

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

SECTION I: EFFORTS TO REACH REGULATORY GOALS	2
SECTION II: MODEL DISABILITY PROGRAM	2
A. PLAN TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT & COMPETENT STAFFING FOR DISABILITY PROGRAM	3
B. PLAN TO ENSURE SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR THE DISABILITY PROGRAM	4
SECTION III: PROGRAM DEFICIENCIES IN THE DISABILITY PROGRAM	4
SECTION IV: PLAN TO RECRUIT AND HIRE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES	5
A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICANTS WITH DISABILITIES	5
B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS	6
C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)	6
SECTION V: PLAN TO ENSURE ADVANCEMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYEES WITH DISABILITIES	8
A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN	8
B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES	8
C. AWARDS	9
D. PROMOTIONS	10
SECTION VI: PLAN TO IMPROVE RETENTION OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES	14
A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS	14
B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES	15
C. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION PROGRAM	17
D. PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES ALLOWING EMPLOYEES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WORKPLACE	17
SECTION VII: EEO COMPLAINT AND FINDINGS DATA	18
A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT	18
B. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION	18
SECTION VIII: IDENTIFICATION AND REMOVAL OF BARRIERS	18

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 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(7)) require agencies to establish specific numerical goals for increasing the participation of persons with reportable and targeted disabilities in the federal government.

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

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

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWD)

Answer: Yes

PWD participation in Cluster GS-11 to SES is 10.93%, which is below the 12% goal.

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

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

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

Answer: No

b. Cluster GS-11 to SES (PWTD)

Answer: Yes

PWTD participation in Cluster GS-11 to SES is 0.84%, which is below the 2% goal.

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

ICE Office of Human Capital has established training on special hiring authorities, mainly Schedule A and veterans with a disability rating of 30% or more, to conduct with the collateral duty recruiters and hiring managers. Additionally, these special hiring authorities are covered in ODCR's mandatory annual training for all ICE managers and supervisors.

Section II: Model Disability Program

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(d)(1), agencies must ensure sufficient staff, training and resources to recruit and hire persons with disabilities and persons with targeted disabilities, administer the reasonable accommodation program and special emphasis program, and

oversee any other disability hiring and advancement program the agency has in place.

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

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: No

Three employees are assigned to the reasonable accommodation (RA) program. In FY 2017, the volume of reasonable accommodation cases increased by 41%, and the agency was unable to meet the goal processing 90% of requests within the 15 business day time frame set forth in the agency procedures for reasonable accommodation.

From FY 2012 through FY 2014, the level of activity in the ICE reasonable accommodation program was consistent, at around 100 cases per year. In FY 2015, the agency received 163 cases, a 63% increase over the previous year. We believe this is due in large part to the release of ICE’s standard operating procedures (SOP) for RA, Procedures to Facilitate the Provision of Reasonable Accommodation, in January, 2015, and the launch of the “Disability 201” training course, which is mandatory for all managers and supervisors, and focused on providing reasonable accommodations in the workplace. These changes increased agency-wide awareness of the reasonable accommodation program, with a corresponding increase in reasonable accommodation activity.

At the beginning of FY 2016, the agency launched the ICE-wide Central Accommodation Fund (CAF) in FY 2016. The CAF increased the visibility of the RA program, while additionally removing a significant disincentive to requesting accommodations, since costs are now paid from a central funding pool managed by ODCR, rather than at the program office or field office level. As a result, in FY 2016, the agency received 351 new RA cases, an increase of 115% over Fiscal Year 2015. Although the CAF is fully funded and three employees are assigned to the reasonable accommodation program, the ever-increasing volume of cases has been a significant challenge to the agency meeting the goal of processing all cases within 15 business days, as stated in the reasonable accommodation SOP.

The agency plans to rectify these shortcomings by ensuring that the RA program maintains sufficient staffing levels, and by reviewing current processes to identify areas for improvement.

