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

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

    a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

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

In FY 2024, 0.94 percent of the GS-1 to GS-10 permanent workforce was PWTD.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES					
Grades GS-1 to GS-10					

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

In FY 2024, specific data regarding PWTD and PWD goals were included in directorate briefings and recruitment, hiring, and outreach touchpoint sessions. This information is also included in the recruitment and outreach plan for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP). For the last fiscal years, BEP has always exceeded the 2.00 percent Federal goals for PWTD. However, in FY 2024, BEP data show PWTD is below the 2percent Federal goal. In addition to focusing on retaining and advancing PWTD and PWD employees in FY 2025, BEP will also investigate what caused the low participation of PWTD in the GS-11 to SES grade levels.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer   Yes

The Office of Equal Employment Opportunity (OEEO) is responsible for the implementation and execution of the requirements for the Disability Program. OEEO Chief required OEEO staff to regularly attend appropriate training and webinars to understand their responsibilities and be able to execute their responsibilities timely and effectively. Furthermore, OEEO worked closely with the Office of Human Resources (OHR) to continually evaluate BEP policies, processes and procedures and assess if there were barriers that prevent PWTD and PWD from fully participating in the BEP workforce and/or effective implementation of BEP's Disability Program requirements.

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	
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Judy Caniban Chief Judy.Caniban@bep.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	7	0	0	Karnelis Godette Chief Karnelis.Godette@bep.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	Daniel Carver Chief Daniel.Carver@bep.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	2	Sharilyn Cook Manager Sharilyn.Cook@bep.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	2	0	Judy Caniban Chief Judy.Caniban@bep.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	11	Karnelis Godette Chief Karnelis.Godette@bep.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.

Answer   Yes

OEEO staff responsible for processing and managing the disability program at BEP received sufficient training, which consisted of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC) Disability Program Manager and other just-in-time training offered by EEOC and other sources. In addition, OEEO provided staff with access to CyberFeds for research purposes on appropriate

processing and managing of the Disability Program. OEEO staff also visited Job Accommodation Network (JAN) website on a regular basis to research regarding medical conditions and/or recommended accommodation.

B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Answer   Yes

The agency has a Reasonable Accommodations and Personal Assistant Services budget that is managed by OEODM and is readily accessible for immediate use when needed and/or requested.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

OHR manages an internal Schedule A repository to track, maintain, and identify qualified Schedule A applications that BEP receives. BEP also partnered with the Treasury and USA Jobs to create a customized job search tool that provides veterans services such as, a federal resume tutorial, and workshops on navigating USA Jobs and interviewing techniques. OHR established an additional Outreach Coordinator position, which will increase OHR's capacity to support outreach and recruitment efforts; position will be filled in FY 2025. In FY 2024, BEP participated in three recruitment events specific to veterans, which were another potential source for PWTD and PWD. The paramount objective with BEP's increased capacity was to plan, identify, and implement changes that will improve opportunities for all groups within the workforce, including PWTD and PWD.

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 hiring authorities that BEP utilized specific to PWTD and PWD were Schedule A and veteran appointment authorities, to include Veterans Readjustment Authority (VRA) and Veterans Employment Opportunity Act (VEOA). Schedule A is available for use along with the VRA and VEOA to appoint PWTD, PWD and veterans or those with a service-connected disability. Hiring officials consulted with OHR before every recruit request for competitive hiring. In addition, Bureau of the Fiscal Service's Administrative Resources Center (ARC), which is BEP's servicing human resources office, always included the discussion about special hiring authorities specific to PWTD, PWD and Veterans during strategic discussions before advertising BEP vacancies. The various available hiring authorities to include VRA, VEOA, Schedule A, etc., were also communicated to hiring managers during monthly meeting between managers, supervisors and OHR.

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.

In FY 2024, when BEP received applications for positions under the Schedule A hiring authority, the servicing OHR Specialist reviewed the submission and determined if the applicant met qualifications or position requirements and submitted the required medical documentation. Applicants deemed qualified were referred to the hiring official non-competitively with guidance on selection procedures, including the application of veterans' preference, where applicable. Hiring officials had the option to interview and/or hire the candidate or to consider other candidates from issued certificates (e.g., Merit Promotion, Non-Competitive, etc.). Alternatively, when individuals submitted their resumes directly to BEP Special Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC) for vacant positions, the SPPC referred the resumes to the designated servicing OHR Specialist upon request from a hiring manager. The OHR Specialist then reviewed the resumes and determined qualifications and eligibility. If qualifications and Schedule A eligibility were met, the resumes were then forwarded to the hiring manager for consideration, with guidance on selection procedures, including the application of veterans' preference, when applicable. In addition, any time BEP managers signified intent to hire a Schedule A candidate, OHR reviewed current available resumes, identified who were eligible for Schedule A appointment and referred for consideration.

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.

