 9
Performance Evaluation - 11, 11

Top 4 Bases - # of Complaints, # of Complainants
Reprisal - 31, 28
Age - 21, 19
Disability - 15, 14
Sex (Female) - 12, 11

In FY 2017, there were no order(s) Entering Judgment by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) recommending a Finding of Discrimination.

APHIS Workforce Profile Data Analysis - FY 2017
In FY 2017, there were 8,211 total employees: 5,838 permanent and 2,373 temporary; 60.02% male and 39.98% female. White Males (WM) represented the majority of the APHIS workforce with 43.45% (3,568) employees, followed by White Females (WF) with 27.12% (2,227) employees. Hispanic Males (HM) and Hispanic Females (HF) represented 6.60% (542) and 3.64% (299), respectively. Black Males (BM) and Black Females (BF) represented 3.26% (268) and 5.42% (445), respectively. Asian Males (AM) and Asian Females (AF) represented 4.19% (344) and 2.27% (186), respectively. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Males (NHOPIM) and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander females (NHOPIF) represented 1.01% (83) and 0.22% (17), respectively. Two or More Races Males (TMRM) and Two or More Races Female (TMRF) represented 0.73% (60) and 0.74% (61), respectively.

In FY 2017, HF, WF, BM, and BF had a lower participation rate in comparison to the Civilian Labor Force (CLF). All other groups were at or above their respective CLF in FY 2017.
(See Appendix A: Table 1 A1.1)
In comparison to FY 2016, the participation levels for WM, AM, AF, NHOPIM, AIANM, TMRM, and TMRF increased. In FY 2017, HM, HF, WM, BF, NHOPIF, and AIANF decreased. Recruitment activities and efforts by OCRDI and HR continue to focus on groups with low participation. A targeted recruitment plan is developed by HR each year to address groups with low participation.
(See Appendix A: Table A-1)

Summary of APHIS Workforce by Race, National Origin (RNO) and Sex
Hispanic Employees
Total employment for Hispanics in FY 2017 was 841 (10.24%), a decrease compared to FY 2016 of the total APHIS workforce. HM and HF represented 542 (6.60%) and 299 (3.64%), respectively of the workforce. HF are underrepresented by -1.15, which is lower than the FY 2016 level of -1.1%. (See Table A1). HM have been well represented within the workforce for the last six years.
African American Employees
Total employment for African Americans in FY 2017 was 713 (8.68%), a decrease compared to FY 2016 of the total APHIS workforce. African American Males and African American Females represented 268 (3.26%) and 445 (5.42%), respectively of the workforce. African American Males and African American Females were underrepresented by -2.23% and -1.11%, respectively. (See Table A1).
Asian Employees
Total employment for Asian Americans in FY 2017 was 530 (6.46%) of the total APHIS workforce. AM and AF represented 344
American Indian/Alaskan Native (AI/AN) Employees
Total employment for AI/ANs in FY 2017 was 110 (1.34%) of the total APHIS workforce. AI/AN Males and AI/AN Females represented 63 (0.77%) and 47 (0.57%), respectively of the workforce. Both male and female AI/ANs were above their respective CLF in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) Employees
Total employment for NHOPI in FY 2017 was 101 or 1.23% of the total APHIS workforce. NHOPI Males and NHOPI Females represented 83 (1.01%) and 18 (0.22%), respectively of the workforce. In FY 2017, the number of NHOPI Males increased by six. Both male and female NHOPIs were above their respective CLF in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

White Employees
Total employment for WM and WF in FY 2017 was 5,795 (70.57%) of the total APHIS workforce. WM and WF represented 2,227 (27.12%) and 3,568 (43.45%), respectively of the workforce. WM were above their respective CLF; however, WF remained below their CLF in FY 2016.

Two or More Races Employees
Total employment for Two or More Races for males and females in FY 2017 was 121 (1.47%) of the total APHIS employment. TMRM and TMRF represented 60 (0.73%) and 61 (0.74%), respectively of the workforce. In FY 2017, TMRM and TMRF increased by 18 and 26, respectively. TMRM and TMRF were above their respective CLF in FY 2016 and FY 2017.

Official and Managers
Of the 5,838 total permanent employees, 1,807 (30.95%) were identified in the “Official and Managers” category, with 50.14% and 49.86% identified as males and females, respectively.

Of the 1,807 employees in this category, the following representations were noted: Hispanics - 6.69%, Whites - 68.89%, African Americans - 17.66%, Asian Americans - 4.48%, Native Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders - 0.39%, American Indians/Alaska Natives - 1.6%, and Two or More Races - 0.28%.

There were 2,373 (40.65%) identified in the Professional category, 8710 (14.90%) identified in the Technician category, and 590 (10.11%) identified in the Administrative Support category.

Of the 2,373 employees in the Professional category, males and females represented 59.04% and 40.96%, respectively with Hispanics - 9.53%, Whites - 73.96%, African Americans - 7.54%, Asian Americans - 6.87%, Native Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders - 0.50%, American Indians/Alaska Natives - 1.23%, and Two or More Races - 0.38%.

Applicant Flow Data
In FY 2017, there was no increase in new hires due to the hiring freeze at the beginning part of the fiscal year. There were a total of 698 new hires (248 permanent and 450 temporary). Of the total new hires, males and females represented 60.46% (422) and 39.54% (276), respectively.

In FY 2017, hiring increases occurred for females - 11.29%, African Americans – 8.93%, and Asian Americans - 0.73%.

Five Year Trend Analysis FY 2013 – FY 2017
HF total employment increased each year between FY 2013 – FY 2014, decreased in 2015, increased in 2016, and decreased in 2017. WF total employment decreased from FY 2013 to FY 2014, increased from FY 2014 – FY 2016, and decreased in FY 2017. Both BM and BF total employment levels increased each year between FY 2013 and FY 2016, and decreased in 2017. OCRDI believes that the decrease in groups with low participation levels is attributed to the hiring freeze.

Major Occupations
In FY 2017, the highest concentration of permanent employees in APHIS were located in the following Major Occupation Categories: 0303 - Miscellaneous Clerk and Assistant 7.38% (431); 0401 – General Biological Science 20.79% (1214); 0421 – Plant Protection Technician 4.42% (258); 0486 – Wildlife Biology 6.11% (357); 0701 – Veterinary Medical Science 11.34% (662); and 0704 – Animal Health Technician 5.89% (344).

Grade Levels
Out of APHIS 5,838 permanent employees, 2,623 were GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, followed by 1,370 employees GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels. At the GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, there were 1,569 employees, followed by 94 employees at the GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels. In Senior Executive Service (SES) positions, there were 38 employees (25 men and 13 women).

