

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

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

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration's policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • "triggers" to identify "barriers" or "underrepresentation" • "benchmarking" that targets specific applicant pools, or • "inclusion" and determination of an "inclusion rate" was not utilized on FY'24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

\*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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration's policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • "triggers" to identify "barriers" or "underrepresentation" • "benchmarking" that targets specific applicant pools, or • "inclusion" and determination of an "inclusion rate" was not utilized on FY'24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-11 to SES	230	23	10.00	4	1.74
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	37	7	18.92	2	5.41

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

Historically, the FEC's workforce outreach efforts have consisted of posting on USAJOBS, LinkedIn, Traverse Jobs, and GovDelivery subscription service to new vacancy announcements on the FEC website. For hard-to-fill or specialized vacancies,

other targeted recruitment methods may also have been used, as appropriate. Previous EEOC target goals of 12% PWD and 2% PWTD were communicated to staff as part of the Agency’s workforce resurvey efforts, to improve awareness of PWD and PWTD in the FEC’s workforce.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Section 508 Compliance	1	0	0	Patcharee Phongsvirajati Web Manager & Section 508 Coordinator 508coordinator@fec.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	1	0	0	India Robinson Physical Security Officer & Admin. Services Mgr.
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	OPM HR Solutions staff San Antonio Services Branch 816-541-8101
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	1	0	0	OPM HR Solutions staff San Antonio Services Branch 816-541-8101
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	Cheryl Painter (RAC) (DPM) Disability Program Manager, EEO Specialist historical reference for FY’24; Kevin Salley is Interim Contact for FY’25
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Cheryl Painter (RAC) (DPM) Disability Program Manager, EEO Specialist historical reference for FY’24; Vacant for FY’25

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

Answer Yes

The agency’s DPM remains current on disability-related law and federal sector training, taking applicable training as it becomes available and in accordance with budget constraints. The DPM is an active member of the Federal Exchange on Employment & Disability (FEED) group and participates in other disability-related networks (e.g. Job Accommodation Network [JAN]; Employer Assistance and Resource Network [EARN]). The DPM coordinates with /informs the Selective Placement Coordinator and other HR staff (as appropriate) of supplemental training opportunities to enhance agency efforts in assisting PWD and PWTD.

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

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

Answer Yes

The Agency’s disability program staff remained current on disability-related law and federal sector training, taking applicable training as it became available and in accordance with budget constraints. Agency staff maintained active membership in the Federal Exchange on Employment & Disability (FEED) group and participated in other disability-related networks (e.g. Job Accommodation Network [JAN]; Employer Assistance and Resource Network [EARN]). Supplemental training opportunities were offered to enhance awareness of PWD and PWTD needs, as appropriate and subject to budget constraints.

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

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

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

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

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

Currently, the agency advertises positions under the USAJOBS label “individuals with disabilities” which may attract Schedule A candidates, individuals with veterans’ preference and other applicants (as appropriate) to apply for positions in the permanent workforce. Applicants may self-identify as PWD or PWTD by requesting accommodation during the early stages (e.g., application, interview) of the hiring process. The HR and EEO Offices work together to support those identified during the process, as they are onboarded, and thereafter.

- 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

As mentioned previously, the agency advertises positions under the USAJOBS label “individuals with disabilities” which may attract Schedule A candidates, individuals with veterans’ preference and other applicants (as appropriate) to apply for positions in the permanent workforce. Additionally, OHR continues to develop operating procedures and training for hiring managers to advise them regarding any rules and flexibilities available with special hiring authorities, as resources permit.

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

In general, the agency focuses on merit promotion process, rather than direct hiring from a list of Schedule A applicants. During minimum qualification review, vacancy announcement requirements are examined to ensure necessary documentation is present for applicants who qualify for status based on Schedule A or another special hiring authority. Those applicants are presented with other qualified applicants simultaneously to hiring managers and/or other decision makers as appropriate.

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

OHR provides introductory training regarding available hiring authorities during the three-year supervisory training requirement, and to new managers as they are appointed. This training contains a module on Schedule A hiring and other hiring preferences.

**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.

Informational contacts are maintained with key members of the disability community via: the Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP), the Computer/Electronics Accommodations Program (CAP) , the Jobs Accommodations Network (JAN), Employer Assistance and Resource Network on Disability (EARN), and Federal Exchange on Employment & Disability (FEED etc.), in order to provide collaborative assistance to OHR staff, hiring managers and other decision makers when vacancies need to be filled.

**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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer No

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • "inclusion" and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

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

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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • "inclusion" and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • "inclusion" and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

## 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.

An Advancement Program plan has not been developed that targets PWD/PWTD to ensure sufficient opportunities for advancement. However, the Agency continues to identify, promote and offer mission-related professional development opportunities for all Agency staff as they become available, in accordance with budget constraints.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

Each agency office maintains a training budget for its staff. Position-specific and related professional development training needs are assessed and offered at the office level. OHR recommends additional training to satisfy OPM requirements enhance professional development (as appropriate) and assist with identifying vendors to address specific staff needs, when requested. Supervisors receive mandatory training every three (3) years in the core competencies as required by OPM regulations.