<p align="center">Answer   Yes</p>

BEP OHR mandated a Recruitment Planning Discussion for all hiring officials prior to submission of a recruitment request, whereby hiring flexibilities and authorities (including Schedule A and Veterans appointments) were discussed and highly recommended. BEP OHR also hosted Monthly Human Resources Update Meetings to provide supervisors and managers ongoing education and updates on topics such as Schedule A, Pathways programs, Prohibited Personnel Practices, career development, EEO-related training opportunities, and retention. In addition, Treasury required all Treasury employees to complete mandatory VEOA and VRA training.

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.

BEP has established a working relationship with the interpreting service providers to provide interpreting services to employees and applicants with disabilities. BEP utilized Handshake to advertise open vacancies at educational institutions that included programs for students with disabilities. In FY 2024, BEP held memberships with two professional organizations, with a focus on employment of PWTD and PWD, Association of People Supporting Employment First (APSE) and the Association for the Severely Handicapped (TASH). As previously reported, BEP also conducted outreach and recruitment events specific to veterans, a potential source of PWTD and PWD candidates.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If "yes", please describe the triggers below.

   a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD)   Answer   No

   b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD)   Answer   No

New Hires	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce	Permanent Workforce	Temporary Workforce
	(#)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
% of Total	0				

Applicants					
% of Qualified Applicants	0				
% of New Hires	0				

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

   a. New Hires for MCO (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

PWD trigger was identified for the following MCOs. The new hires referred rate for Letterpress Operating – 4406 (3.08 percent) & Bulk Money Handling – 6941 (1.03 percent) is less than expected compared to the new hires qualified rate of (5.62 percent) & (5.12 percent). New hires selected rate for Police – 0083 (0.00 percent) Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic – 2606 (0.00 percent) Letterpress Operating – 4406 (0.00 percent) & Bulk Money Handling – 6941 (0.00 percent) is less than expected compared to the new hires qualified rate. PWTD triggers were identified in the following MCOs. The new hires referred rate for Letterpress Operating – 4406 (0.00 percent) is less than expected compared to the new hires qualified rate of (2.25 percent). New hires selected rate for Information Technology Management – 2210 (0.00 percent), Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic – 2606 (0.00 percent) Letterpress Operating – 4406 (0.00 percent) & Bulk Money Handling – 6941 (0.00 percent) is less than expected compared to the new hires qualified rate.

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

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

   a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

PWD trigger was identified for the following MCOs. The internal qualified rate for Letterpress Operating – 4406 (0.00 percent) & Intaglio Press Operating – 4454 (6.06 percent) is less than expected compared to the relevant applicant pool rates of (4.35 percent & 9.46 percent). PWTD triggers were identified in the following MCOs. The internal qualified rate for Police – 0083 (0.69 percent) & Letterpress Operating – 4406 (0.00 percent) is less than expected compared to the relevant applicant pool rates of (4.17 percent & 2.17 percent).

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

   a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

PWD trigger was identified for the following MCOs. The internal competitive promotion referred rate for Information Technology Management – 2210 (10.00 percent) is less competitive promotion selection rates for Police – 0083 (0.00 percent) Information Technology Management – 2210 (0.00 percent) Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic – 2606 (0.00 percent) Intaglio Press Operating – 4454 (0.00 percent) & Bulk Money Handling – 6941 (0.00 percent) is less than expected when compared to the

qualified applicant pool rates. less than expected when compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of (13.55 percent). The internal competitive promotion selection rates for Police – 0083 (0.00 percent) Information Technology Management – 2210 (0.00 percent) Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic – 2606 (0.00 percent) and Intaglio Press Operating – 4454 (0.00 percent) is less than expected when compared to the qualified applicant pool rates. PWTD trigger was identified for the following MCOs. The internal competitive promotion referred rate for Intaglio Press Operating – 4454 (0.00 percent) is less than expected when compared to the qualified applicant pool rate of (3.03 percent). The internal competitive promotion selection rates for Police – 0083 (0.00 percent) Information Technology Management – 2210 (0.00 percent) Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic – 2606 (0.00 percent) Intaglio Press Operating – 4454 (0.00 percent) & Bulk Money Handling – 6941 (0.00 percent) is less than expected when compared to the qualified applicant pool rates.

Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency's plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

BEP offers career development opportunities to all employees via non-competitive and competitive details and promotions. The career development opportunities were marketed through internal communications and external sources to all BEP employees, including PWTD and PWD.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

