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 Yes

For the GS-01 through 10 cluster in FY 2020, the Agency's percentage of PWD was 13.14%, which exceeded the FY 2019 rate of 12.36%and the 12.00% benchmark. However, for the GS-11 through SES cluster, the Agency's percentage of PWD was 8.84%, which was less than the FY 2019 rate of 9.20% and the 12.00% benchmark and which has indicated a trigger for the Agency.

*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

For the GS-01 through 10 cluster in FY 2020, the Agency's percentage of PWTD was 3.65%, which exceeded the FY 2019 rate of 3.27% and the 2.00% benchmark. However, for the GS-11 through SES cluster, the Agency's percentage of PWTD was 1.79%, which was less than the FY 2019 rate of 1.83% and the benchmark of 2.00% and which has indicated a trigger for the Agency.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numarical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	265	27	10.19	6	2.26
Grades GS-11 to SES	5785	473	8.18	63	1.09

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

In the past, the Agency had relayed numerical goals to hiring managers and recruitment personnel through broadcast emails sent from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). However, HHS has ceased sharing this data in this manner. As a result, CMS began sharing such data in FY 2018 through a series of monthly meetings with the CMS recruitment and talent

acquisition personnel within its Human Resources office, which has continued in the current reporting period. Additionally, CMS has had meetings with senior leadership where the PWD and PWTD goals were discussed, as well as the demographic breakdown by demographic group as compared to the Civilian Labor Force (CLF) statistics. Finally, CMS has presented this data to employees through presentations to the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group (DERG). CMS has begun to work collaboratively with the DERG in identifying more specifically the barriers that exist and to brainstorm ways of eliminating those barriers.

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

---

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	6	0	0	Jodi Gram Director, Division of Facilities and Space Management
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	4	0	0	Lei Lonni Giroux Director, Talent Acquisition and Benefits Group
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	72	0	0	Lei Lonni Giroux Director, Talent Acquisition and Benefits Group
Section 508 Compliance	11	0	130	Rajiv Uppal Director, Office of Information Technology and Chief Information Officer
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	1	0	4	Craig Borne Director, Affirmative Employment Group
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	11	0	1	Lee Lunsford Acting Director, Civil Rights and EEO Policy Group, OEOCR

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

In FY 2020, CMS primarily used LRP Publications and The Federal EEO and HR Practitioners Disabilities and Reasonable Accommodation Series of courses to provide supplemental training to RA staff. Such training included, but was not limited to, Reasonable Accommodation; Disability and the Law; and Mental and Emotional Disabilities. RA staff also received supplemental training through a multi-day training session, participation in weekly team meetings, and one-on-one mentoring from the Group and Office Director/Deputy Director.

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

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Brief Description of Program Deficiency	C.2.b.5. Does the agency process all initial accommodation requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, within the time frame set forth in its reasonable accommodation procedures? [see MD-715, II(C)] If “no”, please provide the percentage of timely-processed requests, excluding ongoing interpretative services, in the comments column.

Objective	Obtain the resources to secure more effective tracking system and establish processes to ensure 90% of accommodation request are processed within the time frame set forth in the Agency's procedures for reasonable accommodation.		
Target Date	Oct 31, 2020		
Completion Date			
Planned Activities	***Target Date***	***Completion Date***	***Planned Activity***
	Dec 1, 2016		Determine whether efficiencies can be obtained by replacing the current use of multiple contracts and short-term contract vehicles with Blanket Agreement and/or longer-term contracts with more precise statement of work.
	May 31, 2017		Identify options for replacing the existing reasonable accommodation database to obtain continued support and maintenance and enhanced reporting functions.
	Jun 30, 2017		Review all steps and functions regarding the request and provision of reasonable accommodation and identify staff, training, contracts, process improvements and resources needed to meet the established timeframes.
	Jun 30, 2017		Establish an equipment inventory process to allow more timely deployment of equipment.
	Jan 31, 2020		Establish and launch a reasonable accommodations tracking database that will incorporate all phases of the accommodation process.
	Jun 30, 2020		Continue formalizing reasonable accommodation standard operating policies, forms, templates, and documents.
Accomplishments			

Fiscal Year	*Accomplishment*
2019	REPORT OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND MODIFICATIONS TO OBJECTIVE Accomplishments: • In timely achieving Planned Activity #1 above, CMS has created efficiencies by replacing the previous use of multiple contracts and short-term contract vehicles used for Sign Language Services, Workplace Task Assistance, and transportation services with single and longer term contracts. • In timely achieving Planned Activity #2 above, as explained last year, HHS has deployed a web-based, interactive application called the Automated Reasonable Accommodation Processing System (ARAPS) for HHS Operating Division use. CMS engaged in testing in mid-2019 but determined that ARAPS would not meet its technical needs. CMS next worked with Salesforce, Inc. and Radiant, Inc. to develop a custom-made database that would significantly improve its ability to track, monitor, and develop reports on multiple aspects of the reasonable accommodation process. CMS has set a goal of January 2020 to have this new database launched and in use. • In timely achieving Planned Activity #3 above, the CMS Reasonable Accommodation Program (RAP) continues to review all steps and functions regarding the request and provision of reasonable accommodation in order to meet the established timeframes. Multiple process improvements are in place or underway, including the re-establishment of an Assistive Technology Center with six workstations set up with potential solutions to accommodate employees who are blind or deaf, have low vision, are hard of hearing, or have cognitive or dexterity limitations. Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for bulk orders and inventory are in the approval phase. RAP is working with the Office of Human Capital to ensure that employees hired under Schedule A or special veterans hiring authorities know that reasonable accommodations are available and how to make a request. A Telework Agreement – RA has been created along with other processes to better manage the processing and provision of flexiplace and telework as reasonable accommodations. • In timely achieving Planned Activity #4 above, CMS completed its inventory and is working on other process improvements to expedite provision of equipment, including streamlining the Purchase Card Authorization and market research processes while still complying with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and guidance from the CMS Office of Acquisition and Grants Management and the Office of Financial Management. • In timely achieving Planned Activity #5 above, CMS RAP continues to formalize its standard operating policies and create forms and templates. Forms and templates have been created for the Daily Living Assistance in the Workplace (DLAW) program, for accommodation requests regarding exemption from security screening procedures, for market research, and for reasonable accommodation telework. • An Acting Director was assigned to the program and tasked with improving processing times by identifying root causes and implementing action plans. • Two employees were reassigned from other functions in the EEO office to the reasonable accommodation program. Funding for additional contract support for Personal Assistant Services and Sign Language Interpreting was secured and contracting efforts are underway to put these additional contract resources in place. • In timely achieving activity #1 above, OEOCR identified staffing and skill gaps in RAP that might be impacting processing times. • In meeting activity #2 above, CMS reviewed various database possibilities for implementation at CMS, including traveling to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta, Georgia, to preview and test software developed by the CDC. As a result of these efforts, HHS has deployed a web-based, interactive application called ARAPS to replace the current and outdated RA database. This was scheduled to occur sometime in January 2018, but CMS found that ARAPS did not fully meet its needs. As a result, CMS has implemented a new system (see above) in December 2019. • In timely achieving activity #3 above, the RA Staff attend various training opportunities hosted by LRP Publications for Reasonable Accommodation. CMS also used The Federal EEO and HR Practitioners/Disabilities and RA Series courses such as RA,

