

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

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

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

Persons with disabilities were overrepresented in the GS1-10 cluster at 21.6% versus 14.8% of all DOE's permanent employees on board at the end of FY24.

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

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

- |                                 |        |    |
|---------------------------------|--------|----|
| a. Cluster GS-1 to GS-10 (PWTD) | Answer | No |
| b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)  | Answer | No |

NA

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	6973	1049	15.04	190	2.72
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	243	53	21.81	13	5.35

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

DOE's Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer (HC) establishes annual hiring goals for Persons with Disabilities (PWD) and Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD). DOE's FY24 hiring goals were 12% PWD and 2% PWTD. These goals were communicated to Heads of Departmental Elements (DEs), Human Resources (HR) Shared Service Centers (SSCs), and participants at HC Recruitment & Outreach Community of Practice (CoP) meetings throughout the fiscal year. DOE's HC intranet site (HCnet) housed a Recruiter's Toolbox and a page for employment of PWD. These pages provided resources to facilitate hiring of PWD. Hiring Managers (HM) and Supervisors were directed to these resources in meetings, trainings, and consultations.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

NA

- 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	
Section 508 Compliance	4	0	40	Teddy Dyer (through April 2025) Information Technology Specialist teddy.dyer@hq.doe.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Bradley Shaff Equal Employment Specialist bradley.shaff@hq.doe.gov
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	36	Steven Church Supervisory Human Resources Specialist steven.church@hq.doe.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	3	0	39	Cheryl Lees Disability/Veteran Employment Program Manager cheryl.lees@hq.doe.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	David Brown (through July 2025) Deputy Director, Technical Services David.S.Brown@hq.doe.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	3	0	15	LesleyAnne Ezelle (thru February 2025) Reasonable Accommodations Program Manager leslyanne.ezelle@hq.doe.gov

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

Answer Yes

The RA Program Manager hosted on-line quarterly training sessions for Local Reasonable Accommodations Coordinators (LRACs) and attorneys responsible for RA. Topics in FY24 included: Tracking, Legal Case Review, Visual Processing Disorders and

Software, and Service Animals. The RA program collaborated with the Office of Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity (OCR-EEO) to host 11 one-hour sessions on types of services and support for PWD. LRACS have attended trainings on a case-by-case basis with other organizations (e.g., National Employment Law).

**B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM**

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

Answer Yes

NA

**Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program**

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	C.2.a.6. Do the agency’s training materials on its anti-harassment policy include examples of disability-based harassment? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(2)]		
<b>Objective</b>	Add effective examples of disability-based harassment to DOE's training materials on its Anti-harassment Program (PM #102). The new slide deck will be posted on Learning Nucleus for Supervisors and Employees.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Jan 1, 2025		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<i>Target Date</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>	<i>Planned Activity</i>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<i>Fiscal Year</i>	<i>Accomplishment</i>	
	2023	HC onboarded a new director of the Administrative Investigations Division, which handles all anti-harassment investigations (including IG cases), who has reviewed DOE’s PM102, which sets out DOE's Anti-harassment Program (AHP) and its associated intake forms. The new AHP has worked on revising these to make the process clearer and to reduce potential confusion between the AHP and EEO processes. Additionally, she has developed a “Manager’s Toolkit” to provide managers with templates, laws, and step-by-step instructions on how to perform a simple administrative inquiry with oversight and guidance from the AHP. The toolkit aims to proactively prevent harassment but to also provide early oversight by the AHP in case an inquiry develops into a matter requiring investigation by the AHP.	
	2024	A new contract for ad-hoc AID investigators has been developed to support the AHP. A second contract has been developed to provide necessary AID staffing to support DOE’s AHP. As of the end of FY24 there were three investigators. These staffing resources are important to address the backlog of AHP submissions and to enable attention to be focused on revisions to PM #102. Two one-hour Supervisory Essentials training sessions were completed with registration and course evaluation facilitated by DOE’s Learning Nucleus platform. HC's OPLER, AID provided a one-hour session to the DOE OCR-EEO community at its annual fall meeting.	
	2025	OPLER, AID included a 20-minute overview of the AHP during a two-hour DOE Resource Manager (RM) training session in Q1 FY25. (Note: At DOE, each office has an RM, who serves as a key point of contact between the office and HC functional offices. They perform various HC-related duties, including (often) staffing management and planning.)	

## Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

### A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

In FY24, DOE leveraged various recruitment sources and strategies to promote DOE job opportunities. These included a branded search page for DOE’s open opportunities on USAJOBS at [doe.usajobs.gov](http://doe.usajobs.gov), which served as a one-stop-shop for interested job seekers. DOE encouraged job seekers to use this page and filter their hiring paths to quickly identify open opportunities at DOE that matched their eligibility.

Job opportunities were also disseminated widely through [www.energy.gov/careers](http://www.energy.gov/careers), virtual and in-person job fairs, job boards, disability employment offices, vocational rehabilitation centers, email lists of organizations that offer employment assistance to persons with disabilities, and other external disability-related job sources. Strategic partnerships with various veteran-serving organizations continued to provide information about opportunities at DOE, and DOE participated in recruitment and outreach events that included PWD and PWTD.

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

DOE may use Schedule A and hiring authorities for veterans with disabilities to quickly fill positions prior to or in conjunction with job announcements. PWD and PWTD may be appointed under Schedule A, and veterans with disabilities may be appointed under Schedule A, Veterans Recruitment Appointment (VRA), or the 30 Percent or More Disabled Veteran hiring authorities. Both may also be competitively hired through a job announcement open to them based on their status as a PWD or PWTD applicant or as a veteran with disabilities applicant. Positions filled through Schedule A appointments frequently incorporate advancement opportunity to higher grade levels for employees with successful performance.

Schedule A applicants and 30% or More Disabled Veterans may be referred through DOE’s Schedule A or 30% or More Disabled Veterans Resume Repository, a non-competitive Certificate of Eligibility, or with other applicants from a competitive announcement. Sources for referrals of persons with disabilities may include: standing registers; unsolicited e-mails from people with disabilities; disability employment programs, such as the Department of Veterans Affairs VR&E and the Department of Defense OWF Program; disability employment offices; vocational rehabilitation centers; candidates identified through resume mining on USAJOBS and Department of Labor WRP; or recruitment and outreach events. HCNet includes a Hiring Manager’s Guide to utilizing DOE’s Schedule A and 30% or More Disabled Veterans Resume Repositories.

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.

1. The applicant must submit documentation identifying them as an individual with a certain disability to be eligible for an appointment under such authority. The proof of disability, also known as a Schedule A letter, must be issued by a licensed medical professional; a licensed vocational rehabilitation specialist; or any federal agency, state agency, or an agency of the DC or a U.S. territory that issues or provides disability benefits. The agency reviews the document for sufficiency and authenticity. Acceptable documentation for Schedule A is detailed in Title 5 C.F.R. Section 213.3102(u)(3)(i) and (ii).

2. If an eligible non-competitive applicant is deemed qualified for a vacant position, the applicant’s resume is forwarded to the Hiring Manager (HM), who is provided appropriate guidance on how to evaluate, interview, and select an applicant.

If an HM requests a ranking list from the Schedule A or 30% or More Disabled Veterans Resume Repository, candidates are

referred based on self-certification with eligibility and qualification determined once a selection is made but prior to extension of an offer. In no event is employment offered to applicants who do not meet the qualifications for the position, regardless of disability status.

- 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

HMs are advised by their assigned Human Resources Business Partner (HRBP) on special hiring authorities which afford direct access to qualified persons with disabilities and reduce the time to hire.

Additionally, HC held biannual Strategic Hiring Plan Briefings with 40 Departmental Elements and other training sessions for Supervisors, HMs, and Resource Managers, which included strategies and resources for hiring PWD and disabled veterans, such as the resume repositories for Schedule A and 30% or More Disabled Veterans, DOE’s disability video, tips on utilizing USAJOBS ATP, and Disabled Veteran Hiring Goals.

HMs and HR Professionals complete mandatory online training sessions through the DOE’s learning management system, Learning Nucleus (LN), in courses such as: A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining and Including People with Disabilities; Veteran Employment Training; and Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA). Completion rates for mandatory training on special hiring authorities and USERRA were as follows:

2,015 HMs and HR Professionals (84%) completed the OPM-developed “A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining and Including People with Disabilities,” which included government-wide hiring goals established in Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, among other topics.

