

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

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

### Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

During FY2020, the Workforce Table, B4P, shows we have a total of total of 819 permanent employees of which 128 (16%) were employees with a disability. There are 275 permanent employees in grades GS-1 through 10 positions. Of the 275 employees 54 (20%) stated they have a disability. Of the 544 permanent employees in grades GS-11 through SES, a total of 74 (14%) indicated they have a disability.

\*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

During FY2020, the Workforce Table, B4P shows we have a total of 819 permanent employees of which 128 (16%) listed a disability. A total of 21 (3%) listed a targeted disability. Of the 21, a total of 13 employees with a targeted disability worked in GS-1 through GS10 positions and a total of 8 employees with a targeted disability worked in GS-11 through SES positions.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	275	54	19.64	13	4.73
Grades GS-11 to SES	544	74	13.60	8	1.47

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

The agency communicated the numerical goals to the hiring officials through its Plan for Increasing and Maintaining the Employment of Individuals with Disabilities. This Plan was shared with the Executive Committee who disseminated it to their staff with hiring authority.

## Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

Human Resources has designated a HR Specialist to assist in improving the staffing of people with disabilities by contacting different organizations assisting people with disabilities to re-enter the workforce. We send all vacancy announcements to these organizations. We also have the Employees with Disabilities Advisory Council who assists in finding organizations that assist people with disabilities.

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	0	0	0	N/A
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	Scott Rush Supvy Facility Operations Specialist scott.rush@rrb.gov
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	0	0	1	Melissa T Welch Lead HR Specialist/ Selective Placement Coordinator melissa.welch@rrb.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	Kathy Robinson EEO Specialist kathy.robinson@rrb.gov
Section 508 Compliance	0	0	1	Robert LaBerry Supvy IT Specialist robert.laberry@rrb.gov
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	0	0	1	Regina Block HR Specialist/Labor Relations regina.block@rrb.gov

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

Answer Yes

All managers and supervisors, and HR personnel, completed "A Roadmap to Success: Hiring, Retaining, and Including People with Disabilities" course in RRB University in March of FY2020.

### 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

We have a Selective Placement Coordinator in Human Resources who ensures we have a contact person at various disability organizations so we can advise them of all vacancy announcements being posted to usajobs.gov. This will ensure that people with disabilities are advised of our job openings.

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

<b>Brief Description of Program Deficiency</b>	D.1.c. Does the agency conduct exit interviews or surveys that include questions on how the agency could improve the recruitment, hiring, inclusion, retention and advancement of individuals with disabilities? [see 29 CFR §1614.203(d)(1)(iii)(C)]		
<b>Objective</b>	Meet with the Director of HR about re-establishing Exit Surveys.		
<b>Target Date</b>	Oct 1, 2022		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
	Apr 1, 2021		Contacted the Director of HR to discuss the re-establishment of Exit Surveys and was informed that they (HR) has already begun the process to re-establish it. Will follow-up.
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	
<b>Objective</b>	Meet with the Director of HR about re-establishing exit surveys		
<b>Target Date</b>	Oct 1, 22		
<b>Completion Date</b>			
<b>Planned Activities</b>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>Completion Date</u>	<u>Planned Activity</u>
<b>Accomplishments</b>	<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Accomplishment</u>	

### 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 PWTDD

#### 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.

We do not identify job applicants with disabilities. All positions are filled based on the applicants knowledge, skills and abilities and not on their disability.

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 PWTDD for positions in the permanent workforce

The RRB is restricted in its use of special appointment authorities based on the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA) and the Railroad Unemployment and Insurance Act (RUIA). Both the RRA and the RUIA mandate that all positions within the RRB must be in the competitive service with the exception of only 3 positions (assistant to Board Members). The agency is therefore restricted in its use

of special appointment authorities and is limited to authorities that permit non-competitive hiring into competitive service positions

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.

Individuals do not apply for a position under a hiring authority that takes disability into account because we do not have authority to hire under these special authorities as stated above.

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 N/A

We do not have hiring authority under Schedule A and therefore, no training is provided on Schedule A.

**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.

During FY2020, OEO worked with HR to establish and maintain contacts with eleven organizations that assist PWD and PWTD. These organizations include the Chicago Lighthouse, Aspire Non-Profit, Trinity Services, Inc., Search, Inc., Goodwill Chicago, America Works, the City of Chicago, the Department of Human Services, Independent Living and Transition Advocate Progress Center, and Southwest American Job Center. We secured a contact person at each organization with their email address and telephone number. We send our vacancy notices to them and in turn they disburse the information to clients being serviced by their organization.

