

**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
**CIVILIAN HUMAN RESOURCES MANUAL**

**SUBCHAPTER 1604**

**GUIDE FOR CONDUCTING AN EFFECTIVE BARRIER ANALYSIS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Sections</u></b>	<b><u>Pages</u></b>
1. Background	1
2. Purpose	2
3. Policy	2
4. Responsibilities	3
5. Action	6
6. Barrier Analysis Manual Table of Contents	
– Section 1 – Data Collection	1-1
– Section 2 – Data and Trend Analyses	2-1
– Section 3 – Barrier Identification	3-1
– Section 4 – Responsibility To Continually Assess and Monitor EEO Plans	4-1
– Section 5 – The Role/Responsibilities of Special Emphasis Program (SEP) Managers In Barrier Analysis	5-1
– Appendix A Definitions	6-1

**DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**  
**EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY GUIDE FOR CONDUCTING AN**  
**EFFECTIVE BARRIER ANALYSIS**

**SUBCHAPTER 1604**

- References:**
- (a) Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Management Directive (MD 715)
  - (b) Civilian Human Resources Manual, Subchapter 1603, Equal Employment Opportunity Program Assessment
  - (c) 29 Code of Federal Regulations § 1614.101 and 1614.102
  - (d) Office of the Secretary of Defense Administrative Instruction No. 31
  - (e) Department of Defense (DoD) Directive 1440.1

**1. Background:**

a. Reference (a) establishes the ongoing obligation for agencies to conduct an annual assessment of their EEO programs. There are two aspects of an EEO Program that must be addressed during a self assessment.

(1) The first element is a self-assessment of the command's/activity's EEO program measured against the six essential elements of a model EEO program using the EEOC Agency Self-Assessment Checklist provided in reference (a).

(2) The second element of the self-assessment process is a snapshot of the status of command/activity efforts to identify and eliminate any barriers to EEO. Barrier identification and elimination is the process by which commands/activities uncover, examine and remove barriers to equal participation at all levels of the workforce. A barrier is an agency policy, principle or practice that limits or tends to limit employment opportunities for members of a particular sex, race, or ethnic background, or based on an individual's disability status.

(a) Reference (a) provides 28 Workforce Data Tables to assist commands/activities in the examination of their workforce racial, national origin, gender and disability profiles, the first step of the barrier analysis process. EEOC guidance and information about the EEOC Workforce Data Tables and copies of blank table forms may be found at <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/datatables.html> and <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/tables.html>, respectively

(b) Reference (a) also provides guidance and a specific format, i.e., EEOC Form 715-01 PART I, for command/activities to document their barrier analysis efforts and plans to eliminate any identified barriers.

b. DON specific requirements for accomplishing, documenting and reporting barrier analysis efforts are provided in reference (b).

**2. Purpose:**

a. To provide DON specific guidance and requirements to individuals responsible for implementing, coordinating and conducting command and/or activity barrier analysis efforts to identify and eliminate any impediments to equality of opportunity in the workplace. All commands/activities are required to work proactively to ensure equal employment opportunity (EEO) for all DON employees and applicants for employment to prevent potential discrimination before it occurs and to establish systems to monitor our compliance with the requirements of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and Section 501 of the Rehabilitation Act. All commands/activities must regularly evaluate their employment practices to identify barriers to equality of opportunity for all individuals. Where such barriers are identified, commands/activities must take measures to eliminate them. Only through these efforts will it be ensured that all individuals are provided opportunities to participate in the full range of employment opportunities and achieve their fullest potential.

b. This subchapter is intended to augment the information provided in references (a) and (b) and sets forth DON policy and requirements for barrier analysis efforts.

**3. Policy:**

a. In accordance with references (a) through (c), all DON employees will work towards the goal of creating an inclusive work environment where qualified applicants and employees have the freedom and opportunity to compete and participate in all applicable employment processes, e.g., recruitment, employment, promotion, training, awards, etc.

b. In order to achieve this goal, focused, methodical and on-going efforts to identify and eliminate any barriers to equality of opportunity must be developed and implemented at all levels of the DON.

c. Each command and activity will designate a senior management official(s) who will be responsible for: implementing and executing barrier analysis efforts that are ongoing; accomplishing these efforts in accordance with the requirements of reference (a) and this CHRM; working collaboratively with their EEO offices/servicing offices and other relevant stakeholders; and, achieving the goal of the identification and elimination of any barriers to equality of opportunity.

d. Per reference (a), agencies have an on-going obligation to eliminate barriers that impede free and open competition in the workplace and prevent individuals of any racial, national origin group, either sex, or individuals with a disability from realizing their full potential. As part of this on-going obligation, all DON commands/activities

must conduct a self assessment on at least an annual basis to monitor progress and their ongoing efforts towards identifying and eliminating any barriers that exclude certain groups.

#### **4. Responsibilities:**

a. In accordance with references (a) through (c), the Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) is responsible for communicating and demonstrating a commitment to equality of opportunity for all employees and applicants for employment.

b. The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (ASN) (Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA)), as EEO Director, is responsible for establishing and maintaining a DON-wide EEO Program that is compliant with EEOC MD-715, implementing instructions from EEOC and DoD guidance.

c. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (DASN) (Civilian Human Resources (CHR)) is delegated the responsibility for developing DON-wide policies, programs and directives to ensure successful accomplishment of all aspects of the EEO Program to include the identification and elimination of any barriers to equality of opportunity. The DASN (CHR) has the authority to further delegate these responsibilities to enforce compliance with this instruction.

d. The Director, Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR), is responsible for:

(1) Ensuring that EEO professionals are involved with and consulted on the management and deployment of human resources.

(2) Attracting, developing and retaining EEO professionals with the strategic competencies necessary to accomplish the agency's EEO mission, and interface with agency officials, managers and employees.

e. The Program Director, Office of EEO and Diversity Management is responsible for:

(1) Establishing and disseminating DON policy for barrier analysis efforts.

(2) Providing advice and guidance to DON officials who are responsible for the identification and elimination of barriers to equality of opportunity.

(3) Developing and submitting the agency's Annual EEO Program Status Report to EEOC and DoD.

f. The Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Assistant for Administration USN, and Heads of Echelon 2 Commands are designated as Command EEO Officers (CEEOO). As such, they are responsible for:

(1) Communicating and demonstrating their commitment to equality of opportunity for all employees and applicants for employment.

(2) Ensuring that adequate resources are allocated to effectively achieve and sustain a model EEO program.

(3) Designating a senior level manager(s) to execute and coordinate all barrier analysis efforts with the command's EEO office.

(4) Ensuring that officials responsible for barrier identification and elimination are trained on program requirements.

(5) Ensuring that EEO professionals are involved with and consulted on the management and deployment of human resources.

(6) Attracting, developing and retaining EEO professionals with the strategic competencies necessary to accomplish the agency's EEO mission, and interface with agency officials, managers and employees.

g. The Command Deputy EEO Officer (CDEEOO) is responsible for:

(1) Serving as the primary advisor to the CDEEOO on the command's process for barrier analysis.

(2) Working collaboratively with senior level manager(s) responsible for the command's barrier analysis efforts.

(3) Providing guidance, assistance, and command specific training on barrier analysis to subordinate command/activity officials.

(4) Serving as a link between subordinate activities and OCHR and the DON EEO Program Manager to monitor and enforce compliance with this subchapter.

(5) Reviewing the Annual EEO Program Status Report submission of all subordinate activities/commands to ensure compliance with this subchapter.

(6) Developing and submitting the command's Annual EEO Program Status Report to DON.

h. The Director, Civilian Policy and Procedures (DCPP) is responsible for:

(1) Ensuring that sufficient resources are allocated to execute effective analysis efforts at the command and subordinate activity levels.

(2) Ensuring that EEO professionals are involved with and consulted on the management and deployment of human resources.