	Fiscal Year	Accomplishment
		Disability and the Law, and Mental and Emotional Disabilities. The CMS RA staff consist of RA Coordinators, Provision Specialists, and Intake Specialists with cross training to ensure that coverage is always available. • In timely achieving activity #4 above, CMS has conducted a rigorous inventory audit of all new and old equipment and is maintained and distributed bi-weekly to all RA Coordinators, the Office of Support Services and Operations (OSSO), and to the contractor working with the CMS IT Helpdesk. Any inventory returned due to departure or the employee no longer needing the equipment is retrieved and entered onto the inventory sheet as "available," then stored in the RA-designated area within the CMS warehouse. • In working toward completion of activity #5 above, The RA SOPs previously established are in the process of being reviewed and reformatted to ensure compliance with the requirements of the new system. Due to this need to revise and update, CMS has modified its activity due date for #5 from September 30, 2017 to October 31, 2018.
	2020	Actual effort and not a "flip of the switch." Numbers are decreasing as a result of the efforts, but this is through better work efforts, efficiencies, and expanded knowledge of content. There are no milestones to report other than those noted.
Objective	Obtain the resources to secure more effective tracking system and establish processes to ensure 90% of accommodation request are processed within the time frame set forth in the Agency's procedures for reasonable accommodation.	
Target Date	Dec 31, 2020	
Completion Date	Jan 31, 2020	
Planned Activities	***Target Date***	***Completion Date*** ***Planned Activity***
Accomplishments	***Fiscal Year***	***Accomplishment***
	2019	The Agency enlisted a contractor to develop and test an RA tracking database. The database launched in January 2020.

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

In FY 2017, CMS implemented a web-based tool to provide hiring managers direct access to eligible non-competitive applicants. The database, known as the Non-competitive Resume Database or (NCRD), offers resumes of applicants eligible under the Schedule A hiring authority, along with other non-competitive appointment eligibilities. The database is available to hiring managers for self-guided recruitment and outreach. Transfer of candidates from the old database system into the new system has been completed, and the supporting materials and job aids were implemented in the first quarter of FY 2017. In addition to the deployment of the database CMS provides training on non-competitive hiring authorities and has dedicated staff available to provide refresher training for managers on non-competitive hiring and database assistance. As of the end of FY 2020, the database has been updated with 257 new resumes. Since its inception, a total of 1,150 resumes have been uploaded to the database. CMS continues to effectively communicate with different organizations and their representatives to ensure that the recruitment and hiring strategies are accomplished. In FY 2020, CMS participated in recruitment events (virtual and in-person) sponsored by organizations serving individuals with disabilities. In particular, CMS participated in events such as the Gallaudet University Career Fair, Careers & the disABLED Career Expo (twice) (Note: Careers & the disABLED is the nation's first and only career-guidance and recruitment magazine for people with disabilities who are at undergraduate, graduate, or professional levels.), and the DC

Department of Employment Services (DOES) Veterans Special Hiring Authority Employment Fair. During 2020, CMS also purchased and deployed DiversityJobs, a social media tool that publishes CMS vacancies to a wider variety of sites supporting veterans and disabled applicants. In addition, CMS continued to work through a variety of strategies that focused on existing relationships and contacts, while building new relationships and networks with local colleges and universities, vocational rehabilitation organizations, diverse organizations, and virtual platforms to enhance participation rates of individuals with targeted disabilities.

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

CMS presented new managers and supervisors training on non-competitive hiring authorities such as Schedule A and Veteran's Preference during Leadership in Context (LinC) training. Additionally, CMS continued its modified strategic consultation process encouraging discussions directly with hiring managers about the vision for their vacant positions and to share information about the various hiring options to include non-competitive hiring authorities available to fill their positions. Using these hiring authorities allows managers to reach eligible candidates and reduce the amount of time needed to fill positions. Finally, CMS provided Veteran Employment and Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) training to all managers, Executive Officers, and Human Resources staff on the benefits of hiring Veterans. This course defined Veterans' Preference and explained the uses of special appointing authorities. The course outlined methods for working as a team to cultivate a ready recruitment source of Veterans, especially disabled Veterans. The course outlined the rights of Federal employees under the law and provided details on how Veteran Employment and USERRA rights are to be implemented. In 2020, CMS developed a training program called, "Time-to-Hire Roadshow." This training program uses a 'learning map' to teach hiring managers about the Federal Hiring Process through an analogy of taking a road trip. A significant portion of time is spent talking about non-competitive means to hire someone more quickly. This includes Schedule A and disabled veterans. Over 200 hiring managers attended this training program, both in person and virtually.

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

In FY 2017, CMS implemented a web-based tool to provide hiring managers direct access to eligible non-competitive applicants. The database offers resumes of applicants eligible under the Schedule A hiring authority, along with other non-competitive appointment eligibilities. The database is available to hiring managers for self-guided recruitment and outreach. Job aids were created to assess managers in the first quarter of FY 2017. In addition to deployment of the database and training on non-competitive hiring authorities, CMS has dedicated staff available to provide refresher training for managers on non-competitive hiring and database assistance. In addition to the deployment of the database, CMS provides training on non-competitive hiring authorities and has dedicated staff available to provide refresher training for managers on non-competitive hiring and database assistance. As of the end of FY 2020, the database has been updated with 257 new resumes. Since its inception, a total of 1,150 resumes have been uploaded to the database.

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

During FY 2020, CMS presented new managers and supervisors training on non-competitive hiring authorities such as Schedule A and Veteran's Preference during Leadership in Context (LinC) training. Additionally, CMS continued its modified strategic consultation process encouraging discussions directly with hiring managers about the vision for their vacant positions and to share information about the various hiring options to include non-competitive hiring authorities available to fill their positions. Using these hiring authorities allows managers to reach eligible candidates and reduce the amount of time needed to fill positions. Further, CMS, in conjunction with the Disability Employee Resource Group, conducted several Lunch and Learn workshops for managers focusing on Schedule A hiring and reasonable accommodations. Finally, CMS provided Veteran Employment and Uniformed

Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) Training to all managers, Executive Officers, and Human Resources staff on the benefits of hiring Veterans. This course defined Veterans' Preference and explained the uses of special appointing authorities. The course outlined methods for working as a team to cultivate a ready recruitment source of Veterans, especially disabled Veterans. The course outlined the rights of Federal employees under the law and provided details on how Veteran Employment and USERRA rights are to be implemented. In 2020, CMS continued a training program called, "Time-to-Hire Roadshow." This training program uses a 'learning map' to teach hiring managers about the Federal Hiring Process through an analogy of taking a road trip. A significant portion of time is spent talking about non-competitive means to hire someone more quickly. This includes Schedule A and disabled veterans. Over 200 hiring managers attended this training program. An abbreviated version of the training was delivered at an All Managers Meeting and to Executive Officers. Customized component training was delivered to six components.