Of the groups with low participation, Total Females represented 40% of the employees in GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels, 55% in GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels, 44% in GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, 46% in GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, and...
34% in the SES. HF represented 10% of the employees in GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels, 8% in GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels, 4% in GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, 2% in GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, and 3% in the SES. WF represented 15% of the employees in GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels, 36% in GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels, 30% in GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, 33% in GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, and 29% in the SES. BM represented 2% of the employees in GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels, 4% in GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels, 4% in GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, 4% in GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, and 5% in the SES. BF represented 3% of the employees in GS-1 through GS-4 grade levels, 7% in GS-5 through GS-8 grade levels, 7% in GS-9 through GS-12 grade levels, 8% in GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels, and 3% in the SES. (See APHIS Total Workforce by Grade Level Table)

Data Source: NFC Online Reporting Center – October 20th, 2017

Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD)
There were a total of 245 employees with a PWTD in FY 2017, a decrease of 21 employees from FY 2016. Of the identified PWTD, 95 (1.16%) were hearing impaired; 40 (0.49%) visually impaired; and 53 (0.65%) had psychiatric disabilities. The number of PWD was 879, representing 10.71% of the total APHIS workforce. (See Appendix A: Table B-1)

PWD and PWTD by RNO and Ethnicity
Hispanic Employees
There were 80 Hispanic employees with a reported disability, including 52 (5.98%) males and 28 (3.22%) females. HF were underrepresented by -1.57% as compared to the CLF. There was no underrepresentation among HM. African American Employees
There were 86 African American employees with a reported disability, including 37 (4.25%) males and 49 (5.63%) females. African American Females were underrepresented by -0.9% and African American Males by -1.24% as compared to the CLF. Asian Employees
There were 38 Asian employees with a reported disability, including 26 (2.99%) males and 12 (1.38%) females. Asian Females were underrepresented by -0.55% as compared to the CLF. There was no underrepresentation among Asian Males. American Indian/Alaskan Native (AI/AN) Employees
There were 29 AI/AN with a reported disability, including 14 (1.61%) males and 15 (1.72%) females. There was no underrepresentation among AI/AN males or females. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (NHOPI) Employees
There were 8 NHOPI employees with a reported disability, including six (0.69%) males and 2 (0.23%) females. There was no underrepresentation among NHOPI males or females when compared to the CLF. White Employees
There were 608 White employees with a reported disability, including 368 (42.3%) males and 240 (27.59%) females. WF were underrepresented by (-6.44%) as compared to the CLF. There was no underrepresentation among WM. Two or More Races
There were 21 Two or More Races employees with a reported disability, including 13 (1.49%) males and eight (0.92%) females. There was no underrepresentation among Two or More Races.

Outreach & Sponsorships
The OCRDI Office of Outreach and Administration focused on providing students with opportunities to gain valuable experience through employment and scholarship opportunities. During FY 2017, APHIS participated in and supported numerous scholarship and work experience programs across the educational spectrum, including high school, undergraduate, and graduate students. Examples of APHIS’ levels of commitment to these programs included the following:
APHIS hosted a total of 63 Third Party Summer Internships:
Name of Program - Number of Interns
Conference on Asian Pacific American Leadership (CAPAL) - 2
Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities - 5
Thurgood Marshall College Fund Internship Program - 38
Native American Intern Program - 12
Summer Youth Experience Program - 6
Total - 63

Ag-Discovery Program ($1,086,941)
APHIS sponsored its 12th year of the Ag-Discovery Summer outreach program. In FY 2017, 22 universities hosted the program. Funding for the FY 2017 exceeded $1,000,000. Ag-Discovery is an outreach program designed to introduce students ages 12–17, from limited resourced communities, to careers in plant and animal science, wildlife management, and agribusiness. The program allows students to live on a college campus and learn about agriculture from university professors, scientists, and administrative professionals who work for the U.S. Government in a variety of fields.
The following Universities participated in the FY 2017 AgDiscovery Program:

University - Dates

Alcorn State University - June 18-30, 2017
California State University, Fresno - June 11-24, 2017
Coppin State University - July 10-21, 2017
Delaware State University - June 9-22, 2017
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University - June 11-24, 2017
Fort Valley State University - June 5-16, 2017
Iowa State University - July 16-29, 2017
Kentucky State University - June 11-24, 2017
Lincoln University in Missouri - July 9-22, 2017
North Carolina State University - June 19-30, 2017
Prairie View A&M University - June 19-30, 2017
Purdue University - July 9-23, 2017
South Carolina University - June 18 – July 2, 2017
Tuskegee University - June 4-17, 2017
University of Arizona - June 19-29, 2017
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff - June 10-23, 2017
University of Hawaii at Manoa - July 9-22, 2017
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign - June 25-July 30, 2017
University of Maryland at College Park - July 9-28, 2017

Thurgood Marshall College Fund Internship (TMCF) Program ($450,000)
The TMCF-APHIS Internship Program is a 10-week summer program designed to employ selected scholarship recipients (undergraduate and graduate students) from the TMCF database who have an interest in agricultural related disciplines through hands-on experience within the selected program area. More specifically, this internship is to: strengthen the long-term partnership between USDA APHIS and the TMCF; increase the number of students studying agriculture, food, natural resources or other related disciplines; and offer career opportunities to TMCF Scholars within USDA. APHIS sponsored 36 interns across the various program areas.

USDA/1890 National Scholars Program ($200,000)
The USDA/1890 National Scholars Program offers 4-year scholarships to U.S. Citizens who are seeking a bachelor's degree in agriculture or a related science at one of the 1890 Land Grant Institutions. The purpose of the National Scholars Program is to strengthen the long-term partnership between the Department of Agriculture and the 1890 Institutions; increase the number of students studying agriculture, food and nutrition, and natural resource sciences; and offer career opportunities within USDA. In FY 2017, APHIS had a total of 12 scholars:

University - Number of Students
Tennessee State University - 2
Southern University - 1
Lincoln University - 1
Florida A&M University - 1
*Tuskegee University - 2
Delaware State University - 1
North Carolina A&T University - 1
Fort Valley State University - 1
*Kentucky State University - 1
Langston University - 1

*Graduated (Ex: Tuskegee had 1 scholar to graduate)

Florida A&M University Veterinary Technology Program ($400,000)
This is a capacity building initiative between USDA APHIS, other government agencies and animal health organizations to continue the need for trained veterinary professionals and paraprofessionals to maintain healthy animals in order to aid in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of humans.

Martin Luther King Essay Contest ($5,000)
This contest is designed to inspire students to reflect on the life of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and share their thoughts and insights in an essay or pictorial format. Students chosen are hired for summer employment with APHIS. In the summer of 2017, APHIS had one student to work in Riverdale, MD.

The Patriots Technology Training Center (PTTC) ($10,000)
The PTTC is a 501 (c)(3) charitable and educational organization dedicated to "Empowering Students through Technology." The PTTC accomplishes its mission by providing students (grades 5-12) training and exposure to professionals in the areas of science, mathematics, engineering, and computer technology. In FY 2017, APHIS sponsored a Shadowing Day Exercise at the Riverdale, MD facility. Approximately 50 students shadowed APHIS employees for half a day and learn about the various...
components of our program areas. The day ended with the students giving presentations on what they learned and how the agency accomplishes its mission.