(3) Attracting, developing and retaining EEO professionals with the strategic competencies necessary to accomplish the agency's EEO mission, and interface with agency officials, managers and employees.

i. The Activity Commander or Head serves as the EEOO and is responsible for:

(1) Communicating and demonstrating their commitment to equality of opportunity for all employees and applicants for employment.

(2) Designating a senior level manager(s) to execute and coordinate all barrier analysis efforts with the activity's EEO office or servicing office.

(3) Ensuring that officials responsible for barrier identification and elimination are trained on program requirements.

(4) Ensuring that EEO professionals are involved with and consulted on the management and deployment of human resources.

(5) Attracting, developing and retaining EEO professionals with the strategic competencies necessary to accomplish the agency's EEO mission, and interface with agency officials, managers and employees.

(6) Evaluating managers and supervisors on efforts to ensure equality of opportunity for all employees.

j. The servicing Deputy EEO Officer (DEEOO) is responsible for:

(1) Serving as the primary advisor to the EEOO on the activity's process for conducting regular internal audits, on at least an annual basis, to assess whether the activity has made a good faith effort to identify and eliminate barriers to equality of opportunity.

(2) Working collaboratively with senior level manager(s) responsible for the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

(3) Providing guidance, assistance, and training on barrier identification and elimination to individuals responsible for developing, coordinating and implementing the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

(4) Ensuring that barrier analysis efforts continue on an ongoing basis and involving appropriate stakeholders in this process.

(5) Annually developing objectives and action items as a result of barrier analysis efforts and submitting the activity's Annual EEO Program Status Report to the major command.

k. The Human Resources Director (HRD) is responsible for:

(1) Ensuring that sufficient resources are allocated to execute effective barrier identification and elimination efforts for serviced commands/activities.

(2) Ensuring that EEO professionals are involved with and consulted on the management and deployment of human resources.

(3) Attracting, developing and retaining EEO professionals with the strategic competencies necessary to accomplish the agency's EEO mission, and interface with agency officials, managers and employees.

l. Human Resources (HR) Specialists are responsible for becoming knowledgeable on and participating in, as needed, the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

m. Special Emphasis Program (SEP) Managers are responsible for enhancing the employment, training, and advancement of minority groups, women and/or individuals with disabilities by assisting, supporting and participating in the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

n. The Human Resources Service Center (HRSC) is responsible for supporting the barrier analysis efforts of their serviced commands/activities as requested.

o. Managers and supervisors are responsible for:

(1) Assisting, supporting and participating in the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

(2) Maintaining clearly defined, well-communicated, consistently applied and fairly implemented personnel policies, selection and promotion procedures, evaluation procedures, rules of conduct and training systems.

p. Employees and/or other stakeholders are responsible for assisting, supporting and participating in the activity's barrier analysis efforts.

**5. Action:** All DON components will comply with the requirements of this Subchapter.

# **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

## **SUBCHAPTER 1604**

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b><u>SECTION 1 – DATA COLLECTION</u></b>	
I. Collecting the Data	
A. The Importance of Collecting Accurate Data	1-1
B. Data Categories	1-1
C. Tracking and Monitoring Systems	1-5
II. Data Organization	
Attachment 1 – Excerpt from EEOC MD-715, Section II, Analyzing Employment Processes	1-6 1-9
<b><u>SECTION 2 – DATA AND TREND ANALYSES</u></b>	
I. Data Analysis	
A. Purpose	2-1
B. Triggers	2-1
C. How to Analyze the Data	2-1
II. Trend Analysis	
A. Baseline for Future Analysis	2-5
B. Monitoring Employment Processes for the Identification of Triggers	2-5 2-5
III. Analysis Procedures	2-6
<b><u>SECTION 3 – BARRIER IDENTIFICATION</u></b>	
I. How to Identify a Potential Barrier	
A. What to do with Information Uncovered at the Data analysis Step	3-1 3-1
B. Utilize all Available Data	3-2
II. Documentation of an Identified Barrier	
A. Documentation of Barrier Analysis Efforts	3-2
B. EEOC Form 715-01, Part I, EEO Plan to	



Eliminate Identified Barrier 3-2  
**SECTION 4 – CONTINUOUS ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING  
OF EEO PLANS**

- I. After the Submittal of EEO Plans (Part I)
  - A. Required Actions 4-1
  - B. DON EEO Plans to Eliminate Identified Barriers 4-2
- II. Purpose of EEO Plans 4-3

**SECTION 5 – THE ROLE/RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS  
PROGRAM (SEP) MANAGERS IN BARRIER ANALYSIS**

- I. SEPs
  - A. Definition of SEP 5-1
  - B. Authorized SEPs 5-1
- II. Responsibilities of SEP Managers
  - A. Program Management 5-1
  - B. Program Responsibilities 5-1
  - C. Role/Responsibilities of SEP Manager in Barrier Analysis 5-2

**APPENDIX:**

- A. Definitions 6-1

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **SECTION 1 DATA COLLECTION**

#### **I. COLLECTING THE DATA**

A. The Importance of Collecting Accurate Data: Data is the foundation for executing an accurate, relevant, sound, and complete analysis that will meet the intent of governing laws/regulations by ensuring that we are providing the maximum opportunity for all employees to advance and to perform at their highest potential. The data collection step can be one of the most time-consuming portions of the analysis process. Therefore, in most instances, it is not advisable to initiate efforts to collect data at the point the command/activity is ready to commence an analysis or at the end of the reporting period. Focused, pre-planned efforts to collect relevant data on an ongoing basis are critical to the effective execution of the next steps in the barrier analysis process. Note: The workforce data tables that are submitted at the end of each fiscal year, i.e., 30 September, are merely a snapshot of the workforce at that point in time and should not be used for initiating barrier analysis efforts that should have been executed during the relevant reporting period.

#### **B. Data Categories**

1. EEOC MD-715 Workforce Data Tables: The first step of the barrier analysis process is to look at the workforce racial, national origin, gender and disability profiles. To assist the commands/activities in this first step, EEOC developed 28 Workforce Data Tables. Completion of the workforce data tables will assist the command/activities in their review of the workforce, as generally compared to appropriate comparators, to identify possible triggers. While the EEOC Workforce Data Tables are merely one source of data to be reviewed in this process, if completed properly, they will identify triggers to be explored. A trigger is a situation or a 'red flag' that indicates the possible existence of a barrier to equal opportunity. As the command/activity performs its review of their completed Workforce Data Tables, a trigger for a potential barrier will typically manifest itself through the identification of low participation rates of a particular group when compared to the Relevant Civilian Labor Force (RCLF). Guidance for completing the EEOC Workforce Data Tables and copies of blank table forms may be found at <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/datatables.html> and <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/tables.html> respectively. These workforce data tables are a basic starting point for collecting personnel data to initiate the command/activity barrier analysis efforts. It must be emphasized that the mere completion of the workforce data tables is not the desired end result. Rather it is the information that is revealed in these tables that results in the initiation of the more important process of barrier identification and elimination.

a. The DON currently has the DON Affirmative Employment Reporting Tool (DART), an automated tool that provides some of the data required to populate the Workforce Data Tables. In the future it is anticipated that other automated tools will be developed and/or will become available to obtain this data. Command and/or activity level personnel may also develop additional automated tools to augment the capability provided by DART, depending upon local accessibility and resources.

b. Personnel data is obtained from the Defense Civilian Personnel Data System (DCPDS). DCPDS is a “live” reporting system, which means that every action entered into DCPDS is reported, e.g., if an accession requires a correction to the original action, DCPDS will record this one accession as two accessions – the original accession and the correction. Therefore, it is recommended that command/activity level personnel “clean-up” the data, when possible, before beginning analysis.

c. As indicated above, the data submission requirements of MD-715 are merely a starting point for data collection. Additional data will usually be required in order to conduct a more in-depth analysis. For example, in order to conduct a more in-depth analysis of new hires, data such as: types of series, grade levels, identifying the sub-units within the organization that has the majority of the new hires, Nature of Action Code, etc., are necessary. The following examples illustrate how obtaining additional relevant information may result in the ability to more specifically identify potential barriers and the development of meaningful objectives:

(1) If the data reviewed indicates that the majority of a command’s and/or activity’s accessions are in a specific series and a further examination reveals that the relevant applicant pool is not sufficiently diverse, an appropriate objective may be to focus future recruitment efforts so that they will result in a diverse pool of candidates who are qualified for that particular series. An objective that identifies a broad, non-series specific recruitment effort to attract a diverse pool of candidates may not eliminate this identified problem.

