

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

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

Section I: Efforts to Reach Regulatory Goals

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

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

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

Using the salary clusters and including data from completed Forms SF-256, data on 30% or more disabled veterans, and data on Schedule A(u) appointments which are allowable under the Section 501 regulations, there are no triggers for PWD. As of September 30, 2018, 24.14% of employees earning less than \$68,036 were PWD and 12.18% of employees earning \$68,036 and above were PWD. * Salary threshold of \$68,036 represents salary for an employee paid at the GS-11 Step 1 level in the Washington-Baltimore-Arlington, DC-MD-VA-WV-PA ("Washington DC") locality area as of September 30, 2018. See <https://www.opm.gov/policy-data-oversight/pay-leave/salaries-wages/salary-tables/pdf/2018/DCB.pdf>.

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

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

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

Using the salary clusters and including data from completed Forms SF-256, data on 30% or more disabled veterans, and data on Schedule A(u) appointments which are allowable under the Section 501 regulations, there are no triggers for PWTD. As of September 30, 2018, 6.90% of employees earning less than \$68,036 were PWD and 3.15% of employees earning \$68,036 and above were PWD.

Grade Level Cluster(GS or Alternate Pay Planb)	Total	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
	#	#	%	#	%
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
Grades GS-1 to GS-10	64	14	21.88	4	6.25
Grades GS-11 to SES	1394	148	10.62	46	3.30

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

The Bureau’s new DPM held kick-off and multiple planning meetings for stakeholders, to include staffing and talent acquisition (i.e., recruitment) leadership, to highlight requirements in the final regulations under Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act, including the 12%/2% numerical goals. The Bureau’s recruiters and staffing team are key stakeholder participants in all disability affirmative action planning, including consideration of the numerical goals in the hiring process planning for each fiscal year. Relatedly, the Bureau included and discussed the numerical goals and other Section 501 final rule requirements in both the 2018 Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program and Disabled Veteran Affirmative Action Program Plan. The numerical goals also were communicated to all agency employees – including hiring managers – via digital distribution channels (e.g., in the Bureau’s Ops Digest and Manager Minute publications). Further, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Fairness (OEOF) informed all Division leaders about the Bureau’s Section 501 Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) and numerical goals as part of ongoing D&I strategic planning discussions, and encouraged Division leaders to socialize the goals within their Divisions (including to hiring managers). Most recently, Director Kraninger explicitly referenced the Agency’s AAP, encouraging Bureau employees to support it, in a cover email distributing her annual EEO and Anti-Harassment Policy statement (in February 2019). Her email linked to an “EEO Tip of the Week” posted on the Announcements page of the Agency’s intranet in March 2018. That announcement stated: “The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission requires Federal agencies to engage in affirmative action to recruit, hire, train, advance, and retain employees with disabilities. As part of these efforts, and consistent with Federal regulations, CFPB has adopted the goal of having 12% of the Bureau’s workforce be people with disabilities, and 2% of the workforce be people with 'targeted' disabilities. (Targeted disabilities are a subset of the larger disability category; they include impairments that traditionally have posed significant barriers to employment, above and beyond the barriers faced by people with the broader range of disabilities, often due to myths, fears, and stereotypes about such conditions.) Learn more – including how 'disabilities' and 'targeted disabilities' are defined – in this EEOC Q&A document. And consider helping by updating your personal disability demographic info in HRConnect so the Bureau has an accurate picture of the composition of our workforce.”

Section II: Model Disability Program

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

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

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

Answer Yes

In FY 2018, the Bureau hired a Disability Compliance Program Manager (DPM). The new DPM assumed this position on August 4, 2018. The DPM manages the newly created Disability and Accessibility Program (DAP), a business unit in the Bureau’s OEOF. The DAP centralizes the disability program services into one office to better leverage expertise and to coordinate all Bureau disability-related programs to ensure employees with disabilities are enabled to do their best work to meet the Bureau’s mission. The DPM supervises both the Reasonable Accommodations Program Manager (RAPM) and 508 Program Manager. This required a reorganization/transfer of the 508 program from the Office of Technology and Innovation (T&I) effective January 2019, and the Reasonable Accommodations (RA)/Personal Assistance Services (PAS) program from the Office of Human Capital (OHC) effective February 2019 to OEOF. This reorganization of disability and accessibility services enables the Bureau to continue to build and support a productive work environment that proactively recruits, hires, retains, and promotes persons with disabilities. To prevent perceived or actual conflicts of interests related to administration of the RA/PAS program, the DPM and RAPM are housed in the DAP, rather than in OCR (the Bureau’s EEO office). A firewall is in place to make clear that the head of OEOF has no involvement in the processing of EEO complaints and/or issuance of Final Agency Decisions. The head of OEOF is also firewalled from the DAP and any involvement in disability reasonable accommodation requests. This mitigates perceptions of conflict between OCR and the OEOF Director, between the DAP and the OEOF Director, and between OCR and the DAP. This firewall was memorialized in a memorandum signed by the Bureau Chief of Staff on January 31, 2019.

