




MD-715 Elements	INDICATORS	ASSESSMENT	SCORE
Demonstrated Commitment From Agency Leadership	An EEO policy statement is issued annually by agency head.	<i>SI issued an EEO policy statement in FY 2006.</i>	100
	Agency issued a comprehensive anti-harassment policy.	<i>SI issued a comprehensive anti-harassment policy.</i>	100
Integration of EEO Into the Agency's Strategic Mission	EEO is incorporated into agency's human capital strategic plan.	<i>EEO is incorporated in SI's human capital strategic plan.</i>	100
	EEO director reports to agency head.	<i>SI's EEO director reports directly to agency head.</i>	100
	EEO director has regular access to agency head.	<i>SI's EEO director has regular access to agency head and senior level executives.</i>	100
Management and Program Accountability	EEO director briefs agency head and senior level officials on state of EEO.	<i>SI's EEO director did not provide state of the agency briefing to agency head and senior level officials.</i>	0
	Managers and supervisors have measures in their performance plans to evaluate their efforts to ensure equal employment opportunity for all staff.	<i>Performance plans of all managers and supervisors contain element(s) designed to evaluate the efforts made to ensure EEO within the workplace and hold managers accountable for achieving the same.</i>	100
	Reasonable accommodation procedures are posted on the agency's external website.	<i>SI has posted its reasonable accommodation procedures on its external website.</i>	100
Proactive Prevention of Unlawful Discrimination	Applicant flow data is collected to evaluate the agency's recruitment and promotion activities.	<i>SI did not submit applicant flow data on Tables A/B 7, 9, 11, and 12.</i>	0
	Agency set numerical goal for hiring people with targeted disabilities.	<i>SI did not establish a numerical goal for hiring people with targeted disabilities.</i>	0
	Agency met the government high for participation rate of employees with targeted disabilities.	<i>SI's participation rate of employees with targeted disabilities (0.65%) was 27.43% of the federal high (2.37%).</i>	27
Efficiency	Timeliness of EEO counselings.	<i>SI's rate of timely completing EEO counseling was 100%.</i>	100
	Timeliness of EEO investigations.	<i>SI's rate of timely completing EEO investigations was 100%.</i>	100
	Timeliness of merit decisions on EEO complaints without an administrative judge's decision.	<i>SI's rate of timely issuing final agency decisions on the merits was 100%.</i>	100
	Use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) program.	<i>SI's ADR offer rate during the pre-complaint stage of the EEO process was 100%.</i>	100
	Resolution of EEO counselings.	<i>SI resolved 45.45% of EEO counselings at the pre-complaint stage.</i>	45
Responsiveness and Legal Compliance	Timeliness of submitting complaint files for the hearing.	<i>At the hearing stage, SI submitted its complaint files to EEOC in an average of 11 days.</i>	100
	Timeliness of submitting complaint files on appeal.	<i>At the appellate stage, SI submitted its complaint files to EEOC in an average of 12 days.</i>	100
	Timeliness of 462 report submission.	<i>SI submitted its 462 report to EEOC by October 31<sup>st</sup>, or within the extended time frames granted.</i>	100
	Timeliness of MD-715 report submission.	<i>SI submitted its MD-715 report to EEOC by January 31<sup>st</sup>, or within the extended time frames granted.</i>	100
All	<b>Total Weighted Score: 929 out of 1200. (See Glossary for Weighted Score Formula)</b>		

**Smithsonian Institution (SI) - FY 2006  
EEO Program Outcome Indicators**


**Participation Rate of People with Targeted  
Disabilities in SI's Total Workforce**



**Office of Personnel Management FY 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey  
SI's Responses to Selected Questions**

- Q. 34 – Policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace (for example, recruiting minorities and women, training in awareness of diversity issues, mentoring)**
- Q. 35 – Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of diverse backgrounds (SI Q. 49)**
- Q. 43 – Complaints, disputes or grievances are resolved fairly in my work unit**
- Q. 45 – Prohibited personnel practices (for example, illegally discriminating for or against any employee/applicant, obstructing a person's right to compete for employment, knowingly violating veterans' preference requirements) are not tolerated**
- Q. 46 – I can disclose a suspected violation of any law, rule or regulation without fear of reprisal**

In comparing SI to the government-wide average, the chart below identifies the percentage of employees who answered "strongly agree" or "agree" to the above questions.