1,606 HMs and HR Professionals (82%) completed the “Veteran Employment Training,” which included topics like the benefits of hiring veterans with disabilities, overview of veteran’s preference, special hiring authorities, recruitment sources and federal information resources, and recruitment strategies to reach out to veterans with disabilities.

638 HMs and HR Professionals (80%) completed the “USERRA Training.”

**B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS**

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

DOE maintained and continued to foster relationships with disability employment offices, vocational rehabilitation centers, military bases, and colleges/universities during FY24. Outreach efforts focused on information sessions that offered an introduction to DOE, as well as potential career fields, apprenticeships, and internship opportunities.

**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

NA

New Hires	Total	Reportable Disability	Targeted Disability
-----------	-------	-----------------------	---------------------

	(#)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	376524	7.92	0.00	3.74	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	351039	7.95	0.00	3.73	0.00
% of New Hires	826	6.17	0.00	2.54	0.00

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

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

DOE analyzed workforce and applicant flow data (AFD) and actual representation of PWD and PWTD among new hires for a set of 11 occupations that had at least 150 permanent employees on board at the end of FY24 and for which at least 30 new hires were made in FY24 (DOE refers to these as "major occupational categories").

In total, there were 832 new hires into these 11 occupations, of which 14.7% were PWD. The representation of PWD among new hires in each occupation varied. For example, two occupations far exceeded the 12% PWD hiring goal with 30% or more PWD among new hires: 0201 and 0301. On the other hand, four occupations did not meet the 12% hiring goal: 0340 (6.3% PWD); 0801 (6.6% PWD); 0905 (7.9% PWD), and 1101 (5.3% PWD).

PWTD represented 2.0% of new hires to these same 11 occupations, meeting the 2% hiring goal. PWTD representation did not vary greatly across these 11 occupations. New hires to two occupations had 3.7% PWTD (the maximum representation). Only one occupation had no new hires who were PWTD (0905).

These analyses suggest a potential trigger for access to 0905 for both PWD and PWTD at DOE and triggers for PWD for hiring to 0340, 0801, and 1101.

DOE’s Major Occupational Categories in FY24 were:

- 0201 Human Resources Management
- 0301 Miscellaneous Administration and Program
- 0340 Program Management
- 0343 Management and Program Analysis
- 0801 General Engineering
- 0905 General Attorney
- 1101 General Business and Industry
- 1102 Contracting
- 1109 Grant Management
- 1301 General Physical Science
- 2210 Information Technology Management

Within the USAStaffing AFD, the overall representation of PWD among the 376,473 applicants to new hire positions in these 11 occupations was 7.9% (lower than the 12% goal), PWTD represented 3.7% of applicants (above the 2% goal). PWD and PWTD were less likely than the average referred applicant to be selected for these 11 occupations in total. However, for new hires to 1102 and 1109, PWD and PWTD were as likely or more likely to be selected when compared to the average applicant. For 2210, PWTD (but not PWD) were more likely to be selected when compared to the average applicant.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0201 HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT	1	0.00	0.00

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability	Targetable Disability
		New Hires (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%	2%
0301 MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	57	5.26	0.00
0340 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	38	2.63	0.00
0343 MANAGEMENT AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS	136	5.88	2.21
0801 GENERAL ENGINEERING	128	3.13	0.78
0905 GENERAL ATTORNEY	24	4.17	4.17
1101 GENERAL BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY	48	2.08	0.00
1102 CONTRACTING	232	9.05	5.17
1109 GRANT MANAGEMENT	42	16.67	7.14
1301 GENERAL PHYSICAL SCIENCE	98	4.08	0.00
2210 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	22	4.55	4.55

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

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

NA

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

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

NA

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

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

### A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

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

DOE’s HC supports and promotes DOE’s plan to provide PWD and PWTD with sufficient advancement opportunities, including the SES. Employees can access abundant resources via LN, many of which are on-demand and no-cost. DOE provides career and leadership development opportunities for employees through a suite of programs, rotational opportunities, corporately sponsored courses, and the LN. PWD represented 9-15% of participants in three key DOE leadership development programs in FY24 (which included the OPM Leadership 360-degree Program and DOE’s Leadership Development Program (LDP).