In addition to student programs and partnerships, APHIS provided support through cooperatives, grants and sponsorships with the following Universities and Professional Organizations:

**Society for Advancement of Hispanics/Chicanos and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS) Sponsorship ($10,000)**
SACNAS is a society of scientists dedicated to fostering the success of Hispanic/Chicano and Native American scientists—from college students to professionals—to attain advanced degrees, careers, and positions of leadership in science.

**Fort Valley State University ($68,200)**
APHIS Veterinary Services continues to provide support through a grant with Fort Valley State University’s Veterinary Technician Program. APHIS Veterinary Services Support Program is committed to providing developmental activities that interface APHIS Veterinary Services Program with Veterinary technical students. This funding allows for zoonotic disease surveillance, transmission and control to be demonstrated through field trips to the Center for Disease Control and other communicable disease/quarantine facilities and centers. The University's Molecular Biology Lab emphasizes veterinary diagnostic technology, which is needed by the APHIS Veterinary Services programs, and allow for the demonstration of sample collection and testing techniques.

**Federal Asian Pacific American Council (FAPAC) ($10,000)**
FAPAC is a 501(c)(3) organization, designed to serve as an interagency association within the federal and District of Columbia Governments, providing a focus for over 30 ethnically distinct groups originating from Asian and Pacific regions.

**Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund ($105,000)**
The Federation of Southern Cooperatives/Land Assistance Fund is a 501(c)(3) community based organization. The Federation’s programs include land retention, cooperative development, marketing, outreach, technical assistance, research, and training. They work primarily with the Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers in the Black Belt Region (13 states in the southern region) of the United States. The Federation continues to assist APHIS in conducting regulatory reviews and outreach to Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers.

**University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Outreach ($50,000)**
The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff is a comprehensive 1890 Land-Grant Institution that provides open door liberal and professional education. APHIS continues to enter into a cooperative agreement with the University for assistance in conducting outreach to small socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. FAMU’s mission is to provide comprehensive support to limited and underserved clientele. APHIS continues to enter into a cooperative agreement with FAMU for assistance in conducting outreach to small socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and regulatory review.

**SACNAS Sponsorship ($10,000)**
The Native American Fish & Wildlife Society (NAFWS) is a national tribal organization established informally during the early 1980’s. NAFWS was incorporated in 1983 to develop a national communications network for the exchange of information and management techniques related to self-determined tribal fish and wildlife management.

**Navajo Technical College Vet Tech Program ($127,000)**
This is a capacity building initiative. APHIS, other government agencies and animal health organizations continue to need trained professionals and paraprofessionals to maintain healthy animals in order to aid in protecting the health, safety and welfare of humans. These specialists are being trained to assist veterinary, medical and epidemiologists in the surveillance, diagnoses and preventive medicine measures necessary to control such diseases. APHIS Veterinary Services and other agencies gain trained specialists, skilled in disease recognition and control measures, to augment its current workforce.

**Florida A&M University Outreach ($50,000)**
Florida A&M University (FAMU) has a long and effective track record of coordination, collaboration and program implementation that supports underserved and limited resource and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. FAMU’s mission is to provide comprehensive support to limited and underserved clientele. APHIS continues to enter into a cooperative agreement with FAMU for assistance in conducting outreach to small socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and regulatory review.

**University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff Outreach ($50,000)**
The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff is a comprehensive 1890 Land-Grant Institution that provides open door liberal and professional education. APHIS continues to enter into a cooperative agreement with the University for assistance in conducting outreach to small socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers for regulatory review.

**SACNAS Sponsorship ($10,000)**
The Native American Wildlife Society Conference Sponsorship ($5,000)
The Native American Fish & Wildlife Society (NAFWS) is a national tribal organization established informally during the early 1980’s. NAFWS was incorporated in 1983 to develop a national communications network for the exchange of information and management techniques related to self-determined tribal fish and wildlife management.

**Navajo Technical College Vet Tech Program ($127,000)**
This is a capacity building initiative. APHIS, other government agencies and animal health organizations continue to need trained professionals and paraprofessionals to maintain healthy animals in order to aid in protecting the health, safety and welfare of humans. These specialists are being trained to assist veterinary, medical and epidemiologists in the surveillance, diagnoses and preventive medicine measures necessary to control such diseases. APHIS Veterinary Services and other agencies gain trained specialists, skilled in disease recognition and control measures, to augment its current workforce.

**Florida A&M University Outreach ($50,000)**
Florida A&M University (FAMU) has a long and effective track record of coordination, collaboration and program implementation that supports underserved and limited resource and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. FAMU’s mission is to provide comprehensive support to limited and underserved clientele. APHIS continues to enter into a cooperative agreement with FAMU for assistance in conducting outreach to small socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers and regulatory review.
Annual National Black Farmers Association (NBFA) ($2,500)
The NBFA is a non-profit organization representing African American farmers and their families in the U.S. As an association, it serves tens of thousands of members nationwide. NBFA’s education and advocacy efforts have been focused on civil rights, land retention, access to public and private loans, education, agricultural training and rural economic development for small farmers.

Native American Intern Program ($60,000)
The Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU) Internship Program provides financial assistance to three 1994 TCU to create a 10-week internship program for TCU students. The students are placed in several APHIS programs across the U.S.

National Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) Internship Program ($57,240)
The National HACU Internship Program helps talented students at more than 400 colleges and universities gain valuable experiences through paid internships at federal, private, and non-profit organizations. USDA has been a leading organization working with the program hosting nearly 1,900 HACU student interns since 1994. In FY 2017, APHIS selected five students for summer internships in Riverdale, MD.

Conference on Asian Pacific American Leadership (CAPAL) ($21,000)
CAPAL is a 501(c)(3) charitable and educational organization dedicated to building leadership and public policy knowledge within the Asian Pacific American (APA) community. Its mission is to promote APA interests and success in public service careers, to provide information and education on policy issues affecting the APA community, and to serve the APA community at large. In FY 2017, APHIS entered into a cooperative agreement with CAPAL and hired two summer interns in Riverdale, MD.

