

# **Affirmative Action Plan**

**for the Recruitment, Hiring,  
Advancement, and Retention  
of Persons with Disabilities**

**FY 2025**

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

**Department of Housing and Urban Development - FY 2025**

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

No trigger identified. Both grade level clusters for PWD are above the 12.00 Percent benchmark. Grade level cluster GS-1 to GS-10 is 25.00 Percent and grade level cluster GS-11 to SES is 15.79 Percent.

\* 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

No trigger identified. Both grade level clusters for PWTD are above the 2.00 Percent benchmark. Grade level cluster GS-1 to GS-10 is 6.98 Percent and grade level cluster GS-11 to SES is 3.53 Percent.

| Grade Level Cluster<br>(GS or Alternate Pay Planb) | Total | Reportable<br>Disability Total | Reportable Disability<br>Percentage<br>(Numerical Goal<br>12 Percent) | Targeted Disability Total | Targeted Disability<br>Percentage<br>(Numerical Goal<br>2 Percent) |
|--|-------|--------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| Grades GS-11 to SES                                | 6518  | 1036                           | 15.89   | 231                       | 3.54   |
| Grades GS-1 to GS-10                               | 172   | 43                             | 25.00   | 12                        | 6.98   |

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

In FY 2025, the agency communicated the numerical goals to the senior leaders and hiring officials of each Program Office.

## 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

HUD currently has a part-time Section 508 program manager. HUD also convenes a digital accessibility exceptions committee as needed.

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  | Total Full Time | Total Part Time | Total Collateral Duty | Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)   |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
| Architectural Barriers Act Compliance  | 0               | 0               | 10                    | Rex J. Pace<br>ABA Coordinator<br>rex.j.pace@hud.gov                                       |
| Processing applications from PWD and PWTD  | 1               | 0               | 6                     | Paris Bryant<br>Director, Recruitment and Staffing Division<br>Paris.D.Bryant@hud.gov      |
| Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account | 1               | 0               | 6                     | Paris Bryant<br>Director, Recruitment and Staffing Division<br>Paris.D.Bryant@hud.gov      |
| Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees                     | 7               | 1               | 0                     | Daniel Eckroth<br>Acting Reasonable Accommodation Branch Chief<br>Daniel.V.Eckroth@hud.gov |
| Section 508 Compliance   | 0               | 0               | 1                     | Daniel Williams<br>Section 508 Program Manager<br>Daniel.R.Williams@hud.gov                |
| Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD  | 1               | 1               | 0                     | Jeffrey Salit<br>Section 508 Coordinator<br>Jeffrey.L.Salit@hud.gov                        |

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

Answer: Yes

The Reasonable Accommodations Branch (RAB) has received the following training in FY 2025: Reviewing Medical Documentation; NELI's ADA Workshop; Workplace Accommodations by Job Accommodation Network (JAN); Opening Our Eyes to a World Beyond Sight: Navigating Blindness and Low Vision; Service Animals vs Emotional Support Animals; Accommodating Employees with Intellectual Disabilities; Accommodating Employees with various Cognitive and Neurological Needs; and Pregnant Workers Fairness Act Training. The RAB staff have also individually taken the following courses: Disability Program Manager Basics; Proofreading Skills for Government Employees; Effective Writing Training for Government Employees; Federal Writing Bootcamp; and Briefing and Presentation Skills.

### 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





|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Objective</b>                 | To process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in the HUD reasonable accommodation procedures (30 days) |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>               | 2025   |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery  |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery  |

|                                  |                       |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Daniel V. Eckroth     |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery |
| <b>Responsible Official Name</b> | Matisha D. Montgomery |

|                                   |   |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer            |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |
| <b>Responsible Official Title</b> | Acting Reasonable Accommodations Branch Chief |

## 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.

To identify job applicants with disabilities to include individuals with targeted disabilities, HUD conducts outreach through:

Participation in the Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP), providing access to a national database of pre-screened college students and recent graduates with disabilities.

Partnerships with State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) agencies.

Collaboration with American Job Centers to promote federal employment opportunities.

Engagement with national and local disability focused nonprofit organizations to increase awareness of HUD career opportunities.

Participation in disability-focused hiring fairs and National Disability Employment Awareness Month activities.

Targeted recruitment events and disability-focused career fairs.

In addition, HUD reviews applicant data flow data to assess:

Self-identification rates of individuals with disabilities and individuals with targeted disabilities.

Representation across grade levels and occupational series

Effectiveness of outreach initiatives

Where participation rates fall below expected benchmarks, targeted recruitment strategies are implemented.

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.

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(a)(3), HUD utilizes hiring authorities that take disability into account, including Schedule A (5 CFR 213.3102(u)) to facilitate non-competitive hiring of qualified individuals with disabilities and individuals with targeted disabilities into the permanent workforce. This includes:

Use of Schedule A Hiring Authority – HUD actively promotes Schedule A as a non-competitive hiring authority to facilitate the timely appointment of qualified applicants with disabilities. The Recruitment and Staffing Division, within Human Capital Services, OCHCO provides technical assistance to hiring managers on eligibility requirements, qualification determinations, proper coding and accurate tracking of appointments, and conversion to Schedule A appointees to the competitive service, when applicable.

