U.S. Department of Commerce

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Management Directive 715

Equal Employment Opportunity Program Status Report

FY 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Agency Information (MD-715-01 Parts A – D)…….3

II. Executive Summary (MD-715-01 Part E)…….....7

III. Certification of Establishment of Continuing EEO Programs (MD-715-01 Part F).....15

IV. Agency Self-Assessment Checklist (MD-715-01 Part G)…….16

V. EEO Plans (MD-715-01 Part H)……35

VI. Plan for Barrier Elimination (MD-715-01 Part I)……..56

VII. Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities (MD-715-01 Part J)……69

VIII. Table A Analyses……...90

IX. Table B Analyses……109

X. Attachments

- Organization Chart
- NOAA EEO Policy Statement
- ADR Program Handbook
- Reasonable Accommodations Policy
- Anti-Harassment Policy

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART A - D
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

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

PART A Department or Agency Identifying Information	1. Agency		**U.S. Department of Commerce**	
	1.a. 2nd level reporting component		**National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**	
	1.b. 3rd level reporting component			
	1.c. 4th level reporting component			
	2. Address		**Herbert C. Hoover Building, Room 5128** **14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W.,** **OR** **1305 East West Highway** **SSMC4, Room 7500**	
	3. City, State, Zip Code		**Washington, DC 20230** **OR** **Silver Spring, MD 20910**	
	4. CPDF Code	5. FIPS code(s) 1330	4. CM54	5. 11 – DC 24031 – MD
PART B Total Employment	1. Enter total number of permanent full-time and part-time employees			**11,286**
	2. Enter total number of temporary employees			**126**
	3. Enter total number employees paid from non-appropriated funds			Not Available
	4. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT [add lines B 1 through 3]			**11,412**

PART C Agency Official(s) Responsible For Oversight of EEO Program(s)	1. Head of Agency Official Title	**RDML Timothy Gallaudet, Ph.D., USN Ret. , Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere and Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere**
	2. Agency Head Designee	Benjamin Friedman, Deputy Under Secretary for Operations
	3. Principal EEO Director/Official Title/series/grade	Kenneth M. Bailey, Director, Civil Rights Office ZA-0260-V
	4. Title VII Affirmative EEO Program Official	4. Coneshea Simpson, EEO Specialist
	5. Section 501 Affirmative Action Program Official	5. N/A
	6. Complaint Processing Program Manager	6. Carol Summers, EEO Specialist
	7. Other Responsible EEO Staff	7. Richard Grant, Deputy Director Salim Abddeen, EEO Specialist Amneris Caba, EEO Specialist Linda Walker, EEO Specialist Tillman Peck, Data Analyst

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART A - D
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

PART D	**Subordinate Component and Location (City/State)**	**CPDF and FIPS codes**	
List of Subordinate Components Covered in This Report	National Weather Service (NWS) Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031
	National Ocean Service (NOS) Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031
	National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031
	Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) Silver Spring, MD/Boulder, CO	CM54	24031
	National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service (NESDIS) Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031
	Office of Marine and Aviation Operations (OMAO) Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031
	NOAA Staff Offices Washington, DC and Silver Spring, MD	CM54	24031

EEOC FORMS and Documents Included with this Report			
*Executive Summary [FORM 715-01 PART E], that includes:	**X**	*Optional Annual Self-Assessment Checklist Against Essential Elements [FORM 715-01PART G]	**X**
Brief paragraph describing the agency's mission and mission-related functions	**X**	*EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program [FORM 715-01PART H] for each programmatic essential element requiring improvement	**X**

Summary of results of agency's annual self-assessment against MD-715 "Essential Elements”	**X**	*EEO Plan To Eliminate Identified Barrier [FORM 715-01 PART I] for each identified barrier	**X**
Summary of Analysis of Work Force Profiles including net change analysis and comparison to RCLF	**X**	*Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, and Advancement of Individuals with Targeted Disabilities for agencies with 1,000 or more employees [FORM 715-01 PART J]	**X**
Summary of EEO Plan objectives planned to eliminate identified barriers or correct program deficiencies	**X**	*Copy of Workforce Data Tables as necessary to support Executive Summary and/or EEO Plans	**X**
Summary of EEO Plan action items implemented or accomplished	**X**	*Copy of data from 462 Report as necessary to support action items related to Complaint Processing Program deficiencies, ADR effectiveness, or other compliance issues.	**X**
*Statement of Establishment of Continuing Equal Employment Opportunity Programs [FORM 715-01 PART F]	**X**	*Copy of Facility Accessibility Survey results as necessary to support EEO Action Plan for building renovation projects	**N/A**
*Copies of relevant EEO Policy Statement(s) and/or excerpts from revisions made to EEO Policy Statements	**X**	*Organizational Chart	**X**

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART E
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION
For Period Covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

On October 1, 2003, Management Directive 715 (MD-715) became effective. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, require federal agencies to take proactive steps to ensure equal employment opportunity for all employees and applicants for employment. This means that agencies must work to proactively prevent potential discrimination before it occurs and establish systems to monitor compliance with Title VII.

MISSION AND VISION-RELATED FUNCTIONS

NOAA's mission is to understand and predict changes in climate, weather, oceans, and coasts; to share that knowledge and information with others; and to conserve and manage coastal and marine ecosystems and resources. Our vision of the future incorporates healthy ecosystems, communities, and economies that are resilient in the face of change.

NOAA, one of several operating units within the U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC), provides a variety of services to the Nation. These services are provided by NOAA's National Weather Service (NWS); National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); National Ocean Service (NOS); National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service (NESDIS); Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR); and the Office of Marine and Aviation Operations (OMAO).

NOAA's most populous occupations include the following job series: Meteorologist (1340), Information Technology Management (2210), Fishery Biologist (0482), General Physical Science (1301), and Management Program Analyst (0343).

WORKFORCE ANALYSIS SUMMARY

During Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, NOAA's total workforce (permanent, temporary, and term) included 11,412[1] total employees. This represents a slight decrease from the FY16 workforce (11,449) of 37 individuals (-0.32%). An analysis of the workforce data shows several trends:

[1] The demographic data for this report is based on the MD-715 Data Tables retrieved from the HR Connect/Workforce Analytics database. MD-715 requires that the data include all employees who appeared on the rolls at any time during the year. This is different than typical data reports or references, which are snapshot, and "as of" a certain time of the year, i.e., September 30.

- Total females, Hispanics, White females, African Americans, and American Indian/Alaska Native females continue to have lower than expected participation rates when compared to their representation in the Civilian Labor Force (CLF).

- Although the number of Hispanics, White females, and African Americans increased, their participation rates remained below the CLF.

The following EEO groups were above or equal to the CLF:

- White males
- Asians
- Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders
- American Indian/Alaska Native males

In FY17, NOAA experienced increases in the participation rates among total females (1.63%), Hispanic males (2.37%), Hispanic females (20.00%), White females (0.69%), African American males (2.09%), African American females (1.40%), Asian males (0.51%), Asian females (6.52%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females (4.00%), Multiple Race males (22.22%), and Multiple Race females (8.70%). However, participation of other groups decreased including White males (-1.73%), American Indian/Alaska Native males (-1.69%), and American Indian/Alaskan Native females (-17.65%).

During this same period, the total number of employees with disabilities increased by 66 from 1220 to 1286, resulting in a participation rate of 11.27%. The number of individuals with targeted disabilities increased by 19, from 274 to 293, a participation rate of 2.57%; slightly above the 2% Federal Goal[2].

AGENCY SELF ASSESSMENT SUMMARY OF THE "ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS"

A. Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership

Strengths:

- All new employees (HQs & Field) were provided a copy of the NOAA Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) policy statement during new employee orientation.

- Implemented mandatory Diversity & Inclusion (D&I)/EEO language in the performance plans of all managers and supervisors.

- The Workforce Management Office (WFMO) added the Discipline policy (DAO-202-751) to the Employee section of its website, to ensure that all employees are aware of behaviors inappropriate in the workplace and which may result in disciplinary actions.

[2] In FY 17, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) established the goal of 12% as the Federal benchmark for persons with disabilities and 2% for persons with targeted disabilities. Targeted Disability requirements were revised by EEOC and the percentage of IWTDs drastically increased based on EEOC's new guidance and the updating of OPM Form SF256.

- The Deputy Under Secretary for Operations (DUSO) issued an agency-wide broadcast about NOAA's Sexual Assault/Sexual Harassment Helpline, which provides crisis intervention, referrals, and emotional support to all employees, contractors, and affiliates.

- NESDIS leadership enacted an Employee Engagement Branch to promote D&I resources and information for employees and managers, and made D&I issues and advancements a regular part of the briefings at quarterly Management Status Review Meetings.

- NESDIS conducted a promotional and compliance plan to seek maximum results for the DOC's 2017 No Fear Act Training; resulting in 86% initial completion rate.

- NMFS leadership supported hiring two (2) new employees in the EEO and Diversity Office.

- NMFS established a "Disability Resources" intranet page that includes links to NOAA's Reasonable Accommodation Resources, DOC's Reasonable Accommodations, EEOC's Enforcement Guidance for Reasonable Accommodation, and Telework as a Reasonable Accommodation.

- NOS published guidance on Interview Panel Diversity, to provide guidance to evaluation panels on the ranking/review of applications and interview panels.

- The National Weather Service (NWS) created, distributed and posted a new Anti-Bullying and Employment Discrimination poster at Headquarters and all field offices.

Deficiencies:

- There were no deficiencies identified for this element.

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

Strengths:

- The Civil Rights Office (CRO) was realigned to report directly to the DUSO and the CRO Director regularly attends senior staff meetings, including weekly Tag-ups and NOAA Executive Panel meetings.

- The CRO Director has established weekly communication with senior officials to provide regular EEO updates, including data on complaint statistics, D&I initiatives, and other EEO-related functions.

- The Directors of WFMO and CRO established weekly meetings to discuss and collaborate on pertinent plans, policies and practices to determine its impact on employees.

- The CRO Director is included in the Agency's strategic planning efforts; specifically, the agency's human capital plan, regarding succession planning, training, etc., to ensure that EEO concerns are integrated into the agency's strategic mission.

- NOAA participated in the Department of Homeland Security's "DHS is Hiring Veterans" event, served to engage and potentially hire qualified veterans.

- NMFS approved multi-year funding to the Woods Hole Partnership Education Program, which supports increased diversity in the Woods Hole Science Community.

- NMFS continued to provide competitive developmental programs for six (6) employees (five (5) females/one (1) male) in the Leadership Competencies Development Program.

- NMFS established a partnership with the Cornerstone Montgomery Vocational Services, an organization designed to increase independent living for persons with disabilities, resulting in the placement of two (2) trainees.

- NOAA's Line Office EEO & Diversity staff provided the following training: EEO, Emotional Intelligence, Unconscious Bias, Team Building, Coaching, Effective Listening, Understanding Cultural Differences, Generational Differences, and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and Reasonable Accommodations.

- Forty employees participated in the NOS pilot mentoring program to support the engagement, career growth and retention of employees.

- OAR continues to work with laboratory and program offices to coordinate outreach and recruitment activities targeting underrepresented groups within the sciences at national/local conferences, including the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and the American Indian Science and Engineering Society Conference.

- NWS leadership supported the Center Regionals Annual Girls Love Weather and Science Fair, focused on approximately 200 K-12 students with an interest in science.

- NWS continues to support the Herbert C. Hoover Veterans Resource Group which provides community outreach events, educational opportunities, training, fundraisers, and advocates for Veterans seeking employment.

Deficiencies:

- There were no deficiencies identified for this element.

C. Management and Program Accountability

Strengths:

- Regular EEO updates were provided to management/supervisory officials by CRO.

- Points of Contact were identified from the Office of General Counsel, WFMO, and the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) to include in the review process of EEO-related plans and policy updates.

- CRO reviewed the Merit Promotion Program Policy and Procedures, Employee Recognition Awards Program and Procedures, and Employee Development/Training policies for possible barriers/disparate impact and established annual quarterly reviews.

- NESDIS conducted two (2) staff assistant visits; conducting EEO audits and providing EEO, Diversity and Alternative Dispute Resolution training.

- NMFS new supervisors/managers are required to complete at least four (4) hours of EEO training within the first year of appointment. OAR also held mandatory training on the prevention of sexual harassment.

- OMAO conducted an internal audit on the effectiveness and efficiency of the Title VII and Rehabilitation Act programs.

- NWS conducted separate mandatory EEO Compliance training for new employees and new supervisors.

Deficiencies:

- Not all employees, supervisors, and managers have been informed of the penalties for formally being found to have engaged in discriminatory behavior or for taking personnel actions based upon a prohibited basis.

- The agency, when appropriate, has not disciplined or sanctioned managers/supervisors or employees found to have discriminated over the past two years.

D. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination

Strengths:

- CRO developed and presented quarterly Model Workplace Briefings for Line/Staff Offices to identify possible barriers that may be impeding the realization of EEO, and offered strategies to overcome identified challenges.

- OMAO conducted a self-assessment to identify possible barriers for certain groups and developed strategic plans to eliminate identified barriers.

Deficiencies:

- The participation of supervisors and managers in the ADR process is not required.

E. Efficiency

Strengths:

- CRO ensured the completion of mandatory EEO training and provided D&I certification training for all full-time EEO Counselors.

- A minimum of 90% of all reasonable accommodation requests are processed within the required timeframes.

- NOAA uses iComplaints to track and monitor the status of complaints, analyze trends, and provides regular updates to the appropriate personnel.

Deficiencies:

- The agency does not track/analyze recruitment efforts to identify potential barriers.

- CRO does not provide 100% timely EEO counseling within 30 days of the initial request or within an agreed upon extension in writing, up to 60 days, to all participants.

- The agency does not require all managers and supervisors to receive ADR training.

- After the agency has offered ADR and the complainant has elected to participate, managers are not required to participate.

- There are no measures to ensure that responsible management officials involved in a complaint do not make the final decision when declining participation in ADR and do not serve as the person with settlement authority during ADR, per EEOC Management Directive 110, Chapter 3.III.A.

F. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance

Strengths:

- NOAA complied with federal EEO statutes and regulations, policy guidance, and other applicable written instructions with respect to responsiveness and legal compliance.

- Monetary agreements were timely processed, and documentation for compliance was promptly provided and reviewed by CRO.

Deficiencies:

- There were no deficiencies identified in this element.

TRIGGERS INDICATING POSSIBLE BARRIERS AND EEOC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE VISIT ASSESSMENT

Based on an analysis of NOAA's workforce data tables A and B and the past EEOC Technical Assistance Review, NOAA updated and continued four (4) Part I Plans and developed three (3) new Part J Plans, to address the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD).

The Part I Plans address the following conditions: 1) the low participation rates of women at the GS-13 level (or equivalent) and above; 2) the low participation rates of women in the overall workforce; 3) a possible glass ceiling, blocked pipeline, and glass wall barrier for African American and Asian females, and 4) the low participation rates of Hispanics.

The Part J Plans address: 1) the absence of PWD/PWTD as participants in the Leadership Competencies Development Program; 2) the low rate of Cash Awards at the $501+ level for PWD; 3) the low number of Time-off Awards (9 + hours), Cash Awards at the $100-$500 level, and Cash Awards at the $501+ level for PWTD; 4) several Mission Critical Occupations with low selection rates among new hires for PWD/PWTD; and 5) limited data analysis preventing the identification of triggers and removal of possible barriers to employment and advancement for PWD/PWTD.

EEO COMPLAINT TRENDS

Pre-Complaint:

NOAA CRO only processes EEO complaints in the pre-complaint or informal stage. According to the FY17 EEOC-462 Report, NOAA CRO completed 84 pre-complaint counselings, which represents an increase of 8 (11%) when compared to FY16.

Timeliness:

A total of 9 (11%) EEO counselings were not completed within the prescribed time limits for the pre-complaint stage.

Formal Complaints:

NOAA experienced an increase of 3 (6%) formal complaints from FY16 (50 complaints) to FY17 (53 complaints). Reprisal, Age, Race (African American), Sex (female), and Disability (physical) were the top bases; with Reprisal, Age, and Race continuing at the top for over five years. Harassment (non-sexual) continued to be the highest raised issue in FY17, along with Evaluation/Appraisal, Assignment of Duties, Discipline, and Time and Attendance.

Alternative Dispute Resolutions (ADR):

The use of EEO/ADR increased by 6, from 21 in FY16 to 27 in FY17. Out of the 27 employees who elected ADR, 1 (4%) was resolved, 8 (29%) elected not to file a formal complaint, and 18 (67%) came to no resolution.

NOAA CRO will examine these trends further and continue to collaborate with senior leadership and Line Office EEO Program Officials to address the causes through the promotion of the use of best practices and other model workplace measures to prevent discrimination and increase the resolution rates of EEO issues and concerns. Also, in FY18, CRO will implement mandatory ADR training for managers/supervisors, and will continue to train and encourage employees to utilize ADR, with a focus on conflict resolution.

CONCLUSION

During FY17, NOAA aggressively moved on its commitment towards establishing NOAA as a Model Workplace, through the completion of 14 action plans. As a result, the FY17 Self-Assessment Checklist revealed that only 7 out of 124 basic compliance measures require EEO Action Plans, including those recommended during the past EEOC Technical Assistance Review.

The agency remains committed to examining the reasons for the low participation rates of women, Hispanics, and conducting a barrier analysis on identified triggers for PWD/PWTD, and implementing actions identified in the agency's D&I Plan.

CRO will continue to strengthen relationships with key stakeholders across the agency and other stakeholders on issues relating to MD-715 and will work to address the identified compliance measures that were not met in FY17.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART F
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
CERTIFICATION OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CONTINUING
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

I, **Kenneth M. Bailey, Director, Civil Rights Office, ZA-0260-V**, am the Principal EEO Director/Official for the **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)**.

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

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

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

Signature of Principal EEO Director and Reporting Component Designee Certifies that this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report is in compliance with EEO MD-715.

5 Mar 18
Date

Signature of Agency Head or Agency Head Designee

3/8/18
Date

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART G
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
AGENCY SELF-ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST MEASURING ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION – FY17

Essential Element A: DEMONSTRATED COMMITMENT FROM AGENCY LEADERSHIP
Requires the agency head to issue written policy statements ensuring a workplace free of discriminatory harassment and a commitment to equal employment opportunity.

Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**EEO policy statements are up-to-date.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
		Yes	**No**	
The Agency Head was installed on March 6, 2014. The EEO policy statement was issued in June 2014. Was the EEO policy Statement issued within 6 – 9 months of the installation of the Agency Head? If no, provide an explanation.		**X**		
During the current Acting Agency Head's tenure, has the EEO policy Statement been re-issued annually? If no, provide an explanation.		**X**		
Are new employees provided a copy of the EEO policy statement during orientation?		**X**		
When an employee is promoted into the supervisory ranks, is s/he provided a copy of the EEO policy statement?		**X**		

Compliance Indicator Measures	EEO policy statements have been communicated to all employees.	Measure has been met		For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	
Have the heads of subordinate reporting components communicated support of all agency EEO policies through the ranks?		X		
Has the agency made written materials available to all employees and applicants, informing them of the variety of EEO programs and administrative and judicial remedial procedures available to them?		X		
Has the agency prominently posted such written materials in all personnel offices, EEO offices, and on the agency's internal website? **[see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(5)]**		X		

Compliance Indicator Measures	Agency EEO policy is vigorously enforced by agency management.	Measure has been met		For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	
Are managers and supervisors evaluated on their commitment to agency EEO policies and principles, including their efforts to:				
- resolve problems/disagreements and other conflicts in their respective work environments as they arise?		X		
- address concerns, whether perceived or real, raised by employees and following-up with appropriate action to correct or eliminate tension in the workplace?		X		

- support the agency's EEO program through allocation of mission personnel to participate in community out-reach and recruitment programs with private employers, public schools and universities?	**X**		
- ensure full cooperation of employees under his/her supervision with EEO office officials such as EEO Counselors, EEO Investigators, etc.?	**X**		
- ensure a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, harassment and retaliation?	**X**		
- ensure that subordinate supervisors have effective managerial, communication and interpersonal skills in order to supervise most effectively in a workplace with diverse employees and avoid disputes arising from ineffective communications?	**X**		
- ensure the provision of requested religious accommodations when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship?	**X**		
- ensure the provision of requested disability accommodations to qualified individuals with disabilities when such accommodations do not cause an undue hardship?	**X**		
Have all employees been informed about what behaviors are inappropriate in the workplace and that this behavior may result in disciplinary actions?	**X**		Included Discipline Policy, DAO-202-751 to the Employee section of website.
Describe what means were utilized by the agency to so inform its workforce about the penalties for unacceptable behavior.			
Have the procedures for reasonable accommodation for individuals with disabilities been made readily available/accessible to all employees by disseminating such procedures during orientation of new employees and by making such procedures available on the World Wide Web or Internet?	**X**		
Have managers and supervisor been trained on their responsibilities under the procedures for reasonable accommodation?	**X**		

Essential Element B: INTEGRATION OF EEO INTO THE AGENCY'S STRATEGIC MISSION Requires that the agency's EEO programs be organized and structured to maintain a workplace that is free from discrimination in any of the agency's policies, procedures or practices and supports the agency's strategic mission.				
Compliance Indicator	**The reporting structure for the EEO Program provides the Principal EEO Official with appropriate authority and resources to effectively carry out a successful EEO Program.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	
Is the EEO Director under the direct supervision of the agency head? **[see 29 CFR §1614.102(b)(4)]** For subordinate level reporting components, is the EEO Director/Officer under the immediate supervision of the lower level component's head official? (For example, does the Regional EEO Officer report to the Regional Administrator?)		**X**		
Are the duties and responsibilities of EEO officials clearly defined?		**X**		
Do the EEO officials have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions?		**X**		
If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, are there organizational charts that clearly define the reporting structure for EEO programs?		**X**		
If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, does the agency-wide EEO Director have authority for the EEO programs within the subordinate reporting components?		**X**		
If not, please describe how EEO program authority is delegated to subordinate reporting components. *The NOAA Civil Rights Office (CRO) sets policy and provides oversight and guidance to EEO Program Managers in five major Line Offices.*				

Compliance Indicator Measures	The EEO Director and other EEO professional staff responsible for EEO programs have regular and effective means of informing the agency head and senior management officials of the status of EEO programs and are involved in, and consulted on, management/personnel actions.	Measure has been met		For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	
Does the EEO Director/Officer have a regular and effective means of informing the agency head and other top management officials of the effectiveness, efficiency and legal compliance of the agency's EEO program?		X		
Following the submission of the immediately preceding FORM 715-01, did the EEO Director/Officer present to the head of the agency and other senior officials the "State of the Agency" briefing covering all components of the EEO report, including an assessment of the performance of the agency in each of the six elements of the Model EEO Program and a report on the progress of the agency in completing its barrier analysis including any barriers it identified and/or eliminated or reduced the impact of?		X		
Are EEO program officials present during agency deliberations prior to decisions regarding recruitment strategies, vacancy projections, succession planning, selections for training/career development opportunities, and other workforce changes?		X		
Does the agency consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making human resource decisions such as re-organizations and re-alignments?		X		
Are management/personnel policies, procedures and practices examined at regular intervals to assess whether there are hidden impediments to the realization of equality of opportunity for any group(s) of employees or applicants? **[see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(b)(3)]**		X		

Is the EEO Director included in the agency's strategic planning, especially the agency's human capital plan, regarding succession planning, training, etc., to ensure that EEO concerns are integrated into the agency's strategic mission?	X		
Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**The agency has committed sufficient human resources and budget allocations to its EEO programs to ensure successful operation.**	**Measure has been met**	**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
		Yes / **No**	
Does the EEO Director have the authority and funding to ensure implementation of agency EEO action plans to improve EEO program efficiency and/or eliminate identified barriers to the realization of equality of opportunity?	X		
Are sufficient personnel resources allocated to the EEO Program to ensure that agency self-assessments and self-analyses prescribed by EEO MD-715 are conducted annually and to maintain an effective complaint processing system?	X		
Are statutory/regulatory EEO related Special Emphasis Programs sufficiently staffed?	X		
Federal Women's Program – 5 U.S.C. 7201; 38 U.S.C. 4214; Title 5 CFR, Subpart B, 720.204	X		
Hispanic Employment Program – Title 5 CFR, Subpart B, 720.204	X		
People with Disabilities Program Manager; Selective Placement Program for Individuals with Disabilities – Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act; Title 5 U.S.C. Subpart B, Chapter 31, Subchapter I-3102; 5 CFR 213.3102(t) and (u); 5 CFR 315.709	X		

Are other agency special emphasis programs monitored by the EEO Office for coordination and compliance with EEO guidelines and principles, such as FEORP – 5 CFR 720; Veterans Employment Programs; and Black/African American; American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian American/Pacific Islander programs?	**X**		

Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**The agency has committed sufficient budget to support the success of its EEO Programs.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
		Yes	**No**	
Are there sufficient resources to enable the agency to conduct a thorough barrier analysis of its workforce, including the provision of adequate data collection and tracking systems		**X**		
Is there sufficient budget allocated to all employees to utilize, when desired, all EEO programs, including the complaint processing program and ADR, and to make a request for reasonable accommodation? (Including subordinate level reporting components?)		**X**		
Has funding been secured for publication and distribution of EEO materials (e.g. harassment policies, EEO posters, reasonable accommodations procedures, etc.)?		**X**		
Is there a central fund or other mechanism for funding supplies, equipment and services necessary to provide disability accommodations?		**X**		
Does the agency fund major renovation projects to ensure timely compliance with Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards?		**X**		
Is the EEO Program allocated sufficient resources to train all employees on EEO Programs, including administrative and judicial remedial procedures available to employees?		**X**		

Is there sufficient funding to ensure the prominent posting of written materials in all personnel and EEO offices? **[see 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(b)(5)]**	**X**		
Is there sufficient funding to ensure that all employees have access to this training and information?	**X**		
Is there sufficient funding to provide all managers and supervisors with training and periodic up-dates on their EEO responsibilities:			
- for ensuring a workplace that is free from all forms of discrimination, including harassment and retaliation?	**X**		
- to provide religious accommodations?	**X**		
- to provide disability accommodations in accordance with the agency's written procedures?	**X**		
- in the EEO discrimination complaint process?	**X**		
- to participate in ADR?	**X**		

Essential Element C: MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY
This element requires the Agency Head to hold all managers, supervisors, and EEO Officials responsible for the effective implementation of the agency's EEO Program and Plan.

Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**EEO program officials advise and provide appropriate assistance to managers/supervisors about the status of EEO programs within each managers or supervisor's area or responsibility.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
		Yes	**No**	
Are regular (monthly/quarterly/semi-annually) EEO updates provided to management/supervisory officials by EEO program officials?		**X**		

Do EEO program officials coordinate the development and implementation of EEO Plans with all appropriate agency managers to include Agency Counsel, Human Resource Officials, Finance, and the Chief Information Officer?		**X**		
Compliance Indicator	**The Human Resources Director and the EEO Director meet regularly to assess whether personnel programs, policies, and procedures are in conformity with instructions contained in EEOC management directives. [see 29 CFR § 1614.102(b)(3)]**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	
Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Merit Promotion Program Policy and Procedures for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in promotion opportunities by all groups?		**X**		
Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Employee Recognition Awards Program and Procedures for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in the program by all groups?		**X**		
Have time-tables or schedules been established for the agency to review its Employee Development/Training Programs for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation in training opportunities by all groups?		**X**		
Compliance Indicator	**When findings of discrimination are made, the agency explores whether or not disciplinary actions should be taken.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	

Does the agency have a disciplinary policy and/or a table of penalties that covers employees found to have committed discrimination?	**X**		
Have all employees, supervisors, and managers been informed as to the penalties for being found to perpetrate discriminatory behavior or for taking personnel actions based upon a prohibited basis?		**X**	**See Part H Plan #1**
Has the agency, when appropriate, disciplined or sanctioned managers/supervisors or employees found to have discriminated over the past two years?		**X**	**See Part H Plan #2**
If so, cite number found to have discriminated and list penalty/disciplinary action for each type of violation. **There were a three (3) findings of discrimination. No discipline or sanction was issued.**			
Does the agency promptly (within the established time frame) comply with EEOC, Merit Systems Protection Board, Federal Labor Relations Authority, labor arbitrators, and District Court orders?	**X**		
Does the agency review disability accommodation decisions/actions to ensure compliance with its written procedures and analyze the information tracked for trends, problems, etc.?	**X**		

Essential Element D: PROACTIVE PREVENTION
Requires that the agency head makes early efforts to prevent discriminatory actions and eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity in the workplace.

Compliance Indicator		**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures	**Analyses to identify and remove unnecessary barriers to employment are conducted throughout the year.**	**Yes**	**No**	

Do senior managers meet with and assist the EEO Director and/or other EEO Program Officials in the identification of barriers that may be impeding the realization of equal employment opportunity?	**X**		

When barriers are identified, do senior managers develop and implement, with the assistance of the agency EEO office, agency EEO Action Plans to eliminate said barriers?	**X**		
Do senior managers successfully implement EEO Action Plans and incorporate the EEO Action Plan Objectives into agency strategic plans?	**X**		
Are trend analyses of workforce profiles conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?	**X**		
Are trend analyses of the workforce's major occupations conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?	**X**		
Are trends analyses of the workforce's grade level distribution conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?	**X**		
Are trend analyses of the workforce's compensation and reward system conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?	**X**		
Are trend analyses of the effects of management/personnel policies, procedures and practices conducted by race, national origin, sex and disability?	**X**		

Compliance Indicator	**The use of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is encouraged by senior management.**	**Measure has been met**	**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**	
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	

Are all employees encouraged to use ADR?		X		
Is the participation of supervisors and managers in the ADR process required?			X	**See Part H Plan #3**

Essential Element E: EFFICIENCY
Requires that the agency head ensure that there are effective systems in place for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the agency's EEO Programs as well as an efficient and fair dispute resolution process.

Compliance Indicator		**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures	**The agency has sufficient staffing, funding, and authority to achieve the elimination of identified barriers.**	**Yes**	**No**	
Does the EEO Office employ personnel with adequate training and experience to conduct the analyses required by MD-715 and these instructions?		X		
Has the agency implemented an adequate data collection and analysis systems that permit tracking of the information required by MD-715 and these instructions?		X		
Have sufficient resources been provided to conduct effective audits of field facilities' efforts to achieve a model EEO program and eliminate discrimination under Title VII and the Rehabilitation Act?		X		
Is there a designated agency official or other mechanism in place to coordinate or assist with processing requests for disability accommodations in all major components of the agency?		X		
Are 90% of accommodation requests processed within the time frame set forth in the agency procedures for reasonable accommodation?		X		

Compliance Indicator Measures	The agency has an effective complaint tracking and monitoring system in place to increase the effectiveness of the agency's EEO Programs.	Measure has been met		For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	
Does the agency use a complaint tracking and monitoring system that allows identification of the location and status of complaints and length of time elapsed at each stage of the agency's complaint resolution process?		X		
Does the agency's tracking system identify the issues and bases of the complaints, the aggrieved individuals/complainants, the involved management officials and other information to analyze complaint activity and trends?		X		
Does the agency hold contractors accountable for delay in counseling and investigation processing times?		X		Contractors are not used for Counseling.
If yes, briefly describe how: *Contract investigations are managed at the Agency Level (Department of Commerce, Office of Civil Rights). Investigation timelines are monitored by the Department and Contract Investigators are not paid until cases are completed.*				
Does the agency monitor and ensure that new investigators, counselors, including contract and collateral duty investigators, receive the 32 hours of training required in accordance with EEO Management Directive MD-110?		X		
Does the agency monitor and ensure that experienced counselors, investigators, including contract and collateral duty investigators, receive the 8 hours of refresher training required on an annual basis in accordance with EEO Management Directive MD-110?		X		

Compliance Indicator / Measures	The agency has sufficient staffing, funding and authority to comply with the time frames in accordance with the EEOC (29 C.F.R. Part 1614) regulations for processing EEO complaints of employment discrimination.	Measure has been met		For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
		Yes	No	
Are benchmarks in place that compares the agency's discrimination complaint processes with 29 C.F.R. Part 1614?		X		
Does the agency provide timely EEO counseling within 30 days of the initial request or within an agreed upon extension in writing, up to 60 days?			X	**See Part H Plan #4**
Does the agency provide an aggrieved person with written notification of his/her rights and responsibilities in the EEO process in a timely fashion?		X		
Does the agency complete the investigations within the applicable prescribed time frame?		X		Under DOC purview. See DOC MD 715 Report.
When a complainant requests a final agency decision, does the agency issue the decision within 60 days of the request?		X		Under DOC purview. See DOC MD 715 Report.
When a complainant requests a hearing, does the agency immediately upon receipt of the request from the EEOC AJ forward the investigative file to the EEOC Hearing Office?		X		Under DOC purview. See DOC MD 715 Report.
When a settlement agreement is entered into, does the agency timely complete any obligations provided for in such agreements?		X		
Does the agency ensure timely compliance with EEOC AJ decisions which are not the subject of an appeal by the agency?		X		

Compliance Indicator / Measures	There is an efficient and fair dispute resolution process and effective systems for evaluating the impact and effectiveness of the agency's EEO complaint processing program.	Measure has been met: Yes	Measure has been met: No	For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
In accordance with 29 C.F.R. §1614.102(b), has the agency established an ADR Program during the pre-complaint and formal complaint stages of the EEO process?		X		
Does the agency require all managers and supervisors to receive ADR training in accordance with EEOC (29 C.F.R. Part 1614) regulations, with emphasis on the federal government's interest in encouraging mutual resolution of disputes and the benefits associated with utilizing ADR?			X	**See Part H Plan #5**
After the agency has offered ADR and the complainant has elected to participate in ADR, are the managers required to participate?			X	**See Part H Plan #3**
Does the responsible management official directly involved in the dispute have settlement authority?		X		

Compliance Indicator / Measures	The agency has effective systems in place for maintaining and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of its EEO programs.	Measure has been met: Yes	Measure has been met: No	For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report
Does the agency have a system of management controls in place to ensure the timely, accurate, complete and consistent reporting of EEO complaint data to the EEOC?		X		

Does the agency provide reasonable resources for the EEO complaint process to ensure efficient and successful operation in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102(a) (1)?	**X**		
Does the agency EEO office have management controls in place to monitor and ensure that the data received from Human Resources is accurate, timely received, and contains all the required data elements for submitting annual reports to the EEOC?	**X**		
Do the agency's EEO programs address all of the laws enforced by the EEOC?	**X**		
Does the agency identify and monitor significant trends in complaint processing to determine whether the agency is meeting its obligations under Title VII and the Rehabilitation Act?	**X**		
Does the agency track recruitment efforts and analyze efforts to identify potential barriers in accordance with MD-715 standards?		**X**	**See Part H Plan #6**
Does the agency consult with other agencies of similar size on the effectiveness of their EEO programs to identify best practices and share ideas?	**X**		

Compliance Indicator	**The agency ensures that the investigation and adjudication function of its complaint resolution process are separate from its legal defense arm of agency or other offices with conflicting or competing interests.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	
Are legal sufficiency reviews of EEO matters handled by a functional unit that is separate and apart from the unit which handles agency representation in EEO complaints?		**X**		This is managed by the DOC Office of Civil Rights.
Does the agency discrimination complaint process ensure a neutral adjudication function?		**X**		This is managed by the DOC Office of Civil Rights.

If applicable, are processing time frames incorporated for the legal counsel's sufficiency review for timely processing of complaints?	**X**		This is managed by the DOC Office of Civil Rights.

Essential Element F: RESPONSIVENESS AND LEGAL COMPLIANCE
This element requires that federal agencies are in full compliance with EEO statutes and EEOC regulations, policy guidance, and other written instructions.

Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**Agency personnel are accountable for timely compliance with orders issued by EEOC Administrative Judges.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status**
		Yes	**No**	
Does the agency have a system of management control to ensure that agency officials timely comply with any orders or directives issued by EEOC Administrative Judges?		**X**		

Compliance Indicator / **Measures**	**The agency's system of management controls ensures that the agency timely completes all ordered corrective action and submits its compliance report to EEOC within 30 days of such completion.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
		Yes	**No**	
Does the agency have control over the payroll processing function of the agency? If Yes, answer the two questions below.		**X**		This is partially under NOAA control and the National Finance Center.
Are there steps in place to guarantee responsive, timely, and predictable processing of ordered monetary relief?		**X**		

Are procedures in place to promptly process other forms of ordered relief?		X		
Compliance Indicator	**Agency personnel are accountable for the timely completion of actions required to comply with orders of EEOC.**	**Measure has been met**		**For all unmet measures, provide a brief explanation in the space below or complete and attach an EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H to the agency's status report**
Measures		**Yes**	**No**	
Is compliance with EEOC orders encompassed in the performance standards of any agency employees?		X		
If so, please identify the employees by title in the comments section, and state how performance is measured.		Civil Rights Director; Annual Performance Plan		
Is the unit charged with the responsibility for compliance with EEOC orders located in the EEO office?		X		
If not, please identify the unit in which it is located, the number of employees in the unit, and their grade levels in the comments section.				
Have the involved employees received any formal training in EEO compliance?		X		
Does the agency promptly provide to the EEOC the following documentation for completing compliance:				
Attorney Fees: Copy of check issued for attorney fees and /or a narrative statement by an appropriate agency official, or agency payment order dating the dollar amount of attorney fees paid?		X		
Awards: A narrative statement by an appropriate agency official stating the dollar amount and the criteria used to calculate the award?		X		
Back Pay and Interest: Computer print-outs or payroll documents outlining gross back pay and		X		

interest, copy of any checks issued, narrative statement by an appropriate agency official of total monies paid?			
Compensatory Damages: The final agency decision and evidence of payment, if made?	**X**		
Training: Attendance roster at training session(s) or a narrative statement by an appropriate agency official confirming that specific persons or groups of persons attended training on a date certain?	**X**		
Personnel Actions (e.g., Reinstatement, Promotion, Hiring, Reassignment): Copies of SF-50s	**X**		
Posting of Notice of Violation: Original signed and dated notice reflecting the dates that the notice was posted. A copy of the notice will suffice if the original is not available.	**X**		
Supplemental Investigation: 1. Copy of letter to complainant acknowledging receipt from EEOC of remanded case. 2. Copy of letter to complainant transmitting the Report of Investigation (not the ROI itself unless specified). 3. Copy of request for a hearing (complainant's request or agency's transmittal letter).	**X**		
Final Agency Decision (FAD): FAD or copy of the complainant's request for a hearing.	**X**		
Restoration of Leave: Print-out or statement identifying the amount of leave restored, if applicable. If not, an explanation or statement.	**X**		
Civil Actions: A complete copy of the civil action complaint demonstrating same issues raised as in compliance matter.	**X**		
Settlement Agreements: Signed and dated agreement with specific dollar amounts, if applicable. Also, appropriate documentation of relief is provided.	**X**		

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #1 - Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	All employees, supervisors, and managers have not been informed of the penalties for being found to perpetrate discriminatory behavior or for taking personnel actions based on a prohibited basis.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure that all employees, supervisors/managers are aware of the consequences for perpetrating discrimination.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director USEC WFMO-Director, Workforce Relations Division
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	May 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Draft updated EEO policy statement to include language on penalties for discrimination.	March 2017
2) Finalize updated EEO policy statement and forward to all employees; post in agency facilities and on website.	May 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1 – An updated EEO Policy Statement was drafted by the CRO.