**Smithsonian Institution (SI) - FY 2006  
EEO Program Outcome Indicators**

**Analysis of Total Workforce, Major Occupations, and Odds Ratio for the Senior Grade Levels**

EEO Groups	2000 Civilian Labor Force (CLF)	FY 2006 Agency Partic. Rate in TWF	Major Occupations						Odds Ratio Analysis of Senior Grade Levels			
			Museum Specialist		Curators		Exhibits Specialist		Promotion Grade	Current Grade	Odds Ratio	Odds
			Occ. CLF	Partic. Rate	Occ. CLF	Partic. Rate	Occ. CLF	Partic. Rate				
<b>Male</b>	53.23%	51.75%	40.1%	48.1%	40.7%	48.4%	44.6%	83.5%	SES	GS-15	0.60	<
									SES	GS-14/15	0.82	<
									GS-15	GS-14	1.71	>
<b>Female</b>	46.77%	48.24%	60.5%	51.9%	59.3%	51.6%	55.5%	16.5%	SES	GS-15	1.65	>
									SES	GS-14/15	1.21	>
									GS-15	GS-14	0.58	<
<b>Hispanic/Latino Male</b>	6.17%	2.81%	1.2%	1.0%	1.5%	1.3%	3.5%	1.9%	SES	GS-15	0.79	<
									SES	GS-14/15	1.22	>
									GS-15	GS-14	2.58	>
<b>Hispanic/Latino Female</b>	4.52%	2.08%	2.1%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	3.4%	1.0%	SES	GS-15	3.26	>
									SES	GS-14/15	2.46	>
									GS-15	GS-14	0.63	<
<b>White Male</b>	39.03%	30.02%	29.7%	43.1%	34.7%	44.5%	35.8%	65.0%	SES	GS-15	0.65	<
									SES	GS-14/15	0.89	<
									GS-15	GS-14	1.73	>
<b>White Female</b>	33.74%	28.03%	46.1%	42.8%	51.1%	42.6%	46.7%	11.7%	SES	GS-15	1.56	>
									SES	GS-14/15	1.22	>
									GS-15	GS-14	0.65	<
<b>Black/African-American Male</b>	4.84%	16.19%	7.6%	3.0%	2.9%	0.6%	1.8%	13.6%	SES	GS-15	0.85	<
									SES	GS-14/15	0.38	<
									GS-15	GS-14	0.30	<
<b>Black/African-American Female</b>	5.66%	14.07%	7.2%	3.4%	2.7%	5.8%	1.7%	2.9%	SES	GS-15	1.29	>
									SES	GS-14/15	0.88	<
									GS-15	GS-14	0.54	<
<b>Asian Male</b>	1.92%	2.00%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	1.3%	2.7%	2.9%	SES	GS-15	1.07	>
									SES	GS-14/15	0.68	<
									GS-15	GS-14	0.49	<
<b>Asian Female</b>	1.71%	2.94%	3.5%	1.3%	1.9%	0.6%	2.8%	1.0%	SES	GS-15	1.94	>
									SES	GS-14/15	0.87	<
									GS-15	GS-14	0.31	<
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Male</b>	0.06%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	NA	NA
									SES	GS-14/15	NA	NA
									GS-15	GS-14	NA	NA
<b>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander Female</b>	0.05%	0.00%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	NA	NA
									SES	GS-14/15	NA	NA
									GS-15	GS-14	NA	NA
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native Male</b>	0.34%	0.71%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	0.96	<
									SES	GS-14/15	1.76	>
									GS-15	GS-14	5.14	>
<b>American Indian/Alaska Native Female</b>	0.32%	1.09%	1.4%	2.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.4%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	0.00	<
									SES	GS-14/15	0.00	<
									GS-15	GS-14	2.55	>
<b>2 or More Races Male</b>	0.88%	0.00%	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	NA	NA
									SES	GS-14/15	NA	NA
									GS-15	GS-14	NA	NA
<b>2 or More Races Female</b>	0.76%	0.00%	0.2%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	SES	GS-15	NA	NA
									SES	GS-14/15	NA	NA
									GS-15	GS-14	NA	NA
<b>People with Targeted Disabilities</b>	NA	0.65%	NA	0.0%	NA	1.30%	NA	1.90%				

\*Odds ratio analysis is shown only for race, gender, and ethnicity. Promotion analysis for people with targeted disabilities (PWTD) was deemed inappropriate given the dearth of such persons in the federal workforce.