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.

CMS continues to effectively communicate with different organizations and their constituents to ensure that the CMS recruitment and hiring strategies are accomplished. In FY 2020, CMS participated in recruitment events (virtual and in-person) sponsored by organizations serving individuals with disabilities. CMS also offered webinars open to the public which outlined special hiring authorities such as Schedule A. Further, CMS continued to work through a variety of strategies that focus on existing relationships and contacts, while building new relationships and networks with local colleges and universities, vocational rehabilitation organizations, diverse organizations, and connecting through virtual platforms to enhance participation rates of individuals with targeted disabilities. In 2020, CMS participated in 6 Disability/Disabled Veterans events: Gallaudet University (attended 2 events), Recruit Military (attended 3 events), and Equal Opportunity Publications-Careers and disABLED Expo.

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 Yes

   b. New Hires for Permanent Workforce (PWTD) Answer No

The CMS new PWD hires in the permanent workforce for FY 2020 was at a rate of 10.37%, which is less than the benchmark of 12.00% but higher than the FY 2019 rate of 9.09%. However, the CMS new PWTD hires in the permanent workforce for FY 2020 was at a rate of 2.13%, which is slightly higher than the benchmark of 2.00% and slightly higher than the FY 2019 rate of 2.08%.

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

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

   a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Health Insurance Specialist – 0107: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 3.45%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 13.89%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 1.44%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 3.70%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO. Information Technology Specialist – 2210: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 4.87%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 2.52%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO. Program Management – 0340: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 3.01%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 20.00%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 1.25%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 20.00%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO. Financial Management Specialist – 0501: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 4.17%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 20.00%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 2.27%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO. Medical Officer – 0602: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 1.64%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO. Actuary - 1510: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs newly hired to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD new hires for this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs newly hired to this MCO.

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

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

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

Health Insurance Specialist – 0107: In FY 2020, the total PWD applicant pool for this MCO was 2.68%, which constituted the benchmark. PWD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 2.54%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs qualified for this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD applicant pool for this MCO was 1.08%, which constituted the benchmark. PWTD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 0.78%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs qualified for this MCO. Information Technology Specialist – 2210: In FY 2020, the total PWD applicant pool for this MCO was 5.56%, which represents the benchmark. PWD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 6.15%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs qualified for this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD applicant pool for this MCO was 2.54%, which represents the benchmark. PWTD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 2.79%, which exceeded the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs qualified for this MCO. Program Management – 0340: In FY 2020, the total PWD applicant pool for this MCO was 6.18%, which represents the benchmark. PWD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 4.63%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of

PWDs qualified for this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD applicant pool for this MCO was 3.24%, which represents the benchmark. PWTD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 2.78%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs qualified for this MCO. Financial Management Specialist – 0501: In FY 2020, the total PWD applicant pool for this MCO was 5.68%, which represents the benchmark. PWD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 3.23%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs qualified for this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD applicant pool for this MCO was 2.84%, which represents the benchmark. PWTD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 1.95%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs qualified for this MCO. Medical Officer – 0602: In FY 2020, there were 36 total vacancies for the Medical Officer series. However, those vacancies resulted in no internal applicants. Actuary - 1510: In FY 2020, the total PWD applicant pool for this MCO was 10.53%, which represents the benchmark. PWD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs qualified for this MCO. Likewise, in FY 2020, the total PWTD applicant pool for this MCO was 10.53%, which represents the benchmark. PWTD qualified for this MCO at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs qualified for this MCO.

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

Health Insurance Specialist – 0107: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 2.54%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 6.67%, which exceeded the benchmark. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.78%, which represents the benchmark. PWTDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 2.56%, which was greater than the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs promoted to this MCO. Information Technology Specialist – 2210: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 6.15%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 2.22%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 2.79%, which represents the benchmark. PWTDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs promoted to this MCO. Program Management – 0340: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 4.63%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 2.78%, which represents the benchmark. PWTDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was less than the benchmark. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs promoted to this MCO. Financial Management Specialist – 0501: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 3.23%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 8.70%, which exceeded the benchmark. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 1.95%, which represents the benchmark. PWTDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 8.70%, which exceeded the benchmark. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs promoted to this MCO. Medical Officer – 0602: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO. In FY 2020, the total PWTD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which represents the benchmark. PWTDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWTDs promoted to this MCO. Actuary - 1510: In FY 2020, the total PWD qualified applicant pool for this MCO was 0.00%, which represents the benchmark. PWDs promoted to this MCO was at a rate of 0.00%, which was the same as the benchmark. No trigger exists with respect to the rate of PWDs promoted to this MCO.

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.

CMS follows Merit Systems Principals to ensure equal opportunity for all employees, including those with disabilities. To this end, CMS strives to assist all employees in career advancement whenever possible. Notwithstanding the action items included in this Part J, CMS has worked throughout the fiscal year to ensure that PWDs and PWTDs have sufficient opportunities for advancement within the Agency through a variety of ways, such as career coaching and participation in the Presidential Management Fellows and Intra-Agency Rotation Program. Written procedures regarding training and conference opportunities include a mandate that all locations be compliant with Section 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. As standard protocol, all training announcements should include contact information to request reasonable accommodations. In addition, the General Services Administration assesses training facilities against the Architectural Barriers' Act, and as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period, all training courses were being offered virtually, which the Agency believes will continue even after employees return physically to the office. The net result from the Agency's response to a total virtual environment has resulted in expanded access for PWDs and PWTDs to programs, activities, and services. In FY 2020, CMS introduced the Zoom platform as a tool for broadcasting meetings, conferences and training opportunities into regional offices across the country. The use of Zoom as a meeting and broadcasting tool provides PWDs and PWTDs enhanced accessibility as a host of a Zoom meeting. The use of Zoom as a virtual platform has tremendously increased employee engagement. Further, the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group has been instrumental in assisting Agency officials in brainstorming ways of eliminating physical barriers that exist with respect to the recruitment, hiring, promotion, and retention of PWDs and PWTDs within the Agency, such as the use of broadcast messaging regarding building construction zones and the timing of elevator door closures. Accomplishments for FY 2020 included expanded use of surveys to reach individual PWD and PWTD employees for immediate feedback; focus groups designed to assist the Agency in pinpointing specific barriers identified through statistical analysis; Reasonable Accommodations training for managers and employees; specific training on the Schedule A Hiring Authority and a panel discussion on the use of CMS Tele-Medicine for beneficiaries with disabilities; and "Lunch and Learn" sessions on the Architectural Barriers' Act, Sections 504 and 508 compliance, and peer mentorship. In accordance with the EEOC mandate, all job announcements have also included language informing applicants of the CMS commitment to providing personal assistant services.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

