

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

DOD Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency - FY 2025

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

Analysis of the permanent workforce data contained in Table B-4 indicates that the percentage of PWD in the GG-1 to GG-10 cluster was 10.69 Percent in FY 2025. That is an increase from 9.81 Percent in FY 2024; however, that percentage still falls below the 12 Percent goal. There are only 580 employees in that grade compared to 4,624 employees in the GG-11- SES. In compliance with EOs and OPM Guidance, DCSA discontinued certain piloting programs that directly influenced the increased participation rates for PWD at those grade levels.

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

Analysis of the permanent workforce data contained in Table B-4 indicates the percentage of PWTD in the GG-1 to GG-10 cluster was 1.65 Percent in FY24, and that percentage decreased to 0.86 Percent during FY25, which is below the 2 Percent goal. In compliance with an EO and OPM Guidance, DCSA discontinued certain piloting programs that directly influenced the increased participation rates for PWTD at those grade levels.

Grade Level Cluster (GS or Alternate Pay Plan)	Total	Reportable Disability Total	Reportable Disability Percentage (Numerical Goal 12 Percent)	Targeted Disability Total	Targeted Disability Percentage (Numerical Goal 2 Percent)
Grades GS-11 to SES	4586	591	12.89	97	2.12
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	580	62	10.69	5	0.86

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

Numeric hiring goals are shared during reoccurring senior leadership meetings and the monthly new employee orientation. Those goals are also presented at the annual State of the Agency briefing and are discussed with hiring managers and HCMO. The goals are also highlighted on a quarterly basis in the demographic dashboard. Additionally, Part J was published in the Agency's internal and external webpages.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer: Yes

NA

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

Disability Program Task	Total Full Time	Total Part Time	Total Collateral Duty	Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Ms. Kimberly L. Kersey Branch Chief, Special Hiring Human Capital Management Office Kimberly.l.kersey.civ@mail.mil
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	1	Ms. Kimberly L. Kersey Branch Chief, Special Hiring Human Capital Management Office Kimberly.l.kersey.civ@mail.mil
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	4	0	0	Ms. Lori A. Lupo, Disability Program Manager, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity lorraine.a.lupo.civ@mail.mil Ms. Joy M. Chontosh, EEO Specialist Office of Equal Employment Opportunity Joy.m.chontosh.civ@mail.mil Ms. Dahlia K. Thomas, EEO Specialist Office of Equal Employment Opportunity dahlia.k.thomas.civ@mail.mil
Section 508 Compliance	1	0	0	Mr. Horrace Russell, 508 Program Coordinator Horrace.rusell12.civ@mail.mil
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	Ms. Lorraine A. Lupo, Disability Program Manager Lorraine.a.lupo.civ@mail.mil in coordination with Logistics Management Divisions and Facilities Management
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Ms. Deirdre (Dee Dee) K. Garrett, Branch Chief, Equal Employment Specialist Office of Equal Employment Opportunity deirdre.k.garrett.civ@mail.mil

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

Answer: Yes

In FY 2025, the Agency engaged in training designed to increase the knowledge and skills among disability program staff. Key staff attended the Federal Dispute Resolution Conference, CAP/Ergonomics Funding and Procurement training, and the Tyler Tech RA User Forum.

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

NA

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Program name 1	C.2.b
Program name 1	C.2.b
Description of Program Deficiency	Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]
Description of Program Deficiency	Has the agency established disability reasonable accommodation procedures that comply with EEOC's regulations and guidance? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(3)]
Objective	Update RA Instruction to include the protected basis pregnancy, childbirth, or other related medical conditions.
Objective	Update RA Instruction to include the protected basis pregnancy, childbirth, or other related medical conditions.
Fiscal Year	2025
Fiscal Year	2025
Responsible Official Name	Suhai E. Alston
Responsible Official Name	Bhanot
Responsible Official Title	Compliance Branch Chief
Responsible Official Title	OEEO Director
Program name 2	C.2.b.5
Description of Program Deficiency	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	Update RA Instruction; and Process backlog of full-time telework requests.
Fiscal Year	2025
Responsible Official Name	Suhai Alston
Responsible Official Title	Branch Chief for Compliance

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.

