

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

To capture agencies' affirmative action plan for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD), EEOC regulations (29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(e)) and MD-715 require agencies to describe how their plan will improve the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of applicants and employees with disabilities. All agencies, regardless of size, must complete this Part of the MD-715 report.

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

EEOC regulations (29 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) No
 - b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) No

15.83% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark.

16.53% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark.

2. Using the goal of 2% as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD by grade level cluster in the permanent workforce? If "yes," describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
 - a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) No
 - b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD) No

4.57% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark.

3.61% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark.

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

DLA has consistently communicated through Disability self-identification video, self-identification articles and demographic charts. DLA also promotes National Disability Awareness Month presentations and seminars, which state our commitment to increase the representation of PWTDs to 2% and PWDs to 12% of our workforce. DLA also collaborates with the Office of Diversity Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) within OSD and the DLA HR Recruitment Cadre.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Yes.

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD by Selective Placement Coordinators (SPPCs)	0	0	90	Casandra Green, SPPC; Casandra.Green@dla.mil Steven Carney, SPPC; Steven.Carney@dla.mil
SPPCs answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	2	Casandra Green, SPPC; Casandra.Green@dla.mil Steven Carney, SPPC; Steven.Carney@dla.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	8	0	3	Monique Ray, DLA Disability Program Manager (DPM); Monique.Ray@dla.mil
Section 508 Compliance	6	4	8	Richard Harmon, Branch Chief, Enterprise IT Accessibility, J62LC Richard.Harmon@dla.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	7	Tamberly Averett, Installation Management Division Chief, Tamberly.Averett@dla.mil
Special Emphasis Program for PWDs and PWTDs	9	0	0	Eric Spanbauer, DLA Special Emphasis Program Manager (SEPM); Eric.Spanbauer@dla.mil

3. Has the agency provided disability program staff with sufficient training to carry out their responsibilities during the reporting period? If “yes,” describe the training that disability program staff have received. If “no,” describe the training planned for the upcoming year.

Yes. DLA has a full-time Disability Program Manager (DPM) who works with seven Disability Program Coordinators (DPCs) at the Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) EEO offices.

B. Plan to Ensure Sufficient Funding for the Disability Program

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

Yes. The DPM and all DPCs have attended a Disability Program Manager training course, and regularly attend workshops and webinars hosted by the National Employment Law Institute, the Job Accommodation Network, and the Employer Assistance and Resource Network. They also participate in the Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability, hosted by the EEOC, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Department of Labor. All DPCs regularly receives updates and advisories from the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP).

DO hosts a roundtable every other month to discuss RA, SEP, and AEP matters, conduct on-the-spot training, and share best practices, trends, and solutions.

The DPM hosts a quarterly meeting to discuss RA issues.

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 Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (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.

Job applicants may use Schedule A hiring authority to apply for vacancy announcements. If hired with the Schedule A hiring authority, selectees are required to complete a SF-256 form to identify their disability. On another avenue, supervisors and managers identify and select qualified candidates through the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) for College Students with Disabilities database are hired with the same Schedule A hiring authority.

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.

DLA uses all available and appropriate hiring authorities to recruit and hire PWD and PWTD. Individuals eligible for employment under the hiring authorities pursuant to 29 CFR 1614.203(a)(3), such as Schedule A, Veterans Recruitment Appointment, and 30% or More Disabled Veteran Authority, can be considered for employment opportunities by applying to positions on USAJOBS.

- 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.

Individuals requesting consideration through Schedule A hiring authority are required to provide a letter from a physician or other care provider certifying their eligibility for Schedule A hiring authority. Individuals who request consideration as a 30% or more disabled veteran are required to provide DD Form 214, Military Discharge and a letter from the Department of Veteran's Affairs or branch of the armed forces certifying an overall service-connected disability. Individuals must meet eligibility requirements for the appointment authority and minimum qualifications for the vacancy.

HR refers qualified applicants to the selecting official in veteran's preference order and then if they identify as being eligible for Schedule A hiring authority, for 30% or more disabled veteran's authority, or both. HR refers qualified applicants to the selecting official in veteran's preference order and then if they identify as being eligible for Schedule A hiring authority, for 30% or more disabled veteran's authority, or both.

- 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.

Yes. All new supervisors are trained on Schedule A hiring authority during the HR Management class, which is refreshed every three years.

B. Plan to Establish Contacts with Disability Employment Organizations

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

Organizations that assist PWDs and PWTDs with securing employment where DLA currently maintains contact with:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Labor for the WRP • State Rehabilitation Service • Veteran Employment Centers • Gallaudet University • National Institute of the Blind • National Technical Institution of the Deaf • Disabled American Veterans • Social Security Administration • Wounded Warrior Project • Philadelphia Veterans Contact and Advocacy Program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job Accommodation Network (JAN) • Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) • Job Fairs that target PWD and PWTD populations, such as the Careers and the Disabled Expo. • Local college and university campus disability programs to inform them of job opportunities with DLA and to raise awareness of the different hiring authorities and programs. |
|---|--|

C. Progression Towards Goals (Recruitment and Hiring)

1. Using the goals of 12% for Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) and 2% for Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTDs) 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)..... Yes

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) No

11.95% is less than the 12.00% benchmark.
2.32% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark.

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) Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD).....No

Triggers exist for PWDs in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.)							
MCOs with enough hires (≥8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in red .							
0080	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	0.83% Security Administration
0089	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	0.95% Emergency Management
0201	=	0.95%	of	8	hires	<	8.52% Human Resources
0260	=	0.59%	of	5	hires	<	1.42% Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	1.78%	of	15	hires	<	8.28% Administration and Program
0343	=	1.30%	of	11	hires	<	12.19% Program Management Analyst
0346	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	2.37% Logistics Management
0510	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	2.49% Accounting
0801	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	1.42% General Engineering
0905	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	2.72% Attorney
1101	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	0.59% General Business & Industry
1102	=	2.37%	of	20	hires	<	28.05% Contracting
1104	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	2.72% Property Disposal
2001	=	0.59%	of	5	hires	<	7.22% General Supply
2003	=	0.47%	of	4	hires	<	2.01% Supply Program Management
2030	=	0.24%	of	2	hires	<	0.83% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management
2210	=	1.89%	of	16	hires	<	12.78% Information Technology Management

Note: the other 13 Top MCOs not listed here had no FY22 new hires.

Triggers exist for **PWTDs** in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.)
MCOs with enough hires (≥8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in **red**.