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

Disability Program Task	# of FTE Staff By Employment Status			Responsible Official (Name, Title, Office Email)
	Full Time	Part Time	Collateral Duty	
Processing applications from PWD and PWTD	3	0	0	CFPBInquiries@bpd.treas.g
Answering questions from the public about hiring authorities that take disability into account	3	0	0	CFPBInquiries@bpd.treas.g
Processing reasonable accommodation requests from applicants and employees	1	0	0	CFPB_ReasonableAccomr
Section 508 Compliance	1	0	0	CFPB_Accessibility@cfpb.
Architectural Barriers Act Compliance	0	0	1	CFPBFacilities@cfpb.gov
Special Emphasis Program for PWD and PWTD	0	0	1	CFPB_HR@cfpb.gov

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

Answer Yes

In FY2018, disability program staff received the following targeted training: -- Select staff attended Employer Assistance and Resource Network (EARN) on Disability Inclusion sessions via webinars offered throughout the year on multiple disability services and program topics. -- Select staff attended Federal Dispute Resolution (FDR) training, which included various sessions on reasonable accommodation-related issues and case law updates along with panel discussions. -- Select staff attended the EEOC’s EXCEL Training Conference. Other training and events staff attended included: EEOC/Federal Exchange on Employment and Disability (FEED) training, Small Agency 501 Affirmative Action Regulation Working Group sessions, and the DVAAP Forum and Overview. There were also internal briefings hosted by OEOF or OHC related to the Disability and Accessibility Program (DAP) stand-up, where the Bureau’s AAP and the Section 501 statutory and regulatory requirements were highlighted. CFPB provides a wide range of information and resources both through training and electronic communications to managers and employees about disability-related employment topics, including reasonable accommodations (RA) and Personal Assistance Services (PAS) and about the Bureau’s RA/PAS policy and SOPs, specifically. As part of CFPB’s New Employee Orientation (NEO) and onboarding sessions, OCR provides a briefing to all new employees about EEO at the Bureau. At these sessions, employees are specifically told about their right to disability-related RA and PAS, and about the Bureau’s related policy and SOPs. OCR staff gives employees the name and contact information for the Reasonable Accommodation Program Manager. Employees also receive a binder of EEO materials that describes the RA and PAS process. New employees also are told that all of this information is readily available on the Bureau’s intranet. All CFPB managers and supervisors are required to attend various training sessions, which provide information about the RA/PAS process and legal obligations. This mandatory training includes a 2-day EEO training led by the EEOC Training Institute. OCR also provides supervisors and managers with an EEO Resource Manual containing information about compliance obligations, including information about complying with disability-related requirements, and a copy of the Bureau’s RA/PAS policy and SOPs. In the past, RA program staff also have attended “All Hands” meetings held in the Bureau’s regions to hold “office hours” enabling interested employees or supervisors to raise questions or learn about the program.

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

In FY 2018, the Bureau maintained funding and resources for disability programs and services, and will continue to provide funding and resources through FY 2019. The Bureau hired a DPM in August 2018, and onboarded a new Reasonable Accommodations Program Manager (RAPM) in FY 2019. OHC and OEOF both have budgetary support to ensure sufficient disability service resources, such as the DPM, RAPM, and 508 program manager.

Section III: Program Deficiencies In The Disability Program

Section IV: Plan to Recruit and Hire Individuals with Disabilities

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

A. PLAN TO IDENTIFY JOB APPLICATIONS WITH DISABILITIES

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

In FY 2018, a Bureau-wide hiring freeze limited external hiring and internal competitive promotions. The freeze began on November 27, 2017, and remains in place. However, exceptions are approved when business needs require staff. While under the hiring freeze, the Bureau remains committed to the employment and advancement of PWD and PWTD. The Bureau continues to recruit PWD and PWTD using digital media outreach such as LinkedIn, Glassdoor, Indeed and the Bureau's career page at www.consumerfinance.gov/jobs. The Bureau encourages individuals with disabilities to apply under the Schedule A(u) Hiring Authority to open positions. The Bureau's OHC Staffing and Talent Acquisition team and the DPM also encourage hiring managers to utilize programs such as Workplace Recruitment Program (WRP) and OPM's Bender list to identify, interview, and hire PWD and PWTD non-competitively when possible.

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

The Bureau encourages individuals with disabilities (e.g., Schedule A(u), 30% or more disabled veterans, etc.) to apply for positions that are posted via vacancy announcements on USAJobs. Individuals with disabilities who meet minimum qualifications and provide the appropriate documentation are referred to the hiring manager for consideration. This determination is made by the Bureau's third-party service provider, Department of Treasury's Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS). With the continued use of the Schedule A(u) hiring authority, CFPB continues to leverage the Workplace Recruitment Program (WRP) through the Department of Labor and existing registries housed on www.max.gov.