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	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Garry Gaston, Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPPC), Garry.Gaston@ice.dhs.gov

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff by Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office, Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	2	0	0	Garry Gaston, SPPC, Garry.Gaston@ice.dhs.gov David Conner, Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator, David.Conner@ice.dhs.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	2	0	0	David Conner, Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator, David.Conner@ice.dhs.gov Merechia Davis, Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator, Merechia.Davis@ice.dhs.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Arva Parker, IT Specialist, Arva.Parker@ice.dhs.gov
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	1	0	David Conner, Reasonable Accommodations Coordinator, David.Conner@ice.dhs.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	0	Rita Bhanot, Special Emphasis Program Manager, Rita.Bhanot@ice.dhs.gov

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

Answer: Yes

Garry Gaston – Completed OPMs Selective Placement Program Certification – 2015
 David Conner – Completed DEOMI Disability Program Managers Course – 2016
 David Conner, Merechia Davis – National Employment Law Institute “ADA & FMLA Compliance Update” course, 2016

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

ICE maintains a robust reasonable accommodation program that provides effective accommodations to PWDs and PWTDs. ICE initiated a Central Accommodation Fund (CAF) in FY16 to centralize funding for reasonable accommodations for qualified, disabled employees and applicants for employment. The CAF is still in place and sufficiently funded to meet the accommodation needs of ICE employees and applicants for employment.

Section III: Program Deficiencies in the Disability Program

In Part G of its FY 2017 MD-715 report, the agency identified the following program deficiencies involving its disability program:

Program Deficiencies	Agency Comments
Are 90% of accommodation requests processed within the frame set forth in the agency procedures for reasonable accommodation?	SEE PART H

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 APPLICANTS WITH DISABILITIES

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

The Selective Placement Program Coordinator (SPCC) conducts training on the Federal Hiring Process and assisting applicants with completing a federal resume at local Employment Centers, Military Installations and Rehabilitative Centers in the Washington DC metro area. The SPCC also coordinates with hiring managers to consider hiring noncompetitive applicants before announcing the job on usajobs.gov.

2. Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.203(a)(3), describe the agency’s use of hiring authorities that take disability into account (e.g., Schedule A) to recruit PWD and PWTD for positions in the permanent workforce.

The Agency currently use the following authorities to hire persons with disabilities:

1. Schedule A for PWD
2. Veterans with a 30% or greater disability rating

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.

The applicants will submit the applications on USAJobs for Schedule A consideration or the applicant can request noncompetitive consideration as a person with a disability. The applications are reviewed for qualifications and the applicants that best match the qualifications are forwarded to the hiring manager to make a selection. Once the selection is made the applicant must successfully pass the pre-employment requirement outlined in the tentative job offer. Once complete, the applicant will be given an appointment letter at which time the applicant can request a reasonable accommodation before entry on duty (EOD).

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

1. As part of the mandatory annual training for managers and supervisors offered online as "ICE Disabilities 201," the use of the Schedule A hiring authority is covered.
2. The Schedule A and veterans hiring authorities are covered under the annual mandatory training for all hiring managers/supervisors and HR Specialists.

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.

The SPPC recently established a working relationship with the Department of Aging and Rehabilitative Services Center in Alexandria VA and conducts training at 7 Employment Centers in District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia to conduct training on Schedule A hiring and one-on-one resume assistance. ODCR and the ICE Office of Human Capital (OHC) formalized an outreach relationship by meeting bi-weekly to share resources, including the utilization of Field Special Emphasis Program Managers at recruitment events and the development of targeted recruitment plans for increasing the representation of PWTD's. This strategy will be implemented by expanding outreach to colleges and universities with large populations of PWTDs, including Gallaudet University and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) at the Rochester Institute of Technology. ICE will attend career fairs at these institutions; provide materials to students on ICE employment opportunities; and provide information about these institutions and the use of special hiring authorities to ICE managers.