Below is a list of the various career development programs available at BEP: Winter Emerging HR Program: The Emerging HR Leaders forum is a leadership development program for HR employees in grades 9-12s. Federal Executive Institute/Leadership for a Democratic Society (FEI/LDS): The Leadership for a Democratic Society (LDS) program serves as an enduring foundation for GS-15 and SES employees' personal and professional development. The program offers an unmatched learning experience to prepare senior government leaders for today's complex challenges. There is an internal competitive process, and the Senior Executive Team (SET) selects who attends. Excellence in Government Fellow (EIG): The Excellence in Government Fellows program is the premier leadership development course for federal employees at the GS-14 to GS-15 levels. EIG has helped federal employees develop strong leadership skills through application-based learning, highly interactive activities, authentic self-reflection, personalized coaching and governmentwide networking. Graduates go on to plan, design and implement innovative solutions to address the federal government's biggest challenges and improve their agencies' effectiveness. There is an internal competitive process and the SET selects who attends. Electro-Machinist & Mechanical-Machinist Trainee Program. This program is advertised as a four-year trainee program to journeyman Electro-Machinist. This position is in the Electro-Machine Shop, Office of Security Printing. The incumbent participates in a four-year training program with BEP including formal, laboratory, and "on-the-job" training. The incumbent is normally assigned to maintain/support all currency printing/processing equipment, including temporary and permanent modifications and installations required to maintain production goals. The incumbent works with journeymen and other peers, while participating in "on-the-job" training. Apprenticeship: BEP provides technical apprenticeship programs, which combine on the-job and classroom training with mentoring opportunities to help employees learn the practical and theoretical aspects of highly skilled occupations. The application process for each apprenticeship varies depending on the job series of the position. Positions requiring artistic ability, such as Engraver or Designer positions utilize a two-phase evaluation consisting of an application/questionnaire review and an assessment of the applicant's artwork. Other positions such as Platemakers and Siderographers require an application and questionnaire review. Senior Executive Service Candidate Development Program: Senior leaders at BEP are provided training and development opportunities that are aligned with OPM and the Center for Leadership Development (CLD), including Federal Executive Institute (FEI), Leadership Education and Development Certificate Program (LEAD), Senior Executive Assessment Program, and Department of the Treasury Leadership Development Program (SES) (2017, 2021). These training and development opportunities meet the developmental activities that prepare them for future positions as

senior executives at BEP and the Federal Government. BEP provides senior leaders access to training and development courses that employ OPM-designed curriculum aligned with Executive Core Qualifications (ECQs) and an opportunity to realistically assess their performance on ECQs as well as overall readiness for senior executive positions within the Federal Government. Treasury Executive Institute (TEI): TEI is a shared service and strategic partner of BEP that provides cutting-edge and convenient learning and development programs in an interagency setting to equip and transform BEP leaders for greater impact. All programs and services are aligned to ECQs and fundamental leadership competencies. There is no selection process for individual TEI courses. For most courses, employees will just need to submit the Standard Form (SF) 182 in the Integrated Talent Management (ITM) system. The SF-182 is available in ITM and is required for all external learning activities (i.e., non-Treasury or non-ITM courses). Supervisor approval is required. Certified Coaching Cadre: BEP provides coaching instruction through the Federal Internal Coaching Training Program (FICTP), a rigorous, seven-month program that is certified by the International Coach Federation to provide professional-level coach training. The program fosters a coaching culture by empowering leaders at all levels to practice self-reflection, creativity in problem solving, accountability, and candid and respectful communication. The aim is to cultivate an environment of continuous learning, individual and organizational performance excellence by promoting positive leadership practices. Through this program, selected participants acquire a thorough understanding of the philosophical, historical, and ethical foundations of professional coaching and how they are applied within the Federal context. This course is offered on an annual basis, though participation is limited. Once BEP announces a call for nominations, employees interested in participating in this program must apply and are competitively selected. Onsite Leadership Development Workshops: These workshops provide leaders at all levels with critical skills needed to maintain and/or improve their leadership skills and effectiveness. There is no competitive selection process. Employees submit SF-182 via ITM as required for desired training. Supervisor approval required. College Course. Funding of College-Level Training. There is no competitive selection process. The employee submits an SF-182, Form 1707 and completes a CSA, if needed. Supervisor approval is required.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	6	5	33%	40%	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	6	6	33.33%	33.33%	0	0
Internship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	2	12	50%	50%	0	0

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

        a. Applicants (PWD)   Answer   N/A

        b. Selections (PWD)   Answer   N/A

BEP does not currently track the disability status of applicants and/or selectees. We will continue to work on a plan to successfully capture the applicant flow data for the program.

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

a. Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   N/A

b. Selections (PWTD)   Answer   N/A

BEP does not currently track the disability status of applicants and/or selectees. We will continue to work on a plan to successfully the applicant flow data of the program.

C. AWARDS

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

   a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

PWD received the following awards at lower rates than People Without Disabilities (PWOD2): Award Type PWOD Inclusion Rate (%)3 PWD Inclusion Rate (%) Time Off Hours 11-20 4.15 2.37 Cash Awards: 500 and under 28.42 23.66 Cash Awards: 1000-1999 10.60 8.17 Cash Awards: 3000 - 3999 79.95 54.19 PWTD received the following awards at lower rates than People Without Targeted Disabilities (PWOTD4): Award Type PWOTD Inclusion rate (%) PWTD Inclusion Rate (%) Time Off Hours 11-20 3.73 2.00 Cash Awards: 500 and under 27.20 26.00 Cash Awards: 2000 - 2999 8.50 4.00 Cash Awards: 3000 - 3999 73.62 58.00 Cash Awards: 4000 - 4999 0.76 0.00

