

Affirmative Action Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD) Answer No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD) Answer No

13.67% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark. 29.40% is greater than the 12.00% benchmark.

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) Answer No

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

3.41% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark. 6.11% is greater than the 2.00% benchmark.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	14847	2705	18.22	559	3.77
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	5475	846	15.45	209	3.82

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

DLA has consistently communicated to the workforce through DLA Today (agency news intranet), briefings to the DLA Director, Vice Director, stakeholders, by emails, and multiple presentations on disability topics and trends such as Disability Self-Identification (SF-256 form) video and articles, standardized reasonable accommodation procedures updates, and demographic charts, etc. DLA annually promotes the National Disability Awareness Month presentations and seminars, which states our commitment to increase the representation of PWTDs to 2% and PWDs to 12% of our workforce. DLA also collaborates with the Office of Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity (OCREO) within OSD, the Defense Support Services Center (DSSC) within the Defense Human Resources Activity (DHRA) 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

- 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

Yes. Several positions have been approved to support the RA department on meeting the required goal of 90%.

- 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	0	0	145	Casandra Green, SPPC Casandra.Green@dla.mil Steven.Carney@dla.mil
Section 508 Compliance	7	4	8	Mohan Piniseti, Branch Chief, Enterprise IT Accessibility, Technology/508 Compliance Branch Chief
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	7	Tamberly Averett Chief of Facilities & Equip Operations
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	16	1	3	Eric F. Spanbauer Eric.Spanbauer@dla.mil Judith.Davis@dla.mil
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@dla.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	7	Monica Warren DLA Disability Program Manager (DPM)

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

Answer Yes

Yes. DLA has a full-time Disability Program Director (DPD) and a Disability Program Manager (DPM) who works with twenty Disability Program Coordinators (DPCs) across the Enterprise at all seven Major Subordinate Command (MSC) EEO offices. Offices are working for higher term employees, and we also utilize the WRP program to fill gaps and get effective candidates who

have moved on to provide full-time support to EEO Programs.

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

Yes. The MSC EEM’s, DPD, DPM and all DPCs recently attended a weeklong DEOMI Disability Program Manager training course at HQs DLA. EEO Practitioners also regularly attend workshops and webinars hosted by the National Employment Law Institute (NELI), the Job Accommodation Network (JAN), LRP Federal Webinars, and the Employer Assistance and Resource Network (EARN). They also participate in the Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability (FEED), hosted by the EEOC, the Office of Personnel Management, and the Department of Labor. All DPCs regularly receive updates and advisories from the Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) and the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) for College Students with Disabilities with DoD funding at no charge to DLA except for the WRP students benefits. DO hosts a roundtable every other month to discuss Reasonable Accommodation (RA) and Disability, Special Emphasis Programs (SEP), and Affirmative Employment Program (AEP) matters, conduct on-the-spot training, and share best practices, trends, and solutions. The DPD hosts a monthly meeting with the EEMs and DPC Supervisors and The DPM hosts a bi-weekly meeting with the DPCs to discuss RA issues, concerns, procedures and to advise on any new guidance that comes out.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If “no”, please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.		
Objective	To streamline the RA procedures to ensure all the requests are processed within a time frame of 45 calendar days. Note: The objective was to streamline the process to ensure that all the requests are processed timely. The process was updated to a centralized approach, necessitating the development and implementation of a new management system. This unforeseen issue arose as the RA program had recently adopted ETK, which proved inadequate for effectively tracking requests and managing data.		
Target Date	Sep 30, 2023		
Completion Date	Aug 22, 2023		
Planned Activities	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
Accomplishments	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
	2024	A new Enterprise-wide Disability Program Director was created to solidify the RA leadership, oversight and accountability over the program. Some term employees were hired for one year at MSCs to assist with the backlog of RAs. DLA EEO Offices recently participated in a Continuous Process Improvement with Lean Six Sigma Black Belts to streamline and document the RA process with a map and critical path diagram generated to assist requestors, EEO practitioners and Leadership making the decisions. DLA EEO Offices created a Directive-Type Memorandum (DTM) 23-015 “Equal Employment Opportunity Programs Alignment” templates to document a new process change for requestors to update their forms. In turn, the DTM will eventually turn into a DLA Manual for all parties involved in the RA process. DO worked with Information Technology to re-configure the current RA system to increase efficiency to process, track and report all RAs throughout the Enterprise.	
	2023	DLA streamlined the RA process and have been scheduling meetings with senior leaders and supervisors to notify changes as well as explaining the importance of processing these requests in a timely manner. In addition, the Office of EEO & Diversity have been discussing roles and responsibilities of the supervisors when an RA is requested by the employee. This is a continuous process to improve services to all our customers.	

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

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. Additionally, supervisors and managers identify, select, and hire qualified college students from the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) disabilities database using the 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.

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.

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. Other 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. Qualified applicants who identify as being Schedule A eligible, 30% or more disabled veteran's authority eligible, or eligible for both authorities are referred to the selecting official in veteran's preference order.

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

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 PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

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

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer Yes

11.82% is less than the 12.00% benchmark. 1.95% is less than the 2.00% benchmark.

New Hires	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce	Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce

	(#)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
% of Total Applicants	5558	7.77	0.00	3.65	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	3789	7.63	0.00	3.51	0.00
% of New Hires	66	7.58	0.00	6.06	0.00

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD)

Answer No

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)

Answer No

PWDs in the following MCOs with at least 8 hires or more are significant triggers. Note: A total 10 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWDs, which had no FY24 new hires. 0080 = 0.53% of 7 hires < 1.21% Security Administration 0089 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 0.23% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.76% of 10 hires < 5.37% Human Resources 0260 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 0.91% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 1.36% of 18 hires < 6.66% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 1.89% of 25 hires < 5.98% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.45% of 6 hires < 0.76% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 0.15% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 1.82% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.08% Financial Management 0510 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 2.20% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.15% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.30% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.23% of 3 hires < 0.61% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.23% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 1.06% Attorney 1035 = 0.23% of 3 hires < 0.45% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 0.45% General Business & Industry 1102 = 3.56% of 47 hires < 36.64% Contracting 1104 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 0.83% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.53% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.15% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.91% of 12 hires < 7.80% General Supply 2003 = 0.53% of 7 hires < 1.89% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.15% of 2 hires < 0.45% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 1.97% of 26 hires < 9.08% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: PWDs met the 12.0% benchmark at 14.00% ++++++ PWTDs in the following MCOs with at least 8 hires or more are significant triggers. Note: A total 10 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWDs, which had no FY24 new hires. 0080 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 1.21% Security Administration 0089 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.23% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 5.37% Human Resources 0260 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 0.91% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 6.66% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 5.98% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 0.76% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.15% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 1.82% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.08% Financial Management 0510 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 2.20% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.15% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.30% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.61% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.23% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 1.06% Attorney 1035 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.45% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.45% General Business & Industry 1102 = 0.45% of 6 hires < 36.64% Contracting 1104 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.83% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% of 0 hires = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.53% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% of 0 hires < 0.15% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 7.80% General Supply 2003 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 1.89% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.08% of 1 hires < 0.45% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 0.30% of 4 hires < 9.08% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: PWTDs met the 2.0% benchmark at 2.12%