Action #2 – Continued for FY18.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #2 – New	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency, when appropriate, has not disciplined or sanctioned managers/supervisors or employees found to have discriminated over the past two years.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure that Discipline Policy-DAO-202-751, is equitably implemented for those found to have perpetrated discriminatory behavior or for taking personnel actions based on a prohibited basis.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	Director, WFMO CRO Director Deputy Assistant Administrators
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	January 2018
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO will finalize updated EEO policy statement to include penalties for discrimination.	May 2018
2) CRO/WFMO will monitor findings of discrimination and work with AAs/DAAs to reiterate policies and communicate possible corrective/disciplinary actions.	June 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #3 – Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	• The participation of supervisors and managers in the ADR process is not required. • After the agency has offered ADR and the complainant has elected to participate in ADR, the manager is not required to participate.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure that whenever ADR is offered, all appropriate managers participate in the ADR process.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	Director, WFMO CRO Director Assistant Administrators
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	January 2015
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Work with DOC & NOAA leadership to identify positive & negative impacts of mandatory ADR participation by managers and supervisors.	March 2018
2) Encourage managers & supervisors to participate in the ADR process by providing training to ensure understanding and benefits of early resolution of disputes.	June 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:
Actions #1 & #3 – Continued; Action #2- Initiated discussions; made positive progress towards mandatory participation by supervisors/managers. In FY17, CRO conducted an analysis on ADR participation that revealed the need for increased employee participation. The DUSO also decided that in 2018, all EEO-related ADR requests would be processed by CRO.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #4 – Updated & Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency does not provide timely EEO counseling within 30 days of the initial request or within an agreed upon extension in writing, up to 60 days to all participants.
OBJECTIVE:	Provide EEO counseling within the regulatory timeframes established by EEOC, Management Directive (MD) 110 to all participants.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	December 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) The CRO will use iComplaints as a tracking mechanism for EEO counselor use to determine timeframes throughout the counseling process.	January 2017
2) Add performance measurements for timely EEO counseling to all EEO Specialist performance plans.	December 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1 – CRO used iComplaints to regularly track and provide notifications to EEO Specialist on needed case updates; attaining a 90% timely processing rate.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #5 – Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency does not require managers/supervisors to receive ADR training in accordance with EEOC (29 CFR Part 1614).
OBJECTIVE:	Provide mandatory ADR training to managers/supervisor at regular intervals.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	WFMO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	April 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) WFMO will determine the agency's ADR training needs NOAA-wide.	February 2017
2) Develop NOAA-wide broadcast explaining ADR and the Agency's mandatory training requirement for managers and supervisors.	February 2018
3) Develop schedule to provide ADR training to supervisors/managers	April 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1 – Completed. Determined that mandatory training was necessary bureau-wide.

Actions #2 & #3 – Continued for FY18

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #6 – Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency does not track recruitment efforts and analyze efforts to identify potential barriers in accordance with MD-715 standards.
OBJECTIVE:	Regularly collect and analyze recruitment efforts to identify and address potential barriers.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director WFMO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Develop a schedule to collect recruitment data.	January 2017
2) Assign personnel to conduct analysis and address identified barriers.	February 2017
3) Identify ongoing/new recruitment efforts for Line/Staff Offices.	March 2018
4) Incorporate findings in EEO Program updates to senior leaders.	June 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1 – Complete - WFMO & CRO agreed to collect and analyze data quarterly.
Action #2 – Complete - Decided that CRO staff would conduct analysis of data to identify triggers/barriers.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN #7 – (EEOC Technical Assistance Review) - Continued	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	There are no measures to ensure that responsible management officials involved in a complaint do not make the final decision when declining participation in ADR, and do not serve as the person with settlement authority during ADR, per EEOC Management Directive 110, Chapter 3.III.A.
OBJECTIVE:	An ADR policy that ensures that another level of management is sought when the responsible management official declines to participate in ADR, and ensures that the responsible management official does not serve as the person with settlement authority.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	WFMO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Update current ADR policy/process to ensure compliance with EEOC Management Directive 110.	March 2018
2) Communicate new policy procedures and incorporate process in mandatory ADR training for managers/supervisors.	June 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

In FY17, the DUSO decided that all EEO-related ADR requests would be processed by NOAA's CRO.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN – Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	All new employees are not provided a copy of the EEO policy statement during orientation.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure that new employees NOAA-wide are provided a copy of the EEO policy statement during orientation.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director Director, WFMO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	February 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) WFMO Director will identify WFMO contacts for new employee orientations located in the field offices.	January 2017
2) CRO will provide current EEO policies to WFMO contacts to be inserted in all orientation packages.	February 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1 & #2-Complete-In FY17, the WFMO provided CRO access to new employees list and Google docs to post EEO materials for field office distribution.

CRO continues to conduct EEO presentations at all employee orientations held at NOAA headquarters.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	Non-SES level managers and supervisors are not evaluated on their commitment to EEO policies and principles.
OBJECTIVE:	Implement mandatory EEO language in the performance plans of all supervisors.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director WFMO Director Deputy Under Secretary for Operations (DUSO)
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	June 2014
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	November 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) The Civil Rights Director will collaborate with WFMO to develop supplemental EEO performance language.	June 2014
2) Route developed language to appropriate leaders for review and approval.	February 2017
3) Confirm approval of new language and announce performance requirement along with performance guidance.	May 2017
4) Implement new performance plans.	November 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 – Completed. In FY15, CRO and WFMO developed EEO performance language.
Actions #s-2-4 – Beginning in FY17, all supervisory performance plans contained a Diversity and Inclusion critical element that included language on Civil Rights & EEO laws.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN – Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	All employees have not been informed about what behaviors are inappropriate in the workplace and that the behavior may result in disciplinary actions.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure that all employees are informed of inappropriate workplace behaviors and the ensued disciplinary actions.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	Director, WFMO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	April 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) WFMO will review current DAO 202-751 on Discipline to determine any needed updates.	January 2017
2) WFMO will develop broadcast to all NOAA employees informing them of the Discipline policy and website links.	April 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 & #2 –WFMO reviewed the current DAO-202-751 on Discipline and agree to post a copy on the Employee section of its website.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The Civil Rights (CR) Director does not report directly to the agency head.
OBJECTIVE:	Establish regular update and communication channel between CRO and the agency head.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	Deputy Under Secretary for Operations
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	October 2014
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	November 2016

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) The CRO Director will identify EEO program areas requiring regular status updates and provide data to the Deputy Under Secretary for Operations (DUSO).	November 2016
2) The DUSO will identify senior staff meetings for CRO required participation.	November 2016

As of November 14, 2016, CRO was realigned to report directly to the DUSO and regularly attended senior staff meetings.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The CRO Director does not have a regular and effective means of informing the agency head and other top management officials of the effectiveness, efficiency and legal compliance of the agency's EEO program.
OBJECTIVE:	Establish regular communication channels between CRO, agency head and other senior officials to provide regular EEO updates.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director DUSO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	December 2016

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Identify required senior level meetings and frequency of CRO Director participation.	November 2016
2) CRO will determine relevant data for EEO updates to the DUSO and senior officials.	November 2016

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

As of November 14, 2016, the CRO was realigned to report directly to the DUSO and regularly attended senior staff meeting, providing EEO-related information and updates.

Action #1 – In November 2017, the CRO Director attended weekly senior level meetings including Weekly Tag-ups and the NOAA Executive Panel.

Action #2 – The CRO Director provides weekly data on complaint statistics, diversity & inclusion initiatives, workforce data and updates on the other EEO-related functions.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The CRO Director is not present during agency deliberations prior to decisions regarding recruitment strategies, vacancy projections, succession planning, selections for training/career development opportunities, and other workforce changes. a) The agency does not consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making HR decisions. b) Management policies, procedures, practices are not examined at regular intervals to access any hidden impediments to EEO.
OBJECTIVE:	Establish regular meetings with WFMO/senior officials/Line Office Program Managers to discuss pertinent personnel plans, policies and practices to determine its impact on employees.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director, Line Office EEO Program Managers Director, WFMO, Assistant Administrators
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	March 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Adopt regular schedule for meetings with CRO, WFMO, & EEO Program Managers to discuss HR related decisions/ strategies/policies.	February 2017
2) Develop feasible plans to include CRO in the routing of new/revised agency policies or procedures to allow time for analysis and recommendations.	March 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:
Actions #1 & #2 –WFMO and CRO established weekly meetings to discuss & collaborate on pertinent HR-related plans, policies, and practices.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The Civil Rights (CR) Director is not included in the agency's strategic planning, especially the human capital plan, regarding succession planning, training, etc., to ensure that EEO concerns are integrated into the strategic mission.
OBJECTIVE:	Ensure EEO representation on all teams responsible for agency strategic planning.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	DUSO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	March 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Confirm support for CRO representation at strategic planning meetings and inclusion in future discussions.	November 2016
2) Identify officials/team leads for agency strategic planning initiatives.	November 2016
3) CRO will initiate contact with strategic planning officials to clarify role of EEO.	November 2016

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1-3 – CRO maintained a presence at senior level meetings to discuss strategic planning matters.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	Regular EEO updates are not provided to management officials by EEO program officials.
OBJECTIVE:	Provide regular EEO updates to senior officials.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	April 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) The CRO Director will identify EEO program areas requiring regular status updates, and provide data to appropriate officials.	November 2016

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1- CRO developed and presented Model Workplace Briefings for all Line/Staff Office senior officials and provided quarterly updates.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	EEO program officials do not coordinate the development and implementation of EEO plans with all appropriate agency managers, including Agency Counsel, HR Officials, and the Chief Information Officer (CIO).
OBJECTIVE:	Coordinate the development and implementation of EEO plans with counsel, HR Officials, and CIO.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	February 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO will request POC's for Counsel, HR, and CIO.	January 2017
2) The CRO Director will adjust routing/review process to include appropriate officials for EEO plan development and review.	January 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 & #2 – POCs were identified for General Counsel, WFMO, and OCIO to include in the review process of EEO-related plans & policy updates.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN – Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	Time-tables/schedules have not been established for the agency to review for systemic barriers that may be impeding full participation by all groups for: 1) Merit Promotion Program Policy and Procedures 2) Employee Recognition Awards Program and Procedures. 3) Employee Development/Training Programs.
OBJECTIVE:	Regularly review and analyze relevant HR policies and programs.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director WFMO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO & WFMO will develop a plan and schedule for review of pertinent policies.	February 2017
2) CRO will collect and review current policy and program information.	February 2017
3) CRO will regularly analyze relevant data to determine possible barriers.	June 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 - #3 - During FY17, relevant policies were reviewed for possible barriers and quarterly reviews established annually.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	Senior Managers do not meet with and assist CRO Director in the identification of and plans to eliminate barriers that may be impeding the realization of EEO, including the incorporation of EEO action plans into the agency strategic plan.
OBJECTIVE:	Collaborate with managers to identify and address barriers to EEO and develop an EEO Action Plan to be incorporated into the agency strategic plan.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director Line Office Assistant Administrators DUSO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	September 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Create a barrier analysis team that includes CRO, WFMO, EEO Program Managers, and senior officials to identify and create plans to address possible barriers to EEO.	March 2017
2) Collaborate on identified barriers/root causes, and begin implementation of EEO Action Plans; include plans in strategic plan.	September 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 & #2 - CRO developed and presented quarterly Model Workplace Briefings for Line/Staff Offices; identifying triggers to EEO.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	Trend analyses of workforce profiles, major occupations, grade level distribution, compensation and rewards by race, national origin, sex, and disability are not conducted throughout the year.
OBJECTIVE:	Conduct regular analyses of workforce data to identify and remove barriers to employment.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	April 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO will create regular schedule for analysis of data.	February 2017
2) Collect and analyze data to identify triggers and create action plans to address barriers.	April 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Actions #1 & #2 - CRO presented workforce data and discussed plans to address barriers with Line/Staff office senior leaders on a quarterly basis.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN (EEOC Technical Assistance Review) - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency's Anti-harassment policy/program does not process all allegations of harassment and does not include Genetic Information as a protected basis.
OBJECTIVE:	Update the current anti-harassment policy/program to include all forms of harassment (non-EEO) and Genetic Information.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO Director WFMO Director USEC
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	August 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO will develop updated language and route to senior officials (Counsel, WFMO, DUSO) for review and approval.	March 2017
2) Identify and coordinate with DOC officials to incorporate approved language in the DAO-202-955.	April 2017
3) Inform all employees of new policy/program, post on website.	August 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

In FY17, CRO confirmed that NOAA follows guidance from the Department of Commerce DAO-202-955. The Department will update its policy, inform employees and post on the DOC website. NOAA will also post on CRO's webpage.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART H
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Attain the Essential Elements of a Model EEO Program

FY17 – PART H PLAN– (EEOC Technical Assistance Review) - Complete	
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	The agency's Reasonable Accommodation (RA) Program does not have sufficient staffing.
OBJECTIVE:	Establish a plan to ensure sufficient staffing of the RA Program.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	WFMO Director CRO Director DUSO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	June 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) CRO and WFMO will meet to discuss current and future staffing needs.	January 2017
2) Develop plan for additional staffing and present to the DUSO for consideration.	April 2017

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

In FY16, CRO and WFMO Directors met to discuss staffing needs and a possible realignment of the RA Program from WFMO to CRO.

In FY17, WFMO hired an additional FTE to assist the Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator; resulting in two (2) FTEs.

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I *U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier	
FY 2017: PART I PLAN #1 – Updated & Continued	
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?	**Lower Than Expected Participation Rate for Women at the GS-13 and Above Grade Levels.** The participation rate of permanent women at the GS-13 and above is 31.60%, which is lower than the permanent participation rate of 33.16%.
BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	1) Workforce statistics (A4) for grades GS-13 and above were reviewed and analyzed on a basic level. 2) Leadership Competencies Development Program (LCDP) participant data by gender. 3) Table A4 Separations Data. 4) Table A8 New Hires Data.
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.	1) NOAA has a low permanent participation rate (33.16%); which decreases the applicant pool for higher grade female participation.
OBJECTIVE: State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.	1) NOAA needs to increase the female applicant pool at all grade levels. 2) Careful attention must be paid to NOAA Women's outreach, promotion, recruitment, and retention efforts.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	NOAA Hiring Managers; CRO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	March 2012
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	August 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Brief NOAA leadership on the barrier and alternative agency policies, procedures, and practices.	February 2017
2) Establishing Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) within CRO.	March 2017
3) The Civil Rights Office will direct Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPM) to develop plans and actions to address identified barriers.	February 2018
4) Use NOAA's D&I Plan to address any identified barriers.	February 2018
5) CRO and WFMO shall develop a survey for separating employees, to identify possible barriers to retention efforts.	August 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:
Trigger updated to identify permanent participation rate (32.51%) as benchmark. FY17 participation of women increased to 33.16%. The participation of women in GS-13 & Above increased to 31.60% in FY17. 61% of LCDP participants are women. Table A14 separations data show women separating at 33.05% nearly equal to participation rate. Table A7 reveals new hires at 42.51%; below CLF 48.14%.

1) NOAA held a D&I Summit for all employees to explore demographics, unconscious bias, & best practices in maintaining an inclusive environment. 2) Held State of the Agency with LO/Staff AAs/DAAs on workforce data and possible barriers. 3) CRO staff assigned to perform SEPM responsibilities, 4) Finalized & began applying NOAA D&I Implementation Plan.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART I
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier

FY 2017: PART I PLAN #2 – Updated & Continued

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?	**Lower Than Expected Participation Rate for Women in the overall workforce.** The representation of women in the total workforce is 33.32% as compared to the CLF at 48.16%.
BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	1) Table A1 Total Workforce 2) Table A4 Separations Data. 3) Table A8 New Hires Data.
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.	NOAA needs to focus on outreach, recruitment, and retention of women.
OBJECTIVE: State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.	NOAA will focus recruitment and retention efforts for Women.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	NOAA Hiring Managers; WFMO; CRO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	January 2015
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	September 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE :	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Provide NOAA Leadership with briefings and periodic updates.	January 2017
2) CRO will brief Line Offices on low participation of women in major occupations.	March 2017
3) Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPM) will review NOAA recruitment efforts.	February 2018
4) CRO will focus on new hires and retention efforts throughout NOAA.	May 2018
5) SEPM will analyze major occupations and brief CRO leadership.	June 2018
6) Increase use of Pathways Program for hiring.	September 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:
Table A7 reveals new hires at 42.51%; below CLF 48.16%.

1 & 3) CRO staff assigned to perform SEPM responsibilities; 2 & 4) Held State of the Agency and quarterly briefings with LO/Staff AAs/DAAs on workforce data and possible barriers; 5) Continued for FY18.

