

U.S. General Services Administration
EEOC Management Directive 715
Annual Equal Opportunity Program Status Report

Fiscal Year 2017

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART A - D		U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT	
General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017	
PART A Department or Agency Identifying Information	1. Agency		General Services Administration
	1.a. 2nd level reporting component		
	1.b. 3rd level reporting component		
	1.c. 4th level reporting component		
	2. Address		1800 F Street NW
	3. City, State, Zip Code		Washington District of Columbia 20405
	4. Agency Code	5. FIPS code(s)	GS14 4177
PART B Total Employment	1. Enter total number of permanent full-time and part-time employees		11096
	2. Enter total number of temporary employees		392
	3. Enter total number employees paid from non-appropriated funds		0
	4. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT [add lines B 1 through 3]		11488

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART A - D	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT	
General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017
PART C Agency Official(s) Responsible For Oversight of EEO Program(s)	1. Agency Head	Administrator Emily Murphy
	2. Agency Head Designee	
	3. EEO Director	Associate Administrator for Civil Rights Madeline Caliendo
	4. Affirmative Employment Manager	Deputy Associate Administrator Aaron Scurlock, Director, Civil Rights Division Dennis Oden
	5. Complaint Processing Manager	Director of EEO Program Division Carolyn Sanders
	6. Other EEO Staff	
	7. MD-715 Preparer	Branch Chief, Affirmative Employment Jess Lang
	8. Diversity and Inclusion Officer	
	9. Disability Special Emphasis Program Manager	Disability Program Manager Anthony Speights
	10. Hispanic Special Emphasis Program Manager	
	11. Women's Special Emphasis Program Manager	
	12. Anti-Harassment Program Manager	
	13. Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager	

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART A - D	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT		
General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017	
PART D List of Subordinate Components Covered in This Report	Subordinate Component and Location (City/State)	CPDF and FIPS codes	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Part E. Executive Summary

This report is the FY 2017 Federal Agency Annual Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Program Status of the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA), in compliance with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) Management Directive 715-01 (MD-715). This report and corresponding analyses demonstrate the agency’s commitment to establishing and maintaining an effective civil rights program, inspiring a culture of equal opportunity and inclusion, and ensuring a model workplace free from unlawful discrimination through active engagement, training, and compliance reviews.

E.1 GSA Mission

The mission of GSA is to provide government agencies with a full suite of mission-support services—including real estate, acquisition, and technology—that are easy to use, reliable, and cost-effective. GSA provides the spaces, technical innovation, and goods and services essential to operate the Federal Government. We provide workplaces by constructing, managing, and preserving Government buildings and by leasing and managing commercial real estate. Our acquisition solutions offer private sector professional services, equipment, supplies, telecommunications, and information technology to Government organizations and the military. Our technology leadership helps agencies build, buy and share technology in ways that support their missions to better serve the public. Our implementation of Government-wide policies promotes management best practices and efficient Government operations. Our success relies on bringing together a talented and diverse workforce—including data scientists, real estate experts, architects, acquisition specialists, programmers, policy analysts—and building a cohesive, customer-focused team.

The GSA workforce is serviced by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), a centralized civil rights program with 23 full-time employees. OCR is guided by its vision of being “a premier civil rights program that inspires a culture of equal opportunity” and has a mission to “help ensure an inclusive GSA free from unlawful discrimination through active engagement, training and compliance with Civil Rights laws.” OCR administers five civil rights programs: the Equal Employment Opportunity Complaint Adjudication Program; the Affirmative Employment Program; the Nondiscrimination in Federal Financial Assistance Program; the Non Discrimination in Federally Conducted Programs and Activities Program, and the Environmental Justice Program. OCR also issues decisions on appeals of administrative grievance decisions. OCR includes two organizational units: the Equal Employment Opportunity Division and the Civil Rights Division. The EEO Division has two branches: Early Resolution (ER) and Adjudication and Compliance (A&C). The Civil Rights Division has three branches: Policy, Reporting, and Outreach (PRO); Affirmative Employment Program (AEP); and the External Program (EP).

E.2 GSA Equal Employment Opportunity Program Status

GSA has an Equal Employment Opportunity Program that supports the six essential elements of a model EEO program. This report details the state of the civil rights program as of September 30, 2017, and includes activities planned for execution in 2018 to enhance affirmative employment and barrier identification programs and support a “model” EEO and affirmative employment program, as defined by EEOC. Every year, the agency evaluates whether its civil rights program meets requirements established by law and described in EEOC’s directives for implementation of civil rights laws; and, as necessary, the agency writes plans to ensure that any programmatic deficiencies are corrected.

In FY 2017, GSA conducted a self-assessment of the agency’s Title VII and Rehabilitation Act programs to determine how they measure against the six elements as essential for the establishment of a “model” EEO program. No new program deficiencies were identified in this review, but two deficiencies identified in the FY 2016 had not been fully resolved as of September 30, 2017. These deficiencies are the lack of (1) a fully-developed OCR barrier analysis review of the agency’s reasonable accommodation activity, and (2) a standalone anti-harassment program procedure as part of the existing anti-harassment program. This second element regarding the anti-harassment program has been identified as a program deficiency at GSA since 2014, but has historically been discussed separately and not included in Parts G and H like other program deficiencies, since there is no specific program element in the Part G checklist to cover the anti-harassment program and procedure requirement. The draft procedure to correct this deficiency was submitted to internal stakeholders via the Executive Secretariat document review process at GSA in FY 2017, after it was submitted to EEOC OFO in January 2017 for comment and discussed during a technical review. The issue related to accommodation reviews was not resolved, but significant progress was made in addressing the deficiency, with resolution expected in FY 2018. With respect to the standalone anti-harassment program procedures, the procedures were finalized and implemented on April 5, 2018.

The results of the program review are presented in Part G and summarized below.

1. Demonstrated Commitment from Agency Leadership: 100% (21 of 21) of sub-elements met;
2. Integration of EEO into the Agency’s Strategic Mission: 100% (32 of 32) of sub-elements met;
3. Management and Program Accountability: 90% (9 of 10) of sub-elements met; the unmet program element regards OCR’s

lack of involvement in reviewing disability accommodation decisions and accommodation activity, to ensure compliance with written procedures and analyzing the information tracked for trends and problems.

4. Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination: 100% (10 of 10) of sub-elements met;

5. Program Efficiency: 100% (30 of 30) of sub-elements met; and

6. Responsiveness and Legal Compliance: 100% (19 of 19) of sub-elements met.

During FY 2017, GSA OCR and OHRM planned collaborative reviews of disability accommodation decisions/actions to ensure compliance with written procedures and identification of trends and problems. These plans, implemented in FY 2017 and continuing into FY 2018, will ensure all key data elements are captured with reasonable accommodation requests and that information is regularly provided to OCR for review and analysis. Based on the action plan developed and defined in Part H of this document, GSA expects resolution of this program deficiency in FY 2018.

GSA OCR and OHRM have worked together to develop policies and procedures to support a separate anti-harassment program at GSA. In FY 2016, a draft version of the GSA anti-harassment procedures was provided to EEOC for review and comment. Based on the EEOC review, OCR finalized and submitted new anti-harassment procedures for clearance in FY 2017 in the GSA Controlled Document Tracker. These procedures were issued April 5, 2018.

GSA Leadership Affirmed the EEO Policy Statement. During FY 2017, Timothy Horne, Acting GSA Administrator, demonstrated his commitment to EEO and affirmative employment principles through several initiatives including issuing a statement affirming his commitment to Equal Employment Opportunity at GSA within nine months of his appointment, and participating as a guest blogger on OCR's popular Civil 'Writes' blog to demonstrate his support for EEO and Civil Rights at GSA.

GSA Remains Committed to Early Resolution. GSA continues to promote and require managers to participate in ADR, when elected. As a result, the percentage of employees opting for ADR increased from 56% in FY 2016 to 61% in FY 2017, and the resolution rate increased from 47% in FY 2016 to 54% in FY 2017.

GSA Expanded Mentoring Opportunities at GSA. In an effort to eliminate barriers to entering into a mentoring relationship, GSA OCR partnered with the Office of Human Resource Management (OHRM) to host Virtual Flash Mentoring events at GSA in FY 2017. Approximately 100 employees from across the agency were mentored by a diverse group of GSA senior leaders.

GSA Implemented a Robust Unconscious Bias Training Program. Also in FY 2017, GSA launched a robust outreach and training program across the agency focused on EEO and diversity through the lens of unconscious bias. This effort sought to address the unconscious attitudes and behaviors, which research indicates we all have, that tend to negatively impact women and minorities in the workplace. Through a pilot with GSA's Great Lakes Region, headquartered in Chicago, strategies to "interrupt" unconscious bias were developed, tested and evaluated. These strategies can be used to interrupt the adverse impacts of unconscious bias in the workplace. Approximately 500 GSA staffers voluntarily participated in the pilot. The pilot was so successful the GSA's National Capital Region's Public Building Service, with about 1,200 GSA staff, requested to participate in a pilot in FY 2018 incorporating unconscious bias interrupters, which can be scaled to all GSA.

GSA Continues Civil Rights Outreach. The Associate Administrator for OCR and her staff delivered 12 EEO training webinars in FY 2017 with 1,967 attendees, and additional in-person outreach and training to employees at Blacks in Government (BIG), Lesbian Gay Bisexual, Transgender Allies Group events and at other GSA events. OCR continued its popular Civil Writes blog, a forum to discuss civil rights and related issues at GSA, and in FY 2017 it logged 19,471 visits, half of whom were new visitors. OCR collaborated with different GSA organizations throughout FY 2017 to further EEO goals including the Office of Strategic Communication (OSC). OSC produced six in-house EEO videos supporting several EEO projects, and OHRM's Human Capital Data Analytics Group launched a data analytic/visualization tool to share demographic data with managers. The data analytic tool is designed to be suitable for use by any government agencies conducting civil rights barrier analyses and human resources planning.

GSA Strengthens Analytics to Support Barrier Analysis. OHRM produced and distributed quarterly workforce demographics and personnel data analytics dashboards for senior leadership and conducted a number of agency-level applicant flow analyses for the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) report to OPM. In collaboration with OCR, OHRM conducted a study of affinity bias (a form of unconscious bias often seen in the workplace) on performance reviews. The study specifically looked at how in group and out group bias affects performance reviews with the results used to inform the training of supervisors and managers about how biases could impact the performance review process.

GSA Continues Support of Special Emphasis Programs. In FY 2017, OHRM actively supported GSA's newest special emphasis programs, to include Hispanic and Disability Employment groups and a Federal Women's Program. To enhance outreach to Hispanics and Latinos and to promote GSA as a model employer, OHRM continued to collaborate with the OSC to enhance and maintain the Spanish-language version of the GSA-managed website portal for directories of federal information accessible to the public (Gobierno USA, located at <http://www.usa.gov/gobiernousa>), and continued to promote topics of interest to Hispanics and Latinos with a companion site under the name of First Gov en espanol, which receives over five million visits per year.

EEO Complaint Activity

Starting in January of 2017, the EEO Division conducted a large-scale project to streamline and standardize operating procedures, templates, and electronic document management solutions. Highlights include:

- Early resolution (informal complaint stage) standard documents were re-formatted (or new ones created) to mirror and capture EEOC reporting requirements. OCR provided EEO complaint processing guidance to Complainants which resulted in more accurate claim framing and data management.
- A virtual file room was created to store and organize virtual EEO casefiles. This revolutionized how GSA/OCR works on EEO cases and promoted greater case security and processing efficiency.
- New standard operating procedures were developed to streamline EEO complaint processing.
- Improved complaint processing controls were introduced that ensure quality of product and efficiency of process.
- Hired a highly-experienced program analyst to ensure quality in and standardization of EEO data management and reporting.

Early Resolution. In FY 2017, a total of 37 informal complaints were on hand at the beginning of the year (11 more than in FY 2016), and 175 new complaints were initiated (by 163 persons), which is five fewer than in FY 2016. In FY 2017, 188 informal EEO cases were completed with 100% timeliness. Of these, 57% participated in Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), compared to the government-wide participation rate of 53%, with a resolution rate of 55%, which is higher than the 47% resolution rate in FY 2016. In FY 2017, 26 cases settled during the informal period, with reassignment being the most typical non-monetary benefit resolution; nearly three quarters of the cases (14 of 19) settled with non-monetary benefits. In FY 2017, 76 cases were withdrawn or otherwise did not result in a formal complaint being filed.

Formal complaints. At the beginning of FY 2017, a total of 125 formal complaints were on hand and 88 formal complaints were filed (by 79 individuals). GSA's average formal filing rate since FY 2012 has been 86%, and FY 2017 was consistent with this trend. Compared against the size of the entire workforce, this is a 0.75% formal EEO filing rate, which is a decrease from 0.82% in FY 2016. This is slightly above, but near, the federal-wide average filing rate of 0.50%. GSA's filing rate between FY 2012 and FY 2017 has been 0.74%. This year's filing rate is consistent with past performance. As to timeliness, 99% of all case actions related to processing and closures for formal complaints of discrimination were completed on time, as were 100% of investigations.

As reflected in Figure One (left), reprisal, disability, and age were the top three most prevalent complaint bases alleged, with race and sex tied for a distant fourth. (Note: Multiple bases for discrimination are typically claimed per case, so the sum of the bases in the graphic will not equal the total complaints filed.)

Reprisal for prior EEO activity was not only the top allegation this year, but it has remained among the top four bases alleged for the sixth year in a row, which is consistent with federal trends. Race almost dropped out of the top four most-alleged bases altogether this year, for the first time since FY 2012. Race allegations dropped dramatically this year from nearly tied for first last year to barely making the top four. The totals among these most-often identified bases in formal complaints were reprisal (50), followed distantly by disability (41), age (35), and race/sex (31). Ethnicity (national origin) allegations plummeted from 24 to 9, and color from 33 to 16, and religion from 12 to 3 in FY 2017.

The significant process improvements in the early resolution division may account for these strong trends. The focus on proper framing of allegations appears to have possibly resulted in aggrieved parties identifying fewer (more relevant, accurate, genuinely-related) bases for their complaints. The counseling staff focused energies this year explaining the direct relationship that should exist between a complaint basis and a matter alleged to be discriminatory, to ensure the proper framing of EEO allegations.

Figure Two (right) lists the issues most commonly raised in EEO complaints at GSA in the past year. Allegations of harassment of a non-sexual nature was by far the most prevalent complaint issue, at 33 cases. Nonselection for promotions for internal candidates (as opposed to appointment/hire of persons outside the agency), performance evaluation, and reasonable accommodation of disability all tied for second, at 17 cases filed, while terms of employment and time and attendance tied for third with 13 cases, and duty assignment trailing a very distant seventh at only 9 cases. Across the federal sector, workplace harassment and nonselection allegations are the issues most often raised in EEO complaints. Therefore, GSA's complaint patterns are currently in step with other agencies' complaint activities and have been for several years in a row.

