

# 2009 USAID Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey Results and Analysis

Developed for:



**U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)**

Developed by:



ICF International  
Fairfax, VA



Under Contract OPM-07-00030

**U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Training and Management Assistance Development Division**

OPM Project Code: 02EA3TT863  
OPM Work Order: 3300158  
OPM Purchase Order: TO-0208008246  
Project Title: USAID Diversity Study  
Final Original: July 28, 2009

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. In your view, does USAID value diversity? .....	6
2. USAID embodies your vision of diverse workforce. ....	8
3. Does USAID demonstrate a commitment to achieving a diverse workforce?.....	11
4. USAID promotes an atmosphere that treats people fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect. ....	13
5. Does USAID have enough policies in place to ensure people are treated fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect?.....	16
6. Do you feel that USAID provides all families at posts with equitable treatment including, but not limited to, compound passes, assistance in obtaining visas and work permits, and inclusion in official invitations? .....	18
7. Within the last year, have you ever felt unfairly treated at USAID because of factors related to race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics that reflect differences? .....	20
8. USAID's culture and climate encourage a workplace conducive to diversity and inclusiveness.....	22
9. Employees of different backgrounds interact well at USAID.....	24
10. USAID senior management/leadership is comfortable and respectful interacting with USAID personnel of diverse backgrounds. ....	27
11. Management is held accountable for seeking to ensure a respectful, diverse workplace.	29
12. What do you perceive to be obstacles to achieving diversity objectives at USAID? (check all that apply).....	32
13. The rewards managers give are fair and equitable and based on merit. ....	35
14. In the past year, my USAID immediate supervisor(s) have played a supportive role in my career development. ....	37
15. In the past year, non-immediate supervisors at USAID have played a supportive role in your career development. ....	39

16. Is career mobility and advancement handled objectively and transparently? .....	42
17. Do you understand what criteria are being used in evaluating your performance and considering your candidacy for advancement? .....	44
18. Are the criteria being used in evaluating employee performance and advancement being applied fairly and equitably? .....	45
19. Do you perceive that employees of different backgrounds occupy a representative proportion of higher-level positions? .....	47
20. What do you perceive as internal challenges to career mobility and advancement? .....	48
21. Do you feel there is a sufficient/insufficient amount of USAID training and development opportunities to support your career development? .....	51
22. USAID career development training is made available fairly and equitably. ....	52
23. Do you see a positive connection between workforce diversity and organizational performance? .....	54
24. Are you aware of new diversity initiatives being conducted by the Agency? .....	55
25. Are you aware of the USAID Diversity website available on the USAID intranet? .....	56
26. Are you aware of the Agency's Diversity Profile? .....	58
27. Are you aware of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and do you think USAID management is cognizant of their responsibilities pertaining to this legislation? .....	59
28. Are you aware that valuing diversity is an Agency core value? .....	60
29. Are you aware of the existence of the Agency's Executive Diversity Council? .....	60
30. Are you aware of recent revisions to the Member of Household policy as it pertains to security training, Emergency Visitation Travel, FAST language courses, distance learning training including Rosetta Stone, and a course for Iraq-bound employees? .....	61
31. Do you feel that lack of benefits for same sex partners and lack of a non-discrimination policy that includes gender identity/expression affects the Agency's ability to recruit and retain lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) employees and maintain morale? .....	62
32. Are you aware of USAID's targeted recruitment program for Civil Service and Foreign Service? .....	64
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>65</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 2009 the Executive Diversity Council administered a Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey to all USAID employees, designed to measure workforce perceptions and guide the Agency as it works to advance diversity and inclusiveness throughout the Agency. Analysis of the 2009 survey results indicate that overall, while the Council and the Agency have achieved a number of significant advances, at the same time, it is evident that a prolonged period of transition, and the departure of a number of strong senior advocates for the Agency's diversity initiatives, has resulted in a number of setbacks to the Agency's efforts to serve as a model Agency for advancing diversity and inclusiveness. In addition to measuring workforce perceptions, the Survey highlights areas for renewed focus as the Agency and the Executive Diversity Council chart a path forward to regaining positive momentum in advancing diversity and inclusiveness. A number of areas were identified as in need of heightened attention going forward.

- ***To leverage the effectiveness of its existing policies and programs, the Agency must implement an aggressive communication and outreach strategy, reaching out to all Agency employees. In March 2008 a comprehensive Communication and Outreach Strategy was developed. Subsequent turnover prevented full-scale implementation of this strategy. While the period from 2007 to 2009 did see a 16% increase in employee awareness of the Agency's new diversity initiatives, 61% of the Agency's workforce remain unaware of these initiatives. Communication efforts are critical to broadening the impact of any programs and the Council must take the steps necessary to get the message out. It is only through aggressive communication and outreach that the Agency's diversity initiatives can be utilized to optimum effect throughout the Agency.***
- ***The Agency must ensure that diversity and inclusiveness extend to all employees, independent of employment category. All employees must be treated fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect, their contributions valued, and to the maximum extent possible, opportunities for career growth, advancement and employee benefits must be made available transparently and equitably. While many of the divisions and demarcations underlying USAID's various employment categories are based on legal necessity, where differences are necessary, or the Agency finds itself operating within constraints outside of its control, proactive outreach efforts must be put forth designed to enhance employee understanding of the bases surrounding different employment categories and addressing perceived inequities.***
- ***Senior leaders, managers and supervisors must lead by example, and ultimately be held accountable for fostering a diverse workforce and a workplace conducive to diversity and inclusiveness. Managers and supervisors must be rewarded for good supervision and management, and any failure to support the Agency's initiatives must be addressed. It is only through modeled behavior and active implementation of the Agency's policies and programs that true gains can be realized.***

Certain activities demand a long-term and sustained commitment. Gains can be slow to realize, but quick to dissipate, if a long-term and focused commitment is not put forth. A workforce and workplace conducive to diversity and inclusiveness is one of them. To solidify and build upon its achievements, new champions must step forward and the Agency must renew its commitment to diversity and inclusiveness, building upon its foundation of valuing employees and their inherent diversity, and in the process, positioning the Agency to serve as a model organization, incorporating and capitalizing upon the vast resources inherent in a diverse workforce.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2004 USAID administered a Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey probing workforce perceptions regarding diversity and inclusiveness within the Agency. As a result of those findings, in March 2005 the Executive Diversity Council was formed and charged with leading the initiative to improve diversity within the Agency, working to identify resources and keep the goal of a diverse workplace alive within the Agency at an executive level. In June 2007 the Diversity Council administered a more extensive survey designed to measure progress made since 2004. The results of the 2007 survey were instrumental in informing the Council's activities over the course of the next two years.

2007 through 2009 was a period that saw significant turnover within the leadership ranks of USAID. Against this backdrop, the Council has strove to ensure a commitment to diversity and inclusiveness remains active at the executive level, and that the Agency continues to build on the advances of 2004 to 2007. In May 2009 the Agency administered a follow-up survey to gauge progress made to date and to guide its efforts going forward. This report serves to provide an analysis of the 2009 Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey results, measuring workforce perceptions and identifying progress made as compared to the 2007 survey, considering potential differences in perception within the Civil and Foreign Services, Foreign Service Limited staff, Foreign Service Nationals, U.S. Personal Services Contractors and Institutional Contractors, as well as potential differences by gender, race/ethnicity and employees with disabilities. It is important to note that while there are legal requirements for affirmative action and diversity, the Agency, and the Executive Diversity Council, have embraced a very broad and inclusive vision of diversity, extending well beyond mere compliance, but working to serve as a model Agency for advancing diversity and inclusiveness.

The 2009 Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey included 32 total questions, of which 26 had been previously asked in 2007. Six additional questions were added to the survey by the Executive Diversity Council with the aim of establishing a baseline against which progress could be measured in subsequent years' surveys. The 2009 survey was administered to all 9,000 USAID employees (including CS, FS, FSL, FSN, USPSC, Institutional Contractors, etc). Over 570 responses were received. While we have to recognize that due to a number of extenuating circumstances, the overall response rate to the 2009 survey declined relative to 2007, this further reinforces the need for enhanced communication and outreach activities going forward. This report serves to highlight specific areas of progress made between 2007 and 2009 (illuminated in green), as well as to identify those areas demanding enhanced attention by the Executive Diversity Council as progress remains to be made (illuminated in yellow). Those items illuminated in green do not necessarily indicate that the Agency has arrived at the level to which it strives, but rather indicate significant progress made. The 2009 survey also included a section allowing respondents to provide written comments expanding upon their answers. Many of these representative comments have been included.

The 2009 survey proves invaluable not only in measuring progress-to-date and in identifying those areas demanding renewed attention by the Council, but in so doing, can serve to shape the Executive Diversity Council's future activities, building on a strong foundation and working to ensure future successes. The Agency must build on these successes, demonstrating that its commitment is a sustained and long-term one, where diversity is exemplified as an Agency core value and managed to optimal effect.

## FINDINGS

### 1. In your view, does USAID value diversity?

In 2009, relative to 2007, in the aggregate, the Agency held steady, without seeing significant improvements or deterioration in workforce perceptions. There were some changes in relative distribution. Specifically, over the course of the Council's 24 months of operation from 2007 to 2009, workforce perceptions improved by 11% within the Civil Service, and 5% within the Foreign Service, while witnessing a decline of 8% amongst FSNs. There was not much significant change amongst men and women, white, and black or African American employees, but a decline of 3% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. There was an improvement of 11% amongst Asian American employees, and 7% amongst employees with disabilities. Qualitative input received through survey comments focused on a need to better address the needs of same-sex partners, and the over-arching perception that there is a disconnect between agency rhetoric and its actions.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	84%	84%	87%	79%	85%	85%	90%	76%
No	16%	16%	13%	21%	15%	15%	10%	24%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	85%	73%	82%	81%	93%	86%	88%	85%
No	15%	27%	18%	19%	7%	14%	12%	15%

2004	All	CS	FS
Yes	73%	65%	79%
No	27%	35%	21%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	84%	89%	82%
No	16%	11%	18%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	85%	88%	82%
No	15%	12%	18%

2004	All	Male	Female
Yes	73%	84%	61%
No	27%	16%	39%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	84%	90%	75%	77%	91%	77%	79%
No	16%	10%	25%	23%	9%	23%	21%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	85%	89%	74%	80%	80%	88%	79%
No	15%	11%	26%	20%	20%	13%	21%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	73%	77%	61%
No	27%	23%	39%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	84%	89%
No	16%	11%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	85%	82%
No	15%	18%

### Survey Comments

- *USAID has been and continues to be a strong leader in valuing diversity. The Agency actively recruits, grooms and promotes a strongly diverse workforce. I have never felt that I have been denied an assignment, opportunity or promotion as a result of being a gay member of the USAID Foreign Service. That said, the lack of legal recognition of same sex partners, as well as weak MOH policies at post, is a noted blemish for all members of the Foreign Service.*
- *A lack of equality for same sex partners of foreign service officers, especially non-US citizen partners, continues to be a major problem for USAID, as it sends the message that only traditional families (opposite sex partners) are valued. I fear that the Agency will lose incredibly talented foreign service officers if it does not allow GLBT individuals to have both a career and family life, as straight foreign service officers are able to do. Current Agency policies place undue emotional and financial hardship on GLBT couples that place them at a severe disadvantage when compared to their straight Foreign Service colleagues whose families are treated with respect and provided with a laundry list of benefits unavailable to GLBT individuals.*
- *While USAID management may say they value diversity, I don't see any concrete steps being taken to do so. For example, I was encouraged to see that the Agency General Notices included an announcement of a leadership course supporting diverse groups at the Aspen Institute, but was discouraged when I noticed the announcement was sent a week before the application due date. As a person of color, I would like to see more opportunities like this announced, but in a timely manner so people are actually able to take advantage.*