0260	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	1.42%	Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	8.28%	Administration and Program
0343	=	0.47%	of	4	hires	<	12.19%	Program Management Analyst
0346	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	2.37%	Logistics Management
0801	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	1.42%	General Engineering
0905	=	0.12%	of	1	hires	<	2.72%	Attorney
1102	=	0.71%	of	6	hires	<	28.05%	Contracting
1104	=	0.24%	of	2	hires	<	2.72%	Property Disposal
2003	=	0.24%	of	2	hires	<	2.01%	Supply Program Management
2210	=	0.36%	of	3	hires	<	12.78%	Information Technology Management

Note: the other 20 Top MCOs not listed here had no FY22 new hires.

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).....Yes
 - b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)Yes

Triggers exist for **PWDs** in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.)
MCOs with enough hires (≥8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in **red**.

0080	=	0.94%	of	18	hires	<	1.17%	Security Administration
0201	=	15.30%	of	294	hires	>	14.16%	Human Resources
0260	=	1.04%	of	20	hires	>	0.72%	Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	12.02%	of	231	hires	>	11.65%	Administration and Program
0343	=	13.58%	of	261	hires	<	13.81%	Program Management Analyst
0346	=	2.13%	of	41	hires	<	2.16%	Logistics Management
0501	=	0.16%	of	3	hires	<	0.32%	Financial Administration & Program
0801	=	0.10%	of	2	hires	>	0.07%	General Engineering
1035	=	0.10%	of	2	hires	=	0.10%	General Attorney
1101	=	0.42%	of	8	hires	=	0.42%	General Business & Industry
1102	=	6.66%	of	128	hires	>	5.83%	Contracting
1104	=	10.61%	of	204	hires	>	9.55%	Property Disposal
2001	=	21.75%	of	418	hires	<	24.02%	General Supply
2003	=	8.79%	of	169	hires	<	9.10%	Supply Program Management
2030	=	6.40%	of	123	hires	<	6.93%	Distribution Facilities & Storage Management

Note: the other 15 Top MCOs not listed here had no FY21 internal hires.

Triggers exist for **PWTDs** in the following MCOs: (Percent of new hires in that MCO.)
MCOs with enough hires (≥ 8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in **red**.

0080	=	1.56%	of	5	hires	>	1.47%	Security Administration
0201	=	5.92%	of	19	hires	>	5.49%	Human Resources
0260	=	1.25%	of	4	hires	>	0.57%	Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	15.58%	of	50	hires	>	14.55%	Administration and Program
0343	=	17.45%	of	56	hires	<	18.39%	Program Management Analyst
0346	=	0.62%	of	2	hires	<	1.60%	Logistics Management
0501	=	0.00%	of	0	hires	<	0.12%	Financial Administration & Program
0801	=	0.62%	of	2	hires	>	0.13%	General Engineering
1035	=	0.00%	of	0	hires	<	0.03%	General Attorney
1101	=	0.31%	of	1	hires	<	0.42%	General Business & Industry
1102	=	7.48%	of	24	hires	>	6.26%	Contracting
1104	=	9.35%	of	30	hires	<	9.76%	Property Disposal
2001	=	24.61%	of	79	hires	<	24.99%	General Supply
2003	=	9.66%	of	31	hires	>	8.99%	Supply Program Management
2030	=	5.61%	of	18	hires	<	7.24%	Distribution Facilities & Storage Management

Note: the other 15 Top MCOs not listed here for had no FY22 internal hires.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes,” please describe the triggers below.
- a. Promotions for MCO (PWD).....Yes
- b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)Yes

Triggers exist for **PWDs** in the following MCOs: (Percent of promotions in that MCO.) MCOs with enough hires (≥ 8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in **red**.

0080	=	0.19%	of	24	hires	<	2.47%	Security Administration
0089	=	0.08%	of	10	hires	<	1.41%	Emergency Management
0201	=	0.09%	of	12	hires	<	0.80%	Human Resources
0260	=	0.11%	of	14	hires	<	0.54%	Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	1.80%	of	232	hires	<	20.58%	Administration and Program
0343	=	2.14%	of	276	hires	<	21.41%	Program Management Analyst
0346	=	0.28%	of	36	hire	<	3.33%	Logistics Management
0391	=	0.02%	of	2	hires	<	0.09%	Financial Administration & Program
0501	=	0.29%	of	38	hires	<	3.65%	Accounting
0505	=	0.03%	of	4	hires	<	0.23%	Financial Management
0510	=	0.35%	of	45	hires	<	3.54%	Accounting
0511	=	0.10%	of	13	hires	>	0.02%	Auditing
0690	=	0.01%	of	1	hire	<	0.15%	Property Disposal
0801	=	0.02%	of	3	hires	<	1.14%	General Engineering
0810	=	0.00%	of	0	hire	<	0.02%	Civil Engineering
0905	=	0.12%	of	15	hires	<	3.14%	General Attorney
1035	=	0.00%	of	0	hire	<	0.12%	Public Affairs
1101	=	0.12%	of	16	hires	<	1.38%	General Business & Industry

1102	=	0.57%	of	73	hires	<	7.47%	Contracting
2001	=	0.52%	of	67	hires	<	4.47%	General Supply
2003	=	0.22%	of	28	hires	<	2.93%	Supply Program Management
2030	=	0.00%	of	0	hire	<	0.07%	Distribution Facilities & Storage Management
2210	=	1.35%	of	174	hires	<	12.66%	Information Technology Management

Note: the other seven Top MCOs not listed here had no FY22 Promotions.

Triggers exist for **PWTDs** in the following MCOs: (Percent of promotions in that MCO.) MCOs with enough hires (≥ 8) for the trigger to be significant are marked in **red**.