(2) If the data collected indicates that the majority of a command and/or activity’s accessions are at the journey level and further examination reveals that the applicant pool for journey level positions is not sufficiently diverse, an appropriate objective may be to consider entry level hires vice only at the journey level.

(3) If the data collected indicates that the majority of a command and/or activity’s accessions are from a specific sub-unit of the organization, an appropriate objective may be to examine the selection process for that particular segment of the organization to determine if there are any barriers to EEO in their selection policies, practices or procedures.

(4) If the data collected indicates that the majority of a command and/or activity’s accessions are hired through the use of CHART, an appropriate objective might be to explore the use of different hiring authorities potentially resulting in a more diverse applicant pool.

2. Employment Processes: Barriers to equal opportunity will typically arise in the different employment processes. Therefore, as a required part of their barrier analysis efforts, commands/activities must include an examination of their program, policies and procedures for following processes:

- Recruitment
- Hiring and Placement
- Employee Development and Training Opportunities
- Promotions and Other Internal Selections
- Award Distribution
- Discipline
- Separations

a. Reference (a) includes a list of questions that will be helpful to the command/activity during its thorough investigation into each process. A copy of these questions is provided as Attachment 1. Due to the scope of these examinations, these processes should be reviewed during the course of the reporting period, not at the end, to determine the existence of any possible barriers.

b. The results of an investigation into these processes may assist the command/activity in further pinpointing any potential barriers. Documentation of the outcome of a command/activity's investigation into these processes should be maintained in the working file for each annual assessment reporting period.

c. It may not be feasible to examine each employment process on an annual basis. In this event, a schedule and timetable to review each employment process should be developed and implemented. Information regarding the schedule and timetable should be included in the command/activity's annual assessment report.

d. Command/activities should address all employment processes that are relevant to current issues within their organization. For example, if an activity is downsizing its workforce, an examination of its procedures for the Voluntary Separation Incentive Program/Voluntary Early Retirement Authority (VSIP/VERA) may be appropriate.

e. Other employment processes that may be considered for examination include, but are not limited to:

- Performance rating procedures
- Advertisement and selection for reassignment opportunities
- Honorary awards
- Comparison of pay rates between males/females performing substantially similar work
- Pay distribution in a pay for performance system (i.e., NSPS, Demonstration Projects)
- Command/activity level career development programs

3. Other Relevant Data: Additional data that should be considered as part of the barrier analysis may include, but is not limited to:

- a. Discrimination complaint activity (formals, informals, contacts)
- b. More detailed information on accessions, promotions and separations, i.e., name of employee, organizational code, pay plan, series, grade, gender, Ethnicity and Race Indicator (ERI) code, handicap code, EEOC job category, nature of action description, nature of action code, authority code, entry date, effective date, veterans' preference (NOTE: this information is covered under the provisions of the Privacy Act and must be safeguarded and used for official use only)
- c. Organizational environment, e.g., hiring freeze, BRAC activity, downsizing efforts, fiscal constraints, increased hiring efforts, etc.
- d. Exit survey results
- e. Input from Special Emphasis groups
- f. Input from union officials
- g. Input from employees, to include supervisors and managers
- h. Input from Human Resources practitioners
- i. Government reports, e.g., EEOC, GAO, OPM, MSPB, DOL
- j. Reports and/or studies in local and national news periodicals

4. Collecting information from stakeholders: In order to perform an accurate and relevant analysis, various stakeholders, e.g., supervisors/managers, employees, Special Emphasis groups/committees, union officials, counsel, human resources, financial, IT, etc. should be involved in the process when applicable. These individuals may be able to provide critical information that should be considered in the analysis, e.g., organizational environment, budget forecast, human capital plan, human resources employment processes expertise, business practices/policies/procedures, employee concerns/issues, etc.

a. The information provided by stakeholders is not only invaluable, but serves as an opportunity to involve individuals critical to the successful implementation of barrier elimination plans.

b. Some of the positive outcomes of successfully integrating stakeholders into the barrier analysis process include:

- Ownership of the barrier analysis process by individuals external to the EEO Office;
- Additional sources of information for the identification of potential triggers or barriers to EEO;
- Acquired knowledge and a heightened awareness that will ensure equality of opportunity is carefully considered and integrated into the process during the development/revision of employment practices, policies and procedures;
- The creation of an inclusive work environment that provides equal employment opportunity to all employees with the anticipated positive outcome of fewer filings of discrimination complaints.

C. Tracking and Monitoring Systems: Some of the data needed to conduct a thorough analysis must be collected over a period of time and may be quite voluminous. Examples of this type of information include, but are not limited to:

- Applicant flow data for recruitments and selections
- Applicant flow data for career development programs and selections
- Disciplinary actions
- Exit surveys
- Climate survey results
- Performance evaluation data
- Pay comparisons (in pay for performance systems)

Due to the volume of this data, it is strongly recommended that tracking and monitoring systems, preferably automated, be developed as a means to efficiently collect the data. Access to these systems should be strictly limited and the information, e.g., ERI code, handicap code, names, performance ratings, etc., be safeguarded in accordance with the provisions of the Privacy Act. Prior to making a determination that the development of a tracking/monitoring system is needed, EEO practitioners should verify that an existing system is not already in place at the command or DON levels.

II. DATA ORGANIZATION All the data collected through various sources should be assembled and organized so that all the relevant information is available for the next step in the analysis process, i.e., data and trend analyses. Section II provides information on the data and trend analyses steps of the barrier analysis process.

## Excerpt from EEOC MD-715, Section II

### Analyzing Employment Processes

The following is a list of employment processes where barriers typically arise, followed by a list of questions to be answered during a thorough investigation into each process. Agencies should consider this list a minimum starting point and feel free to add to the list of processes and questions, as the need arises.

---

#### Recruitment (See Tables A1, B1, A2, B2, A7, B7, A8, B8)

1. What opportunities are anticipated for external/internal hiring for the agency?
2. What criteria are considered in the development of the agency recruitment plan? With respect to the agency's SES candidacy program and/or succession planning, what criteria are considered?
3. Are disabilities, and targeted disabilities in particular, considered in the plan? If yes, how?
4. What is the applicant rate of persons with disabilities, including individuals with targeted disabilities? Are applications being received at the expected rate?
5. Do present recruitment sources yield the expected rate of qualified applicants of all racial and national origin groups, and both sexes, who meet organizational needs?
6. When were qualification requirements last examined to determine whether they are still current and necessary?
7. Does recruitment literature reflect the agency's desire to reach all segments of the potential workforce? How so?
8. Do/did EEO officials participate in the development of the recruitment plan?
9. Do/did EEO officials provide technical assistance to the personnel office and monitor recruitment efforts?
10. When paid advertising is used for recruitment or institutional purposes, is a wide variety of media with diverse readership included?
11. Does management make itself available to community, civic, and other groups interested in enhancing equal employment opportunity? If yes, how?
12. Does the agency provide opportunities and services to the community such as cooperative education programs and shared use of training facilities?
13. Does the agency participate in community career information programs, conferences, and occupational study projects? Provide examples.
14. Has the agency examined means for expanding worker-trainee placement?