Workforce Recruitment Program (WRP) – HUD participates annually in the WRP to recruit college students and recent graduates with disabilities for internships and permanent positions. This participation support early career recruitment and serves as a pipeline to permanent employment within the Department.

Vacancy Announcement Practices – All competitive vacancy announcements are posted on USAJOBS and include language encouraging individuals with disabilities to apply. Announcements identify available hiring authorities, including Schedule A, and provide contact information for applicants requesting reasonable accommodation.

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.

When an individual applies for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account, such as Schedule A (5 CFR 213.3102(u)), the agency follows a structured process to ensure eligibility verification, proper documentation, and timely referral to the appropriate hiring official.

### 1. Determining Eligibility for Appointment

Upon receipt of an application indicating consideration under Schedule A, the Recruitment and Staffing Division within Human Capital Service, OCHCO conducts a two-part eligibility review:

A. Documentation Verification – The Recruitment and Staffing Division staff verifies that the applicant has submitted appropriate proof of disability documentation consistent with regulatory guidance. Acceptable documentation may include certification from:

A licensed medical professional

A licensed vocational rehabilitation specialist

A federal, state, or District of Columbia agency that issues disability benefits

If documentation is incomplete or unclear, the Recruitment and Staffing Division staff will contact the applicant to provide clarification or request additional information.

B. Qualification Determination – The Recruitment and Staffing Division staff evaluates the applicant's experience, education, and competencies against the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) qualification standards for the position. Applicants must meet minimum qualification requirements, including any selective placement factors.

Only applicants who both:

1. Meet Schedule A eligibility criteria, and
2. Meet position qualification standards

### 2. Referral to the Hiring Official

Once eligibility and qualifications are confirmed:

A. Referral Process – The Recruitment and Staffing Division staff forwards the applicant's materials to the appropriate hiring official. The referral package clearly identifies:

The applicant's eligibility under Schedule A  
 The non-competitive nature of the hiring authority  
 Instructions regarding interview and selection procedures  
 Guidance on documentation and appointment processing

When applicable, referrals may occur alongside competitive certificates or as a separate non-competitive referral list.

B. Explanation of Appointment Process – The Recruitment and Staffing Division staff provides the hiring official with written guidance explaining the following:

Schedule A permits non-competitive appointment of qualified individuals with disabilities;  
 Selections may occur without full competitive rating and ranking procedures;  
 The initial appointment may be made as an excepted service appointment; and  
 The individual may be eligible for conversion to the competitive service after two years of satisfactory service, consistent with regulatory requirements.

In addition, the Recruitment and Staffing Division staff also provides consultation regarding reasonable accommodation obligations and onboarding considerations to ensure compliance with Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act.

### 3. Oversight and Accountability

The agency tracks Schedule A referrals and selections to assess utilization rates and ensure equitable consideration of applicants with disabilities. Data related to disability hiring authorities is reviewed as part of the agency's MD-715 reporting and barrier analysis process.

This structured approach ensures that individuals applying under disability hiring authorities are evaluated fairly, referred appropriately, and provided clear information regarding appointment and conversion procedures, while maintaining compliance with merit system principles and applicable regulations.

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



| New Hires                 | Total (Number) | Reportable Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage) | Reportable Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage) | Targeted Disability Permanent Workforce (Percentage) | Targeted Disability Temporary Workforce (Percentage) |
|---------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| % of Total Applicants     | 0              | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   |
| % of Qualified Applicants | 0              | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   |
| % of New Hires            | 0              | 0.00   | 0.00   | 0.00   | 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

The percentage of PWD new hires (0.00 Percent) was the same as the qualified applicant pool benchmark (0.00 Percent). The percentage of PWTD new hires (0.00 Percent) was the same as the qualified applicant pool benchmark (0.00 Percent).

The percentage of PWD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (5.61 Percent). The percentage of PWTD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (0.93 Percent).

The percentage of PWD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (5.71 Percent). The percentage of PWTD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (2.86 Percent).

The percentage of PWD new hires (33.33 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (6.56 Percent). The percentage of PWTD new hires (33.33 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (2.55 Percent).

| New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations | Total (Number) | Reportable Disability New Hires (Percentage) | Targetable Disability New Hires (Percentage) |
|---|----------------|--|--|
| 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. Select "n/a" if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

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

The percentage of PWD qualified applicants (16.67 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (6.45 Percent). The percentage of PWTD qualified applicant (16.67 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (6.45 Percent).

The percentage of PWD qualified applicants (3.85 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (11.40 Percent). The percentage of PWTD qualified applicants (1.92 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (4.66 Percent).

The percentage of PWD qualified applicants (3.23 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (16.46 Percent). The percentage of PWTD qualified applicants (3.23 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (7.32 Percent).

The percentage of PWD qualified applicants (10.06 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (10.84 Percent). The percentage of PWTD qualified applicants (5.33 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (5.42 Percent).

Note: The relevant applicant pool is the percentage of PWD/PWTD voluntary identified applicants compared to the qualified applicants.

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

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD)

Answer: Yes

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

The percentage of PWD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (16.67 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (16.67 Percent).

The percentage of PWD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.85 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (1.92 Percent).

The percentage of PWD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.23 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.23 Percent).

The percentage of PWD employees promoted (9.09 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (10.06 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employees promoted (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (5.33 Percent).