C. PROGRESSION TOWARDS GOALS (RECRUITMENT AND HIRING)

1. Using the goals of 12% for PWD and 2% for PWTD as the benchmarks, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires in the permanent workforce? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.
 - a. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) Answer: No
 - b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer: No

New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWD) constituted 30.12% of all new hires, well above the 12% benchmark.
 New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) constituted 2.44% of all new hires, well above the 2% benchmark.

2. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the new hires for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.
 - a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer: Yes
 - b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Selections for the 1801 Series (PWD) consisted of 51.30% of all selections, well above the 12% benchmark.
 Selections for the 1801 Series (PWTD) consisted of 3.90% of all selections, well above the 2% benchmark.
 Selections for the 1811 Series (PWD) consisted of 12.58% of all selections, slightly above the 12% benchmark.
 Selections for the 1811 Series (PWTD) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, well below the 2% benchmark.
 Selections for the 0905 Series (PWD) consisted of 11.84% of all selections, slightly below the 12% benchmark.
 Selections for the 0905 Series (PWTD) consisted of 0.66% of all selections, well below the 2% benchmark.
 Selections for the 0132 Series (PWD) consisted of 20.00% of all selections, well above the 12% benchmark.
 Selections for the 0132 Series (PWTD) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, well below the 2% benchmark.

3. Using the relevant applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants for any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.
 - a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer: Yes
 - b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Relevant applicant pool data is not available. Identifying which current ICE employees would qualify for a job series they are not currently in is a difficult undertaking. The ICE Office of Human Capital does not adjudicate applicant qualifications until an applicant applies for a specific position, and the applicant may qualify based on experience obtained prior to entry into their current job series, or into ICE. DHS has not attempted to develop an estimate for job series-relevant applicant pools to date. In FY 2018, DHS will work to determine whether there is a way to develop the relevant internal applicant pool percentages for each series.

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, do triggers exist for PWD and/or PWTD among employees promoted to any of the mission-critical occupations (MCO)? If “yes”, please describe the triggers below.
- a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer: Yes
- b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer: Yes

Selections for the 1801 Series (PWD) consisted of 18.32% of all selections, above the 12% benchmark.

Selections for the 1801 Series (PWTD) consisted of 1.23% of all selections, below the 2% benchmark.

Selections for the 1811 Series (PWD) consisted of 6.19% of all selections, well below the 12% benchmark.

Selections for the 1811 Series (PWTD) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, well below the 2% benchmark.

Selections for the 0905 Series (PWD) consisted of 6.96% of all selections, well below the 12% benchmark.

Selections for the 0905 Series (PWTD) consisted of 1.10% of all selections, well below the 2% benchmark.

Selections for the 0132 Series (PWD) consisted of 34.74% of all selections, well above the 12% benchmark.

Selections for the 0132 Series (PWTD) consisted of 2.11% of all selections, above the 2% benchmark.

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.

The Agency recently hired a Retention and Recruitment Program manager in OHC that will focus on advancement and retention of all employees.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

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

The agency offers training opportunities for all employees via the DHS Performance and Learning Management System (PALMS) online portal where applicants can complete certification courses or career development courses. In PALMS, employees can request job related training opportunities using the SF 182 request for training form.

2. Do triggers exist for PWD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWD)

Answer: No

b. Selections (PWD)

Answer: No

Data for these programs will be collected and consolidated within ICE during FY 2018, and will be analyzed and reported in the FY 2018 MD-715 report.

3. Do triggers exist for PWTD among the applicants and/or selectees for any of the career development programs identified? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for applicants and the applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Applicants (PWTD)

Answer: No

b. Selections (PWTD)

Answer: No

Data for these programs will be collected and consolidated within ICE during FY 2018, and will be analyzed and reported in the FY 2018 MD-715 report.

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: No

PWD Triggers:

7.46% of Time-Off Awards (9+ hours) were received by PWD, less than the 12.99% agency inclusion rate.

8.95% of Cash Awards (\$500+) were received by PWD, less than the 12.99% agency inclusion rate.

6.52% of Quality Step Increases (QSI) were received by PWD, less than the 12.99% agency inclusion rate.