CMS is committed to continuous learning and exploring innovative methods to develop and retain highly skilled employees to carry out its mission critical functions. A wide range of professional development opportunities are provided to all CMS employees, including PWD and PWTD employees, to support career satisfaction and development within the agency. In FY 2020, CMS conducted the following workshops, activities, and programs to assist employees with their careers and professional development goals. The Agency plans to continue such efforts in FY 2021: • The CMS Asian American and Pacific Islander (AAPI) Employee Resource Group sponsored a presentation discussing COVID-19 and the Post-George Floyd Era for the AAPI community, which was open to all employees. • The CMS Federal Women's Group sponsored the Building Your Professional Network Lunch and Learn workshop for all employees. Participants learned how to share knowledge and influence to help others, grow social capital, develop a networking strategy, and focus on making high-quality connections. • The CMS Veterans Assistance Committee continues to sponsor Veteran-related workshops and discussions, which is available to all CMS employees. During these monthly meetings, participants learned about several benefits available to veterans and their family members and shared tools on how to access these critical benefits. • The CMS Disability Employee Resource Group and the Reasonable Accommodations Program Team hosted two separate workshops on the CMS Reasonable Accommodations Process, one specific to managers and the other to employees. The purpose of these two one-hour workshops was to outline the procedures for requesting reasonable accommodations within CMS, as well as to tailor the question and answer segment specifically to managers and employees. These workshops were able to train a total of 84 employees and 39 managers in the Reasonable Accommodation process. • The CMS Disability Employee Resource Group continued its Peer Mentoring program. This program included a workshop featuring discussions on the responsibilities of mentors and mentees, as well as qualifications and expected commitments. To date, this endeavor has doubled the previous year's total by engaging 14 mentor/mentee relationships as a result of these efforts. • Latinx, the CMS Hispanic Employee Resource Group, co-hosted a panel discussion with several Hispanic members of the Senior Executive Service from the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). The panel discussion focused on the theme of "Overcoming Challenges and Achieving Success in the Federal Workforce" and was open to all CMS employees. CMS will continue to offer the following career development programs in FY 2021 in addition to the multiple Employee Resource Group opportunities presented above: • CMS Intra-Agency Rotation Program (Traditional Program) • CMS Intra-Agency Rotation Program (Direct Match Pilot) • Presidents

Management Council (PMC) Program • White House Leadership Development Program (WHLDP) • Federal Executive Institute Leadership for a Democratic Society

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

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Internship Programs	1518	81	5.10%	1.54%	2.35%	0.00%
Mentoring Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Fellowship Programs	72	19	n/a	0.00%	n/a	0.00%
Coaching Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Training Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Detail Programs	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Career Development Programs	160	120	8.13%	7.50%	4.38%	4.17%

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

CMS Intra Agency Rotation Program (IARP; GS-11 to SES) In FY 2020, 109 total employees (99 non-PWDs and 10 PWDs) out of 5,759 eligible individuals (5,250 non-PWDs and 509 PWDs) applied for the IARP. Of that total, 77 employees were selected (70 non-PWDs and 7 PWDs) for participation in the program, which constituted 70.64% of all applicants (70.71% of non-PWDs and 70.00% of PWDs). Taking the relevant applicant pool and the participation rate of selectees in account, a trigger may exist with respect to this program, though it appears to have achieved statistical parody. Similarly, of the 109 applicants, 103 out of 5,656 eligible were non-PWTDs and 6 out of 103 eligible were PWTDs, constituting an application rate of 1.82% of non-PWDs and 5.83% of PWDs) to the program. Of that total, 72 non-PWTDs and 5 PWTDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 69.92% of non-PWTDs and 83.33% of PWTDs). Taking the relevant applicant pool and the participation rate of selectees in account, no trigger exists with respect to this program. White House Leadership Development Program (WHLDP; GS-15) In FY 2020, 4 total employees out of a pool of 844 eligible employees applied for the WHLDP. Of that total, 2 employees were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 50.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% and which was less than the 0.50% inclusion rate of non-PWDs (4 applicants out of 793 eligible non-PWDs). Likewise, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWDs to the program, which was at a participation rate of 0.00% and which was lower than the non-PWD inclusion rate of 50.00%. President’s Management Council Program (PMCP; GS-13 to 15) In FY 2020, 8 total employees (8 non-PWDs and 0 PWDs) out of a pool of 4,665 eligible employees (4,290 non-PWDs and 375 PWDs) applied for the PMCP. Of that total, 4 employees (4 non-PWDs and 0 PWDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 50.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% of the applicant pool (0 out of 375) and which was less than the inclusion rate of 0.19% (8 out of 4,290). Likewise, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWD to the program, which was at a participation rate of 0.00% (0 out of 0) and which was lower than the inclusion rate for non-PWDs of 50.00%. Federal Executive Institute Program (FEIP; GS-15 to SES) In FY 2020, 8 total employees (8 non-PWDs and 0 PWDs) out of 918 eligible employees (860 non-PWDs and 58 PWDs) applied for the FEIP. Of that total, 8 employees (8 non-PWDs and 0 PWDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 100.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% of the applicant pool (0 out of 58) and which was less than the inclusion rate of 0.93% (8 out of 860). Likewise, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWDs to the program, which was at a rate of 0.00% (0 out of 0) and which was less than the non-PWD inclusion rate of 100.00% (8 out of 8).