0080	=	0.09%	of	12	hires	<	2.66%	Security Administration
0089	=	0.04%	of	5	hires	<	1.49%	Emergency Management
0201	=	0.06%	of	8	hires	<	0.89%	Human Resources
0260	=	0.06%	of	8	hires	<	0.65%	Equal Employment Opportunity
0301	=	0.90%	of	116	hires	<	22.37%	Administration and Program
0343	=	1.10%	of	142	hires	<	23.55%	Program Management Analyst
0346	=	0.15%	of	19	hires	<	3.61%	Logistics Management
0391	=	0.02%	of	2	hires	<	0.10%	Financial Administration & Program
0501	=	0.13%	of	17	hires	<	3.94%	Accounting
0505	=	0.02%	of	3	hires	<	0.26%	Financial Management
0510	=	0.13%	of	17	hires	<	3.89%	Accounting
0511	=	0.00%	of	0	hires	<	0.12%	Auditing
0690	=	0.01%	of	1	hire	<	0.15%	Property Disposal
0801	=	0.01%	of	1	hire	<	1.16%	General Engineering
0810	=	0.00%	of	0	hires	<	0.02%	Civil Engineering
0905	=	0.09%	of	11	hire	<	3.26%	General Attorney
1035	=	0.00%	of	0	hire	<	0.12%	Public Affairs
1101	=	0.07%	of	9	hire	<	1.50%	General Business & Industry
1102	=	0.33%	of	42	hire	<	8.04%	Contracting
2001	=	0.27%	of	35	hire	<	4.99%	General Supply
2003	=	0.10%	of	13	hire	<	3.14%	Supply Program Management
2030	=	0.00%	of	0	hires	<	0.07%	Distribution Facilities & Storage Management
2210	=	0.67%	of	87	hire	<	14.01%	Information Technology Management

Note: the other seven Top MCOs not listed here had no FY22 Promotions.

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 Persons with Disabilities (PWDs), including Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTDs), have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

Plans for additional programs in FY23:

- DO continues to recommend and monitor improvements to track and advertise mentoring programs temporarily delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic.
- DLA will continue to maximize the use of hiring authorities and flexibilities for individuals with disabilities.
- DLA will continue to conduct outreach programs to educate and attract employees with disabilities to apply for positions within the agency.
- DLA will continue to provide effective Reasonable Accommodations (RA) ensuring all qualified employees and applicants with disabilities are afforded benefits and privileges of employment equal to employees and applicants without disabilities.
- The DLA Career Mapping Program continues to develop the DLA Career Guide, the DLA Career Pyramid, DLA Career Paths and DLA Career Checklists for specific job series, which will be available to all employees to assist them with advancement of their careers. The Career Mapping Program will continue to publish new career field specific tools, which will assist with planning employee's career development and progression.
- Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Special Emphasis Program Committee groups for PWDs were curtailed throughout FY2022. DO has drafted the Diversity & Inclusion charter and is on the glide path to a full committee implementation with stakeholder representatives from each D/J codes after the groundwork for virtual meetings becomes accessible to all stakeholders by FY2023 1st quarter.
- DLA will continue to fortify its Strategic Plan for DEIA, People and Culture and Sustainability, which includes all Disabled employees within the Agency. DLA's ability to attract, develop, and retain a diverse, skilled, and agile workforce is vital to our continued success as the nation's combat logistics support agency. The DLA People and Culture Plan aligns DLA's mission, goals, and objectives with proven human capital strategies. DLA organizations enterprise wide owns this plan and work together to achieve a shared vision.
- Continuous learning has been a long-standing strategy to ensure the DLA workforce has the skills needed to meet the Agency's ever-changing requirements. Rotational assignments focus on experiential development designed to expand an individual's functional, cross-functional, and leadership abilities through on the job learning. Rotational assignments are a key means of obtaining depth and breadth of knowledge, fostering greater information sharing and understanding of DLA's mission, collaboration, networking, gaining corporate perspective, as well as professional enhancement.

- Several of the DLA organizations use the Pathways to Career Excellence (PaCE) program, which is a two-year entry level program that includes successfully completing performance-based measures for advancement and promotion. Another two WRP participants were successfully induced into PaCE after having met or exceeded, satisfactory requirements in FY22.

B. Career Development Opportunities

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

DLA Enterprise Tuition Assistance Program: Provides financial support for continued education courses at the undergraduate or graduate level. Permanent, full-time civilian employees are eligible after their initial two-year probationary/trial period in Federal civilian service.

DLA Enterprise Leader Development Program: An Agency-wide leadership development program designed to build and enhance the leadership skills of DLA employees at all levels. The competencies include supervisory certification, coaching, mentoring, the use of leadership development guides, multi-source feedbacks, and behavior-based interviewing techniques.

Defense Civilian Emerging Leader Program: A DoD cohort and competency-based leadership development program for entry level and emerging leaders. Permanent full-time, civilians in grades 7 through 12 are eligible, including Federal Wage System employees.

DLA Enterprise Rotation Program (Cross-Organizational): Cross-organizational rotational assignments within DLA. (Intra-organizational rotations are also available) Rotational assignments were listed seeking GS-11 to GS-14 employee participation.

Logistics for the 21st Century: A 5 ½-day course designed by the Institute for Defense and Business to provide early-career, high-potential logisticians with a comprehensive and tailored educational experience. GS-11 through GS-13 early-career civilian logisticians are eligible.

DoD Defense Pricing and Contracting Acquisition Exchange Program: A unique developmental 6- to 9-month experience through rotational assignments for high caliber individuals in acquisition related career fields. Permanent civilian acquisition employees in grades GS 11 and above are eligible.

OSD Sustainment Fellowship Program: A 12-month hands-on leadership and management program to enhance the career development of mid-level logistics professionals. Civilian logistics employees in grades GS-13 and GS-14 are eligible.

In-House Coaching Program Pilot for FY19: Through in-house coaching, improve leadership capability across the agency. Employees who have completed ELDP Level 3 and managers are eligible.

DLA Executive Development Program: A program that allows managers to nominate high potential, highly motivated individuals to attend up to two training programs, for approval by DLA's executive board. Permanent civilians in grades GS-13 through GS-15 with at least 18-months of continuous service with DLA are eligible.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs	581	519	11.95%	10.67%	2.50%	2.24%
Fellowship Programs	1	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Mentoring Programs	---	---	---	---	---	---
Coaching Programs	---	---	---	---	---	---
Training Programs	306	258	18.60%	15.69%	1.94%	1.63%
Detail Programs	---	---	---	---	---	---
Tuition Assistance Program	131	119	10.08%	9.16%	1.68%	1.53%
Other Career Development Programs	160	126	18.25%	14.38%	3.17%	2.50%
Total	1,179	1,023	58.89%	49.89%	9.30%	7.90%

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

a. Applicants (PWD).....Yes

b. Selections (PWD).....Yes

A total of 11.95% of the 581 applicants to the *Internship Programs* (PaCER) were PWDs and 10.67% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **below** the permanent 15.51% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 18.60% of the 306 applicants to the *Training Programs* were PWDs and 15.69% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **above** the permanent 15.51% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 10.08% of the 131 applicants to the *Tuition Assistance Program* were PWDs and 9.16% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **below** the permanent 15.51% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 18.25% of the 160 applicants to the *Other Career Development Programs* were PWDs and 14.38% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **below** the permanent 15.51% PWD workforce benchmark.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTDS 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)Yes
 - b. Selections (PWTD)Yes

A total of 2.50% of the 581 applicants to the *Internship Programs* (PaCER) were PWTDS and 2.24% of the selectees were PWTDS, which is **below** the permanent 3.74% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 1.94% of the 306 applicants to the *Training Programs* were PWTDS and 1.63% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **below** the permanent 3.74% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 1.68% of the 131 applicants to the *Tuition Assistance Program* were PWTDS and 1.53% of the selectees were PWTDS, which is **below** the permanent 3.74% PWD workforce benchmark.