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0089 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT	2	0.00	0.00
0201 HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	16	6.25	6.25

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0260 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	6	0.00	0.00
0301 MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION & PROGRAM	20	10.00	10.00
0343 MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	22	9.09	4.55

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

- a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

Triggers exist for PWDs who qualified as Internal Applicants for each MCO as indicated below. Note: A total 10 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWDs and No Disabilities, which had no FY24 new hires. 0080 = 0.04% < 1.42% Security Administration 0089 = 0.03% < 0.40% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.27% < 4.49% Human Resources 0260 = 0.08% < 0.42% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 0.88% < 18.02% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 1.26% < 20.91% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.19% < 6.93% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.03% < 0.28% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.03% < 0.83% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% < 0.05% Financial Management 0510 = 0.04% < 0.49% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% < 0.10% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.01% < 0.06% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.01% < 0.29% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% < 0.01% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.07% < 1.41% Attorney 1035 = 0.07% < 0.56% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.03% < 1.43% General Business & Industry 1102 = 0.24% < 5.85% Contracting 1104 = 0.18% < 3.29% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.00% < 0.09% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% < 0.02% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.45% < 9.52% General Supply 2003 = 0.27% < 6.31% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.08% < 3.00% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 0.83% < 13.82% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: Qualified Internal PWD Applicants did not meet the 12.0% benchmark at 5.09%. ++++++ No

Triggers exist for PWTDs who qualified as Internal Applicants for each MCO as indicated below. Note: A total 10 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWTDs and No Disabilities, which had no FY24 new hires 0080 = 0.11% < 1.42% Security Administration 0089 = 0.04% < 0.40% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.32% < 4.49% Human Resources 0260 = 0.03% < 0.42% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 0.98% < 18.02% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 1.35% < 20.91% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.38% < 6.93% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.04% < 0.28% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.05% < 0.83% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% < 0.05% Financial Management 0510 = 0.03% < 0.49% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% < 0.10% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.00% < 0.06% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.03% < 0.29% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% < 0.01% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.07% < 1.41% Attorney 1035 = 0.05% < 0.56% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.06% < 1.43% General Business & Industry 1102 = 0.37% < 5.85% Contracting 1104 = 0.16% < 3.29% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.01% < 0.09% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% < 0.02% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.50% < 9.52% General Supply 2003 = 0.34% < 6.31% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.13% < 3.00% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 1.12% < 13.82% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: Qualified Internal PWTD Applicants met the 2.0% benchmark at 6.17%.

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

- a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

Triggers exist for PWDs who qualified as Internal Applicants for each MCO are as indicated below. Note: A total 6 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWDs and No Disabilities, which had no FY24 new hires. 0080 = 0.00% < 0.89% Security Administration 0089 = 0.00% < 0.17% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.28% < 6.08% Human Resources 0260 = 0.11% < 0.50% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 0.73% < 15.06% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 0.95% < 12.94% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.22% < 3.40% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.06% < 0.22% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.11% < 1.62% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% < 0.06% Financial Management 0510 = 0.06% < 1.12% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% < 0.00% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.06% < 0.11% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.00% < 0.50% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% < 0.06% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.00% < 1.17% Attorney 1035 = 0.00% < 0.89% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.00% < 2.01% General Business & Industry 1102 = 0.61% < 15.90% Contracting 1104 = 0.06% < 5.08% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.00% < 0.00% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% < 0.06% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.06% < 5.80% General Supply 2003 = 0.17% < 4.85% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.06% < 3.07% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 0.67% < 10.76% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: Qualified Internal PWD Applicants did not meet the 12.0% benchmark at 4.18%. ++++++ No Triggers exist for PWTs who qualified as Internal Applicants for each MCO as indicated below. Note: A total 10 out of 30 Top MCOs did not include PWTs and No Disabilities, which had no FY24 new hires 0080 = 0.06% < 0.89% Security Administration 0089 = 0.00% < 0.17% Emergency Management 0201 = 0.06% < 6.08% Human Resources 0260 = 0.06% < 0.50% Equal Employment Opportunity 0301 = 0.89% < 15.06% Administration and Program 0340 = 0.00% < 0.00% Program Management 0343 = 0.45% < 12.94% Program Management Analyst 0346 = 0.22% < 3.40% Logistics Management 0391 = 0.00% < 0.22% Telecommunications Specialist 0401 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Natural Resources Management and Biological Sciences 0501 = 0.06% < 1.62% Financial Administration & Program 0505 = 0.00% < 0.06% Financial Management 0510 = 0.00% < 1.12% Accounting 0511 = 0.00% < 0.00% Auditor 0560 = 0.00% = 0.00% Budget Analysis 0690 = 0.00% < 0.11% Industrial Hygienist 0801 = 0.06% < 0.50% General Engineering 0810 = 0.00% < 0.06% Civil Engineering 0905 = 0.06% < 1.17% Attorney 1035 = 0.06% < 0.89% Public Affairs Specialist 1101 = 0.11% < 2.01% General Business & Industry 1102 = 0.45% < 15.90% Contracting 1104 = 0.17% < 5.08% Property Disposal 1301 = 0.00% = 0.00% General Physical Science 1515 = 0.00% < 0.00% Operations Research Analyst 1811 = 0.00% < 0.06% Criminal Investigating 2001 = 0.17% < 5.80% General Supply 2003 = 0.17% < 4.85% Supply Program Management 2030 = 0.00% < 3.07% Distribution Facilities & Storage Management 2210 = 0.50% < 10.76% Information Technology Management Overall Conclusion: Qualified Internal PWT Applicants met the 2.0% benchmark at 3.51%.

Section V: 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 PWT, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

Plans for additional programs in FY25: • DLA will continue to inform its supervisors and managers at the Major Subordinate Commands of their responsibility to employ and advance disabled veterans within the workforce. Information will be disseminated through the issuance of regulatory guidance, instructions, civilian personnel newsletters, and other appropriate correspondence. • DLA has recently added an additional tier of high-level expertise and oversight/accountability to its Disability Program with the placement of its first Disability Program Director (DPD). • DLA EEO Leadership is currently facilitating the creation of an internal RA Tracking and Management System with greater flexibility and expansion capabilities for the reasonable accommodation program after collaborating with Lean Six Sigma 1 Belt Team and work through a Continuous Process Improvement (CPI) plan to improve its processes, and timelines as well as implementing a more comprehensive Directive Type Memorandum outlining the purpose, roles and responsibilities, workflow, and other vital information regarding the process for Leaders, Employees and Applicants and desk guide for EEO Disability Program practitioners. • DLA agency leaders will continue to receive relevant workforce demographics, to include veteran statistics, which enable them to determine the effectiveness of their efforts to improve equal opportunities and representation of targeted groups. • DLA Human Resource Specialists will advise managers and supervisors of the various veteran hiring authorities when filling vacancies. • DLA will continue to hold the quarterly and monthly Enterprise-

wide Disability Program, Special Emphasis Program & Affirmative Employment Program Round table meeting that is a forum for on-the-spot training, sharing best practices and trends, discussing accommodation issues, and implementing solutions. The Enterprise Disability Program Manager will continue to hold the Biweekly Disability Program Meetings to discuss disability specific issues, concerns, reporting, tracking and to provide guidance to the MSC Disability Program Coordinators enterprise wide.