DCSA maintains working relationships with multiple universities and colleges, collaborates with Armed Forces transition coordinators and medical treatment facilities, and engages with other prominent organizations that service veteran and disabled members.

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.

Under the Defense Civilian Intelligence Program (DCIPS) personnel system, DCSA is under the excepted service and does not have Schedule A hiring authority. Prior to the implementation of the hiring freeze during FY 2025, DCSA piloted a Persons with Disabilities (PWD) recruitment initiative designed to increase access to qualified applicants with disabilities. The program connected hiring managers with qualified candidates from the disability community. The applications are referred to the recruitment HCMO. HCMO replies to the individual and provides advice on where to find open positions, how to apply and whether Schedule A applies.

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.

The applications are referred to the recruitment HCMO. HCMO replies to the individual and provides advice on where to find open positions, how to apply and whether Schedule A applies.

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

DCSA does not have Schedule A hiring authority under DCIPS. Education, guidance, and awareness via training are provided to each hiring manager when requests for recruitment are initiated.

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.

DCSA maintains a partnership with a variety of organizations and programs that support recruitment and employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities. Outreach efforts include engagement with colleges and university, participation in the DoW Operation Warfighter Internship Program and the Department of Veterans Affairs Non-Paid Work Experience Program, and active attendance at Wounded Warrior employment events.

Additionally, the Agency has begun evaluating participation in the Office of Personnel Management's Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) as a potential pipeline for recruiting qualified college students and recent graduates with disabilities. This effort is intended to further strengthen the agency's outreach strategy and expand access to candidates eligible for Federal employment.

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", describe the trigger(s) below.

a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD)

Answer: No

b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

In FY 2025, both PWD and PWTD observed a significant shift in percentage trend for new hires in the permanent workforce. While PWD remains well above the 12 Percent goal, PWTD declined drastically below the 2 Percent goal. PWD new hires are at 55.90 Percent while PWTD new hires are 1.02 Percent.

New Hires	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage)	Reportable Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage)	Targeted Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage)	Targeted Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage)
% of Total Applicants					
% of Qualified Applicants					
% of New Hires					

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

- a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer: Yes
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

DCSA has 5 mission-critical occupations (MCO). The occupations are the following: 0080, 0132, 1801, 1810, and 2210. Analysis of the hiring data on Table B6 indicates hiring for PWD and PWTD in the MCO's listed below fall below the 12 and 2 Percent goals, respectively.

1801, PWD: 0
 1801, PWTD: 0

 1810, PWD: 0
 1810, PWTD: 0

 2210, PWTD: 0

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability New Hires (Percentage)	Targetable Disability New Hires (Percentage)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%

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. 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: No
- b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer: No

DCSA does not have relevant applicant data. N/A

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

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

The triggers that exist for the internal competitive promotions in the mission-critical occupations were within 1810. There were 3 internal competitive promotions in the 1810 MCO, but no promotions are identified as PWD or PWTD.

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 PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

PWD and PWTD are considered, along with all eligible employees without disabilities, for the Leadership Development Program, career development training, mentoring, awards, specialized training, promotions, and any other advancement programs.

DCSA's compliance team provides customized training for managers and supervisors to increase knowledge across the workforce of reasonable accommodation requirements and protocols. The training focuses on the decision-maker's role and responsibilities as well as those of the employee and of the compliance team. The goal is to equip managers and supervisors with the tools and resources available for conducting the interactive process, coordinating with the RA team, and effectively navigating through the RA process.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

DCSA Leadership Development Program (LDP)
 Executive Leadership Development Program (ELDP)
 National Defense University College (NDU)
 Defense Senior Leader Development Program (DSLDP)
 Defense Civilian Emerging Leader Program
 White House Leadership Development Program
 Joint Duty Program and rotational assignments
 United States Army War College (USAWC)