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

CMS Intra Agency Rotation Program (IARP; GS-11 to SES) In FY 2020, 109 total employees (103 non-PWTDs and 6 PWTDs) out of 5,754 eligible individuals (5,651 non-PWTDs and 103 PWTDs) applied for the IARP. Of that total, 77 employees (72 non-PWTDs and 5 PWTDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 70.64% of all applicants (69.92% of non-PWTDs and 83.33% of PWTDs). Taking the relevant applicant pool and the participation rate of selectees in account, no trigger exists with respect to this program. White House Leadership Development Program (WHLDP; GS-15) In FY 2020, 4 total employees (4 non-PWTDs and 0 PWTDs) out of a pool of 844 eligible employees (837 non-PWTDs and 7 PWTDs) applied for the WHLDP. Of that total, 2 employees (2 non-PWTDs and 0 PWTDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 50.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWTDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% and which was less than the 0.48% inclusion rate of non-PWTDs (4 applicants out of 837 eligible non-PWTDs). Similarly, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWTDs to the program, which was at a participation rate of 0.00% and which was lower than the non-PWTD inclusion rate of 50.00%. President’s Management Council Program (PMCP; GS-13 to 15) In FY 2020, 8 total employees (8 non-PWTDs and 0 PWTDs) out of a pool of 4,665 eligible employees (4,592 non-PWTDs and 73 PWTDs) applied for the PMCP. Of that total, 4 employees (4 non-PWDs and 0 PWTDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 50.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWTDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% of the applicant pool (0 out of 73) and which was less than the inclusion rate of 0.17% (8 out of 4,592). Likewise, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWTD to the program, which was at a participation rate of 0.00% (0 out of 0) and which was lower than the inclusion rate for non-PWTDs of 50.00%. Federal Executive Institute Program (FEIP) In FY 2020, 8 total employees (8 non-PWTDs and 0 PWTDs) out of 918 eligible employees (910 non-PWTDs and 8 PWTDs) applied for the FEIP. Of that total, 8 employees (8 non-PWTDs and 0 PWTDs) were selected for participation in the program, which constituted 100.00% of applicants. A trigger exists for the applicant pool of no PWTDs to the program, which constituted a participation rate of 0.00% of the applicant pool (0 out of 8) and which was less than the inclusion rate of 0.88% (8 out of 910). Likewise, a trigger exists in the selection of no PWTDs to the program, which was at a rate of 0.00% (0 out of 0) and which was less than the non-PWTD inclusion rate of 100.00% (8 out of 8).

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

Performance-based, Non-discretionary Awards: CMS allows non-discretionary, performance-based awards to be provided either as a cash award or as a time-off award. Since the employee chooses the method by which to be compensated for a performance award, both cash-based and time-off awards will be discussed together. In FY 2020, PWDs accounted for 9.03% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWDs received a performance-based award at a rate of 8.50%, which was less than the participation rate of 9.03% and less than the Federal benchmark of 12.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWDs receiving performance-based awards. In FY 2020, PWTDs accounted for 1.87% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWTDs received a performance-based award at a rate of 3.00%, which was greater than the participation rate of 1.87% and greater than the Federal benchmark of 2.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to PWTDs receiving performance-based awards. All Other Discretionary Awards All non-performance-based awards are considered discretionary awards, which may be awarded as time-off or cash awards. Again, the Agency provides the option to employees to convert cash awards to time-off awards (not the opposite), so statistics related to time-off awards also include converted cash awards. As a result, all discretionary awards will be presented together. In FY 2020, PWDs accounted for 9.03% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWDs received a discretionary award at a rate of 8.80%, which was less than the participation rate of 9.03% and less than the Federal benchmark of 12.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWDs receiving discretionary awards. In FY 2020, PWTDs accounted for 1.87% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWTDs received a discretionary award at a rate of 3.10%, which was greater

than the participation rate of 1.87% and greater than the Federal benchmark of 2.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to PWTDs receiving discretionary awards.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 hours: Awards Given	2635	39.80	44.21	34.78	40.60
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Total Hours	24994	390.80	418.66	369.57	394.20
Time-Off Awards 1 - 10 Hours: Average Hours	9	1.80	0.17	14.49	-0.23
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 hours: Awards Given	1368	18.80	23.22	15.94	19.26
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Total Hours	26337	358.80	449.18	284.06	370.77
Time-Off Awards 11 - 20 Hours: Average Hours	19	3.80	0.37	24.64	0.46
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 hours: Awards Given	217	4.00	3.59	4.35	3.94
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Total Hours	5610	98.80	93.90	115.94	96.06
Time-Off Awards 21 - 30 Hours: Average Hours	25	4.80	0.50	37.68	-0.46
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 hours: Awards Given	244	3.00	4.17	2.90	3.02
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Total Hours	9937	123.60	169.19	115.94	124.83
Time-Off Awards 31 - 40 Hours: Average Hours	40	8.20	0.77	57.97	0.23
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	2091	28.20	35.58	30.43	27.84
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Total Amount	1399679	18203.00	23893.70	19065.22	18064.97
Cash Awards: $501 - $999: Average Amount	669	129.00	12.96	907.25	4.41
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Awards Given	1915	24.60	33.32	18.84	25.52
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Total Amount	2350562	29967.60	40953.12	22700.00	31131.09
Cash Awards: $1000 - $1999: Average Amount	1227	243.60	23.74	1744.93	3.25
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Awards Given	168	3.20	2.72	2.90	3.25
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Total Amount	414150	7672.00	6717.40	6276.81	7895.36
Cash Awards: $2000 - $2999: Average Amount	2465	479.40	47.63	3137.68	53.83

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Awards Given	441	4.60	7.73	4.35	4.64
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Total Amount	1561422	15901.80	27392.14	13731.88	16249.19
Cash Awards: $3000 - $3999: Average Amount	3540	691.20	68.48	4576.81	69.14
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Awards Given	2	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Total Amount	9013	0.00	174.10	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: $4000 - $4999: Average Amount	4506	0.00	87.04	0.00	0.00
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Awards Given	102	1.60	1.78	0.00	1.86
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Total Amount	1042205	20115.60	17899.01	0.00	23335.96
Cash Awards: $5000 or more: Average Amount	10217	2514.40	194.55	0.00	2916.94

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 Yes

   b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

Quality Step Increase (QSI): In FY 2020, PWDs accounted for 9.03% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWDs received a performance-based QSI at a rate of 7.80%, which was less than the participation rate of 9.03% and less than the Federal benchmark of 12.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWDs receiving performance-based QSIs. In FY 2020, PWTDs accounted for 1.87% of the CMS workforce. During the reporting period, PWTDs received a performance-based QSI at a rate of 3.00%, which was greater than the participation rate of 1.87% and greater than the Federal benchmark of 2.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to PWTDs receiving performance-based QSIs.

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

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

   a. Other Types of Recognition (PWD) Answer N/A

   b. Other Types of Recognition (PWTD) Answer N/A

Not applicable.

D. PROMOTIONS

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

   a. SES

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

Internal Selection for Senior Level Positions: SES: In FY 2020, there were no internal PWD applicants for this grade, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Likewise, there were no qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark. Likewise, there were no internal qualified PWD applicants for this grade, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Likewise, there were no PWD selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark. GS 15: In FY 2020, there were 1,338 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 67 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 5.01%. Of the total qualified applicant pool of 336 individuals, there were 8 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 2.38%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 336 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 8 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 2.38%. Of the 44 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 14: In FY 2020, there were 3,913 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 206 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 5.26%. Of the 847 qualified applicants, there were 19 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 2.24%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 847 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of that amount, there were 19 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 2.24%. Of the 99 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 13: In FY 2020, there were 4,833 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 341 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 7.06%. Of the 981 qualified applicants, there were 59 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 6.01%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 981 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of that amount, there were 59 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 6.01%. Of the 152 total selectees, PWDs accounted for 9 selectees, constituting a participation rate of 5.92%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate exceeded the benchmark.