## 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.

HUD is committed to fostering a workplace where employees with disabilities have access to advancement opportunities. The agency provides a range of career development programs, including rotational assignments of up to 120 days, mentoring, coaching, and targeted training initiatives. These programs are designed to enhance skills, build leadership capacity, and prepare employees for promotional opportunities.

Eligible employees are actively encouraged to participate in these developmental activities, which are promoted through internal communications and supported by supervisors. HUD also conducts regular reviews of its advancement programs to assess effectiveness and identify areas for improvement. Feedback is solicited through employee engagement surveys and exit interviews (survey), with a specific focus on the experiences of employees with disabilities.

To ensure continuous progress, HUD integrates findings from these reviews into strategic planning and policy updates, reinforcing its commitment to the recruitment, hiring, advancement, and retention of employees with disabilities across all levels of the organization.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

During FY 2025, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) offered a wide range of career development opportunities tailored to support employees at all levels. These included centralized programs such as Mentoring, Coaching, and Rotational Assignments, which are accessible to all staff. HUD also introduced targeted initiatives, including the Soar Academy—a voluntary 12-session program designed to build competencies among early and mid-career professionals (GS-5 through GS-12). This immersive learning experience aimed to cultivate high-potential talent across two cohorts.

In addition, HUD’s open-enrollment training programs, provided through Talent Development and Workforce Planning (TDWP), consistently attracted high participation, often reaching hundreds of employees. While some competitive programs had seating or policy-based limits, the overall availability of development resources reflected HUD’s commitment to fostering employee growth and advancement.

To ensure access to these opportunities, HUD provides a range of accommodations for employees with disabilities. These include American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation, closed captioning for virtual sessions, and access to live interpreters upon request. HUD also works closely with its Disability Program Manager and Reasonable Accommodations team to ensure that all career development programs are inclusive and accessible.

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 Applicants (Percentage) | Total Participants Selectees (Percentage) | PWD Applicants (Percentage) | PWD Selectees (Percentage) | PWTD Applicants (Percentage) | PWTD Selectees (Percentage) |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Training Programs                 | 82   | 30  | 23.17%                      | 20.00%                     | 1.22%                        | 0.00%                       |
| Detail Programs                   | 72   | 9   | 31.94%                      | 33.33%                     | 6.94%                        | 0.00%                       |
| Internship Programs               | 80   | 0   | 1.25%                       | 0.00%                      | 3.75%                        | 0.00%                       |
| Fellowship Programs               | 0  | 0   | 0.00%                       | 0.00%                      | 0.00%                        | 0.00%                       |
| Mentoring Programs                | 0  | 0   | 0.00%                       | 0.00%                      | 0.00%                        | 0.00%                       |
| Coaching Programs                 | 247  | 56  | 32.79%                      | 26.79%                     | 4.45%                        | 7.14%                       |
| Other Career Development Programs | 20   | 13  | 40.00%                      | 38.46%                     | 15.00%                       | 7.69%                       |

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: Yes
- b. Selections (PWD) Answer: Yes

The percentage of PWD applicants for internship programs was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark. The percentage of PWD selectees for internship programs was below the applicant pool benchmark.

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: Yes
- b. Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

The percentage of PWTD applicants for all of the career development programs was below the relevant applicant pool. The percentage of PWTD selected for detail programs is below the applicant pool benchmark.

### C. AWARDS

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

- a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer: Yes
- b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTD) Answer: Yes

When comparing PWD and PWTD with people with no disability (PWND) a trigger exists. The triggers identified are listed below.

**Time Off Awards:**

PWD (14.77 Percent) fell slightly below the rate for employees with no disability (15.78 Percent) for time off awards between 1 - 10 hours. No trigger exists for PWTD in time off awards between 1 – 10 hours. PWTD (16.26 Percent) was above the rate for employees with no disability (15.78 Percent).

PWD (11.93 Percent) fell below the rate for employees with no disability (13.24 Percent) for time off awards between 11 - 20 hours. No trigger exists for PWTD in time off awards between 11 – 20 hours. PWTD (14.23 Percent) was above the rate for employees with no disability (13.24 Percent).

PWD (11.19 Percent) and PWTD (11.79 Percent) fell below the rate for employees with no disability (13.44 Percent) for time off awards between 21 - 30 hours.

PWD (16.97 Percent) and PWTD (17.89 Percent) fell below the rate for employees with no disability (21.44 Percent) for time off awards between 31 - 40 hours.

**Cash Awards:**

PWD (5.41 Percent) and PWTD (4.88 Percent) in cash awards, \$500 and under, was below the rate for employees with no disability (6.69 Percent).

No trigger exists for PWD (4.22 Percent) and PWTD (6.10 Percent) in cash awards, \$501 - \$999, both were above the rate for employees with no disability (4.00 Percent).

PWD (21.38 Percent) and PWTD (21.54 Percent) in cash awards \$1000 - \$1999, was slightly below the rate for employees with no disability (22.16 Percent).

PWD (37.80 Percent) and PWTD (35.37 Percent) in cash awards, \$2000 - \$2999, was slightly below the rate for employees with no disability (45.64 Percent).

PWD (11.28 Percent) and PWTB (8.54 Percent) in cash awards, \$3000 - \$3999, was below the rate for employees with no disability (18.35 Percent).