A total of 3.17% of the 160 applicants to the *Other Career Development Programs* were PWDs and 2.50% of the selectees were PWDs, which is **below** the permanent 3.74% PWD workforce benchmark.

C. Awards

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

Time-Off Awards										
1 - 10 Hours:	PWDs	=	14.37%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	3.52%	<	3.73%
11 - 20 Hours:	PWDs	=	15.47%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	3.93%	>	3.73%
21 - 30 Hours:	PWDs	=	18.04%	>	15.41%	PWTDS	=	4.89%	>	3.73%
31 - 40 Hours:	PWDs	=	16.11%	>	15.41%	PWTDS	=	2.01%	<	3.73%
41 or More Hours:	PWDs	=	0.00%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	0.00%	<	3.73%

Cash Awards										
\$500 and Under:	PWDs	=	14.40%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	3.65%	<	3.73%
\$501 - \$999:	PWDs	=	16.14%	>	15.41%	PWTDS	=	4.15%	>	3.73%
\$1,000 - \$1,999:	PWDs	=	15.19%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	4.05%	>	3.73%
\$2,000 - \$2,999:	PWDs	=	15.45%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	3.46%	<	3.73%
\$3,000 - \$3,999:	PWDs	=	15.21%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	3.23%	<	3.73%
\$4,000 - \$4,999:	PWDs	=	13.94%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	2.93%	<	3.73%
\$5,000 or More:	PWDs	=	13.43%	<	15.41%	PWTDS	=	2.24%	<	3.73%

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

Quality Step Increases (QSI) Awards			
\$500 and Under:	PWDs = 16.33%	> 15.41%	PWTDs = 3.44% < 3.73%

Performance Based Pay Increase (PBPI) Awards:			
\$2,000 - \$2,999:	PWDs = 9.09%	> 15.41%	PWTDs = 0.00% < 3.73%

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)No
 - b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD).....No

DO and HR are not aware of other employee recognition programs.

D. Promotions

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWDs 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)No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD)No
 - b. Grade GS-15
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)Yes
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD)Yes

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

	Applied		Qualified		Selected	
	No Disability	PWDs	No Disability	PWDs	No Disability	PWDs
SES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GS-15	11.63%	0.86%	12.98%	0.40%	0.42%	0.72%
GS-14	34.05%	3.05%	39.88%	1.74%	1.70%	3.50%
GS-13	54.32%	4.90%	47.14%	2.29%	3.24%	4.34%

Note: SES had no triggers because there were no SES promotions during FY22. In overall, 8.81% PWDs applied, 4.43% were qualified and 8.56% were selected, versus 91.19% PWODs applied, 95.57% qualified and 91.44% were selected.

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

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

	Applied		Qualified		Selected	
	No Disability	PWTDs	No Disability	PWTDs	No Disability	PWTDs
SES	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GS-15	11.47%	0.51%	12.76%	0.39%	7.63%	0.28%
GS-14	34.12%	1.50%	39.99%	1.67%	30.79%	0.56%
GS-13	54.42%	2.43%	47.25%	2.20%	61.58%	2.82%

Note: SES had no triggers because there were no SES promotions during FY22. In overall, 4.4% PWTDs applied, 4.26% were qualified and 3.67% were selected, versus 95.56% PWODs applied, 95.74% qualified and 96.33% were selected.

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

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

0.00% of 0 SES new hires were PWD, vs 0.00% of qualified PWD applicants (note: there were no SES openings in FY22).
 1.96% of 20 new hires to GS-15 were PWD, vs 0.94% of qualified PWD applicants.
 2.45 % of 48 new hires to GS-14 were PWD, vs 1.44% of qualified PWD applicants.
 9.31% of 132 new hires to GS-13 were PWD, vs 3.62% of qualified PWD applicants.

DLA is now receiving AFV reports, and triggers were identified. DLA will continue to leverage the data and further investigate the triggers to identify potential barriers in the hiring process. The USA Staffing Office at OPM changed the former Applicant Flow Data (AFD) Detail Report and re-named it as the Applicant Flow Vacancy (AFV) Level Detail Report during the FY22 3rd quarter. OPM created the schema, which includes a new ability to identify application details broken down by supervisory vacancies, gender, ethnicity, race, and additional disability indicators. DO will look for ways to further leverage the AFV data to better identify triggers to conducting barrier analyses.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWDs 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.
- e. New Hires to SES (PWD).....No
 - f. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD)Yes
 - g. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)Yes
 - h. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)Yes

0.00% of 0 SES new hires were PWTD, vs 0.00% of qualified PWTD applicants (*note: there were no SES openings in FY22*).

0.49% of 20 new hires to GS-15 were PWTDs, vs 1.44% of qualified PWTD applicants.

0.49% of 48 new hires to GS-14 were PWTDs, vs 0.62% of qualified PWTD applicants.

2.94% of 132 new hires to GS-13 were PWTDs, vs 0.56% of qualified PWTD applicants.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If “yes,” describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
- a. Executives
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD)No
 - b. Managers
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD)No
 - c. Supervisors
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWD)No

DLA is now receiving AFV, and triggers were identified. DLA will continue to leverage the data and further investigate the triggers to identify potential barriers in the hiring process. The USA Staffing Office at OPM changed the former Applicant Flow Data (AFD) Detail Report and re-named it as the Applicant Flow Vacancy (AFV) Level Detail Report during the FY22 3rd quarter. OPM created the schema, which includes a new ability to identify application details broken down by supervisory vacancies, gender, ethnicity, race, and additional disability indicators. DO will look for ways to further leverage the AFV data to better identify triggers to conducting barrier analyses.

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).....No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD).....No
 - b. Managers
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD).....No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD).....No
 - c. Supervisors
 - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD).....No
 - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD).....No

DO will work with HR to formulate a data plan to include Executives, Managers and Supervisors on a permanent basis.