- DLA is required to brief efforts to increase equal opportunities and the number of veterans and people with disabilities in the workforce during their Executive Board Meetings with the DLA Director and during the Agency Alignment Group meetings. The status and courses of action to increase the number of veterans and persons with disabilities is provided at these meetings.
- DLA employees are required to attend an on-line RA training course designed to provide awareness of matters affecting people with disabilities in the workplace and DLA's reasonable accommodation request process. All employees are required to renew this training every two years and supervisors/managers are required to take it annually. The training was recently updated to include opening remarks by the Vice Director of the Agency and the Director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Office. The training will be updated again to include the updates to the newly revamped RA process.
- DLA will conduct a self-assessment annually to identify the number of disabled veterans hired during the fiscal year. This assessment will enable DLA to determine if current recruiting strategies should be revised.
- DLA reviews program accomplishments, in conjunction with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Management Directive 715 (MD-715) report that includes the accomplishments for people with disabilities. The information gathered from the assessment will be used to make future improvements.
- DLA will continue to fortify its Strategic Plan for Equal Opportunity, People and Culture and Sustainability, which includes all Disabled Veterans.
- DLA's ability to attract, develop, and retain the right skillsets, experiences, and agile workforce are vital to our continued success as the nation's combat logistics support agency. This plan aligns DLA's mission, goals, and objectives with proven human capital strategies. DLA organizations enterprise widely own this plan and work together to achieve a shared vision.
- DLA's People and Culture Plan Objectives have not changed:
- Objective 7: Build Connections – Create an environment where employees share a common perspective allowing them to work effectively across organizational boundaries, eliminate “silos,” and promote actions that are in the best interest of DLA as a whole. DLA must develop and implement opportunities for collaboration in a manner that reduces stovepipes and gains efficiencies across organizations. DLA must also cultivate a cohesive environment that engages employees, promotes mutual respect and trust, and provides tools and flexibility at all levels that maximize individual and collective potential.
- Objective 7.1: Increase communication, collaboration, and integration by fortifying practices that help employees work across organizational lines to reach a goal.
- Objective 7.2: Provide interpersonal communication strategies and robust/targeted training that promotes building healthy relationships between supervisors and employees, as well as between employees in virtual and non-virtual environments.
- Objective 7.3: Promote an environment of equal opportunities that empowers employees at all levels to perform to their maximum potential. DLA will provide opportunities for employees to increase productivity and effectiveness, remove identified barriers that limit employee advancement, identify strategies to recruit underrepresented groups, and promote equal opportunity.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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 feedback, 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 is 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: 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 (%)
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	158	158	13.92	13.92	1.90	1.90
Internship Programs	1017	1017	9.64	9.64	1.67	1.67
Fellowship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	24	19	12.50	15.79	4.17	5.26
Training Programs	678	659	16.67	15.63	3.39	3.34

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

a. Applicants (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Selections (PWD)

Answer Yes

A total of 9.64% of the 1,017 applicants and 9.64% of selectees to the Internship Programs were PWDs, which is below the permanent 16.45% PWD workforce benchmark. A total of 16.67% of the 678 applicants and 15.63% of selectees to the Training Programs were PWDs, which is below the permanent 16.45% PWD workforce benchmark. A total of 12.50% of the 24 applicants and 15.79% of selectees to the Detail Programs were PWDs, which is below the permanent 16.45% PWD workforce benchmark. A total of 13.92% of the 158 applicants and 13.92% of selectees to the Tuition Assistance Program were PWDs and which is below the permanent 16.45% PWD workforce benchmark. Note: Data on Mentoring, Coaching and Other Career Development Programs were not available. However, DLA Human Resources made significant improvements in collecting data from several archaic training systems during FY24. DO continues to address the deficiencies and work with HR to meet the EEOC data collection requirements. DO is working with HR to consolidate into an upgraded centralized system for the next quarterly reports so it may readily identify triggers necessary to launch various types of barrier analyses. In overall, the participation of PWDs and PWTDs in all training programs were higher far above the 12 and 2% benchmarks except for a minor PWTD participation rate of 1.90% in the Tuition Assistance Program (counted as the "Other Career Development Programs).

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

a. Applicants (PWTD)

Answer Yes

b. Selections (PWTD)

Answer Yes

A total of 1.67% of the 1,017 applicants and 1.67% of selectees to the Internship Programs were PWDs, which is below the permanent 3.64% PWTD workforce benchmark. A total of 3.39% of the 678 applicants and 3.39% of selectees on the Training Programs were PWDs, which is below the permanent 3.64% PWTD workforce benchmark. A total of 4.17% of the 24 applicants and 5.26% of selectees to the Detail Programs were PWDs, which is above the permanent 3.64% PWTD workforce benchmark. A total of 1.90% of the 158 applicants and 1.90% of selectees on the Tuition Assistance Program were PWDs and which is below the

permanent 3.64% PWTB workforce benchmark. Note: Data on Mentoring, Coaching and Other Career Development Programs were not available. However, DLA Human Resources made significant improvements in collecting data from several archaic training systems during FY24. DO continues to address the deficiencies and work with HR to meet the EEOC data collection requirements. DO is working with HR to consolidate into an upgraded centralized system for the next quarterly reports so it may readily identify triggers necessary to launch various types of barrier analyses. In overall, the participation of PWDs and PWTBs in all training programs were higher far above the 12 and 2% benchmarks except for a minor PWTB participation rate of 1.90% in the Tuition Assistance Program (counted as the "Other Career Development Programs").