The Safeguarding Natural Heritage Program ($186,904.47)
The Safeguarding Natural Heritage Program is an educational outreach program designed to enhance youth’s exposure to agriculture, natural resources and wildlife biology through activities within the environments of the Native American culture. In FY 2017, there were four institutions that sponsored programs: Navajo Technical University, Dine College, University of North Carolina at Pembroke, and College of Menominee Nation. There were a total of 101 students that attended the summer program.
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### Essential Element A: DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT FROM AGENCY LEADERSHIP

Requires the agency head to issue written policy statements ensuring a workplace free of discriminatory harassment and a commitment to equal employment opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Indicator</th>
<th>EEO policy statements are up-to-date.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Agency Head was installed on 06/14/2013 The EEO policy statement was issued on 07/26/2013</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the current Agency Head's tenure, has the EEO policy Statement been re-issued annually? If no, provide an explanation.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are new employees provided a copy of the EEO policy statement during orientation?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When an employee is promoted into the supervisory ranks, is s/he provided a copy of the EEO policy statement?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compliance Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EEO policy statements have been communicated to all employees.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the heads of subordinate reporting components communicated support of all agency EEO policies through the ranks?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the agency made written materials available to all employees and applicants, informing them of the variety of EEO programs and administrative and judicial remedial procedures available to them?</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the agency prominently posted such written materials in all personnel offices, EEO offices, and on the agency’s internal website? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(5)]</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>Measure has been met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency EEO policy is vigorously enforced by agency management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are managers and supervisors evaluated on their commitment to agency EEO policies and principles, including their efforts to:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolve problems/disagreements and other conflicts in their respective work environments as they arise?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address concerns, whether perceived or real, raised by employees and following-up with appropriate action to correct or eliminate tension in the workplace?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support the agency's EEO program through allocation of mission personnel to participate in community out-reach and recruitment programs with private employers, public schools and universities?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure full cooperation of employees under his/her supervision with EEO office officials such as EEO Counselors, EEO Investigators, etc.?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, harassment and retaliation?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure that subordinate supervisors have effective managerial, communication and interpersonal skills in order to supervise most effectively in a workplace with diverse employees and avoid disputes arising from ineffective communications?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure the provision of requested religious accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ensure the provision of requested disability accommodations to qualified individuals with disabilities when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
<td>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all employees been informed about what behaviors are inappropriate in the workplace and that this behavior may result in disciplinary actions? Describe what means were utilized by the agency to so inform its workforce about the penalties for unacceptable behavior.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the procedures for reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities been made readily available/accessible to all employees by disseminating such procedures during orientation of new employees and by making such procedures available on the World Wide Web or Internet?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have managers and supervisor been trained on their responsibilities under the procedures for reasonable accommodation?</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Essential Element B: INTEGRATION OF EEO INTO THE AGENCY’S STRATEGIC MISSION

Requires that the agency’s EEO programs be organized and structured to maintain a workplace that is free from discrimination in any of the agency’s policies, procedures or practices and supports the agency’s strategic mission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</th>
<th>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Compliance Indicator**

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Measures**

- Is the EEO Director under the direct supervision of the agency head? [see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)] For subordinate level reporting components, is the EEO Director/Officer under the immediate supervision of the lower level component’s head official? (For example, does the Regional EEO Officer report to the Regional Administrator?)
  - The agency does not have a 2nd level EEO reporting component.

- Are the duties and responsibilities of EEO officials clearly defined?
  - The agency does not have a 2nd level EEO reporting component.

- Do the EEO officials have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions?

- If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, are there organizational charts that clearly define the reporting structure for EEO programs?
  - The agency does not have a 2nd level EEO reporting component.

- If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, does the agency-wide EEO Director have authority for the EEO programs within the subordinate reporting?
  - The agency does not have a 2nd level EEO reporting component.

- If not, please describe how EEO program authority is delegated to subordinate reporting components.

**Compliance Indicator**

The EEO Director and other EEO professional staff responsible for EEO programs have regular and effective means of informing the agency head and senior management officials of the status of EEO programs and are involved in, and consulted on, management/personnel actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Measures**

- Does the EEO Director/Officer have a regular and effective means of informing the agency head and other top management officials of the effectiveness, efficiency and legal compliance of the agency’s EEO program?
  - X

- Following the submission of the immediately preceding FORM 715-01, did the EEO Director/Officer present to the head of the agency and other senior officials the "State of the Agency" briefing covering all components of the EEO report, including an assessment of the performance of the agency in each of the six elements of the Model EEO Program and a report on the progress of the agency in completing its barrier analysis including any barriers it identified and/or eliminated or reduced the impact of?
  - X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</th>
<th>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are EEO program officials present during agency deliberations prior to decisions regarding recruitment strategies, vacancy projections, succession planning, selections</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the agency consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making human resource decisions such as reorganizations and re-alignments?</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are management/personnel policies, procedures and practices examined at regular intervals to assess whether there are hidden impediments to the realization of equality of opportunity for any group(s) of employees or applicants? [see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(b)(3)]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the EEO Director included in the agency’s strategic planning, especially the agency's human capital plan, regarding succession planning, training, etc., to ensure</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance Indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>The agency has committed sufficient human resources and budget allocations to its EEO programs to ensure successful operation.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the EEO Director have the authority and funding to ensure implementation of agency EEO action plans to improve EEO program efficiency and/or eliminate identified barriers to the realization of equality of opportunity?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are sufficient personnel resources allocated to the EEO Program to ensure that agency self-assessments and self-analyses prescribed by EEO MD-715 are conducted annually and to maintain an effective complaint processing system?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are statutory/regulatory EEO related Special Emphasis Programs sufficiently</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Employment Program - Title 5 CFR, Subpart B, 720.204</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People With Disabilities Program Manager; Selective Placement Program for Individuals With Disabilities - Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act; Title 5 U.S.C. Subpart B, Chapter 31, Subchapter I-3102; 5 CFR 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR 315.709</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are other agency special emphasis programs monitored by the EEO Office for coordination and compliance with EEO guidelines and principles, such as FEORP - 5 CFR 720; Veterans Employment Programs; and Black/African American; American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian American/Pacific Islander programs?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compliance Indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>The agency has committed sufficient budget to support the success of its EEO Programs.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there sufficient resources to enable the agency to conduct a thorough barrier analysis of its workforce, including the provision of adequate data collection and tracking systems?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient budget allocated to all employees to utilize, when desired, all EEO programs, including the complaint processing program and ADR, and to make a request for reasonable accommodation? (Including subordinate level reporting components?)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has funding been secured for publication and distribution of EEO materials (e.g. harassment policies, EEO posters, reasonable accommodations procedures, etc.)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient funding to ensure the prominent posting of written materials in all personnel and EEO offices? [see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(b)(5)]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient funding to ensure all employees have access to this training and information?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the EEO Program allocated sufficient resources to train all employees on EEO Programs, including administrative and judicial remedial procedures available to employees?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient funding to ensure the prominent posting of written materials in all personnel and EEO offices? [see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(b)(5)]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient funding to ensure that all employees have access to this training and information?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there sufficient funding to provide all managers and supervisors with training and periodic up-dates on their EEO responsibilities: for ensuring a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, including harassment and retaliation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provide religious accommodations?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to provide reasonable accommodators in accordance with the agency’s written procedures?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the EEO discrimination complaint process?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to participate in ADR?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Essential Element C: MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY

This element requires the Agency Head to hold all managers, supervisors, and EEO Officials responsible for the effective implementation of the agency’s EEO Program and Plan.

### Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Indicator</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EEO program officials advise and provide appropriate assistance to managers/supervisors about the status of EEO programs within each manager’s or supervisor’s area or responsibility.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are regular (monthly/quarterly/semi-annually) EEO updates provided to management/supervisory officials by EEO program officials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do EEO program officials coordinate the development and implementation of EEO Plans with all appropriate agency managers to include Agency Counsel, Human Resource Officials, Finance, and the Chief information Officer?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Human Resources Director and the EEO Director meet regularly to assess whether personnel programs, policies, and procedures are in conformity with instructions contained in EEOC management directives. [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(b)(3)]</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Merit Promotion Program Policy and Procedures for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in promotion opportunities by all groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Employee Recognition Awards Program and Procedures for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in the program by all groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Employee Development/Training Programs for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in training opportunities by all groups?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When findings of discrimination are made, the agency explores whether or not disciplinary actions should be taken.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency have a disciplinary policy and/or a table of penalties that covers employees found to have committed discrimination?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
<td>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have all employees, supervisors, and managers been informed as to the penalties for being found to perpetrate discriminatory behavior or for taking personnel actions based upon a prohibited basis?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the agency, when appropriate, disciplined or sanctioned managers/supervisors or employees found to have discriminated over the past two years?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, cite number found to have discriminated and list penalty/disciplinary action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency promptly (within the established time frame) comply with EEOC, Merit Systems Protection Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, labor arbitrators, and District Court orders?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency review disability accommodation decisions/actions to ensure compliance with its written procedures and analyze the information tracked for trends, problems, etc.?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Essential Element D: PROACTIVE PREVENTION
Requires that the agency head makes early efforts to prevent discriminatory actions and eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity in the workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</th>
<th>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Compliance Indicator

#### Analyses to identify and remove unnecessary barriers to employment are conducted throughout the year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do senior managers meet with and assist the EEO Director and/or other EEO Program Officials in the identification of barriers that may be impeding the realization of equal employment opportunity?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When barriers are identified, do senior managers develop and implement, with the assistance of the agency EEO office, agency EEO Action Plans to eliminate said barriers?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do senior managers successfully implement EEO Action Plans and incorporate the EEO Action Plan Objectives into agency strategic plans?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are trend analyses of workforce profiles conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are trend analyses of the workforce's major occupations conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are trends analyses of the workforce's grade level distribution conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are trend analyses of the workforce's compensation and reward system conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are trend analyses of the effects of management/personnel policies, procedures and practices conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compliance Indicator

#### The use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is encouraged by senior management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are all employees encouraged to use ADR?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the participation of supervisors and managers in the ADR process required?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Essential Element E: EFFICIENCY
Requires that the agency head ensure that there are effective systems in place for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the agency’s EEO Programs as well as an efficient and fair dispute resolution process.

### Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

For period covering October 1, 2016, to September 30, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Indicator</th>
<th>The agency has sufficient staffing, funding, and authority to achieve the elimination of identified barriers.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the EEO Office employ personnel with adequate training and experience to conduct the analyses required by MD-715 and these instructions?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has the agency implemented an adequate data collection and analysis systems that permit tracking of the information required by MD-715 and these instructions?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have sufficient resources been provided to conduct effective audits of field facilities’ efforts to achieve a model EEO program and eliminate discrimination under Title VII and the Rehabilitation Act?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a designated agency official or other mechanism in place to coordinate or assist with processing requests for disability accommodations in all major components of the agency?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are 90% of accommodation requests processed within the time frame set forth in the agency procedures for reasonable accommodation?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>The agency has an effective complaint tracking and monitoring system in place to increase the effectiveness of the agency’s EEO Programs.</td>
<td>Measure has been met</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency use a complaint tracking and monitoring system that allows identification of the location, and status of complaints and length of time elapsed at each stage of the agency's complaint resolution process?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency’s tracking system identify the issues and bases of the complaints, the aggrieved individuals/complainants, the involved management officials and other information to analyze complaint activity and trends?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency hold contractors accountable for delay in counseling and investigation processing times?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If yes, briefly describe how:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency monitor and ensure that new investigators, counselors, including contract and collateral duty investigators, receive the 32 hours of training required in accordance with EEO Management Directive MD-110?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency monitor and ensure that experienced counselors, investigators, including contract and collateral duty investigators, receive the 8 hours of refresher training required on an annual basis in accordance with EEO Management Directive MD-110?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Measure has been met</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The agency has sufficient staffing, funding and authority to comply with the time frames in accordance with the EEOC (29 C.F.R. Part 1614) regulations for processing EEO complaints of employment discrimination.</td>
<td>Yes No N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are benchmarks in place that compare the agency's discrimination complaint processes with 29 C.F.R. Part 1614?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency provide timely EEO counseling within 30 days of the initial request or within an agreed upon extension in writing, up to 60 days?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency provide an aggrieved person with written notification of his/her rights and responsibilities in the EEO process in a timely fashion?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency complete the investigations within the applicable prescribed time frame?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Final agency decisions are not within the Mission Areas of APHIS - (agency level.) Final Agency decisions are handled at the Department- OASCR writes final agency decisions for all of the agencies in the USDA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When a complainant requests a final agency decision, does the agency issue the decision within 60 days of the request?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When a complainant requests a hearing, does the agency immediately upon receipt of the request from the EEOC AJ forward the investigative file to the EEOC Hearing Office?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>When a settlement agreement is entered into, does the agency timely complete any obligations provided for in such agreements?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency ensure timely compliance with EEOC AJ decisions which are not the subject of an appeal by the agency?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>There is an efficient and fair dispute resolution process and effective systems for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the agency’s EEO complaint processing program.</td>
<td>Yes No N/A</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>In accordance with 29 C.F.R. §1614.102(b), has the agency established an ADR Program during the pre-complaint and formal complaint stages of the EEO process?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the agency require all managers and supervisors to receive ADR training in accordance with EEOC (29 C.F.R. Part 1614) regulations, with emphasis on the federal government's interest in encouraging mutual resolution of disputes and the benefits associated with utilizing ADR?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Compliance Indicator

**The agency has effective systems in place for maintaining and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of its EEO programs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Compliance Indicator**

The agency ensures that the investigation and adjudication function of its complaint resolution process are separate from its legal defense arm of agency or other offices with conflicting or competing interests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Compliance Indicator**

The agency has effective systems in place for maintaining and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of its EEO programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency provide reasonable resources for the EEO complaint process to ensure efficient and successful operation in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency have a system of management controls in place to ensure the timely, accurate, complete and consistent reporting of EEO complaint data to the agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency's EEO programs address all of the laws enforced by the EEOC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency track recruitment efforts and analyze efforts to identify potential barriers in accordance with MD-715 standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency consult with other agencies of similar size on the effectiveness of their EEO programs to identify best practices and share ideas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Are legal sufficiency reviews of EEO matters handled by a functional unit that is separate and apart from the unit which handles agency representation in EEO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Does the agency discrimination complaint process ensure a neutral adjudication function?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