PWTD Triggers:

0.66% of Time-Off Awards (9+ hours) were received by PWTD, less than the 1.10% agency inclusion rate.

0.89% of Cash Awards (\$500+) were received by PWTD, less than the 1.10% agency inclusion rate.

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 |

PWD Triggers:

6.52% of Quality Step Increases (QSI) were received by PWD, less than the 12.99% agency inclusion rate.

PWTD Triggers:

1.09% of Quality Step Increases (QSI) were received by PWTD, slightly less than the 1.10% agency inclusion rate.

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) | Answer: N/A |
| b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) | Answer: N/A |

N/A

D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. SES

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

b. Grade GS-15

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

c. Grade GS-14

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

d. Grade GS-13

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: No

ICE is unable to determine the percentage of qualified internal applicants by disability distribution, due to limited applicant flow data available.

Internal selections for SES (PWD) consisted of 7.41% of all selections, below the 8% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-15 (PWD) consisted of 7.41% of all selections, below the 9% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-14 (PWD) consisted of 8.84% of all selections, above the 7% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-13 (PWD) consisted of 11.35% of all selections, above the 11% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

This is not an error – oddly enough, the percentage for both is exactly the same, at 7.41%.

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. SES

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

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

ICE is unable to determine the percentage of qualified internal applicants by disability distribution, due to limited applicant flow data available.

Internal selections for SES (PWTD) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, below the 1% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-15 (PWTD) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, below the 1% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-14 (PWTD) consisted of 0.61% of all selections, below the 1% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

Internal selections for GS-13 (PWTDD) consisted of 0.79% of all selections, below the 1% relevant applicant pool benchmark.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

ICE was unable to analyze new hires for PWD compared to the required benchmark using applicant flow data. However, based on a review of MD-715 Table B8: New Hires by Type of Appointment, filtered down by hires for Senior Level Positions (GS 13, 14, 15, and SES) - Distribution by Disability, PWD hire rates exceeded the 12 percent goal for all grades with the exception of SES new hires.

Goal	Hires	Qualified Applicant Pool	Regulatory
New Hires to SES	0.00%	Not Available	12%
New Hires to GS-15	20.00%	Not Available	12%
New Hires to GS-14	18.75%	Not Available	12%
New Hires to GS-13	21.05%	Not Available	12%

4. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

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

ICE was unable to analyze new hires for PWTD compared to the required benchmark using applicant flow data. However, based on a review of MD-715 Table B8: New Hires by Type of Appointment, filtered down by hires for Senior Level Positions (GS 13, 14, 15, and SES) - Distribution by Disability, PWTD hire rates were below the 2 percent goal for all grades with the exception of GS-13 new hires.

Goal	Hires	Qualified Applicant Pool	Regulatory
New Hires to SES	0.00%	Not Available	2%
New Hires to GS-15	0.00%	Not Available	2%
New Hires to GS-14	1.02%	Not Available	2%
New Hires to GS-13	2.10%	Not Available	2%

5. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: No

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWD) Answer: No

Qualified internal applicant data is not available because it is not currently possible to break out data restricted to internal applicants from OPMs applicant flow data. Current data on internal selections is only broken down into 3 grade clusters (15 and above, 13-14, and 12 and below), from which only the "Executive" category can be clearly identified. Internal selections for Executives Grade 15 and above (PWD) consisted of 6.98% of all selections, below the 12% benchmark.

6. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTD among the qualified *internal* applicants and/or selectees for promotions to supervisory positions? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

a. Executives

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: Yes

b. Managers

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

c. Supervisors

i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer: No

ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer: No

Qualified internal applicant data is not available because it is not currently possible to break out data restricted to internal applicants from OPMs applicant flow data. Current data on internal selections is only broken down into 3 grade clusters (15 and above, 13-14, and 12 and below), from which only the "Executive" category can be clearly identified. Internal selections for Executives Grade 15 and above (PWTB) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, below the 2% benchmark.

7. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) | Answer: No |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) | Answer: No |

Current data on selectees for new hires is only broken down into 3 grade clusters (15 and above, 13-14, and 12 and below), from which only the "Executive" category can be clearly identified.

Selections for Executives Grade 15 and above (PWTB) consisted of 18.18% of all selections, above the 12% benchmark.

8. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB among the selectees for new hires to supervisory positions? If "yes", describe the trigger(s) in the text box.
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|
| a. New Hires for Executives (PWTB) | Answer: Yes |
| b. New Hires for Managers (PWTB) | Answer: No |
| c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTB) | Answer: No |

Current data on selectees for new hires is only broken down into 3 grade clusters (15 and above, 13-14, and 12 and below), from which only the "Executive" category can be clearly identified.

Selections for Executives Grade 15 and above (PWTB) consisted of 0.00% of all selections, below the 2% benchmark.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer: No

As of October, 2017, 7 ICE employees who were initially hired under Schedule A were eligible for conversion but had not yet been converted to the competitive service. ODCR and OHC will jointly examine these occurrences to ensure any barriers to procedures or processes have been identified and corrected.

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

The percentage of PWD among voluntary separations (5.72%) exceeds that of persons without disabilities(4.34%).
The percentage of PWD among involuntary separations (0.31%) exceeds that of persons without disabilities(0.22%).

3. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, did the percentage of PWTD among voluntary and involuntary separations exceed that of persons without targeted disabilities? If "yes", describe the trigger below.
 - a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: Yes
 - b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer: Yes

The percentage of PWTD among voluntary separations (8.71%) exceeds that of persons without disabilities(4.34%).
The percentage of PWTD among involuntary separations (0.45%) exceeds that of persons without disabilities(0.22%).

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.

ICE has identified that the absence of an exit interview process for employees who depart the Agency limits its ability to identify and determine ways to enhance its retention of PWDs. As a result, ODCR continues to seek alternative means to investigate these triggers as well as exploring the feasibility of initiating an exit interview process.

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

A notice of employees' and applicants rights under Section 508 appears at:
<https://www.ice.gov/es/node/201>

This notice does not currently describe how to file a complaint. We have been informed that the DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties will be providing standard language on how to file a Section 508 complaint for use by all DHS Components. Until such language is provided, ICE will provide the following instruction:

Complaints alleging violations of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act may be sent to the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, Department of Homeland Security by mail at Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Building 410, Mail Stop #0190, Washington, D.C. 20528, by email at crcl@dhs.gov or by fax at 202-401-4708. CRCL can be reached by phone at 202-401-1474.

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.

The agency does not currently have a notice on its public website regarding the Architectural Barriers Act. We have been informed that the DHS Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties will provide standard language on the Architectural Barriers Act for use by all DHS Components. Until such language is provided, ICE will provide the following instruction:

Employees, applicants for employment, and members of the public may file complaints under the Architectural Barriers Act (ABA). The ABA requires that requires that buildings or facilities that were constructed or altered by or on behalf of the United States, or leased or financed in whole or in part by the United States, after August 12, 1968, be accessible to individuals with physical disabilities.

Complaints under the ABA are filed directly with the U.S. Access Board. Details are provided on their website at: <https://www.access-board.gov/aba-enforcement/file-a-complaint>. Questions regarding accessibility at ICE facilities also may be directed to the ICE Office of Diversity and Civil Rights by email at ICEReasonableAccommodation@ice.dhs.gov or by phone at 202-732-0077.

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.

Over the next fiscal year ICE plans to determine the current status of each Section 508 application and request remediation plans for any applications that have outstanding issues. We also plan to add a backup Section 508 coordinator in order to improve our policies and practices.

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.)

The average processing time for reasonable accommodation requests in FY17 was 24.37 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.