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

The Bureau encourages individuals with disabilities (e.g., Schedule A(u), 30% or more disabled veterans, etc.) to apply for positions that are posted via vacancy announcement. Individuals with disabilities who meet minimum qualifications and provide the appropriate documentation are referred to the hiring manager for consideration. This determination is made by our third-party service provider, Department of Treasury's Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS). If an applicant with eligibility under a hiring authority that takes disability into account is selected, BFS will provide guidance to the hiring manager on how the individual may be appointed. The Bureau also promotes the use of non-competitive hiring authorities to hiring managers. Once a hiring manager identifies a position that they would like to fill non-competitively outside of vacancy announcement procedures, the Bureau's DPM

and Staffing Consultants in OHC work with the hiring manager to identify eligible candidates. The hiring managers for these positions are provided with an overview of the hiring authorities that take disability into account prior to and throughout the hiring process.

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

The OHC Talent Management team delivers Supervisory Development Seminars (SDS) – a one-time training CFPB requires all supervisors/managers (at all levels) to take within their first supervisory year. This training includes a section on hiring authorities such as Schedule A(u). OCR also circulates information to managers about this hiring flexibility through the digital (email) bi-weekly Manager Minute publication and on OCR’s intranet site. Written materials (such as the EEOC brochures on using the Schedule A (u) hiring authority) are also made readily available on display stands throughout CFPB facilities. The DPM and Staffing Consultants assigned to each office also assist managers with all staffing related inquiries, to include Schedule A(u) and other hiring authorities that take disability into account.

B. PLAN TO ESTABLISH CONTACTS WITH DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Describe the agency’s efforts to establish and maintain contacts with organizations that assist PWD, including PWTD, in securing and maintaining employment.

The Bureau hired a DPM in August 2018. The DPM, along with other Bureau Stakeholders in OHC and OMWI, continued to work with organizations/programs that assist PWD and PWTD, such as the Job Accommodation Network (JAN), EARN, Workplace Recruitment Program (WRP), and Wounded Warrior program to maintain contact. The Bureau also continues to rank on the Top 20 Government Employers list of the CAREERS & the disABLED Magazine. The Bureau ranked 15th on the list featured in the Winter 2018/2019 edition of the magazine. The readers of CAREERS & the disABLED magazine selected the top companies and/or government agencies in the country for which they’d most like to work or which they believe would provide a positive working environment for people with disabilities. OHC, OMWI, and OCR consult at least annually on outreach and recruitment strategies and priorities. Along with the continued use of the Schedule A(u) hiring authority, the CFPB continues to explore how to best leverage WRP through the Department of Labor and existing registries housed on www.max.gov.

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 Yes

The Bureau hiring freeze went into effect November 27, 2017, and is expected to continue throughout FY 2019; however, exceptions are approved when the need exists to hire. The Bureau had 16 permanent new hires in FY 2018, 2 of which (12.5%) were PWD and 0 (0.0%) of which were PWTD.

New Hires	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targeted Disability	
		Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)	Permanent Workforce (%)	Temporary Workforce (%)
% of Total Applicants	5916	6.63	0.56	3.18	0.35
% of Qualified	3589	5.74	0.59	3.01	0.31

Applicants					
% of New Hires	54	5.56	1.85	1.85	0.00

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

a. New Hires for MCO (PWD) Answer Yes

b. New Hires for MCO (PWTD) Answer Yes

The Bureau has four MCOs: 0110/Economists, 0301/Miscellaneous Administration & Program, 0570/Examiners, 0905/General Attorneys. There are triggers for PWD and PWTD for the permanent new hires when compared to the qualified applicant pool for all MCOs except for the Economists and PWD for Examiners. No one who self-identified as a PWD or PWTD was selected for the Misc. Admin. & Program or Attorney positions.

New Hires to Mission-Critical Occupations	Total (#)	Reportable Disability		Targetable Disability	
		Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)	Qualified Applicants (%)	New Hires (%)
Numerical Goal	--	12%		2%	
0110ECONOMIST	588	2.21	0.17	1.70	0.17
0301MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM	3832	4.25	0.00	2.17	0.00
0570FINANCIAL INSTITUTION EXAMINING	119	1.68	1.68	5.04	0.00
0905GENERAL ATTORNEY	875	3.20	0.00	1.03	0.00

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

a. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWD) Answer N/A

b. Qualified Applicants for MCO (PWTD) Answer N/A

Very limited hiring occurred during FY 2018 before the hiring freeze was put into place. For internal applicants, there is only data for the 0301/ Misc. Admin & Program series. While there is a trigger for PWD and PWTD for this series, there was a very small sample size with only five total applications received and 3 qualified applicants. Zero applications (0%) received were from PWD or PWTD.