C. AWARDS

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

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)

Answer Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTB)

Answer Yes

Time-Off Awards: 1 - 10 Hours: PWDs = 13.40% < 14.46% PWTBs = 2.32% < 2.55% 11 - 20 Hours: PWDs = 0.79% < 14.46% PWTBs = 0.16% < 2.55% 21 - 30 Hours: PWDs = 0.16% < 14.46% PWTBs = 0.04% < 2.55% 31 - 40 Hours: PWDs = 0.11% < 14.46% PWTBs = 0.02% < 2.55% 41 or More Hours: PWDs = 0.00% < 14.46% PWTBs = 0.00% < 2.55% ++++++ Cash Awards: \$500 and Under: PWDs = 5.06% < 16.17% PWTBs = 1.09% < 3.54% \$501 - \$999: PWDs = 1.80% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.40% < 3.54% \$1,000 - \$1,999: PWDs = 4.19% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.93% < 3.54% \$2,000 - \$2,999: PWDs = 2.70% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.61% < 3.54% \$3,000 - \$3,999: PWDs = 1.78% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.39% < 3.54% \$4,000 - \$4,999: PWDs = 0.46% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.08% < 3.54% \$5,000 or More: PWDs = 0.20% < 16.17% PWTBs = 0.04% < 3.54%

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	16355.00	16.7044	83.2956	3.5769	96.4231
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	84281.00	16.5399	83.4601	3.5453	96.4547
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	5.15	5.1025	5.1634	5.1077	5.1549
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	760.00	15.7895	84.2105	4.0789	95.9211
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	11629.00	15.7709	84.2291	4.2050	95.7950
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	15.30	15.2833	15.3047	15.7742	15.2812
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	252.00	12.3016	87.6984	2.7778	97.2222
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	6096.00	12.3688	87.6312	2.7559	97.2441
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.19	24.3226	24.1719	24.0000	24.1959
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	90.00	20.0000	80.0000	2.2222	97.7778
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	3455.00	20.3763	79.6237	2.3155	97.6845
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	38.39	39.1111	38.2083	40.0000	38.3523
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Awards Given	8354.00	15.3459	84.6541	3.3876	96.6124
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total Amount	2905792.00	15.3688	84.6312	3.3845	96.6155
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Average Amount	347.83	348.3495	347.7387	347.5159	347.8435
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	3220.00	17.1429	82.8571	3.8509	96.1491
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	2502615.00	17.1531	82.8469	3.8034	96.1966
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	777.21	777.6721	777.1139	767.6210	777.5937
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	8520.00	16.3967	83.6033	3.6620	96.3380
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	12508018.00	16.1745	83.8255	3.6055	96.3945
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1468.08	1448.1832	1471.9789	1445.4199	1468.9385
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	5166.00	17.9830	82.0170	3.9876	96.0124
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	13073201.00	17.9686	82.0314	3.9418	96.0582
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2530.62	2528.5985	2531.0675	2501.5777	2531.8298
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	3579.00	17.0159	82.9841	3.6602	96.3398
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	12555077.00	16.9463	83.0537	3.6160	96.3840
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3507.98	3493.6404	3510.9259	3465.5649	3509.5963
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	1201.00	13.3222	86.6778	2.3314	97.6686
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	5369339.00	13.1454	86.8546	2.2781	97.7219
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4470.72	4411.3688	4479.8463	4368.5357	4473.1628
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	499.00	12.2244	87.7756	2.6052	97.3948
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	3035721.00	11.4064	88.5936	2.3085	97.6915
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	6083.61	5676.4918	6140.3082	5390.6923	6102.1440

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 Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTD)

Answer Yes

Quality Step Increases (QSI) Awards: Total No Disability PWDs PWTDs 636 540 96 19 100.0% 84.91% 15.09% 2.99%
--

\$2,116,315 \$1,790,315 \$326,000 \$60,351 PWDs were 3.09% above the 12% benchmark and PTWDs were above 0.99% benchmark. ++++++ Performance Based Pay Increase (PBPI) Awards: Total No Disability PWDs PWTDS 20 20 0 0 100.0% 100.0% 0.00% 0.00% \$212,083 \$212,083 \$0 \$0 Trigger: PWDs were 0% under the 12% benchmark and PTWDs 0% under the 2% benchmark.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

3. If the agency has other types of employee recognition programs, are PWD and/or PWTDS 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 No
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTDS) Answer No

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

D. PROMOTIONS

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

a. SES

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

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 No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No

d. Grade GS-13

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

Internal Selections Qualified Internal Applicants Internal Selections Qualified Internal Applicant Benchmarks Grades No Disability PWDs Total No Disability PWDs Total No Disability PWDs SES 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 15 9.89% 0.39% 10.28% 5.35% 0.00% 5.35% -4.53% -0.39% 14 50.49% 2.13% 52.62% 59.12% 2.92% 62.04% 8.64% 0.79% 13 35.17% 1.94% 37.11% 31.14% 1.46% 32.60% -4.02% -0.48% Total 95.54% 4.46% 100.0% 95.62% 4.38% 100.0% Note: There were no new hires for SES positions in FY24. Triggers: Qualified PWD Internal Applicants Benchmarks were noted in red for

GS-15 (-0.39%), GS-14 (0.79%), and GS-13 (0.48%) were below the overall 4.38% benchmark of PWTB Internal Selections.

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

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer No

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer No

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer No

Internal Selections Qualified Internal Applicants Internal Selections Qualified Internal Applicant Benchmarks Grades No Disability
PWTBs Total No Disability PWTBs Total No Disability PWTBs SES 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 15
9.79% 0.46% 10.25% 5.41% 0.00% 5.41% -4.38% -0.46% 14 49.49% 3.19% 53.18% 59.71% 2.70% 62.41% 9.71% -0.49% 13
34.82% 1.75% 36.57% 31.45% 0.74% 32.19% -3.37% -1.01% Total 94.60% 5.40% 100.0% 96.56% 3.44% 100.0% Note: There
were no new hires for SES positions in FY24. Triggers: Qualified PWTB Internal Applicants Benchmarks were noted in red for
GS-15 (-0.46%), GS-14 (-0.49%), and GS-13 (-1.01%) were below the overall 3.44% benchmark of PWTB Internal Selections.

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

a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer No

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 Yes

New Hires to Senior Grade Levels Qualified Applicants New Hires Qualified Internal Applicant Benchmarks Grades No Disability
PWTBs Total No Disability PWTBs Total No Disability PWTBs SES 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 15
5.64% 0.37% 6.00% 58.89% 0.00% 8.89% 3.25% -0.37% 14 24.48% 1.34% 25.82% 28.89% 0.00% 28.89% 4.41% -1.34% 13
65.79% 2.39% 68.18% 57.78% 4.44% 62.22% -8.01% 2.05% Total 95.90% 4.10% 100.0% 95.56% 4.44% 100.0% Note: There
were no new hires for SES positions in FY24. Triggers were noted in red for PWD New Hires against the Qualified Applicant

benchmarks with Grades 15 (-0.37%) and GS-14 (-1.34%), except GS-13 (2.05%) which was -0.34% below the GS-13 2.39% benchmark.