PWD (4.40 Percent) and PWTB (3.66 Percent) in cash awards, \$4000 - \$4999, was below the rate for employees with no disability (10.30 Percent).

PWD (0.28 Percent) and PWTB (0.00 Percent) in cash awards \$5000 or more, was below the rate for employees with no disability (0.41 Percent).

| <b>Time-Off Awards</b>                          | <b>Total<br/>(Number)</b> | <b>Reportable<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Without<br/>Reportable<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Targeted Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> | <b>Without Targeted<br/>Disability<br/>(Percentage)</b> |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given      | 1016.00                   | 15.85   | 84.15   | 3.94  | 96.06   |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours       | 8121.00                   | 16.09   | 83.91   | 4.11  | 95.89   |
| Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours     | 7.99                      | 8.12  | 7.97  | 8.35  | 7.98  |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given     | 860.00                    | 15.12   | 84.88   | 4.07  | 95.93   |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours      | 14159.00                  | 15.07   | 84.93   | 4.08  | 95.92   |
| Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours    | 16.46                     | 16.42   | 16.47   | 16.51                                       | 16.46   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given     | 858.00                    | 14.22   | 85.78   | 3.38  | 96.62   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours      | 20943.00                  | 14.27   | 85.73   | 3.41  | 96.59   |
| Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours    | 24.41                     | 24.49   | 24.40   | 24.66                                       | 24.40   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given     | 1326.00                   | 13.95   | 86.05   | 3.32  | 96.68   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours      | 48240.00                  | 13.75   | 86.25   | 3.27  | 96.73   |
| Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours    | 36.38                     | 35.85   | 36.47   | 35.82                                       | 36.40   |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given  | 0.00                      | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours   | 0.00                      | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  |
| Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours | 0.00                      | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  | 0.00  |

| Cash Awards                                  | Total (Number) | Reportable Disability (Percentage) | Without Reportable Disability (Percentage) | Targeted Disability (Percentage) | Without Targeted Disability (Percentage) |
|--|----------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Awards Given    | 444.00         | 13.29                              | 86.71                                      | 2.70                             | 97.30                                    |
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Total Amount    | 186060.00      | 13.90                              | 86.10                                      | 2.78                             | 97.22                                    |
| Cash Awards \$500 and Under: Average Amount  | 419.05         | 438.47                             | 416.08                                     | 431.50                           | 418.71                                   |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given     | 266.00         | 17.29                              | 82.71                                      | 5.64                             | 94.36                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount     | 199781.00      | 17.54                              | 82.46                                      | 5.74                             | 94.26                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount   | 751.06         | 761.83                             | 748.80                                     | 764.40                           | 750.26                                   |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given   | 1482.00        | 15.72                              | 84.28                                      | 3.58                             | 96.42                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount   | 2211794.00     | 15.55                              | 84.45                                      | 3.57                             | 96.43                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount | 1492.44        | 1476.26                            | 1495.46                                    | 1488.68                          | 1492.58                                  |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given   | 2892.00        | 14.25                              | 85.75                                      | 3.01                             | 96.99                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount   | 7371124.00     | 14.33                              | 85.67                                      | 3.04                             | 96.96                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount | 2548.80        | 2563.47                            | 2546.36                                    | 2572.41                          | 2548.07                                  |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given   | 1093.00        | 11.25                              | 88.75                                      | 1.92                             | 98.08                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount   | 3838563.00     | 11.16                              | 88.84                                      | 1.93                             | 98.07                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount | 3511.95        | 3482.93                            | 3515.63                                    | 3519.05                          | 3511.81                                  |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given   | 591.00         | 8.12                               | 91.88                                      | 1.52                             | 98.48                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount   | 2641600.00     | 8.06                               | 91.94                                      | 1.50                             | 98.50                                    |
| Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount | 4469.71        | 4435.42                            | 4472.74                                    | 4400.00                          | 4470.79                                  |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given    | 26.00          | 11.54                              | 88.46                                      | 0.00                             | 100.00                                   |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount    | 254231.00      | 11.44                              | 88.56                                      | 0.00                             | 100.00                                   |
| Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount  | 9778.12        | 9696.00                            | 9788.83                                    | 0.00                             | 9778.12                                  |

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

a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTB)

Answer: Yes

b. Pay Increases (PWTB)

Answer: No

PWD (6.15 Percent) in quality step increases, was below the rate for employees with no disability (7.02 Percent). No trigger exists for PWTD (7.32 Percent) in quality step increases. PWTD was above the rate for employees with no disability (7.02 Percent).

| Other Awards                                  | Total (Number) | Reportable Disability (Percentage) | Without Reportable Disability (Percentage) | Targeted Disability (Percentage) | Without Targeted Disability (Percentage) |
|---|----------------|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded | 0.00           | 0.00                               | 0.00                                       | 0.00                             | 0.00                                     |

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

- a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer: Yes
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer: Yes

PWD (0.18 Percent) and PWTD (0.00 Percent) in other types of recognition, was below the rate for employees with no disability (0.21 Percent).

Note: For this question the "Other Types of Recognition) is identified as Performance Based Pay Increase.

### 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 (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

SES: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (58.49 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (51.14 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (100.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (58.49 Percent).