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	Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
c. Grade GS-14		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
d. Grade GS-13		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTD)	Answer	Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	No

SES: In FY 2020, there were no internal PWTD applicants for this grade, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Likewise, there were no qualified PWTD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWTD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark. Likewise, there were no internal qualified PWTD applicants for this grade, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Additionally, there were no PWTD selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark. GS 15: In FY 2020, there were 1,338 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 38 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 2.84%. Of the total qualified applicant pool of 336 individuals, there were 5 qualified PWTD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 1.49%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWTD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 336 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 5 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 1.49%. Of the 44 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 14: In FY 2020, there were 3,913 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 92 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 2.35%. Of the 847 qualified applicants, there were 5 qualified PWTD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 0.59%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWTD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 847 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 5 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 0.59%. Of the 99 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 13: In FY 2020, there were 4,833 internal applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 153 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 3.17%. Of the 981 qualified applicants, there were 25 qualified PWTD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 2.55%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWTD applicant participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 981 internal qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 25 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 2.55%. Of the 152 total selectees, PWTDs accounted for 5 selectees, constituting a participation rate of 3.29%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate exceeded the 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. 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	Yes
d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD)	Answer	Yes

Per HHS, the BIIS system does not collect data regarding new hires for the senior grades. The below analysis is based on the "selected" category within the OPM USA Staffing applicant flow data charts for FY 2018. SES: In FY 2020, there were 440 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 16 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 3.63%. There were 9 selectees, and PWDs accounted for 1 of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 11.11%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate exceeded the benchmark. GS 15: In FY 2020, there were 1,123 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 47 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 4.19%. Of the 7 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 14: In FY 2020, there were 1,946 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 87 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 4.47%. Of the 8 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 13: In FY 2020, there were 5,928 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 218 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 3.68%. Of the 46 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark.

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	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	Yes

Per HHS, the BIIS system does not collect data regarding new hires for the senior grades. The below analysis is based on the "selected" category within the OPM USA Staffing applicant flow data charts for FY 2019. SES: In FY 2020, there were 440 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 7 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 1.59%. Of the 9 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 15: In FY 2020, there were 1,123 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 19 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 1.69%. Of the 7 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 14: In FY 2020, there were 1,946 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 36 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 1.85%. Of the 8 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. GS 13: In FY 2020, there were 5,928 qualified applicants for this grade. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for 96 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 1.62%. Of the 46 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any of the selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for this grade, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark.

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

a. Executives

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

ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer	N/A
b. Managers		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer	N/A
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer	N/A
c. Supervisors		
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer	Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer	Yes

*CMS does not differentiate between managers, supervisors, or executives (except for those in the Senior Executive Service). As such, the following information and analysis represents all three supervisory designations. In FY 2020, there were 2,516 internal applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 138 applicants, constituting a benchmark of 5.48%. Of the total qualified applicant pool of 626 individuals, there were 16 qualified PWD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 2.56%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWD applicant participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark. Likewise, there were 626 internal qualified applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 16 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 2.56%. Of the 65 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was less than the 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. 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	N/A
ii. Internal Selections (PWTD)	Answer	N/A
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	No

*CMS does not differentiate between managers, supervisors, or executives (except for those in the Senior Executive Service). As such, the following information and analysis represents all three supervisory designations. In FY 2020, there were 2,516 internal applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for no applicants, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Of the total qualified applicant pool of 626 individuals, there were no qualified PWTD applicants, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the qualified PWTD applicant participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark. Likewise, there were 626 internal qualified applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWTDs accounted for no qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Of the 65 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was the same as the 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. Select “n/a” if the applicant data is not available for your agency, and describe your plan to provide the data in the text box.

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

*CMS does not differentiate between managers, supervisors, or executives (except for those in the Senior Executive Service). As such, the following information and analysis represents all three supervisory designations. In FY 2020, there were 2,554 qualified applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWDs accounted for 112 qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 4.39%. Of the 5 total selectees, PWDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to the PWD selectee participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was less than the benchmark.

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

a. New Hires for Executives (PWTD)	Answer	N/A
b. New Hires for Managers (PWTD)	Answer	N/A
c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWTD)	Answer	No

*CMS does not differentiate between managers, supervisors, or executives (except for those in the Senior Executive Service). As such, the following information and analysis represents all three supervisory designations. In FY 2020, there were 626 qualified applicants for supervisory positions. Of this total, PWTDs did not account for any qualified applicants, constituting a benchmark of 0.00%. Of the 5 total selectees, PWTDs did not account for any selectees, constituting a participation rate of 0.00%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to the PWTD selectee participation rate for supervisory positions, since the participation rate was the same as the benchmark.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer No

In FY 2020, CMS converted eight of thirteen Schedule A employees. Of the remaining employees, five were not converted. Two were terminated, one prior to eligibility and one after initial conversion. The remaining three employees were not converted after the two-year probationary period because of the relatively recent eligibility. OHC is informing the employing office of the employees’ conversion eligibility to ensure the appropriate steps are taken to convert these employees.

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

In FY 2020, there were 545 PWDs at CMS and 5,488 non-PWDs. During the reporting period, 62 PWDs (including disability not identified) voluntarily separated from CMS at a separation rate of 11.38%. The voluntary separation rate for the 235 non-PWDs was 4.28%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWD voluntary separations, since the voluntary separation rate of PWDs exceeds that of non-PWD voluntary separations. During the same period, 1 PWD involuntarily separated from CMS at a separation rate of 0.18%. The involuntary separation rate for the 9 non-PWDs was 0.16%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWD involuntary separations, since the involuntary separation rate of PWDs exceeds that of non-PWD involuntary separations.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	12	0.20	0.19
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	74	1.37	1.18
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	148	5.08	2.16
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	57	1.56	0.87
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	291	8.20	4.40

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 No

In FY 2020, there were 113 PWTDs at CMS and 5,920 non-PWTDs. During the reporting period, 6 PWTDs voluntarily separated from CMS at a separation rate of 5.31%. The voluntary separation rate for the 291 non-PWTDs was 4.92%. Therefore, a trigger exists with respect to PWTD voluntary separations, since the voluntary separation rate of PWTDs exceeds that of non-PWTD voluntary separations. During the same period, no PWTDs involuntarily separated from CMS at a separation rate of 0.00%. The involuntary separation rate for the 10 non-PWTDs was 0.17%. Therefore, no trigger exists with respect to PWTD involuntary separations, since the involuntary separation rate of PWTDs was less than that of non-PWTD involuntary separations.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permanent Workforce: Reduction in Force	0	0.00	0.00
Permanent Workforce: Removal	12	0.00	0.20
Permanent Workforce: Resignation	74	2.86	1.18
Permanent Workforce: Retirement	148	4.29	2.38
Permanent Workforce: Other Separations	57	0.00	0.93
Permanent Workforce: Total Separations	291	7.14	4.69

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.