For employees who desire to obtain a position in the SES, HC hosted “Aspiring to the SES” training. The two-part session included an overview of the SES application and hiring process, background on the SES profession, and an in-depth instruction on how to develop executive core qualifications (ECQs). In FY24, a total of 126 employees attended at least one of the sessions, with 20% PWD and 2% PWTD among attendees. Resources are available on the DOE intranet at: <https://hcnet.doe.gov/executive-resources/aspiring-ses>

OCR-EEO analyzes FEVS results related to DOE’s workforce. Two FEVS items offer a way to assess PWD opinions about access to employee development: "I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my organization" and "I receive the training I need to do my job well," for an Employee Development scale. Overall, 77.6% of DOE employees had positive scores on this scale in 2024, while PWD at DOE had a lower score at 73.5%. However, both the DOE overall score and the DOE PWD score were higher than the government-wide average of 69.5%.

**B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES**

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

DOE employees are required to establish an Individual Development Plan (IDP) in consultation with their supervisor within 60 days of joining DOE or being reassigned, or at the beginning of a new appraisal period. Employees may waive this requirement by selecting this option in LN. An IDP is a tool for employees to plan, guide, and document self-development. OCR-EEO research found that as of November 26, 2024, 18% of Headquarters Staff and Program Offices employees had an approved/ accepted FY25 IDP, and 71% had not yet started work on their FY25 IDP. Even absent an IDP, employees are encouraged to apply for opportunities to broaden their skills and competencies for career progression.

HC sends a weekly list of learning and development opportunities to all DOE employees, with additional promotion via HC’s intranet site (HCNet); LN; and internal email distribution lists or newsletters. A robust set of resources are available, many on-demand and with no cost, on LN. Additionally, many DOE Program and Staff Offices sponsor employees or offer training through the DOE National Training Center (NTC) or outside vendors. OCR-EEO research in FY24 indicated high satisfaction with DOE’s career development opportunities.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Training Programs	2446	2446	15.3	15.3	3.0	3.0
Mentoring Programs	30	30	30.0	30.0	3.3	3.3
Other Career Development Programs	650	650	12.8	12.8	2.6	2.6
Detail Programs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Internship Programs	39	39	0.0	0.0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Coaching Programs	44	44	18.2	18.2	2.3	2.3

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

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer No

AFD for career development programs are not available. Participation data were available via analytics of the LN platform, which allows employees to request and register for career development opportunities. Since PWD were not under-represented among DOE’s participants in Mentoring, Coaching, Other Career Development, or Training Programs (see the Table, above, under item 2), a need for detailed AFD is not indicated.

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

- a. Applicants (PWTd) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWTd) Answer No

AFD for career development programs are not available. Participation data were available via analytics of the LN platform, which allows employees to request and register for career development opportunities. Since PWD were not under-represented among DOE’s participants in Mentoring, Coaching, Other Career Development, or Training Programs (see the Table, above, under item 2), a need for detailed AFD is not indicated.

**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 No

NA

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	356.00	14.8876	85.1124	3.6517	96.3483
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	2690.00	13.9777	86.0223	3.3457	96.6543
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	7.56	7.0943	7.6370	6.9231	7.5802
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	311.00	14.7910	85.2090	4.8232	95.1768
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	5490.00	15.4645	84.5355	5.1548	94.8452
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.65	18.4565	17.5132	18.8667	17.5912
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	415.00	16.8675	83.1325	4.3373	95.6627
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	11397.00	17.1449	82.8551	4.3783	95.6217
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	27.46	27.9143	27.3710	27.7222	27.4509
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	445.00	18.6517	81.3483	2.9213	97.0787

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	17359.00	18.5264	81.4736	2.9495	97.0505
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	39.01	38.7470	39.0691	39.3846	38.9977
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	531.00	15.6309	84.3691	3.0132	96.9868
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	29684.00	15.4966	84.5034	2.9039	97.0961
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	55.90	55.4217	55.9911	53.8750	55.9650