Complaints reporting and required training. GSA's Annual EEOC Form 462—EEO Complaint Activity Report was timely submitted to EEOC, and the mandatory quarterly and annual No FEAR Act postings are made in a timely manner on the GSA internal and external websites. All GSA personnel were required to complete No FEAR Act training on a biannual schedule through GSA Online University. OCR is currently revising and enhancing mandatory and non-mandatory training related to sexual harassment and assault, owing to the prevalence of this issue nationwide.

OCR detailed action plans addressing the program deficiencies identified above are presented in Part H of this document. In addition to these plans, in FY 2017 and onward, OCR will implement actions to continue to build program efficiencies and

develop required civil rights program elements.

E.3 Workforce Analysis

In FY 2017, GSA conducted a comprehensive barrier analysis, following the guidance and best practices provided by the EEOC. No new barriers were identified in FY 2017. A summary of the data sources used to conduct the barrier analysis along with a summary of the trigger and barrier analysis is presented below.

Data Sources Used to Conduct Barrier Analysis

Personnel data is available from the CHRIS database that maintains demographic information for GSA employees. All information present in available records is provided on a voluntary basis by employees. The statistics regarding ethnicity, race, and sex from the National Civilian Labor Force (NCLF) and the GSA Relevant Civilian Labor Force (GSA RCLF) provide benchmarks for comparison. The individual, occupational CLF benchmarks in workforce table A6 are derived from the relevant civilian labor force statistics (RCLF) for each occupation. The RCLF is collection of data subsets of the national statistics, but instead describes the numbers of persons in demographic groups currently employed in certain jobs—and therefore, with more-closely defined, relevant skills and experience, as opposed to the overall civilian labor force that includes thousands of occupations without federal workforce equivalents.

The NCLF is comprised of 2010 data from the American Community Survey (ACS) from the Census Bureau. The NCLF includes all persons over the age of 16 within the U.S. in the non-institutional civilian population (i.e., persons not in penal and mental health facilities or nursing homes) who are employed or seeking employment and who are not on active duty in the military. The GSA RCLF, which is a more-precise subset of the NCLF, is calculated from an aggregation of the employment availability statistics associated with the specific occupations comprising the GSA workforce. Use of the GSA RCLF and occupational CLF for benchmarking is a refined approach, far more appropriate for comparative civil rights analyses and the only way for agencies to determine their true states of equal employment. Using this RCLF data, with relevant skills and work experience as filters, allows agencies to estimate rates for expected workforce participation of various demographic groups based on their employment availability, job experience and skills, rather than merely their existence in the public. These comparisons are used in accordance with EEOC's interpretive authority (regarding the Civil Rights Act and Rehabilitation Act) and the Commission's guidance in its MD-715 "Instructions to Agencies."

Workforce Totals

At the end of FY 2017, GSA had 11,096 permanent and 392 temporary employees. This reflects a net decrease of approximately 0.5%. The GSA workforce is comprised almost entirely of white-collar, salaried employees in the General Schedule (GS) and related pay systems, including a Senior Executive cohort of 110. The remaining 1% is employed within the blue-collar, hourly Wage Grade (WG) system, and in the workforce tables attached to this report, WG employees are not included in the same workforce tables to analyze grade breakouts as GS employees because the grade levels as described by numbers are not comparable.

The GSA workforce is 53.7% male, which is slightly higher than the NCLF (51.9%), but lower rate than federal-wide service (57.5%), and significantly higher than GSA's alternative RCLF benchmark of 49.9%.

Persons with disabilities comprise 8.8% of the workforce, and among these employees with disabilities is a 1.2% subgroup of individuals with targeted disabilities (IWTDS). "Targeted" disabilities are a special category established by the EEOC and OPM for special scrutiny related to workforce analysis, since the severe limitations caused by certain conditions may be more likely to lead to on the job discrimination and lesser opportunities. These employment rates fall below benchmark of 12% for disability employment and 2% for targeted disability employment, established in EEOC's "Final Rule of Affirmative Action for Persons with Disabilities in Federal Employment" as finalized and promulgated to Executive agencies in January of 2017. The two largest GSA occupations are in the Contracting and General Business and Industry categories, which are usually female-dominated on a national level, per the aforementioned RCLF statistics; yet in GSA, men outnumber women in the General Business series by a significant margin (56% to 44%), primarily because White women are participating at a rate 20% below their employment availability in the public in this job category. Persons with disabilities (particularly targeted disabilities) are employed under federal hiring goals in both occupations. These two positions alone comprise almost 30% of the GSA workforce. This is significant because it demonstrates these jobs drive much of our overall demographic composition in the agency.

Major Occupations

As of the end of FY 2017, 123 different job series are represented in the GSA workforce. For the purposes of this report and corresponding workforce and barrier analyses, EEOC requires that agencies identify significant, "major" occupations, determine appropriate benchmarks, and examine these for data anomalies ("triggers") that may point to EEO issues. These ten occupational series are identified in the A6 and B6 workforce tables attached to this report. Three quarters of the workforce is employed in these ten occupations alone. As is reflected in Figure Three (right), more than 60% of the workforce population is employed in just the top six job series alone. Therefore, these occupations are the driver for GSA trends.

Contracting: 1102 Series. At 15% of the workforce, Contracting is the largest occupation at GSA for the fifth year consecutively. Women outnumber men in this field, 57% to 43%, which is 4% over the RCLF benchmark for contracting work. This is the case even though White women are employed at a rate 16% under their employment availability. Women still outnumber men owing to the facts that minority women's employment rate in all demographic categories (including American Indians) is near or above their availability, and that Hispanic and White men's participation rates are below the occupational availability statistics. As defined by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the 1102 series includes positions that manage, supervise, perform, or develop policies and procedures for professional work involving: the procurement of supplies, services, construction, or research and development using formal advertising or negotiation procedures; the evaluation of contract price proposals; and the administration or termination and closeout of contracts. This series requires knowledge of the legislation, regulations, and methods used in contracting; and knowledge of business and industry practices, sources of supply, cost factors, and requirements characteristics. Demographic breakouts to reflect the composition of this occupation and those major occupations that follow may be found in the attached workforce tables labeled A6 and B6, for ethnicity/race/gender and disability status, respectively.

General Business and Industry: 1101 Series. 1101 is noteworthy because General Business, Building Management, and Transportation Operations occupations, which fall under this job series, are the only occupations at GSA in which Hispanic men are found in levels higher than their availability rate in the NCLF. This series covers all classes of positions administering, supervising, or performing any combination of duties characteristic of two or more series in the 1100 group, or doing other work properly classified in the group for which no other series has been provided. The overall group includes all classes of positions requiring knowledge of: business and trade practices; characteristics and proper use of equipment or property; industrial production methods and processes; collection and analysis of information; contract management with industry and commerce; examination and appraisal of property; and administration of regulatory controls.

Management and Program Analysis: 0343 Series. This is the third-largest GSA occupation. As defined by OPM, positions in the 0343 series require knowledge of: the substantive nature of agency programs and activities; agency missions, policies, and objectives; management principles and processes; and the analytical and evaluative methods and techniques for assessing program development or execution and improving organizational effectiveness and efficiency. In the GSA workforce, women are prevalent in this series, well beyond the extent we would expect from in the RCLF figures identified for the occupation in table A6, with women's participation rates in every single group landing either close to or well above the expected, occupational-availability statistics for each. White women, although far below their expected rate in every major occupation except for the attorney series, are within 2% of their availability in the series. Furthermore, Black women are choosing GSA as an employer for occupations in this job series at a rate over 26%, far over their availability rate of just under 4%.

Miscellaneous Administration: 0301 Series. Conversely, Miscellaneous Administration (0301)—the job series which during the past few years at GSA this occupation has fluctuated in and out of third position in the list with 0343 based on population size—offers more high-grade opportunities, especially senior executive positions. OPM defines 0301 work as performance or management of higher-grade tasks for which no other series is appropriate—requiring skills like analytic ability, discretion, and knowledge of a substantial body of administrative policies and objectives. Benchmarking data for the series can be problematic, because thousands of job titles are applied within this series nationwide, and the actual work and required skills for these jobs varies widely. At GSA alone, the 0301 series has a few hundred job titles associated with it. Since the availability benchmarks are so imprecise in this "miscellaneous" series, it is scarcely worth noting that Hispanic and White women at GSA are employed at rates significantly below their availability for this series, and more worth noting that this is true in virtually every other job series at GSA as well.

Building Management: 1176 Series. The fifth-largest population at GSA is in the aforementioned group with Contracting and Business and Industry. OPM defines work in this series as involving management of buildings, campuses, and other facilities to provide organizations with appropriate office spaces and essential building services. No matter what job title is designated to employees in the 1176 series, they generally perform one or several of the following duties: applying business knowledge to manage or assist with the operation buildings and surrounding campuses; directing complete building management programs and plans; and applying building management methods and developing standard management protocols. As with most occupations, Hispanic and White women are employed in this series below their expected participation rate. This is one of only a few categories where Hispanic men's employment levels are at expected rates.

Information Technology Specialists: 2210 Series. The next occupation is the Information Technology Specialist series. As reflected in the RCLF, this is a predominantly male field, and the GSA workforce deviates little from the expected population for men versus women. Hispanic women at .9% are under their 2% availability, White men at 43% are under their 52% availability, and White women at 16% are under their 21% availability. However, Black women are employed far above their expected rates at 15% and 10% respectively, when their availability is 7% and 5%. Workforce analysis to support barrier discussions related to a review of the agency's merit promotion plan revealed the explanation for this (seeming) anomaly identified in prior MD-715 reports. IT at GSA is headquartered in Washington D.C., so geography is the primary driver of this multi-year trend. Per the regional RCLF for the 2210 job series, the distribution pattern is in line with expected employment rates for all persons except White men and women. Prior workforce analyses regarding the 2210 series indicates that a significant, high-graded population of technology specialists are also employed at GSA, and these persons perform web development and data architecture

responsibilities that do not fall within the 2210 series classification per OPM standards. Therefore, these persons are classified in the 0301 series instead, within agency's Technology Transformation Services division (which last year was its own first-tier organization, but now falls within the Federal Acquisitions Service).

Transportation/Finance/Budget/Attorney Series: 2150, 0501, 0560, 0905. The remaining major occupations employ far fewer persons, and these are: the Transportation Operation Series (2150), which are jobs requiring experience in maintaining, retailing, purchasing, or procurement of automotive, rail, air, bus, or other transportation equipment or services, or in the operation of a commercial transportation facility or terminal; the Financial Administration & Program Series (0501), reflecting positions that perform, supervise, or manage administrative work of a fiscal, financial management, accounting or budgetary nature that is not classifiable to another more specific professional or administrative series in Accounting; Budget Analysis Series (0560), and these are positions that perform, advise on, or supervise work in any of the phases of budget administration when such work requires knowledge and skill in applying budget-related laws, regulations, policies, and techniques; and lastly, General Attorneys (0905).

A notable point about the General Attorney series at GSA: Data reviews and discussions in the BAW (relevant to the merit promotion policy) revealed the importance of analyzing 0905 as a "major occupation." To an even greater extent than the aforementioned 0301 and IT job series (as discussed in prior MD-715 reports) and their significant presence in the SES cohort in proportion to workforce size, this is even more evident in the 0905 series. Attorneys are a fraction in the agency (at under 1% of the overall workforce in FY 2017), but many Executive opportunities are in this occupation or are held by persons who originated in this occupation—not just directly as agency counsel or serving in legal advisory capacities in program offices, but also in the Office of the Inspector General and serving as contract appeals judges in the CA pay plan. Therefore, although this group is the smallest of GSA's major occupations, analyzing application and promotion data for this attorney series remains essential to complete understanding of the composition of the SES cohort.

Ethnicity/Race Indicator (ERI) and Sex Data

GSA's ethnicity and race indicator (ERI) distributions remained relatively static during the past year, as reflected in the attached workforce tables. Despite a net change of -.5% overall in the workforce, a few demographic groups actually saw net increases in their populations, most notably Hispanic, Black, and Asian men. The rate of change in the workforce for White women (Hispanic and non-Hispanic) exceeded the net change for the workforce, making the fifth consecutive year that the overall employment trend of White women is out of step with the rate of change in the workforce overall. Minority employees at GSA currently comprise 40% of the population. The observations regarding White women may be especially significant given population size.

As reflected in Figure Four (right): With a workforce that is 60% White and 40% minority employees, GSA is among the more diverse agencies in the federal government. Against the GSA-specific NCLF, based on their availability for employment with skills matching GSA's complement of particular occupations, Hispanics and White women are the only groups at GSA whose participation rates are lower than expected, but Hispanic employees are within one percentage point of the RCLF. The workforce is 5.4 % Hispanic, 26.9% Black, 6.5% Asian, 0.24% Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 0.81% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 0.44% multi-minority-race. In prior reporting cycles, more-significant-sounding data triggers were discussed with Hispanic employment, but these observations were based on the less precise national benchmark. Also, the most significant data disparities noted prior to this fiscal year at GSA pertained to minorities' and women's rates in grade 15 and the SES, compared with their representation in the middle band.

With a review of workforce, complaints, and survey data, and in conjunction with a 2016 BAW review of the merit promotion plan, OCR examined these disparities further to determine if barriers existed, and what, if any, actions needed to be taken for their elimination or mitigation, recognizing that a few aspects in the data triggers have also been observable on a national level, as reported in EEOC's annual federal workforce reports since 2002. Fewer minority employees and women in the SES as a result of external factors (primarily, regional RCLF availability), and fewer White women opting to apply for and remain in federal employment, are federal employment trends across agencies and not unique to GSA. Therefore, the AEP division and the complementary BAW efforts are still operating with the knowledge that external barriers are likely the driver for the trend regarding White women, and GSA has not identified artificial, internal barriers existing solely within GSA policies and practices that single out White women. The barrier analysis remains geared toward answering a series of pointed questions about minorities' and women's representation (including White women) in the higher grades.