GS-15: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (70.48 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (63.56 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (75.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (70.48 Percent).

GS-14: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (64.30 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (60.32 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (61.29 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (64.30 Percent).

GS-13: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (58.87 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (54.07 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (44.83 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (58.87 Percent).

Note: The relevant applicant pool is the percentage of voluntary identified applicants.

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: No

SES: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (3.77 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (4.55 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.77 Percent).

GS-15: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (9.16 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (8.14 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (9.16 Percent).

GS-14: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (9.15 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (8.64 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (3.23 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (9.15 Percent).

GS-13: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (9.58 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (8.73 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (9.58 Percent).

Note: The relevant applicant pool is the percentage of voluntary identified applicants.

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

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

SES: The percentage of PWD new hires (100.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (42.11 Percent).

GS-15: The percentage of PWD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (48.48 Percent).

GS-14: The percentage of PWD new hires (60.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (40.26 Percent).

GS-13: The percentage of PWD new hires (54.55 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (36.84 Percent).

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer: Yes
- b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWTB) Answer: Yes
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWTB) Answer: Yes
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWTB) Answer: No

SES: The percentage of PWTB new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (2.63 Percent).

GS-15: The percentage of PWTB new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (5.95 Percent).

GS-14: The percentage of PWTB new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (4.40 Percent).

GS-13: The percentage of PWTB new hires (18.18 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.79 Percent).

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

c. Supervisors

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

Executives: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (58.49 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (51.14 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (100.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (58.49 Percent).

Managers: Applicant flow data for Managers is not available.

Supervisors: The percentage of PWD qualified internal applicants (64.10 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (60.01 Percent). The percentage of PWD employee internal selections (76.47 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (64.10 Percent).

Note: The relevant applicant pool is the percentage of voluntary identified applicants.

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 (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

b. Managers

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

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: N/A

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Executives: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (3.77 Percent) was below the relevant applicant pool benchmark (4.55 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (3.77 Percent).

Managers: Applicant flow data for Managers is not available.

Supervisors: The percentage of PWTD qualified internal applicants (9.28 Percent) was above the relevant applicant pool benchmark (8.67 Percent). The percentage of PWTD employee internal selections (5.88 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (9.28 Percent).

Note: The relevant applicant pool is the percentage of voluntary identified applicants.

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: No

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

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer: Yes

Executives: The percentage of PWD new hires (100.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (42.11 Percent).

Managers: Applicant flow data for Managers is not available.

Supervisors: The percentage of PWD new hires (33.33 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (42.36 Percent).

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD) Answer: Yes

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

c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Executives: The percentage of PWD new hires (100.00 Percent) was above the qualified applicant pool benchmark (42.11 Percent).

Managers: Applicant flow data for Managers is not available.

Supervisors: The percentage of PWTD new hires (0.00 Percent) was below the qualified applicant pool benchmark (4.28 Percent).

## 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: Yes

Yes, HUD converted all eligible Schedule A employees with a disability into the competitive service after two years of satisfactory 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: Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD)

Answer: Yes

PWD (32.02 Percent) exceeded the rate of persons with no disability (28.30 Percent) for voluntary separations.  
 PWD (1.56 Percent) exceeded the rate of persons with no disability (0.82 Percent) for involuntary separations.

| Separations                             | Total (Number) | Reportable Disabilities (Percentage) | Without Reportable Disabilities (Percentage) |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0              | 0.00                                 | 0.00   |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 93             | 1.55                                 | 1.31   |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 1198           | 19.38                                | 16.97  |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 737            | 10.10                                | 10.79  |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 122            | 2.27                                 | 1.67   |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 2150           | 33.30                                | 30.74  |

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(s) in the text box.

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

PWTD (28.46 Percent) exceeded the rate of persons with no disability (28.30 Percent) for voluntary separations.  
 PWTD (1.63 Percent) did not exceed the rate of persons with no disability (0.82 Percent) for involuntary separations.

| Separations                             | Total (Number) | Targeted Disabilities (Percentage) | Without Targeted Disabilities (Percentage) |
|---|----------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force | 0              | 0.00                               | 0.00                                       |
| Permanent Workforce: Removal            | 93             | 1.61                               | 1.34                                       |
| Permanent Workforce: Resignation        | 1198           | 16.47                              | 17.39                                      |
| Permanent Workforce: Retirement         | 737            | 9.24                               | 10.73                                      |
| Permanent Workforce: Other Separations  | 122            | 2.41                               | 1.74                                       |
| Permanent Workforce: Total Separations  | 2150           | 29.72                              | 31.20                                      |

4. If a trigger exists involving the separation rate of PWD and/or PWTB, please explain why they left the agency using exit interview results and other data sources.

Analysis of the PWD/PWTB responses in the exit interviews showed that 15.00 Percent of the motivation for leaving the agency was “Organizational Culture”, 17.00 Percent was due to “Senior leaders words and actions”, and 21.00 Percent was for “Policies and programs about telework/remote work”

## 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.

Internet address: <https://www.hud.gov/accessibility>

How to file a complaint: Send an email describing the barrier encountered to [508@hud.gov](mailto:508@hud.gov), who will then route to the appropriate office for intake or investigation. Employees and applicants may also file directly with the Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity (ODEEO) by email at [EEO@hud.gov](mailto:EEO@hud.gov).