EEOC FORM
715-01 PART I
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier

FY 2017: PART I PLAN #3 – Continued (EEOC Technical Assistance Review)

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?	**A possible glass ceiling, blocked pipeline, and glass wall barriers for African American and Asian females.** African American and Asian females in the 0482 and 1301 series and senior grade levels were lower than their availability in the Occupational Civilian Labor Force (OCLF).
BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	Reviewed MD-715 Data Tables A4, A6, A7. Further data and analysis required from data tables A11.
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.	Incomplete data tables A11 needed to pinpoint barrier and determine if females are encountering obstacles while moving into senior grade levels.
OBJECTIVE: State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.	The CRO will utilize the Root Cause Analysis Tool to identify the cause of this condition.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	CRO; WFMO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2016
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	September 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE :	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Discuss additional data needs with WFMO contact.	March 2018
2) CRO will analyze data tables and identify team to conduct barrier analysis.	June 2018
3) Develop plan to implement any corrective action.	September 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier	
FY 2017: PART I PLAN 4-Updated & Continued	
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?	**Lower Than Expected Participation Rate for Hispanics.** A review of total workforce data revealed that the representation of Hispanics/Latinos is 3.10%; this rate is 6.86% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 9.96%. The representation of **Hispanic/Latino Males** is 1.89%; this rate is 3.28% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 5.17%. The representation of **Hispanic/Latino Females** is 1.21%; this rate is 3.58% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 4.79%.
BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	Data collection and analysis included a review of tables A1, A4 and A6 to identify occupational series which tend to lead to NOAA's Senior Leadership positions up to SES. This analysis indicated that the top three major occupations that tend to lead to Senior Leadership positions are: 1340 (Meteorologist), 2210 (Information Technology Management) and 0482 (Fishery Biology), which represents 38% of total workforce. These three are also the major occupations for Hispanics/Latinos representing 35% of total Hispanic/Latino workforce at NOAA. Hispanic/Latino representation in the 1340 job series was at 2.378%; this rate is 0.68% above the OCLF of 2.1%; however, Hispanic/Latino representation at the 2210 and 0482 job series was below the expected representation rate when compared to the OCFL. Hispanic/Latino 2210s were at 3.7% which is 3.9% below the OCLF of 7.6% and Hispanic/Latino 0482s were at 2.12% which is 2.38% below the OCLF of 4.5%.

	In FY17, CRO sent a Questionnaire regarding the representation of Hispanics/Latinos within NOAA directly to members of Latinos@NOAA, an employee resource group for Hispanics/Latinos, and the two most common concerns expressed in the feedback received were: 1) the promotion process is not transparent, and 2) the perception is that promotions are given more as the result of personal relationships rather than actual merit. A review of the participants in NOAA's Career Development Program indicated that 3.23% (one out of 31) of the total participants is Hispanic/Latino. Overall, 113 individuals applied for this program; however, there is no demographic data available for these applicants. Further analysis will be conducted during FY18. NOAA currently doesn't have an Agency-wide Mentoring Program. The National Ocean Service, who has a low participation of Hispanics (1.44% vs. 9.96 CLF), launched a Pilot Mentoring Program in November 2016 open to all NOS employees. 42 mentors were selected, but no Hispanics or Latinos applied. Data on mentees will be analyzed for possible barriers in FY18. See enclosure in response to EEOC memorandum dated January 18, 2017 requesting Agencies to conduct a Barrier Analysis on Hispanic or Latino employment at the GS12 to SES levels.
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.	NOAA's recruitment efforts did not focus on Hispanic populations. Possible Glass Ceiling, Pipeline, or even a potential institutional barrier in the Recruitment/Selection Process for NOAA Senior Leadership Positions, which affects the overall representation of Hispanics/Latinos.

OBJECTIVE: State the alterative or revised agency policy, procedure, or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.	Increase participation rate for Hispanics or Latinos at NOAA. Review the Senior Leaders Recruitment and Promotion Process to determine if there are steps in the process that have a direct impact of the selection of Hispanics in Senior Leader positions particularly Females in the GS15 to SES positions.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	NOAA Hiring Officials; CRO; WFMO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	November 2015
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	August 2018

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD OBJECTIVE COMPLETION:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) Brief NOAA leadership on the barrier and alternative agency policies, procedures, and practices.	February 2017
2) The Civil Rights Office will direct Special Emphasis Program Managers (SEPM) to develop plans and actions to address identified barriers.	February 2017
3) Include DOC's Diversity Plan to address any identified barriers.	February 2017
4) Establishing Diversity and Inclusion within CRO.	March 2017
5) CRO and WFMO will develop a survey for separating employees to identify possible barriers to retention.	July 2018
6) Review hiring procedures, and the diversity of panel members and selecting officials to identify any possible barriers for Hispanic Senior Leadership positions in Major Occupations 0482-Fisherby Biologist and 2210 (IT Management).	August 2018

REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE:

Action #1- Held State of the Agency with LO/Staff AAs/DAAs on workforce data and possible barriers.
Action #2- CRO staff assigned to perform SEP responsibilities.
Action #3- Finalized & began applying NOAA D&I Implementation Plan.
Action #4-NOAA held a Diversity Summit for all employees to explore demographics, unconscious bias, & best practices in maintaining an inclusive environment.

During FY17, NOAA participated in five outreach events focusing on the hiring of Hispanics/Latinos to improve the representation and Inclusion of Hispanics/Latinos at NOAA.

Initiated partnership with Latinos@NOAA conducting year around Career Development/Mentoring sessions focusing on the Hispanic population. In FY17 Latinos@NOAA held seven of these sessions with over 350 participants.

Agency: National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Fiscal Year: 2017
RE: EEOC Hispanic Barrier Analysis
Due Date: January 31, 2018

Workforce Analysis

- **Identify triggers and potential barriers to Hispanic/Latino employment at the GS 12-SES levels.[1]**

    - A review of total workforce data revealed that the representation of Hispanics/Latinos is 3.10%; this rate is 6.86% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 9.96%.
    - In FY17, the representation of Hispanics/Latinos increased slightly by 28 employees, an increase of 9% from FY16 (FY17: 354 vs FY16: 326).
    - The representation of Hispanic/Latino Males is 1.89%; this rate is 3.28% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 5.17%.
    - The representation of Hispanic/Latino Females representation is at 1.21%; this rate is 3.58% lower than the expected CLF participation rate of 4.79%.
    - A review of table A4 shows that 73.71% of the total Hispanics/Latinos at NOAA are in grades GS12 and above; of these, 67% are Males and 33% are Females.
    - Although the representation Hispanic/Latino Males at grades GS12 – SES don't show any potential trigger, there's a drastic decrease in the representation of Hispanic/Latino Females in grades GS-15 to SES.
    - In FY17, CRO sent a Questionnaire regarding the representation of Hispanics/Latinos within NOAA directly to members of Latinos@NOAA, an employee resource group for Hispanics/Latinos, and the two most common concerns expressed in the feedback received were: 1) the promotion process is not transparent, and 2) the perception is that promotions are given more as the result of personal relationships rather than actual merit.

  Possible Issues:
  - Glass Ceiling = When a group cannot get promoted into senior leadership positions
  - Blocked Pipeline = When a group cannot get into the feeder pool for higher-graded positions
  - Institutional barriers, to include inconsistencies in the Recruitment/Selection Process for NOAA Senior Leadership Positions, which affects the overall representation of Hispanics/Latinos.

Root Cause Analysis

- **Summarize recruitment outreach events focused on Hispanic/Latino populations.[2]**
    - The Civil Rights Office supported the 2017 Hispanic Employee Resource Group (ERG) 2nd Mini Annual Student Forum and Career Fair with a recruitment booth
    - Latinos@NOAA for the fourth year in a row supported the Smithsonian Latino Center at their event "Descubra! Meet your Science Expert at the National Zoo".

- For the fourth year in a row, Latinos@NOAA held the Hour of Code Program for 4th and 5th graders at Shepherd Elementary School, a school in Washington, DC with a large population of Hispanic students.

- **Applicant flow analysis showing Hispanic/Latino representation at each stage of the recruitment/hiring process (applicant, eligible, qualified, referred) compared to overall agency applicant flow.[3]**

  Analysis was limited to data provided in Table A11. Further analysis must be conducted during FY18.

- **Analysis of hiring of Hispanic/Latinos at the GS-12 through SES levels compared to corresponding Civilian Labor Force (CLF) and agency workforce benchmarks.[4]**

  A review of tables A7 and A11 was conducted focusing on the two major occupations for Hispanics/Latinos that are below the OCLF; 2210 and 0482 job series.

  FY17 A7 Table – New Hires:

  - Overall, 0.38% (15 individuals out of 3,928) of the total Qualified Hispanics/Latinos were hired. However, the total number of individuals selected represents a hiring rate of 7.61% which is 2.36% below the CLF of 9.96%.

  - 2210 Series: 0.19% (One individual out of 521) of the total Qualified Hispanics/Latinos were hired. This represents a hiring rate of 11.11% which is 3.55% above the OCLF of 7.56%; however, in comparison to White hires the hiring rate was drastically low (11% Hispanics/Latinos vs. 78% Whites).

  - 0482 Series: Although 106 Hispanics/Latinos were qualified for 0482 positions, none were selected. The expected representation rate identified by the OCFL for Hispanics/Latinos in the 0482 series is 4.50%.

    Conclusion of A7 table analysis – Indicates possible Glass Ceiling. Hispanics/Latinos are qualifying into the feeder pool; however, they are not getting selected. Further analysis must be conducted during FY18 to review hiring procedures, and the diversity of panel members and selecting officials to identify any possible barriers.

  FY17 A11 Table - Internal Selections to Senior Level Positions

  - No Internal Selections to Senior Level Positions were made during FY17.

    Conclusion of A11 table analysis – Indicates possible Glass Ceiling, Pipeline, or even a potential institutional barrier. Further analysis must be conducted during FY18 to identify those eligible candidates for promotion to a Senior Level Position (if any) and if they were eligible why they were not selected for the next grade.

- **Analysis of promotions and separations (voluntary and involuntary) by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, compared to overall promotions/separations.[5]**

    - Review of FY17 A9 Table – Promotions

        - Data collected only reflected internal competitive promotions for the 1341 (Meteorological Technician) job series which is not one of the major occupations, however, the table indicates that out of the 33 employees qualified, two of them were Hispanics/Latinos but none were selected.

    - Review of FY17 A14 Table – Separations

        - Hispanics/Latinos separated at 3.39% rate which is 0.29% above their overall total workforce representation of 3.10%.
        - 8% of total Hispanics/Latinos separations were involuntary and 92% voluntary; 63% of the total Hispanics/Latinos voluntary separations were due to retirement.
        - Further analysis must be conducted during FY18 to include conducting exit interviews.

- **Analysis of career tracks that lead to SES within the agency.**

    - Data collection and analysis included a review of tables A1, A4 and A6 to identify occupational series which tend to lead to NOAA's Senior Leadership positions up to SES. This analysis indicated that the top three major occupations that tend to lead to Senior Leadership positions are: 1340 (Meteorologist), 2210 (Information Technology Management) and 0482 (Fishery Biology), which represents 38% of total workforce.

- **Analysis of Hispanic/Latino representation at the GS-12 through SES level in the career tracks identified as predominantly leading to SES.**

    - A review of table A6 indicated that the top three major occupations for Hispanics/Latinos that lead to NOAA's Senior Leadership positions up to SES are the same ones mentioned above (1340, 2210 and 0482), which represents 35% of the total Hispanic/Latino workforce at NOAA. Hispanic/Latino representation in the 1340 job series was at 2.378%; this rate is 0.68% above the OCLF of 2.1%; however, Hispanic/Latino representation at the 2210 and 0482 job series was below the expected representation rate when compared to the OCFL. Hispanic/Latino 2210s were at 3.7% which is 3.9% below the OCLF of 7.6% and Hispanic/Latino 0482s were at 2.12% which is 2.38% below the OCLF of 4.5%.

- **Participation in leadership development programs by individuals of Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, compared to overall employee participation.[6]**

    - A review of the participants in NOAA's Career Development Program indicated that 3.23% (one out of 31) of the total participants is Hispanic/Latino. Overall, 113 individuals applied for this program; however, there is no demographic data available for these applicants. Further analysis will be conducted during FY18.

- **Analysis of latest available Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) results relating to employee satisfaction, engagement, and inclusion, by Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, compared to overall employee participation.[7]**

    - A review of FY17 FEVS results revealed that:

        - Only 20% (70 of 354) of the total Hispanic/Latino workforce participated in the FY17 FEVS.
        - The Hispanic/Latino satisfaction rate is 56.4% which is 12.1% below the NOAA satisfaction rate of 68.5%.
        - The Hispanic/Latino engagement rate is 59.7% which is 7.3% below the NOAA engagement of 67.2%.
          The Hispanic/Latino inclusion rate is 54.5% which is 7.5% below the NOAA inclusion rate of 62.2%.

Solution Development

- **Narrative summary of strategies the agency will take to strengthen pipelines and improve retention and upward mobility for Hispanic/Latino employees. These strategies might include targeted outreach, internships, mentoring, rotational assignments, awards/recognitions, and leadership accountability measures.**

    - Ongoing:
        - NOAA will continue its partnership with Latinos@NOAA who sponsors different monthly Hispanic programs and career development events.
        - Continue its partnership with the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), the LULAC Federal Training Institute Partnership (FTIP), the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities (HACU) and the National Council of Hispanic Employment Program Managers.

    - To be implemented:
        - Exit surveys targeting Hispanics/Latinos
        - Conduct surveys, separate from the FEVS, directed only to the Hispanic/Latino community to serve as another method to gather data regarding satisfaction, inclusion, opportunities, promotions, etc.
        - Enhance NOAA's partnership with the University of Puerto Rico and develop relationships with other Hispanic/Latino institutions to promote our Internship Opportunities and other Job Opportunities within NOAA.

Showcase best practices

- **Narrative summary of best practices that show success or improvement in an agency's Hispanic/Latino employment, retention programs, and promotion opportunities.**

    - During FY17, NOAA increased its partnerships with different Organizations and Diversity Councils such as LULAC, FTIP, and NCHEPM focusing on networking, outreach, sharing resources and sharing best practices to help increase the Hispanic/Latino representation within the Agency.
    - Participated in different outreach events targeting the Hispanic/Latino community such as Hispanic Diversity Conferences and Job Fairs at Colleges.

- The Civil Rights Office designated a Staff Member to serve as a Liaison for the Hispanic/Latino workforce and to develop different strategies to improve the representation and Inclusion of Hispanics/Latinos at NOAA.
- The EEO Director meets monthly with the Chair of Latinos@NOAA to discuss upcoming events and discuss different strategies to improve the representation of Hispanics/Latinos at NOAA.
- The EEO Director actively supports Latinos@NOAA events, including sending out Agency-wide Broadcast messages to promote individual events, resulting in more participation during those events.

NOAA has not currently identified any causal relationships between the triggers in its workforce statistics and any specific policies, procedures, or practices. However, the review and analysis of NOAA policies, procedures, and practices is an ongoing process that NOAA will use to identify any potential disparate impacts on particular groups.

[1] Available in Agency MD-715 data table A1
[2] Available in Agency Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) Reports
[3] Available in Agency Applicant Flow Analyses
[4] Available in Agency MD-715 data table A7, A11
[5] Available in agency MD-715 data table A9, A14
[6] Available in agency MD-715 data table A12
[7] Available in agency FEVS results: Employee Satisfaction, Engagement Index, Inclusion Quotient

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I *U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission* FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier	
FY 2017: PART I PLAN-NOAA-Deleted—See Part J	
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?	**Lower Than Expected Participation Rate for Employees with Targeted Disabilities.** The participation rate of NOAA employees with targeted disabilities was 0.73% in FY 2016, substantially below the 2% Federal Goal.
BARRIER ANALYSIS: Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.	NOAA's employees with targeted disabilities have low participation rates at all occupational categories except administrative support.
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.	1) Use of Schedule A hiring authority is limited. 2) NOAA does not regularly encourage individuals with targeted disabilities to identify themselves.
OBJECTIVE: State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.	1) Disabilities Program Manager (DPM) should identify all occupations that qualified individuals with targeted disabilities may apply for. 2) Careful attention must be paid to NOAA individuals with targeted disabilities recruitment and retention efforts. 3) Utilize Schedule A and disabled veteran hiring authority whenever possible.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	DPM, NOAA Managers; CRO
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	January 2012
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	August 2017

PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	**TARGET DATE (Must be specific)**
1) SEPM shall work with DPM to identify occupations that can benefit from hiring individuals with targeted disabilities.	June 2017
2) SEPM shall work with DPM to generate messages to NOAA employees to request they reveal their disability status.	March 2017
3) SEPM shall use the action items from the DOC.	May 2017
4) DPM shall partner with state vocational rehabilitation centers.	June 2017
REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE	

MD-715 – Part J
Special Program Plan for the Recruitment, Hiring, Advancement, and Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals (CRO)

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

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

a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWD)	Yes 0	**No 0**
b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)	**Yes 0**	No 0

a. No. PWD in GS-1 to GS-10 is 19.30%

b. Yes. PWD in GS-11 to SES is 10.46%

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)	Yes 0	**No 0**
b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)	Yes 0	**No 0**

a. No. PWTD in GS-1 to GS-10 is 5.9%.

b. No. PWTD in GS-11 to SES is 2.26%

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

- Held State of the Agency and quarterly briefings with LO/Staff AAs/DAAs on workforce data and possible barriers.
- Conducted briefings on "ABCs of Schedule A Hiring"
- Marketed Workforce Recruitment Program to hiring managers.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Yes 0 No 0

Yes. The agency currently employs a program manager. The program manager provides oversight and advocacy for the program. The agency also employees 35+ human resources specialists who serve as points of contact to hiring managers for questions regarding program use.

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	1		35	Kiana Campbell Disability Program Manager, Human Resources Kiana.D.Campbell@noaa.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1		35	Kiana Campbell Disability Program Manager, Human Resources Kiana.D.Campbell@noaa.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	2			Debbie Ferrera, Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator, WFMO, Debbie.a.ferrera@noaa.gov Carol Martin, HR Specialist, WFMO, carol.martin@noaa.gov
Section 508 Compliance	1			Jennifer Coletta, IT Specialist, OCIO, Jennifer.coletta@noaa.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance				Edward Horton, Chief Administrative Officer, OCAO, Edward.horton@noaa.gov

Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	2		35	Carol Summers, SEPM for PWD/PWTD, Civil Rights Office, carol.l.summers@noaa.gov Kiana Campbell Disability Program Manager, Human Resources Kiana.D.Campbell@noaa.gov

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

Yes 0 No 0

Yes. The disability program manager has received training from several outlets including USDA Graduate School, ASKEARN Training Center, and the Disability Management Employer Coalition. Also, CRO staff will attend EEOC's Disability Program Manager course in FY18.

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Yes 0 No 0

Yes. To ensure the program's success, funding has been designated for outreach and recruitment.

Section III: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICANTS WITH DISABILITIES

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

Currently the Agency uses outreach to vocational rehabilitation centers, veteran organizations, and the resume mining feature from USAJOBS to search for applicants with disabilities. We have also encouraged managers to use the Workforce Recruitment Program database and OPM Bender List to identify applicants to fill positions.

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.**

The Agency encourages managers to use Schedule A to fill vacant positions whenever possible. We have also used the hiring authority for veterans with 30% or more disability rating to fill 13 positions. Our outreach to vocational rehabilitation centers and disabled veterans organizations encourages eligible applicants to make resumes searchable in USAJOBS and to submit resumes to NOAA via a specific email address.