Disability Status

The federal government recognizes the importance of ensuring that individuals with disabilities (IWDs) are given equal opportunity to succeed in the workplace, despite the significant barriers they may face as compared with individuals without disabilities. In 2010, Executive Order 13548 was signed to direct agencies to increase recruitment, hiring, and retention of persons with disabilities, and the EEOC requires special emphasis on affirmative employment and retention of individuals with targeted disabilities (IWTDS). IWTDS are defined as persons with the more-severe varieties of disabling conditions, those persons that OPM and the EEOC consider to be most likely to be treated disparately owing to stereotyping, underemployment, and on-the-job discrimination. OPM and the EEOC have established an official list of these targeted disability categories, to include: deafness, blindness, missing extremities, full or partial paralysis, epilepsy, cognitive disorders, psychiatric illness, and

dwarfism. OPM and EEOC modified the self-identification data collection form in August of 2016, with additional categories were added to the list of targeted disabilities, to include development disabilities like autism spectrum disorder, severe disfigurement, mobility disorders, and traumatic brain injury ("TBI"). EEOC and OPM have also recognized some disabilities that are not designated as targeted may be just as severe, or more severe, than some targeted disabilities.

As part of its LEAD Initiative ("Leadership for the Employment of Americans with Disabilities") nearly a decade ago, the EEOC recommended a 2% goal for the federal employment of IWTDs at Executive agencies. After EEOC's expansion of rules related to Section 501 of the Rehab Act this year, the federal government is required to set that 2% benchmark, in addition to reporting more statistics, performing more meaningful barrier analyses, tracking accommodation activities in granular detail, and writing plans to reach specific numeric goals for employing persons with disabilities. In the GSA workforce as a whole, just over 1.3% of the population self-identified as having one of the disabilities in the above-listed categories. This falls short of the federal 2% goal, but is slightly over the federal average of 0.9%. An employment trend of note is the rate of deaf persons employed at GSA. In the past year, the agency added five deaf persons to the workforce, effectively doubling the population. The agency's administrative functions are concentrated in the Washington D.C. metro area, and therefore entry-level positions are available for recruitment at Gallaudet, a deaf-serving local institution. OCR and OHRM will continue to discuss the opportunity to increase the deaf population at GSA.

GSA employs no persons in positions that would tend to disqualify many IWDs. Therefore, GSA is increasing its efforts to recruit IWDs and IWTDs; at the beginning of the year, GSA used "Ready Cert" tools (a number of human resources strategies and methods for getting lists of qualified applicants to hiring managers quickly) to work with targeted groups of individuals eligible under disability hiring authorities. Additional resources that the HR Service Centers used included OPM's Shared Register of Candidates with Disabilities, Department of Labor, State Rehabilitation Centers and Centers for the Visually Impaired. Also, to ensure retention of IWDs, GSA continued development of the agency's accommodation program.

As of the end of FY 2017, 8.8% of GSA employees had voluntarily identified themselves as IWDs, which is now, for the first time in ten years, over the 8.7% federal average and closer to the 12% federal goal. The multi-year trend as indicated in Figure Five (right) reflects gains almost 3% for disability employment since FY 2011. The IWTD employment rate increased from under 1% to 1.3%, largely owing to the aforementioned changes to the SF-256 disability categories and a large-scale disability resurveying project (related to the revisions to the SF-256) begun at the end of FY 2017. In the past year, as reflected in the attached table B1, GSA saw an 11% net increase in disability employment, and 51% net increase in targeted disability employment, despite the overall net loss of .5% in the workforce overall in 2017. These are the first disability employment gains GSA has made since 2011, and the agency will continue its recruitment and re-surveying efforts to continue this momentum.

GSA has not yet established a hard, numeric goal for targeted disability employment. In lieu of a numeric goal for hiring IWTDs, a percentage goal of 2.5% has been established for all new hires. There are 146 IWTDs in the workforce; so with 11,488 employees, and being at approximately half the federal goal, GSA will still need to approximately double this number of IWTDs the current workforce. If recent hiring trends continue, with GSA hiring an average of 600 employees per year, an established 2.5% goal means our presumable "numeric goal" (based on the percentage goal) for IWTD hires is approximately 18 persons per year. Factoring in the attrition of IWTDs as well, at that rate (of only 2.5% of all new hires), GSA may take a decade or more, or perhaps never reach, the 2% federal goal.

As is true in many agencies, GSA struggles with obtaining current, accurate disability information via employees' voluntary self-identification. Persons hired under Schedule A noncompetitive authority on the basis of profound disability do not necessarily voluntarily provide disability status information, and GSA has no developed protocol to review and discuss collecting and entering accurate information from such individuals, despite possessing statutory authority to do so as described on the SF-256 itself. And although no such statutory authority exists regarding veterans hired under noncompetitive appointment or veterans' preference associated with significant disability, EEOC in its guidance regarding Section 501 encourages agencies to consider more sources of personnel information to accurately count persons with disabilities in the workforce, and GSA has determined that a significant portion of the veterans hired under such authorities are not identifying disability status either. More discussion about this issue and a means to address it is included in the barrier analysis section to follow in this summary.

Grade

The average grade at GSA is 12.5, which is higher than the federal (non-military, non-U.S. Postal Service) average of 10.4. GSA's major occupations require specialized, professional experience, whereas other agencies have a greater number of entry-level opportunities in general job categories. There is a slight difference in the average grade for men and women (12.5 and 12.3, respectively), and the averages for persons without and with disabilities show an even greater difference (12.4 and 11.7). The average grade is lowest of all for IWTDs, at 10.4.

In keeping with trends detected in the federal sector overall, persons with targeted disabilities do not approach parity in the upper grades and the SES, as reflected in the attached B-4 tables. There is also a slight disparity associated with ERI and gender. White employees' average grade is 12.5, whereas minority employees' average is 12.2, a gap that has narrowed by .1% in the past two years. Further analysis indicates that the disparity is largely owing to Hispanic and Black women's lower grade averages, at 11.8 and 11.9. Asian men and women average the same grade as White employees, at 12.5. Analysis in the

past few years has focused on measuring the impact of job series and the location of upper-grade positions in the agency. Job series has had the greatest impact, as discussed in prior MD-715 reports from 2015 and 2016.

The attached A4 table shows the grade distribution of the permanent workforce by ethnicity and race indicator and sex. Although some discrepancies become apparent when groups within grade ranges are compared against their overall representation rates, there are two caveats to consider. First, the number of employees in each grade grouping varies widely, so the groups are only very generally comparable. There are comparatively few employees in the lowest grades, with fewer than 400 total in the lowest tier of pay bands, whereas there are about 8,000 employees in the “middle” band, and back downward to about 2,600 in the 14-15 group, and only 110 SES. The smaller the group, the overly-weighted each individual is when compared with individuals in large groups. Further, the trigger analysis and barrier discussions in 2016 revealed that the entire middle band taken as a whole group is not genuinely representative of the highest grades, and absolutely not representative of the SES, where job series is a huge part of the equation—or if not job series, at least a related job family.

Last year’s MD-715 report detailed how certain occupations in GSA are more likely than others to lead to a GS-15 and the SES. Some occupations only lead to one SES opportunity, or even none whatsoever, for the entire field. Large groups of employees at GSA are concentrated in positions that do not extend to the higher grades in comparable measures or lead to the SES, thus creating the surface appearance of a disparity where one may not actually exist. Some occupations that ladder to a GS-12/13 do not involve skills and experience that may translate to other occupations with higher promotional potential. Therefore, for advancement opportunities, employees in these occupations would have to effect a complete career change. The lower grade average for IWTDs, however, cannot be resolved via data analysis. Less than 4% of the whole workforce falls into the lower band (GS 1-8), yet one quarter of IWTDs fall into this category. As described in the EEOC’s revision to Part J of this report, IWTDs comprise almost 8% of the grade cluster up to GS-11, but only 1% in the uppermost cluster. Only two appointments have been made in grades 14-15 under Schedule A on the basis of profound disability; this noncompetitive authority is used more extensively in the lower grades. Notes about these trends are found in Part J of this report.

The GSA Relevant Civilian Labor Force Reporting Project

During FY 2017, OCR partnered with the Human Capital Analytics Division to develop a substantively more inclusive approach than the agency’s prior benchmarking method to examine demographic data for the workforce. Using the data analytic/visualization software Tableau, the collaboration produced a direct, simple, and more meaningful method to analyze and visualize demographic data for affirmative employment purposes. This new approach, started in FY 2017 and finalized in early FY 2018, has already improved GSA’s AEP capabilities. The method itself for the creation and generation of the results is simple and direct enough that GSA believes it can be incorporated and applied to any number of agencies or departments in the Federal Sector and will be promoting this as a solution for other government organizations in FY 2018. There is potential for government-wide impact, and GSA will be reaching out to EEOC to explore this possibility further in FY 2018.

The newly-created RCLF Dashboard incorporates personnel data (aggregated and anonymized) to compare it against the relevant Census data, as taken from the 2006-2010 American Community Survey EEO Tabulation. Using geographic details based on the duty location of each position, the dashboard allows GSA to filter results based on occupational series, selected ERI and sex classifications, organizational elements (both regional and service/staff office levels), fiscal year, and level of statistical significance. The data used is largely the same as the data used to generate the required tables for the MD 715 report, with the inclusion of organizational markers and geographic information.

To create the RCLF, GSA matches the occupational series and its overall proportion of the workforce against the corresponding Census data. By weighting the results from the Census data based on the representation of an occupation within GSA, the GSA can say with greater specificity when and where potential triggers might occur. Although the results derive from the state-level data within the EEO Tabulation, a specific change was made to account for the Washington, D.C. metro area. Due to the number of states within the D.C. metropolitan statistical area (MSA), a combined view was specified for the positions located there. Approximately half of the GSA workforce is located within the D.C. area, so this change eliminated several false positives that originally appeared when viewing solely at the state level. Additional applications of MSA-specific measures will be considered for future versions.

The Dashboard includes several views on the GSA workforce. The overall snapshot view seen in Figure Six presents the demographic comparison for each major sub-organization unit first as a bullet chart on the top, with the bar representing the actual count within the labeled organization, and the vertical black line where the expected representation to be based on the geographic location of the employees. The bottom portion displays the same information as a heat map, with the size of the segments denoting how significant of a difference there is as compared to the expected results. Information can be shown for instances for either greater-than or less-than-expected representation for a particular demographic group. Each segment in the heat map is delineated by geographic location.

Figure Six: Overall Snapshot, GSA RCLF Dashboard showing results for Female employees.

The second view shows the same information in a more detailed heatmap, as seen in Figure Seven. Showing information by Fiscal Year and by occupational series, this view allows for a longer, more detailed view on the trends for any particular

occupation over time. The information is color-coded to indicate the significance of the differentials witnessed.

Figure Seven: Heat Map view of the change in representation rate of Female employees over time. The numbers indicate whether the actual counts were above or below the expected rate of representation based on the occupational series and location of each position.

The third view displays information similar to the Heat Map view, but compares the actual counts per Fiscal Year against the expected results. Figure Eight shows three separate views. The top is a line chart showing the counts per year compared to the calculated expected results. The middle portion shows the difference between those two values. The bottom portion displays a comparison of gains and losses per year – this portion is vital to help pinpoint potential drivers of change for a demographic group and provides a significant level of context during the barrier analysis process.

Figure Eight: Timeline view showing the change over time of the Female GSA workforce as compared to calculated expected results.

The fourth and final view shows detailed results of the data used in the previous views, compiling the various data points into a single reference table. The information, as seen in Figure Nine, displays a detailed breakdown by state, actual count, the Census benchmark, the expected counts, and the difference from expectations. This view, similar to the Timeline view in Figure Eight, provides greater detail for more specific analytical purposes.

Figure Nine: Detail view of the GSA workforce by geographic location and the specific measures in determining variations from the expected rates of representation.

As with any new method or tool, the use of the new RCLF database will increase over time as the benefits can be incorporated into overall barrier analysis efforts. While no specific data "surprises" have been discovered due to the integrated method, the RCLF tool has provided further insight into several areas under examination by OCR.

One example is in the representation rate of Hispanic or Latino Women in GSA; the MD-715 tables included in this report show that this group's participation rate within the agency (2.7%) is well below the expected rate of participation (4.0%), and there is still a level of specificity needed to further look at causes for this difference. By using the RCLF tool, OCR is not only able to see where the groups have the greatest divergence from their expected rates of participation, but also by specific occupational series as well. In the case of Hispanic or Latino Women, a closer look using the RCLF tool shows that the primary drivers for the less than expected rate of participation occur primarily due to the positions located in and around the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. With approximately half of the entire agency working in this area, the actual number of Hispanic or Latino Female employees (119) falls well below the expected rate (181), and the primary occupational series driving this appear to be also some of the agency's mission critical occupations: 0301, 2210, 1101, and 1176.

Other regions of the country fall below expected rates of participation, but positions located in California and Texas (homes of GSA Region 9 and Region 7, respectively) are the secondary drivers of less than expected rates of participation for Hispanic or Latino Women. This information significantly narrows the area in which OCR will look in subsequent analyses, particularly the accessions and departures of Hispanic or Latino Women over recent years. The next steps allow for even more granular analyses, expediting the determination as to whether a possible barrier exists for this group within GSA or if there are other externalities that could be causing the less than expected rate of representation.

This new approach, started in FY 2017 and finalized in early FY 2018, has already improved GSA's AEP capabilities. The method itself for the creation and generation of the results is simple and direct enough that GSA believes it can be incorporated and applied to any number of agencies or departments in the Federal Sector and will be promoting this as a solution for other government organizations in FY 2018. There is potential for government-wide impact, and GSA will be reaching out to EEOC to explore this possibility further in FY 2018.

Discussion of Data Triggers and Barrier Analysis

In addition to the annual self-assessment, MD-715 requires federal agencies to analyze their workforce data for any triggers that may indicate that barriers to EEO exist. Triggers are symptoms that indicate a barrier to equal opportunity may exist, whereas barriers are the root cause of these symptoms—in the form of policies, practices, or conditions within the agency itself that limit equal opportunity for individuals in demographic groups.

Lower Participation Rates for Minority Groups in GS-15 Positions and the SES. OCR will conduct more job series and career-progression studies in FY 2018 and examine complaint trends and survey data that may uncover barriers or potential explanations for these triggers. OCR will present this background information to the BAW to shape discussions about the

agency's major personnel policies. The upcoming year will focus on reviewing the recruitment and selection process for SES appointment at the agency.

Participation Rates for Individuals with Disabilities Below Federal Benchmarks. Conversely, statistical anomalies continue to appear for workforce representation rates for persons with disabilities, without the aforementioned external explanations. A review of EVS and exit interview data will continue to drive the analytic activities, in addition to reviews of reasonable accommodation data and all EEO decisions related to disability-related allegations, particularly the processing speed and disposition of requests for reasonable accommodation. Given an ongoing problem with an abnormally high attrition rate of persons with disabilities, (particularly this year's near-8% rate), involuntary separations of IWTDs, exit data from these persons would be critical to determining a root cause for anomaly. Unfortunately, federal agencies do not make a general practice of collecting exit interview statements from employees who are terminated or otherwise leave the agency under unfavorable/involuntary circumstances, and GSA is not an exception. Also, as indicated in the Part J section of this report that follows, it still appears that attitudinal barriers regarding the ability of persons with severe disabilities to perform work in the agency, and institutional barriers in the form of underdeveloped education regarding the promotion and use of special hiring authorities, may be affecting IWTDs' rates of representation.