ATTACHMENT 1

15. Do current plans call for maximum participation in the worker-trainee opportunities program, or other such programs, with particular emphasis on the identification of developmental positions?
16. By what methods are applicants invited to apply? If the agency uses an on-line application product, does it comply with the Rehabilitation Act? Was the product reviewed by both the agency's information technology office for technical sufficiency and the agency's legal counsel for legal sufficiency? When?



---

## Hiring and Placement (See Tables A3, B3, A4, B4, A5, B5, A6, B6, A, B7, A8, B8)

1. Are workforce participation rates substantially similar to those rates in the relevant civilian labor force (RCLF)?
2. Where there are variations, in what specific area(s) is the variation occurring (e.g., particular job category, particular grade, particular installation, etc.)?
3. What feeder groups affect the categories identified above? Are those feeder groups substantially similar to the RCLF benchmark? If not, determine where the disparity is occurring. If yes, determine whether a disparity appears between feeder group population and next category.
4. Is the selection process reviewed periodically to ensure equal treatment regardless of race, sex, national origin, disability or EEO participation?
5. Are selection panels used? If so, how is it determined who will serve on the panels?
6. Is the EEO office consulted when it is determined who will serve on a selection panel? Is the EEO office consulted with respect to selections for SES candidacy programs and succession planning?
7. Are selection requirements and procedures job-related and consistent with business necessity? Do they include unnecessary barriers to full utilization of population? If barriers are job-related and consistent with business necessity, can the effect of the barrier be nonetheless minimized ?
8. Are there a substantial number of EEO complaints where non-selection(s) is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (e.g., particular group, supervisor, or installation)? What can be done to address this trend (e.g., train selecting officials, train employees, improve communication of the selection criteria or the application process)?
9. Has the union, the ombudsman, an employee advocacy group, special emphasis group, or any other interested stake holder group expressed concern regarding recent selections? If yes, what were the specific concerns raised and what is the agency's response and plan of action?

---

## Employee Development and Training Opportunities (See Tables A12, B12)

1. What developmental opportunities were made available during the last fiscal year (*i.e.*, training, details, etc.)? Which of these opportunities provided competency experience required for advancement to the SES level?
2. What is the workforce distribution of the participants for identified opportunities for the last fiscal year (grade, occupation, installation, race, sex, national origin, disability)?
3. Were the opportunities provided in the last fiscal year balanced across all parts of the workforce? If not, which group(s) were less utilized than others, and why?
4. How are participants for identified opportunities selected?
5. Is the selection process reviewed periodically to ensure equal treatment regardless of race, sex, national origin or disability?
6. How are training/developmental opportunity selection panels comprised, if at all?
7. Is EEO consulted when training/developmental opportunity selection panels are composed?
8. Are systems for tracking information on employee skills and training in operation?
9. Has a survey of current skills and training of the agency's workforce been conducted to determine the availability of employees from the entire workforce that have skills required to meet agency mission needs?
10. Are efforts being made to ensure that appropriate training and other developmental opportunities are available to employees at all grade levels, including management and executive training, and in all occupational areas, without regard to race, national origin, sex or disability?
11. Are internal selection requirements and procedures for developmental opportunities job-related and consistent with business necessity? Do they include unnecessary barriers to full utilization of skills and training? If barriers are job-related and consistent with business necessity, can the effect of the barrier be minimized?
12. Are there a substantial number of EEO complaints wherein developmental opportunities, such as denial of training or non-selection for a detail, is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend *e.g.*, particular group, supervisor, or installation? What can be done to address this trend (objective criteria, better communication of process and expectations)?
13. Has the union, the ombudsman, an employee advocacy group, special emphasis group, or any other interested stake holder expressed concern regarding the distribution of opportunities? If yes, what were the specific concerns raised and what is the agency's response and plan of action?

---

## Promotions and Other Internal Selections (See Tables A9, B9, A10, B10, A11, B11B)

1. Of the promotions that occurred in the last fiscal year, were the selections reflective of the pool of eligible candidates? Also, if the pool of eligible candidates did not include representatives from particular groups, was consideration given to including external candidates?
2. Where there are variations, in what specific area(s) are the variations occurring (e.g., particular job category, particular grade, particular installation, etc.)?
3. Are variations occurring in management, executive or SES selections? Are such selections meeting the needs of the agency's succession plans?
4. What feeder groups were available for each identified promotion? Are those feeder groups substantially similar to the RCLF benchmark? If not, determine where the disparity is occurring (e.g., recruitment, selection, promotion, etc.). If yes, determine why the disparity appears between feeder group population and promotion selectees.
5. Is the promotion/selection process reviewed periodically to ensure equal treatment regardless of race, sex, national origin, or disability?
6. For career-ladder promotions, is there a difference in time with which one or more groups achieve their full grade potential as compared to other groups (i.e., is the time-in-grade higher for a particular group)?
7. Are employees achieving full performance for their occupation at similar rates with others of different race, national origin, sex or disability?
8. How are promotion selection panels composed when they are used?
9. Is EEO consulted when selection panels are composed?
10. Are internal promotion qualification requirements and procedures job-related and consistent with business necessity? Do they include unnecessary barriers to full utilization of skills and training? If barriers are job-related and consistent with business necessity, can the effect of the barrier be minimized nonetheless?
11. Are there a number of EEO complaints where non-promotion is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (e.g., particular group, supervisor, or installation)? What can be done to address this trend (train selecting officials, train employees, better communication of process and expectations)?

---

## Award Distribution (See Table A13, B13)

1. What is the workforce distribution of award recipients for the last fiscal year (grade, occupation, installation, race, sex, national origin, disability, etc.)?
2. Of the awards given in the last fiscal year, was the rate of success substantially similar for all parts of the population? If not, which group(s) enjoyed less success than others, and why?
3. How are award recipients selected? Are there objective criteria available for selecting officials?
4. Is the awards selection process reviewed periodically to ensure equal treatment regardless of race, religion, sex, national origin, disability or EEO participation?
5. Are award selection panels utilized and, if so, how is it determined who will serve on a panel?
6. Is EEO consulted when award selection panels are composed?
7. Are there a substantial number of EEO complaints where award non-selection is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (e.g., particular group, supervisor, or installation)? What can be done to address this trend (objective criteria, better communication of process and expectations)?
8. Has the union, the ombudsman, an employee advocacy group, special emphasis group, or any other interested stakeholder expressed concern regarding the distribution of awards? If yes, what were the specific concerns raised and what is the agency's response?

---

## Discipline (See Table A14, B14)

1. What is the workforce distribution of discipline, including removal, during the last fiscal year (grade, occupation, installation, race, sex, national origin, disability, EEO participation, types of discipline, etc.)?
2. Of the disciplinary actions based on conduct taken in the last fiscal year, was the rate of receipt substantially similar for all parts of the population? If not, which group(s) received more or harsher discipline than the others, and why?
3. Of the disciplinary actions based on performance taken in the last fiscal year, was the rate of such actions substantially similar for all parts of the population? If not, which group(s) received more or harsher discipline than the others, and why?
4. Where there is a difference in rates based on conduct, does the difference occur at the proposal stage, the implementation stage, or in both (*i.e.*, was one group recommended for disciplinary action at a higher rate than all other groups; is that group's conduct subjected to a higher level of scrutiny; do others engage in similar misconduct without having disciplinary actions proposed or taken against them)?
5. Where there is a difference in rates based on performance, does the difference occur at the proposal stage, the implementation stage, or in both (*i.e.*, did the individuals in the group with higher occurrence rates receive sufficient training, assignments, and supervisory assistance; were they given opportunities to improve compared to opportunities given to other employees; what information can be gleaned from prior performance appraisals; were the recommending decision/performance appraisals based on predetermined objective criteria and/or were they highly subjective; was the affected group held to a higher standard of demonstrated performance than other employees and/or subjected to stricter scrutiny of their work; did performance appraisal and/or recommendation narratives disclose that recommending and/or rating official held stereotyped or otherwise negative views of the affected group)?
6. How are disciplinary actions determined?
7. Are there objective criteria used (*i.e.*, table of offenses with corresponding appropriate discipline)? If disciplinary decisions (type and timing) are left to the discretion of individual supervisors, why?
8. Is the disciplinary table of offenses reviewed periodically to ensure equal treatment regardless of race, religion, sex, national origin, disability or EEO participation (*i.e.*, is there something that typically occurs only at one installation, such that disciplinary action for this issue will have a particularly negative effect on one group)?
9. Is the EEO office consulted when developing or modifying the table of offenses?
10. Are there a substantial number of EEO complaints where discipline, including removal, is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (*i.e.*, particular group, supervisor, or installation)? What can be done to address this trend (objective criteria, better communication of process and expectations)?