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

If an applicant applies for a position outside of the competitive process, the human resources specialist will review qualifications and eligibility for appointments, i.e. Schedule A documentation. Once an applicant meets both criteria, the specialist will use a secure file to forward the applicant's resume to the hiring manager for review.

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.**

Yes 0 No 0 N/A 0

Yes. The Agency offers bi-monthly in person or webinar training to hiring managers, such as ABC's of Schedule A Hiring. The Agency also provides Schedule A and Veterans Hiring online training to managers.

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.

Currently, the Agency has a representative to visit vocational rehabilitation centers near the headquarters and offer assistance to PWD and PWTD including training on how to understand and apply for federal positions. Beginning Q2 FY18, the agency will increase visibility to targeted areas nationwide.

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)	Yes 0	**No 0**
b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD)	Yes 0	**No 0**

a. No. New hires for PWDs was 20.5%
b. No. New hires for PWTDs was 3.36%

2. **Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below.**

   a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) **Yes 0** No 0
   b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) **Yes 0** No 0

PWD: **IT Management (2210)** is 30.00% of OCLF 42.54%.

PWTD: **Meteorology (1340)** is 1.56% of OCLF 1.94%; **IT Management (2210)** is 0.00% of OCLF 2.55%; **Fishery Biology (0428)** is 0.00% of OCLF 0.99%; **General Physical Science (1301)** is 0.00% of OCLF 1.70%; **Management Program Analysis (0343)** is 0.00% of OCLF 2.09%

3. **Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If "yes", please describe the triggers below.**

   a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Yes 0 No 0
   b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis. Addressing needs through Part J Plan in FY18.

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

   a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Yes 0 No 0
   b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis. Addressing needs through Part J Plan in FY18.

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

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.

1) Initiate Employee Resource Groups meetings to discuss career development program opportunities. **March 2018**

2) Develop & present briefings on Individual Development Plans, Leadership Competencies Development Program (LCDP) & other career development programs. **June 2018**

2) SEPMs shall use the action items from the NOAA D&I Implementation Plan. **September 2018**

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

- **Leadership Competencies Development Program (LCDP)** - a competitive, 18-month program that provides a series of training and developmental experiences for a cadre of NOAA individuals, GS-13-15, who have high potential for assuming leadership responsibilities.
- **The NOAA Leadership Seminar (NLS)** is a 4+ day residential training program for employees from all NOAA Line and Staff Offices, all occupations, from both the field and headquarters.
- **The NOAA Rotational Assignment Program (NRAP)** provides developmental assignments for employees at all grade levels to broaden their skills, gain knowledge, and enhance their personal and professional growth.

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

a. Applicants (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. Selections (PWD)	**<u>Yes 0</u>**	No 0

a. RSNO/D Applicant data was not available in FY 2017.
b. Yes. There were no PWD identified as selectees in the LCDP.

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

a. Applicants (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. Selections (PWTD)	**<u>Yes 0</u>**	No 0

a. RSNO/D Applicant data was not available in FY 2017.
b. Yes. There were no PWTDs identified as selectees in the LCDP.

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)	**Yes 0**	No 0
b.	Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)	**Yes 0**	No 0

a. Yes. In FY17, Cash Awards $501+ for PWD was 9.09% as compared to the inclusion rate of 11.20%.
b. Yes. Time-off Awards (9+ hours) for PWTD was 2.11%, compared to the inclusion rate of 2.57%. Cash Awards at the $100-$500 level for PWTD was 2.30%. Cash Awards for PWTD at the $501+ level was 2.25% .

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

a.	Pay Increases (PWD)	**Yes 0**	No 0
b.	Pay Increases (PWTD)	**Yes 0**	No 0

a. Yes. In FY17, QSIs for PWD was 8.43% compared to the inclusion rate of 11.20%.
b. Yes. QSIs for PWTD was 1.81% compared to the inclusion rate of 2.57%.

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)	Yes 0	No 0	**N/A 0**
b.	Other Types of Recognition (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0	**N/A 0**

N/A

D. Promotions

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

   a. SES

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

   b. Grade GS-15

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

   c. Grade GS-14

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

   d. Grade GS-13

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

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

   a. SES

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

   b. Grade GS-15

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

   c. Grade GS-14

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

   d. Grade GS-13

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

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.**

   a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Yes 0 No 0
   b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Yes 0 No 0
   c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Yes 0 No 0
   d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

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

   a. New Hires to SES (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0
   b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0
   c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0
   d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Yes 0 No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0
c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)	Yes 0	No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0
c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)	Yes 0	No 0

Data not available for analysis in FY17. Addressing needs in FY18.

Section V: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. Voluntary and Involuntary Separations

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

Yes 0 No 0 N/A 0

Yes.

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)	**Yes 0**	**No 0**
b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)	**Yes 0**	**No 0**

a. No
b. No

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)	**Yes 0**	**No 0**
b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)	**Yes 0**	**No 0**

a. No
b. No

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*.**

N/A

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES (OCIO)

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

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

http://www.noaa.gov/accessibility

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.

http://www.noaa.gov/accessibility

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.**

The NOAA Web Committee frequently provides advice and training for individuals across NOAA in the proper development and presentation of accessible electronic information. The Committee has a Section 508 working group that meets monthly with open membership to address specific regulatory requirements and implementation concerns and maintains an internal website which provides training materials, tools and other resource for developers and managers.

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

The average time frame for processing requests is 7.3 days.

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.**

During FY 2017, all new employees received information on the reasonable accommodations program during New Employee Orientation.

RA Webinars are offered quarterly. The webinar is available via Commerce Learning Center (CLC). The webinar was accessed 27 times during the FY.

RA Training was provided to 168 employees of which 16 were managers/supervisors (1.4%).

Accommodations are monitored by the employee and the supervisor through continued on-going communication to ensure the effectiveness of the accommodation.

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

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(5), federal agencies, as an aspect of affirmative action, are required to provide 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.

The PAS policy was developed by the Department of Commerce in FY 2018. No current requests for PAS.

Section VI: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO Complaint data involving Harassment

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

   Yes 0 **No 0** N/A 0

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?**

   Yes 0 No 0 N/A 0

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.**

There were no findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status.

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?**

   Yes 0 **No 0** N/A 0

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?**

   Yes 0 No 0 N/A 0

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.**

Yes. Leave Restored, Accommodation Approved, Personnel File Purged of Adverse Material, Compensatory Damages, Attorney's Fees/Costs.

Section VII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

Element D of MD-715 requires agencies to conduct a barrier analysis when a trigger suggests that a policy, procedure, or practice may be impeding the employment opportunities of a protected EEO group.

1. **Has the agency identified any barriers (policies, procedures, and/or practices) that affect employment opportunities for PWD and/or PWTD?**

   Yes 0 No 0

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

   Yes 0 No 0 N/A 0

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.**

Trigger 1	There were no PWD/PWTD participants in the Leadership Competencies Development Program (LCDP).
Barrier(s)	NOAA does not have a formal plan to ensure advancement opportunities for PWD/PWTD.
Objective(s)	Increase the awareness of career development programs with focused outreach to PWD/PWTD.

Responsible Official(s)	**Performance Standards Address the Plan?** (Yes or No)
CRO, WFMO	Yes

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	**Barrier(s) Identified?** (Yes or No)
Yes	Yes

Sources of Data	**Sources Reviewed?** (Yes or No)	**Identify Information Collected**
Workforce Data Tables	No	
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	N/A	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other (Please Describe)	LCDP Roster	List of participants by RSNO/D

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding** (Yes or No)	**Modified Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Completion Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)
3/2018	Initiate Employee Resource Groups meetings	Yes		
6/2018	Develop & present briefings on LCDP/IDPs & other career development programs	Yes		
9/2018	Track applicants/participants by RSNO/D	Yes		

Fiscal Year	**Accomplishments**

Trigger 2	Cash Awards for PWD at the $501+ level was 9.09% as compared to the inclusion rate of 11.20%.
Barrier(s)	Possible lack of employee/manager awareness of agency Incentive Award Programs.
Objective(s)	Increase employee and manager awareness and use of award programs to incentivize high performance.

Responsible Official(s)	**Performance Standards Address the Plan?** (Yes or No)
WFMO	Yes

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	**Barrier(s) Identified?** (Yes or No)
Yes	No

Sources of Data	**Sources Reviewed?** (Yes or No)	**Identify Information Collected**
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	Table B13
Complaint Data (Trends)	Yes	FY13-17 - Low # of complaints filed based on awards
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	Yes	2016 FEVS-Improvement in areas of rewarding creativity and innovation
Exit Interview Data	N/A	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other (Please Describe)	Yes	Incentive Awards Program Handbook

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding** (Yes or No)	**Modified Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Completion Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)
4/2018	Coordinate with Disability Program Manager to create briefings on Incentive Award Programs	Yes		
8/2018	Hold Lunch & Learn on Incentive Award Program	Yes		

Fiscal Year	**Accomplishments**

Trigger 3	Time-off Awards (9+ hours) for PWTD was 2.11%, compared to the inclusion rate of 2.57%. Cash Awards at the $100-$500 level for PWTD was 2.30%. Cash Awards for PWTD at the $501+ level was 2.25%.
Barrier(s)	Possible lack of employee/manager awareness of agency Incentive Award Programs
Objective(s)	Increase employee and manager awareness and use of award programs to incentivize high performance.

Responsible Official(s)	**Performance Standards Address the Plan?** (Yes or No)
WFMO/CRO	Yes

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	**Barrier(s) Identified?** (Yes or No)
Yes	No

Sources of Data	**Sources Reviewed?** (Yes or No)	**Identify Information Collected**
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	Table B13
Complaint Data (Trends)	Yes	FY13-17 - Low # of complaints filed based on awards
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	2016 FEVS-Improvement in areas of rewarding creativity and innovation
Exit Interview Data	N/A	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other (Incentive Awards Program Handbook)	Yes	The CRO Director is present during Performance Management Awards Committee meetings.

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding** (Yes or No)	**Modified Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Completion Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)
4/2018	Coordinate with Disability Program Manager to create briefings on Incentive Award Programs	Yes		
8/2018	Hold Lunch & Learn on Incentive Award Program	Yes		

Fiscal Year	**Accomplishments**

Trigger 4	Several Mission Critical Occupations with low selection rate vs. qualified among new hires for PWD/PWTD. PWD: MCO **2210** is 30.00% of OCLF 42.54%. PWTD: MCO **1340** is 1.56% of OCLF 1.94%; MCO **2210** is 0.00% of OCLF 2.55%; MCO **0428** is 0.00% of OCLF 0.99%; MCO **1301** is 0.00% of OCLF 1.70%; MCO **0343** is 0.00% of OCLF 2.09%
Barrier(s)	Possible low use of Schedule A hiring authority for MCO positions.
Objective(s)	Increase hiring manager's awareness and use of Schedule A hiring authorities for MCO positions. Conduct more in-depth barrier analysis.

Responsible Official(s)	**Performance Standards Address the Plan?** (Yes or No)
WFMO/CRO	Yes

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	**Barrier(s) Identified?** (Yes or No)
Yes	Yes

Sources of Data	**Sources Reviewed?** (Yes or No)	**Identify Information Collected**
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	Table B7
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	N/A	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other	No	

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding** (Yes or No)	**Modified Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Completion Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)
4/2018	Coordinate with Disability Program Manager to present manager briefings on barriers and various hiring authorities for PWD/PWTD/Veterans.	Yes		
6/2018	Hold Lunch & Learn on hiring authorities for hiring managers.	Yes		

6/2018	Conduct workforce briefings w/senior managers on barriers to seek solutions.	Yes		
7/2018	Conduct in-depth analysis to determine barrier.	Yes		
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishments**			

Trigger 5	Insufficient data on internal PWD/PWTD applicants/selectees by MCO, senior grade levels, and supervisory positions for new hires and promotions.
Barrier(s)	Limited data analysis prevents the identification of triggers and removal of possible barriers to employment and advancement for PWD/PWTD.
Objective(s)	Collect and use all required data to conduct a proper barrier analysis for PWD/PWTD.

Responsible Official(s)	**Performance Standards Address the Plan?** (Yes or No)
WFMO/CRO	Yes

Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	**Barrier(s) Identified?** (Yes or No)
Yes	Yes

Sources of Data	**Sources Reviewed?** (Yes or No)	**Identify Information Collected**
Workforce Data Tables	No	
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	N/A	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)	No	
Other	No	

Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding** (Yes or No)	**Modified Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)	**Completion Date** (mm/dd/yyyy)
5/2018	Conduct meeting with WFMO and CRO to discuss data needs, identify sources, and develop delivery schedule.	Yes		
7/2018	Conduct barrier analysis on identified triggers	Yes		

Fiscal Year	**Accomplishments**

A TABLES ANALYSES

OVERALL NOTES:

Groups, in which the number of people are less than 10, if the benchmark is applied, are too low for a valid evaluation.

TABLE A1: TOTAL WORKFORCE – DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Overall

The total number of employees (permanent and temporary) at NOAA decreased from 11,449 in FY16 to 11,412 in FY17. A net loss of 37 total employees.

Overall, the representation of males in the workforce decreased (-1.27%). Specific decreases included White males (-1.73%) and American Indian/Alaska Native males (-1.69%). Although there were no decreases in the overall representation of females within the total workforce, decreases did occur in the representation of American Indian/Alaska Native females (-17.65%).

However, NOAA did see an increase in its representation of Hispanic males (2.37%), Hispanic females (20%), White females (0.69%), African American males (2.09%), African American females (1.4%), Asian males (0.51%), Asian females (6.52%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males (4%), Two or More Races males (22.22%), and Two or More Races females (8.7%).

Permanent

The total number of permanent employees at NOAA decreased from 11,315 in FY16 to 11,286 in FY17. A net loss of 29 permanent employees.

This represented an overall decrease in representation of males (-1.22%) in NOAA's permanent workforce. Specific decreases to the permanent workforce included White males (-1.68%), Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander females (- 4.55%), American Indian/Alaska Native males (-3.39%), and American Indian/Alaska Native females (-15.15%).

However, within the permanent workforce NOAA did see increases in its representation of Hispanic males (2.38%), Hispanic females (17.39%), White females (0.89%), African American male (2.64%), African American (1.59%), Asian males (0.26%), Asian females (6.67%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males (4%), Two or More Races males (22.22%), and Two or More Races females (8%).

Temporary

The total number of temporary employees decreased from 134 in FY16 to 126 in FY17. This represents a net loss of eight (8) employees in the temporary workforce.

This represented a decrease in the representation of both males (-7.14%) and females (-4.69%) in the temporary workforce. Specific decreases included White males (-7.69%), African American males (-66.67%), White females (-9.43%), African American females (-20%), and American Indian/Alaska Native females (-100%).

Within the temporary workforce, NOAA did experience increases in its representation of Hispanic females (300%), Asian males (100%), Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander females (100%), and American Indian/Alaska Native males (100%).

The following groups are above their participation rate in the CLF:

White males: Total Workforce FY17 57.11% with CLF at 38.33%;
Asian males: Total Workforce FY17 3.43% with CLF at 1.97%;
Asian females: Total Workforce FY17 2.15% with CLF at 1.93%;
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males: Total Workforce FY17 0.23% with CLF at 0.07%;
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females: Total Workforce FY17 0.19% with CLF at 0.07%.

The following groups are below their participation rate in the CLF:

Hispanic males: Total Workforce FY17 1.89% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: Total Workforce FY17 1.21% with CLF at 4.79%;
White females: Total Workforce FY17 24.25% with CLF at 34.03%;
African American males: Total Workforce FY17 3.42% with CLF at 5.49%;
African American females: Total Workforce FY17 5.06% with CLF at 6.53%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: Total Workforce FY17 0.51% with CLF at 0.55%;
American Indian/Alaska Native females: Total Workforce FY17 0.25% with CLF at 0.53%;
Two or More Races males: Total Workforce FY17 0.10% with CLF at 0.26%;
Two or More Races females: Total Workforce FY17 0.22% with CLF at 0.28%;

TABLE A2: TOTAL WORKFORCE (PERMANENT EMPLOYEES ONLY) BY COMPONENT - DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

In FY17, the National Weather Service (NWS) remained the largest Line Office with 4,326 employees, representing 38.33% of the Total NOAA Workforce. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) followed with 2,885 employees, representing 25.56% of the Total NOAA Workforce.

In FY17, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) had the highest number of female employees at 1,250, representing11.08% of the Total NOAA Workforce.

The following groups had lower than expected participation rates when compared to the CLF:

Staff Offices of the Office of the Under Secretary
Hispanic males: 2.04% with CLF of 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 2.30% with CLF of 4.79%;
White males: 25.26% with CLF of 38.33%;
White Females: 30.48% with CLF of 34.03%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males: 0.0% with CLF at 0.07%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: 0.26% with CLF at 0.55%; and
American Indian/Alaska Native females: 0.38% with CLF at 0.53%.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
Hispanic males: 1.66% with CLF at 5.17%;

Hispanic females: 1.21% with CLF at 4.79%;
African American males: 2.01% with CLF at 5.49%
African American females: 3.05% with CLF at 6.53%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: 0.35% with CLF at 0.55%;
American Indian/Alaska Native females: 0.31% with CLF at 0.53%; and
Two or More Race males: 0.10% with CLF at 0.26%.

National Ocean Service (NOS)
Hispanic males: 0.77% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 0.67% with CLF at 4.79%;
White females: 29.86% with CLF at 34.03%;
African American males: 3.54% with CLF at 5.49%;
African American females: 6.12% with CLF at 6.53%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: 0.48% with CLF at 0.55%;
American Indian/Alaska Native females: 0.19% with CLF at 0.53%;
Two or More Races males: 0.10% with CLF at 0.26%; and
Two or More Races females: 0.19 with CLF at 0.28%.

National Weather Service (NWS)
Hispanic males: 2.17% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 01.11% with CLF at 4.79%;
White females: 15.40% with CLF at 34.03%;
African American males: 2.20% with CLF at 5.49%
African American females: 2.13% with CLF at 6.53%;
Asian female: 1.06% with CLF at 1.93%; and
American Indian/Alaska Native females: 0.18% with CLF at 0.53%.

Office of Under Secretary
Hispanic males: 0.44% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 1.77% with CLF at 4.79%;
White males: 35.84% with CLF at 38.33%;
African American males: 3.98% with CLF at 5.49%;
Asian males: 0.44% with CLF at 1.97%;
Asian females: 1.33% with CLF at 1.93%;
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 0.00% with CLF at 0.07%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: 0.44% with CLF at 0.55%
Two or More Races males: 0.00% with CLF at 0.26%; and
Two or More Races females: 0.00% with CLF at 0.28%.