**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

The RRB hired a total of 60 new employees during FY2020. A total of six (6) new employees (10%) listed a disability and 15 or (25%) did not want to identify their disability. I believe these individuals have a disability and they should be included. So together, that accounts for twenty-one (21) employees or 35% of our new hires. Of the 60 new employees, two (2) or 3% identified their disability as a targeted disability.

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	966	5.69	0.00	3.52	0.00
% of Qualified Applicants	830	5.30	0.00	3.25	0.00

% of New Hires	11	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 No
- b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

The RRB has two mission critical occupations (MCO): 2210 and 0993. Only two (2) individuals were hired in the 2210 MCO. We only know this from our accession report. We believe they are not shown on the AFD Table A7/B7 because they omitted their demographics and did not provide their race, sex nor disability status on usajobs.gov. A total of eighteen (18) individuals were hired in the 0993 MCO. One (1) new employee (5%) said their disability was not listed (code 06) however, four (4) new employees (22%) did not want to disclose their disability (01). Together, that represents 27%. Since code 01 and code 06 does not tell us the nature of the disability, we can not make a well informed decision as to whether any new hire had a targeted disability.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
0993RAILROAD RETIREMENT CLAIMS EXAMINING	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2210INFORMATIOI TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

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

A total of only twenty-six (26) internal applicants applied for promotion in the MCO 0993. A total of two (2) or 8% of the employees identified a disability and two (2) or 8% identified a targeted disability. A total of seven (7) or 27% applicants did not identify a disability and seventeen (17) or 65% stated they did not have a disability. There were eight (8) or 13% applicants selected and one applicant did not identify their disability, code (01). This may or may not be a trigger, but will continue to monitor the statistics. There were no internal applicants for MCO 2210.

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

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

For MCO 0993, nineteen (19) employees were promoted into 0993 positions. Of the nineteen (19) two (2) employees or 11% of the employees listed a disability and they were both targeted disabilities. There were seven (7) employees selected for promotion and

they all cited having no disability. This may or may not trigger a barrier analysis because the selection is so small. We will continue to monitor the statistics. We also want to state that one of the employees with a disability withdrew her application. There were no promotions for MCO 2210.

## 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.

All employees have advancement opportunities based on their knowledge, skills and abilities. Reasonable accommodations are provided to those in need but advancement is based on the individuals skills and abilities and not because they have a disability.

### B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

All employees can complete an Individual Development Plan (IPD) to assist them in moving ahead in the agency. They share their plan with their supervisor and they set short term and long term goals as to what they would like to achieve at the RRB. We have online courses that they can take to help them with their goals. By writing it down and sharing it with supervisor, they are reminded of their goals and their supervisors are tasks with encouraging and assisting them reach their goals and/or positions they aspire to.

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Fellowship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detail Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

a. Applicants (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Selections (PWD) Answer N/A

The RRB did not offer any other career development programs other than the IDP in 2020. As stated above, all employees are encouraged to participate in the IDP. There were 60 employees who participated in the IDP and eight (8) or 13% reported having a disability. There were no employees who identified themselves as having a targeted disability. Out of the sixty (60) participants in the program seven (7) or 12% did not identify a disability, (code 01). And as always, all managers and supervisors took required supervisory/management training.

4. Do triggers exist for PWTB 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 (PWTB) Answer N/A
- b. Selections (PWTB) Answer N/A

The RRB did not offer career development programs in FY2020.

**C. AWARDS**

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

- a. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWD) Answer No
- b. Awards, Bonuses, & Incentives (PWTB) Answer No