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).....No
 - b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)No
 - c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)No

DO will work with HR to formulate a data plan to include Executives, Managers and Supervisors on a permanent basis. DO will further investigate when the Enterprise Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (DEIA) committee becomes established in FY23.

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)No
 - b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)No
 - c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)No

DO will work with HR to formulate a data plan to include Executives, Managers and Supervisors on a permanent basis. DO will further investigate when the Enterprise Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (DEIA) committee becomes established in FY23.

Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

To be a model employer for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD), 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.

No. Sixteen of 20 employees with Schedule A appointments identified as eligible for conversion were converted to career or career conditional appointments. The remaining four (4) employees were not converted due to an oversight. The actions are anticipated to be processed by pay period beginning 2/26/23.

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)No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)No

Out of the total workforce separations, 95.98% were permanent and 4.02% were temporary.

Voluntary permanent separations under the 12% benchmark: 11.79% PWDs vs 58.03% PWODs.

Involuntary permanent separations under the 12% benchmark: 10.09% PWDs vs 54.13% PWODs.

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).....No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)No

Voluntary permanent separations under the 2% benchmark: 0.92% PWTDs vs 33.947% PWODs.

Involuntary permanent separations under the 2% benchmark: 1.83% PWTDs vs 54.13% PWODs.

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.

None.

B. Accessibility of Technology and Facilities

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

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

The outward facing/external DLA web page, www.dla.mil, has a link at the bottom of the page has a link that reads "Section 508." This link takes visitors to the DLA Section 508 page: <http://www.dla.mil/508.aspx>. This page has resources and instructions individuals who are having difficulty accessing any part of the DLA website to complete the hyperlinked DoD Section 508 Issues, Complaints and Concerns Form at <https://dodcio.defense.gov/DoDSection508/Section-508-Form/> which starts the current complaint process.

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

<http://www.dla.mil/EEO/ABA/>

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.

During FY2022, the DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility (J62LC) strengthened its accessibility initiatives in the areas of User Support, Procurement of Accessible IT, Application and Content Development, and Training.

User Support

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team maintains a contract for AT support services. This contract provides configuration, troubleshooting and support of AT across the DLA Enterprise so that users with disabilities can execute their work and support the warfighter. This contract also provides the specialized AT knowledge that is needed to support DLA's Reasonable Accommodation (RA) program. Engineers under this contract provide state-of-the-art IT recommendations to support one or multiple disabilities; they also provide input into DLA's IT policy and infrastructure decisions to address the needs of users with disabilities in future infrastructure decisions.

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team maintains enterprise licensing for AT software. This more efficient, centralized process has greatly reduced lengthy and unproductive wait times experienced by AT users by decreasing the time needed to obtain the software from weeks to hours and the time needed for installations from days to minutes.

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team continues to support and engage with Employees with Disabilities by:

- Providing Tier 2 ServiceNow support;
- Hosting a dedicated support group so that their concerns are routed to a specialized team that can address their issues and promptly resolve them; and
- Implementing a dedicated team mailbox providing direct support to users of AT tools, IT developers, and content creators.

Over the next fiscal year, we plan to:

- Continue to evaluate new releases of Assistive Technology software and provide to DLA users as appropriate.

Procurement of Accessible IT

DLA J7 has implemented procedures to ensure incorporation of Section 508 contract language into official contracting documents.

- Since January 2022, DLA Acquisition, J72 has pulled a report every other month from Federal Procurement Data System – Next Generation (FPDS-NG) of all IT related contracts. From this report, randomly selected contracts were reviewed to ensure the following:
 - Section 508 requirements were incorporated in Performance Work Statement (PWS), Statement of Objective (SOO), or Statement of Work (SOW) in solicitations for ICT products and services, and Procurement notes H11 & L29 were incorporated in solicitations and awards when procuring ICT products and services.
- Additionally, DLA J7 reviews DLA's ICT contracts in GSA's Solicitation Review Tool (SRT) for compliance.

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team continues to advocate for buying and developing accessible IT by providing training, communications, and resources to build awareness of what is required and who is responsible. Helpful resources are published on the J62LC intranet site, <https://dlamil.dps.mil/sites/J62L/SitePages/J62LC.aspx> Additionally, DLA HQ Contracting Office has a better understanding of the legal requirements for IT accessibility, and they are updating their job aids to ensure management of IT accessibility throughout the procurement phases (pre-award, award, and post-award).

Application and Content Development

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team continues to work with the Learning Management System (LMS) program to provide application compliance recommendations, accessibility implementation guidance and application testing with multiple Assistive Technology (AT) software tools. The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team maintains a partnership with the J1 LMS multimedia team to functionally test courses, as well as provide course design guidance and spot checking of enterprise-wide mandatory courses prior to their deployment. This engagement continues to reduce the number of courses that require alternate engagement actions for AT users.

In coordination and collaboration with the DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team, the DLA Enterprise Test Office provides Section 508 compliance testing support for the portfolio community on an as-needed basis. The Enterprise Test Office performs manual testing with JAWS, ZoomText, and Dragon Naturally Speaking as well as keyboard-only testing. They also engage with the J62 portfolio community, stressing the importance of including Section 508 requirements in all ICT development and in procurement actions.

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team uses automated software solutions to assist DLA personnel in testing and validating website compliance.

In 2021, the Enterprise IT Accessibility Team completed a pilot of the automated scanning tool, axe Monitor, with 17 J62 applications. The team has initiated an Enterprise deployment. The project employs two tools, axe Monitor and axe Expert, to assess accessibility compliance.

- axe Monitor: Scanning application which dynamically scans, monitors, and reports on accessibility defects of websites and web applications.
 - It provides a mechanical check against the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 AA standard.
 - It provides trend data on improvements or regressions and assists with root cause analysis.
- axe Expert: Browser extension that provides fast, in-browser accessibility defect results during coding, allowing immediate remediation.

DLA's public website, www.dla.mil, has been undergoing redesign with accessibility as a requirement for content, going page by page through the site starting in October 2021. Even though the required annual page reviews in prior years included criteria dedicated to Section 508 accessibility, the opportunity to have a temporary dedicated team examine content revealed more improperly formatted content than expected. Only a few sections remain before redesign is completed and all pages would have been reviewed for accessibility.

The redesign team addresses the following specific areas when adapting content, but also looks out for any other related accessibility issues:

DLA's public website, www.dla.mil, has been undergoing redesign with accessibility as a requirement for content, going page by page through the site starting in October 2021. Even though the required annual page reviews in prior years included criteria dedicated to Section 508 accessibility, the opportunity to have a temporary dedicated team examine content revealed more improperly formatted content than expected. Only a few sections remain before redesign is completed and all pages would have been reviewed for accessibility.