National Environmental Satellite Data and Info Services (NESDIS)
Hispanic males: 2.16% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 0.68% with CLF at 4.79%;
White females: 19.46% with CLF at 34.03%;
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females: 0.0% with CLF at 0.07%;
American Indian/Alaska Native males: 0.27% with CLF at 0.55%;
American Indian/Alaska Native females: 0.14% with CLF at 0.53%;
Two or More Races males: 0.0% with CLF at 0.26%; and
Two or More Races females: 0.27% with CLF at 0.28%.

Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR)
Hispanic males: 2.18% with CLF at 5.17%;
Hispanic females: 2.34% with CLF at 4.79%;
White females: 25.90% with CLF at 34.03%;
African American males: 2.03% with CLF at 5.49%;
African American females: 4.68% with CLF at 6.53%;
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males: 0.0% with CLF at 0.07%;
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females: 0.0% with CLF at 0.07%;
Two or More Races males: 0.0% with CLF at 0.26%; and
Two or More Races females: 0.16% with CLF at 0.28%.

TABLE A3-1: OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES (PERMANENT) - DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Officials and Managers

The **Officials and Managers** job group consisted of 3,669 total employees. Of the 3,669 total employees, there were 2,236 (60.94%) males and 1,433 (39.06%) females.

Of the 2,236 (60.94%) males within the Officials and Managers job group, the breakdown by race/ethnicity and sex was as follows: 1,867 (50.89%) White males; 155 (4.22%) African American males; 109 (2.97%) Asian males; 71 (1.94%) Hispanic males; 17 (0.46%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; 10 (0.27%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 7 (0.19%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 1,433 (39.06%) females within the Officials and Managers job group, the breakdown by race/ethnicity and sex was as follows: 962 (26.22%) White females; 311 (8.48%) African American females; 73 (1.99%) Asian females; 45 (1.23%) Hispanic females; 18 (0.49%) Two or More Races females; 14 (0.38%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; and 10 (0.27%) American Indian/Alaska Native females.

- **Executive/Senior Level (Grades 15 and above)**

  The **Executive/Senior** level (Grades 15 and above) within the Officials and Managers job group consisted of 1269 total employees. Of the 1,269 total employees, there were 884 (69.66%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Executive/Senior level was as follows: 775 (61.073%) White males; 47 (3.7%) Asian males; 34 (2.68%) African American males; 23 (1.81%) Hispanic males; 5 (0.39%) American Indian/Alaska Native; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

  Of the 1,269 total employees represented in the Executive/Senior level grades within the Officials and Managers job group, there were 385 (30.34%) females. The breakdown of the females was as follows: 317 (24.98%) White females; 43 (3.39%) African American females; 14 (1.1%) Asian females; 6 (0.47%) Hispanic females; 3 (0.24%) Two or More Races females; 1 (0.08%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; and 1 (0.08%) American Indian/Alaska Native female.

- **Mid-level (Grades 13-14)**

  The **Mid-level** (Grades 13-14) within the Officials and Managers job group consisted of 583 total employees. Of the 583 total employees, there were 509 (87.31%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Mid-level was as follows: 456 (78.22%) White males; 17 (2.92%) Hispanic males; 17 (2.92%) Asian males; 13 (2.23%) African American males; 3 (0.51%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; 2 (0.34%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 1 (0.17%) Two or More Races male.

  Of the 583 total employees represented in the Mid-level grades within the Officials and Managers job group, there were 74 (12.69%) females. The breakdown of the females was as follows: 59 (10.12%) White females; 4 (0.69%) African American females; 4 (0.69%) Asian females; 3 (0.51%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; 2 (0.34%) Hispanic females; 0 (0%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; and 2 (0.34%) Two or More Races females.

- **First-Level (GS 12 and below)**

  The **First-Level** (GS 12 and below) within the **Officials and Managers** job group consisted of 18 total employees. Of the 18 total employees, there were 12 (66.67%) males. The breakdown of the males in the First-level was as follows: 8 (44.44%) White males; 2 (11.11%) Asian males; 1 (5.56%) African American male; 1 (5.56%) American Indian/Alaska Native; 0 (0%) Hispanic males; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

  Of the 18 total employees represented in the First-Level grades within the Officials and Managers job group, there were 6 (33.33%) females. The breakdown of the females was as follows: 6 (33.33%) White females; 0 (0%) Hispanic females; 0 (0%) African American females; 0 (0%) Asian females; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; 0 (0%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races females.

- **Other Officials and Managers**

  Other Officials and Managers, within the **Officials and Managers** job group consisted of 1,799 total employees. Of the 1,799 total employees, there were 831 (46.19%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Other Officials and Managers category was as follows: 628 (34.91%) White males; 107 (5.95%) African American males; 43 (2.39%) Asian males; 31 (1.72%) Hispanic males; 8 (0.44%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; 8 (0.44%) American Indian/Alaska Native), and 6 (0.33%) Two or More Races males.

  Of the 1,799 total employees represented in the Other Officials and Managers category within the Officials and Managers job group, there were 968 (53.81%) females. The breakdown of the females was as follows: 580 (32.24%) White females; 264 (14.67%) African American females; 55 (3.06%) Asian females; 37 (2.06%) Hispanic females; 12 (0.72%) Two or More Races females; 10 (0.56%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; and 9 (0.5%) American Indian/Alaska Native females.

Professionals

The **Professionals** job group consisted of 6,553 total employees. Of the 6,553 total employees, there were 4,652 (70.99%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Professional job group was as follows: 4,058 (61.93%) White males; 259 (3.95%) Asian males; 173 (2.64%) African American males; 120 (1.83%) Hispanic males; 26 (0.4%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; 13 (0.2%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 3 (0.05%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 6,553 total employees represented in the Professionals job group, there were 1,901 (29.01%) females. The breakdown of females was a follows: 1,717 (23.15%) White females; 150 (2.29%) African American females; 139 (2.12%) Asian females; 67 (1.02%) Hispanic females; 15 (0.23%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; 7 (0.11%) Two or More Races females; and 6 (0.09%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females.

Technicians

The **Technicians** job group consisted of 571 total employees. Of the 571 total employees, there were 532 (93.17%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Technician job group was as follows: 452 (79.16%) White males; 40 (7.01%) African American males; 16 (2.8%) Hispanic males; 10 (1.75%) Asian males; 11 (1.93%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; 3 (0.53%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 571 total employees represented in the Technician job group, there were 39 (6.83%) females. The breakdown of the females within the Technicians job group was as follows: 23 (4.03%) White females; 10 (1.75%) African American females; 3 (0.53%) Hispanic females; 3 (0.53%) Asian females; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; 0 (0.53%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races females.

Sales Workers

NOAA had no employees in this position category during FY17.

Administrative Support Workers

The **Administrative Support Workers** job group consisted of 500 total employees. Of the 500 total employees, there were 94 (18.8%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Administrative Support Workers job group was as follows: 66 (13.2%) White males; 17 (3.4%) African American males; 6 (1.2%) Asian males; 4 (0.8%) Hispanic males; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; 1 (0.2%) American Indian/Alaska Native male; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 500 total employees represented in the Administrative Support Workers job group, there were 406 (81.2%) females. The breakdown of the females in the Administrative Support Workers job group was as follows: 252 (50.4%) White females; 105 (21%) African American females; 22 (4.4%) Hispanic females; 22 (4.4%) Asian females; 3 (0.6%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; 2 (0.4%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races females

Craft Workers

The **Craft Workers** job group consists of 30 total employees. Of the 30 total employees, there were 30 (100%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Craft Workers job group was as follows: 23 (76.67%) White males; 3 (10%) African American males; 2 (6.67%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; 1 (3.33%) Hispanic male; 1 (3.33%) Asian male; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 30 total employees represented in the Craft Workers job group, there were 0 (0%) females.

Operatives

The **Operatives** job group consisted of 10 total employees. Of the 10 total employees, there were 10 (100%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Operatives job group was as follows: 6 (60%) White males; 2 (20%) Asian males; 1 (10%) Hispanic male; 1 (10%) African American male; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; 0 (0%) American Indian/Alaska Native males; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races males.

Of the 10 total employees represented the Operatives job group, there were 0 (0%) females.

Laborers and Helpers

NOAA had no employees in this position category during FY17.

Service Workers

The **Service Workers** job group consisted of 79 total employees. Of the 79 total employees, there were 55 (69.62%) males. The breakdown of the males in the Service Workers job group was as follows: 45 (56.96%) White males; 4 (5.06%) Asian males; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander males; 3 (3.8%) Hispanic males; 1 (1.27%) African American male; 1 (1.27%) American Indian/Alaska Native male; and 1 (1.27%) Two or More Races male.

Of the 79 total employees represented in the Service Workers job group, there were 24 (30.38%) females. The breakdown of the females in the Technicians job group was as follows: 13 (16.46%) White females; 8 (10.13%) Asian females; 2 (2.53%) African American females; 1 (1.19%) Hispanic female; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; 0 (0%) American Indian/Alaska Native females; and 0 (0%) Two or More Races females.

TABLE A4-1: (PERMANENT) PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GS GRADES AND CAPS BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

There are no employees within the permanent workforce employed at the GS-01 and GS-02 pay grades during FY17.

GS-03: There was one (1) White female (100%) employee at this pay grade,

GS-04: There were 10 employees at this pay grade, five (5) males (50%), and five (5) females (50%).

- Of the five (5) male employees within this pay grade, all 5 were White (100%).

- Of the five (5) female employees within this pay grade, two (2) were Hispanic (20%); two (2) were White (20%); and one (1) was African American (10%).

GS-05: There were 54 employees at this pay grade, 37 males (68.52%) and 17 females (31.48%).

- Of the 37 male employees within this pay grade, 33 were White (61.11%); two (2) were Hispanic (3.7%); one (1) was African American (1.85%); and one (1) was Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (1.85%).

- Of the 17 female employees within this pay grade, 11 were White (20.37%); five (5) were Hispanic (9.26%); and 1 was Asian (1.85%).

GS-06: There were 61 employees at this pay grade, 39 males (63.93%) and 22 females (36.07%).

- Of the 39 male employees within this pay grade, 22 were White (36.07%); 13 were African American (21.31%); two (2) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (3.28%); 1 was Asian (1.64%); and one (1) was Hispanic (1.6%).

- Of the 22 females within this pay grade, 12 (19.67%) are White; 9 (14.75%) are African American; and 1 (1.64%) is American Indian/Alaska Native.

GS-07: There were 191 employees at this pay grade, 126 males (65.97%) and 65 females (34.03%).

- Of the 126 male employees within this pay grade, 88 were White (46.07%); 20 were African American (10.47%); 10 were Asian (5.24%); four (4) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (2.09%); three (3) were Hispanic (1.57%); and one (1) was Two or More Races (0.52%).

- Of the 4565 female employees within this grade, 48 were White females (25.13%); 10 were African American females (5.24%); five (5) were Hispanic (2.38%); one (1) was Asian (0.52%); and one (1) was Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.52%).

GS-08: There were 241 employees at this pay grade, 78 males (32.37%) and 163 females (67.63%).

- Of the 78 male employees within this pay grade, 68 were White males (28.22%); five (5) were African American (2.07%); and three (3) were Asian (1.24%); and two (2) were Hispanic (0.83%).

- Of the 163 female employees within this pay grade, 113 were White (46.89%); 30 were African American (12.45%); 11 were Hispanic (4.56%); three (3) were Asian (3.32%); and one (1) was Two or More Races (0.41%).

GS-09: There were 219 employees at this pay grade, 128 males (58.45%) and 91 females (41.55%).

- Of the 128 male employees within this pay grade, 99 were White (45.21%); 17 were African American (7.76%); 7 (3.2%) were Asian, three (3) were Hispanic (1.37%); one (1) was a Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.46%), and one (1) was an American Indian/Alaska Native (0.46%).

- Of the 91 female employees within this pay grade, 59 were White (26.94%); 20 were African American (9.13%); seven (7) were Asian (3.2%); two (2) were Hispanic (0.91%); two (2) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.91%); and one (1) was a Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.46%).

GS-10: There were 171 employees at this pay grade, 98 males (57.31%) and 73 females (42.69%).

- Of the 98 male employees within this pay grade, 77 were White (45.03%); 8 were African American (4.68%); six (6) were Hispanic (3.51%); four (4) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (2.34%); two (2) were Asian (1.17%); and one (1) was an American Indian/Alaska Native (0.58%).

- Of the 73 females within this pay grade, 50 were White females (29.24%); three (3) were Hispanic (1.75%); two (2) were Asian females (3.08%); and one (1) was an African American female (1.54%).

GS-11: There were 1,014 employees at this pay grade, 687 males (67.75%) and 327 females (32.25%).

- Of the 687 male employees within this grade, 572 were White (56.41%); 48 were African American (4.73%); 25 were Hispanic (2.47%); 24 were Asian(2.37%); 12 were American Indian/Alaska Natives (1.18%); and six (6) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.59%).

- Of the 327 female employees within this pay grade, 202 were White (19.92%); 74 were African American (7.3%); 26 were Asian (2.56%); 22 were Hispanic (2.17%); two (2) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.2%); and one (1) was a Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.1%).

GS-12: There were 1,828 employees at this pay grade, 1,214 males (66.41%) and 614 females (33.59%).

- Of the 1214 male employees within this pay grade, 1,057 were White (57.82%); 56 were African American (3.06%); 47 were Asian (2.57%); 37 were Hispanic (2.02%); and eight (8) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.44%); five (5) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (0.27%); and four (4) were Two or More Races (0.22%).

- Of the 614 females within this pay grade, 462 were White (25.27%); 86 were African American (4.7%); 33 were Asian females (1.81%); 19 were Hispanic (1.04%); seven (7)

were American Indian/Alaska Native females (0.38%); five (5) (0.27%) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females; and four (4) were Two or More Races (0.22).

GS-13: There were 2,206 employees at this pay grade, 1,679 males (76.11%) and 527 females (23.89%).

- Of the 1,679 male employees within this pay grade, 1,488 were White (67.5%); 82 were Asian (3.72%); 59 were African America (2.67%); 37 were Hispanic (1.68%); eight (8) were American Indian/Alaska Natives (0.36%); three (3) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (0.14%); and three (3) were Two or More Races (0.14).

- Of the 527 females within this pay grade, 396 were White (17.95%); 70 were African American (3.17%); 35 were Asian (1.59%); 17 were Hispanic (0.77%); four (4) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.18%); three (3) were Two or More Races (0.14%); and two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.09%).

GS-14: There are 2,087 employees at this pay grade, 1,322 males (63.34%) and 765 females (36.66%).

- Of the 1,322 male employees within this pay grade, 1,149 were White (55.06%); 62 were Asian (2.97%); 60 were African American (2.87%); 39 were Hispanic (1.87%); eight (8) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.38%); two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.1%); and two (2) are Two or More Races (0.1%).

- Of the 765 females within this pay grade, 570 were White (27.31%); 101 were African American (4.84%); 49 were Asian (2.35%); 26 were Hispanic (1.25%); eight (8) were Two or More Races (0.38%); seven (7) were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0.34%); and four (4) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.19%).

GS-15: There were 1,047 employees at this pay grade, 639 males (61.03%) and 408 females (38.97%).

- Of the 639 male employees within this pay grade, 545 were White (52.05%); 39 were Asian (3.72%); 25 were Hispanic (2.39%); 24 were African American (2.29%); two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.19%); and one (1) was Two or More Races (0.1%).

- Of the 408 females within this pay grade, 288 were White (27.51%); 62 were African American (5.92%); 37 were Asian (3.53%); eight (8) were Hispanic (0.76%); eight (8) were Two or More Races (0.76%); four (4) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.38%); and one (1) was a Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.1%).

SES: There were 106 employees at this pay grade, 85 males (80.91%) and 21 females (19.81%).

- Of the 85 male employees within this pay grade, 78 were White (73.58%); 4 were Asian (3.77%); two (2) were African American males (1.89%); and one (1) was Hispanic (0.94%).

- Of the 21 female employees within this pay grade, 19 were White (17.92%); one (1) was Hispanic (0.94%); and one (1) was African American (0.94%);

OTHER SENIOR PAY (NON-SES): There were 2,050 employees at this pay grade, 1,407 males (68.63%) and 643 females (31.37%).

- Of the 1,407 male employees within this pay grade, 1,176 were White (57.37%); 108 were Asian (5.27%); 76 were African American (3.71%); 34 were Hispanic (1.66%); 10 were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.49%); two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.10%); and one (1) was Two or More Races (0.05%).

- Of the 643 female employees within this pay grade, 486 were White (23.71%); 98 were African American (4.78%); 38 were Asian (1.85%); 14 were Hispanic (0.68%); four (4) were Two or More Races (0.20%); two (2) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.10%); and one (1) was Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.05%).

TABLE A5-1: (PERMANENT) WAGE GRADE PARTICIPATION RATES BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

There were no employees within the permanent workforce employed at the WG-01 through WG-04, WG-07, or WG-12 through WG-15 pay grades during FY17.

WG-05: There were three (3) male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- Of the three (3) male employees within this pay grade, two (2) were white (66.67%), and one (1) was Asian (33.33%).

WG-06: There were nine (9) male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- Of the nine (9) male employees within this pay grade, six (6) were White (66.67%); one (1) was Hispanic (11.11%); one (1) was African American (11.11%) ; and one (1) was Asian (11.11%).

WG-08: There were four (4) male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- Of the four (4) male employees within this pay grade, three (3) were White (75%) and one (1) was African American (25%).

WG-09: There were 10 male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- Of the 10 male employees within this pay grade, seven (7) were White (70%); two (2) were African American (20%); and one (1) was American Indian/Alaska Native (10%).

WG-10: There were 11 male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- Of the 11 male employees within this pay grade, eight (8) were White males (72.73%); one (1) was Hispanic (9.09%); one (1) was Asian (9.09%); and one (1) was American Indian/Alaska Native (9.09%).

WG-11: There were three (3) male (100%) employees at this pay grade.

- All three (3) male employees within this pay grade were White males (100.00%).

TABLE A6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS (PERMANENT) BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Overall Note: The following Major Occupations are the most populous occupations employed at NOAA: 1) Meteorology (1340); 2) Information Technology Management (2210); 3) Fishery Biology (0482); 4) General Physical Science (1301); and 5) Management Analyst (0343).

1) Meteorology (1340):

In FY17, this was NOAA's highest employed major occupation with 2,484 employees. There were 2,100 males (84.54%) and 384 females (15.46%). Of those employees, the following had a participation rate less than their respective CLF: White females (329, 13.24%) with CLF at 16.2%; African American males (30, 1.21%) with CLF at 2.4%; African American females (11, 0.44%) with CLF at 1.5%; American Indian/Alaska Native (nine (9), 0.36%) with CLF at 1%; and Two or More Races (one (1), 0.04%) with CLF at 0.5%.

2) Information Technology Management (2210):

In FY17, this occupation included 1,027 employees. There were 829 males (80.72%) and 198 females (19.28%). Of those represented, the following had a participation rate less than their perspective CLF: White females (114, 11.1%) with CLF at 20.9%; African American females (37, 3.6%) with CLF at 4.5%; American Indian/Alaska Native females (one (1), 0.1%) with CLF at 0.3%; and Two or More Races (0, 0%) with CLF 0.3%.