11. Has the union, the ombudsman, an employee advocacy group, special emphasis group, or any other interested stake holder expressed concern regarding the rate of discipline for a particular group? If yes, what were the specific concerns raised and what is the agency's response?

---

## Separations (See Tables A14, B14)

1. What is the workforce distribution of separations, including disability retirement, for the last fiscal year (grade, occupation, installation, race, sex, national origin, disability, EEO participation, etc.)?
2. Did a higher percentage of a particular group separate from the agency, or from a particular installation?
3. Were exit interviews conducted? If not, why not? If yes, were any trends identified (e.g., leaving: because of harassment, perceived barriers to advancement for certain groups, for more money, because of atmosphere of agency, because of particular supervisor, for personal reasons, etc.)?
4. Where a trend emerges in the above analysis, what is the agency's response to address the issue now, as well as prevent it from occurring in the future?
5. Are efforts made to ensure that separations are conducted fairly and in a non-discriminatory manner? If yes, what are those efforts?
6. Are reductions-in-force conducted in a non-discriminatory manner? What procedures are in place to ensure this?
7. Are there a substantial number of EEO complaints where constructive discharge is identified as the issue? If yes, is there an identifiable trend (*i.e.*, particular group, supervisor, or installation)? What can be done to address this trend (implementation of EEO policies, managers held accountable for implementing policies, etc.)?
8. Has the union, the ombudsman, an employee advocacy group, special emphasis group, or any other interested stake holder expressed concern regarding the rate of separations for a particular group? If yes, what were the specific concerns raised and what is the agency's response?

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **SECTION 2 DATA AND TREND ANALYSES**

#### **I. DATA ANALYSIS**

A. Purpose: It is important to remember that the end product of collecting, tracking and monitoring the data outlined in Section 1 is not merely to produce a report of these numbers. Rather, the end result of any data analysis is to gather enough information to identify problem areas that may indicate the existence of potential barriers to EEO. Keep in mind that the problem areas identified by an analysis of the data are NOT the barriers to equality of opportunity, but are a symptom of a problem that needs to be addressed.

B. Triggers: Triggers are problem areas that may indicate the existence of a potential barrier to EEO and could be identified by a variety of different methods, e.g., the analysis of data, examination of employment processes, discrimination complaint activity and trends, etc. Triggers serve a red flag that a particular employment process should be investigated further to determine whether or not a barrier exists. Some examples of triggers include:

- Low participation rates for a particular group(s)
- Information revealed as a result of an investigation into an employment process(es), e.g., a particular group(s) is separating from the organization at a significantly higher rate in comparison to their representation rate in the workforce.
- Input from Special Emphasis groups
- Input from union officials, e.g., a high number of grievances have been filed that raise issues about selection procedures.
- Input from employees, to include supervisors and managers
- Input from Human Resources practitioners
- Government reports, e.g., EEOC, GAO, OPM, MSPB, DOL
- Reports in local and national news periodicals
- Applicant flow information
- Discrimination complaints trends

The identification of a potential problem should prompt an investigation into why a situation exists and the initiation of efforts to pinpoint the actual barrier.

#### **C. How to Analyze the Data:**

1. EEOC MD-715 Workforce Data Tables: Utilize these workforce data tables to become familiar with the organization's make-up and composition. Information uncovered by the analysis of this data should not lead to any conclusions without a more in-depth barrier analysis. The following example serves as an illustration of why further analysis to accurately identify a potential barrier is an important and critical step.



a. The data in Table A-1, Total Workforce, indicates that the Relevant Civilian Labor Force (RCLF) for Hispanic males is 20%. Hispanic males represent 3% of the activity's workforce. At first glance, this may appear to be a trigger for a potential barrier.

b. Before a determination that this is indeed a trigger for a potential barrier, a review of the data in Table A-3, Job Categories, should be accomplished. A review of this table indicates that 50% of the activity's workforce is in the professional category. The officials/managers category has the next highest representation of employees in the workforce with 24%. The technician category represents 18% of the workforce and the office and clerical category represents 7%. Lastly, the craft workers, operatives, laborers and service workers collectively represent only 2% of the activity's workforce.

(1) The RCLF for Hispanic males in the professional category is 2.3%. The activity's representation of Hispanic males in this category is 3.4% which is above the RCLF.

(2) The RCLF for the craft workers, operatives, laborers and service workers are 25.8%, 33.2%, 55.4%, and 14.9%, respectively. The surrounding area that is included in the RCLF is predominantly agricultural and/or industrial. Occupations in these fields are not found at this particular activity as validated by a review of its workforce representation in the Table A-3, Job Categories.

(3) Before concluding that this particular trigger does not uncover a potential barrier, a review of the data found in Table A-6, Participation Rates for Major Occupations, should be completed. This review indicates that out of the 5 top major occupations at this activity, 4 are in the professional series, i.e., 0855 Electronics Engineer, 1550 Computer Scientist, 0830 Mechanical Engineer, and 0861 Aerospace Engineer. In order to accurately identify a potential barrier, a more specific CLF should now be used, i.e., a series specific CLF. The comparison with a series specific CLF indicates that Hispanic males represent:

- 4.2% of workforce for the 855 series compared to a series specific CLF of 3.6%;
- 5.5% of the workforce for the 1550 series compared to a series specific CLF of 3.1%;
- 2.5% of the workforce for the 0830 series compared to a series specific CLF of 3.1%; and,
- 4.8% of the workforce compared to a series specific CLF of 4.1%.

Further calculations for the only professional series (0830 series) that shows a low participation rate for Hispanic males (total # of the workforce in series X series CLF% = Y, subtract total # of Hispanic males in that series from Y; the numerical result of this calculation is the number of Hispanic males needed to reach parity) indicate that if the activity hired 1 Hispanic male in this series, they would be at parity. Based on this data

analysis, the trigger of a low participation rate of Hispanic males in the professional category did not uncover a significant problem in this series.

(a) Before we leave this particular example, let's review the last of the top 5 major occupations at this activity. The 2<sup>nd</sup> highest major occupation at this activity is the 0856, Electronic Technician series. Hispanic males represent 4.5% of the workforce in this series compared to a series specific CLF of 14.2%. After executing the formula to determine the actual number of Hispanic males required in this series to reach parity, the delta is 23.

(b) Whether or not this situation uncovers a potential barrier requires yet more information. For example, the following information should be considered:

- The organization is currently in the process of downsizing the number of employees in this particular series through recent VSIP/VERA opportunities;
- A review of the hiring trend for the last 3 years in this series indicates a continuing downward trend in the number of hires.
- The organization's current human capital plan does not identify a need for future hiring in this series.

In view of the information provided above, in this example it is not likely that efforts to pinpoint any specific barriers, for this particular series, would be useful to the organization. Although the organization's future hiring plans did not indicate a need for this series, the activity's analysis efforts and findings should be documented in its annual assessment report.