## 2. USAID embodies your vision of diverse workforce.

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall deterioration in workforce perceptions as the percent that agreed or strongly agreed that USAID embodies their vision of a diverse workforce decreased from 76% to 72%. Specific declines in perceptions included a 9% decline amongst FSN employees, 3% amongst male employees, 5% amongst female employees, 6% amongst white employees, and 11% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. There were some areas of improvement, however, including a 6% improvement within the Civil Service, 7% amongst Asian Americans, and 9% amongst employees with disabilities. The qualitative input received via survey comments focused on the need for diversity of thought, religion, and sexual orientation, as well as ensuring cultural sensitivity for host countries, and that diversity permeates all levels of the Agency.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	7%	9%	7%	6%	1%	8%	0%	8%
Disagree	21%	21%	23%	33%	20%	19%	13%	19%
Agree	56%	54%	51%	56%	70%	54%	61%	54%
Strongly Agree	16%	16%	18%	6%	8%	19%	26%	19%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	6%	9%	7%	9%	3%	7%	4%	13%
Disagree	18%	26%	23%	25%	9%	16%	16%	14%
Agree	64%	52%	56%	58%	77%	61%	66%	65%
Strongly Agree	12%	12%	13%	8%	11%	16%	14%	7%

2004	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	11%	15%	8%
Disagree	21%	25%	19%
Agree	53%	38%	63%
Strongly Agree	15%	23%	10%

2009	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	7%	7%	5%
Disagree	21%	15%	27%
Agree	56%	57%	56%
Strongly Agree	16%	21%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	6%	7%	6%
Disagree	18%	12%	22%
Agree	64%	66%	63%
Strongly Agree	12%	15%	9%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	11%	9%	14%
Disagree	21%	23%	20%
Agree	53%	52%	52%
Strongly Agree	15%	16%	14%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	7%	5%	9%	10%	10%	4%	8%
Disagree	21%	21%	23%	29%	20%	25%	25%
Agree	56%	56%	56%	49%	59%	55%	54%
Strongly Agree	16%	19%	12%	12%	12%	16%	13%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	6%	5%	9%	3%	11%	4%	7%
Disagree	18%	15%	23%	26%	25%	12%	21%
Agree	64%	65%	61%	63%	48%	70%	62%
Strongly Agree	12%	14%	6%	9%	16%	14%	10%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	11%	11%	12%
Disagree	21%	19%	28%
Agree	53%	54%	48%
Strongly Agree	15%	16%	12%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	7%	4%
Disagree	21%	11%
Agree	56%	75%
Strongly Agree	16%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	6%	9%
Disagree	18%	15%
Agree	64%	65%
Strongly Agree	12%	12%

## Survey Comments

- *While there may be a variety of sexes and colors within USAID, everyone has to fit a specific mold of government bureaucrat in order to be taken seriously. The Agency does not respect, or only pays lip service to, diversity of opinion in meetings and other fora. People who do not fit the mold and are not comfortable conforming to the mold suffer. You can hire as many representatives of diverse groups as possible, but if we're not all respected equitably we suffer as an agency whose core value should be about understanding diverse opinions not about co-opting diverse values.*
- *USAID has a diverse workforce simply because it employs people from all the countries where it has Missions. There is no point in trying to imagine what the workforce would be otherwise. I think it is especially important for USAID American employees who work abroad to have and demonstrate respect for the countries they are hosted by, their cultures, customs and very particularly their people.*
- *The GS/FS divide keeps this Agency from fully embracing diversity. The reality is for a variety of reasons, it is harder for a woman to be in the FS. We are much more likely than men to have the responsibility to care for elderly parents and so can't go overseas. We are more likely to be primary caretakers of children and in the event of divorce, it means that if we go overseas, we can lose custody of our children. Single parents are also not recognized as part of diversity unlike many other USG agencies.*
- *After attending the Agency's required EEO training and listening to the head of our EOP office -- as well as my interaction with that unit on hiring decisions, I feel that the agency's diversity agenda is too closely linked to race/ethnicity and not enough to other factors of diversity. There appears to be pressure to hire candidates from groups deemed "underrepresented" in the individual unit, regardless of how that affects overall numbers; or to hire people from certain racial groups rather than people with diverse religious, age, cultural, gender, etc. differences.*
- *The Agency needs to emphasize the gay, lesbian, and transgender component. Although it is mentioned occasionally, it is not emphasized to the extent that other diversity programs are throughout the Agency. Outreach, recruitment efforts, and more programs sponsored for the cause would improve the current state of affairs.*
- *The Agency lacks initiatives to diversify the workforce based on other self-identified characteristics including religious and spiritual identity. This is a huge problem considering the diverse countries USAID works in and the importance of religion and spirituality in those environments. Also, USAID lacks a quiet space for people to pray, meditate, and de-stress. USAID has some serious work-life balance issues in addition to stress issues and this can give a space for employees to quietly get away and reflect in addition to supporting religious and spiritual diversity and accommodation. Using your cube is not a vital option and provides no privacy. This is the same for the EOP space that has been made available at times to employees. It requires employees to ring a doorbell, is sometimes occupied by other meetings, and thereby makes employees feel unwelcome.*
- *The definition of diversity should be properly expanded to include religious equity in recruitment and benefits. HR should post vacancy announcements to Muslim Students Associations at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Muslim employees should have a dedicated prayer room for the mandatory mid-day prayers.*
- *I would like to see more attention explicitly paid to religious diversity and accommodations for religious practice.*
- *While a number of different racial/ethnic groups are represented at USAID, the majority of minority group employees are employed in lower level civil service positions in specific offices, such as HR, whereas the majority of foreign service and senior foreign service officers are of Caucasian descent.*

*I think that through the DLI program, USAID has been actively recruiting more minority Foreign Service officers, which is a big improvement for the Foreign Service.*

- *There is an imbalance of diversity as you move up the grade and technical ladder. While gender diversity is decently balanced, racial diversity is not. Technical positions are overwhelmingly white; administrative positions are overwhelmingly black.*
- *I am concerned about ensuring diversity in the Missions where we work. Often, on account of historical inequities, we may lack adequate representation of disadvantaged ethnic groups in our foreign national personnel and to my knowledge, there is no clear policy or initiatives for addressing this problem.*
- *The Agency has come a long way towards making the work place more diverse. I believe we have a ways to go, but feel strongly that we will get there. When management is more diverse, then and only then, will employees feel better about their working environment.*

### 3. Does USAID demonstrate a commitment to achieving a diverse workforce?

In 2009, relative to 2007, in the aggregate, little significant change was noted when asked whether USAID demonstrates a commitment to achieving a diverse workforce. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements within both the Civil Service and Foreign Service of 17% and 11% respectively, 4% amongst male employees, improvements amongst white, black or African American, and Asian American employees of 5%, 3% and 10% respectively, and 3% amongst employees with disabilities. Balancing these gains out, however, there were a number of declines in workforce perceptions, including declines of 22% amongst FSNs, 2% amongst female employees, and 10% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments emphasized a concern over whether the Agency's actions were consistent with its rhetorical support for diversity.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	60%	66%	72%	47%	48%	51%	55%	48%
No	16%	16%	15%	6%	16%	23%	6%	11%
Don't know	24%	20%	13%	47%	35%	26%	39%	41%
<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	59%	49%	61%	55%	70%	60%	49%	51%
No	15%	24%	21%	19%	9%	10%	10%	13%
Don't know	25%	27%	17%	26%	21%	30%	41%	36%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Yes	61%	54%	67%
No	20%	27%	15%
Don't know	19%	20%	19%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	60%	70%	52%
No	16%	11%	20%
Don't know	24%	19%	28%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	59%	66%	54%
No	15%	13%	18%
Don't know	25%	22%	28%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	61%	75%	47%
No	20%	16%	24%
Don't know	19%	9%	29%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	60%	67%	56%	46%	61%	48%	53%
No	16%	12%	21%	28%	12%	12%	19%
Don't know	24%	21%	23%	26%	27%	40%	28%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	59%	62%	53%	56%	51%	64%	56%
No	15%	11%	23%	22%	19%	11%	19%
Don't know	25%	27%	25%	22%	30%	26%	25%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	61%	65%	52%
No	20%	14%	36%
Don't know	19%	21%	12%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	60%	62%
No	16%	15%
Don't know	24%	23%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	59%	59%
No	15%	9%
Don't know	25%	32%

### Survey Comments

- *USAID is fortunate to attract a more diverse pool of candidates than most federal agencies including people with a propensity to appreciate the value of diversity. That said, senior Agency leadership is trapped in a colloquial vision of diversity that, with few exceptions, does not model the behavior of an agency interested in promoting organizational change through increased diversity. Racial politics pervade and dominate the diversity agenda.*
- *The rhetoric is there, but implementation is difficult. For instance, although USAID claims to be family friendly, I have not experienced this.*
- *Too much emphasis is being placed on being a minority. Decisions are no longer based on merit.*

### 4. USAID promotes an atmosphere that treats people fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect.

The period from 2007 to 2009 saw an overall decline in workforce perceptions as the percent that agreed or strongly agreed that USAID promotes an atmosphere that treats people fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect decreased from 77% to 72%. Specific declines in perceptions included a 2% decline amongst FS employees, 13% amongst FSNs, 7% amongst female employees, 4% amongst white employees, 4% amongst black or African American employees, and 15% amongst employees with disabilities. There were some limited areas of improvement, however, including a 2% improvement within the Civil Service. Qualitative input received via survey comments emphasized perceived instances of reverse discrimination, as well as concerns over the potential that the Agency's diversity efforts were an obstacle to maintaining technical leadership. Additional concerns were noted regarding age discrimination as pertains to the requirement for FSOs to retire at 65.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	7%	8%	6%	16%	6%	4%	10%	4%
Disagree	20%	19%	21%	16%	26%	15%	16%	15%
Agree	56%	53%	59%	53%	54%	65%	55%	65%
Strongly Agree	16%	20%	15%	16%	14%	15%	19%	15%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	6%	9%	6%	6%	5%	2%	4%	5%
Disagree	17%	20%	19%	22%	14%	17%	13%	18%
Agree	63%	59%	60%	59%	67%	62%	65%	67%
Strongly Agree	14%	12%	15%	13%	14%	18%	17%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	8%	10%	6%
Disagree	20%	23%	19%
Agree	60%	50%	68%
Strongly Agree	11%	18%	6%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	7%	6%	7%
Disagree	20%	14%	26%
Agree	56%	54%	59%
Strongly Agree	16%	25%	8%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	6%	5%	6%
Disagree	17%	14%	19%
Agree	63%	62%	63%
Strongly Agree	14%	18%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	8%	5%	12%
Disagree	20%	18%	23%
Agree	60%	64%	56%
Strongly Agree	11%	14%	9%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	7%	5%	12%	2%	7%	9%	8%
Disagree	20%	18%	23%	24%	16%	17%	21%
Agree	56%	59%	54%	61%	56%	54%	56%
Strongly Agree	16%	18%	11%	14%	21%	20%	15%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	6%	5%	9%	6%	2%	4%	6%
Disagree	17%	14%	22%	22%	20%	17%	20%
Agree	63%	64%	62%	61%	59%	63%	62%
Strongly Agree	14%	17%	7%	11%	19%	17%	12%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	8%	10%	4%
Disagree	20%	19%	24%
Agree	60%	60%	60%
Strongly Agree	11%	11%	12%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	7%	21%
Disagree	20%	18%
Agree	56%	57%
Strongly Agree	16%	4%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	6%	6%
Disagree	17%	18%
Agree	63%	73%
Strongly Agree	14%	3%

### Survey Comments

- *Non-minority and non-special interest group persons are valuable employees as well. In the current USAID environment, it is made painfully obvious that persons who don't belong to a protected, special, or minority group do not have equal opportunities.*
- *USAID is so committed to diversity that it is approaching reverse discrimination.*
- *It seems by my observations that USAID has reverse discrimination when it comes to the number of direct hires.*
- *My perception is that diversity is in fact favoritism for non-whites. There is such an overt emphasis on people of color that it creates a sense of bias against whites and a system that doesn't treat all fairly.*
- *I feel sometimes that USAID is recruiting staff with a focus on improving diversity, but at the same time reducing technical expertise. I have met a number of DLIs recently who qualify for diversifying the agency, but do not qualify technically for the position. I think this is very dangerous and can lead to a backlash in the Agency's hiring process.*