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	89	5.59	4.30	8.00	5.30
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	752	49.46	35.33	72.00	46.75
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	8.45	1.90	0.63	18.00	-0.04
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	66	2.37	4.15	2.00	2.41
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	1140	39.14	72.35	32.00	40.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.27	3.56	1.34	32.00	0.13
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	11	0.22	0.77	2.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	270	5.16	18.89	48.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.55	5.16	1.89	48.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	27	0.22	0.08	0.00	0.24
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	960	6.88	3.07	0.00	7.71
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	35.56	6.88	3.07	0.00	7.71
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Awards Given	51	3.23	2.53	4.00	3.13
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount	36426	2370.97	1795.39	3100.00	2283.13
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount	714.24	158.06	54.41	1550.00	-9.64
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given	181	8.17	10.60	12.00	7.71
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount	229218	10720.00	13275.35	14000.00	10324.82
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount	1266.4	282.11	96.20	2333.34	34.97
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Awards Given	151	10.11	7.76	4.00	10.84
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount	387952	25726.88	20117.82	10176.00	27600.48
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount	2569.22	547.38	199.19	5088.00	0.32
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Awards Given	1322	54.19	79.95	58.00	53.73
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount	4126584	168749.46	249779.88	179980.00	167396.39
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount	3121.47	669.64	239.94	6206.20	2.59
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Awards Given	13	0.65	0.77	0.00	0.72
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount	55000	2795.70	3225.81	0.00	3132.53
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount	4230.77	931.90	322.58	0.00	1044.18
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Awards Given	2	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount	11500	0.00	883.26	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount	5750	0.00	441.63	0.00	0.00

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

>   a. Pay Increases (PWD)   Answer   No

>   b. Pay Increases (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

Zero PWTD received QSI, compared to 0.64 percent of PWOTD.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

>   a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD)   Answer   Yes

b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

The results of the most recent "BEProud Awards" program was reviewed, and it was noted that 1.08 percent of PWD were recognized, compared with 1.77 percent of PWOD. PWTD exceeded the benchmark, however, with 6.00 percent of PWTD receiving a BEProud award, compared to 1.51 percent of PWOTD. The BEProud Awards are held annually to recognize BEP employees for exceptional performance, outstanding customer service, leadership, quality achievements, innovative contributions, exhibition of BEP core values in the workplace and service to the community at large.

D. PROMOTIONS

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

   a. SES

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

   b. Grade GS-15

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

   c. Grade GS-14

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   d. Grade GS-13

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

GS-13: Selected internal applicants is 22.22 percent which is less than expected when compared to 32.07 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger. GS-14: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 37.50 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

   a. SES

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   No

   b. Grade GS-15

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

       ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    c. Grade GS-14

       i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

       ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    d. Grade GS-13

       i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

       ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

GS-13: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 15.76 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger. GS-14: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 15.00 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger. GS-15: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 17.65 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

    a. New Hires to SES (PWD)   Answer   No

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

    c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD)   Answer   No

    d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)   Answer   Yes

GS-13: Selected applicants is 7.69 percent which is less than expected when compared to qualified internal applicants by 8.00 percent. This is a trigger. GS-15: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 15.13 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

    a. New Hires to SES (PWTD)   Answer   No

    b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

    d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD)   Answer   No

GS-14: Selected applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 5.88 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger. GS-15: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 6.72 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

   a. Executives

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   No

   b. Managers

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

   c. Supervisors

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWD)   Answer   Yes

Managers: Selected applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 32.00 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger. Supervisors: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 3.03 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

   a. Executives

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

   b. Managers

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

   c. Supervisors

      i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)   Answer   No

      ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)   Answer   No

Executives: Selected applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to qualified internal applicants by 17.65 percent. This is a trigger. Managers: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 20.00 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

---

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

      a. New Hires for Executives (PWD)   Answer   Yes

      b. New Hires for Managers (PWD)   Answer   No

      c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD)   Answer   No

Executives: Selected applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to qualified internal applicants by 15.13 percent. This is a trigger.

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

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

Executives: Selected applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to qualified internal applicants by 6.72 percent. This is a trigger. Managers: Selected internal applicants is 0.00 percent which is less than expected when compared to 5.98 percent for qualified internal applicants. This is a trigger.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer   No

In FY24, BEP had 8 employees that were hired under a Schedule A hiring authority who may have been eligible for conversion during the FY 2024 reporting period. Of those 8 employees, 2 were converted to career-conditional appointments; 4 resigned prior to their two-year trial period being complete; 1 employee transferred to another agency prior to conversion and 1 employee was terminated during their trial period.

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

a.Voluntary Separations (PWD)	Answer	No
b.Involuntary Separations (PWD)	Answer	Yes

1.04 percent of PWD were involuntarily separated in FY 2024, compared to 0.23 percent of people without disabilities (PWOD).