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 (%)
Internship Programs						
Fellowship Programs						
Mentoring Programs						
Coaching Programs						
Training Programs						
Detail Programs						
Other Career Development Programs						

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

- a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

N/A -To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how to resume these types of analyses.

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

- a. Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

N/A -To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how to resume these types of analyses.

**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

N/A – To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	59.00	11.8644	88.1356	1.6949	98.3051
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	506.00	14.2292	85.7708	3.1621	96.8379
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	8.58	10.2857	8.3462	16.0000	8.4483
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	11.00	9.0909	90.9091	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	192.00	16.6667	83.3333	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	17.45	32.0000	16.0000	0.0000	17.4545
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	2.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	48.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	24.00	0.0000	24.0000	0.0000	24.0000
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	2.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	64.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	32.00	0.0000	32.0000	0.0000	32.0000
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Awards Given	84.00	10.7143	89.2857	3.5714	96.4286
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total Amount	31233.00	10.5978	89.4022	3.6436	96.3564
Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Average Amount	371.82	367.7778	372.3067	379.3333	371.5432
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	113.00	11.5044	88.4956	2.6549	97.3451
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	84787.00	11.8214	88.1786	2.4237	97.5763
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	750.33	771.0000	747.6400	685.0000	752.1091
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	240.00	9.1667	90.8333	1.6667	98.3333
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	340712.00	8.7288	91.2712	1.5887	98.4113

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1419.63	1351.8182	1426.4771	1353.2500	1420.7585
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	86.00	6.9767	93.0233	0.0000	100.0000
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	195915.00	6.4344	93.5656	0.0000	100.0000
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2278.08	2101.0000	2291.3625	0.0000	2278.0814
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	1.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	3487.00	0.0000	100.0000	0.0000	100.0000
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3487.00	0.0000	3487.0000	0.0000	3487.0000
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	0.00	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

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 – To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
--------------	-----------	-------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------

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 – To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

**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 N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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 N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

b. Grade GS-15

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

c. Grade GS-14

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

d. Grade GS-13

- i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
- ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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 N/A
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer N/A
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer N/A

Applicant pool data was not identified in time to conduct an accurate analysis for PWD in these categories by the extension deadline. Any addendum to this section will be uploaded to FEDSEP before FY23 system closure on 8/1/24.

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 N/A
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTD) Answer N/A
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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 N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB) Answer N/A

ii. Internal Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer N/A

b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer N/A

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the

EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer N/A

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

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

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

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer N/A

The agency did not have any employees that were hired specifically under Schedule A authority and were eligible for conversion to the competitive service. All positions at the FEC are within the excepted service.

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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

Separations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	3	0.00	1.15
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	5	3.33	1.53
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	17	3.33	6.13

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	25	6.67	8.81

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

To ensure FEC EEO Program alignment with the current Administration’s policies and EEOC goals, the MD-715 analysis methodology involving: • “triggers” to identify “barriers” or “underrepresentation” • “benchmarking” that targets specific applicant pools, or • “inclusion” and determination of an “inclusion rate” was not utilized on FY’24 data. We await specific guidance from the EEOC, after its quorum has been regained, on how/whether to resume these types of analyses.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	3	0.00	1.05
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	5	16.67	1.40
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	17	0.00	5.96
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	25	16.67	8.42

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.

N/A

**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.

<https://www.fec.gov/accessibility-statement/> <https://www.fec.gov/about/equal-employment-opportunity/#accessibility>

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

<https://www.fec.gov/accessibility-statement/> <https://www.fec.gov/about/equal-employment-opportunity/#accessibility>

3. Describe any programs, policies, or practices that the agency has undertaken, or plans on undertaking over the next fiscal year, designed to improve accessibility of agency facilities and/or technology.

The Office of the Chief Information Officer has initiated an ongoing agency-wide program to train staff to make documents 508 compliant for staff and members of the public. This was also done to help the agency comply with federal laws requiring that all

content posted on the agency website be accessible, especially to those using assistive technology.

**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.)

Within two (2) business days.

- 2. Describe the effectiveness of the policies, procedures, or practices to implement the agency’s reasonable accommodation program. Some examples of an effective program include timely processing requests, timely providing approved accommodations, conducting training for managers and supervisors, and monitoring accommodation requests for trends.

The FEC has maintained an effective accommodation program that processes accommodation requests and facilitates accommodation plan development in a timely manner. Disability awareness and accommodation-related training are available on an on-going basis throughout the year; mandatory review of the Accommodation Policy is required of all staff biennially and new staff receive training during onboarding.

**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.

At its inception, the PAS notice was posted timely and the procedures for PAS were incorporated in the agency’s Accommodation Policy. To date, no employee or applicant has requested 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 No

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

The agency had zero (0) findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status during the last fiscal year.

**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.

The agency had zero (0) findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during the last fiscal year.

**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.

N/A