2. Workforce Analysis: A workforce analysis, utilizing the information in the EEOC MD-715 Workforce Data Tables and any other relevant data, should be completed on an annual basis. It is recommended that this data analysis include an examination of the following:

- The organization's total workforce compared to the relevant CLF.
- The organization's permanent and temporary workforce compared to the relevant CLF.
- The organization's occupations compared to EEOC's nine job categories and the relevant CLF.
- The organization's major occupations compared to a series specific CLF.
- The organization's grade group structure by GS, WG, NSPS, or other demo system compared to the relevant CLF, i.e., the command/activity's total workforce which is further broken down by Ethnicity and Race Identification (ERI) and gender. (The collection of ERI data is authorized under the authority of 42 U.S.C. Section 2000e-16 and in compliance with the Office of Management and Budget's 1997 Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data

on Race and Ethnicity. Employees are requested to provide ERI data on Standard Form 181.)

This analysis, at a minimum, will include a comparison of the organization's workforce by ERI categories, gender and disability.

a. The results of this data analysis will serve as the organization's starting point for further analysis because it will identify any "red flags" or triggers for potential barriers that should be examined.

b. A written summary of the results of an annual workforce analysis will serve as a useful tool to:

- Benchmark progress or lack of progress from one year to the next.
- Conduct appropriate trend analysis.
- Document identified triggers for potential barriers without having to read through voluminous reports.
- Document an organization's analysis efforts.

3. Employment Processes: The data obtained as a result of reviews of the employment processes described in MD-715 should be analyzed in conjunction with the data obtained from the MD-715 workforce data tables and the workforce analysis to identify any potential triggers and to further pinpoint any potential barriers. The following is an example of how this data may be utilized.

a. The workforce data tables and the activity's workforce analysis both indicate a low participation rate of Black males in the 0855, Electronics Engineer, series. The recruitment employment process analysis shows a sufficiently diverse applicant pool and that the recruitment schedule includes Historically Black Colleges and Universities and the National Society of Black Engineers conference. Based on the above, there does not appear to be any apparent potential barriers in the recruitment process.

b. This information should next direct the activity to review its hiring and placement employment process to determine if there is a potential barrier in their hiring practices, policies and/or procedures. Information that may be useful in pinpointing any barriers may include the answers to questions such as:

- What hiring authorities are normally utilized to fill the 0855 positions?
- What specific subcomponent(s) of the organization typically hires in the 0855 series?
- What are the hiring procedures utilized by these subcomponents?
- How are candidates typically referred to the selecting officials?
- What are the factors considered in the hiring process?
- Are positions typically filled at the entry or journey level?

The answers to these questions and any other relevant information should allow the command/activity to determine if a potential barrier exists.

4. Other Relevant Data Sources: Other relevant sources of information include the various stakeholders in the barrier analysis process, government reports, local and national news reports, etc.

a. Input from the various stakeholders, e.g., Special Emphasis groups, union officials, supervisors/managers, employees, HR practitioners, etc. may answer some of the questions that may arise during the analysis process. For example, supervisors and managers may provide information regarding the factors that are considered in filling vacancies, provide information about internal hiring procedures, etc.

b. These same stakeholders may also provide information on other triggers to potential barriers. For example: an employee's observation on how training opportunities are not marketed to all individuals who are similarly situated, a supervisor who questions a policy of hand-picking candidates for developmental assignments, etc.

c. Government and news reports may provide valuable insight into a particular employment situation. For example, OPM issues an annual report to the President on the Employment of Hispanics in the Federal Government. In some instances, these various reports may provide information that is not available from any other source and/or provide answers to questions that cannot be explained at the activity level.

5. How to Use the Available Data: Data obtained from the workforce data tables, workforce analysis, employment processes analyses, stakeholders, government reports, etc. should not be analyzed in a stove pipe fashion. Rather, the totality of all the available data should be analyzed and put in the proper context to narrow and focus barrier identification efforts.

## II. TREND ANALYSIS

A. Baseline for Future Analysis: A trend analysis is a process of documenting baseline information for a particular employment process. This baseline information in turn is then used to compare and monitor changes to the established baseline. For example, an analysis of awards in the \$501 and over category this year indicates that all females, on average, receive a lower dollar amount than their male counterparts. It would be difficult to determine, based on just one year's data, whether or not this is a trigger for a potential barrier. However, a snapshot of this baseline data can be used as a comparison for future award activity for females in the \$501 and over category. If this situation persists over a period of time, it could be considered a trigger for a potential barrier and warrant further analysis.

B. Monitoring Employment Processes for the Identification of Triggers: There are a number of processes that should be monitored over a period of time to determine whether or not the data reveals a trend that warrants further investigation. For example:

- The level of complaint activity involving a particular group and/or a particular employment process over a period of time.
- Hiring statistics for a particular group(s) over a period of time.

- Separation statistics for a particular group(s) over a period of time.
- Career progression for a particular group(s) over a period of time.
- Composition of the supervisory population over a period of time.

As an illustration, if a trend analysis reveals that individuals with targeted disabilities represent the highest percentage of separations for the last 5 years, this situation would warrant further investigation. Does further analysis indicate that members of this group separate at a higher rate in comparison to the rest of the workforce because of the perception they don't receive consideration for developmental assignments, training, promotions, etc? Or, does the analysis indicate that the average age of this group is 57 and nearly all the separations are due to a voluntary retirement action? The data obtained as a result of this analysis will allow a more focused effort for the identification of any potential barrier.

### III. ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

An analysis cannot and should not be conducted in a "cookbook" type approach. In other words, it may not necessarily be a chronological, step-by-step process. Instead, one should follow the "trail" that the information uncovered during an analysis provides. This information will influence and determine the next steps in the analysis process. For example: What does the information uncovered tell you, where does the information lead you, do you need more data or information, what is the purpose of a current policy/practice/procedure, is it needed, why does a situation exist, etc. The answers to these and other questions will lead to the next steps in the analysis process.

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **SECTION 3 BARRIER IDENTIFICATION**

#### **I. HOW TO IDENTIFY A POTENTIAL BARRIER**

##### **A. What to do with Information Uncovered at the Data Analysis Step:**

1. Identification of a Trigger: The data uncovered during the data analysis step could result in the identification of triggers to potential barriers. These triggers should prompt an investigation into why a situation exists in order to pinpoint the actual barrier.

2. Barrier Identification: The identification of a potential barrier requires the investigation into all the possible reasons why the trigger exists. To illustrate this point further, let's look at a possible scenario. In a review of MD-715 Table A-13, Employee Recognition and Awards, the data reveals that all females, on an average, receive a lower dollar award amount in the \$501+ category. The trigger is the lower dollar award amount for females. Is the barrier a practice, policy or procedure that results in females being awarded a lower dollar amount or is there another reason? To pinpoint the actual barrier in this example, the following questions need to be asked and answered as part of the examination process:

- What are the criteria for awards in the \$501+ category?
- If the answer is – grade level determines the award amount, the next question might be what is the average grade level of females compared to males?
- If the answer is – on average females are employed at a much lower grade level than males, the next question might be which series are most typically represented in the higher grade levels?
- If the answer is – those series that represent craft workers, the next question might be what is the representation of females in the craft workers job category?
- If the answer is – they participate at a low rate, the next question might be what does an analysis of hires in the craft worker category indicate?
- If the answer is – females typically represent a small percentage of hires in the craft worker category, the next question might be what is the make-up of the applicant pool?
- If the answer is – females represent a small percentage of the potential applicant pool, the next question might be how does the activity recruit for these positions?
- If the answer is – there is no recruitment plan in place, then we may have pinpointed the actual barrier.