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	7	0.63	0.27
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	18	1.67	0.68
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	98	2.92	5.74
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	50	3.75	2.19
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	173	8.96	8.89

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

a.Voluntary Separations (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

b.Involuntary Separations (PWTD)   Answer   Yes

7.69 percent of PWTD separated voluntarily in FY 2024 compared to the 6.26 percent of people without targeted disabilities (PWOTD). 1.92 percent of PWTD were separated involuntarily in FY 2024, while only 0.40 percent of PWOTD were involuntarily separated.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	7	1.92	0.32
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	18	3.85	0.85
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	98	3.85	5.08
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	50	1.92	2.59
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	173	11.54	8.83

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.

Exit survey data has not yet been reviewed.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

External Website: https://www.bep.gov/footer/accessibility-statement How to file a complaint: For information about filing a complaint against the BEP under Section 508, contact OEODM at (202) 874-3460 or TTY at (202) 874-4931 or by email at OEODM@bep.gov.

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.

External Website: https://www.bep.gov/footer/accessibility-statement How to file a complaint: For information about filing a complaint against the BEP under the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA), contact the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Management (OEODM) at (202) 874- 3460 or TTY at (202) 874-4931 or by email at OEODM@bep.gov. An ABA complaint can be filed online using the online complaint form: https://access-board.my.site.com/s/ Alternative ABA Complaint Filing Methods 1) E-mail to enforce@access-board.gov; 2) Fax to (202) 272- 0081 3) Mail to: Compliance and Enforcement U.S. Access Board 1331 F Street, N.W., Suite 1000 Washington, DC 20004-1111

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.

Accessibility of Facility In FY 2024, the Western Currency Facility (WCF) continued projects to support ABA compliance, such as widening doorways in the facility, and adjusting grab bars and soap dispensers in the bathrooms. At the Washington, DC Facility (DCF), the DC Replacement Facility team consulted with OEODM to help ensure accessibility is integrated into plans for the new facility. Additionally, a project was initiated to deploy a Gravograph machine to support braille signage at the DCF. The project team obtained IT Security approval and installed the required software and began preparations to train the personnel who will operate the machine. Anticipated deployment is early FY 2025. Accessibility of Technology BEP awarded a contract for IT consulting services in the last quarter of FY 2023, to evaluate the current IT accessibility policies. In FY 2024, the assessment began with a survey to BEP offices, which enabled OES to identify gaps and recommend solutions to better meet employee accessibility needs. In addition, BEP's Office of Enterprise Solutions partnered with OEODM and provided just in time training to the BEP workforce during two of OEODM's virtual office hour sessions in the third quarter of FY 2024. OES provided a guest speaker to discuss Sec 508 at the conclusion of a session focused on Reasonable Accommodations, and also for a Sec 508-focused session titled "Creating Accessibility Through 508 Compliance."

C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM

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

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

Reasonable accommodation cases in FY 2024, were unusually high and complex. OEODM processed 37 individual requests, 8 of which included multiple accommodations requested per case. 32 requests were process within the 20-day goal. Average processing time was 11 days. A Part H is being initiated for FY 2025 to improve processing time.

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.

Overall, BEP has an effective Disability Program, supported by various policies, procedures, and practices. Throughout FY 2024, BEP provided reasonable accommodations guidance via training courses, virtual office hours, and postings on its internal and external websites. Employees also were required to attend mandatory reasonable accommodations training in July 2024. In FY 2024, BEP continued to leverage appropriate stakeholders, to include OHR, the Offices of Chief Counsel and Office of Facilities Support (OFS), BEP Medical Provider Chief Information Officer (CIO) organizations, and other relevant partners to ensure timely and effective processing of RA requests. BEP has a dedicated reasonable accommodation budget that was readily and easily accessible, when needed. Other BEP organizations such as CIO, OFS, Office of Security, and requesting employee's organization have also utilized their budget to fund accommodation requests that were specific to their programs. BEP also has multiple sources providing American Sign Language interpreting services. Furthermore, BEP continued to use the RA tracker established by Treasury's OCRE, to track timeliness of processing and types of requests as well as monitor RA data for trends.

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

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

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

BEP has an established PAS policy and procedures, and a PAS contract that can be utilized when a PAS request is received. In FY 2023, BEP received no PAS requests

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

    Answer   No

2. During the last fiscal year, did any complaints alleging harassment based on disability status result in a finding of discrimination or a settlement agreement?