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

Internet address: <https://www.hud.gov/accessibility>

An ABA complaint can be filed using the methods below:

1. Online ABA Complaint Form: <https://access-board.my.site.com/s/>
2. E-mail: [enforce@access-board.gov](mailto:enforce@access-board.gov)
3. Fax: 202-272-0081
4. Mail: U.S. Access Board, 1331 F Street, NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20004

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 (OCIO) conducted presentations to various groups about the importance of and requirements for digital access. For FY 2025, HUD published a revised Section 508 Policy, relaunched a Section 508 exceptions committee and required all staff to take general awareness training about Section 508 requirements. HUD will continue to ensure that it addresses statutory requirements under Section 508.

## 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.)

HUD provided final determinations on 739 reasonable accommodations requests in FY 2025. Out of those final determinations, 6.9 Percent were closed within 30 days, and HUD's average processing days was 165 days from start to finish. Please note that these average timeframes do not include delays outside of the Agency's control, such as waiting for equipment to be delivered. Data regarding these types of delays outside of the Agency's control is currently not readily available on a cumulative basis in HUD's current reasonable accommodations case management system. Additionally, the Reasonable Accommodation (RA) Branch experienced significant employee turnover and loss which hindered the ability to process requests in a timely manner.

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.

In FY 2025, new reasonable accommodations training for managers was rolled out. During FY 2025, the RA Branch conducted training for managers focusing on their obligations to provide effective and timely accommodations, and the presenters responded to questions from managers. Additionally, the RA Branch Chief participated in a Fireside Chat along with an EEOC Attorney Advisor on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (PWFA). The Branch Chief also provided training to all employees and managers focusing on the reasonable accommodations process and new hires.

On a biweekly basis, the RA Branch provides onboarding employees RA training during HUD's New Employee Orientation session. Reasonable accommodations training is provided on a one-on-one basis for managers and employees when processing specific accommodation requests.

The RA Branch updated templates for notifications that supervisors and employees received in order to provide clear processing instructions for reasonable accommodations and to provide information to assist the managers in making decisions for reasonable accommodations. The updates also served to educate employees on what they needed their medical documentation to state to show they have a disability and a nexus or need for an accommodation. The RA Branch provided general data to the program offices about accommodations in their specific areas.

## **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.

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

The PAS request process is centrally managed through the RAB Branch Chief in coordination with a designated RAB program case manager and the appropriate service contract points of contact. This structured routing ensures that requests are reviewed promptly, properly authorized, and assigned without unnecessary delay.

To ensure effectiveness and accountability, weekly assessments and evaluations are conducted for all PAS services provided. These reviews focus on timeliness, service quality, and compliance with applicable policies and regulatory requirements. Any identified concerns are addressed promptly, which minimizes service delays and mitigates potential quality issues.

In addition, ongoing oversight allows leadership to identify trends, recurring issues, or gaps in service delivery and to take corrective action as needed. This proactive monitoring supports continuous improvement and ensures that approved PAS services are delivered as intended.

To further enhance oversight and operational efficiency, measures are being implemented to introduce a centralized software tracking tool for all PAS requests. This system will allow requesters, RAB staff, and authorized stakeholders with a need-to-know to access real-time status updates, track service effectiveness, and monitor timelines.

The application will also generate standardized reports to assist with follow-up actions, conduct trend analysis, enable management review, and provide future program enhancements, thereby strengthening transparency, consistency, compliance, and overall program effectiveness.

## 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: Yes

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.

There were no findings of discrimination relative to this request during FY 2025.

### B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION

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

Answer: No

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

Answer: No

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

N/A

## Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer: No

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

Answer: N/A

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

### Source of the Trigger 1 (Workforce Data Table, Complaints data, FEVS, or other sources)

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B7  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | In FY 2022, the percentage of PWD New Hires (2.13%) in the MCO 0301 CPD Specialist/ Representative, was below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 3.49%.<br><br>In addition, the percentage of PWTD New Hires (0.00%) in the MCO 0360 Equal Opportunity Specialist is below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 2.55%. |
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B7  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | In FY 2022, the percentage of PWD New Hires (2.13%) in the MCO 0301 CPD Specialist/ Representative, was below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 3.49%.<br><br>In addition, the percentage of PWTD New Hires (0.00%) in the MCO 0360 Equal Opportunity Specialist is below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 2.55%. |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?</b>   | N  |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?</b>  | N  |

### Statement of Identified Barrier:

Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

### Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice

### Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 04/01/2023   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027   |
| <b>Date Completed</b>                 |  |
| <b>Objective Description</b>          | Convene Barrier Analysis Working Group to conduct Barrier Analysis Process |
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 07/31/2023   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027   |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Date Completed</b>        |  |
| <b>Objective Description</b> | Develop Action Plan based on barrier analysis results. |

**Responsible Official(s)**

|                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>Title</b>                       | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer |
| <b>Name</b>                        | Matisha Montgomery                 |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b> | Yes                                |

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                       | Director, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity (ODEEO) |
| <b>Name</b>                        | Wayne A. Williams   |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b> | Yes   |

**Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Target Date</b>                        | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                 | Identify specific objectives, strategies, and action steps to complete barrier analysis. |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | Yes  |

|                        |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| <b>Modified Date</b>   |            |
| <b>Completion Date</b> | 09/30/2023 |
| <b>Target Date</b>     | 09/30/2023 |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                 | Develop draft recommendations/action plan to incorporate into the Agency’s Disability Employment Plan with timelines and strategic goal and accomplishments that will reflect the increase of the participation. |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | Yes  |

|                        |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| <b>Modified Date</b>   |            |
| <b>Completion Date</b> | 12/20/2022 |
| <b>Target Date</b>     | 09/30/2024 |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                 | Increase awareness of special hiring authorities for PWD/PWTD by conducting informational sessions for hiring managers. |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | Yes   |

|                        |            |
|------------------------|------------|
| <b>Modified Date</b>   |            |
| <b>Completion Date</b> | 09/19/2024 |
| <b>Target Date</b>     | 09/30/2024 |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                 | Continue barrier analysis process to identify where in the employment cycle participation of PWD/PWTD is impacted. |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                      | 09/30/2027   |

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| <b>Completion Date</b> |  |
|------------------------|--|

**Report of Accomplishments**

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | 2025 |
|--------------------|------|

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Provided workshops to all Program Offices, focusing on SF-256 self-identification of disability or non-disabled status. These workshops emphasized the importance of self-identification helping to accurately capture the representation of individuals with disabilities within the workforce. |
|-----------------------|--|

|                    |      |
|--------------------|------|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b> | 2024 |
|--------------------|------|

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Provided workshops to all employees focused on understanding the reasonable accommodations process and emergency evacuation preparedness. |
|-----------------------|---|

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2024   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Increased awareness of hiring authorities for PWD/PWTD by conducting informational sessions for employees and managers throughout the fiscal year. |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Continued to meet regularly with barrier analysis working group to identify triggers and potential barriers.                                       |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | The barrier analysis team partnered with OCHCO to obtain and review applicant flow data for 0301 series.   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Conducted soft launch of the SF-256 resurvey campaign to encourage employees to update their disability status.                                    |

**Source of the Trigger 2 (Workforce Data Table, Complaints data, FEVS, or other sources)**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B7  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | In FY 2022, the percentage of PWD New Hires (2.13%) in the MCO 0301 CPD Specialist/ Representative, was below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 3.49%.<br><br>In addition, the percentage of PWTD New Hires (0.00%) in the MCO 0360 Equal Opportunity Specialist is below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 2.55%. |
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)  |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B7  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | In FY 2022, the percentage of PWD New Hires (2.13%) in the MCO 0301 CPD Specialist/ Representative, was below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 3.49%.<br><br>In addition, the percentage of PWTD New Hires (0.00%) in the MCO 0360 Equal Opportunity Specialist is below the benchmark of qualified applicants at 2.55%. |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?</b>   | N  |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?</b>  | N  |

**Statement of Identified Barrier:**  
Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

**Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan**

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 04/01/2023   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027   |
| <b>Date Completed</b>                 |  |
| <b>Objective Description</b>          | Convene Barrier Analysis Working Group to conduct Barrier Analysis Process |
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 07/31/2023   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Date Completed</b>                                    |  |
| <b>Objective Description</b>                             | Develop Action Plan based on barrier analysis results.   |
| <b>Responsible Official(s)</b>                           |  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer   |
| <b>Name</b>  | Matisha Montgomery   |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>                       | Yes  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Director, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity (ODEEO)  |
| <b>Name</b>  | Wayne A. Williams  |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b>                       | Yes  |
| <b>Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective</b> |  |
| <b>Target Date</b>                                       | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                                | Identify specific objectives, strategies, and action steps to complete barrier analysis.   |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>                | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                                     |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                                   | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                                       | 09/30/2023   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                                | Develop draft recommendations/action plan to incorporate into the Agency's Disability Employment Plan with timelines and strategic goal and accomplishments that will reflect the increase of the participation.   |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>                | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                                     |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                                   | 12/20/2022   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                                       | 09/30/2024   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                                | Increase awareness of special hiring authorities for PWD/PWTD by conducting informational sessions for hiring managers.  |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>                | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                                     |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                                   | 09/19/2024   |
| <b>Target Date</b>                                       | 09/30/2024   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                                | Continue barrier analysis process to identify where in the employment cycle participation of PWD/PWTD is impacted.   |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b>                | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                                     |  |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                                   | 09/30/2027   |
| <b>Report of Accomplishments</b>                         |  |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>                                       | 2025   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b>                                    | Provided workshops to all Program Offices, focusing on SF-256 self-identification of disability or non-disabled status. These workshops emphasized the importance of self-identification helping to accurately capture the representation of individuals with disabilities within the workforce. |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>                                       | 2024   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b>                                    | Provided workshops to all employees focused on understanding the reasonable accommodations process and emergency evacuation preparedness.  |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2024   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Increased awareness of hiring authorities for PWD/PWTD by conducting informational sessions for employees and managers throughout the fiscal year. |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Continued to meet regularly with barrier analysis working group to identify triggers and potential barriers.                                       |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | The barrier analysis team partnered with OCHCO to obtain and review applicant flow data for 0301 series.   |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2023   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Conducted soft launch of the SF-256 resurvey campaign to encourage employees to update their disability status.                                    |