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 Applicants (Percentage)	Total Participants Selectees (Percentage)	PWD Applicants (Percentage)	PWD Selectees (Percentage)	PWTD Applicants (Percentage)	PWTD Selectees (Percentage)
Internship Programs	94	94	15	15.95	3	3.19
Fellowship Programs	8	8	2	25.	0	.00
Mentoring Programs	106	106	12	11.32	4	3.77
Coaching Programs	222	222	29	13.06	7	3.15
Training Programs	282	282	41	14.53	5	1.77
Detail Programs	57	57	6	10.53	2	3.50
Other Career Development Programs	674	674	97	14.39	24	3.56

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: No

b. Selections (PWD)

Answer: No

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: No

b. Selections (PWTD)

Answer: No

NA

C. AWARDS

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

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

An analysis of employee recognition and awards was conducted to assess inclusion rates for employees with disabilities within the permanent workforce. The Agency's permanent workforce consists of 5,204 employees, of which 658 employees (12.64 Percent) identify as People with Disabilities (PWD) and 104 employees (2.00 Percent) identify as People with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD).

The inclusion rate of the below categories reflect triggers within awards and recognition; the agency is diligently working to ensure equitable recognition across the workforce./

/Time-Off Awards:/

11-20 Hours: Trigger for PWTD (0.14 Percent)

21-30 Hours: Trigger for PWTD (0.07 Percent)

Cash Awards:

\$500-\$999: Trigger for PWTD and PWD (0 Percent)

\$2000-\$2999: Trigger for PWTD (1.54 Percent); PWD (11.59 Percent)

\$3000-\$3999: Trigger for PWTD (0.40 Percent); PWD (3.33 Percent)

\$4000-\$4999: Trigger for PWTD and PWD at (0 Percent)

\$5000+: Trigger for PWTD (0.09 Percent); PWD (1.31 Percent)

Time-Off Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	687.00	13.97	86.03	1.89	98.11
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	5496.00	13.97	86.03	1.89	98.11
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	8.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	481.00	13.72	86.28	1.04	98.96
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	7696.00	13.72	86.28	1.04	98.96
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00	16.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	307.00	16.61	83.39	0.65	99.35
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	7368.00	16.61	83.39	0.65	99.35
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	91.00	12.09	87.91	3.30	96.70
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	3312.00	12.56	87.44	3.14	96.86
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	36.40	37.82	36.20	34.67	36.45
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Cash Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Awards Given	1.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total Amount	475.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Average Amount	475.00	0.00	475.00	0.00	475.00
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	6126.00	10.86	89.14	1.70	98.30
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	6126500.00	10.85	89.15	1.70	98.30
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1000.08	1000.00	1000.09	1000.00	1000.08
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	3608.00	11.59	88.41	1.50	98.50
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	9018500.00	11.59	88.41	1.50	98.50
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2499.58	2500.00	2499.53	2500.00	2499.58
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	953.00	12.28	87.72	1.47	98.53
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	3335500.00	12.28	87.72	1.47	98.53
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3500.00	3500.00	3500.00	3500.00	3500.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	2.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	348.00	13.22	86.78	0.86	99.14
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	1853000.00	12.95	87.05	0.94	99.06
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	5324.71	5217.39	5341.06	5833.33	5320.29

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

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTB)

Answer: No

b. Pay Increases (PWTB)

Answer: No

NA

Other Awards	Total (Number)	Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disability (Percentage)	Targeted Disability (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disability (Percentage)
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

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

NA

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 (PWTD) Answer: Yes
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

Relevant applicant data is not available.

DISES and/or Defense Intelligence Senior Level (DISL): There was 1 internal vacancy announcement. There were 2 qualified applicants. Each identified as having no disability (100 Percent), zero identified as PWD, and no one chose to not identify. There were no selections, no disabilities, no PWD, and no one chose to not identify.

GG-15: There were 2 internal vacancy announcements. There were 16 qualified applicants. 13 identified as having no disability (81.25 Percent), 1 identified as PWD (6.25 Percent), and 2 chose not to identify (12.50 Percent). There were 0 selections, 0 no disability, 0 PWD, and no one chose to not identify.