    Answer   No

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

N/A

B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

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

    Answer   No

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

    Answer   No

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

N/A

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

    Answer   No

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

    Answer   N/A

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

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B9
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?	Trigger 1 A review of Table B9-2 shows that PWD and PWTD received some awards at lower rates than PWOD and PWOTD, respectively. Specifically: • Time Off Hours 11-20: PWD and PWTD both had triggers in this category. o 2.37 percent of PWD received this award, compared to 4.15 percent of PWOD o 2.00 percent of PWTD received this award, compared to 3.73 percent of PWOTD • Cash Awards 500 and under: PWD and PWTD both had triggers in this category. o 23.66 percent of PWD compared to 28.42 percent of PWOD o 26.00 percent of PWTD compared to 27.20 percent of PWOTD • Cash Awards 1000 – 1999: PWD had a trigger in this category. o 8.17 percent of PWD received this award, compared to 10.60 percent of PWOD • Cash Awards 2000 – 2999: PWTD had a trigger in this category. o 4.00 percent of PWTD received this award, compared to 8.50 percent of PWOTD. • Cash Awards 3000 – 3999: PWD and PWTD both had triggers in this category. o 54.19 percent of PWD received this award, compared to 79.95 percent of PWOD. o 58.00 percent of PWTD received this award, compared to 73.62 percent of PWOTD. • Cash Awards 4000 – 4999: PWTD had a trigger in this category. o 0.00 percent of PWTD received this award, compared to 0.76 percent of PWOTD. • Zero PWTD received QSI, compared to 0.64 percent of PWOTD. • 1.08 percent of PWD received a BEProud Award (BEP's internal award program), compared with 1.77 percent of PWOD. Even though PWD fell below the benchmarks in four out of seven of the time off and cash award categories, it is noted that this group was above the inclusion rate for QSI. 1.08 percent of PWD received QSI in FY 2024 compared to 0.46 percent of PWOD.
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	*Barrier Group* People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N
Barrier(s) Identified?:	N
STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name** **Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	**Target Date**	**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?**	**Date Modified**	**Date Completed**	**Objective Description**
09/30/2023	09/30/2025	Yes	09/30/2024		Review awards policy, practice and/or procedure to determine the potential barriers to PWTD receiving awards comparable to employees without disabilities.

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Chief Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Management	Judy Caniban	Yes
Chief Office of Human Resources	Karnelis Godette	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
09/30/2023	Review awards policy, practice and/or procedure to determine the potential barriers to PWTD receiving awards comparable to employees without disabilities.	Yes	09/30/2024	
09/30/2023	Continue to review awards data to determine if decisions issued have disparate impact on PWTD.	Yes	09/30/2024	
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**			

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B11
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?	Trigger 2 PWTD did not meet the Federal goal of 12 percent in two (2) of the six (6) MCOs while PWD did not meet the Federal goal of 2 percent in one (1) MCO: A review of BEP's MCOs by disabilities shows PWTDs are below the 2 percent Federal goal in three of the MCOs - 0083 (Police) at 1.05 percent, and 4406 (Letter Press Operator) at 1.32 percent. PWD did not meet the Federal goal of 12 percent in one MCO (4406 at 11.40 percent). It is noted that there has been improvement in MCO participation since FY 2023; last year, PWTD had low or no participation in three MCOs, and PWD's participation in 4406 has improved in FY 2024. Additionally, 45.45 percent and 18.18 percent of new hires in 2606 (Electronic Industrial Controls Mechanic) were PWD and PWTD, respectively. PWTD also had no representation at the GS-5, GS-6, and GS-8 levels; however, these triggers were not statistically significant due to the population sizes of those grade levels (five, six, and two employees, respectively). While PWTD currently have robust participation in the GS-11 to SES cluster, analysis is needed to determine if any barriers are impeding opportunities for PWTD to participate in lower-graded positions. PWD and PWTD have lower participation rates in selections for GS-13 through GS-15 positions: PWD and PWTD have robust participation in grades GS-13 to GS-15, exceeding the Government-wide goals at those grade levels. However, analysis of the B11 and B15 tables show triggers in internal promotions and new hires: • GS-13 internal promotions o PWD: 32.07 percent of qualified applicants / 22.22 percent of selections o PWTD: 15.76 percent of qualified applicants / 0.00 percent of selections • GS-14 internal promotions o PWD: 37.50 percent of qualified applicants / 0.00 percent of selections o PWTD: 15.00 percent of qualified applicants / 0.00 percent of selections • GS-13 new hires o PWD: 15.24 percent of qualified applicants / 7.69 p
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	***Barrier Group***
	People with Disabilities
	People with Targeted Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N
Barrier(s) Identified?:	N

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	**Target Date**	**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?**	**Date Modified**	**Date Completed**	**Objective Description**
09/30/2023	09/30/2024	Yes	09/30/2025		To determine, what if any, barriers preventing PWD and PWTD from fully participating in the BEP workforce, specifically in the occupations and grade levels listed above.