- *We should not tolerate age discrimination. FSOs being required to retired at 65 is very old school and discriminating. I suspect this was established based on the risks of having health issues overseas since GS don't have this discrimination. Why then do we allow USPSCs and re-hired annuitants to serve us overseas way past 65 as long as they are able to obtain a medical clearance? I realize this is a law, but why isn't USAID taking the lead to change this discriminating law if they truly want diversity?*
- *The Agency needs to challenge the statutory cap on FS careers at age 65. It is unrealistic and harmful to the Agency, as it unfairly discriminates against persons who may be as able as ever, but disqualify from service when they are at or near their performance peaks. Especially when the Agency is so short on experienced staff, and therefore needs to implement work-arounds that eventually wind up introducing other problems and inequities, why is the DG/Foreign Service not making a huge deal of this issue?*
- *USAID has a double standard when it comes to diversity. The Agency goes out of its way to hire and rapidly promote African-Americans and Hispanics, but devalues people with disabilities and older individuals.*
- *I believe that often times managers are afraid to give employees from various backgrounds negative evaluations because of the fear of having a discrimination complaint filed against them. While I believe that the Agency has done an excellent job at valuing and promoting diversity, I believe it needs to do more to give managers the confidence that they can honestly evaluate staff who are under performing regardless of their race or sexual orientation.*

**5. Does USAID have enough policies in place to ensure people are treated fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect?**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall 4% decline in employees who believe that USAID has enough policies in place to ensure people are treated fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect. Specific declines included an 8% decline amongst FS employees, 4% amongst FSN employees, 6% amongst female employees, 9% amongst black or African American employees, 7% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 10% amongst Asian American employees. There were some areas of improvement, however, including a 7% improvement within the Civil Service, and 7% amongst employees with disabilities. Qualitative input received via survey comments noted the need to ensure that existing policies were being effectively implemented and that managers and supervisors are being held accountable for ensuring that policies are adhered to. The comments noted the need to develop enforceable policies to ensure that all managers are compliant with the Agency's diversity goals.

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>FSL</b>	<b>FSN</b>	<b>USPSC</b>	<b>Institutional Contractor</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Yes</b>	48%	51%	50%	44%	55%	46%	29%	46%
<b>No</b>	23%	20%	30%	22%	22%	15%	13%	15%
<b>Don't know</b>	29%	30%	20%	33%	23%	38%	58%	38%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	52%	44%	58%	44%	59%	55%	39%	42%
No	18%	23%	21%	23%	17%	16%	9%	12%
Don't know	30%	33%	21%	34%	25%	28%	51%	46%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	48%	57%	41%
No	23%	19%	25%
Don't know	29%	24%	34%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	52%	58%	47%
No	18%	17%	20%
Don't know	30%	25%	34%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	48%	52%	39%	47%	41%	57%	45%
No	23%	19%	27%	27%	24%	18%	25%
Don't know	29%	29%	34%	25%	34%	24%	30%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	52%	53%	48%	54%	51%	52%	51%
No	18%	15%	23%	22%	15%	20%	21%
Don't know	30%	32%	29%	24%	34%	28%	28%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	48%	57%
No	23%	11%
Don't know	29%	32%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	52%	50%
No	18%	24%
Don't know	30%	26%

### Survey Comments

- USAID has great policies and training opportunities but needs to focus on implementing our policies and holding senior management accountable for actions that run counter to our policies.
- The problem is implementation of the policy.

- *Field Missions should be required to ensure that awareness sessions are held, at least annually, to sensitize staff to issues of diversity and inclusiveness. In addition, Missions should be required to submit to the Council on an annual basis information to support diversity or lack thereof. There should be some degree of oversight in respect of hiring, training and promotion practices, on a random basis, but within a three-year period ALL Missions should be assessed.*
- *The Agency needs to equalize benefits for USPSCs, and enable qualified USPSCs to apply for direct hire jobs (e.g. after 3-5 years of USPSC service), particularly since there are many USPSCs who have worked with the Agency for 10 years or more.*
- *I would like to recommend USAID consider implementing an incentive or training program that would address the needs of internal employees who wish to transition or crossover to other areas of expertise.*
- *While the Agency has taken some positive strides (largely through the work of the Executive Diversity Council) to promote activities that will enhance greater diversity within the Agency, it still has a way to go. The Agency must develop enforceable policies to ensure that all managers are compliant with its diversity and equal opportunity goals and objectives. Managers should also be held accountable for actions that are discriminatory, lack merit, and systematically deny opportunities to certain minority groups. One way to achieve the above would be to replace the ineffective review of Merit Promotion decisions by the EOP Office with a review by a newly established Merit Promotion Oversight Panel (composed of members from the Executive Diversity Council). The Panel's task would be to review all merit-based decisions where the organization's EEO profile shows a conspicuous absence of certain minority groups. While the Panel's review and recommendations would be subject to the approval of the AA or independent office head, they could potentially lead to better and more representative selections. This process would place greater emphasis on meeting the Agency's goals for diversity and inclusiveness while ensuring that the "best qualified" candidates are selected. Another way would be to overhaul the FS recruitment process. At present, the process includes artificial barriers to the recruitment and hiring of "highly qualified" minority candidates. This is clearly evident when you consider the relatively small number of minority candidates that have been hired over the past year.*

**6. Do you feel that USAID provides all families at posts with equitable treatment including, but not limited to, compound passes, assistance in obtaining visas and work permits, and inclusion in official invitations?**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall deterioration in workforce perceptions as the percent of employees that feel that USAID provides all families at posts with equitable treatment declined from 31% to 19%. The number of employees responding that they did not know was exceedingly high in all employee categories with the exception of the Foreign Service, FSNs and USPSCs. Specific declines included 22% within the Foreign Service, 11% amongst FSNs, and 11% amongst PSCs.

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>FSL</b>	<b>FSN</b>	<b>USPSC</b>	<b>Institutional Contractor</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Yes</b>	19%	8%	31%	26%	24%	28%	13%	11%
<b>No</b>	23%	9%	41%	21%	28%	36%	9%	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	58%	84%	28%	53%	48%	36%	78%	89%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	31%	12%	53%	32%	35%	39%	15%	24%
No	16%	5%	28%	22%	18%	25%	8%	11%
Don't know	52%	83%	19%	47%	47%	36%	76%	65%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	19%	25%	13%
No	23%	21%	24%
Don't know	58%	53%	63%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	31%	35%	28%
No	16%	18%	16%
Don't know	52%	47%	57%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	19%	21%	16%	19%	12%	21%	16%
No	23%	24%	14%	32%	19%	27%	26%
Don't know	58%	55%	70%	49%	69%	52%	58%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	31%	33%	27%	36%	24%	32%	30%
No	16%	17%	13%	24%	13%	16%	16%
Don't know	52%	51%	61%	40%	63%	51%	54%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	19%	18%
No	23%	14%
Don't know	58%	68%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	31%	23%
No	16%	3%
Don't know	52%	73%

### Survey Comments

- The lack of benefits and other support for non-citizen MOHs directly impacts FSOs in the USA and in the field.

**7. Within the last year, have you ever felt unfairly treated at USAID because of factors related to race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics that reflect differences?**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall increase of 8% amongst employees who, within the last year, have felt unfairly treated at USAID because of factors related to race, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics that reflect differences. Specific increases included a 3% increase amongst CS employees, 10% amongst FS employees, 17% amongst FSLs, 13% amongst FSN employees, 9% amongst USPSCs, 8% amongst male and female employees, 9% amongst white employees, and 6% amongst black or African American employees. There were some limited areas of improvement, however, including an 8% improvement amongst Institutional Contractors, and 4% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments indicated perceived inequities of treatment due to differences in employment status, as well as unfair treatment directed at single employees, single parents, employees with disabilities, and age discrimination against younger employees.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	30%	32%	35%	39%	32%	24%	10%	12%
No	70%	68%	65%	61%	68%	76%	90%	88%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	22%	29%	25%	22%	19%	15%	18%	20%
No	78%	71%	75%	78%	81%	85%	82%	80%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Yes	49%	45%	49%
No	51%	55%	51%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	30%	26%	33%
No	70%	74%	67%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	22%	18%	25%
No	78%	82%	75%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	49%	40%	57%
No	51%	60%	43%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	30%	26%	36%	25%	27%	36%	33%
No	70%	74%	64%	75%	73%	64%	67%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	22%	17%	30%	29%	27%	19%	27%
No	78%	83%	70%	71%	73%	81%	73%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	49%	55%	38%
No	51%	45%	63%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	30%	41%
No	70%	59%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	22%	22%
No	78%	78%

### Survey Comments

- *Greater attention is required to level the playing field and promote equality among staff members with diverse employment status. For example, a recent survey of USPSCs, carried out under the auspices of the Staff Care Working Group, identified lack of equality in the workplace as a major concern. In highlighting this concern, many PSCs indicated their outright indignation over how their supervisors and other DH staff treated them as "second class citizens." They also, more generally, expressed resentment over the unequal benefits relative to DHs, yet were typically expected to carry out responsibilities similar to their DH colleagues. Unless restricted by law, USAID policy should extend benefits, entitlements, authorities, responsibilities and limitations on the basis of the scope of a given position rather than the category of employment.*
- *Single officers are at a disadvantage to married staff. Singles are expected to work longer hours and work in more difficult environments (e.g., unaccompanied posts) by virtue of being single. This makes it extremely difficult for single officers to establish families and encourages singles to depart the Agency.*
- *Blatant discrimination exists against single people and people with non-married partners. It's time to focus on them, not families who get tons of benefits while others are ignored, denied leave during holidays, asked to stay late, etc.*
- *Single parents are often unable to go on long TDYs, travel constantly or serve at unaccompanied posts, and despite having superior qualifications and work ethics can be overlooked in terms of both*

hiring and promotion based on this fact. While this is an international Agency and travel is required some accommodation should be made to allow single parents to continue to work and fully contribute to the Agency's Mission. Things such as virtual field support, telecommuting and general appreciation that single parents have strict schedules in terms of childcare should be institutionalized and better appreciated by agency management.

- Out at missions, I think there is still much work that needs to be done regarding the rights of people with disabilities (such as hiring people with disabilities, making the physical infrastructure accessible and incorporating disabled people's organizations more fully into our development activities).
- Age discrimination (against younger people) has been a problem at USAID in the past, and I hope that hiring masses of DLIs changes this. I have been in the FS overseas for 10 years since I was 31 and it was tough in the early years. With each new client/manager I had to prove myself - that got annoying! Now, I have gray hair and finally receive some respect! I am consciously nicer now to young people, though, because of what I went through.
- There are diversity issues with FSNs, and their treatment and status vs. USDHs. The Agency is starting to address this, which is good, but more attention is needed. In particular, to differentiate us from DOS, which is very hierarchical. USAID is more egalitarian, and needs to stay that way.
- USAID's work is based on its programs and activities in developing countries. It claims that the FSNs in Missions are the backbone of USAID, however it discriminates against them in career development, training, and last but not least, compensation and benefits. FSNs are people too who are serving the USG diligently and honestly. They just happen to be of other nationalities so are not considered as important as USG employees.