If applicable, are processing time frames incorporated for the legal counsel's sufficiency review for timely processing of complaints?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</th>
<th>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Essential Element F: RESPONSIVENESS AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE**  
This element requires that federal agencies are in full compliance with EEO statutes and EEOC regulations, policy guidance, and other written instructions. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Indicator</th>
<th>Agency personnel are accountable for timely compliance with orders issued by EEOC Administrative Judges.</th>
<th>Measure has been met</th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Yes No N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency have a system of management control to ensure that agency officials timely comply with any orders or directives issued by EEOC Administrative Judges?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>The agency's system of management controls ensures that the agency timely completes all ordered corrective action and submits its compliance report to EEOC within 30 days of such completion.</td>
<td>Measure has been met</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Yes No N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency have control over the payroll processing function of the agency? If Yes, answer the two questions below.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there steps in place to guarantee responsive, timely, and predictable processing of ordered monetary relief?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are procedures in place to promptly process other forms of ordered relief?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Indicator</td>
<td>The agency's system of management controls ensures that the agency timely completes all ordered corrective action and submits its compliance report to EEOC within 30 days of such completion.</td>
<td>Measure has been met</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Yes No N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is compliance with EEOC orders encompassed in the performance standards of any agency employees?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, please identify the employees by title in the comments section, and state how performance is measured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the unit charged with the responsibility for compliance with EEOC orders located in the EEO office?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not, please identify the unit in which it is located, the number of employees in the unit, and their grade levels in the comments section.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the involved employees received any formal training in EEO compliance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the agency promptly provide to the EEOC the following documentation for completing compliance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney Fees: Copy of check issued for attorney fees and/or a narrative statement by an appropriate agency official, or agency payment order dating the dollar amount of attorney fees paid?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</td>
<td>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awards:</strong> A narrative statement by an appropriate agency official stating the dollar amount and the criteria used to calculate the award?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Back Pay and Interest:</strong> Computer print-outs or payroll documents outlining gross back pay and interest, copy of any checks issued, narrative statement by an appropriate agency official of total monies paid?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensatory Damages:</strong> The final agency decision and evidence of payment, if made?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training:</strong> Attendance roster at training session(s) or a narrative statement by an appropriate agency official confirming that specific persons or groups of persons attended training on a date certain?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Actions (e.g., Reinstatement, Promotion, Hiring, Reassignment):</strong> Copies of SF-50s</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posting of Notice of Violation:</strong> Original signed and dated notice reflecting the dates that the notice was posted. A copy of the notice will suffice if the original is not available.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplemental Investigation:</strong> 1. Copy of letter to complainant acknowledging receipt from EEOC of remanded case. 2. Copy of letter to complainant transmitting the Report of Investigation (not the ROI itself unless specified). 3. Copy of request for a hearing (complainant's request or agency's transmittal letter).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Agency Decision (FAD):</strong> FAD or copy of the complainant's request for a hearing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restoration of Leave:</strong> Print-out or statement identifying the amount of leave restored, if applicable. If not, an explanation or statement.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civil Actions:</strong> A complete copy of the civil action complaint demonstrating same issues raised as in compliance matter.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Agreements:</strong> Signed and dated agreement with specific dollar amounts, if applicable. Also, appropriate documentation of relief is provided.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

1. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102.

2. When an agency makes modifications to its procedures, the procedures must be resubmitted to the Commission. See EEOC Policy Guidance on Executive Order 13164: Establishing Procedures to Facilitate the Provision of Reasonable Accommodation (10/20/00), Question 28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</th>
<th>For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36
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?

It is required by the EEOC to conduct a barrier analysis for Hispanics in the workforce. Hispanic females are underrepresented in APHIS’ total workforce.

BARRIER ANALYSIS:

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

Workforce Data Tables
EEOC Technical Assistance Letter
Federal Employment Viewpoint Survey
Focus Groups

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.

No specific barriers were found. APHIS will continue outreach, recruitment and retention efforts to target the low participation rate for Hispanic females.

OBJECTIVE:

State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.

Increase participate rate for Hispanic females.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

Director, OCRDI; Director HR and Managers and Supervisors

DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:

11/01/2016

TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:

09/30/2018

OBJECTIVE:

State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.

Increase the applicant pool by targeting recruitment efforts.

RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

Director, OCRDI; Director HR and Managers and Supervisors; and 2210 Workgroup

DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:

10/01/2015

TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:

9/30/2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:

Provide training for hiring and selecting officials regarding hiring authorities, recruitment and the new federal hiring reform process.

Implement hiring reform with mechanisms to track improvements in the hiring process, including self-audits of the programs plan.

Provide updates on recruitment activities and workshops. Meetings will be held on a quarterly or more often, if needed.
Review applicant flow data quarterly --populating Table A7, A9, and A11 and OCRDI will review the information along with Civil Rights, Diversity Advisory Committees (CRDAC) to determine and senior leadership.

09/30/2018

Encourage employees to confirm that their race, ethnicity and disability selections are correct via the Employee Personal Page (EPP) and allowed employees to make the corrections if required.

09/30/2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE

- Marketing and Regulatory Programs (MRP) Business Services, issued “Pocket Cards” to the Administrator and management officials identifying new hires by RNO, disability and veteran hires and summarizing the information for each pay period.

- The HR Recruitment Specialist assists with the development of a comprehensive recruitment calendar for the Fiscal Year. The recruitment calendar is now being shared on the Sharepoint site. Each event targets various targeted groups to address workforce deficiencies for groups with low participation.

- Monthly meeting with HR recruitment specialist meets with the Office Civil Rights, Diversity and Inclusion and HR Operations each month to discuss upcoming and previously attended outreach and recruitment events and provide updates and summaries of the events. The recruitment specialist facilitates special workshops such as the Workforce Recruitment Program and Pathways Presentations.

- The Recruitment Specialist collaborates with the Office of Human Resources Management to develop a comprehensive list of events for each Agency to either participate in or sponsor. This information is shared through OHRM Recruitment office. The HR Recruitment Specialist meets on an as needs basis to solicit volunteers to staff booths, sponsor a particular recruitment events or provide materials for distribution from Agency programs.

- The HR Recruitment Specialist requests planned activities from Agency programs to determine if the event will be attended by other Agency programs and if they seek participation from outside of their programs. This measure is cost effective because it allows other programs within APHIS to solicit information about their respective program. Information that was distributed included job opportunities, current openings, and program specific activities.

- HR provided applicant flow data for Tables A7, A9, and A11 on a quarterly basis; this information was shared with the Civil Rights Diversity, Advisory Committee and APHIS Management Team. The information will be reviewed again to determine if the results have improved in FY2018.

- Barrier analysis training was provided to the specific programs in FY 2017. CRDAC members can conduct barrier analysis for their specific programs because they understand the dynamics of the environment in their respective areas/regions.
**Department of Agriculture/USDA Animal**

**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?

- In FY 2015 (September 29, 2015) the EEOC conducted a review of USDA SES data and found that females had lower than expected participation rates.
- A review of the APHIS workforce in FY 2015 and FY 2016 was conducted and females and minority groups with the exception of Hispanic and Asian males, have lower than expected participation rates.