GSA's rate of 1.3% instead of 2% IWTD employment remains short of the federal goal mandated by EEOC. Many of the job-related factors influencing IWTD employment (fitness requirements, nature of the agency's work) that are common among federal agencies are not relevant factors at GSA, necessitating in-depth barrier analyses and barrier mitigation activities in FY 2017. An outline of individual, first-level program offices' varying successes with IWTD employment may be found in B1. It is noteworthy that both OHRM and OCR have reached or exceeded the 2% goal for targeted disability employment. A review of the aforementioned survey and exit interview data has been central to analytic activities in the past few years and resulted in reviews of reasonable accommodation decisions related to disability-related allegations in EEO cases, particularly regarding the processing speed and disposition of requests. The BAW's reading library included barrier studies produced by EEOC ("Improving the Participation Rate of People with Targeted Disabilities in the Federal Workforce"), the National Council on Disability ("National Disability Policy: A Progress Report"), and the Department of Labor ("Federal Agency Employment Strategies: A Framework for Disability Inclusion"). These national studies cite common obstacles to employment of persons with disabilities and challenges to achieving minority representation. GSA is not immune from hiring challenges outlined in these national studies, based on FY 2017 statistical and program review findings.

The discussion regarding applicant flow data and hiring of persons with disabilities reinforced conclusions described in GSA's 2016 MD-715. Barrier studies produced by EEOC and the National Council on Disability cite the aforementioned barriers as common obstacles to minority representation and employment of persons with disabilities. Exit interview statements do not indicate persons with disabilities are articulating specific reasons for leaving the agency. EVS responses for persons with disabilities do not indicate significant differences of opinion about merit issues. GSA's FY 2016 analysis revealed complaint trends that suggest disability findings are more typical than other types of complaints, given GSA had disability findings of discrimination in 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015; and settlement figures are significant where disability is raised as a basis, as discussed earlier in this narrative and in last year's MD-715 report.

The lower grade average for IWTDs is reflected in the following B4 tables and the Part J discussion. IWTDs are concentrated in grades 1-9, where their representation rate is 3.8%, nearly four times their overall rate, whereas their representation rate falls to barely 1% in the higher grade cluster. GSA has made very few appointments via Schedule A for grades 14-15 in the past few years; this noncompetitive authority is used more extensively in the lower grades, rather than being used to enhance disability employment in the higher grades or to directly, non-competitively promote internal employees with disabilities, and OHRM and OCR continue to discuss ways to ensure hiring managers know about opportunities to promote persons with disabilities via Schedule A.

GSA, as is true at many agencies, faces a very large issue related to its disability employment statistics. It is very difficult to obtain and maintain accurate, complete disability information from employees, many of whom prove reticent to voluntarily self-disclose disability status. OHRM conducted an agency-wide disability resurvey via email in 2017, and OCR set up informational tables at both NDEAM events in the headquarters offices to support the effort. Thus far, nearly a thousand employees have accessed the form and affirmed or updated their information, resulting perhaps in the first measurable improvement (.94%) in the overall disability rate, and 0.43% for targeted disability for the first time in five years. However, the most significant workforce data factor detected in FY 2017 is that 800 veterans in the current workforce who were hired with personnel codes associated with 30% or more disability have not disclosed any disabilities via the SF-256, the collection vehicle for voluntary disability self-identification. That is 70% of the veterans hired under programs associated with disability who have not yet disclosed disabilities. While it is true that the veterans preference codes associated with disability are not a guarantee that that veteran still has a disability or has significant limitations, it is unlikely that all 800 are without any disabilities whatsoever. Disclosure of this information must remain 100% voluntary; veterans group participants and affinity members have offered anecdotal information to AEP staff, and have stated many times that it is strongly against military culture to disclose disability. OCR is partnering with OHRM to appeal to persons with disabilities in the workforce to disclose their disabilities, especially veterans who may be hesitant to do so. If the agency succeeds in convincing veterans to disclose, these numbers suggest GSA is already at or above both the 12% and 2% goals for disability and targeted disability employment.

The awareness campaign will focus on ramping up vet recruitment, but emphasizing the fact that veteran recruitment might not be viewed as the best solution for disability hiring unless veterans are willing to disclose. Since veterans appear to be afraid to report disability, it looks like the agency's efforts will never produce numeric results. Therefore, OCR and OHRM will work in 2018 to get out the word that information disclosed on the SF-256 isn't seen by supervisors or coworkers or available in a personnel file with the employee's documents. The overall purpose is NOT simply to improve the agency's statistics; rather, the effort is for civil rights and disability analysis, to ensure that disability and vet employment programs are actually working the way they are supposed to. Rather than this being about the numbers themselves, it is what the numbers mean, and how the civil rights program in concert with the Disability Program Manager can use data to make sure barriers for veterans with disabilities aren't keeping qualified people out of the GSA workforce. Veteran employment must be a cornerstone of GSA's affirmative employment plan, to meet this mandated numeric goal. However, until GSA succeeds in convincing veterans to disclose their disability status accurately, veteran employment will not look like an effective cornerstone of a disability employment plan.

As briefly mentioned at the beginning of this section, EEOC's "New Rule Implementing Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act," released in January of 2017, discusses agencies incorporating information received from employees in the context of reasonable accommodation activities into recordkeeping systems, to identify persons in the workforce and count them in appropriate reporting categories. OCR is working with OHRM to determine the best path to implement this rule which could result in large shifts in GSA's disability statistics. A spot-check of such records indicates that a great number of persons who have established their disability status (to a higher standard than simply submitting an SF-256) through the interactive process of requesting disability accommodation. In the meantime, all planned activities related to improving the rate of employment of persons with disabilities will move forward as stated. The attached workforce tables indicate the agency was not positioned in FY 2017 to hire employees at the same robust levels as in prior reporting cycles, and this effort has been the agency's best chance to evaluate its actual state of disability employment and draw more definitive conclusions.

Less Than Expected Participation of Minorities, Persons over the Age of 40 and Persons with Disabilities in the GSA 18F Organization as Compared to the Relevant Civilian Labor Force. In FY 2016, a barrier issue was brought to OCR's attention in two ways: First, demographic composition analyses by OCR revealed strong data triggers that merited further review of the 18F division in GSA's Technology Transformation Service, and second, a complaint was brought to OCR's attention raising EEO concerns in 18F.

What data triggers were detected?

When comparing 18F's workforce to the relevant civilian labor force, the following triggers were evident. Specifically, the program employed:

- More white employees (80%) than GSA overall (61%) and from employment availability benchmarks for the 0301 job series (71%);
- More white men (52%), than what we would expect from benchmarks (27%);
- More Asian men (6.2%) and Asian women (6.2%) than expected for the 0301 job series for Asian men (3.6%) and Asian women (2.6%);
- Fewer Black/African American employees (6%) than expected for the 0301 job series for Black/African American employees (12%), and far fewer than expected for the 0301 job series in the DC area (28%);
- Hispanic employees (1.4%) below their 0301 employment benchmark (8%);
- Zero American Indian/Alaska Native employees, whereas GSA overall meets the benchmark of 1% employment for this group;
- Fewer persons with disabilities (5%) than GSA employs overall (7%), which is below the federal goal of 12%;
- Zero persons with targeted disabilities, which is below the overall GSA rate of .8%, and even further below the Federal Goal of 2%;
- 2% veterans—under the overall GSA rate of nearly 20%;
- Nearly 70% persons under the age of 40, as compared to GSA's rate of 35%, which is an approximate inverse to the workforce as a whole;
- Almost an entire workforce categorized under the 0301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program occupational series instead of more specific occupational categories to reflect actual job duties and requirements.

The above-referenced triggers in conjunction with the referenced complaint suggested EEO barriers at 18F may have presented in the division's use of an expedited hiring authority unrelated to disability (under the authority of an OPM memo based on the special skills of the candidates in question), in lieu of competitive hiring practices, as well as a lack of training about federal-sector civil rights, merit principles, diversity and inclusion, and disability employment principles, conducted a barrier analysis of the triggers noted to determine whether a barrier to EEO in 18F existed, owing to the gravity of the complaint notification received, strength of the triggers detected, and high-profile nature of the allegation(s).

What did OCR request 18F's leadership to provide?

The Associate Administrator for Civil Rights approached her counterpart in the Technology Transformation Service (TTS), the

GSA organization under which 18F is located. He agreed that OCR was positioned to help the agency detect and mitigate civil rights problems, and designated a contact point within the Service to respond to AEP staff. OCR contacted the designee, who had already been apprised by leadership in TTS about the principal issues.

OCR mapped a barrier analysis strategy to address the various triggers. The AEP division had theories about why the workforce composition within 18F differed from expectations for employment in the 0301 series (as well as GSA generally), but needed confirmation by way of documentation. The general mission of 18F was known to AEP staff designing the barrier analysis. Therefore OCR requested the following:

- Copies of position descriptions for “innovation specialists” and “industry specialists”
- Sample performance plans
- A description and/or listing of recruitment and outreach sources
- Notes about the nature and scope of the hiring authority used to build 18F’s workforce
- Summary of 18F’s mission and commitments and deliverables for FY 2017

TTS provided the necessary documentation for OCR to conduct its analysis. Direct discussions took place between the Director of the Civil Rights Division, the AEP Branch Chief, and the 18F designee immediately thereafter to discuss the information and arrive at conclusions.

What were the conclusions regarding barriers, based on this information?

The demographic anomalies were explainable. Virtually all of the employees in 18F require top-level industry expertise in web development. There is no such federal equivalent in OPM’s classification guide for work of the nature done in 18F, and that is why the employees worked in the 0301 series instead of 2210, and why the 0301 employees did not, and never reasonably would, resemble the national group of 0301s in federal service. The position descriptions, performance plan samples, and information about the Service provided by 18F designee completely substantiated this point.

As determined via the American FactFinder tool on the Census website, the availability benchmarks for web developers (in California and Washington D.C., the primary locations of the division’s employees) proved that 18F’s demographics actually were a fair match for the availability statistics for persons with the required skills, from the ethnicity/race/gender standpoint. As for the review of personnel policies and practices related to selection of the workforce, the information revealed that the initial rounds of hiring had been conducted very heavily by word-of-mouth among colleagues and college acquaintances, so hires were based heavily upon the prior education and work relationships among web development and data architecture specialists at the top of their fields on a national level. Therefore, this trigger was resolved.

18F was using a diverse and extensive list of industry network groups, especially to target minorities and women, to move beyond the prior recruitment construct. There were, however, no veteran or disability groups in the list, and the veteran employment question was relevant since it is so closely tied to disability employment. Also, very few 18F employees had completed the No FEAR training immediately upon hire as new federal employees, and as many of the “Innovation Specialists” were new to the federal sector and lacked institutional knowledge about basic merit and EEO principles, it was unsurprising that a number of the employees were not completely accustomed to federal EEO guidelines for workplace behavior.

Concerns independently voiced to the 18F designee mirrored several elements within the complaint material, and 18F was eager to avail itself of OCR training resources and civil rights advice to resolve existing issues. Collaboration between OCR and 18F commenced, to select the appropriate educational material, best medium for training, and scope of training modules to address gaps in civil rights training to establish coverage of the entirety of 18F.

What barriers were identified, and what were the next steps to address them?

Although many demographic triggers were mitigated during the review, OCR worked with 18F to address the civil rights issues which remained. The aforementioned barrier was word-of-mouth recruitment and the lack of variety in recruitment sources beyond ethnicity, race and gender considerations. OCR recommended that 18F expand its recruitment sources to include veterans, and to implement a framework for outreach to disability employment groups. However, positions in 18F are not permanent, and therefore such efforts will not directly support permanent disability employment in the federal sector. Second, OCR provided training to the entire 18F workforce in October 2017 during its “IRL (In Real Life)” operational meeting in D.C.; this training was required, and in-person for all its employees. 18F has requested further training opportunities related to sexual harassment and EEO complaint processing.

What changes at 18F are evident this year, after these barrier activities?

There have been improvements in the rate of employment of both IWDs and IWTDs in the 18F cohort, in that its representation rates are now consistent with GSA overall. The barrier discussion and resolution of the plan related to 18F is featured in Section I. The barrier is resolved, in that the overly-restricted recruitment policy is no longer in practice at 18F. They received training, and their disability employment numbers have improved.

We are considering the barrier resolved, since 18F’s practices have changed and the workforce statistics have changed. A new review of all demographic data (styled upon 715 Tables A/B1, A/B5, and A/B8) for 18F against the appropriate web

development benchmark indicates that from the ERI/G perspective, 18F is at or very close to the benchmarks we would expect based on employment availability, in that we see:

Less than half a percentage point of difference for white men in 18F as the benchmark would have us expect (52.3% versus 51.6%), and only 2% fewer white women than the benchmark (26.2% versus 28.5%);
Only about 2% more Asian men (6.2%) and 2.5% more Asian women than would be expected for web development;
Only about a half a percentage point more Black men (3.8% versus 3.2%) and 1.5% more Black women (3.1% versus 1.7%) as the benchmark would have us expect; and
Hispanic men and women about a percentage point off (2.3% versus 3.5%; .8% versus 1.8%).

Improvement in disability status (modeled on B1) is as follows:

A comparable percentage of persons with disabilities (8%) as GSA overall (8.8%), which is still below the federal goal of 12%;
1% persons with targeted disabilities (below the goal of 2%);
Only 2% veterans--well under the overall GSA rate of nearly 33%;
67% persons under the age of 40, as compared to GSA's rate of 29%.

E.4 Accomplishments

During FY 2017 and the beginning of FY 2018, GSA implemented action plans to address the two barriers identified in FY 2016 MD-715.

The first barrier mitigated was with the above-mentioned 18F scenario. During FY 2017, the 18F organization reviewed and expanded their recruiting sources, changed recruiting practices, with the entire organization being provided in-person by OCR in the first quarter of FY 2018.