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

a. Promotions for MCO (PWD) Answer No

b. Promotions for MCO (PWTD) Answer No

For Table B9, there were only internal promotions data for the 0301/ Misc. Admin & Program series. Since there were only five

applicants who self-identified, three who were deemed qualified and one selection, there is insufficient data to determine if a trigger exists amongst PWD and PWTD.

Section V: Plan to Ensure Advancement Opportunities for Employees with Disabilities

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.203(d)(1)(iii), agencies are required to provide sufficient advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities. Such activities might include specialized training and mentoring programs, career development opportunities, awards programs, promotions, and similar programs that address advancement. In this section, agencies should identify, and provide data on programs designed to ensure advancement opportunities for employees with disabilities.

A. ADVANCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN

Describe the agency’s plan to ensure PWD, including PWTD, have sufficient opportunities for advancement.

The OHC will continue to post all internal advancement opportunities, details, temporary promotions and reassignments on the Bureau’s internal website and ensure that these opportunities are listed on the Daily Announcements feed on the Agency’s intranet so that all employees are informed. Additionally the Bureau hired a DPM in August 2018, who will promote reassignment, promotion, detail, and temporary promotion opportunities that become available to ensure that PWD and PWTD are aware of them. The DPM will also partner with other offices that promote internal advancement opportunities, such as OHC and OMWI. Other advancement opportunities will include: • Access to core competency training classes and other on-line learning tools such as Skillsoft courses, Books 24x7, and training courses available through the Bureau’s Learning Management System. • Encouraging all employees to utilize the Bureau’s Career Development Framework and other internal resources to enhance the growth and development of all employees. • Promoting the development of personal learning and development goals and helping employees to develop and implement Individual Development Plans. OCR will continue leading barrier analysis efforts to assist with directing efforts providing or improving internal advancement opportunities for PWD and PWTD.

B. CAREER DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITES

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

To support and enhance career development, all employees, including PWD and PWTD, were encouraged to access a myriad of training resources and online learning tools such as Skillsoft courses, Book 24x7, and training courses through CFPB’s Learning Management System. The Career Development Framework and other internal resources for professional growth and development continued to be available to employees interested in promoting their career and development goals. Because of the hiring freeze, Bureau managers have relied on internal details, temporary promotions, and reassignments to develop staff and augment work. Internal career opportunities are posted on the Bureau’s website as well as on the Daily Announcements feed on the Agency’s internet, which is widely seen by all Bureau employees. While the Bureau does not currently have a formal career development program, stakeholders across the Bureau are working to identify internal Bureau programs, such as the details program, that will be considered for formal development in future planning.

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	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fellowship Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mentoring Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Coaching Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

Career Development Opportunities	Total Participants		PWD		PWTD	
	Applicants (#)	Selectees (#)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)	Applicants (%)	Selectees (%)
Detail Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Career Development Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

N/A: Bureau does not have a formal career development program.

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

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

N/A: Bureau does not have a formal career development program.

C. AWARDS

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

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

For PWD and PTWD, the EEOC instructs agencies to use the Inclusion Rate (IR), which compares the number of people within the target population (e.g., PWTD or PWD) to the number of people within the benchmark population (e.g., Persons without a Targeted Disability (PWOTD) or Persons without a Disability (PWOD)). This is used because there is no Civilian Labor Force (CLF) category for PWD/PWTD. For Awards, when the IR percentage for the target is lower than the benchmark, there is a trigger. PWD Target (\$100-\$500): 78 PWD Benchmark: 151 PWOD Target (\$100-\$500): 753-78=675 PWOD Benchmark: 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 51.66% > PWOD 51.64%. No trigger. For everything (except separations), when the inclusion rate (IR) percentage is lower than the PWOD, there’s a trigger. PWD Target (\$501-\$1500): 35 PWD Benchmark: 151 PWOD Target (\$501-\$1500): 371-35=336 PWOD Benchmark: 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 23.18% < PWOD 25.71%. This is a trigger. PWD Target (\$1501+): 1 PWD Benchmark: 151 PWOD Target (\$1501+): 22-1=21 PWOD Benchmark: 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 0.66% < PWOD 1.61%. This is a trigger. PWD Target (1-9 hours): 12 PWD Benchmark: 151 PWOD Target (1-9 hours): 159-12=147 PWOD Benchmark: 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 7.95% < PWOD 11.25%. This is a trigger. PWD Target (9+ hours): 14 PWD Benchmark: 151 PWOD Target (9+ hours): 128-14=114 PWOD Benchmark: 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 9.27% > PWOD 8.72%. No trigger. ----- PWTD Target (\$100-\$500): 22 PWTD Benchmark: 47 PWOTD Target (\$100-\$500): 753-22=731 PWOTD Benchmark: 1458-47=1411 PWTD IR 46.81% < PWOTD 51.81%. This is a trigger. PWTD Target (\$501-\$1500): 14 PWTD Benchmark: 47 PWOTD Target (\$501-\$1500): 371-14=357 PWOTD Benchmark: 1458-47=1411 PWTD IR 29.79% > PWOTD 25.30%. No trigger. PWTD Target (\$1501+): 1 PWTD Benchmark: 47 PWOTD Target (\$1501+): 22-1=21 PWOTD Benchmark: 1458-47=1411 PWTD IR 2.13% > PWOTD 1.49%. No trigger. PWTD Target (1-9 hours): 1 PWTD Benchmark: 47 PWOTD