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. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)	Answer	No
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	Yes

New Hires to Senior Grade Levels Qualified Applicants New Hires Qualified Applicant Benchmarks Grades No Disability PWTDs
 Total No Disability PWTDs Total No Disability PWTDs SES 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 15 5.65%
 0.07% 5.72% 8.89% 0.00% 8.89% 3.24% -0.07% 14 24.52% 0.66% 25.18% 28.89% 0.00% 28.89% 4.37% -0.66% 13 65.92%
 3.18% 69.10% 57.78% 4.44% 62.22% -8.14% -1.27% Total 96.09% 3.91% 100.0% 95.56% 4.44% 100.0% Note: There were no
 new hires for SES positions in FY24. Triggers were noted in red for PWD New Hires against the Qualified Applicant benchmarks
 with PWTD New Hires for Grades 15 (-0.07%) and GS-14 (-0.66%), GS-13 (1.27%) which was -1.91% below the 3.18%
 benchmark.

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

a. Executives

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

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

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

A comprehensive review of Qualified PWD Internal Applicants and Internal Selections did not indicate any triggers due to missing data indicators on Executive/Managerial/Supervisory/Non-Supervisory data elements because USAStaffing does not differentiate between Executive, Managerial, and Supervisors like DCPDS. DO will continue to work with HR Reports to review other options or alternatives to obtain this critical data.

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

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
---	--------	----

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	No
--------------------------------	--------	----

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
---	--------	----

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	No
--------------------------------	--------	----

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	No
---	--------	----

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	No
--------------------------------	--------	----

A comprehensive review of Qualified PWD Internal Applicants and Internal Selections did not indicate any triggers due to missing data indicators on Executive/Managerial/Supervisory/Non-Supervisory data elements because USAStaffing does not differentiate between Executive, Managerial, and Supervisors like DCPDS. DO will continue to work with HR Reports to review other options or alternatives to obtain this critical data.

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)	Answer	No
-----------------------------------	--------	----

b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)	Answer	No
---------------------------------	--------	----

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)	Answer	No
------------------------------------	--------	----

A comprehensive review of the qualified PWD selectees for new hires to supervisory positions were not available because USAStaffing does not differentiate between Executive, Managerial, and Supervisors like DCPDS. DO will continue to work with HR Reports to review other options or alternatives to obtain this critical 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. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)	Answer	No
------------------------------------	--------	----

b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)	Answer	No
----------------------------------	--------	----

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)	Answer	No
-------------------------------------	--------	----

A comprehensive review of the qualified PWD selectees for new hires to supervisory positions were not available because USAStaffing does not differentiate between Executive, Managerial, and Supervisors like DCPDS. DO will continue to work with HR Reports to review other options or alternatives to obtain this critical data.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

1. In this reporting period, did the agency convert all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service (5 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

Yes. All eligible Schedule A employees were converted into competitive service after two years of satisfactory service.

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

Out of the total workforce separations, 96.53% were permanent and 3.47% were temporary. • Voluntary PWD permanent separations were 4.02% above the 12% benchmark or 16.02% PWDs vs 74.58% PWODs. • Involuntary PWD permanent separations were 1.24% under the 12% benchmark or 1.24% PWDs vs 4.68% PWODs.

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	127	0.66	0.48
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	375	1.40	1.52
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	764	3.72	2.93
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	733	2.91	2.94
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	1998	8.69	7.86

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer No

Out of the total workforce separations, 96.53% were permanent and 3.47% were temporary. • Voluntary PWTD permanent separations were 2.10% above the 2% benchmark or 4.10% PWTDs vs 74.58% PWODs. • Involuntary PWTD permanent separations were 0.37% under the 2% benchmark or 0.37% PWTDs vs 4.68% PWODs.

Separations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	127	1.00	0.49
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	375	1.33	1.51
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	764	4.45	3.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	733	3.34	2.92
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	1998	10.12	7.91

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.

Based on the 2024 Exit Survey data, only 16.97% of the departing 2,734 employees responded. Triggers could not be readily identified when demographic questions such as Sex, RNO and Disabilities were removed from the survey because of PII sensitivity concerns. However, other data sources such as the Denison Survey and the Federal Employee Viewpoint survey, which details were not readily available for further assessments. DO will work with HR to review and implement alternate data solutions.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

The outward facing/external DLA web page, www.dla.mil, has a link at the bottom of the page that reads "Section 508." This link takes visitors to the DLA Section 508 page: <http://www.dla.mil/508/>. This page has resources and instructions for 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 applicants' rights under the Architectural Barriers Act, including a description of how to file a complaint.

Please note at <https://www.dla.mil/EEO/Business/Architectural-Barriers-Act/>, which links to the "Complaints Page" under "Enforcement".

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.

Agency-wide Section 508 Policy: During FY2024, DLA's Enterprise IT Accessibility Office (J62LC) completed a draft agency-wide Section 508 and Assistive Technologies policy and submitted it to the DLA Policy Pipeline process. Key policy elements focus on policy and governance, technical assistance, outreach and training, data-driven reporting, and assistive technology support. At the time of reporting the policy is at Stage 2 (of Stages 0 through 4) and is anticipated to be signed and issued in FY2025. Assistive Technologies Support: The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team maintains a contract for AT support services. This contract provides configuration, troubleshooting and support of AT across DLA Enterprise so that users with disabilities can perform 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 Employees with Disabilities by: • Providing Tier 2 DLA Service Portal 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. • A dedicated team mailbox providing direct support to users of AT tools, IT developers, and content creators. Knowledge Management: The DLA Enterprise IT Accessibility Team uses various platforms to increase knowledge of accessibility through the DLA enterprise, to include the following: • Provided 10 live interactive accessibility webinars • Providing 300 licenses to developers giving access to Deque University, an on-line accessibility learning platform • Provide training courses in DLA's Learning Management System (LMS) • Maintaining an intranet site with best practice accessibility information • Maintaining and developing issue-focused knowledge-based articles (KBAs).

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 FY24, a total of 2041 RA requests were submitted which 55% were timely processed as compared to 76% in FY23 and 89% in FY22. The reason for this decrease in timeliness was in part due to the increase in the types of requests that were submitted during this timeframe (remote work and deviations from the DLA telework policy, such as the continuing teleworking other than the allowable Monday and Friday teleworking. The number of requests doubled for FY24 with 1,096 requests due to employees returning to work and a change in the DLA telework/remote work policy. During FY24, the average time it took to process an RA took 86 workdays to approve or deny a request for an RA such as mainly remote work and deviations from the telework policy and reassignments. It took 35 days in FY23 and 20 days in FY22. The increase in processing timeframes is associated with a significant increase in RA requests for telework/remote work per DO's RA Status Update as of 01/17/2025, outdated and incomplete guidance, misapplied resources, inefficient training, and inconsistent operations in the RA process.