**BARRIER ANALYSIS:**
Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.

- Workforce Data Tables
- EEOC Technical Assistance Letter
- Federal Employment Viewpoint Survey
- Focus Groups

**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.

Based on the EEOC’s Technical Assistance letter to APHIS, we will (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 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 interview panels about their processes for 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) conduct a longitudinal review of applicant flow statistics found in tables A7 and A9; (10) review the participation of females by grade level in the occupations with upward mobility; and (11) meet with selecting officials to examine their experiences in the hiring process and to discuss their perception of female applicants.

**OBJECTIVE:**
State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.

- Increase the diversity of the SES.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:**
APHIS Administrator, Director, OCRDI & Managers and Supervisors

**DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:**
11/16/2015

**TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:**
09/30/2017

---

**EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I-2**

**EEO Plan To Eliminate Identified Barrier**

**PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>TARGET DATE (Must be specific)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)</td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interview Data</td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>9/30/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The National Civil Rights and Diversity Advisory Committee (NCRDAC) began the barrier analysis process to identify the barriers inhibiting upward mobility to Executive Level positions, 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 2018, OCRDI will be utilizing the agency’s Diversity Liaisons to assist the NCRDAC with the barrier analysis.

• In FY 2017, APHIS identified and speculated that the triggers are unconscious bias, conscious stereotyping, status as primary caregiver, lack of availability in the mission-critical occupations, and lack of self-promotion.
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 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with reportable and targeted disabilities in the federal government.

1. Using the goal of 12% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
   a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer: No
   b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer: Yes

   In FY 2017, there were 400 employees (10.88%) with disabilities in the GS-11 to SES cluster. This was 1.12% 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

   There were no triggers involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce.

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

   There is a direct line of communication between Human Resources (HR) and the Office of Civil Rights Diversity and Inclusion (OCRDI) by our establishment of the
HR/OCRDI monthly meeting. The goals are communicated by OCRDI to HR staff, and HR includes the numerical goals in the annual Outreach and Recruitment Plan. The Recruitment Plan is used to declare outreach and recruitment intentions for each special emphasis group. The Recruitment Plan 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 DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

   Answer: Yes

The agency has designated sufficient qualified personnel to implement its disability program.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Program Task</th>
<th># of FTE Staff by Employment Status</th>
<th>Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processing applications from PWD and PWTD</td>
<td>9 Full Time, 0 Part Time, 0 Collateral Duty</td>
<td>Nancy Varichak, Deputy Director, HR Operations - HR <a href="mailto:Nancy.C.Varichak@aphis.usda.gov">Nancy.C.Varichak@aphis.usda.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 1 Full Time, 0 Part Time, 1 Collateral Duty | Adrienne Burch, Management Analyst - OCRDI [Adrienne.m.burch@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Adrienne.m.burch@aphis.usda.gov)  
Thomas Mack, HR Specialist - HR [Thomas.l.mack@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Thomas.l.mack@aphis.usda.gov) |
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees | 2 Full Time, 0 Part Time, 0 Collateral Duty | David Walton, RA Coordinator - HR [david.walton@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:david.walton@aphis.usda.gov)  
Carol Griffith, RA Specialist - HR [Carol.a.griffith@aphis.usda.gov](mailto:Carol.a.griffith@aphis.usda.gov) |
### Disability Program Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Program Task</th>
<th># of FTE Staff by Employment Status</th>
<th>Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Part Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 508 Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Barriers Act Compliance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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(s) that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training(s) 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

The agency provides sufficient funding and other resources to successfully implement the disability program.

### 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 APPLICANTS 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 2017, APHIS collaborated with organizations such as Lighthouse for the Blind, Association of People Supporting Employment First, and Gallaudet University’s sign language instructors. 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. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD)   Answer: No
   b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD)   Answer: No

   No triggers exist for PWD and PWTD among new hires in the permanent workforce.

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.
   a. New Hires for MCO (PWD)   Answer: No
   b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)   Answer: No

   Not Applicable
   Qualified applicant pool data was not provided with Table B7; therefore, we are unable to use qualified applicant pool data as a benchmark.

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified internal applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.
   a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)   Answer: Yes
   b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)   Answer: Yes

   0704 – Animal Health Technician
   6.71% of the relevant applicant pool are PWD; however, none applied. 1.17% of the
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.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES
1. Please describe the career development opportunities that the agency provides to its employees.

The Basic Leadership Development Program (BLDP) 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 one week of class room sessions and weekly web based courses.

The Intermediate Leadership Development Program (ILDP) targets employees at GS 7-11 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 full-time GS 12 - 14 employees in supervisory or managerial positions. No cohort was held in FY 2017.

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

APHIS contracts with the Brookings Institute to deliver leadership development training to a diverse group of the Agency’s high performing GS 14 level employees called the Brookings Executive Education (BEE) Program. Brookings offers a 9-month interagency cohort-based learning opportunity. 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.

In addition to the Brookings program, high performing APHIS GS 14 level employees are also sent to the Harvard Kennedy School- Senior Executive Fellow Program, a 4-week residential program that takes place on the University’s Cambridge, MA campus. Participants receive valuable training and practice in making decisions about real world challenges and scenarios. The Program curriculum includes 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 receive a Certificate of Completion from Harvard and invitations to future alumni events.

2. 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 applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", 
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describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer: No
b. Selections (PWD) Answer: No


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

a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No
b. Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

C. AWARDS

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

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer: No
b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer: No

Though the percentage of employees with disabilities who received a cash award is 11.47%, it is only 0.7% below the 12.17% inclusion rate benchmark; therefore, it is not a trigger.

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

a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer: No
b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer: No

Though the percentage of employees with disabilities who received a quality step increase is 11.82%, it is only 0.35% below the 12.17% inclusion rate benchmark; therefore, it is not a trigger.

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

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

   a. SES

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

   b. Grade GS-15

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

   c. Grade GS-14

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

   d. Grade GS-13

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS levels for the positions that qualified internal applicants are applying towards. Therefore, APHIS is unable to use relevant applicant pool and qualified applicant pool as benchmarks. However, out of 83 employees promoted to GS-13 internally, only 9 were PWD (10.84%). Out of the 57 employees promoted to GS-14, 9 were PWD (15.79%). Out of the 13 employees promoted to GS-15 internally, none were PWD. Two APHIS employees were converted to SES, none of which have a disability.

(See chart in Part J)
2. 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.

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

b. Grade GS-15
   i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)  Answer: Yes
   ii. Internal Selections (PWD)  Answer: Yes

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

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS levels for positions that qualified internal applicants are applying towards. Therefore, APHIS is unable to use relevant applicant pool and qualified applicant pool as benchmarks. However, based on the chart given in Section IV.D.1, no PWTD were promoted to any senior grade levels.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS levels for new hire positions (Please see Table B7 in the Appendix). However, outside of Schedule A, only 5.11% of new hires to permanent positions were PWD. In regards to the GS-13 level, six out of the
31 new hires were PWD (19.35%). None of the GS-14 and GS-15 new hires were PWD.