GG-14: There were 8 internal vacancy announcements. There were 33 qualified applicants. 26 identified as having no disability (78.79

Percent), 2 identified as PWD (6.06 Percent), and 5 chose not to identify (15.15 Percent). There were 2 selections, 2 (100 Percent) no disability, 0 PWD, and no one chose to not identify.

GG-13: There were 24 internal vacancy announcements. There were 250 qualified applicants. 190 (76 Percent) identified as having no disability, 41 (16.40 Percent) identified as PWD, and 19 (7.6 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 5 selected, 4 (80 Percent) no disability, 1 (20 Percent) PWD, and none chose to not identify.

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

b. Grade GS-15

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer: Yes |

c. Grade GS-14

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer: Yes |

d. Grade GS-13

- | | |
|---|------------|
| i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) | Answer: No |

Relevant applicant data is not available

SES: There were 2 qualified applicants. 2 identified as having no disability (100 Percent), 0 identified as PWTD, and 0 chose not to identify. There were 0 selections, 0 no disability, 0 PWTD, and 0 chose not to identify.

GG-15: There were 16 qualified applicants. 13 identified as having no disability (81.25 Percent), 1 identified as PWTD (6.25 Percent), and 2 chose not to identify (12.50 Percent). There were 0 selections, 0 no disability, 0 PWTD, and 0 chose not to identify.

GG-14: There were 33 qualified applicants. 26 identified as having no disability (78.79 Percent), 1 identified as PWTD (3.03 Percent), and 5 chose not to identify (15.15 Percent) There were 2 selections, 2 (100 Percent) no disability, 0 PWTD, and 0 chose not to identify.

GG-13: There were 250 qualified applicants. 190 (76 Percent) identified as having no disability, 16 (6.40 Percent) identified as PWTD, and 19 (7.6 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 5 selections, 4 (80 Percent) no disability, 0 PWTD, and 0 chose not to identify.

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: Yes |
| b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) | Answer: Yes |

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)

Answer: No

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)

Answer: No

DISES and/or DISL: There were 3 vacancy announcements. There were 28 qualified applicants. 22 (78.57 Percent) identified as no disability, 2 (7.14 Percent) identified as PWD, and 4 (14.29 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 3 selections, 3 no disability, 0 PWD, and none chose to not identify.

GG-15: There were 16 vacancy announcements. There were 161 qualified applicants. 104 (64.60 Percent) identified as no disability, 34 (21.12 Percent) identified as PWD, and 23 (14.29 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 6 selections, 4 (66.67 Percent) no disability, 0 PWD, and 2 (33.33 Percent) chose not to identify.

GG-14: There were 34 vacancy announcements. There were 716 qualified applicants. 531 (74.16 Percent) identified as no disability, 98 (13.69 Percent) identified as PWD, and 87 (12.15 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 15 selections, 12 (80.00 Percent) no disability, 2 PWD (13.33 Percent), and 1 (6.67 Percent) chose not to identify.

GG-13: There were 57 vacancy announcements. There were 1274 qualified applicants. 959 (75.27 Percent) identified as no disability, 175 (13.74 Percent) identified as PWD, and 140 (10.99 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 19 selections, 14 (73.68 Percent) no disability, 5 PWD (26.32 Percent), and 0 chose not to identify.

It is important to note that DISES, DISL, GG-15, GG-14 and GG-13 PWD in the permanent workforce all meet or exceed the 12 Percent goal.

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

a. New Hires to SES (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTB)

Answer: No

SES: 28 qualified applicants. 22 (78.57 Percent) identified as no disability, 1 (3.57 Percent) identified as PWTB, and 4 (14.29 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 3 selections, 3 no disability, 0 PWTB, and 0 chose not to identify.

GG-15: 161 qualified applicants. 104 (64.60 Percent) identified as no disability, 11 (6.83 Percent) identified as PWTB, and 23 (14.29 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 6 selections, 4 (66.67 Percent) no disability, 0 PWTB, and 2 (33.33 Percent) chose not to identify.