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. DLA EEO Offices recently participated in a Continuous Process Improvement with Lean Six Sigma Black Belts to streamline and document our process. A new process map and critical path diagram was generated to assist requestors, EEO practitioners and Leadership making the decisions. • In FY 24 DLA created a new Disability Program Director (DPD) position to add leadership, oversight and accountability over the program Enterprise-Wide. DLA also hired some term employees for one year at the MSCs to assist with the backlog of RAs. • DLA EEO Offices are currently creating a DTM to document the new process changes and are updating their forms and templates to align with the new process. The DTM will eventually turn into a DLA Manual for all parties involved in the process. • DLA is working with Information Technology operations to configure an RA System that will provide up to date and effective processing, tracking and reporting of RAs Enterprise-Wide. The current system does not provide adequate tracking and reporting of RAs based on the Agencies needs and new data acumen requirements. • During FY24, DLA processed 55% RA requests within 45 workdays, which was below the 90% target goal. In FY22, 76% were processed and 89 % in FY22. Again, this decrease in timeliness was in part due to the 100% increase and the types of requests that were submitted during this timeframe (remote work, deviations from the DLA telework policy and reassignment) and the number of requests that were submitted. • DLA provides interim accommodations while requestors are waiting for their final RA decision which 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 people 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 Augments the LMS training within person and virtual trainings where employees and supervisors can ask questions and engage with the DPC's, DPM and DPD. • 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 ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE

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

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

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 DLA Instruction 1440.01 and SOP 1440.01-01, RA for Individuals with Disabilities are currently being updated and will include the PAS information. Note: No requests for PAS were received on FY24.

Section VII: 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 governmentwide 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 Yes

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.

(#1) No. The DLA percentages were lower than the Government-wide average for formal complaints of harassment cases at 28.93%. DLA average for FY24: Per the 462 Report, PART IV, Part 2, there were 26 out of 110 formal complaints filed that alleged harassment based on disability = 23.63%. Of the 26 formal complaint cases based on disability were related to either a mental or a physical, or both. • Mental: 16 of 110 formal complaints = 14.54% • Physical: 10 of 110 formal complaints = 9.09% (#2) Yes. In FY24, there were seven (7) cases that alleged harassment based on disability that resulted in a settlement agreement. Three of the seven complaints were pre-complaints. There were no findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability in FY24. (#3) 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?

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 Yes

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.

(#1) No. The DLA percentages were lower than the Government-wide average for failure to Accommodate at 20.33%. DLA average for FY24: Per 462 Report PART IV, Part 2, there were 21 complaints out of 110 formal complaints filed = 19.09%. Of the 21 cases the individual either alleged mental or physical disability (or both). • Mental: 8 of 110 formal complaints = 7.27% • Physical: 13 of 110 formal complaints = 11.81% (#2) Yes.. In FY24, there were 3 pre-complaints that were settled, and 7 formal complaints that were settled. There were no findings of discrimination alleging failure to provide a RA. (#3) There were none during FY24.

Section VIII: 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

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1				
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?	1) Glass ceiling for PWTB 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.				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	Barrier Group People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y				
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.	Barrier Name Inaccessible DLA Policy Documents		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice DLA policy documents are not accessible to all employees. DLAs, DLA Regulations (DLARs), DLA Manuals (DLAMs), and DLA SOPs do not pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.		
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
12/01/2018	09/30/2021	Yes	09/30/2022		Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation Act.
Responsible Official(s)					
Title	Name			Standards Address The Plan?	
Director, DLA Transformation (DT)	Aleeta Coleman			No	
Deputy Director, DLA Transformation (DT)	Greg Wicklund			No	
Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)	Thomas Doyle			No	
HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities	HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities			No	
Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)	Todd Lloyd			No	
DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)	Bryon Grosvalet			Yes	
Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)	T.A. DeLaney			No	

Responsible Official(s)				
Title		Name	Standards Address The Plan?	
DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)		Michael Dingle	Yes	
Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)		Patricia Wright	Yes	
DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)		Sylvia Nance	Yes	
Division Chief (J72)		Kathryn Hammer-Wells	No	
Business Process Analyst (J72)		Anne Burleigh	No	
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
12/01/2018	Identify all DLAI, DLARs, DLAMs, Directive-type Memoranda (DTMs) and DLA SOPs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
12/01/2018	Identify all DLA GOs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (DT)	Yes		11/09/2018
09/30/2021	Replace historical inaccessible GOs with altered GOs that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2022	
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		01/30/2019
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 signed by DT and J code, D code, or MSC Issuing Authorities meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuances must state: 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) HQs J and D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense. DT will monitor and report on progress of compliance action plans to leadership on a quarterly basis. (DT)	Yes		02/04/2019
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	12/31/2022	

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
02/28/2019	Alter DLAI 4000.19, Agreements Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all documents signed by the agency's senior designee meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuance must state: 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. 3) Organizational Support Agreements Managers will ensure their organization agreements and supporting documentation meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		01/09/2019
06/30/2019	Alter all GO templates to ensure approved GO documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes		06/21/2019
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		06/12/2019
06/01/2019	Alter Defense Logistics Management System documents to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J67B).	Yes		09/05/2019
06/30/2019	HQs J and D codes and MSCs provide compliance action plans to DT for: 1) Policy and procedures 2) Current Mission and Functions Historical (non-current) GOs (DT)	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		01/10/2020
04/30/2020	Supervisors add relevant planned activities to the performance standards of their non-supervisory Responsible Officials. (All)	Yes	12/31/2022	01/10/2020
09/30/2021	Replace current inaccessible GOs and Mission and Function documents with altered documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2022	
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	12/31/2022	
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2020	Almost all the planned activities in Part VII were completed.			
2018	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.			
2019	The D&I committee met repeatedly to discuss the barrier and how DLA should remove it any aspects of policy and procedural barriers. Most of the planned activities for FY19 were accomplished, as documented above.			
2021	Planned activities put on hold due to short staffing and hiring new personnel by end of FY21.			

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1				
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?	1) Glass ceiling for PWTB 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.				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Targeted Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y				
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.	Barrier Name Inaccessible DLA Policy Documents		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice DLA policy documents are not accessible to all employees. DLAs, DLA Regulations (DLARs), DLA Manuals (DLAMs), and DLA SOPs do not pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.		
Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
06/01/2025	09/30/2027	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiate outreaching plans to mentor, develop, educate the workforce regarding PWDs/PWTBs opportunities for advancement. Increase recruiting in mission critical occupational positions that can lead to Senior level positions & work w/HR to improve hiring authority knowledge & identify barriers to mission critical position with higher level advancement opportunity. Identify participation rates in DLA Training that can build PWDs/PTWDs leadership competency towards senior positions.
02/28/2019	03/30/2019	Yes		01/30/2019	Alter the DLAI, DLAR, DLAM, DTM and DLA SOP templates to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)
12/01/2018	12/01/2018	Yes		11/09/2018	Identify all DLAs, DLARs, DLAMs, Directive-type Memoranda (DTMs) and DLA SOPs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (DT)