CMS collected no exit interview data. An HHS contract was terminated in July 2019, and the Agency is currently in the process of establishing its own internal exit survey protocol.

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.

www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/CMS-Information-Technology/Section508/Section_508_policies_procedures.html To file a complaint, https://cmsintranet.share.cms.gov/OEOCR/Documents/OEOCRCounselorsContact508.pdf

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.

www.cms.gov/Outreach-and-Education/Medicare-Learning-Network-MLN/MLNMattersArticles/Downloads/MM9153.pdf In order to file a complaint,

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.

Throughout FY 2018 and into FY 2019, CMS worked to provide a web-based interactive application to assist employees with disabilities to submit a request for reasonable accommodation. This web-based system was abandoned in FY 2019 due to a question regarding the accessibility of the targeted program. Instead, CMS began developing a proprietary database system internally, and this database was launched in January of 2020. Further, based on stakeholder input and to provide its customers with technical, visual, and hands on experience with specific technology, CMS updated its Assistive Technology Center (ATC). Finally, CMS worked with the organization responsible for the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) to provide assistive technology for those under emergency relocation.

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 timeframe for processing an initial request for reasonable accommodation was 52 calendar days in FY 2020, which was down from 56 calendar days the previous fiscal year. This time period varies greatly depending on an employee's ability to provide the required medical documentation and if the physicians at Federal Occupation and Health (FOH) are requested to conduct a review and provide a recommendation. The time period also depends greatly on the time needed to conduct market research and the delivery of items that are ultimately purchased.

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.

OEOCR provides a variety of training for CMS supervisors and managers on the RA process. Throughout FY 2020, OEOCR presented EEO and RA-related training covering the RA process for CMS central office components, as well as two Lunch and Learn presentations for supervisors in July 2020. CMS also provides information through the Agency's monthly newsletter, This Just In, on a variety of RA-related topics. The manager of an employee seeking a reasonable accommodation is provided an opportunity to ask questions and is generally required to participate in an interactive dialogue with a CMS Reasonable Accommodation Coordinator. In order to ensure effective processing of requests, OEOCR coordinates all requests with any relevant CMS component division that will be involved in implementation. The CMS Reasonable Accommodation Program maintains a

designated storage area in the CMS warehouse and maintains an inventory of certain frequently ordered items. OEOCR monitors accommodation requests for trends. Trending items or more frequently requested items may be ordered in bulk to help facilitate timely processing of reasonable accommodations. CMS maintains a list of the top accommodations requested and shares a “top 10” list with senior leadership.

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

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

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

At CMS, the Personal Assistance Service program required by 29 C.F.R. 1614.203(d)(5) is known as Daily Living Assistance at Work (DLAW) and is administered by OEOCR’s Reasonable Accommodation Program. CMS drafted a policy consistent with the regulation, which was submitted to the EEOC for review and approval. The DLAW program has a dedicated CMS email mailbox to receive requests. All requests have been timely processed. Training was provided to a leadership meeting as well as to the Office of Human Capital, and requests are monitored for trends.

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.

In FY 2020, there were 36 total formal EEO complaints, of which there were 10 formal EEO complaints where a disability-based complaint alleged a hostile work environment. This accounted for 27.78% of the total formal complaints. Based on 2018 data, the government-wide average was 20.00%. Therefore, the Agency rate exceeded the government-wide average.

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.

In FY 2020, there were 4 formal EEO complaints out of a total of 36 formal EEO complaints filed that alleged failure to provide a reasonable accommodation, accounting for 11.11% of the total. Based on 2018 data, the government-wide average was 13.00%. Therefore, the Agency did not exceed the government-wide average.

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

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	Barrier analysis has identified that CMS has low participation rates for PWDs.
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	***Barrier Group*** People with Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	N
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y

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.

Barrier Name	Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice
CMS is not adding to its PWD workforce and is not sustaining its PWD and PWTD workforce.	A Low Entry/High Exit Barrier Analysis has identified that CMS has low participation rates for Persons With Disabilities (PWD) in both permanent new hires and in voluntary/involuntary separations. Analysis of the data revealed that PWD new permanent hires were underrepresented at a rate of 9.09% of the CMS new hires, as compared to the overall PWD participation rate of 9.36%. Likewise, the FY 2019 PWD separation rate was 11.53%, which was higher than the PWD participation rate of 9.36%, indicating that barriers exists with respect to the hiring and retention of PWDs at CMS. Further analysis of the data related to Persons with Targeted Disabilities (PWTD) revealed that PWTD new permanent hires were overrepresented at a rate of 2.08% of the CMS new hires, as compared to the overall PWTD participation rate of 1.90%. However, the FY 2019 PWTD separation rate of PWTDs was 3.12%, which was higher than the overall PWTD participation rate of 1.90%, indicating that a barrier exists with r

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
05/01/2018	07/01/2018	Yes			1. To work with OHC to improve the current recruitment processes until the desired application rates are achieved. 2. To educate hiring officials that there is a low participation rate for this demographic group. 3. To conduct further analysis into reasons for separation of PWDs.

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
Director, Office of Equal Opportunity & Civil Rights	Anita Pinder	Yes
Director, Office of Human Capital	Elisabeth Handley	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective

Target Date	Planned Activities	Sufficient Staffing & Funding?	Modified Date	Completion Date
05/01/2018	OEOCR will develop a project schedule and standard operating procedure for conducting barrier analysis.	Yes		05/01/2018
06/01/2018	OEOCR and OHC will discuss possible reasons why hiring rates are low and separation rates are slightly high. This will assist in identifying resources and improved processes that may be utilized.	Yes		07/01/2018
08/01/2018	OEOCR and OHC will review all recruitment schedules and plans. Both will reach out to disability employee groups, including the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group (DERG), to obtain suggestions for improvement. OEOCR and OHC will discuss adding to the recruitment plans any additional sources provided.	Yes		08/01/2018
10/01/2018	OEOCR and OHC will discuss the practical use of exit surveys to gather additional information on retention. OEOCR will assist OHC in brainstorming ideas that will best work within the Agency and will gather best practices from other agencies.	Yes		07/01/2018
10/01/2019	OEOCR will continue to expand its data by gaining access to applicant flow data and by performing additional analysis to determine entry and exit data for targeted demographic groups.	Yes		10/01/2018

Report of Accomplishments

Fiscal Year	Accomplishment
2018	During the reporting period, CMS developed a project schedule and a draft standard operating procedure for conducting barrier analysis. OEOCR and OHC began meeting monthly to discuss possible reasons why hiring rates are low and began to identify resources and improved processes that may be utilized in the future. In August of 2018 and 2019, OEOCR and OHC met to review all recruitment schedules and plans, and OEOCR provided recommendations on targeted recruitment based on applicant flow data provided through USA Staffing. Both will continue these efforts by reaching out to other disability employee groups, including the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group to obtain suggestions. OEOCR and OHC will discuss adding to the FY 2021 recruitment outreach plan any additional sources provided. CMS expanded its data pool by gaining access to applicant flow data in July of 2018 through USA Staffing. In October of 2018, CMS was provided access to the upgraded USA Staffing system, which has allowed the Agency to pinpoint more accurately recruitment-related data. Using the capabilities of the upgraded information, CMS has performed additional analysis to determine entry and exit data for targeted demographic groups from FY 2019 and has included this analysis in the FY 2019 report.