## 8. USAID's culture and climate encourage a workplace conducive to diversity and inclusiveness.

In 2009, relative to 2007, in the aggregate, little significant change was noted when asked whether USAID's culture and climate encourage a workplace conducive to diversity and inclusiveness. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements within both the Civil Service and Foreign Service of 8% and 5% respectively, 2% amongst white employees, and 9% amongst Asian American employees. Balancing these gains out, however, there were a number of declines in workforce perceptions, including declines of 12% amongst FSLs, 16% amongst FSNs, 6% amongst USPSCs and 8% amongst institutional contractors.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	7%	0%	8%
Disagree	15%	15%	13%	32%	25%	7%	10%	8%
Agree	62%	60%	67%	42%	62%	69%	57%	64%
Strongly Agree	17%	20%	14%	21%	9%	16%	33%	20%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	4%	6%	5%	8%	2%	3%	4%	6%
Disagree	16%	22%	20%	18%	11%	18%	14%	17%
Agree	68%	60%	62%	63%	78%	65%	69%	66%
Strongly Agree	11%	12%	14%	12%	9%	14%	13%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	5%	8%	2%
Disagree	19%	29%	11%
Agree	63%	50%	73%
Strongly Agree	13%	13%	13%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	5%	4%	5%
Disagree	15%	12%	18%
Agree	62%	60%	66%
Strongly Agree	17%	24%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	4%	4%	5%
Disagree	16%	12%	20%
Agree	68%	68%	68%
Strongly Agree	11%	16%	8%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	5%	2%	8%
Disagree	19%	16%	23%
Agree	63%	63%	63%
Strongly Agree	13%	19%	8%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	5%	3%	7%	4%	2%	8%	6%
Disagree	15%	11%	21%	21%	10%	19%	19%
Agree	62%	65%	62%	62%	71%	57%	63%
Strongly Agree	17%	20%	9%	13%	17%	17%	13%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	4%	3%	6%	5%	3%	3%	5%
Disagree	16%	14%	22%	19%	20%	17%	20%
Agree	68%	69%	65%	66%	63%	69%	66%
Strongly Agree	11%	14%	6%	10%	14%	11%	9%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	5%	5%	4%
Disagree	19%	12%	36%
Agree	63%	67%	52%
Strongly Agree	13%	16%	8%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	5%	4%
Disagree	15%	11%
Agree	62%	74%
Strongly Agree	17%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	4%	3%
Disagree	16%	13%
Agree	68%	78%
Strongly Agree	11%	6%

**9. Employees of different backgrounds interact well at USAID.**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall 4% decline in employees who believe that employees of different backgrounds interact well at USAID. Specific declines included a 5% decline amongst FS employees, 7% amongst FSL employees, 14% amongst FSNs, 8% amongst female employees, 6% amongst black or African American employees, 6% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 8% amongst employees with disabilities. Qualitative input received via survey comments again focused on tensions between employees of differing employment status, as well as the need to better integrate the Agency’s diverse constituencies into a cohesive and united workforce.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	5%	5%	3%	11%	6%	4%	0%	4%
Disagree	16%	15%	17%	11%	22%	8%	13%	12%
Agree	63%	59%	64%	63%	61%	74%	61%	73%
Strongly Agree	17%	21%	17%	16%	11%	15%	26%	12%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	3%	4%	1%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%
Disagree	13%	15%	13%	11%	11%	12%	15%	11%
Agree	69%	65%	69%	66%	74%	66%	62%	71%
Strongly Agree	15%	15%	17%	20%	12%	20%	20%	15%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	3%	3%	4%
Disagree	12%	13%	11%
Agree	72%	71%	74%
Strongly Agree	13%	13%	11%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	5%	5%	5%
Disagree	16%	9%	21%
Agree	63%	63%	62%
Strongly Agree	17%	23%	12%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	3%	2%	3%
Disagree	13%	10%	15%
Agree	69%	67%	71%
Strongly Agree	15%	20%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	3%	0%	7%
Disagree	12%	11%	12%
Agree	72%	73%	71%
Strongly Agree	13%	16%	10%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	5%	3%	6%	4%	2%	8%	6%
Disagree	16%	11%	23%	19%	15%	19%	20%
Agree	63%	65%	59%	65%	66%	57%	61%
Strongly Agree	17%	20%	11%	12%	17%	17%	13%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	4%	3%
Disagree	13%	10%	19%	14%	13%	13%	16%
Agree	69%	69%	70%	72%	74%	67%	70%
Strongly Agree	15%	20%	8%	11%	11%	17%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	3%	5%	0%
Disagree	12%	5%	28%
Agree	72%	75%	64%
Strongly Agree	13%	15%	8%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	5%	4%
Disagree	16%	26%
Agree	63%	56%
Strongly Agree	17%	15%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	3%	3%
Disagree	13%	18%
Agree	69%	70%
Strongly Agree	15%	9%

### Survey Comments

- *FS versus CS infighting detrimentally hampers USAID's mission.*
- *While I see regular notices of individual group meetings which reflect well on our diverse population within USAID, I do not see much effort to blend these diverse elements into a unified workforce. Even the two unions (GS and FS) are never seen working in concert. That sends a message to the workforce of several teams within the Agency working together generally as opposed to a unified team working as one towards our larger Agency goals.*

- *The myriad of hiring mechanisms creates internal divisions among staff and drastic inequities in pay among workers performing the same job function.*

### **10. USAID senior management/leadership is comfortable and respectful interacting with USAID personnel of diverse backgrounds.**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall 3% decline in employees who believe that USAID senior management/leadership is comfortable and respectful interacting with USAID personnel of diverse backgrounds. Specific declines included an 11% decline amongst FSN employees, 4% amongst female employees, and 6% amongst black or African American employees. There were some areas of improvement, however, including a 5% improvement within the Foreign Service, 9% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 6% amongst employees with disabilities.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	6%	8%	5%	0%	5%	4%	0%	4%
Disagree	16%	18%	11%	21%	20%	19%	18%	19%
Agree	60%	54%	66%	68%	59%	58%	57%	58%
Strongly Agree	18%	20%	17%	11%	16%	19%	25%	19%

  

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	5%	7%	6%	8%	2%	3%	5%	6%
Disagree	14%	21%	16%	16%	12%	14%	7%	13%
Agree	67%	62%	63%	64%	73%	66%	72%	67%
Strongly Agree	14%	10%	15%	13%	13%	17%	16%	14%

  

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	5%	8%	2%
Disagree	16%	21%	13%
Agree	64%	59%	67%
Strongly Agree	15%	13%	17%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6%	5%	6%
<b>Disagree</b>	16%	11%	20%
<b>Agree</b>	60%	60%	61%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	18%	24%	13%

<b>2007</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5%	5%	5%
<b>Disagree</b>	14%	11%	17%
<b>Agree</b>	67%	67%	68%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	14%	17%	10%

<b>2004</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5%	0%	9%
<b>Disagree</b>	16%	10%	23%
<b>Agree</b>	64%	71%	56%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15%	19%	12%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian American</b>	<b>Other Race / Ethnicity</b>	<b>All Racial &amp; Ethnic Minorities</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6%	3%	9%	4%	5%	12%	8%
<b>Disagree</b>	16%	13%	24%	12%	18%	18%	19%
<b>Agree</b>	60%	63%	59%	70%	60%	43%	58%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	18%	22%	9%	14%	18%	27%	15%

<b>2007</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian American</b>	<b>Other Race / Ethnicity</b>	<b>All Racial &amp; Ethnic Minorities</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5%	4%	6%	5%	5%	4%	5%
<b>Disagree</b>	14%	11%	20%	20%	20%	15%	19%
<b>Agree</b>	67%	70%	66%	61%	60%	65%	64%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	14%	16%	8%	14%	15%	15%	12%

<b>2004</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>All Racial &amp; Ethnic Minorities</b>
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	5%	3%	8%
<b>Disagree</b>	16%	15%	20%
<b>Agree</b>	64%	65%	60%
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	15%	17%	12%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	6%	4%
Disagree	16%	12%
Agree	60%	73%
Strongly Agree	18%	12%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	5%	0%
Disagree	14%	21%
Agree	67%	67%
Strongly Agree	14%	12%

**11. Management is held accountable for seeking to ensure a respectful, diverse workplace.**

The period from 2007 to 2009 saw an overall decline in workforce perceptions as the percent that agreed or strongly agreed that management is held accountable for seeking to ensure a respectful, diverse workplace, declined from 69% to 65%. Specific declines included a 10% decline amongst FSL employees, 13% amongst FSNs, 6% amongst USPSCs, 5% amongst female employees, 4% amongst white employees, 3% amongst black or African American employees, 4% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 9% amongst employees with disabilities. There were some limited areas of improvement, however, including an 8% improvement within the Civil Service, and 14% amongst Asian American employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on the need for accountability and leadership to be demonstrated at the highest levels, coupled by enhanced transparency of processes.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	8%	11%	6%	5%	4%	12%	0%	12%
Disagree	27%	23%	30%	47%	29%	23%	25%	23%
Agree	54%	56%	50%	42%	54%	58%	57%	58%
Strongly Agree	11%	11%	13%	5%	13%	8%	18%	8%

  

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	7%	12%	9%	12%	3%	7%	6%	5%
Disagree	24%	29%	30%	31%	16%	22%	20%	30%
Agree	60%	51%	55%	53%	68%	63%	65%	57%
Strongly Agree	9%	8%	7%	4%	12%	9%	9%	9%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	10%	16%	4%
Disagree	40%	43%	39%
Agree	46%	35%	54%
Strongly Agree	4%	5%	2%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	8%	5%	10%
Disagree	27%	24%	30%
Agree	54%	56%	52%
Strongly Agree	11%	14%	9%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	7%	7%	7%
Disagree	24%	21%	26%
Agree	60%	61%	59%
Strongly Agree	9%	11%	7%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	9%	5%	15%
Disagree	40%	36%	46%
Agree	46%	55%	37%
Strongly Agree	4%	5%	2%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	8%	5%	12%	2%	8%	11%	9%
Disagree	27%	27%	29%	33%	20%	25%	27%
Agree	54%	56%	51%	55%	63%	45%	52%
Strongly Agree	11%	12%	8%	10%	10%	19%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	7%	6%	10%	8%	7%	6%	8%
Disagree	24%	23%	29%	23%	34%	18%	25%
Agree	60%	64%	55%	57%	48%	60%	56%
Strongly Agree	9%	8%	7%	12%	11%	16%	11%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	9%	7%	17%
Disagree	40%	45%	30%
Agree	46%	43%	52%
Strongly Agree	4%	5%	0%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	8%	7%
Disagree	27%	29%
Agree	54%	54%
Strongly Agree	11%	11%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	7%	3%
Disagree	24%	23%
Agree	60%	71%
Strongly Agree	9%	3%

### Survey Comments

- *I believe that accountability, fairness, etc. starts at the top. It would be nice if management holds management accountable for her/his actions when needed.*
- *In my experience, USAID senior management demonstrates a strong ability to manage upward, but seldom show interest in the careers or lives of their subordinates. They do not value their skills, talents, or contributions. It's all about them and their careers. They do not value nor consider dissenting opinions. There is no transparency in decision-making. They simply dictate. Obviously, they are not rewarded for managing people with respect nor penalized for showing disrespect.*
- *Upper management should be specifically evaluated on their performance in both achieving and implementing remedial actions, where appropriate, for diversity goals. Additionally, the Agency should ensure sufficient resources for career development; upper management should be held accountable for adequate training; and frontline supervisors and managers should be held accountable for ensuring career advancement and counseling for mid-level staff.*
- *Until management (AAs, DAAs, and all of those at other senior management levels) is held to task in respect to being fair, objective, and transparent, employees won't have a chance. For fear of falling "out of favor" or because the feeling is that "nothing will be done about it," no one wants to address certain issues.*
- *There is not enough transparency to determine who holds management accountable or how that process is even supposed to work.*

## 12. What do you perceive to be obstacles to achieving diversity objectives at USAID? (check all that apply).

In 2007 and 2009 employees were asked to identify perceived obstacles to achieving diversity objectives at USAID. Lack of senior commitment, lack of modeled behavior and lack of Agency-wide understanding of diversity remain the most identified obstacles. While gains were made in some of these areas, including those identifying a lack of Agency-wide understanding of diversity, the total remains high, as 46% of all employees, 56% of the Civil Service and FSNs identify lack of Agency-wide understanding of diversity as an obstacle. While still high, it is important to note that this is in fact an overall improvement of 8% from 2007. One area where the Agency witnessed a decline in workforce perceptions is in those identifying a lack of attention to family considerations in assignments as an obstacle. 50% of Foreign Service employees identified this to be an obstacle in 2009, relative to 42% in 2007. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on poor agency-wide communication, as well as the need for managers and supervisors to lead by example, and the need for implementation of family-friendly policies.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Lack of Senior Commitment	43%	51%	39%	62%	29%	43%	50%	59%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	47%	58%	39%	54%	38%	39%	67%	47%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	46%	56%	30%	54%	56%	36%	50%	35%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	30%	22%	50%	46%	18%	29%	25%	24%
<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Lack of Senior Commitment	42%	54%	48%	48%	31%	47%	40%	33%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	48%	57%	52%	50%	43%	39%	37%	49%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	54%	57%	45%	62%	58%	52%	48%	53%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	21%	7%	42%	33%	14%	27%	21%	22%
<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS					
Lack of Senior Commitment	55%	61%	50%					
Lack of Modeled Behavior	40%	36%	40%					
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	50%	43%	60%					
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	27%	11%	43%					