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
12/31/2018	02/28/2018	Yes		02/04/2019	Alter DLAI 7750.07, Forms Management Program, to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all forms created/revised meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)
02/28/2019	03/30/2019	Yes		02/04/2019	Alter DLA Issuance procedures (DLAI 5025.01, DLAM 5025.01, DLAI 5025.13) to address 508 compliance requirements, ensuring all policy and procedure documents signed by DT and J-code, D-code, or MSC Issuing Authorities meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. Issuances must state: 1) All policy and procedure documents created/revised will be 508 compliant. 2) HQ J and D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making their existing policy and procedure documents 508 compliant. 3) HQ J and D codes and MSCs
12/01/2018	12/01/2018	Yes		11/09/2018	Identify all DLA GOs which do not meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d. (DT)
02/28/2019	04/30/2019	Yes		01/09/2019	1) All agreements created or revised will be 508 compliant 2) HQ J and D codes and MSCs will be responsible for making supporting documentation 508 compliant. - Will meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines.
06/30/2019	07/31/2019	Yes		06/21/2019	Alter all GO templates to ensure approved GO documents signed by the DLA Vice Director meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)
02/28/2019	03/30/2020	Yes		02/04/2019	1) GO packages created/revised will be 508 compliant 2) DT responsible making GO templates and resource documents compliant 3) HQ J&D codes/MSCs responsible making their current Mission and Functions and Org charts compliant 4) Org charts depicted in Missions & Functions document; a stand-alone org chart not required 5) HQ J and D codes and MSCs must provide DT a compliance completion action plan in accordance with TMT tasking suspense
06/30/2019	07/31/2019	Yes		06/12/2019	Address 508 compliance requirements in planned revision of DLAI 5105.02, Annual Operating Plan, to ensure HQ J and D codes and MSC's Dynamic Operating Plans meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan						
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description	
02/28/2019	03/30/2019	Yes		02/04/2019	Current 1) General Order memos & missions/ functions are 508 compliant since 2020; 2) DT is responsible for ensuring that General Order memos & missions/functions docs are compliant; 3) HQs D/J- Codes/MSCs must provide compliant memos & missions/functions. Historical: 1) General Order memos signed by DLA DV for missions/functions dated 2020 afterwards must be 508 compliant. 2) All must provide DT compliance memos for missions/ functions.	
Responsible Official(s)						
Title			Name		Standards Address The Plan?	
Director, DLA Transformation (DT)			Aleeta Coleman		No	
Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)			Thomas Doyle		No	
Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)			Todd Lloyd		No	
Division Chief (J72)			Kathryn Hammer-Wells		No	
Deputy Director, DLA Transformation (DT)			Greg Wicklund		No	
DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)			Michael Dingle		Yes	
Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)			Patricia Wright		Yes	
HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities			HQ J/D code and MSC Issuing Authorities		No	
DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)			Bryon Grosvalet		Yes	
Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)			T.A. DeLaney		No	
DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)			Sylvia Nance		Yes	
Business Process Analyst (J72)			Anne Burleigh		No	
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective						
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
04/30/2020	Supervisors add relevant planned activities to the performance standards of their non-supervisory Responsible Officials. (All)			Yes	12/31/2021	01/10/2020
04/30/2020	Alter DLA Acquisition Directive template to meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines, consistent with 29 USC §794d (J72)			Yes	12/31/2022	06/25/2020
12/31/2020	Conduct a forms survey on active DLA-level forms for continued use, revision, or cancellation. (DT)			Yes	12/31/2021	01/30/2023

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
06/30/2021	DLAHQ J Codes/D Staff & MSCs use the 508th compatible template to draft issuances through TMT to DT using the 5-year lifecycle IAW the issuance pipeline process.	Yes	12/31/2021	01/30/2023
09/30/2021	Using the normal 5-year Issuance life cycle, replace all inaccessible policy and procedure documents with documents that meet the WCAG 2.0 guidelines. (DT)	Yes	12/31/2021	01/30/2019
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	12/31/2021	03/31/2024
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	12/31/2021	03/31/2024
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2021	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.			
2020	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.			
2018	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.			
2022	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.			
2023	Planned activities on all aspects of accessibility will continue in FY23. DO will review with the DLA Transformation office in FY24 2nd Quarter to ensure all objectives have been met.			
2024	All objectives were met by the end of FY24 2nd Quarter. All General Orders memorandums and missions and functions documents that have been created since 2020 meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines for Section 508 compliances way forward.			
2019	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.			

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)				
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1				
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?	1) Glass ceiling for PWTs 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.				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	<i>Barrier Group</i> People with Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y				
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.	Barrier Name DLA policy documents		Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice 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) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
12/01/2018	12/31/2023	Yes			Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees from year 2000 way forward. DLAs (DLA Instructions), DLA Regulations (DLARs), DLA Manuals (DLAMs), and DLA SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) will be evaluated, tested and pass the Adobe Acrobat accessibility checker.
Responsible Official(s)					
Title	Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)	Michael Dingle		Yes		
Division Chief (J72)	Kathryn Hammer-Wells		No		
Business Process Analyst (J72)	Anne Burleigh		Yes		
Director, DLA Transformation (DT)	Aleeta Coleman		No		
Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)	Dana Norton		Yes		
Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)	Sabrina DeWalt		No		

Responsible Official(s)				
Title		Name	Standards Address The Plan?	
Kathryn Hammer-Wells		Division Chief (J72)	Yes	
Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)		Dennis King	No	
DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)		Randy Davis	Yes	
DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)		Jodi Beard	Yes	
Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)		T.A. DeLaney	No	
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
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	Accomplishment			
2019	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.			
2021	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.			
2022	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.			
2020	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.			
2018	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.			

Source of the Trigger:	Other				
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Accessibility				
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?	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.				
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	Barrier Group People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities				
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y				
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y				
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.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Barrier Name</th><th>Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Accessibility</td><td>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.</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Barrier Name	Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice	Accessibility	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.
Barrier Name	Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice				
Accessibility	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) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
12/01/2018	12/31/2022	Yes		12/31/2023	Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation act.
Responsible Official(s)					
Title	Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
Director, DLA Transformation (DT)	Aleeta Coleman		No		
HQs D-Staff, J-Codes and MSC Issuing Authorities	HQs D-Staff, J-Codes and MSC Issuing Authorities		No		
Chief Policy Management & Oversight (DT)	Sabrina DeWalt		No		
Chief Strategy Plans & Governance Division (DT-SPG)	Dennis King		No		
DLA Issuances Program Manager (DT-PMO)	Michael Dingle		Yes		
Enterprise Organizational Alignment Program Manager (DT-SPG)	Dana Norton		Yes		
DLA Forms Program Manager (DT-PMO)	Randy Davis		Yes		

Responsible Official(s)				
Title		Name	Standards Address The Plan?	
DLA Agreements Program Manager (DT PMO)		Jodi Beard	Yes	
Director Enterprise Business Standards Office (J67B)		T.A. DeLaney	No	
Division Chief (J72)		Kathryn Hammer-Wells	Yes	
Business Process Analyst (J72)		Anne Burleigh	Yes	
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
12/01/2018	Ensure all DLA policy documents are accessible to all employees, consistent with the Rehabilitation act.	Yes		12/31/2023
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2022	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.			
2023	Planned activities on all aspects of accessibility will continue in FY23. DO will review with the DLA Transformation office in FY24 2nd Quarter to ensure all objectives have been met. It will be further supported when the Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Accessibility (DEIA) charter is updated and completed in alignment with the DLA’s Strategic Plan for People and Culture and a DEIA committee becomes established targeted in FY24.			
2021	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.			
2018	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.			
2019	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.			
2020	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.			