Target (1-9 hours): 159-1=158 PWOTD Benchmark: 1458-47=1411 PWTD IR 2.13% < PWOTD 11.20%. This is a trigger. PWTD Target (9+ hours): 5 PWTD Benchmark: 47 PWOTD Target (9+ hours): 128-5=123 PWOTD Benchmark: 1458-47=1411 PWOTD IR 10.64% > PWOTD 8.72%. No trigger.

Time-Off Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Time-Off Awards: 1-9 hours : Total Time-Off Awards Given	159	7.55	90.57	0.63	6.92
Time-Off Awards: 9+ hours : Total Time-Off Awards Given	130	11.54	86.15	3.85	7.69

Cash Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Cash Awards: \$100 - \$500: Total Cash Awards Given	753	10.36	89.64	2.92	7.44
Cash Awards: \$501+: Total Cash Awards Given	394	9.14	90.86	3.81	5.33

2. Using the inclusion rate as the benchmark, does your agency have a trigger involving PWD and/or PWTD for quality step increases or performance- based pay increases? If “yes”, please describe the trigger(s) in the text box.

- a. Pay Increases (PWD) Answer No
- b. Pay Increases (PWTD) Answer No

N/A

Other Awards	Total (#)	Reportable Disability %	Without Reportable Disability %	Targeted Disability %	Without Targeted Disability %
Quality Step Increases (QSI): Total QSIs Awarded	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Performance Based Pay Increase	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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

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

N/A

D. PROMOTIONS

1. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWD among the qualified internal applicants and/or selectees for promotions to the senior grade levels? (The appropriate benchmarks are the relevant applicant pool for qualified internal applicants and the qualified applicant pool for selectees.) For non-GS pay plans, please use the approximate senior grade levels. If “yes”, describe the trigger(s) in the text box. 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 No
c. Grade GS-14	
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer No
d. Grade GS-13	
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWD)	Answer No
ii. Internal Selections (PWD)	Answer Yes

CN-71 (GS-15 equivalent): There is a trigger for qualified internal applicants. The qualified internal applicants (4.17%) are lower than the relevant applicant pool (8.84%). For internal selections, while the selections (4.00%) are lower than the qualified applicant pool (4.17%), we would not consider this a trigger based on discretion that the percentages are nearly identical. CN-60 (GS-14 equivalent): There is a trigger for qualified internal applicants. The qualified internal applicants (0.00%) are lower than the relevant applicant pool (10.03%). CN-53 (GS-13 equivalent): There is a trigger for internal selections. The selections (0.00%) are lower than the qualified applicant pool (1.79%).

2. Does your agency have a trigger involving PWTB 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 (PWTB)	Answer No
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer No
b. Grade GS-15	
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer No
c. Grade GS-14	
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer No
d. Grade GS-13	
i. Qualified Internal Applicants (PWTB)	Answer Yes
ii. Internal Selections (PWTB)	Answer No

CN-71 (GS-15 equivalent): There is a trigger for qualified internal applicants. The qualified internal applicants (2.08%) are lower than the relevant applicant pool (3.54%). CN-60 (GS-14 equivalent): There is a trigger for qualified internal applicants. The qualified internal applicants (0.00%) are lower than the relevant applicant pool (3.01%). CN-53 (GS-13 equivalent): There is a trigger for qualified internal applicants. The qualified internal applicants (0.00%) are lower than the relevant applicant pool (2.55%).

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 No
- c. New Hires to GS-14 (PWD) Answer No
- d. New Hires to GS-13 (PWD) Answer No

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B7-1 new table required for FY 2019. We can see the percentage of new hires by pay band level, but do not have the benchmark for comparison purposes. GS-13/CN-53: 14.29% of New Hires were PWD (1 of 7 in permanent new hires) GS-14/CN-60: 33.33% of New Hires were PWD (1 of 3 in permanent new hires) GS-15/CN-71: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 1 in permanent new hires) SES/CN-81/82/90: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 1 in permanent new hires)

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

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B7-1 new table required for FY 2019. We can see the percentage of new hires by pay band level, but do not have the benchmark for comparison purposes. GS-13/CN-53: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 7 in permanent new hires) GS-14/CN-60: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 3 in permanent new hires) GS-15/CN-71: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 1 in permanent new hires) SES/CN-81/82/90: 0.00% of New Hires were PWD (0 of 1 in permanent new hires)

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

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

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

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B8-1 new table required for FY 2019.