**Smithsonian Institution (SI) - FY 2006**  
**Glossary**

**Comprehensive Anti-Harassment Policy:**

A comprehensive anti-harassment policy addresses all EEO bases.

**DNF:**

The agency did not file a FY 2006 MD-715 report with EEOC.

**Federal Human Capital Survey:**

The Federal Human Capital Survey is a tool that measures employees' perceptions of whether, and to what extent, conditions characterizing successful organizations are present in their agencies. The survey was first conducted in 2002, which set a baseline for ongoing assessment in the federal government. The survey was conducted again in 2004 and 2006. The goals of the survey include (1) providing general indicators of how well the federal government is running its human resources management systems; (2) serving as a tool for OPM to assess individual agencies and their progress toward "green" status on strategic management of human capital under the President's Management Agenda; and (3) giving senior managers critical information to answer the question of "what can I do to make my agency work better".

**NA:**

Not applicable.

**NRF**

Not required to file.

**Occ. CLF:**

The U.S. Census Bureau defines the Civilian Labor Force (CLF) as all non-institutionalized civilians 16 and older who are either working or looking for work. The 2000 Census includes over 31,000 occupation titles based upon how individuals reported their type of work. The occupational CLF provides a participation rate for each EEO group's employment in particular occupations.

**Odds Ratio:**

Odds ratio is a method of comparing whether the probability of a certain event is the same for two groups. Each EEO group is compared to the rest of the agency workforce and the event measured is promotion to GS-15 or SES. An odds ratio of 1 implies that a promotion is equally likely. An odds ratio greater than 1 implies that a member of the EEO group is more likely to be promoted than an employee in the rest of the workforce. An odds ratio less than 1 implies that a member of the EEO group is less likely to be promoted than an employee in the rest of the workforce. Odds ratio analysis is shown only for race, gender, and ethnicity. Promotion analysis for people with targeted disabilities was deemed inappropriate given the dearth of such persons in the federal workforce.

**Odds Ratio Formulas:**

$$\frac{\text{EEO Group SES} \times (\text{Total 15} - \text{EEO Group 15})}{(\text{Total SES} - \text{EEO Group SES}) \times \text{EEO Group 15}}$$

$$\frac{\text{EEO Group SES} \times (\text{Total 15\&14} - \text{EEO Group 15\&14})}{(\text{Total SES} - \text{EEO Group SES}) \times \text{EEO Group 15\&14}}$$

$$\frac{\text{EEO Group 15} \times (\text{Total 14} - \text{EEO Group 14})}{(\text{Total 15} - \text{EEO Group 15}) \times \text{EEO Group 14}}$$

**Odds Ratio Scoring:**

Odds > means the ratio is above 1

Odds < means the ratio is below 1

Odds = means the ratio is 1

**Partic. Rate:**

Participation Rate is the percentage of the total workforce represented by the particular group.

**Raw Score for Indicators Evaluating Average Days in the EEO Program Activities:**

The raw score for indicators evaluating the average days to submit complaint files at the hearing and appellate stages is calculated as follows:  $[100 \text{ minus } \{( \text{the average days for EEOC to receive the agency's complaint files minus (the regulatory required time frame plus five days for mailing)) \text{ multiplied by two} \}]$ . For example, if EEOC received the complaint files from an agency in an average of 47 days at the appellate stage, which is after the 30 day time frame, the raw score would be 76  $[100 \text{ minus } \{(47 \text{ minus } (30 \text{ plus } 5)) \text{ multiplied by } 2\}]$ .

**Resolution Rate:**

Resolution rate is the percentage of EEO counselings that are resolved by either settlement or withdrawal from the EEO process during the pre-complaint stage.

**Weighted Score of the EEO Program Activities Indicators:**

Each of the MD-715 six essential elements is weighted equally at 200 total points per element, resulting in a maximum weighted score of 1200 points. Because some of the elements have a raw score that exceeds 200 points, the raw score is converted to a weighted score by using the following formula:  $(\text{agency's raw score for that element multiplied by } 200) \text{ divided by the maximum raw score for that element}$ . For example, if the agency has a raw score of 345 in the Efficiency element out of a maximum raw score of 500, the weighted score would be 138  $[(345 \text{ multiplied by } 200) \text{ divided by } 500]$ .

**TWF:**

The total workforce is a snapshot of the agency's employees on Sept 30, 2006, as reported by the agency in its MD-715 workforce data table A-1.