The second barrier mitigated is the attitudinal and institutional barriers affecting the rate of recruiting and hiring individuals with targeted disability (IWTD). OHRM is taking steps to ensure that separate certificates of qualified individuals with disabilities are always presented separately and prominently to hiring managers for every announcement created promotional and educational materials to ensure managers and supervisors are aware of the tools and resources available to recruit and effectively manage IWTDs, with specific focus on special hiring authorities. To support OHRM in this effort, the GSA OCR analyzed RA data regarding reasonable accommodations including discrimination allegations over the past five years to identify recommendations and developed a sample training presentation regarding promotion of Schedule A hiring. OCR and OHRM collaborated to resurvey the workforce. Due to the low frequency of updating disability information and the average tenure of the GSA workforce, OCR believes an accurate survey of the workforce will result in more favorable representation of IWTDs. GSA resurveyed the workforce in Q1 FY 2018 and had close to 10% of the workforce updating their information.

Although successfully implementing all actions steps in the barrier elimination plans, GSA will continue to monitor data and assess if these or other barriers to equal employment opportunity.

E.5 Planned Activities

A brief summary of significant actions planned for upcoming years includes:

Maintenance and Continuation of the Barrier Analysis Workgroup (BAW). In support of the EEOC's model program element of proactive prevention of discrimination, OCR will review major personnel policies (merit promotion, awards, training) on a formal schedule, using the established, cross-functional team comprised of volunteers from OCR, OHRM, and GSA program staff.

Support of Disability, Hispanic Employment, and Federal Women's Programs. The collateral-duty Special Emphasis Program Managers selected by OHRM will participate in special emphasis observances, barrier analysis, affinity group development, and related affirmative employment activities. OHRM will maintain affinity groups like the Veterans Employee Resource Association and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender (LGBT) and Allies Employee Association, and will be involved in the barrier analysis workgroup discussions.

Continuation of the EEO Innovation Project. OCR will extend the project to continue to improve the way services are delivered in the formal stage of the EEO process in OCR's Adjudication and Compliance Branch.

Enhanced Dashboard Reporting. OCR and OHRM developed a dashboard to demonstrate demographic information within the context of regional Relevant Civilian Labor Force (RCLF), and this may be extended to other agencies as well.

Development of EEO and Unconscious Bias Training Modules. A number of training modules and pilots are also under development related to EEO complaints, unconscious bias, and the full complement of civil rights services OCR can provide to the agency. An unconscious bias pilot was tested on a larger scale and will continue to include: awareness of what unconscious bias means, using "mindfulness" as an interrupter to unconscious bias, and a discussion about micro-inequities.

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART F	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT
General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

**CERTIFICATION of ESTABLISHMENT of CONTINUING
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS**

I, Associate Administrator for Civil Rights Madeline Caliendo am the

(Insert name above) (Insert official
title/series/grade above)

Principal EEO Director/Official for General Services Administration

(Insert Agency/Component Name above)

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 Agency Head or Agency Head Designee

Date

Signature of Principal EEO Director/Official

Date

Certifies that this Federal Agency Annual EEO Program Status Report is in compliance with EEO MD-715.

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART G		U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT					
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.							
General Services Administration			For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017				
Compliance Indicator	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
Measures				Yes	No	N/A	
The Agency Head was installed on <u>01/23/2017</u> The EEO policy statement was issued on <u>10/23/2017</u> Was the EEO policy statement issued within 6-9 of the installation of the Agency Head?				X			
During the current 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	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
Measures				Yes	No	N/A	
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			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
Compliance Indicator	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
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
Are managers and supervisors evaluated on their commitment to agency EEO policies and principles, including their efforts to:		X			

General Services Administration

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

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

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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? Describe what means were utilized by the agency to so inform its workforce about the penalties for unacceptable behavior.	X			Employees are required to take No FEAR training which addresses GSA's policy regarding inappropriate workplace behavior and 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.							
General Services Administration			For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017				
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?)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Are the duties and responsibilities of EEO officials clearly defined?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Do the EEO officials have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, are there organizational charts that clearly define the reporting structure for EEO programs?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If the agency has 2nd level reporting components, does the agency-wide EEO Director have authority for the EEO programs within the subordinate reporting		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
If not, please describe how EEO program authority is delegated to subordinate reporting components.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Compliance Indicator		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
Measures					Yes	No	

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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	X			
Does the agency consider whether any group of employees or applicants might be negatively impacted prior to making human resource decisions such as reorganizations and re-alignments?	X			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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		X			
Compliance Indicator	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
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
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		X			Completed 10/31/2015
Federal Women's Program - 5 U.S.C. 7201; 38 U.S.C. 4214; Title 5 CFR, Subpart B, 720.204		X			Completed 10/3/15
Hispanic Employment Program - Title 5 CFR, Subpart B, 720.204		X			Completed 10/31/2015
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	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
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
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			

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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.

General Services Administration

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

Compliance Indicator	EEO program officials advise and provide appropriate assistance to managers/supervisors about the status of EEO programs within each manager's 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
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
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	N/A	
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	N/A	

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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			
Has the agency, when appropriate, disciplined or sanctioned managers/supervisors or employees found to have discriminated over the past two years?	X			There was one finding in FY 2016 involving one manager who was not disciplined.
If so, cite number found to have discriminated and list penalty /disciplinary action				
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		See Part J.

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.

General Services Administration

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

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	N/A	

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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	N/A	

Are all employees encouraged to use ADR?

X

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017		
Is the participation of supervisors and managers in the ADR process required?	X		

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.	
General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017

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	N/A	
Does the EEO Office employ personnel with adequate training and experience to conduct the analyses required by MD-715 and these instructions?		X			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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	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
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
<p>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?</p>	X			
<p>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?</p>	X			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017				
Does the agency hold contractors accountable for delay in counseling and investigation processing times?		X				Contractors are obligated to meet all timeframes set out in the contracts. If a contractor fails to meet its obligations (and GSA is unable to meet the timeframes set out in 29 CFR 1614, et seq), GSA will no longer use that contract firm. Staff review interrogatories and affidavits to ensure contractors take appropriate and timely follow-up.
If yes, briefly describe how:						
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	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	
Measures		Yes	No	N/A		

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
Are benchmarks in place that compare 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			
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			Completed in FY 2015.
When a complainant requests a final agency decision, does the agency issue the decision within 60 days of the request?	X			Completed in FY 2015.
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			
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	Measure has been met			

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.				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	N/A	
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			
After the agency has offered ADR and the complainant has elected to participate in ADR, are the managers required to participate?		X			
Does the agency ensure that the responsible management official directly involved in the dispute does not have settlement authority?		X			
Compliance Indicator		Measure has been met			

General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
	<p align="center">The agency has effective systems in place for maintaining and evaluating the impact and effectiveness of its EEO programs.</p>				<p align="center">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</p>
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
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		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		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			
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	<p align="center">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.</p>	Measure has been met			<p align="center">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</p>
Measures		Yes	No	N/A	
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		X			
Does the agency discrimination complaint process ensure a neutral adjudication function?		X			
If applicable, are processing time frames incorporated for the legal counsel's sufficiency review for timely processing of complaints?		X			

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.						
General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017				
Compliance Indicator	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 report	
Measures		Yes	No	N/A		
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		X				
Compliance Indicator	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	
Measures		Yes	No	N/A		
Does the agency have control over the payroll processing function of the agency? If Yes, answer the two questions below.		X				
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	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	
Measures		Yes	No	N/A		

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
<p>Is compliance with EEOC orders encompassed in the performance standards of any agency employees?</p>	X			
<p>If so, please identify the employees by title in the comments section, and state how performance is measured.</p>	<p>EEO Specialists have standards to ensure timely completion of work, including processing corrective action. Performance is also measured by quality, including compliance with regulation and directives and timeliness with respect to the due date.</p>			
<p>Is the unit charged with the responsibility for compliance with EEOC orders located in the EEO office?</p>	X			

General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017			
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 interest, copy of any checks issued, narrative statement by an appropriate agency official of total monies paid?	X			
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			

Footnotes:

1. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.102.

2. When an agency makes modifications to its procedures, the procedures must be resubmitted to the Commission. See EEOC Policy Guidance on Executive Order 13164: Establishing Procedures to Facilitate the Provision of Reasonable Accommodation (10/20/00), Question 28

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART H-1	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT	
General Services Administration		For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017
STATEMENT of MODEL PROGRAM ESSENTIAL ELEMENT DEFICIENCY:	C.3.e.: Ensure that the agency reviews merit decisions related to disability to ensure compliance with accommodation procedures; analyzes trends in tracked accommodation data; and identifies issues.	
OBJECTIVE:	Enable the agency to review merit decision related to disability to ensure compliance with accommodation procedures; analyzes trends in tracked accommodation data; and identifies issues.	
RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:	Jess Lang	
DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:	09/30/2015	
TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:	09/30/2018	
PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:		
REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE		

EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I-1	U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission FEDERAL AGENCY ANNUAL EEO PROGRAM STATUS REPORT	
General Services Administration	For period covering October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017	
<p>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</p> <p>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</p>	<p>When comparing 18F's workforce to the relevant civilian labor force, the following triggers were evident regarding minority representation, persons over the age of 40, and persons with disabilities.</p>	

BARRIER ANALYSIS:

Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.

Analysis included a review of all demographic data (styled upon 715 Tables A/B1, A/B5, and A/B8) for 18F. When comparing 18F's workforce to the relevant civilian labor force, the following triggers were evident. Specifically, the program employed:

- Far more white employees (80%) than GSA overall (61%) and from employment availability benchmarks for the 0301 job series (71%);
 - Far more white males (52%), than what we would expect from benchmarks for the 0301 job series (27%);
 - More Asian men (6.2%) and Asian women (6.2%) than expected for the 0301 job series for Asian men (3.6%) and Asian women (2.6%);
 - Far fewer Black/African American employees (6%) than expected for the 0301 job series for Black/African American employees (12%), and far fewer than expected for the 0301 job series in the DC area (28%);
 - Hispanic employees (1.4%) below their 0301 employment benchmark (8%);
 - Zero American Indian/Alaska Native employees, whereas GSA overall meets the benchmark of 1% employment for this group;
 - Fewer persons with disabilities (5%) than GSA overall (7%), below the federal goal of 12%;
 - Zero persons with targeted disabilities (below the goal of 2%);
 - Only 2% veterans--well under the overall GSA rate of nearly 20%;
 - Nearly 70% persons under the age of 40, as compared to GSA's rate of 35%;
 - Almost an entire workforce categorized under the 0301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program occupational series instead of more specific occupational categories to reflect actual job duties and requirements.
- Therefore OCR requested the following:

- Copies of position descriptions for "innovation specialists" and "industry specialists"
- Sample performance plans
- A description and/or listing of recruitment and outreach sources
 - Notes about the nature and scope of the hiring authority used to build 18F's workforce
 - Summary of 18F's mission and commitments and deliverables for FY 2016

OCR had the necessary documentation and information within two weeks. Direct discussions took place between the Director of the Civil Rights Division, the AEP Branch Chief, and the 18F designee immediately thereafter to discuss the information and arrive at conclusions.

Virtually all of the employees in 18F require top-level industry expertise in web development. There is no such OPM benchmark for work of the nature done in 18F, and that is why the employees worked in the 0301 series instead of 2210, and why the 0301 employees did not, and never would, resemble the national group of 0301s in federal service. The position descriptions, performance plan samples, and information about the Service completely substantiated this point.

The availability benchmarks for web developers (in California and D.C., the primary locations of the division's employees), as determined via the American FactFinder tool on the Census website, proved that 18F's demographics actually were a fair match for the availability statistics for persons with the required skills, from the ethnicity/race/ gender standpoint.

	<p>rounds of hiring had been conducted very heavily by word-of-mouth and prior education and work relationships among web development and data architecture specialists. 18F was using a diverse and extensive list of industry network groups, especially to target minorities and women. There were, however, no veteran or disability groups in the list, and veteran employment is closely tied to disability employment. Also, very few 18F employees had been required to attend the usual complement of EEO training, and the entire workforce was new to the federal sector and lacked institutional knowledge about basic merit and EEO principles. Concerns voiced to the 18F contact mirrored complaint material, and 18F was eager to avail itself of OCR training resources and civil rights advice.</p> <p>Although many demographic triggers were mitigated during the review, OCR is working with 18F to address the civil rights issues which remain.</p>
<p>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.</p>	<p>The barrier was word-of-mouth hiring and the lack of variety in recruitment sources beyond ethnicity, race and gender considerations. OCR recommended that 18F expand its recruitment sources to include veterans, and to implement a framework for outreach to disability employment groups. However, positions in 18F are not permanent, and therefore such efforts will not directly support permanent disability employment in the federal sector. EEO and ?New IQ? training must be delivered by OCR to the entire workforce. 18F is making this training required, and in-person for all its employees.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE:</p> <p>State the alternative or revised agency policy, procedure or practice to be implemented to correct the undesired condition.</p>	<p>Expanded recruitment should increase diversity in key factors in 18F. Enhanced training for 18F staff about the whole complement of civil rights responsibilities, concepts, and protections will improve the EEO climate and prevent instances of harassment or inappropriate conduct.</p>
<p>RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:</p>	<p>Madeline Caliendo; David Shive</p>
<p>DATE OBJECTIVE INITIATED:</p>	<p>10/01/2016</p>
<p>TARGET DATE FOR COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:</p>	<p>09/30/2017</p>
<p>EEOC FORM 715-01 PART I-1</p>	<p>EEO Plan To Eliminate Identified Barrier</p>
<p>PLANNED ACTIVITIES TOWARD COMPLETION OF OBJECTIVE:</p>	<p>TARGET DATE (Must be specific)</p>
<p>Schedule in-person training.</p>	<p>03/01/2017</p>
<p>Meet with 18F designee to review new recruitment sources.</p>	<p>04/01/2017</p>
<p>REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS and MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE</p>	
<p>18F demonstrated the barrier (word-of-mouth hiring and the lack of variety in recruitment sources) was eliminated. 18F was expanding its outreach and working to ensure persons with disabilities in their workforce knew how to report disability and would be comfortable doing so. The original plan was modified; 18F originally planned to conduct live training in its locations, with prior plans for a travel budget no longer realized; ultimately 18F and TTS elected to have the staff all report to D.C. the third week in October 2018. At that time, the Civil Rights Director delivered training to attendees instead of traveling offsite.</p>	

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 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 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)

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)

Answer: Yes

The rate of representation of IWD in the GS-1/10 cluster is 14.1%, over the 12% goal. The rate of representation of IWD in the GS-11-SES cluster is 7.9%, under the 12% goal.

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

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

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

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

The rate of representation of IWD in the GS-1/10 cluster is 14.1%, over the 12% goal. The rate of representation in the GS-11-SES cluster is 1%, under the 2% benchmark.

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

Managers and supervisors take a complement of required courses when they become new supervisors, and the hiring goals related to disability are in reference material thereafter, and refresher courses are required.