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Lack of Senior Commitment	43%	42%	44%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	47%	40%	52%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	46%	46%	46%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	30%	34%	28%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Lack of Senior Commitment	42%	37%	45%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	48%	41%	53%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	54%	53%	55%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	21%	27%	17%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Lack of Senior Commitment	55%	40%	66%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	40%	32%	46%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	50%	56%	46%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	27%	24%	29%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Lack of Senior Commitment	43%	37%	59%	23%	48%	34%	45%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	47%	46%	55%	36%	35%	47%	46%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	46%	40%	47%	64%	61%	53%	54%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	30%	41%	16%	15%	29%	22%	19%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Lack of Senior Commitment	42%	37%	45%	47%	59%	40%	46%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	48%	47%	48%	39%	56%	48%	47%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	54%	43%	64%	60%	54%	60%	61%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	21%	33%	10%	14%	31%	18%	15%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Lack of Senior Commitment	55%	54%	56%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	40%	41%	44%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	50%	46%	61%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	27%	29%	17%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Lack of Senior Commitment	43%	65%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	47%	53%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	46%	82%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	30%	12%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Lack of Senior Commitment	42%	33%
Lack of Modeled Behavior	48%	44%
Lack of Agency-Wide Understanding of Diversity	54%	56%
Lack of Attention to Family Considerations in Assignments	21%	33%

### Survey Comments

- *There are many barriers to top qualitative interaction between races and religions. Lack of understanding, tolerance and acceptance of others is the chief roadblock. To generalize, I have noticed that the younger employees have fewer issues concerning diversity than the older employees - a very positive sign! However, human nature being what it is, many people (of all races and religions) often feel discriminated against - however, frequently the feeling of discrimination is actually the result of misperception. An honest discussion of poor work performance is often perceived by an employee as a result of a supervisor's racism, sexism, religious intolerance, etc. Human nature equals employee's perception: I am doing a great job; supervisor's perception: employee is not doing a quality job. The difference between the two perceptions is often rationalized by the employee in some way: prejudice... supervisor doesn't like me.... supervisor favors others... This variance in perception due to rationalization is difficult to overcome, and should be looked into as an area to address. It isn't always about bias.*
- *The communication within the Agency is very poor and morale seems to be very low. Managers walk around not leading by example, and not speaking to staff for reasons other than business. Also, the managers are chosen because of friendships and not based on their managerial skills or work skills, They seem to not know the job, but are so eager to assume supervisory positions, that they fail to be effective and efficient managers. USAID should check the patterns of GS-13's and up to see if they have been in the same divisions as certain individuals (friends) and they will see this for themselves.*
- *The problem is with bureaucratic inertia, lack of commitment, and accountability. USAID needs to not only set the standard by establishing clear expectations... but it needs to "walk the walk" so to speak.*
- *The recent recruitment to get our diversity targets in line with the composition of the American public was wonderful. As a manager, I can see where the pressure of work and the stress of heavy*

responsibilities limits the time one has to spend with employees, in general, to understand them, their background, experiences and talents. Only when we have the time to take to do this will USAID really capitalize on the diversity of people, experiences, and expertise that the Agency's workforce has to offer.

- I have heard from many sources that USAID is a family-friendly employer when entering the Foreign Service. In fact, even though the career presents many unique opportunities for the professional and his/her family, I have heard enough about the challenges to question whether the term family-friendly is appropriate.
- The Agency may be able to recruit a diverse workforce, but its lack of application of family-friendly policies will make it hard to retain these people (especially female DLIs) as they marry and have children and run against the myriad of issues. Further, gay and lesbian people will be discouraged from serving in CPCs for a host of reasons related to the lack of family-friendly policies (or the lack of their application).

### 13. The rewards managers give are fair and equitable and based on merit.

In 2009, relative to 2007, in the aggregate, little significant change was noted when asked whether the rewards managers give are fair and equitable and based on merit. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements of 6% within both the Civil Service and Foreign Service, 2% amongst white employees, and 18% amongst Asian American employees. Balancing these gains out, however, there were a number of declines in workforce perceptions, including declines of 14% amongst FSNs, 9% amongst USPSCs, 9% amongst female employees, 5% amongst black or African American employees, 3% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 6% amongst employees with disabilities.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	9%	11%	7%	17%	7%	8%	4%	12%
Disagree	29%	28%	25%	33%	43%	33%	21%	12%
Agree	56%	55%	61%	44%	50%	53%	63%	68%
Strongly Agree	6%	6%	7%	6%	0%	6%	13%	8%
2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	10%	17%	10%	13%	6%	7%	5%	10%
Disagree	28%	27%	28%	36%	29%	26%	27%	29%
Agree	56%	48%	56%	47%	59%	62%	62%	60%
Strongly Agree	6%	7%	6%	4%	5%	6%	6%	1%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	6%	14%	0%
Disagree	44%	36%	52%
Agree	42%	42%	41%
Strongly Agree	7%	8%	7%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	9%	6%	12%
Disagree	29%	24%	34%
Agree	56%	62%	50%
Strongly Agree	6%	8%	4%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	10%	9%	5%
Disagree	28%	23%	33%
Agree	56%	61%	52%
Strongly Agree	6%	7%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	6%	0%	13%
Disagree	44%	43%	45%
Agree	41%	50%	35%
Strongly Agree	7%	8%	8%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	9%	7%	15%	6%	2%	15%	11%
Disagree	29%	23%	38%	42%	14%	35%	34%
Agree	56%	62%	45%	52%	76%	46%	52%
Strongly Agree	6%	8%	2%	0%	7%	4%	3%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	10%	8%	13%	11%	13%	7%	11%
Disagree	28%	25%	34%	34%	22%	29%	32%
Agree	56%	61%	50%	49%	59%	57%	52%
Strongly Agree	6%	7%	2%	6%	6%	7%	5%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	6%	3%	14%
Disagree	44%	51%	29%
Agree	41%	41%	43%
Strongly Agree	7%	5%	14%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	9%	11%
Disagree	29%	26%
Agree	56%	56%
Strongly Agree	6%	7%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	10%	9%
Disagree	28%	22%
Agree	56%	56%
Strongly Agree	6%	13%

### Survey Comments

- Awards, unfortunately, continue to go to offices that have higher visibility, and leadership is removed from the value added by support offices. That point is what makes the awards process appear to favor only certain staff.

### 14. In the past year, my USAID immediate supervisor(s) have played a supportive role in my career development.

When asked if their immediate supervisor(s) have played a supportive role in their career development within the past year, 2009 results were mixed compared to 2007. While there were positive gains of 7% in the Foreign Service, 3% amongst men, and 11% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and white employees, these were countered in part by a decline in workforce perceptions of 2% within the Civil Service, 4% amongst FSNs, 3% amongst women, 6% amongst black or African American employees, and 27% amongst employees with disabilities.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	11%	12%	9%	16%	10%	8%	7%	19%
Disagree	17%	19%	11%	21%	24%	13%	21%	15%
Agree	47%	47%	46%	32%	46%	58%	68%	35%
Strongly Agree	25%	22%	34%	32%	20%	21%	4%	31%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	9%	11%	9%	6%	7%	6%	11%	10%
Disagree	20%	17%	18%	18%	24%	20%	15%	17%
Agree	50%	48%	46%	42%	52%	56%	53%	54%
Strongly Agree	22%	23%	27%	34%	18%	18%	21%	19%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	10%	13%	9%
Disagree	20%	26%	15%
Agree	36%	33%	36%
Strongly Agree	34%	28%	40%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	11%	10%	11%
Disagree	17%	12%	23%
Agree	47%	53%	42%
Strongly Agree	25%	25%	24%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	9%	7%	10%
Disagree	20%	18%	21%
Agree	50%	53%	47%
Strongly Agree	22%	22%	22%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	10%	7%	14%
Disagree	20%	16%	23%
Agree	36%	47%	23%
Strongly Agree	34%	30%	40%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	11%	8%	16%	15%	8%	12%	14%
Disagree	17%	15%	21%	13%	18%	30%	21%
Agree	47%	51%	44%	43%	35%	40%	41%
Strongly Agree	25%	27%	18%	30%	40%	18%	24%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	9%	7%	11%	9%	12%	7%	10%
Disagree	20%	16%	21%	29%	15%	23%	22%
Agree	50%	52%	50%	44%	41%	50%	48%
Strongly Agree	22%	24%	18%	18%	32%	20%	20%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	10%	11%	8%
Disagree	20%	20%	20%
Agree	36%	41%	20%
Strongly Agree	34%	28%	52%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	11%	19%
Disagree	17%	33%
Agree	47%	30%
Strongly Agree	25%	19%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	9%	7%
Disagree	20%	17%
Agree	50%	63%
Strongly Agree	22%	13%

**15. In the past year, non-immediate supervisors at USAID have played a supportive role in your career development.**

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall 3% increase in employees who believe that in the past year, non-immediate supervisors at USAID have played a supportive role in their career development. Specific improvements included a 14% increase amongst FS employees, 4% amongst male employees, 9% amongst white employees, 13% amongst Asian American employees, and 7% amongst employees with disabilities. There were some areas of decline, however, including a decline of 7% amongst FSNs, 6% amongst black or African American employees, and 7% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments indicated a lack of mentoring on behalf of more senior employees toward new hires.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	7%	8%	6%	21%	6%	4%	0%	12%
Disagree	24%	26%	16%	16%	35%	27%	35%	15%
Agree	54%	52%	57%	37%	51%	60%	58%	54%
Strongly Agree	15%	14%	21%	26%	8%	10%	8%	19%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	8%	8%	6%	5%	7%	11%	11%	8%
Disagree	27%	26%	29%	27%	27%	16%	24%	33%
Agree	54%	51%	56%	51%	56%	59%	51%	42%
Strongly Agree	12%	14%	8%	16%	10%	14%	14%	17%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Strongly Disagree	13%	13%	13%
Disagree	34%	41%	29%
Agree	36%	38%	33%
Strongly Agree	17%	8%	25%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	7%	7%	7%
Disagree	24%	24%	24%
Agree	54%	53%	55%
Strongly Agree	15%	15%	14%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	8%	7%	8%
Disagree	27%	28%	25%
Agree	54%	52%	55%
Strongly Agree	12%	12%	11%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	13%	9%	16%
Disagree	34%	33%	36%
Agree	36%	44%	27%
Strongly Agree	17%	14%	20%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	7%	4%	13%	6%	8%	15%	11%
Disagree	24%	22%	25%	33%	23%	33%	28%
Agree	54%	56%	49%	56%	55%	41%	50%
Strongly Agree	15%	18%	14%	4%	15%	10%	11%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	8%	8%	9%	7%	14%	5%	8%
Disagree	27%	27%	21%	26%	29%	33%	26%
Agree	54%	54%	55%	54%	41%	55%	53%
Strongly Agree	12%	11%	14%	13%	16%	7%	12%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	13%	15%	8%
Disagree	34%	37%	24%
Agree	36%	35%	40%
Strongly Agree	17%	13%	28%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	7%	15%
Disagree	24%	15%
Agree	54%	50%
Strongly Agree	15%	19%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	8%	9%
Disagree	27%	29%
Agree	54%	56%
Strongly Agree	12%	6%

### Survey Comments

- *I see a big disconnect and lack of mentoring from the more seasoned employees toward the new hires. My perception is that the top of the Agency does not see value in trying to grow and quickly develop the new hires into viable team members. New hires want field experience to go along with the training and mentoring that the Agency does provide, however these field assignments are consistently denied.*

### 16. Is career mobility and advancement handled objectively and transparently?

In 2007, when asked whether career mobility and advancement is handled objectively and transparently, a resounding 40% of the total workforce, 46% of the Civil Service, 43% of the Foreign Service, 36% of FSNs, 39% of men, 42% of women, 38% of white employees, 48% of black or African American employees, and 50% of Asian Americans responded *No*.