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Awards Given	586.00	15.3584	84.6416	2.2184	97.7816
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total Amount	250777.00	15.1920	84.8080	2.1932	97.8068
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Average Amount	427.95	423.3111	428.7883	423.0769	428.0576
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	154.00	14.9351	85.0649	3.8961	96.1039
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	117284.00	14.9304	85.0696	3.6331	96.3669
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	761.58	761.3478	761.6260	710.1667	763.6689
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	520.00	15.1923	84.8077	2.5000	97.5000
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	684891.00	15.7048	84.2952	2.3624	97.6376
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1317.10	1361.5316	1309.1383	1244.6154	1318.9566
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	504.00	15.8730	84.1270	2.5794	97.4206
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	1200367.00	15.9789	84.0211	2.7383	97.2617
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2381.68	2397.5625	2378.6840	2528.4615	2377.7943
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	487.00	19.0965	80.9035	4.1068	95.8932
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	1684513.00	19.1679	80.8321	4.0579	95.9421
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3458.96	3471.8925	3455.9061	3417.8000	3460.7216
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	480.00	17.9167	82.0833	3.1250	96.8750
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	2163467.00	17.8535	82.1465	3.0311	96.9689
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4507.22	4491.3256	4510.6929	4371.7333	4511.5935
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	3158.00	13.2046	86.7954	2.4383	97.5617
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	25574709.00	12.8334	87.1666	2.3488	97.6512
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	8098.39	7870.7626	8133.0175	7801.3377	8105.8117

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

NA

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	324.00	9.8765	90.1235	0.9259	99.0741

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 No
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer No

NA

### D. PROMOTIONS

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

- a. SES
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- b. Grade GS-15
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. Grade GS-14
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- d. Grade GS-13
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

GS13: PWD represented 18.9% of GS12. Among minimally qualified applicants for GS13 Internal Competitive Promotions (ICP), PWD represented 9.8%, below the benchmark.

GS14: PWD represented 16.9% of GS13 employees at DOE but 9.1% of qualified applicants for ICP. Referred PWD candidates were less likely to be selected than all referred applicants.

GS15: PWD represented 15.2% of DOE’s GS14 employees but 8.8% of applicants for ICP to GS15 positions. Referred PWD were less likely to be selected compared to all referred applicants.

SES: PWD represented 10.9% of DOE’s GS15 employees, which was the same as PWD representation among ICP applicants. None of the five minimally qualified PWD applicants were selected. Overall, only two internal selections were made, representing insufficient data for a trigger.

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

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

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

GS13: PWTD represent 3.9% of GS12. Among minimally qualified applicants for GS13 ICP, PWTD represented 4.4%. PWTD were less likely to be selected when compared to the total pool for GS13 ICP.

GS14: PWTD represent 3.0% of GS13 employees and 3.7% of qualified applicants for ICP. PWTD were less likely to be selected compared to the overall applicant pool.

GS15: PWTD represent 2.8% of DOE’s GS14 employees and 3.6% of applicants for ICP to GS15 positions. PWTD were less likely to be selected compared to overall applicant pool.

SES: PWTD represent 2.8% of DOE’s SES employees, which is not meaningfully different from the PWTD representation among ICP applicants. With such small numbers, this analysis is not robust; there is no evidence of a trigger.

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

- a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer Yes
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer Yes
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer Yes

PWD accounted for 7.9% of qualified applicants for GS13, GS14, and GS15 positions open to the public, which are all meaningfully lower than the 12% benchmark. PWD were even less represented among applicants to SES positions open to the public at 3.9%.

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

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

NA

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

- a. Executives
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer No
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer No
- b. Managers
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes
- c. Supervisors
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer Yes
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer Yes

Executives: PWD represent 10.9% of DOE’s GS15 employees, which is the same as PWD representation among ICP applicants. Overall, only two internal selections were made, representing insufficient data for robust statistical determination of a trigger.

Managers: 14.1% of GS14 (regardless of supervisory status) and GS15 non-supervisory permanent employees were PWD, representing the relevant applicant pool for ICP Manager positions. PWD represented 7.3% of applicants and one of the 93 selections made, indicating the presence of a trigger for a potential barrier for both application and selection for GS15 supervisory



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

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

The qualified applicant pool for PWTD new hires to Executive (2.2%), Manager (4.4%), and Supervisor (3.3%) positions were all on par with the 2%. PWTD were more likely than other candidates to be selected for new hire Supervisor positions. No PWTD selections were made for new hire Managers positions (with 35 selections) or SES positions (with 38 selections). In both cases, the expected value for the representation of PWTD among new hires was <1, therefore, evidence of a trigger is not indicated.

## Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer No

In FY22, DOE hired 82 employees on Schedule A, of which 31 were self-identified as PWD. Of these, 16 (51.6%) converted to Appointment type 10 or 15 (Career or Career conditional), with 10 (41.2%) not converted. Five left the agency. In comparison, 58.8% of Schedule A FY21 PWD new hires had converted as of FY23.

HC generates a report to Departmental Element Resource Managers, which identifies Schedule A employees who are nearing completion of their two years of service and eligible for conversion. If a Schedule A employee's service is satisfactory, the Resource Manager must initiate workflow actions in order to convert a Schedule A employee.

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

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

NA

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	22	0.75	0.18
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	123	1.34	1.50
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	226	3.17	2.63
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	167	2.92	1.85
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	538	8.18	6.15

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 No

NA

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	22	0.46	0.26
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	123	0.92	1.49
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	226	3.69	2.68
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	167	2.30	1.99
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	538	7.37	6.42

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.

NA

**B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES**

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

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

DOE has issued a notice explaining employee and applicant rights under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. A description of how to file a complaint is also on this public website. During FY2024, the information could be found here: <https://www.energy.gov/cio/department-energy-doe-and-section-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.

OCR-EEO has maintained information regarding the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA) on its webpage. However, the webpage is currently under review to comply with CY 2025 Executive Orders and guidance.

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.

In FY24, the Agency did not implement any projects to improve accessibility of facilities during the reporting period. The DOE Headquarters building is fully ADAAA compliant.

In FY24, HC offered Lunch and Learn sessions for DOE employees that focused on Assistive Technology to support PWD in the workplace and created a webpage to explain the use of these services and how to request them. The RA Program worked with the

National Signals Agency (NSA) to address an increase in requests to bring Electronic Medical Devices (EMD) into secure settings where classified information is stored and classified conversations are held, with a presentation made to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and LRACs responsible for processing RA requests for employees working in secure areas.

Office of the Chief Information Officer executed actions to improve technology accessibility, which included: • Guidance on testing information and communications technology (ICT) with screen readers, color contrast analyzers, and other tools.

- Supported deployment of Siteimprove, a Web Governance Tool to monitor and improve the accessibility of DOE's public-facing websites.
- Remediated widely distributed documents and forms for Section 508 compliance and employed DHS Trusted Tester techniques and principles to support accessible DOE ICT.
- Facilitated DOE's annual OMB/GSA Government-wide Section 508 Program Maturity Assessment.

### 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.)

HC developed an RA Tracker in FY24 to facilitate timely case resolution by LRACs and data mining. Processing times were reduced to an average of 18.5 days across the Departmental Elements included in the HQ+ MD-715 Report. Training was provided to other DOE HC SSC's about the tracker, with plans for the three other SSCs to develop a similar tracking system in FY25.

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.

DOE's RA Program information is located at: [www.energy.gov/hc/department-energy-reasonable-accommodation-program](http://www.energy.gov/hc/department-energy-reasonable-accommodation-program). DOE updated its RA policies (Policy Memo (PM) #100C Reasonable Accommodation and Personal Assistance Services) and developed a new, separate PM #134 Religious Accommodation. The HCnet internal website was updated and expanded with relevant videos, factsheets, templates, and trainings. Additional products planned for FY25: Essential Functions for Deciding Management Officials (DMOs), Telework and RA, and FAQs. HC conducted numerous RA training sessions for employees, managers, and supervisors.

An online ordering system for ASL and 508-compliant materials was implemented. Despite the online ordering system, however, PWD raised concerns with accessibility of audio description for videos, 508 compliant documents and products, and access to ASL interpreters. The RA Program Manager set up a working group to examine the issues and make recommendations.

FEVS data show that the many efforts to strengthen the DOE RA program are increasingly assessed as effective by DOE's PWD employees. OCR-EEO analysis of FEVS scores on the average of three items about the agency's efficacy of providing accommodations showed a meaningful 5.4 percentage increase between 2022 (71.3% positive) and 2024 (76.7% positive).

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

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

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

Information about Personal Assistance Services (PAS) is located at: <https://hcnet.doe.gov/career-benefits/reasonable-accommodation>. In FY24, DOE received no requests for PAS.

## Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

### A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer No

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

Answer Yes

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

N/A - no findings.

### 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 - no findings.

## Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer No

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

Answer N/A

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

NA