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

   a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Answer: Yes
   b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer: Yes
   c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer: Yes
   d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer: No

APHIS does not have data that specifies the GS levels for new hire positions (Please see Table B7 in the Appendix). However, in regards to the GS-13 level, one out of the 31 new hires was a PWTD (3.22%). None of the GS-14 and GS-15 new hires 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.

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

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions in which internal applicants are selected for promotion. However, in regards to GS-13, GS-14, and GS-15, please see the table in Section IV. D.5
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.

   a. Executives
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer: No
      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)            Answer: Yes

   b. Managers
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer: No
      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)            Answer: Yes

   c. Supervisors
      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer: No
      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)            Answer: Yes

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions in which internal applicants are selected for promotion. However, in regards to GS-13, GS-14, and GS-15, please see the table in Section IV. D.6.

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

   a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)         Answer: No
   b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)           Answer: No
   c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)        Answer: No

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions for new hires nor qualified applicant pool data.

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

   a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)        Answer: No
   b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)          Answer: No
   c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)       Answer: No

APHIS does not have data that specifies the supervisory status of positions for new hires nor qualified applicant pool data.
Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be a model employer for persons with disabilities, agencies must have policies and programs in place to retain employees with disabilities. In 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 personal assistance services.

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

   Answer: No

   There are 3 employees that have not been converted – we are currently following up with the respective programs to address this issue.

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

   a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer: No

   b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer: No

   There are no triggers in regards to voluntary and involuntary separations of PWD.

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

   a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: No

   b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: No

   There are no triggers in regards to voluntary and involuntary separations of PWTD.

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.

   No trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTD.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES
Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform job 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. However, 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.

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 has a collateral duty 508 program manager. Available funding does not exist for the program and thus nothing has been completed to date in this area. To support this program in greater detail 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 manufactures 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.

Make reasonable accommodations and Work Life Wellness (WLW) information available to disabled veteran applicants during the recruitment process. Through WLW, veterans have access to WorkLife4You, an agency-paid benefit which offers counseling.

APHIS manages a comprehensive Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program and maintains an informative website: http://www.aphis.usda.gov/mrpbs/hr/reasonable_accommodation.shtml. The site includes a link to the MRP Reasonable Accommodation Departmental Directive and provides other information and resources. Marketing and Regulatory Programs Business Services (MRPBS), which includes APHIS, has a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Program Coordinator and a full-time Reasonable Accommodation Specialist for handling requests for accommodations.

During the last fiscal year, the RA staff delivered seven workshops, including five overview presentations detailing the accommodation process and two webinars focusing on telework as an accommodation. The RA staff trained eight members of the IES staff on March 1, 2017. The two telework webinars took place on May 8, 2017, with 54 employees attending, and on July 12, 2017, with 63 employees attending. In FY 2017, the RA staff began participating in the Federal Human Resources Management Training (FHRM). The RA staff participated in four FHRM trainings, along with representatives of the Office of Civil Rights, Diversity, and Inclusion, on June 21, 2017, at which 30 participants were trained; July 25, 2017, at which 25 people received training; August 22, 2017, at which 25 people received training; and September 12, 2017, at which 25 attendees received training.

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 program 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 assistive technology and assistive software used as reasonable accommodations.
- The MRP Reasonable Accommodation policy is administered as appropriate to process requests for reassignments as a reasonable accommodation.
- During FY 2017, the Reasonable Accommodation program opened 150 cases. Of that number 121 were closed within the fiscal year. (See table for breakdown of accommodations by program area.)
- The 2017 fiscal year was the first year in which the Reasonable Accommodation program’s centralized accommodation fund, authorized by the APHIS Administrator, was in operation for the entire fiscal year.
- During this year, there were 58 requests for technology items which were purchased using the centralized accommodation fund. The total cost for funding these requests was $19,795. The cost of providing interpreting services for APHIS employees who are deaf was $200,257. The fact that the 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.

FY2017 Cases by Program
MRPBS - 30
AC - 5
BRS - 4
IS - 2
LPA - 2
OA - 2
PPD - 5
PPQ - 56
VS - 38
WS - 6
Total - 150

APHIS FY 2017 RA Cases - Type of Accommodation Granted
Telework - 53
Modify Job Duties - 10
Office Equipment - 50
Special Software - 8
Other - 29
Total - 150
Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide personal assistance services (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, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

APHIS’ Employee Assistance Program (EAP) is extremely effective. The EAP counselors are available to our employee’s on a 24 hour per day and 7 day per week basis. Employees receive a call back within 24 to 48 hours of contacting EAP except in instances of emergency. The EAP also provides a large variety of presentations to our supervisors, managers and employees. We host at least 4 webinars from our headquarters location annually and presentations are always available at our other APHIS worksites upon request. APHIS also receives quarterly and annual return on investment reports which detail employee usage in all areas of the EAP.

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: No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?
   
   Answer: No

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

   APHIS did not find any discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during FY 2017.

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

   Answer: No

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

   Answer: No

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

   APHIS did not find any discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during FY 2017.

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?

   Answer: Yes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trigger 1</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• APHIS does not meet the 12% goal of PWD and PWTD in the GS-11 – SES cluster.</td>
<td>Improve the advancement abilities for PWD and PWTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With MCO – Animal Health Technician (0704) PWD and PWTD are not applying for the position, though the relevant applicant pool for PWD is 6.71% and 1.17% for PWTD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PWD and PWTD were not selected for MCO – Miscellaneous Clerk &amp; Assistant (0303) and Wildlife Biology (0486) though PWD and PWTD make up a percentage of those who qualified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Official(s)</td>
<td>Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne Burch</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Identify Information Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Data Tables</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Data derived from the National Finance Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint Data (Trends)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Data (Trends)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interview Data</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Describe)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>Planned Activities</th>
<th>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding (Yes or No)</th>
<th>Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
<th>Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Communicate retention strategies to managers, supervisors and EEO collateral duty officials.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Maintenance of the Disability Employment Programs which are designed to promote employment, advancement, development, and retention of veterans.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Promote assistive technology for PWD and PWTD, and train information technology staff on ways to implement them.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Promote career development programs towards PWD/PWTD. Collect data on PWD and PWTD who apply for career development programs, qualification, and selection.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Increase disability employment program managers’ communication with managers and supervisors through the use of conference calls, newsletters and email.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/30/2018</td>
<td>Require annual reasonable accommodation procedures and sensitivity training to managers and supervisors to alleviate the separation of PWD due to the lack of resources or knowledge.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Year | Accomplishments**
---|---
2017 | Partnered with employees who are veterans with disabilities and non-veterans with disabilities.
2017 | Updated and maintained contacts with vocational rehabilitation offices, state agencies and organizations.

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

Not Applicable.

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

APHIS provided agency-sponsored programs designed to educate managers, supervisors and human resource managers on ways to use the Schedule A hiring authority to recruit and hire talented PWD. Employees of the agency worked with APHIS hiring officials to first consider applicants under the special hiring authorities. This means considering qualified PWD and veterans in filling critical vacancies. APHIS has established a new form for new hires which requests the official to document which special hiring options have been considered.

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

Not Applicable.