3) Fishery Biology (0482):

In FY17, this occupation included 850 employees. There were 518 males (60.94%) and 332 females (39.06%). Of those represented, the following had a participation rate less than their perspective CLF: Hispanic males (14, 1.65%) with CLF at 2.4%, Hispanic females (four (4), 0.47%) with CLF at 2.1%, White females (307, 36.12%) with CLF at 39.5, African American males (seven (7), 0.82%) with a CLF at 1.4%, African American females (eight (8), 0.94%) with a CLF at 1.60%, Asian males (19, 2.24%) with CLF 3.2%, Asian Females (eight (8), 0.94%) with a CLF at 4.1%, and Two or More Races males (0, 0%) with CLF at 0.2% and Two or More Races females (0, 0%) with CLF at 0.1%.

4) General Physical Science (1301):

In FY17, this occupation included 679 employees. There were 506 Males (74.52%) and 173 females (25.48%). Of those represented, the following had a participation rate less than their perspective CLF: Hispanic males (12, 1.77%) with CLF at 2.3%, Hispanic females (four (4), 0.59%) with CLF at 1.9%, White females (145, 21.35%) with CLF at 27.8%, African American females (10, 1.47%) with CLF at 2.2%, Asian males (55, 8.1%) with CLF at 8.2%, Asian females (14, 2.06%) with CLF at 6.7%, American Indian/Alaska Native females (0, 0%) with CLF at 0.2% and Two or More Races females (0, 0%) with CLF at 0.2%.

5) Management Program Analysis (0343):

In FY17, this occupation included 596 employees. There were 199 males (33.39%) and 397 females (66.61%). Of those represented, the following had a participation rate less than their perspective CLF: Hispanic males (eight (8), 1.34%) with CLF at 2.4%, White males (156, 26.17%) with CLF at 49%, Asian males (eight (8), 1.34%) with CLF at 3.4%, Asian females (14, 2.35%) with CLF at 2.5%, American Indian/Alaska Native males (one (1), 0.17%) with CLF at 0.4%, and American Indian/Alaska Native females (two (2), 0.34%) with CLF at 0.4.

TABLE A7: APPLICANT FLOW DATA FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS – DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

1) Meteorology (1340):

In FY17, there were 3,735 applicants, of which 2,926 self-identified their race/ethnicity and sex. Of the 2,926 who self-identified, 2,350 (1,874 males and 476 females) qualified for the position. Of the 2,350 applicants who qualified, 31 males and 18 females were selected. Males were selected at 63.27%, 17.43% below the OCLF of 80.80%, and females were selected at 36.73%, 17.43% above the OCLF of 19.30%.

In addition, of the 49 new hires: 28 were White males (57.14%), 17.26%, below OCLF of 74.40%; 16 White females (32.65%), 16.45% above the OCLF of 16.20%; one (1) African American male (2.04%), 0.36% below the OCLF of 2.40%; and one (1) Asian male (2.04%), 0.94% above the OCLF of 1.10%.

2) Information Technology Management (2210):

In FY17, there were 8,037 applicants, of which 6,301 self-identified their race/ethnicity and sex. Of the 6,301 who self-identified, 4,021 (3,368 males and 653 females) qualified for the position. Of the 4,021 applicants who qualified, nine (9) (seven (7) males and two (2) females) were selected. Males were selected at 77.78%, 7.42% above the OCLF of 70.36%, and females were selected at 22.22%, 7.42% below the OCLF of 29.64%.

In addition, of the nine (9) new hires: six (6) were White males (66.67%), 14.46%, above OCLF of 52.21%; one (1) was a White female (11.11%), 9.78% below the OCLF of 20.89%; one (1) was a African American female (11.11%), 7.11% above the OCLF of 4.0%; and one (1) was a Hispanic male (11.11%), 5.72% above the OCLF of 5.39%.

3) Fishery Biologist (0482):

In FY17, there were 2,413 applicants, of which 1,939 self-identified their race/ethnicity and sex. Of the 1,939 who self-identified, 1,374 (698 males and 676 females) qualified for the position. Of the 1,374 applicants who qualified, five (5) (three (3) males and (2) females) were selected. The males were selected at 60.00%, 8.00% above the OCLF of 52.00%, whereas, females were selected at 40.00%, 8.00% below the OCLF of 48.00%.

In addition, of the five (5) new hires: two (2) were White males (40.00%), 4.30%, below the OCLF of 44.30%; one (1) was a White female (20.00%), 19.50% below the OCLF of 39.50%;

one (1) was an Asian male (20.00%), 16.80% above the OCLF of 3.20%; and one (1) American Indian/Alaska Native female (20.00%), 19.60% above the OCLF of 0.40%.

4) General Physical Science (1301):

In FY17, there were 3,052 applicants, of which 2,369 self-identified their race/ethnicity and sex. Of the 2,369 who self-identified, 1,666 (1199 males and 467 females) qualified for the position. Of the 1,666 applicants who qualified, 10 (eight (8) males and two (2) females) were selected. Males were selected at 80.00%, 19.11% above the OCLF of 60.89%, whereas, females were selected at 20.00%, 19.11% below the OCLF of 39.11%.

In addition, of the 10 new hires: five (5) (50.00%) were White males, 1.86% above the OCLF of 48.14%; two (2) were Hispanic males (20.00%), 17.64%, above the OCLF of 2.36%; two (2) were White females (20.00%), 7.82% below the OCLF of 27.82%; and one (1) was an Asian male (10.00%), 1.8% above the OCLF of 8.20%.

5) Management Analyst (0343):

In FY17, there were 7,602 applicants, of which 5,456 self-identified their race/ethnicity and sex. Of the 5,456 who self-identified, 3,911 (1,674 males and 2,237 females) qualified for the position. Of the 3,911 applicants who qualified, five (5) (one (1) male and four (4) females) were selected. Males were selected at 20.00%, 38.45% below the CLF of 58.45%, whereas, females were selected at 80.00%, 38.45% above the CLF of 41.55%.

In addition, of the five (5) new hires: two (2) (40.00%) were White females, 7.44% above the CLF of 32.56%; one (1) was a White male (20.00%), 29.01% below CLF 49.01%; one (1) was an African American female (20.00%), 16.20% above the CLF of 3.80%; and one (1) was a Two or More Races female (20.00%), 4.00% below the CLF of 24.00%.

TABLE A8: NEW HIRES BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT – DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Permanent Hires

In FY17, there were 668 total permanent new hires. Males represented 384 (57.49%), 5.63% above CLF of 51.86% and females represented 284 (42.51%), 5.63 below CLF of 48.14%, of all permanent new hires.

- White males represented the highest number of new hires at 290 (43.41%), 5.08% above the CLF of 38.33%. In addition, the following males were hired: 43 African American males (6.44%); 0.95% above the CLF of 5.49%; 23 Hispanic males (3.44%), 1.73% below CLF of 5.17%; 21 Asian males (3.14%), 1.17% above the CLF of 1.97%; four (4) American Indian/Alaska Native males (0.6%), 0.05% above the CLF of 0.55%; two (2) Two or More Races males (0.6%), 0.32% above the CLF of 0.28% and one (1) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander male (0.15%), 0.08% above the CLF of 0.07%.

- White females represented the second highest group of new hires at 190 (28.44%), 5.59% below the CLF of 34.03%. In addition, the following females were hired: 24 Hispanic females (3.59%), 1.20% below the CLF of 4.79%, 45 African American females

(6.74%), 0.21% above the CLF of 6.53%; 21 Asian females (3.14%), 1.21% above the CLF of 1.93%; three (3) American Indian/Alaska Native females (0.45%), 0.08% below the CLF of 0.53%; and one (1) Two or More Races females (0.15%), 0.13% below the CLF of 0.28%.

Temporary Hires

In FY17, there were 47 total temporary new hires. Of those, 21 males (44.68%) were hired, 7.18% below the CLF of 51.86%, and 26 females (55.32%) were hired, 7.18% above CLF of 48.14%.

- White males represented the highest number of new temporary at 16 (34.04%), 4.29% below the CLF of 38.33%. In addition, the following males were hired: 1 Hispanic male (2.13%); 3.04% below the CLF of 5.17%, one (1) African American male (2.13%); 3.36% below the CLF of 5.49%; two (2) Asian males (4.26%), 2.29% above the CLF of 1.97%; and one (1) American Indian/Alaska Native male (2.13%), 1.58% above the CLF of 0.55%.

- White females represented the second highest number of new temporary hires at 13 (27.66%), 6.37% below the CLF of 34.03%. In addition, the following females were hired: five (5) African American females (10.64%), 4.11% above the CLF of 6.53%; one (1) Asian female (2.13%), 0.2% above the CLF of 1.93%; one (1) Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander females (2.13%), 2.06% above the CLF of (0.07%).

Table A9: SELECTION FOR INTERNAL COMPETITION PROMOTION FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX:

Data was not available in FY17. Will address data needs in FY18.

Table A10: ALL NON-COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS – TIME IN GRADE - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Gender:

In FY17, there were 1,528 employees eligible for career ladder promotions, 890 males (58.25%) and 638 females (41.75%).

- Of the 890 males, 744 were White (48.69%); 55 were African American (3.6%); 58 were Asian (3.8%); 17 were Hispanic (1.11%); nine (9) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.59%); four (4) were Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander (0.26%); and three (3) were Two or More races (0.2%).

- Of the 638 females, 468 were White (30.63%); 90 were African American (5.89%); 37 were Hispanic (2.42%); 37 were Asian (2.42%); two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.13%); and four (4) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.26%).

Of the 1,528 eligible employees, 1,407 employees who were promoted, 830 males (58.99%) and 577 females (41.01%), and had been in their pay grades for the minimum amount of time, plus one to 12 months.

- Of the 830 males, 696 were White (49.47%); 56 were Asian (3.98%); 49 were African American (3.48%); 16 were Hispanic (1.14%); eight (8) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.57%); three (3) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.21%); and two (2) were Two or More Races (0.14%).

- Of the 577 females, 31 were Hispanic (2.2%); 418 were White (29.71%); 86 were African American (6.11%); 37 were Asian (2.63%); two (2) were Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (0.14%); three (3) were American Indian/Alaska Native (0.21%).

Of the 1,528 eligible employees, five (5) employees who were promoted, two (2) males (40%) and three (3) females (60%), had been in their pay grades for the minimum amount of time, plus 13 to 24 months.

- Of the two (2) males both were White (40%).

- Of the three (3) females, two (2) were White (40%); and one (1) was African American (20%).

Of the 1,528 eligible employees, 15 employees who were promoted, six (6) males (40%) and nine (9) females (60%), had been in their pay grades for the minimum amount of time, plus 25+ months.

- Of the six (6) males, five (5) were White (33.33%) and one (1) was Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander (6.67%).

- Of the nine (9) females, one (1) was Hispanic (6.67%), eight (8) were White (53.3%), and one (1) was Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (6.67%).

Table A11: INTERNAL SELECTIONS FOR SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS (GS 13/14, GS15, AND SES- Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Gender:

Data was not available in FY17. Will address data needs in FY18.

Table A12: PARTICIPATION IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT- Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Gender:

There were no career development program meeting the definition outlined in EEOC guidelines.

Table A13: EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION AND AWARDS – Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Cash Awards $500 and Under:

During FY17, 3,044 cash awards were distributed to employees totaling $1,093,572.31. From this amount males received $762,971.05 (71.35%) and females received $330,601.26 (28.65%).

The average cash award provided to the total workforce was $359. Males averaged $351 and females averaged $379. All EEO-groups except Hispanic males ($344), Hispanic females ($304), White males ($349), Asian males ($358), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders males

($318), American Indian/Alaska Native females ($319), and Two or More Races males ($321) were equal to or greater than the average of the Total Workforce.

Cash Awards $500+:

In FY17, 9,709 awards were distributed totaling $14,731,087.02. From this amount males received $9,787,169.84 (65.94%) and females received $4,943,917.18 (34.06%).

The average cash award provided of the total workforce was $1,517. Males averaged $1,528 and females averaged $1,494. All EEO-groups except Hispanic males ($1,443), Hispanic females ($1,383), African American females ($1,388), Asian females ($1,270), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders males ($1,303), American Indian/Alaska Native males ($1,276), American Indian/Alaska Native females ($1,254), Two or More Races males ($1,253), and Two or More Races females ($1,485) were equal to or greater than the average of the Total Workforce.

Quality Step Increases (QSI):

In FY17, 166 awards were distributed totaling $398,498. Males received $281,784 (70.48%) and females received $116,714 (29.52%).

The average QSI to the total workforce was $2,400, with males averaging $2,408 and females averaging $2,381.

All EEO-groups except African American females ($1,696), Asian females ($1,596), American Indian/Alaska Native males ($1,899), and American Indian/Alaska Native females ($2,070) were equal to or greater than the average of the total workforce.

Time-Off Awards 1-9 hours:

In FY17, 894 employees received Time-off awards (6,152 total hours). Of this, 594 were males (66.44%) and 300 were females (33.56%).

The average to the total workforce was 6.88 hours. All EEO Categories received Time-off awards at rates equal to or above the average awarded except White males (6.75 hours), Asian females (6.28 hours); American Indian/Alaska Native males (6.6 hours); and Two or More Races males (4 hours).

Time-Off Awards 9+ hours:

In FY17, 758 employees received Time-off awards (18,518 total hours). Of this total 403 were males (53.17%) and 355 were females (46.83%).

The average to the total workforce was 24.4 hours. All EEO Categories received Time-off awards at rates equal to or above the average except White females (23.8 hours); African American females (23.8 hours); Asian males (23.3 hours), and American Indian/Alaska Native females (21.6 hours).

TABLE A14: PERMANENT SEPARATIONS BY TYPE OF SEPARATION – DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Total Separations:

In FY17, there were 708 total separations. A total of 474 males (66.95%) were separated compared to the total male workforce of 7,544 (66.84%); and a total of 234 females (33.05%) were separated compared to total female workforce of 3,742 (33.16%).

Hispanic males separated at a rate higher than their representation in the total workforce. The separation rate for Hispanic males from the Agency in FY17 was 2.54% (18 employees) compared to their overall representation in the workforce of 1.91% (215 employees). The separation rate for African American males was 4.52% (32 employees) compared to a 3.45% representation (389 employees), the separation rate for African American females was 5.93% (42 employees) compared to a 5.09% representation (574 employees) in the workforce, the separation rate for American Indian/Alaska Native males was 1.13% (eight (8) employees) compared to a 0.51% representation (57 employees), and the separation rate for American Indian/Alaska Native males was 0.85% (six (6) employees) compared to a 0.25% workforce representation (28 employees).

Voluntary Separations:

There were 685 total voluntary separations. The separation rate for males was 66.57% (456 employees) compared to the total male representation in the workforce of 66.84% (7,544 employees). The separation for females was 33.43% (229 employees) compared to their total representation in the workforce at 33.16% (3,742 employees).

Hispanic males separated at a rate higher than their representation in the total workforce at 2.34% (16 employees) compared to a 1.91% representation rate (215 employees), the rate of separation for African American males was 4.09% (28 employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 3.45% (389 employees), the rate of separation for African American females was 5.84% (40 employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 5.09% (574 employees), the rate of separation for American Indian/Alaska Native males was 1.17% (eight (8) employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 0.51% (57 employees), and the rate of separation for American Indian/Alaska Native females 0.88% (6 employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 0.25% (28 employees).

Involuntary Separations:

There were 23 total involuntary separations. The separation rate for males was 78.26% (18 employees) compared to the total male representation in the workforce of 66.84% (7,544 employees). The separation rate for females 21.74% (five (5) employees) compared to their total representation in the workforce at 33.16% (3,742 employees).

Hispanic males separated at a rate higher than the total workforce at 8.7% (two (2) employees) compared to a 1.91% representation rate (215 employees), African American males separated at a rate of 17.39% (four (4) employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 3.45% (389 employees), African American females separated at a rate of 8.7% (two (2) employees) compared to a workforce representation rate of 5.09% (574

employees), and Asian males separated at a rate of 4.35% (one (1) employee) compared to a workforce representation rate of 3.45% (389 employees).

B TABLES ANALYSES

OVERALL NOTES:

NOAA has adopted the Federal Goal of 2% for hiring persons with targeted disabilities, and therefore is using that figure as the benchmark for comparison.

TABLE B1 TOTAL WORKFORCE – DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY

In FY17, there were 11,412 total employees; an overall decrease of 37 individuals. During this same period, the total number of employees with disabilities increased by 40 from 924 (8.07%) to 964 (8.45%); and the number of individuals with targeted disabilities increased by 19 from 274 (2.39%) to 293 (2.57%). The participation rate of NOAA employees with targeted disabilities is 2.57%, which is above the EEOC Federal Goal of 2.00%.

The following Targeted Disabilities saw an increase in representation: Traumatic Brain Injury increased by one (1), from 0 (00%) to one (1) (0.34%); Deaf/Difficulty Hearing increased by 10, from 126 (45.99%) to 136 (46.42%); Missing Extremities increased by one (1), from five (5) (1.82%) to six (6) (2.05%); Significant Mobility Impairment increased by six (6), from 21 (7.66%) to 27 (9.22%); Intellectual Disability increased by one (1), from one (1) (0.36%) to two (2) (0.68%); Epilepsy/Other Seizure Disorders increased by two (2), from 11 (4.01%) to 13 (4.44%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder increased by two (2), from 33 (12.04%) to 35 (11.95%)

The following Targeted Disabilities had a decrease in representation: Partial/Complete Paralysis decreased by two (2), from 23 employees (8.39%) to 21 employees (7.17%) and Significant Disfigurement decreased by two (2), from five (5) employees (1.82%) to three (3) employees (1.02%).

The following Targeted Disabilities remained constant: Blind/Difficulty Seeing 48 employees (16.38%); and Dwarfism Disability 1 employee (0.34%).

The number of permanent employees with reportable disabilities increased by 42, from 911 (8.05%) to 953 (8.44%). The number of permanent employees with targeted disabilities increased by 21, from 269 (2.38%) to 290 (2.57%).

The number of temporary employees with reportable disabilities decreased by two (2), from 13 employees (9.7%) to 11 employees (8.73%), and the targeted disabilities decreased by two (2) from five (5) employees (3.73%) to three (3) employees (2.38%).

TABLE B2: TOTAL WORKFORCE (PERMANENT EMPLOYEES ONLY) BY COMPONENT – DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY

For FY17, there were 11,286 permanent employees within the workforce. Of the 11,286 employees, 953 employees (8.44%) had a disability. Of the 953 that self-identified, 290 (2.57%) had targeted disabilities. The targeted disabilities identified were as follows: Traumatic Brain Injury one (1) (0.34%); Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 135 (46.55); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 48 (16.55%); Missing Extremities six (6) (2.07%); Significant Mobility Impairment 27 (9.31%); Partial or Complete Paralysis 21 (7.24%); Epilepsy 12 (4.14%); Intellectual Disability two (2)

(0.69%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder 34 (11.72%); Dwarfism one (1) (0.34%) and Significant Disfigurement three (3) (1.03%).