By 2009, while the percentage of negative responses remains high, significant progress has been made as workforce perceptions improved by 5% Agency-wide, 11% within the Civil Service, 5% within the Foreign Service, 4% amongst FSNs, 7% amongst men, 4% amongst women, 7% amongst white employees, 9% amongst black or African American employees, and 21% amongst Asian Americans. A couple of areas of negative growth, however, include a deterioration in workforce perceptions of 11% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees, and 19% amongst employees with disabilities. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on needed improvements to the annual evaluation process as well as the need for career development contacts for the Civil Service.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	27%	27%	29%	35%	32%	23%	3%	23%
No	35%	35%	38%	40%	32%	30%	28%	31%
Don't know	38%	38%	33%	25%	36%	47%	69%	46%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	28%	23%	27%	20%	35%	27%	25%	19%
No	40%	46%	43%	44%	36%	38%	33%	42%
Don't know	32%	31%	30%	35%	29%	35%	42%	39%

2004	All	CS	FS
Yes	24%	23%	26%
No	55%	48%	60%
Don't know	22%	30%	15%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	27%	35%	19%
No	35%	32%	38%
Don't know	38%	33%	44%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	28%	29%	27%
No	40%	39%	42%
Don't know	32%	32%	31%

2004	All	Male	Female
Yes	24%	27%	21%
No	55%	52%	56%
Don't know	22%	20%	23%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	27%	31%	26%	17%	22%	21%	22%
No	35%	31%	39%	46%	29%	38%	39%
Don't know	38%	38%	35%	37%	49%	42%	39%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	28%	28%	26%	27%	19%	40%	29%
No	40%	38%	48%	35%	50%	35%	42%
Don't know	32%	34%	27%	38%	31%	26%	29%

2004	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	24%	17%	42%
No	55%	65%	29%
Don't know	22%	17%	29%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	27%	30%
No	35%	44%
Don't know	38%	26%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	28%	34%
No	40%	25%
Don't know	32%	41%

### Survey Comments

- *The annual evaluation process results in a list of names for promotion, far distant from the performance of the individual. The process is also too highly dependent on the writing skills and interest of a supervisor in investing time and energy in this process. This is a process that does not motivate nor recognize employees who are excelling in challenging environments. It is more of a*

*status quo that all staff, unless for some very unusual circumstances, will be promoted based on average number of years of service, not performance.*

- *Unlike FS, CS does not currently have a Career Development POC - or at least not one that is openly advertised. My friends at State get career development advice on how they can move up and between backstops. That sort of information is not made available to USAID Civil Service. The only development that I can do is in my own backstop and any request for training outside of my series is denied.*
- *There is under representation of Hispanics in the SMG and in career enhancing assignments. USAID is not attracting/retaining the increasing number of qualified Hispanics/Latinos. I recently retired at the FS-1 level, and did not try to get into SMG as it is still too much who you know, and not what skills you have. However, I had a wonderful career with USAID and if they can attract/retain more qualified Hispanics/Latinos, USAID would be more representative of the American public.*

**17. Do you understand what criteria are being used in evaluating your performance and considering your candidacy for advancement?**

In 2009, relative to 2007, little significant change was noted in the aggregate when asked whether they understand what criteria are being used in evaluating their performance and considering their candidacy for advancement. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements within the Foreign Service of 4%, 5% amongst FSNs, 4% amongst white employees, and 7% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Balancing these gains out, however, there were a number of declines in workforce perceptions, including declines of 9% within the Civil Service, 19% amongst Asian American employees, and 19% amongst employees with disabilities.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	71%	68%	79%	60%	73%	72%	64%	69%
No	29%	32%	21%	40%	27%	28%	36%	31%

  

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	69%	77%	75%	72%	68%	61%	54%	60%
No	31%	23%	25%	28%	32%	39%	46%	40%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	71%	74%	69%
No	29%	26%	31%

  

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	69%	72%	68%
No	31%	28%	32%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
	Yes	71%	76%	67%	67%	54%	73%
No	29%	24%	33%	33%	46%	27%	34%

  

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
	Yes	69%	72%	66%	60%	73%	69%
No	31%	28%	34%	40%	27%	31%	34%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
	Yes	71%
No	29%	29%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
	Yes	69%
No	31%	10%

**18. Are the criteria being used in evaluating employee performance and advancement being applied fairly and equitably?**

While a significant majority of all employees are aware of the criteria being used in evaluating their performance and considering their candidacy for advancement, when asked whether these criteria were being applied fairly and equitably, 63% of all employees, 65% of the Civil Service, 64% of the Foreign Service, 56% of men, 71% of females, 62% of white employees, 66% of all racial and ethnic minorities, and 61% of employees with disabilities, don't believe or don't know whether the criteria used are being applied fairly and equitably.

This remains an area for renewed focus by the Executive Diversity Council, as these numbers are comparable to those encountered in 2007. The Council must work to ensure that the criteria are applied fairly and equitably, as well as ensuring sufficient transparency such that the workforce is assured that the performance evaluation processes function effectively. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on the role of personal relations, as opposed to performance, when considering employees' candidacy for advancement. Survey comments additionally indicated a perceived reluctance of supervisors to take action against poor performers for fear of discrimination complaints.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
	Yes	36%	36%	36%	35%	46%	40%	21%
No	27%	30%	27%	35%	27%	21%	25%	19%
Don't know	36%	35%	37%	30%	26%	40%	54%	54%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	38%	33%	31%	44%	51%	32%	25%	31%
No	28%	32%	36%	31%	23%	26%	22%	21%
Don't know	34%	35%	33%	25%	27%	42%	53%	48%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	36%	44%	30%
No	27%	23%	31%
Don't know	36%	33%	40%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	38%	43%	34%
No	28%	25%	30%
Don't know	34%	32%	36%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	36%	38%	35%	37%	32%	30%	34%
No	27%	24%	30%	35%	20%	42%	32%
Don't know	36%	38%	35%	27%	49%	28%	34%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	38%	38%	33%	40%	37%	46%	38%
No	28%	25%	33%	35%	23%	25%	30%
Don't know	34%	37%	34%	24%	40%	29%	31%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	36%	39%
No	27%	32%
Don't know	36%	29%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	38%	33%
No	28%	24%
Don't know	34%	42%

### Survey Comments

- Opportunities seem to be given to employees regardless of their performance, but rather based on their personal relations with supervisors. It seems that there is no "system" in place like in corporate firms, but rather that the system is based on the individual with the highest authority.

- *Encourage diversity, but treat people based on merit and performance. Some supervisors are so afraid of having a discrimination complaint filed that they let people get away with outrageous conduct -- not showing up for work, missing deadlines, etc. and it's bad for general morale.*
- *USAID should appropriately deal with those individuals that are diverse and who happen to be poor performers, without fear or threats of possible litigious actions. Too many poor performers have been allowed to remain within the Agency simply because of their race or gender.*

**19. Do you perceive that employees of different backgrounds occupy a representative proportion of higher-level positions?**

In 2009, relative to 2007, in the aggregate, little significant change was noted when asked whether they perceive that employees of different backgrounds occupy a representative proportion of higher-level positions. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements within the Civil Service of 11%, 3% amongst female employees, 25% amongst Asian American employees, and 5% amongst employees with disabilities. Balancing these gains out, however, there were a number of declines in workforce perceptions, including declines of 11% within the Civil Service, and 3% amongst black or African American employees.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	52%	51%	52%	58%	57%	42%	48%	42%
No	48%	49%	48%	42%	43%	58%	52%	58%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	50%	40%	50%	40%	59%	54%	43%	49%
No	50%	60%	50%	60%	41%	46%	57%	51%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Yes	44%	40%	47%
No	56%	60%	53%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	52%	57%	47%
No	48%	43%	53%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	50%	57%	44%
No	50%	43%	56%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	44%	51%	36%
No	56%	49%	64%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	52%	54%	42%	47%	55%	58%	48%
No	48%	46%	58%	53%	45%	42%	52%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	50%	53%	45%	45%	30%	54%	46%
No	50%	47%	55%	55%	70%	46%	54%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	44%	54%	24%
No	56%	46%	76%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	52%	58%
No	48%	42%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	50%	53%
No	50%	47%

**20. What do you perceive as internal challenges to career mobility and advancement?**

In 2007 and 2009 employees were asked what they perceive as internal challenges to career mobility and advancement. Overall, favoritism remains a concern by over half of both the Foreign Service and Civil Service, and is perceived as an even greater challenge in 2009 than it was in 2007, with significant increases in perception within the Civil Service, and amongst FSL, FSN and USPSC employees. There was little change within the Foreign Service, with 53% of employees identifying favoritism to be a challenge. The assignment process was another challenge identified by 65% of Foreign Service employees, up 4% from 2007. A lack of training opportunities was one area where the Agency was able to make significant progress, witnessing a 12% decrease amongst all employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on perceptions of favoritism and a lack of transparency as relates to career mobility and advancement.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Assignment Processes	49%	41%	65%	69%	41%	54%	38%	45%
Favoritism	54%	61%	53%	50%	45%	64%	43%	45%
Lack of Training Opportunities	33%	33%	23%	25%	58%	28%	29%	20%
Lack of Viable Openings	48%	54%	45%	81%	41%	44%	48%	30%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Assignment Processes	43%	41%	61%	49%	33%	49%	44%	39%
Favoritism	42%	57%	52%	29%	28%	33%	42%	49%
Lack of Training Opportunities	45%	38%	40%	31%	60%	34%	34%	30%
Lack of Viable Openings	49%	55%	36%	62%	47%	49%	60%	58%

<b>2004</b>	All	CS	FS
Assignment Processes	42%	41%	71%
Favoritism	61%	54%	66%
Lack of Training Opportunities	37%	41%	34%
Lack of Viable Openings	34%	35%	34%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Assignment Processes	49%	52%	48%
Favoritism	54%	51%	57%
Lack of Training Opportunities	33%	32%	34%
Lack of Viable Openings	48%	46%	50%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Assignment Processes	43%	43%	44%
Favoritism	42%	38%	44%
Lack of Training Opportunities	45%	41%	48%
Lack of Viable Openings	49%	47%	51%

<b>2004</b>	All	Male	Female
Assignment Processes	42%	48%	38%
Favoritism	61%	52%	68%
Lack of Training Opportunities	37%	16%	53%
Lack of Viable Openings	34%	26%	40%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Assignment Processes	49%	52%	57%	55%	47%	38%	52%
Favoritism	54%	50%	71%	61%	44%	67%	64%
Lack of Training Opportunities	33%	27%	52%	45%	22%	46%	45%
Lack of Viable Openings	48%	51%	56%	66%	53%	51%	57%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Assignment Processes	43%	47%	34%	39%	56%	42%	39%
Favoritism	42%	41%	48%	44%	33%	32%	42%
Lack of Training Opportunities	45%	36%	52%	53%	42%	58%	53%
Lack of Viable Openings	49%	50%	48%	44%	50%	51%	48%

<b>2004</b>	All	White	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Assignment Processes	42%	49%	30%
Favoritism	61%	57%	61%
Lack of Training Opportunities	37%	29%	43%
Lack of Viable Openings	34%	35%	39%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Assignment Processes	49%	59%
Favoritism	54%	64%
Lack of Training Opportunities	33%	50%
Lack of Viable Openings	48%	50%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Assignment Processes	43%	54%
Favoritism	42%	50%
Lack of Training Opportunities	45%	58%
Lack of Viable Openings	49%	58%

### Survey Comments

- *I do not see any solution to the favoritism problem. Our management is supported in their decisions and an affected employee has no real recourse.*