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

a. Executives

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

b. Managers

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

c. Supervisors

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

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B8-1 new table required for FY 2019.

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

- a. New Hires for Executives (PWD) Answer No
- b. New Hires for Managers (PWD) Answer No
- c. New Hires for Supervisors (PWD) Answer No

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B8-1 new table required for FY 2019.

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

This data is not available or required for FY 2018 data tables. This data is part of the B8-1 new table required for FY 2019.

Section VI: Plan to Improve Retention of Persons with Disabilities

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

A. VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY SEPARATIONS

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

Answer Yes

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWD) Answer No

The Bureau only had voluntary separations during the reporting period. (There were no actions processed with a termination code in FY 2018.) For PWD and PTWD, the EEOC instructs agencies to use the Inclusion Rate (IR), which compares the number of people within the target population (e.g, PWTD or PWD) to the number of people within the benchmark population (e.g., Persons without a Targeted Disability (PWOTD) or Persons without a Disability (PWOD)). This is used because there is no Civilian Labor Force (CLF) category for PWD/PWTD. For Separations, when the IR percentage for the target is greater than the benchmark, there is a trigger. PWD Target (Table B14): 13 PWD Benchmark (Table B1): 151 PWOD Target (Table B14): 142-13=129 PWOD Benchmark (Table B1): 1458-151=1307 PWD IR 8.61% < PWOD 9.87% For separations, when the inclusion rate (IR) percentage is higher than the PWOD, there’s a trigger. Since the IR for PWD is lower than the PWOD, there is not a trigger.

Seperations	Total #	Reportable Disabilities %	Without Reportable Disabilities %
Permenant Workforce	1458	10.36	89.64
Total Separations	142	9.15	90.85
Voluntary Separations	142	9.15	90.85
Involuntary Separations	0	0.00	0.00

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

a. Voluntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

b. Involuntary Separations (PWTD) Answer No

The agency only had voluntary separations during the reporting period. (There were no actions processed with a termination code in FY 2018.) PWTD Target (Table B14): 2 PWTD Benchmark (Table B1): 47 PWOTD Target (Table B14): 142-2=140 PWOTD Benchmark (Table B1): 1458-47=1411 PWTD IR 4.23% < PWOTD 9.92%. For separations, when the inclusion rate (IR) percentage is higher than the PWOTD, there’s a trigger. Since the IR for PWTD is lower than the PWOTD, there is not a trigger.

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Permenant Workforce	1458	3.22	96.78
Total Separations	142	1.41	98.59

Seperations	Total #	Targeted Disabilities %	Without Targeted Disabilities %
Voluntary Separations	142	1.41	98.59
Involuntary Separations	0	0.00	0.00

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

N/A

B. ACCESSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

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

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

<https://www.consumerfinance.gov/accessibility/> <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/accessibility/file-accessibility-complaint/>

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

<https://www.consumerfinance.gov/accessibility/> <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/accessibility/file-accessibility-complaint/>

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

The Bureau assigned a designated individual to receive and take necessary action on any facilities-related accessibility matters, including creating a designated email inbox individuals can use to inform the Bureau of potential problems. This contact information was placed on the Agency’s external website. In FY 2019, The Bureau’s DPM will lead working group efforts to partner with Bureau Administrative Operations, Faculties, and T&I offices to ensure that accessibility to Bureau facilities and technology are considered in Bureau services and the procurement of supplies and services.

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.

- 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.)

CFPB’s current reasonable accommodation SOPs generally require accommodations to be provided in no more than 30 days, absent extenuating circumstances (which are strictly defined in the SOPs). Where extenuating circumstances exist the Bureau will investigate whether there are temporary measures that can be taken to assist the requestor and provide temporary measures where feasible. During FY 2018, OHC’s Reasonable Accommodation program processed 100 reasonable accommodation cases, within an average processing time of 17 days (measured beginning the date the relevant request was received until the time a decision on the accommodation was communicated).

-

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.