The redesign team addresses the following specific areas when adapting content, but also looks out for any other related accessibility issues:

- Use of and logical progression of headers on pages to subdivide content, from H1-H4.
- Ensuring tables are not being used for layout purposes, table data is organized properly and logically, and row/column headers are used.
- Images have alt text.
- Images of text are replaced with actual text, or a text equivalent is provided.
- Color is not the sole indicator of emphasis or action within text.
- Favoring open-captioned videos when given the choice of video content to embed Major accomplishments include:
 - Redesigned hundreds of previously inaccessible tables to formats that are both more accessible, easier to read and navigate.
 - Developed code to clean up system-generated images associated with our news and biographies that weren't displaying alt text.
 - Created text-based equivalents of dozens of promotional brochures.

The largest challenge will be when the sitewide redesign is complete and individual content managers begin creating and editing new content. Risks are mitigated by specifically citing what made previous content inaccessible, providing updated standards that further enforce accessibility, and continuing to provide training resources to support accessible best practices.

Training:

The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team uses various platforms to increase knowledge of accessibility through the DLA enterprise, to include the following:

- Four real-time interactive accessibility webinars.
- Providing 300 (up from 150) licenses to developers giving access to Deque University, an on-line accessibility learning platform;
- Provide training courses in DLA's Learning Management System (LMS)
 - 18 self-paced accessibility training courses;
 - Nine recorded interactive accessibility webinars;
- Maintaining an intranet site with best practice accessibility information;
- Publishing best-practice articles on the DLA intranet site on various accessibility topics; and
- Maintaining 14 issue-focused knowledge-based articles (KBAs) and more when the need arises.

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.)

In FY22, a total of 743 (389 in FY21, 589 in FY20) of RA requests were made and 89% (96% in FY21, 91% in FY20) of those completed were timely and 1 (1 in FY21, 8 in FY20) remained open to the following FY.

On average during FY22, the Reasonable Accommodation (RA) process took 20 workdays (12 in FY21, 20 in FY20) to approve or deny a request for an RA, and 26 workdays (27 in FY21, 34 in FY20) from the initial request to provide the RA.

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.

DLA has Instructions and detailed procedures for the Reasonable Accommodation Process that outline the process and the roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders within the process.

During FY22, DLA processed 89% (96% in FY21, 88% in FY20) of RA requests within 45 workdays, just below the 90% goal. This decrease in timeliness was in part due to the increase in the types of requests that were submitted during this timeframe (remote work, fulltime telework, telework for three or more days a week and reassignment).

DLA provides interim accommodations while requestors are waiting for their final RA decision. This allows employees to continue to work while waiting on the RA process.

DLA employees are required to attend an on-line RA training course designed to provide awareness of matters affecting persons with disabilities in the workplace and DLA's reasonable accommodation application process. All employees are required to renew this training every two years and supervisors/managers are required to take it annually.

DLA will continue to hold the quarterly Enterprise-wide Disability Program, Special Emphasis Program & Affirmative Employment Program Roundtable meeting that is a forum for on-the-spot training, sharing best practices and trends, discussing accommodation issues, and implementing solutions.

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

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

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

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

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

PAS information is available at <https://www.dla.mil/EEO/Offers/PersonalAssistanceServices/> about "Requesting a Personal Assistance Services" which explains the rights and procedures of the PAS process. The new DPM is working to update the DLA SOP 1440.01-01, RA for Individuals with Disabilities, which will include the PAS information.

One request was received in the past, but after further clarification and vetting with the Office of General Counsel, it was determined that the employee did not qualify, and the individual was provided a reasonable accommodation instead. To date the EEO offices have not yet received any PAS requests, but they are ready to provide PAS once requested.

Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO Complaint data involving Harassment

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

No. The percentages were lower than the Government-wide average for formal complaints of harassment cases at 21.98%.

DLA average for FY22: 462 PART IV, Part 2

Mental: 8 of 127 formal complaints = 6.29%

Physical: 7 of 127 formal complaints = 5.51%

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?

In FY22, a total of 7 settlement agreements were entered. There were no findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability.

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.

None.

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?

No. The percentages were lower than the Government-wide average - Failure to Accommodate at 14.03%.

DLA average for FY22: 462 PART IV, Part 2

Mental: 1 of 127 formal complaints = 0.78%

Physical: 6 of 127 formal complaints = 4.72%

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?

In FY22, there were zero findings of discrimination, and four settlement agreements were entered.

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.

FY22: N/A.

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 Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTDs)? **Yes**
2. Has the agency established a plan to correct the barrier(s) involving PWDs and/or PWTDs? **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.

Barrier 1

Trigger 1	1) Glass ceiling for PWTDs above the GS-12 level. 2) 3.78% of the permanent workforce has reported a targeted disability, but 3.13% of the employees who voluntarily separated from DLA had reported a targeted disability.
Barrier(s)	DLA policy documents are not accessible to all employees. DLAs (DLA Instructions), DLA Regulations (DLARs), DLA Manuals (DLAMs), and DLA SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) do not pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.
Objective(s)	Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation act.

Responsible Official(s)

Name and Title	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)
Aleeta Coleman, Director, DLA Transformation (DT)	No
HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities	No

Name and Title	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)
Sabrina DeWalt, Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)	No
Dennis King, Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)	No
Michael Dingle, DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)	Yes
Dana Norton, Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)	Yes
Randy Davis, DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)	Yes
Jodi Beard, DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)	Yes
T.A. DeLaney, Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)	No
Kathryn Hammer-Wells, Division Chief (J72)	Yes
Anne Burleigh, Business Process Analyst (J72)	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
12/01/2018	Identify all DLAI, DLARs, DLAMs, Directive-type Memoranda (DTMs) and DLA SOPs which do not meet the Website Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		11/9/2018
12/01/2018	Identify all DLA General Order memorandums and missions and functions which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (DT)	Yes		11/9/2018
12/31/2018	Alter DLAI 7750.07, Forms Management Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all forms created/revised meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		2/4/2019
02/28/2019	Alter the DLAI, DLAR, DLAM, DTM and DLA SOP templates to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		1/30/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLA Issuance procedures (DLAI 5025.01, DLAM 5025.01, DLAI 5025.13) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all policy and procedure documents	Yes		2/4/2019