- *I believe this is a worthwhile initiative, but favoritism and lack of transparency often eliminate all the good efforts that the Agency is putting in place. Many have taken the courses, but do not really practice what they learned.*

**21. Do you feel there is a sufficient/insufficient amount of USAID training and development opportunities to support your career development?**

When asked whether they feel there is a sufficient/insufficient amount of USAID training and development opportunities to support their career development, there was little overall change noted in 2009, relative to 2007. There were some changes in relative distribution, including improvements within the Civil Service of 6%, 7% amongst white employees, and 3% amongst Asian Americans. There were declines, however, of 5% amongst FSNs, 3% amongst female employees, 6% amongst black or African American employees, and 26% amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on shortages of funding at the missions to permit employees to attend trainings, as well as demanding job responsibilities making it difficult for employees to get away from their job duties to participate in trainings. Additional survey comments indicated the need for an Agency-wide curriculum on diversity.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Sufficient	57%	61%	63%	58%	60%	38%	48%	28%
Insufficient	43%	39%	38%	42%	40%	62%	52%	72%

  

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Sufficient	59%	55%	62%	58%	65%	51%	48%	59%
Insufficient	41%	45%	38%	42%	35%	49%	52%	41%

2009	All	Male	Female
Sufficient	57%	57%	58%
Insufficient	43%	43%	42%

2007	All	Male	Female
Sufficient	59%	56%	61%
Insufficient	41%	44%	39%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Sufficient	57%	62%	56%	48%	55%	46%	52%
Insufficient	43%	38%	44%	52%	45%	54%	48%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Sufficient	59%	55%	62%	74%	52%	61%	63%
Insufficient	41%	45%	38%	26%	48%	39%	37%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Sufficient	57%	59%
Insufficient	43%	41%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Sufficient	59%	58%
Insufficient	41%	42%

### Survey Comments

- *There may be training opportunities available, but if the employee has demanding job responsibilities and there is no one to delegate it to, this discourages the employee from being away from his/her job. There is no on-the-job training provided to the new hire because the person who knows the job is already gone, and the other members in the same team are too busy or do not know the job themselves.*
- *There is a wealth of training resources out there, but not always sufficient OE at Missions to permit deserving candidates to attend trainings. We need an Agency-wide curriculum on diversity - a component of our AID 101 courses like the PAL, Programming Foreign Assistance, so that civil service and FSOs especially are sensitized to diversity and intercultural issues before going into the field/diverse work environments.*
- *The Agency needs to re-implement the Upward Mobility Program.*

### 22. USAID career development training is made available fairly and equitably.

The period from 2007 to 2009 witnessed an overall 4% increase in employees who believe that USAID career development training is made available fairly and equitably. Specific improvements included a 5% increase amongst CS employees, 10% amongst FS employees, 16% amongst FSLs, 6% amongst male employees, 3% amongst white employees, 6% amongst black or African American employees, and 11 % amongst Hispanic or Latino employees. Qualitative input received via survey comments focused on limited career advancement opportunities for FSNs.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	6%	5%	4%	5%	13%	10%	3%	0%
Disagree	24%	23%	23%	11%	40%	19%	13%	19%
Agree	42%	44%	49%	47%	35%	44%	27%	31%
Strongly Agree	9%	12%	10%	11%	6%	6%	7%	8%
Don't know	18%	17%	14%	26%	6%	21%	50%	42%

<b>2007</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Strongly Disagree	8%	7%	10%	14%	11%	5%	4%	4%
Disagree	27%	24%	29%	27%	31%	30%	19%	22%
Agree	41%	43%	42%	37%	41%	41%	44%	35%
Strongly Agree	6%	8%	7%	5%	4%	8%	7%	4%
Don't know	17%	18%	13%	18%	14%	15%	27%	36%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	6%	6%	6%
Disagree	24%	22%	26%
Agree	42%	47%	38%
Strongly Agree	9%	10%	8%
Don't know	18%	16%	21%

<b>2007</b>	All	Male	Female
Strongly Disagree	8%	8%	9%
Disagree	27%	23%	31%
Agree	41%	44%	39%
Strongly Agree	6%	7%	5%
Don't know	17%	18%	16%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	6%	4%	6%	14%	2%	6%	7%
Disagree	24%	19%	27%	26%	29%	46%	31%
Agree	42%	46%	38%	40%	44%	35%	39%
Strongly Agree	9%	9%	11%	10%	2%	6%	8%
Don't know	18%	22%	17%	10%	22%	8%	15%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Strongly Disagree	8%	6%	9%	13%	6%	11%	10%
Disagree	27%	24%	30%	36%	23%	28%	30%
Agree	41%	44%	38%	34%	45%	42%	39%
Strongly Agree	6%	8%	5%	5%	6%	4%	4%
Don't know	17%	18%	19%	11%	21%	15%	17%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	6%	4%
Disagree	24%	39%
Agree	42%	29%
Strongly Agree	9%	11%
Don't Know	18%	18%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Strongly Disagree	8%	3%
Disagree	27%	24%
Agree	41%	42%
Strongly Agree	6%	6%
Don't Know	17%	24%

### Survey Comments

- USAID does not advertise training for LGBT employees or training that would support learning on these issues, such as Out and Equal's annual workplace summit.
- FSNs do not have the possibility of developing a career path or advancement.

### 23. Do you see a positive connection between workforce diversity and organizational performance?

Workforce perception, while strong in 2007, was even stronger in 2009, when considering the positive connection between workforce diversity and organizational performance. 75% of all employees, 68% of the Civil Service, 87% of the Foreign Service, 78% of men, 74% of women, 78% of white employees, and 73% of all racial and ethnic minorities see a positive connection between workforce diversity and organizational performance.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	75%	68%	87%	78%	71%	78%	69%	81%
No	25%	32%	13%	22%	29%	22%	31%	19%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	71%	65%	78%	74%	74%	67%	67%	66%
No	29%	35%	22%	26%	26%	33%	33%	34%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	75%	78%	74%
No	25%	22%	26%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	71%	72%	71%
No	29%	28%	29%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	75%	78%	72%	75%	78%	71%	73%
No	25%	22%	28%	25%	23%	29%	27%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	71%	73%	66%	64%	82%	75%	70%
No	29%	27%	34%	36%	18%	25%	30%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	75%	69%
No	25%	31%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	71%	71%
No	29%	29%

#### 24. Are you aware of new diversity initiatives being conducted by the Agency?

In 2007, when asked for the first time whether they were aware of the new diversity initiatives being conducted by the Agency, only 23% of all employees, 34% of the Civil Service, 25% of the Foreign Service and 21% of FSNs were aware of the Agency's new diversity initiatives. The Agency did make some strides in increasing awareness over the subsequent two years, however, much work remains to be done. By 2009, 39% of all employees, and 49% of the Civil Service and Foreign Service were aware of the Agency's diversity initiatives. No gains were made with respect to FSNs, as only 20% were aware. It remains critical that to maximize the effectiveness of its initiatives, the Agency must greatly enhance its communication and outreach efforts to ensure the Agency's diversity initiatives are being effectively communicated, and implemented, Agency-wide. Qualitative input received via survey comments noted the need for enhanced communication and outreach activities.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	39%	49%	49%	11%	20%	27%	17%	35%
No	61%	51%	51%	89%	80%	73%	83%	65%

  

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	23%	34%	25%	13%	21%	14%	14%	18%
No	77%	66%	75%	87%	79%	86%	86%	82%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	39%	41%	37%
No	61%	59%	63%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	23%	25%	21%
No	77%	75%	79%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	39%	41%	39%	32%	38%	42%	38%
No	61%	59%	61%	68%	62%	58%	62%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	23%	21%	24%	24%	30%	24%	25%
No	77%	79%	76%	76%	70%	76%	75%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	39%	43%
No	61%	57%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	23%	24%
No	77%	76%

### Survey Comments

- USAID should better publicize these efforts.

### 25. Are you aware of the USAID Diversity website available on the USAID intranet?

Much as the Agency needs to enhance its communication and outreach efforts to increase awareness of its diversity initiatives, one of its primary means of outreach remains significantly underutilized. In 2005 the Executive Diversity Council established the Agency's Diversity

website on the USAID intranet as a means of communication and outreach on the Agency's diversity initiatives. By 2007, it became clear that this means of communication was not being effectively utilized as only 29% of all employees, 38% of the Civil Service, 39% of the Foreign Service, and 25% of FSNs were aware of the Agency's Diversity website. While awareness did increase over the subsequent two years, overall awareness remains low. By 2009, 43% of all employees, 52% of the Civil Service, 48% of the Foreign Service, and 30% of FSNs were aware of the USAID Diversity website. To maximize this means of outreach, the website must be effectively advertised, and subsequently maintained with engaging and informative content. Qualitative input received via survey comments indicated a lack of responsiveness to input submitted via the Diversity Council's website.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	43%	52%	48%	32%	30%	37%	10%	46%
No	57%	48%	52%	68%	70%	63%	90%	54%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	29%	38%	39%	20%	25%	22%	20%	19%
No	71%	62%	61%	80%	75%	78%	80%	81%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	43%	50%	35%
No	57%	50%	65%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	29%	32%	27%
No	71%	68%	73%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	43%	44%	45%	34%	46%	43%	43%
No	57%	56%	55%	66%	54%	57%	57%

2007	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	29%	28%	31%	30%	29%	27%	30%
No	71%	72%	69%	70%	71%	73%	70%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	43%	57%
No	57%	43%

2007	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	29%	30%
No	71%	70%

### Survey Comments

➤ I've sent comments on the diversity website but I never receive a response.

### 26. Are you aware of the Agency's Diversity Profile?

Consistent with the general low levels of awareness of the Agency's diversity initiatives, in 2007, when asked if they were aware of the Agency's diversity profile, only 23% of all employees, 30% of the Civil Service, and 33% of the Foreign Service were aware of the Agency's diversity profile. By 2009, while some gains were made, levels of awareness remain low, as only 33% of all employees, 39% of the Civil Service, and 40% of the Foreign Service were aware of the Agency's diversity profile. It is only through proactive distribution of the demographic analyses of bureau and independent office diversity profiles, accompanied by outreach to senior/executive management staff, that significant and rapid increases in awareness can be achieved.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	33%	39%	40%	16%	27%	22%	10%	32%
No	67%	61%	60%	84%	73%	78%	90%	68%

2007	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	23%	30%	33%	9%	20%	17%	11%	11%
No	77%	70%	67%	91%	80%	83%	89%	89%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	33%	36%	29%
No	67%	64%	71%

2007	All	Male	Female
Yes	23%	24%	21%
No	77%	76%	79%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	33%	33%	37%	29%	40%	33%	35%
No	67%	67%	63%	71%	60%	67%	65%

<b>2007</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	23%	24%	19%	24%	23%	21%	21%
No	77%	76%	81%	76%	77%	79%	79%

<b>2009</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	33%	54%
No	67%	46%

<b>2007</b>	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	23%	27%
No	77%	73%

**27. Are you aware of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and do you think USAID management is cognizant of their responsibilities pertaining to this legislation?**

In 2009, when asked for the first time whether they were aware of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and whether they thought management was cognizant of their responsibilities pertaining to this legislation, 68% of all employees, 74% of the Civil Service, 77% of the Foreign Service, 73% of men, 62% of women, and 65% of employees with disabilities responded positively. Going forward, it would be advisable to investigate this issue further, breaking this question into two distinct questions, probing overall awareness, and subsequently management’s cognizance of their responsibilities pertaining to this legislation.

<b>2009</b>	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	68%	74%	77%	71%	35%	70%	63%	75%
No	32%	26%	23%	29%	65%	30%	37%	25%

<b>2009</b>	All	Male	Female
Yes	68%	73%	62%
No	32%	27%	38%

<b>2009</b>	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	68%	74%	68%	56%	57%	53%	61%
No	32%	26%	32%	44%	43%	47%	38%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Employees with Disabilities</b>
<b>Yes</b>	68%	65%
<b>No</b>	32%	35%

**28. Are you aware that valuing diversity is an Agency core value?**

Valuing diversity has long been one of USAID’s five core values. In 2009, when employees were asked for the first time whether they were aware of this core agency value, 85% of all employees, 84% of the Civil Service, 95% of the Foreign Service, 87% of men, 82% of women, and 81% of employees with disabilities responded positively.