During FY2020 the RRB issued fifty-seven (57) time-off awards and one hundred and thirty-eight (138) non performance based awards (includes suggestion awards, group awards, cash award not based on performance) totaling 196 awards. A total of twenty-six (26) employees (13%) listed a disability and three (3) or 2% listed a targeted disability. Again, I believe we should include the employees who did not identify their disability. A total of eleven (11) employees or 6% did not identify their disability. Added with the 26 who listed their disability, we total 19%.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	50	7.75	5.65	9.09	7.48
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	356	58.91	39.08	72.73	56.07
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	7	5.43	0.92	36.36	-0.93
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	2	0.00	0.31	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	32	0.00	4.89	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	16	0.00	2.44	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Awards Given	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Total Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time-Off Awards 41 or more Hours: Average Hours	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Awards Given	87	12.40	10.08	31.82	8.41
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Total Amount	66798	9728.68	7729.16	27559.09	6062.62
Cash Awards: \$501 - \$999: Average Amount	767	607.75	117.10	3936.36	-76.64
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Awards Given	262	27.91	33.74	31.82	27.10
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Total Amount	379472	41372.09	48873.44	48963.64	39811.21
Cash Awards: \$1000 - \$1999: Average Amount	1448	1148.84	221.07	6990.91	-52.34
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Awards Given	118	10.08	15.42	4.55	11.21
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Total Amount	285348	23546.51	37358.63	11009.09	26124.30
Cash Awards: \$2000 - \$2999: Average Amount	2418	1810.85	369.77	11009.09	-80.37
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Awards Given	88	5.43	12.06	0.00	6.54
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Total Amount	295493	18460.47	40434.96	0.00	22256.07
Cash Awards: \$3000 - \$3999: Average Amount	3357	2637.21	511.76	0.00	3179.44
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Awards Given	46	6.20	5.34	9.09	5.61
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Total Amount	215080	29553.49	24937.40	45409.09	26293.46
Cash Awards: \$4000 - \$4999: Average Amount	4675	3693.80	712.37	22704.55	-214.95
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Awards Given	5	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Total Amount	65982	0.00	10073.59	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: \$5000 or more: Average Amount	13196	0.00	2014.66	0.00	0.00

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

During FY2020, a total of one hundred and forty-eight (148) employees received a quality step increase and five hundred and



fourteen (514) employees received a performance based incentive award for a total of six hundred and sixty-two (662) employees. A total of ninety-five (95) or 14% of these employees listed a disability. Of the 662 employees, seven-teen (17) or 3% listed a targeted disability.

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Total Performance Based Pay Increases Awarded	0	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 N/A
- b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer N/A

The RRB does not have any additional recognition programs other than those listed above.

**D. PROMOTIONS**

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

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

During FY2020, no employee was promoted into a SES position. A total of two (2) employees applied and qualified for a GS-15 position. Both reported no disability. There were twenty-nine (29) employees who applied for a GS-14 position and ten (10) were qualified. Of those who qualified, four (4) applicants reported no disability; and six (6) employees (24%) did not identify their disability (code 06). There were four (4) applicants who applied for the GS-13 positions, and all four reported having no disability. All four applicants qualified and one was selected.

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

- a. SES
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A
- b. Grade GS-15
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A
- c. Grade GS-14
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A
- d. Grade GS-13
  - i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD) Answer N/A
  - ii. Internal Selections (PWTD) Answer N/A

During FY2020 there was one internal applicant who applied for a GS-14 position who reported having a targeted disability (code 40). No other applicants reported a targeted disability. Many applicants did not want to identify their disability so we do not know if they had a targeted disability or not. The data does not trigger a barrier analysis.

3. Using the qualified applicant pool as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the new hires to the senior grade levels? For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.
- a. New Hires to SES (PWD) Answer N/A
  - b. New Hires to GS-15 (PWD) Answer No
  - c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer No
  - d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer No

During FY2020, the RRB did not hire any new employees into a SES position. The RRB hired two (2) individuals for a GS-15 position (external posting). Neither one stated a disability. The RRB hired one (1) individuals for a GS-14 position (external posting). The selectee reported no disability. The RRB hired one (1) individual for a GS-13 position (external posting). The selectee did not want to identify his disability. We do not believe the data is large enough to trigger a barrier analysis.

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

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

During FY2020, the RRB did not hire any new employees into an SES position. The RRB hired two (2) individuals for a GS-15 position. Neither stated a disability. Therefore, there were no targeted disabilities. The RRB hired one (1) individuals for a GS-14 position. The applicant flow data did not show any GS-14 data on new hires. The only data we had was the RRB accessions report where one new employee was hired. The selectee reported no disability. Therefore, there no targeted disabilities. And, the RRB hired one (1) individual for a GS-13 position. The selectee did not want to identify his disability. So we do not know if he had a targeted disability. Since the RRB does not have hiring authority under Schedule A and the new hires are small in number, we do not see a trigger to support a barrier analysis.