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 DISABILITY PROGRAM

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

Answer: Yes

N/A

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	OHRM; Anthony Speights, Special Placement Program Coordinator, (202) 708-0090, anthony.speights@gsa.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	1	OHRM; Anthony Speights, Special Placement Program Coordinator, (202) 708-0090, anthony.speights@gsa.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	0	0	20	OHRM; Alexandra Vernacchio; Deputy Workforce Relations Division/National Employee Relations Program Manager (215) 292-0780 alexandra.vernacchio@gsa.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	23	OCR; Evelyn Britton; Branch Chief, External Programs; (601) 410-3594, evelyn.britton@gsa.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	OCR; Evelyn Britton; Branch Chief, External Programs; (601) 410-3594, evelyn.britton@gsa.gov

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	OHRM; Anthony Speights, Special Placement Program Coordinator, (202) 708-0090, anthony.speights@gsa.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(s) that disability program staff have received. If “no”, describe the training(s) planned for the upcoming year.

Answer: Yes

All staff receives annual training in their fields of specialty, across program offices like human resources, information technology, and civil rights.

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

N/A

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.

GSA used "Ready Cert" tools (a number of human resources strategies and methods for getting lists of qualified applicants to hiring managers quickly) to work with targeted groups of individuals eligible under disability hiring authorities in Q1. Additional resources that the HR Service Centers used included: OPM's Shared Register of Candidates with Disabilities, Department of Labor, State Rehabilitation Centers and Centers for the Visually Impaired.

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.

GSA has designated a SPPC to coordinate special placement, and when candidates are located this SPPC works with local human resources specialists to effect the hires and coordinate onboarding and accommodation coordination (when applicable).

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.

Applicants who apply under Schedule A via USAJobs have eligibility determined via the same evaluation process as other candidates, but are placed on a separate certificate for hiring managers' consideration. Applicants who apply directly to the SPPC have their qualifications reviewed by a human resources specialist (locally identified by the SPPC) for the position identified, and the human resources specialist explains whether and how the hire can/will be effected and the person brought onboard.

4. Has the agency provided training to all hiring managers on the use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A)? If "yes", describe the type(s) of training and frequency. If "no", describe the agency's plan to provide this training.

Answer: Yes

Managers and supervisors take a complement of required courses when they become new supervisors, and the hiring goals related to disability are in reference material thereafter, in a course titled "Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities," which is required for managers to complete every two years.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

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

GSA maintains a disability SEP/affinity group with an SES champion to serve as an advocate at the senior level to act as catalyst for change and to advise. GSA will continue to engage executive champions by implementing a diversity and inclusion council. The council will focus on GSA's internal policies and practices, talent recruitment and development, education and training, identifying barriers, building partnerships with rehab agencies, measuring the effectiveness of the diversity initiative process, and ensuring transparency of its operations.

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

N/A

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) Answer: Yes

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

Application and hire rates for IWD in all major occupations are under the 12% benchmark except the Financial Admin/Program series (0501). Application and hire rates for IWTD in all major occupations are under the 12% benchmark except the Financial Admin/Program series (0501).

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) Answer: Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Only the Management/Program Analyst series (0343) reached the internal benchmark for IWD. Only the Management/Program Analyst series (0343) reached the internal benchmark for IWD.

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) Answer: Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Only the Management/Program Analyst series (0343) reached the internal benchmark for IWD. Only the Management/Program Analyst series (0343) reached the internal benchmark for IWTD.

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

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

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

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

GSA ensures its HR and OCR staff works in concert to produce FEORP and MD-715 analyses and evaluations related to hiring and promotion; EEO complaint information is promulgated among all GSA employees to describe remedies; hiring managers have required training related to civil rights and merit principles, and selecting officials are provided with reference tools to encourage neutral hiring and promotion practices.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

GSA ensures its HR staff works in concert to produce FEORP and MD-715 analyses and evaluations related to career development; EEO complaint information is promulgated.

2. 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 applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer: Yes

b. Selections (PWD) Answer: Yes

Applicant percentages 5.9/4.4, under 9.3/5.2 relevant pools; no trigger in 15/SES.
Selectee percentages 4.4/1.9, under 9.3/5.2/4 pools; no trigger in 15/SES.

3. Do triggers exist for PWTD 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) Answer: Yes
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Applicant percentages in middle band 1/0, under 1.1; no trigger in 5-12 or SES.

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: No
 - b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Blind employees' cash awards average 1k less; but this is tied to salary, and two IWTD lower the average in this category, while the other five awards are on par.

- 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: No

N/A

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

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) 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: No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: No

N/A

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) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

N/A

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) Answer: No

b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer: No

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

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

N/A

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) Answer: No
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer: No
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer: No
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer: No

N/A

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) Answer: No
- ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: No

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

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

N/A

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) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

N/A

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) Answer: No

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

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

N/A

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) Answer: No

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

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

N/A

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.

Answer: No

No; two of the persons eligible under Schedule A were not converted. They were not performing at a level to qualify as even minimally successful, and they were terminated during their probationary period. All other persons eligible under this authority were performing at an acceptable level and they were converted to permanent/competitive status.

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

29.6% of terminations were persons with disabilities, far over the 8.8 % participation rate for this group.

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: No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

5.6% of involuntary separations (3 persons) were IWTD, yet they only comprise 1.2% of the population.

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.

GSA, like virtually all agencies, does not solicit exit interview information from persons who are terminated or otherwise involuntarily separated; as for exit interview statements from persons with disabilities, positive responses are slightly higher among persons with disabilities, though the nature of any correlation there is not readily discernible.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(4), federal agencies are required to inform job 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.

<https://www.gsa.gov/policy-regulations/policy/information-integrity-and-access/it-accessibilitysection-508>

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.

<https://www.gsa.gov/real-estate/design-construction/accessible-facility-design>

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.

GSA's Office of Administrative Services provides the Center for IT Access (CITA), a centrally funded program that provides assistive technology needs assessments and expertise for all employees with disabilities as well as their management. CITA also maintains an inter-agency agreement with the Department of Defense's Computer Accommodation Program, which provides many kinds of assistive technology and related training. In addition, there are centralized funds provided by the Office of Administrative Services (OAS) to cover these same items when CAP unable to for any reason. OAS also provides workplace modifications when needed from a centralized budget. There is no central funding for interpreters or CART services at this time, but OCR is undertaking a proposal to create an agency-level central fund for each of the separate funding streams the agency operates under. OCR's External Programs Branch will partner with the Public Building Service to develop a system to assess GSA owned, managed and leased space for accessibility purposes pursuant to applicable Federal civil rights laws. Development of this system will allow building management staff to assess their building to ensure access to individuals with disabilities.

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.)

We are unable to calculate average timeframes for provision of accommodations based on the database structure; see part J to address barriers and the issue of accommodation data management as a program deficiency.

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.

GSA's accommodation procedure is currently undergoing a re-write. The lack of a complete data set related to accommodation hinders the agency's ability to make definitive statements about timeliness and approval rates, or to determine 1) exactly how much/what type of medical information is requested, how often (or how it's transmitted and stored), 2) how often requests are modified/denied, or 3) what kinds of disability categories and products/services are requested, and this must be addressed in the new procedure. Training for managers and supervisors is required every other year. Complaint files and settlement/finding data indicates that issues related to RA management exist, and must be dealt with using the procedural re-write as an opportunity to address these potential barriers and the program deficiency.

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, timely providing approved services, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring PAS requests for trends.

The PAS requirement is understood by the cohort of RACs, and OHRM coordinated with a program analyst from OCR to obtain a sample job description/PD from another agency (one that has provided PAS as RA before it was required) as an example of a PAS/administrative assistant contract person to use at GSA when the need arises, since it is typical for such persons to be hired as specialized, contract staff and to multitask for these functions.

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?

Answer: No

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

Answer: Yes

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

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 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?

Answer: Yes

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

Answer: Yes

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

Trigger 1	At the conclusion of FY 2017, GSA had a population of IWTDs just over 1%, below the 2% employment goal established for federal agencies. IWTDs separated involuntarily at a rate over 7%, and voluntarily at a rate almost twice their overall representation rate, and these are multi-year trends. Further, IWTDs are concentrated in the lower grade cluster below GS-11 (7.9%), and although statistical analyses are far less reliable for small populations like IWTDs, and we have fairly conclusive numeric indicators from other sources like veteran hiring records associated with disability and accommodation records, these triggers still must be addressed. Persons with disabilities (overall) comprise 8.8% of the workforce, also under the 12% goal.	
Barrier(s)	Attitudinal barriers (as identified in national studies from EEOC and National Council on Disability), as well as institutional barriers (in the form of underdeveloped training with, and promotion of, the use of special hiring authorities) may be affecting the rate of IWTD hires and recruitment at GSA.	
Objective(s)	To hire approximately 100 IWTDs within two years at GSA.	
Responsible Official(s)	Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)	
Madeline Caliendo; Antonia T. Harris	Yes	
Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)	Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)	
No	Yes	
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected

Sources of Data		Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected		
Focus Groups		No	N/A		
Interviews		No	N/A		
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		Yes	OCR has reviewed results of external studies conducted by the EEOC and the National Council on Disability on common obstacles to employment faced by individuals with disabilities which suggest attitudinal barriers and managers' lack of awareness about resources for recruiting IWTDs, as well as chronic underuse of excepted hiring authorities, such as Schedule A and VRA, are typical root causes for observed disparities. These reports also suggest that reasonable accommodation processing and funding issues may explain high attrition rates just like the high rates observed at GSA. Data related to accommodation requests, kept in accordance with EEOC enforcement guidance, must be analyzed to determine: who at GSA is requesting accommodations (job title/series/grade), for what categories of disability, how much the agency is spending on RA, grant and denial rates for requests, and average time taken to inform employees about decisions and provide equipment/services.		
Other (Please Describe)		Yes	Deficiencies in recordkeeping were evident. GSA has overhauled the collection mechanism to track accommodation activity more completely.		
Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	
09/30/2018	<p>Development of promotional material regarding use of Schedule A and hiring/promotion of persons with disabilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OCR will submit promotional material to OHRM by July 31, 2018. • OHRM will distribute promotional material by Sep 30, 2018. 	Yes			

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2017	Modification of RA database and review of more-complete data set and RA policies.

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

Modification of the existing database was time-consuming, and the planned activity was completed shortly after the end of the fiscal year.

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

Adding the new fields to the database enabled the appropriate barrier analysis activity.

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.

Promotional materials and policy changes were not in effect long enough for the activities to correct the trigger/barrier.

Table A2: TOTAL WORKFORCE BY COMPONENT - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
GS11	#	544	194	350	5	16	120	159	40	138	24	34	0	1	3	2	2	0
GS11 percent row	%	100	35.66	64.34	0.92	2.94	22.06	29.23	7.35	25.37	4.41	6.25	0.00	0.18	0.55	0.37	0.37	0.00
GS31	#	125	73	52	4	1	44	26	21	21	2	3	0	0	1	0	1	1
GS31 percent row	%	100	58.40	41.60	3.20	0.80	35.20	20.80	16.80	16.80	1.60	2.40	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.80	0.80
GS18	#	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS18 percent row	%	100	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS32	#	74	31	43	2	2	22	25	6	13	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
GS32 percent row	%	100	41.89	58.11	2.70	2.70	29.73	33.78	8.11	17.57	1.35	2.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.35
GS12	#	145	68	77	1	1	60	52	6	16	1	7	0	0	0	1	0	0
GS12 percent row	%	100	46.90	53.10	0.69	0.69	41.38	35.86	4.14	11.03	0.69	4.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.69	0.00	0.00
GS13	#	29	13	16	0	0	10	7	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS13 percent row	%	100	44.83	55.17	0.00	0.00	34.48	24.14	10.34	31.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS15	#	308	161	147	13	11	115	76	22	41	11	18	0	0	0	0	0	1
GS15 percent row	%	100	52.27	47.73	4.22	3.57	37.34	24.68	7.14	13.31	3.57	5.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.32
GS30	#	3076	1540	1536	87	84	1020	825	312	530	88	79	9	2	18	11	6	5
GS30 percent row	%	100	50.07	49.93	2.83	2.73	33.16	26.82	10.14	17.23	2.86	2.57	0.29	0.07	0.59	0.36	0.20	0.16
GS10	#	37	11	26	2	3	2	11	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS10 percent row	%	100	29.73	70.27	5.41	8.11	5.41	29.73	18.92	32.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS33	#	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS33 percent row	%	100	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS28	#	497	315	182	14	6	195	82	51	70	50	22	1	0	3	2	1	0
GS28 percent row	%	100	63.38	36.62	2.82	1.21	39.24	16.50	10.26	14.08	10.06	4.43	0.20	0.00	0.60	0.40	0.20	0.00
GS20	#	28	11	17	0	0	7	11	3	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS20 percent row	%	100	39.29	60.71	0.00	0.00	25.00	39.29	10.71	17.86	3.57	3.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS02	#	146	48	98	2	4	23	39	21	46	1	4	0	1	0	4	1	0
GS02 percent row	%	100	32.88	67.12	1.37	2.74	15.75	26.71	14.38	31.51	0.68	2.74	0.00	0.68	0.00	2.74	0.68	0.00
GS04	#	22	6	16	0	0	3	6	3	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS04 percent row	%	100	27.27	72.73	0.00	0.00	13.64	27.27	13.64	40.91	0.00	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS01	#	7	4	3	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS01 percent row	%	100	57.14	42.86	0.00	0.00	57.14	42.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS03	#	5497	3249	2248	159	159	2257	1135	620	776	171	147	5	5	28	14	9	12
GS03 percent row	%	100	59.10	40.90	2.89	2.89	41.06	20.65	11.28	14.12	3.11	2.67	0.09	0.09	0.51	0.25	0.16	0.22
GS26	#	187	81	106	2	3	59	59	13	38	5	4	0	0	2	1	0	1
GS26 percent row	%	100	43.32	56.68	1.07	1.60	31.55	31.55	6.95	20.32	2.67	2.14	0.00	0.00	1.07	0.53	0.00	0.53
GS14	#	290	72	218	2	9	52	97	16	105	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	0
GS14 percent row	%	100	24.83	75.17	0.69	3.10	17.93	33.45	5.52	36.21	0.34	2.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.34	0.00

Table A4: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES by Race/Ethnicity and Sex (Permanent)