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
	<p>signed by DT and J code, D code, or MSC Issuing Authorities meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuances must state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All policy and procedure documents created/revised will be 508 compliant. 2) HQs J and D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their existing policy and procedure documents 508 compliant. 3) DT created a standard issuance with Section 508 compatible template for use to document policies and procedures throughout the agency. 4) DT provided the guidance, tools, and training to the OPR policy managers and procedural writers for oversight requirements for 508 compliancy. OPR must establish decentralized operation to ensure their local issuances are complying. <p>DT will monitor and report on progress of compliance action plans to leadership on a quarterly basis. (DT)</p>			
02/28/2019	<p>Ensure Enterprise Organizational Alignment procedures (DLAI 5010.05) address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring the General Order memorandums, and missions and functions documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state:</p> <p><u>Current:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) General Order memorandums and missions and functions are 508 compliant beginning in 2020. 1) DT is responsible for ensuring that General Order memorandums and missions and functions documents are compliant. 2) HQs J and D codes and MSCs must provide compliant memorandums and missions and functions. <p><u>Historical (year 2020 and after):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Historical (non-current) General Order memorandums signed by the DLA DV and the missions and functions dated 2020 and after must be 508 compliant. 2) HQs J and D codes and MSCs must provide DT compliance memorandums and missions and functions. 	Yes		2/4/2019
02/28/2019	Alter DLAI 4000.19, Agreements Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all documents signed by	Yes		01/09/2019

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
	<p>the agency's senior designee meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) All agreements created or revised will be 508 compliant. 2) HQs J and D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making supporting documentation 508 compliant. <p>Organizational Support Agreements Managers will ensure their organization agreements and supporting documentation meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)</p>			
06/30/2019	Ensure the General Order memorandums and missions and functions signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		6/21/2019
06/30/2019	Address 508 compliance requirements in planned revision of DLAI 5105.02, Annual Operating Plan, to ensure HQs J and D codes and MSC's Dynamic Operating Plans meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		6/12/2019
06/01/2019	Alter Defense Logistics Management System documents to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (J67B)	Yes		9/5/2019
6/30/2019	<p>HQs J and D codes and MSCs provide compliance action plans to DT for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Policy and procedures. 2) General Order memorandums and Missions and Functions. <p>Historical (non-current) General Order memorandums and missions and functions dating back to 2020. (DT)</p>	Yes		12/20/2019
12/31/2019	Conduct a forms survey on active MSC-level forms for continued use, revision, and re-designating to DLA-level forms, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes		1/10/2020
04/30/2020	Supervisors add relevant planned activities to the performance standards of their non-supervisory Responsible Officials. (All)	Yes	12/31/2022	1/10/2020
4/31/2020	Alter DLA Acquisition Directive template to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J72)	Yes	12/31/2022	6/25/2020

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)
12/31/2020	Conduct a forms survey on active DLA-level forms for continued use, revision, or cancellation. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2023	
06/30/2021	HQs J and D codes and MSCs must provide all altered policy and procedure documents to DT using the 3-year Issuance life cycle from 2019-2021. (All)	Yes	12/31/2023	
09/30/2021	Using the normal 3-year Issuance life cycle, replace all inaccessible policy and procedure documents with documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2023	
09/30/2021	Replace currently inaccessible General Orders memorandums and mission and function documents dating back to 2020 with altered documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2023	
09/30/2021	Replace historically inaccessible General Orders memorandums and missions and functions dating back to 2020 with altered documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2023	

Report of Accomplishments

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
FY18	The barrier and its root causes were identified. The templates that the MSCs, J-codes, and D-codes are using to draft policies do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. No administrative control existed to ensure that the final document meets WCAG 2.0 guidelines.
FY19	The D&I committee met repeatedly to discuss the barrier and how DLA should remove any aspects of policy and procedural barriers. Most of the planned activities for FY19 were accomplished, as documented above.
FY20	Almost all the planned activities in Part VII were completed; User Support systems were readily made available to provide configurations, troubleshooting and Assistive Technology support throughout the Enterprise.
FY21	Continue to evaluate new releases of Assistive Technology software and provide to DLA users as appropriate; Implemented Section 508 procedures for MSCs; and increased Section 508 training on technology standards; and DLA won the SECDEF award for Accessible Communication and Technology in October 2021.
FY22	Worked with 508 Program Management team to continue to evaluate accessibility on all posted documents on both intra and external websites; The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team uses various platforms to increase knowledge of Section 508 accessibility through the DLA enterprise.

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
FY23	Planned activities on all aspects of accessibility will continue in FY23 and it will be further supported once the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (DEIA) committee becomes established.

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

During FY21, DLA completed almost all the planned activities in Part VII of the FY20 report, four target dates for the four of the activities were readjusted and had to be retargeted to FY21 due to reduced EEO staffing. In FY22, planned activities continued and delays are not anticipated for FY23.

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

DLA's upgraded policy templates allow for new policy documents to be accessible. Current policy documents will become accessible as they are reviewed during the normal policy review cycle.

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.

DLA has made significant progress in making policy documents accessible, so the plan does not currently need improvement. DO remains in close collaboration with the DLA Section 508 office and continues to monitor newer developments to ensure full compliance.

Appendix 1 – Glossary

The following definitions apply to this report:

Applicant: A person who applies for employment.

Applicant Flow Data: Formerly Applicant Flow Data: Information reflecting characteristics of the pool of individuals applying for an employment opportunity.

Barrier: An Agency policy, principle, practice, or condition that limits or tends to limit employment opportunities for members of a gender, race, or ethnic background or for an individual (or individuals) based on disability status.

Blocked Pipeline: A blocked pipeline occurs when people who are in upwardly mobile occupations fail to reach the senior grade levels within those occupations.

Disability: For the purpose of statistics, recruitment, and targeted goals, the number of employees in the workforce who have indicated having a disability on an Office of Personnel Management Standard Form 256. For all other purposes, the definition contained in 29 CFR § 1630.2 applies.

Civilian Labor Force (CLF): Persons 16 years of age and over, except those in the armed forces, who are employed or are unemployed and seeking work. The EEOC recently updated the CLF with a tabulated (2014-2018) American Community Survey as of January 3, 2022.

Relevant Civilian Labor Force (RCLF): A specific group in the workforce by individual Job Series.

Employees: Members of our permanent or temporary work force, whether full or part-time and whether in competitive or excepted service positions.

Fiscal Year: The period from October 1 of one year to September 30 of the following year.