**Source of the Trigger 3 (Workforce Data Table, Complaints data, FEVS, or other sources)**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)                           |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B14  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | PWD/PWTD separated from the agency at rates above the rate of PWND. |
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)                           |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B14  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | PWD/PWTD separated from the agency at rates above the rate of PWND. |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?</b>   | N   |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?</b>  | N   |

**Statement of Identified Barrier:**  
Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

**Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan**

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 10/01/2023  |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2024  |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes   |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027  |
| <b>Date Completed</b>                 |   |
| <b>Objective Description</b>          | Develop Action Plan based on barrier analysis results |
| <b>Date Initiated</b>                 | 10/01/2023  |
| <b>Target Date</b>                    | 09/30/2024  |
| <b>Sufficient Funding / Staffing?</b> | Yes   |
| <b>Date Modified</b>                  | 09/30/2027  |

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>Date Completed</b>        |  |
| <b>Objective Description</b> | Convene Barrier Analysis Working Group to conduct Barrier Analysis Process |

**Responsible Official(s)**

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Title</b>                       | Director, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity |
| <b>Name</b>                        | Wayne Williams  |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b> | Yes   |
| <b>Title</b>                       | Acting Chief Human Capital Officer                            |
| <b>Name</b>                        | Matisha Montgomery  |
| <b>Standards Address The Plan?</b> | Yes   |

**Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Target Date</b>                        | 09/30/2025   |
| <b>Planned Activities</b>                 | Review and conduct analysis of exit survey data to determine if there are any barriers within the agency causing PWD/PWTD to separate at higher rates. |
| <b>Sufficient Staffing &amp; Funding?</b> | Yes  |
| <b>Modified Date</b>                      | 09/30/2027   |
| <b>Completion Date</b>                    |  |

**Report of Accomplishments**

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2025   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Provided workshops to all Program Offices, focusing on SF-256 self-identification of disability or non-disabled status. These workshops emphasized the importance of self-identification helping to accurately capture the representation of individuals with disabilities within the workforce. |
| <b>Fiscal Year</b>    | 2024   |
| <b>Accomplishment</b> | Reconvened the barrier analysis working group to identify triggers and determine if barriers exist.  |

**Source of the Trigger 4 (Workforce Data Table, Complaints data, FEVS, or other sources)**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)                           |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B14  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | PWD/PWTD separated from the agency at rates above the rate of PWND. |
| <b>Source</b>  | Workforce Data (if so identify the table)                           |
| <b>Specific Workforce Data Table</b>   | Workforce Data Table - B14  |
| <b>Statement of Condition that was a Trigger for a Potential Barrier:</b><br>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier? | PWD/PWTD separated from the agency at rates above the rate of PWND. |
| <b>Barrier Analysis Process Completed?</b>   | N   |
| <b>Barrier(s) Identified?</b>  | N   |

**Statement of Identified Barrier:**

Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**

**Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan**

**Date Initiated** 10/01/2023

**Target Date** 09/30/2024

**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?** Yes

**Date Modified** 09/30/2027

**Date Completed**

**Objective Description** Develop Action Plan based on barrier analysis results

**Date Initiated** 10/01/2023

**Target Date** 09/30/2024

**Sufficient Funding / Staffing?** Yes

**Date Modified** 09/30/2027

**Date Completed**

**Objective Description** Convene Barrier Analysis Working Group to conduct Barrier Analysis Process

**Responsible Official(s)**

**Title** Director, Office of Departmental Equal Employment Opportunity

**Name** Wayne Williams

**Standards Address The Plan?** Yes

**Title** Acting Chief Human Capital Officer

**Name** Matisha Montgomery

**Standards Address The Plan?** Yes

**Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective**

**Target Date** 09/30/2025

**Planned Activities** Review and conduct analysis of exit survey data to determine if there are any barriers within the agency causing PWD/PWTD to separate at higher rates.

**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?** Yes

**Modified Date** 09/30/2027

**Completion Date**

**Report of Accomplishments**

**Fiscal Year** 2025

**Accomplishment** Provided workshops to all Program Offices, focusing on SF-256 self-identification of disability or non-disabled status. These workshops emphasized the importance of self-identification helping to accurately capture the representation of individuals with disabilities within the workforce.

**Fiscal Year** 2024

**Accomplishment** Reconvened the barrier analysis working group to identify triggers and determine if barriers exist.

4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities. Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.

In FY 2025, the administration's priorities changed and all planned activities were updated with modified completion dates.

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

Participation rates for PWD in the permanent workforce continue to increase over the past few fiscal years. In FY 2023, the participation rate was 13.67 Percent in FY 2023, which rose to 14.56 Percent in FY 2024, and reached 16.02 Percent in FY 2025, significantly exceeding the government-wide goal of 12.00 Percent.

PWTD participation rates in the permanent workforce also increased from 2.95 Percent in FY 2023, to 3.19 Percent in FY 2024, and 3.62 Percent in FY 2025, exceeding the government-wide goal of 2.00 Percent.

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.

The agency observes a continuous rise in the participation rate of PWD and PWTD within the workplace. HUD remains committed to collaborating with both internal and external stakeholders to implement the remaining planned activities, identify triggers, and address any potential barriers within the workforce for PWD and PWTD.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING  
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

**OFFICE OF DEPARTMENTAL  
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY**

**EEO@HUD.GOV**