Source of the Trigger:	Workforce Data (if so identify the table)
Specific Workforce Data Table:	Workforce Data Table - B1
STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER: Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue. How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?	CMS is not adding to its PWD workforce and is not sustaining its PWD and PWTD workforce. An institutional or attitudinal barrier may exist with respect to the hiring and retention of PWDs and PWTDs in the CMS workforce. Additional analysis will need to be performed to further identify the actual barrier.
STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:	***Barrier Group*** People with Disabilities
Barrier Analysis Process Completed?:	Y
Barrier(s) Identified?:	Y

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.	**Barrier Name**	**Description of Policy, Procedure, or Practice**
	Low Entry/High Exit Barrier	A Low Entry/High Exit Barrier Analysis has identified that CMS has low participation rates for Persons With Disabilities (PWD) in both permanent new hires and in voluntary/involuntary separations. Analysis of the data revealed that PWD new permanent hires were underrepresented at a rate of 10.37% of the CMS new hires, as compared to the overall PWD Federal benchmark of 12.00%. Likewise, the FY 2020 PWD separation rate was 11.56%, which was higher than the separation rate of all other individuals, which was 4.45%, indicating that barriers exists with respect to the hiring and retention of PWDs at CMS. Further analysis of the data related to PWTDs revealed that PWTD new permanent hires achieved parody at a rate of 2.13% of the CMS new hires, as compared to the PWTD Federal benchmark of 2.00%. However, the FY 2020 PWTD separation rate was 5.31%, which was higher than the separation rate of all other individuals, which was 5.08%, indicating that a barrier exists with respect to the ret

Objective(s) and Dates for EEO Plan

Date Initiated	Target Date	Sufficient Funding / Staffing?	Date Modified	Date Completed	Objective Description
01/01/2021	10/31/2022	Yes			1. To further identify the institutional and/or attitudinal barriers that may exist with respect to the hiring and retention of qualified PWDs and PWTDs in the CMS workforce. 2. To educate hiring officials that there is a low participation rate for this demographic group. 3. To facilitate or conduct additional professional or career development opportunities for the CMS PWD and PWTD community to aid in retention efforts.

Responsible Official(s)		
Title	**Name**	**Standards Address The Plan?**
OEOCR Director	Anita Pinder	Yes
OHC Director	Tia Butler	Yes

Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective				
Target Date	**Planned Activities**	**Sufficient Staffing & Funding?**	**Modified Date**	**Completion Date**
10/31/2021	OEOCR and OHC will discuss the practical use of exit surveys to gather additional information on retention. OEOCR will assist OHC in brainstorming ideas that will best work within the Agency and will gather best practices from other agencies. Yes n/a 07/01/2018	Yes		

Report of Accomplishments	
Fiscal Year	**Accomplishment**
2020	During the reporting period, CMS developed a project schedule and a draft standard operating procedure for conducting barrier analysis. This important step has helped the Agency prioritize its next steps in conducting overall barrier analysis. OEOCR and OHC continued to meet on a semi-monthly basis to discuss possible reasons why hiring rates are low and began to identify resources and improved processes that may be utilized in the future. By conducting these ongoing dialogues, the Agency can work in tandem between its Human Resources and EEO function, instead of debriefing at the end of each fiscal year. OEOCR and OHC continue to share information on all recruitment schedules and plans, and OEOCR provided recommendations on targeted recruitment based on applicant flow data provided through USA Staffing. Both will continue these efforts by reaching out to other disability employee groups, including the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group, to obtain suggestions. OEOCR and OHC discussed adding to the FY 2020 recruitment outreach plan all additional sources provided. Further, CMS expanded its data pool by gaining access to applicant flow data in July of 2018 through USA Staffing. In October of 2018, CMS was provided access to the upgraded USA Staffing system, which has allowed the Agency to pinpoint more accurately recruitment-related data. Using the capabilities of the upgraded information, CMS has performed additional analysis to determine entry data and has included this analysis in this report. Unfortunately, HHS owned the exit survey contract and allowed it to expire in July 2019 without providing an alternative, thereby losing all exit-related data between July 2019 to present. CMS concluded gathering best practices from other agencies with respect to exit surveys and will launch its internal exit surveying process during the 3rd quarter of FY 2021.

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

Not applicable. CMS initiated its objectives and goals for eliminating the above barrier in December of 2017 and is on target for an October 2021 completion date.

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

During the reporting period, CMS developed a project schedule and a draft standard operating procedure for conducting barrier analysis. This important step has helped the Agency prioritize its next steps in conducting overall barrier analysis. OEOCR and OHC continued to meet on a semi-monthly basis to discuss possible reasons why hiring rates are low and began to identify resources and improved processes that may be utilized in the future. By conducting these ongoing dialogues, the Agency can work in tandem between its Human Resources and EEO function, instead of debriefing at the end of each fiscal year. OEOCR and OHC continue to share information on all recruitment schedules and plans, and OEOCR provided recommendations on targeted recruitment based on applicant flow data provided through USA Staffing. Both will continue these efforts by reaching out to other disability employee groups, including the CMS Disability Employee Resource Group, to obtain suggestions. OEOCR and OHC

discussed adding to the FY 2020 recruitment outreach plan all additional sources provided. Further, CMS expanded its data pool by gaining access to applicant flow data in July of 2018 through USA Staffing. In October of 2018, CMS was provided access to the upgraded USA Staffing system, which has allowed the Agency to pinpoint more accurately recruitment-related data. Using the capabilities of the upgraded information, CMS has performed additional analysis to determine entry data and has included this analysis in this report. Unfortunately, HHS owned the exit survey contract and allowed it to expire in July 2019 without providing an alternative, thereby losing all exit-related data between July 2019 to present. CMS concluded gathering best practices from other agencies with respect to exit surveys and will launch its internal exit surveying process during the 3rd quarter of FY 2021.

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.

Not applicable. CMS initiated its objectives and goals for eliminating the above barrier in December of 2017 and is on target for an October 2019 completion.