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

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

During FY2020, no employee applied or was selected for a SES or Executive position. A total of thirty-seven (37) applied and twenty (20) qualified for a supervisory/management position at the GS-13 through GS-15 level. A total of three (3) applicants had a disability but only 1 applicant with a disability was qualified for the position. That disability was not listed (code 06). The Applicant Flow Data program could not separate the supervisors from the managers, therefore all management positions were included together under supervisors on the relevant A19 and B19 tables.

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. 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 No

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

During FY2020, no employee applied or was selected for an SES or Executive position. A total of thirty-seven (37) applied and twenty (20) qualified for a supervisory/management position at the GS-13 through GS-15 level. A total of three (3) applicants had a disability and two had a target disability. Both applicants with a targeted disability were rated not qualified. Therefore, no applicant with a targeted disability could be selected. Please note that the Applicant Flow Data system could not separate the supervisors from the managers, therefore all management positions were included together under supervisors.

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

During FY2020, one (1) external applicant was hired to fill a supervisory position. This applicant stated no disability. Most applicants either reported having no disability or did not identify the disability. These new hires are so small in number that we do not see this as a trigger.

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

Of all the applicants who applied for the supervisory position, no one listed a targeted disability. Since the RRB cannot use Schedule A and our new hire numbers are so small, we do not see this as a trigger.

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

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

### A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer N/A

The agency is restricted from using Schedule A.

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

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

During F2020, a total of eighty-nine (89) employees separated from the RRB. Two employees (2) were involuntary separated from the RRB. One employee (1) had no disability (code 05) and the other employee did not wish to identify their disability (code 01). No trigger with only 2 employees to analyze whether trigger exists. A total of eighty-seven (87) employees voluntarily separated from the RRB. Sixty-four employees (64) stated they had no disability. Three (3) employees did not wish to identify their disability (code 01), three employees (3) stated that their disability was not listed on the form and seventeen employees (17) or 20% stated they had a disability.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	1	0.00	0.14
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	1	0.00	0.14

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

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

During FY2020, a total of eighty-nine employees separated from the RRB. Two employees (2) were involuntary separated from the RRB. One employee (1) had no disability (code 05) and the other employee did not wish to identify their disability (code 01). No trigger with only 2 employees to analyze whether trigger exists. Although one listed a disability but they did not want to say what it was, the sample is too small. A total of eighty-seven (87) employees voluntarily separated from the RRB. Sixty-four employees (64) stated they had no disability. Three (3) employees did not wish to identify their disability (code 01), three employees (3) stated that their disability was not listed on the form and seventeen employees (17) stated they had a disability. Of the seventeen, a total of four (4) stated a targeted disability (5%).

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	1	0.00	0.12
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	1	0.00	0.12

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.

No trigger existed.

**B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES**

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

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

<https://www.rrb.gov/Resources/OfficeOfEqualOpportunity/Nondiscrimination>.

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

<https://www.rrb.gov/Policy#aba>

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 IT department is still in the process of revising/changing some of the RRB systems so that they are compatible with each other and pull data from each other so claims are paid quicker and more efficiently. These program updates will take a couple of years to complete.

**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 time frame for processing initial requests was 23.5 work days. The lowest time was 8 workdays for an ergonomic desk and the longest time as 67 workdays for a sit/stand workdesk. All others were 30 work days or less.

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

The reasonable accommodation policy and procedure is very effective. Employees are able to come to the Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) if they are not satisfied with their accommodation or they are denied an accommodation and wish to file a complaint or just talk about it. This policy is on OEO and HR internal website for all employees to read. OEO provides an annual new supervisors training. When revisions are made to the policy, a training PowerPoint is downloaded to our training module (RRB University) and we ensure all employees complete it by tracking their progress. The RRB had eleven (11) requests for a reasonable accommodations and four of the requests involved a sit/stand desk.

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

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

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

We included the PAS procedure in the Reasonable Accommodation Policy. During FY2020, no one requested PAS so no data is available on this.

## Section VII: EEO Complaint and Findings Data

### A. EEO COMPLAINT DATA INVOLVING HARASSMENT

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

Answer No

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

Answer No

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

The agency had no findings of discrimination alleging harassment based on a disability during FY2020.

### 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 RRB had no findings of discrimination involving the failure to provide a reasonable accommodation during FY2020.

## Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer No

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

Answer N/A

- 3. Identify each trigger and plan to remove the barrier(s), including the identified barrier(s), objective(s), responsible official(s), planned activities, and, where applicable, accomplishments
  
- 4. Please explain the factor(s) that prevented the agency from timely completing any of the planned activities.

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A