GG-14: 716 qualified applicants. 531 (74.16 Percent) identified as no disability, 51 (7.12 Percent) identified as PWTB, and 87 (12.15 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 15 selections, 12 (80.00 Percent) no disability, 0 PWTB, and 1 (6.67 Percent) chose not to identify.

GG-13: 1274 qualified applicants. 959 (75.27 Percent) identified as no disability, 78 (6.12 Percent) identified as PWTB, and 140 (10.99 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 19 selections, 14 (73.68 Percent) no disability, 2 PWTB (10.53 Percent), and none chose not to identify.

It is important to note that DISES, GG-14, and GG-13 PWTB in the permanent workforce all exceed the 2 Percent goal.

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: Yes |

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: Yes |

DCSA does not collect relevant applicant data. Data is also unavailable for internal applicants at the management level.

Executive: There were 2 qualified applicants for internal competitive promotions at the executive level. Both are identified as a person without a disability. No selections were made.

Supervisory internal applicants are not broken down by grade level. Collectively there were 113 qualified applicants. 89 (78.76 Percent) identified as no disability, 16 (14.16 Percent) identified as PWD, and 8 (7.08 Percent) did not identify. There were 4 selections, 4 (100 Percent) no disability, 0 PWD, and none chose not to identify.

In FY 2025, DCSA met the PWD 12 Percent goal in the Management and Supervisory occupational categories.

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: Yes |

DCSA does not collect relevant applicant data. Data is also unavailable for internal applicants at the management level.

Executive: There were 2 qualified applicants for internal competitive promotions at the executive level. Both are identified as a person without a disability. No selections were made.

Supervisory internal applicants are not broken down by grade level. Collectively, there were 113 qualified applicants. 89 (78.76 Percent) identified as no disability, 6 (5.31 Percent) identified as PWD, and 8 (7.08) did not identify. There were 4 selections, including 4 (100 Percent) with no disability, 0 PWTD, and none chose not to identify.

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: Yes |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Answer: Yes |

Data is unavailable for new hires at the management level.

SES: There were 3 vacancy announcements. There were 28 qualified applicants. 22 (78.57 Percent) identified as no disability, 2 (7.14 Percent) identified as PWD, and 4 (14.29 Percent) chose not to identify. There were 3 selections, 3 no disability, 0 PWD, and none chose not to identify.

There were 45 vacancy announcements. Collectively there were 687 qualified applicants. Supervisor new hires are not broken down by grade level. There were 486 (70.74 Percent) identified as no disability, 113 (16.45 Percent) identified as PWD, and 88 (12.81) did not identify. There were 22 selections, 17 (77.27 Percent) no disability, 2 (9.09 Percent) PWD, and 3 (13.64 Percent) chose not to identify.

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: Yes |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) | Answer: Yes |

Data is unavailable for new hires at the management level.

Executive new hires are not broken down by grade level. Collectively there were 28 qualified applicants. 22 (19.40 Percent) identified as no disability, 1 (3.57 Percent) identified as PWTD, and 4 (14.29) did not identify. There were 3 selections, 3 no disability (100 Percent), 0 PWTD, and none chose not to identify.

Supervisor new hires are not broken down by grade level. Collectively there were 687 qualified applicants. 486 (70.74 Percent) identified as no disability, 50 (7.28 Percent) identified as PWTD, and 88 (12.81) did not identify. There were 22 selections, 17 (77.27 Percent) no disability, 0 PWTD, and 3 (13.64 Percent) chose not to identify.

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: N/A

Under the Defense Civilian Intelligence Program (DCIPS) personnel system, DCSA is an excepted service and the Agency lacks Schedule A authority. Conversion to competitive service is N/A.

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)

Answer: No

For voluntary separations, the inclusion rate for PWD is 15.65 Percent which is higher than the inclusion rate for persons with no disabilities, 11.50 Percent.

Separations	Total (Number)	Reportable Disabilities (Percentage)	Without Reportable Disabilities (Percentage)
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	0	0.00	0.00

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(s) in the text box.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

For voluntary separations, the inclusion rate for PWTD is 16.35 Percent, which is higher than the inclusion rate for persons with no disabilities, 11.50 Percent.