Glass Ceiling: A glass ceiling exists when a EEO group cannot reach the executive level of leadership in an organization, despite their presence in positions that comprise the feeder pool for executive positions.

Glass Wall: When individuals in an EEO group cannot obtain employment in our MCOs.

Goal: Under the Rehabilitation Act, an identifiable objective set by an Agency to address or eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity or to address the lingering effects of past discrimination.

Mission Critical Occupations (MCO): Agency occupational series without which the agency cannot fulfill its mission. These occupations also tend to be the most heavily populated relative to other occupations within the agency and typically follow a career path to senior leadership positions. For barrier analysis in FY18 and FY19, DO is using the 29 series that reach the GS-15 and SES level.

Persons without Disabilities: Defined by EEOC to be the sum of people who reported that they did not have a disability and people who reported that they had a disability, but that the disability was not listed on Standard Form 256.

Reasonable Accommodation (RA): Generally, any modification or adjustment to the work environment, or to the manner or circumstances under which work is customarily performed, that enables an individual with a disability to perform the essential functions of a position or enjoy equal benefits and privileges of employment as afforded to similarly situated individuals without a disability. For a more complete definition, see 29 CFR § 1630.2(o). See also: EEOC's Enforcement Guidance on Reasonable Accommodation and Undue Hardship under the Americans with Disabilities Act, No. 915.002 (October 17, 2002).

Targeted Disabilities: Disabilities that the Federal Government, as a matter of policy, has identified for special emphasis in affirmative action programs. They are:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1) Developmental disability | 4) Blindness | 7) Partial or complete paralysis | 10) Intellectual disability |
| 2) Traumatic brain injury | 5) Missing extremities | 8) Significant mobility impairment | 11) Dwarfism |
| 3) Deafness | 6) Partial or complete paralysis | 9) Conclusive disorders | 12) Significant disfigurement |

Technical Assistance: Training, assistance, or guidance provided by the EEOC, in writing, by telephone, or in person

Appendix 2 – Organizational Chart

WHO'S WHO IN DLA



VADM MICHELLE C. SKUBIC, USN
DIRECTOR



BRAD B. BUNN
VICE DIRECTOR



CSM TOMEKA N. O'NEAL, USA
SENIOR ENLISTED LEADER



W. ERIC SMITH
CHIEF OF STAFF



BG ERIC P. SHIRLEY, USA
COMMANDER
DLA TROOP SUPPORT



BRIG GEN SEAN TYLER, USAF
COMMANDER
DLA AVIATION



BG GAIL E. ATKINS, USA
COMMANDER
DLA LAND AND MARITIME



BRIG GEN JIMMY R. CANLAS, USAF
COMMANDER
DLA ENERGY



RADM GRAFTON D. CHASE JR., USN
COMMANDER
DLA DISTRIBUTION



MICHAEL O. CANNON
DIRECTOR
DLA DISPOSITION SERVICES



SHARYN SAUNDERS
DIRECTOR
HUMAN RESOURCES (J1)



RADM JOSEPH D. NOBLE, USN
DIRECTOR
LOGISTICS OPERATIONS (J3)



DR. GEORGE DUCHAK
DIRECTOR
INFORMATION OPERATIONS (J6)



MATTHEW R. BEEBE
DIRECTOR
ACQUISITION (J7)



JOHN ARTHUR (ART) HAGLER
DIRECTOR
FINANCE (J8)



MG TRIPP BOWLES
DIRECTOR
JOINT RESERVE FORCE (J9)



CAPT PATRICK BLAKE, USN
COMMANDER
DLA INDO-PACIFIC



COL GERARD ACOSTA, USA
COMMANDER
DLA CENTCOM & SOCOM



COL FAITH CHAMBERLAIN, USA
COMMANDER
DLA EUROPE & AFRICA



RUTH M. VETTER
DIRECTOR
GENERAL COUNSEL (DG)



WILLIAM A. RIGBY
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG)



DWIGHT D. DENEAL
DIRECTOR
SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS (DB)



DONALD PHILLIPS
DIRECTOR
INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT (DM)



CH (COL) THOMAS A. BROOKS, USA
COMMAND CHAPLAIN (DH)



STEPHANIE SAMERGEADES
DIRECTOR
INTELLIGENCE (DI)



JOHN K. MULLER
DIRECTOR
LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS (DL)



JOSEPH YOSWA
DIRECTOR
PUBLIC AFFAIRS (DP)



JANICE SAMUEL
DIRECTOR
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY (DO)



ALEETA D. COLEMAN
DIRECTOR
TRANSFORMATION (DT)

As of December 2022

Appendix 3 – Policy Statements

Policy Statement on Equal Employment Opportunity



DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY
HEADQUARTERS
8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN ROAD
FORT BELVOIR, VIRGINIA 22060-6221

January 13, 2022

MEMORANDUM FOR DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY EMPLOYEES

SUBJECT: Policy Statement on Equal Employment Opportunity

Equality of opportunity for our workforce is one of the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA's) unwavering endeavors. Equality, diversity, and inclusion for everyone are not just principles; they are integral components to accomplish DLA's mission and strategic goals. Workplace discrimination, including harassment, of any kind directed towards an individual, or group of individuals who are singled out and treated differently because of their race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy, gender identity, and sexual orientation), national origin, age (over 40), disability, and genetic information is prohibited. Retaliation against individuals engaged in protected Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) activity, such as participating in the EEO complaint process or opposing discriminatory practices or actions, is also prohibited.

DLA is committed to ensuring a workplace free from unlawful discrimination, harassment, and retaliation. Supervisors and employees will adhere to EEO policies and regulations, and refrain from engaging in acts of discrimination. Employees that observe acts of discrimination must report such matters to the appropriate officials. Supervisors who observe acts of discrimination, to include acts of harassment, must address such matters promptly, to include discipline and provide remedies for individuals harmed.

Employees who believe they have been subjected to workplace discrimination because of their protected activity should immediately raise their concerns with their chain of command or contact their servicing EEO office within 45 calendar days from the date of the alleged discriminatory act. When such matters are raised, supervisors and employees will make a good faith effort to reach agreeable solutions.

As DLA continues to achieve new levels of performance, accountability, and customer satisfaction, it is vital that all employees have a role in eradicating workplace discrimination, be a beacon of dignity and mutual respect, and embrace equal opportunity and inclusiveness for everyone. For more EEO information, please visit the DLA EEO website at www.dla.mil/EEO.


M.C. SKUBIC
Vice Admiral, SC, USN
Director