Based on the scenario above, the identified barrier could be, “A recruitment plan that seeks out a diverse pool of applicants for craft workers does not exist.”

a. In this scenario, there should have been multiple triggers identifying this situation as a potential barrier, e.g., low participation rate of females in high grade positions, low participation rate of females in a major occupation, etc.

b. Note that a different answer to any one of the questions listed above could potentially lead to the identification of a different barrier all together. For example, if there was no standard criteria for determining award amounts, that may have been identified as the barrier. It is important to note that this scenario also illustrates what initially began as a potential barrier in the awards process ultimately led to the identification of a barrier in the recruitment process. This scenario demonstrates why conclusions made without further examination could lead to the inaccurate identification of a barrier and a waste of resources by pursuing the wrong objective.

B. Utilize all Available Data: Make sure to utilize all the relevant data at your disposal. In the scenario described in paragraph A.2. above, data from the MD-715 workforce data tables, the awards employment process analysis, hiring trend analysis, applicant flow information, input from stakeholders, etc. was used to identify the relevant questions to be asked, provide responses to the questions that arose, identify other avenues to explore for the identification of potential barriers, etc.

## II. DOCUMENTATION OF AN IDENTIFIED BARRIER

A. DOCUMENTATION OF BARRIER ANALYSIS EFFORTS: The command's/activity's complete barrier analysis efforts should be documented in writing, even if the analysis does not result in the identification of a barrier to EEO, and include the following:

- Sources of information, e.g., EEOC MD-715 workforce data tables, trends analysis, government studies, etc.
- Summary of findings.
- Basis for findings.
- Recommended actions for the elimination of the identified barrier.

This documentation should be maintained as part of the working documents used to support and prepare the command's/activity's Annual EEO Program Status Report. This documentation should also simplify the process of completing EEOC Form 715-01, Part I, EEO Plan to Eliminate Identified Barrier, for the annual assessment report.

B. EEOC FORM 715-01, PART I, EEO PLAN TO ELIMINATE IDENTIFIED BARRIER (BARRIER ELIMINATION PLANS): After the command/activity has analyzed all available source materials, followed clues to pinpoint potential barriers, conducted thorough investigations of these potential barriers, and identified specific barriers, the next step is to plan for improvement by developing overall objectives for barrier elimination, with corresponding action items, identify responsible personnel and target dates. The command/activity plan will be documented on EEOC Form 715-01 Part I (Part I). A blank copy of this form may be found at <http://www.eeoc.gov/federal/715instruct/forms.html>.

1. Timeframe for Completing Barrier Elimination Plans (Part I Forms): As appropriate, Barrier Elimination Plans should be developed and updated over the course of the entire reporting period. Commands/activities have an ongoing obligation to eliminate barriers to equal employment opportunity in the workplace. Therefore, analysis efforts should not be conducted only at the end of the fiscal year. DON policy is to, at a minimum, conduct appropriate data and barrier analysis on data collected through the end of the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter, i.e., 30 June.

2. Format of Barrier Elimination Plans (Part I Forms): The command/activity annual assessment reports should include three separate categories of Barrier Elimination Plans as follows:

(a) Barrier Elimination Plan (Part I) – Command/Activity Accomplishment Report on their Plans reported in the previous fiscal year’s report.

(b) Barrier Elimination Plan (Part I) – Command/Activity EEO Plans to Eliminate Identified Barrier for the upcoming fiscal year.

(c) Barrier Elimination Plan (Part I) – Accomplishment Report on the DON EEO Plans to Eliminate Identified Barrier for the previous fiscal year, as applicable.

The three (3) different categories of Barrier Elimination Plans (Part I) forms should be clearly marked so that they can be easily distinguished.

3. Determining the Appropriate Number of Barrier Elimination Plans: After an analysis of all the relevant data, a listing of potential barriers should be made and the command’s/activity’s most significant problems identified. Depending on the available resources, it may not be feasible to conduct an in-depth barrier analysis into all the potential barriers. It is recommended that each command/activity work and report on no more than 3-5 issues/concerns each fiscal year. These Barrier Elimination Plans should focus on the command’s/activity’s most significant problem areas. An explanation should be provided in the Executive Summary that identifies all potential barriers and explains the basis for those selected.



## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **SECTION 4**

#### **RESPONSIBILITY TO CONTINUALLY ASSESS AND MONITOR EEO PLANS**

I. **A RECAP OF THE BARRIER ANALYSIS PROCESS:** Up to this point in the barrier analysis process, commands/activities should have: established tracking/monitoring systems to collect relevant data, collected the relevant data, performed the appropriate statistical/trend analyses for the purpose of identifying triggers for potential barriers to EEO; identified other sources for triggers for potential barriers to be examined to include the monitoring of employment processes; conducted in-depth investigations/examinations to pinpoint and identify specific barriers; identified specific barriers and developed objectives to eliminate these barriers; and, documented barrier analysis efforts in their EEO plans. It is important to note that a plan is nothing more than a piece of paper if it is not implemented. The process of barrier identification and elimination is a continuous, evolving process as described below.

#### II. **AFTER THE SUBMITTAL OF BARRIER ELIMINATION PLANS (PART I)**

##### A. **Required Actions:**

1. All commands/activities are expected to monitor all the planned activities identified in their respective Plans throughout the reporting period, to ensure completion by the established Target Date. All commands/activities are expected to document accomplishments as they occur to simplify annual assessment reporting requirements. The successful elimination of any identified barriers will typically be attained in incremental steps. Therefore, Plans will identify only those Planned Activities that a command/activity expects to complete within the next reporting cycle. Objectives that represent a long-term effort may be reported as the same Plan for two or three consecutive annual assessment reports. However, the Planned Activities associated with the Objective will likely be different from year to year as incremental milestones are established, completed and/or adjusted. In other words, it is expected that Planned Activities will change from year-to-year, unless some unforeseen event prevents the completion of an Activity.

2. Assess the effectiveness of Planned Activities toward the completion of the stated Objective.

a. If Planned Activities are successful and an Objective is achieved prior to the end of the reporting period, document results and close out the applicable Part I.

b. If at any time during the reporting period it is determined that the Planned Activities do not meet the stated Objective, an adjustment to the Planned Activity(ies) may be required. As soon as it is determined that an adjustment is necessary, the command/activity's explanation of the modification(s) and new actions should be

documented in the Planned Activities Toward Completion of Objective and Report of Accomplishments and Modification to Objective sections of the Barrier Elimination Plan. The following is provided as an example of a situation that might require an adjustment of a Planned Activity(s).

(1) The Objective is to provide a diverse pool of candidates to selecting officials for the 0855 series. One of the Planned Activities is to revise the recruitment schedule to add additional sources that are expected to result in a more diverse pool of candidates.

(2) After implementing recruitment efforts to meet this Objective, an analysis of the applicant pool indicate that the Objective of a diverse pool of candidates has been achieved.

(3) A further analysis to determine whether or not a more diverse pool of candidates positively impacted selection rates in the 0855 series indicated that the desired result had not been achieved.

(4) A further analysis to determine the possible reason(s) why the desired result was not achieved led to the discovery that approximately one-half of the candidates in this more diverse pool of applicants were not appointable.

(5) As a result of this finding, new Planned Activities such as the addition of recruitment sources that are likely to produce appointable candidates or publicizing the requirements for appointment to potential candidates may be added to the command's/activity's Plan.

c. In some cases, additional information obtained during the continuing assessment and/or analysis process may require a modification to the Objective and/or the Statement of Identified Barrier. As soon as it is determined that an adjustment is necessary, the command/activity's explanation of the modification(s) and new actions should be documented in the applicable sections of Part I.

3. If a Plan is completed before the end of the reporting period, the activity's listing of identified potential barriers should be reviewed, a new Plan developed and added to the command/activity's annual assessment plan, if applicable. A new Part I should be identified as such and an explanation provided for its addition.

B. DON EEO Plans: All commands/activities should become familiar with the DON EEO Plans and Objectives. The DON Plans are developed based on a review of all the major command Annual EEO Program Status Report submissions. The barriers identified at the DON level reflect the most common, significant problem areas within the DON. Therefore, it is anticipated that at least one or more of the DON Plans will be relevant to each command/activity.