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
GS-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-01 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-02 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-03	#	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-03 percent row	%	100	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-04	#	11	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-04 percent row	%	100	18.18	81.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	18.18	72.73	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-05	#	42	11	31	0	2	2	9	8	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-05 percent row	%	100	26.19	73.81	0.00	4.76	4.76	21.43	19.05	45.24	2.38	2.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-06	#	38	5	33	0	4	2	10	3	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-06 percent row	%	100	13.16	86.84	0.00	10.53	5.26	26.32	7.89	47.37	0.00	2.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-07	#	140	44	96	6	6	21	46	12	38	4	3	0	0	1	2	0	1
GS-07 percent row	%	100	31.43	68.57	4.29	4.29	15.00	32.86	8.57	27.14	2.86	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.71	1.43	0.00	0.71
GS-08	#	31	9	22	0	1	6	9	2	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
GS-08 percent row	%	100	29.03	70.97	0.00	3.23	19.35	29.03	6.45	32.26	3.23	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.23
GS-09	#	389	178	211	7	20	108	79	52	100	10	12	0	0	1	0	0	0
GS-09 percent row	%	100	45.76	54.24	1.80	5.14	27.76	20.31	13.37	25.71	2.57	3.08	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-10	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-10 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-11	#	822	457	365	33	28	270	152	126	153	18	24	1	1	8	6	1	1
GS-11 percent row	%	100	55.60	44.40	4.01	3.41	32.85	18.49	15.33	18.61	2.19	2.92	0.12	0.12	0.97	0.73	0.12	0.12
GS-12	#	3407	1790	1617	93	112	1162	773	388	610	109	98	6	5	21	11	11	8
GS-12 percent row	%	100	52.54	47.46	2.73	3.29	34.11	22.69	11.39	17.90	3.20	2.88	0.18	0.15	0.62	0.32	0.32	0.23
GS-13	#	3212	1725	1487	89	74	1204	779	291	507	118	107	4	2	16	10	3	8
GS-13 percent row	%	100	53.70	46.30	2.77	2.30	37.48	24.25	9.06	15.78	3.67	3.33	0.12	0.06	0.50	0.31	0.09	0.25
GS-14	#	1897	1043	854	48	40	748	490	163	257	71	60	1	1	6	5	6	1
GS-14 percent row	%	100	54.98	45.02	2.53	2.11	39.43	25.83	8.59	13.55	3.74	3.16	0.05	0.05	0.32	0.26	0.32	0.05
GS-15	#	813	453	360	15	12	362	240	58	85	16	20	0	0	2	2	0	1
GS-15 percent row	%	100	55.72	44.28	1.85	1.48	44.53	29.52	7.13	10.46	1.97	2.46	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.00	0.12
All Other (Unspecified GS)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other (Unspecified GS) percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Senior Executive Service	#	94	64	30	1	1	53	23	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	100	68.09	31.91	1.06	1.06	56.38	24.47	3.19	6.38	7.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	4	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	100	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	11061	5896	5165	295	300	4010	2637	1144	1834	356	328	15	9	55	36	21	21
TOTAL percent row	%	100	53.30	46.70	2.67	2.71	36.25	23.84	10.34	16.58	3.22	2.97	0.14	0.08	0.50	0.33	0.19	0.19

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	100	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	361	226	135	10	4	166	84	28	33	19	14	0	0	2	0	1	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100	62.60	37.40	2.77	1.11	45.98	23.27	7.76	9.14	5.26	3.88	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.00	0.28	0.00

Table A5: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR WAGE GRADES by Race/Ethnicity and Sex (Permanent)

WD/WG, WL/WS & OTHER Wage Grades		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Grade-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-01 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-02 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-03	#	12	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-03 percent row	%	100	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-04	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-04 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-05	#	13	7	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-05 percent row	%	100	53.85	46.15	0.00	0.00	7.69	0.00	30.77	46.15	0.00	0.00	15.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-06	#	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-06 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-07	#	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-07 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-08	#	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-08 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00	0.00	80.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-09	#	9	9	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-09 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-10	#	31	31	0	0	0	17	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-10 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	54.84	0.00	45.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-11	#	7	7	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-11 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.71	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-12	#	6	5	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-12 percent row	%	100	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00	83.33	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-13	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-13 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-14	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-14 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-15	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-15 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other Wage Grades	#	28	22	6	1	0	16	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Wage Grades percent row	%	100	78.57	21.43	3.57	0.00	57.14	0.00	17.86	21.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	114	94	20	1	0	51	1	39	19	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100	82.46	17.54	0.88	0.00	44.74	0.88	34.21	16.67	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Table A6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex (Permanent)

Job Title/Series Agency Rate Occupational CLF (Job Title-Series)		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
1102: CONTRACTING	#	1683	712	971	34	55	427	447	191	411	46	49	0	0	11	4	3	5
1102: CONTRACTING percent row	%	100	42.31	57.69	2.02	3.27	25.37	26.56	11.35	24.42	2.73	2.91	0.00	0.00	0.65	0.24	0.18	0.30
CLF for Major Occupation 1: CONTRACTING	%	100	46.45	53.55	3.33	3.8	38.26	41.72	3.01	5.48	1.41	1.73	0.02	0.12	0.29	0.29	0.1	0.22
1101: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	#	1519	856	663	51	39	649	379	106	198	36	38	4	2	6	5	4	2
1101: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY percent row	%	100	56.35	43.65	3.36	2.57	42.73	24.95	6.98	13.03	2.37	2.50	0.26	0.13	0.39	0.33	0.26	0.13
CLF for Major Occupation 2: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	%	100	36.83	63.17	2.84	5.7	27.4	44.05	3.48	8.79	2.56	3.62	0.02	0.05	0.37	0.37	0.2	0.34
0343: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	#	1104	395	709	9	34	282	333	78	292	23	41	0	0	2	5	1	4
0343: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS percent row	%	100	35.78	64.22	0.82	3.08	25.54	30.16	7.07	26.45	2.08	3.71	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.45	0.09	0.36
CLF for Major Occupation 3: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	%	100	58.43	41.57	2.44	2.12	49.12	32.69	2.95	3.79	3.34	2.46	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.17
0301: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	#	975	456	519	24	24	341	314	53	145	33	30	0	1	2	4	3	1
0301: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM percent row	%	100	46.77	53.23	2.46	2.46	34.97	32.21	5.44	14.87	3.38	3.08	0.00	0.10	0.21	0.41	0.31	0.10
CLF for Major Occupation 4: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	%	100	36.83	63.17	2.84	5.7	27.4	44.05	3.48	8.79	2.56	3.62	0.02	0.05	0.37	0.37	0.2	0.34
1176: BUILDING MANAGEMENT	#	953	681	272	41	21	464	125	145	104	19	17	1	1	10	3	1	1
1176: BUILDING MANAGEMENT percent row	%	100	71.46	28.54	4.30	2.20	48.69	13.12	15.22	10.91	1.99	1.78	0.10	0.10	1.05	0.31	0.10	0.10
CLF for Major Occupation 5: BUILDING MANAGEMENT	%	100	49.11	50.89	3.98	5.11	39.69	38.53	3.19	4.83	1.55	1.51	0.04	0.09	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.22
2210: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST	#	644	440	204	22	6	280	105	77	65	57	26	1	0	2	2	1	0
2210: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST percent row	%	100	68.32	31.68	3.42	0.93	43.48	16.30	11.96	10.09	8.85	4.04	0.16	0.00	0.31	0.31	0.16	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 6: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST	%	100	70.42	29.58	5.31	2.13	52.52	21.09	6.51	4.36	5.11	1.55	0.1	0.05	0.15	0.15	0.34	0.12
1170: REALTY	#	601	303	298	13	32	206	157	70	84	13	19	0	1	1	3	0	2
1170: REALTY percent row	%	100	50.42	49.58	2.16	5.32	34.28	26.12	11.65	13.98	2.16	3.16	0.00	0.17	0.17	0.50	0.00	0.33
CLF for Major Occupation 7: REALTY	%	100	49.11	50.89	3.98	5.11	39.69	38.53	3.19	4.83	1.55	1.51	0.04	0.09	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.22
0501: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM	#	248	101	147	2	7	59	78	24	46	13	16	0	0	1	0	2	0
0501: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM percent row	%	100	40.73	59.27	0.81	2.82	23.79	31.45	9.68	18.55	5.24	6.45	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.81	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 9: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM	%	100	43.58	56.42	3.77	5.74	32.93	38.93	4.73	7.52	1.6	3.15	0	0.07	0.34	0.34	0.24	0.16
0905: GENERAL ATTORNEY	#	160	81	79	1	1	72	59	7	11	1	7	0	0	0	1	0	0
0905: GENERAL ATTORNEY percent row	%	100	50.63	49.38	0.63	0.63	45.00	36.88	4.38	6.88	0.63	4.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 10: GENERAL ATTORNEY	%	100	67.23	32.77	2.51	1.78	60.25	26.4	2.13	2.55	1.82	1.67	0.02	0.01	0.12	0.12	0.2	0.15

Table A6: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR MAJOR OCCUPATIONS - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex (Temporary)

Job Title/Series Agency Rate Occupational CLF (Job Title-Series)		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
1102: CONTRACTING	#	18	10	8	1	0	6	4	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1102: CONTRACTING percent row	%	100	55.56	44.44	5.56	0.00	33.33	22.22	11.11	22.22	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 1: CONTRACTING	%	100	46.45	53.55	3.33	3.8	38.26	41.72	3.01	5.48	1.41	1.73	0.02	0.12	0.29	0.29	0.1	0.22
1101: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	#	18	13	5	0	0	11	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1101: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY percent row	%	100	72.22	27.78	0.00	0.00	61.11	22.22	5.56	0.00	5.56	5.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 2: GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	%	100	36.83	63.17	2.84	5.7	27.4	44.05	3.48	8.79	2.56	3.62	0.02	0.05	0.37	0.37	0.2	0.34
0343: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	#	22	12	10	1	1	9	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0343: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS percent row	%	100	54.55	45.45	4.55	4.55	40.91	31.82	0.00	9.09	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.55	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 3: MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS	%	100	58.43	41.57	2.44	2.12	49.12	32.69	2.95	3.79	3.34	2.46	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.16	0.24	0.17
0301: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	#	204	126	78	3	3	105	62	10	3	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
0301: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM percent row	%	100	61.76	38.24	1.47	1.47	51.47	30.39	4.90	1.47	3.92	4.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 4: MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	%	100	36.83	63.17	2.84	5.7	27.4	44.05	3.48	8.79	2.56	3.62	0.02	0.05	0.37	0.37	0.2	0.34
1176: BUILDING MANAGEMENT	#	12	12	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
1176: BUILDING MANAGEMENT percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00	8.33	0.00	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 5: BUILDING MANAGEMENT	%	100	49.11	50.89	3.98	5.11	39.69	38.53	3.19	4.83	1.55	1.51	0.04	0.09	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.22
2210: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST	#	3	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2210: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 6: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SPECIALIST	%	100	70.42	29.58	5.31	2.13	52.52	21.09	6.51	4.36	5.11	1.55	0.1	0.05	0.15	0.15	0.34	0.12
1170: REALTY	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1170: REALTY percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 7: REALTY	%	100	49.11	50.89	3.98	5.11	39.69	38.53	3.19	4.83	1.55	1.51	0.04	0.09	0.32	0.32	0.18	0.22
0501: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM	#	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0501: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM percent row	%	100	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 9: FINANCIAL ADMIN AND PROGRAM	%	100	43.58	56.42	3.77	5.74	32.93	38.93	4.73	7.52	1.6	3.15	0	0.07	0.34	0.34	0.24	0.16
0905: GENERAL ATTORNEY	#	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0905: GENERAL ATTORNEY percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
CLF for Major Occupation 10: GENERAL ATTORNEY	%	100	67.23	32.77	2.51	1.78	60.25	26.4	2.13	2.55	1.82	1.67	0.02	0.01	0.12	0.12	0.2	0.15

General Services Administration

File Process Date and Time: null

Table A8: NEW HIRES BY TYPE OF APPOINTMENT - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Permanent New Hires	#	788	489	299	21	12	334	163	96	100	28	20	0	1	6	2	4	1
Permanent New Hires percent row	%	100	62.06	37.94	2.66	1.52	42.39	20.69	12.18	12.69	3.55	2.54	0.00	0.13	0.76	0.25	0.51	0.13
Temporary New Hires	#	319	179	140	7	8	122	64	28	57	16	9	0	0	4	1	2	1
Temporary New Hires percent row	%	100	56.11	43.89	2.19	2.51	38.24	20.06	8.78	17.87	5.02	2.82	0.00	0.00	1.25	0.31	0.63	0.31
Non-Appropriated New Hires	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non-Appropriated New Hires percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total New Hires	#	1107	668	439	28	20	456	227	124	157	44	29	0	1	10	3	6	2
Total New Hires percent row	%	100	60.34	39.66	2.53	1.81	41.19	20.51	11.20	14.18	3.97	2.62	0.00	0.09	0.90	0.27	0.54	0.18
CLF2010	%	100	51.86	48.14	5.17	4.79	38.33	34.03	5.49	6.53	1.97	1.93	0.07	0.07	0.55	0.53	0.26	0.28

General Services Administration
File Process Date and Time: null

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Table A14: SEPARATIONS BY TYPE OF SEPARATION - Distribution by Race/Ethnicity and Sex

Employment Tenure		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Voluntary Separation	#	715	383	332	13	17	278	177	67	115	20	17	0	1	3	3	1	2
Voluntary Separation percent row	%	100	53.57	46.43	1.82	2.38	38.88	24.76	9.37	16.08	2.80	2.38	0.00	0.14	0.42	0.42	0.14	0.28
Involuntary Separations	#	33	22	11	4	1	7	5	9	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Involuntary Separations percent row	%	100	66.67	33.33	12.12	3.03	21.21	15.15	27.27	15.15	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Separations	#	748	405	343	17	18	285	182	76	120	21	17	0	1	4	3	1	2
Total Separations percent row	%	100	54.14	45.86	2.27	2.41	38.10	24.33	10.16	16.04	2.81	2.27	0.00	0.13	0.53	0.40	0.13	0.27

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Subordinate Component		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
GS14	#	290	249	14	26	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
GS14 percent row	%	100	85.86	4.83	8.97	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.34	0.34
GS31	#	125	100	3	22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS31 percent row	%	100	80.00	2.40	17.60	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.80	0.00

Table B4: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES by Disability (Permanent)