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)	
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1	
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?	PWDs and PWTDs underrepresentation in GS-13/14/15/SES under Senior Leadership positions below the 12% and 2% benchmarks. • Underutilization of the Schedule A applicants and 30% Disabled Veteran placement authority for those qualified for positions above their current pay grade. • Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) for College Students with Disabilities, career development beyond entry level. • Identification of barriers in mission critical job areas with senior level promotion potential based on Job Series with a likely track to SES positions. • Average New Hires were 7.51% for PWDs, which was 4.69% below the 12.00% federal benchmark, and 0.61% for PWTDs which was 1.39% below the 2.00% federal benchmark. • Average of Workforce Demographics were 11.21% for PWDs, which was 0.79% below the 12.00% federal benchmark, and 2.02% for PWTDs which was 0.02% above the 2.00% federal benchmark. Borderline representation is predicted to change drastically approximately by 10% of the workforce eligible for retirement within the next five years.	
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	Barrier Group People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities	
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N	
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y	
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.	Barrier Name PWDs & PWTDs underrepresentation in GS-13/14/15/SES below the 12%/2% Benchmarks	Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underutilization of the Schedule A applicants and 30% Disabled Veteran placement authority for those qualified for positions above their current pay grade. • Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) for College Students with Disabilities, career development beyond entry level. • Identification of barriers in mission critical job areas with senior level promotion potential based on Job Series with a likely track to SES positions. • Average New Hires were 7.51% for PWDs, which was 4.69% below the 12.00% federal benchmark, and 0.61% for PWTDs which was 1.39% below the 2.00% federal benchmark. • Average of Workforce Demographics were 11.21% for PWDs, which was 0.79% below the 12.00% federal benchmark, and 2.02% for PWTDs which was 0.02% above the 2.00% federal benchmark. Borderline representation is predicted to change drastically approximately by 10% of the workforce eligible for retirement within the next five years. • PWDs/PWTDs leaving the workforce due to inflexible telework policies;

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan						
Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description	
06/30/2025	09/30/2027	Yes			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Initiate outreaching plans to mentor, develop and educate the workforce regarding opportunities for advancement.• Increase recruiting in mission critical occupational (MCOs) positions that can lead to Senior level positions and work with HR to improve hiring authority knowledge and identify barriers to mission critical position with higher level advancement opportunity.• Identify participation rates in DLA Training that can build their leadership competency towards senior positions.	
Responsible Official(s)						
Title		Name		Standards Address The Plan?		
Human Resources (J1), Director		Dr. Charles V. Barber		Yes		
DLA Disability Program Manager (DPM)		Monica Warren		Yes		
Human Resources (J1), DLA Recruitment Cadre Team Leader		Anthony E. “Tony” Pounds		Yes		
Human Resources (J1), DLA Special Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) - DHRS-Columbus		Casandra L. Green		Yes		
Human Resources (J1), DLA Training Director		Yolanda Howell		Yes		
Human Resource (J1-DHRS-DL) Staffing Director		Kate DeDobbelaere		Yes		
Human Resources (J12), DLA Workforce Planning Staff Director		Leonard "AJ" Jones		Yes		
Human Resources (J1), DLA Special Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) - DHRS-New Cumberland		Steven W Carney		Yes		
Enterprise Equal Opportunity Program Manager		Judith Davis		Yes		
MSC Equal Opportunity Program Coordinators (EOCs)		MSC EOCs		Yes		
Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective						
Target Date	Planned Activities			Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
12/31/2024	Identify and understanding of the roles and responsibility of HR personnel. HR/J1 Recruiting, Retention, Training, Staffing and reporting on all employees who attend training.			Yes		12/31/2024
02/01/2025	Conduct recurring meetings with HR to improve transparency, training, and information sharing.			Yes		
06/30/2025	06/30/2025 Work with HR to determine those mission critical positions with higher level advancement opportunities.			Yes		

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
04/30/2025	HR create and provide a plan to improve hiring authority knowledge for supervisors and employees in developmental positions.	Yes		
09/30/2025	Initiate plans for mentorship and development for WRP and PaCERs with disabilities.	Yes		
06/30/2025	Develop training sessions like lunch and learns and webinars that focus on hiring authority knowledge advancement for PWDs and PWTDs.	Yes		
12/31/2025	Determine the participation rates of PWDs and PWTDs and Section 508 accessibility in all aspects of DLA training programs and courses.	Yes		
06/30/2025	Establish a Focus Group to conduct barrier analysis on People with Disabilities, collect results and report aggregated findings.	Yes		
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	Accomplishment			
2024	<div>Triggers were noted across the board by GS levels, which did not meet the 12% benchmarks for PWDs and 2% benchmarks for PWTDs.</div> <div><div>Overall Totals</div><div>by Higher Grades No Disability & Not Identified PWDs PWD 12% Benchmark Triggers</div><div>PWTDS PWTD 2% Benchmark Triggers</div><div>SES 0.43% 0.43% 0.00%</div><div>-12.00% 0.00% -2.00%</div><div>GS-15 7.39% 6.45% 0.94%</div><div>-11.06% 0.16% -1.84%</div><div>GS-14 29.93% 25.49% 4.43%</div><div>-7.57% 0.76% -1.24%</div><div>GS-13 62.25% 51.49% 10.76%</div><div>-1.24% 2.09% 0.09%</div><div>Total 100.0% 83.87% 16.13% 3.01%</div></div> <div>+++++</div> <div>Borderline representation is predicted to change drastically approximately by 10% of the workforce eligible for retirement within the next five years.</div> <div><div>PWDs (includes PWTDS) PWTDS</div><div>Retirement Eligibility</div><div>Average within 10 Years 2.09% 0.45%</div><div>Federal Benchmark 12.00% 2.00%</div><div>Retirement Eligibility 6.28% 1.35%</div><div>Potential Shortfall -5.72% -0.65%</div></div>			

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

There were no delays, and DLA completed all the planned activities for FY24.

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 are now accessible meeting the WCAG 2.0 guidelines as they are reviewed during the normal policy review cycle. Historical General Order memorandums, missions and functions dating back to 2020 have been updated, and all 2020 to the present General Order memorandums and missions and functions will meet WCAG 2.0 guidelines for Section 508 compliances.

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 by meeting the WCAG 2.0 guidelines which is accessible to date, so the plan does not currently need improvement. DO remains in close collaboration with the DLA Section 508 and DLA Transformation offices while continuing to monitor newer developments to ensure full compliance way forward.