Of the 100 RA cases processed in FY2018 (average processing time of 17 days), the Bureau had 86 cases in which the accommodation request was granted (including twelve cases in which the requestor was provided alternate accommodations), 12 cases where the request was withdrawn (no decision), and 2 cases where the request for accommodation was denied for failure to provide additional documentation to support the request. As of early FY2019, of the requests made in FY2018, zero requests are still "open." In total the Bureau has spent approximately \$18,783.34, averaging \$218.41 per case across all accommodations granted, to provide accommodations requested in FY2018. The Bureau has in place a Reasonable Accommodation Policy – approved by the EEOC – to ensure that applicants and employees know about their rights under the Rehabilitation Act to receive a reasonable accommodation for disability-related limitations if needed to apply for a Bureau job, perform the essential functions of a job, or enjoy equal benefits and privileges of employment at the Bureau. This policy also explains management's responsibilities when a supervisor or manager is put on notice that an employee requires a reasonable accommodation. Accompanying Standard Operating Procedures Related to Reasonable Accommodation Requests (SOPs) lay out the interactive process used when an employee requests a reasonable accommodation for a disability. In FY 2018, the Bureau reviewed and revised its reasonable accommodation policy and standard operating procedures to comply with EEOC's new affirmative action regulations under Section 501. In a letter dated February 9, 2018, the EEOC informed CFPB that its revised policy, SOPs, and forms had been approved in their entirety (without the need for any additional revisions), and comply with applicable EEOC regulations and guidance. The Bureau is now finalizing these documents internally to conform to recent programmatic and personnel changes – including the hiring of the DPM and Reasonable Accommodations Program Manager. The Bureau will disseminate and train appropriate staff on the revised policy and procedures (and forms), and post them on www.consumerfinance.gov, as required under the new affirmative action regulations. The most updated, finalized policy and procedures will be available at <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/office-civil-rights/reasonable-accommodation-persons-disabilities/>. During FY 2018, OEOF coordinated with the OHC Work-Life team, which during FY 2018 was responsible for CFPB's disability Reasonable Accommodation and Personal Assistance Services (PAS) program. In FY 2019, the Bureau transferred responsibilities for reasonable accommodations and PAS to the DAP in OEOF, under the supervision of the Agency's new DPM. Both the DPM and OCR Director now report to the OEOF Director. However, to avoid the appearance of any conflict of interest, the OEOF Director takes no part in any decisions pertaining to the providing of reasonable accommodations or the processing or adjudication of EEO complaints raising allegations of violations of the Rehabilitation Act. The Reasonable Accommodation/PAS program also receives legal support from the Legal Division's Office of General Law and Ethics to ensure it is complying with all legal obligations; support from the Bureau's Section 508 Program Manager on technology issues; technical assistance from OCR staff as needed; support from the Department of Treasury's Bureau of the Fiscal Service (BFS) for applicants seeking reasonable accommodations; and contractor medical professional advice when needed. Accommodations are also centrally funded and have been since CFPB opened. The Bureau remains committed to providing reasonable accommodations to all employees. During FY 2018, the Bureau conducted mandatory training on the Rehabilitation Act and reasonable accommodations. All supervisors, managers and executives were required to attend this training to understand the Rehabilitation Act and their role in the reasonable accommodation process and to learn how to respond appropriately when an individual requests a reasonable accommodation. Since the realignment of the Reasonable Accommodations Program to the OEOF team in February 2019, the Bureau has plans for FY 2020 to leverage the Entellitrak system, the Bureau's system of record for reasonable accommodations, to identify any trends in accommodations requests.

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.

The Bureau has updated its reasonable accommodation policy and SOP to include procedures for implementing the PAS requirement. The SOP provides that the process for requesting PAS, the Bureau's process for determining whether such services are required, and the Bureau's right to deny PAS requests when it would pose an undue hardship, are the same as for reasonable accommodation. The revised policy and SOPs (and accompanying forms) were submitted to EEOC for review in December 2017.

In a letter dated February 9, 2018, the EEOC informed CFPB that its revised policy, SOPs, and forms had been approved in their entirety (without the need for any additional revisions), and comply with applicable EEOC regulations and guidance. CFPB is now finalizing these documents internally. CFPB will review and analyze the effectiveness of the revised policy and SOPs on an ongoing basis and as appropriate. The Bureau has had no requests for PAS to date.

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.

According to the EEOC's benchmark, 18.05% of all formal EEO complaints filed government-wide included an allegation of (non-sexual) harassment based on either a mental or physical disability. According to CFPB data for FY 2018, 4 out of the 21 formal EEO complaints filed alleged disability-based (non-sexual) harassment. Thus, the CFPB percentage of such complaints is 19.04% -- only slightly above the government-wide benchmark. In a final agency decision issued in early FY 2018, the Bureau's OCR found that the Bureau had unlawfully discriminated against one individual in violation of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by failing to provide reasonable accommodations for the individual's disability. The underlying formal complaint had also alleged disability-based harassment, but OCR concluded that no unlawful harassment had occurred.

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 Yes

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.