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
GS-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-01 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-02 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-03	#	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
GS-03 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
GS-04	#	11	7	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
GS-04 percent row	%	100	63.64	0.00	36.36	27.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.27	0.00	0.00
GS-05	#	42	32	3	10	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
GS-05 percent row	%	100	76.19	7.14	23.81	7.14	2.38	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.38	0.00
GS-06	#	38	28	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS-06 percent row	%	100	73.68	2.63	26.32	2.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00
GS-07	#	140	114	6	26	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	1
GS-07 percent row	%	100	81.43	4.29	18.57	5.00	0.00	1.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.71	2.14	0.71
GS-08	#	31	24	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
GS-08 percent row	%	100	77.42	0.00	22.58	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.23	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-09	#	389	319	13	70	10	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	2	0
GS-09 percent row	%	100	82.01	3.34	17.99	2.57	0.26	0.77	0.26	0.51	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00
GS-10	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-10 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-11	#	822	723	31	99	9	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	0
GS-11 percent row	%	100	87.96	3.77	12.04	1.09	0.12	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.00	0.61	0.00
GS-12	#	3407	3064	83	343	33	1	4	0	6	1	2	0	17	0
GS-12 percent row	%	100	89.93	2.44	10.07	0.97	0.03	0.12	0.00	0.18	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.50	0.00
GS-13	#	3212	2989	73	223	17	1	0	3	2	1	2	0	5	0
GS-13 percent row	%	100	93.06	2.27	6.94	0.53	0.03	0.00	0.09	0.06	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.16	0.00
GS-14	#	1897	1799	45	98	10	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	4	0
GS-14 percent row	%	100	94.83	2.37	5.17	0.53	0.05	0.11	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.21	0.00
GS-15	#	813	769	18	44	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
GS-15 percent row	%	100	94.59	2.21	5.41	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other (Unspecified GS)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other (Unspecified GS) percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Senior Executive Service	#	94	89	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	100	94.68	2.13	5.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	10914	9973	275	941	99	6	13	4	15	3	7	6	38	1

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
TOTAL percent row	%	100	91.38	2.52	8.62	0.91	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.14	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.35	0.01

Table B4: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES by Disability (Temporary)

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
GS-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-01 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-02	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-02 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-03	#	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-03 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-04	#	26	21	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
GS-04 percent row	%	100	80.77	11.54	19.23	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-05	#	11	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-05 percent row	%	100	100.00	18.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-06	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-06 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-07	#	52	42	9	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
GS-07 percent row	%	100	80.77	17.31	19.23	3.85	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.85	0.00
GS-08	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-08 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-09	#	26	23	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-09 percent row	%	100	88.46	7.69	11.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-10	#	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-10 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-11	#	12	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-11 percent row	%	100	58.33	8.33	41.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-12	#	13	9	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-12 percent row	%	100	69.23	15.38	30.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-13	#	39	35	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-13 percent row	%	100	89.74	0.00	10.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-14	#	48	45	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-14 percent row	%	100	93.75	2.08	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-15	#	125	116	4	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
GS-15 percent row	%	100	92.80	3.20	7.20	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.60	0.00
All Other (Unspecified GS)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other (Unspecified GS) percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Senior Executive Service	#	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	362	318	24	44	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
TOTAL percent row	%	100	87.85	6.63	12.15	1.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.00	1.10	0.00

Table B5: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR WAGE GRADES by Disability (Permanent)

WD/WG,WL/WS & Other Wage Grades		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
Grade-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-01 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-02 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-03	#	12	10	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grade-03 percent row	%	100	83.33	0.00	16.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	0.00
Grade-04	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-04 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-05	#	13	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grade-05 percent row	%	100	84.62	0.00	15.38	7.69	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.69	0.00	0.00
Grade-06	#	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-06 percent row	%	100	50.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-07	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-07 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-08	#	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-08 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-09	#	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-09 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-10	#	31	28	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-10 percent row	%	100	90.32	0.00	9.68	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-11	#	7	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-11 percent row	%	100	85.71	0.00	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-12	#	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-12 percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-13	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-13 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-14	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-14 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-15	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-15 percent row	%	100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other Wage Grades	#	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Wage Grades percent row	%	100	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	114	105	0	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100	92.11	0.00	7.89	2.63	0.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.75	0.00	0.00

Table B14: SEPARATION by Type of Separation - Distribution by Disability

Types of Separations		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
Voluntary Separation	#	715	650	19	65	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	0
Voluntary Separation percent row	%	100	90.91	2.66	9.09	1.40	0.00	0.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.14	1.12	0.00
Involuntary Separations	#	33	22	2	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
Involuntary Separations percent row	%	100	66.67	6.06	33.33	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.03	6.06	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Separations	#	748	672	21	76	13	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	0
Total Separations percent row	%	100	89.84	2.81	10.16	1.74	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.27	0.13	1.07	0.00

General Services Administration
File Process Date and Time: null

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

Occupational Categories	Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.																	

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	4	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	11061	5896	5165	295	300	4010	2637	1144	1834	356	328	15	9	55	36	21	21
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	361	226	135	10	4	166	84	28	33	19	14	0	0	2	0	1	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
AD-35	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-35 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AD-36	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-36 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AD-37	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-37 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AD-38	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-38 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AD-39	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-39 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
AD-40	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-40 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total AD Workforce (Permanent)	#	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total AD Workforce (Permanent) percent row	%	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

Table A5: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR WAGE GRADES by Race/Ethnicity and Sex (Permanent): Calculated within Group

WD/WG, WL/WS & OTHER Wage Grades		Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
Grade-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-01 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-02 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-03	#	12	5	7	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-03 percent row	%	10.53	5.32	35.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.82	36.84	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-04	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-04 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-05	#	13	7	6	0	0	1	0	4	6	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-05 percent row	%	11.40	7.45	30.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	0.00	10.26	31.58	0.00	0.00	66.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-06	#	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-06 percent row	%	1.75	2.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-07	#	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-07 percent row	%	0.88	1.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-08	#	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-08 percent row	%	4.39	5.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	0.00	10.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-09	#	9	9	0	0	0	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-09 percent row	%	7.89	9.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	0.00	15.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-10	#	31	31	0	0	0	17	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-10 percent row	%	27.19	32.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	35.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-11	#	7	7	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-11 percent row	%	6.14	7.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.76	0.00	2.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-12	#	6	5	1	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-12 percent row	%	5.26	5.32	5.00	0.00	0.00	9.80	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-13	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-13 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-14	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-14 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-15	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-15 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other Wage Grades	#	28	22	6	1	0	16	0	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Wage Grades percent row	%	24.56	23.40	30.00	100.00	0.00	31.37	0.00	12.82	31.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	114	94	20	1	0	51	1	39	19	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

WD/WG, WL/WS & OTHER Wage Grades	Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
----------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	------------	--------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------	--------------	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--------------------------

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

WD/WG, WL/WS & OTHER Wage Grades	Total Workforce	Total Workforce Male	Total Workforce Female	Hispanic or Latino Male	Hispanic or Latino Female	White Male	White Female	Black or African American Male	Black or African American Female	Asian Male	Asian Female	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Male	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Female	American Indian or Alaskan Native Male	American Indian or Alaskan Native Female	Two or More Races Male	Two or More Races Female
NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.																	

Table B3: Occupational Categories - Distribution by Disability: Calculated within Group

Occupational Categories		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers (Grades 15 and Above)	#	756	704	17	35	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Executive/Senior Level Officials and Managers (Grades 15 and Above) percent row	%	6.83	7.16	6.16	3.70	1.96	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mid-Level Officials and Managers (Grades 13-14)	#	1490	1387	39	64	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Mid-Level Officials and Managers (Grades 13-14) percent row	%	13.47	14.10	14.13	6.76	2.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	2.63	0.00
First-Level Officials and Managers (Grades 12 and Below)	#	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
First-Level Officials and Managers (Grades 12 and Below) percent row	%	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other	#	6927	6073	172	682	68	4	12	3	8	3	5	0	29	0
Other percent row	%	62.63	61.75	62.32	72.02	66.67	57.14	92.31	75.00	53.33	100.00	71.43	0.00	76.32	0.00
Officials and Managers - TOTAL	#	9177	8168	228	781	73	4	12	3	10	3	6	0	30	0
Officials and Managers - TOTAL percent row	%	82.97	83.05	82.61	82.47	71.57	57.14	92.31	75.00	66.67	100.00	85.71	0.00	78.95	0.00
Professionals	#	1302	1158	37	107	12	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	5	0
Professionals percent row	%	11.77	11.77	13.41	11.30	11.76	14.29	7.69	25.00	13.33	0.00	14.29	0.00	13.16	0.00
Technicians	#	228	212	5	11	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Technicians percent row	%	2.06	2.16	1.81	1.16	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Sales Workers	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sales Workers percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Administrative Support Workers	#	183	138	6	39	13	1	0	0	2	0	0	6	3	1
Administrative Support Workers percent row	%	1.65	1.40	2.17	4.12	12.75	14.29	0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	75.00	7.89	100.00
Craft Workers	#	59	56	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Craft Workers percent row	%	0.53	0.57	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Operatives	#	13	9	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Operatives percent row	%	0.12	0.09	0.00	0.42	1.96	14.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00
Laborers and Helpers	#	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Laborers and Helpers percent row	%	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.11	0.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00
Service Workers	#	61	58	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Service Workers percent row	%	0.55	0.59	0.00	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total Workforce	#	11061	9835	276	947	102	7	13	4	15	3	7	8	38	1
Total Workforce percent row	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

Table B4: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES by Disability (Permanent): Calculated within Group

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
GS-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-01 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-02 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-03	#	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
GS-03 percent row	%	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.21	2.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00
GS-04	#	11	7	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
GS-04 percent row	%	0.10	0.07	0.00	0.43	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
GS-05	#	42	32	3	10	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
GS-05 percent row	%	0.38	0.32	1.09	1.06	3.03	16.67	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00
GS-06	#	38	28	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
GS-06 percent row	%	0.35	0.28	0.36	1.06	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.63	0.00
GS-07	#	140	114	6	26	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	1
GS-07 percent row	%	1.28	1.14	2.18	2.76	7.07	0.00	15.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.67	7.89	100.00
GS-08	#	31	24	0	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
GS-08 percent row	%	0.28	0.24	0.00	0.74	1.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-09	#	389	319	13	70	10	1	3	1	2	1	0	0	2	0
GS-09 percent row	%	3.56	3.20	4.73	7.44	10.10	16.67	23.08	25.00	13.33	33.33	0.00	0.00	5.26	0.00
GS-10	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-10 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-11	#	822	723	31	99	9	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	0
GS-11 percent row	%	7.53	7.25	11.27	10.52	9.09	16.67	15.38	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.29	0.00	13.16	0.00
GS-12	#	3407	3064	83	343	33	1	4	0	6	1	2	0	17	0
GS-12 percent row	%	31.22	30.72	30.18	36.45	33.33	16.67	30.77	0.00	40.00	33.33	28.57	0.00	44.74	0.00
GS-13	#	3212	2989	73	223	17	1	0	3	2	1	2	0	5	0
GS-13 percent row	%	29.43	29.97	26.55	23.70	17.17	16.67	0.00	75.00	13.33	33.33	28.57	0.00	13.16	0.00
GS-14	#	1897	1799	45	98	10	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	4	0
GS-14 percent row	%	17.38	18.04	16.36	10.41	10.10	16.67	15.38	0.00	6.67	0.00	28.57	0.00	10.53	0.00
GS-15	#	813	769	18	44	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
GS-15 percent row	%	7.45	7.71	6.55	4.68	3.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	13.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other (Unspecified GS)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other (Unspecified GS) percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Senior Executive Service	#	94	89	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	0.86	0.89	0.73	0.53	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	10914	9973	275	941	99	6	13	4	15	3	7	6	38	1

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

Table B4: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR GENERAL SCHEDULE (GS) GRADES by Disability (Temporary): Calculated within Group

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
GS-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-01 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-02	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-02 percent row	%	0.28	0.31	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-03	#	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-03 percent row	%	1.38	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-04	#	26	21	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
GS-04 percent row	%	7.18	6.60	12.50	11.36	20.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-05	#	11	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-05 percent row	%	3.04	3.46	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-06	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-06 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-07	#	52	42	9	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
GS-07 percent row	%	14.36	13.21	37.50	22.73	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
GS-08	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-08 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-09	#	26	23	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-09 percent row	%	7.18	7.23	8.33	6.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-10	#	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-10 percent row	%	0.28	0.00	0.00	2.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-11	#	12	7	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-11 percent row	%	3.31	2.20	4.17	11.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-12	#	13	9	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-12 percent row	%	3.59	2.83	8.33	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-13	#	39	35	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-13 percent row	%	10.77	11.01	0.00	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-14	#	48	45	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GS-14 percent row	%	13.26	14.15	4.17	6.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
GS-15	#	125	116	4	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
GS-15 percent row	%	34.53	36.48	16.67	20.45	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00
All Other (Unspecified GS)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other (Unspecified GS) percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Senior Executive Service	#	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Executive Service percent row	%	0.55	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES)	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Senior Pay (Non-SES) percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	362	318	24	44	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

General Services Administration
 File Process Date and Time: null

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

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
AD-40	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-40 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total AD Workforce (Permanent)	#	42	42	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total AD Workforce (Permanent) percent row	%	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

General Services Administration

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

File Process Date and Time: null

Grade Level		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
AD-40	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AD-40 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total AD Workforce (Temporary)	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total AD Workforce (Temporary) percent row	%	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.

Table B5: PARTICIPATION RATES FOR WAGE GRADES by Disability (Permanent): Calculated within Group

WD/WG, WL/WS & Other Wage Grades		Total Workforce	No Disability [05]	Not Identified [01]	Disability [06-94]	Targeted Disability	Hearing [16/17 or 18]	Vision [23/25 or 21]	Missing Extremities [28, 32-38 or 30]	Partial Paralysis [64-68] or 69]	Complete Paralysis [71-78 or 79]	Epilepsy [82]	Severe Intellectual Disability [90]	Psychiatric Disability [91]	Dwarfism [92]
Grade-01	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-01 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-02	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-02 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-03	#	12	10	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grade-03 percent row	%	10.53	9.52	0.00	22.22	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-04	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-04 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-05	#	13	11	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Grade-05 percent row	%	11.40	10.48	0.00	22.22	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-06	#	2	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-06 percent row	%	1.75	0.95	0.00	11.11	33.33	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-07	#	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-07 percent row	%	0.88	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-08	#	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-08 percent row	%	4.39	4.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-09	#	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-09 percent row	%	7.89	8.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-10	#	31	28	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-10 percent row	%	27.19	26.67	0.00	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-11	#	7	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-11 percent row	%	6.14	5.71	0.00	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-12	#	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-12 percent row	%	5.26	5.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-13	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-13 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-14	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-14 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Grade-15	#	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grade-15 percent row	%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
All Other Wage Grades	#	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
All Other Wage Grades percent row	%	24.56	26.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL	#	114	105	0	9	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
TOTAL percent row	%	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00

NOTE: Percentages computed down columns and NOT across rows.