In large part due to the publishing of the ICE Procedures to Facilitate the Provision of Reasonable Accommodation and the introduction of the Central Accommodation Fund, the number of reasonable accommodation requests at ICE more than doubled from 163 cases in FY15 to 351 in FY16 (representing 591 individual requests). From FY16 to FY17, the number of cases and requests both increased by 41% (to 901 individual requests from 494 ICE employees and applicants.) ODCR is instituting a continuous system of process improvement by developing case checklists, developing dashboards, and initiating a new method of monitoring cases to keep up with the higher volume and to increase efficiency and timeliness of the reasonable accommodation process.

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

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

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

To date, ICE has not received any PAS requests. By maintaining up-to-date knowledge of PAS issues across the ICE disability program, we intend to be ready for such requests if and when they occur. ICE will update the agency's written reasonable accommodation procedures and mandatory reasonable accommodation training for managers and supervisors to make it clear that PAS services, though not reasonable accommodations, must be provided to employees who need them, and that such services will be paid for through the ICE Central Accommodation Fund.

ODCR will work closely with the ICE Office of Human Capital to ensure that equal opportunities are available to potential job applicants in need of PAS, and to identify recruiting strategies for individuals that could have been excluded in previous years due to their need for PAS.

Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer: No

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

Answer: Yes

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

The agency had one (1) finding of discrimination alleging harassment based on disability status. Complainant was awarded \$3,000 in non-pecuniary damages and \$1,825 in attorney fees and costs. A Letter of Reprimand was issued to the RMO.

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 no findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation.

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: Yes

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

Answer: Yes

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

Trigger 1	In FY 2017, 60% of reasonable accommodation requests were processed within 15 business days, which falls short of the goal of processing 90% of requests within the time frame set forth in the agency procedures for reasonable accommodation.	
Barrier(s)		
Objective(s)	The agency plans to rectify these shortcomings by ensuring that the RA program maintains sufficient staffing levels, and by reviewing current processes to identify areas for improvement.	
Responsible Official(s)		Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)
Assistant Director ODCR; Chief Diversity Officer; Disability Program Manager		No
Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)		Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)
No		No
Sources of Data	Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected
Workforce Data Tables	Yes	
Complaint Data (Trends)	No	
Grievance Data (Trends)	No	
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)	No	
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)	No	
Exit Interview Data	No	
Focus Groups	No	
Interviews	No	

Sources of Data		Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected		
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No			
Other (Please Describe)		Yes	Internal RA Data		
Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	
09/30/2017	Initiate process improvement initiative aimed at increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of operations and reducing processing time. Review internal controls and measurements of the reasonable accommodation program's effectiveness.	Yes			
06/01/2018	Review agency reasonable accommodation procedures to ensure that written procedures reflect current practice and are consistent with all current legal and regulatory requirements.	Yes			
Fiscal Year	Accomplishments				

Trigger 2	The process of preparing this document revealed that out of 494 individuals requesting RA in FY 2017, 68% of them (or 338) did not disclose a disability on SF 256.				
Barrier(s)					
Objective(s)	The agency will initiate a continuous program to encourage employee's self-identification of disability status by volunteering disability information and/or updating their current information.				
Responsible Official(s)			Performance Standards Address the Plan? (Yes or No)		
Assitant Director, ODCR; Chief Diversity Officer; Disability Program Manager			No		
Barrier Analysis Process Completed? (Yes or No)			Barrier(s) Identified? (Yes or No)		
Yes			No		
Sources of Data		Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected		
Workforce Data Tables		Yes			
Complaint Data (Trends)		No			
Grievance Data (Trends)		No			

Sources of Data		Sources Reviewed? (Yes or No)	Identify Information Collected		
Findings from Decisions (e.g., EEO, Grievance, MSPB, Anti-Harassment Processes)		No			
Climate Assessment Survey (e.g., FEVS)		No			
Exit Interview Data		No			
Focus Groups		No			
Interviews		No			
Reports (e.g., Congress, EEOC, MSPB, GAO, OPM)		No			
Other (Please Describe)		Yes	Internal RA Data		
Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)	Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	
06/30/2018	Initiate recurring reminders that periodically request employees to review and update disability status.	Yes			
Fiscal Year	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