TABLE B3: OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES (PERMANENT) – DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY

For FY17, there were a total of 3,669 Officials and Managers in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 2.18% (80 employees). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 39 (48.75%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 12 (15%); Significant Mobility Impairment seven (7) (8.75%); Partial/Complete Paralysis 7 (8.5%); Epilepsy five (5) (6.25%), Significant Psychiatric Disorder 9 (11.25%), and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (1.25%).

For FY17, there were a total of 6,553 Professionals in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 2.2% (144 employees). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Traumatic Brain Injury one (1) (0.69%); Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 61 (42.36%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 27 (18.75%); Significant Mobility Impairment 17 (11.81%); Missing Extremities 3 (2.08%), Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis eight (8) (5.56%); Epilepsy five (5) (3.47%), Intellectual Disability two (2) (1.39%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder 18 (12.5%); Dwarfism one (1) (0.69%); and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (0.69%).

For FY17, there were a total of 571 Technicians in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 4.38% (25 employees). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 18 (72%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing one (1) (4.0%); Missing Extremities one (1) (4.0%); Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis three (3) (12.0%); Epilepsy one (1) (4.0%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (4.0%).

For FY17, there were a total of 500 Administrative Support positions in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 8.0% (40 employees). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficult Hearing 15 (37.5%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing seven (7) (17.5%); Missing Extremities two (2) (5.0%); Significant Mobility Impairment three (3) (7.5%); Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis three (3) (7.5%); Epilepsy two (2) (5.0%), Significant Psychiatric Disorder seven (7) (17.5%), and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (2.5%).

For FY17, there were a total of 30 Craft Workers in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 3.33% one (1) employee. The identified targeted disability was Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing one (1) (100%).

For FY17, there were a total of 10 Operatives in the overall workforce. There were no employees with a targeted disability in this category.

For FY17, there were a total of 79 Service Workers in the overall workforce. Persons with targeted disabilities had a participation rate in this category of 3.8% (3 employees). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Blind or Serious Difficulty Seeing three (3) employees (100%).

TABLE B4: (PERMANENT) PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GS BY DISABILITY

For FY17, employees with targeted disabilities had a higher participation rate at the (GS 13) and (GS-14) pay levels than any other pay level.

Specifically:
GS- 03: There was a total of one (1) employee at this paygrade who did not have a targeted disability.

GS-04: There was a total of 10 employees at this pay grade. There was one (1) employee with a targeted disability (10%). The identified targeted disability was Deaf/Difficulty Hearing (100%).

GS- 05: There was a total of 54 employees at this pay grade. There were four (4) employees with a targeted disability (7.41%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Missing extremities one (1) (25%); Partial or Complete Paralysis one (1) (25%); Intellectual Disability one (1) (25%); and Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (25%).

GS-06: There was a total of 61 employees at this pay grade. There were four (4) employees with a targeted disability (6.56%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Blind/Difficulty Seeing three (3) (75%) and Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (25%).

GS-07: There was a total of 191 employees at this pay grade. There were nine (9) employees with a targeted disability (4.71%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing five (5) (55.56%); Missing extremities one (1) (11.11%); Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (11.11%); Partial or Complete Paralysis one (1) (11.11%); and Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (11.11%).

GS-08: There was a total of 241 employees at this pay grade. There were 17 employees with a targeted disability (7.05%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing seven (7) (41.18%); Significant Mobility Impairment three (3) (17.65%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (16.65%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing two (2) (11.76%); and Epilepsy extremities two (2) (11.76%).

GS-09: There was a total of 219 employees at this pay grade. There were seven (7) employees with a targeted disability (3.2%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing three (3) (42.86%); Partial or Complete Paralysis one (1) (14.29%); and Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (14.29%).

GS-10: There was a total of 171 employees at this pay grade. There were 14 employees with a targeted disability (8.19%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing eight (8) (57.14%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing two (2) (14.29%); Significant Mobility Impairment two (2) (14.29%); Partial or Complete Paralysis two (2) (14.29%); and Significant Psychiatric Disorder one (1) (14.29%).

GS-11: There was a total of 1,014 employees at this pay grade. There were 36 employees with a targeted disability (3.55%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 19 (52.78%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 19 (52.78%); ; Partial or Complete Paralysis five (5) (13.89%); Intellectual Disability one (1) (2.78%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder four (4) (11.11%); Significant Mobility Impairment three (3) (8.33%); Missing Extremities one (1) (2.78%); and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (2.78%).

GS-12: There was a total of 1828 employees at this pay grade. There were 39 with a targeted disability (2.13%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 12 (33.33%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 14 (35.9%); Significant Mobility Impairment three (3) (7.69%); Partial or Complete Paralysis two (2) (5.13%); Epilepsy two (2) (5.13%); Missing Extremities one (1) (2.56%); Intellectual Disability one (1) (7.69%); and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (2.56%).

GS-13: There was a total of 2206 employees at this pay grade. There were 59 employees with a targeted disability (2.67%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 26 (44.07%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing 12 (20.34%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder 11 (18.64%); Epilepsy four (4) (6.78%); Partial or Complete Paralysis two (2) (3.39%); Missing Extremities one (1) (1.69%); Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (1.69%); and Dwarfism one (1) (1.69%).

GS-14: There was a total of 2087 employees at this pay grade. There were 49 employees with a targeted disability (2.35%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 25 (51.02%); Significant Mobility Impairment seven (7) (14.29%); Partial or Complete Paralysis six (6) (12.24%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing four (4) (8.16%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (6.12%); Epilepsy two (2) (4.08%); Missing Extremities one (1) (2.04%); and Significant Disfigurement one (1) (2.04%).

GS-15: There was a total of 1047 employees at this pay grade. There were 12 employees with a targeted disability (1.62%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 12 (70.59%); Significant Mobility Impairment seven (7) (14.29%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (17.62%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing one (1) (5.88%); Missing Extremities one (1) (2.04%); and Epilepsy one (1) (5.88%).

TABLE B5: (PERMANENT) WAGE GRADE PARTICIPATION RATES BY DISABILITY

For FY17, there was only one wage grade category (WG-10), which had employees with targeted disabilities.

WG-10: There was a total of 11 employees at this wage grade. There was one (1) employee with a targeted disability (9.09%). The identified targeted disability was Blind/Difficulty Seeing (100%).

TABLE B6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS (PERMANENT) BY DISABILITY

Overall Note: The following Major Occupations were the most populous occupations employed at NOAA: 1) Meteorology (1340); 2) Information Technology Management (2210); 3) Fishery

Biology (0482); 4) General Physical Science (1301); and 5) Management Analyst (0343). The Occupational Civilian Labor Force (OCLF) is determined by the percentage of the population that is available for a specific position. Therefore, each position is compared to the respective OCLF.

1) Meteorology (1340):

In FY17, this occupation included 2,484 employees. There were 177 employees with reported disabilities (7.13%), of which 50 identified as having a targeted disability (2.01%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 22 (44.0%); Blind/Difficult Seeing 11 (22%); Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis five (5) (10%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder four (4) (8.0%); Epilepsy three (3) (6.0%); Significant Disfigurement two (2) (4.0%); Missing Extremities one (1) (2.0%); Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (2.0%); and Intellectual Disability one (1) (2.0%).

2) Information Technology Management (2210):

In FY17, this occupation included 1,027 employees. There were 104 employees with reported disabilities (10.13%), of which 33 identified as having a targeted disability (3.21%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing 13 (39.39%); Significant Mobility Impairment seven (7) (21.21%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing five (5) (15.15%); Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis two (2) (6.06%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (9.09%); Traumatic Brain Injury one (1) (3.03%); Missing Extremities one (1) (3.03%); and Dwarfism one (1) (3.03%).

3) Fishery Biology (0482):

In FY17, this occupation included 850 employees. There were 39 employees with reported disabilities (4.59%), of which 13 identified as having a targeted disability (1.53%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing six (6) (46.15%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder four (4) (30.77%); Blind/Difficulty Seeing two (2) (15.38%); and Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (7.69%).

4) General Physical Science (1301):

In FY17, this occupation included 679 employees. There were 31 employees with reported disabilities (4.57%), of which nine (9) identified as having a targeted disabilities (1.33%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing five (5) (55.56%) and Blind/Difficult Seeing four (4) (44.44%).

5) Management Program Analysis (0343):

In FY17, this occupation included 596 employees. There were 57 employees with reported disabilities (9.56%), of which 10 identified as having a targeted disability (1.68%). The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing three (3) (30%); Epilepsy three (3) (30%); Significant Psychiatric Disorder Two (2) (20%); Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (10%); and Partial Paralysis/Complete Paralysis one (1) (10%).

TABLE B7: APPLICATION AND HIRES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS (PERMANENT)– DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY

Schedule A

In FY17, there were 16 Schedule A applications and no hires.

VOLUNTARILY IDENTIFIED OUTSIDE OF SCHEDULE A:

For FY17, out of 75,537 applications received, 136 individuals were hired. Of the 75,537 applications received, 44,742 (59.23%) did not have a disability, 26,695 (35.34%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 4,100 (5.43%) had a disability, and 1,807 (2.39%) had a targeted disability.

Of the 136 hired, 65 (47.79%) had no disability, 67 (49.26%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 4 (2.94%) had a disability, and one (1) (0.74%) had a targeted disability.

OCCUPATION SERIES CODE:

1) Meteorology (1340):

For FY17, out of 3,735 applications received, 64 individuals were hired. Of the 3,735 applications received, 2,188 (58.58%) did not have a disability, 1,410 (37.75%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 137 (3.67%) had a disability, and 77 (2.06%) had a targeted disability.

- Out of the 3,735 applications received, 2,995 individuals were deemed qualified applicants. Of the 2,995 qualified applicants, 1,735 (57.93%) did not have a disability, 1,158 (38.66%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 102 (3.41%) had a disability, and 58 (1.94%) had a targeted disability.

- Out of the 2,995 qualified applicants, 64 individuals were hired. Of the 64 individuals hired, 32 (50.00%) did not have a disability, 29 (45.31%) did not self-identify as having a disability, three (3) (4.69%) had a disability, and one (1) (1.56%) had a targeted disability.

2) Management Program Analysis (0343):

For FY17, out of 7,602 applications received, nine (9) individuals were hired. Of the 7,602 applications received, 3,883 (51.08%) did not have a disability, 3,251 (42.77%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 468 (6.16%) had a disability, and 192 (2.53%) had a targeted disability.

- Out of the 7,602 applications received, 5,411 individuals were deemed qualified applicants. Of the 5,411qualified applicants, 2,829 (52.28%) did not have a disability, 2,276 (42.06%) did not self-identify as having a disability, 306 (6.16%) had a disability, and 113 (2.53%) had a targeted disability.

- Out of the 5,411 qualified applicants, nine (9) individuals were hired. Of the nine (9) individuals hired, four (4) (44.44%) did not have a disability, four (4) (44.44%) did not self-identify as having a disability, and one (1) (11.11%) had a disability, but the disability was not a targeted disability.

3) Fishery Biology (0482):

For FY17, out of 2,359 applications received, six (6) individuals were hired. Of the 2,359 applications received, 1,581 (67.02%) did not have a disability, 713 (30.22%) did not self-identify, 65 (2.76%) had a disability, and 28(1.19%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 2,359 applications received, 1,716 individuals were deemed qualified applicants. Of the 1,716 qualified applicants, 1,148 (66.90%) did not have a disability, 529 (30.83%) did not self-identify, 39 (2.27%) had a disability, and 17 (0.99%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 1,716 qualified applicants, six (6) individuals were hired. Of the six (6) individuals hired, four (4) (66.67%) did not have a disability, and two (2) (33.33%) did not self-identify.

4) General Physical Science (1301):

For FY17, out of 3,052 applications received, 11 individuals were hired. Of the 3,052 applications received, 1,870 (61.27%) did not have a disability, 1,049 (34.37%) did not self-identify, 133 (4.36%) had a disability, and 53 (1.74%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 3,052 applications received, 2,160 individuals were deemed qualified applicants. Of the 2,160 qualified applicants, 1,312 (60.74%) did not have a disability, 759 (35.14%) did not self-identify, 89 (4.12%) had a disability, and 35 (1.62%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 3,052 applications, 11 individuals were hired. Of the 11 individuals hired, five (5) (45.45%) did not have a disability and six (6) (54.55%) did not self-identify.

5) Information Technology Management (2210):

For FY17, out of 8,037 applications received, 10 individuals were hired. Of the 8,037 applications received, 4,617 (57.45%) did not have a disability, 2,920 (36.33%) did not self-identify, 500 (6.22%) had a disability, and 240 (2.99%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 8,037 applications received, 5,176 individuals were deemed qualified applicants. Out of the 5,176 qualified applicants, 2,972 (57.42%) did not have a disability, 1,913 (36.96%) did not self-identify, 291 (5.2%) self -identified as being disabled, and 132 (2.55%) had a targeted disability.

- Of the 8,307 applications, 10 individuals were hired. Of the 10 individuals hired, seven (7) (70%) did not have a disability, and three (3) (30%) did not self-identify

TABLE B8: NEW HIRES BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT – DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY:

In FY17, there were 715 total new hires. Of the 715 new hires, 568 (79.44%) did not have a disability, 63 (8.81%) did not self-identify, 84 (11.75%) had a disability, and 24 (3.36%) had targeted disabilities.

- Of the 715 total new hires, 668 were permanent new hires. Of the 668 permanent new hires, 533 (79.79%) did not have a disability, 58 (8.68%) did not self-identify, 77 (11.53%) had a disability, and 24 (3.59%) had targeted disabilities.

- Of the 715 total new hires, 47 were temporary new hires. Of the 47 temporary new hires, 35 (74.47%) did not have a disability, 5 (10.64%) did not self-identify, 7 (14.89%) had a disability, and none had targeted disabilities.

TABLE B9: SELECTIONS FOR INTERNAL COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS DISABILITY:

Data was not available in FY17. Will address data needs in FY18.

TABLE B10: NON-COMPETITIVE PROMOTIONS – TIME IN GRADE DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY:

In FY17, there were 1,528 total employees eligible for career ladders promotions. Of the 1,528 eligible employees, 1,358 (88.87%) had no disabilities, 54 (3.53%) did not self-identify, 116 (7.59%) had a disability, and 33 (2.16%) had targeted disabilities.

For employees within time in grade of 1 to 12 months, 1,407 employees of the 1,528 received noncompetitive promotions. Of the 1,407 employees, 1,261 (89.62%) had no disabilities, 43 (3.06%) did not self-identify, 103 (7.32%) had a disability, and 30 (2.13%) had targeted disabilities.

For employees within time in grade of 13 – 24 months, five (5) employees out of the 1,528 received non-competitive promotions. Of the five (5) employees, five (5) (100%) had no disabilities.

For employees within time in grade of 25 or more months, 15 employees out of the 1,528 received non-competitive promotions. Of the 15 employees, 13 (86.67%) had no disabilities, and two (2) had a disability.

Of the 1,528 to be eligible for career ladder promotions, 101 did not receive a promotion. Of the 101, 79 (78.22%) had no disability, 11 (10.89%) did not self-identify, 11 (10.89%) self-identified as having a disability, and three (3) (2.95%) had targeted disabilities.

Table B11: INTERNAL SELECTIONS FOR SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS (GS 13/14, GS15, AND SES-DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY:

Data was not available in FY17. Will address data needs in FY18.

Table B12: PARTICIPATION IN CAREER DEVELOPMENT- DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY:

There were no career development program meeting the definition outlined in EEOC guidelines.

Table B13: EMPLOYEE RECOGNITION AND AWARDS – DISTRIBUTION BY DISABILITY:

Cash Awards $500 and Under:

In FY17, 3,044 employees received cash awards of $500 and under totaling $1,093,572. Of the 3,044 employees who received these awards, 2,707 (88.93%) had no disabilities, 255 (8.38%) self-identified as having a disability, 82 (2.69%) did not self-identify, and 70 (2.30%) had a targeted disabilities.

Cash Awards $500+:

In FY17, 9,709 employees received cash awards of $500+ totaling $14,731,087. Of the 9,709 employees who received these awards, 8,826 (90.91%) had no disabilities, 210 (2.16%) did not self-identify, 673 (6.93%) self-identified as having a disability, 218 (2.25%) had targeted disabilities.

Quality Step Increases (QSI):

In FY17, 166 employees received a QSI totaling $398,498. Of the 166 employees receiving a QSI, 152 (91.57%) had no disabilities, 2 (1.20%) did not self-identify, 12 (7.23%) self-identified as having a disability, and 3 (1.81%) had targeted disabilities.

Time-Off Awards 1-9 hours:

In FY17, 894 employees received Time-off awards (16,426 hours). Of the 894 employees receiving these Time-off awards, 786 (87.92%) had no disabilities, 27 (3.02%) did not self-identify, 81 (9.06%) self-identified as having a disability, and 27 (3.02%) had targeted disabilities.

Time-Off Awards 9+ hours:

In FY17, 758 employees received Time-off awards (18,518 hours). Of the 758 employees receiving these Time-off awards, 682 (89.97%) had no disabilities, 19 (2.51%) did not self-identify, 57 (7.52%) self-identified as having a disability, 16 (2.11%) had targeted disabilities.

TABLE A14: PERMANENT SEPARATIONS BY TYPE OF SEPARATION – DISTRIBUTION BY RACE/ETHNICITY AND SEX

Total Separations:

In FY17, there were 708 total separations, of which 599 (84.6%) had no disabilities; 31 (4.38%) did not self-identify, 78 (11.02%) self-identified as having a disability, 18 (2.54%) had targeted disabilities.

The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing five (5) (27.78%), Blind/Difficulty Hearing four (4) (22.22%), Significant Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (16.67%), Partial/Complete Paralysis two (2) (11.11%), Significant Disfigurement two (2) (11.11%), Significant Mobility Impairment one (1) (5.56%), and Epilepsy/Seizure Disorders one (1) (5.56%).

Voluntary Separations:

In FY 17, there were 685 voluntary separations, of which 580 (84.67%) had no disabilities, 75 (10.95%) self-identified as having a disability, 30 (4.38%) did not self-identify, and 16 (2.34%) had targeted disabilities.

The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Deaf/Difficulty Hearing five (5) (0.73%), Blind/Difficulty Seeing four (4) (0.58%); Partial Paralysis one (1) (0.15%), and Psychiatric Disorder three (3) (0.44%).

Involuntary Separations:

In FY 17, there were 23 involuntary separations, of which, 19 (82.61%) had no disabilities, three (3) (13.04%) self-identified as having a disability, two (2) (8.70%) had targeted disabilities, and one (1) (4.35%) did not self-identify.

The identified targeted disabilities were as follows: Partial/Completed Paralysis one (1) (4.35%) and Epilepsy/Seizure Disorders one (1) (4.35%).