According to the EEOC's benchmark, 12.50% of all formal EEO complaints filed government-wide included an allegation of failure to accommodate based on either a mental or physical disability. According to CFPB data for FY 2018, 1 out of the 21 formal EEO complaints filed alleged disability-based failure to accommodate. Thus, the CFPB percentage of such complaints is 4.76% -- below the government-wide benchmark. In a final agency decision issued in early FY 2018, the Bureau's OCR found that the Bureau had unlawfully discriminated against one individual in violation of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by failing to provide reasonable accommodations for the individual's disability. (The underlying formal complaint had also alleged disability-based harassment, but OCR concluded that no unlawful harassment had occurred.) OCR ordered significant remedial and make-whole relief (including imposition of appropriate discipline, leave restoration, non-pecuniary compensatory damages, injunctive relief, a posting notice, mandatory training on reasonable accommodations for agency managers, and expunction of discrimination-related content in the complainant's personnel file and performance rating documents, among other things).

Section VIII: Identification and Removal of Barriers

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

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

Answer No

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

Answer N/A

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

<p>STATEMENT OF CONDITION THAT WAS A TRIGGER FOR A POTENTIAL BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a brief narrative describing the condition at issue.</p> <p>How was the condition recognized as a potential barrier?</p>	<p>Various. See below.</p>			
<p>STATEMENT OF BARRIER GROUPS:</p>	<p><i>Barrier Group</i></p> <p>People with Disabilities</p> <p>People with Targeted Disabilities</p>			
<p>BARRIER ANALYSIS:</p> <p>Provide a description of the steps taken and data analyzed to determine cause of the condition.</p>				
<p>STATEMENT OF IDENTIFIED BARRIER:</p> <p>Provide a succinct statement of the agency policy, procedure or practice that has been determined to be the barrier of the undesired condition.</p>	<p>See below.</p>			
<p>Objective</p>				
<p>Responsible Officials</p>				
<p>Target Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</p>	<p>Planned Activities</p>	<p>Sufficient Staffing & Funding (Yes or No)</p>	<p>Modified Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</p>	<p>Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)</p>

Fiscal Year	Accomplishments
2018	<p>OCR submitted the Bureau’s first-ever Affirmative Action Plan (AAP) for people with disabilities and targeted disabilities to the EEOC for review in March 2018, in conjunction with filing the Bureau’s FY 2017 MD-715 report. In a May 21, 2018 letter from the Commission, the EEOC approved the Bureau’s AAP. The EEOC also provided direction to the Bureau on specific parts of the Bureau’s disability program requiring additional focus and resources.</p> <p>The EEOC encouraged the Bureau to examine whether barriers exist in the recruitment process for PWD as well as the selection process for PWD and PWTD. It found that “the agency has not established a plan to investigate triggers for potential barriers involving PWD and PWTD.” EEOC specifically stated:</p> <p>§ “In its next AAP, we expect CFPB to continue to examine its recruitment and hiring processes for potential barriers involving external applicants with disabilities in the 0110, 0301, and 0905 series. Even if barriers are not identified, the agency should seek to improve its recruitment of qualified PWD to its mission-critical occupations.”</p> <p>§ “In its next AAP, we expect CFPB to investigate whether PWD are experiencing barriers that either prevent them from applying for and/or receiving promotions to the senior grade levels. Moreover, once CFPB has access to applicant flow data for new hires to the senior grade levels, the agency should assess whether triggers exist in the recruiting and/or hiring processes for external applicants with disabilities.”</p> <p>§ “We urge CFPB to identify the proportion of mission-critical occupations that lead to supervisory positions. If PWD have a low participation rate in the occupations with the highest proportion of supervisory positions, that could explain these triggers. Moreover, once CFPB has access to applicant flow data for supervisory positions, the agency should assess whether triggers exist in the recruiting and/or hiring processes for internal and external applicants with disabilities. We look forward to reviewing the results of CFPB’s barrier analysis efforts in its next AAP.”</p> <p>In late FY 2018, the Bureau awarded a new five-year Blanket Purchase Agreement contract (BPA) to a third-party contractor. This new BPA will allow for greater continuity and efficiency in the Bureau’s barrier-analysis efforts. The Bureau has already issued the first call under this BPA, tasking the new contractor with analyzing data related to the experiences and participation rates of employees with disabilities and targeted disabilities, as recommended in the May 2018 EEOC technical assistance letter approving the Bureau’s first Affirmative Action Plan.</p> <p>After reviewing CFPB’s first AAP, a draft of this second AAP, workforce data, complaints data, and other data sources, this contractor has now completed a plan for conducting a wide-ranging barrier analysis concerning applicants and employees with disabilities at the Bureau. The barrier analysis investigation will look at a variety of facets of the Agency’s overall disability program, and specifically investigate each of the items listed in the EEOC’s letter. The Bureau anticipates that this barrier investigation will be completed during FY 2019 or by early FY 2020. A copy of the full barrier-analysis plan will be uploaded to FedSEP as a supplemental document with the submission of this AAP on or before May 31, 2019.</p> <p>No barriers pertaining to applicants or employees with disabilities have been identified to date.</p>

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A