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Chief, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity	Judy Caniban	Yes

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Chief, Office of Human Resources (FY 2024)	Karnelis (Kay) Godette	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
09/30/2023	Review outreach and recruitment policy, practice and/or procedure specifically in MCOs.	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2023	Review outreach and recruitment policy, practice and/or procedure related to hiring and promotion of PWD and PWTD at the GS-13 through GS-15 grade levels.	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2024	Accelerate strategic consultation and engagement with appropriate hiring managers and provide data on status of BEP and specific directorate information on PWTD hires and workforce composition to ensure information is considered when making outreach and hiring decisions.	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2024	Establish a PWD and PWTD Hiring and Awareness Campaign that will include: • Re-educating managers and supervisors on BEP's responsibility to meet the 2 percent and 12 percent goal of hiring PWTD and PWD respectively. • Provide appropriate managers and supervisors with quarterly status of PWD and PWTD hires, participation for awareness and inclusion in outreach and recruitment decisions	Yes	09/30/2025	
09/30/2025	Review positions and corresponding position description to determine availability of opportunities to hire PWTD at GS-1 through GS-10 grade levels.	Yes	09/30/2025	

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Trigger 3 Review of Table B1 showed triggers in the PWOD and PWTD separation rates: • In FY 2024, BEP had 119 voluntary separations, which includes the Resignation, and Retirement categories: o 7.69 percent of PWTD separated voluntarily in FY 2024, compared to 6.26 percent of PWOTD. • BEP had nine involuntary separations during the reporting period, which includes the Removal and Reduction in Force categories: o 1.04 percent of PWD separated involuntarily in FY 2024, compared to 0.23 percent of PWOD. o 1.92 percent of PWTD separated involuntarily in FY 2024, compared to 0.40 percent of PWOTD. Note that the "Other Separations" category was excluded from the "voluntary" and "involuntary" tabulations, as it includes some separation types (such as death of an employee) which do not reflect a voluntary action on the part of the employee, or an adverse action on the part of the agency.
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	***Barrier Group*** People with Disabilities People with Targeted Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N
Barrier(s) Identified?:	N

STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER: Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan					
Date Initiated	**Target Date**	**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?**	**Date Modified**	**Date Completed**	**Objective Description**
09/30/2024	09/30/2025	Yes			To determine, what if any, barriers cause PWD and PWTD to separate from BEP at higher rates than employees without disabilities.

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Chief, Office of Equal Employment Opportunity	Judy Caniban	Yes
Acting Chief, Office of Human Resources (FY 2025)	Douglas Schott	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
09/30/2025	Review applicable policies, practices, procedures and exit surveys to investigate why PWDs and PWTDs were separating at higher rates compared to those without disabilities.	Yes		
Report of Accomplishments				
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**			

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

Planned activities are on track to be completed in FY 2025.

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

Accomplishments Fiscal Year 2024 Outreach and Recruitment Efforts: Established and maintained partnerships with minority, women, and other associations, to include organizations focusing on PWDs, to help develop and maintain a pipeline of qualified candidates from all segments of society, for employment in BEP's mission-critical positions. Some of the partnerships included: Association of Latino Professionals for America (ALPFA); Association of People Supporting Employment First (APSE); Hispanic/ Latino Professionals Association (HLPA); Mid-Atlantic Association of Women in Law Enforcement (MAAWLE). Partnered with vocational and trade schools to highlight the modern, cutting-edge technologies, strong culture at BEP, pride in what is being produced, and supporting BEP's mission: These partners included: National Tech to Gov Virtual Event (Virtual); Law Enforcement Recruitment Opportunities – Military (separation) (DC); Fort Worth Law Enforcement Hiring Expo (TX); North Texas Job Fair (TX). WiM Winter Virtual Career Fair and WiMEF Virtual Career Fair Virtual; BEP Summer Break 2024 Craft Demo; Level Up to Public Service Career Fair at HBCU (Delaware); OHR began working on plans to establish partnerships with vocational schools in the DC/Maryland and Dallas/Ft. Worth areas in the next fiscal year; OHR worked with representatives from BEP's Manufacturing community to plan and conduct outreach to highlight the need for vocational education and applications. OHR deployed a survey for candidates at outreach events to gather demographic data; 22 responses were collected in FY 2024. Of the responses collected, approximately 40% of respondents were female and/or minority. Within the minority responses, approximately 23% identified as African American, 9% identified as Hispanic, 9% identified as Asian / Pacific Islander, and the remaining 5% of minority respondents identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native. When asked what attracted attendees to BEP employment, salary and incentives and unique mission and work duties ranked among the top attractions, each ranking at approximately 23%. Approximately 45% of respondents were not previously aware of BEP or the type of positions offered. Explored and exploited appropriate social media platform as a source to recruit prospective candidates and another way to promote the Bureau; OHR collaborated with the Office of External Relations on using social media to gain a presence and to more effectively brand BEP. Currently BEP has a presence on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, and LinkedIn. OHR also collaborated with the Office of Personnel Management and USA Staffing to build a BEP branding page on USA Jobs, taking applicants directly to all of BEP posted opportunities. BEP purchased 13 professional memberships in FY 2024 to assist in focusing recruitment and outreach to People with Disabilities. Retention Strategies: BEP continued to deliver mandatory EEO related training for supervisors and non-supervisory employees. Both supervisors and non-supervisors were required to complete one hour of live training with five topics: EEO complaints, anti-harassment, accommodations for disabilities and religious practices, alternative dispute resolution, and information about respectful communication. The training included a case study related to RA. OEODM continued to deploy virtual office hour sessions to enhance engagement, and potentially retention, by educating the workforce on topics specific to EEO. Sessions were offered to all shifts, to ensure as many employees as possible had an opportunity to attend. Fifteen different topics were presented in FY 2024, several of which were specific to the Disability Program. BEP re-deployed Civil Treatment training sessions in FY 2024. Building upon the content presented in mandatory EEO training, Civil Treatment provides employees and supervisors practical guidance inappropriate workplace behavior and identifying and correcting issues before they rise to the level of harassment or discrimination. All BEP offices will receive this training. In FY 2024, OEODM delivered eight Civil Treatment for Employees sessions, engaging 139 employees; and five Civil Treatment for Leaders sessions, engaging 28supervisors. To proactively accommodate employees who are deaf or hard of hearing (as well as members of the public), BEP initiated a project to