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>FSL</b>	<b>FSN</b>	<b>USPSC</b>	<b>Institutional Contractor</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Yes</b>	85%	84%	95%	89%	81%	78%	72%	69%
<b>No</b>	15%	16%	5%	11%	19%	22%	28%	31%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Yes</b>	85%	87%	82%
<b>No</b>	15%	13%	18%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian American</b>	<b>Other Race / Ethnicity</b>	<b>All Racial &amp; Ethnic Minorities</b>
<b>Yes</b>	85%	91%	79%	74%	71%	85%	78%
<b>No</b>	15%	9%	21%	26%	29%	15%	22%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Employees with Disabilities</b>
<b>Yes</b>	85%	81%
<b>No</b>	15%	19%

**29. Are you aware of the existence of the Agency’s Executive Diversity Council?**

In 2009, when asked for the first time whether they were aware of the existence of the Executive Diversity Council, only 60% of all employees were aware of the Council. The Civil Service and Foreign Service had increased levels of awareness, with 67% and 78% respectively, while

FSNs and USPSCs had significantly lower levels of awareness of the EDC, with 29% and 35% positive awareness respectively.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	60%	67%	78%	74%	29%	35%	34%	65%
No	40%	33%	22%	26%	71%	65%	66%	35%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	60%	59%	60%
No	40%	41%	40%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	60%	65%	56%	40%	59%	55%	53%
No	40%	35%	44%	60%	41%	45%	47%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	60%	59%
No	40%	41%

**30. Are you aware of recent revisions to the Member of Household policy as it pertains to security training, Emergency Visitation Travel, FAST language courses, distance learning training including Rosetta Stone, and a course for Iraq-bound employees?**

In 2009, when asked for the first time whether they were aware of recent revisions to the Member of Household policy, awareness levels were low as only 24% of all employees, 26% of the Civil Service, and 41% of the Foreign Service were aware of these revisions.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	24%	26%	41%	5%	11%	19%	3%	12%
No	76%	74%	59%	95%	89%	81%	97%	88%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	24%	28%	21%
No	76%	72%	79%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	24%	27%	18%	25%	24%	27%	22%
No	76%	73%	82%	75%	76%	73%	78%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	24%	29%
No	76%	71%

**31. Do you feel that lack of benefits for same sex partners and lack of a non-discrimination policy that includes gender identity/expression affects the Agency's ability to recruit and retain lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) employees and maintain morale?**

In 2009, when asked for the first time whether they felt that the lack of benefits for same sex partners and the lack of a non-discrimination policy that includes gender identity/expression affects the Agency's ability to recruit and retain lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender (LGBT) employees and maintain morale, 41% of all employees, 32% of the Civil Service, and 64% of the Foreign Service believed it did. There was a high percentage of respondents in all employment categories that indicated they did not know. Qualitative input received via survey comments strongly emphasized the adverse effect the lack of benefits for same sex partners, as well as the absence of a non-discrimination policy that includes gender identity/expression, was having on recruiting and retaining LGBT employees.

2009	All	CS	FS	FSL	FSN	USPSC	Institutional Contractor	Other
Yes	41%	32%	64%	47%	12%	33%	43%	42%
No	14%	15%	13%	11%	19%	12%	15%	15%
Don't know	45%	53%	23%	42%	69%	56%	42%	42%

2009	All	Male	Female
Yes	41%	39%	44%
No	14%	16%	12%
Don't know	45%	45%	44%

2009	All	White	Black or African American	Hispanic or Latino	Asian American	Other Race / Ethnicity	All Racial & Ethnic Minorities
Yes	41%	50%	18%	46%	44%	37%	32%
No	14%	12%	19%	8%	13%	18%	15%
Don't know	45%	37%	64%	46%	44%	45%	53%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	41%	11%
No	14%	21%
Don't know	45%	68%

### Survey Comments

- *The Agency needs to reach out more, and try to find a way to bridge gaps between different types of employees more proactively. Lack of benefits for same sex partners and lack of a non-discrimination policy that includes gender identity/expression certainly must affect the Agency's ability to recruit and retain LGBT employees and maintain morale. I think that this policy should be changed forthwith. This would benefit the entire Agency by allowing it to recruit and hire from a broader pool of interested candidates and is also the right and fair thing to do.*
- *The Agency is doing a huge discredit to their employees who have same sex partners by not affording them the same rights as married couples. There is no excuse for this and represents a severe oversight on behalf of the Agency. This, in my opinion, is a true example of discrimination on a large scale.*
- *To define "Family" as married heterosexuals and narrowly allow benefits (health care, support for visa, commissary, evacuation, etc.) is both insulting and an embarrassment to the goal of diversity within the Agency.*
- *Despite much encouragement from seasoned Civil and Foreign Service officers to pursue a long-term path at USAID, the lack of benefits for same-sex partners is definitely a factor in my plans to not consider a career with the Agency.*
- *I feel increasingly frustrated by the Agency's lack of benefits for my same-sex partner of 13 years. My partner is a foreign national, and lack of the ability to provide a visa for him to remain with me during assignment to Washington limits my ability to/interest in serving at headquarters.*

- *While I appreciate the work of many to achieve recognition of LGBT partners, access to Rosetta Stone and other such minimal benefits is not the sort of window dressing that will enable prospective LGBT individuals to join the Foreign Service and support their partners. We need equal treatment - health insurance, access to retirement benefits, travel to and from post, etc. These are the dollar and cents benefits that count for us all, gay and straight alike.*
- *USAID senior management, perhaps through the Executive Diversity Council, must actively pursue means through which gay and lesbian employees and their families can be treated equitably and on par with straight employees and their families. MOH policy is only a beginning and not an end. USAID senior management must publicly demonstrate a commitment toward eliminating the inequity faced by gay and lesbian employees.*

### **32. Are you aware of USAID’s targeted recruitment program for Civil Service and Foreign Service?**

In 2009, when asked for the first time whether they were aware of USAID’s targeted recruitment program for Civil Service and Foreign Service, awareness levels were low as only 35% of all employees, 37% of the Civil Service and 46% of the Foreign Service indicated they were are aware of the Agency’s targeted recruitment program. These low levels of awareness must be addressed if the Agency is to be successful in enlisting a diverse cadre of employees to assist in the Agency’s recruitment and outreach activities. Qualitative input received via survey comments indicated the need for greater outreach activities within the Agency, particularly as relates to recruitment activities for the Civil Service.

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>FS</b>	<b>FSL</b>	<b>FSN</b>	<b>USPSC</b>	<b>Institutional Contractor</b>	<b>Other</b>
<b>Yes</b>	35%	37%	46%	26%	18%	35%	27%	31%
<b>No</b>	65%	63%	54%	74%	82%	65%	73%	69%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
<b>Yes</b>	35%	33%	37%
<b>No</b>	65%	67%	63%

<b>2009</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black or African American</b>	<b>Hispanic or Latino</b>	<b>Asian American</b>	<b>Other Race / Ethnicity</b>	<b>All Racial &amp; Ethnic Minorities</b>
<b>Yes</b>	35%	34%	39%	32%	34%	38%	36%
<b>No</b>	65%	66%	61%	68%	66%	62%	64%

2009	All	Employees with Disabilities
Yes	35%	37%
No	65%	63%

### Survey Comments

- *I would appreciate more published and widely distributed information on the targeted recruitment program for Civil Service and Foreign Service. It seems that many of my colleagues are not aware of it, both inside and outside the Agency. Allowing us to reach out to our informal networks for recruitment would likely yield a more diverse workforce.*
- *I'm aware of USAID's recruitment for FS, but not GS.*

### CONCLUSION

USAID and the Executive Diversity Council have been engaged in an ambitious effort to lead the effort to advance diversity and inclusiveness. Like any such effort, it has experienced its share of accomplishments and setbacks, seen changes in personnel and leadership, and operated within a rapidly changing external environment. The 2009 Diversity and Inclusiveness Survey is invaluable as it not only allows the Agency to measure progress relative to the 2007 survey, but serves to identify areas demanding future Agency attention. While the survey results indicate progress made as a result of the Executive Diversity Council and the Office of Human Resources and Equal Opportunity Programs efforts to advance the Agency's Diversity and Inclusiveness Action Agenda, it is equally evident that much work remains to be done. Much as was the case in 2007, to truly leverage the effectiveness of its efforts, the Agency must implement a focused and strategic communication and outreach strategy. While advances were achieved, these gains were made despite only 39% of the workforce being aware of the Agency's new diversity initiatives. Building the policies and programs necessary to support a diverse workforce is critical, but equally so, is effectively informing the workforce of these policies and programs, effectively communicating the Agency's expectations, and holding managers and supervisors accountable for their implementation.

As the Agency and the Executive Diversity Council settle in after a prolonged period of turnover and transition, they must set their sights on crafting a strategic path forward to regain momentum and reaffirm their commitment to achieving a diverse workforce and a workplace conducive to fostering diversity and inclusiveness. A number of themes raised in 2007 remain prominent in 2009, indicating that these are issues demanding long-term solutions, and a sustained effort to fully address them. Perceived inequities in treatment and value of contribution is prevalent within the Civil Service, vis-à-vis their Foreign Service counterparts. Civil Service employees point out limited opportunities for career growth, the absence of career development points of contact, and limited outreach and recruitment efforts. Equally, the 2008 and 2009 Diversity and Inclusiveness Action Agendas were designed to address perceived inequities on behalf of the FSN community. Despite successful implementation of a number of related initiatives, the FSN community remains particularly outspoken in identifying perceived inequities of treatment. Additional targeted programs, and enhanced efforts to communicate these programs, is key to ultimately addressing the concerns of the FSN community. While

many of the divisions and demarcations underlying USAID's various employment categories are based on legal necessity, proactive outreach efforts must be put forth designed to enhance employee understanding of the basis surrounding different employment categories and addressing perceived inequities. Diversity and inclusiveness must extend to all Agency employees, independent of employment category. All employees must be treated fairly, equitably and with dignity and respect, their contributions valued, and to the maximum extent possible, opportunities for career growth, advancement and employee benefits must be made available transparently and equitably.

Much as in 2007, qualitative input received via survey comments indicate inadequate policies and procedures supportive of gay and lesbian employees, single parents, non-traditional members of household, and an aging workforce. A common thread of their message was a general lack of focus on the needs of these groups. The Council should further consider programs or activities that address their concerns. Again, USAID should work to ensure that equitable treatment for all truly is inclusive, and embodies gay and lesbian employees, single parents, non-traditional members of household, and employees of all ages. While recognizing these numerous concerns, and operating under finite resources, the Council should consider a strategy which effectively addresses the concerns of multiple constituencies, avoiding the peril of allowing their efforts to be spread too thin, ultimately limiting their overall impact.

Management must be held accountable for seeking to ensure a respectful, diverse workplace. The percentage of respondents who believe management is being held responsible declined 4% between 2007 and 2009. Managers must be rewarded for good supervision and management, and the absence of such must be addressed. As one employee put it, *"Until management is held to task in respect to being fair, objective, and transparent, employees won't have a chance."* The tone is set at the top. It is only through modeled behavior and active implementation of the Agency's policies and programs that true gains can be achieved.

Throughout its tenure, USAID and the Executive Diversity Council have made great strides in advancing diversity and inclusiveness. 2007 to 2009 was a prolonged period of turnover and transition for the Agency, which saw the departure of a number of strong senior advocates for the Agency's diversity initiatives. While operating within this environment, the Council succeeded in making a number of advances. These gains need to be solidified and built upon, and a number of outstanding areas remain to be addressed. As the Agency completes this period of transition, the champions of diversity need to step forward to ensure the Agency's commitment to diversity thrives within the Agency at an executive level, and permeates all reaches of the organization. The pursuit of diversity and inclusiveness cannot be isolated in scope or reach, but must start at the top, and enlist all employees to work towards its fulfillment.