1. Barrier Analysis: The information needed to conduct in-depth analyses and the ability to eliminate the identified barrier(s), in almost all cases, is only available and possible at the command/activity level. For example, the examination of specific employment practices, policies, procedures, and stakeholder input can only occur at the command/activity level. Likewise, the elimination of identified barriers is a line management responsibility at the command/activity levels as employment-related decisions are typically made at this level, e.g., who is hired, receives training, promotions, etc. Accordingly, the development of accurate DON Barrier Elimination Plans is dependent upon the accomplishment of focused, methodical and thorough barrier analyses efforts at the command/activity levels.

2. Accomplishment Reports: All commands/activities must become familiar with and submit an Accomplishment Report for each DON EEO Plan that is applicable at their respective level. Accomplishment reports should include a concise, complete description of their continuing barrier analysis efforts, noteworthy activities, problems/issues encountered, accomplishments toward the completion of the stated objective, and any other relevant information for DON review and reporting purposes.

### III. PURPOSE OF EEO PLANS

Remember, the purpose of developing EEO Plans is not to simply fulfill a requirement to submit a written report at the end of each year. Rather, it is to attain DON's goal to eliminate identified barriers to equal participation at all levels of the DON workforce and the achievement of a Model EEO Program.

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **SECTION 5**

#### **THE ROLE/RESPONSIBILITIES OF SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAM (SEP) MANAGERS IN BARRIER ANALYSIS**

##### **I. Special Emphasis Programs (SEP):**

A. Definition: Per reference (d), SEPs are defined as programs established as integral parts of the overall EEO program to enhance the employment, training, and advancement of a particular minority group, women, or disabled individuals, e.g., Federal Women's Program, Hispanic Employment Program, People with Disabilities Program, etc.

B. Program Management: SEP Managers are responsible for establishing and maintaining programs that promote the recruitment, hiring, development and training, promotion, award recognition, and retention of a particular group(s). An effective SEP Program will consist of the elements identified below and paragraph II. The recognition of Special Emphasis Program events, e.g., luncheons or cultural events, without these required elements, does not represent a program that is compliant with DON policy and references (d) and (e). Program manager responsibilities include:

1. Developing, coordinating, implementing, and recommending to managers, other officials and covered groups the policy, guidance, information and activities necessary to attain the objectives of the command/activity and the overall DON Civilian EEO Program.
2. Communicating the goals and objectives of the program to enable them to obtain the understanding, support, and commitment of managers and other officials at all levels within the organization.
3. Ensuring program compliance with references (d) and (e)
4. Assisting in the development, implementation, and evaluation of the annual assessment report to ensure inclusion of objectives, as applicable, directed toward the recruitment, employment and advancement of targeted groups.
5. Advising the CDEEOO or DEEOO on matters affecting the employment and advancement of targeted groups.
6. Initiating and maintaining positive contacts with other government agencies and private organizations, such as professional groups, colleges, and universities that are concerned with or have an interest in the employment and career advancement of targeted groups.
7. Preparing and submitting required reports and/or present briefs.

8. Assisting in the counseling of members of targeted groups about career opportunities and encouraging them to participate in self-development and continuing education.

9. Encouraging management to use the Upward Mobility Program and to restructure positions to provide opportunities for employees who are in lower grades or dead-end positions to progress to their highest potential.

10. Increasing management's awareness of the economic advantages of fully using the talents of all employees.

11. Monitoring, evaluating and assisting in the efforts to identify any barriers to the employment of targeted groups.

12. Assisting in the identification, modification or elimination of inappropriate selection criteria that may have an adverse impact on targeted groups.

13. Establishing and maintaining a working committee to collect and disseminate information, sponsor workshops, seminars, and organize and participate in special events for the SEP.

II. Role/Responsibilities of SEP Manager in Barrier Analysis The SEP Manager can serve as a valuable source of information and an additional resource in conducting a more in-depth barrier analysis. The role/responsibility of a SEP Manager in the barrier analysis process includes, but is not limited to:

A. SEP Managers should assist in compiling the data, relevant to their assigned group, that is required as part of the barrier analysis process. SEP Managers may also assist in the review and analysis of data collected (i.e., workforce demographic data, review of employment processes, etc). The collection and review process will enable the SEP Manager to become knowledgeable on the workforce representation of and any employment issues/concerns pertinent to their assigned group.

B. SEP Managers may also be in the unique position of possessing information that may assist in the identification of triggers for potential barriers. Any information that will assist in the identification and elimination of any barriers to equal employment opportunity for a targeted group should be shared with individuals responsible for barrier analysis.

C. Some of the employment issues affecting a particular targeted group may not be significant enough, at an overall organizational level, to warrant the development of an EEO Plan (Part I). In these cases, the SEP Manager should take the following actions:

1. Implement planned activities to ensure the situation does not worsen.

2. Track and monitor the employment issue to determine whether or not the situation worsens to the point a plan objective may be required in a future report.

D. SEP Managers should become familiar with any government reports, local or national news reports, studies, etc., that may provide some insight into any employment issues affecting their assigned group.

E. SEP Managers should become familiar with, track progress of, assess effectiveness of, and/or take the action to complete or assist in the completion of planned activities developed for any applicable plans/objectives (at the activity, command and DON levels) for their assigned group.

F. SEP Managers are responsible for reporting accomplishments, noteworthy activities, and/or submitting recommendations to modify and/or amend any applicable plans/objectives to the assigned Responsible Official for incorporation into the annual assessment report.

G. SEP Managers should work collaboratively with the individuals responsible for conducting barrier analysis.

## **BARRIER ANALYSIS MANUAL**

### **APPENDIX A DEFINITIONS**

Applicant Flow Data: Information reflecting characteristics of the pool of individuals applying for an employment opportunity.

Barrier: A policy, practice or procedure that limits or tends to limit employment opportunities for members of a particular race, gender, ethnic background or because of a disability.

Barrier Analysis: A process that examines relevant data, trends and benchmarks to identify a policy, practice or procedure that limits or tends to limit employment opportunities.

Civilian Labor Force (CLF): Data collected and compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau for persons 16 years of age and over, except those in the armed forces, who are employed or are unemployed and seeking work. This information is to be used as the benchmark to compare and analyze the command/activity workforce as part of the barrier analysis process.

DART: The DON Affirmative Employment Reporting Tool that provides DON workforce demographics, as required by MD-715, in an automated format.

Employment Decision: Any decision affecting the terms and conditions of an individual's employment, including but not limited to hiring, promotion, demotion, disciplinary action and termination.

EEO Plans (Part I): An EEOC MD-715 form utilized as part of the annual assessment process to report an agency's plan to eliminate identified barriers.

Major Occupations: Agency occupations that are mission related and heavily populated, relative to other populations within the agency.

Relevant Civilian Labor Force (RCLF): The source from which an agency draws or Recruits applicants for employment or an internal selection such as a promotion will determine a more precise benchmark to use to compare the command/activity workforce. The identification and use of the correct RCLF is critical to performing an accurate analysis of workforce data, e.g., for major occupations the command/activity must utilize a series specific CLF.

Special Emphasis Program: Programs established as integral parts of the overall EEO program to enhance the employment, training, and advancement of a particular minority group, women, or disabled individuals, e.g., Federal Women's Program, Hispanic

Employment Program, Program for People with Disabilities, Asian/Pacific Islander Employment Program, American Indian/Alaskan Native Employment Program, Black Employment Program.

Trigger: A situation or a ‘red flag’ that indicates the possible existence of a barrier to equal opportunity, e.g., low participation rates identified in the command’s/activity’s workforce demographic profiles (i.e., overall workforce, grade levels, awards, etc.), an unusually high number or recurring complaints that identify concern/issues with a specific employment process (e.g., selections, performance evaluations, etc.).