procure additional video phones to be deployed in conference rooms and at entrances to BEP facilities. OHR hosted Monthly Human Resources Update Meetings to provide supervisors and managers ongoing education and updates on topics such as Prohibited Personnel Practices, career development, EEOrelated training opportunities, and retention. Barrier Analysis Efforts BEP continued to support the Barrier Analysis Team (BAT). In FY2024, a member of the SET served as the ES for the BAT. BEP's BAT, which was established in FY 2023, continued to meet biweekly in FY 2024. The team, which includes hiring managers from across BEP, along with advisors from OEODM and OHR, focused this year's analysis on identifying potential barriers to participation in BEP's MCOs. The BAT developed a new process and Barrier Analysis tool to review Position Descriptions (PD), comparing them to OPM Qualification standards to determine if the PDs contained requirements which might limit equal opportunity. Leveraging this process, the team identified and prioritized several triggers for further analysis. In addition to BAT meetings, OHR and OEODM held bi-weekly partnership meetings, which included reviewing personnel policies, practices, and procedures to determine if there are barriers to equal opportunity for certain groups. In February of 2024, the BAT briefed BEP's senior executives on its work using EEOC's root cause analysis tool and the common triggers for MCOs which included recruitment plans, marketing BEP and review of qualifications and position descriptions. BEP's SET supported the continued work of the BAT. OEODM conducted regular review of BEP's workforce demographics and participation of PWD and PWTD to determine triggers and address accordingly with appropriate partners, to include OHR and managers and supervisors. To identify potential barriers in acquisition and procurement, OES reviewed BEP's acquisition policies and began the development of a playbook and updated written policies to integrate accessibility requirements into the procurement process. To assist the SET and supervisors with understanding workforce demographics, BEP developed a Workforce Demographics dashboard in FY 2023 as a timely resource for providing a snapshot of the workforce. In FY 2024, OEODM and CIO continued to collaboratively refine the dashboard, so SET members will have insight into Directorate-level data visualizations. 508 Compliance Requirements Collaboration Site: BEP continued to maintain an internal collaboration site on its Intranet to provide BEP employees and contractors a single location to obtain information on 508 compliance requirements. The site covers general information, services that are provided and resources for more information. In FY 2023, the Office of Enterprise Solutions (OES), which includes BEP's Section 508 Team, set up a contract for a Section 508 organizational review; in FY 2024, the assessment began with deploying a survey to BEP offices to establish a baseline. The assessment survey received a 79 percent response rate and enabled OES to identify gaps and recommend solutions. The Manager of OES' Enterprise Strategic Planning and Management Division briefed BEP's Office Chiefs on the results of the assessment and plans to continue addressing the identified gaps. Physical Access Enhancement WCF continued projects to support ABA compliance, such as widening doorways in the facility, and adjusting grab bars and soap dispensers in the bathrooms, along with ensuring all bathrooms have braille signage. DCF o The DC Replacement Facility team consulted with OEODM to help ensure accessibility compliance is integrated into plans for the new facility. Leaders from BEP's Office of Facilities Support (OFS), OES, and OEODM collaborated to ensure continuation of efforts in response to the Department of the Treasury, Office of Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity (OCRE) audit on the effectiveness and efficiency of BEP's Title VII and Rehabilitation and other EEO-related programs, including Accessibility reviews on the facilities at both BEP locations. Reasonable Accommodation A dedicated parking area was identified for BEP's DCF fleet of scooters, which were procured for reasonable accommodation (RA) purposes. To proactively accommodate employees who are deaf or hard of hearing (as well as members of the public), BEP initiated a project to procure additional video phones to be deployed in conference rooms and at entrances to BEP facilities. The RA circular was updated and submitted for approval; it will be released in FY 2025. Training and education of New Employee Orientation: BEP conducted bi-weekly new employee orientations for each location (Washington, DC and Forth Worth, TX facilities) in FY

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

To maintain the robust presence of PWD and PWTD in the BEP workforce, it is imperative that we continue to do outreach and recruitment to areas where there are potential qualified PWDs and PWTDs. In addition, BEP will continue to deploy effective and timely reasonable accommodation program, make physical and virtual work environment accessible, and provide a safer workplace to ensure PWDs and PWTDs are able to fully participate within the BEP workforce and perform the essential functions of their jobs.