For involuntary separations, the inclusion rate for PWTD is 2.88 Percent, which is higher than the inclusion rate for persons with no disabilities, .42 Percent.

Separations	Total (Number)	Targeted Disabilities (Percentage)	Without Targeted Disabilities (Percentage)
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	0	0.00	0.00

- 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.

Though DCSA employs exit surveys, such surveys are a voluntary tool, and all information provided on those surveys is wholly voluntary. During FY25, there were 657 voluntarily separations, and 27 involuntarily separated from the agency. There were 143 voluntary responses to the FY25 exit survey (0.21 Percent response rate), of which 17 (0.12 Percent) declined to identify, 94 (0.66 Percent) identified as not being disabled, and 32 (0.22 Percent) affirmed having disabilities. No further data can be conferred at this time.

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.

- 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.

<http://www.dcsa.mil/accessibility/>

- 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.

<http://www.dcsa.mil/accessibility/>

- 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.

DCSA has implemented several compliance studies throughout the previous FYs, and those studies supported implementation of a robust program of risk identification and mitigation, expeditious corrective action, and continuous monitoring that directly improve the ADA and 508 compliance needs of its population. / The program oversight mechanisms are in place to monitor accessibility compliance across agency facilities and digital platforms. DCSA's Compliance Branch is represented at the monthly 508 Working Group Meetings

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.

- 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.)

Because of the increased volume of accommodation requests associated with Agency return-to-office initiatives and evolving workplace requirements, processing timelines may vary depending on the complexity of the request, the need for supporting medical documentation, and procurement or validation of assistive technology or equipment. When appropriate, interim accommodation may be provided to support employees while additional documentation or resources are being reviewed and evaluated.

The Agency remains committed to processing requests as expeditiously as possible while ensuring compliance with applicable regulatory standards and maintaining the integrity of the interactive process. Current average case processing time is approximately 80 days, and timelines may extend for cases requiring additional documentation, medical review, or equipment procurement. The Agency continues to evaluate programs capacity, resourcing, and workflow processes to address increased demand while ensuring timely and equitable consideration of all accommodation requests.

- 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.

During FY 2025, DCSA processed more than 442 RA requests through its centralized case management system, Entellitrak, demonstrating the Agency's capacity to respond to increased demand following the implementation of the Return to Office (RTO) EO. This surge in requests reflects both the workforce's reentry dynamics and increased awareness of accommodation resources. To meet these needs, DCSA invested approximately \$21,000 in accommodation equipment and leveraged an additional \$7,936 through the DoW Computer/Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP), directly enabling employees to perform essential job functions and maintain productivity.

OEEO continues the use of Entellitrak as a case management platform which delivers real-time tracking, enhanced data visibility, and streamlined reporting, allowing leadership to make informed decisions and monitor compliance with Federal accessibility requirements.

In partnership with the Safety and Occupational Health Office, the integration of expert-led ergonomic assessments further strengthened individualized support. Collectively, these efforts reduced administrative barriers, and improved response times, reinforcing operational readiness and mission continuity.

DCSA also sustained comprehensive accessibility support through contracted American Sign Language (ASL) services, which were utilized during 26 agency-wide events, 39 individual employee support engagements, and various background investigation interviews supporting mission-critical operations. These services ensured equitable access to information and participation across the workforce, directly contributing to employee engagement and performance.

In addition, DCSA conducted Architectural Barrier Studies and accessibility reviews across facilities and common areas enterprise wide. These assessments led to the resolution of previously identified deficiencies and the implementation of improvements such as enhanced shared spaces, lactation rooms, and wellness areas. These upgrades not only ensured compliance with accessibility standards but also promoted an inclusive workplace environment that supports employee well-being, retention, and long-term organizational effectiveness.

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 procedures are incorporated in the revised DCSA RA policy. PAS requests are processed in the same manner as RA requests. In FY 2025, DCSA did not receive any PAS requests.

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: No

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

NA

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

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

Answer: No

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

Answer: No

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

NA

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: No

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

Answer: No

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

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities. Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

NA

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

NA

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.

NA